

## DOSSIER

Food Insecurity, Hunger and  
Obesity in contemporaneous  
Brazil

## Editor

Francisco de Assis Guedes  
de Vasconcelos

## Support

Fundação Oswaldo Cruz – Distrito  
Federal. Project GERE-019-FIO-21  
– Research on food [in]security and  
hunger in the context of Covid-19 for  
black and brown populations – Brazil  
2021.

## Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there are no  
conflicts of interest.

## Received

June 7, 2023

## Final version

September 12, 2023

## Approved

October 26, 2023

# Who are the Solidarity Kitchen users? Study on inequalities to ensure food and nutritional security based on the experience of Sol Nascente community – Distrito Federal, Brazil

## *Quem são os usuários da Cozinha Solidária? Estudo sobre desigualdades na garantia da segurança alimentar e nutricional a partir da experiência da comunidade do Sol Nascente – Distrito Federal, Brasil*

Samanta Winck Madruga<sup>1</sup> , Beatriz Oliveira Blackman Machado<sup>2</sup> ,  
Anelise Rizzolo de Oliveira<sup>3</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Departamento de Nutrição, Faculdade de Nutrição. Pelotas, RS, Brasil.

<sup>2</sup> Coletivo Multiplicassan, Observatório de Políticas de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional. Brasília, DF, Brasil.

<sup>3</sup> Universidade de Brasília, Departamento de Nutrição, Faculdade de Saúde. Brasília, DF, Brasil. Correspondence to:  
SW MADRUGA. E-mail: <samantamadruga@gmail.com>.

**How to cite this article:** Madruga SW, Machado BOB, Oliveira AR. Who are the Solidarity Kitchen users? Study on inequalities to ensure food and nutritional security based on the experience of Sol Nascente community – Distrito Federal, Brazil. Rev Nutr. 2024;37:e230112. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1678-9865202437e230112>

### ABSTRACT

#### Objective

To review the demographic and socioeconomic profile of the Homeless Workers Movement's Solidarity Kitchen project users in the Sol Nascente Community, Federal District, Brazil.

#### Methods

Descriptive cross-sectional study. The interviews were conducted with adults, users of the solidarity kitchen, in August 2022, using a standardized questionnaire containing demographic, socioeconomic, housing and food consumption information. The outcome of the study was Frequent Use (picking up food at the solidarity kitchen five days/week). General and gender descriptive analyses were conducted, as well as a bivariate analysis based on the chi-square test ( $p < 0.05$ ).

#### Results

The sample was composed of 83 dark complexion women with a mean age of 39.6 years ( $SD=14.6$ ). A total of 35 women (42.2%) had attended the first year of high school or over, and approximately 65.0% had a job and were paid up to one minimum wage. Most received social benefits and 81.9% were unemployed at the time of the survey. More than half of the respondents owned their own home and among those who did not, 64.0% paid rent. A total of 46.3% respondents had up to two daily meals. The prevalence of users who were considered Frequent Users was 61.0%. Women reported lower family income, greater dependence on aid,

more unemployment, in addition to living with a greater number of people and having more people in the house who took food from the solidarity kitchen, all statistically significant differences.

### Conclusion

The project Solidarity Kitchen essentially caters to dark complexion women with lower family income, who enhance the inequalities and inequities conditions in food security in the country.

**Keywords:** Food insecurity. Nongovernmental organization. Socioeconomic factors. Solidarity.

## RESUMO

### Objetivo

Analisar o perfil demográfico e socioeconômico dos usuários do projeto Cozinha Solidária do Movimento dos Trabalhadores Sem Teto no Sol Nascente, Distrito Federal, Brasil.

### Métodos

Estudo descritivo do tipo transversal. As entrevistas foram realizadas com adultos, usuários da cozinha solidária, em agosto de 2022, a partir de um questionário padronizado contendo informações demográficas e socioeconômicas, sobre moradia e alimentação. O desfecho do estudo foi considerado Consumo Frequente (pegar comida na cozinha solidária nos cinco dias da semana: sim/não). Foram conduzidas as análises descritivas geral e por sexo, e bivariadas a partir do Teste qui-quadrado ( $p < 0,05$ ).

### Resultados

A amostra de 83 indivíduos foi composta predominantemente por mulheres, pretas e pardas, com idade média de 39,6 anos ( $DP=14,6$ ). Onde 42,2% cursaram o 1º ano do ensino médio ou mais e aproximadamente 65% recebiam até um salário-mínimo. A maioria recebia benefício social e 81,9% estava desempregada no momento da entrevista. Mais da metade dos entrevistados possuíam casa própria e, entre os que não tinham, 64,0% pagavam aluguel. O número de refeições diárias foi de até duas para 46,3% dos entrevistados. A prevalência de usuários que tinham Consumo Frequente foi 61%. As mulheres relataram menor renda familiar, maior dependência de auxílios, maior desemprego, além de residirem com mais pessoas, os quais pegavam mais comida da cozinha solidária, sendo todas diferenças estatisticamente significativas.

