

WORLD FORUM ON ACCESS TO LAND
AND NATURAL RESOURCE

WFAL 2016



PROCEEDINGS

Valencia (Spain)
March 31, 1 and 2 April 2016

**WORLD FORUM ON ACCESS TO LAND AND
NATURAL RESOURCE**

WFAL 2016



PROCEEDINGS

ENGLISH

Valencia (Spain)

March 31, 1 and 2 April 2016

PRESENTATION

BRIEF PRESENTATION OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF 2016 WFAL

The meetings of the Global Forum on Access to Land and Natural Resources (WFAL 2016) took place over three days of work, discussions in the form of plenary sessions and workshops held from 31 March to 2 April 2016 on the campus of the Polytechnic University of Valencia in Spain.

It brought together representatives from three categories of signatories of the WFAL call, with the majority present being from rural organizations and rural civil society (organizations of farmers, fishers and forest communities) and urban civil societies from around the world, especially women's and youth organizations.

These organizations have worked and discussed with other participants, researchers, representatives of local, national and international governmental institutions and representatives of other actors under the modalities established by the International Organization Committee.

These organizations and individuals come from 70 countries in Africa, Asia, South and North America, and Europe; They collated analysis of rural development in recent decades and its impact on cities; They identified policy measures to solve the problems that constitute these developments and generated effective citizen action for political change and reversal of the serious tendencies observed.

This document constitute the minutes of this meeting. It facilitates the meticulous transcription of the exchanges between participants during the plenary sessions (introductory presentations and debates) as well as a summary of the thirteen workshops in sub-groups.

This has been prepared by the Permanent Secretariat of WFAL, supported in turn and since 2014, by the Association for Improvement of the Governance of Land, Water and Natural Resources (AGTER, France) and the Centre for Rural Studies and International Agriculture (CERAI, Spain).

Vicent Garcés, President of the CIO-WFAL, and the Permanent Secretariat of WFAL, secretariat@landaccessforum.org



Association for Improving governance of Earth, Water and
Natural Resources

Head office: 45 bis avenue de la Belle Gabrielle,
94736 Nogent sur Marne Cedex, France

Tel: +33 143 947 259

Web: <http://www.agter.asso.fr> ; <http://agter.org>



Centre for Rural Studies and International Agriculture

Venue: School of Agricultural Technicians

Camí del Port s / n. 46470 Catarroja,
Valencia / Spain

Tel: +34 963 52 18 78

Web: <http://cerai.org>

INDEX

ENGLISH

8 ORGANIZERS AND PARTNERS

9 International Committee of Organization WFAL 2016

10 Local organizing committee

11 Permanent Secretariat of WFAL

12 The WFAL has benefited from the support of

13 The WFAL has been possible thanks to the involvement of all its participants

13 Thanks

14 MARCH 31, 2016 – RESULTS OF THE EVOLUTION OF ACCESS TO LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES AND TO THE PROCESS OF RESISTANCE TO LAND GRABS OVER THE PAST 10 YEARS

15 Opening Session

33 Plenary Session I. Summary of contemporary developments 10 years after the ICARRD in Porto Alegre (2006): Clarifications by continent

33 Presentations

57 Debate

61 Workshops (Synthesis)

61 WORKSHOP 1: Land grabbing and land concentration: What are the numbers and who are the actors?

67 WORKSHOP 2: Forest areas

72 WORKSHOP 3: Grabbing of fishery resources

76 WORKSHOP 4: Evictions, exodus, migration, impact on cities

80 WORKSHOP 5: The difficulty for women of access to land and natural resources

85 Plenary Session II Analysis of struggle and resistance to the process of land grabbing

85 Presentations

96 Debate

98 APRIL 1, 2016 – ACCESS TO LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES: ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND CULTURAL CONSEQUENCES

99 Plenary Session III. Family farming enterprises or large companies with employees? Economic, social, environmental and cultural consequences

99 Presentations

114 Debate

136 Workshops (Synthesis)

136 WORKSHOP 6: Production, employment creation and incorporation of young people, share the wealth

142 WORKSHOP 7: Environment, agroecology, soil, water, climate change

148 WORKSHOP 8: International trade, autonomy, food sovereignty at different geographical scales and food systems

154 WORKSHOP 9: Natural resource management by the people. Indigenous peoples. Common goods

160 Plenary Session IV Economic, social, cultural and ecological scope of access to land and natural resources

160 Presentations

174 Debate

176	APRIL 2, 2016 -ACCESS TO LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES. THE FUTURE OF HUMANITY. WHAT ARE THE PROPOSALS AND ACTIONS?
177	Plenary Session V Access to land and natural resources. The future of humanity. What are the proposals and actions?
177	Presentations
186	Debate
206	Workshops (Synthesis)
206	WORKSHOP 10: Voluntary Guidelines on responsible governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests in the context of national food security (VG): actions that have been applied in the field
212	WORKSHOP 11: Food security and sovereignty, land rights (individual and collective), common goods
218	WORKSHOP 12: Fiscal Policies, regulation of financial markets and the size of production units
222	WORKSHOP 13: Strengthening farmer organizations, pastoralists, indigenous peoples and fishermen. Expand partnerships in society
228	Plenary Session VI Final synthesis
233	Comments from members of the drafting committee
236	Comments from participants
241	Closing Session
251	WFAL photographic gallery index

ORGANIZERS AND PARTNERS

- 09 INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF ORGANIZATION WFAL 2016
- 10 LOCAL ORGANIZING COMMITTEE
- 11 PERMANENT SECRETARIAT OF WFAL
- 12 THE WFAL HAS BENEFITED FROM THE SUPPORT OF
- 13 THE WFAL HAS BEEN POSSIBLE THANKS TO THE INVOLVEMENT OF ALL ITS PARTICIPANTS
- 13 THANKS

FARMER 'S ORGANIZATIONS & OTHER CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS

ACTIONAID.

COPROFAM(Organizations Coordinator Family Producers Mercosur) represented by CONTAG (National Confederation of Agricultural Workers), Brazil.

EKTA PARISHAD, India.

ROPPA (Network of Farmers' Organizations and Agricultural Producers in West Africa).

SLOW FOOD.

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL NGOS

FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

(MDA) Brazilian Development Ministry, Federal Republic of Brazil.

Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Equipment, Republic of Senegal.

Ministry of Agrarian Reform, Philippine Republic.

INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPANTS

Samir Amir (World Forum for Alternatives, Egypt-France).

José Bové (MEP, France).

Hubert Cochet (Professor, AgroParisTech, France).

Olivier De Schutter (UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food 2008-2014 Belgium).

Vicent Garcés (former European deputy, CERAI, Spain), president of the CIO.

Cecilia Leiva Montenegro (former vice-Minister of Agriculture of Chile).

Kaul Nurm (EESC member and rapporteur of the Council of the EESC on land grabbing).

Michel Merlet (director of AGTER, France).

Marcel Mazoyer (emeritus professor, AgroParisTech, France).

Henri Rouille d'Orfeuill (Academy of Agriculture of France, France Coordinator of the International Year of Family Farming, France).

OBSERVER MEMBERS

IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development).

IFOAM International Organics.

ILC (International Coalition for Access to Land).

WRF (World Rural Forum).

SPECIAL GUESTS

European Commission.

Hans Herren (Millennium Institute, Biovision Foundation, Switzerland).

Michel Pimbert (Center for Agroecology, water and resilience, Coventry University, UK).

Francisco Sarmiento (University of Coimbra, Portugal).

The first two meetings of the CIO took place in Rome (Italy) at the headquarters of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) on 19 and 20 June and 3 and 4 November 2014. The third and final meeting of the CIO before the world meeting took place in the European Economic and Social Committee in Brussels (Belgium) on 10 and 11 June 2015.

LOCAL ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

COLLEGE:

- Rector of the Polytechnic University of Valencia (UPV).
- Higher Technical School of Agricultural Engineering and Natural Habitats (ETSIAMN).
- Department of Economics and Social Sciences at the UPV.
- Cátedra Tierra Ciudadana.

PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS:

- Valencia City Council.
- Valencia Provincial Council, Department of Environment.
- Valencia Regional Ministry of Agriculture, Environment, Climate Change and Rural Development.
- Valencia Regional Ministry of Transparency, Accountability, Participation and Cooperation.

UNIONS:

- AVA-ASAJA.
- Union of Llaboradors i Ramaders.

ORGANIZACIONES DE LA SOCIEDAD CIVIL:

- Per l'Horta.
- Valencia NGO Coordinator
- Spanish Society for Ecological Agriculture (SEAE)
- Valencia Agrifood Cooperatives Federation

Contact: Executive Secretary: Mathieu Perdriault (AGTER).

WFAL address has been supported jointly by AGTER and CERAI since late 2013.

AGTER (Association for Improving governance of Land, Water and Natural Resources) AGTER is an international non-profit host to French law. It was created in March 2005 by a group of people from different backgrounds and who had participated in work or exchanges between civil society organizations related to the problems of access to natural resources and land. Convinced of the interest of explaining the relationship between the causes of poverty and underdevelopment, and access to resources, they considered it essential to create alternatives to current policies.

For AGTER there are two major priorities: 1. contribute to the cessation of land grabbing of land and natural resources and give this an 180 degree turn. 2. participate in the construction of a regulated access to land and natural resource use and which ensures equitable distribution of its benefits and its ecological sustainability.

For AGTER, improving governance of natural resources is for the consideration of those without voice, re-equilibrating the weight of each part in the public debate and decision-making process and with the implementation of guidelines for groups that guarantee fundamental individual interests as well as the general interest of the community as a whole. This goal ensures the dissemination of an ongoing process of reflection and collective learning, designed to help members of civil society and other stakeholders aware of the need for information, the making of proposals and their implementation.

website: www.agter.org

e-mail: agter@agter.org

CERAI (Center for Rural Studies and International Agriculture)

CERAI was created in 1994 in Valencia (Spain) to analyse Spanish and European rural and agricultural world, its relations with international trade, global inequalities, the environment, organic farming and its future, sustainable development, rural depopulation, overexploitation of fish stocks, aquaculture, as well as the problems with the existing industrial food production model.

CERAI wants to contribute to the transformation of the rural world and participate in social movements for food sovereignty and human development (broadly and not just in the economic sense) of all the peoples of the world. It intends to carry out this work thanks to scientific, technical, social, political and economic cooperation with rural and urban communities and institutions, whether local, national or at international level.

website: www.cerai.org

e-mail: info@cerai.org

THE WFAL HAS BENEFITED FROM THE SUPPORT OF

VALENCIA CITY COUNCIL, SPAIN

AGENCE FRANÇAISE DE DÉVELOPPEMENT (AFD), FRANCE

CÁTEDRA TIERRA CIUDADANA, SPAIN

VALENCIA PROVINCIAL COUNCIL, SPAIN

COMMITTEE ÉCONOMIQUE EUROPÉEN ET SOCIALE (CESSATION), BELGIUM

FONDATION DE FRANCE

**FONDATION CHARLES LEÓPOLD MAYER POUR LE PROGRÈS DE L'HOMME (FPH),
SWITZERLAND**

**MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES ÉTRANGÈRES ET DU DÉVELOPPEMENT
INTERNATIONAL, FRANCE**

**MINISTÈRE DE L'AGRICULTURE, DE L'AGROALIMENTAIRE ET DE LA FORÊT,
FRANCE**

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO)

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (IFAD)

GENERALITAT VALENCIANA, SPAIN

INTERNATIONAL LAND COALITION (ILC)

POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY OF VALENCIA, SPAIN

THE WFAL HAS BEEN POSSIBLE THANKS TO THE INVOLVEMENT OF ALL ITS PARTICIPANTS

Thanks to the interest and commitment of all participants WFAL could muster a wide range of organizations and viewpoints. Everyone devoted a significant part of their time to the process and a large number of those who participated in the global meeting covered their own travel and subsistence expenses.

THANKS

Translation from French/Spanish into English:

Bettina and Patrick Wood

MARCH 31, 2016

Results of the evolution of access to land and natural resources and to the process of resistance to land grabs over the past 10 years

Jose MORA, Rector of the Polytechnic University of Valencia, Spain. Moderator of the opening session.

Good morning Ladies and Gentlemen, welcome to the World Forum on Access to Land and Natural Resources, here at the Polytechnic University of Valencia.

For the opening ceremony we are honoured to have the Honourable President of the Generalitat Valenciana Don Ximo Puig, His Excellency the Mayor of the city of Valencia Don Joan Ribo, the Honourable Regional Minister for Agriculture, Environment and Climate Change Doña Elena Cebrián, the illustrious Autonomous Secretary of Agriculture and Rural Development Don Francisco Rodriguez, the distinguished Director General of Rural Development and Agrarian Policies Community Maria Teresa Cháfer, Lord President of the International Committee of the Organization of the Global Forum on Access to Land Don Vicent Garcés, the principal representative for land tenure of the United Nations Organization for Food and Agriculture, FAO, Mr. Javier Molina Cruz, the director of the National Institute of Colonization and Agrarian Reform in Brazil, Mr. Richard Torsiano, the honourable President of Network of Farmer´s Organizations and Agricultural Producers of West Africa, ROPPA, Mr. Mamadou Cissokho President, the Campaigns Coordinator for Ekta Parishad Mr. Ramesh Sharma and President of the National Confederation of Agricultural Workers of Brazil, CONTAG, Mr. Alberto Broch.

I call on His Excellency the Mayor of Valencia Don Joan Ribó.

Joan RIBÓ, Mayor of Valencia, Spain.

Mr. President of the Generalitat, Ximo Puig, His Excellency Rector of the Polytechnic University of Valencia, Don Francisco Jose Mora, Regional Minister for Agriculture, Dona Lena Cebrián, representatives of rural networks in Asia, Africa and Latin America, the Ministry of Rural Development Brazil and FAO, coordinator of the International Organizing Committee of the WFAL, Don Vicent Garcés, participants in this forum, ladies and gentlemen.

From the |City Council of Valencia we support the need to promote equality of the right to access to land by all farmers including those with fewer resources as well as to water and other natural resources. For us it is a real pleasure that Valencia is hosting this global forum and returns twelve years after that held on agrarian reform debate as an international meeting to address such burning

and important questions. Therefore I welcome you to this open city so tied to the land, surrounded by orchards, endorsing all the causes that contribute to a better, fairer world while fighting poverty of all types.

From the City Council we welcome all the representatives of social organizations, public institutions and experts who have come from all over the world to attend this meeting. We hope that these days will serve to lay the foundations for a future that will ensure better access to land and that resolutions are adopted to execute economic and labour legislative reform necessary to change the current unacceptable situation.

Nearly 400 farmer and social organizations from all over the world, governments such as those of France, Senegal, the Philippines or Brazil, international agencies such as FAO or the International Fund for Agricultural Development and hundreds of experts from around the world support this global forum that Valencia welcomes with enthusiasm and with the hope that it will begin to turn around the relationship that exists between inequality in access to land, a fact that causes poverty and social exclusion of hundreds of millions of human beings around the world.

This is a state of affairs that has been reported in successive forums such as the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development held in Brazil in 2016 but nevertheless there is still much to be done. It is essential to improve the living conditions of the most vulnerable to eradicate hunger which unfortunately continues to rise in the world, to provide hope, work and sustenance to those who need it most. There are enough resources, I repeat enough resources and there is only the need to improve the current distribution and invest a minimal in certain rural areas to make available the natural resources to everyone.

For the City Council of Valencia it is very important to participate in the global forum on access to land Valencia 2016. We want to be a reference of support for a such a just cause, to a worldwide meeting in which these coming days will address crucial issues such as the persistence of hunger in the world, population growth and insecurity for the loss of food sovereignty in many areas. Another world is possible as it is another form of access to land, water and natural resources. I encourage you to work for it and I wish you all a fruitful, happy and memorable stay in Valencia on behalf of Valencia and in the name of all Valencians. Understand that the effort, reflection and debate during these days have our full support and solidarity.

Thank you very much.

Alberto BROCH, President of the National Confederation of Agricultural Workers of Brazil, CONTAG, Brazil.

Dear colleagues, good morning, I will try to speak in "Portuñol".

First I want to acknowledge the authorities that make up this table, the highest authorities of Valencia, the authorities of the committee convener coordinator of this World Forum of access to land and natural resources and I do it on behalf of our great coordinator, this great companion Vicente Garcés, who, on behalf of the whole forum, was fundamental to setting up this forum. Greetings to the authorities of the FAO, rural farmers authorities, greetings to everyone in this big auditorium and the big attendance we can see. Also I am greeting with great joy the delegation coming from Brazil, especially CONTAG, the National Confederation of agricultural workers, its directors, virtually all of its directors, regional leaders south, north-east, north and COPPROFAM entities and say, in the first instance that the representatives of the FAO, the government of Brazil and many other supporters of this great forum are present.

I mean all of you who are accompanying the serious political crisis that is happening in Brazil right now, it is very serious because it is not here to make a defence of President Dilma Rousseff, what is at issue here is the defence of democracy, so dear to us all. What is happening is a blow, a blow not by arms, but by the media, Congress, judges. The Brazilian people are in a very difficult struggle for the conquest of democracy. We therefore hope that at the right time we can express in this forum autonomously in favour of democracy in Brazil and anywhere in the world.

Secondly what unites us here is the issue of access to land and natural resources. We have the opportunity to make a huge assessment of this issue at world level, after the meeting in Porto Alegre, 12 years on from the Global meeting held here when the University Polytechnic of Valencia opened its doors to discuss this topic. We want to evaluate, we want to propose, because we believe that there will not be food sovereignty or food security in the world if access to the land is not discussed. There will be not be food sovereignty and security if farmers and women are not valued, if we do not look after the natural resources, if we do not discuss the issues of land globally and especially in Brazil and parts of Latin America where there was a process of agroupment of the land. We need to put this issue on the agenda of companies, multilateral organizations, the FAO, the United Nations, governments, because this is about access to life, access to food and there is no access to food if we do not discuss access to natural resources. We are all called on to make this a successful forum, and that this seed can germinate in the world to bear fruit for access to land, democracy, food sovereignty for the world. Thank you.

Ramesh CHANDRA SHARMA, Campaign Coordinator Ekta Parishad, India.

(Namaste in India).

First, I would like to thank the organizers for this great event. I see land rights activists from the North and from the South. I am happy to represent here Ekta Parishad, a movement for land rights in India, an organization that has many members in northern and eastern India.

I am happy that the Global Forum on Access to Land is being celebrated at this crucial moment. The situation is crucial for us, as a series of crises are occurring around natural resources in the world. If we take the example of countries in Latin America, Africa, Asia in the context of land reforms, laws are the subject of significant reforms. These laws are actually determined by multinationals, the World Bank, and many multinational companies that change the nature and even the notion of development. There is a change in the concept and rationale of development that has had an impact on the lives of millions of people in Southern countries.

According to a recent book by a group of authors gathered around Vandana Shiva, we have lost almost 70% of pasture, 50% savannahs, 35% of temperate forests and 27% of tropical forests because of this aggressive development model. This aggressive development model affects a large number of poor people in the South. As is the example of India.

Taking the example of India. Recently, the government has said that nearly 29.98% of the population is homeless and without land. A great shame. We are assisting in gradual policy reforms that actually benefit directly or indirectly large private multinational groups and not the needy. Free trade agreements, on the other hand, change all understanding and the concept of government. So notions are completely modified. Which does not benefit the general population.

Unfortunately, in a fairly recent past, there have been many changes in security-policy legislation. I can put as an example the case of India and that of our neighbouring countries where social movements are harassed, where the leaders of these movements are imprisoned. They are subject to numerous accusations because they only want to question the disorder and challenge the powerful. It is therefore a pleasure for me to share some viewpoints.

At the end of the day, all this goes back to the way free trade terminology undermines the concept of freedom. Thus, free trade is an expression that, by itself, changes the whole notion of freedom, that of Southern countries and their people, that of those who "freely exchange", that of companies who, not only have entered into different continents and their countries, but also in the life of the people.

I can name several and say how they have entered, how they have occupied our communal lands in India, how they have occupied coastal land and how they have begun to displace and expel the local population of coastal areas.

The third and most important aspect in this development is the appropriation of the commons. It is a very important issue because a large number of people depend on common ownership of the land and have lost this to appropriation of the land.

However, there is hope in other ways. I can take as an example the voluntary guidelines on land, fisheries and forest governance recently adopted in the context of national food security that gives us new hope. It's a new framework on thinking about agricultural reforms that have been intensively discussed by the FAO and today within reach at country level. We use this as a reference to convince our governments, to talk to our governments.

I can also cite many social movements fighting strongly in Southern countries. Thanks to these struggles, internal changes are taking place. This is the case of India with the recent bill "Forest Rights Act" which benefits 80 million indigenous people living on the coast for centuries.

Therefore, there is hope and I am sure that during these three days we will discuss all these different dynamics of these social movements.

Again, thank you very much to all the organizers for giving me the opportunity to say this.

Mamadou CISSOKHO, honorary President Network of Farmer´s Organizations and Producers in West Africa, ROPPA, Senegal.

Lord Mayor of the City of Valencia, President of the Province, Madam Minister, President of the Global Forum on Access to Land, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, dear friends, here we are after Porto Alegre, in Valencia.

On behalf of Africa, the cradle of humanity, I would like to share with you, with a renewed awareness of the limits of resources and our responsibilities to preserve them, the commitment of the Network of Farmers in Africa, and also of civil society through our consciousness, our renewed commitment to family farms that are social, cultural enterprises and economically create jobs and wealth, under the principle of solidarity. I would also share our desire to defend the food sovereignty of all countries to preserve and promote our food values. Because everyone agrees to say that "we are what we eat". This product that comes from the relationship between nature and cuisine is a richness shared by humanity and all peoples.

However, let me share our commitment to support inclusive integration processes and transparency of States and of peoples to promote solidarity of goods, knowledge and powers in the service of well being and shared amongst all.

Rural producer´s associations and civil society, this vision of the family engages us, along with all of you, in this long and difficult struggle to be heard from those who are convinced that science will find solutions to all human

follies. Since this is the real problem. They say "Are there many production problems? Not to worry NGOs will fix the problem! Are there problems of cardiovascular disease? Pharmaceuticals will produce the required medicine! Here is the vision that guides us and makes us forget that the reality at the beginning is the reality at the end, in contempt of unshakable realities that mankind does not come from between heaven and earth but is born from the ground. Humanity was born in several regions, but obviously comes from the cradle, that is, Africa. It is from here that that humanity evolved using natural resources, in respecting them they provide everything necessary for our lives. We have not lived in the sky or under the earth, we are human and we live on earth with the animals and the forests.

For this reason this Earth cannot be recognized, nor analysed as an economic good. You can not take the Earth as a physical tool to produce more, which should commodified, etc. The Earth is more than this, it is life, it is history, is all that is important for humans, beyond everything that is accountable. It is important to remember that multiple lifestyles have always been carried by economic, social and cultural systems in harmony and taking into account the limits of nature. Because everything we have with nature we can lose. Overuse can render us naked much as we are experiencing today.

Coming from Africa, I would like to share with you questions about the future of our continent, cradle of humanity. According to a global agreement by 2030 there will be 800 million rural and 700 million urban peoples in Africa. In 2050, 900 million rural and more than one billion urban. These figures make the World Bank state that what is needed is to create 300 million jobs by 2030 and more than 500 million by 2050. Where do we create? What kind of jobs will be created? Where? With a population that will reach over 2 billion.

According to the World Bank, three actions are recommended:

1. Securing the rights of family and community land use.
2. Providing public support to populations: training, education, health, infrastructure ...
3. Supporting rural social organizations so they can take care of their development because, as they recognize, the impact of agricultural growth is 2 to 4 times higher than non agricultural growth for the poorest people.

So it is, at the framework level of the policeman of the world economy, the debate on what takes precedence to respond to the four challenges that Africa must overcome. We are the only continent that has four challenges that need reforming simultaneously: (1) create our own institutions of governance for our societies, (2) master the demographic transition, (3) control climate change and (4) create our way within a globalization that excludes us. No other continent has lived these four challenges simultaneously. And thus here is the trap that Africa faces to be at the rendezvous.

Each to his own: "Africans do not work", "They are corrupt", etc. I would ask: What continent was developed by performing four challenges at the same time? We are forced to do so because the collective suicide is forbidden. However instead of reappraising to reduce disparities and injustices that are violations of fundamental human rights to live together as stipulated in the UN Charter, what is being proposed? Agreeing more and more privileges to agribusiness, for the benefit of large companies, accelerating grabs of quality or better irrigated lands in detriment to a redistribution using public investment for the benefit of farmers. Intensification, supported by the massive import of pesticides is performed by bulk import of pesticides, herbicides that destroy the land, creating health problems and that destroy millions of jobs for the sake of several thousand technicians and their machines.

All this leads us to the search for answers to implement changes on production systems over the entire value chain. But we often forget the question: for whose benefit? For how long? You can develop all this for ten years. We can turn everyone rich for thirty years. But what we want is sustainability. As well as fairness.

I have just delivered to you the ROPPA analysis of civil society in Africa. This second forum should allow us to advance in the identification of resistance to the paradigm shift. Why, despite all this knowledge, are we blocked? Let us look inwards, we have looked a lot externally. Let's look at home, at our rural farmers, at NGOs and within our civil society. Simply because we have internal challenges to overcome. We should agree to be guinea pigs to give disruptive models. It is not easy to continue blaming others and to live like them. It is a debate.

It is also important to develop communication mechanisms to build our bases. There are millions who have understanding systems that differ from those we use. Finally, it is important to keep the links between families, communities, spaces and resources, develop alternatives in the value chain. Let us remember that if we do not take care of ourselves, others will come and do as they please.

Ladies and gentlemen, together we strengthen the resistance to live that which we wish to live.

Thank you.

Richard TORSIANO, National Institute of Colonization and Agrarian Reform, INCRA, Ministry of Agrarian Development of Brazil, MDA, Brazil.

Good morning colleagues, let me also speak Portuguese. I would like to thank the fellow officers, officials, Brazilian friends, the national leader of one of the most important social movements in Brazil, colleague Alberto Broch, and all friends of the delegation of CONTAG and social movements as well our friends from the government. I would also like to thank on behalf of all present, our colleague Vicente Garces, president of the International Committee of WFAL,

and our friends at the United Nation FAO, with whom we have been talking for a long time on land issues.

This year marks the 10 years since President Lula assumed power in Brazil during 2003 to 2006. His mandate marked a cycle of conquests for the Brazilian people and popular movements in Brazil. This cycle has been renewed with following elections by President Dilma Rousseff who was democratically elected by the Brazilian people, ruling the country until today and who will be ruling the country until her term finishes in 2018, because the Brazilian people will not allow a coup against democracy in our country.

Among the achievements it is important to note that we have carried out land reform in half of this 500 year old country during the Presidencies of Lula and Dilma Rousseff. With land reform we have also conquered a series of policies for rural people and for certain social categories. It is not enough just to distribute land by agrarian reform, it is also necessary to ensure conditions to produce on this distributed land to ensure that family farming is developed in the best way. Millions of Reais have been invested in agricultural development policies in Brazil - in supporting purchasing policies for the resultant production from family farming with a food purchase program like the national school feeding program, in loans for land reform, with credit for agrarian reforms and with housing policies.

In previous governments there were millions of homeless. We began with the Lula government the "my house my life" program and where millions of people have gained houses. And yesterday President Dilma inaugurated the new program cycle "my house my life" with more than 2 million houses planned for the rural and urban population.

Millions of people have come out of poverty in our country. Millions of young people have entered University for the first time. All this has deeply troubled the bourgeoisie in our country. It's a problem for the bourgeoisie of our country to share a seat on a plane with the poor, sharing the seat in college with a young man from a poor family..... This is a problem for those who always treated the poor and the Brazilian people as a commodity. The government of Lula and Dilma considers the people as a subject of its own history. The conquests of government are the conquests of the Brazilian people and of organized social movements.

It is therefore necessary at this time that we talk a lot in depth on the rights of farming people, on the issues of access to land, on the very important issue of strategic land governance. We need to talk about access to land, on how the people can have access to land and how that land will be where these people will be placed and how their rights will be guaranteed. This is very important, given the crises of past periods, food crisis, the crisis of global demand, the water crisis, the lack of water in Brazil and in other countries.

It is essential that we develop in our countries voluntary guidelines on

governance of land, water and forests established with the FAO, to also develop the very strategic issue of the respect of the social function of land. It is necessary that in all our countries we have the requirement of respect with the social function of land. It is by this way that we can combat the water crisis, the food crisis and we can guarantee people's rights and the protection of the most vulnerable communities today.

In Brazil we have made great progress in the implementation of the FAO guidelines for land governance and a series of actions in agrarian land reform, protection of vulnerable communities, land governance and policies on land cadastral. Today we assume the Vice Presidency of the permanent Ibero-American Committee for land registry (CPCI) and we acquired our space at the heart in the inter-American network of land governance. I wish, under this aegis, to invite you to the land right symposium planned for August 30 to September 2 in Brazil. It is an international symposium where all strategic systems important for all countries of the world will be discussed and debated.

Finally, I would like to speak with you, like Alberto, of the need for democracy to rise for our countries. This forum should manifest itself with the need to deepen democracy in the world and to combat any attempted coup against democracy anywhere in the world.

The Brazilian government and Brazilian democracy is an achievement of the Brazilian people. The coup did not happen. The Brazilian people will be on the streets today March 31 to defend democracy and to combat coup attempts in certain parts of Latin America, always carried out by the same actors as in Brazil, namely the most conservative groups in society. They will not succeed. We have to fight and defend democracy and guarantee the rights that the people had achieved until the elections of 2018.

I wish to deepen this debate so that we leave here with an understanding of this meeting in this manner.

Thank you very much and have a good debate.

José GRAZIANO DA SILVA, Director General of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, FAO, Brazil.

Ladies and gentlemen,

It is a great honour for me to address you on the occasion of the presentation of the Global Forum on Access to land and natural resources. This is a great initiative that reflects the importance that the issue of land, with its various interrelated dimensions, is taking on in the international agenda. Especially welcome as it comes just a decade after the international FAO conference on agrarian reform, cities and rural development, held in Porto Alegre and the World Forum on Agrarian Reform held in Valencia several months later.

Natural resources are, above all, basic means of life for food security and

nutrition. Since its inception FAO has drawn attention to the need to examine the adequacy of existing eradication of hunger and rural poverty agricultural structures. The Charter approved in 1979 remains an important point of reference.

In recent years, governments have show interest in the development of mechanisms and global instruments for the regulation of these issues. They are supported by the FAO who coordinate with other UN agencies, civil society, private sector, academic structures and donors. We would like to cite, as examples, two recent and fundamental mechanisms.

In 2012 voluntary guidelines on responsible governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests and the context of food security were adopted. These are part of the wider dynamic rooted in the voluntary guidelines on the human right to access to adequate food.

In 2014, the principles were approved for the responsible investment in agriculture and food systems. These protect the rights of small farmers, rural workers and those in the food sector.

My friends, the 2030 agenda for sustainable development provides for equal access to land as a fundamental right. FAO will continue to work and progress on this issue with renewed enthusiasm. Agroecology and support for small producers and family farmers must be central elements in this way, without forgetting new and modern developments in biotechnology.

I wish you all great success in the Forum.

Thank you very much.

Javier MOLINA CRUZ, principal agent land tenure, Climate, Energy and Tenure (NRC), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Colombia.

Good morning to you all, members of the board, fellow participants in this forum:

It is an honour to be here with you and contribute to this necessary and unavoidable dialogue on access to land and natural resources. As you know, 75% of the impoverished people in the world live in rural areas and most are involved in one way or another in agricultural activities. Agriculture, economic growth and environmental sustainability play a key role in reducing poverty. However, as we all know, the pressure on land and natural resources (water, forests, fisheries) is stronger each time, and competition for access to these resources will, most likely in the future, lead conflicts ever more complex and on a larger scale than anything we have known so far.

For this reason, responsible management to land access and tenure is at the heart of the agenda and is the order of the day. FAO, as you know and as already stated by the Director General, is currently working on the issue of responsible

land management thanks to the adoption of the voluntary guidelines. Some countries have already updated these as mentioned by my colleague from India and as we shall see in the case of Colombia, Sierra Leone and Guatemala during the debates that will take place over the next three days. The Guidelines are an instrument which will enable us to promote access to land and to protect their tenure fairly, equitably and respectful of the rights of access for small farmers, indigenous peoples and women. As we already know, this is necessary to assure food security and sustainable development as mentioned by the Director General of the FAO, José Graziano da Silva.

We are here to reaffirm the support of FAO in this forum and, of course, to continue working with you. Even more importantly we are here to follow up with the results of the fruit of the work of these three days, so as to continue the work currently being conducted.

Thank you very much.

Vicent GARCÉS, President of the International Committee of the Global Forum on Access to Land, WFAL 2016, Spain

Thanks to all of you and you for joining us this morning and for 3 intense days we will live at the Polytechnic University of Valencia around the themes suggested by the WFAL. I will be very brief because we will have plenty of opportunity to talk more during these days.

I would like simply to note that we are in March 2016, 10 years after The International Conference of Agrarian Reform and Rural Development ICARRD and I wish to especially remember Parviz Koofkhan, who as a friend amongst us, was one of us the great managers of the international conference in Porto Alegre in Brazil. I also wish to remind us that here at the UPV in 2004 was held the World Forum on Agrarian Reform with the presence of the broadest representation of organized civil society at that time. From this surged the force and energy convince the government of Brazil and the FAO to convene the conference held in Porto Alegre.

Today, in 2016, the major problems that were raised at that time are still present. Some have been solved, others are on the way to be solved but big problems remain: problems of hunger, social exclusion, malnutrition, land access rights for the young and women, the difficulties that small farmers with little land or landless have to access these basic fundamental productive resources.... these great problems still exist today in 2016.

This forum that we inaugurate today could not have been possible without the tremendous effort of all and everyone here present of us here and all the background work. There are over 1200 experts and professionals of social and farmer´s organizations, public institutions who have joined the call for this forum. Present here there about 400 people who represent this multicoloured world: Asia, Africa, Latin America, Europe, who, concerning the issues of rural

development, have a right to their perspectives about their futures.

Here, in the coming days, we welcome participation of 45% women, which, I have to say, our current panel of orators does not match and which I deplore. However at other tables you may find the situation reversed.

This forum will start with people who have come to Valencia from more than 70 countries worldwide. It's a huge effort, a personal effort, economic, tiring, in many difficulty in getting visas, difficulty in getting lodgings in this beautiful and welcoming city that is Valencia. But notwithstanding here we are once again! We are the symbol of that that unshakable will of the people willing to fight for their future. We are here.

I have some statements that have been sent to us these past hours. I will mention two: one of the Department of Agrarian Reform of the government of the Philippines and another from the foreign minister of the government of Niger who have sent a heartfelt message to the Forum and wish us a successful forum. Others come from dozens of organizations and institutions whose financial support has made possible the presence here of so many people, as already mentioned.

But I wish to highlight the special effort made by CERAI and AGTER who have ensured the permanent secretariat of this forum for 3 years. I wish also to recognize the role of two major international institutions, the FAO and IFAD, that have contributed to us being able to be here.

And, of course, how not to mention the magnificent technical support offered by the University Technological de Valencia (UPV) who, with its infrastructures and capabilities have allowed us to celebrate this Forum, thank you Rector.

We have all heard the word of the mayor of Valencia: this city is very unique. It is a city that is a strange combination of rural and urban worlds, between the world of the sea and of the land. This city is perfectly able to understand what are the major problems of humanity at this time.

Thanks also to the Ministry of Agrarian Development (MDA) of Brazil. The MDA is a key element in this process that started in 2004 and has brought us here in 2016. And, of course, Ekta Parishad, ROPPA, CONTAG, COPROFAM, how not to thank them for their great support and the demands and requirements that have made this forum.

This forum will conclude within three days and hopefully positively after days that will start at 7 am to 9 pm. This forum will conclude, hopefully, with a set of analyses, diagnoses and recommendations for the future. The International Committee of Organisation of WFAL ICO met yesterday afternoon and determined to put together a committee for drafting of the final document. A final document that will include the main elements drawn from the workshops and plenary sessions through the speakers who will make a special effort every afternoon, in the plenary sessions, the conclusions of the day sessions. This set of proposals arising from the workshops and plenary sessions will

be collected by the drafting Committee and a final proposal will be coherently made, formalized and presented.

For the information of all, the drafting committee will be constituted by our friends Alberto Broch, Ramash Sharma, Mamadou Cissokho, Michel Merlet et Hubert Cochet. These five are going to make this effort to pick the best of what emerges from the forum. Of course they are open during the forum to collect any opinions or proposals that emerge from any of you.

I hope that by next Saturday we arrive at a final closing session in which will be expressed this enormous capacity and wish to improve by those gathered here.

I can not say conclude these opening remarks without denouncing and condemning the violence in rural areas and in the field worldwide. Continued deaths of agrarian leaders, the terrible persecution in the many countries represented here carried out by people who do not deserve the name of citizens against those who are fighting for their rights. How can we not remember Berta Cáceres, murdered but a few days ago. Berta Cáceres represents these thousands, tens of thousands of farmers who have lost their lives to defend farmer´s rights. One proposal could be that we join, as WFAL, is in the meeting to be held in April in Tegucigalpa in honour Berta Cáceres and all that she represents in the farmer´s struggle.

I will finish in renewing my appreciation to you all and wishing a strong focus in the coming work these days. Even if the city merits it and if the night is long we have not come to sightsee but to work.

Thank you comrades, and welcome once again and now, forward.

Thank you.

Ximo PUIG, President of the Generalitat Valenciana, Spain

Dear Rector, Dear Councillor, dear Vicent, representatives of international organizations, friends present at this table, ladies and gentlemen, good morning and above all, welcome. As our mayor has said, welcome to all especially those who have come from so afar.

This is an open city and as both the Mayor and Vicent have said, it is a caring city, a city that hopefully, despite the intensity of these coming days, you will have the opportunity to know better.

I also want to thank the organizers for the possibility to be here at this opening session among other things because the different perspectives shared this morning have indeed been extraordinarily positive for me to learn and listen to.

To convene an open debate, an all inclusive debate with different stakeholders and institutions, to reflect on the improvement of access to land, water, natural resources, with farmers who have lots of problems, the poorest farmers, is certainly a worthy and commendable initiative. It is a big decision. It's a decision that we, the Valencian government recognize, for all the work done

and the multiple efforts made by all of you to be here today.

This is commendable because these debates, these reflections that you will have during the next three days have a common goal, a committed aim of contributing to the fight against hunger, malnutrition and inequality in the world. Congratulations therefore for this initiative, congratulations to the organizers of this forum for taking on this responsibility, congratulations to all those who every day in thousands of villages around the world are fighting for the dignity of all of us.

To Vicent, as chairman of the International Organizing Committee of the World Forum on access to land and natural resources, a special thanks for your dedication, your long dedication to always fighting for justice, equality and freedom. Thanks also to the UPV and its Rector who has always placed the University as a space that goes beyond education, a key fundamental element, that without values and without connection to society would lose its value of universality which this University has always had. The UPV has always had this vocation and the Rector carries this in permanence.

Promoting universal access to food, promoting universal access to food security and sustainable development of our land, is more than a priority, it is a moral urgency. A priority because we are talking about that which is most basic, to us, around us, to human beings and the environment. We must act from a responsible investment in agriculture and food systems, because it is essential to improve food security and nutrition, and support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of food security for all, not just for a part of the world.

We should pay special attention to small producers, members of marginalized and vulnerable groups, by creating decent work for those who are working in food production that is the foundation of life of a society. It was said earlier that we are, indeed, what we eat.

We must act in eradicating poverty, promoting social equality, promoting gender equality, elimination of the worst forms of child labour and especially also in the promotion of participation in social inclusion. Without grass roots organizations worldwide, across the political and social space, it will be impossible to continue the push the rural world needs. We must act ultimately in increasing economic growth within the parameters sustainable development. There is no progress if there is no justice, if there is no equality.

I believe, as the recent report by the FAO target “Zero hunger” shows and as mentioned earlier today, that ending poverty and hunger is possible, urgent and necessary. It is a conviction that we have to realize. The United Nations has said that by 2030 this will be possible. However, if we do not change strategies, if we do not change the will of the governments of this world, this probably will not be possible. This is urgent. We cannot wait until 2030. We need to try to make this happen before. For this reason this meeting that you have organized,

which begins today, is a step further.

We need a change of mentality, a new approach, a massive mobilization of resources to eradicate hunger, to end overcoming inequalities. Let us all work on this.

We will work from our government of Valencia. We also know about exclusion and internal inequalities here in Europe. In recent years, in these past years of crisis, inequalities have grown enormous also in Europe.

Eliminating hunger and poverty requires a combination of social protection, international/global will, favourable investment for the poor and the disadvantaged, plus a rapid push to help people escape extreme poverty, and then, from there, a progressive continuation to ensure that those still in poverty can transgress to a state of human dignity.

Appropriate policies and co-ordinated programs should address this area globally to guarantee benefits in terms of growth opportunities and job creation in both the public and private sector.

Ladies and gentlemen, I was saying a moment ago that we must act to increase economic growth within sustainable development parameters. Sustainable development means food and sustainable agriculture. For this reason we need to improve the effective use of natural resources and achieve a productivity without prejudice - a sustainable productivity.

