

Paradigms for Philosophy of Food Politics

Rohollah Eslami¹ 

1. Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Faculty of Law and Political Science, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran.
(Corresponding Author Email: eslami.r@um.ac.ir)

Received: 2025-07-27

Revised : 2025-10-02

Accepted: 2026-06-03

Available Online: 2026-03-30

How to cite this article:

Eslami, R. (2026). Paradigms for Philosophy of Food Politics.
Iranian Political Studies Journal, 1(2): (21 - 41)
<https://doi.org/10.22067/ips.2026.94656.1013>

Abstract

Politics is the planning and orientation that draws the intelligence of human communities to achieve different goals. Politics is a platform where players have the power to try to direct the game according to their own interests. Actors such as governments, organizations, parties, classes, movements, and companies make meaningful issues based on the terminal points they have outlined for themselves. Food is one of the most crucial aspects of human life. What is a healthy and standard food? What are the health regimes and the epistemic systems governing food diversity or plurality? What should be the bases for water, soil, seeds, and food management, and also for the food distribution systems? It all stems from the political philosophy often underlying food policies. What kind of epistemic devices and networks of thought do food policymakers in the world refer to? In this paper, drawing on the theoretical paradigm framework developed by Thomas Kuhn and the normative approach, we analyze eight main philosophical paradigms in relation to food policy. In a sense, there are eight philosophical paradigms in the existing world food policy; depending on the epistemology or ideological apparatus (political apparatus), each political actor has a different type of thought and action.

Keywords

Food policy, political philosophy, paradigm, epistemology

Introduction

One of the sources of power for political actors is access to food production and distribution cycles. All human beings need food, and from this point of view, a government, organization, or company which have a good food policy will have a better place in the structure of international relations. All hegemonic powers plan for food and try to direct strategic foodstuffs and international food policy orientations to their advantage. One of the leading indicators of the evolution of history, for example, was the transition from the Middle Ages to the modern era of natural and human technologies that changed human diets. In this process, the traditional production methods were replaced by mechanical and modern

technologies, which led European countries to dominate India, Egypt, North America, and Latin America. In fact, the introduction of modernity began with mass-produced food policies and the use of diets structured in England and later in the USA. Food policy has evolved since the 1990s, driven by the development of information technologies. There is a kind of self-awareness and return to nature, with non-governmental actors placing a great deal of emphasis on the environment, care for soil and water, and on keeping up with nature, challenging the uniform policies of globalization in the food sector.

The question for this paper is what kind of political philosophy do food policies embody? The mass production policy, which supports organic cultivation, preserves food diversity, and prioritizes only a few strategic food commodities, promotes self-sufficiency in agricultural products, emphasizes environmental protection, encourages vegetarianism, and reduces meat consumption. It also involves separating halal¹ food products from Haram² products, reflecting a specific political philosophy. We believe that basic awareness and epistemological apparatus have a fundamental role in food policy. This article will analyze eight main philosophical paradigms in the field of food policy. Political actors, such as governments, international organizations, parties, corporations, guilds, and even classes, can be categorized into eight distinct paradigms. Sometimes they themselves produce hegemonic policies, and sometimes they resist the legitimacy of diets. There is considerable conflict among the eight philosophies, and each tries to promote and support a specific food policy. This article will analyze the eight paradigms of liberalism, Marxism, phenomenology, Islamism, feminism, nationalism, postmodernism, and technologists. These paradigms are behind the minds of political actors and consciously and unconsciously shape the food policy orientation.

Theoretical framework

This writing is based on the normative approach, which is embedded in political philosophy (Rimer, 2014: 73). In this sense, the paper is situated within the context of interdisciplinary studies between agricultural (food policy) and political sciences. To qualitatively analyze the phenomena of political philosophy in the field of food policy, we have employed three interpretive theories: paradigm, epistemology, and apparatus, each of which can help clarify the issue. Within each of these interpretive packages, there are semantic mechanisms that allow the interpretation of political philosophy paradigms and their implications for food policy.

What is the paradigm? Cohen's book, *The Structure of the World's Scientific Revolutions*, demonstrated that a theory was developed in the natural sciences and could revolutionize existing theories by gaining consensus among scientists. He argued that scientific theories are not continuous and cumulative, but rather revolutionary, and political dynasties have a history of revolution and rupture. So we face the paradigm, and especially in the humanities, there are always different paradigms in every subject. The consensus among scholars and think tanks is that the paradigm is acceptable (Kuhn, 2012). In the first phase, the purpose of the article is to illustrate the eight philosophical paradigms on food policy, all of which currently exist and compete with one another.

Epistemology? French post-structuralist thinker Foucault demonstrated, through the Use of Archae-

1. Halal foods are those produced and prepared according to the Islamic rules and regulations.

2. Haram is the opposite of Halal.

ological and genealogical methods, that human knowledge is produced within a network of power. That is, every knowledge is formed directly in relation to power, and there is always intense competition between epistemic devices or epistemologies. Knowledge is not impartial, scientific, positive, and humanistic, but always power-oriented, as Nietzsche analyzes, in epistemic systems (Foucault, 2002). We employ this theory to elucidate the relationship between power regimes and knowledge regimes in the text, demonstrating that all philosophical paradigms possess power-oriented wills and should not be regarded as impartial or scientific knowledge (Foucault, 1977).

Ideological Apparatus? Agamben, the postmodern Italian thinker, also highlights the ideological underpinnings of Foucault's theories. In his view, there are always political, trade, and class roots within the epistemic apparatus of knowledge, so that, as weapons, military and economic power are the sources of power, knowledge is the same as the apparatus. Knowledge is the dominant mechanism, and dominance without power and knowledge is not established without a network of relationships among political actors (Agamben, 2009). We utilize Agamben's theory to analyze each of the eight philosophical paradigms studied, examining a network of parties, institutions, pressure groups, governments, and international organizations that serve as mechanisms of power. In fact, human beings are always seeking to strengthen their position and utilize ideological knowledge and mechanisms to foster relationships based on their own interests. Every paradigm is like the dominant ideology of soft power. Table 1 presents the framework for the philosophy of food policy.

Table 1: Theoretical Framework of Food Policy Philosophy

framework theory	Thinker	Definition
Paradigm	Thomas Kuhn	Theoretical consensus of scientists, intellectual sharing, and the intellectual elite approved by the scientific elite.
Epistemology	Michel Foucault	Epistemology that has a two-way relationship with power regimes.
Ideological Apparatus	Giorgio Agamben	Intellectual apparatus and brain packs are ready to maintain and expand power.

