



COUNCIL OF EUROPE CONSEIL DE L'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



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 MIJARC Europe
in co-operation with the
European Youth Centre Strasbourg
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
Executive summary	7
Introduction.....	8
Program	9
<u>I. Introduction of the session.....</u>	<u>9</u>
<i>a. Objectives.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>b. Main content</i>	<i>9</i>
1) <i>What is Food Sovereignty (FS) and why working on this concept and how?.....</i>	<i>9</i>
2) <i>Welcome & Presentation Council of Europe.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<u>II. Working groups.....</u>	<u>11</u>
1) <i>Common methodology.....</i>	<i>11</i>
1) <i>Education</i>	<i>12</i>
2) <i>Economy.....</i>	<i>12</i>
3) <i>Politics: Governance and agricultural Policies.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<u>III. Plenary sessions.</u>	<u>16</u>
1. <i>Marcel Mazoyer: Will the world agriculture be able to feed humankind in the 21st century ?</i>	<i>16</i>
a) <i>Objectives.....</i>	<i>16</i>
b) <i>Main content</i>	<i>16</i>
2. <i>A North/South perspective on food systems.....</i>	<i>19</i>
a) <i>Objectives</i>	<i>20</i>
b) <i>Game on world food market (by CCFD).....</i>	<i>20</i>
c) <i>Testimonies.....</i>	<i>20</i>
3. <i>What do I think about agriculture?.....</i>	<i>24</i>
a) <i>Objective and methodology.....</i>	<i>24</i>
b) <i>Main Outcomes</i>	<i>24</i>
4. <i>Are agroecological practices compatibles with FS? By Silvia Vitoria Perez</i>	<i>26</i>
a) <i>Objectives</i>	<i>26</i>
b) <i>Main outcomes</i>	<i>27</i>
5. <i>An ethical point of view on food By Jurgen Seeger, KLJB.....</i>	<i>30</i>
<u>IV. Forum on best practices</u>	<u>30</u>
1. <i>Objectives.....</i>	<i>30</i>
2. <i>Main outcomes</i>	<i>30</i>
Strategy sessions and main outcomes.....	33
1. <i>Methodology.....</i>	<i>33</i>
2. <i>“Young citizens wonder: what European policy to guarantee food sovereignty from north to south?”</i>	<i>33</i>

a) <i>Objectives:</i>	33
b) <i>Main outcomes</i>	33
3. <i>European Strategies</i>	35
4. <i>National Strategies</i>	35
Final Conclusions and recommendations.....	37
Analysis of the Session.....	38
Annexes.....	39

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
CoE	Council of Europe
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

Executive summary

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’. This concept has a very strong political dimension, but it’s 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 organizations, the intellectual world, and even in farmer’s practices. Agroecology, local markets, food education, alternative agricultural techniques, solidarity nets among the actors of agricultural sectors... are already building the agriculture of tomorrow. The concept of Food Sovereignty can gather all these initiatives toward a 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 this new paradigm. The international food institutions face difficulties in promoting sustainable food policies, mostly because they lack inclusiveness. Some politicians are in the way to sustainable agriculture but the political sphere in general is still quite reluctant to change the neoliberal paradigm that lead to this situation. This is why our organizations don’t 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 consumer’s organizations. All our proposals on political, economical and educational systems were developed in a political statement we made at the end of this study session. Now that we are back to our countries, our organizations will further develop these statements with debates, projects, actions, advocacy, trainings... We’re building the agriculture of tomorrow!

Introduction

This study session aims were, first to raise awareness on the concept of food sovereignty among European rural young people coming from MIJARC national movements and partner organizations. This concept being poorly known in Europe, even by local leaders of civil society organizations 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 at favour European and national initiatives among rural youth about sustainable agriculture and 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 organization 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 groups was split in 3 groups with a special focus: 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 strategically work. A forum of best practices was organized, as well as a meeting with a politician in order to help the participants to finalize the political document. 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 member and partner movements.

Program

I. Introduction of the session

a. Objectives

Welcome the participants, introduce the topic, the Council of Europe, the team, explain the objectives of the study session and the outlines of the study session.

b. Main content

1) What is Food Sovereignty (FS) and why working on this concept and how?

Terminology:

Right to eat to food : A juridical concept

Food security : A technical concept

Food Sovereignty : A political concept, that enables people to decide what they what to eat (right to discuss and have your say in agricultural policies).

MIJARC Europe has a political role in the promotion of this concept. We are targeting this concept on a global scale, hence we strongly appreciate to have a 'southern' participant.

Concept & Working Process

The study session employed the process SEE-JUDGE-ACT, to 'build & work' together. MIJARC is a facilitators versus 'trainers or experts' in the field. Tasks groups were be put in place to integrate everybody in the process.

The objectives of the program were:

1st Objective : Raise awareness on the concept of FS.

2nd Objective : To build an analysis on the realities of the European agricultural sector.