Sustainability requires direct actions to conserve, protect and enhance natural resources. Actions that should be undertaken and put to work in a joint fashion. Agriculture that fails to protect and improve rural livelihoods, an agriculture that only feeds a privileged part of our society makes no sense. Equality in treatment and social welfare is also the basis of this new model.

We will support all the resilience, the resistance by individuals, communities, ecosystems because it is essential we meet this demand for sustainable agriculture.

Ultimately sustainability in food and agriculture requires mechanisms of accountable and efficient governance, and this is why we are engaged, this is our commitment to this meeting, with our hope being that these results will permeate this change in culture so necessary for humanity.

We thank you in advance for your effort and dedication in these coming days, for these discussions, these thoughts, these deliberations and proposals. I thank you for this hard and intensive work you will perform, because it is not just centred on you, not just on the participants, not just a focus for your organizations but because it is a work in the interest of all humanity.

I am convinced, when finished this forum in three days, Valencia can also become part of the new paradigm, part this new strategy against poverty that should integrate access to natural resources and land, the fight against hunger and malnutrition, against inequality and to develop these new visions of what

we want for our community, for our planet.

For this strategy to be possible it needs to be part of an ambitious political project based on democracy. A democracy that can not be subject to the vagaries of certain economic powers, but must have, as a fundamental value, the freedom of its citizens.

Today we feel particularly united with all those countries in the world that are experiencing the problem of difficult access to democracy and freedom. The values that they inspire, republican values of liberty, equality and fraternity are absolutely essential. We believe in these values and we are clearly concerned about what is happening in Brazil and elsewhere in the world, because this is the meaning of being Universal humanists, with republican values, which definitely means it is worth to continue the struggle every day in all villages and in all countries of the world.

Encouragement, thanks and go forth!

José MORA, Rector of the Polytechnic University of Valencia, Spain

Thank you very much Mr. President, very honoured President of Valencia, honoured Mrs. Minister of agriculture, environment, climate change and rural development, Mr President of the International Forum Committee, authorities, ladies and gentlemen,

...it is an honor and a pleasure to celebrate an event like this at the UPV. An event which will analyze the main issues that we face of access to land and natural resources and that will be, as the President has said, an intense debate over several days with participants from all continents that are present here with us. We are here together to analyse and discuss our experiences and specific issues in different region.

I wish to thank all of you present, the more than 400 attendees at this forum, and also the organizing committee for the hard work. I know, friend Vincent, the hard work put in to prepare for this event.

I also wish to especially thank the Institutions that have supported this Forum, with today's participation the result of that intense collaboration, to the Mayor and the Valencia City Council, the Generalitat Valenciana, whose highest authority the President of all Valencians is here with us today, along with the Minister of Agriculture and his technical team, testimony to the relevance and importance given to this event.

This event is a continuation of the Agrarian Reform Forum held here in Valencia in 2004 and the 2006 Forum in Porto Alegre. 400 representatives of different associations, farmers' associations, academic institutions, scientists, governments and civil society are present.

I think that this wide ranging attendance is necessary to confront and answer fundamental questions presented on how we can improve access to natural

resources, especially for those marginalized populations most affected, as well as the ongoing conflict between family farming and large-scale industrial agriculture, taking into account social, economic, employment aspects.

It's a question that has, for a long time, been worrying and which has demographic and economic impacts on rural societies and developing countries. This marginalizes populations less prepared to face these challenges and advance. The truth is I believe the situation since 2006 has gotten worse. Poverty and inequality among people has grown larger.

In the UPV, our research and teaching are committed to development, social progress, sustainable economic, social welfare and this consists of working together to find viable solutions to improve quality life of the people.

This debate in these coming days has experts from all fields and from diverse origins; farmers' associations, civil society, scientists and technical experts.

They should look to deepen the research and combine actions and projects in the short and long term with plans for immediate action. Our School of Agricultural Engineering & the Natural Environment has a great faculty, one of the best in the world, as per independent reviewers. We have some great experts on these subjects who will contribute and will help provide ideas and solutions in this forum.

The participation of all is to increase social awareness to combat this serious problem that is the access to natural resources. Thanks to the Slow Food and Fair Trade movements, who, in my view have gained International success, the awareness of our form of eating and the methods of productions of food have been strengthened. Here, at the UPV and in this sense, we have contributed on numerous occasions with large support from young people. In this respect, the work of the FAO is essential to combat misinformation and to provide more knowledge about this problem.

In conclusion I wish you all to have an intensive forum, fruitful days and to bring forth positive, executable propositions and I thank you all, especially those who come from very far away, who have come to share with us their opinions and knowledge. I wish you all a happy stay in Valencia, at the UPV, your university. We are at your disposal for any question you wish to ask about the university, our school of agronomists and our research centres. From the bottom of my heart I wish you a very pleasant stay here with us.

I declare open this forum, thank you very much for your attention.

Plenary Session I

Summary of contemporary developments 10 years after the ICARRD in Porto Alegre (2006)

Clarifications by continent

Presentations

Cecilia LEIVA MONTENEGRO, President CEO of Procasur, Chile - Chair of session.

Dear friends, let's start this first plenary session with the aim to outline contemporary developments ten years after the International Conference of Porto Alegre on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD) held in 2006. To support this debate our University friends here will distribute papers where you will be able to note your desire to intervene. Please indicate your name, your organization and your theme so I can give you the floor accordingly during the debate.

We have here a selected panel of representatives from Asia, Africa, Europe and Latin America who will present their view on the situation. Before they present, I would like to give the floor to Michel Merlet, Director of AGTER, who will make an introduction.

Michel MERLET, director of the Association contributing to improved Governance of Earth, Water and Natural Resources, AGTER, France.

I will first, in a few words, explain the type of event in which you are participating. This is not an academic conference, but a forum. The idea is to have three days of dialogue and contradictory debates between us. We will try to present introductory expositions to serve as debate launchers.

We favour the participation of people from the room and that participants do

not limit themselves to asking the people on the panel. It is very important to understand this. We have very little time. The purpose is to have a dialogue and exchange between us, which is difficult. We have simultaneous translation in three languages, but there are always risks of misunderstandings and non-comprehension.

We need therefore a lot of attention, a willingness to share and build together a number of solutions. All who want to participate in workshops or presentations may do well to give testimony or to provide elements of analysis, either to advance some proposals for policies or for actions that would be interesting to promote. The aim is to discuss among ourselves and have different reactions from participants on the different propositions.

We implore you to make interventions brief. Mine will also be very brief so as to promote dialogue. It is therefore a true forum and not a conference of researchers presenting the result of their work.

We are working on a very specific topic, access to land and natural resources. This issue is linked to many other issues.

Twelve years ago, when the World Forum on Agrarian Reform (WFRA) was convened, the subject did not interest anyone internationally with the exception of some farmers' organizations and the people who really needed to have access to land. Then it was relatively easy to organize the Global Forum on Access to Earth. Twelve years later and very much harder to organise the WFRA.

Everyone talks about this issue of access to land but it appears that there is little willingness to find solutions to solve the problems. For this reason we decided to organize this forum, which is why we're all here, that you have decided to come here and support your convictions.

During this discussion paper, we will present some clarifications to show that the world in which we live is extremely diverse. We have enormous differences in demography, with rural / urban population relationships in different continents.

There are very sparsely populated lands, and other overpopulated. There are very different agricultural systems and farms are of extremely different sizes. It is very important to keep this in mind so as not to address issues that go into minutia. In Asia, in China, Vietnam and India, we have very small production units. In North or South America, there are production units that can be much larger, sometimes thousands of hectares. These are situations that do not have relations one with the other.

We care about what has changed in the last ten years, but also what has changed in the last thirty to forty years. A number of fundamental things have changed. Some have already been mentioned this morning. There has been an extremely rapid technological development, with the development of the use of fossil fuels. We also had a generalization of a market society with the development of transport and trade. This is very important. I would like to recall the analysis of Karl Polanyi that shows that eventually if we do not succeed in surpassing

this market society, we will face catastrophes like in the twentieth centuries World Wars and the disaster that followed the liberalization of trade in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. It is an issue that has already been broached by Ramesh Sharma of Ekta Parishad in his introduction. It is something that will be present and reflected in the background through all we will do and is very important to keep in mind.

Another important thing to keep in mind is the type of financial revolution that we are living. Today, we can buy land or invest lots of money we don't have by obtaining money from the financial markets or obtaining loans from international institutions.

In the forums ICARD and WFRA, discussions have been often on issues of land grabbing, the phenomena of violent land grabs. But these are not the only issues that interest us. During these three days of discussions, we will be interested in the evolution of agricultural structures in developed countries, in Europe in particular and in the former socialist countries as well as the countries of North America. As an example, in the US region we will not be discussing during this session, that since the 1980's to 2007 the size of farms have increased considerably. In 1982, half of the cultivated areas were represented by farms over 236 hectares. In 2007, half of the cultivated area is located on farms of more than 422 hectares. In other words, using the same indicators we have moved from 230 to 420 hectares in the space of about thirty years.

However, there was no land grabbing in the usual sense, but an evolution of the structures that actually hides a very strong polarization: some very small farms and increasingly more larger farms. The same is being observed in Europe, in the countries of Eastern Europe, and this is also something to consider because there are still some small farmers in these regions, but they are disappearing extremely fast.

The effort that we will try to make during this forum is to go beyond speeches, beyond easy analysis and reflection on a number of concepts, on a number of misconceptions that prevent making good decisions and look to see where are the real challenges. We need to reflect on large and small production. We need to see what is really important for society as a whole and not just for the producers.

We need to think about what actually is an investment. Is investment automatically a good thing or is it not eventually a theft, a theft of natural resources, public resources, that are made available to investors through public policies? One should take into account the impact for society as a whole. A priori, we are extremely critical of the win-win model. We are always under the impression that if there are very large farms – we will discuss this further in the workshops - it is because they are probably responsible for the destruction of very small farms. This is what we need to reflect on and that requires change. Once again it is essential to benefit from your various contributions.

A few months ago, the climate conference, COP21, took place in Paris. The climate is recognized as a global urgency for the survival of humanity. We, the people who called the WFAL, believe that the issues of evolution of access to land and natural resources in the world also constitute a global threat to the whole of humanity. If it continues at the current rate of transformation, we will arrive in a world without farmers. We will only see large companies where agricultural workers will be found, as is already the case in some regions of Argentina or the United States. This is starting to be the case in France also. It is a considerable change since for thousands of years the world's food has been produced by farmers and if farmers are eliminated from this space, from the earth, we risk seriously also eliminate the chances of ensuring the survival of humanity.

These are questions that we would like to discuss. You may not be in agreement with what I have just said, it is a bit of provocation. We are here to debate and we are pleased that there are so many of you here to debate and build together propositions.

DAO The Anh, Director of Research, Academy of Sciences of Vietnam, Vietnam.

I would like to begin by thanking the International Committee of the Organization WFAL for inviting me to present on the issue of land rights in the countries of South East Asia.

South East Asia is Laos, Vietnam, Cambodia and Burma. We have representatives of Vietnam and Cambodia in this room. As the expected representative of China could not come, I will say a few words about this country where certain developments resemble those in Vietnam.

These countries, particularly Vietnam and China, are characterized by a very ancient hydraulic water management system and with irrigation in the type of agriculture undertaken as being important. The lands are in the main used for rice cultivation and are located in delta areas. Since 1975, there was a phenomena of agrarian reforms that have certainly been concentrated on these plains and the rice fields.

In Vietnam and China, we have begun an allocation of land for farming families has finally led to a return to family farming. Almost all rural families have land. There are no landless farmers. The consequence is that farm sizes are very small. In Vietnam, 85% of farms are smaller than 0.5 ha. We find holdings of 5 hectares in the mountains, but in limited quantities.

It is the right of use that has been privileged in land reforms in Vietnam and Laos. In general, we have opted for a state land ownership for agricultural with land use rights for families allocated for periods of 20 years. In China, the same was done.

In Cambodia and Burma, however, the situation is different. These countries have adopted a concession model. They have granted certification titles of land for

family farms that have existed in history. This has enabled the rapid development of concessions to agribusinesses. This is the current situation.

We think that the situation of the land after reform has had very positive effects on food security. Vietnam passed quickly from a rice importing country during the 1990s to being ranked 2nd in world exporting today. Cambodia has recently become an exporter of rice to Europe and the United States.

I think the land reforms have had a very positive effects. In China the situation is particular. There was a rapid loss of agricultural land due to industrialization. It is very difficult to ensure supply of domestic demand. They have begun importing rice from Vietnam, etc.

In recent years, after the positive results of land reform in these countries, things have changed. We have become very productive countries in agricultural products, as exporters, but integrating the issue of competitiveness has become very important for small farms.

Agricultural cooperatives are still very weak and agricultural professional organizations do not play a prominent role. This is a weakness. Regulation is missing at the level of agricultural production. The phenomena of excess and overproduction, have become very important. Farmers face other problems. The quality of products is low and therefore the price is very low. With a small area, farming does not ensure sufficient income. This is the great challenge actually for the countries of South East Asia.

In this context and, at agricultural policy level, there are two currents. In Vietnam, between the objectives of export and that of food security, the government has chosen to prioritize food security.

Therefore, they have strengthened land security rights for families. With the new land law of 2013, the right of use for land has increased from 20 to 50 years. The government thinks that security of land use over a longer period of time will encourage farmers to produce more. In Cambodia, it is different. The development of concessions to big business has been rapid. Today, approximately 20% of the best land is in the hands of large companies. Small farms dominate more in areas of difficult access. Perhaps our Cambodians colleagues can provide some evidence of this phenomenon.

On the other hand, there is an increasing development of concessions in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and Burma on sloping land, mountains and plantations. Where real estate investments are not profitable, when the economy stagnates, then many investors, dominant in industry, return to agricultural investments. This is a phenomenon that promotes land grabbing in our countries. In response to this situation and in Vietnam the State has given small family farms the power to negotiate with the companies the price of agricultural land at market price.

We think that in our countries, the decision to rely on family farming remains a topical issue. But the challenge is that professional organizations of rural farmers and professionals are underdeveloped. They have an essential role to

play. They can provide services for the organization of land resource usage, for greater efficiency and for the market. We currently work with colleagues, of which some are in the hall today, on supporting new cooperatives in Vietnam.

It is a great challenge to ensure the competitiveness of family farming. At the same time we ask for more State investment to support public research to give more technologies to family farms.

Thank you.

Ramesh CHANDRA SHARMA, campaign coordinator of Ekta Parishad, India.

I will try to be brief and to bring you an understanding of the situation in South Asian countries.

According to us, one of the most important issues in South Asia is land insecurity and insecurity concerning land rights. Given the large number of landless and homeless in these countries, the resolution of this problem is a major challenge. Each country has an interesting history of agrarian reform.

I can start with Nepal that has a very interesting topography. Almost two thirds of the territory of Nepal is inaccessible. Moreover, given the large area of these territories, it is very difficult to start a new culture in a new area. It is possible, but carries some risk to the environment. It is the ever increasing demographic concentration on small areas of land that is becoming the main challenge for land reform in Nepal. Nepal has an interesting history. From 1963 to 2008, a series of reforms to land rights took place. The most recent was in 2008. But these political changes have not fully materialize on the ground and is starting to become a major problem.

Pakistan has also a history of interesting land reforms on access and exploitation but in a different way. In 1977, they launched a process with a law on the reform of land use. But a short time later, a judgment of the Shariah Federal Court in 1998 completely changed the notion of land reform. For the first time, fundamental rights on land resources have been questioned by the Court itself. The situation is increasingly contradictory. When we look at the recent situation since 2000 and according to a recent report 2% of the population controls 45% of the land in Pakistan. This is a real problem to solve the insecurity related to land use.

Sri Lanka has an interesting history of reform of land use from 1972 to the Land Reform of 2001. However, as the World Bank has said in a recent report, 11% of the population is landless and 38.5% of the population has access to land that does not give any returns. It is for this reason that we must be careful with the term "security of land use" and also why it is an issue of great importance for this country. Bangladesh faces more or less the same situation.

In India, in a report published in 2011, the government officially acknowledged for the first time 29.9% of the population is officially without land or home. It is a considerable challenge. That is why I have stated that the overall situation of

land regulations or land rights is always a subject that requires major attention. I would now like to draw your attention to land grabbing in these countries. By land grabbing I mean Northern countries land grabbing in Southern countries through multinational, large companies.

Recently there have been many negotiations carried out by Chinese companies, Saudis or even European states in Pakistan to produce quality rice to be exported to these countries. This is a relevant issue. In Pakistan, there is a struggle over this issue.

In Nepal, the most important factor are the International Financial Institutions (IFIs). As I said, in this country the poverty level is very high and in the name of charity, development, the IFIs are actually pushing to make changes to the laws of these countries, particularly Nepal. It is a matter of concern.

Mining in the Arabian Sea, which directly affects India and Sri Lanka indirectly, is a concern. Because once we start operating in the marine environment, we will destroy the seas, the marine resources. I take for example these two countries because we spend enormous sums for this type of research in India. And the attacks of multinationals in South Asia are very worrying.

So what's going on? The government misuse, badly use or even abuse the word "reform." Like a sword there are two sides. The concept of reform has completely changed. Permit me to explain by using one or two examples.

The first is the ambiguity of structural reforms in the area of urbanization, which is in play again in these countries. There is, of course, a requirement to respond to the needs facing cities. So on behalf of urban development urbanization you apply reforms but at the same time villages are destroyed ... this is the case in Nepal, Bangladesh, India and, most recently, Bhutan as well.

The second example is legal reforms. Free trade agreements are a threat to the freedom in these countries. These agreements are in the process of imposing legislative reform. For example, the clause "profit sharing" is a new idea in mining legislation. We no longer say we do not want an agreement with mining company in our territories, in Nepal, Bhutan and India, as we can ask for our share of the profit. What kind of percentage is this? 20%, maybe 10% ... Whatever it is the legal reasons to say we do not want mining companies has become weak due to these new trade agreements.

Most recently the environmental legislation in Nepal and India has been completely modified to allow for new investments. The way the report "Doing Business" from the World Bank has been taken by some countries as reference to modify their environmental legislation and access to land is question of concern.

The third area is in economic reforms. The paradigm that prevails at present posed by transnational organizations raises a great question. Take the example of Trans-Atlantic Treaty which will allow transnational corporations to legally pursue Sovereign States. A number of cases have already occurred here and

there.

Movements are not allowed to access these legal mechanisms because the courts are biased, with the legal framework completely destroyed. The means available to defend social movements are therefore reduced.

Today we are witnessing the militarization of social movements and of society itself. The word reform means no more than a few phrases of a process for trade reform. But we are the heirs of a very interesting history of social movements, non-violent social movements, popular movements. Take for example the Asia Indigenous People Act, the Food Sovereignty Network, and the Asia Land Coalition, that are emerging coalitions in Asia to oppose these kind of anti-reform and anti-poor processes.

We have a very rich history of progress in legal frameworks that have been obtained, to some extent, in these countries. We can cite the case of the Forest Rights Act in India, drawn up in 2006 and finally implemented in 2008. A large number of Indigenous Indians today have benefited from this new legislation. Born and carried out thanks to a movement.

The same happens in Nepal where movements have taken a leaf out of the Indian movements and organized citizens' actions, particularly those in the movement for women's land rights point to a particularly interesting twist in Nepal. They play a determining role to secure the rights of land use for women and have an impact in politics and recent laws.

The sensitive issue of agricultural work is well followed by land rights movements in Pakistan. They constantly ask the Pakistani government to make new amendments. In the past, there was a law against forced labour, but that was repealed in the nineties. They brandish this as a reference in front of the government. Another interesting movement supports the homeless in Bangladesh.

There is hope therefore. I can say that hope moves people and organizations forward.

Personally, I think the VG voluntary guidelines on responsible land governance are a great reference and support for all of us.

How do the social movements in these countries use this? Take the case of current land access reforms being developed in Nepal, India and Pakistan - which are at a very preliminary stage. In these three countries, social movements constantly provide text proposals to their governments. In India we have ensured that the government agrees, to a certain extent, our proposals for reform of land use and access. But great vigilance is still needed since 2013.

The right to land for housing, security of tenure and rights is an important issue. New legislation to ensure the right to land for homes is well promoted by the movements of Bangladesh and India. Land rights movements of indigenous peoples are now very popular in India as well as in neighbouring countries.

Finally, let me just say a word on the subject of global action for peace and justice. The new idea that we try to spread in India and neighbouring countries is to organize a global action. We are organizing a major demonstration that will gather one million people. Their slogan is "millions of people can walk" ("Millions can walk¹"). We are known for our walks and we are ready to fight for the people of Asia, but also for all the landless and homeless throughout the world.

Thank you

Sidy BA, National Council for Coordination and Cooperation of Rural Sector, CNCR, and Network of Farmer Organizations and Producers in West Africa, ROPPA, Senegal.

I thank our friends WFAL for this invitation. I ask you to be a little lenient with me and allow me to greet who is my reference in the farmer movement, and present here in this venerable Assembly, Mr. Mamadou Cissokho. He is a leader in Senegal and in Africa. He is the honorary president of the Network of Farmer Organizations and Producers in West, ROPPA Africa and at the same time, is the honorary president of my platform, the National Council for Coordination and Cooperation of Rural Sector, CNCR. Let me also mention a woman who can not be present with us, Ms. Mariam Sow as well as another great man from Senegal who daily struggle for inclusive agrarian reform and whom I would like to nominate president of my platform, Mr. SAMBA GUEYE.

Invited friends from 5 continents I wish you all a successful forum.

Access to land issues have evolved strongly these ultimate years due to new challenges and opportunities of these 'scarce' resources globally. As known, land has always been an important resource in social, economic, cultural and environmental planning. It is currently primarily an instrument of recognized sovereignty and considered as such by all countries except, unfortunately I must say, by the leaders of the world's poorest countries.

Several countries, and even sometimes multinational companies, have looked to conquer this commodity far from their own bases for reasons linked to satisfying food and energy requirements of their citizens, on economic / financial benefits, or sometimes just purely for speculative motives. This has resulted in a profound change in land use practices, especially in the southern countries where a relative availability of land is noted.

Many southern countries in sub-Saharan Africa in particular have begun in recent years agrarian reform processes, often under the guidance or encouragement of donors and other development partners. From the point of view of the leaders and their aforementioned supporters reforms should attract investment and develop

¹ <http://www.ektaparishad.com/Home/TabId/55/ArtMID/709/ArticleID/84/Millions-Can-Walk.aspx>

agriculture while all the meanwhile protecting the rights of small producers.

But apparently in practice this is not so easy. In some countries, these reforms have resulted in wide short-term balance so diverse, that I would evoke the lack of detailed information on the subject to pronounce further. By contrast, in other countries I know best, like Senegal, land reforms are taking their time to be introduced. Blockages are at State level, who lack political will, and at the level of civil society (NGOs, producers, etc.) who understand the challenges and implications of such reforms and who mobilize for better preserving the interests of rural actors while carrying out actions that incidently contribute to slowing down the reform process.

Faced with this situation, the political regimes with liberal tendency that have appeared since 2000, continue to carry out actions with consequences often negative on the local populations, who are constantly deprived of their lands for the benefit of a new aristocracy and a new class of farmers, "Sunday farmers", but also multinationals. Thus, the REVA (Return to Agriculture) and GOANA plans (Great Agricultural Offensive for Food and Abundance) promotes as alternatives to the emigration of young people, through a return to agriculture and as a solution to food crises such as that of 2008, have in some parts been taken over by communities intent on encouraging the rifling of land held by smallholding agro-pastoralists in rural areas.

To this one must add the support to agribusiness, especially foreign, shown by many Southern country governments to the detriment of family farming: eloquent discourses held around this agricultural model describing how it can lead to food security, job creation and the modernization of agriculture, facilitating installation procedures with the creation of specialized institutions such as the APIX (Agency for Investment Promotion and major Projects) in Senegal, the granting of large areas land formerly used by local population to multinationals for the production of food commodities or biofuels, with all their consequences in terms of social misery and ecological disasters. The emblematic case of Fanaye, in Senegal, is the example that is often presented to illustrate this trend. But unfortunately it is but just the tree that hides the forest.

Changes in land ownership too have accelerated over the last ten or fifteen years and often contrary to the interests of the poorest classes in society.

Even if the responsibility of those considered victims - and rightly so because it is clear and must be noted there are cases of land sold by the populations themselves and who are the same who later cry out against exploitation - one must note two things that puts once again the full responsibility with the State in these processes:

- First, most land transactions made by the people are guaranteed, sometimes encouraged, and often validated by representatives of the State. For example, in Senegal it is the local "mayors" who have the power to control and validate agricultural transactions.

- Many of the people who sell their lands are aware of the issues and the importance of them. But with poor support from the State and having on hand a resource that is not profitable because of lack of means and being hard pressed by poverty and the immediate needs of their family, these individuals act as "rational actors" and favour the solution that consists of surviving by selling at any price this valuable resource.

This means that protecting the access of rural actors to natural resources can only be achieved through the adoption of legislative measures to recognize and confirm their rights to the resource, and also through proactive measures in terms of overall agricultural policy support for family farming in the sense of their transformation, not to say modernization.

To return to the example of Senegal, currently the government has relaunched the process and has made significant progress in the direction in the realization of agrarian reform. But the reform options recommended by the National Commission for Agrarian Reform (CNRF) are oriented towards national land registration, either on behalf of the State or on behalf of local authorities.

Senegalese civil society gathered around the Framework Program for Research and Action on Earth (CRAFS) considers that these axes of reform would help pave the way to an agricultural market which could be detrimental to small farmer agriculture and family farms. They have worked with local communities in different parts of the country around alternative proposals to formally reject this option of generalized land registration and, instead, propose maintaining the spirit of the National Property Law, where certain imperfections need correcting. But civil society above all proposes the adoption of structural measures to sustain and develop structurally family farming. Because at the heart of the issues associated with land access and control of natural resources is the major issue that is food security for the people.

Thank you very much.

Mohamed ELLOUMI, Researcher, National Institute of Agronomic Research, INRA, Tunisia.

Thanks to Ms. President and the organizers for giving me the pleasure to quickly expose some ideas on the situation particular to Tunisia. I have no legitimacy to speak of Africa or North Africa. There are Algerian colleagues here, I cannot see Moroccans but we can talk about this in the workshops.

I will talk about the situation in Tunisia because it is what I know best.

It is, I would say, a "textbook case".

This because Tunisia has a long history with land grabbing. In the late nineteenth century, it was the conflict over land grabbing by French financial companies who were at the origin of the establishment of the French protectorate in Tunisia, to effectively protect French interests in this country. This resulted in a total

agricultural colonization in Tunisia, with its social cost: the dispersal of peoples on the land that served the colonization, using the processes we now see a little everywhere linked to juristic blurring that surrounds the legal status of many lands.

At the time of independence of Tunisia, in 1956, we inherited a state property ownership that represents just over 10% of the Tunisian agricultural land - among them the best lands.

In parallel, we inherited a classic agrarian dualism of access to land resources. The management of these two characteristics makes partially for the different characteristics that are in place until today.

I will take especially the case of the public lands which were actually the blueprint with the characteristics of the agricultural policies used to put in place the various policies and, in particular, the policies of insertion in the international division of labour by the mobilization of these lands to produce cheap agricultural materials.

All this has developed in parallel with the emergence of relatively prosperous family farming which, in my opinion, has been the strength of Tunisian agriculture until the 2008 crisis. A crisis due to all the association and liberalization agreements signed by the successive Tunisian governments, which weakened this family farming and which put it in competition with a stronger, more developed agriculture, not only in the domestic market but especially in its export market at European Union level.

On public lands, we went from an external land grabbing process to a process of internal appropriation by the power in place, by the family of the ruling power. We mobilized this property to make - here it is much the same model as in Morocco - gifts for services rendered around the power in place.

I think that it is the conjunction of the crisis of family farming and the resentment with regards to the policies in place that actually gave rise to the Tunisian revolution, in December 2010 and January 2011. It is at the origin a rural revolution, deeply rural, starting with Sidi Bouzid, a rural village relatively integrated with an urban space and paradoxically a region where agriculture was prosperous. But this crisis in family farming, the stopping of this social dynamic, led to a revolution of the youth that demanded dignity, employment and social justice, the three slogans put forward by these people.

Since the revolution, things have flattened out, that is to say, we have a debate again at the level of society. I think that one of the achievements of the Tunisian revolution is actually to have opened up the space for public debate and freedom of expression. This debate deals in part with these lands, the State lands, and the place of agriculture in the development scheme. At the same time, there are actions on the ground, that is to say that the people in place have never forgotten that these lands belonged to their ancestors, even if sometimes it was fictitious, pictorial, because the tribes, the populations that were in place, have indeed

been dispersed or even decimated by land grabbing.

We have again land reclamation, especially in the Tunisian Djeri, oases where young people have recovered the palm groves that belonged to the community but were developed by national companies. The youth have recovered, invaded, occupied these lands and are exploiting them in common under the aegis of the entire community.

Where these young people were not supervised, these movements were rather violent reactions to an occupation that was felt by the young, by the local populations as a colonization from the inside.

In Tunisia, we have had two national debates on this land issue, on State lands. Unfortunately, the debate has really been divisive with, on the one hand, offices and big-business advocates who want to use these areas of the State to attract foreign direct investment, and on the other hand, all the left wing defenders who demand an agrarian reform on these State agricultural lands to strengthen family farming. Unfortunately, this debate has not been settled.

We are in a kind of status quo that is not profitable to anyone because this national heritage represents the 10% of the best lands in Tunisia which is currently in a state of under exploitation and thus largely under valued. This debate was put to one side during the debate on the investment code, because the investment code is intended in Tunisia to call and attract foreign investors. One of the questions was; how to open up, although the law prohibits the sale of agricultural land in Tunisia to foreigners; how to bring in capital through Tunisian investors and associations with foreign capital. And here too, the debate is still going on in the Chamber of Deputies to know if indeed we should not open up breaches to again encourage investment on these lands.

Finally, I would say that the problem in Tunisia is while there is a debate around this, unfortunately we see that the rural world, the farmers, have very few spokespeople. They are themselves very poorly organized. The two agricultural trade unions do not represent the mass of small farmers. 53% of Tunisian farms have less than five hectares. So they are very poorly represented in the public debate, they are very poorly represented in political parties including leftist parties that defend land reform but who have no presence in rural areas.

I have shown you that the debate at the root of the Tunisian revolution, which was fundamental, was completely diverted towards an ideological debate, towards a debate on identity, on the place of religion in society, that was finally never mentioned during all the months of the Tunisian revolution. We are in a debate that obscures the real economic debates on land reform, the future of State lands, the future of collective lands, of the place of agriculture in the agricultural sector understanding that that these issues are eminently political and important for the choice of society that we can make and the ways of living together that we can have between rural people, farmers and urban people. There is a kind of rupture between these two worlds. Historically, all the revolts in Tunisia have

been linked to a rupture, a lack of dialogue between the agricultural world and the urban world.

Thank you.

Philippe LAVIGNE DELVILLE, Director of Research, Institute of Development Research, IRD, France.

Good morning everyone and thanks to the organizers for inviting me. I would start apologizing on behalf of Professor Kojo Amanor from Ghana, who should be here at this table but could not come. I will try very briefly to compliment the presentation made by Mr Sidy BA with a wider geographical perspective, placing the emphasis on two events of the last ten years.

In the 1990's, the land issue emerged in sub-Saharan Africa at the intersection of increased land conflicts on the one hand and economic liberalization related to structural adjustment and democratic demands on the other. Many countries have initiated land policy debates - and sometimes reform processes - around the questioning of the State's land monopoly, accused of facilitating the abuse of power by political elites and agents of the State. And, as a corollary, the question of the legal recognition of the land rights of agricultural producers. At the international level, as in national debates, there were two main options: on the one hand, land privatization policies, justified by the theories that private property rights are a condition for economic development, and on the other, policies for securing the land rights of rural peoples, for which the challenge is above all to enable these rural peoples to use their lands and resources peacefully. This controversy largely, but not totally, overlapped with that on agricultural development models, between support for family farming and promotion of aggro-business.

At the turn of the 1990s, privatization policies seemed to be disqualified from both a scientific and a political point of view. Empirical studies showed the dynamism and adaptability of customary land regulations. World Bank economists have shown that land privatization is neither a necessary condition nor a sufficient condition for economic development and that liberalizing the land market, when there are "significant imperfections" in the other dimensions of the productivity process, is likely to increase inequality without productivity gains. Even in international institutions - though some of them in only certain areas - the "replacement paradigm" of replacing customary rights with private property seemed disqualified in favour of an "adaptation paradigm", that starts with the recognition of local rights to integrate them into national policies.

The land policy debates in different countries reflect these tensions and controversies with the underlying conflicts of interest, in their terms reflecting the political issues of State building, the land interests of the elites and in a context where the legal framework is largely a colonial legacy.

In some countries, particularly in Eastern and Southern Africa, they are coupled

with shows of civil war (Mozambique, Uganda), or violent political crisis (the political violence of the 2007 presidential elections in Kenya, where the political instrumentalisation of land has played a large role). The second half of the 2000's saw land reform in a number of countries made concrete from initial engagement in the 1990s: Madagascar in 2005, Benin in 2007, Kenya in 2009 (Uganda earlier, in 1995). They reflect variable and often ambiguous trade-offs between State and government resistance to the questioning of State ownership, pressures for privatization and attempts to promote recognition of rural land rights based on national histories and power struggles.

Caricaturising, there where the debate is linked to political crises, the policies incorporating strong innovations have implementation problems due to lack of instruments. And where the debate is driven by donors, the focus has been on finding practical solutions with the support of international aid, with difficulties in transcribing them into policies and going beyond pilot operations.

Overall, the recognition and securing of tenure rights of rural peoples are only partially integrated, where innovative principles are diverted. In several countries, the debate was opened and closed. In Senegal, there are repeated attempts by the State to take control of customary lands and offer them to investors, attempts blocked by the mobilization of civil society.

The end of the 2000s also corresponds to the awareness of the extent of land grabbing on a global scale, highlighted by the Daewoo affair in 2008, the revelation of which contributed to the fall of President Marc Ravalomana. Sub-Saharan Africa is one of the regions where these land grabbing are concentrated for different reasons: it is the continent where land is supposed to be "available" in large quantities, on the condition of forgetting the farmers, the breeders, and the environmental issues of equatorial forests; the State's land monopoly allows - at the legal level - to grant concessions on huge surfaces in denial of the rights of the populations who occupy and exploit them; the price of land is particularly low - Sudan and Ethiopia cedes them at US \$ 0.5 or US \$ 1 per hectare per year; the dismantling of support for agriculture means that recourse to investors sometimes seems like the only solution to national elites who are profoundly contemptuous of the capacities of their farmers. Some states set up agencies dedicated to the reception of investors (Ethiopia, Mozambique); in others, agreements are made in opacity, in direct negotiation with political power. Hundreds of thousands of hectares have been allocated, particularly in East African countries (Mozambique, Ethiopia, Tanzania), but also in Nigeria, Senegal, etc. These monopolies have led to unprecedented forms of mobilization involving farmer or community organizations, national civil society organizations, international organizations. These movements have helped to raise awareness of the scale of these processes, have succeeded in opposing certain attempts, and have strengthened the bargaining power of local communities, at least in relatively democratic states.

The degree of achievement of these projects is very variable, often low. But

their impact in terms of dispossession of farmers and pastoralists is no less real. Efforts to document land grabbing processes and their extent have also highlighted the extent of land purchases by national elites, a process that is already old but is accelerating. Although more dispersed, involving smaller unit areas but a much larger number of cases, these monopolies are probably quantitatively as important as, if not more than, large international acquisitions. They sometimes translate to logical productive investments – rubber trees in the Ivory Coast, oil palm in Cameroon – but also strategies of land accumulation and speculation.

The 2010's see increased pressure for the formalization of land rights by international institutions (Doing Business). The cadastral industry put forward technical changes to legitimize massive operations. In international debates, the doubts of the 1990s seem forgotten and the discourse promoting the formalization of land rights on a large scale is resuming. The millions of parcels recorded in Rwanda and Ethiopia are valued with little questioning of these large-scale experiments are carried out by authoritarian States, on their agrarian and social impacts, on the concrete possibility of effective management for the duration of the registered rights, on the type of underlying agricultural policy. While the formalization of land rights – particularly in terms of private property – often helps to speed up the land market, it is highlighted as a means of protecting local rights against land grabbing, in the sense that it would concretise the end of the State's land monopoly.

At the national level, States seek to preserve or strengthen their land-use allocation capacity. Long reluctant to formalize private property rights in rural areas, which would have profoundly destroyed rural societies and challenged their strategies for land grabbing under the legal jurisdiction of the State, elites also seem to be converting to the principle of land privatization and seek to legalize the land they have acquired.

Land professionals are essential actors in the process of legalization of plots and increase the cost and complexity of procedures, making them inaccessible to farmers. Economic interests and corporatist interests combine to transform for their benefit land security policies that are supposed to be inclusive (Ivory Coast).

Land administrations and private interests, try to hijack the land reform processes that were directed towards the securing of local land rights or call them into question. The processes of exclusion are reinforced.

They are further reinforced by the fact that, alongside land grabs on agricultural or pastoral lands, international and local mobilizations have helped to partially disqualify the argument of the legitimate area of new investment fronts for international capital – and therefore grabbing – this time on the forests through the mechanisms of the carbon market. These mechanisms are not yet even in place as negotiations are underway to promote capital investments, this time on

lands supposed to be "degraded", which would be entrusted to companies "able" to invest to restore them and who would have secondly, the right to allocate them for remuneration... In other words, the risks of exclusion of farmers, pastoralists, forest-exploiting peoples have never been stronger, and vigilance and the fight for the defence of land rights for rural societies have never been so essential.

Jan VAN DER PLOEG, Professor, University of Wageningen. Netherlands

I will talk about the European situation. I will try to answer the question: What happened in Europe after ten years, after Porto Alegre² in 2006?

I will address four trends that together create a disconcerting picture. A panorama that contains an equal number of contradictions that allow us either to be optimistic or pessimistic.

The first trend is a positive trend. It is the growing recognition in Europe by civil society, the importance and interest of family farming. 2014 was the International year of family farming. The phenomenon of family farming in Europe has been discussed by agricultural unions and civil society in a more comprehensive manner. It has been recognized as a multidimensional reality that promises to be very attractive to stakeholders, a place that allows them to be autonomous, a place that links the past, present and future, a place where you can live and work, a very good place to grow. Family farming contributes greatly to maintaining biodiversity and landscapes, and many other dimensions. Naturally, these positive aspects are threatened by policies, markets and many other trends. But in any case, the fact is that family farming is a valuable part of our societies. All this is also linked to the issue of access to land.

Due to the current economic crisis, both on the Mediterranean and north-west Europe, many young people have entered into agriculture. They face great difficulty in accessing land. This is complementary to the situation in Eastern Europe, where land grabbing is a serious phenomenon. Today in Europe there are more than 10 million family farms. The vast majority of these farms are small. In the past, one would say "small farms are disappearing, large farms are progressing." With new methods, data has been re-analysed. Small farms are disappearing, but this is equally true for large farms; over the years, some of them disappeared.

The important point of this new understanding of the phenomenon is that agricultural policies can no longer be selective and be oriented only towards larger farms. They should support including small and medium-sized farms as well. This is particularly true for Europe and especially the CAP was always more oriented towards large farms at the expense of small ones that are marginalized.

² Jan Douwe Van Der Ploeg refers to the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development held from 7 to 10 March 2006 in Porto Alegre, Brazil.

Another consequence in line with this refers to the contribution of small farms - this data concerns my country, the Netherlands - to global growth. The problem is clear. The large farm is very impressive, it seems very modern, while the small farm, in comparison, is minuscule. People, the politicians, all assume that the large farm is important. Of course there are many, many small farms and that there are actually few large farms. If one is interested in their contribution to the overall growth and development from 1990 to 2006, then it is found that small farms contributed four times more to global growth than large, quite large and super large farms as a whole. This means that small farms are indispensable for food security. Without small and medium-sized farms, the agricultural sector would be bankrupt.

The second important point I would like to point out is that the importance and interest of small farms is gradually becoming more recognized.

Thirdly, there is general recognition of the value of small-scale farming, how to cultivate, how small farmers organize their activities on small plots. This is increasingly recognized. Small farmers go where large farmers cannot go: in hills, wetlands or elsewhere. Small-scale farming is a sustainable agriculture that does not destroy natural resources. It helps to fight against poverty, it creates more jobs than industrial agriculture, it is able to create more income. It is able to produce using much less fossil energy, it is able to contribute to the mitigation of global warming.

Last but not least, small-scale agriculture is able to defend itself even in times of economic difficulties. One of the important mechanisms has been the rediscovery of multifunctionality. On this image (projected to the participants on the screen of the room), we see three young farmers in North Holland who also work on energy production, landscape maintenance and development of biodiversity. They make agriculture a multifunctional activity by earning income through different activities. Another important aspect of this type of agriculture is the production of food for its own consumption and the organization of a direct market. This is a very important phenomenon in Europe.