1. Liberalism

Since 1990, liberalism has become the hegemonic idea. The central point of liberalism is the belief in freedom and individualism, in the sense that if one is to be abandoned and the ban is reduced, spontaneous order will produce the best (Wall, 2015: 14). The difference between humans and other beings lies in the degree of freedom and ability to use reason. Throughout history, humanity has been plagued by mythical, religious, philosophical, and ideological idols; only in the modern age has it been possible to achieve a rational civilization with the help of science. On the basis, liberalism draws on the theses of thinkers such as Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Charles de Montesquieu, John Stuart Mill, Immanuel Kant, Friedrich Hayek, and John Rawls. This narrative now dominates all advanced countries in a way that has shaped the most fundamental paradigm of life since the Renaissance (Rawls, 1993). Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, liberalism has been regarded as the only victorious school of power currents, and even

Francis Fukuyama has called the liberal paradigm the latest version of human reason (Fukuyama, 2006). According to the Liberals' paradigm, what is rational and practical is only possible in the realm of science. According to Karl Mannheim, the new science is democratic, and the construction and establishment of democracy is compatible with the liberalism of the middle class (Mannheim, 1950). Liberalism takes the power of knowledge from the aristocracy and provides equal opportunities for education by establishing universities for citizens. In this version of optimism, there is an evolutionary and continuous view of human reason, and human history is seen as a continuous progression that culminates in the end of liberalism. Rationality, freedom, humanism, individualism, secularism, science, market, competition, and spontaneous order are the constituent elements of the liberal apparatus.

Liberalism in politics has concepts that have been developed in modern times. Belief in the national government, which is now a major player in international relations, as well as the constitution of power mechanics based on the constitutionality of the state, is the foundation of the political philosophy of liberalism (Wall, 2015: 165-167). Liberals believe that free and wise men themselves know what truth and happiness are and that governments should, as far as possible, respect the market system for goods such as power, wealth, and pleasure. It is the market that elects, dismisses, and shapes the elite. Parties are political companies that also shape national interests in pursuit of their own interests. Parliament and the cabinet are like designers and executives of the stock market. If they find a villain who wants to disrupt the fair game, the government will act as a powerful but small and innovative civil police force. Democracy, citizenship, and human rights, therefore, are the political foundations of liberalism in order to defend human freedom. In the international arena, too, liberals believe in free competition and the regulation of international law based on a social contract. Liberalists believe that, as in countries within the international environment, they differ in terms of actors' ability, effort, technology, and policy-making, and inequality is quite natural. Every actor must demonstrate their ability to compete without resorting to dumping. Competition is also regulated by international law and organizations, based on the principles of ignorance and fairness, to reduce inefficiencies such as instability, war, poverty, and drought. Now, all developed and many developing countries, except for some socialist and Islamic countries, have adopted the principles of liberalism and formulated their behavior according to the rules of the United Nations, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization, and other capitalist institutions.

The paradigm of food liberalism, as well as its foundations and politics, is rooted in scientific and competitive epistemology. Scientific in the sense that they believe science can manage the world. Science is an inductive and empirical knowledge that has universal rules of thumb. Humans in the age of dying have been able to identify the rules governing the cultivation and production of food through science and eliminate many famines, waste, and malnutrition processes. Science has enabled the creation of abundant food through technology, providing a wide variety of high-energy foods and vitamins that nourish billions of the world's population. With each passing decade, humans have been utilizing soil and water more effectively, thanks to the advancements in science and technology, resulting in increased productivity. Flood irrigation and traditional farming have evolved into mechanized farming, while costly livestock and hunting have become outdated and are now largely replaced by scientific methods. Wherever science has advanced, suffering, sickness, famine, and malnutrition have disappeared. All fruits are now produced throughout the year, and water, heat, and other severe crises, as well as thousands of types of pests, have been eliminated through experimentation and environmental control. Science has been the miracle of salvation of the human being who receives capital and

political support every day in the light of a free society and rational research, and now more countries take refuge in its safe haven.

There are no obstacles to human reason, and science has discovered all the previously unknown territories. If human beings once prayed for God to send rain for them, and the angels of the Earth would be fertile and goblins away, now with the construction of dams, deep wells, production of chemical fertilizers, application of drip irrigation, greenhouse cultivation, livestock and poultry, and fish farming. All barriers have been removed. The production of all types of food is possible, and food has become cheaper and more affordable. The competition and profits from the market economy have increased class mobility and financial incentives for peasants and producers. Technology has come to their service, and animal, marine, and agricultural products have global customers.

Technology has made it possible for frozen warehouses and durable packaging. Food production and distribution processes have gained a comparative advantage due to the principle of competition. In short, the optimistic approach of human food liberalism is closely linked with the market and science. Science, combined with mass production technology, provides the market with conditions for sales and profit. Citizens turn out from being enslaved to being useful, healthy, hopeful, and effective individuals who can overcome the constraints of time and place, as well as any powers that have deprived them of food.

2. Marxism

Karl Marx founded the Marxist paradigm. Before Marx, in ancient times, Plato and Mazdak, and in the modern period, Simon and Rousseau exhibited socialist tendencies, but Marx laid out all the lines that led to him (Rimer, 2014: 176). According to Marx, human beings make sense in society, and to understand human collective behavior and the interpretation of history, one must refer to material indices, especially the devices and means of production. In Marx's view, all philosophers were dependent agents of the elite class who interpreted events conservatively; for the first time, he sought to produce true consciousness with a revolutionary drive that would lead to change. This paradigm was formed by Marx's propositions on class conflict and garnered many supporters (Marx, 2008). Human beings are instinctively inclined to Marxism because it is simple and packed with thoughts, and seeks to achieve a paradise for the equality of religions in the name of communism on the Earth. Marxists believe that the whole history of class struggle is, but fortunately, in every revolution, the level of consciousness and action of the lower classes increases, and the upper classes are curtailed and overthrown (Harvey, 2010). It is a deterministic movement, and economic infrastructures largely determine all aspects of human life, including law, religion, culture, politics, and the family. In short, Marxism's intellectual foundations are a form of deterministic materialism that traces its roots to the underlying indicators of economics, making human beings meaningful only in the collective form of classes (Fine, 2010).

Politically, the Marxist paradigm employs a critical approach, positing that history is the comprehensive narrative of the struggle between the lower classes and those who have seized control of the means of production. Humans are inherently equal, yet they are often repressed in the name of rationality, freedom, individualism, and competition. When we are all equal, why are a small portion of human beings capable and able to afford them all, but most citizens do not enjoy the right to a healthy and natural life? Marxists believe that the ideologues of the state and the apparatuses of the capitalist system have enslaved and subjugated all citizens (Althusser, 2014). Humans are often unaware of their circumstances, and the ideology of all citizens is so deeply entrenched in the illusions of happiness

that they have been denied the possibility of critical action. The revolutions have gone into oblivion, and the last fortress of liberation, the Soviet Union, has also fallen apart. Welfare-left governments have disappeared under the pressure of the capitalist system, and any resistance to the market is doomed. According to the Marxist paradigm, not all versions of liberalism are a mirage, and what is happening in reality is the cruel and ruthless system of capitalism that has made human beings cheap laborers in the global form and colonized all world citizens with instrumental reason. Humans have no authority, and as creatures of alien and one-dimensional beings, are caught up in the aristocratic hierarchy of capitalists. According to Marx, states are parasites that are the tools of the capitalists to draw the blood of the lower classes. The entire judicial system, the church, the law, the political system, the schools, and the universities are capitalist ideological devices that have bound the world together in the name of the market and in coalition internationally. Marxists reject inequality and strive to anger and criticize workers and peasants for a self-conscious revolution.