3rd Objective : To favor European and National initiatives among rural youngster about sustainable agriculture and FS.

Presentation of participants.

The participants located themselves with regards to Strasbourg activity, to present where they come from, who they are and how long did each one of them took to get there. Then the participants explained their fears and expectations. (*see annex n° 1, p.40*)

2) Welcome & Presentation Council of Europe

We had a welcome by Darius, representative of Council of Europe with a brief presentation of EYC and Council of Europe. Then Xavier Baró gave more details about the structure, objectives and agenda of the Council of Europe.

Some datas:

- 47 member states (Vatican and Belarus are not members but it includes countries like Turkey, Iceland,..) with 5 countries with observer status.(Mexico, Japan, Canada, US, ...).
 - Belarus is not a member as they are not 'respecting' some of the values/policies of CoE.
- 800 million Europeans
- Founded in London in 1949, just after World War II.
- Now based in Strasbourg for its symbolic value, as it has been a source of conflict between Germany and France. The idea was to represent the unification of Europe.
- Support its three key values of : Human Rights, Democracy, Rule of Law.
- Council of Europe (CoE) is not the European Union.

Council of Europe Structures

Governments:

- The committee of Ministers
- 47 - one for each country.

Parliaments :

- The parliamentary Assembly.
- More than 360.
- They have executive power.
- They work on the conventions and the amendments that will be proposed to adapt to the legislations. These are then brought back to the countries.

Regions and Municipalities :

- The Congress
- represented as well in the chambers.

NGO's :

- The conference of INGO (International NGO)
- Represents the power of civil societies.

Judiciary :

- The European Court of Human Rights (HR)
- If you are part of CoE (your country) you are protected by The Commissioner of HR
- Assessment about the various countries that assess the level of HR. They write a report later on The Secretariat.

Directorate of Youth & Sport:

Addresses mainly :

- Intercultural learning
- Working with multipliers (people that can spread the info further)

- Youth Participation – People taking responsibility
- Co-Management
- HR approach
- Quality
- Young people as a resource : No to consider them as 'future' citizens, but as current.

Council of Europe – Youth Policy

Agenda 2020

Three main spheres: HR & Democracy , Living Together in Diverse societies, Social Inclusion of Youth people.

II. Working groups

The objective of the working groups was to allow the participants to deepen a key aspect of FS in small groups. 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.

1) Common methodology

In order to ensure that the results of the working groups would be compatible at the end, a common methodology was proposed, based on MIJARC technique “see-judge-act”:

25th May: Introduction (16h30 – 18h)

***Objectives:** Introduce the topic of each WG, Introduce the participants again and gather their expectations, Create a group dynamic*

Process:

- Introduction of the participants and expectations
- Presentation of the program
- Input on the topic (text, film, game...)

26th May: Introduction of the topic (14h-16h)

***Objectives:** Get into the topic and start analyzing it.*

Process:

- Experience sharing on the topic

27th May: SEE: field visit (9h-16h)

***Objectives:** Discover interesting initiatives linked with the topic, exchange about what people saw in the field visits, prepare the sharing with the other groups.*

Process:

- Visit some interesting projects
- Exchange with outside people
- Exchange on the impressions of the participants

- Prepare the sharing evening

28th May: JUDGE (16h30-18h)

Objectives: *Analysis of the situation*

Process:

- Reading/presentation of some documents, inputs, already written of food sovereignty
- exchange: do we agree with these statements?

29th May: ACT: Writing a political document (9h-12h)

Objectives: *draft the basis of a political paper: propose solutions, action plan and political statement.*

Process:

- Work on a political paper proposal
- Draft a document
- Prepare the sharing for the plenary

Following this methodology, the 3 working groups came up with a proposition for the political document.

1) Education

What we want:

- More debates between peasants and politicians.
- Teaching how to diversify local production
- Important links between rural and urban
- Networks of farmers and consumers
- Education to inform people about what they're 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 don't promote purely industrial policies but also traditional techniques

What we want to do:

- A campaign to be launched via internet, games, forums, etc
- launch agriculture into school curriculums
- establish the course of future farmers

Via informal education, encourage the creation of networks to improve the awareness on agriculture and FS.

2) Economy

Facts

- Many people and organizations are engaged in building a viable alternative to the current food production, distribution and consumption.
- Seventy-five percent (75%) of the 1 billion hungry people 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 CAP of 2013 the government 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. But many people work for supermarkets and not in farms.
- Bulgaria: the country produces lots of luxury products (wine, jam, rose, tobacco) but not supplied in Bulgarian market: exported and sold in EU. Bulgarian people eat food imported from Greece and Turkey. But poor quality, no taste. Before the policies decreased imports but now it's the opposite. There is a price dumping on food.