The fourth trend is that all this is threatened. We are currently experiencing a deep crisis of agriculture in Europe. The prices are very low and many farming families are disappearing, there is poverty, there is a lack of prospects. In Porto Alegre³, the role of the state was discussed. Looking back over the last ten years, one can only conclude that the State of Europe has withdrawn from agriculture rather than reinforcing positive trends. This has allowed large companies, agribusiness companies and retail businesses to control the market. Together, in reality, the food empires today control the markets, both the agricultural market and the food market. This withdrawal of the State also allowed the emergence of new and very large industrial exploitations. This is the first time

³ Jan Douwe Van Der Ploeg refers to the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development held from 7 to 10 March 2006 in Porto Alegre, Brazil.

we have seen farms with 18,000 cows for milk production in Europe. But this type of farming is growing. This farm is now expanding to accommodate 32,000 cows. This represents a danger in that it could drive out family farms from the market. In conclusion, indeed family farming, small farms and small-scale farming are a very valuable component of our European societies and are seen very positively by the general public. This is something valuable. But they are threatened and we must fight harder than ever to defend this precious constellation. Thank you.

Eduardo BAUMEISTER, Researcher, Central Institute for Social and Development Studies, INCEDES, Argentina.

I am going to talk about Central America, trying to see what are the most specific agrarian and rural trends and how certain historical continuities are combined with more recent events. First, remember that Central America is seven small countries between Mexico and Colombia. In this small geographical area live about 50 million inhabitants with a density close to 100 inhabitants per km², that is to say much higher than the density of North or South America. Thus, in this small geographical area, the rural and agrarian question is entirely relevant. It should be noted that one out of every three workers works in agriculture in all seven countries and that almost half of the population live in rural areas.

This is also an area where social indicators are more dramatic. For example, the rate of chronic child malnutrition is one of the highest in the world. It is important to keep in mind that this whole area, because of its geographical location, its climatic conditions and being relatively small in surface area, occupies top position in the market for certain agricultural products. It is the worlds largest producer of pineapple, the fourth or third largest producer of sugar, banana... therefore, a grouping that weighs in world agriculture and that is intensifying over the past twenty years.

This context of expansion of certain agricultural products has certain characteristics. In the 1990s these export products could coexist with a significant production for the domestic market. Until the early 1990s, the region produced most of what it consumed. This has changed drastically. The production capacity of corn, beans and staple foods has been greatly reduced. At the same time, there has been an expansion of products for export and for the external market. In short, we are dealing with a massive appropriation of lands now dedicated to agricultural products such as palm or sugar cane or the expansion of mines, tourism and cities. Over the past two decades, the demand for land for these activities has increased significantly. The important feature of this land-grabbing process is that it involves activities that require a lot of land, a lot of water, and generate very few jobs.

This tendency to reduce agricultural employment, whether itself or via salaried

workers, occurs while in this region of the world the population growth from the 50s to the 80s has been very high. So it's totally problematic. On the one hand, the number of people of working age continues to grow. On the other hand, the phenomena of land appropriation by all these agricultural and non-agricultural activities that I mentioned, mining resources and water for hydroelectric purposes, generate very few jobs. The recent death of Berta Cáceres in Honduras was mentioned today. She was part of an indigenous community struggling to defend a river threatened by hydroelectric construction.

In conclusion, it should be noted that this is only one side of current trends. We must also see the other side to understand what is specific in this region. While large farms have grown and strengthened in recent years, the persistence of family farming is significant, not generally but in some specific productions. The most interesting case to study to illustrate the importance of small-scale family farming is coffee production in Honduras, which is currently the world's fifth largest coffee exporter. It was a country that had a very low coffee activity 30 years ago. Today, it is the largest producer of the seven Central American countries. There are of course negative aspects. Many of these family producers live in unjust conditions and poverty but it is important to underline that for some agricultural productions, the presence of family farming continues to be significant, despite the overall unfavourable context.

It is also necessary to observe the strategies of rural households in this context. What is observed in various places is a combination of different agricultural and non-agricultural strategies, rural and urban, national and international, linked to the high level of migration that characterizes the region. These migrations are ways to compensate and generate income, and sometimes to invest at the family level.

It is important to see how the various issues around the earth can be articulated, the land in its broadest sense including water, climate change ... And how to limit the expansion of the type of crops whose presence have been greatly increased as a result of the increase in oil prices in the past years: agrofuels, ethanol production ... They played a key role in the land concentration processes I mentioned.

It must be remembered that we are talking about the part of the world with the highest levels of violence per capita. The homicide rate in rural areas and in these countries in general is the highest in the world. One must recall that these countries went through processes of internal war between the 1960s and the 1990s, and underwent political processes that are well known.

To conclude, I would say that the big problem that we have in these regions and that extends elsewhere is the following: How can one add different initiatives that have to do with the theme of the earth, with the theme of change climate, with that of water, that of forests, the use of land, the food of local populations? How will all these initiatives, that have different strategies to change or limit

land use, how can they meet to move in the direction of improvement in these difficult contexts and extreme inequality that are observed in this part of world and in other places?

Thank you very much.

Fernando EGUREN, Researcher, Peruvian Center for Social Studies, CEPES, Peru.

I will speak here about South America that comprises of a dozen countries.

Much of the history of Latin America has revolved around conflicts over natural resources. Wood, earth and minerals were the leitmotiv of the "Conquista" in the 16th century. Since there were not enough people, people were imported. This was the origin of slavery. This appropriation of resources has never been peaceful. Those who originally used it have always resisted. In this sense, what is happening today, the dispute over natural resources, has a secular origin. The land structure that exists today has a colonial origin. In most countries, there is a more or less large, more or less vigorous agricultural sector, which may be characterized by a bipolar structure, with a relatively small number of landowners who own most of the land and access the largest part of the water. At the other extreme, an overwhelming majority of the population, family farmers and communities own only a small portion of the less productive land and have limited access to water.

The investment and public services orientation respected and strengthened this structure by serving the minority and marginalizing the majority. Then agrarian reforms took place throughout the twentieth century, starting with Mexico, then with the frustrated experience of Guatemala, the Bolivian revolution, Cuban agrarian reform in the 1950s and, from the 1960s onwards, various agrarian reforms in South American countries. The most radical were those of Chile and Peru who, in their time, eliminated large estates. In the 1980s, we also saw Nicaraguan agrarian reform. But when you look at the region as a whole and in the long run, the results of these reforms are not really impressive. Many of the expropriated land has been returned or sold by the beneficiaries of the reforms themselves. Where there has been no land reform, it remains an eternal promise that never becomes reality, due to lack of political will of the rulers or lack of pressure from those who should be the beneficiaries. Or also because we need not only political will and pressures but also social and political alliances broader than those that seem to exist now to be able to implement agrarian reforms.

In the early 1960s, a report by the Canadian Agricultural Development Agency, CIDA, that is an agency of the Organization of American States, OAS, reported on the immense concentration of land in Latin America. This report has been helpful in pointing to the need for agrarian reforms in the region. Today, after these agrarian reforms have taken place, a study by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in 17 countries in the Latin America

region have given similar results. This means that things have not changed and that the agrarian reforms have not achieved their goals.

The paradox is that while many things have changed, many things have remained the same. Where they took place, the agrarian reforms freed hundreds of thousands of farmers from bondage chains and allowed them full access to citizenship, which was extremely important. This has made it possible to break precapitalist labour relations, liquidate the territorial power formed by the alliance between the landowner, the parish priest and the judge; allowed, by putting an end to the haciendas, to put directly the link of the small producer with the market without the intermediation of the landowner. A large part of the rents that were taken for this were devolved to the farmers. But in general, the agrarian reforms were not irreversible with regard to one of their main objectives: to end the polarization of the agrarian land structure, in which few have many and many have little. The FAO study conducted in these 17 countries in 2012 concludes that the magnitude of recent land grabbing in Latin America and the Caribbean, in terms of number of countries and land grabbed area, is greater than assumed, although variable depending on the country.

Today it is more evident than ever that the concentration of land is also a concentration of capital. The neo-large estates are generally capital-intensive forms of management and apply expensive and sophisticated technologies. Their production processes more closely resemble industrial processes. Cybernetic regulation of these processes is generalized. All this leads to a significant need for skilled labour, where demand has increased so strongly that often this must come from distant locations. These new estates operate generally as enclaves, with a very weak relationship to the local population. However, they exert territorial influence on local and regional authorities and also on local markets for goods and services, even on the labour market of unskilled workers. They establish contractual relationships with small farmers to ensure the provision of inputs also extracted and exported. These contracts are generally strongly asymmetric where the risks are borne almost entirely by the small producer.

Unlike traditional landowners who were part of the local society which established reciprocal relationships, as well as asymmetrical ones, the neo-large estates do not build up the social fabric in the territories where they are registered. The owners are shareholders who probably don't even know the area in which their businesses are, let alone the surrounding territory. Moreover, the most important neo-large estates are usually corporations with diverse interests in other sectors of the economy, for whom agriculture is no more than a good business, and they maintain their activity in this sector as it remains a good deal. Conservation of natural resources of this business is generally not part of the mission and vision of these companies. If resources are degraded, capital migrates to another more promising sector.

This leads to a review of the important features of large estates, both of yesteryear and today. The majority are mono-cultures, with a high degree of specialization.

Lack of variety of crops leads to depletion of the soil and increasing use of industrial inputs. In some countries, such as Brazil and Argentina, foreign investment plays an important role in the formation of these estates. In other countries, strong domestic investment is essential and also the level of State support. However, in almost all cases production is export-oriented.

Agriculture practised by these estates and family farming are two different and largely opposing paradigms. The estates approach to industrial processes, their effectiveness and durability, are increasingly being questioned because of environmental, social and economic negative externalities.

On the contrary, family farming is in the process of being reinvigorated, particularly for its ability to maintain and develop biodiversity, essential for adaptation to climate change; for the strong support it gives to food security - in Latin America, 80% of food comes from the family agriculture - but also for a series of cultural and social reasons and because it can be more effective in the fight against poverty.

However, this family agriculture needs support in order to effectively develop their full potential. These reasons are enough to guide the policies of governments that, with rare exceptions, have chosen to support large estates. The FAO study finds that there is no resentment, in most countries, against the processes of land concentration. The small-farmer movement never before managed to exert enough pressure to reorientate this and probably will not succeed if it fails to persuade the majority of citizens that the problem is not only an agricultural sector problem, and that the large land estates paradigm threatens the durability of resources, of soil, of water, of biodiversity, of food, that is to say life itself. And that concerns all of us.

Thank you.

Jacqueline GÓMEZ, President of the National Institute of Colonization, representative of Uruguay within the Specialized Meeting on Family Agriculture (REAF) of the Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR), Uruguay.

I would like to talk about issues related to public policies and the roles of the State. I belong to a public institution and report back to a government. Building a model of rural development has always been linked to an ideological and political definition: What do we want? What kind of society do we want to build? When it comes to household production and access to land, we speak no doubt about the politics of wealth redistribution. And this comes under the context of a political and ideological definition of the model of society we wish to build.

It would be necessary to strengthen the role of governments and states in this process. So far, there is no doubt about the fact that it is social movements who have been defenders of territories and household production. Many of the governments that represent us today are products of such social struggles. But governments now have the means to promote access to land and generate and uphold laws that allow access to land and family production.

I would like to turn now to the role of private property in the model of society we want to build. If we want to promote access to land for family farming, we must not copy the model of private property and the capitalist model. If the land is already private, there needs to be limits on private property while having the goal of family production in mind. Today, there were references to the experiences of agrarian reforms, particularly in Chile. If we start a process of distributing land titles in the space of two or three generations a market for land will start. Without a doubt.

If we think of a land policy in the long term, we can go through land securitisation provided it is regulated - this being necessary with the social conflicts that there are. But the State must also maintain land outside the private property and market system. These lands must be recovered by the State or transferred to family producers logically to protect family production in these territories. Because the reality is that agribusiness and the agricultural capitalist model want all lands. The important thing for them is to access this resource. We must therefore think - even myself from within the State for example - to build tools that protect these territories and limit private property in family production areas. The type of land tenure is not trivial for maintaining family farming in the territories.

JORGE HERNÁNDEZ, Mensa Civica and SlowFood, Zaragoza, Spain

I would like to talk about how the production model is concentrated on a small number of seeds, the "super foods", which allow large economies of scale and promote financial speculation. What some call "superfoods" goes against biodiversity and diversity of production. From this point of view, we would like this session to condemn the way of talking about "super food" because all the world diets are based on a productive diversity that allows the enrichment of human food crops. Therefore, it is necessary to condemn this terminology.

Sidy SECK, Researcher, University Gaston Berger of Saint-Louis, Senegal

Charting the evolution of agricultural policies, Mr. DAO has established, in his speech, production relations in the case of Vietnam and in the case of Cambodia. He said that since 1990, these countries have been exporting rice with public policies having a positive aspects. I would like it if he could develop a bit further on relationships between these public policies and increased production mechanisms.

DAO The Anh, Director of Research, Academy of Sciences of Vietnam, Vietnam

Regarding the role of public policy in South-east Asia and Vietnam, I think it is necessary to insist on the fact that land reform has only been granted for the right of use for families. It is not a right of private property. So after 50 years, the state can redistribute land depending on demand. I think it's a clue, but I'm not sure this is a universal solution. This was to answer the question about how to design policy to promote access to land for family farming.

Secondly, I believe that to support family farming, access to land is important. But in the context of Vietnam, it is also necessary to discuss the role of public investment, particularly for irrigation. During the Green Revolution, irrigation was very important for intensification. Vietnam currently has almost 75% of its agricultural land irrigated annually, allowing for stable production and ever increasing yields.

The other important factor is linked to the role of public policy is public investment in research to improve yields and technical progress. This is the legacy of the Green Revolution period. At first, the government attributed the land with the objective of food security, not thinking about export. But with the three factors that are access to land, public research and irrigation, family farming has proven its strength. And thus now we become exporters.

Currently, small family farms are facing challenges on the issue of management of quality, hygiene and others. There is a demand for new cooperative movements to try to regulate these issues. Competition between the models of family farming - also productive but facing difficulties in managing quality - and the model of industrial agribusiness, which can more easily be invested in, is an important issue in Vietnam at this time.

Rukka SOMBOLINGGI Coordinator Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara, AMAN (Indigenous Peoples Alliance of the Archipelago), Indonesia.

First of all, I have to say that I welcome the discussions we have here. But I would like to talk about my experience with indigenous peoples.

In the context where our lands have been taken away from us, where our lands have been grabbed and our leaders corrupted by the government and private businesses, there are only two components of communities that continue to struggle: women and youth. I appreciated this morning that this forum addresses issues that are common to all humans, but I think it would have been nice if we had put gender and age issues - women and men young people - at the centre of our discussions right from the start. Because when we talk about land issues, it is women and young people who suffer the most. When there is destruction of our environment, of our living spaces, it is the women who suffer the most. They suffer because of their domestic role as wives and mothers.

They suffer too, because their husbands are corrupt. I'm sorry to say that, but when they're back in their communities, they bring back the human immunodeficiency virus, HIV, that they pass on to their wives. There are many cases of this in Indonesia. Most women living with HIV in Indonesia are mothers. Where did they catch this? From their husbands. The situation of indigenous women in mining areas has recently been denounced by the National Commission for Human Rights in Indonesia. The majority of women, wives and mothers, carry HIV. I really do not understand why this issue affecting women is not seriously studied here from the start. I did not see a woman among the panelists this morning. We still have two days of debate and I hope we will talk about this problem in more detail. That was the first thing I wanted to say.

Secondly, we are talking a lot about people living in rural areas. Yes, indeed, most of the indigenous people I represent live in rural areas. But I think we must also talk about the townspeople because we rural people have to produce their food, we must continue to sacrifice ourselves for the townspeople. They eat all the food we produce and tell us that we are stupid, poor and dirty. We must also talk about promoting urban family farming because what happens in rural areas is mainly due to the needs of urban populations. People in developed countries need energy, food. In developing countries, we are not protected by our governments. We suffer, because of the needs of people living in developed countries and in the cities.

I think the interdependence between rural and urban areas needs to be addressed during this forum because I think that's where elites control 60% of the world's property and wealth today. This is where they win, by widening the gap between cities and rural areas that are in this interdependent relationship. That's where they make profits. They create injustice and suffering for the rural population but also for the townspeople. I find that talk on this relationship is missing. Once again I know that we have several days ahead, but I wanted to emphasize these two points: women and young people as well as the rural-urban relationship.

WORKSHOP 1:

Land grabbing and land concentration: What are the numbers and who are the actors?

After a first plenary meeting on the evolution of access to land and natural resources in different continents, the workshop has allowed participants to provide numerous testimonies, to determine the different forms land grabs and land concentration take and to discuss the scope of ongoing processes while reflecting on the adequacy of the tools available to quantify such phenomena. The workshop began with four presentations; on land dispossession suffered by the indigenous community in Argentina Qom; contradictions and problems of land policy in Madagascar; the situation of access to land in South Africa; and development of land access in Romania. The Land Matrix, a database often cited was the theme of the fifth presentation⁴, underlying its coverage and limits.

Review

The term land-grabbing, which is used very often, refers to a particular type of phenomenon, particularly outrageous, but far from reflecting all the changes in access to land that are underway in the world and that are also serious problems. The quantitative evaluations often cited only count for a small part. It is imperative to specify what must be taken into account before claiming to quantify the phenomena of land grabbing and concentration that apply to the land, but also to forest resources and fishing resources (see the respective workshops⁵).

Teniendo en cuenta los ejemplos presentados o citados, podemos distinguir claramente lo siguiente:

⁴The Land Matrix is only intended to offer a comprehensive quantitative assessment of large-scale real estate transactions. It is limited in documenting and verifying cases that have been identified and which meet the criteria set (more than 200 hectares, since 2000, etc.). It does not take into account transactions between individuals of the same country. Therefore, the use of this by journalists and researchers to analyse the characteristics of these phenomena and actors is often abused.

⁵ The issue of access to land by women was also addressed in a parallel workshop.

1 / Processes of dispossession of indigenous communities, appropriation by external actors of territories of indigenous peoples or other populations, to develop large-scale agricultural activities, mining projects, large forest exploitation, to build infrastructures, roads, dams, canals, pipelines, for urban expansion, to create nature reserves, etc. The examples of indigenous territories in Argentina, infrastructure development and agribusiness in Sri Lanka, the progress of "pioneer fronts" (agriculture and livestock) in Brazil, plus also those of forest concessions in the Central African Republic, the creation of "ranches" in pastoral zone in Niger or plantations in Senegal fall under this first category.

2 / Concentration processes of land use rights and natural resources, which occur through the purchase / sale of smaller plots, their lease, and also during generational changes. Mention was made in particular of the cases of Romania, many Western European countries, including France, Canada, and the United States in the morning plenary. The actors involved are very varied. There are of course large corporations, international or national, pension funds, but also states, indirectly through their land, trade and investment policies, or directly through expropriations or allocations of concessions. It's not always very big companies that accumulate land. These phenomena have their roots in history, sometimes very ancient.

Colonial history has created fertile ground for these processes of dispossession and land concentration (e.g. the extreme case of South Africa), which extends well after independence. Land not registered in the name of particular owners has become national land (Latin America), public land (e.g. Madagascar, Tanzania, Senegal, etc), even when occupied by indigenous people for a very long time and governed by customary rules. By not recognizing the rights of use of the populations living in these areas, the State justifies its power to sell them by way of very long leases or to sell them to those whom it considers most suitable for "developing" the country. The proposed solution to land insecurity is the delivery of land titles to the inhabitants, individually, which they can then sell or pledge them. In Madagascar, the land reform of 2005 that challenged the principle of ownership and allowed the recognition of the rights of the inhabitants with land certificates failed to reach a sufficiently rapid development and the State continued to cede leases often to foreign investors on large amounts of land for agricultural and mining activities. As a general rule, the intermediate levels of social organization and land/resource management are not recognized, resulting in the systematic privatization of the use of community and common lands.

The forced collectivization of countries claiming socialism has been another driving force of dispossession and accelerated concentration of land in the course of twentieth-century history. The example of Romania illustrates the irreversible short-term nature of this process. With the de-collectivization, the lands were redistributed formally to a large number of beneficiaries who, having no means to work, had to rent them, often very inexpensively. Very large farms

were very quickly built up on the best land, with entrepreneurs and investors renting thousands of small plots to build these farms.

State interventions to quickly correct a very unequal distribution of land, land reforms, remain more relevant than ever, even if they have not always achieved the expected results in the long term. In the morning plenary, the very positive results of Vietnam were highlighted, as was the impossibility in Peru and Chile of avoiding a new and very rapid concentration of land after radical agrarian reforms. The extreme polarization of South Africa also illustrates the foreseeable failure of the so-called land reform reform advocated by the World Bank, which expected a fair redistribution of land through voluntary purchase-sales between landowners, landless and farmers. In Brazil, despite the presence of powerful social movements in the countryside and federal policies with a component of agrarian reform and support for family production, the polarization of agrarian structures continued to increase. The advance of the pioneer fronts since the 1970s has increased the agricultural area of this country by some 100 million hectares, mainly benefiting very large farms that practice different mono cultures.

The context of global liberalization of global trade, the development of agricultural and transportation technologies based on the use of fossil energy and non-renewable resources, the promotion of exclusive property rights, have led to a deep and damaging relationship of human societies with nature. It has also led to a breakdown of societies and a decline in their ability to regulate access to land and natural resources. Land is increasingly treated as a commodity. For the first time in human history, one denies its specificities and those of natural resources. The consequences are dramatic for the whole of humanity. Communities and peoples lose control over their territories, their ancestral knowledge and their organizational abilities. These developments have been accelerating for the 10 years and are irreversible in the medium term. In regions of the world where access to land is better distributed among rural inhabitants, as in many Asian countries where a large proportion of the world's rural population is concentrated, the adoption of land registers and the generalization of land rights Individual property ownership also leads to weaker control of developments by communities and increased tension in rural and urban areas. In Europe and North America, the concentration of land use for the benefit of companies, aimed only at short-term profitability, breaks the relationship of human societies to nature: the countryside is empty, environmental damage is increasing, links between farmers and other citizens disappear.

Proposals

Today, we do not have the tools to measure the entire process of dispossession and land concentration around the world. Emphasis has been put on land grabs involving direct violations of the rights of the people, often giving priority to grabs by foreigners, leading to a response based primarily on respect for human rights. It's important, but not enough. We must also be able to measure the concentration in small steps, which is no less rapid in view of the geographical extent in which it operates. It is a prerequisite to understand the scale of the impacts this will generate over the long term and anticipate the situations for future generations, both rural and urban. For this purpose, it is necessary to create observatories, built with research and citizens' organizations, which will not only attempt to list specific cases, but also to evaluate, on the basis of existing data and assessments of the partners, the global evolution of production structures and in the different countries, in order to highlight trends over the medium term, even when statistical data is incomplete.

New regulations at national and international level are essential. Only the establishment of relative autonomy at the intermediate levels will allow communities and peoples to avoid the instrumentalisation of agricultural policies against their interests, and will allow them to regain control over what has been abandoned market forces.

Interventions

The following list is not exhaustive. We apologize to exhibitors or attendees of this workshop not listed here and invite you to write to the following address so that we can publish a new version of this synthesis with the full list: secretariat@landaccessforum.org

Introductory lectures:

ANDREW, Nancy, researcher, France / United States.

BATAGOIU, Raluca, a specialist in agricultural development, Romania.

DIAZ, Felix, leader of the ethnic Qom, Qarashe qopiwini, Argentina.

RABEHERIFARA, Jean-Claude, TANY collective to defend the lands, Malagasy, Madagascar.

TAYLOR, Michael, director of the Secretariat of the ILC (International Coalition for Access to Land), Botswana.

Intervening participants:

ABARCHI, Harouna, AREN (Association for revitalizing the breeding Niger) Niger.

ADEMBA, Frank, Mviwata Kilimanjaro, Tanzania.

ANICE PORTO DA MOTA, Cleia, CONTAG (National Confederation of Agricultural Workers), Brazil.

BA, Sidy, CNCR (National Council for Dialogue and Rural Cooperation), Senegal.

Baumeister, Eduardo, researcher, INCEDES (Central Institute for Social and Development Studies), Nicaragua.

BAYLAC, Michel, president of the AEIAR (European Association of Institutions in Rural Development), France.

BESSAOUD, Omar, researcher, IAMM (Mediterranean Agronomic Institute of Montpellier), France.

BOEHM, Terry, farmer, former president of the NFU (National Farmers Union), Canada.

BUZZALINO, Mario, COPROFAM (Coordinating Body of Mercosur Family Producers), Uruguay.

KARIYAWASAM Majuwana Gamage, Thilak, farmer, Sri Lanka Nature Group, Sri Lanka.

KARIYAWASAM MAPALAGAM HEWARUPPAGE, Ravindra, researcher, Center for the Study of the Environment and Nature, Sri Lanka.

KEMANDA, Bienvenu Florentin engineer water and forest resources, Maison de l'Enfant et de la Femme Pygmées, Central African Republic.

MACZ, Maria Josefa, National Coordinating Committee delegate of Guatemala farmer Unity (CUC), Guatemala.

MOLINA, Javier, liaison officer with the United Nations, United Nations Organization for Food and Agriculture (FAO), Colombia.

Monreal GAINZA, Borja, rural development consultant for the United Nations, United Nations Organization for Food and Agriculture (FAO), Spain.

OBREGÓN, Saul River Foundation, Nicaragua.

PALEBELE, Kolyang, president of CNCPR (National Council for Coordination of Rural Producers of Chad), Vice PROPAC (Regional Platform of farmer Organizations of Central Africa), Chad.

SUAREZ, Victor, National Association of Commercialization Enterprises (ANEC), Mexico.

Moderator:

Michel MERLET, AGTER (Association for Improving governance of Earth, Water and Natural Resources), France.

Witness:

HURTADO, Laura, sociologist, Action Aid, Country Director, Guatemala.

WORKSHOP 2: Forest areas

Review

Forest areas, like the other resources, are being grabbed. Some companies, often with the support of States, degrade and deprive local people of their natural environment or resources that they depend on for their living conditions.

The exploitation of forest and mineral resources, development of hydroelectric projects and transport infrastructure, with tourism and hunting as well as concessions for agricultural land expansion or the illegal exploitation of forests endanger these territories. It can also happen that local populations, where certain forms of slash and burn agriculture is carried out on a small scale, contribute to the degradation of these territories.

“Conservation” projects and carbon sequestration also happen to be a threat to forest peoples. The REDD+ mechanism⁶, promoted within the framework of State action against climate change has been much discussed. This mechanism, still in the experimental stage, issues certificates of emission reduction of carbon dioxide that supposedly allow to carry out conservation projects, forest management or even planting⁷. Certificates are delivered to companies that can re-sell/trade them and serve to those that hold them, to demonstrate their involvement in the fight against climate change. Some promoters of REDD+ hope that one day they can sell carbon emission allowances to other companies in the market who want to maintain or expand their right to pollute. This makes the REDD+ mechanism more conducive to legitimize the current global emissions of greenhouse gas more than to reduce them.

Many REDD+ projects foster land grabbing and restrict access of local populations to forests, relocating their food safety. In Madagascar, the creation of 6 million hectares of protected area has resulted in the exclusion of local communities and restricted forest areas available for farming and harvesting. Often, the compensation granted is minimal.

⁶ “Reducing emissions of greenhouse gases from deforestation and forest degradation”.

⁷ Participants denounced the definition of forest selected in the context of REDD+ pilot projects enabling a palm oil plantation can choose the certificate.

Overall, forestry projects pose a worrying threat to the survival of indigenous and native peoples whose culture is intrinsically linked to their natural environment. The origin of these processes is the commodification of nature. The use of the term 'natural resources' is loaded with connotations because it eliminates the sacredness of nature and helps to spread the idea that it can be sold as an object.

The forest peoples are rarely involved and often excluded from decisions affecting the forest. Often relocation of dispossessed populations are on infertile land⁸ with derisory compensation. Members of communities struggling against these projects are criminalized, imprisoned and subjected to intimidation and physical violence. In Indonesia, 106 militants are in prison for trying to protect their territories. In Nicaragua, between 15 and 20 leaders have been brought to court for their activities. Berta Cáceres and Walter Manfredo Barrios were killed in early 2016 for their militancy in Honduras and Guatemala respectively as many more have been in many other countries.

The big winners are private companies, often multinationals, who degrade the environment (pollution of soil and water, drying up streams, massive deforestation) without regard to local populations and with the consent of states and international organizations.

Certain political steps have been discussed by participants, like that of the ratification by South American countries of the Convention 169 of the International Labour Organization or, more locally, the recognition of indigenous ownership of the territories of Nicaragua and Honduras, or also the organization of community forestry in Mexico and community forest management in Senegal. But, in general, National laws benefit economic interests more than those of local and indigenous populations, and the alleged advances in the field of recognition of the rights of communities may be a trap.

In Nicaragua, for example, the form in which ownership of the ancestral domains of autochthonous and indigenous communities has been recognized has not prevented abuses by national or regional authorities and sales of land rights by some members of certain communities.

⁸ In Madagascar, crops displaced by the creation of a mine populations have been decimated.

Proposals

Citizen action must aim to support communities and strengthen their capacities to resist against threats and to obtain full recognition of their rights over forest lands:

- Sharing of relevant knowledge and information between different groups and movements. This action supposes notably the sensitization of the local populations on the mechanisms used by the multinationals to monopolize the territories. Tools and methods for mapping the territories of indigenous communities, for example, should be shared,
- Globalization of the struggle. This implies greater cooperation between movements and the adoption of an international agenda. This last element is imperative in view of the multinational nature of companies,
- Alerts on "round tables for sustainable exploitation / production". Organized by the multinationals to make them virtuous in the eyes of the public and the consumers of their harmful practices, must be denounced.
- Strengthening links between indigenous / local communities and urban citizens / consumers. Consumers can be allies of local and indigenous communities against businesses by deciding not to buy their products. Whether it is palm oil products or illegally traded timber, for example, they must be informed about their conditions of production.

Citizens' actions must be structured around common political demands which must lead to the adoption by States of the following political measures:

- The implementation of international declarations relating to autochthonous and indigenous peoples (notably Convention 169),
- Recognition and effective respect of customary law of communities living on or in forest lands. In this regard, participants were very reserved about the market mechanisms that are emerging in the wake of the land rights securitisation programs. The formalization of property and use rights, whether individual or collective, is not a guarantee of improving the living conditions of indigenous peoples if it is conceived as a prerequisite for their possible sale on land markets.
- The creation of dedicated national public institutions so that indigenous peoples can easily obtain documents materializing their land rights (of use and ownership),
- The protection of forest lands for the survival of native and indigenous peoples, which can include stopping deforestation and preventing environmental degradation by private companies,
- Stop the repression / criminalization of indigenous activists and leaders opposed to government projects,
- The involvement of local communities in the decision-making process,

the obligation to seek their opinion before any implementation of so-called "development" projects and the agreement of a preponderant weight to their voice during these consultations,

- Recognition of local and indigenous communities' knowledge to protect the environment and, as such, the granting of benefits and direct aids. In this regard, several participating organizations are calling for the allocation of REDD+ funding directly to communities as part of their ongoing contribution to forest conservation and the freedom to use these funds as they choose.

Numerous examples of citizen / community movement actions that have obtained concrete measures were mentioned during the workshop.

Two are mentioned as examples here:

In Senegal, forests had virtually disappeared. Thanks to the advocacy of communities that included former logging employees, the government became aware of the environmental degradation by these companies. New measures have been adopted, such as the priority use of forest areas for communities organized in Economic Interest Groups (EIG), as part of reforestation programs, and the strengthening of their rights.

The struggles of the Coordination of Indigenous Organizations of the Amazonian Basin (COICA) in Peru have made it possible to halt the advance of agricultural frontiers on forest areas and deforestation.

Interventions

The following list is not exhaustive. We apologize to the speakers of the workshop and participants who do not find their names on it, and we invite you to contact us at the following address so we can edit a new version of this summary for the full list: secretariat@landaccessforum.org

Introductory speeches (Missing the names of two of the speakers):

SOMBOLINGGI, Rukka, coordinator of the Alliance of Indigenous Peoples of the Archipelago, Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara (AMAN).

ROBINS, Taymond, Mayangna Nation, Nation Mayangna of Nicaragua, Nicaragua.

VASQUEZ, Edwin, Coordinator of Indigenous Organizations of the Amazon Basin (COICA), Peru.

A speaker of CONTAG.

Interventions of participants:

PEACOCK, Peter, Tierras comunitarias de Escocia, Reino Unido.

Moderator:

LAFORGE, Michel, consultor, Francia.

Witness:

RAKOTONDRAINIBE, Mamy, presidenta del Colectivo para la Defensa de las Tierras Malgaches, TANY, Francia.

WORKSHOP 3: Grabbing of fishery resources

Review

At present, a set of laws and practices are being developed that exclude artisanal fishermen and their communities from the control of fisheries resources. When dealing with the grab phenomena, a very low and secondary interest is generally given to the issue of fisheries resources. Yet, fisheries and aquaculture are the foundation of the economic survival of millions of people⁹. Similarly, fisheries activity is essential to ensure global food security. In a large number of countries, it provides the largest source of quality animal protein for the population and, in general, it tends to provide an ever larger share of human nutrition. Testimonies suggest that the resource grabbing of seas and rivers is a reality, similar to land grabbing.

Around the world, fishermen and farmers face significant threats to their business. Since the mid-1980s, states have been pushing for the privatization of fisheries by delivering fishing quotas to large manufacturers. There is a growing concentration of fisheries resources to a handful of large companies to the detriment of the more numerous family and artisanal fishing communities. The case of Chile is emblematic of these processes in that the 2013 fisheries reform allowed more than 90% of the country's fishing quotas to be allocated to only seven families in the industrial fishing sector. Such a concentration of fishing rights effectively excludes the thousands of small-scale fishermen and simply signals the end of the existence of family and artisanal fisheries.

The development of intensive industrial fishing, whose powerful actors are driven only by the profit-maximizing economic interest, has led to over exploitation of fish resources. According to the FAO, the state of the fishery resources is today very worrying, with about 25% of stocks seriously over exploited. Everywhere, the predominance of intensive industrial fishing leads to the depletion of fish populations, thereby threatening human food security and marine ecological balances.

⁹ This economic sector comprises of around 55m people.

Unequal fisheries agreements signed between "industrialized" countries and "developing" countries favour this evolution. The impacts of the fisheries agreements signed by the member states of the Subregional Fisheries Commission¹⁰ (SRFC) of West Africa with third countries provide an example. Under these agreements, the SRFC countries provide foreign vessels with fishing licenses in exchange for, often, very low financial compensation. Thanks to their technological efficiency and their already organized access to international markets, foreign companies deconstruct the local fishing activity they compete with, and with it its economic, social and cultural functions. While the African countries concerned lack quality animal protein, the majority of fish caught in their waters are now destined for export.

Conversely, now 60% of the fish consumed in the EU come from waters outside the EU. In addition, the share of industrial fish farming in fisheries activity continues to increase. This aquaculture focuses on the breeding of a small number of species with a lot of inputs (feed partly based on fish caught at sea and not marketable, pesticides, antibiotics, dyes ...) and generates highly polluting effluents with sometimes introducing invasive species into the environment. This disrupts local ecosystems and leads to the disappearance of endogenous species traditionally caught by small-scale fishermen. Governments tend to allocate part of the coastal land to investors in industrial aquaculture, which reduces the access of small-scale fishers to coastal areas and thus become privatized.

Another process leads to the destruction of marine and coastal environments and the weakening of the livelihoods of family fishing communities and artisanal fisheries. This is the development of tourism and coastal infrastructure. In Sri Lanka, many luxury tourist resorts are now preventing fishermen from accessing the coastal strip, and have even taken steps to suing them for illegal intrusion. In this country, a project to build a mega-port city by Chinese investors in Colombo will deprive, if realized, thousands of fishermen access to their fishing areas.

Faced with these destructive factors on the family fishery and artisanal fishing, millions of small fishermen are impoverished and forced to abandon their activity to join the ranks of those excluded from "growth".

For example, in Spain, 20 years ago, 200 000 people lived from small-scale fishing, today there are only 60 000. In Galicia, 40 000 people lived from the artisanal fishery at the end of the 1990's against 8,000 today.

The destruction of fishing communities around the world brings with it the disappearance of particular lifestyles and cultures. It causes the irreversible extinction of much of human diversity.

¹⁰ Members of SRFC are Cape Verde, Gambia, Rep. Guinée, Guinée Bissau, Mauritania, Senegal and Sierra Leone.

Proposals

It is imperative to ensure the maintenance of a family fishery and a sustainable artisanal fishery at the service of local populations. It is a question of working for the democratization of the access to the resources, by establishing modes of governance where the populations are fully involved and even responsible for the management of the resources of their territories.

Citizen action

- Expand alliances: as long as fishermen are the only ones to defend the fishery, there will be no improvement in their situation. There is a need to include various categories of stakeholders in fisheries debates, particularly consumers.
- Giving greater visibility to the issue of "Ocean/sea" resource grabbing when tackling the phenomena of natural resource grabbing: it is crucial to make the wider population aware that there are also many rural people fishing communities. In particular, it is important to inform people about the harmful effects of industrial fishing and to take steps to raise awareness and encourage responsible consumption of fishery products.
- Lobby government institutions to obtain:
 - the revision of the many unequal fisheries agreements in force around the world, guaranteeing the predominance of big fishing enterprises over artisanal fisheries,
 - the implementation of policies favourable to family and artisanal fishermen (see next).

Political measures needed

- Exit unequal bilateral fisheries agreements,
- Guarantee the access of family and artisanal fishermen to coastal areas and fish stocks, as well as to other means of production, particularly loans at preferential rates,
- Set up a system to help diversify the activities of family and artisanal fishermen for the sustainability of small-scale fishing (processing of fishery products, association with agricultural activities, etc..),
- Implement co-management systems for fisheries resources, ensuring that the views of small-scale fishers are truly taken into account in these processes and that coastal populations are really involved in setting governance rules,
- Limit the size of fishing boats,
- Ban fishing by trawling in deep waters.

Interventions

The following list is not exhaustive. We apologize to exhibitors or attendees of this workshop not listed here and invite you to write to the following address so that we can publish a new version of this synthesis with the full list: secretariat@landaccessforum.org

Introductory talks :

MBENGUE, Moussa, Secretary General of ADEPA (Association for the Development of Artisanal Fisheries in West Africa; WADAF, for its acronym in English), Senegal.

Interventions of participants:

COCHET, Hubert (Professor, AgroParisTech, France).

Hernandez, Jorge (president and CEO of Mensa and SlowFood Civic Association, Zaragoza, Spain).

MATA, Francisco (medical, Social Marine Institute, Valencia, Spain).

Moderator:

Allut GARCIA, Antonio (Lonxanet president of the Foundation for Sustainable Fisheries, Spain).

Witness:

Segbenou, René, COPAGEN (Coalition for the Protection of African Genetic Heritage) and member of ADEPA (Association for the Development of Artisanal Fisheries in West Africa).

WORKSHOP 4: Evictions, exodus, migration, impact on cities

Review

The fate of family farming and urban development are closely linked.

1) Factors involved in the disappearance of family farming:

They are multiple and interactive:

- Decrease of arable land and pastoral areas due to climate change;
- Land grabbing (water and other natural resources) by agro-industrials or mining groups which, in addition to their land impact, cause pollution;
- Diversion of land from their local food production and allocation to food production intended for export, production of agrofuels or feed for the so-called "developed" countries;
- Impossibility for farmers to access local markets due to loss of income and distance of buyers;
- Liberalization of trade in favor of western agribusiness (agricultural agreement of 1994, A.P.E., ...) and of its capacity to export within urban areas in the North and the South, because of clearly lower cost prices

2) Exodus

All in all, the rural populations, who are largely farmers, can no longer derive a decent income from their activities or eat properly. Every year, on a global scale, 65 million people leave farming in a state of great poverty!

Of these 65 million, only 20 million remain in their rural areas. Every year, 45 million former peasants come to swell cities!

They constitute the first flow responsible for the demographic growth of metropolis's (100,000 more inhabitants per year in Antananarivo)!

They are in a state of great fragility and not solvent, they can only feed the ranks of

the unemployed and concentrate in shanty towns. Before, for some, more distant migrations were attempted.

The States and communities that manage these urban areas have considerable difficulty in welcoming everyone, controlling tensions and providing the necessary services to the people. But States and communities must first ensure that they can feed themselves. Urbanization itself, often adds additional impediments.

Conclusion: If we want to combat urban hypertrophy, we must tackle the very sources of the destruction of the small farmers and their exodus. When we can live in rural areas with dignity, going to town can result from a real choice and not from an unavoidable obligation.

Proposals

The workshop identified 4 specific proposals for urbanization shown below. They are based on two prerequisites:

- The capacity of local communities to question their current planning policies;
- That of small farmer's movements and urban social movements to ally, especially in their demand for food sovereignty.

1) Territorial policies

From the local to the global level (UN Habitat) it is necessary to move from an urbanistic approach that organizes only the growth of cities to a territorial approach encompassing the three sectors, urban, peri-urban and rural, and taking into account the social function of the earth in all its dimensions.

Only territorial development projects are able to deny the consumption of agricultural land and natural areas, to correctly pose the need for non-usurer credit to poor farmers and their access to the market. It is in this context that, for example, some communities are attempting policies to support settlement and food production, ensuring both the outlet for producers and the supply to central kitchens providing collective feeding services. We can thus go to real contracts of reciprocity between urban metropolises and rural areas. In fact, it is a matter of building food sovereignty on an adapted territorial scale.

