**The Criterion: An International Journal in English**
Bi-Monthly Peer-Reviewed Open Access e-Journal
(ISSN: 0976-8165) Vol. 17, Issue-VIII, September 2026
*Special Issue: World Literature*
www.the-criterion.com

# When Eating Becomes Obedience: A Cross-Cultural Comparative Study of Ideology, Power, Food, and Violence

**Ms. Priyanka Kobalkar**
MA Part II (Student & Research Scholar), Department of English
K. J. Somaiya College of Arts and Commerce, Mumbai
p.kobalkar@somaiya.edu.in

https://doi.org/10.66376/criterion.v17.n8.23

**Abstract:**

Eating is not freedom, but a necessary discipline. This article breaks the liberal assumption that eating is a private decision, to demonstrate how it is one of the most intimate forms of power. The distribution of food is not born of any biological or natural need but born out of ideology, or meaning structures that both authorize the invention of social hierarchy and the discipline of bodies. The paper juxtaposes a comparative reading of Han Kang's *The Vegetarian* and Shahu Patole's *Dalit Kitchen of Marathwada*, and argues that obedience is enforced not by law and force, but by regulating everyday appetites. In South Korea under patriarchy, where Han Kang's *The Vegetarian* is situated, the act of starving is transformed into the crime of madness and sent to the psychiatric clinic. Through psychiatry, observation and feeding forced the obedience became illness and obedience, on the other hand became treatment. The act of starving has become state policy and, in caste-based Marathwada in Patole's writing where refusal is absent because the option is not even available, enforced through caste ideology, purity-rituals, and the weight of a legacy of suffering. Marxist, feminist, Foucauldian and subaltern studies have revealed food as an ideological and a represssive apparatus-disciplining bodies through repetition, shame, and banalised violence-where gender and caste intersect to not only effect control but become the very spaces in and through which women and the Dalit body come to be disciplined, expendable, and muted. But as much determinism as those approaches may embody, this thesis proposes that while the examination of food indeed operates under power, it is neither only the terrain of power's operation, but also a field for power struggle, memory and budding resistance. Yeong-hye's starving, the Dalit people's practice with food though trapped within its ideological confines, prove that resistance may always find its space within the moment of obedience, that meaning can be manufactured within the act of redefinition. Even more critically: a feminine approach suggests that this negotiates the body in and around food. This negotiates the self-image as compliance, surrender and submission into domination by food. Indeed power exercises its jurisdiction beyond public forums and structures of power but even in the intimate sphere, in the realm of the private, the personal space of appetites-who is eating what, how; whom are we feeding; and who amongst those feasting on food is dying hungry. Yet there remains the possibility of denial, redirection and reconstruction within eating, within life itself. Eating foods politically is thus no metaphor, but a necessity.

**Article History**: Submitted-29/04/2026, Revised-30/06/2026, Accepted-20/07/2026, Published-30/09/2026.
Copyright vests with the author. Licensing: Distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

**Keywords: Food Politics, Ideology, Power, Caste, Patriarchy, Biopower, Structural Violence, Dalit Studies, Feminist Theory, Resistance.**

## Introduction

From the begining of humanity to present day, food has been considered the most basic component of survival, a biological necessity preceding culture, politics, and ideology. The human sciences, from anthropology to philosophy, did not consider food a cultural and political commodity until quite recently, while modern liberalism treats it as an issue of taste and lifestyle. Whether or not they eat, how they eat and with whom, matters less for them than for us; there has been a split in the way bodies relate to food and the way food is understood both as food-to-be-eaten and food-to-be- savored.