### Conclusão

O projeto atende essencialmente mulheres, pretas e com menor renda familiar, corroborando o panorama das desigualdades e iniquidades no acesso à alimentação no país.

**Palavras-chave:** Insegurança alimentar. Organização não governamental. Fatores socioeconômicos. Solidariedade.

## INTRODUCTION

The actions carried out in Brazil regarding the issue of food, nutrition, sovereignty and food security placed the country, for a short time, under the spotlight when it comes to combating hunger and poverty. The inclusion of adequate nutrition as a constitutional right in 2010 and the creation of the National Food and Nutritional Security Policy were driven by the civil society, which promoted the inclusion of Food and Nutrition Security (FNS) in the country's public agenda [1-3].

The *Direito Humano à Alimentação Adequada e Saudável* (DHAAS, Human Right to Adequate and Healthy Food) became one of the fundamental guarantees of Brazilian citizens in the Federal Constitution, after more than a decade of political tensions between State/Society. Promoting FNS has become a responsibility of the State through the implementation of public policies capable of guaranteeing the implementation of DHAAS [4,5].

Popular Restaurants (PR), within the Network of Public Food and Nutritional Security Equipment, are important contributions to combating hunger and food and nutritional insecurity (FNS). Studies confirm that PR help alleviate the FNS situation; however reduced investment, discontinuity of public resources allocation and reduced social participation have hampered the implementation of DHAAS [6-8].

Changes in the economic, political and social context in recent years have caused the weakening and dehydration of public policies in the country, especially those related to the population's FNS. In this connection Popular Restaurants and Community Kitchens are public facilities that were seriously affected [9]. In 2019, the State's negligence associated with the failure to carry out national inquiries and research began to be denounced by civil society entities. The scenario of human rights violations, with the increase in poverty and hunger, has been visibly increasing in Brazilian cities and metropolises [10-12].

Data from *Pesquisa de Orçamentos Familiares* (POF, Household Budget Survey) 2017-2018 already showed a high prevalence of Food Insecurity (FI); in fact, around 36.7% of Brazilian households experienced some degree of FI during that period [13]. The *Inquérito Nacional sobre Insegurança Alimentar no Contexto da Pandemia da COVID-19 no Brasil* (VIGISAN, National Survey on Food Insecurity in the Context of the COVID-19 Pandemic), based on a population survey, carried out by the Brazilian Network for Research in Sovereignty and Food and Nutritional Security, in 2020, showed that the residents of less than half of the Brazilian households (44.8%) enjoyed FNS [12,13].

The denialist way in which the federal government faced the COVID-19 public health emergency further enhanced the state of social vulnerability of thousands of Brazilians. The non-recognition of the State as the bearer of obligations towards rights holders (citizens) generated situations of violation of the DHAAS and worsening of the Food and Nutrition Insecurity (FNI) situation of socially vulnerable communities, social groups and/or territories [14-16].

It was then that, in 2020, in connection with the still early phase of the pandemic in Brazil, as a strategy led by the *Movimento dos Trabalhadores Sem Teto* (MTST, Homeless Workers Movement), at a national level, the Solidarity Kitchen (SK) project was developed, based on the Movement practice and experience with community kitchens in squatted buildings. Through a network of solidarity and affection, with the aim of facing the chaos of hunger, which grew during this period, the project became a collective alternative that sought and seeks to guarantee the right to adequate and healthy food for thousands of people every day based on 46 solidarity kitchens on the outskirts of the municipalities of this country [17].

This project goes beyond offering a mere plate of food; it proposes a new relationship with food supply and society for the preparation of meals, incorporating incentives for growing community urban gardens and reception of food produced by local farmers. In this connection priority is given to the agrarian reform settlers who produce agro-ecologically associated with a critical vision not only of the land use but also of social relations [17]. Thus, the project presents an innovative arrangement that can dialogue with the formulation of new public policies to combat hunger and FNI within the scope of the *Sistema Nacional de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional* (SISAN, Food and Nutrition Security System) [18]

In this connection, this paper aims to review the demographic and socioeconomic profile of the Homeless Workers Movement's Solidarity Kitchen's users in the Sol Nascente community, Distrito Federal.

## METHODS

This is a cross-sectional descriptive study, carried out at Sol Nascente Solidarity Kitchen, in the administrative region of Ceilândia, Distrito Federal, an area that is home to the largest horizontal *favela* (shanty town) in the country – Sol Nascente and Pôr do Sol communities.

