



A sustainable agriculture for food sovereignty ?

Role and place of rural youth building the future agriculture

Report of the study session held by
International Movement of Catholic Agricultural and Rural Youth
(MIJARC Europe)
in co-operation with the European Youth Centre of the Council of Europe

European Youth Centre Strasbourg
25-30 May 2010

This report gives an account of various aspects of the study session. It has been produced by and is the responsibility of the educational team of the study session. It does not represent the official point of view of the Council of Europe.

A sustainable agriculture for food sovereignty ?

Role and place of rural youth building the future agriculture

Report of the study session held by
International Movement of Catholic Agricultural and Rural Youth
(MIJARC Europe)
in co-operation with the European Youth Centre of the Council of Europe

European Youth Centre Strasbourg
25-30 May 2010

Acknowledgements

- *Team* : Gael Montassier, Jurgen Seeger, Georges Dixon Fernandez, Claire Quintin
- *Reporters* : Claire Quintin, Patricia Matzdorf

International Movement of Catholic Rural Youth (MIJARC Europe)

53 rue J.Coosemans
1030 Bruxelles
Belgium

tel: +32-2-7 42 30 64, fax: +32- 2- 7 34 93 25
E-mail: office-europe@mijarc.info
website: www.mijarc.info

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	4
List of acronyms and abbreviations:.....	6
Introduction	7
Final Political paper	9
Program.....	14
<u>I. Day 1- Introductions</u>	<u>14</u>
a. Morning- Introduction and expectations	14
b. Afternoon	14
1/ Marcel Mazoyer: Will the world agriculture be able to feed humankind in the 21st century ?	14
2/ Working groups- introductions	16
<u>II. Day 2- Get to Know Food Sovereignty</u>	<u>17</u>
a. Morning- A North/South perspective on food systems	17
1/ CCFD Game: experience the world food market.....	17
2/ Testimonies	17
b. Afternoon	20
1/ Working groups - sharing experiences.....	20
2/ Debate - What do I think about agriculture?	20
<u>III. Day 3- Field visits and agro-ecology</u>	<u>23</u>
a. Morning- Field visits	23
b. Afternoon	23
1/ Working groups – Exchange on the field visits	23
2/ Are agroecological practices compatibles with food sovereignty? by Silvia Vitoria Perez	23
<u>IV. Day 4- Best practices</u>	<u>26</u>
a. Free Morning	26
b. Afternoon	26
1/ Forum of best practices	26
2/ Working groups – analysis of the situation	28
<u>V. Day 5- political document</u>	<u>28</u>
a. Morning	28
1/ Working groups- Writing a political document	28
2/ An ethical point of view on food By Jurgen Seeger, (Katholischen Landjugendbewegung Deutschlands).....	28
b. Afternoon	29
1/ Working groups- Writing a political document	29
2/“Young citizens wonder: what European policy to guarantee food sovereignty from North to South?”- With Claude Breune.....	32
<u>VI. Day 6- strategies</u>	<u>33</u>

<i>a. Morning- Finalizing the political paper</i>	33
<i>b. Afternoon- strategies</i>	33
Final Conclusions and recommendations	35
Analysis of the Session.....	36
Annexes	37

List of acronyms and abbreviations:

ATC	Asociación de Trabajadores del Campo
CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
CCFD	Comité Catholique contre la Faim et pour le Développement- Terre Solidaire
EiR	Edukacja I Rozwoj
EU	European Union
EYC	European Youth Center
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization (UN body)
FS	Food Sovereignty
GIEC	Intergovernmental Group of Experts on the Evolution of the Climate (IPCC)
GMO	Genetically Modified Organism
HR	Human Rights
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
KLJB	Katholischen Landjugendbewegung Deutschlands
MGD	Millennium Goals for Development
MIJARC	International Movement of Catholic and Rural Youth
MRJC	Mouvement Rural de Jeunesse Chrétienne
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
UN	United Nations
USA	United States of America
WFP	World Food Program
WG	Working Group
WTO	World Trade Organization
YMDRAB	Youth movement for rural development of Rural Areas in Bulgaria

Introduction

Feeding the world is a huge challenge for humankind. More and more people are getting hungry, less and less land is available to produce food, the population increases, most food systems are unsustainable and the environmental challenges add even more complexity to the situation. Moreover, our way to produce food in Western countries has a strong impact on the economic, environmental and political situation of poorer countries. Our food system as it is now is in crisis and needs to be changed.

The concept of “food sovereignty” was conceived by the very victims of the present situation to change the food paradigm at a global level. It is “the right of the people, the countries, to have a voice to decide their own consumption and food production as long as this does not harm other countries”¹. This concept has a very strong political dimension, but its implementation requires also environmental, social and economical changes in the food system. As rural youngsters, we aim at building a sustainable world, starting from today and for the upcoming generations. For us, this concept can be a real tool to empower the actors of the agricultural system to ensure a sustainable production of food and other agricultural products.

If nothing is done, we, the youth, will be the first victims of the situation. But we also recognize that plenty of solutions are already in germ in our organisations, the intellectual world, and even in farmers’ practices. Agro ecology, local markets, food education, alternative agricultural techniques, solidarity nets among the actors of agricultural sectors etc. are already building the agriculture of tomorrow. The concept of food sovereignty can gather all these initiatives towards the same direction and spread these innovative ideas to speed up the change.

The lacking part for a major change is the political will to support these initiatives and carry out this new paradigm. The international food institutions face difficulties in promoting sustainable food policies, mostly because they lack inclusiveness. Some politicians are in favour to sustainable agriculture but the political sphere in general is still quite reluctant to change the neo-liberal paradigm that lead to this situation. This is why our organisations do not trust the politicians to solve the problems by themselves. We are willing to make our voices heard at all levels, together with allies from youth, farmers, environmental, women and consumers organisations.

This study session aims were, firstly, to raise awareness on the concept of food sovereignty among European rural young people coming from MIJARC national movements and partner organizations. This concept is poorly known in Europe, even by local leaders of civil society organisations promoting this concept. Then the second objective was to build a common analysis on the realities of the rural sector in Europe, using the knowledge of the participants and supported by experts. Finally, this study session aimed to favour European and national initiatives among rural youth about sustainable agriculture and food sovereignty.

¹ Via Campesina definition of Food Sovereignty

Twenty five young people (including the team) participated, coming from 8 countries of the Council of Europe and 1 from outside Europe. The presence of a participant from Latin-America was a great chance for the group to keep in mind the situation outside Europe and consider the interdependence in the agriculture system at all levels. All the participants were local or national leaders of a rural organisation, which will hopefully ensure a continuity between the study session and future activities of these organisations. Most of the participants were not very familiar with the concept of food sovereignty, even though they were working more or less directly on agricultural issues in their organisation. So it was for us a great success to be able to build together a political document as well as a common strategy to promote food sovereignty in Europe.

The program was build according to our methodology “see-judge-act”, which is a participative process for collective training. The whole session alternated plenary sessions with experts and working groups, which ensured a good balance between external inputs and experience sharing among the participants. The plenary sessions dealt with different perspectives on agriculture: macro-economical, North/South, ethical and agro-ecological. In the working groups, the participants were split in 3 groups with a special focus in each group: educational, political and economical. These working groups were a chance to exchange practices, discover experiences during a field visit and draft a part for the political paper.

The end of the study session was focused on strategical work. A forum of best practices was organised, as well as a meeting with a politician in order to help the participants to finalise the political document. All the proposals on political, economical and educational systems were developed in this political statement made at the end of the study session. Once the political document was done, the participants set up national and European strategies to reach the objectives mentioned in the political document.

This study session was thus a great opportunity for the participants to understand collectively the meaning and the strength of the concept of food sovereignty to ensure a sustainable agriculture at all levels: environmentally, socially, economically and politically. The motivation that they expressed at the end of the study session proved the strategy we set up together will not remain just a paper but will come into action in MIJARC Europe members and partner movements. Now that we are back to our countries, our organisations will further develop these statements with debates, projects, actions, advocacy, trainings... We're building the agriculture of tomorrow!

Final Political paper

(as validated at the end of the seminar)

Rural youngsters building the future agriculture

The obligation to commit oneself to the development of peoples is not just an individual duty, and still less an individualistic one, as if it was possible to achieve this development through the isolated efforts of each individual. It is an imperative which obliges each and every man and woman, as well as societies and nations.

So we, as European youngsters from the rural area, emphasize that a world without poverty and hunger, and with sustainable agriculture is possible as well. *Solidarity, option for the poor and the responsibility for Gods' creation is undoubtedly a Christian virtue.*

Seventy-five percent (75%) of the estimated 1 billion hungry people live in rural areas. On the other hand we see an over consumption in many countries and an agriculture that has never been as modernized as today. This is the result of global capitalism and neo-liberal policies which do not respect the environment and the well-being of humankind with regards to the development of agricultural production and emerging markets.

Many people and organisations are engaged in building a viable alternative to the current food production, distribution and consumption. Food sovereignty has emerged as a solution promoted by farmers and civil society. It is the right of peoples', countries' or groups of countries' to self define their agriculture and food policy, to provide their own population with qualitative good food, which is sufficient, healthy and nutritious and which corresponds to their cultural habits. The different nations should have the possibility to protect themselves from dumping. At the same time they are obliged to avoid negative consequences for third party nations.