This study asserts that eating has never been a neutral act, and that food has historically been one of the most potent means of controlling society. All societies regulate eating in different ways in order to produce obedience, from who eats first and who eats last to what one is allowed and what one must go without, who is forced to live without sustenance. The distribution of food does not arise out of natural biological needs, but out of ideology, a web of meanings that legitimize the establishment of social hierarchy and teach bodies to obey. Following Althusser, this paper argues that ideology is not only repressive, but produces subjects by making their position seem natural and commands seem self-evident (Althusser 162); power functions when submission feels natural. Power is thus not simply juridical or coercive but disciplinary, in Foucault's sense of operating through habitual processes, repetition, and the standardization of everyday life (*Discipline and Punish* 135-140). Eating, for example, is a bodily habit when to eat, what to eat, how much to eat, and never what to refuse to eat. The body learns through this daily repetition and is disciplined into submission, often under the supervision of medicine and psychiatry which redefines dissent as illness and authorizes interventions aimed at curing the subject.

It is within this context of ideology, power and discipline that this study engages in a comparison between *The Vegetarian* and *Dalit Kitchen of Marathwada*. Though set in vastly different cultures, both narratives expose the exact same politics of food. In *The Vegetarian*, which is set in patriarchal Korea, the refusal of food becomes a medical deviance: psychiatry, surveillance and force feeding are used to convert women's dissent into illness and obedience into treatment; in Patole's writing, there is no space for the act of refusal as a matter of choice as eating is centrally determined within the caste system; access to grains, ghee, milk, meat and water are rationed within an upper caste structure that defines certain foods as pure, sattvik and the rest rajasik and tamasik dictating which food should be eaten and which should not be, based on the categories of purity and polluting behavior. This establishes caste foods as matters of prescribed duty and not personal desire; starvation is structurally built and food not an abundance but absence. Following Bourdieu, this paper interprets food practices within the caste system as the politics of taste, where hierarchy reproduces itself in daily habits of food consumption (Bourdieu 170); and following Galtung, starvation becomes an issue of structural violence, defined by slow and passive perpetuation (Galtung 171), that has become internalized as nature. The question of whether the subaltern can speak and whose voice is heard has to be re-asked here in the context of food; the subaltern can indeed speak through starvation, shame, and endurance, although power refuses to listen (Spivak 287).

Together, these two texts illuminate two sides of a singular ideology of domination-the discourse of surplus, correction, medicine and patriarchy in Kang. And absence, deprivations, history and caste in Patole. Both these mechanisms succeed in defining both food and the bodies that eat. The power that defines the parameters of ingestion, the parameters of choice and, indeed, the necessity for submission, is not just the power to create institutions or govern territory; it is, more fundamentally, the power to govern appetite, to command and reward compliance, and to sanction hunger. However, the study at the same time believes that food

cannot be considered solely as a domain of domination, but also a site for negotiation, memory, and subtle defiance; Yeong-hye's starvation and Dalit foods also indicate areas where power falters and allows the creation of an alternative meaning for eating practices and eating processes. The act of starvation here acquires significance from its link to gender and feminine passivity as an act of obedience, sacrifice and domination while food itself becomes a symbol of subjugation in the lives of men and women. Eventually, this paper argues that institutions and laws do not possess exclusive rights to governance. It is appetite that becomes central in the exercise of power, determining who eats what and when, and thus, who is granted the privilege of nourishment and who is condemned to suffer indignity while swallowing food. Yet, amidst the all-encompassing nature of power that constrains them, eating practices in Kang and Dalit communities retain a fragile capacity for resistance, interpretation and redemption-a capacity which can, and needs to be amplified by reading them not as a metaphor, but as an inextricable dimension of power politics.