The territory of Sol Nascente began to be occupied irregularly in the 1990s, with the informal construction of approximately 80 slum-houses. The occupation of this area occurred rapidly and continuously based on precarious infrastructure conditions. The *Pesquisa Distrital por Amostra de Domicílios* (District Household Sample Survey) in 2021 indicated that the urban population of Sol Nascente/Pôr do Sol was composed of 93,217 people, 50.3% of whom were female with an average age of 28.6 years [19]. Regarding race/skin color, 53.9% of residents reported dark complexion. Regarding education, 95.5% of residents aged six or over indicated knowing how to read and write, and among people aged 25 or over, 39.2% reported having completed secondary education [19]. In terms of income, the remuneration for the main job, was R\$ 1.578,78 on average, with 70% of the individuals being paid one to two minimum wages. Food security assessment showed that 49.8% of households were experiencing mild, moderate or severe food insecurity in the three months prior to the date of the survey [19].

In this framework, the Sol Nascente Solidarity Kitchen, which is a social facility coordinated by MTST and financed by civil society and partners through donations, has been installed in the territory since the beginning of the pandemic and serves an average of 120 people, including adults and children, offering free lunch from Monday to Friday. The space consists of an agroecological garden behind the kitchen, where species of food plants and medicinal teas are grown; there is also a large space where collective activities and meal delivery are carried out. Another component is the library, which has donated books to both children and adults.

The study sample was made up of all people, users of the solidarity kitchen, who picked up food during a one-week period in August 2022. The interviews were carried out with both genders adult individuals, at the time they were waiting in line for picking up the meal. During this waiting period, the interviewers approached them individually, inviting them to participate in the study, explaining the content of the Free and Informed Consent Form (FICF) and, upon acceptance, the interviewee signed the form before the start of the interview. The exclusion criterion for the study was being under 18 years of age.

The variables were collected from a standardized questionnaire, built on Google Forms\*, with 16 closed questions and two open-ended questions. The interviewers were previously trained to apply the instrument, and the survey was carried out on the interviewers' own cell phones by accessing the relevant link.

The end-point of the study was based on the question "how many times a week do you usually get food from the Solidarity Kitchen?", and then the individual who reported picking up meals from the kitchen five days a week was classified as "Frequent SK user".

The following information was collected: demographic and socioeconomic data, such as gender (cis woman, trans woman, cis man, trans man, non-binary) [20], race/color reported by the interviewee (white, black, brown, yellow, indigenous), age (years), education (elementary education: up to the 3<sup>rd</sup> year), secondary education (4<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> year), high school (1<sup>st</sup> year or over), family income (in *reais* [R\$]), subsequently categorized into two groups: ≤1 minimum wage and >1 minimum wage – considering the minimum wage value of R\$ 1.200,00), whether the respondent received any social benefit (yes/no), which benefit(s) and whether he/she was working at the time of the interview (yes/no).

The housing variables assessed were: (a) whether the interviewees had their own home (yes/no); (b) whether the house had been obtained as a result of the MTST's struggle for housing

(yes/no); (c) whether they paid rent (yes/no); (d) the amount in *reais* paid for the rent and; (e) the number of people who lived in the house. Finally, issues related to food were surveyed, such as: a) number of meals a day; (b) whether anyone else in the house got food from the Solidarity Kitchen (yes/no); (c) their opinion on the quantity that is served (open-ended question) and; (d) the place where they ate when they did not get food from the (open-ended question) solidarity kitchen. The open-ended questions were categorized as shown in Table 1.

Using the Stata Program version 12.0, general descriptive analyses and by gender (absolute numbers, means and proportions) and bivariate analyses were conducted, which used the Chi-square test with a confidence level of 95% (frequent use of the solidarity kitchen: Yes No).

Bivariate analyses explored the association between the different independent variables and the outcome “frequent use” of the Solidarity Kitchen.

The interviewees were shown the Free and Informed Consent Form and were subsequently asked to sign two copies, one of which was left with the person interviewed. The study was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Health Sciences of the University of Brasília under number 5.626.405.

## RESULTS

A total of 83 adult individuals were interviewed and the sample (Table 1) was predominantly composed of dark complexion females, with a mean age of 39.6 years (SD = 14.6). Among those interviewed, 42.2% completed the 1st year of high school or over and 82.4% belonged to the family income group of up to one minimum wage. The majority received social benefits from the government, with 48.9% of people receiving two or more benefits such as *Auxílio Brasil*, *DF Social*, *Vale Gás*, *DF Escola*, *Prato Cheio*, *Cartão Escola*, etc. Around 82% of the respondents were not working at the time of the interview.

In relation to housing, approximately 67.0% had their own home and out of these, 39.3% had obtained their land lots through the MTST's struggle for housing. Among those who did not own their own home, 64.0% paid rent and the average amount paid was R\$ 461,25, ranging from 200.00 to R\$ 850,00. More than half of the sample had three or more residents in the house.

The prevalence of “Frequent Use” was 61.0%, that is, they got food from the solidarity kitchen five times a week. Regarding food variables, 8.5% of respondents had only one meal a day and 46.3% had up to two meals.