I. Agricultural policies

We notice that:

The European agricultural system is in crisis. There is enough food produced on this planet to feed the global/entire population but there is a lack of political initiative to organize the food sector in such a way that everyone can exercise their right and access to food. The current "free" trade has not led to the reduction of hunger in the world. On the contrary, food policies remain inadequate and unfair: they promote unsustainable food production methods and distribution, which do not benefit the majority of rural and urban population resulting in (number) deaths from hunger every year case in point. On the international level, the Structural Adjustment Policies implemented by the World Bank, the IMF and the Agreement on Agriculture in WTO, bilateral free trade agreements like EU's Economic Partnership agreements and EFTAS Free Trade Agreements, produce/engender detrimental effects on farmers' ability to feed their own people. This contrasts with the European level, where the CAP (Common Agricultural Policy) does not prioritise enough sustainable agriculture at all levels. This has led to large scale commercial and environmentally hostile farming whereby consumers have become detached from producers and the (agricultural) food processes.

Intellectual property rights (IPR) (like patents), seed breeders rights and other national and international efforts to control seeds also undermines farmers autonomy and young peoples possibilities.

There is a lack of young people who farm. Rural areas are not attractive enough for young people because of a lack of social activities. Such situations prevent young people from wishing or succeeding in becoming farmers. This is only worsened by the fact that youth have no access to land.

So we call for:

- A land reform for an equitable and fair access to land.
- More young farmers: policies to support farm start up.
- The right to set up control measures for the protection of local food products.
- A fair trade for all. For us fair means local trade as much as possible to prevent food dumping. When local supply is not possible, trade should be fair for producers and suppliers, which means that it can not be done by big trans-national companies.
- The rejection of intellectual property rights on life. (e.g. seeds, ...).
- Policies which favours environmental friendly agriculture.
- The adoption of Food Sovereignty in any international food policy.
- At the international level: prevent dumping allow local market oriented agricultural model instead of export-oriented.
- In Europe: a CAP in 2013 that recognizes food sovereignty, allows decent income for the farmers, promote sustainable use of all natural resources, help access to land and set-up of farms for young farmers, focus on rural development instead of the international trade rules and stop promoting GMOs and large-scale industrialized agro-fuels.
- Recognize a sustainable and local production and consumption of Agro-fuels as long as it will not compete with food.
- Implementation of the conclusions of IAASTD, that states that business as usual is no longer an option and that small-scale sustainable agriculture can play the major role in feeding the world.
- Rejuvenate rural areas.
- We need more youth participation in consultation and policy making bodies.
- Implement the rights of women in agricultural policies, as they are marginalized, while they are producing 50 % of the food in the world (up to 80 % in most developing countries).

II. Governance for food decisions

We notice that :

Food decisions are taken by non-democratic and non-transparent bodies. Multinationals have too much power. They only represent a commercial interest of a small amount of people. They have taken control over farmers and customers-consumers and tell us what to eat. The World Trade Organization controls global food policies without respecting local, regional and national sovereignty. Moreover, there are not sufficient opportunities for civil society to participate in all aspects of agricultural issues.

So we call for:

- Multi-participatory decision bodies. A priority should be given to the participation of producers as well as consumers in food and agriculture decision making processes. The strong imbalance of means between private companies lobbies and social movements should be compensated by some political regulations.
- Global governance is a chance for stakeholders at all levels to participate.
- The United Nations shall have more power than the International Monetary Fund and World Bank.
- We demand the opportunity for young voices to be heard in policies that affect rural youngsters and their future.
- A local democratic control over food producing resources: natural resources, land, seeds, credit and market
- The recognition of small and medium young farmers as sustainable managers of the natural resources.
- Community market orientation policies: democratic structures by farmers, consumers and national governments.

II. Food Markets and Economy

We notice that:

There are several economic factors which are central to the struggle for food sovereignty. The privatisation and commodification of food and water generates a capitalist ideology and action on a global scale. This approach in turn threatens the production of good, healthy and abundant food. The ruinous practices of multi-national corporations such as land grabbing, the destruction of local markets via price dumping (*dumping of food at prices below the cost of production in the local/global economy*) and the export of the high quality produce have a knock-on effect on the power balance between farmers, consumers, and the multi-nationals. These difficulties encourage rural to urban migrations, which factor in the progressively rising costs which threaten the future of food production.

So we call for:

- Farmers must be rewarded and supported for developing their business and generating economic activity and development.
- Prioritise local and national economies and markets (i.e. producers and consumers) over the demands of global markets and international corporations
- Facilitate economic stability via (e.g. mechanisms for periodical review (FPPR),
- Redistribution, equitable access and control over natural and productive resources
- Local supply and demand of primary resources/inputs, (e.g. seeds/ seed swaps, livestock,..) for producers as/and consumers
- To exercise the right to food from local and sustainable markets from our own region.
- Equal access to local markets

To promote:

- Fair wages for farmers and agricultural workers – proposed schema (wages, affordable food, fair prices to agriculture worker and farmers, avoids rural to urban migration,...)
- Fair ethical prices which enable a ‘fair’ standard of living
- Affordable food, that is healthy, enough and culturally acceptable
- Encourage price protection policies for countries, (e.g. increased import taxes on products which can be produced in the ‘home’ country and lower import taxes on not-local products)
- Agrarian reform that ensures economic justice and local autonomy
- Increasing farms autonomy, that is to say the independence of the farmers.
- Local markets
- Food security, quality and safety
- Development of rural areas via increased employability, wages and access to information and opportunities for young people
- ‘Not mass production, but production by the masses: which serves to improve economic stability via increased employment, thus increased opportunities, wages and standard of living.

IV. Farming education

We notice that:

The future of youth in agriculture is uncertain. As the future generation we believe that there is a lack of recognition of traditional farmer knowledge concerning ecologically-sound and sustainable farming methods/techniques. While *many* believe that new technology will save the world, looks down on peasant knowledge and lack of direct trade between farmer / consumer in agricultural education / training... There is a lack of networks and links due to individual agriculture, a difficulty to link young people with fewer opportunities and a lack of transparency and information to consumers, in particular about the real price of the food that permit a fair income to producers. Cities not offer enough opportunities to get in touch with nature and environment to thus to learn about them.

We could link it to the fact that education does not promote local trade methods, alternative production systems. In schools there is a lack of education about farming and food production.

Local agriculture is in decline and the economic crisis has a negative influence on agriculture: it generated more industrialized monoculture farming. The land prices are high, so it's difficult to start up as a farmer. "One size fits all"-solutions are unacceptable. Solutions must be adapted to local situations.

So we call for:

- Debates between peasants and politicians.
- Recognize traditional methods in combination with new knowledge.
- Teaching about how to diversify local production.
- Improve link between rural and urban, create network between farmer and consumer.
- Education and information so that everyone knows what they are eating and how it was produced.
- Passing on of traditional peasant knowledge.
- Small scale farming to improve the relation and transparency between farmer and consumer.
- Teaching both ways between farmer and technicians, to prevent top-down processes.
- Agricultural education has to include teaching of alternative agricultural methods as organic farming, agro-ecology, biodynamics, permaculture etc.
- Training and information sessions on market changes at local, regional and national - ("glocal")

V. Our Commitments

Lobby work :

- Participate and promote youth and women participation to local, national and international consultations on food policies.
- Youth participation to Nyeleni process and in regional, as well as international meetings such as the Young People Summit, Social Forums, etc.
- Demand more democracy and transparency in food policies.
- Lobby for policies targeting young farmers.
- Press releases on local farming activities.
- Reduce transportation miles in the food system.
- Promote local services in rural areas.
- To strengthen the movements of young people for food sovereignty at the grass-roots level.
- We demand the access to and control over land and food resources.

Information campaigns

- Inform all the levels of politicians and all the social classes of population with particular attention to young people with fewer opportunities.
 - What is the real price of food that permits a fair income to producers.
 - Access to land (land grabbing, speculation, prices of the land)
 - Change in food policy
 - Link between urban consumers and producers
 - Waste of foods
 - Food waste utilization (collection, composting, feeding animals etc.)
 - Different types of alternative agriculture and trade (permaculture, organic, AMAP, local chain of selling)
- Educate local people on their local culture, by non-formal and formal education.
- Press releases on local farming activities.

These campaigns could be launched with all the traditional aims of communication (petition, forums documents, movies) but also with new aims (cyclo-foncier, games, internet...)

Formal education:

At school with children

- Fix farming education in school programs, through:
 - Cooking sessions in classroom
 - Gardening
 - Field trips to local small-scale farmers and local, skilled manual food producers (butchers, bakers etc)

In future farmer training:

- Open the training of future farmers as follows:
 - with the traditional methods of agriculture, in relation with their region.
 - with alternative systems of production
 - in politics
 - in economics (market functions, etc.)
 - in exchanges of good practices on agricultural, agro-ecological, social and experiences to develop the local economy
 - Youth training of economics and the market functions, ethical consumption & agro-ecology

Non-formal education:

- Promote and develop gardening to strengthen food autonomy of the people, especially the persons with fewer opportunities.
- Capacity building by promotion of sustainable production via agro-ecological, small-scale and family farming. This should be supplemented by resource support (e.g. subsidies)
- Encourage all the organisations which create social network in order to improve non-formal education about agriculture and food sovereignty
 - AMAP (Associations for the preservation of peasant farming)
 - association of producers/ consumer
 - farmer group of discussion

o Program

I. Day 1 - Introductions

a. Morning - Introduction and expectations

We started the study session by a general introduction on what is Food Sovereignty and why it is interesting to work on this concept. A clarification was made on terminologies: the “*Right to food*” is a juridical concept, when “*Food security*” is a technical concept and “*Food Sovereignty*” is a political concept, that enables people to decide what they want to eat (right to discuss and have your say in agricultural policies). MIJARC Europe has a political role in the promotion of this concept. MIJARC is targeting this concept on a global scale, hence we strongly appreciated to have a 'southern' participant from Nicaragua.