2) Preservation of food spaces in the city

Today, "building the city on the city" has become a key formula for urban planners. It is a formula that sets out a real subject: the obligation, in order to preserve the feeding potential of the region and not to reject the poor or new populations

from outside the urban centres, to densify the habitat, the zones of industrial activities, etc.. It is possible to re-qualify suburban areas by densifying them, to reconquer some industrial or commercial wastelands. These operations are expensive and is the argument used by their detractors, but the real cost of urban sprawl (investment in networks, corresponding depreciation and running costs) has been little studied; the environmental and social costs of sprawl should be considered, including its effect on land speculation.

Local communities need smart densification to be accepted: it's not about building towers everywhere or removing dedicated spaces for relaxation, playgrounds, shared gardens or other forms of urban farms. Food sovereignty involves both the preservation of active peasant agriculture and non-commercial citizen initiatives for food production.

3) Necessary alliances

Fighting local situations of land grabbing, defending the small farmers, building food sovereignty and densifying intelligently are all necessary, but for local authorities and their elected officials, this requires a lucidity and political courage that is not spontaneous.

Workshop 4 concluded the major requirement being to be able to weigh in on the rights as on the conduct of the local public actions undertaken to treat the factors resulting in the disappearance of family farming and its effects (Cf Review above). To develop structured and powerful alliances between the small farmers and all the social movements that gather together both urban dwellers and consumers.

Interventions

The following list is not exhaustive. We apologize to the all participants whose names do not appear. You are cordially invited to send your names to the following address, so as to publish a new version of this summary with the full list: secretariat@landaccessforum.org

Introductory statements:

CHARRIER, Maurice, President of the International Urban Development Association (INTA). France.

DJAOMAMY, Association for the Development of Agriculture and the peasantry of Sanbirano, Madagascar.

GBANFREIN, Pau. Responsible Project "Securing land rights in urban areas", Center for Research and Action for Peace (CERAP), Ivory Coast.

LALANDE, Christophe, Head of the Department of Housing UN-Habitat, France.
MARIANI, Maurizio, Eating Cities project, president of Risteco Consortium, Italy
RAPARISON, Eric, Coordinator of the Platform for Solidarity interventions Property (SIF) Madagascar.

ROUILLÉ D'ORFEUIL, Henri, Agricultural Academy, France.

ZARATE, Lorena, President of Habitat International Coalition, Mexico.

Participants interventions (Not exhaustive, lack the identity of some participants):

BECKH, Charlotte, Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies, IASS, Germany.
BUISSON, Michel, Association for the Taxation of International Transactions, ATTAC, France.

COSTA MORAIS, María José, National Confederation of Agricultural Workers, CONTAG, Brazil.

DA SILVA MATIAS, Willian Clementino, National Confederation of Agricultural Workers, CONTAG, Brazil.

FRU NGANG, Francis, Secretary General of the African Institute (INADES Formation) Economic and Social Development, Ivory Coast.

NASCIMENTO SILVA, Adriana, National Confederation of Agricultural Workers, CONTAG, Brazil.

WARTENA, Sjoerd, founder and president of Terre de Liens, France.

WOESSNER, Julien, Charles Leopold Mayer Foundation for the Progress of Man, Switzerland.

Moderators:

LERAS, Gerard, France, Former dairy farmer, a former regional representative and Special Advisor of Land Policy in the Rhone-Alpes Region, France.

SIMONNEAU, Claire, Urbanist, postdoctoral researcher, Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium.

Witness:

FAYE, Iba Mar, Sociologist, head of mission "family farming and land," GRET, Senegal.

Workshops (Synthesis)

WORKSHOP 5: **The difficulty for women of access to land and natural resources**

By way of introduction, participants have paid homage to Berta Caceres, ecological and defender of indigenous peoples activist who was murdered in La Esperanza (Honduras), on March 3, 2016.

Review

Around the world, the vast majority of women face conditions of access and control of land and natural resources unequal to those of men.

Social reports have trivialized the fact that they are fully in charge of domestic work and the education of their children, which prevents them from devoting themselves as much as men to agricultural activities. In the fields, they are the forced workers of the family and take on the tasks that are often the least valued - considered as a part of their domestic obligations. As a result, they generally do not earn any income.

The customary rules of inheritance often perpetuate inequality. In some areas of Madagascar, for example, women have no rights over the inheritance of their father or husband. In indigenous and indigenous communities, inheritance is often the affair of "elders", most often men. The exclusion of women from the inheritance of land is sometimes advocated in the name of religion.

National institutions reflect these patriarchal structures. Many States are reluctant to ensure the equality and social inclusion of women and continue to give secondary attention to gender issues. In some countries, there are no data on women in the agricultural sector, only for families and family properties. Legal texts concerning the environment and development do not always clearly consider the role of women. Generally, women do not enjoy the status of farmers and have less access to credit and agricultural equipment.

Very often, women do not have a recognized right to land. In India, only 12% of women own their land. The property is accessible to them only after the death of the husband. When it is recognized in their community, collective ownership is often the only guarantee of some access to resources. They are therefore the greatest victims of the disappearance

of this form of property. If an individual right to land and natural resources is recognized by law, they are generally not able to bear the cost of the administrative procedures necessary for its realization (cadastral operations, rights, etc..). In the same way, they rarely have the means to fully value their land.

Market mechanisms that apply to land rights, labour, means of production and credit are ineffective in providing women with real access and control over land and natural resources. They are a minority in representative organizations, civil society organizations and local, national and international decision-making processes. This is what many WFAL panels have unfortunately reflected. Management positions are still too often in the hands of men, which jeopardizes the changing status of women.

In the current context of land grabbing and the concentration of land and natural resources by fewer and fewer individuals and businesses, and with the eviction of the majority of rural people, women are thus doubly penalized. There is still a long way to go towards the full and effective implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), of which one of the specific commitments is to promote access to and control of land and other more equal means of production for women. This commitment has been reaffirmed in the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Strong political action for women is therefore essential for them to access and control natural resources. Access to land and its control by women is paramount for their emancipation, the well-being of families and, therefore, for the fight against malnutrition and poverty. Their role in the agricultural field is essential. They provide up to 70% of the work in family farming. In doing so, they are the first contributors to the achievement of sovereignty and food security.

Proposals

Citizen action should be aimed at strengthening women's organizations, supporting the presence of women in farmers' organizations and at educating society as a whole.

Strengthen women's movements and their presence in farmers' organizations:

- Promote the basic legal education of women so that they are aware of existing legal texts concerning them, such as CEDAW,
- Provide women with equitable representation in peasant family farming organizations and in the fight against land grabs, so as to ensure that they do not duplicate patriarchal structures,

- Strengthen existing women's organizations and support the creation of new ones or where the advocacy of their interests are not organized. Create federations at national and international level to make the rural women's voice heard. It was proposed to draw on examples of women's movements and actions presented during the workshop, such as the MAKAAAM¹¹ network in India or the CONTAG¹² -sponsored Marguerites markets in Brazil. 70% of the lands of this country are today man-woman co-owned.

Educate society:

- Raise awareness about all forms of violence against women,
- Measure the "invisible" work of women and promote it at community and government level,
- Highlight the major potential contribution of women to fight against land grabbing, the evolution of agroecology and thus the fight against poverty, malnutrition and under-nutrition and climate change.

The political demands of these movements should include the adoption by the State of **political measures** as in following:

- The protection of women against community and institutional violence,
- Women's full participation in governmental, national and local institutions and decision-making
- The implementation and protection of women's rights, including those stipulated in CEDAW and including their secure access to land and natural resources and other means of production plus their right to control the use they make of it, not to mention recognition of the status of women farmers,
- Women's access to credits, subsidies and tax breaks to make women's agricultural activity possible and sustainable.
- The obligation to include the names of women on the documents embodying land rights (ownership, use),
- Recognition of agricultural work done by women.

¹¹ Network made up of 74 women farmers' organizations. It was set up to demand the implementation of their demands: in particular the redistribution of land to women, the registration of their rights, equal access to services, but also the creation of community resource centers to promote women's rights. gender justice, namely the possibility for women to make free choices based on individual capacities and aspirations.

¹²The last march of the "Marguerites" was held in August 2015 and brought together 70,000 women.

Interventions

The following list is not exhaustive. We apologize to those involved at the time of the workshop and participants who do not find your name here, and we invite you to contact the following address, to allow us to edit a new version of this synthesis with the full list:

secretariat@landaccessforum.org

Introductory statements:

BORQUEZ, Rita, PROCASUR Chile.

ECHEVARRIA LEON, Dayma, Center for the Study of the Cuban Economy, Cuba.

El Hadji FAYE, Environment and Development Third World Natural protection of cultures (PRONAT ENDA), Senegal.

COSTA LUNAS, Alessandra, National Confederation of Agricultural Workers, CONTAG, Brazil.

Nitya Rao, School of International Development, University of East Anglia, UK.

RAVONIARISOA, Lilia, Federation of Rural Women in Madagascar, TMVB, Madagascar.

Interventions of participants:

GUTIERREZ ANGULO, Elga Betty, Peasant Confederation of Peru, Peru.

BEL Mokthar, Siham, Agronomist, Office of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs Section, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Morocco.

BEN SAAD Abdallah, Professor, National Institute of Agronomic Research of Tunisia (INRAT), Tunisia.

GAMBOA Beltetón, Klemen Guadalupe, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, Guatemala.

HERNANDEZ, Veronica, Alliance of Community Forestry Organizations of Guatemala, Guatemala.

I MOBIN Jinnah, Shah, Executive Director of the Community Development Association (CDA), Bangladesh.

MARTINEZ JIMENEZ, Florita, Bribri and Cabécar Indigenous Network (Ribcage), Costa Rica.

NAIT SID, Kamira, President of the World Amazigh Congress, Association of Mountain People of the World, Algeria.

Moderador:

CASTILLO HUERTAS, Ana Patricia, agrarian Feminist, Guatemala.

Relator:

Gatundu, Catherine, ActionAid, Kenya.

Plenary Session II

Analysis of struggle and resistance to the process of land grabbing

Presentations

NURM Kaul, Director of the Estonian Farmers Federation (Eestimaa Talupidajate Keskliit ETK), Delegate of the Economic and Social Committee (EESC), Estonia.

I'll start by telling them about the experiences in Europe, in particular the experiences taking place in the European Union (EU). I was a member of the European Social Committee (EESC), which is one of the European Institutions and Economic Committee, and is responsible for representing civil society organizations in the EU. This committee has an advisory role to the Commission, the Council and the European Parliament. Generally, it is said that land grabbing and land concentrations occur on other continents. People do not know that this phenomena happens even within the EU. They are not as widespread but do undoubtedly take place, more or less visibly.

At the EESC, I led an initiative, a report on land grabbing and concentration in the EU. Why have we done this? Because someone had to create this debate in Europe. Why has it been necessary for civil society organizations to instigate this? Because we have found that the European Commission, the European Parliament or the European Council did not want to talk about this problem. Our goal was to create debate and propose ideas and workable solutions.

As you know, in the European Union some issues remain under the EU and others under the Member States. The right to land policies and land tenure are matters which concern the latter. For this reason, the Commission denies the existence of land grabbing in the EU. According to the agency, all land transactions are legal - land taken in exchange for money, so it is not considered grabbing. Yes, this might not be a problem but all studies indicate that land ownership and land use rights are increasingly concentrated. This concentration of land is replacing

family farms by industrial agriculture. This is the final result. If you do not like industrial agriculture, and we do not like it, we need to talk about the reality of this problem in the EU.

Several messages are in this report. First, we need that the land market is regulated. Regulation of the land market is limited by EU treaties which establish four fundamental rights: the free movement of capital, goods and people. The message of this report is that the earth is not a good as any other because it is a limited resource we cannot make. For this reason, we need that treaties are interpreted and, in those that are to do with food, we must work towards obtaining rights to regulate the land market.

Another message is that politicians must take control. I have the honour to tell you that we have maybe influenced the European Parliament, thanks to this report that has been adopted by civil society organizations in Europe. Indeed, the European Parliament has made further studies on the concentration of land in Europe and has decided to make their own political report on this issue.

If Parliament determines that it is a problem that must be regulated, this may exert stronger pressure on the Commission to manage this issue. I am totally convinced that without regulation and without political will to regulate the land market, nothing is possible, at least in the EU.

In Romania, the largest farm has 65 000 ha and belongs to a single owner. In Estonia, a small country in northern Europe, farms have 10 000 ha and thousands of cows. How can family farms be competitive against these large companies? Impossible. We need regulation. We also need a Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) to support family farms.

That's how these thing works in Europe. We need documents, send messages to society, to politicians and to all policy makers.

Michel DAVID, Farmer, Farm Union Confederation Paysanne, France.

I'm a farmer, member of the Confédération Paysanne (Farmers' Union) through which and together with Via Campesina we defend family farming agriculture. Thanks to our family farming agriculture model, as well as organic in my case, we defend farming respecting the human element, i.e., an agriculture that aims at farmers keeping their land and ensuring the quality of food, water and the environment. Doing this now is to fight against land grabbing because, when we fight here for food sovereignty we fight against the four million tons arriving each year to France to feed the French and European livestock.

Our imports promote land grabbing in the South and cause global warming, the expulsion of small farmers, natives, etc.. So the fight for family farming agriculture here is also a fight against land grabbing.

When we fight against the 1,000 cow farm - tomorrow twenty farms with 1,000 cows and perhaps farms with 18,000 or 20,000 cows in Europe - we fight against

land grabbing here and elsewhere! Through the fight against this model, we fight against provoking climate refugees too. When we fight against the CAP, which distributes 300 000 euros to agri-managers in my region, we fight against land grabbing because every day, in my region, there is one less farm. Every day!

There are, in France, more symbolic struggles against land grabbing. Basically, we are confronted with two processes: we grab land in other countries and we convert the land in France to big useless projects like the airport of Notre Dame des Landes. There is no need for this airport, since there is already one that can do the job. It is a long fight that we will win I hope. On these lands, currently there are alternative farmers who grow organic for themselves and for refugees. It is also an example.

We accompany the farmers in Palestine in their struggle to continue working on the edges of the colonized areas. That too is another form of land grabbing that has not been mentioned here. Plus we fight against the land development, like those or commercial malls that push to import things that are often useless but help grow imports. This too is a fight against land grabs and the destruction of small farmers and small artisans here.

The conclusion, since Michel said earlier that there are not many happy prospects, is that I hope we will win Notre Dame des Landes.

It is also necessary that tomorrow we move forward the Voluntary Guidelines so that a certain number of Voluntary Guidelines are transformed into constraints, because we must stop tomorrow all this climate that is being destroyed, all these small farms that we destroy. So it will require not only volunteering but also a number of requirements made to multinationals. And I forgot to mention the seeds, when we fight to protect seeds, we fight against land grabbing that destroys the Amazon forest and its natives and small farmers.

Elena Lazos, Professor, National Autonomous University of Mexico, UNAM, Mexico.

When we discuss all the struggles and resistances against land grabbing and also for cultural diversity and for the defence of the territories, that is to say for the respect of life and alternative models, the first images that we have in mind images of repression, violence, co-optation of movement leaders, and of criminalization of which we have spoken here not to mention all the killings and imprisonments. This demonstrates the social and political vulnerability of those affected and who resist, as well as to their economic vulnerability.

To say this, however, is unfair to those here who represent social movements and organizations, a network of committed leaders.

Some are here, others are absent but we know their struggles: Movement of Landless, STD, Brazil, Zapatistas in Chiapas, the Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador, CONAIE, the network of Resistance to the Latin Mining

Exploitation, or the Latin American Tribunal of Environmental Conflicts.

However, there is a big void in the recognition of rights. We must think about the power of the actors who face these struggles for life: large multinational companies, mining, gas, oil, and all those that form the agri-food industry that not only make contract farming, but appropriate all the profitable land and destroy the land. They use the land or not as they want. Paper companies too, as the comrade of Uruguay told us. Companies that privatize water, like Coca-Cola. In Mexico, 90% of water companies belong to Coca-Cola. Also tourism companies make exclusive tourism, as Eduardo Baumeister told us for Central America and also Nancy Andrew for South Africa. In Mexico, it is the beaches and the fishermen who are dispossessed of their resources, not only access to the sea but also to the rivers.

There is also green grabbing with the creation of protected areas that rob communities of their resources, as Kolyang Palebele of Chad or the Central African Republic told us.

Thus, we see the strength of these transnational companies with their various strategies.

One of their strategies is to make new alliances with government institutions at different levels, federal, national or local. This guarantees companies impunity and creates a great loss of confidence that makes the recourse of social movements to their own public institutions difficult. This is why social movements must appeal to international tribunals such as the Latin American Court and other international tribunals. They must use these mechanisms rather than trust their own states.

The strategies of social movements also reflect the ruptures between organizations in the face of intimidation or persuasion. Some consider that it is not worth fighting and that it is enough to say "How much?": "How much does it cost?", "How much does this wood cost?"; or ask the question in terms of the number of jobs: "If it creates a few jobs, it's okay" ... all this creates breaks between organizations.

On this, Omar Bessaoud described the dissolution of agricultural cooperatives in the Arab world. There are also breaks and divisions between communities. A study in the North identifies 155 billboards of the mining company in villages of 2,000 to 3,000 inhabitants. They promote the fact that mining companies buy and "offer" football teams, schools, churches, or provide services such as water distribution and road development. As Franck Ademba told us, "we exchange land for hospitals". These are the strategies that companies have to access the land. We also see alliances with armed groups, drug trafficking groups, with the military, or with paramilitary groups. All of this weakens social movements.

We also have strategies that multinationals undertake with national companies as nominees often with the elites of the national bourgeoisie. They disguise themselves behind a pseudo "nationalization" of resources.

For example, communities face drug traffickers, land grabs by big producers and banks, the financialisation of agriculture, the treatment of food as "commodities". The fact that corn is listed on the stock exchange, for example, has a big impact on poverty and inequality and thus on migration processes. This also weakens social movements. As well as subsidies for large producers that leave small producers on the margin, as well as the World Trade Organization (WTO), and free trade treaties.

There is a privatization of the countryside, not only land but also of services.

There are today "Nestlé" schools, "Monsanto" schools, "schools" of mining companies. This also weakens social movements through propaganda to children or farmers who go to these schools.

There are changes in the legislative frameworks too, with the Seeds Act, or the Water Act, going towards privatization. It also raises barriers against social movements.

In this context, we must also think about issues of communication, information, capacity building that could be important for social movements, such as community radios that are today marginalized.

There is also privatization of research with companies entering public universities.

We must mention environmental degradation: chemical inputs, pollution of water, soil, and especially the spoiling of genetic resources, the control of seeds, with 60% of seeds that are currently in the hands of private companies such as Monsanto and its subsidiaries.

All of this weakens social movements. There is also a fall in mobilizing religious ideologies as was the theology of liberation in Latin America for example.

Willian Clementino DA SILVA MATIAS, National Confederation of Agricultural Workers, (Confederação Nacional dos Trabalhadores na Agricultura, CONTAG), Coordination of Organizations of Family Producers of Mercosur (Coordinadora de Organizaciones de productores Familiares del Mercosur, COPROFAM), Brazil.

The issue of land grabs is very strong right now. The earth is a finite good, and we must take care of it. We must consider the earth as a good of nature that has a fundamental role for all of society.

In Brazil, we have a very big threat from the agribusiness that take the land from the peasants and family farmers and from all peoples who have their life in the countryside. There is a very strong trend to take the lands of the Amazon to make large plantations of soybeans and other mono cultures in general. So we have to fight every day to guarantee the rights of the small farmers. Unfortunately, we have lost many comrades in these struggles as we confront the capital that tries to take our lands. We should leave here with a strong proposal to continue the struggles for access to land and also a proposal to put the theme of agrarian

reform back on the agenda.

The question of agrarian reform is not only a question of "underdeveloped" countries, we must return to this proposal for agrarian reform. Our challenge is to globalize the fight for agrarian reform and to challenge capital that is globally articulated, while we, we are globally weakened. We must defend seeds to guarantee food security and sovereignty for the people. Only small farmers are in a position to feed the world and end hunger, to finish the violence against social organizations.

Ramesh CHANDRA SHARMA, Campaign Coordinator activist movement Ekta Parishad, India.

Our friend from Tanzania was asking for examples of success stories from local communities, so I'm going to talk about the movement we've started in India.

Ekta Parishad is known for having organized many walks for food. In 2007, we walked with 25,000 people on a highways across the country to challenge the central government. This led to the Forest Rights Act, which was adopted in India because there were negotiations with the central government at that time. Similarly, in 2012, we organized a march of 100,000 people where we walked on the same road to Delhi. Meanwhile there was a negotiation that led to the Land Rights Act and we had the land reform policy. How are these movements formed? To answer, I will bring two or three strategy elements.

The first is that we believe in what we call the "power of the poor". The poor have very different abilities and powers to defend themselves. It is our responsibility as a social movement to understand the potential of their power. Gandhi said, "Some laws are not meant to be obeyed", some laws are not supposed to be respected. We are constantly discussing negative laws, negative policies and negative frameworks. He gave us a very interesting speech during the movement "freedom to struggle", the freedom to fight, saying that some laws do not have to be respected. If the law does not protect your rights, you have the right to disobey laws. We have examples of this kind of action. The land occupation movement in India is a very clear example of how a large number of homeless and landless people come and occupy the land, take possession of it and finally win.

We have a series of success stories that illustrate how these indigenous peoples' movements challenge large mining companies, such as Vedanta's Sterlite Group, and sue them in the Supreme Court in India and win. We won because it was a struggle for the truth. All legal actions and direct actions, that we call non-violent direct actions, work very well.

Another important element for us is that the struggle is also a constructive work of dialogue. They work together. Do not resort to fighting alone. You must carry out constructive work together, at the same time. We must create spaces for dialogue. These three very important components are, for us, an integral part of a movement.

We have very different strategies to fight. One of them is the market for food. I continue to say that the day of the protests is over today. If you are organizing a demonstration, the government is happy to provide you with security services, water, ambulances. They then say "Are you happy? Now go home." That's why we invented food markets as a very effective tool. Imagine 25,000 people walking together for a month on a national road. It is not easy for the government to manage these people.

You must create a constant pressure. This constant pressure can be exerted in different ways. At the same time, it is also important to carry out constructive work because, when you personally engage in constructive work, it is also a space for you to contribute physically, morally and financially to your own movement. A movement is not carried or directed by external instances but more generated by the people.

This is the third component, the space for dialogue. As citizens of one of the largest democracies, we believe in space for dialogue. Take to the streets because it is vital. Some people are very cautious and ask "What are you doing? ".

Corruption is perhaps a real menace for those who have other very different threat models and one can corrupt the 1 or 2% of a group, not a million people walking in the streets. Therefore, it is better to continue the process of dialogue and engage in dialogue. Propagate the idea of a "politic of the people" is, likewise, important. When I talk about politics of the people, I mean that you have to invent a different culture of politics. I will give you an example.

In the state of Odisha, eastern India, when we organized a march for food just before the elections, one of the local leaders used a very interesting slogan: "No Land, No Vote". If they want our voice, they have to promise agrarian reform for our people. And there, in that village, there was the largest number of land titles issued to redistribute land rights in all the state of Odisha. So, we have several successful examples of situations in which people are at the negotiating table and able to change the political configuration of a country.

For us, the social movement is a powerful tool for social education. I mean that the movement is not only an action against the State. One must understand the immense potential of the social movement as a tool for social education. We continue to say that it is necessary that civil society is united. But what about the citizens? Do you only want to favour civil society organizations? Or do we really want to talk to ordinary people, civilians? So change the basic knowledge of social movements and go to the ordinary people. I remember the 25 000 people in the street, associations of lawyers, teachers, student movements and associations of doctors who were on the street. They came to help these people.

What is at stake is the construction of the second generation of militants. I am very happy that there was a question about the new generation. We fight a lot and have a very good knowledge of our struggle but do we really want to teach the new generations? Are we really interested in building the second generation of

militants? It is important! All these great actions would be better off integrating the new generations to create more energy each time. For us, food marches are occasions to give a mobile training. We do not give classes in the classroom. The formations are always on the ground, in the place of the fight.

Finally, I would like to pose some philosophical questions. It is very interesting to see all the liberation movements in India. One of the questions that Gandhi had before he died was focused on the idea of colonization, and it was a very interesting question: are we not colonizing ourselves to adopt a new development model, realizing development without adopting different perspectives?

If you read the research by the Worldwatch Institute, the rate of resource consumption is a very interesting tool to understand the poverty gap and to configure ones movement not only locally but also internationally. As I said in my previous presentation, corporations and countries 'export' their environmental degradations by causing them in the South. A very interesting case study shows how we challenge companies that produce biofuels in India.

We have achieved huge victories in certain regions of India. If you truly want to see this with your own eyes you are most welcome to visit.

Today, urbanization is a big issue. The concepts of a global economy, work and employment are new challenges for us. We do not believe that self-employment is more worthy than employment. In the terminology of work and employment, we do not consider self-employed, non-salaried work as a path that provides necessarily more dignified living conditions.

To conclude, I would like to say that if you are not ready to decolonise yourself, from the inside, it is very difficult to achieve decolonization from that which comes from the outside.

Ardo Samba SOW, Collective of 37 communities in the Ndiaël region, Senegal.

I am going to talk about the cases of West Africa and more particularly, of Senegal, cases that I master better and especially the case of the Ndiael collective from where I come.

It is a collective of pastoralists that was born when President Abdoulaye Wade signed a decree, five days before the presidential elections, to decommission a forest and allocate 20,000 hectares to an Italian company. We, farmers, have decided to face up to this and not to position ourselves as victims, to face this enterprise, to confront the State of Senegal, to face all those people who are mobilized behind these assets and who have come to grow biofuels while our country is investing billions to import food for the country.

Because we found that it was not fair, we started to raise awareness, to mobilize. But we realized that to really oppose the project, we had to go beyond this awareness and be able to defend our position, to defend our refusal.

We called our movement CODEN, which means "can live" and in French COLlectif for the DEFence of Ndiael. This choice was strategic especially for the media strategy. This naming, by putting forward a mobilizing motif allowed a better reading of the issues in order to obtain support. Several actions have been initiated. Letters of protest were sent around the country. The newly elected president was questioned. He had initially rejected the project and finally approved it. We called him, we met people. We also met Senegalese civil society, particularly within the Framework for Reflection and Action on Land in Senegal, CRAFS. Thanks to this synergy, the clearing of the area was stopped and the police forces left. This because we had told the state of Senegal "you can put the military here but we will not stop." Then the property tax base was lowered by the State of Senegal. On 20,000 hectares we were able to recover 10,000 hectares. But we will not stop, we will recover the other 10,000.

We can mention several cases of land grabs.. The case of Urou where it was also Italians looking to grow biofuels. Sidy Ba spoke earlier about Mineral Deposit Limited, an Australian company that exploits zircon along the Senegalese coast. The case of Wassadou, in the area of Tambacounda, where a Spanish person wanted to have 80 000 hectares for tourism. So there are a lot of cases. And thanks to this synergy of actions with the social movements and the civil society, we managed nevertheless to draw the attention of the authorities, to stop certain cases and to follow up on a case by case basis as well.

This civil society today does not only support the populations in its struggles but it keeps a watch also and, in particular, on land reform. It's a bit in an attempt to anticipate. On land reform we are working today with the National Commission for Land Reform, CNRF. There are consultations that take place between civil society and the CNRF. The CRAFS made some proposals less than a month ago, a document of proposals from the population, farmers and breeders has been submitted to the National President of the Land Reform who reports directly to the President of the Republic of Senegal. These meetings and dialogue continue until now. We will continue to defend the interest of the rural world, the interest of the producer.

This situation may be identical to other countries in Africa, particularly in Mali where we have the Malian Convergence against Land Grabbing, CMAT. In these two countries, Senegal and Mali, we have a strong civil society. But in other countries this is not the case. We continue to arrest people, to imprison them. And that's why we set up the African Convergence against land grabbing, water and seeds. This African convergence, has put in place a strategy of struggle – The West African Caravan. The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), of which Mauritania is a member, has been called upon. We mobilized more than 400,000 people with this caravan which left on December 3 from Ouagadougou through Bobo Dioulasso, Bamako, to Dakar where a Green Booklet was given to President Macky Sall.

The main objective of the caravan is to initiate a dialogue, a political dialogue, a

social dialogue around land rights and issues. This booklet contains our analysis of the West African reality in relation to land, water, and farmer's seeds, as well as our analysis of the structural problems that exist and which are at the root of abuses and violations of rights of communities thus jeopardizing the future of a prosperous and peaceful Africa, the future of an Africa that has suffered greatly since the slave trade.

We see it every day at 8 pm on TV. We are shown, if not the damage caused by terrorists, the canoes of young Africans who perish in the Mediterranean. Every day, they are called "stowaways". But the first stowaways are those who came to Africa to trade slavery! Those who travelled into Africa and to the Cape of Good Hope. They looted African resources. They are the first stowaways. They came without being invited, and without a visa! These illegal immigrants are those who have colonized this rich Africa, which has its natural mineral resources, which has an ocean and coastline full of fish. We are often told about the benefits of chocolate from Belgium and Switzerland. But there is no cocoa tree in those countries! Everything is imported from Ivory Coast, Ghana, Brazil, or of course Mexico. And at what price?

Illegal immigrants who want to cross the Mediterranean, I do not consider them illegal. They have come to find what was taken from them. And I appeal to those States of the European Union who, by their policies, encourage land grabs. If we say that in ten years we want to drive here with biofuels when we know that land is exhausted in Europe, where are they going to produce this biofuel? Home? But I too need my land! That's why I say: the struggle continues! The struggle continues to build a strong movement, a movement within West Africa, within Africa itself, but also a movement with the countries of Asia and Latin America. Together to restore the balance that will allow each country and each community of farmers, pastoralists, fishermen, and indigenous peoples to enjoy the resources that nature offers and in a sustainable way. My land! My land! My land!

Debate

Sipho Khumalo, rural worker, The Farm Dwellers Advocacy Network, South Africa.

I represent poor and landless people. I would like to share with people here some ideas. In South Africa, we are very poor because the people who own the land evicted us and we did not have rights to use the land or access the land. The year before and this year we told the government and the Court of Justice. But the problem is that the Minister and the Director General of the Department of Rural Land Reform play hide-and-seek with us, those asking them to give us back the land. The Minister of Rural Development and the Director General provided us with the help from their own lawyers. But the information they finally gave to the Court was not the same as the one we wanted to give. I would like to ask all the people here who talk about land grabs to help us: what can we do?

Espérance BINYUKI NYOTA, Coordinator, Union pour l'Emancipation de la Femme Autochtone (Union for the emancipation of the indigenous woman, UEFA), Democratic Republic of Congo.

I coordinate an organization of indigenous Pygmy women in the Democratic Republic of Congo and I wanted to share with the assembly the experience of our country. At home, we have a legal conflict that, until today, does not give the chance to the people, local and indigenous communities, to find themselves within the legal texts. Our country gained independence in 1960. With the laws of that era that governed land management, we had a problem because the communities were not taken into account until today. Now, with regard to the non-access of indigenous peoples to the land, we find that today there are communities that have acquired titles with numbers corresponding to forests that should be reserves. But communities did not know this. This goes back to colonial times. Today, we see that the State is starting to resurrect the action of allocating forests to communities on reserves. Yet there are many forests that have already been expropriated. Today, we are seeing that the grabbing of native forests is still relevant. We must therefore campaign a lot, do a lot of things so that this does not happen. The accompaniment of local and indigenous communities is of great importance at our country level. But it is not easy to take action and we want to ask that, as our brother has said, at the African Great Lakes region and especially in Rwanda, Burundi and Congo, that we can fight for protect these forests, which today are still at risk of being expropriated.

Verónica Hernández, National Alliance of Community Forestry Organizations of Guatemala Y Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests (AMPB), Guatemala.

I would like to start with a famous sentence by Benito Juarez: "A hungry people is a people without peace". Why does hunger exist? Notably when we do not have access to land!

I would like to say in this forum that agrarian reform is very urgent in all countries, because we see everywhere the same problems, the same needs that are being experienced. In Guatemala, through Utz Che ', we work with those who live on the Pacific coast, who take care of the mangroves and protect them because they give life to all who live near the sea and live from the sea. I can mention a recent case where the Guatemalan Coordination for the defence of Mangroves and Life, COMANGLAR, managed to recoup the waters of the Coyolate River that were destined to feed sugar cane refineries on the Pacific coast.

So there it is. Land reform is as urgent in our country as in other countries.

Elhadj Mamadou BA – Farmer, president of the Mauritanian Association for Self Development (AMAD), Mauritania.

I am going to talk about my country which is Mauritania. Mauritania is 80% a desert country. For a long time we have been fighting against climate change and desertification. All populations converge on the Senegal River at the border with Senegal, where pastoralists and farmers are found. Currently, the state is trying to grab more than 200,000 ha in this valley of the Senegal River. Imagine, 40% of the population live on less than one euro a day. That is to say that more than 26% of the population is in a state of food insecurity. The country imports more than 40% of its food. Currently, we are moving the problem between farmers and pastoralists. We do not even have 100,000 ha of irrigated land in Mauritania but we give 100,000 hectares to Saudi, Sudanese, Spanish and Canadian people to come and exploit these lands. In Mauritania, the problem is not the legal texts, because these texts forbid the Mauritanian government to give these lands. So if the state applied these laws, there would be no problem of land grabbing in Mauritania. The State has signed the Voluntary Guidelines for Responsible Governance for Land, Fisheries and Forests (VG) elaborated with FAO in 2012. But these Voluntary Guidelines have remained in law, they are not popularized, they are not used by the Mauritanian population.

April 1, 2016

**Access to land and natural resources:
Economic, social, environmental and
cultural consequences**

Plenary Session III

Family farming enterprises or large companies with employees?

Economic, social, environmental and cultural consequences

Presentations

Moderator: Sidy Seck, researcher, Gaston Berger University of Saint-Louis, Senegal.

The WFAL offers the opportunity for participants to bring testimonials, to share analyses and to discuss them. This plenary will be followed by workshops that will go a little deeper on what will be said.

Yesterday, during workshop 1, Mr Taylor said about the Land Matrix: "our idea is to participate to change processes". I would say, for this session, that our understanding of things is a fundamental prerequisite for being able to act effectively on the course of things. The problematic that brings us together, which we are discussing - subsistence or entrepreneurial farming? What consequences? - is not a simple problem as the historical and political processes, the actors involved, the opportunities and the risks, are different from one continent to another, from one country to another or even, for certain aspects of this problem, within the same country.

In southern countries, particularly in West Africa, the articulation of the problem of family-farming versus farming businesses has increased, particularly following the structural adjustment programs that saw the disengagement by the State and therefore a decline in its support for family farming. These countries have also seen a decline in structural investment, particularly in rural areas at the expense of family farming. Hence the idea of using private investment, "agribusiness" as some would say. Among the justifications put forward for the latter, one can be in the realm of myth or realities.

First order related to myths and realities: our States in the South believe, or agree to believe, that agribusiness, the agricultural business, will promote the development of agricultural production and food self-sufficiency. The question is that the investor, whoever he is, is trying to make a profit. In the specific case of agriculture, this means that he will choose speculations that will enable him to make this profit. It does not mean that these choices will correspond to the agricultural choices or the food choices of the countries in which they intervene. Taro, millet and sorghum in African forest areas, are certainly not going to be preferred. So while they may be involved in increasing agricultural production in terms of food self-sufficiency we can ask questions and discuss them.

Second order related to myths or realities: the question of employment. It is often said that private sector investment, the arrival of agribusiness, will foster the development of employment and opportunities. This is probably true. But the facts show that in some countries they are relatively precarious, seasonal jobs, relatively low wages, the lack of social protection of these employees, etc.

More myths and realities: agribusiness and its modern farms with their fairly intensive technical methods will allow a diffusion of techniques and technologies around the family farms that surround them. This is the idea of spin off techniques and technologies. However we're seeing more and more what we've been saying about mining, particularly the enclave theory now being seen in agribusiness, in some cases we have some sort of "Bunkerisation": barbed wire that prohibits access, cut livestock tracks or tracks to cut wood.

Contribution to local development, through corporate social responsibility: myth or reality? We realize that even if there is progress at this level, we have an extremely important asymmetry between the local populations, and even between the States and these companies, in the definition of the centres where to make this investment. In some cases that I know, these "investments" are limited to building a mosque or a church, paying for air tickets to Mecca, or building clinics. All this is a good thing, but they are short term. Recurring things are quickly forgotten. So we have a diversity of experiences that can help illustrate and deepen these type of questions.

To conclude on this type of questioning, we can also query the wording of this work session:

"Family farming / small-scale farming": Is there a difference between family farming and small-scale farming?

"... or salaried workers" Does this mean that family farming should not or does not have the right to use salaries and employees? Is this not reducing it to an archaic form of agriculture in need of modernization? Does this absolve the State and public policy, to invest and provide a livelihood for ' this type of agriculture? ' ...and the "or" is this to say that there is no possibility that the two coexist? Or is it that we have not witnessed cases in which both have coexisted? Can we not define conditions under which both could exist?

I think the OECD and the French cooperation have given clues. For example, the "Operational Guide ex-ante and analysis of land investment projects" that tries to see or arrange for acceptable conditions, negotiable for this coexistence.

These are certain issues. But there is a discourse worth undertaking in my opinion between land rights / insurance and family farming. Today and yesterday we discussed these issues. The question that comes to me is to understand whether there is any security in family farming possible without supporting their development. It is true that today these farms contribute globally around 65% to 80%, according to statistics, of the global food production. But in 2050, what will be their capacity, if nothing is done, to feed the 9 billion – meaning that a production growth of 30-80% is required? The fact is all that can be said about the good deeds of family farming: respect for the environment, maintaining populations in the territories, life in the territories, is illustrated and in my view sufficiently interesting. But the fact remains that today small producers represent two-thirds of the 850 million poor people in the world.

We must, as the organizers say, all contribute our part to build a common understanding of what family farming, farming and corporate agriculture or agribusiness and its economic, social and environmental consequences.

In this regard, here, where we are having this session can not be an illusion. There is not here on the one hand those who know and, on the other, those who learn – as is done in universities - there is neither those who propose questions and those who respond. Each among us, among you, should contribute to respond with your experiences and analysis so that we understand this agriculture and their diverse problems and social consequences.

Also, I invite you to consider what I just said and communications we will hear, like a stone that each authors provides as a construction for our common understanding to which you can provide your own stones.

Parviz Koohafkan, President of the World Agricultural Heritage (World Agricultural Heritage Foundation) Foundation, Iran.

I will essentially focus on those who produce our food in a world in crisis and in particular on family farming.

Today, the world's population is over seven billion people, half of whom live in cities. Nearly one billion do not have enough food to eat according to the United Nations Agriculture and Food Organization, FAO, and 1.6 billion eat too much. This morning, in a report by the British Broadcasting Corporation, BBC, it was said that obesity has tripled in the last thirty years in most countries. Waste represents more than 30% of production. The access of agribusiness to the land is related to all this.

I have prepared a report for the FAO on the state of the world's land and water (State of Land and Water, 2011). Here are some data. In the last 50 years,

there has been a 12% increase in agricultural production using areas such as forests and wetlands. At the same time, as far as water is concerned, an average of 70% of freshwater went to agricultural production. In particular, we have significant problems with aquifers in arid zones: India, China, the Middle East. Most aquifers that today feed us - 40% of agricultural production is made possible by pumping natural waters - are drying up. In the next 20 years, many of these reserves will disappear. The consequences of the last 50 years of a green revolution, of intensive agriculture, are erosion, salinisation, land degradation, stagnation by sand, climate change and of course migration. In this report we have identified a number of risk systems, such as aquifer systems, but also wetlands, watersheds. Most of these risky systems are in Asia where, curiously, it appears that agriculture is doing well unlike in other parts of the world. In Africa too, many systems are at risk.

My favourite field is in agricultural heritage and its legacy. An agricultural heritage is, for example, a rice terraced system in China, the mixed "rice-fish" systems. Many of them disappeared because they were abandoned or because they are transformed into new systems. Dietary diversity is also crucial but also is being lost. 10,000 years ago, some 10,000 species of plants were consumed. Today, 90% of this diversity has been lost. Today, only 3 species, rice, corn and wheat, account for 50% of calories consumed. This is because of the generalization of mono cultures. The change of food culture, of what we eat, affects biodiversity and therefore people (health, nutrition).

As I said, more and more people are obese or suffer from other pathologies. According to the FAO, to meet the needs of the world's population in 2050, we must increase food production by 60% globally and by 100% in developing countries. Of course, we need a sustainable system combining natural resources and food security. Meeting the food needs of very large cities, especially in Asia, is a very, very important challenge because too many cities today exceed eight million inhabitants. With dietary changes, we are eating more meat today, a product that requires ten times more water than grain or fruit production: 15,000 litres per kilogram of meat produced versus 1,000 to 1,500 litres per kilo of fruit and cereals produced.

The International Year of Family Farming, IYFF, revealed in 2014, that despite all the industrialization of the food system, food remains mostly produced by small family farmers and small-scale agriculture. They are a major opportunity but also a challenge because many of them migrate. They produce more than 70% of global food production. They make up the largest number of custodians of the environment and the services it provides, including biodiversity. Their farming systems support the richest biodiversity and the greatest resilience. Greater and more sustainable production at their level would have an impact on poverty reduction, economic growth and environmental preservation.