This paradigm on food extends its political philosophy, namely that the birth and distribution of food in the world is unfair and inefficient. This is mainly due to the capitalist system. The capitalist system is limited by the logic of profit and gain, driven by individuals who have monopolized the food market through force, propaganda, and government support. Capitalism has destroyed all natural based for healthy food processes. From the beginning, it has destroyed various products to benefit others and promote the principle of comparative advantage. The logic of money has assigned every region of the world to a particular crop, thereby destroying the genetic diversity of crops. The capitalists' insatiable greed has distorted the natural color and taste of products, rendering all food artificial and potentially harmful. The use of different fertilizers and pesticides has exacerbated various cancers and diseases. Unhealthy agricultural products are mass-produced in experimental and greenhouse environments, resulting in a loss of their originality and natural status. These unhealthy products are delivered to the customer with beautiful packaging and a deceptively expensive advertising system. The logic of rush and benefit raises various livestock and poultry by injecting ampoules and forcing pills, and what does not matter is human health. Capitalism shows no mercy even to the land and water. It has destroyed the soil due to excessive cultivation and has ruined the water due to overuse. The plains have subsided, the forests have been destroyed, the Arctic ice has melted, and everything in existence has been exploited by capital.

Marxists believe that not only production but also food distribution is unjust. Every year, many products are lost to maintain the market. The expropriation and destruction of commodities is an obvious thing in the capitalist system (Albritton, 2009: 170-175). Banks and companies based in developed countries often exploit all workers and peasants in underdeveloped countries. Irregular and unreliable contracts and very low wages for workers, and the use of cheap labor for women and children in poor countries are commonplace in the capitalist system. The brutal system of capitalism and the unjust logic of capitalism benefit by creating war and instability, destroying various biological and agricultural patterns. It destroys the environment, and banks and multinationals serve the trees, forests, water, and soil. In corporations, the labor is done by people from poor countries, but the profits are taken by the capitalists.

The Marxist paradigm of present-day food policy views the world as capitalist and seeks to critique and raise awareness about the creation of a world led by the American-led liberal empire (Albritton, 2009: 186). Marxists believe that the mechanisms of food production and distribution must be based on justice and equality for human beings, as they are all equal. The first person to create a circle around themselves and claim ownership made a significant mistake. People must revolutionize the

creation of a food justice system, reversing the decline in dietary diversity, reducing the power of brokers and global stock exchange systems, and preventing oppression. Liberalism has formed a media, legal, and security system under the slogan and in the realm of capitalism that has a global network of diet regimes and will remain in power until food is taken from this paradigm.

3. Phenomenology

Phenomenology is rooted in the ideas of Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger, originating in Germany. Husserl believed that Descartes began the philosophical basis of modernity with the dualism of mind and object and the quantification of all phenomena. Descartes believed that the human mind is capable of discovering the universe and that humans are a distinct entity that can control all other beings. According to Husserl, modern science, influenced by Descartes and Bacon's humanistic ideas, has attributed the status of a human being to God and has created environmental crises through its attacks on existence, leading to the inexorable conquest of the world (Moran, 2012). The mathematics of the universe was not only confined to the natural environment but also occupied the human world. All subjects, from nature and man to emotions and morals, became numbers, and the inexhaustible human desire occupied all the breathing spaces of existence (Smith, 2007). In Heidegger's view, man has overcome his self-centeredness by focusing his intellect; however, we are becoming increasingly caught up in the good we think. According to Heidegger, in *Being and Time* and the works leading up to it, the focus is on the conditions in which human beings find themselves. Humans have been placed in history, language, and existence, and have been thrown into existence more correctly. How can a weak, flawed, mortal, and resilient creature overcome and seek to subdue it? Heidegger suggests that one should doubt modern knowledge and reexamine the foundations of Western rationality. From Plato to the present, the world has been interpreted in terms of the human subject, and such selfishness needs to be rethought (Wrathall, 2011).

Husserl's phenomenology was a scientific endeavor that sought to identify and address the crisis of modernity and the West in the twentieth century, drawing on the philosophy of critical thought. However, Heidegger was a philosophical and existential phenomenologist and suspended all Western subject-oriented consciousness. Heidegger believes that human beings come first, and we are thrown into the world; therefore, it is our duty to listen to and respect that being (Heidegger, 2001). According to Heidegger's thought, even the world's mystical religions and traditions were better understood. When they looked at the Rhine, they saw the power of God, the sound of water, and the beauty of nature, but the modern world has led us to constantly rely on the power of turbines, horsepower, and kilowatts of electricity. We have destroyed the beauty of the world through the myth of deconstruction in the name of reason, entrapping ourselves in a cage for profit. We have conceived the world as a source of energy for humanity, even though the world possesses more power than we do. Humans have always been the guardians of existence and shepherds of the environment, but now we are boundless looters working to destroy the environment. We could only listen to nature's care, care for it, and nature would continue to do so. However, with the destruction of forests, the elimination of animal species, the diversion of rivers and streams, and the conversion of gardens and grasslands into residential and economic zones, nature's care is compromised. We have transformed the Earth into a dustbin. Phenomenologists are devoid of science, modernity, and Western reason, and humanity's main enemy is technology. Phenomenologists believe that technology is not a tool, but a biological

world that destroys human behavior and ethics. Technology was created for power generation, and modern technologies have deterministically made man the enemy of nature. No marshes, wetlands, forests, rivers, or plains were immune to the power of human technology, and everywhere they were conquered by the force of scientific tools. This conquest broke billions of years of environmental laws, and the world went into turmoil. Arctic ice is now melting, the planet is warming, forests are burning, streams are drying up, and drought and dehydration are sweeping the Earth. Sudden changes in weather, earthquakes, and unpredictable storms are signs of environmental destruction. Existence has rules and reason, and now it has invaded our lives because humans have invaded it.

According to political philosophy, diet phenomenologists have not been beyond the reach of modernity and Western science. In the past, although humans lived in mythological, religious, or philosophical phenomena, environmentally friendly foods were diverse. Technology has now unified all foods. The phenomenological paradigm holds that human foods are not produced with respect to existence. They rule the logic of numbers and mathematics. In the past, plants, animals, and humans formed a natural cycle of harmonious living that had internal order, spontaneous defense mechanisms, and proliferative capabilities. Technology has now destroyed the original taste of food, and its use—through the creation of tractors, combines, and various mechanical and digital tools—has primarily been aimed at accelerating growth and increasing profits. Chemical fertilizers and pesticides have ruined the taste of fruits, and the hormones used in the production of chemicals and medicines have contaminated meat and animal products. All foods are spoiled and have fallen into the cycle of producing unknown diseases. The logic of profit and mathematics has led humans to create dietary technology without relying on time or place, which has increased the incidence of cancer and unknown pain. In the age of technology and machines, people no longer understand the taste of apples and cherries, and everything they eat, from milk to meat, has become artificial. Most vegetables and other plants are toxic, and poultry and eggs are all crafted according to the logic of speed and utility. Even organic-labeled foods are manipulated in laboratories and greenhouses. Nature is in danger, and humanity has become rebellious.

According to the phenomenological paradigm, one must respect the existence, hear the sound of water, and not disrupt the logic and order of the environment. Every plant and product, wherever it has been produced for centuries, is the same, and human beings have no right to disrupt the natural flow of water and the paths of soil and forest trees. History and geography have power, and humans are very powerless because they are a part of the natural world. Environmentalist political movements, especially green parties and movements, have phenomenological ideas. Even mystical philosophies, orientalist, and ancient religions have much sympathy with phenomenologists. The result is that if one listens to the environment and nature, and does not interfere with its logic, it will have access to authentic, natural, and varied foods. If the modern and technological way goes, the human race will be destroyed because it is destroying its home, that is, existence.