Objectives

- Farmers must be rewarded and supported for developing their business and generating economic activity & 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), training/guidance facilities which counsel (give advice) market changes at local, regional and national - ("glocal")
- Redistribution, equitable access and control over natural and productive resources
- Local supply and demand of primary resources/inputs, (e.g. seeds, livestock,..) for producers as/and consumers
- Increasing local food production, local markets, seed swaps

To promote:

- Transparent international trade,
- Fair wages for farmers & agricultural workers (wages, affordable food, fair prices to agriculture worker & farmers, avoids rural to urban migration,...)
- fair ethical prices which enable a 'fair' standard of living
- affordable food
- 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
- 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 masse' : aim for increased economic stability via wages,

To fight against:

- The dumping of food at prices below the cost of production the global economy
- The privatisation and commodification of food (access to food)
- The threat of global capitalism to the production of good, healthy and abundant food – food supply
- Rural to urban migration factor
- Rising costs threaten the future of food production (links to wages)
- Bad practices of transnational corporations, (e.g. land grabbing, destruction of local markets via price dumping, exporting the high quality products)

Proposed Actions

- 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: Governance and agricultural Policies

The context:

1. International food institutions

World Trade Organization (WTO) is very powerful, formed in 1994, liberalize trade, and sees agriculture as a commodity. It has powerful control tools in each country to regulate trade

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO): is a unit of the United Nations: implements policies, takes decisions at consensus, in Rome. Before it was split into WFD, IFAD and CIGAR (seeds).

This institution is more and more open to the participation of civil society, but could be sometimes lacks resources to be really powerful.

World Bank: Its mission is to create development in the world. It gives loans for countries, with conditions, because they think they know how countries shall develop! Country who pay more have more power to decide. 27% decisions are controlled by USA.

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD): works on a long term basis for food security in developing countries. // **World Food Program (WFP)** works on short term.

2. CAP (European Common Agricultural Policy)

It started in 1950 with the Rome treaty. The objective was to have sufficient food for Europe after World War 2. It gave indirect then direct subsidies to farmers.

It can be a chance to develop an ecologically, sustainable farming (eg. farm management, rural environmental protection scheme). It's the only budget completely financed by EU. And is structured in 2 pillars: Agriculture and Rural Development.

There is a reform of the CAP for 2013.

3. Women and Youth in decision making processes

In rural areas, farmers lack of time to get involved in politics. Youth are not interest of the local policies because many are not interested in rural areas.

Women have even more work so even less time. Agriculture is mostly a male industry, but if a women want to become a farmer, it's also successful. So if there are no women it's by choice, not prejudice.

Sometimes, there are some youth « rural unions » to help each other. In Ireland, Norway, Poland, ... some rural women organizations intend to increase their status and equalizing the place of women.

Our conclusions:

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.

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.
- More power to the UN agencies.

Our commitments :

- Increase of youth knowledge on politics.
- Participate and promote youth and women participation to local, national and international levels.

For more details about the final proposals of the working groups, please go to the final political paper in the annex n°5 p.45.

III. Plenary sessions.

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

a) Objectives

Give a global perspective on the topic and a definition of Food Sovereignty.

b) Main content

A dramatic world food situation :

- 6,8 billion human beings in the world
- 3 billion poor who lack sufficient access to food
- 2 billion who suffer from malnutrition
- 873 million who suffer from hunger most of the time (FAO STAT 2004- 2006)
- 2007-2008 : + 200 million who suffer from hunger (FAO information)
- 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 the 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. 60-70% in south. In the countries in the south there a frequently old and children working, but not necessarily full time. 1.4 billion people work in agriculture. In the world there are 28 million tractors in the world for 2 % of the farmers. There are 1 billion peasant working manually, (hoes, machetes,...etc). They cultivate less than 1 hectare per person. They don't have the means to buy commercial seeds, fertilizers,... They are able only to produce 10 per hectare (at max).

Many of these manual farmers, don't have access to land, largely because they were expropriated in colonial times, and is still wide spread (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 there production. Many work on part time basis as they don't earn enough.

Causes & consequences of this situation:

Agricultural revolution (1950s) and the green revolution (motorisation of agriculture, modern farming techniques).

- The 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, those who have 200 horse-power tractors. 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 – scale of inequalities remains the same even.
- Some situation would allow large & rich farmers to buy the best land, technology and increase their yield. Hence they will be able to produce at a lowest possible cost.

The relocation of Agricultural revolution in countries with large estates and low wages:

- equipment and productivity levels similar to those of the most productive family farmers (US, EU)
- Wages 25 to 50 times lower and production costs 2 times lower than those of the most competitive families.

Finally in 50 years :

- 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 border, the self – consumption of production.
- Peasant markets: They directly sell on the local market
- International market: Everything beyond, what is exported to other countries

How does the international market work?

- 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 farmer 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 rise 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. This is in the eastern EU countries, in the US the price is... 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 long period of increasing surpluses at decreasing prices and their consequences.