On that basis, we can see what a sustainable food system could be. Production

must be local on small plots, implemented by family operators, community-based, biologically and culturally diversified, economically viable and socially just and participatory. Men in harmony with nature. These are the principles of a sustainable agricultural production system as, once again, endorsed by FAO during the nutrition conference.

Given this context, we, myself and some colleagues such as Miguel Altieri, created in 2002 a program called Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems (GIAHS). It targets family farming, smallholders and traditional agriculture. Here is the FAO's 2002 definition of these heritages: "There are remarkable landscapes and land-use systems rich in biological diversity that are the result of the co-evolution of a community, its needs and aspirations for sustainable development, together with its environment".

These are, for example, mixed "rice-fish" systems, oasis systems, alpaca systems, Satoyama systems in Japan, lemon gardens in Italy ... Many of these systems still exist today. We have listed that more than 200 of these systems are important for the whole planet. Which means that they have an important function in terms of biodiversity.

We try to promote understanding, awareness, national and international recognition of these systems. Today, FAO has a program dedicated to this. It was approved by their management last year. It allows piloting innovative models to engage communities, local and national governments, in adaptive management of agricultural biodiversity sheltered in these traditional systems and to give this culture and identity to local communities.

This has three levels: the global level, with the identification, selection and recognition of GIAHS; National level, through policy, regulatory and incentive capacity building to protect these outstanding systems and to serve as reference systems in terms of sustainability; And finally the local level, by building the capacity of local communities and technical assistance for sustainable management of natural resources, promoting traditional knowledge and enhancing its sustainability. In other words, this approach aims to intensify without simplifying.

Linking the local to the global means trade and especially fair trade. It is also about getting the highest political leaders to recognize farming communities and indigenous peoples. In Peru, we have done a good job in this area, especially with the biodiversity conservation parks for potatoes.

It is also about building the capacity of women to bring them back to the forefront of food production and social organizations. We also use political tools to recognize traditional farming systems of national importance, for example in China. China has recognized this as a very big program. This country has important traditional national farming systems that are really supported by policy measures. Of course the GIAHS offer us the opportunity to revitalize economies and make their cultural identity to people. We work particularly on

the diversity of ecosystems, socio-economic diversity, cultural diversity, culinary and therapeutic. Biodiversity is the life insurance policy for life itself. Also, we must imperatively bring back biodiversity. Thank you.

Laura LORENZO, Coordinator of the International Relations Office of the World Rural Forum (Foro Rural Mundial, FRM), Spain.

Hello everyone,

I would like to thank the organization of the WFAL. It is a process that, from our point of view, is necessary and that the World Rural Forum supports. I would also like to welcome the composition of this panel of high quality speakers, some of whom have supported the International Year of Family Farming since the beginning.

Thanks in particular to Parviz Koohafkan for having so perfectly defined family farming before my intervention. I would like to point out that, indeed, 88% of the world's farmers are family farmers who produce about 70% -80% of the food, but industrial agriculture occupies 80% of the land!

What is family farming? In my opinion, it is much more than a form of production. It is much more than a model of agricultural economics. It is the basis of sustainable food production. This is the starting point on the road to security and food sovereignty. It is the basis of territory, of rural development, and it is an important source of cultural and social life forms intrinsic to the rural environment. For me, family farming is a way of life and a way of managing and living with the land. Family farmers are the ones who know their crops best and those who know how to make the most of their land. They have immense potential in terms of security and food sovereignty, the fight against poverty, in terms of job creation, reduction of inequalities - I think the numbers speak for themselves, right? What family farming needs, what supporting organizations advocate - and by asking the United Nations to declare 2014 the "International Year of Family Farming", (IYFF) - is support.

Support has declined in recent years and we need to create a real impetus to put family farming on the international agenda and create policies that support it. This is what motivated the IYFF and which was proposed by 360 organizations from 50 countries. The UN finally declared 2014 "IYFF".

I am going to present today's conclusions and the way forward. More than 800 activities - especially advocacy - were conducted during the IYFF. We identified six results:

1. Family farming has been recognized as a fundamental producer of food and its role in the fight against poverty has been recognized. This is not trivial. It was not easily won. At first, many people told us that family farming is a thing of the past, that it will never feed everyone. The IYFF has served to

show that yes, it is possible;

2. Some governments did engage during the IYFF in favor of family farming. They have policies and programs in place to support them. This is also the case for international organizations such as the United Nations Agriculture and Food Organization, FAO, and the International Fund for Agricultural Development, IFAD;
3. There has been a massive involvement of all types of actors, notably through platforms for political dialogue;
4. The IYFF has influenced the outcome of the Millennium Development Goals, MDGs: Sustainable Development Goals, SDGs;
5. The IYFF has strengthened producer organizations, provided them with facilities for dialogue with governments;
6. It has had an impact on public policy: a dozen important legislative changes in favor of family farming are to its credit in different countries.

We have made a great effort and we must continue it. The IYFF is a process, it is not reduced to one year. In this logic, we continue to support platforms for national political dialogue. It is important to create a consensus on the measures to be supported to promote family farming. We believe that this is a bottom-up process, unlike other voluntary directives. We have removed the word "voluntary" because it is thought that such guidelines should not be voluntary precisely. A consensus between organizations must grow from the ground up. Organizations need to go beyond their daily frictions to think about the future of farmers, pastoralists, fishermen, natives ...

Then we must also arrive at a better link between research centres and farmers' organizations, for a participatory research. So that farmers are not seen as mere receivers of knowledge as they themselves have the knowledge in the field.

I would like to finish with some lessons that we learned from the advocacy work we have done.

First of all, it is fundamental for us that mechanisms for permanent dialogue exist between rural agents - producer organizations - and governments. Governments need to facilitate these spaces, it's fundamental. Then we can revindicate the central role of the State. The State must believe in family farming and really invest in it. Third, good legislation is needed. In many cases we have laws, but not the budget to implement them. Also, it is essential to be able to count on strong agrarian organizations which make it possible to enter into dialogue with the government as equals.

Two conclusions:

First, the future lies in policies that focus on two central themes: Youth and Women. But it is not a question of seeing women and young people as mere subjects of rights but as actors who must participate in politics.

Finally, we must build bridges between organizations of different natures and

overcome quarrels, overcome the short term by thinking of our future, how we will feed humanity.

Hubert COCHET, Professor, AgroParisTech, France.

Thank you very much, hello to all,

Following on from the speech that has just been made, I would like provoke a bit by saying the following: this International Year of Family Farming, IYFF, has allowed us all, and many Governments and international institutions, to convince themselves of the virtues of this small family farming capable of producing, managing complex environments, able to produce low quality products. We are all convinced in this room, and well beyond, of the effectiveness of this family farming.

But why, if everyone is so convinced, do our governments and our international institutions all continue to promote the opposite? That is, large single-crop farms that rely heavily on fossil fuels, industrial inputs, seeds grown far away from where they are used, and hired labour.

How is it, if all governments have been convinced by the International Year of Family Farming, that they almost all continue to promote a model of so-called industrial agriculture?

A first answer to this question - the easiest way - is to say that it is the fault of the multinationals who, obviously, find their interest in selling seeds, pesticides, machinery, energy, and so on. Of course it's their fault. But we can not just denounce this if we want to change things, if we want to go a little further in the analysis. This is what I would like to offer you in a few minutes.

It is a kind of dualism that is taking hold at the global level that ultimately promotes both at the same time. Policymakers say "we will put in place specific policies for family farming". This is an asset of the IYFF and we must rejoice. But they also say: "We will continue, at the same time, to promote agribusiness because ultimately only these large companies will be able to feed cheap nine billion people and cities by 2050. So, we must put in place an institutionalized dualism".

The precursors in this field are the Brazilians who invented two ministries of agriculture, one for small producers, the other for agribusiness. Morocco is now putting in place a "Green Morocco" plan with a component for young people and a section for adults. And we see in a very large number of countries to set up a two-headed government structure, a head for small, a head for big.

We are also often told that in the end this joint development of corporate agriculture and family farming could even be done together under different forms of contracts that would lead to a win-win process, which is the win-win we all know well.

This dualism also rests on a kind of division of tasks: family farming is reserved

for local, organic, quality production and the rest for large enterprises. In the criticisms that have been made, particularly since 2008, against this broad process of land grabs, the main arguments that have been put forward have been social and environmental arguments. Very few voices were raised to question the economic efficiency of these large companies. The governments, as I said in the introduction, are still convinced that the most efficient, from an economic view, are the big companies.

I am professor of agro-economics at a University in Paris and, as an agronomist and teacher of economics, I would like to give you the following thoughts for reflection: I think it is necessary that the small farmer's communities and organisations, governments, teachers and researchers appropriate an agriculture economy that is much closer to the land. Because the agricultural economy today has been confiscated by a part of the economy that is the financial economy!

This financial economy is good for calculating the profitability of capital but much less effective for measuring the concrete economy of agriculture as practised by one billion people in the world.

In a few minutes, let's try to economize differently. I propose for you to start by ending the dictatorship of performance. Performance is the criterion that everyone puts forward today when trying to measure corporate farming and small-scale agriculture. When we try to compare them, we compare the yield. In all the documents circulating in international organizations, universities, we talk about the "performance gap". For example, between a small family farm that would produce a maximum of two tons of maize per hectare and a farm business capable of producing eight or ten tons per hectare. So we are talking about yield difference, yield gap. In the face of this kind of result, it is concluded that only large firms are able to ensure an increase in production.

But let's break down this yield a bit. If, to produce 1,000 euros of production, you have to spend 800 euros of fossil energy, insecticides, pesticides, machinery, etc., obviously there will remain only 200 euros of wealth produced per hectare. Next to this, the small family farm may produce a lower yield, although this is not always the case, but at costs that are so much lower than the wealth created per unit area, based on the same calculation, with nine times out of ten cases higher in small family farms than in large farms. So, do not leave the economy to finance. Let's make a concrete economy of the production systems, the productive processes, so as to argue in a rigorous and convincing way on these economic questions.

In terms of value added, of wealth created per unit area, family farming all over the world, with a few exceptions, produces more wealth per unit area than that of enterprise farming. So why are these companies profitable? Probably firstly because they have access to almost free resources. Obviously, when you have access to free resources, it's easy to be profitable. Access is given them to land in all the countries where they come. We see companies that have access to very

large areas of land at a cost of one euro per hectare per year. This is an order of magnitude that is proposed by governments, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. This when you do not give them five years or even ten years of grace before they have to start paying. On the best land in Ukraine or Russia, entrepreneurs pay rent of 20 euros per hectare. This is ten or fifteen times less than in Europe or the United States. It is an access to land almost free.

Access to the labour force is very cheap too. From the moment these companies operate on the basis of a salaried work force, the work becomes a cost. Profitability pushes down on costs and so pushes down on labour. This is exactly the opposite of what happens on a family farm. Thus, pushing down costs to produce cheap food for cities is first to push down on labour in favour of the return of capital.

This profitability of large companies, this "efficiency" as we are told, is therefore a financial efficiency. This financial efficiency is such that it attracts capital to this sector and that capital is paid back at extremely high rates sometimes. In terms of their economic profitability, their economic efficiency, to feed the world, to create jobs, we can easily demonstrate whether we are conducting an economic analysis differently than it is.

It is therefore necessary to deconstruct this myth of the economic efficiency of these large companies. Otherwise dualism will prevail and all resources, land, water, public support, access to the market, offered to companies will be lacking for small-scale agriculture. Then we will have cohorts of hundreds of millions of expelled workers from this sector who will feed migration flows and wars in our world.

To illustrate my point, I propose a short video of three minutes to start the debate on this question.

Thank you.

Voiceover of the video animation "Why should we privilege access to land and natural resources for small agricultural operations?" projected to participants (Visible on the site www.landaccessforum.org).

For several years, private investors have been taking control of large areas of land to create large farms, mainly in southern countries. These projects are supported by governments that often reserve them the most fertile lands and the best locations, close to infrastructure for example. This has social consequences because some citizens are displaced without compensation. Also environmental consequences, especially because these large farms use a lot of chemicals.

So why are governments facilitating these projects? According to them, large farms produce more than small farms and are more profitable. To verify this, let's compare these two types of farms: A large farm employs wage labourers, uses farm machinery and produces large quantities for the market. It usually

produces only one kind of culture. A small farm, on the other hand, is often run by a family that often uses hand tools or sometimes machines. It produces several crops in order to feed itself but also to sell on the markets. Its income is often low because it has small areas of land.

But which of these farms is the most efficient? To produce the equivalent of 1,000 euros of production per hectare, a large farm must obtain seeds, chemical fertilizers and pesticides because monoculture favours the emergence of parasites. They must also buy fuel for the machines. Of the 1,000 euros only about 300 euros remain. Let's take the example of a small farm. It has an often lower yield per hectare, for example the equivalent of 800 euros of production, but it recovers seeds thanks to its cultures, uses manure as fertilizer and limits the pesticides because the diversity of the cultures lends itself less to the development of diseases. They also buy little fuel. Of the 800 euros 600 euros remain. So small farms produce more value per hectare. Numbering 500 million worldwide, they account for more than three quarters of agricultural production. So why do large farms seem more profitable? Because investors have access to very large areas almost free of charge, they usually pay little for their workers and pay little or no taxes.

Access to land and water, but also credit and public support must therefore be reserved primarily for small farms around the world.

Elga Betty GUTIERREZ ANGULO, Farmer, Peasant Confederation of Peru, member of the coordination of organizations of family farmers in the South American common market (COPROFAM).

I am a farmer, responsible for work and gender issues at the Confederation of Peasants of Peru, CPP.

Thank you to the Forum for giving us space to share our views. I will present to you some of the struggles experienced by our organization. On access to land, I will start with some religious words. They say that God created the earth so that every living thing lives in it. But God did not divide the land among people, he gave it as a common good. Land has always been contested and today more than ever. On earth, there are many natural resources that are used to feed humanity. But today, these resources are wildly exploited by multinational corporations. Access to land is reduced today.

Even if in Peru, thanks to the struggles, there was an agrarian reform to "give the land to the one who works it", the policies of the various governments have always been in the direction of land grabs by legislative means, through laws, or even by force with evictions. Today, in Peru, we have arrived at a concentration of land in the hands of large transnational companies, including through concessions to various extractive companies of gas, wood, oil....with this unreasoned use of resources, a new problem has appeared in the world, global warming. This is not only because of the misuse of land but also because of other factors, such

as the production of ethanol, the use of insecticides, pesticides The CPP, with its struggles, has had a very important role in the implementation of the agrarian reform, a model copied elsewhere later, as in Bolivia. The role of women in organizations is fundamental. In our organization, we have parity. In Peru, more than 50.5% of the population are women, especially in the peasant sector. The role of women is therefore very important in the development of the family economy, and yet it is not remunerated.

We need policy responses to the problems of access to land. Governments do not promote public policies for the defence of the land. Peasant family farming corresponds to a particular form of life and is fundamental. In Peru, 80% of the population feeds on small-scale peasant production. And yet, for this production, there are no public policies. For example, those who make the most profits from all this peasant production are the intermediaries. We demand differentiated public policies with direct producer-consumer access.

Recently, we had the law on small family farming, but it is still not regulated. It is therefore without any result for the moment. There is no political will.

Another problem is that of water, the blue gold, which today is also disputed with the concessions granted to multinationals. In Peru, it is mainly mining companies that leave small farmers without water to irrigate their productions or water their animals. And in addition they pollute the water.

We must stand up against all these activities of the multinationals. Our struggles are strong, we have already managed to stop the activity of some multinationals. There have been deaths for that, particularly in mining areas.

As a conclusion, we demand the development of proposals in the field of production through an exchange of ecological production experiences between countries. Experiments that add value to all products and are validated for further public support. We propose to create and promote meetings of farmers producers, coordination with unions, urban organizations. It is necessary to develop relations with urban organizations in order to achieve, for example, direct sales from the producer to the consumer, to favor the direct exchange of agricultural products.

We farmers work for the preservation of traditional production methods, and all the vision of the world that that implies, and especially for the use of our own seeds. For example, in Peru we have a huge diversity of varieties of potatoes and corn. We want to continue to sow our own seeds, the ones we select. We must not allow multinational corporations to impose on us their transgenic seeds.

We demand the recognition of our rights to land and territory, we demand differentiated public policies for small-scale agriculture. Water is not just any resource either. We must claim access as a human right.

I just have to tell you that it's only through struggle that we get our rights!

Thank you.

Jan VAN DER PLOEG, Professor, University of Wageningen. Netherlands.

What was said by Sidy Seck in the introduction is true. Situations and problems differ from continent to continent. However, it is also true that there is more and more in common. What I want to emphasize is that a new and vast contradiction is emerging. These are no longer contradictions only within the Latin-American region, between large agricultural enterprises and peasant farms. It is no longer a question of only contradictions between large agricultural enterprises and small peasant farms in Europe. It is now a very consistent contradiction at the international level that is observed between large agricultural enterprises that produce industrially and peasant agriculture wherever it is located.

Take the example of a very large agricultural enterprise in Ukraine with 18.6 million laying hens. It currently produces over six billion eggs a year and has recently obtained an export license to the European Union. It is able to flood this market with cheap eggs, which will deeply impact some of the European breeders. At the same time, it is very remarkable - echoing a bit Hubert Cochet's argument - that this company had a net loss of almost 30 million US dollars in 2014. And that in 2015, she had a net loss of 158 million dollars. This demonstrates - it is a global problem - that economic efficiency is not an objective with this type of business. What they are looking for is economic power, market shares, and the ability to control the markets for their benefit. This is the key.

Take the example of another very large company, Van Oers. It's a global network. They are in the Netherlands, Portugal, Morocco, Senegal and Ethiopia. In Morocco, it has three companies, one of which cultivates 1,200 hectares for horticultural production, irrigated. It's exceptional, nowhere else in the country is there such a large agricultural production enterprise. It is located near the port of Tangiers and the products are delivered in twenty-four hours to the port of Rotterdam in a way that they control more and more the European market. They have all these companies in different countries in Africa and Europe. It becomes a privileged partner of large distribution companies. This seems to echo what Sidy Seck said when he spoke about myths and realities. With one of those myths in this case, the one that these kinds of operations would generate jobs.

The subsidiary of Van Oers in Morocco was recently bought by the French company Agrial, also located in Morocco. The problem is that this company has wells 200 meters deep. This is quite different from small-scale farming in Morocco that is used to make shallow wells connected by horizontal tunnels to capture water between 40 and 48 meters deep no more. This company captures the waters and dries the farmers' aquifers. It excludes Moroccan farmers from competition and at the same time, floods the European market, also competing with European producers.

You can see how they create new big contradictions. There is no happy cohabitation between these big companies and the family farms.

Now let's take another example in Latin America, in Piura, Peru, quite close to the farmers community of Catacaos situated around an irrigation canal. On the one hand, peasant agriculture is in dire need of water. Farmers make holes in the ground in which they put corn seeds that they cover with a seal to save water. It's a long fight. On the other side, you have a water reservoir where it is in abundance. This is the blue gold that Elga Betty Angulo Gutierrez was referring to. It is accumulated as private property by the new big capitalist enterprises. It is guarded by armed guards. This water is used to produce all kinds of high value products such as asparagus, peppers, onions, grapes, organic bananas. All this is exported to the United States and Europe. Asparagus, for example, is transported refrigerated by boat or plane to Poland where it is cut into pieces, scattered over pizzas and exported to Western Europe. These are global chains. These companies connect poor regions and rich regions. They make huge profits. They flood the European market with these very inexpensive asparagus. You may wonder if this brings development to Peru, if it creates jobs?

The exploitation of one hectare by this company, as has been calculated, implied the loss of 15 to 20 hectares of small-scale agriculture. So they create jobs in a particular place, but elsewhere they destroy many more jobs. This applies to Morocco and in this case to Peru.

To summarize, if we look at the problem as a whole, we come to a conclusion that is not an ideal conclusion, one based on many studies, an empirical conclusion, which of course corresponds to what many of us have said; that these big agricultural enterprises threaten small-scale agriculture.

In the first place, they are a fragile. For them, it is very easy to leave agriculture and food production as soon as it suits them. This is a considerable difference from the logic of continuity of small-scale agriculture. To resume the Peruvian example, the irrigation canal of this company is not made of concrete but plastic. It can easily be moved by the company to another place if better option. Currently, this company is eyeing China.

These companies then represent an industrial way of farming that requires a lot of energy, fresh water, pesticides, herbicides and other chemicals. It is a way of producing that goes completely against the actions to be taken to face the new shortages that the world has to face today. They are less productive. This has already been said and I can only repeat it. Whether by unit of land, animal, or fruit tree, whatever the unit, their production is lower. Especially if you take into account the time factor. For example, perhaps a cow's milk production is higher in one year, but taking into account that the productive time of a dairy cow is only two years and then the animal is slaughtered, milk production becomes lower compared to a dairy cow on a farm.

Finally, it is a type of destructive agriculture that is emerging, whose destructive effects affect Europe as much as Morocco or Peru. They strike in a more global way, both North and South.

This type of agriculture is also destructive because it destroys jobs, local communities, natural resources.

This is what I wished to say. Thank you.

Debate

Sidy SECK, researcher, University Gaston Berger of Saint-Louis, Senegal – Moderator.

We have received 31 intervention requests. I have proceeded to classify them as much as possible. I first grouped them by continent. Then some consisted of specific questions addressed to one speaker or another. I have given each of these questions to the speaker concerned. Finally, there were questions that were not addressed to one speaker in particular but to all of us. I will start by giving you these questions. Before that, I would like to recall two expectations that I said in my introductory remarks and that seem important to me: the construction of our common understanding of the issue, in its differences and specificities, and the participation of everyone in the context these issues, based on his own experiences and analysis.

Everyone contributes his grain of sand.

One of the questions is: What is the role of consumers in all this - what should they do, how to have more capacity for action from them and towards them?

Another question that was given to me: Beyond the measures taken by the various institutions, is there not a great work of education or rehabilitation to be done by the whole society, especially consumers, farmers? To sensitize them, to profoundly change the model of capitalist society that refers to well-being in terms of wealth?

There are 29 questions left. In terms of time, this represents two minutes and 15 seconds for each speaker and ten minutes for the room.

What bothers me in this thankless task is that I can not mute the speaker. But, apart from two or three people I saw at the back of the room (laughs), we are all adults to play this game and I defer to your common sense.

Monique MUNTING, researcher and documentary filmmaker, AGTER, SCAM, Amnesty International, COTA, Belgium.

It seems to me that in the interventions of this morning, a criterion, an argument, was very little mentioned or even not mentioned at all, and that is the question of climate.

However, we have just had a big meeting on this issue not too long ago (21st Conference of the Parties of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, COP21, which resulted in the Paris Agreement). However most presentations could have incorporated it in as an additional argument. For

example, when we were told that governments continue to support small farmers and agro-industrial agriculture at the same time. Why do they continue? Especially because they do not take into account the climate issue. Even in the intervention where we were told how a certain production model is harmful for both Morocco, the Netherlands and Peru. It could be said that it is harmful for the entire planet because it is a strong emitter of greenhouse gases. I think in all areas it's an argument. In my opinion, it is much more a global part of the environmental argument that includes biodiversity, soils, water, and also the climate. But it seems to me that politically also it is a criterion that must become truly central in the work with our governments.

Mario MESSORE, Common organization of Qom peoples, Pilagá, Wichí and Nivaclé (QOPIWINI), Argentina.

I work in collaboration with Qopiwini. I will speak as a former government official from the current government in Argentina. I perceived very directly, when I was a civil servant, the meaning of the laws. It is hard to see the reality, but the fact is that there is a very serious world problem. We must change completely the paradigm. And it is very difficult to argue this. We always talk, on one side and the other, about the economy. Are there good returns or not, etc.. I think we need a more general cultural change, of solidarity. I do not know if we can argue this from a logical point of view. We must continue the fight. At one point, we will have to see life from another perspective, from beyond, and that's a paradigm shift.

Hector ROBLES, executive coordinator of the website Farm subsidies in Mexico, Mexico.

I would like to come back to four points:

- First of all, in order to understand each other, we need to define what we mean by "family farming",
- Secondly, it is important to agree that it is not enough for States to have signed the declaration on family farming. In fact, at the same time, the policies they apply and the budgets proposed go against small scale agriculture. In the majority of our countries, 80% of agricultural budgets are favourable to large-scale agriculture,
- Thirdly, being today in a university building we must take advantage of it to call and summon universities so that they can come and observe family and small-scale agriculture. Because, on the whole, research carried out goes in mostly in the direction of industrial agriculture,
- Finally, the fourth point is that we cannot think of agriculture on a small scale without concern about the organization. There is no future in individualism and our approach must necessarily go through a process of organization.

Biennu KEMANDA, hydraulic water engineer and forester, Casa del Niño and Pygmy Women, Central African Republic.

I take the floor to present the situation of the Central African Republic with regard to this theme that we are discussing this morning. Central African family farming, as I speak, is almost non-existent because of the crisis in the country. It is important to emphasize here the importance of family farming for farmers. The government is currently unable to support or help farmers to produce food to satisfy people. It must be said that food insecurity is growing in the country. My second point is that in my country, there are people who produce wood and yet it is very difficult for a Central African to find timber for its construction or for any other use. Everything is exported. How can we act together to eradicate this practice? Unfortunately the interests of the government go before the interests of his people. This is just a plea I'm giving so we can think a bit about how to balance the situation between governments and the governed. Thank you.

Mariame OUATTARA TOURÉ, New Field Foundation, Burkina Faso.

My question is for Laura LORENZO who made a brilliant presentation on the evaluation of the International Year of Family Farming. Unless the cause was my lack of attention, I noted that no special mention has been made of gender mainstreaming in this process. When one looks at everything that is described as characteristic of family farming, it is important to emphasize that women and men play a vital role. And the gender inequalities that can be exerted between the two can negatively influence the added value that this family farming can bring. Conversely, if we succeed in achieving equality between the two, it is certain that this added value will be further boosted. So here's my question: why is gender mainstreaming not emphasized at all? And what are the strategies or arrangements that are taken to correct the gender issue, which is no longer a question of fashion or voluntary practices but a development imperative? For me this is fundamental. Thank you.

Rija ANDRIANTIANA, president of the National Committee for the defence of Land Rights, Madagascar.

I've noticed that you have devoted your exhibitions mostly to show the relevance of family farming. Would not the time to discuss more on strategies and solutions for securing the foundations of family farming in the world?

Sidy SECK, researcher, University Gaston Berger of Saint-Louis, Senegal - Moderator.

Thank you. It is recalled, in one of the interventions that the issue of family farming resulted in a mobilization that led to the International Year of Family Farming. Also I remember that the idea of collectively building our common understanding aims

to prepare for action. I would be interested to hear your answer to this question: "How to lay the foundations of family farming in Madagascar? In Peru? In Sri Lanka?". All these responses would build a convergence and a better understanding.

Michel DAVID, farmer, Confederation Paysanne, France.

The interventions were all remarkable. I liked them a lot. In the perspective of the struggles, I would like to say that ten years ago we prevented the development of a plant for six million chickens in the department of Marne in France. They finally settled in a northern country and her owners was sentenced for animal abuse because when there was a disease and as it cost more to kill the chickens, he let them die.

My contribution is about the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), and is particularly addressed to our comrade from Peru and also to Hubert Cochet.

I would like to say that the CAP is strengthening the industrial agriculture that I call predatory. Predatory because, for us, she is predatory to other agriculture. The two cannot live together. For example, with a plant of 1000 cows Mr. "Millevaches" claimed to lower the price per ton of milk from 400 euros to 300 euros with cows fed soya that destroys the natives and their forests. He thus pretends to liquidate small dairy farmers. The CAP encourages industrial agriculture. In my county, there is a farm, with people subsidized by the CAP to the tune of 300 000 euros. They farm 1,000 ha of cereals and 100 ha of vines with two or three "human work units" as they say in agriculture, which eliminate the small farmers. One farm per day disappears in our county.

Finally, I wanted to say that the French Socialist Government, pushed by the National Federation of Farmers' Unions, (FNSEA), has abolished in the French application of the CAP aid to farms of less than ten cows. They have set this "floor" for access to aid when we, the farmers' confederation, demanded the opposite of ceilings. The FNSEA even asked that the aid should not be paid to farms with fewer than 30 cows.

I'm finished, thanks.

Emmanuel HYEST - President of the National Federation of Territorial Arrangement and Rural Establishment (FNSAFER), France.

I am a farmer in Normandy, France, and president of the FNSAFER, a structure that deals with agricultural land throughout the country.

My intervention on family farming is to say that this is not a model that is characterized by the size of the farm although we heard this a lot this morning. For me and for the FNSAFER, the family farming model is rather characterized by the fact that the farmer and his family have the power of decision on the management, capital and work organization of this farm. I think we need to help family farms grow around the world. When I say "develop" it does not necessarily mean to grow.

But it does mean accessing techniques and others issues.

These farms need income to stay in farming and can help family members in a dignified way and especially maybe make them want to become farmers too. I think this is a key point if we want family farming to continue. The children of farmers must want to come back. The new techniques must be accessible to all. Why? Because, contrary to what I saw in Mr. Cochet's presentation earlier, I find it hard to accept as a farmer that there would be an agribusiness on one side. That would be entitled to the technologies and, on the other side, there would be a hoe for the peasants.

This is frankly not the model in which, in my opinion, farmers want to meet again. The technologies are also needed by people who live in the countryside and not just people who live in the city. To support family farmers all over the world to develop, we must give them the same means, that is, funding, technology and training. I think that, compared to family farming, the main risk is the financialisation of agriculture. We must therefore secure the farmer, put in place regulatory tools, as we have in France under the FNSAFER, to allow family farmers to demonstrate their economic efficiency over the long term.

Luc BONAMOUR, International Solidarity for Development and Investment (SIDI), France.

I am a volunteer consultant, in particular with the International Solidarity for Development and Investment (SIDI) which, to put it simply, is a non-governmental venture capital organization that provides loans and equity financing. My question is twofold. On the one hand, as I am not a land specialist, I am surprised that we do not have documentation of all successful experiences with access to land at the global level. It would be essential to know what different communities are doing. It would already be a great help to move forward in this struggle, which is absolutely essential. The second thing is that I think we need to federate energies, initiatives at the local, regional, national, continental and global levels. We should be able to do what Michel said yesterday, namely to organize, for access to land, something equivalent to the 21st Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP21). This is in the same logic as what Mr. Cochet told us this morning. Thank you.

Maria HEUBUCH, dairy cattle farmer, MEP, Germany.

I am a dairy farmer in southern Germany and a member of the European Parliament. For me, it has been an interesting day.

At the beginning of this session, the moderator talked about how family farming can be seen as an old model. After the presentations made by the panellists, we saw that it was not at all an old model but rather, on the contrary, a modern agriculture because it is durable and resilient. Sustainable if we consider the

environment, the social problems, but also and especially in my opinion, which as a parliamentarian, because it is economically sustainable.

We had very good exchanges on family farming. We need that. In Parliament, it's always the same thing, if we talk about family farms, many people answer: "OK, but large farms can do the same thing!". We saw this morning that they cannot do the same thing. It is necessary for us to be able to argue in this direction. Just as it is necessary to have a holistic approach.

In politics we discuss each problem separately. We discuss all these things and try to find solutions for each problem. But that's not what we should do. We need to create a solution for these problems as part of a holistic approach. We need to show and support what connects the problems.

Today, we face the problem created by the fact that we have supported in the past a little family farming but also a lot of industrial agriculture. However, it does not work to support both models at the same time. We need to have a decisional vote on what we want in the future: what kind of agriculture is the future to be made of? Then we can say, "OK, that's the vision for the future, and now we need to move towards that, with clear guidelines."

Kamira NAÏT SID, president of the World Amazigh Congress, Association of World Mountain People (APMM), Algeria.

We talked about a lot but we did not talk about the mountain and the mountain people. So I wanted to speak out to carry the voice of the mountain dwellers. We mountain people, we live on the land and the forest. Today we start losing them. Lands and forests are threatened by climate change, threatened by mass tourism, threatened by dams built in the plains but whose water comes from our mountains, there is no water left in our mountains to irrigate our fields. They are threatened by large farms, mountain people work hard on the mountain but unfortunately goods arrive cheaper and people prefer to buy cheaper what comes from elsewhere - so many mountain people abandon the mountain. Over the years, many mountain people have no job; it is an exodus.

I am an Amazigh native from North Africa, from Kabylie. Today, most villages are empty. When an indigenous person leaves the mountain, it is not only the land that we leave it is our identity, our language, our culture. And if it continues like this - many mountains are emptying around the world - we will lose identities, cultures and human civilizations. That's what I want to draw your attention to, this link we have to this land. We love this land because it is us, our survival depends on it, our identity depends on it. Today I call you on the mountains. What can we do for mountain dwellers? What can we do for our indigenous peoples? First for their survival, but also for the survival of their cultures, their identity and simply the survival of human civilizations. Thank you.

Sidy BA, National Council of Coordination and Coordination of Rural and Network of Peasant Organizations and Producers in West Africa (ROPPA), Senegal.

I will contribute a little bit about family farms. We had the opportunity, from 20 to 22 November 2012, to organize a big forum in Dakar with ROPPA and CNCR which was devoted to the following question: How do family farms feed the world, feed Africa?

There, we had to produce a good document that unfortunately is not available here today. It has been shown that a large part of the agribusiness tools, the agro-industry installed in our countries, operate on the basis of what small farms have shown them. If I take the example of the peanut industry, that of the federation of which I am a member, the industrial units that are based in Dakar, Kaolack and Ziguincho are supplied with raw materials from what we do. So it's us, the family farms, that make them work, that make them run despite the unfair prices they offer us.

We had to conduct a study, a follow-up, with a large federation, the CNCR, covering 3,000 family farms, to see how they work. This study found that family farming is one of the main employers of labour. An agricultural workforce that is on the spot and who works at least six months out of twelve in zones under rain and ten months or eleven months out of twelve in irrigated zones. So the problems of jobs we can solve them and we have to solve them through the family farms.

Perhaps where we were hurt was with the Structural Adjustment Plans, PAS, and the financial turnaround program that disrupted the momentum we had. Because at that time, we were told: "No longer subsidize, do not accompany these small farmers any more", "They delay you and burden the State budget".

In conclusion, I say that it is the duty of our States to think about those family farms that can help them out. They should not undress themselves in promoting agribusiness, thinking that agribusiness can solve their problems. On the contrary, that's what I see in Senegal, they do not solve anything. They produce to export here in Europe. On the contrary, they create problems for those who live in Africa or they come from because there is cheap labour, cheap land and free water. And by selling at lower prices, they can even affect the lives of family farms as Michel David said.

Elhadj BA, farmer, president of the Mauritanian Association for Self Development (WADA), Mauritania.

I wanted to mention the contradiction in Mauritania. We are a desert country and also have huge potentials, the Senegal River, and we live on family farms. Now 80% of our vegetables and fruits are imported while we have farms that are there, that work. We have 70% of our milk that is imported while we have more than 16 million small ruminants, more than three million cows.

2014, the International Year of Family Farming, coincided with the year in which

our President was President of the African Union. What he did was just say he was going to give 200,000 ha to multinational firms to produce and he was going to introduce wheat into Mauritania. This is the contradiction. Instead of supporting family farms.

Imagine, there is no cold room to allow these small farms to keep these vegetables. Imagine someone, a woman, who produces vegetables that she puts on the market. If she does not sell them, she loses her production. That's why the young people left the land to live in the slums of Nouakchott, where they find unemployment, banditry.

If we do not have a conservation mode, if we do not have the means to market our products, these family farms will disappear. It was just a testimony of our living conditions in Mauritania.

Ricardo FRANÇA, Office of International Affairs and Trade Promotion, Ministry of Agrarian Development (MDA), Brazil.

Our proposal to have two ministries of agriculture was not based on a reflection on the need for two different public policies.

This proposal was made following the observation that a certain group of farmers did not benefit from any public policy. It was a kind of resistance movement. In a way, it was positive because it was an example for other countries in Latin America. We have people here from Argentina and Uruguay who can testify to that. This has helped to create institutions working with family farming.

What disturbs us when we go to certain places of the world is that people say: "it seems that the Brazilians have found a solution for the good cohabitation of these two models". In reality, the real question is: Is there not something abnormal in the global supply that forces us to be an exporter of raw material? Is not this what is at the root of problems such as land grabbing?

When you go to a country like Mozambique, which wants to learn from our lessons and do the same thing, to export soybeans, there seems to be something wrong. We tried in Brazil to organize the export of family products, even organic products, but the European laws on certifications make this impossible. If it is to protect European family farming, then we agree with that. We believe that family farming must be defended everywhere on the planet. But it is so easy to export soybeans and so difficult to export healthy and quality food. That's what we think is odd. There is no coexistence between the two models, on the contrary, there are permanent tensions. Finally, one last piece of information: we have a new program to reduce the use of pesticides in Brazil. Of the eight ministries concerned, the only one against this project was the Ministry of Agriculture, which is used to working with large landowners and farmers. This shows the extent of our fight.

Nitya RAO, School of International Development, University of East Anglia, UK.

I would like to thank the panellists, which was said was very interesting. I would just like to come back to what the lady from Burkina Faso said about gender issues. I think the interesting thing about dualism is that it involves analysing what family farming is, as you pointed out Mr Moderator. In Asia, we did an analysis for the International Year of Family Farming. We realized that in India the woman is usually the head of the family and that in China it is the elderly who are heads of family because the young people have all migrated. So when we talk about family farming, I think we need to focus specifically on what the family is, who the people we are talking about are.

This brings us to the question of work, the division of labour and the implications of change in agrarian structures on the division of labour. For example, of the implications of contract farming, or migration-related diversification, on the gender division of labour in the villages and the labour relations themselves. What we found in our research on Asia is that in contract farming women work as wage earners but at the lowest wages. Migration-related diversification in South Asia is predominantly male.

We have seen a great precariousness of work. Wages are available, but they are unsecured, particularly leading women into very risky projects and sometimes to a decline in terms of well-being and dependence on men. I particularly liked the point about conflict, because I think there are cases of conflict at different levels, including at the household level where the number of conflicts is increasing. We now have evidence, according to a World Bank report, that in sub-Saharan Africa almost 35 to 40 percent of households are headed by women or formed by members of separated couples. So there is a real problem of conflict as a result of changes in agrarian structures that go up to the household level.

I think the last point, in terms of the well-being of families, is nutrition. You mentioned the decline of biodiversity, fragility and conflict. This has implications for nutritional outcomes. In India, we have significant economic growth, but in fact our nutritional levels have decreased. This is considered by the Prime Minister as a shame.

Victor SUÁREZ, National Association of Producers' Enterprises del Campo, (ANEC), Mexico.

I am Victor Suarez from ANEC, a farmer's organization in Mexico. I think that the theme of the debate in this session should not be the question "Small-scale farming or large-scale industrial agriculture?" This debate is already outdated!

The problem is to know why we have not been able, as farmer's and social movements, to reach the agri-food policies of our countries and to get the international organizations really put in the centre the small-scale and family agriculture !

There is a double discourse of the United Nations for Agriculture and Food, FAO, international organizations and our governments. It's very convenient, everyone is talking about family farming. We saw yesterday the Director of FAO say that the solution to the problem of hunger is: "small-scale agriculture, agroecology and modern biotechnology".

Which means the green revolution, agribusiness! It's double speak! We must fight against this double discourse because we observe a decline in the peasant struggle at global level, as we saw yesterday. Especially in countries that have progressed well, such as Brazil.

There is a decline because the agri-food industry is moving faster than family farming. We in Mexico want to share with you the fact that we have stopped Monsanto with farmer's organizations and social movements. We allowed a resolution to be passed by a judge who banned the Mexican government from granting a license to market transgenic maize. Yes, we can stop the monopolies! Yes we can catch up with agribusiness!

We have embarked on an initiative to ensure that the 80% of public subsidies that are currently in the hands of the agri-food industry are directed to small-scale agriculture. We have succeeded in stimulating an alternative model to the green revolution which is not only the idyllic recovery of agriculture of the past but which recovers the values of traditional agriculture by integrating advanced scientific knowledge.

The important question is: How to drive social movements at national and international level? And this goes through a self-criticism of farmer's movements that have not been able to slow down the decline of recent years. The subject is not so much to discuss small-scale or industrial agriculture, but rather how to ensure that small-scale agriculture is really at the centre of national and multinational policies.

Michel BUISSON, Agronomist, Association for the Taxation of financial transactions and citizen action (ATTAC), France.

Three comments, two briefs and one long: We should not talk about family farming without taking into account the contradictory dynamics that exist within family farming. I do not have time here to expound, but in addition to the division by gender, there are divisions by size, by dynamics and many family farms becoming production orientated or even companies. So we have to take into account these dynamics. If everyone is talking about family farming, it is because it is a soft consensus that suits entrepreneurs.

Second point: I am in favour of merging the approach of Jan Douwe Van Der Ploeg with that of Hubert Cochet in the sense that one speaks of the traditional production systems and the other, indeed, adds in all the capitalist dynamic through a whole bunch of very interesting examples. We do not understand the evolution of agriculture today if we do not think in terms of the diversity of family

farming itself. This requires the system approach and the industrialist approach as developed by Jan Douwe Van Der Ploeg.