Almost 55.0% of the respondents reported that other people in the house also took food from the kitchen. Regarding the amount of food offered, 89.5% considered it good/enough and, furthermore, 57.0% reported that they ate at home when they did not get the food from the solidarity kitchen.

In Table 1, differences between women and men are also described, in which the former reported lower family income, greater dependence on government aid, greater occurrence of unemployment, in addition to living in the house with a larger number of people and having more people in the house who got the food daily at the solidarity kitchen, all differences being statistically significant.

**Table 1** – Description of the sample according to the sociodemographic and behavioral characteristics of adult users of Homeless Workers Movement's Solidary Kitchens (SK). Sol Nascente (DF), Brazil, 2022.

Variables	Sample (N=83)		Women (N=42)		Men (N=41)		p-value
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Race/Color							0.106
Brown	55	66.3	27	64.2	28	68.3	
Black	18	21.7	7	16.7	11	26.8	
White	10	12.0	8	19.1	2	4.9	
Age (years)							0.195
Min-30*	29	35.0	19	45.2	10	24.4	
31-40	13	15.7	6	14.2	7	17.1	
41-50	21	25.3	10	23.8	11	26.8	
51-Max	20	24.1	7	16.7	13	31.7	
Education							0.928
Up to 3 <sup>rd</sup> year elementary school	18	21.7	9	21.4	9	22.0	
4 <sup>th</sup> to 9 <sup>th</sup> middle-school years	30	36.1	16	38.1	14	34.2	
High school 1 <sup>st</sup> year or more	35	42.2	17	40.5	18	43.8	
Monthly family income (MW)							<b>0.032</b>
Up to 01 (MW)	61	82.4	34	91.9	27	73.0	
More than 01 (MW)	13	17.6	3	8.1	10	27.0	
Receive social benefit							<b>&lt;0.001</b>
No	36	43.4	8	19.1	28	68.3	
Yes	47	56.6	34	80.9	13	31.7	
How many benefits**							0.374
One	24	51.1	16	47.1	8	61.5	
Two or more	23	48.9	18	52.9	5	38.5	
Work							<b>0.001</b>
No	68	81.9	40	95.2	28	68.3	
Yes	15	18.1	2	4.8	13	31.7	
Own home							0.756
No	27	33.3	13	31.0	14	34.2	
Yes	56	66.7	29	69.0	27	65.8	
Homeless Workers Movement's achievements***							0.740
No	34	60.7	17	58.6	17	63.0	
Yes	22	39.3	12	41.4	10	37.0	
Pay rent****							0.790
No	9	36.0	4	33.3	5	38.5	
Yes	16	64.0	8	66.7	8	61.5	
Number of people in the house							<b>0.002</b>
1	16	19.8	1	2.4	15	38.5	
2	15	18.5	9	21.4	6	15.4	
3	18	22.2	10	23.8	8	20.4	
4	13	16.1	10	23.8	3	7.7	
5	10	12.4	7	16.7	3	7.7	
6 or more	9	11.0	5	11.9	4	10.3	
Number of meals/day							0.285
1	7	8.5	2	4.9	5	12.2	
2	31	37.8	13	31.7	18	43.9	
3	24	29.3	15	36.6	9	22.0	
4 or more	20	24.4	11	26.8	9	22.0	
Other house dwellers pick up food at Solidarity Kitchen							<b>&lt;0.001</b>
No	39	47.0	11	26.2	28	68.3	
Yes	44	53.0	31	73.8	13	31.7	
About the amount of food served							0.135
Little/insufficient	8	10.8	2	5.3	6	15.8	
Good/enough	68	89.5	36	94.7	32	84.2	
Place where people eat when they don't get food							0.209
Home	45	57.0	28	68.3	17	44.7	
Popular restaurant	9	11.3	3	7.3	6	15.8	
Home/Popular restaurant	7	8.9	2	4.9	5	13.2	
Home with family/friends/work	14	17.7	7	17.1	7	18.4	
Another location	4	5.1	1	2.4	3	7.9	

Note: \*Emancipated 16-year-old teenager with consent given after signing the Free and Informed Consent Form; \*\*Analysis restricted to those who receive social benefits (N=47); \*\*\*Analysis restricted to those who own their own home (N=56); \*\*\*\*The two homeless individuals were excluded. Maximum number of missing values was for the Family Income variable (N=9). The numbers in bold shows statistical significance.

Table 2 describes the gross analysis between “Frequent Use” and the independent variables evaluated. Although the prevalence of frequent users has been shown to be higher among some groups, such as individuals with less education, family income less than or equal to the minimum wage or among those who receive more than one social benefit, the results show that only the relationship between frequent use and having other people in the household picking up food was statistically significant.

**Table 2** – Analysis of frequent visits according to the independent variables evaluated among adult users of Homeless Workers Movement’s Solidarity Kitchens (SK). Ceilândia (DF), Brazil, 2022.