• *For poor agricultural countries* : 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 institution) leading to lack of governability (as it's these int. financial institutions that own governments. It is those you loan the money at the final level who are at fault), conflicts, famines...

>The international financial system is already corrupted – so how can we be surprised by the corruption within these countries?

>The conflicts and famines are hence the direct effect of these three elements

• *for the world economy* : lack of purchasing power, excess of saving and financial capital, speculation, financial crisis, generalized 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 the toxic to the whole financial system.

Perspectives

Can agriculture feed humankind?

To be able to correct the food deficit we need: enough land, technology and the political situation to foster this equilibration.

• We are now in a period of demographic transition (9.2 billion people in 2075)

• Demographic consideration :

- How much food will be necessary to eliminate malnutrition?
- If the population go to 9.2 – 35 % is needed?
- if we wanted everybody to have enough food to eat (like the 'rich')?

Possibilities:

Taking into consideration best & medium quality land for cultivation, ignoring the land that is difficult to cultivate and 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, forest,, infrastructures...); the world cultivated area is 1,4.

We actually known 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
- all this will permit to increase world average production per hectare by 30 %

We need a **real green revolution**: if we are not careful we will produce as much poverty as wealth (like now).

Questions and Answers

What can we do at our level to help change of the situation as much of what was said was on a global scale?

Even if the problem is global, the consequence that can be produced are also local: farmers and consumers are also effected. Peasants producing wheat earn only 0,10 euros per kilo, whereas the bread is sold at 4 euros (4 times) more. In other days the wheat and the bread was sold at the same price. This doesn't leave anything of the baker. So now they have decided to grow, produce the bread and try to sell their products directly to increase their profit margin, which is already very low. You as a consumer can adapt what you consume in line with agricultural consideration, but you will not change the system. You will not be able to change the structure, but you can limit the negative effects. You need to struggle to understand and make others understand the consequences of their consumption, so they become aware that everybody have the right to eat and earn their living. Motivate people to take part in a social movement to try and change the system. But this won't change it, this aims rather to regulate the system.

Micro-credit is a bad thing ?

Is not an efficient system for farmers. The farmers can't necessarily understand the 'language' of the micro-creditor. For the case of vegetables, it takes 1 years to organize the production, for animals there are several year to get the money back. Food prices are so low so it's impossible to get more than your 10% of your investment. So when there are micro-creditors in the village they are usually there for other reasons. If you see agricultural micro-creditors this need to be subsidized, and need to loan money at less than 5% of micro-credit and there are no micro-creditors who lend money at this rate.

When the peasant have to carry the weight of the system, it is impossible to give them micro-credits as it can simply lead them to exist the market.

About climate- change, nothing was mentioned in relation to the agricultural revolution and at the same time the possibility to lower CO2 emissions?

The big models created by GIEC show that temperature increases, hence increasing the cultivatable land (5 - 10%). Only in southern countries where this surface will decrease. There is an the increase in vegetation and agricultural yield and rain with the increase of temperature and CO2.

In the evaluation of GIEC, we aren't sure of all of the theories that relate to the 'theories' of climate change. Given that we have on average the risk of making mistakes is around 10%, they remain theories.

One thing, we cannot use forestry areas for cultivation, as this would engender enormous negative effects that go far beyond that of the 'hypothetical' notion of climate change. That why it is not part our analysis of 'cultivatable land'.

Stop giving land to multinational farmers, the ones who deforest lands and use every unsustainable resources that is very costly provoking damage. The land should be given to peasants who work on a smaller scale. It's important to allow the small scale farmers to be part of conservation policies to preserving certain areas.

E.g. In Niger – Chinese us resources to produce cars – socially, economically and not good

2. A North/South perspective on food systems

a) Objectives

Understand better the world food system by experimenting it, give a “Southern” point of view on the food system, understand the impact of food consumption in Europe on the food production in the world.

b) Game on world food market (by CCFD)

The participants were divided in several countries (India, Bolivia, France, United States) with different food realities. Their aim was to eat & 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.

c) Testimonies

After the game and a short exchange, an input – discussion was done with people who come from or represent southern countries to explain what is their reality.

Elvis Gomez from Nicaragua

Elvis gave us an idea about the situation of Nicaragua and Central America.

- They are a region very centered on agriculture. Throughout history they have had a conflictual history. 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.
- More than 70 % of the population live with 1 dollar a day.

5, 5 million inhabitants in the country:

- 1.5 million emigrated to Costa Rica looking for work
- 75 % of population are very young (18-35 years)
- Most have 2 hectares of land to cultivate, some used for woodland, livestock and housing
- Manual/local type production – most of the production in Nicaragua is Cereals (rice, bananas, corn, meat)
- That trade method takes place through intermediaries
 - The order 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 US. The competition between 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

His Organization (ATC) : International Farm workers Association works with trade unions that work specifically in agriculture and trade.