4. Feminism

Humanity had forgotten for centuries a significant issue in the name of women, who make up half of the human population, and it was feminists who commemorated this significant loss. Feminism is a pivotal critical paradigm that posits the history of thought in the world was written by men, and that philosophy, myth, religion, and science were predominantly male narratives. In a sense, feminists are advocates of

women's rights who are trying to bring half of the eliminated population into the public sphere by deconstructing male reason. Looking at it from a woman's perspective, women have historically been excluded from education, economic, and social fields, as well as political participation, due to their epistemic systems and practices. Historically, women have been considered primarily responsible for the home, children, and husband, and are often depicted as non-citizens (Dobson, 2006: 53). Even in the 21st century, women continue to face limited representation in politics and policymaking, and their role in leadership remains underrepresented. What seems natural and obvious is to move women to the private sphere and the underworld and to turn them into unequal beings who, with a great deal of effort, get only a slight right, is the great silence of history, which feminists have challenged.

The feminist paradigm has three well-known narratives. The first version is of liberal feminists who believe that women should have equal rights with men (Mill, 2012). This narrative emerged in the wake of the French Revolution, particularly among elite and middle-class women, whose primary demand was political participation, especially the right to vote. Later, of course, it was promoted to a candidate for political office and a major policy maker. The second version of Marxist feminists, formed from the middle and lower classes, was influenced by Marx's ideas and believed that women should be able to participate in social and especially economic activities like men (De Beauvoir, 1949). There should be no discrimination in the choice of job, employment, and wage, and women have the same rights as men. Under the influence of leftist socialist ideas, this wave demanded equal economic participation by women in society and achieved significant gains, often in opposition to and criticism of capitalism. The third version was formed in the late twentieth century and is influenced by postmodern thought. Postmodern feminists believe that two previous versions of masculine discourse have been thought and acted upon so far, and femininity must be recognized. This wave believes that advocating for women's rights is only possible from a woman's perspective. Women are different from men, and this difference must be recognized. This difference does not mean that women are discriminated against and excluded from the public sphere and politics, but rather that they are empowered and have abilities that have made women superior to men and can complement male intellectual deficiency. Women possess characteristics such as affection, love, maternity, caring, nursing, and empathy, which are precisely the opposite of the dry and aggressive traits of men. Men have written the history of science and philosophy, and philosophers and politicians have often been men. Men are left with nothing but destruction and a souvenir of the attack, and wherever a few men gather, they must devise a plan to invade (Genevieve, 2004). Man means death, imperfection, and destruction, because men are not capable of giving birth and perpetuating a generation. In contrast, women are associated with birth, life, and the continuity of a generation, implying that they are closer to nature and the environment. The elements of nature and the environment are more closely aligned with the mental and physical structure of women. Women tend to understand flowers and trees more, possess a gentler and more natural sense of Being, and are more mindful of nature. The third generation is considered radical because it rebels against many traditional masculine structures, ranging from the family to the legal and political systems, and features revolutionary literature (Dobson, 2006: 62).

As for food, feminists in the first and second narratives criticize the capitalist structure and inadequate distribution of food, believing that drought, food policy, and men's lifestyles have led to malnutrition and starvation. Women require high amounts of vitamins and nutrients due to childbearing, but are often deprived of them. Even women have little access to sunlight and exercise. Women in

poor underdeveloped countries are weak and hungry, and in developed countries, they have to be austere and lean because of the prevailing fashion trends. The feminist paradigm holds that religion, myth, and science are equally involved in women's deprivation, and men have always received the highest and best share of food. Even now, it promotes the propaganda of skinny women and fashions that shape the popular determinism of women's lifestyles.

Women have historically been food producers, and while men were hunting and fighting, women cooked together with care. Cooking is an art, and if this feminine art were taken seriously—and celebrated through festivals and exhibitions rather than scientific or militaristic displays—the world would experience greater peace. Women listen more closely to the call of Being and show more profound respect for the Earth and its flowers and trees. Feminists argue that women perceive color and taste more intuitively, as if nature speaks to them in a new way. If men also engage in cooking and child-rearing and collaborate with women in private spheres, they cultivate greater affection. When men cook, they tend to value food more, and feminists argue that men should embrace a measure of femininity. History has witnessed little constructive masculinity, and perhaps the twenty-first century may mark a turn toward femininity. Women now form parties, movements, groups, and manifestos supported by developed countries, the European Union, and the United Nations. This movement advocates for the equitable distribution of food, the education of men in cooking, the organization of food festivals, and the use of food as a diplomatic tool. It maintains that wherever women are present, war is absent, the environment is more peaceful, and communities have something to eat.

5. Nationalism

Nationalists believe we are not one of the existing political philosophies; we are the only real and applicable paradigm. This paradigm was founded on Machiavelli's ideas and was developed by Hegel and Weber. Machiavelli wrote that his ideal paradise is Italy, his motherland, where happiness is to be realized. According to Machiavelli in *The Prince*, he works in every way possible and by any means to further the national interest of his country. The public interest, the national interest, and the good of the country are the ultimate goals of all political actors, and in this respect, individual morality, goodness, and reliance on moral virtues are of no use. However, instead of an efficient blend of the lion's courage and the fox's virtues (Machiavelli, 2008: 65). Ethnicity, tribe, and clan, as well as globalization and the concept of the global village, are abstract and groundless concepts created by idealists in the world of politics. The primary political unit and main actor in state policy are nations, which are modern countries characterized by sovereignty, a government, citizens, and geographical boundaries that shape political transactions. In Spinoza's view, there is no sin or evil outside the state, and if one country does not prosper in this world, there will be no rest in the world. There is a link between patriotism, defending the national government, and development in nationalist literature.

This literature was developed by the German philosopher Hegel, who demonstrated in the course of his thought that every time human beings can create a national state beyond the family and civil society, it has reached the height of rationality. In Hegel's view, the ultimate human mind was the Napoleonic cannon and the creation of a national government that was established in Europe and was drawn to all parts of the world. The empire, the city government, the clan of tribes, the king, the caliphate, and others were scattered, disordered, and irrational forms of political entities, and it was only in the new era that the nation-state was formed, based on a balance of security and freedom in the sense of

law. Although technology has advanced enormously in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries and numerous political scholars and schools of thought have emerged, Hegel still defines nationalism and the defense of nation-states as the unfolding of rationality. The United Nations, international law, the European Union, regionalism, human rights, the Internet, and networked societies, among others, have failed to undermine the credibility of the nation-state. Governance and the global village are no more than slogans; what remains genuine is the national interest and the preservation of the national state in every way possible (Dobson, 2006: 82).

The paradigm of nationalism is pragmatic and conservative, meaning that it views all grand propositions offered to societies as utopian and illusory, and holds that any step forward must be taken only when the ground is firmly secured beneath one's feet. This paradigm holds that the environment and ecology of the world's regions are not our concern, but what is important for the conservation of soil and water is the territory beyond national borders. It is the government's responsibility to produce healthy and sufficient food, and governments must meet the needs of citizens in every way possible, whether through peace, diplomacy, or force and war. There are strategic commodities, such as wheat and maize, in which the country must be self-sufficient in any way possible or, if it is dependent on another country, that country depends on our particular product. This is the formula that only power can be restrained by power, and countries in the anarchic field of international relations know nothing but encouragement and punishment; any ethics, norms, and values should be nothing but ideal slogans and failures.