### 1.1. Korean Cultural Lens: Meat, Normalcy, and Biomedical Discipline

The South Korean lens of Food, Nature, and Biomedical Discipline centers around normative social and biological constructions of food. The act of eating meat serves as a signal that a person is living a normal, modern and socially acceptable life. Vegetarianism is instantly branded as ideological deviancy rather than ethical choice. Society refuses to read vegetarianism as free will. “I don’t eat meat,” Yeong-hye states simply (Kang 15), only to be instantly categorized: “So you’re one of those vegetarians, are you?” (Kang 15). This language implies ideological suspicions. As her husband reflects, people usually turn vegetarian because “they subscribe to a certain ideology,” and the very idea of a “special diet” makes him uncomfortable (Kang 16). Difference threatens normalization. This discomfort quickly escalates into social erasure. At gatherings, Yeong-hye is not debated or confronted; she is ignored. “Gradually, the other guests learned to ignore her presence” (Kang 17). These are the

liberal societal punishments; silence and erasure, without drama. The family and social environment function exactly as Althusser Ideological State Apparatuses; eating correctly does not lead to dialogue, but to invisibility. Followed by the assertion that “Meat eating is a fundamental human instinct… It just isn’t natural” (Kang 15-16). Food has become less about taste than about truth-truth of what makes you human, Korean, and sane. We live in a current society, one which on one hand encourages liberty of consumption and choice, yet restricts the choices food can take, almost to a state where the decision itself can be construed as an indication of your pathology or beliefs. Her silence is investigated whether it's a matter of religion, ideology or health, until medicine comes into the picture. Psychiatrists replace dialogue with force: “They don’t even try to understand…they just force me to take medication and stab me with needles” (Kang 109). The hospital scene, where her body is penetrated by a feeding tube lubricated and inserted with clinical precision (Kang 121), exemplifies what Michel Foucault terms biopower, the governance of life through institutions that claim care while enforcing conformity (*Discipline and Punish*). In this system, hospitals turn into an place of ideological reform. Vegetarians get diagnosed a sickness, not obeying will get classified as an illness in order to make you disciplined as well as corrected through remedy, that’s to make it more orderly. Thus, Yeong-hye is dehumanised in direction of a corpse that must be regarded, restrained as well as confined and even meals becomes an agent used to figure out who needs to be changed.

### 1.2. Indian Cultural Lens: Vegetarian Supremacy, Caste, and Ritualized Shame

The Indian context, however, presents a different, but similarly coercive food regime: one centered on caste ideology and ritual purity. Patole states, "Indian food culture is divided in the same hierarchy as that of Indian culture" (Patole 2), and "In Hinduism, the class system, caste system and food culture are the three sides of the same coin" (Patole 11). From the earliest Vedic classifications of arya and das, the organization of food solidified social order (Patole 3).

Dietary practices were rigidly stratified into pure vegetarian, vegetarian, mixed, non-vegetarian, culture-compliant non-vegetarian, culminating in the debasing of Ati-Shudras whose food was, by definition, "impure". Vegetarianism itself served as moral power, while Buddhist and Jainism promoted it as an ethical discipline, Brahmanical Hinduism weaponized it as a vehicle for hierarchy. Vegetarianism became sanctified as spiritual superiority as animal sacrifice (yajna) faded; meat-eating thus became taboo (Patole 292). Furthermore, the categories of sattvic, rajasic and tamasic ahar-which corresponded with concepts of purity and proximity to God and of lust, laziness, and degradation-further normalized inequality: sattvic meals aligned with moral purity, while tamasic meals, often forced upon Dalits, symbolized baseness (Patole 294-95). This system was never about consent: Who would compel Dalits to eat "worse" food? Access was refused; resources forbidden; meals imposed (Patole 298). Geography became surveillance: Dalits were ostracized from villages-Mahars and Mangs had to reside outside because they ate beef (Patole 16). Dalits are not merely denied food but denied validation as food-eaters, reduced to mere bodies whose primary directive is to ingest protein as discreetly, invisibly, and gratefully as possible.

What is most insidious about the ideological nature of food politics is not merely the restriction but also the enduring afterlife of shame, guilt and self-surveillance, long after the original taboo has vanished. In *Dalit Kitchens of Marathwada*, Shahu Patole argues that caste ideology succeeded in that it rendered upper caste tastes "culture" and marginal foodways "embarrassment." He documented how Dalits-who had rich protein-heavy diets historically-still live with "a sense of shame and guilt about their food" (Patole 11); that even Dalits with an understanding of caste history and social movements still "feel guilty, ashamed, scared and confused when their food customs and culture are discussed" (Patole 11). "We don't eat anything like that" is not a truthful statement but an ideological performative of years of humiliation. It becomes not about a meal itself, but about the individual’s relation to food.