Objectives of ATC:

- Try to look for alternatives for the small farmers.
- A capitalization that takes quality in account and incorporates women and family in to the 'system'.
- 27 % of population in Nicaragua suffers from malnutrition. They can improve this by capitalization and commercialization. They can provide them with tools, animals, materials to a enable them to farm, favoring the use of cooperatives. This facilitates the legal framework which enables the access to programs.
- Establish spaces for trade, which enable :
 - small producers to sell directly to consumers
 - diversify the production, create 'green markets' (for direct sales between producers & consumers)
 - They need a physical 'local' farmers market to eliminate the middle man

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 favors exodus.

- Created a university course – a technical training program in agriculture and livestock
 - 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 graduated from this program
 - 90 currently taking the course
 - The aim is to expand this to the North (area rich in agriculture) & throughout the country

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

Exodus:

We can't really ask emigrants to come back as there is little incentives for them to come. Many emigrate illegal, leading to a low and precarious lifestyle (low standard of living).

- The aim is to help these people to have legal status: ATC have had some successes.

With Via Campesina they have explored and worked on the concept of Food Sovereignty. Recently the law on Food Sovereignty was approved. - this will help in implementing FS.

- Nicaragua is the first country to sign the land charter, recognizing and helping the environment (reducing global warming) which favors policies of FS and food security by way of small farmers.
- This law has encouraged governmental projects to get involved and create centers (schools have set up centers as well as give training) that recognizes 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.

Success stories

- The creation of trade unions of farmers which has enabled them to produce more and achieve FS.

Questions & Answers

The impact of free trade agreement with EU & US (EPA)?

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 can't compete, leading to their indebtedness with international organization and financial institutions. The impact in terms of FS : when producers can't or longer can produce food they are forced to import this food, we are overwhelmed. When all farmers have been forced out of the market , the prices go up – (coca cola is cheaper than milk!).

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

What is FS?

- Term first used in 1996, during the 1st world food summit by Via Campesina
 - 'food is a basic human right, and they can only be recognized if the farmers-peasant have the right to produce food and consumers to be able to decide what they consume.'
- Their belief: The right way to achieve food security is to give small farmer the right and the power to create food security.

Timeline:

- Via Campesina 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 couldn't 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.
 - FS gave a framework to civil society.
 - The concept of FS was taken and developed clearly and organized in southern countries to better the general well-being/quality of life & food for all.
- 2007 – Mali, Nyeleni Forum (name of female farmer that played a symbolic and important role in FS in Mali):
 - Via Campesina, NGOs and partners organized this study session to clarify and solidify the content and concept of FS.
 - 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'. I.e. 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, fisherfolks, pastoralists, nomads - i.e. everybody who produce food.

Important actors:

There are growing transnational & retailing companies spreading all over the world, creating a massive problem. When you are dealing with goods in large volume you need a standardized production, hence smaller/local farmers won't have access to this market

- In near future, there will be a new Nyéleni Forum for Europe, in Austria 2011.
 - A gathering of organizations of small farmers, consumers and environmentalists.
 - To make more concrete this term 'FS'.
 - Growing awareness of quality, unsustainable manner of producing, people are looking for a change:
 - Safeguard the earth for future
 - Export should not be the prime objective
 - FS is the way to balance the inequalities and conflicts between northern and southern countries

Q&A Session:

What is the role of Youth for Food Sovereignty?

Youth are extremely important in the combat for Food Sovereignty.

Acting at grassroots level is very important, get involved at the first point. Try to use all opportunities that are offered. (eg. 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 it's fullest potential, specifically for young people and women. This is a place to make our voices heard.

Subsidies – how do they work in the framework of 'dumping' ?

Subsidies for exports are going to be banded soon. All subsidies help you to live, even with low prices. (Jacques Bertelot - economist - Shows that all subsidies are the cause of dumping). We need fair prices and to achieve this we need FS. And we need the right to protect our market.

3. What do I think about agriculture?

a) Objective and methodology

- After hearing many inputs, give the possibility to the participants to express themselves on sensitive questions.
- Debate among diverging visions of agriculture.

The participants were asked to position themselves physically between two poles (yes-no) in the room according to the answer they would give to several questions. Then a debate was open between the 2 parts of the room, and anyone could change his/her position according to the arguments the others were raising.

b) Main Outcomes

The questions were as follows:

“European Agricultural subsidies have to be eliminated?”

Majority : Agree

- It's a political statement which expresses the government's support for agriculture.
- The subsidies laws need to change – the policies need to change to promote subsidies in other countries around the world
- EU subsidies causes 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 buyer than have no concept of sustainable agriculture.)
- In the long term, (in Norway) 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 work (farm), when I speak about what I would like to produce. 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'.

Minority : Disagree

- Subsidies – no, Protection -yes (spikes and troughs in the market- price fluctuations- fair prices to producers).
- It would put a lot of farmers out of business and cause a sharp rise in food prices that the EU and World consumer couldn't 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 need have to be provided with technical systems?”