1 of 2

Variables	Frequent Solidarity Kitchen visits (%)	p-value
Gender		0.422
Female	65.8	
Male	56.8	
Race/Color		0.249
Brown	54.9	
Black	75.0	
White	75.0	
Age (years)		0.306
Min-30*	65.4	
31-40	58.3	
41-50	44.4	
51 - Max	73.7	
Education		0.326
Up to 3 <sup>rd</sup> year elementary school	76.5	
4 <sup>th</sup> to 9 <sup>th</sup> middle-school years	59.3	
High school 1 <sup>st</sup> year or more	54.8	
Monthly family income (MW)		0.099
Up to 01 MW	67.3	
More than 01 (MW)	40.0	
Receive social benefit		0.435
No	56.3	
Yes	65.1	
How many benefits**		0.284
One	57.1	
Two or more	72.7	
Work		0.216
No	64.5	
Yes	46.2	
Own home		0.332
No	53.9	
Yes	65.3	
Homeless Workers Movement’s conquest***		0.236
No	58.6	
Yes	75.0	
Pay rent****		0.143
No	37.5	
Yes	68.8	
Number of people in the house		0.962
1	60.0	
2	69.2	
3	58.8	
4	58.3	
5	62.5	
6 or more	75.0	

**Table 2** – Analysis of frequent visits according to the independent variables evaluated among adult users of Homeless Workers Movement’s Solidarity Kitchens (SK). Ceilândia (DF), Brazil, 2022.

Variables	Frequent Solidarity Kitchen visits (%)	p-value
Number of meals/day		#
1	100	
2	53.3	
3	52.4	
4 or more	70.6	
Other house dwellers pick up food at Solidarity Kitchen		<b>0.027</b>
No	46.9	
Yes	72.1	
About the amount of food served		0.696
Little/insufficient	57.1	
Good/enough	64.2	
Place where you eat when you don’t get food		0.994
Home	65.1	
Popular restaurant	62.5	
Home/Popular restaurant	60.0	
Home with family/friends/work	58.3	
Another location	66.7	

Note: \*Emancipated 16-year-old teenager with consent given after signing the Free and Informed Consent Form; \*\*Analysis restricted to those who receive social benefits (N=47); \*\*\* Analysis restricted to those who own their own home (N=56); \*\*\*\* The two homeless individuals excluded. #p-value not calculated (100% on a bitch). The numbers in bold shows statistical significance.

## DISCUSSION

The results of the present study describe the demographic and socioeconomic profile of a solidarity kitchen’s users in a period of profound social crisis post-pandemic due to COVID-19, in which frequent access to this social equipment was considered as a marker of FNI. The profile of people who benefit from this social equipment clearly reflects the scenario of inequalities and inequities of access to food in this country, where women, black women, with lower family income, unemployed, who live with more people in the household and who are dependent on government aid, are the target of the weakening of government social policies [21].

In the face of an expanding framework of the dismantling social policies intended to curb hunger and poverty that has been plaguing the country, more markedly since 2014, and considering the worsening of the FNI situation as a result of the pandemic, the rallying of all the people for a solidarity policy based on actions to mitigate hunger was essential [21,22].

Santos et al. [23], in their article that deals with an analysis of public policies at the interface with food and nutrition in the midst of the pandemic, states that proposals regarding DHAAS assurance in periods of calamity have permeated civil society, class entities and social movements, which enhances the role of these movements in their denunciation of a government project that violates rights and democracy itself [23].

The population assessed lives in a peripheral territory of the Federal District, in the administrative region of Sol Nascente/Pôr do Sol. The relevant social indicators (occupation, income, access to education and basic sanitation), which have historically reflected the inequalities affecting the black population, especially women, are present in this connection [24,25].

Based on the survey results, 88.0% of the people evaluated had dark complexion and were prominent in the solidarity kitchen queue; we highlight the minor presence, specifically, of white men (4.9%) in that same territory. Looking at the national scenario, the outbreak of the pandemic in Brazil significantly worsened the determinants of FNS for the black population, especially black women [25,26].

The characterization of the population that visits the solidarity kitchen reflects hunger as an effect of structural racism and structuring of social and institutional relationships. By highlighting the minor presence of white people, we recognize that the socioeconomic privileges granted to whiteness, especially to men, are protective factors for FNS. Therefore, combating racism through public policies aimed at guaranteeing the rights of black populations ought to be part of FNS policies [27,28].

Other dimensions identified as determinants for regular and permanent access to adequate and healthy food, within the framework of racial issue, are work and income. As Gonzalez (1984) puts it:

[...] racism, as an ideological articulation and set of practices, denotes its structural effectiveness insofar as it refers to a racial division of work that is extremely useful and shared by contemporary capitalist and multiracial socioeconomic formations. In terms of maintaining the balance of the system as a whole, it is one of the most important criteria in articulating recruitment mechanisms for positions in the class structure and social stratification system [29].