Patole records how Dalits deliberately purchase mutton or chicken and "publicly display their dishes" when upper caste friends visit in an effort to be accepted (Patole 11), an act which signifies forced compliance not cultural assimilation; privileged food, not shared culture.

Historically, this exclusion is an intentional construction. Patole documents how Dalit diets consisted of beef, discarded animals, birds and domesticated animals and they were never prohibited to eat these foods nor prescribed Brahmanical fasting rites (Patole 5); no Brahmanical authority was ever required to regulate their consumption, because their eating habits were already deemed repulsive. Upper castes, Patole notes, "had neither time nor interest to find out what this category ate" (Patole 5). Through ignorance, this silence not only erased Dalits' food history but legitimized Brahmanical vegetarianism as national cuisine.

The silencing becomes more unsettling when Patole indicates that Dalit foodways are comparable to many rich meat based diets in Europe and Africa, yet Indian cultural writersremain "tight-lipped about it." Patole poses the disturbing question: do cultural writers feel that regional cuisine can be identified solely by upper-caste foodways? Or do they choose to ignore Dalit food history and thus deny the existence of Dalit foodways, because it would shatter the ideology of vegetarian morality? Silence, in this case, becomes an epistemic violence, which removes entire histories of food out of a notion of legitimate eating. What constitutes 'normal eating' is already a political identity; what is considered 'culture' is a privileged marker. It remembers caste long after legal emancipation; it remembers patriarchy long after modernity. *Dalit Kitchens of Marathwada* and *The Vegetarian* together illustrate the most enduring truth about food politics: power need not restrict; it needs only to instil guilt. Once the feeling of being ashamed is successfully internalized, it becomes a mechanism of self-preservation and control which continues throughout the individual's life-at every meal.

### 1.3. Food, Gender, and Social Discipline:

Food is arguably the most gendered arena of power. From a feminist perspective, women's bodies have been understood as not just biological beings but as ideological texts on which concepts of obedience, care, sacrifice, and silence are written. The consumption of food (What? How? When? And For Whom?) is at the core of these processes. Food works as a mechanism of discipline and produces gendered subjects, serving to uphold patriarchal and caste hierarchies in both *The Vegetarian* and *Dalit Kitchens of Marathwada*.

Food relates to the value women hold within a society from a feminist materialist perspective. In *The Vegetarian*, Yeong-hye's identity as wife cannot be divorced from her compliance at the dining table. Her husband's outburst, "How on earth could she be so self-centered?" (Kang 9), reflects the patriarchal assertion that a woman's appetite should conform to the male authority. The man's outrage reveals the gendered logic of consumption: that a woman's body exists to cook, serve, and consume in conformity with the male will. This means that the women's duty to compromise cannot be expected in return; compromise is womanly obligation. Choice exercised by a woman is equated with selfishness. The concept of the construction of the subject articulated by Simone de Beauvoir in *The Second Sex* appears to have materialized through food: Yeong-hye has been "made" a wife through the act of eating what has been provided at the exact moment it was required without a questioning stance. Her defiance is construed as a threat to the patriarchal world order. Here the notion of the Ideological State Apparatuses (ISA) described by Althusser comes into play: as ideology speaks through paternal authority when Yeong-hye's father shouts out, "If he tells you to eat, you eat!" (Kang 27), yet soon collapses into what he calls Repressive State Apparatus (RSA) with violence, slaps, and forced feeding and the spill of blood (Kang 28-29). Thus, the ISA turns into the RSA. The "will" of the dead mother also becomes a tool (Kang 33), illustrating how patriarchy uses emotion, memories, and guilt to exercise control over women's bodies.