It was also explained that the methodology used during the study session would be the traditional methodology used in MIJARC activities, which is the process “SEE-JUDGE-ACT”, to 'build & work' together. MIJARC is using facilitators versus 'trainers or experts' in the field. Tasks groups were be put in place to integrate everybody in the process.

After this general introduction, the floor was given to the participants to present themselves and express their fears and expectations. (*see annex n° 1*). The main expectations were about learning more about the topic, exchanges and interactions with the other participants and the field visits. On the side of fears, most were related to communication problems, the legitimacy of the participants and usefulness of the study session for local levels.

The introduction plenary was finalized by a welcome by Dariusz Grzemny, representative of Council of Europe with a brief presentation of the European Youth Centre and Council of Europe. Then Xavier Baró, our educational advisor, gave more details about the structure, objectives and agenda of the Council of Europe.

b. Afternoon

1/ Marcel Mazoyer: Will the world agriculture be able to feed humankind in the 21st century ?

We started the afternoon with a plenary let by Marcel Mazoyer, agricultural economist, who gave a global perspective on the topic and a definition of food sovereignty. He explained how dramatic is the world food situation : among the 6,8 billion human beings in the world, there are 3 billion of poor who lack sufficient access to food, 2 billion who suffer from malnutrition and 873 million who suffer from hunger most of the time (FAO STAT 2004- 2006), and 9 million who die from hunger each year.

There have been an explosion of the prices of primary resources leading to a new wave of hungry people. Now we don't have current statistics but the increase is clear. In the last 15 years the number of starving people is increasing. There were more deaths of hunger than during the holocaust during the World War II. Meanwhile, hunger is part of the MGD (Millennium Goals for Development).

Most of the poor, malnourished, undernourished and hunger victims are peasants in developing countries. Poverty and undernourished people are concentrated in rural areas.

To understand this dramatic food situation and why it exists in the rural areas and slum areas, we need to understand the world situation.

Currently we have 6,8 billion people in the world. There is a very large agricultural farm population, reaching up to 60-70% in the so called South of the world. In the countries in the South there are frequently old people and children working, but not necessarily full time. 1.4 billion people work in agriculture. In the world there are 28 million tractors, for 2 % of the farmers. There are 1 billion peasants working manually, using for example hoes and machetes. They cultivate less than 1 hectare per person. They don't have the means to buy commercial seeds, fertilizers, etc. They are able only to produce 10 tones per hectare (at max).

Many of these manual farmers don't have access to land, largely because they were expropriated in colonial times, especially in Asia, Latin America, India. In some cases some lands has been given back, so they haven't had the time to acquire the means to better their production. Many work on part time basis as they don't earn enough.

The Agricultural revolution (in the 1950s) and the green revolution (motorisation of agriculture, modern farming techniques) showed their limits: there are only 28 million tractors in the world – this has completely changed the agricultural productions. Those working with tractors in 2000, give a yield of up to 200 hectares per workers and can produce 2000 tons. Many of these belong to large farms and multi-national farmers. The gap between the production of the large majority to minority is a big gap in terms of productivity – the scale of inequalities remains the same even. Some situations would allow large and rich farmers to buy the best land, technology and increase their yield. Hence they will be able to produce at a lowest possible cost.

A second reason was the relocation of agricultural revolution in countries with large estates and low wages, where equipment and productivity levels are similar to those of the most productive family farmers (in the US and in EU countries). But there, the wages are 25 to 50 times lower and production costs 2 times lower than those of the most competitive families.

In conclusion, 50 years what happened is that the Capital will find the best technology (in terms of productivity) to increase your yield to have access to the world demand. To do this you must understand the world markets, international market that goes beyond borders, the self consumption of production. Now 2 kinds of markets are living in parallel: Peasant markets were products are directly sold on the local market , and international market where the production is exported to other countries

Marcel explained us how the international market works; the person who sets the international price is the farmer who can sell at the lowest price, hence the person with highest yield and the lowest price. These are the multi-national farmers who can afford these lowest prices due the highest yield. Then they must consider export and import. The farmers must take note of their investment yield. If the production price is too low, with the export prices, they may arrive at a point where the investment to buy their next lot of seeds is too high. So to avoid this price drop, there are speculators who buy up the product ahead of time. Speculation leads either to an excessive raise in prices that then collapsed, but it was then their selling the leads to the massive drop in prices. So why are the prices so low? Because the production is no longer increasing, hence the production becomes less 'rentable'. The cost of production is becoming more expensive. This has now changed the cost of production of agriculture, we

can now produce at less than 100 Euros per hectare. So how the US farmers survive? They survive by way of subsidies, which they receive to counter these low-price competitor countries. This is to be linked to the Marrakech agreement. The problem isn't with the country but with the multi-national companies. Often there is considerable damage. It's the agricultural capitalism that has taken over.

The consequences of the long period of increasing surpluses at decreasing prices were that on one hand or poor agricultural countries a blocking-up of development impoverishment, undernourishment, rural-urban migrations, unemployment, low wages, emigration, food dependency, macroeconomic deficits, over indebtedness, loss of sovereignty (imposed by international financial institutions) leading to lack of governability, as it is these international financial institutions that own governments. It is those you loan the money at the final level who are at fault for conflicts, famines etc. On the other hand, for the world economy, a lack of purchasing power, excess of saving and financial capital, speculation, financial crisis, generalised crashes. It reduces the purchasing power of half the people. But this has its end. There are financial products which are very dangerous if we loan money to States that are already over indebted. There is no way that they can pay it back. These toxic-financial products are toxic to the whole financial system.

Marcel presentation ended with some perspectives and possibilities. He explained that if agriculture wants to be able to feed humankind, it needs to be able to correct the food deficit we need enough land, technology and the political situation to foster this equilibration. Then we should increase land use in some parts: taking into consideration the best and medium quality land for cultivation, ignoring the land that is difficult to cultivate and the land which should not be used for agriculture, if we eliminate the land used for infrastructure at reserves (some of it we will not use – e.g. national reserves, forests, infrastructures...), the world cultivable area is 1,4%. So there are still some margins of progress. We actually know the techniques. When corrected from their drawbacks, they permit to maintain production per hectare on the half of the world which progressed most, to double production per hectare in the half of the world which progressed least and all this will permit to increase the world average production per hectare by 30%. In conclusion, we need a real green revolution: if we are not careful we will produce as much poverty as wealth (like now).

The presentation was followed by a session of questions and answers when the participants exchanged with Marcel about what can we do at our level to help change of the situation as much of what was said was on a global scale?, whether Micro-credit is a bad thing, and on climate change and Co2 emissions in agriculture.

2/ Working groups - introductions

The objectives of the working groups was to allow the participants to deepen a key aspect of food sovereignty in small groups: educational aspects, political aspects and economical aspects. The fact to be in small groups allowed the participants to share experiences, build a common analysis of the situation and participate actively in the preparation of the political document.

In the first session of the working group, the participants had the chance to introduce each other once more, and have a brief overview of what was the topics they were dealing with, with a short game or presentation.

Some groups organized a brainstorming on the problems in education, some experienced a game on the inequalities of resources in agriculture, and a short presentation on the main actors of the agricultural sector was presented.

This session was quite short and just let the participants know better the people of their sub-group and start understanding their sub topic better.

II. Day 2 - Get to Know Food Sovereignty

a. Morning - A North/South perspective on food systems

1/ CCFD Game: experience the world food market

The morning started by a game to understand better the world food system by experimenting it. The participants were divided in several countries (India, Bolivia, France, United States) with different food realities. Their aim was to eat and feed their populations according to their cultural habits. But no one had enough to be food autonomous, so they had to exchange with the other nations and experience the strong inequalities among states regarding food. There were also changes in the world (events) which may affect the process (drought, market crisis, etc.) and that they had to take into account.

It was very appreciated by the participants who enjoyed learning by doing.

2/ Testimonies

After the game– discussion was done with people who come from or represent Southern countries to explain what is their reality.

Elvis Gomez- ATC, La via Campesina Nicaragua

The first testimony came from Elvis Gomez from Nicaragua. He gave us an idea about the situation of Nicaragua and Central America. They are a region very centred on agriculture where more than 70% of the population live with 1 dollar a day. Throughout history they have had several conflicts. In 1979, they had a “Sandinist revolution” which allowed them to expropriate 270 farms from the monopolist families. This was 155,139 acres of lands. It affected 100 producers.

There are 5, 5 million inhabitants in the country, of which 1.5 million emigrated to Costa Rica looking for work. 75 % of the population are very young (18-35 years).