The author describes racism as the basis for organizing the economic system according to the dimensions of employment and income. According to the *Rede Brasileira de Pesquisa em Soberania e Segurança Alimentar* (Brazilian Research Network on Food Sovereignty and Security) (2022), food security was present in around 53% of households in which the reference person had a job; for those who were in the informal sector this rate was 30%, and for unemployed people only 20% of households were food secure [12].

The present study characterized a population in which 81.9% of people were unemployed and 82.4% had an income of up to one minimum wage, with this rate being greater than 90% among women, showing a significant difference in relation to men (73.0%). Thus, working conditions are considered determinants in the area of FNS, indicating that DHAAS assurance should involve public policies that promote better working conditions and income for the population, and especially for the black population [28,29].

According to Siliprandi [27], FNS Public Policies recognize women as family providers and essential in the struggle against hunger and FNI, but not always as protagonists, decision makers and capable of generating income for emancipation and changing the situation of insecurity in which they live [27].

When reviewing the components of family income, we found that the participation of social benefits was essential in the income composition, but it was still insufficient to reduce the frequency of use of the solidarity kitchen and consequently guarantee regular access to adequate and healthy food. The results show the complexity of social issues in a territory where income transfer keeps women as the beneficiaries of the programs and the majority queuing at the solidarity kitchen; in other words, although this project mitigates the consequences of hunger, it does not change alone the reality of FNI in the territory. This scenario indicates that public policies are necessary for changing the structures of gender and racial inequality observed. Such policies should insure formal

employability and fair compensation for work, daycare and children's school, as well as quality public transport, and the set of emancipatory citizenship rights [28].

The results of the characterization highlight the division of labor arising from "social gender relations" that reserved the reproductive sphere for women and the productive sphere for men. In the findings of the present study, around 38% of men interviewed reported living alone and more than 52% of women lived with four or more people in the household, establishing a relationship that defines production and remuneration for men, and reproduction/care and unpaid work for women, corroborating the finding of the present study that frequent use of the solidarity kitchen among men is lower than among women. Although the "traditional" model of the male breadwinner and the female caregiver is changing as both are included in the job market, family care continues to be the primary responsibility of women [30,31].

According to an analysis carried out by Melo and Merandi [32], who evaluated the distribution of GDP *per capita* between women and men in Brazil, from 1991 to 2015, it was shown that Brazilian women increased and improved their participation in the labor market, managing to increase their income during the period. In 2019, in Brazil, women dedicated almost twice as much time each week to caring for people or doing household chores compared to men (21.4 hours versus 11.0 hours). Furthermore, even for women who were employed, involvement in unpaid activities influenced the way they entered the job market, as they try to combine a double shift: paid and unpaid work. Despite having a higher average level of education than men, women still have a per capita income of just over 50% of men's per capita income, indicating that this inequality goes beyond the possible justification of a difference in qualifications [32,33].

The education dimension was also reviewed as a determinant in connection with FNS; we found an important difference between individuals depending on their education: 54.0% individuals with higher education are frequent users and among those with less education, 76.5% consume the solidarity kitchen food daily. According to II VIGISAN (2022), of the Distrito Federal among individuals without education or with up to eight years of study, only 22.4% were in a food secure situation, compared to 46.5% individuals with more than eight years education. In other words the higher the level of education, the greater the possibilities of maintaining food security [12].

If food is a human right, it must generate obligations for the State and responsibilities of different social players (individuals, families, local communities, non-governmental organizations, civil society organizations, as well as organizations in the private sector) in relation to the fulfillment of this right. In this framework, society is the holder of rights and the State is the bearer of obligations, two sides of the same coin [10,3]. Food as a human right reveals the relationship of universality, indivisibility and interdependence between rights. The offer of housing does not imply FNS which means that other policies ought to be added so that the population has access to their rights, which are universal, as they apply to all people and are indivisible, interdependent and interrelated because we cannot separate one from the other, or choose "the best" among them, which is a recurrent dilemma in the suburbs. It is clear that "competition" between the offers can "sabotage" social inclusion, especially for women and children. It is not possible to choose between eating or studying, eating or living, etc. Achieving citizenship is only possible through a policy that understands the complexity of inequalities [10].

Our study presents, as potentiality, the first description of people who have daily access to social facilities set up to mitigate hunger and understanding as a limitation the impossibility of building a sample power for the purpose of associative statistical analyses.

## CONCLUSION

The solidarity kitchens program was born in the framework of social movements supportive of efforts for curbing hunger during the COVID 19 pandemic. Within the scope of the MTST, a collective alternative was formulated to mitigate the hunger issue, based on the principles of solidarity, collaboration and the social value of the solidarity kitchen and food.

In this connection, the MTST Solidarity Kitchens program constitutes an essential political action to assure the food and nutritional security of people in situations of social vulnerability in the territory of Sol Nascente/Ceilândia in the Federal District, since the citizens who benefited from this equipment suffered strongly from social vulnerability.