Agree : Minority:

- What is mechanic systems? Machines that does 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's 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?

Disagree : Majority:

- Agriculture can work without mechanic systems, we have talked about “permaculture”, we think this can be a solution.
- What is 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's 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, neighbors 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.
- Over-production

- Mechanism 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”

Agree: Minority

- 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 you production needs energy and labor saving in all links of the process (trade system), it's easier to exploit labor force in production, transportation and selling. Higher needs of mechanization to save energy.
- It is important to have exchange, we can't eliminate that. But agriculture have to be less specialized, 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.

Disagree: Majority

- 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 orange, bananas, pineapple, 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 not 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 don't need to be harmful.
- People have to think about what they eat and where it comes from.

4. Are agroecological practices compatibles with FS? By Silvia Vitoria Perez

a) Objectives

- Questioning the compatibility between environmental and political approaches of food sovereignty.

- Use what the participants have learned from the beginning to question agroecology. After the presentation from Silvia, the participants were asked to think about the compatibility between agroecology and FS in small groups and come back to the debate with their positions.

b) Main outcomes

Agro-ecology

- Term first used 1930s
- A way to think of agriculture
- 1960 – agroecology grew in south America, due the waste being produced in the agriculture industry
- By Miguel Altermier and Stefan Leasemen – (agronomist) - another great figure of Agro-ecology
- Cannot be sum up as an agronomical concept.

It came from contribution from history, anthropology, ethno-botanic, not oly agronomy. There is a strong movement to bring this back to the very technical front. But Silvia and other 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 dimension. Three key elements of the 'broad approach':

1. Agro-ecological system
2. Social & ecology co-evolution
3. Knowledge and practices of small- farmers

Miguel Altermier definition of agroecology:

The scientific discipline centered on the ecology and agriculture and it analyzes eco- agri in a broad sense with the goal to improve the entire concept, the **ecosystems** and agro-ecology. **Agro-ecosystem** is a man-made (artificial) system made by man. How do we sustain the natural ecosystem? E.g When you grow one certain crop, this will privilege one crop over another thereby effecting 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 nature balance of the ecosystems. Basing our knowledge on their knowledge, locally based, territorial in nature and it is diverse 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 scientist's knowledge. Many agro-ecologist have gone into the field and realize that there is not much that they can teach farmers, much the contrary. Peasant's knowledge and place is stigmatized, believing them to be 'ignorant'. Agro-ecology is against this idea and values the knowledge of the peasant farmers.

Agro-ecology based on the traditional practices, that have made it possible **natural balance to be maintained** and the **proliferation of social movements**. The social

movements, peasant movements in particular, enhances practices and knowledge that have been held in high esteem throughout history.

An example: 1980s in Andalucia

- they 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 wouldn't poison the earth. They didn't 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 ways and others that still retain the traditional methods. There are now many social movements and new way 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 & women that work there as well as the environment.

The proposal of agro-ecology:

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

Agro-ecology : takes into account social, political & economical problems of agriculture into account. It intends to use traditional practices that have allowed to guarantee a balance between eco-system – 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.

Social Aspect: Includes people who work, live and act with these systems. It studies: What type of social organization the peasant VS farmers have? How do they organize themselves? How do they work? Are there towns around the area (e.g. the nearest city)?

Political aspect – allows people to work and self-manage the framework and system, 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 agroecological approaches:

Andalusia, 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 technician 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. It's a very different thing to sell what you produce.

In small groups: How can agro-ecology contribute to FS?

- Emphasis on the peasant and their knowledge is historical not very present in economy
- Definition varies from country to country
- It would definitely benefit FS, as some of the main goals of FS look to providing land, seed and water to 'peasant' farmers to enable them to create their future in agriculture. A the knowledge that could be provided by Agro-ecology would enable these farmers to understand their environment of the action agriculturally, socially and economically, ... 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 FS.
- It's nothing new, but it can facilitate ...
- There's a need of public policies and systems that can complete the production cycles

Questions and answers:

How can we implement this system?

The short circuit that ties production directly to market. Like that, consumers will take a look at the people who produce food for them. It's important to get rid of the 'middle-men'.

- e.g. In Switzerland, there is an area of francophone Switzerland with an organization 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 chains (e.g. 'Coop' & 'migro'). It's important to get directly to consumers.

Can we find a balance between political support and FS?

There is nothing that we can expect from public policy. There are so many difficulties. FS 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 FS.

According to Mazoyer, a global solution needs to be thought and local initiatives are useless...

Silvia completely disagrees. At local levels there are movements that impact massive changes. E.g 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.

5. An ethical point of view on food By Jurgen Seeger, KLJB

The objective was to take a spiritual and philosophical point of view on food. But because of some logistical problems, Jurgen gave us a very short presentation on the ethical view of the Church on Food.