Discipline and punishment as conceptualized by Michel Foucault also helps reveal how modern power structures are characterized by regulation rather than solely law: Yeong-hye is not being imprisoned for not eating meat, but being institutionalized with a medical label; psychiatrists observe, categorize, and administer treatment. As various feminist scholars like Sandra Bartky argue, women's bodies are predominantly sites for this type of disciplinary apparatus through mechanisms of diet control, medical interventions, and moral judgment, and as a result Yeong-hye's body is one of magnified surveillance.

The Dalit feminist critique offers an added depth by situating gendered food discipline in terms of the interplay of caste and class. Women in *Dalit Kitchens of Marathwada* suffers from "triple subjugation", as women, Dalits and workers. The contribution of Dalit feminism to understand these realities is its refusal to treat "woman" as an abstract category in the Indian context but rather understands womanhood in terms of the relations of caste and class. Dalit feminists have highlighted that patriarchy, for Dalit women, does not operate as a solitary structure but as an amalgamation of caste violence, gendered work, and economic exploitation.

A Marxist feminist approach places the women's food labor squarely in the space of invisibilization described by Silvia Federici as productive work essential for societal reproduction and well-being but excluded from value. In *Dalit Kitchens of Marathwada* women appear to "control" the kitchen space (Patole 54), however; their control seems purely functional since the kitchen acts as an site for the exploitation of women's unpaid work, which supports household needs, agriculture, and the caste order, and in turn, leads to no power, authority, and dignity for women. The acts such as grinding grains, cooking, shelling groundnuts "until your lips bleed" (Patole 158-59) are perceived as inherent women's duty rather than labor, as if these acts were not laborious in nature. This kind of work is merely disguise for exploitation, disguised in traditional forms of duty.

Further, the Dalit feminist critique elucidates how caste becomes another category through which labor is marked as stigma. While domestic work done by women of upper castes is valorized as sacrifice and purity, the food labor of Dalit women is labelled as polluting. In this context, Pierre Bourdieu's theory of taste as a classed and morally-oriented social practice can be seen to operate in terms of providing insights: "Taste is a social practice that distinguishes groups from one another...it can thus operate as an instrument of social distinction and domination" (Bourdieu 170). The content of food items is irrelevant to the problem; it is the category of people who prepare and consume it that marks it as lower-class and hence "polluting." Thus, the devaluation of Dalit food is nothing but symbolic exclusion, aimed at the reproduction of the tangible disparities. Michel Foucault's theory of biopower sheds light on the governance of the body of Dalit women through food. He theorizes power in terms of regulation of the body, that is, on what food the body should be fed, the hours of food intake and the physical burden the body has to carry, etc (Foucault 139). Chronic hunger, tiredness, and bodily injuries sustained by Dalit women in Marathwada, therefore, are not merely incidental but strategically planned conditions of this capitalist and caste system.

The capitalization and modernization process is thus marked by the enhancement of governance. It subsumes women belonging to the lowest castes into low-wage informal labor like agricultural work, domestic service and food processing, while excluding them from owning property or benefits, feeding markets with products without receiving any form of empowerment or acknowledgement of the fruits of their labor. The Marxist theory labels such work as extraction without credit: the working bodies producing wealth are denigrated as lower status and thus, are not recognized for their labor. Capitalism has re-organised the caste food hierarchy rather than abolishing it to maximize the rate of profit.

Dalit feminist criticism also discusses the issues surrounding the silencing of resistance: Dalit women speak of memory, pain and survival through their daily practices related to food

and their oral narratives (e.g., jatyavarchya ovya recited while grinding grains (Patole 327u). Yet, according to Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's argument regarding the subaltern's speech being absorbed without political acknowledgement (*Can the Subaltern Speak?* 287), these songs are translated into folklore stripped of their critical element and made neutral. Hence, alongside material destitution, there is also epistemic violence. B. R. Ambedkar's explanation of the institution of caste further elaborates this idea; the caste system regulates not only the nature of labor and marriage but the body too; control over food, contact, and space is thus extended to a woman's body, and for the women who are situated at the bottom of the social stratification, the aspect of food gains extreme importance.