## REFERENCES

1. Brasil. [Constituição (1988)]. Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil [internet]. Brasília, DF: Senado Federal; 2010 [cited 2023 Jul 7]. Available from: [https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil\\_03/constituicao/constituicao.htm](https://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/constituicao/constituicao.htm)
2. Brasil. Ministério da Saúde. Política Nacional de Alimentação e Nutrição. Brasília: Ministério da Saúde, 2013.
3. Leão M. (org.). O direito humano à alimentação adequada e o sistema nacional de segurança alimentar e nutricional Brasília: ABRANDH; 2013.
4. Instituto Fome Zero. O Direito Humano à Alimentação Adequada (Dhaa) como Diretriz para Erradicação da Fome no Brasil [Internet]. São Paulo: Cátedra Josué de Castro; 2022 [cited 2023 Jul 7]. Available from: <https://catedrajc.fsp.usp.br/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Fome-e-DHAA.pdf>
5. Guerra LDS, Cervato-Mancuso AMB, Couto AD. Alimentação: um direito humano em disputa - focos temáticos para compreensão e atuação em segurança alimentar e nutricional. *Cien Saude Colet*. 2019;24(9):3369-94. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-81232018249.20302017>
6. Godoy KC, Sávio KEO, Akutsu RC, Gubert MB, Botelho RBA. Perfil e situação de insegurança alimentar dos usuários dos Restaurantes Populares no Brasil. *Cad Saude Publica*. 2014;30(6):1239-49. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-311X00084013>
7. Padrão SM, Aguiar OBD. Restaurante popular: a política social em questão. *Physis*. 2018;28(3):e280319. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-73312018280319>
8. Gonçalves MP, Campos ST, Sarti FM. Políticas públicas de segurança alimentar no Brasil: uma análise do Programa de Restaurantes Populares. *RG&PP*. 2011;1(1):e97826. <https://doi.org/10.11606/rgpp.v1i1.97826>
9. Santarelli M, Burity V. Cortes orçamentários. In: Santarelli M, Burity V, editors. *Informe Dhana 2019: autoritarismo, negação de direitos e fome*. Brasília: FIAN Brasil; 2019. p. 43-48.
10. Rocha NC. Curso básico de direito humano à alimentação e à nutrição adequadas: módulo 1. Brasília: FIAN Brasil; 2021.
11. Rede PENSSAN. I VIGISAN: Inquérito Nacional Sobre Insegurança Alimentar no contexto da Pandemia da Covid-19 no Brasil [Internet]. Rio de Janeiro: Rede PENSSAN; 2021 [cited 2023 Jul 4]. Available from: <https://olheparaafome.com.br/pesquisa2020/>
12. Rede PENSSAN. II VIGISAN: inquérito nacional sobre insegurança alimentar no contexto da pandemia da covid-19 no Brasil [Internet]. Rio de Janeiro: Rede PENSSAN; 2022 [cited 2023 Jul 5]; Available from: <https://olheparaafome.com.br/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Relatorio-II-VIGISAN-2022.pdf>
13. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. Pesquisa de orçamentos familiares 2017-2018: análise da segurança alimentar no Brasil [Internet]. Rio de Janeiro: IBGE; 2020 [cited 2023 Jul 7]. Available from: <https://biblioteca.ibge.gov.br/visualizacao/livros/liv101749.pdf>
14. Sousa, LRM, Segall-Corrêa AM, Ville AS, Melgar-Quiñonez H. Food security status in times of financial and political crisis in Brazil. *Cad Saude Publica*. 2019;35(7):e00084118. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-311X00084118>