Regarding agriculture, most farmers have 2 hectares of land to cultivate, some used for woodland, livestock and housing. Their models of production is very manual and local type production. Most of the production in Nicaragua is cereals, rice, bananas, corn, meat.

Their trade method takes place through intermediaries: The orders of production are not capitalized, so they use loans from micro-finance organizations. Here we find middle men, that put condition on the price. There a no direct trade mechanism. There is now a Trade agreement with the USA: They have had a negative effect on productive trade, taking away the purchasing power form the farmer.

The mechanisms for trade in Nicaragua are simple (free trade agreements): rice needs to be imported from the US. The competition between the US and Nicaragua is unfair as Nicaraguan don't have the tools resources or the subsidies that the US government gives to their farmers. Due to these trade agreement this requires Nicaragua to purchase goods from the US – Nicaragua lost its food identity and now consume a lot of junk-food. This has led to

unemployment and rural exodus for rural to urban areas or to Costa Rica. There are fewer universities, schools, well developed health systems. Many Nicaraguans have lost their land. With 75% of the population being young, they need to focus on education rather than the current system that favours exodus.

His Organization, the Agricultural Workers Association (ATC) works with trade unions that work specifically in agriculture and trade. The objectives of this organization is to try to look for alternatives for the small farmers. It organizes a capitalization that takes quality into account and incorporates women and family in to the 'system'. Since 27 % of the population in Nicaragua suffers from malnutrition, they can improve this by capitalization and commercialisation. They can provide them with tools, animals, materials to a enable them to farm, favouring the use of cooperatives. This facilitates the legal framework which enables the access to programmes. ATC also establishes spaces for trade, which enable small producers to sell directly to consumers, diversify the production, create 'green markets' (for direct sales between producers & consumers) and organize 'local' farmers market to eliminate the middle man.

To answer the need for education of young people, they created a university course – a technical training programme in agriculture and livestock. It is based on the idea that adults often don't know more about the trade, administration and the commercial functions that go beyond producing. The youth could bring this knowledge. Attending university during the week and later go back to their farms with local producers where they can then apply practical systems. 40 people were graduated from this programme, 90 are currently taking the course. They aim at expanding this education concept to the North (area rich in agriculture) and throughout the country.

ATC attempts to create initiatives designed to help organise and motivate young people to get involved in this training program. The young people that have gotten involved, have resulted in improving agricultural production.

Regarding the exodus, ATC aims at helping these people to have legal status. Many emigrate illegally, leading to a low and precarious lifestyle (low standard of living).

With Via Campesina they have explored and worked on the concept of food sovereignty. Recently the law on food sovereignty was approved and this will help in implementing food sovereignty. Nicaragua is the first country to sign the land charter, recognising and helping the environment (reducing global warming) which favours policies of food sovereignty and food security by way of small farmers. This law has encouraged governmental projects to get involved and create centres (schools have set up centres as well as give training) that recognises the power and role of small farmers and educate them. The idea has taken on. This law has made it possible to inherit land from parents to farm.

This presentation of the situation of Food in Nicaragua and initiatives to solve the problems was followed by a session of questions & answers, where the participants mainly discussed about the impacts of free trade agreements. Elvis explained that producers in Nicaragua produce on a lower scale with less technology than the US farmers who benefit from the necessary tools, subsidy and technology (it's the same in the EU). They cannot compete, leading to their indebtedness with international organisations and financial institutions. The impact in terms of food sovereignty : when producers cannot no longer produce food they are

forced to import this food, and we are overwhelmed. When all farmers have been forced out of the market, the prices go up, for example Coca-Cola is cheaper than milk!

Geneviève Savigny : Member of 'la confédération paysanne' France & Via Campesina board member

Geneviève gave us a history of how the concept of food sovereignty was born. The term was first used in 1996, during the 1st world food summit by Via Campesina. It was based on the idea that food is a basic human right, and they can only be recognised if the farmers-peasant have the right to produce food and consumers to be able to decide what they consume. Their belief was that the right way to achieve food security is to give small farmer the right and the power to create food security.

Here is the timeline of the dissemination of the concept:

- Via Campesina was created in 1993
- 1994 – WTO was created (agricultural production was part of the agreement promoting ‘free access’ of agricultural goods. The countries had to engage themselves into 5% of their products. And lowering taxes and tariffs – hence one could not protect their internal markets. This had a knock-on effect.)
- 2002, Rome World Food Summit, a time where more NGOs were involved with food sovereignty , food security & FAO.
 - Food sovereignty gave a framework to civil society.
 - The concept of food sovereignty was taken and developed clearly and organized in Southern countries to better the general well-being/quality of life and food for all.
- 2007 – Mali, Nyeleni Forum (name of female farmer that played a symbolic and important role in food sovereignty in Mali):
 - Via Campesina, NGOs and partners organised this study session to clarify and solidify the content and concept of food sovereignty.
 - Result: Declaration and statement with the change for the ‘right for the people’ to the ‘the right of the country to have a voice to decide their own consumption as long as this does not harm other countries’ (e.g. because you have the advantages of subsidies) hence, no dumping on other ‘developing countries’. This means that a country has the right to protect itself from ‘too low’ prices from external markets.
 - Right to define their own policy based on their needs and not according to the market demands.
 - People should have the right to take part in these decisions: farmers, indigenous people, fisher folks, pastoralists, nomads, i.e. everybody who produces food.

Then Geneviève give us an overview of the different important actors on the topic of food sovereignty. There are growing trans-national and retailing companies spreading all over the world, creating a massive problem. When you are dealing with goods in large volume, you need a standardised production, hence smaller/local farmers will not have access to this market. In the near future, there will be a new Nyéléni Forum for Europe, in Austria 2011. This will be a gathering of organisations of small farmers, consumers and environmentalists, which objective will be to make more concrete this term ‘food sovereignty’. This should be

successful because there is growing awareness of the importance of food quality, and unsustainable manner of producing, so people are looking for a change. The key points will be to safeguard the earth for the future, remind that export should not be the prime objective, explain that food sovereignty is the way to balance the inequalities and conflicts between Northern and Southern countries

Geneviève's presentation was followed by a session of questions and answers, where the role of youth for food sovereignty was discussed. Geneviève expressed her view that youth are extremely important in the combat for food sovereignty. She advised the youth to act at grassroots level, get involved at the first point. But also to try to use all opportunities that are offered. (e.g. consultation about next CAP where you can give your opinion) or getting involved with the FAO civil society process which is broadening. This should be used to its fullest potential, specifically for young people and women. This is a place to make our voices heard.

There was also some discussions about subsidies. It was explained that subsidies for exports are going to be banned soon. All subsidies help you to live, even with low prices. (Jacques Bertelot - economist - Shows that all subsidies are the cause of dumping). Instead, we need fair prices for farmers and to achieve this we need food sovereignty. And we need the right to protect our market.

b. Afternoon

1/ Working groups - sharing experiences

This second session of the working groups consisted in exchanges on realities of the participants on the topics. Due to logistical issues, the group only split on 2 groups for the experience sharing: education on one part, politics and economy on the other.

The group on education exchanged mainly on the drawbacks of the actual educational system, both in schools and in agricultural system. This discussion resulted in the first paragraph of the section on education in the political paper (section "we notice that")

It was the same on the group on economy, agricultural policies and governance.

It was also discussed the particular issue of women and youth in agriculture and their unequal access into political life. In rural areas, farmers lack the time to get involved in politics, which is even stronger for youth and women. Youth are not interested in the local policies because many are not interested in rural areas. Women have even more work than men so even less time for political activities.

2/ Debate - What do I think about agriculture?

At the end of the day, all participants gathered to have a moving debate giving the possibility to the participants to express themselves on sensitive questions, and diverging visions of agriculture.

"European agricultural subsidies have to be eliminated?"

The majority agreed with this idea, arguing that:

- The subsidies laws need to change – the policies need to change to promote subsidies in other countries around the world.

- EU subsidies cause massive problems (dumping on 3rd world countries where there are no such subsidies. It would lead to a massive land-grab in the South, the local farmers from the South would not correspond to standards imposed by EU countries, leaving the government to sell this land to opportunist foreigner buyers than have no concept of sustainable agriculture).
- In the long term, in Norway for example we use less than 10% of our income on food. This is unsustainable and needs to be increased. This will cause huge problems for many EU citizens, but if something goes up something must go down (e.g. housing which is expensive).
- I'd like to settle down and live of my farm. I would like to have the opportunity to receive a fair price for what I produce without depending on the help of subsidies.
- Today most of the subsidies go to the large-scale farms, allowing the larger farms to have more power and neglecting the rights and voices of the smaller farmers. This needs to 'nipped in the bud'.

A minority disagreed, arguing that:

- It is a political statement which expresses the government's support for agriculture.
- Subsidies – no, protection - yes.
- It would put a lot of farmers out of business and cause a sharp rise in food prices that the EU and world consumers could not afford.
- The capital received enables me the start-up capital to buy the technology and material to start my farm.
- We all agree that there is a problem with the existing subsidies, but the EU consumer is not in a position to pay for this food. There is so little food actually traded in the world, which will happen if subsidies are taken away – hence reducing consumer's ability to buy it. So if subsidies go – who will take care of these regions where it's less economical to grow crops?

“Poor peasants have to be provided with technical systems?”