The gendered nature of food cannot only be seen in the manner in which it is produced but in the way it is consumed. The consumption of food by man as described by Ramdas Swami (a commanding tone while choosing the spices and an appeased stomach after consuming the meal) is a vivid example of androcentric consumption, where men's eating is understood to be legitimate, authoritative and deserving, while women's work exists to enable this enjoyment (Patole 309). Eating is thus not only a neutral act of nourishment but a celebration of power.

Feminist materialists observe that the reproductive and domestic labor women perform are made invisible by patriarchy. Marxist feminists say that cooking for men is perceived not as a job but as love or affection. This invisibility allows men to consume the food provided without being questioned about how it was prepared and with what labor, and hence allows men to feel they have a rightful claim to comment on the quality of the food and assert what the meal should contain and, above all, a feeling that they have a natural claim over women's domestic labor that sustains their dining culture. The man's entitlement to judge and be served comes from structural privilege, backed up by patriarchal ideology.

The social locations may be different in various contexts, but the logic of the gendered nature of food is the same: patriarchy eats first, judges later and disciplines all the time. The

sameness between Yeong-hye and Dalit women lies not in their specific experiences, but in their shared experience of structures that reproduce gender identities, perpetuate caste divisions, and naturalize inequality.

### 1.5 Food as a Site of Agency, Resistance, and Cultural Negotiation

Reducing eating to mere domination fails to capture the nuances this study attempts to expose. Although it disciplines bodies through the structuring of appetites, ideology does not encompass all possible meanings of food. Power is not monolithic; it is negotiated, struggled for, and sometimes subtly transformed within the practices it seeks to control. As Foucault suggests, where there is power, there is resistance (95). Hence, food is both a vehicle for compliance and a potent arena in which such compliance is questioned.

In *The Vegetarian*, Yeong-hye's abstention from meat transcends the logic of pathology. Her resistance is embodied within the "madness" with which it is met, her silence offering a potent critique of patriarchial, social, and ecological violence. Yeong-hye's repeated assertion "I had a dream" (Kang 23) points to an interiority that defies translation into rational discourse and a dream that remains incoherent in terms of dominant ideology, but can be seen as a refusal to partake, a subtle withdrawal of the self from power.

In *Dalit Kitchens of Marathwada*, although caste ideology mandates dietary hierarchies and devalues Dalit cuisines, the inability to eradicate these culinary traditions allows for a reclaiming of cultural agency, not as purely suffering and deprivation, but as archives of memory, resistance and adaptability. Ongoing eating of so labelled "stigma", could thus, be taken as an act of affirmation of cultural continuity. As Bourdieu puts it, taste is lived, and not merely commanded (170). Dalit food which so often is dismissed as inferior contains an ecological knowledge as well as a cultural survival and that the songs of jatyavarchyaovyas are still sung demonstrates that an alternative expression continues to thrive despite restraint,

perhaps even because of it, and as such may stand as an answer to Spivak's anxieties about the silent subaltern (287). These are little, layered acts of resistance that disrupt total structure control.

This also brings into account the significance of enjoyment, habit, the ecology of the community, for that only way in which we turn all the consumption of food into acts of obeying makes us over-simplify the situation in the guise of critique, as well. A way to perceive the situation leads us to food as an area where agencies are fought; a point of contest where neither we are entirely free, nor the power is fully at work, in which we don't just consume power, we also negotiate with and subvert it. It is no more about if power is at work or not, but how it is countered and negotiated.