The country must be self-sufficient in the production of food, fruit, energy, and in protecting its soil and climate, and utilize its maximum potential. It does not matter what the situation is in the neighborhood, the region, or the world; what matters is the needs of the nationals. Each country only guarantees the food of its citizens and must do its best to preserve the natural resources that, if followed by international actors, will achieve an appropriate balance in the international arena. The slogans of human rights, environmentalism, greenhouse gases, and the fight against poverty, and so forth, issued by the so-called cosmopolitan idealists will not harm the national interests of the countries that these gangs have cheated. Every politician is responsible for their own country, and every political actor must think about their own government, because multinational, sectarian, and cosmopolitan ideals will destroy the leviathan giant. The government must maintain a monopoly on power, and if national interest in food and food policy is neglected, relying on companies and other countries, national interest will disappear.

The government should possess the production and distribution of barley, wheat, rice, soybeans, and food-sensitive commodities, provide financial support to the private sector within the country, and offer opportunities for competition and production. Resist the entry of food products and never make the country dependent on other organizations and governments. Even legal and environmental regulations and regimes should not hinder the country's self-sufficiency and preservation of its food diversity. Food production and distribution are politics, and if any government is weak in this regard, it endangers all other features. The policy of Nizam al-Mulk, the national thinker of Iran, states that Moses did not destroy what God did to Pharaoh because he was the bread provider of his people, and thousands upon thousands of people lined up at Pharaoh's table (Yavari, 2018). The paradigm of nationalism is realistic; it does not rely on slogans of globalization or environmental protection. It is conservative; it does not make any concessions that the national interest is marginalized, and it produces

strategic food commodities independently. Alternatively, with the policy of buyer and customer diversification and domestic birth protection, it tries not to give the country a thorn in the face (Dobson, 2006: 88). Therefore, this paradigm in the production, distribution, and consumption of goods has the complete monopoly of policy making in the national interest.

6. Postmodernism

The postmodernism paradigm is a break with modernism and the age of mechanics, marking the entry into the quantum period. It was first formulated in the philosophy of postmodernism through critiques of Nietzsche, Freud, and Marx by thinkers from capitalist civilization, and later continued in the twentieth century by their exponents, such as Derrida, Lyotard, Lacan, Boudiar, and Deleuze (Bauman, 1992). Postmodernism is a deconstructing and rejecting foundation, with no fear of achieving freedom, and ridicules all taboos and red lines. According to this paradigm, humans are creatures that constantly deceive themselves, and the different narratives are the imagination and mental patterns that organize the world through willpower (Lyotard, 1989). There is no fundamental difference between myth and science, and the same forms of satisfaction and hardship once experienced by Native Americans are now shared by citizens of the Information Age. What deceives us is the media, images, universities, and science centers. In the past, people would go to a priest and confess their private secrets in order to be absolved by their spiritual father and to feel liberated. Now they go to the psychologist and confess to all their personal issues that they might be liberated from. The old knowledge of religion is often referred to as superstition, and the new knowledge of science is often referred to as science. At the same time, both have the same level of institutional power. Postmodernism holds that the world is not as we perceive it, and that scientific knowledge is merely one form of human knowledge that has established relations of subjection.

Postmodernists believe that human beings constantly create stories and narratives to deceive themselves and others, and that history is nothing more than a collection of random and meaningless events written by the victors. Whether conquered by the king or the minister, or by the fortunate inventor and author of the billions of works that have been coincidentally coincidental. History, like all science and thought, is nothing but rupture, emptiness, and fragmentation. The postmodernist stream, therefore, intends to scandalize all self-evident concepts and propositions.

Power is ubiquitous—within government institutions, organizations, public spaces, and everyday life—such that individuals are, in Foucault's terms, immersed in networks of power (Foucault, 2002). Therefore, neutrality, scientificity, public interest, and national interest are words produced by policymakers and academic associates for subordination. All colleges and institutions, like parties and corporations, have a will to power. Science is power, and if it is not power, no science will survive. There is also fierce competition between the various sciences to reach the center of power. Psychologists blame all people with mental health problems; criminalize citizens' law and ignorance of citizenship rights, physicians make people sick, and food science experts consider all production unhealthy and corrupt, so they can manipulate budget and policy centers by manipulating public opinion. Postmodernists believe that the dominant narrative of food and what humans use is influenced by power. Power decides which products are widespread and which ones to marginalize. Self-sufficiency policies or comparative advantage are both justified. Mechanical or organic production policies are pretty similar. Postmodernists argue that food companies and related organizations, including lobbying

groups, seek to promote their products by shaping and manipulating public opinion while pushing competitors out of the market. The media plays a decisive role in shaping diets (Baudrillard, 1988), determining the style and content of food that will be prevalent in a region. Those who criticize and promote healthy and natural foods should be questioned whenever they use repetitive sentences and advertising mechanisms, because healthy, standard, scientific, hygienic, and natural diets are no longer the norm. Attractive in the hospital, psychiatrists at the hospital, food scientists at the university, and lab produce science for their own benefit, and in reality have no choice but to rise above the hierarchy of institutions and government. There is the conquest of organizations, public opinion, and government funding, as well as the intimidation to deliver products and services in the food science arena.

In the Middle Ages, for example, humans struggled to prosper and enjoy the afterlife, practicing austerity and fasting, and the same relationships are now prevalent in new diets. Vegetarianism, refusal to eat, and rigid diets have made fashion lean. Companies and entities that produce and distribute food products operate in highly professional and specialized ways, shaping distinct culinary styles and consumption patterns. Postmodernists believe that food, even taste, is shaped by power regimes. Human thinking is shaped by the media, over which the epistemology of medical science has a predominant influence (Kellner, 1995). Warning, panic, and then the release of products in the name of health are the secret advertising that organizes the food market. So food is also an industry dominated by both technological tools and thought technologies. In the name of the narrative of the food industry's progress, it moves forward with a show that has occupied all public areas. Imagination in a crowded, messy world has been stifled, and critical thinking has been overshadowed by experts and professors who have come to power. This power extends not only to the state but also to public and private institutions and organizations. The development and endurance of reason in modern civilization is not an illusion; however, many of the so-called food standards are merely propagandistic stereotypes based not on principles of induction but on rules of analogy. An analogy with the intentions of domination and the networks of power that govern humanity by fixing symbolic capital.