A minority agreed, arguing that:

- What is mechanic systems? Machines that do not accord to the land that they use, to produce more food will make the prices fall. But we should provide tools.
- If the farmers don't use mechanic systems it is like the Middle Ages. We are dependent on the rural areas to provide food, and if we give mechanical tools to accelerate the growing and cultivation, the peasants will be less poor.
- Imagine that you're a farmer with 200 cows, is it possible to milk them every day?

The majority disagreed, arguing that :

- Agriculture can work without mechanic systems, we have talked about “permaculture”, we think this can be a solution.
- What are mechanic systems? Is it a tool? If a mechanic system is a tractor, I think we can do good, sustainable agriculture that can feed the world.
- I don't think it is necessary to use mechanic systems, the aim doesn't need to be to produce more, the access to markets and a fair market system is what is important. In long term this mechanic systems pollute the environment. Historically and

traditionally it is muscles that produce the food. About using animals for producing, we should use simple tools instead of machines, so that we don't need to use fossil fuels.

- Machines = less employment, not sustainable. Milking of cows have to be done with friends, neighbours etc. Training and education, giving people means, is the solution.
- Poor peasants is not someone with 200 cows, this is unsustainable.
- George (president of MIJARC World) said: “Do you want mass production or production of the masses?” If we want a lot of people producing food we will solve lots of problems, migration, rural exodus etc.
- What we do need is more people to produce. In Latin America, Nicaragua, the peasants are actually the ones producing the most, without mechanical instruments like this. It's a healthy way of living, preserving human and animal life. We don't need to create a business and a market for food, we need to create food to eat.
- It causes over-production
- Mechanisms will come sooner or later, but we should not force it on no one. It has to be done slowly. Mechanization like in the Western Europe and USA is not the way to do it.

“Only local food production have to be consumed”

A minority agreed, arguing that:

- We don't need mechanical systems for food production, so if we want to import food, we have to use mechanical systems, so if we will ban the one we have to ban the other.
- In Bulgaria: imports are a problem for farmers because they import of cheap Turkish vegetables and importation creates pollution.
- One community can't produce everything, but being able to export your production needs energy and labour saving in all links of the process (trade system), it's easier to exploit labour force in production, transportation and selling. Higher needs of mechanization to save energy.
- It is important to have exchange, we cannot eliminate that. But agriculture have to be less specialised, so one community shouldn't produce only two products.
- Thinking of the actual system, no one will eat what is produced locally. Many things were different before, but it is possible to diversify the agriculture. There might be a change in consumer habits, towards more locally produced food. If there is surplus, we might export something.

The majority disagreed, arguing that:

- We should support local producers, but not consume only local produced food. Some competition is good.
- It is absolutely impossible to produce everything at one place. In my community we only produce rice and milk, we can't spend our life eating only that. We don't have to import, we can eat what is produced at a national level.
- I like oranges, bananas, pineapples, but we can't grow it in Armenia!
- Currently we move food and we could do that better, but I feel in some areas where food is produced there aren't enough food to eat it, and where the people are, there is no land to produce food.
- My decision is slightly based on the fact that I love some products from the whole world. This scenario is impossible, we have to make it better maybe by green transport. I think there are other solutions that do not need to be harmful.

- People have to think about what they eat and where it comes from.

III. Day 3- Field visits and agro-ecology

a. Morning - Field visits

The groups split in 2 groups for field visits

The first group went to visit an organic wine farm in the surroundings. They could discover how the farm was organized, respecting the ecological balances, working with sheeps to take out the weeds, etc. There were exchanges with the wine producer about his conviction and realities. Then the visit ended by a tasting session of the production.

The second group met a representative from agricultural chamber; Michel Batt. He gave quite deep explanations on the history of food policies in Alsace, including some religious perspectives, then was open an interesting debate about the Common Agriculture Policy. Nevertheless, the participants were quite disappointed that he focused too much on history and little on actual agricultural political realities.

Then they visited a local brewery in Strasbourg. It was a bar where the beer processing was open to the public and explained. The group could exchange with the brewery owner about where the products were coming from, etc. It was a good exercise to try to analyse the sustainability of such an enterprise from the food sovereignty point of view. For example, the participants were quite surprise to learn that the barley used to process the beer was coming from Ukraine, and not a local producer.

b. Afternoon

1/ Working groups – Exchange on the field visits

The first group spend the whole morning and the beginning of the afternoon visiting the farm. The second group met in the afternoon to exchange opinions on the field visits and prepare a funny sharing of what they learned to the rest of the group in the evening.

2/ Are agro-ecological practices compatibles with food sovereignty? Input by Silvia Vitoria Perez

In the end of the afternoon was held a plenary on the topic of agro-ecology and how this topic can be linked to food sovereignty. Silvia Vitoria Perez, sociologist expert in Agro-ecology, starting giving a presentation of what this concept means.

The term was first used in the 1930s. It is a way to think of agriculture developed By Miguel Alteries and Stefan Leasemen (agronomist), which cannot be summed up as an agronomical concept. In 1960, agro-ecology grew in South America, due to the waste being produced in the agriculture industry.

It came from contributions from history, anthropology, ethno-botanic, not only agronomy. There is a strong movement to bring this back to the very technical front. But Silvia and others believe that we should keep the more all-encompassing view. There are a number of different definition. It's the application of ecological concepts, including social, economic and

cultural dimensions. Three key elements of the 'broad approach': Agro-ecological system, Social & ecology co-evolution and Knowledge and practices of small- farmers.

According to Miguel Altieri, agro-ecology is a scientific discipline centred on the ecology and agriculture and it analyses eco- agriculture in a broad sense with the goal to improve the entire concept, the ecosystems and agro-ecology. Agro-ecosystem is a (artificial) system made by man. How do we sustain the natural ecosystem? For example, when you grow one certain crop, this will privilege one crop over another thereby affecting the rest of the ecosystem. What man does is just as important for the ecosystem. This is what agro-ecology deals with.

3rd system: In agro-ecology we believe that the practices and knowledge of peasant farmers have proven throughout history to maintaining the natural balance of the ecosystems. The main idea is to base agricultural knowledge on peasant's knowledge, locally based, territorially adapted to nature and it is diversity, dependant on the region. Agricultural 'extension' is the combination of universal knowledge where scientist go all around the world and 'teach' farmers how they should feed their plants, fertilizers, etc., But we take into account the fact that the basic farmers, throughout centuries, have been able to manage without the other scientists' knowledge. Many agro-ecologists have gone into the field and realise that there is not much that they can teach farmers, much the contrary. Peasants' knowledge and place is stigmatised, believing them to be 'ignorant'. Agro-ecology is against this idea and values the knowledge of the peasant farmers.

Agro-ecology is **based on the traditional practices**, that have made possible **natural balance to be maintained** and the **proliferation of social movements**. The social movements, peasant movements in particular, enhance practices and knowledge that have been held in high esteem throughout history.

Then Silvia gave some success stories for agro-ecology. One of the main example occurred in the 1980s in Andalusia where there were land occupations. At the time of the socialist government, a very small proportion was given to them, and they had decided to work differently. They grew olive trees, vegetables & fruit and sunflowers in a way that would not poison the earth. They did not know how to do this, so the agricultural workers went to the peasant farmers to find this knowledge. Many in this region work in this way and others that still retain the traditional methods. There are now many social movements and new ways of thinking that have developed as a result. This brought up the question of those 'landless' and the devaluation of peasant farmers. This gave a new dimension to agro-ecology – a more social vision, rather than the technical definition of the EU, where using organic fertilizer becomes 'ecological'. This new vision is more of a holistic system, the interlinking of all these elements searching for a social balance for these systems. Giving this knowledge its social and general value, that guarantees the well-being of the men and women that work there as well as the environment.

In brief, the proposal of agro-ecology is: A **comprehensive** vision that takes into account of all elements of any rural areas (market, distribution, energy system and agriculture) taking a global look and searching for the balance and **harmony**. The people that work in this area should be able to work **autonomously**. This deals with policy, experts, management of workers and workers' well-being. One of the objectives is to minimize the negative effects of inputs and consequence that result from a given agricultural activity takes this into account and uses local knowledge (in Northern countries much of this knowledge has been lost). It looks into history to find first hand account concerning agricultural knowledge to try and

preserve this knowledge. Agricultural systems have not only used agriculture, but also building, arts, etc.

Agro-ecology takes into account social, political and economical problems of agriculture. It intends to use traditional practices that have allowed to guarantee a balance between ecosystem – between social movement and integrating modern movement, and social systems that allow the well-being of the workers and the ecosystem. Traditional practices are the starting point.

There is a very important social aspect in this practice, as it includes people who work, live and act with these systems. It studies what type of social organisation the peasant as opposed to farmers have? How do they organise themselves? How do they work? Are there towns around the area (e.g. the nearest city)?

There is also an important political aspect, that we can reassume by saying that it allows people to work and self-manage the framework and system and be autonomous.

On the contrary, agronomy has a technical approach of environment, in only taking into account the environmental aspect and leaves out farmers knowledge.

Examples of agro-ecological approaches:

- In Andalusia, an important work has been done on growing olives. When Granada university researched on these issues, they found solutions to the plant sickness in ancient Arab scripts!
- Brazil is the only country in the world to train its own technicians that takes into account how to learn from farmers and its history.
- Italy is a very clear example that should be kept in mind. Most of the eco-production is destined to be exported. Cooperatives have been produced creating 5 000 jobs, but what they produced is exported.