Ordinalethics:

E.g. Wage : Fair remuneration

Social Ethics

How should be the social and economic order? Be designed?

Ethic Solidarity

Ethics of Vision :What vision do I have for the improvement of the 'world'?

IV. Forum on best practices

1. Objectives

The objective of this forum was to give the participants an overview of possible solutions to reach FS. 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.

2. Main outcomes

❖ MRJC Best Practices (*Mouvement Rural de Jeunesse Chrétienne*)

It's the French branch of MIJARC, that works in local groups, that try to implement projects at rural level and beyond.

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 mind-set of the people.

The player imagines that he is a young farmer. At the beginning of the game you set yourself objectives regard 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 sort of meeting place that provides information and counseling 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 program with local government: 8 programs for village to develop their facilities.

❖ **Spire (Norway)**

Is not a rural organization or Catholic organization, 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 agrofuels 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 FS. 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 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 & summer camps on this subject.

Lobbying:

Spire do not believe that the politicians will come to them hence they actively go to them. We can't to 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.

Strategy sessions and main outcomes

1. Methodology

Each working group end up with a draft proposal of chapter for the final political document. The first step to discuss these chapters was a plenary session with Claude Breune (**cf. next chapter**), from the political world, to confront the proposals of the participants with the opinion of someone experienced on the topic, but also to promote our ideas to the politicians.

After hearing the opinion of M.Breune, each working group could update its document, then a plenary session was held to debate together and agree on the content of the final political document.

Once the political document adopted by the plenary (*see annex n°5 p.45*), the participants set up strategies to implement the objectives mentioned. (*see chapter on strategies p.35*). After setting a common European strategy, the participants gathered by nationality to think about national strategies.

2. “Young citizens wonder: what European policy to guarantee food sovereignty from north to south?”

a) Objectives:

At this point of the session, we wanted to confront the outcomes of the working groups with the political sphere. We started by presenting the results of the 3 working groups (*cf. chapter on WG, p.12-16*), then we opened the debate with Claude Breune, Parliamentary assistant to the French Green senator Jacques Muller. The main question of the debate was “What European policy to guarantee food sovereignty from North to South?”

b) Main outcomes

Introduction word by with Claude Breune:

“ I’m happy to meet you hear for several reasons. As a prior member of MRJC during my youth, this structure is not unfamiliar to me.” He later worked with the CCFD and he organized seminar and events in Africa. The question of FS is extremely important to him and Jacques Muller, the 'senator' he works for. They continuously promote notions related to the principles of FS. It is in their mind extremely important to highlight the importance of Agricultural and Food Policy.

MIJARC Presentation:

We are active young people who aim to the discuss and envision our role in the future. We aim to take an active role in the shaping of our 'future' world.

Intervention of Claude Breune:

“Your thought are very close to what I thought previously. I have some links with what you said. In 1971, the father of the Agriculture policy in CAP, wrote 'I'm sure that we have to change quickly and totally our policy if we don't want to disappear. It's not possible to destroy the planet'. The problems are not new, new to us but not in the word.”

Farmers are economic actors, but agriculture are an original activity for 2 reasons:

1. The purpose it to feed the people not the car, hence they can not be treated the same way as other products.
2. Agriculture is a specific activity in the economy : In EU the milk crisis (last Year) 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.

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 it's inhabitants. The Principle of FS is not supported on international level, because food continues to be considered as a commodity.

Food production is multi-dimensioned:

1. On environment: Water, biodiversity, degradation of the soil, GMOs...
2. Agricultural activities produce not only food but also landscapes
3. Role of 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.

Anecdote about the « Grenelle de l'environnement »

Jacques Muller, senator, put forward the word 'biofuel' instead of 'agrofuel'. The proposal was refused...

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.

Questions and answers

Agriculture must become and important sector of the world policy?

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 find new solutions to these problems...

3. European Strategies

After brainstorming on possible strategies, 3 main focuses were selected :

- **Lobby work:**

Aims: Promote our political paper in media, face to face meetings, letters, phone contacts, forums, ...

To meet: Governments, politicians (all levels), NGOs, Economic organizations, Church, trade unions, educational organizations.

- **An Information Campaign about FS**

Aims: A coordination team composed by several movements will use the political document as:

- 1) A base to build a document
- 2) Then organize information sessions on FS in all the movements
- 3) To promote 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.

- **Cooperation and networking with other youth organizations for FS**

Idea : To create a European Youth Network for FS. 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 FS (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, we will create a network via:

- mailing list for Youth Europe
- Inviting each other to our meetings and seminars
- Activities
- Blog

4. National Strategies

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

Portugal: Organize a fair to promote local products and during which there would be a roundtable about FS for the population and young farmers. Training members nationally on the topic, take more contacts and cooperate with older organizations which work with farmers.

Norway: Cooperation with other youth networks, info campaign on land grabbing, share best practices with other national movements, receive our political document. For lobby, it's difficult when you are not in the EU but it's important to work on CAP. They will lobby on food issues toward Norwegian politicians, ...