7. Islamism

Religions possess a philosophical framework and have been shaped by a set of concepts that have structured their worldview throughout history. In modern times, religions have often become mythological and have shifted from the public and political to the religious and private. Islam has not undergone such a development, and unlike other religions, it has a strong presence in society, politics, economics, movements, and policy-making of the twentieth century. In addition to the fact that Islam has shaped the private worship, ethics, and beliefs of Muslims, it clearly has economic, social, and political binding and identifiable rules that are fully implemented even in the 21st century. Islam means submission to God. In this religion, God is one, and the world is temporary, and what is true is the Hereafter. God created humans and sent the prophets to guide them. The last and most complete Prophet and religion is believed to be Prophet Muhammad and the religion of Islam. Monotheism, Resurrection, and Prophecy are core tenets of the Islamic faith, shaped by additional doctrinal elements, such as justice, the Imamate, and other theological distinctions between Shi'a and Sunni traditions. The religion of Islam declares that God sends a message to the Muslims through revelation and that what is stated in the Qur'an is accepted as the chapter of punishment. After the Qur'an, the Prophet's traditions are recognized as sources, and then the actions and speeches of the companions, Rashid Caliphs,

Imams, and jurists are the source of thought and judgment. Islam encompasses a range of intellectual, theological, philosophical, instructional, and mystical aspects. Jurisprudential and theological tendencies tend to relegate and defend religion, and philosophical and mystical tendencies move toward interpretation and rationalism. In each of these tendencies, there is the idea of cosmism and religious hierarchy, and the world of divine metaphysics dominates everyday life. Islam is a secular religion that promotes a prosperous life. Muslims believe that one should always work and think about subsistence. In a sense, Islam is not austere, isolationist, or fatalistic. Human beings must constantly make jihad and use all their efforts to learn and acquire science. In Islam, science is more important than worship, and it is recommended to think and lead a good life.

Islam built a formidable medieval civilization with significant scientific achievements. However, it eventually lost its central place as Mongol invasions, militant dominance, and the expansion of Sufi thought pushed it to the margins. Cynicism, austerity, political despotism, and worldwide anti-philosophical principles were prevalent among Muslims. While western countries have been undergoing religious reforms, scientific and political revolutions since the 16th century, medieval times continued in the Islamic world until one hundred years ago. In the new era, reformist, constitutional, and revolutionary movements sought to rethink Islam, while economic and political relations were still in flux. In the paradigm of Islamic political thought, the goal of the formation of the Islamic Ummah is to carry out Islamic rulings by the Islamic State and to maintain the tradition of the past. This interpretation is promoted in radical and fundamentalist readings. These readings are often incapable of understanding new environmental and food issues because they are unable to rethink and adapt to current conditions. In traditional fundamentalist thought, the principle is with the believer, and existence is created for him. Humans are regarded as superior beings who claim the right to use water, soil, land, and animals as they wish. Everything is presumed to exist for their benefit, and nature is viewed as lacking any inherent understanding. Humanity is seen as divine and as God's representative on the Earth, with "being" conceived as a divine gift bestowed upon it. Under such an intensely anthropocentric and carnivorous mindset, hunting, environmental destruction, and the rejection of any form of moderation toward nature naturally follow. However, in the mystical and intellectual currents that emerged at the end of the twentieth century, there are signs of environmentalism and a growing consonance with nature. That man is also a part of nature and must respect existence. For example, by referring to Hafiz³ and Rumi⁴, it is acknowledged that all intelligent beings with a right to life are respected. One should respect animals, as stated in the Qur'an and the Prophet's tradition. It is not right to constantly shed blood, kill creatures, and destroy forests and natural life. These thought tendencies have embraced the idea of balancing and not disrupting the ecosystem.

In the Islamic paradigm, diet also has a special tradition. Muslims categorize food into Halal and Haram (Ayatollahi, 1992: 118). Halal refers to foods that are permitted for consumption by God; most halal foods include mutton, poultry, beef, as well as vegetables and fruits. Forbidden diets include pork, blood, and animal carcasses. In Islam, alcohol is also forbidden. To make it easier for Muslims to distinguish between lawful and forbidden things, halal signs have been introduced in restaurants, fast-food

3. *Persian poet (1315-1390)*

4. *Persian poet (1207-1273)*

establishments, companies, and on various other products in the 21st century. Islamic countries have their own dietary regimes and drinks with a legal symbol. Muslims also believe in fasting and set aside one month from dawn to dusk to abstain from eating and drinking. According to Muslims, fasting is about balancing, healing, and allowing the body to rest.

Muslims are encouraged to stop eating before they are full and to eat before they become hungry. They are advised to chew their food thoroughly and to reflect on what they eat, in accordance with the Quran. Islamic dietary practices involve ritualized behaviors: at the dining table, people often sit together politely and respectfully, observing social hierarchies. Meals begin with the name of God and end with a prayer. The Muslim diet is diverse, encompassing both traditional and spicy foods, often prepared according to principles of hot and cold elements. Muslims believe in maintaining a balance between these qualities, and they consider food a blessing from God. Consequently, when they see pieces of bread on the ground, they treat them with respect and collect them.

8. Technologists

Technique is a tool that can overcome the limitations of location, time, and power (Nye, 2004). The difference between man and other beings is in technical reason. The technique shortens the paths that disrupt geography and history in a way that often fulfills one's wishes. Technique is the deceptive and instrumental reason of human beings who, with the inventions and discoveries of engineering, medicine, humanities, and social sciences, try to disrupt and provide the firm natural axioms and principles. Technologists believe that through evolutionary wisdom, human evolution will continue to advance and reflect the history of ascending and transcending reason. Technique is identity for humans, and all analyses of science and technology that trace the history of decay and destruction have mental problems and pessimism. Humans have reduced sickness; medical advances have increased lifespan; health has reached all continents; and biomarkers have been established. Engineering technologies have enabled the creation of dams, bridges, roads, and advanced transportation infrastructure. Even if there is skepticism that science has been handed over to evil forces, it is primarily due to the advances in media and the invention of the Internet and social networks, from which bad news spreads faster and more widely.

Most of the bad news and pessimistic analysis is wrong. Human beings have been able to harness dictatorship and despotism through techniques such as parliament, constitutionalism, separation of powers, a constitution, civil society, and democracy. With the invention of the atomic bomb and other powerful weapons, wars have been constrained by the balance of power and the looming threat of destruction. Genocide and religious and tribal wars are on the decline, and the waves of democracy in the 21st century have accelerated with new social movements (Mossberger, 2008). Technology has profoundly impacted all aspects of human life, and information technology has revolutionized them in particular. A revolution that has provided hope for the survival and fulfillment of mechanically suppressed aspirations. In the modern age, with mechanical technologies, human beings have tried hard to reduce death, illness, despotism, war, floods, and earthquakes, but they have failed. In the information age, due to databases and information aristocracy facilitated through the Internet and software, there is a growing human capacity. Technologists believe that it is easier for women, children, workers, and all other social groups to assert their rights in the information age.

In the information age, technology has enhanced humans' ability to tackle previously unsolvable and

exciting problems. For example, the human genome map has been completed, weather forecasts have been made, child mortality rates have been reduced, and new inventions in homes and public places have helped temper the heat. Humans have been able to fertilize the clouds. The power of national governments has diminished, and borders have lost their traditional significance, both in the Westphalian and modern contexts. Communities have become interconnected, with enhanced power monitoring and transparency. Humans can now form identity-based communities worldwide through modern information technology and advanced software systems. The world has become a global village through shared global processes. People vote by mobile, polling, forming a virtual civil society, and the concept of a citizen journalist makes sense. The ability of humans in a networked society has given them tremendous power to create multidimensional global planning and to establish international standards for food, the environment, and all other international issues. In the era of human intelligence, it transcends national governments and the borders of the modern era, entering the age of globalization. In this era of global governance, cities are becoming international. The most important issues require international action, and technology has made this cooperation possible.