My longer thought: I agree as an economist with the proposal of Hubert Cochet to replace the return by the added value as the criterion of comparison. But let's not forget that performance is still useful. That's what we eat. We do not eat the added value. So be careful. We need to go further in adding value, understanding why performance matters so much to companies and the dominant forces. Increasing yields per hectare per worker increases agricultural purchases in the upstream sector and allows the sale of downstream products. This is the basis of capital accumulation upstream and downstream. So yes, let's consider the added value, but we have to understand why performance is so important for the dominant economic forces.

Elisa BOTTELLA, Professor, Department of Economics and Economic History, University of Salamanca, Spain.

When we compare family farming with large export monoculture companies, I think it's important to point out three dimensions. For small producers, there is the issue of income and employment opportunities, as we pointed out. There is also that of production and productivity. But I believe that the most important dimension for developing countries is that of food, nutritional security and food sovereignty.

This implies trying to make the connection between these concepts as do the United Nations for Agriculture and Food, FAO, since 2012. In this sense, there is a third dimension.

It is important to defend the case studies, to identify cases that can help us understand how important the contribution of small producers is. Country experiences like Cuba during "el período especial", the "special period" where, after the food crisis of 1993, the small producers had to return to the fields, recovered their farmer's tradition with the researchers and the academicians, and are set to defend an agro-ecological model that has the capacity to feed the population with crops of fruits and vegetables, cereals, urban agriculture and others.

What's happening in Central America after Hurricane Mitch? The same. It is the small producers who have to feed the population. When there is an external shock, it is the small producers who alone have this capacity thanks to less dependence on external inputs, fertilizers, machines, etc.. What is happening in countries that have a largely agro-exporting model like Costa Rica after the 2007-2008 global food crisis? Again, basic grain production programs had to be promoted, basic grain farming recovered which even had a higher productivity than many non-traditional export crops.

That's my reflection, thank you.

KARIYAWASAM HEWARUPPAGE MAPALAGAM, Ravindra Gunawardana, Center for Environmental Studies and Nature, Sri Lanka.

I would like to say that every day three farmers die in Sri Lanka because of chronic kidney disease of unknown origin (CKDu). In the last two years, almost 2,000 farmers have died. Ten years ago, there was another crisis similar to this one. In fact, international organizations have reported on this which clearly mentions the causes of these CKDu. These are pesticides and fertilizers. I would like to ask you, the organizations and individuals here, to pay attention to these kinds of diseases before the peasants lose all their kidneys. Thank you.

Jacqueline Gomez, President of the National Institute of Colonization, Specialized Meeting on Family Agriculture, REAF, the Southern Common Market, MERCOSUR, Uruguay.

I am Jacqueline Gómez from the Specialized Meeting on Family Farming of the Southern Common Market and the Colonization Institute of Uruguay. I would like to give you a vision of family farming and its importance in the region. You can find documents outside the room that explain that there are more than 7,000,000 production units in the Mercosur region that includes Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, Paraguay, Venezuela, Bolivia, Chile and Ecuador. There are more than 28 million people involved in family farming. This family farming in Mercosur produces between 20 and 40% of agricultural production in value. Beyond this, the importance of family farming is linked to the processes that our Spanish colleague spoke about: food sovereignty, food security, the construction of social networks, the construction of territories.

Where there is family farming there are schools, access to health, there is a society and the growth of citizenship. Let's say this is the approach to family production that we have at Mercosur. This has led us to create a space for public policy dialogue where we sit down together, social organizations and governments, to discuss policies that affect family farming. In this space, we began by asking ourselves how to define family production. We have defined it for the Mercosur countries. Each of us went back to his country with this definition and we set up a register of producers of family farming that allowed us to apply public policies transparently to family farming. And to tell the whole society that the subsidies that exist have been allocated to the sectors that needed it. Not everyone can claim to be a producer of family farming. This national registry allows us to say who is one and who is not, and allows society as a whole to allocate subsidies to vulnerable sectors.

This led us to create an explanatory leaflet and to work on the attribution of these subsidies, that is to say the production of differentiated and well differentiated policies. A policy for family production is not the same thing as a policy for

agribusiness. Working with agribusiness is a social injustice.

What is important is the strengthening of organizations. The fundamental axis of this construction process is related to organizations. What is important is the strengthening of the dialogue between the social organizations, which in reality are the ones that build the policies, and the governments that simply have to apply them.

Saïd KAMEL, President of the Association of World Mountain People (APMM), Morocco.

My colleague Kamira Naït Sid from Algeria raised the problem of the desertification of mountain villages. On our side, as activists of the APMM Morocco, we were aware of this problem. We try to act to avoid this and we have managed to create an association to bring to bear an alternative agriculture. With the problem of climate change, cereal production is zero. So we distributed to the population trees such as almond, cherry, apple. Then we formed associations in the development and management of projects. Then, it was necessary to look for the means to finance the project of these associations. We are starting to build cooperatives because the products are there but there is a problem with marketing them. Today, we have a project of ten cooperatives in different fields: bee-keeping, horticulture, medicinal plants, etc.. The marketing of these products is a problem, because consumption habits, especially by city dwellers, do not encourage this type of trade, I would like to ask the following question: would there be way to organize a regional or international trade to add value to these local products?.

Sidy Seck, researcher, University Gaston Berger of Saint Louis, Senegal - Moderator.

I add to your question a note that has been given me regarding the impact of the Economic Partnership Agreements between the African, Caribbean and Pacific States and the European Union ACP-EU EPA on family farms in Africa Western. It can be applied to the problems of these products.

Francis FRU NGANG, Secretary General of the African Institute for Economic and Social Development (INADES-Formation), Ivory Coast.

Many of the panellists are academics and I think that's a good thing. When we listen to the contributions of these academics, we are going in the right direction. I think dualism is not the way to go. We must start by rejecting the dualist positions. I really appreciated the economic analysis. I am an economist myself - trying to demonstrate the economic benefits of family farming compared to industrial agriculture.

The first thing I want to ask is this: do we need to make this kind of comparison? I think we are trying to compare two things that are not similar. First, family

farming is to feed people while industrial farming seeks to make a profit. From the perspective of objectives, we can not compare them. Second, the type of value created varies from family farming to industrial farming. The market can not pay for the value created by family farming. Yes, we look at entrances and exits, but what do we do with the social functions of family farming, the environmental perspective, climate change, to which family farming contributes? What value do we put on this? What do we do with its cultural aspects? Family farming is a way of life for people. In my opinion, we will never have an exact conclusion. So let's just say now that we want food systems based on family farming, that's all.

Finally, I wanted to talk about the challenges we could pose to governments and national cooperation. Challenge them as consumers. We have power when we choose, buy on the market. How do we use this vote? Are we voting for family farming or are we continuing to buy from multinationals? Do the shareholders of these multinationals eat organic food or what they produce?.

Sidy Seck, researcher, University Gaston Berger of Saint Louis, Senegal - Moderator.

True, it is necessary that family farming is defined.

Ms. Heubuch asked the question. Here, the "or" as an exclusive (in the title of the session: "family farming or large companies with employees") is problematic. In any case, I have a problem. To say "Family farming is to feed people, agribusiness or entrepreneurial agriculture is to make profit", I do not disagree. But we can not deny today that rural producers, the family farmers wants to feed himself and also wants to pay for the education of his children, also wants to travel, take vacations, equip himself....so we are beyond feeding. This leads us to reconsider things in relation to these cleavages or these classic setups and to ask or analyse them not only in terms of differentiation of situations but also in terms of dynamics of evolution - as someone said.

Yesterday, in one of the workshops, we asked the question of concentrations. This is significant for large companies, it's true. But we see that in different countries there is an extension, an expansion of family farms. You are an economist, a geographer and a sociologist. I believe that the debates must be open. I think it starts with a characterization, an analysis of the situation of these family farmers. Economists will come back on it. There are important things to develop here.

Elvis Santiago MORALES, Farmer, Campesino Committee of the Highlands, CCDA, Guatemala.

Hello from the depths of Guatemala. The point of view I want to give is that thanks to family farming, which has been made visible here, we know that there are ancestral practices that have contributed a lot. We small farmers are not in the fifth or sixth category. We are in the first category too. We are human beings. We

need to consume, produce, but also supply the local community market. This is what we do and we do it well. It gives us the identity to practice family farming, it gives us back our identity. It gives us the opportunity to show ourselves and to be able to add value to what we produce as small producers. The differences are huge. In Guatemala, we produce on small amounts of land, but we do it efficiently and we consider that we contribute a lot. Our concern is that we continue to make family farming visible. There was a time when there was a lot of fair trade. Everyone sees what fair trade is now! We need to continue building and giving ideas to differentiate who we are referring to when we talk about family farming. To make it clear that we, the producers, are the ones who feed the planet.

Laurent LEVARD, Agronomist, Left Party, France.

On this question, "Family farming or agribusiness?": I believe that we are here between people of good will who ask the question for the general interest of societies, countries, and humanity in a general way. But we must not forget that the world we are in is not this one. That is to say, there are also economic interests and therefore there is a need to fight, to fight social and political battles on these issues. The ideological and cultural battle against the choice between family farming and agribusiness, are also between ecological agriculture and industrial agriculture. This battle must be fought.

I share the fact that we need to be able to compare different agricultural models against criteria that are meaningful from the point of view of the general interest, from the point of view of the whole of society. Indeed, there is the question of value added per hectare. But there is also the issue of food production per hectare. There is the criterion of employment. The criterion of what use is made of non-renewable resources. The criterion of climate change, of the impact on climate change mentioned earlier. A lot of work has been done on this but we need a more systematic work to valorize this work, and to supplement this work by field studies, by a research program that is interested in these different criteria and which has a real means to diffuse the results of this type of evaluation at the level of each country and also at the international level. Maybe I'm going ahead with the proposals we can make tomorrow, but I think that's the kind of proposal we can make.

Compared to that, I would add one last thing about what Hubert Cochet was saying earlier. I believe that in the face of the argument that agribusiness is to feed the next nine billion people, we can no longer be absent from the debate about the amount of food production per hectare. What is sometimes difficult in the comparison between the different agricultural models is that, for these comparisons to have any meaning, they must be done under identical production conditions: same production, same type of soil, same type of access to credit, same type of access to capital. Now, very often, it is very complicated to compare family farming and agribusiness because they do not have the same conditions of production. I think

we would be quite capable of showing that, under similar production conditions, family farming is superior to agribusiness also in terms of food production per hectare.

Borja Monreal, rural development consultant, United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Spain.

Unless we dethrone the dictatorship of Gross Domestic Product, GDP, as a single measure of development of countries, we will not be able to change the policies that are all designed to ensure that this GDP grows constantly. Either we change the way we measure things, or it is impossible for politicians to promote substantial changes that value all these issues we are talking about, cultural values, values of sustainability. Unless we propose another indicator that includes all these measures, the policies that our governments are promoting will always be in the direction of increasing the GDP which has become an objective in itself, far from that of the valuation of all other issues.

I suggest that speakers consider the proposal of another indicator of genuine progress that includes other economic, social and cultural measures that could change the philosophy and the way in which people and governments do and think policies.

Mohammed ELLOUMI, Researcher, National Institute of Agricultural Research, INRAT, Tunisia.

We organized two seminars, a first in 2014 on the occasion of the International Year of Family Farming called "Family Farming in the Mediterranean, myth or reality?", And a second, last year, on agrarian dualism, "Cooperation or competition?"

The first concluded that family farming is truly a myth in our own countries. Indeed we have more and more policies to the detriment of family farming, more and more restrictions and more and more favours to agribusiness or industrial agriculture, which gives a strong and unfair to that of family agriculture. Not only in competition for access to land, but especially for access to natural resources, especially water, that is a scarce commodity in our countries, and for access to financial resources, information, research innovations, etc..

We are really in a situation where family farming is in great difficulty. Add to this also that in our countries the total absence of organizations that bear the voice of these farmers. It means that the state must change. But the state is a social construction. The state will not change if we do not change it. Elected officials are elected for programs by lobbies, and they are there to defend goals. Indeed, as long as there are no farmer's organizations, as I see in other countries where they are strong, the balance of power will not change. To go beyond that, I think there are two or three important elements:

1. Have an argument that goes beyond the quantitative and purely economic evaluation and concerns a more comprehensive evaluation.
2. Put agriculture back into a wider development model than the agricultural sector: the model that has worked in the countries of the North can no longer work in our own countries. The exiting of labour from the agricultural sector to offer labour to the industrial sector no longer works. We need another model.
3. The model on which our agriculture is built faces the problem of climate change, the problem of resource depletion. This gives us the opportunity to have an alliance with consumers and with a better understanding between consumers and producers. Because, for the moment, the policies at play clash between consumers and producers. We also need an alliance between producers. We see through the television screens of French farmers who suffer, who disappear, and family farming that suffers in all countries. I think that leads us to have alliances between different farmers. Because indeed it is through these alliances, the reinforcement of the balance of power, that we can change things. It is not just by making good speeches that farmers are properly defended.

Thank you.

Margarita HUAYHUA, sociocultural anthropologist, Rutgers University (Rutgers University, USA), Quechua Community Pampamarca, Peru.

I come from Peru, from Cuzco. I speak Quechua.

On family models and alternatives, I would like to point out that the communities of the Andean zone of South America, most of them Quechua-speaking, have a rather sustainable alternative model which has been gradually destroyed by the neoliberal governments.

I would like to ask the following question: what is the relationship between the models of the State, the models of public policies they establish, and the profits, the benefits they get when they make concessions?

What is the role of governing elites, whether conservative or liberal in the Latin American sense that is different from the European or North American sense?

I do not understand why here there is a kind of dilution of the strong component that is "ancestral" traditions, which are in fact very modern in my opinion, a dilution of what is a practicing sustainable agriculture and totally sovereign. The way in which this sovereign process has been destroyed over the years has a fairly strong connection with colonization and with the new colonizing models of today.

Elga Betty ANGULO GUTIERREZ, Campesina, Farmer ´s Confederation of Peru, CCP, Coordinator of Family Organizations producers of Mercosur, COPROFAM, Peru.

I listened attentively to all the opinions of all the speakers who were very good.

The only thing I have to emphasize is that taking care of water, climate and natural resources is everyone's responsibility. In Peru, for example, we have our mountains and our forests. Our task to all and especially to the organizations we represent in Peru is therefore reforestation, which is very important to counteract climate change, both on the coast and in the mountains and the forest. On the ground, it's difficult, but as organizations, that's what we're doing. We certainly do not have government support.

Another very important topic for the farmer's world, to improve family farming and food sovereignty, is the conservation of our seeds. In this sense, women play a very important role because we are the ones who sort seeds to continue to sow and not to lose our traditions and seeds that are so important and varied in Peru. All of this is related to environmental education.

Parviz KOOHAFKAN, World Agricultural Heritage Foundation, Iran.

I would like to highlight the need for a comparative framework, as just pointed out one of our colleagues.

In my opinion there are five major elements:

1. Health and nutrition,
2. Work and job creation,
3. Culture,
4. The environment
5. The economy.

If all these elements together under a holistic perspective, a global perspective of agriculture, the comparison will result in family farming, traditional farming or small-scale agriculture bringing them all together.

Industrial agriculture only responds to one or two criteria. You need to think about this.

Laura LORENZO, Office of International Relations Coordinator, World Rural Forum, FRM, Spain.

I would like to thank the farmers from whom we have just heard, they are the true protagonists of family farming. I think they have no doubt about who they really are as small family farmers. It is important to define family farms, especially at the national level so as to legislate. It's fundamental. For this reason we continue to offer support especially to organizations that represent them.

I would also say one thing about women. Two conclusions have emerged: women

and young people are the future of family farming and we need to focus on them. Last year, during the International Year of Family Farming, an international conference to try to hear the voice of women and connect organizations and individuals to continue collaboration was held. This is fundamental.

Jan Douwe VAN DER PLOEG, Professor, University of Wageningen, Netherlands.

It has been asked "What are the strategies to defend small farmers? ". I would say that there is a full set of strategies at three levels:

At the level of farms themselves one needs to develop multifunctionality to defend families. One needs to develop new market mechanisms, short circuits, agroecology, pluriactivity, cooperation between families. But also historical memory, collective memory, which is an important tool.

At a higher level, there is the strategy to be present at international forums such as the Committee on Food Security, CSA, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the European Parliament.

At a third level, more visible, there are blockades, strikes, demonstrations. It is important also not to take this as a joke. Strategies exist.

There are two major challenges that we must resolve:

1. How to merge more strongly with the most visible actions with what happens on the first level, at farm level.
2. How to merge these movements with urban movements? The obvious ties are food, life, defence of life. But there's still a lot to do.

Hubert COCHET, Professor, AgroParisTech, France.

Two points to try to answer the questions that were asked of me or that were suggested by the interventions of the room:

First of all, on the definition of family farming: we are not going to go back into this debate, which has occupied the whole of 2014, but all the same, I would like to make it clear. There are not, on the one hand, people who would work with a hoe and on the other people who would have access to technology. If that is the message that was included in my presentation, I regret it, because it is not the one I wanted to convey. You will have noticed that in the small video that was projected there is a tractor on both sides. But they were not the same size.

The level of capital as such, as well as the cultivated area, is not a criterion for classifying either as family farming or as entrepreneurial farming.

This too was an important conclusion of the International Year of Family Farming. In each country, historical trajectories define what is a small family farm. In France, it will have 50 hectares. In the Red River Delta, it will have 0.3 hectares. Each historical trajectory in each country defines what an entrepreneurial farm can be. I believe that neither the surface nor the level of capital are relevant criteria of

definition.

On the other hand, who works?

It is here, it seems to me, that there is a real line of fracture. Since the majority of the work, if not the totality, is done by salaried workers, we switch to an operation that is radically different, where work becomes a cost. And since the work becomes a cost in the accounting, then profitability is grown by lowering this cost and lowering the work in favor of the capital. The real line of fracture seems to me is there. Even if, obviously, between these two poles that I am describing, there is a multitude of intermediate situations in each country.

I come back to the intervention by Mr. Hyst of the FNSAFER: a billion people work with the hoe, with hand tools on our planet. They are still the ones who contribute to producing the largest amount of food on the planet. Do not forget it. This is not a view of the mind. It is the result of extraordinarily different capital access paths between each type of agriculture in each country, and between each country.

I do not want to come out of this session with the idea that on the one hand people are working without technology and others have access to technology. I think we need to clearly distinguish these two words: techniques and technologies. Someone who works with hand tools in a parcel of associated crops uses techniques as sophisticated, as complex, and I would say even more complex, than the one with three chemicals and a powerful tractor that puts in place a monoculture intended for the domestic market or for export.

The second point, on which I will finish, will be shorter. This is the link we need to make between access to resources and resource use modalities. I think this is one of the central themes we wanted to bring to this forum. Why? Because in national or international meetings that take place on these issues, in general, things are little related. On the one hand, there are experts and farmers' organizations working on the modalities of access to land, on how to secure tenure, with lawyers, anthropologists, and so on. On the other hand, we have people working on agricultural models, on the agro-ecological revolution.

These two worlds are largely ignored and one of the objectives of our forum here is to be able to make the link between access modalities, distribution of resources, and modalities of use of these resources.

Thank you.

Betty Elga GUTIÉRREZ ANGULO, Farmer, Farmer 's Confederation of Peru, CCP, Coordinator of Organizations of Mercosur Family Producers, COPROFAM, Peru.

We must be aware of the need for a common program among all organizations, based on the theme of food sovereignty and food security. Taking into account the fact that these problems are political and we need political solutions. We also need to change the focus of our organizations, not so much ideological discourses and

more in concrete work.

Forgive me, but I think that women have had less time to express ourselves here. Men have had more time to express themselves and they were not interrupted. We, we had our time reduced!

This is my protest as a woman.

Sidy SECK, researcher, University Gaston Berger of Saint Louis, Senegal, Moderator.

In order not to be more restrictive, I would say that I started with two words: myths and realities. I will try to finish with two other words: anxiety and hope.

From my point of view, it is clear that we have heard topics that can be put in the register of worry. The figures we have heard in relation to the population, the food needs, the population growth, the degradation of resources, whatever they are, I think these are objects of concern. The need for support that is essential for family farming, whose benefits and weaknesses are recognized, can be maintained and help meet the challenges, these needs are important. But at the same time, in southern countries in particular, there is an erasure of the State or a defeat of the State on other actors. These concerns raise a sizeable health risk in terms of human health, environmental concerns over resources and climate change. We can thus multiply this register of worries.

On the register of hope we can rank the conviction or shared sense of the role and importance of family farming, the need to defend it, even if - as someone said - well, that everyone recognizes its importance. Those who decide, including in international institutions, do not play the game completely. Hope also before the agreement on the indispensable need to guide or define rather strong public policies in favor of that sector. Given the agreement also on the need to look more lucidly at the stakes and contradictions between family farming in the South and family farming in the North. We do not have to be veiled, we said, there are issues and contradictions, even if we share, you share, a lot of positions in this type of forum. But for me this awareness is an important element. Lastly, the agreement on the need to regroup, to federate initiatives, to mobilize to act on political problems, on public policies. The issue is economic, it is social, but it is also political when the political actors who define things act or take actions that are translated socially as well as economically and environmentally.

Between these two bounds of anxiety and hope there is, from my point of view, a significant and important need to improve and strengthen knowledge:

1. by systematizing the knowledge we have of systems and the savings in both the types of cases that have been analysed,
2. by breaking down the myth of the economic importance of agro-business through what has been said so that people understand it,
3. by documenting experiences, life stories, or success stories but also constraints,

4. conducting complementary research that increases our knowledge and understanding of tools that can become important tool to alleviate concerns and turn our hopes into reality.

WORKSHOP 6: Production, employment creation and incorporation of young people, share the wealth

Review

The processes of land grabbing and concentrations are placing heavy pressure on family farming and societies as a whole. The destruction of small-scale agriculture is attributable to international and national policies that actively support the development of capitalist, wage-earning agriculture¹³.

States widely promote the industrial agricultural model by providing financial support to large farms through subsidies and tax exemptions. Control mechanisms for land markets that would preserve land for the benefit of family farming are lacking. The better endowed are at liberty to take control of immense fertile areas, through rental or sales contracts, often in a completely opaque manner¹⁴.

The unequal competition of capitalist, wage-earning farms, which are better endowed with land and means of production, and the difficulties of access to markets endanger existing family farms. Rural people have no choice but the exodus or, for a minority, wage-earning on large farms¹⁵. Generational renewal is compromised.

The requirement to have more and more capital to access land prevents many people from settling as a farmer. The access of young people and women to land is even more affected because, in many societies, the habits and customs reserve the inheritance only to men or even the only elder. On the other hand,

¹³ The South African participants recalled that these processes are not new and that in this country, as in many others, they started in the colonial period.

¹⁴ In Nicaragua, for example, concession companies in the construction and operation of the main trans-oceanic canal have been given *carte blanche* by the government to operate for 100 years and develop different types of activities.

¹⁵ For example, many South African farm operators are forced, in order to repay their loans, to go into exile to work in the large farms of neighbouring countries where they are paid only 4 euros for 13 working hours.

small-scale agriculture and family and community use of natural resources in general are becoming less valued by young people, who often prefer to look beyond the rural area. As a result of these factors, innumerable family farms are disappearing.

In France, where, unlike most countries, land rights transfers (use and ownership) are subject to regulation, more than 10,000 farms disappear each year on average. In Africa, Asia, where most of the world's farmers are found, in Latin America and Eastern Europe, tens of millions of farmers are forced to cease their activity each year (workshop 4)

The destruction of family farms poses major problems for those directly affected. It is also very serious for society as a whole. These farms produce 70 to 80% of the food consumed globally, often in conditions that respect the environment (workshop 7) and human health. This agricultural model is able to ensure food security while meeting the demand for diversified and quality food products. Their disappearance compromises security and food sovereignty. It also aggravates the global economic and social crisis.

In the family farm, the wealth generated mainly pays the workers. On the other hand, capitalist farms, with employees, pay the largest share to their shareholders. For example, in large farms in South Africa, 80% of the wealth created is used to remunerate capital, compared to 9% for workers. They thus greatly reduce the sharing of the benefits of production.

Depending on the country and the type of agriculture that is developed, family farming systems can provide more than 20 times more jobs per hectare than capitalist farms. In Andalusia (Spain), where land concentration is particularly high - 2% of landowners own 50% of arable land - unemployment is 40% to 60% among young people. This region, like many others, bears witness to the de-vitalization of the territories brought about by the concentration of land by salary paying capitalist farms.

How could these territories remain dynamic without the maintenance of small farms? Family farms disappearance provokes massive migratory flows and the impoverishment of cities (workshop 4). Unable to deny the damaging impacts of the capitalist agricultural model, States have sometimes adopted policies to correct them. But it is important to note their inefficiency, some of them even dangerous for small family farmers. Measures to restore access to land often leave young people with less capital and no access to credit unable to settle. Credit access programs (for women in particular) oblige their beneficiaries to compensate (purchase of GMO seeds, pesticides, etc..) which reduce their decision-making autonomy, prevent them from implementing agro-ecological agriculture and increase their vulnerability to climatic hazards.

In some cases, individual grants allow the survival of family farmers but not the development of their means of production to cultivate and produce sustainably.

The general precariousness of the rural population also largely concerns agricultural workers whose working conditions are very often extremely difficult. The disappearance of family farming and other family / community uses of natural resources is a threat to humanity. The generalization of the capitalist-to-wage farm model reduces the number of agricultural workers and the sharing of benefits. The family farm has the best assets to produce a sufficient quantity of food and generate jobs and activities that guarantee a dignified and happy life for rural majorities. It is urgent to adopt and truly implement public policies that favour family use of natural resources. These policies must lead to the revalorization of these activities and lifestyles, and ensure their transmission to young people, from generation to generation.

Proposals

Political measures

Facilitate access to land

- Strengthen existing programs and / or initiatives to support the settlement of young farmers and women in both northern and southern countries (as in Portugal, creating land banks in this country, young people also benefit from privileged access to subsidies and are exempt from taxes for the first 3 years after their installation).
- Regulate land to avoid land grabbing / concentration and encourage generational renewal, especially access to land for young people (the initial vocation of Land Development and Rural Settlement Societies, SAFER, in France was mentioned) and women.

Make agricultural facilities viable.

- Ensure remunerative prices through trade regulation policies (see Workshop 8).
- Improve access to local and regional markets.
- Prioritize grants to support farmers and other family and community users of natural resources implementing environmentally friendly practices.
- Develop and generalize agro-ecological practices through farmer-to-farmer exchanges and other trainings.
- To help stem rural-urban migration, policies must make it easier for rural (and especially farmer's) populations to access health, education, infrastructure and social security.

Strengthen urban-rural relations (consumers-producers)

- Involve women and youth in decision-making processes related to access to land and natural resources, food production and access of urban citizens to this food.
- Design and implement, in a democratic way, integrated food and agricultural policies, to relocate the urban food supply and encourage the installation of farmers in peri-urban areas.
- Develop the links between rural and urban areas, with the anchoring of food habits to territories and local knowledge / know-how through innovations allowing for new supply chains and routes to market.

Citizen actions

The revitalization of urban-rural relations and policies favoring small-scale agriculture and other family / community uses of natural resources will be achieved only through concrete citizen actions and strong movements. The participants discussed different forms of action to obtain political changes, such as strikes in South Africa, recent marches in India, West Africa and Brazil, or the occupation of land as in Andalusia.

Experiences of concrete reorganization, by the citizens themselves, of the food supply of communities (schools, administrations, etc..), have shown that change also commits itself directly to action. The generalization of sustainable farming and food systems based on family and community use of natural resources, however, calls for much stronger alliances among all these initiatives.

Interventions

The following list is not exhaustive. We apologize to the participants in the workshop whose name do not appear, and we invite you to send us your data, to the following address, so we can edit a new version of this synthesis with the full list: secretariat@landaccessforum.org

Introductory speeches:

BORQUEZ, Rita, PROCASUR, Chile.

COCHET, Hubert, Professor, AgroParisTech, France.

DAO, The Anh, Vietnam Academy of Sciences, Vietnam.

DARROUY, Guillaume, Young Farmers, France.

FORTUIN, Bettie, Women on Farms Project, South Africa.

GONZÁLEZ, Paul, Andalusian Union of Workers (SAT), Spain.

JAHEL, Camille, Association for Improving governance of Earth, Water and Natural Resources (AGTER), France.

OBREGON, Saul, River Foundation, Nicaragua.

ROBLES, Hector, Observatory of Rural Mexico Grants.

VIDAL Y GONZÁLEZ, Mireia, Coordinator of Organizations of Farmers and Ranchers - Autonomous Region of Valencia (COAG-CV), Spain.

Intervention of participants:

ANDREWS, Nancy, Researcher, France, United States.

CISSE, El Hadji Thierno, National Council for Coordination and Cooperation of Peasants (CNCR), Senegal.

FAYE, Iba Mar, Head of the Mission Family Farming and Property, GRET, Senegal.

GBANFREIN, Paul, Project for the Protection of Property Rights in urban areas, Center for Research and Action for Peace (CERAP), Ivory Coast.

LERAS, Gérard, a former dairy farmer, former Vice President of the Rhône Alpes in charge of land policy, AGTER, France.

JIMÉNEZ MARTÍNEZ, Florita, Red Indigenous Bribri and Cabécar (Ribcage) and Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests (AMPB), Costa Rica.

NEVES Vitor Carlos, Central Cooperatives and Solidarity Enterprises (UNISOL), Brazil.

PALEBELE, Kolyang, President of the National Council of Coordination of Rural Producers of Chad (CNCPRP), and Vice-president of the Regional Platform of Peasant Organizations of Central Africa (PROPAC), Chad.

RUSSO, Nuno, Coordinator of the National Land Bank, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Development, Portugal.

Moderator:

THE OUAAMARI, Samir, Association for the Improvement of governance of land, water and natural resources (AGTER), France.

Witness:

SARMENTO Francisco, Center for Social Studies, Portugal.

WORKSHOP 7: Environment, agroecology, soil, water, climate change

Review

The dominant agricultural model, based on an abusive and destructive use of natural resources, leads us into a sanitary, social, ecological, climatic, economic and cultural impasse.

In the North, as in the South, a regulatory arsenal limits the rights of farmers to exchange and reproduce their seeds. The privatization of seeds, the first link in the food chain, and their growing control by multinational companies seeking to increase their monopoly by imposing hybrid seeds and GMOs is a threat to sovereignty and global food security.

The water crisis is global despite its abundance. Its poor governance, that is to say its grabbing by some farms at the expense of others, largely spreads the water stress of crops. Intensive irrigation agriculture is wasting and contaminating water resources and threatening the sustainability of aquatic ecosystems.

The first challenge facing world agricultural production is that of feeding humanity in quantity but also in sufficient quality. The belief that agro-ecology is not productive enough to meet the planet's food needs is wrong. The productive possibilities of agro-ecology are proven in particular by studies of the potential of organic agriculture. The agro-ecological mode of production allows yields in weight equivalent to those of the non-ecological agriculture, in the short and medium term. In the long term, it is even more efficient because of its lower use of fossil fuels and non-renewable resources. The nutritional quality of foods derived from agro-ecology is much higher than that of foods from conventional agriculture.

Faced with the current ecological crisis, twenty-first century agriculture must also produce in a sustainable way. It must limit its emissions of greenhouse gases and other environmental damage while adapting to climate change.

The aim is to promote agro-ecologically intensive agriculture, that is to say intensively using renewable resources such as solar energy, atmospheric CO₂, soil (and what it contains, living organisms and materials organic - humus). Soil fertilization through agroforestry, planting nitrogen-fixing legumes (and also a source of protein for humans and animals), incorporation of green waste and

animal waste, diversification and crop rotation to reduce pests and pathogens are all agro-ecological techniques that can intensify production and preserve the environment and resources of a given natural environment.

Agroecology relies on the diversity of the natural environment to enhance its performance and resilience, unlike large-scale capitalist agriculture, which relies on the simplification of the environment and interventions (monoculture, mono-breeding ...) to meet its internal imperative of short-term financial profitability.

Large-scale, capitalist agricultural and forestry production is becoming widespread and standardizes rural areas. It threatens biological and cultural diversity and in particular the practices that have been tested for millennia by peasants and communities to the test of the geo-ecological and climatic conditions of each soil.

Agroecology requires a larger and more complex investment in work that comes from craftsmanship. It is therefore in smaller, more numerous and diverse production units that the development potential of agroecology lies. It can, for this reason, respond to the challenge of mass unemployment that affects our societies and boost the economy, relying in particular on the valuation of products by short supply chains (AMAP, local markets, etc.). In the face of current evolution of rural development that seem to be contrary – the politics of agriculture, food, trade and research-training policies are needed to preserve, develop and generalize agroecology.

Proposals

Some of the proposals made by the participants concern both citizen actions and public policy measures (for the implementation of practices and concrete exchanges between producers and with the general public, for example). Others relate specifically to legislative / regulatory measures and public interventions. But their adoption and implementation requires significant citizen advocacy movements that it is therefore necessary, above all, to amplify. All these proposals are grouped around three objectives.

Promote the circulation of agro-ecological knowledge - invest in training

- Development of **farmers to farmers exchanges**. They must be at the heart of the development process of agroecology [*citizen actions and public policy measures*].

- Financing the development of professional training in agro-ecology. Put in place a system of support to promote access to these trainings, targeting in particular women, who provide the bulk of the work in small peasant family farms. [*citizen actions and public policy measures*]

- Rethinking of relations between peasants and agricultural technicians. Agricultural technicians must learn how to integrate farmers' perspectives into agro-ecology development projects, and learn from them in agro-ecology. *[citizen actions and public policy measures]*

- Promote the establishment of training modules in agro-ecology in agricultural education, including in agronomist schools of engineering. *[citizen actions and public policy measures]*

Guarantee fair remuneration for farmers and a better quality of life in rural areas

- The work of agro-ecological farmers must be remunerated to the level of the benefits of the general interest that it generates. In order for agro-ecology to remain attractive for the new generations, it is essential that its farmers receive a fair income enabling them to live with dignity. It can be obtained through remunerative prices (producer prices in general: see workshop 8 or even specific premiums conditional on the practice of agroecology), guarantees from commercial outlets and the fight against the unfair competition and impacts of conventional agricultural products. Negative effects on the environment and health (see next objective). *[public policy measures]*
- Invest in quality public services in rural areas to fight against poverty and rural exodus. *[public policy measures]*

Support and encourage the consumption of organic, local and seasonal products

- Promote short marketing channels through various support, such as the introduction of farmer market support, AMAP¹⁶, or direct selling agricultural products. *[public policy measures]*

- Incorporate the cost of externalities of industrial agricultural production into final prices (costs of environmental and health damage not borne by producers and industrial intermediaries). Including the environmental cost in the price of food would allow organic foods, for example, to no longer suffer unfair competition from industrial foods. A public debate informed by scientific knowledge must determine whether the internalisation of the damage is acceptable or whether regulatory measures must be taken to ban certain practices. *[public policy measures]*

- Sensitize the general public on agricultural and food issues by highlighting their links with cross-cutting themes such as health, well-being, job creation,

¹⁶ Association for the Maintenance of Farming Agriculture, a form of organization developed in France and many other countries under other names, which associate small producers and end consumers.

social link or climate resilience. [citizen actions and public policy measures]

- Prohibit GMO's and fight the privatization of seeds, the common good of humanity. Protect the rights of peasants to produce, breed and trade their own seeds. [legislative and public policy measures]; Multiply and promote peasant seed exchange initiatives. [*citizen actions and public policy measures*]

- Put in place public and community management of water and aquatic ecosystems, key elements to guarantee food sovereignty. [public policy measures]

- Immediately remove from the market the most polluting and destructive chemical inputs, such as neonicotinoids and "bee killer" pesticides. [*public policy measures*]

- Recognize and develop Participatory Guarantee Systems (GSP) in organic farming. GSPs are certification systems in which groups of producers, sometimes in association with consumers, carry out their certification by verifying the application of the standards of the specifications of organic farming through cross-referencing farms. The GSPs make it possible to reduce control and certification costs, strengthen alliances between producers, involve and educate consumers, boost rural areas and boost confidence in organic farming. [*citizen actions and public policy measures*]

Finally, for many peoples, agriculture meets the goal of food production but is also inseparable from their spiritual relationship to the land. This spiritual dimension must be fully considered in any debate on the choice of agricultural models.

Interventions

The following list is not exhaustive. We apologize to those involved at the time of the workshop and participants who do not find your name here, and we invite you to contact the following address, to allow us to edit a new version of this synthesis with the full list: secretariat@landaccessforum.org

Introductory statements:

Dufumier, Marc, Emeritus Professor, AgroParisTech, France.

Arrojo Pedro, University of Zaragoza, New Water Culture Foundation, Member of Parliament (WE), Spain.

UGAS, Roberto, International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM), Peru.

MORENO, José Luis, Spanish Society of Organic Agriculture (SEAE), Spain.

Koohafkan, Parviz, President of the World Agricultural Heritage Foundation, Iran.

Interventions of participants:

BA, Sidy, National Council for Rural Consultation and Cooperation (CNCR), Senegal.

BA, Elhadj Mamadou, Mauritanian Association for the Self (WADA), Mauritania.

CLEMENTE ABAD, Juan, Coordinator of Organizations of Farmers and Ranchers - Valencia (COAG-CV), Spain.

CRUZ, Artemio, Chapingo Autonomous University, Mexico.

DEL POZO FERNANDEZ, Rodrigo, Solidarity and Autogestión Internationalist (SAIN), Spain.

FAYE, El Hadji, Environment and Development Third World Natural protection of cultures (PRONAT ENDA), Senegal.

IMOBIN JINNAH, Shah, Community Development Association (CDA), Bangladesh.

KARIYAWASAM Majuwana Gamage, Thilak, Sri Lanka Nature Group, Sri Lanka.

KEMANDA, Bienvenu, House Pygmy children and women, Central African Republic.

MONREAL GAINZA, Borja, United Nations Organization for Food and Agriculture (FAO), Spain.

MORA, Francisco, Polytechnic University of Valencia, Spain.

NDIYE Ndeye Tabara, New Field Foundation, Senegal.

NÉSPOLO, Nelsa Inés, Central Cooperative and solidary Empreendimentos (UNISOL), Brazil.

NEVES Vitor Carlos Empreendimentos Central Cooperative and solidary (UNISOL), Brazil.

RAVIDRA Gunawardana, Mapalagam Hewaruppage Kariyawasam, Center for the Study of the Environment and Nature, Sri Lanka.

SEGBENOU, René, Coalition for the Protection of African Genetic Heritage (COPAGEN et JINUKUN), Benin.

SOMBOLINGGI, Rukka, Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara - Alliance of Indigenous Peoples of the Archipelago (AMAN), Indonesia.

SORENSEN, Neil, Land Portal, France.

SOUSA DE ALMEIDA, Simone, National Confederation of Agricultural Workers (CONTAG), Brazil.

THOMSON, Frances, University of Sussex, UK.

TOURÉ OUATTARA, mariame, New Field Foundation, Burkina Faso.

VETTRIANO, Jean, Secours Catholique Caritas, France.

Modetador:

LOYAT, Jacques, Agronomist, Association for the Taxation of financial transactions and citizen action (ATTAC), France.

Witness:

CABALLERO, Edurne, Center for Rural Studies and International Agriculture (CERAI), Spain.

WORKSHOP 8: International trade, autonomy, food sovereignty at different geographical scales and food systems

Review

The international market for agricultural products - the one in which products are exchanged between countries - only accounts for 15% of world production and consumption of agricultural products.

Commodity prices in this market are very low because the farms that supply it are highly mechanized and able to produce at very low cost. Under the effect of trade liberalization, this market competes with all food producers including those whose products are consumed locally.

Farmers who supply most of the world's food are forced to lower their prices and reduce their income to the lowest. The liberalization of trade in agricultural products is generating mass poverty. 500 million family farms, or 3 billion people, foremost among them the farms of the so-called "developing" countries of Africa, Latin America and Asia, are put in competition with a minority of companies and gradually ruined and forced to rural exodus.

The liberalization of trade in agricultural products is contradictory to the goal of resolving hunger in the world which mainly affects rural people whose income is insufficient to produce or buy their food. It is contradictory to the need to maintain and create more jobs, which only family farming can do at present in so-called "developing countries". It keeps and sinks the world into an economic crisis.

According to some estimates, locking rural people into poverty through trade liberalization deprives the market for goods and services of \$ 3 trillion to \$ 4 trillion a year. Destroying family farming and the potential of a diversified local food supply, trade liberalization causes food systems to change until some countries become dependent on an external supply for their food.

By promoting the development of a highly mechanized agriculture that practices monoculture of standard varieties which resorts to massive inputs,

this undermines family farming. The liberalization of trade leads to the waste of natural resources and the destruction of cultivated biodiversity, and prevents the development of agro-ecological agriculture.

Free trade agreements also have a negative effect on health, linked in many communities to the use of local varieties. Free trade trade agreements restrict agricultural and food policy choices, as they impose deregulation of the prices of imported products. They prevent countries from keeping prices on their domestic market at a level that prevents the ruin of agricultural producers.