After this presentation made by Silvia, the participants discussed in small groups the question: How can agro-ecology contribute to food sovereignty?

The main outcomes of the working groups were the following:

- The emphasis on the peasant and their knowledge is historically not very present in economy. This is a pity because lots of useful knowledge has been lost.
- Definitions of agro- ecology vary from country to country, because it had to be adapted to the local context. One way of practicing agro- ecology somewhere cannot be copied somewhere else.
- Agro-ecology would definitely benefit food sovereignty, as some of its main goals look to providing land, seed and water to 'peasant' farmers to enable them to create their future in agriculture. The knowledge that could be provided by agro-ecology would enable these farmers to understand their environment of the action agriculturally, socially and economically, etc. to then plant and produce in the most sustainable and holistically healthy way possible.
- Agro-ecology is, in the most global sense, the basis for sustainable farming.

- It takes into account all the various elements that impact and are consequences of agriculture thereby implicating all the economical, social and agriculture aims of food sovereignty.
- This concept is not new, the idea is very old, but the emphasis on it has been lost. Reminding the importance of a holistic perspective, as well as the importance of traditional knowledge can facilitate the way toward food sovereignty.
- There is a need of public policies and systems that can complete the production cycles. This cycles are right now reduced mostly to an economical perspective and forget many essential elements of the ecosystems, such as biodiversity, the soils, etc. The concept of agro-ecology, could guide policy makers to broaden their perspective, in order to reach food sovereignty.

After these inputs from the participants, a session of questions and answers was open. It was discussed the question of how can we implement this system., when it was mentioned that The short circuit can tie production directly to market. Like that, consumers will take a look at the people who produce food fro them. It is important to get rid of the 'middle-men". For example, in Switzerland, there is an area of francophone Switzerland and organisation called 'marché paysan'. They decided that every consumer should be close and have access to farmers markets and locally production goods. They were so successful, that they presented competition to big supermarket change (e.g. 'Coop' & migro'). It is important to get directly to consumers.

Then it was discussed how can we find a balance between political support and food sovereignty. Silvia stated that there is nothing that we can expect from public policy. There are so many difficulties. Food sovereignty is a grassroots movement, it will either come from the bottom-up or fail. Nobody can impose on any State what they must do.. If peasants get this power, this would de facto lead to food sovereignty.

Finally, some participants raised the fact that according to Marcel Mazoyer, a global solution needs to be thought and local initiatives are useless... It is something to which Silvia completely disagrees. At local levels there are movements that impact massive changes. E.g. in Brittany, a group of young people organized a bike-tour around different places about access to land. There has been a political impact in the province and got offers of lands afterwards.

IV. Day 4- Best practices

a. Free Morning

In the morning the participants were free.

b. Afternoon

1/ Forum of best practices

The afternoon started with a forum of best practices, where some people from the province came to present their project, but it was also an opportunity to enhance the experience of the participants who were already working in the field of food sovereignty.

Here are the projects that were presented during this forum:

❖ **MRJC- France projects (Mouvement Rural de Jeunesse Chrétienne)**

It is the French branch of MIJARC, that works in local groups, that try to implement projects at rural level and beyond. Some examples include:

Project 1 : Exchange with Togo

Project 2 : Game « *Les Agronautes* »

Aim : to understand and debate the agricultural and personal choices of the farmers. This helps you put yourself into the mindset of the people.

The player imagines that he is a young farmer. At the beginning of the game you set yourself objectives regarding salary, size of the farm, number of workers and the time that you intend to achieve this aim. There are natural events (children, etc) that impact the course of this game. At the end of the game you look at where you have arrived and compare this your beginning objectives.

Project 3: " *La Marmite* "

This is a meeting place that provides information and counselling to people who want to set up their farms. This association in Brittany. This place is a forum/platform for you to get helped collectively, i.e. learning from group experiences. There are debate evenings, etc. These are frequently cases of pioneering & unconventional projects.

❖ **CCFD (Comité Catholique contre la Faim et pour le Développement)**

Food sovereignty 4-year campaign.

❖ **EIR (Poland)**

Project : Guidance programme with local government: 8 programs for villages to develop their facilities.

❖ **Spire (Norway)**

s not a rural organisation or Catholic organisation, but it maintains the same goals as MIJARC. Part of development NGO ' the Development fund'.

Campaign on land grabbing

Large scale land acquisition are lead by foreign countries in developing countries to produce food or agro-fuels for their own 'Western countries'. (e.g. Ghana). This campaign is politically motivated to make the Norwegian government see the problems related to bio-fuels, which are produced in large amount in direct competition to food production. This event undermines the principles of food sovereignty. They make promotional materials, seminars, summer camps, in dialogue with the Norwegian social forum and direct actions.

Spire also organized a study-visit to Mozambique to visit the place where people have had their land 'grabbed' for the production of bio-fuels. They proposed a 'park grab' in Oslo to make people aware. They are hoping to set up several seminars and summer camps on this subject.

Lobbying:

Spire do not believe that the politicians will come to them, hence they actively go to them. We cannot do one without the other (words without action). It's a two-sided process. They try as much as possible to meet politicians to make them aware of the problems and causes that require attention and change. They direct each of their political lobbies to specific goals, (e.g. donate more money). They aim their lobbies to points in the Norwegian government actions to encourage a change.

❖ **YMDRAB (Bulgaria):**

Action/Project : Bio-humus production (organic manure)

This is a 3-month process which recycles organic waste. Up to 95% of our waste could be used to make compost, thereby reusing our waste, using red-worms to accelerate the composting process.

2/ Working groups – analysis of the situation

The final step of this day was done in working groups, where the participant were invited to read some documents, inputs, already written of food sovereignty, and exchange on whether they agreed with these statements. This in order to start preparing their own position.

Both groups read the same documents; some declaration of people's forums, Nyeleni forum declaration, the European food declaration, MIJARC world documents, etc. (*see the annex on list of references*). But they shared and analyzed the documents according to the topic they were in charge of (education, economy or politics).

Most of the documents were inspiring for the participants, who wished to re-use most of them in their own political paper.

V. Day 5- political document

a. Morning

1/ Working groups- Writing a political document

A draft proposal of declaration was suggested to the different working groups, based on the discussions of the previous days. Then this session was used to amend the draft, to include elements raised in the previous discussions and found in the documents studied the day before.

Many discussions happened, concerning the vocabulary used, and was a good occasion to deepen the political content of the declaration. For eg; the question of whether agrofuels were harmful to environment, whether agricultural education should only be based on environmental techniques, etc.

2/ An ethical point of view on food, Input by Jurgen Seeger (Katholischen Landjugendbewegung Deutschlands)

At the end of the morning, Jurgen Seeger, gave us a very short presentation on the ethical view of the Church on Food. The objective was to take a spiritual and philosophical point of view on food. But because of some logistical problems, the input could only be very short.

He explained what were the 4 main ethical perspectives that could be used to analyse the food system in the Christian religion. These 4 perspectives are ethical points that people should

always have in mind, in order not to harm anyone or the planet.

The first perspective is the “Ordinal ethics”. This ethic looks at how the wealth is distributed in society, whether the distribution is fair, etc. (E.g. Wage : Fair remuneration). In the case of food sovereignty, in this perspective we can denounce the unequal distribution of food in the world, but also the low income the farmers earn from what they produce.

The second ethical perspective is the “Social Ethics”. This one wonders how should be the social and economic order? How should society be designed?

In the case of Food sovereignty, a new food system is promoted, with shorter food chains, where the actors of the food chain are empowered, control the chain and are not victims of unfair competition, dumping, etc.

Then comes the “Ethic of Solidarity”, which reminds us that we are all interconnected among each others and should care for the well-being of others as brothers. It is from this perspective that we are revolted by the fact that some people still die of hunger in this world. In that sense, food sovereignty carries a strong feeling of solidarity, because it states that any food system developed somewhere (even if it would be very local), should always care about the rest of the world.

Finally comes the “Ethics of Vision” this ethics tries to answer the question: What vision do I have for the improvement of the 'world'? This ethics brings us into action, but an action with a specific direction that we take time to think about. This is exactly what food sovereignty is about: another food paradigm that will be fairer for everyone, all over the world.

b. Afternoon

1/ Working groups- Writing a political document

In the afternoon, the working groups came to a first collective draft chapter for each working group. Here are the results:

a) Education

What we want:

- More debates between peasants and politicians
- Teaching decision makers, future farmers and farmers how to diversify local production
- Stronger links between rural and urban people
- Strong networks of farmers and consumers to share better knowledge and non-formal education about food and agriculture, and better mutual understanding
- Education to inform people about what they are eating and how the food was farmed
- A teaching system that goes both ways farmers = technicians
- Technical components should include aspects of sustainable farming
- Equality and access to land
 - make more room for small-scale producers and alternative education
 - create awareness about the importance of seed-growing
 - more inclusive and liberal system for farmers, what to produce, how and amount to produce

- international institutions that do not promote purely industrial policies but also traditional techniques

What we want to do:

- A campaign to be launched via internet, games, forums, etc to raise awareness of citizens on the issues related to food and agriculture
- introduce agriculture into school curriculums in general.
- establish a course for future farmers to spread the concept of food sovereignty

Via informal education, we will encourage the creation of networks to improve the awareness on agriculture and food sovereignty

b) Economy

Many people and organisations are engaged in building a viable alternative to the current food production, distribution and consumption. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the 1 billion of hungry people in the world live in rural areas. This is the result of global capitalism and neo-liberal policies which do not respect the environment and the well-being of humankind (with regards to the development of agricultural production and emerging markets.) In line with the renewed Coordinated Agricultural Policy of 2013 the Governments and the European Commission have proposed to keep global competitiveness of Europe’s food industry as the chief objective of Europe’s CAP. Farmers earn few money, intermediaries earn a lot, consumers have to pay a lot in the process of producing and selling agricultural products. But many people work for supermarkets and not in farms. An example is Bulgaria. The country produces many different luxury products (wine, jam, rose, tobacco) but they are not supplied on the Bulgarian market: exported and sold in European Union. Bulgarian people eat food imported from Greece and Turkey. But this food is often of poor quality, and has no taste. Before the policies decreased imports but now the situation is the opposite. There is a price dumping on food.