In such circumstances, diets and optimistic logic will also govern the evolution of food political philosophy. Technologists believe that with less land, better soil, water production, and technology-based crops, the world can be saved from starvation and vitamin deficiency. As always, science helps humanity. In most underdeveloped countries that lack the knowledge and experience to utilize technology effectively, they are harming their ecosystems. In the Middle East and Africa, water is often wasted and polluted, and low-energy production has become a common practice. Wherever technology is introduced, humans are moving towards renewable energy. Technology is responsible for expanding forests, producing fresh water, and halting desertification. Stopping desertification and balancing the environment cannot be done with technology alone. Technologists believe that the sun is the primary source of energy, and it makes no sense for humans to rely solely on oil and gas in a world abundant in energy. Wind, sun, uranium, and water are natural and renewable resources that can be effectively harnessed if invested in responsibly. Water is abundant across the globe, and if humans adopt technologies such as cloud fertilization, artificial clouds, and water transport, many issues related to microbes and desertification could be mitigated. Soil and water have the potential to sustain all of humanity with appropriate knowledge and technology. The real challenge lies in the pessimistic perspectives of the intelligentsia and the projections they make about humanity's future, often influenced by apocalyptic metaphysics and the ideals of imagined Marxist cities.

Humans have been able to produce synthetic meat technology and will soon produce compact, inexpensive, and high-vitamin diets. Technology-equipped warehouses have reduced the possibility of crop spoilage and made food accessible throughout all seasons. Greenhouses and farms equipped with the latest technologies, which minimize soil and water usage and incorporate environmental control, have been able to increase productivity. In the past, farmers worked hard to produce regional crops, destroying water and soil, and frequently did not make a profit, leading to a difficult life. Products were also often destroyed, and the speculators benefited. Technology has now reduced all barriers, genetics has produced new products, and wild products have been tamed. Sprouts and herbal pills have become available, and food is now canned. Multinational and global companies have been established with networking processes to make products cheaper and bring the real buyer and seller closer together. In a sense, the wishes once thought of in heaven were fulfilled in the 21st century on

the Earth. Technologists tend to be optimistic and linear in their thinking, believing that technology has eliminated mass hunger and facilitated the production, supply, and sale of goods in cyberspace, free from the constraints of space, time, and government regulation.

Table 2: All paradigms for philosophy of food policy

Paradigm	Intellectual Foundations	Aspect analysis	politics	Food	Result
Liberalism (Stuart Mill, John Rawls)	Science, Mono-linguals, Secularism, Humanism, Individualism, Freedom	Global	Democracy, National Government, Parliament, Globalization, International Organizations, World Bank, International Monetary Fund	Mass production, machinery, mechanics, instrumentalism, utilitarianism, competition, multinationals, regulated global production and distribution, global food planning	Comparative Advantage, Specialization, Global Competition, Profit, Capital, Inequality Advantage, Elitism
Marxism (Karl Marx, Wallerstein)	Equality, collectivism, materialism, justice, humanism, dialectics	Global	Revolution, Protest, Criticism, Rebellion, Workers, the Lower classes, Criticism of Modernism and Liberalism and Their Deconstruction, Crisis of Capitalism	Criticism of the Capitalist System in Diets, Defending the Rights of Producers and Peasants, Criticism of Consumerism and Luxury, Distributive Negation, Food Justice	Justice to food distribution
Phenomenology (Husserl, Heidegger)	The power of being and existence, the critique of humanism, the concept of being, the respect for being	Mental	Criticism of Modernity, Opposition to Modernity and Technology, Consistency with Nature, Determinism and Satisfaction, Criticism of Subjectivity	Earth is human's home, man is in existence, harmony with nature, disrupting nature's order, natural diet, natural food, non-manipulation	Environmentalism, Respect for Soil and Water, Environmental NGOs, Greens, Organic Products

Femi- nist (De Beauvoir, Fires- tone)	Women's Knowledge, Critique of Male Wisdom, Looking at the Vision of Women, Peace-lov- ing Women, Kind and Producers	Gen- der	Patriarchal criti- cism, dual public and private criti- cism, equality between men and women, critique of the domination of patriarchal sys- tems, critique of male warfare, defense of peace and mother- hood, and the birth of women	Women's diets, the role of women in food production, equal pay for wom- en in food produc- tion, the elimina- tion of women's malnutrition, food and cooking, that is, peace, men cook, women as- sociate with food and have always been a source of celebration.	Food diploma- cy, cooking fes- tivals, women's rights asso- ciations, and branches of the food system, where there is food and there will be no war
Nation- alism (Mach- iavelli, Hobbes)	National govern- ment, land, territory, sovereign- ty, political reason, realism	Nation State	Leviathan, Independent Government, National Policy, Public Interest, National Inter- est, Balance of Power	Food self-suffi- ciency, staples, strategic agri- cultural produc- tion, food policy, preserving the country's power and independ- ence, controlling production and distribution, and consumption of goods and food.	Self-sufficien- cy and food independ- ence, strategic commodity production, control, and management of resources i.e., power
Islamism (Seyed Qutb, Rashid al-Ghan- nushi)	God, Rev- elation, Prophets, Quran, Quotation, Sunnah, Sire, Res- urrection Wisdom	Islam- ic Um- mah	Islamic Ummah, Islamic World, Opposition to the West, Grief ontology, Tentative and Cosmic Politics, Austerity	Unity of the Islamic World, Healthy Deals, Laws on Killing Animals, Creep- ing Humans, Encouraging Agriculture, Encouraging Pro- duction, Fasting and Ramadan Diet	Halal system, Islamic slaugh- ter, carnivore, environmental balance, rejec- tion of instru- mental and commodity perspectives

Post-modernism (Michel Foucault, Lyotard)	Anti-subject, critique of modernity, anti-humanism, epistemological rupture, anarchy, relativism	Relativism	The deconstruction of connected constructs has a two-way attention to everyday power, truth regimes, knowledge and relational power, resistance to subjectivity	Confessions and Obedience System in Diets, Medical Knowledge and Food Regulation, Narrative of Progress in Food Making, Food Media Institutions and Virtual Simulation, Food Display Industry	Food industry subjugation, medical knowledge system for food and its subjugation, symbolic industry and virtual advertising simulations of unhealthy foods
Technological (Joseph Nye, Rosena, Castells)	Information Age, Quantum, Internet, Cyberspace, Information Technology, Simulation, Network Communities	Universal	Globalization, Fading Borders, Flow Space, Declining National Government Power, Decreasing Time and Space, Networking, Cyber Policy	Simulation, Radical Science, Cyberspace and Food Chain Information Technology, Artificial Meat Production, Genetics, Food Manipulation, Distribution Networking, Scientific Diets, Diet Technology Evolution	Creating Earthly Paradise with Technological Food Production, Cyber Food Marketing, Planning, Food Preparation, Global Mass Production, Statistics, Mathematics, Scientific Optimism

Conclusion

What stories lie behind a meal? Eight important paradigms of food policy were interpreted qualitatively and phenomenally using the normative approach in political philosophy. Food policy appears to be a straightforward planning process that different actors undertake to reduce poverty and deliver healthy food to human beings. However, one can see the differences in philosophies by examining the variations in policies. Governments, on the one hand, need to demonstrate that food production and distribution statistics are optimal in order to show their effectiveness and legitimacy in staying in power. Private companies and institutions are looking to increase profits in food policy. People and civil society lack food policies to address the mass production and destruction of water, soil, and ecosystems. International institutions are also working to eradicate food poverty, increase food diversity, and reduce inequality in access to food from the perspective of food justice and equality. It is essential to note that policies promoting self-sufficiency, halting mass production, ensuring food justice, fostering dietary diversity, protecting the environment, safeguarding health, and maintaining food security must not overlook the role of comparative advantage, competition, and profit for all stakeholders. Food policies are embedded within the power structure, and without a political-philosophical ap-

proach, it is impossible to accurately assess the situation, understand the damages, or propose effective solutions. Indeed, the philosophy of food policy seeks to rejuvenate and refine the very concept of food planning while revealing and enhancing well-established, self-evident policies.