Even in Europe and the United States, citizens are forced to organize to resist the destruction of the fabric of local productions and supply (associations or municipal policies for direct supply with local producers).

Europe is offsetting the income declines experienced by its farmers as a result of international competition by providing subsidies. The distribution of these favours large farms.

The transatlantic treaty being negotiated between North America and Europe aims to deepen the liberalization of trade in agricultural products between these regions. It is a threat to family farming, as are the other trade agreements being negotiated between other regions, notably the European Union - Africa Caribbean Pacific (ACP-EU) Economic Partnership Agreement, the effects of which concern an ever increasing number of people.

The Climate Smart Agriculture and New Alliance for Food Security initiatives in Africa are contributing to the development of large agricultural and agro-industrial enterprises at the expense of family farming.

Trade liberalization generates a great deal of violence as a result of conflicts for access to land, which is brought about by the grabbing of natural resources by capitalist salaried farms that benefit from the liberalized trading system.

The adoption of "intellectual property" agreements, which mean the appropriation of biodiversity cultivated by large seed companies, often goes hand in hand with trade liberalization. They violate farmers' freedom to select and reuse their own seeds. Some agreements even expose them to sanctions on the basis of a mere "presumption" of intellectual property infringement.

Who is behind this self-destructive general policy orientation? In particular, it is large transnational agribusiness companies that influence political choices far more than citizens do, which are largely excluded from the decision-making process.

Conclusion

In the past, agricultural policies in favour of family farming have been implemented in all so-called "developed countries", and in most so-called "emerging countries". It is to a large extent thanks to these policies that they

have been able to reach this ranking. The absence or weakness of such policies in many countries of the world for decades, and their challenge in those who adopted them, has dramatic economic, social, ecological and political effect.

To guarantee family farmers a worthwhile return for their work, it is necessary to protect them from the unequal competition that trade liberalization creates. Agriculture must no longer be subject to the liberalized trade regime and, public policies must regulate agricultural prices in order to ensure the sustainability of peasant family farms.

Proposals

Countries must regain the right to protect their family farming and food systems, without provoking dumping that is harmful to family farming in other countries. **It is necessary to put an end to the exchange regime imposed by the Agricultural Agreement and Free Trade Agreements and to replace them with other international rules, equally binding, in order to ensure food sovereignty.**

Political measures needed

- regulate the prices of agricultural products through trade policies applying to imports and exports (quotas, levies) and, if necessary, production management policies (milk quotas, etc..);
- guarantee farmers' access to land and natural resources, as well as to other means of production, notably access to loans at preferential rates;
- guarantee the supply to populations of healthy and local food products by all measures while favouring the relocation of trade. Some others here: create "equalization funds" financed by customs duties to buy food on the local market and redistribute at preferential prices for the poorest urban dwellers; encourage or partially impose the signing of supply agreements for collective restaurants (in hospitals, schools, administrations) with local producers; to promote family farming associations directly linking consumers and producers; promote "green purchasing" through the introduction of labelling to accurately inform consumers about the origin and quality of products.

Citizen action

To make this general political shift, we need a movement to demand conditions globally at an unprecedented scale:

- A broad coalition needs to be formed around a proposal for internationally co-ordinated agricultural and trade policies for family farming, and an

omnipresent strength of conviction to counterbalance agribusiness lobbies with policy makers and international institutions (including the United Nations and the European Commission). This can be achieved by creating a broad platform of all stakeholders in family farming and by setting up expert offices dedicated to promoting alternative policies.

- This movement should first prevent the conclusion of trade liberalization agreements affecting trade in services and agricultural products under negotiation (EPA, CETA, TTPIP ...). A declaration denouncing these treaties should be drafted and proposed for the signature of the largest number of organizations and citizens;

Interventions

The following list is not exhaustive. We apologize to those involved and workshop participants who do not find your name written here and we invite you directed us at the following address, so we can edit a new version of this synthesis with the full list: secretariat@landaccessforum.org

Introductory statements:

BOEHM, Terry,; Farmer, former president of the National Farmers Union (NFU), Canada.

BUISSON, Michel; Agronomist Association for the Taxation of Financial Transactions and Citizen Action (ATTAC), France.

DAVID, Michel; farmer, Confédération Paysanne, France.

HERNANDEZ, José; SlowFood Saragossa, Spain.

MAZOYER, Marcel; Emeritus Professor, Agroparistech, France.

WARTENA, Sjoerd,; Founder and former president of Terre de Liens, France.

Intervention of participants:

BAYLAC, Michel,; President of the European Association for Rural Development Association, France.

BOTTELA RODRIGUEZ, Elisa,; Lecturer in Economics of Latin America (PhD), University of Salamanca, Spain Department of Economics and Economic History, University of Salamanca, Spain.

TEN, Vera, ; Agronomist, Center for Rural Studies and International Agriculture (CERAI), Spain.

HYEST, Emmanuel: President of the National Federation of land management and rural settlement Institutions (FNSAFER), France.

J. BUENO ESCRICHE, Pedro, ; President of the Center for Rural Studies and International Agriculture (CERAI), Spain.

COSTA LUNAS, Alessandra, ; Brazil National Federation of Agricultural Workers (CONTAG), Brazil.

MARIANI, Maurizio, ; Eating Cities Project, president of the consortium Risteco, Italy.

MUNTING, Monique,; Researcher, consultant and film maker, AGTER, SCAM, Amnesty International, COTA, Belgium.

PLUVINAGE, Jean, ; Researcher, Fondation Terre de Liens, France.

SUAREZ, Victor,; National Association of Rural Commercialization Enterprises (ANEC) Mexico.

Moderador:

LEVARD, Laurent; Parti de Gauche, France.

Witness:

Raluca Batagoiu ; Rural development expert, Romania.

WORKSHOP 9: Natural resource management by the people Indigenous peoples Common goods

Review

The research and the direct testimonies of the participants leads us to note how much the situation of the indigenous/indigenous peoples¹⁷ and rural communities in general (farmer, forest, pastoral, fishermen) is dramatic all around the planet. 2.5 billion people, members of so-called indigenous / indigenous and rural peoples in general, live on land they share and use in common. Yet only one-fifth of these lands are registered as community lands by national governments. In the vast majority of cases, rural people do not have effective State protection of their community rights over the lands they have occupied for centuries. It is therefore very difficult for them to preserve these and their natural resources from land grabbing processes. The lack of securing collective land tenure leaves the field open for the state, often considering that it belongs to it, to concede these spaces to foreign or national companies.

All the testimonies reported by the representatives of communities present in this workshop attest to the endangerment of entire peoples in all corners of the planet: Afar of Ethiopia, Mapuche of Chile, Fulani of Niger, Peoples of the forests ("Pygmies") From the Democratic Republic of Congo, artisanal fishermen from Senegal, forest communities from Guatemala, Honduras, Panama, Mexico and Cambodia, Amazighs from Morocco, Qoms from Argentina, Mayas Quechis from Guatemala, Malagasy farming communities, etc..

In Niger, the government does not recognize the economic importance of pastoralism and delivers grazing land to people from the "elite" national and/or local entrepreneurs, politicians, even foreign companies at the expense of many

¹⁷ Participants have specified that the terms "native peoples", "indigenous peoples" or "autochthonous peoples" can assume different political meanings according to the countries, so care must be taken with the terms used. The word "indigenous" for example is very little used in Africa, while it is very common in Latin America.

pastoral populations (mainly Fulani) for whom the provisions of the national framework for their rights of access to land are rarely enforced.

In Ethiopia, semi-nomadic herders (Afar) are having their best grazing land grabbed for the benefit of large agro-exporting companies, to whom the Ethiopian state offer almost free access. As is often the case, land grabbing is accompanied by the grabbing of other natural resources. In the case of the Afar region, the construction of dams on the Awash River for the irrigation of sugar cane plantations and floriculture companies deprives Afars and their livestock of access to water. Without water or pasture, livestock are decimated and the impoverished Afar population is on the verge of starvation.

In Cambodia, the State grants 99-year concessions to private companies on the land of many local communities for which it does not recognize rights; in most cases, these companies develop crops for export (mainly cassava and sugar cane) that are destructive of the local environment: water and soil pollution, deforestation for the expansion of plots, etc.. Serious repression is taking place on indigenous and rural populations who are trying to oppose the grabbing of their resources. Many documented cases of harassment, imprisonment and killings were reported by participants.

Land grabbing undermines the diversity of human life forms. The existence of many peoples is inseparable from their link to their natural environment, which constitutes the substratum of their life and their culture, being the main source of their diet, their "pharmacy", and the support of mythologies based on of their original relationship to the world.

Everywhere, land grabbing and destruction eradicate cultures based on a conception of Man as part of nature, expressed by a community member as follows: "We are not the owners of nature but we are nature itself".

Numerous analyses have shown that indigenous peoples and rural communities are able to ensure the sustainable management of natural resources because of the importance they attach to them as their common goods, both economically and socially. ecological, social, symbolic, spiritual and cultural. Their contribution to preserving natural resources, common goods of humanity, must be fully recognized. This means first that they can be fully responsible for the uses of their territories, while respecting basic human rights.

Proposals

In order to ensure that indigenous and rural peoples do not disappear, it is essential that they gain a prominent place in the political decision-making processes that affect them and their territories.

Their right to exist and to decide for themselves their present and their future, in the interest of the good of humanity, must be recognized and respected at different scales (local, national and international).

To gain full political and legal recognition of their existence as communities and their collective territorial powers, participants call for building strong alliances among peoples through the establishment of national and global networks.

To strengthen the capacity of peoples to deploy their modes of organization and decision-making community and to be respected, these alliances must:

- promote exchanges between communities,
- strengthen the efforts to denounce the cases of land grabbing and the repression or criminalization of peoples struggling to defend their lives and nature, and to demand their respect and protection,
- to promote people's access to appropriate tools, techniques and training, in line with their needs, to claim and promote respect for their collective ways of working for the benefit of humanity. In particular, they must be able to seize cartographic tools to support claims for land protection, and analysis tools to strengthen the demonstration of their economic, ecological, social and cultural virtues,
- to work for a universal awareness of the dimension of "common goods of humanity" of the earth, seeds, forests and water, to fix the common rules of use and access and to valorize the local community arrangements that preserve them,
- create a global fund to support their struggles for land and territory.

These alliances must contribute to advancing law and policy frameworks:

- to obtain the ratification by governments of Convention 169 of the International Labour Organization on the rights of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples and the establishment of truly binding legal instruments for governments and enterprises to ensure its effective implementation,
- start up an independent international body that acts as a guarantor of the rights for future generations,
- obtain legal rights in law and in reality a value of the will of communities concerning their present and their future rights – in particular concerning projects for the use of the natural resources of their territory- done with the democratic representation of indigenous peoples and rural communities in supra-community decision-making bodies (local and national),

- recognize the plurality of possible forms of securing land tenure beyond exclusive private ownership.

A strong alliance for the interests of indigenous peoples and rural communities in general must make itself heard, including at the two upcoming international forum: the 22nd Conference of the Parties to the UN Convention on Climate Change (7-18 November 2016, Marrakech, Morocco) and that of the Parties to the Convention on Biodiversity (4-17 December 2016, Cancun, Mexico).

Interventions

The following list is not exhaustive. We apologize to those participants who spoke and who can not find his name on the list, we invite you to notify this lack by e-mail to the address below, so that in future we can publish a new version of this synthesis with a complete list: secretariat@landaccessforum.org

Introductory speeches:

ABARCHI, Harouna, Head of Pastoral Association for Re-invigoration of Livestock in Niger (AREN).

DIAZ, Felix, Qarash (head) of the Potae Napocna Navogoh community and representative of qopiwini common organization of Qom, Pilaga, Wichi and Nivaclé peoples, Argentina.

GONGORA, Luis, National Alliance of Forestry Organizations of Guatemala, Maya Biosphere Association of Forest Communities of Petén (ACOFOP), Guatemala.

MAMALO, Abdoul Karim, former Permanent Secretary of the Rural Code in Niger.

BENGUE, Moussa, Secretary General of the Association for the Development of Artisanal Fisheries in West Africa (ADEPA), Senegal.

OEUR, Il, Executive Director, Center for Analysis of Development Issues (ADIC), Cambodia.

SAMPHORS, Doung, deputy executive director, Star Kampuchea, Cambodia.

YAYO ABA'AMI, Sanava, livestock, ramidus Afardacarsitoh Egla, Ethiopia.

Interventions of participants:

BINYUKI NYOTA, Espérance, Coordinator of the Union for the emancipation of Native Women (UEFA), Democratic Republic of Congo.

CABALLERO, José Serapio, New Flores Cooperative Federation of Agroforestry Producers of Honduras (FEPROAH), Honduras.

CABALLERO, Santos, President of the Coordinator of Peasant Organizations of

Honduras (COCOCH), Honduras.

DOGIRAMA, Edilberto, President of the General Embera Wounaan Congress, Panama.

CORNERS, José Alcázar, a former official FAO and Professor of Studies Against Hunger, Spain.

FRU NGANG, Francis, Secretary General of the African Institute for Economic and Social Development, INADES Training, Ivory Coast.

MACZ, Maria Josefa, Deputy National Coordinator of Campesino Unity Committee of Guatemala (CUC), Guatemala.

MERLET, Michel, Director of the Association for the Improvement of Governance of Land, Water and Natural Resources (AGTER), France.

NAIT SID, Kamira, President of the World Amazigh Council, Association of World Mountain Peoples, Algeria.

PRAK, Neth, spokesman for the Association Bunong Indigenous People (BIPA), Cambodia.

SANCHEZ, Gustavo, President of the Mexican Network of Forest Campesino Organizations (Red MOCAF), Mexico.

SANCHEZ, Rubén, lawyer, Observatorio Ciudadano, Chile.

TAYLOR, Michael, Director of the International Alliance for the Earth (ILC), Botswana.

TZI, Ernesto, Association for Welfare Action (APROBA-SANK), Guatemala

YAYO BARULI, Alo, livestock, ramidus Afardacarsitoh Egla, Ethiopia.

Moderator:

RAKOTONDRAINIBE Mamy, President of Collective TANY for the defence of the Madagascan land, France.

Witness:

LAZOS Elena, Professor, National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), Mexico.

Plenary Session IV

Economic, social, cultural and ecological scope of access to land and natural resources

Presentations

Alessandra LUNAS COSTA, National Confederation of Agricultural Workers (CONTAG), Brazil - moderator.

I would like to make an agreement with you all. In view of the time left after the very dense presentation of the workshops this afternoon - which is a good thing and shows the large amount of analysis and proposals that have been discussed and debated - we must absolutely be vigilant about our speaking times. We must commit ourselves to it both on the side of the speakers, who speak from the platform and on the side of the room. So to address this theme of the economic, social, cultural and ecological significance of access to land and natural resources, I ask the panellists, who were originally allowed ten minutes, to speak for only five minutes. Thank you for your understanding.

I give the floor to Ms. Doung Samphors.

Doung Samphors, Director of Star Kampuchea, Cambodia.

I would like to thank the organizing committee for giving me this opportunity to speak during this important forum. I am from Cambodia, I am deputy director of the local non-governmental organization Star Kampuchea, which works to protect people who face conflicts over land and natural resources. We are working on forests, land and fisheries resources. Before talking about today's theme, namely the economic, social and cultural impacts, I would like to tell you a bit about the conflict around the land in Cambodia. As you may know, during the Khmer Rouge dictatorship from 1975 to 1979, land was the property of the State. People did not have the right to access the land. They worked there as

slaves. Many have not survived this hell.

After the dictatorship, Cambodia was ruled by the People's Republic of Kampuchea. The country is now governed by the Cambodian People's Party (CPP). During this period, land was given to organized people in groups called Solidarity Groups. People worked together in rice fields and growing vegetables for example. In 1989, the government began to give families land recognized by local authorities through a small piece of paper valued as a land title. In 2001, land legislation was adopted. The government have made land registrations sporadically due to limited resources. The majority of people continue to live and use their farmland or non-title residential land. In 2011, the government donated two million hectares to private companies in the form of Economic Land Concessions. These concessions are for 99 years.

People living around areas given to companies are fighting to recover their land overlapped by the perimeters of the concessions. These companies took their land. People have lost their access to natural resources and also their farmland. Yet, because of economic and demographic growth, land has become the priority need of people. At the same time, powerful people also want large plots of land to sell, grow or do other businesses. Powerful people, companies with economic land concessions, have also taken control of community lands. This situation creates violence, conflicts. This has economic impacts, people lose their daily income they earned through natural resources and the land they farmed.

In order to bring cases to court, people have to pay lawyers, pay for their trip to go to court that is far from where they live. So they lose everything, their income and their money. Moreover, they do not have access to micro-credits. Indeed, they are excluded if they do not have a land title, often requested as a guarantee by the lenders, or, for those who have one, if they are in a legal procedure that exposes them to the risk of losing it.

As for the economic, social and cultural impacts, this has led to violence and demonstrations in the cities and areas where it is happening. Roads are sometimes blocked, fires started, etc.. On the other hand, the initiation of legal proceedings runs up against corruption.

You must know, in Cambodia, the judicial system is really unfair. If you are rich, you will win the lawsuit. If you do not have money, you will lose it. Powerful people give money to the judges to win the lawsuits. In the end, the small farmers lose their money and their land.

In a case of social injustice such as this, the poor and minority groups do not win the lawsuits and lose their lands. In reality, they lose all their farmland and sometimes even their residential land because they sometimes sell the land to pay for transportation to the court.

Another social and cultural impact: people lose the lands on which their cultural activities are anchored, the places they belong to and respect. It also has an

impact on women and children since if the husband, father, loses the case and is incarcerated, they lose social respect. Children may be excluded from school for this reason and lose their access to education.

As for the economic impacts, when the forest is destroyed, illegal hunting increases and the inhabitants find fewer animals. Many forests have been destroyed, there are not many animals left.

Due to environmental degradation, climate change, floods and droughts that occur in some areas, agricultural activity is affected as the irrigation system is poor. This has impacts on food, agricultural production and farmers because of income losses.

Another impact concerns fisheries resources. Many destroy the forests floodplains around Tonle Sap Lake. In particular, you surely know that in Cambodia many minorities from Vietnam - I'm sorry to say this here in front of our friend from Vietnam - destroy our fisheries resources by practicing illegal fishing, using illegal fishing tools, to fish all fish including small ones, which compromises reproduction. So we are also losing our fisheries resources. In the face of all this, what is our intervention as an organization of civil society? We are advocating to ask the government again and again to reduce and stop economic land concessions. The result? The government has reduced the term of 99-year concessions to 50 years and some concession companies have had their contracts cancelled.

The process of "Systematic Land Registration" has been initiated in some areas. I would like to suggest to the development partners, and to you who are here, to support us in protecting the activists of the land. Because, did I not say, that some land activists are incarcerated.

Another demand concerns action against land grabbing and securing rights to land: land registration needs to be speeded up.

As I mentioned during a workshop, we would like land registration to be completed as soon as possible. We would like to have a mobilization to reduce the duration of economic land concessions not to 50 years but less, or even better, stop them.

We are mobilizing for social land concessions. We want the government to give them to the poor and the landless. Earth is life, and without land they cannot live.

In addition, we would like to work with the relevant authorities or ministries to develop ecotourism so that communities have income.

Our last demand is improving access to information, including land rights and what good governance means for a government.

Francesc LA-ROCA Cervigon, Professor, University of Valencia, New Water Culture Foundation (Fundació Nova Cultura de l'Aigua), Spain.

I represent the Fundació Nova Cultura de l'Aigua. I will tell you about the current situation of the debate on the water policy of the Spanish State. Spain is a very diverse country in terms of climates and rainfall. There are places where there are more than 2,000 millimetres of precipitation per year and others less than 200 millimetres. Which of course determines very different agricultural models.

We also have very different land tenure structures. I will tell you about the water in the Iberian Peninsula, starting from the failure of the model, which was created during the twentieth century around the interests of the hydroelectric and irrigation companies and engineers of the "Bridges and Roads" section that forms part of the Hydrographic Trade Union Confederation and who are the main protagonists of water management and planning.

The proposal that emerged at the end of the twentieth century was to set up "the interconnection of basins", based on the observation that water is poorly distributed in the areas and that this poor distribution must be corrected. A series of hydraulic works, storage and distribution of water were then put in place. This policy has placed us first in Europe and fourth in the world with the highest number of dams per million inhabitants.

The irrigated areas, although having exceeded all the limits, continue to grow. The legacy of this policy is also environmental deterioration. In many regions, the quantity of good quality surface water has decreased. And in general, the state of polluted water has worsened. To this is associated an over-assignment. The volume of water rights recognized in some basins exceeds the available stock. In addition, there is an unfair distribution of costs. Urban people finance with their taxes the agricultural sector that makes the greatest use of it.

There is also a democratic deficit in this management. This is managed, as I said at the beginning, by this water community, which excludes all other types of visions and interests. And as a consequence, there is an increase in water conflicts between the different types of urban and agricultural users, especially because of the pollution of agricultural origin which must be treated for urban use and which ends up being irretrievable. because of the excessive costs.

Conflicts also occur between donor and recipient basins over the amount of redistributed water. Other conflicts are related to the number of displaced and expropriated because of hydraulic works, which is also important.

What can be said for the present century? Basically, these problems associated with the model of the twentieth century persist. But in addition, we must now solve them in a more difficult global context hit by climate change. This assumes more frequent and permanent droughts.

What are the proposals for change? On the one hand, there are the social movements that have been created in response to the conflicts I just mentioned. On the other hand, there is a change in the European water policy that changes

perspectives to aim for sustainable management objectives.

We are facing the active resistance of the old policy that defends the status quo of the current distribution of water. Only the administration sees a rhetorical adaptation to the European Directive regulating the management of water. What is more worrying is that we are moving towards privatization policies and the commodification of water rights.

That is to say, we will witness the transition from the current regime of concessions to a marketable securities regime on a future water market.

Armando BARTRA, Instituto Maya, Mexico.

I am going to read a passage from the conclusions reached by some 100 representatives of organizations, civil society and researchers at a meeting held just over two years ago in La Paz, Bolivia, during of the World Forum of Alternatives on the theme of access to land and the role of family farming:

"Latin America, the Caribbean and the world face a huge challenge, a crisis that includes two fundamental dimensions: the dramatic environmental deterioration and the deep food crisis. We are at a crossroads for our civilization, a two-way crossroads. On the one hand, the land grabbing, the concentration of the lands of the family farms, native peoples and Afro-descendants, a concentration comparable to that which took place during the colonization and which imposes today the new latifundiums, toxic mining activity, large dams that destroy basins, extractive farming, rent and speculation. This way deepens the crisis.

The other way is to strengthen the peasant and indigenous world and the agriculture practised by its men and women, community agriculture and family and cooperative farming. This is the way that stops the environmental and food crisis by sustainable methods, diversified, and respectful of nature.

This alternative is civilized and proposes global and strategic definitions. It is the alternative between agribusiness and the agriculture that is inspired by native indigenous, Afro-descendant and peasant communities.

The choice we make coincides with a lot of voices, especially now with that of the UN Special Rapporteur on Agriculture and Food. The path that is proposed is strategic but its adoption also requires immediate action, laws, policies, programs and specific initiatives that lead to food sovereignty, the defence of nature and the restoration of social conviviality. This requires respect for the socio-cultural diversity of peoples and the recognition of their territorial rights, but also the intensification of national democratic processes.

Small and medium-sized agriculture, family farming, will not be able to strengthen and feed a growing world population if we continue to take land and water from peasant, indigenous and Afro-descendant communities. A looting that has intensified in recent years and has become a vertiginous race to divide the world. It is urgently necessary to stop and reverse this process by restoring

the lands and territories that have been stolen, including in this act of justice women whose general and agrarian rights have historically been ignored by the ancestral patriarchy still in force.

Restitution is indispensable from the perspective of hunger: we can not expect a decisive contribution of the peasants to food sovereignty if they do not have enough land. Restitution must also be done mainly because it is an historical and ancestral right of peoples. Defending and strengthening the good farming practices of rural women and men involves changing the current types of tenure of the land and recognizing the political systems of indigenous peoples.

But we cannot stop there, because in an unfavourable economic context and without resources to cultivate and live worthily, farmers abandon their plots. It is therefore necessary for governments to get involved in agricultural policies not thought of as agribusiness as yet, but in line with farmers' needs, uses and farming practices. The peasants feed us but at the same time they preserve the life of the planet. And in this area they also have the right to support, to understand the co-responsibility of the urban population, and to the recognition and reward of their contributions by the State.

Mother Nature, Pachamama, is priceless. To restore the health that has been taken involves costs to society and we must recognize it. Without the participation of all in decisions, that is to say without democracy, the road is closed. The rural world, the American rural world in particular, needs democracy urgently. On this point again the natives and peasants of Afro-descendants teach us that there is no only one way to practice democracy. They practice a democracy from the bottom up, a participative and consensual democracy, community, which is the only one that legitimizes the local, provincial and national governments.

We are at a civilization crossroads that neither the peoples nor the Latin American governments can circumvent. The racist, colonial and patriarchal model that exploits nature, exploits workers, subjugates the colonized, oppresses women and excludes young people by robbing them of their future, must be abandoned.

We, the participants in the debate on global alternatives in La Paz believe that the most promising path is that taught us by natives, peasants and Afro-descendants. Listen to their voices. "

Like here, in this event, we listen to them.

Marc Dufumier, Professor Emeritus, Agroparistech, France.

Do you allow me a personal opinion after these two days together?

The goal, I believe we share: to feed all humanity properly and sustainably. Correctly, that is to say, without pesticides on fruits and vegetables, without hormones in milk, without antibiotics in meat, without these endocrine disruptors and others. Sustainably, this means without major greenhouse effects.

An agriculture that will have to adapt to global warming, so with more resilient

production systems. Sustainably also means not to jeopardize soil fertility and even the fertility of environments for future generations. This means ensuring decent incomes for farmers. This has been said in the working groups. It's not just about producing to eat. Farmers deserve decent incomes, incomes that are decent enough so that peasants are not forced to migrate prematurely to rural slums while there are no jobs, and for some to have to start an illegal emigration under the conditions we know.

I think that's the goal. Then the question is asked: What form of agriculture would be best able to meet all these goals at once?

My opinion is that it would be family farming qualified as medium size. In any case, surely not the agriculture done by people using a hoe, no! I think family farming deserves better. To generate sufficient income, this family farming must have means, sufficient income to eat well, feed the family, meet its needs, save, invest, progress, in sustainable production systems.

Agriculture, which fails to replicate the fertility of its soils, is eroding it. It is an agriculture that is not in the general interest. I wish I did not see this any more in the world. It cannot be either capitalist agriculture with employees - that of people who do not invest time in their work, who are absentee, who invest only capital, where even the manager is salaried. They are investing capital, wondering if they will earn as much as a Miami Beach real estate businesses or in casinos. This agriculture, as we know, maximizes an internal rate of return. As a rule, this means reducing labour costs, not paying wages at their fair price, or, even more, replacing workers with machines, putting people out of work, amortizing equipment, on a single culture, monoculture. This is not in keeping with the general interest and is one we will have to break.

What is needed is medium-sized family farming. That of people who work for their own account, who have the ability to invest capital but who, when they make their capital investment, wonder what to invest this capital in to better live with their work. For me this is family farming. The one where one can sometimes make full use of the family work force, that is to say, staggering the time of work, avoiding the peaks of work and avoids timeouts. This means diversifying cultures, diversifying activities. It is agriculture that combine agricultures and livestock farming.

We discover that this agriculture, as a rule, is that which is inspired by agroecology, which makes the most intensive use of renewable natural resources that cost nothing, that makes the most on saving on fossil fuels and, at the most, avoids agri-toxins.

Be careful, do not forget, family farming can also be an industrial agriculture. In the competition between farmers, we know that there are people who start to specialize their productions excessively. We need to promote agro-ecology based family farming that combines farming and livestock farming, which diversifies

its activities, that manages not to kill predatory insects, to kill pathogenic fungi, but to make it possible to produce without products with "-cides" that you know well and that poison us. An agriculture that will manage to live with predatory insects, which will come to live with pathogenic fungi. That which will manage to neutralize their pest effects. It will be an agriculture of extreme biodiversity. An artisanal agriculture. The opposite of an industrial agriculture. It will be learned and brilliant. It will use mycorrhizal fungi to flush out mineral elements stuck in clay sheets. It will use bees to fertilize apples, pears, fruit trees. In short, a wise, artisanal agriculture, intensive in jobs.

Is it serious to promote intensive agriculture jobs in countries where there unemployment and where people prematurely move to shanty towns? Of course not!

The issue of employment, that of the peasant's right to live with dignity on their land and in their country, and to feed their own people by themselves is one of the issues in question. The problem is that if it is more demanding than in the workplace, it must be properly paid. It should not be such that because they make good products, only the better-off sectors of society can pay the price that allows farmers to be properly remunerated. I do not agree with the vision that organic farming should be for affluent people and endocrine disruptors are for the rest.

It is the whole of world agriculture that will have to make a real revolution, which will have to operate the equitable sharing of resources. Equitable sharing of resources is indeed agrarian reform in the vast majority of countries.

Finally, I wanted to say that the solution can not be a dual farming. If we want quality products to be sold at a reasonable price, it should not be forbidden to pay farmers for their environmental support. I am not talking about compensation. On the eve of the 22nd Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Agreement on Climate Change, COP22, I would suggest that we put agri-based agriculture on the agenda of solutions. If a green fund is released at COP22, it will largely be used to remunerate precisely those family-size farms that would be able to provide services of general interest and thus allow them to sell their good products at a price accessible to the wider less affluent public.

José Esquinas, Farmer, former employee of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Spain.

I worked for 30 years at FAO, but I'm a farmer first and foremost.

Being a farmers son and grandson has been for me the best University. I add to this preamble that I see the United Nations as the United Nations of governments and that what we are forming here, now, in this forum, is the United Nations of Peoples. Which is much more important!

I really hope that one day they will become a real world parliament with a place in world governance. This world parliament does not exist today and you, fortunately, you can make it! I will make a proposal and justify it. This proposal has already been made at the Rio Earth Summit of 1992: the creation of a Parliament at the United Nations that would be the institutional figure of the defender of future generations. There is an African proverb that says: "Natural resources do not belong to us, it is a loan from our children". What do we do with our resources and with this unequal and unsustainable system where we produce twice the food that humanity needs to eat and where, at the same time, 40,000 people starve every day? In this system more than 1,300 million tons of food, one third of world production, is thrown in the trash or is lost on the way! That's the situation.

Faced with this, it is not a question of producing more food, of producing it in Europe or in the United States to send it to Africa. It is about increasing local production and adapting local production to real needs. This is the very basis of family farming and the small farmer who is the great scientist and who has arrived to this day with his knowledge, with his traditional knowledge, often very superior or in any case, absolutely complementary to that which have the scientists.

What is happening between this mercantile agriculture and natural resources such as land, water, air, biodiversity, energy? Agriculture is neither more nor less than the transformation of these natural resources into food. If we lose these natural resources it's the end of the world's food, it's simple!

Land: between five and seven million hectares become non-cultivable each year; ten million hectares are deforested each year; 1,400 million hectares of farmland are used to produce food that ends up in the garbage.

Water: there is the drastic pollution that some have talked about. I can tell you that when I was little I went to any river and drank the water directly. Now you have to buy it in the bottle at the shop! A quarter of the fresh water used by humans is used to produce food that will be thrown away!

The air: I never could have imagined that the air could be appropriated too! The tragedy of the commons is not only pollution, it is that when they see a rare good, large industries appropriate it and resell it after. The air, which was thought to be impossible to appropriate, is appropriate through the famous carbon credits! Ten percent of the causes of climate change are greenhouse gases that are used

to produce these 1,300 million tonnes of food that is discarded.

The same could be said about energy and agricultural biodiversity, which has been my favourite theme for many years in FAO.

I will stop for a moment and go on in the terms of loss, underutilization and appropriation.

On the subject of loss, I can say that according to United Nations data, humans have used around 8,000 to 10,000 species throughout their agricultural and food history. Today, we only commercially grow 150 species, of which only four provide 70% of the human calorie diet: wheat, rice, maize and potato. In the twentieth century, we lost 90% of the cultivated biological diversity we had! This leads us to a scarcity that leads to appropriation through the famous intellectual property rights. They are used primarily to enrich the global seed oligopoly formed by the six major companies that manage all seeds with the help of laws that require uniformity and stability that will not be able to cope with climate change.

What is the cause of all this? What is behind it?

There is our economic and political system in which future generations who own these natural resources do not vote. The ability to provide for all is limited for the present generation and all those who come after. The demand that meets the current offer is that of a single generation! It's very clear, the market is very useful for a lot of things, but not to give a price equivalent to value in the case of natural resources that also belong to future generations. It is useless! We must reform all that. Our current system of democracy can not take into account the interests of future generations since they do not vote.

One solution is to "internalize" the "externalities", that is to say to integrate the costs of conservation in the price that the consumer will pay. In other words, if I buy oranges I must not only pay for the costs of production but also for the cost of conserving natural resources: land, water, air, biodiversity, so that my grandchildren can continue to eat them.

I want to make another proposal here that I hope will become important. It is certain that future generations will not vote, that their interests are not taken into account. The solution, therefore, is to establish an institutionalized legal person to take part in national parliaments as well as in the United Nations. In other words, this entity, this defender of future generations, when a new law is going to be adopted, a new norm, will have to ask the following question: how will this affect future generations? Thus we will hope to bring to light impacts. Lawmakers will then decide whether they agree or not to the standards discussed, but they will not be able to ignore the impact it will have on future generations, which is suicidal for our children from whom we are actually stealing the future.

Cándido Mezua, Secretary responsible for International Affairs, Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests, AMPB, Panama.

I will say here that we do not really share what you just said. For us indigenous peoples, our resources are ours. The territory is ours, we the indigenous peoples. Water is part of our life, the forest is part of our life, the animals are part of our resources and our brothers. We do not see them as separate. It's our identity. Our way of living with the forest, the forests of Latin America, the tropical rain forests, have proved their worth. Our own indigenous, global policies have shown that our lifestyles help maintain the balance of the planet as they have kept it for the past millennia!

Do you imagine if indigenous peoples had another way of seeing life? Another way to coexist? If they had another way of seeing production? The planet would not exist any more! Perhaps you remember that recently, Pope Francis said: "Excuse me, my brothers, sorry."

It's a way to reconcile. He does it not only to Christians but to all peoples. It is a way of recognizing the atrocities that have been committed, the land grabbing, the theft of resources. Even today we are victims of different forms of grabbing, of forms of appropriation of our resources. Indigenous peoples, we struggle to survive and maintain our own way of life.

What does this imply? A change of policies! Pope Francis calls on States to change their policies towards indigenous peoples who have shown how to maintain the balance of the planet. This we learn in the forest which is our University, with our grandparents. Perhaps we do not have the rhetoric of having read great books, but we have the knowledge of our ancestors. It's here. I heard our brothers in Africa say that we do not take fisheries into account if we only talk about "territory".

If we see it from the indigenous point of view we do not separate life, water and territory, we do not separate the forest from communities, people, and water. It's part of our life as a whole! But here you want to separate water, resources ... No! There are important elements that Universities have brought yes, but there is also indigenous, traditional, cultural knowledge, which has given rise to demonstrations that have been supported by scientific knowledge.

I would like to make a call here to respect identities, to the recognition of the lifestyles of indigenous peoples, indigenous communities, forest communities. A way of life in which everyone has a role. We speak for our future generations. An authority that does not speak in representation of its future generations, who sees only with avarice what it has today, will not exist tomorrow. We must speak for our future generations. Today we have this responsibility. If we do not do it, then who will? If we do not do it today, now, when? When will we assume this responsibility?

It is good that we are all united today. Many things have happened, but we must not live in the past. You have to face things. When we say "Let's go to Marrakech"

(at the 22nd Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Agreement on Climate Change, COP22, ndr) as a solid proposal, we raise the issue of territorial rights that must be guaranteed for all indigenous peoples, for all forest communities, for all those who have the courage to say: "We have arrived so far. It is necessary to maintain the life and the climate of the planet, it is necessary to maintain the life of our generations".

The recognition of the consultations we, the indigenous peoples, are making and the application of free and informed prior consent, should not be just programs for indigenous peoples but for all societies. The criminalization of indigenous leaders must stop! We who protect forests. However nothing is done, there are no policies for that, on the contrary!

"Clean development" is threatening and criminalizing indigenous peoples. "Green development" also criminalises indigenous peoples.

Hydro companies, what are they doing? From "clean development" they are grabbing land! And the famous Nicaragua canal? Land grab, Hydroelectric projects, mono cultures ...all are forms of land grabbing.

To conclude I would just like to say that we indigenous peoples are part of this planet and we carry our load, and we will continue to carry. That is why we are here sharing with you, with those who are not natives but who have that feeling, this heart to encourage the life of Mother Earth.

Elhadji FAYE, Framework for Action and Reflection on the land in Senegal (CRAFS), Environment and Development Third World Natural protection of cultures (PRONAT ENDA), Senegal.

I must say that it is always difficult to be with the elders because they speak up and tell us afterwards "you must denounce this". It is discrimination against youth. That being said, I will come back to some aspects that have been dealt with here.

I stayed on the theme of seeing the cultural, social and economic significance of access to land. I will not insist on the economic aspects, because precisely these are the aspects that led us to the impasse where we are today. There is a stalemate in Africa, if we look, the consequences of the green revolution in terms of environmental degradation, soil weakness and social and economic poverty. I think that we are really in a dead end and that it is time, way past time, to change this mode of production and this way of seeing things, at least in terms of access to land.

I am going to talk a lot about the issue of cultural significance because I am African. In Africa, culture has a special meaning, especially in relation to the issue of access to land. The earth is above all a natural resource that is linked to supernatural forces, if I am allowed to say things like that. Because in certain areas, in certain African traditions, you will even see that access to land and

its use are linked to a certain number of sacrifices, contracts, or in any case relations with certain protective entities. I do not want to dwell on what was said earlier. This connection with the sacred makes us use the land in a truly conscientious way. In tradition anyway, life had a really special relationship with the land.

I will give some examples of land use and preservation. In some villages we have what are called sacred groves. Those who know Casamance, know it very well. They do not use land just anyhow. This is to say that land is not just an economic product. "My life, my land!" As my compatriot said yesterday. It's the cultural, the symbolic, the social. Access to this resource must indeed meet principles that take into account these different dimensions.

The earth is a common good of humanity. As Saint-Exupéry put it so well and adapts so well to the African context: "We do not inherit the land of our parents, we borrow them from our children".

This is why, in most African traditions, there is a formal rejection of the private appropriation of land. We are not into exclusion but rather into collective community management.

In my opinion, this should inspire more of our leaders rather than import insane or even incoherent models that favour the strongest, crush the weakest, increase the competitiveness at the local level for access to natural resources and marginalize the most vulnerable, especially women and young people.

Imbalances and inequalities in the distribution of natural resources have been the source of many social tensions. In Africa we know something. Many of the conflicts in the world, and in Africa in particular, have a base that is closely or indirectly related to the issue of access to land and the distribution of resources. Access to land is at the heart of reducing poverty and social inequality. The very strong demographic growth we have experienced in Africa, with the high rates of young people entering the labour market each year, must also guide our choices in the management and use of resources.

We see in many African cities the phenomenon of rural exodus, illegal immigration and with it a lot of desolation. All those young Africans who die at sea. How can we best use the land and natural resources to respond to these challenges, in a context of climate change and the depletion of natural resources?

These are the issues that I think should be at the heart of land policies and programs. We need to be able to link these issues and the economic scope of access to land with that of preserving social peace, biodiversity, and local cultures by valuing traditional knowledge, as earlier on said Mr. Dufumier when he was talking about agroecology. The land should, in my opinion, be used for environmentally friendly practices, food sovereignty.

In Africa we are in a context of all-out reform. We are in the process of reforming the land, the pastoral land, there are the fishing codes, and so on. I think that

all the issues I just mentioned should be at the heart of these reforms. But, because we tend to forget them, we are moving towards imported models that do not meet our needs, our realities. They may confuse us and result in the same consequences as in other countries. That is why, from this rostrum, I appeal to all African leaders to take into account all these issues, particularly those related to youth employment, the phenomenon of climate change, the same sacredness of the earth to truly make reforms, laws that address these issues and which promote socio-eco-cultural development and peace.

The Senegalese civil society, in any case the organizations gathered around the Framework of Action and Reflection on Land, CRAFS, which I chair and represents here, have worked with local communities, fishermen, researchers, women and men. young people, all strata of society, to arrive at reform proposals that take into account these dimensions.

This is a call I would like to make to everyone: work with local communities, natives and others and integrate their thoughts, their realities, their practices in any reform action. That's where the leaders are. I would like to develop more but since time does not allow me, thank you.

Debate

Alessandra LUNAS COSTA, National Confederation of Agricultural Workers (CONTAG), Brazil - moderator

Two interventions from participants were handed to me on paper:

One from the **Andalusian Workers Union (Sindicato Andaluz de Trabajadores / as, SAT)** reminds us of the importance of debating the consequences of the persecution of the struggles for the land.

The other from **KARIYAWASAM MAPALAGAM HEWARUPPAGE Ravindra Gunawardana, Center for Environment and Nature Studies, Sri Lanka**, as to why we must focus our attention on policies and perhaps, at the end of this forum, have a paper to send to large companies in our countries.