To solve this situation, we believe that farmers must be rewarded and supported for developing their business and generating economic activity and development. We should prioritise local and national economies and markets (i.e. producers and consumers) over the demands of global markets and international corporations, Facilitate economic stability via e.g. mechanisms for periodical review (FPPR), training/guidance facilities which counsel (give advice) market changes at local, regional and national (“glocal”), Redistribute, share equitably access and control over natural and productive resources. Additionally, we need local supply and demand of primary resources/inputs, (e.g. seeds, livestock,..) for producers as/and consumers , as well as increasing local food production, local markets, seed swaps.

In order to reach these objectives, we want to promote the following:

- Transparent international trade, with civil society access to decisions
- Fair wages for farmers and agricultural workers (wages, affordable food, fair prices to agriculture workers and farmers, avoids rural to urban migration, etc.)
- Fair ethical prices which enable a ‘fair’ standard of living
- Affordable quality food for all, especially the poorest

- Encourage price protection policies for countries, e.g. increased import taxes on products which can be produced in the ‘home’ country and lower import taxes on not-local products
- Agrarian reform that ensures economic justice and local autonomy
- Local markets support and development
- Food security, quality and safety, but with regulations that will let small scale units to be sustainable.
- Development of rural areas via increased employability, wages and access to information and opportunities for young people
- ‘Not mass production, but production by the mass’ : aim for increased economic stability via wages.

This will be possible only if we reduce the dumping of food at prices below the cost of production, stop with the privatisation and commodification of food (access to food), as well as the threat of global capitalism to the production of good, healthy and abundant food – food supply , the rural to urban migration factor , the rising costs threatening the future of food production (links to wages), and the bad practices of trans-national corporations, e.g. land grabbing, destruction of local markets via price dumping, exporting the high quality products

The group made a list of possible actions to be implemented by local or national member movements of MIJARC:

- Capacity building by promotion of sustainable production via agro-ecological, small-scale and family farming. This should be supplemented by resource support, e.g. subsidies.
- We demand the access to and control over land and food resources.
- Exchanges of good practices on agricultural, agro-ecological, social and experiences to develop the local economy
- Youth training of economics and the market functions, ethical consumption & agro-ecology.

3) Politics and governance

The conclusions of the group on policies and governance was the following: The European agricultural system is in crisis. There is enough food produced on this planet to feed the global population but there is a lack of political initiatives to organize the food sector in such a way that everyone can exercise his/her right to food. The current “free” trade has not led to the reduction of hunger in the world.

The international institutions most powerful in agriculture are the financial and commercial ones (International Monetary Fund IMF, WTO, World Bank...) , but not the agricultural ones (FAO, IFAD...).

Rural citizens need better living conditions, empowerment and opportunities to get involved in politics.

To reach these goals, we call for: Multi-participatory decision bodies, local democratic systems supported by policies at all levels, policies to promote sustainable food production, equal access to production resources and markets, special attention for Youth and Women and more power to the UN agencies.

2/“Young citizens wonder: what European policy to guarantee food sovereignty from North to South?”- Debate with Claude Breune

In the last session of the day, the different working groups had an occasion to confront their outcomes with the political sphere. They presented their outputs to Claude Breune, Parliamentary assistant to the French Green senator Jacques Muller. Then a debate was open, on the topic “What European policy to guarantee food sovereignty from North to South?”

Claude Breune, who was in the past an active member of the French member movement of MIJARC, expressed his satisfaction about the positions presented by the working groups and admitted that the position that he, and Jacques Muller have on food sovereignty is very close to what was presented by the participants. The question of food sovereignty is extremely important to him and Jacques Muller, the 'senator' he works for. They continuously promote notions related to the principles of food sovereignty. It is in their mind extremely important to highlight the importance of Agricultural and Food Policy.

He explained that farmers are economic actors, but agriculture is an original activity for 2 reasons: The purpose is to feed the people not the car, hence they can not be treated the same way as other products, and because agriculture is a specific activity in the economy: In the EU the milk crisis or the pig crisis showed that we need an Agriculture Policy. In 1962, when the CAP was founded, its objective was clear: it was during a time of food crisis, hence they developed a food support policy. But food can become a weapon, it has a strategic dimension. It is a basic right for a country or a group of countries to control the food of its inhabitants. Food production is multi-dimensional: on environment: water, biodiversity, degradation of the soil, GMOs..., agricultural activities produce not only food but also landscapes, and finally has a role in rural development.

Decreased employment in agriculture is not a fatality. But we need people in the farms. It is not possible to separate food and landscapes. In this rural agriculture, the farmers have an important role in constructing the landscapes of a country. We have to be aware that we have to struggle against chemical, pharmaceutical lobbies and other firms which are playing at being God with their chemical products. It's the same problem for agro-fuel.

The Principle of food sovereignty is not supported on international level, because food continues to be considered as a commodity. He highlighted that many of the working groups discussed the integration of young people into the future of agriculture, but there is a real problem of cost of land. We have to attempt to find new tools to combat this. In France, *'Terre de Liens'* ('Land of Links') was created, it aims at buying land and put it to the disposal of people who wouldn't have the opportunity to buy it themselves.

Then the participants discussed with Claude about whether Agriculture should become an important sector of the world policy. Claude explained that many people are now aware of its importance, but not the majority of politicians. *'Local solutions for global disorder'* is a book which describes the problems and people who are trying to find new solutions to these problems...

At the end of this session, the participants felt quite proud that their ideas were at the same level as what a politician would say. Some of them even considered that they had more to tell about the topic than Claude Breune himself. Some others were glad to see that some politicians

can share their views on such an issue. This will definitely make the participants more confident in the future to raise their voice in the political sphere.

VI. Day 6- strategies

a. Morning- Finalising the political paper

In the first part of the morning, the working group had a last chance to modify their political papers after hearing the opinion of M. Breune.

Then a plenary session was held to debate together and agree on the content of the final political document. The debates were long, but we got to quite a good result.

b. Afternoon- strategies

Once the political document adopted by the plenary, the participants set up strategies to implement the objectives mentioned.

They started by adopting a common European strategy. 3 main focuses were selected : lobby work, a campaign on food sovereignty, and cooperation and networking.

The objectives of the lobby work are to Promote our political paper in media, face to face meetings, letters, phone contacts, forums, ... targeting governments, politicians (all levels), NGOs, economic organizations, Church, trade unions, or educational organisations.

Then an information Campaign about food sovereignty should be based on the political document as a base, then organize information sessions on the topic in all the movements and promote the creation and implementation of initiatives (flash mobs, brochures, website page, info in MIJARC seminars, facebook groups, exchanges of best practices,...), considering other newspapers at a good medium to raise awareness and interest for the topic.

Finally, cooperation and networking with other youth organisations for food sovereignty will be developed to create a European Youth Network for food sovereignty. A first step will be to participate in the preparation of the Nyeleni Forum in August 2011. This network should include existing youth platforms working on the topic (Via campesina Youth group, organizations which participated to Civil Society Youth Forum in Rome, Reclaim the field, Rural youth Europe, Spire, Friends of the Earth Youth, etc.). Apart from the Nyeleni process, a network will be developed via mailing lists for youth in Europe, inviting each other to our meetings and seminars, common activities, blogs, etc.

After agreeing on a European strategy, each country set up its own strategy to promote food sovereignty back home after the study session.

Portugal will organize a fair to promote local products and during which there would be a roundtable about the topic for the population and young farmers. They will also train members nationally on the topic, take more contacts and cooperate with older organizations which work with farmers.

Norway will cooperate with other youth networks, organize info campaign on land grabbing, share best practices with other national movements, receive our political document. Since they are not in the EU, lobby work on CAP is not easy for them, but they will lobby on food issues toward Norwegian politicians.

Poland will create a map of local producers to promote food sovereignty, put notes on cooking book, advertise for it in schools, create events in cultural houses to train volunteers on this topic, organize common events within the euro-region (Czech Republic) and spread ideas in their movement.

Bulgaria will start a campaign to spread the idea of food sovereignty toward people and farmers, promote food security for hungry people, work on access to land, and participate to lobby via the European team of MIJARC.

France will integrate the concept in the activities that already exist: many activities go in this direction but are not called as such, for example political debates when elections, national agricultural meetings, ... They agreed to link their local action in particular to the activities of the local farmer with the principle of food sovereignty.