**1.6 Conclusion**

The title of this research began with a paradoxical insight: namely, that eating could serve as a practice of domination which reduced liberty to habit, in a process of discipline which structure the life of citizens, classes, people and flesh. Across diverse classes, communities and bodies, it has become evident that food is much more than subsistence: it is a command, a mode of discipline, a mundane act of violence. By drawing parallels between the novels *The Vegetarian* and *Dalit Kitchens of Marathwada*, this research has demonstrated two differing yet fundamentally similar mechanisms of control: one through excessive provision and correction coupled with surveillance and pathology, the other through deficiency and denial enforced by inherited hunger and shame. Although one system, South Korean post-modern liberalism, enforces adherence via medicine, a psychiatric conceptualization of strangeness, and an idea of support, the other, Indian caste society, makes hunger standard and permits discrepancy with theologically justifying ideas, physical isolation and spiritual disgrace. Regardless of the system applied, the outcome is a subjected being molded by indulgence; a complaisant being. The critical idea from this document is that thoughts can significantly be affected by way of

ideology; the forced sustenance provided to Yeong-hye mimics the willful starvation imposed upon Dalits through history which depletes people their autonomy through food. Guided by Althusser's thought of ideology, Foucault's thought of discipline, Bourdieu's idea of liking and Spivak's thought of the subaltern voice this examine has highlighted the best way consuming food became one path whereby power manifests to create compliant topics.

Nevertheless, conclusions to this point may result in the concept of totalizing energy, which this paper aims to keep away from. Food turns into not solely a field wherein obedience is fashioned however one wherein interpretations continue to be modified and constructed because illustrated by this analysis. Yeong-hye's quiet rebellion, inspite of her pathological description undermines basic notions of being average; whilst Dalit food, no matter social prejudice attaches to them continues to hold memories of hope and resilience. Bodies don't passively undergo suppression; they fight again, adapt and comprehend in the face of constrain. Genders represent an important distinguishing dimension within the arena of control and bargaining as, for women, bodies still exist as controlled territories where the act of eating serves to verify self-denial, virtue and willingness.

The patriarchal regime feasts earlier than everybody and guidelines; Yeong-Hye is disciplined for rejection and Dalits (each women and men) face stigmatisation for their feeding. Whilst one undergoes the infringement of physique, the opposite is orally harassed however silent protest endures in memory, stoicism and refusal to be insignificant. In the end, this examine emphasizes the profound truth that power is past the limits of formal institutions, regulation and border as it additionally controls appetite-it governs who eats and who starve, who relish nourishment and who drown in humiliation.

However, the reign of consumerism could not ever truly prevail, a gap between insurrection and conformity. A middle ground that could negotiate identity, diverse understandings and silent resistance. Understanding consuming as a political idea is not a

metaphor, however necessary as the stomach isn't impartial however is wholly shaped by power, ideology and historical past; a body wherein power exists to be reasserted, disputed, and often transcended. If consuming with obedience results in lack of independence within the mundane acts of consumption, it nonetheless provides a small window of prospect within these instances. This paper recognises: emancipation cannot truly be conceived without first reclaiming the basic right to eat without fear, shame, coercion or condemnation. Until then, every meal is both a site of power and, as has been demonstrated, a site of possibility.

**Works Cited**

Althusser, Louis. *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. Translated by Ben Brewster, Verso, 2014.

Ambedkar, B. R. *Annihilation of Caste*. Verso, 2014.

Bartky, Sandra Lee. "Foucault, Femininity, and the Modernization of Patriarchal Power." *Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression*, Routledge, 1990, pp. 63–82.

Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. Translated by Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier, Vintage Books, 2011.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Translated by Richard Nice, Routledge, 1984.

Federici, Silvia. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. Autonomedia, 2004.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, Vintage Books, 1995.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Vintage Books, 1990.

Galtung, Johan. "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 6, no. 3, 1969, pp. 167–191.

Kang, Han. *The Vegetarian*. Translated by Deborah Smith, Hogarth Press, 2016.

Patole, Shahu. *Dalit Kitchens of Marathwada*. Translated by Bhushan Korgaonkar, People's Archive of Rural India, 2018.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, University of Illinois Press, 1988, pp. 271–313.