The paradigms of political philosophy function like glasses, in that each food policy has a different perspective. While there is only one perspective from the positivist perspective, different paradigms can be identified from a normative perspective. In the natural and empirical sciences, a paradigm emerges and remains in place until a revolution is made against it; however, in the human sciences, there can be several parallel paradigms, each covering parts of reality and its remedies. Give. From Plato, Zoroastrianism, and Confucius to Foucault, Baudrillard, and Castells, all have offered theories within the humanities that persist as enduring frameworks, underscoring the need to study various paradigms to interpret the philosophy of food policy. In the humanities, self-interpretation serves as both explanation and practical engagement; without proper understanding, corrective action is impossible. To comprehend the nature of food policies and the reasons why humans are currently harming the environment, reducing food diversity, and prioritizing the logic of capital and profit, it is necessary to identify critical paradigms and marginal flows. Examining the regressive and outdated paradigms among these eight frameworks reveals the often-silent yet significant principles of food policy, enabling policymakers to grasp the broader context and implement informed corrective measures.

So a subject that seems impartial, scientific, and self-evident is in a web of power-driven wills. As leftists chant for self-sufficiency and food justice, they have designed the most unjust food systems, and their citizens have fallen into the pit of authoritarianism in the name of equality. While rightists are preaching the mass production and eradication of poverty with science and technology, they are actually planning to increase the profits of multinational corporations. The slogans are always beautiful, but the execution has not been successful. Out of the eight paradigms, liberalists rule the world, and their narrative of market, comparative advantage, and mass production is now practiced in complex countries. Even technology-centric ones who are optimistic about the future are practically given the liberal paradigm. A world full of the blessings of heaven on the Earth has been the cause of liberalism. A world without borders where all humans are in leisure with the help of technology and the abundance of food is found. Other paradigms have heavily criticized this paradise with reference to reality. The feminist paradigm has focused on gender inequality in the production and distribution of food, aiming to change food policies for women. Environmentalists have targeted meat-based and animal-friendly policies, and they argue that Earth's technology has destroyed the human home. Phenomenologists have also allied with the green parties, and Heidegger is a manifesto of environmental currents that oppose the growth of mechanical technologies and food policies of mass production, as well as the destruction of food pluralism, namely McDonaldization. Marxists also envision an ideal city where capital has no ownership and all human beings have access to food, particularly workers, the lower classes, children, and those in underdeveloped countries. All criticisms of liberalism are marginal, and only liberalism is at the center of food policy. Although some governments and international organizations have attempted to employ some of the critical principles and improvements of the other seven paradigms, they are overwhelmingly liberal and ideological. The liberal paradigm has a full scope and learns from other paradigms, employing their criticisms. It is natural, of course, that the media, parties and guilds, international organizations, capitalist governments, and finally corporations and private institutions use criticisms of other paradigms to promote liberalism.

Reference

- Althusser, Louis (2014). *On the Reproduction of Capitalism: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*, trans. and ed. G.M. Goshgarian, Verso
- Ayatollahi, Taghi (1992), nutrition from the point of view of Islam, medical journal Islamic republic of iran, volume 6, number 2, p 115- 122, access in internet:
https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=5&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2a-hUKEwj1_9DKwvvnAhXhQhUIHak1CywQFjAEegQICBAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fmjiri.iums.ac.ir%2Farticle-1-1491-en.pdf&usg=AOvVaw1pmuDZJgMbCrOZpqPo5V9s
- Baudrillard, Jean (1988) "Simulacra and Simulations." In: Jean Baudrillard. *Selected Writings*. Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Bauman, Zygmunt (1992), *Intimations of postmodernity*, London New York: Routledge
- De Beauvoir, Simone (1949), *second Sex*, she published it in two volumes, *Facts and Myths* and *Lived Experience*
- Fine, Ben (2010). *Marx's Capital*. 5th ed. London: Pluto
- Foucault, Michel (1977), *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, New York: Random House
- Harvey, David (2010). *A Companion to Marx's Capital*. London: Verso
- Heidegger, Martin (2001). *Poetry, Language, Thought*, New York: Harper Modern Perennial Classics
- Kellner, Douglas (1995). *Media culture: cultural studies, identity, and politics between the modern and the postmodern*, London / New York: Routledge
- Lloyd, Genevieve (2004), *the man of Reason: male and female in western philosophy*, London: Routledge
- Lyotard, Jean-François (1989), *The Lyotard reader*, Oxford, UK / Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell
- Machiavelli, Niccolò (2008), *Prince*, translated, with introduction and notes, by James B. Atkinson, Reprinted by Hackett Publishing Company
- Mannheim, Karl. (1950) "Freedom, Power, and Democratic Planning." Oxford University Press
- Marx, Karl; McLellan, David, ed. (2008). *Capital: An Abridged Edition*. Oxford: Oxford Paperbacks. Abridged edition
- Mill, John Stuart (2012), *On the Subjection of Women*, London: Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer.
- Moran, D. and Cohen, J. (2012) *The Husserl Dictionary*, London: Continuum Press
- Mossberger, Karen (2008), *Toward digital citizenship: addressing inequality in the information age*, in the book *internet politic*, edited by Andrew Chadwick & Philip N Howard, London newyork: Rutledge
- Nye Jr, Joseph S (2004), *Power In The Global Information Age From Realism To Globalization*, London And New York: Routledge
- Rimer, Neal (2014) *the change of politics*, London: Sage
- Smith, David Woodruff (2007) *Husserl*, London: Routledge
- Albritton, Robert (2009), *Let's Eat Junk: How Capitalism Creates Hunger and Obesity*, Published by: Pluto Press
- Dobson, Andrew, Robyn Eckersley (2006), *Political Theory and the Ecological Challenge*, Cambridge University Press
- Yavari, Neguin (2018), *The Future of Iran's Past: Nizam Al-Mulk Remembered*, Oxford University Press
- Kuhn, Thomas S (2012), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions: 50th Anniversary Edition*, University of Chicago Press
- Foucault, Michel (2002) *The Archeology of Knowledge*, Psychology Press
- Agamben, Giorgio (2009), *What is an Apparatus? And Other Essays*, Stanford University Press
- Rawls, John (1993), *Political Liberalism*, Columbia University Press
- Fukuyama, Francis (2006), *the End of History and the Last Man*, Simon and Schuster
- Wall, Steven (2015), *The Cambridge companion to Liberalism*, London: Cambridge university press
- Wrathall, Mark (2011) *Heidegger and Unconcealment: Truth, Language, and History*, Cambridge University Press