15. Gurgel AM, Santos CCS, Alves KPS, Araujo JM, Leal VS. Estratégias governamentais para a garantia do direito humano à alimentação adequada e saudável no enfrentamento à pandemia de Covid-19 no Brasil. *Cienc Saude Coletiva*. 2020;25(12):4945-56. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-812320202512.33912020>
16. Ribeiro-Silva RC, Pereira M, Campello T, Aragão É, Guimarães JMM, Ferreira AJ, et al. Implicações da pandemia COVID-19 para a segurança alimentar e nutricional no Brasil. *Cienc Saude Coletiva*. 2020;25(9):3421-30. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-81232020259.22152020>
17. Movimento dos Trabalhadores Sem Teto. Cozinha Solidária [Internet]. São Paulo: MST; 2020 [cited 2022 Jan 10]. Available from: <https://www.cozinhasolidaria.com/>
18. Presidência da República (Brasil.) Lei nº 11.346, de 15 de setembro de 2006. Cria o Sistema Nacional de Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional. SISAN com vistas em assegurar o direito humano à alimentação adequada e dá outras providências. *Diário Oficial da União*, 2006 Set 15;179(seção 1):1-2.
19. Companhia de Planejamento do Distrito Federal. Pesquisa Distrital por Amostra de Domicílios [Internet]. Brasília: CODEPLAN; 2021 [cited 2023 Jul 5]. Available from: [https://pdad2021.ipe.df.gov.br/static/downloads/relatorios/p%C3%B4r\\_do\\_sol.pdf](https://pdad2021.ipe.df.gov.br/static/downloads/relatorios/p%C3%B4r_do_sol.pdf)
20. Companhia de Planejamento do Distrito Federal. Gênero e Orientação Sexual no DF - um olhar inclusivo: Inserção de perguntas sobre identidade de gênero e orientação sexual na Pdad 2021 e em questionário suplementar on-line [Internet]. Brasília: CODEPLAN; 2022 [cited 2023 Jul 5]. Available from: <https://www.codeplan.df.gov.br/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/NT-Genero-e-Orientacao-Sexual-no-DF-um-olhar-inclusivo.pdf>
21. Burity VTA, Rocha NC. O direito humano à alimentação e à nutrição adequadas (Dhana). In: Burity VTA, Rocha NC, editors. *Informe Dhana 2021: pandemia, desigualdade e fome*. Brasília: FIAN Brasil; 2021.
22. Oliveira JTC, Camargo AM, Machado BOB, Oliveira AR, Fiates GMR, Vasconcelos FAG. "Hunger and rage (and the virus) are human things": reflections on solidarity in times of Covid-19. *Rev Nutr*. 2021;34:e200183. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1678-9865202134e200183>
23. Santos MVA, Oliveira IG, Pereira FMN, Santos PR. Insegurança alimentar e nutricional: uma análise sobre as políticas públicas de interface com alimentação e nutrição em meio a pandemia por Sars-CoV-2. *Segur Aliment Nutr*. 2021;28:e021003. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20396/san.v28i00.8661450>
24. Santos FB, Silva SLB. Gênero, raça e classe no Brasil: os efeitos do racismo estrutural e institucional na vida da população negra durante a pandemia da covid-19. *Rev Direito e Prax*. 2022;13(3):1847-73. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2179-8966/2022/68967>
25. Madeira Z, Gomes DDO. Persistentes desigualdades raciais e resistências negras no Brasil contemporâneo. *Serv Soc Soc*. 2018;(133):463-79. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0101-6628.154>
26. Salata A. Race, class and income inequality in Brazil: A social trajectory analysis. *Dados Rev Cienc Sociais*. 2020;63(3):e20190063. <https://doi.org/10.1590/dados.2020.63.3.213>
27. Siliprandi E. Políticas de segurança alimentar e relações de gênero. *Cad Deb*. 2004;11:38-57.
28. Silva SO, Santos SMC, Gama CM, Santos MEP, Silva NJ. A cor e o sexo da fome: análise da insegurança alimentar sob o olhar da interseccionalidade. *Cad Saude Publica*. 2022;38:e00255621. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-311XPT255621>
29. Gonzalez L. Mulher Negra. Comunicação "The Black Woman's Place in the Brazilian Society", apresentada na "1985 and Beyond: A National Conference", promovida pelo African-American Political Caucus e pela Morgan State University. Baltimore; 1984.
30. Sousa LP, Guedes DR. A desigual divisão sexual do trabalho: um olhar sobre a última década. *Estud Av*. 2016;30(87):123-39. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-40142016.30870008>
31. Oliveira AR. Reflexões e contradições sobre o comer na modernidade. In: Rosaneli CF, editor. *Fomes Contemporâneas* [Internet]. Curitiba: PucPess; 2020 [cited 2023 Jul 9]. p.915-1036. Available from: [https://www.pucpress.com.br/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/fomes\\_contemporaneas\\_completo.pdf](https://www.pucpress.com.br/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/fomes_contemporaneas_completo.pdf)
32. Melo HP, Morandi L. A divisão sexual do trabalho no contexto da pandemia. *Rev Trabalho Necessário*. 2021;19(38):105-2. <https://doi.org/10.22409/tn.v19i38.45884>

33. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. Em média, mulheres dedicam 10,4 horas por semana a mais que os homens aos afazeres domésticos ou ao cuidado de pessoas. Estatísticas Sociais [Internet]. Rio de Janeiro: IBGE; 2020 [cited 2023 Jul 5]. Available from: <https://agenciadenoticias.ibge.gov.br/agencia-sala-de-imprensa/2013-agencia-de-noticias/releases/27877-em-media-mulheres-dedicam-10-4-horas-por-semana-a-mais-que-os-homens-aos-afazeres-domesticos-ou-ao-cuidado-de-pessoas>

## CONTRIBUTORS

SW MADRUGA contributed to the conception and design, analysis and interpretation of data, review and approval of the final version of the article. BOB MACHADO contributed to the collection, analysis and interpretation of data, review and approval of the final version of the article. AR OLIVEIRA contributed to the conception and design, discussion, review and approval of the final version of the article.