Germany was not so sure of what new they could do because the subject is already a principal topic in the movement, with a working group working on it. There is currently a campaign in place which integrates the notions of food sovereignty whose related concepts will be implemented in all corresponding political and campaign papers.

Nicaragua decided to work on actions and campaigns, with Via Campesina, and would like to continue working with them and MIJARC in future.

Final Conclusions and recommendations

This study session has been a great experience for most of the participants. It was a training as well as a working session and a catalyst for further actions on food and agriculture in our rural areas. A lot of content was shared and many ideas emerged from the session.

A political paper and a strategy were set up collectively, now it is time to put it into actions at local, national and international levels. This will be MIJARC's mission to facilitate the continuity of this project.

Analysis of the session - Summary of participants' evaluations

POSITIVE

- Participants learned a lot from the study session, it was a new concept for most of them. They went back home with a great motivation to promote this concept in their movements.
- They appreciated the study session as a change to exchange with other people, in a good and positive atmosphere.
- Created contacts with other movements and organizations. Future cooperation is foreseen
- Field visits
- Expect a snow-ball effect of the study session
- Speakers were inspiring, even if not all of them answered the question they were asked.
- Working groups were a good place to learn from each others.
- Great informal moments together, evenings, ...
- Great facilities; building, bicycle renting (except the deposit).
- Great final political paper grounded one people's experience, it's a good start!
- Good idea to involve participants in the organization and reflection groups.

NEGATIVE:

- Some people are not sure to be able to find concrete actions to make once back home.
- The language barrier made it difficult for some participants to fully enjoy and understand the content of the study session and participate to the discussions.
- Frustrated not to have been able to participate more in the debates, because it was a new topic so hard to have an opinion.
- Lack of time in the working groups
- Lacks eco-friendly food, heating system

PROPOSALS:

- Prepare a list of concept and vocabulary to reduce the language problem
- Continue to cooperate in the future
- Continue working on the topic because there is still a lot to be done

Annexes

- ANNEX 1: Fears and expectations “garden”
- ANNEX 2: Final Programme, as implemented
- ANNEX 3: List of participants names, organisations and countries
- ANNEX 4: List of references

ANNEX 1: Fears & Expectations 'GARDEN':

Fears	Expectations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Am I in the right place, will I waste my time here? (Other demands on my time?) •Will I acquire enough skills here for my future work in the rural world 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Find the best political issues on food sovereignty •To share experiences on farming and agricultural issues •To exchange contacts for future cooperative work •To get to know other movements
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Unsure that I will be able to represent my & my movement's of point of view (language barriers) •Difficulty to accurately represent the views of my movement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Good discussion •Broader understanding on issues linked to food sovereignty •Increased awareness of food sovereignty •Discuss different points of views on food sovereignty
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Only words and no action 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •My wish for more field visits •Exchange between different countries •Meet friends and share ideas to come here and have a good intercultural exchange
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Getting bored from long talks & not understanding •To think about fear and fearing during the study sessions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Expect the field visit to be the most interesting thing (practical aspect) •Meet the participants and enjoy the time together •Hope not stay inside the building too long (beautiful weather) •Hope to represent Bulgaria in a positive light and give something to think about
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Not understanding the theme of the study session •Participants won't be able to under her due to language barriers •Objectives and goals may not be clear enough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Obtain a more global perspective on the issue •Be able to share local experience on the given issues •Share the knowledge acquired during the study session at home • Establish relationships between people
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Language barriers – lack of participation • Lack of similar situation to implement food sovereignty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Create platform with other movements, include intentions of all members, for a common policy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Farmers are not sufficiently involved in food sovereignty, politics and markets control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Practice knowledge about food sovereignty •Become more aware of food sovereignty
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Fear that it will not be sufficient policy, so it will be difficult to implement 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Has a fear about communication in English and to express ones opinions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Learn about food sovereignty to teach local chapters, and how to communicate about it to young people
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Fear language problems, to pass ones opinions, and fear that I lack enough knowledge on food sovereignty •Lack of vocabulary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Want to learn more about politics of agriculture •Want to learn more about agriculture in other countries, and share experiences
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Not to transmit ideas and objectives from the local groups that I represent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •To learn more, new ideas, and to work together in small groups
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •I want to meet expectations from all participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •To learn more about agriculture in Europe
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lack of comprehensive working tools so that everybody can participate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Hopes that the study session will have a snowball effect, so that food sovereignty will be more known around in the participant countries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Not to lead the groups properly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •To build a youth movement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lack of dynamics in the group, or lack of solidarity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Want to discover European cultures through the informal section
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lack of ownership from the participants in the group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Hopes that other participants will enjoy their time

ANNEX 2: Final program

	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	
8h00		<i>Breakfast</i>	<i>Breakfast</i>	<i>Breakfast</i>	<i>Breakfast</i>	<i>Breakfast</i>	<i>Breakfast</i>	<i>Breakfast</i>	
9h00	Arrival	Introduction Official welcome by President of MIJARC Europe Official welcome by the Council of Europe Introduction of the participants Explanation about the Council of Europe Planning and practical information	Introduction of the topic « A North-South perspective »: - Game by CCFD	Field visits: - Organic wine farm - Representative from Agricultural Chamber - Local brewery	Free morning Reimbursement of transportation	Working groups: Write the political document	Plenary session: Sharing and debating about the political paper	Departure	
10h30		<i>Pause</i>	<i>Pause</i>			<i>Pause</i>	<i>Pause</i>		
11h00		Expectations of the participants	Continuation: Testimonies from: - Elvis Gomez (Nicaragua) - Geneviève Savigny (Via Campesina)			- Input: “An ethical point of view on the food system” (Jurgen Seeger)	Continuation		
12h30		<i>Lunch</i>	<i>Lunch</i>	<i>Lunch</i>	<i>Lunch</i>	<i>Lunch</i>	<i>Lunch</i>		
14h00		Introduction of the topic: “Will the world agriculture be able to feed the humankind in the 21st Century?» (Marcel Mazoyer)	Working groups Experience sharing	Working Groups: Sharing about the field visits. Preparation of the evening	Forum of best practices « <i>Initiatives for FS</i> »	Continuation of the working groups	Plenary session: Building a European strategy for FS		
16h00		<i>Pause</i>	<i>Pause</i>	<i>Pause</i>	<i>Pause</i>	<i>Pause</i>	<i>Pause</i>		
16h30		Working groups Introduction	Plenary debate: « What do I think about agriculture ? »	Plenary session: “Are agroecological practices compatible with food sovereignty?» (Silvia Vitoria Perez)	Working groups Analysis of the situation	Debate « <i>Young citizens wonder: what European policy for FS from North to South? »</i> Claude Breune	Plenary: Building national strategies for FS		
18h00		Reflection groups	Reflection groups	Reflexion groups	Reflexion groups	Reflexion groups			
19h00		Dinner	Dinner	<i>Dinner in town</i>	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner		Dinner
21h00		Introduction; practical information	Intercultural evening		Field Visit presentations	Alsacian evening	Free evening		Farewell party

ANNEX 3: List of participants (by country of residence)

Rural Youth Europe	MARTIROSYAN	Gayane	Armenia
YMDRAB	CHECHEVA	Daniela	Bulgaria
YMDRAB	PEICHEVA	Polina	Bulgaria
YMDRAB	STEFANOV	Dimo	Bulgaria
YMDRAB	NIKOLOVA	Anna	Bulgaria
MIJARC Europe	QUINTIN	Claire	France
MRJC	MONTASSIER	Gael	France
MRJC	POUSIN	Estelle	France
MRJC	BOSSY	Nathalie	France
MRJC	JAUNET	Corentin	France
KLJB	SEEGER	Jurgen	Germany
KLJB	NORDHUS	Veronika	Germany
KLJB	SETTELE	Klaus	Germany
Rural Youth Europe	MCEVOY	Kieran	Ireland
Via Campesina - ATC	GOMEZ	Elvis	Nicaragua
Sprout	MOSTUEN	Gro Grytli	Norway
Spire	BULL	Christian	Norway
EiR	CARYK	Anna	Poland
EiR	HAWRYŁO	Krzysztof	Poland
EiR	CARYK	Piotrek	Poland
JARC	CARREIRA	Ligia Joana Miranda	Portugal
JARC	BATALHA	Joao	Portugal
JARC	DUARTE	Rita	Portugal
JARC	SILVA	Alexandre	Portugal

ANNEX 4: List of references

- Declarations of CSO parallel forum to World Food Summit, Rome 2009: <http://peoplesforum2009.foodsovereignty.org/node/275>
- CAP 2013 declaration by European Coordination Via Campesina: http://viacampesina.org/fr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=488:pour-une-politique-agricole-et-alimentaire-commune-2013-dans-le-cadre-de-la-souverainete-alimentaire-&catid=21:souverainetlimentaire-et-commerce&Itemid=38
- European Food Declaration: <http://www.europeanfooddeclaration.org/who-are-we>
- Nyeleni Forum final declaration: http://www.nyeleni.org/?lang=en&lang_fixe=ok
- Report “*Who will feed us*”, ETC Group, November 2009, www.etcgroup.org
- MIJARC World campaign and materials : <http://www.mijarc.org/>