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

Bulgaria: Start a campaign to spread the idea of FS toward people and farmers, promote food security for hunger people, access to land, participation to lobby via the European team.

France: Integrate the concept in the activities that already exist: many activities go in this direction but are not called as such. Eg: political debates when elections, national agricultural meetings, ... Agreed to link our local action in particular to the activities of the local farmer with the principle of FS.

Germany: We haven't been able to make clear decision. The subject of FS is already a principal topic in the movement. It has a working group. There is currently a campaign in place which integrates the notions of FS. FS concepts will be implemented in all corresponding political and campaign papers.

Nicaragua: We have decided to work on actions and campaigns with FS, with Via Campesina. We 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 catalysis 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 executed
- ANNEX 3: List of participants names, organisations and countries
- ANNEX 4: List of references
- ANNEX 5: Final political paper

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 FS •To share experiences on farming and agricultural issues •To exchange contacts fo 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 movements of point of view (language barriers) •Difficulty to accurately represent the views of my movements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Good discussion •Broader understanding on issues linked to FS •Increased awareness of FS •Discuss different points of views on FS
<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 friend 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 •Not understanding him •Participants won't be able to under her due to language barriers and the hence • objects & goals may not be clear enough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Obtain a more global perspective on the issue •to be able to share local experience on the given issues •to share the knowledge acquired during the study session at home • establish relationship s between people
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Language barriers – lack of participation •lack of similar situation to implement FS 	<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 FS, politics and markets control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Practice knowledge about FS •more aware of FS
<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 FS to teach local chapters , and how to communicate FS to young people
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Fear language problems, to pass ones opinions, and fear that I lack enough knowledge on FS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Want to learn more about politics of agriculture
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Lack of vocabulary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Want to learn more about agric 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 expectation from all participation 	<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 S, 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 Council of Europe Introduction of the participants Explanation about the CoE 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	Departures	
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)	Continuation			- Input: <i>“an ethical point of view on the food system”</i> Jurgen Seeger		Continuation
12h30		<i>Lunch</i>	<i>Lunch</i>	<i>Lunch</i>	<i>Lunch</i>	<i>Lunch</i>	<i>Lunch</i>		<i>Lunch</i>
13h45		Energizers	Energizers	Energizers	Energizers	Energizers	Energizers		Energizers

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 the field visits. Preparation of the evening	Forum of best practices « Initiatives for FS »	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	Grupos de trabajo Analysis of the situation	Debate con politicos with a politician « Young citizens wonder: what european policy for FS from North to South? » Claude Breune	Plenary: Building national strategies for FS	
18h00		Reflexion groups	Reflexion groups	Reflexion groups	Reflexion groups	Reflexion groups		
19h00	Dinner	Dinner	<i>Dinner in town</i>	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner	Dinner	
21h00	Introduction games and practice info	Inter-cultural evening		Field Visit presentations	Alsacian evening	Free evening	Farewell party	

ANNEX 3: List of participants

MIJARC Europe	Quintin	Claire	France
MRJC	Montassier	Gael	France
KLJB	Seeger	Jurgen	Germany
MIJARC	MATZDORF	PATRICIA	UK- France
KLJB	NORDHUS	VERONIKA	Germany
KLJB	SETTELE	KLAUS	Germany
Via Campesina- ATC	Gomez	Elvis	Nicaragua
Rural Youth Europe	MARTIROSYAN	GAYANE	Armenia
Rural Youth Europe	MCEVOY	KIERAN	Ireland
Sprout	MOSTUEN	Gro Grytli	Norway
Spire	BULL	CHRISTIAN	Norway
EiR	CARYK	ANNA	Poland
EiR	HAWRYŁO	KRZYSZTOF	Poland
EiR	CARYK	PIOTREK	Poland
YMDRAB	CHECHEVA	DANIELA	Bulgaria
YMDRAB	PEICHEVA	POLINA	Bulgaria
YMDRAB	STEFANOV	DIMO	Bulgaria
YMDRAB	NIKOLOVA	ANNA	Bulgaria
MRJC	Pousin	Estelle	France
MRJC	Bossy	Nathalie	France
MRJC	Jaunet	Corentin	France
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/>

ANNEX 5: 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 organizations 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 prioritize 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 transnational companies.
- The rejection of intellectual property rights on life. (eg. 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 GMO's and large-scale industrialized agro-fuels.
- Recognize a sustainable and local production and consumption of Agrofuels 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 & 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 & agricultural workers - PROPOSED SCHEMA (wages, affordable food, fair prices to agriculture worker & 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.

Campaigns of information

- ✓ 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

- 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 formation of future farmers

- with the traditional methods of agriculture, in relation with their region.
- with alternative systems of production
- Politics
- Economics (market functions, etc.)
- 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 organization witch 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