For the moment we do not have time to debate, otherwise those who have to take the bus will find themselves without means of transport.

I believe that everything we heard here, despite the limited time, gave a very rich session with many contributions, and we were able to quickly have a vision of all continents.

I think we all see the immense responsibility that is ours not only to discuss these topics here, perhaps to make a final document, but also to appeal to all to join the struggle, for to engage in a common world struggle in defence of all that what has been expressed is our responsibility in the struggle for natural resources.

Thank you all. See you all tomorrow to continue our work.

April 2, 2016

**Access to land and natural resources
The future of humanity
What are the proposals and actions?**

Plenary Session V

Access to land and natural resources

The future of humanity

What are the proposals and actions?

Presentations

Maria HEUBUCH, milk producer, member of the European Parliament, Germany - moderator

I am a milk producer in Germany and also a member of the European Parliament. I will serve as moderator of this session. We will discuss proposals for actions to create more access to land and natural resources. These first two days, we have talked a lot about the problems we face in the different regions represented here. I think it will not be easy to find a solution for everyone. We need different solutions, different for each region, for each problem. However, during these first two days we agreed that we need a family farming system to create new solutions. We need a family farming system to keep our world in a good balance, the land and all healthy societies. Because when we lose family farming, we not only lose soil health, production, we also lose our societies and our life together.

I think it was during the first day of debate that one of the panellists said, "It's more than production, it's a way of life." That is true. If you are a farmer and you do not like that way of life, you are a bad farmer. I think you have to live with your animals, your fields and your soil and also with the society around your farm. I think we need family farming for food security and food sovereignty but also to fight against climate change, environmental problems, to work for a happy life, for the dignity of women, so that rural people can stay in rural areas to do business and earn enough income to live decently.

We should not forget that farmers have in their hands the basic needs of human beings because we all need to eat every day. So, we need good family farming so that all future generations will have the chance to eat healthy in sufficient quantities.

Also, as you can see, we have a big debate today to reach solutions, strategies to find good solutions.

Brendan BURNS, President of the Section for Agriculture, Rural Development and Environment of the Economic and Social Committee (EESC), Scotland, United Kingdom.

I will surely surprise many of you because I am not going to talk specifically about what is happening in Scotland but rather what might be the results and outcomes of a forum such as this one.

I am a forester. I work in Scotland, I manage more companies than forests but these companies are all based on agriculture and rural communities. In addition, I work in Brussels, where I was appointed by the British government to represent companies.

I have a very unusual vision because I am in political organizations and also outside of them. I would like to send you one or two messages.

The problems do not interest politicians. In reality, politicians do not want to know your problems, they want solutions. If you are not going to see them with ingenious solutions, on the basis of which they can act, you will have the same results as you have achieved in your respective countries.

In Scotland, the situation is very strange. What you have described today, yesterday, before yesterday, and on other occasions before, is in fact what happened in my country 260 years ago.

We were also the victims of the British Empire. They cut Scotland in two. The southern half represented the Empire and the northern half what you might call Aboriginal Peoples. If you really want to know what's going to happen in your country in the next 50 years, come to Scotland and take a look at the vast open spaces where people used to live and where there is now nothing. What you will also see is what has been done since 1960 to get people back to the countryside. I could talk about Scotland as you have done in your respective countries in the last two days, but that's not the message I would like to convey.

I wish to say the following things:

1. You must begin to understand your consumers, the people who consume what you produce, and 2. You must understand the politicians and what they can and can not do.

You need to understand the policies. It's useless to go to them and complain because it will not change anything. Many of you have said that in your own countries. You went to see your politicians, you complained ... but, as was said yesterday, the debate continues since 1992 and we can not say that it went very far!

This is not just a problem for indigenous peoples. This is a problem that is happening in Europe today: in Bulgaria, in Romania ... It is still happening in Scotland, to a certain extent. At home, after 260 years, we managed to convince our rulers that something had to change. Yesterday, a discussion took place on land ownership. We came to the conclusion that land ownership was not the

issue. The real issue is land use. If you're talking about land ownership, you're going to have to argue around the issue of land purchase, ownership, or the ways in which people who own the land should not have the yield up that land. And you are going to expose yourself to a whole series of problems that will only lead to confusion.

In Scotland, we decided that it was not a good way to progress. In my country, what you can do is force the people who own the land to use it properly. And if they do not do it right, then you can take action. You can take any actions with the support of policy makers if you have explained the matter to them. You can tax them. You can literally use the taxes you charge them to buy back their land. What is needed are solutions.

I also wanted to tell you a story or two. Your consumers live in the city. You, the rural people, you are in a completely foreign world. They do not understand you. Not long ago a survey was conducted in London with children who were asked "where does this milk come from?" The answer: "the supermarket". A child at school has no idea where the food comes from. I live in a country that is supposed to be an advanced European country. It stunned me when, on a Sunday, walking alone in the country, I saw townspeople who came to watch the cows and sheep because they do not understand the world in which we live. My message is therefore: understand your consumers, understand your politicians, understand what you can and cannot do. And remember that you will have to educate those who make these decisions.

Thank you.

Willian Clementino DA SILVA MATIAS, National Confederation of Agricultural Workers (CONTAG), Coordinator of organizations of family farmers of MERCOSUR(COPROFAM), Brazil.

Hello everyone. I represent CONTAG and COPROFAM. I am a family farmer who benefited from agrarian reform. I live in the Amazon province of Brazil.

I would like to say a sentence from Eduardo Galeano: "Utopia is on the horizon. I take two steps and she walks away two steps. The horizon is moving away. So what is the point of Utopia? For this: to move forward. "

The proposals: to make agrarian reform and access to land the basic rule for agricultural development and the strengthening of indigenous peasants, to make agrarian reform the basis for changing the reality of peasant life.

We must look beyond the land, we must aim for security and food sovereignty. I think that's the theme we need to put in the centre for the people who live in the city. We need to emphasize our role in producing healthy food for all, so that people have a better understanding of our role. It's a challenge.

Another challenge for us is that we must put in place an international cooperation

between the social movements to strengthen us in our organization and in our articulation for a global struggle.

The fight for family farming cannot be done alone in one's country, we must globalize the fight.

Then, to be able to change it, it is necessary that our claims arrive on the table of the governors.

Because with our only will it is not possible to change.

I will tell you another challenge around the world: we must show everyone the violence that is happening in the countryside today, so that everyone sees the violence that peasants suffer. It's too much. Yesterday, in my country, in my province, another peasant has been killed, without the world knowing it.

Then we have to talk about the production model that we want for indigenous and peasant family farming. The base must be agroecology to produce healthy food.

Finally, the issues of gender and generation. The peasants are the most able today to promote the security and food sovereignty of the people.

We must also prepare a major campaign for the ten years of the International Year of Family Farming.

So my message is continue the fight! Let's globalize the fight! And let's globalize hope!

Javier MOLINA CRUZ, Senior Land Tenure, Climate, Energy and Tenure (NRC), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Colombia.

The good news is that FAO is currently working with many of you in 47 countries to implement the Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Governance of Land, Fisheries and Forest Tenure in the Context of National Food Security (VG). This is very important because VGs are an instrument with which we can promote equitable, just access to land that respects the rights of indigenous communities, women, peasants, and promotes sustainable use.

Since 2012, the FAO focuses on different axes of action:

first, to make as many as possible become familiar with VG; with the concepts and principles.

secondly, key is letting them know how they can be used to strengthen the legislative frameworks that have to do with land policies and land administration.

If we do not work to transform cadastral systems and registers, we will have serious problems in determining who and under what conditions have access to land. Because land administrations are those that regulate access and the conditions under which a person, a community, a people has access to resources.

Thirdly, working directly with countries to support the implementation of VGs. For example, we are currently working with the Government of Sierra Leone to

formulate a new agricultural law. In this process, we show the government the importance of incorporating all VG principles through which customary rights of communities, women's rights to access to land, and the right to legally use these as a production tool are recognized. The same thing happens with resources such as water or forests. In the case of Guatemala we have also worked with the Government to incorporate VG's into the revised agricultural policy, so that, for the first time, the Guatemalan State recognizes the rights of indigenous peoples and in agreement with the recognition of customary rights. There are other cases that will be discussed further in Workshop 10.

Finally, the key message that I want to convey to you is this: when you return to your respective countries and institutions, read the VG monitoring and evaluation guide and ask yourself how in your country you can articulate to the dynamic VGs to ensure that your government is acting on this theme and invite FAO to review agricultural policies and legislative frameworks in the light of the VGs.

You have a key role in this process. Without you, this process will be much more difficult.

This is my concluding message.

Marcel MAZOYER, Professor Emeritus, AgroParisTech, France

We are here to ask what are the possible alternatives to what exists, what is happening, the policies in place and their successes or disadvantages.

I would like to remind you that the policies under which farmers around the world have been subjected to for the past 30 years are policies that have practically abolished the agricultural policies that were favourable to the development of family and peasant farms and that were put in place in the last few years. The day after the war. These policies had led to great successes in agriculture but also in social life during the years 1945, 1950, 1960 and 1970.

These policies began in 1945 with agrarian reform in countries where land inequality was enormous. Land reform was done in West Germany and Italy. We have seen the agrarian reform in Japan. A few years later in Korea, Taiwan, and then in many other parts of the world. The agricultural policies of "Western" countries, as it was said at the time, were very favourable policies for the development of family farming. Following agrarian reforms, there were structural policies that facilitated access to land for most, if not all, family farmers. We had training and research policies favourable to the development of family farming, and especially price policies corresponding to the level of productivity in the different countries.

Thirty years later, in the countries that had best implemented or applied these policies, there were practically no more unemployed people and hunger had disappeared.

In 1945, three quarters of the countries that subsequently implemented these

policies were still in food rationing situations. With these policies, poverty had disappeared, hunger had disappeared, virtually everyone had an education, access to care, and so on.

In the 1970s, with the policies resulting from the "Bretton Woods" agreement, a break occurred. We see the abolishing of the fixed rate of exchange of currencies against the dollar, the circulation of capital, and so on. This led to industrial relocation, and so on. It was even possible to negotiate agricultural issues within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, GATT, which was not the case before. Agricultural issues were the prerogative of each country. In each country we could make land policies, price policies, which were favourable to family farming.

Of course the liberalization of agricultural policies, that is to say the abandonment of policies favourable to family farmers and peasants from all over the world, were not done on their own. These policies were not applied everywhere, but where they were, it worked quite well. There may have been mistakes in research and development directions at the agro-ecological level. It is clear that the focus was on agro-mechanics and agro-chemicals. Of course, there is no question today of making the same mistakes again. They must even be corrected.

In the 1980s, with the Structural Adjustment Plans and the negotiating round of the so-called Uruguay Round GATT agreements that resulted in the Marrakesh Accords and the creation of the World Trade Organization, WTO, bit by bit almost all governments in the world, with few exceptions, have completely abolished policies that favour family farming.

A liberalized global agricultural policy has been put in place which has favoured the return of capitalist agriculture and salaried workers. Of course, it has not developed everywhere, anyhow.

In general, investors, who could afford engineers if they themselves were not competent, began to buy up land by the thousands, hundreds of thousands, even millions of hectares in countries and at very low prices with also low wages. Using the most "efficient" techniques put in place in previous years, they created an agriculture that roughly produces agricultural raw materials at half the price of that which North American or European farmers can do and at the fourth or sixth of the price of what can be done by farmers working by hand or with animals all around the world.

This policy is a machine for making peasant poverty. There are three billion people in the world who can not afford to produce or buy what they consume. 80% are rural, the remaining 20% are urban, peri-urban, people who live in shanty towns, and who are almost all ex-peasants driven out of their land by poverty.

In other words, the rebirth of capitalist agriculture is exactly the opposite of what the Western governments wanted in the aftermath of the Second World War and who had just lived through a good half-century of world wars, totalitarianism and crises.

We must stop the global policy of liberalization of agricultural policies, which only favors the return to a capitalist agriculture of salaried workers, relocated to low-cost land and low-cost labour, and which is ruining 1.4 billion farm workers. It is therefore necessary to restore agricultural policies favourable to family farming. We must start by stopping large-scale land acquisitions to the detriment of local populations. When we create high-performance capitalist enterprises based on low land prices and low wages and ruin three-quarters of the world's peasants, we create a global, global economic crisis, which ultimately only serve the interests of a very small number of shareholders in the major international companies that grab land.

The policy of liberalization of agricultural policies has become practically the enemy of the whole of humanity. So all the peasants of the South, who know it well, must fight. It is also necessary that the farmers of the North, who know it anyway but a little less well, are allied to them clearly and that they are not allied with the agrarian neo-capitalist who are ruining the world economy.

We are at a growth rate that is close to zero on a global scale. We are producing not just a crisis in the economic system, as we have just said, but also a political crisis. We do not even know how to maintain global security! It is the future of humanity that is there.

What our governments do not know, which the economists who advise them do not know, is that the key to the problem is in fact agricultural and food.

Rukka SOMBOLINGGI, Coordinator of the Alliance of Indigenous Peoples of the Archipelago (AMAN for its acronym in Indonesian), Indonesia.

I am native of Indonesia. I belong to the Toraja peoples. I work as assistant secretary general of AMAN, an organization of indigenous peoples in Indonesia. Our members are indigenous communities, we have 3,000 partners today. The head office is in Jakarta. There are twenty-one regional committees and one hundred and ten local committees. We have three sister organizations: indigenous youth, indigenous women and lawyers - because we always have problems of legal defence.

I would like to ask everyone to stop calling us "alternative". The world is in the hands of demons. We call them "the main voice" and they call us "the alternatives". We have to stop calling ourselves "alternatives" because in doing so we admit it, we continue placing ourselves in a position of weakness.

Our mission here is to restore Mother Earth, take charge of our lives. As citizens of the world, indigenous people, farmers, consumers, workers, scientists...we have sufficient evidence, scientific evidence. We have heard enough of problems, we have gathered enough scientific evidence to show that this is the wrong way, that they have created a world of inequality, separation, all those bad things. Climate change is the result of the failure of this path. So we should stop calling

ourselves "alternative". Are we okay with this? Can we start calling ourselves the "solutions"? Can we do this from now?

Our governments not only have voluntary regulations. They have obligations, obligations to respect fundamental human rights, our basic rights. We have enough good tools, good laws. The problem is that we continue to say that there are contradictory laws. Why we do we not push on good laws? It's what we need to do in the future.

I agree that we should reach consumers. They do not know us. We must build alliances with them. Because we are all victims. And everyone should tell them to stop taking advantage of us. The only way to annoy, disturb our enemy is by touching his wallet. And who can do it for us? Those who buy their products.

For this reason we need imperatively to get closer to our consumers, for victims in other parts of the world.

We have here many scientists, we have heard enough, we have politicians, members of the European Parliament. They must speak up and get the support of even more people. We have to go out, speak up and convince people.

How can we do this? We must demand that the story of what happens to us is told, we have sophisticated communication systems, we must convince, we must use the mainstream media to get out our message.

We must build, launch our own media, because we know that media builds opinion – that is the function of most of the mainstream media. So we must have our own media. We have to write the stories, the history, from our point of view.

We don't need to launch anything new as we already have global platforms such as Land Rights Now! International Coalition for Access to Earth to ask for land rights. With indigenous peoples and some universities and organizations, we have the Land Mark Map, global mapping platform on which we place ourselves in the world map. The latter is important because we must be visible. It is a tool you can use to say: "You should look at me". Make yourself visible wherever because governments do not want us to be visible. We must render ourselves visible. These are the two platforms that can be used.

But basically what I meant to say here is that we should not copy the modus operandi of the oppressors. We will never find justice if leave behind the women, young people, people with special needs, the LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender), the poor, those living in slums. We have to work with them, we must include them in our work.

If we do not do this, we will recreate the same world created by the demons and in which we live in today: the exploited women, exploited children. Do you want to do the same? They have left us behind. Will we do the same to others? We must work on our proposals, our speeches, and not copy what they have done. We must create a better world, a better future together, because it is the only way to succeed. Thank you.

Debate

Maria Josefa Macz, Deputy Coordinator of the National Peasant Unity Committee (CUC), Guatemala

Hello, I'm Maria Josefa Macz. I am Maya Quichí from Guatemala, from the Committee of Peasant Unity.

I believe we are here to look for solutions and proposals to solve the agrarian problem and, as the name of the forum says, access to land of course. But also to solve the problems of use and benefit sharing.

When we talk about the Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Governance of Land, Fisheries and Forest Tenure in the Context of National Food Security, VG, there is a question: why are they voluntary?

Many governments, like the one in Guatemala today, do not have the political will to seek solutions to the agrarian problems that exist in the country! The solutions that we indigenous peoples bring are not taken into account. My question is this: We see that the VG proposal is good "in theory", but how do we apply it in practice when we face dozens of violent evictions on our native territories?

When they sack our resources, when they expel families, indigenous communities, without seeking solutions? What are we talking about? What can be the future we are talking about when the rights to food, water, housing are violated, when we dislodge people without really looking at who actually owns the land?

Why, in the Polochic Valley, did they dislodge more than eight hundred Mayan Quechís families with the public security forces? There was not the slightest proposal for a solution.

In Guatemala's plan of government we do not see this important theme that is just killing us evermore. They have no proposals to find solutions to agrarian problems. We, we have proposals for the Law of Integral Rural Development that have been brought to Congress more than 12 years ago. We have not got an answer back.

Michel Buisson, Agronomist, Association for the Taxation of Financial Transactions and Aid of Citizens (ATTAC), France

I would like to react to the intervention of Mr Mazoyer, whom I appreciate, with an intervention that seems fair.

Why stop at the consequences of the evolution of policies and the statement of a great crisis?

You say that we need to change policies, but why not mention elements as to the

direction to take, to reflect this policy change?

Our friend from CONTAG talked about food sovereignty. I think that if Mamadou Cissokho could have been there, he would have done the same.

We have at our disposal a claim, a concept, a movement. It certainly raises questions, but it would be necessary to debate around the question, around the proposal of food sovereignty. It seems to me, and to others, a base for a collective reflection and a progression of the movement already engaged in relation to this change of policies.

This movement should make it possible, in particular, to set up another international framework and thereby enable States to protect themselves, to set up other policies favourable to land reform, pricing policies, policies for organizing markets, preservation of family farming.

At this time of the discussions on the proposals, I put this outline into the debate hoping actually that the forum will be able to evoke it, as it was evoked by our friend of CONTAG, as it was evoked by M Cissokho in his introductory statement the other day.

There is there the material, a movement, a force, ideas, which probably needs to be put back to work because the notion of food sovereignty poses questions, but I invite the forum and its follow-up to take into account this question of food sovereignty.

Terry Boehm, farmer, former president of the National Farmers Union of Canada, Canada.

I would like to expand on or comment on what Messrs Burns and Mazoyer said. Mr. Mazoyer points to the rupture of Marrakesh¹ and the international agreements which multiplied from that moment as having ruined any possibility for the peasants to gain a right return of their work.

I think that's a very important point. We are at a critical moment today when, in the movement launched by the Marrakesh Agreement, international trade agreements are produced and signed at full speed without receiving the necessary scrutiny. We must insist that this stop, especially for agriculture but also for the whole society. The CETA and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership or TTIP, allow dominant international companies to override democracies and their peasants.

Mr. Burns is absolutely right when he says that we can not get in front of politics with only complaints. They want solutions. One of the possible strategies I mentioned in a workshop that I undertook when I was president of the Canadian National Farm Syndicate was writing amendments, writing papers. For example, I wrote one entitled "Principles of a Fundamental Law on Seeds". This changed the terms of the debate. The debate has changed. Not victoriously for us, but we asked formally what we wanted next to what the international industrial

companies were asking for, which they always manage to formulate, to ask in a more efficient way and to get what they want.

A given claim cannot be adapted to all jurisdictions in the world. The list of solutions must point to ways to take hold of things that affect farmers around the world. One of these things is the subsidies. Where government support programs are administered, we need to get them drawn in such a way that these farm subsidies go down as the size of the farm increases. It needs degressive support.

When you go to see politicians or parliamentarians, you have to ask them to make a statement or even sign a letter that says what they will do after talking to you. We must not leave the discussion in abeyance. We must use the anti-oligopolistic legislation that has been put in place in some countries for one hundred and twenty years to break up companies.

I take an example from the United States, although I'm Canadian: why was it important in this country to breakup Standard Oil or Carnegie Steel a hundred years ago?

Because people understood that monopolies were damaging to society and the economy. So they used anti-monopoly laws to get these companies to behave in accordance with the general interest.

I think that if we use this anti-monopoly angle, we can ask that international trade agreements, which favour large seed companies, preserve the use of native seeds. We can request that there be an investment in public research independent of private capital. There are so many things now that are driven by partnerships involving private capital. The results are predictable!

We must always ask who will benefit from such new legislation or other documents that are presented and request that these draft texts clearly indicate this, based on relevant and independent analysis.

Elvis Santiago MORALES SICAN, Farmer 's Committee of the Highlands, CCDA, Guatemala.

My speech is along the same line as comrade Maria Josefa Macz.

In the presentation made by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, FAO (Javier Molina Cruz), it has been said that an agricultural policy has been put in place in Guatemala.

The majority of peasant organizations like ours did not participate in a direct way. It was mainly centres of study, research, non-governmental organizations. We are less represented in this process.

The other issue is that Guatemala is going through some very serious problems, as in the area of access to water.

Many communities that live downriver see water diverted by large companies.

The fish die, the people die too. There is no access to water. We would like FAO's willingness to come forward by working for the implementation of a Water Law that does not exist at the moment, to take it seriously and to make an important paper. based on the Voluntary Guidelines as we believe the term "voluntary" does not work for Guatemala.

The other question is that in Guatemala access to land is complicated because land is a means of power and control. The more certain individuals own a lot of land, the more they will control the population. That is why, this April 12, we have planned a march of indigenous peoples and peasants in Guatemala.

I call for this global forum to this march that will take place in Guatemala for access to land and natural resources.

Eduardo Baumeister, Researcher, Central Institute for Social and Development Studies, INCEDES, Nicaragua.

I would like to call on Professor Mazoyer to deepen his presentation a little.

This consensus on land reform and protectionist agricultural policies, after the Second World War, took place with the idea of ending fascism in the world. Especially in those countries that you mention: Japan, Italy, Germany. It has therefore been possible for major philosophical and political paradigms to emerge that establish a link with the agrarian question at that time. They aimed to solve the agrarian question, the challenge of agriculture, to deal with the challenge of democracy, of industrialization, these were the big ideas.

Today, we know that there is no cohesion of paradigms of this type. For the present, we should reflect on what happened after the Second World War: the creation of the United Nations Organization for Agriculture and Food (FAO), the idea of agrarian reform, protectionist policies and even food sovereignty, which today sounds to some as a very radical idea. For all these European countries, as early as the nineteenth century or even before, food sovereignty was at the heart of the problem of war.

How can we deepen the ideas that could be today's big paradigms linking themes like agriculture, environment and climate change? It seems to me that would be the gauntlet of your presentation.

Rodrigo Del Pozo Fernández, Internationalist Solidarity Party Autogestión, SAIN, Spain.

I will be very brief, because I do not want to take time from the organizations that fight as they are the ones that should be able to talk more. It has been spoken much of industrial production but I think that industrial production has a weak point, which is financial speculation. We have not talked about price gouging. If we make a decisive action to end speculative mechanisms that determine prices, the industry will weaken and it will be easier to adopt policies that we talked about here.

Iba Mar FAYE, Sociólogo, Jefe de misión Agricultura familiar y de la tierra, GRET, Senegal.

I would like to make two comments. The first concerns alliances. We spoke this morning of alliances regarding actions. I would like to hear more about how we are going to build these alliances, especially between farmers in the North and those in the South, and how we will set priorities when we know that everything is a priority.

The second is the Voluntary Guidelines for Responsible Governance of Tenure for Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security, (VG). I would really like to know what the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, (FAO), and the United Nations system are finally offering to reward or punish those countries that would make an effort or not to implement VGs.

In fact, did the FAO simply work on the VGs to appear as an organization that did what it had to do and not necessarily to go further, that is to push countries in terms of monitoring and support for to implement these VG? We do not feel this follow-up, neither in terms of tools, nor in terms of mechanisms, to support countries and to assess how far they have taken into account these VG's.

I would like to know a little more about that.

Also, do they plan, at the level of these accompaniments, to go a little into the detail, at the level of countries or regions, because we know that the devil is in the details.

What is the mandate of FAO? How far can it go with countries?

Thank you.

Thilak KARIYAWASAM Majuwana Gamage, Agriculture, Nature Group organization Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka.

These past two days we have had some very interesting discussions. Now we know that farmers in Asia, Latin America, Europe and Africa are facing problems. In particular, everyone has a problem to market their products. Consumers in these areas also have problems.

Does the European Union recognize family farming as a concept as such? As an economic community, can we think differently about developing family farming, the market, the economic "forum"? Can these ensure that family farming is supported by a market for family farming products to help farmers in the North and South.

On the other hand, there are regulatory tools that already exist that we can use if we really want to develop that, like as in technical barriers. We need certifications and others. Can we use some of the existing systems, such as the Participatory Guarantee System to come to Europe and sell our products to cooperative movements in Europe or North America? Can we really put solidarity on both

sides, farmers and consumers?

Massa KONÉ, Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Associations and Coordination for the defence of the Rights of Needy (UACDDDD, for its acronym in French), Speaker of the Malian Coalition Against Land Grabbing (CMAT) and No Vox Afrik, Mali.

Our debate is about proposals for alternatives. I would like to begin by saying that although we may talk about the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation, FAO, we can talk about the United Nations, but our different countries have ratified many international conventions that have never been applied.

Why are not they enforced? Because we are not strong in our countries. You must first be strong in your country. It is therefore necessary to converge the struggles. The first solution is that the various peasant communities, fishermen and growers must come together to become a counter power in their own country. This is the first thing.

When one is against one's power in one's own country, one can have the guidelines imposed whether they are voluntary or binding. Because our governments in Africa ratify everything, but it is never applied in our countries. So, whether it's binding, non-binding, it's the same, you have to be strong in your own country first. That's the number one point!

A first alternative would be that the movements converges, that different organizations, different communities converge to recognize their own rights. And our fundamental rights are our lands! As long as these rights are not recognized, these customary rights, as long as these authentic rights are not recognized, do not say that it is the Universities that can have our rights recognized. Never! We are in a capitalist system. It's the money and the goods that take precedence. We, our fight is for that right. When there are rights, that we are guaranteed our lands, as long as our lands are secure, we, we invest on our lands and we can make sustainable development.

The only alternative is the recognition of our rights. But our rights will never be recognized until we are strong in our countries, as long as we do not take the lead and we do not engage in the struggle.

The second point is the format. It is necessary that we, from our own countries, from our own regions, can make our own proposals for forms of governance and that we can impose them in our legislation. This is what we did in West Africa with the Global Convergence of struggles for land and water and seeds that made a caravan. It is this global movement against land grabs, grabbing of water and our seeds that made this caravan possible. We produced a Green Book of Convergence for West Africa that we handed to Senegalese President Macky Sall. It was March 17th. The other comrades who participated are here

in this room. We made major actions following the themes chosen by the communities, from Burkina Faso to Senegal. With these great actions, in all the cities where we have made great actions, we have forced the governors, the authorities of these countries to come and take our Green Paper. Why? It is always said that communities do not know anything. We, we have proved that we know something by making our own proposals. And this proposal is also an alternative of sustainable development. When we want to live in peace, when we want the revenues of the States to be well shared, we must first of all be able to propose something. We, we proposed it. We also ask the WFAL to support this Green Paper.

A third proposal: we must break these border barriers. They divided us to control us. The communities of the different regions have to take each other's hands and ignore their borders. These boundaries are made knowingly so that there is always insecurity, conflict. We do not have time to think about our own fate. That's what you have to fight.

As my friend from Brazil said, we need to bring the struggles together. I appeal to the various experts and academics to come out of their university format and look at our socio-cultural values to highlight them, so that they are respected. That they are respected, that our legislation takes into account our different laws, is essential.

In Mali, we tried to impose our own law which is a law of 158 articles. The government reduced it to 49 articles. That means they do not want to recognize our rights. Each country must impose its own legislation that meets its socio-cultural rights for the recognition of its own right to land, seas, etc.. Otherwise, it will be the capitalist system that will grab everything.

Let's be united, support each other to get out of this mess. Take agroecology as an example. Everyone has to do it because it protects us from all the chemicals that kill our land, which endangers us and poisons us. We must invest in agroecology as an alternative. We did it. We must invest in our rural seeds, our knowledge, because we have a gift for centuries. Our great-grandparents had the knowledge and values. These are the values that need to be developed.

We must force our countries to develop local knowledge. If we develop local knowledge it is certain that we will get out of this problem. Otherwise, today the land grabbing system is the system of those who want to make money, money, on the blood of the poor and communities. We must fight against.

Together we can do it! Thank you.

Pablo GONZÁLEZ, Asesor, Sindicato Andaluz de Trabajadores/as (SAT), España.

Thank you very much. I would like to focus on something we have already talked about during these three days: the repression and the violence of which we are victims, we the organizations that fight for the land. During these days, we talked about the case of Berta Cáceres. The comrade of Brazil also spoke yesterday of the murder of a comrade. I come from Andalusia, from the Union of Agricultural Workers (SOC-SAT), an organization that, in Europe, in the Europe of rights and freedoms, in the twentieth century, has on its back more than 600 comrades with lawsuits adding up to more than 400 years of requested prison sentences.

Our struggle, what is it? That of occupying land and defending the workers of Andalusia. On March 30, just before coming here, the Spanish National Police kidnapped one of our comrades, Andrés Bódalo, and now it is four days he has been in prison. He is a trade unionist, a labourer, a landless farmer who, in Spain, ends up in prison. I have to say it here. Excuse me because I'm pretty nervous, he is a very close comrade and we think about this every day.

I would like to say that it would be a lack of respect if, since this forum, after so many kilometres - because Valencia is very pretty, we enjoy a beautiful sun, but our organizations are victims of a reality - if after so many kilometres travelled by the comrades of Brazil who are victims of a fascist coup, the comrades of Guatemala and any community in Africa, Asia and America, it would be very sad and a great lack of respect if we leave here without an appeal, without a declaration, without support for our struggles.

Thank you very much.

Kaul NURM, Director of the European Federation of Farmers Estonia (Eestimaa Talupidajate Keskkliit, ETK), Delegate of the Economic and Social Committee (EESC), Estonia.

Colleagues, dear friends, we have common problems: land grabs and land concentration. But we do not have common solutions. There is no single solution that can work properly anywhere in the world. That's why, in my opinion, every country needs its own solutions. There is not a single idea that can solve the situation, but rather complex measures.

Nevertheless, in my opinion, the source of this problem is common to all of us. This is the principle of free movement of capital and goods internationally. This principle has been enshrined in the Treaty of the European Union, the EU, and many international trade agreements.

My main question is: Does the land come under this principle? Land is not a good like any other, we can not produce land as we can for any other commodity. That's why my proposal is the following. We should all ask politicians, lawyers, if the land should not be removed from these regulations and principles. If land can be an exception, then we can start regulating the market. We can change the

regulations, set limits, define how many acres of land a person or business can own or use. This is just an idea to find solutions.

Second idea: what I urge is the cessation of subsidies for large industrial farms. For example, in Romania, the largest farm covers 65,000 hectares, the second largest on 40,000 hectares. Is there anyone here who thinks that these farms need EU subsidies to support them? These subsidies should help maintain family farming. Family farming should be the target of taxpayers' money and not industrial agriculture. In the EU, all large farms receive the largest part of the EU agriculture budget.

This is one of the solutions. We must ask politicians. We must write papers. I did it when I was working at the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) and I was the rapporteur of a study on land grabbing in Europe. All these proposals are fixed. I am fully aware that these proposals are not enough. They are not because the proposals of civil society organizations themselves are very different from each other. We must come to an agreement. All the proposals that are set out in the document drawn up with the EESC are consensus's approved by trade unions, workers, employees, farmers. You can find there some ideas that can be implemented in your own country.

I would like to conclude by saying that I am convinced that politicians will not start working voluntarily. We must put pressure on them and we must provide ideas, solutions. And without the support of consumers, we will not be able to do anything.

This is what I wished to say.

MBENGUE Moussa, Secretary General of the Association for the Development of Artisanal Fisheries in West Africa (ADEPA), Senegal.

Soy el secretario ejecutivo de la asociación de África del Oeste para el Desarrollo I am the executive secretary of the West African Association for the Development of Artisanal Fishing which intervenes in 16 African countries. I would first like to thank the WFAL for giving me the opportunity to participate in this important forum.

I have a concern that burns in my throat and I would like to share it with you. I sincerely regret the fact that during these 3 days artisanal fisheries and fishery resources are not the subject of particular attention. I think that when we talk about access to land, we should also be very careful about the waters and oceans that, as you know, represent two-thirds of the world. I believe that one person in this room said that we should call our planet "water planet" instead of "planet earth".

My first recommendation in this forum is that we pay more attention to fisheries resources. Because it's important. That being the case, we are at the end of the forum and I think it is time to draw some important conclusions and make very

strong proposals to feed the resolutions of earlier.

I made four major observations on the basis of which I will build proposals:

1. I consider – and it has been visible through all the interventions - that natural resources play extremely important environmental, social and culturally important functions, for the States as well as for the communities;
2. There is a pernicious degradation of these natural resources in the broad sense that compromises biodiversity and endangers life even on earth;
3. These are bad and irresponsible policies of management of these natural resources that exclude local communities from the management of resources of their lands, which consume land and natural resources in the broad sense;
4. I see that there is a restrictive view, somewhat, of natural resources.

From this, I would like to make the following suggestions:

1. Promote good governance of natural resources as part of a holistic approach that allows us to see the earth as a whole - it also makes me think of how to revisit the paradigm;
2. Accompany, strengthen the capacity of political influence of local communities to enable them to be strong, to have the skills, to participate in public policies of the management of natural resources. Because these resources will only be sustainably managed when communities have the capacity to participate;
3. What I heard here and there makes me realize that there have been successful experiments in natural resource management. In terms of proposals, we should consider capitalizing on lessons learned in natural resource management and supporting their application and dissemination.

There that's what I wanted to say and thank you.

Monique MUNTING, researcher and documentary filmmaker, AGTER, SCAM, Amnesty International, COTA, Belgium.

I wanted to share with you two considerations, some of which have already been said. One concerns the laws, regulations and directives. Of course the laws are useful guidelines. But I think we have to admit that in many countries what prevails on the ground is power relations. I saw in a country like Tanzania that, at times, the government put bans on all land deals. But at the same time, big companies came in and created de facto situations: clearing the land, planting and growing, despite the laws.

Of course, in Brazil there have been very good negotiations, especially to protect indigenous peoples for example. But I think we have to think about power relations, because laws are not enough. "How to change the balance of power?" Should be one of our key questions.

My second idea is that I think we should start by quoting La Via Campesina's phrase: "small farming cools the planet" - peasant agriculture is cooling the planet. I think we are now in a situation where governments around the world are supporting large-scale agriculture and sometimes, marginally, they give a little money for small family farming. I think our fight should go much further than just asking for a small place for family farming. I think, as Rukka Sombolinggi said, that small-scale farming should be declared as the solution to the problems of environmental and climate destruction. I think we should use these arguments to show governments that they cannot continue to support an agriculture that destroys not only human societies but also the environment and the climate. And so I have a question about the Voluntary Guidelines for Responsible Governance of Land, Fisheries and Forests Regimes in the Context of National Food Security: Is Climate Included in these Guidelines? What place is given to climate and the environment in these guidelines?

KARIYAWASAM MAPALAGAM HEWARUPPAGE Ravindra Gunawardana, Center for the Study of the Environment and Nature (Center for Environment and Nature Studies), Sri Lanka.

I wish to say that we can talk about many things here around land grabbing, including for example how it impacts micro-organisms. What I mean is that before moving to the final communiqué, we must examine things a thousand times, because otherwise it will lead to ineffective policies or conclusions. This is all meant to say. Thank you.

Francis FRU NGANG, Secretary General of the African Institute for Economic and Social Development (INADES), Ivory Coast.

I decided to intervene when I heard the first panellist say that we had to meet our consumers and get to know them. It reminded me of what is really bad in the current system. Consumers do not need to know us. We have to go to the politicians and tell them what we think. Consumers do not need to come to us to ask us what we think and defend us. Because they are either there or to defend us. They are aware of us. In fact, that leads us to all that is bad in this current system. I think, as has been said by others, that we need a change of system. Anything we do will be superficial if we do not have a system change. Some examples:

When we talk about natural resources and land, some say "there is a problem with the land, what we need is land titles, a land market". But the land market is for the powerful who have the money to buy the land and dictate the rules! There are land reforms, but these land reforms must respect the rules of the market and ensure that everyone has access to land and those who have money can buy!

This is fundamentally bad. When we say that the exploitation of natural resources is bad, what do we have? We have the Kimberley initiative, we have the initiative

for forest certification. All this is only for the markets!

And does that stop the exploitation of resources and deforestation. When we say that small farmers do not have access to credit, what is the answer? Micro finance! But microloans are actually much more expensive - three or four times more expensive - than conventional banks where companies get credit. So the poor pay more for credit than the rich! And there are endless examples.

So as long as we do not question the central value of the market - a market that dictates needs, directs decisions about what to produce and how to distribute - we will never get out of this system.

To change this system means that we have to change the central principles and values according to which we operate, our fundamental beliefs. We all agree that the human being is at the centre of development. But we do not all agree on the place of humans, we do not all agree that the freedom of the markets is the way to go.

When we fight against free markets and empower people, why do we say "the rich must produce and then we will redistribute wealth"? No! Let's say we redistribute opportunities! Why do we say that we can all feed ourselves through a social system? No, we are all strong people who can work for an income!

We are not going to say that the path to policy change is for those who have the power to influence policy makers, that is, companies that put everyone in their pockets, including consumers. There is this that we call the market dictatorship. As long as we do not come out of this dictatorship of the market, everything we say will not work.

Ramesh Chandra SHARMA, Campaigns Coordinator Ekta Parishad, India.

As far as land legislation is concerned, I think that in the countries of the South are witnessing a colonial legacy. Each of us is completely concerned about these legislations that were developed during the colonial period. What is happening today? I absolutely agree that we need to educate our politicians, our bureaucrats. But what space is available for us to educate? This is a very big question.

In the early days we were promised a profit-sharing model: you can no longer ask for your land not to be acquired, but you can ask how much compensation you can receive. We were sent back to the receiving side in this case. My question here is: what do we want? New legislation, new laws?

We have the choice. Do we want to propose and engage in endless discussions and submit again and again to politicians, bureaucrats and international institutions? Or do we have the courage to disobey the law? I think we have a choice between these two possibilities. When I say "disobeying the law" I mean disobeying the laws elaborated under the British empire, which really break up the forests, break up the commons, the fields. Which in reality divides the entire community.

Mamy RAKOTONDRAINIBE, president of the Collective for the defence of Malagasy Land, TANY, France.

I would like to take the floor to insist heavily on the magnificent quality of this WFAL both in terms of participants and content, that of the various themes, some of which were the subject of workshops and others not.

I would like to emphasize especially the continuation of the WFAL because all these interesting things will require work afterwards. I'll explain why.

We are all convinced of the need to develop family farming, we find that the governments do not do it and that the reason is that, in the balance of power, we remain very weak. This is the case both in each country and in the world. In each country, I think it is difficult to give advice to everyone, although some have given advice earlier and I agree with them. But what I would like to ask the organizers of the WFAL and all the audience to reflect on tonight, how we will continue together all these exchanges and the struggle for all this to become reality and that the WFAL does not become a new meeting after hundreds of others with very little results or a dubious result.

I would just like to emphasize the fact that at this WFAL came people, communities, community representatives who wanted to make the WFAL and the world aware of the realities that exist at home. Others could not come, for example some representatives of the mountain people of Morocco who sent us a message. These different communities that I will not mention now have asked the WFAL, at least in one workshop, to make known in the statements the situation at where they are. But I think the essential will be also in the continuation of the fight, in the diffusion of the collective work, of the collective reflection on the difficult solutions. I totally agree on the need to find solutions. Some solutions have already been stated. But others are still to be found.

Thank you very much.

Laurent LEVARD, Agronomist, Left Party (Parti de Gauche), France.

I would like to speak specifically about what could be done in European countries. I will make three proposals:

1. Organize the transition from agriculture to ecological farming and relocation of production by combining, among other things, two types of measures:

- A calendar that gives us a horizon at five or ten years, to obtain standards that are completely out of the model based on the use of pesticides and chemical fertilizers,

- Totally rethink the Common Agricultural Policy, CAP, so that public support will essentially finance the ecological transition of agriculture and the remuneration of the positive externalities of agriculture.

2. The need to stop or even to reverse the process of concentrating production in an ever smaller number of very large farms. For this, in France, we are fortunate

to have tools that exist historically even if, for lack of political will, they are not used. First, a maximum limit of the economic size of each farm per farm asset must be set. Secondly, to give itself the possibility of reallocating the lands that are released on the land market in favour of small farms and small farms engaged in the ecological transition of agriculture,

3. We know that organic farming requires more work, we sometimes know that yields are lower, we know that sometimes the costs of production are higher. The ecological transition of agriculture is possible only if there are remunerative prices and therefore if there is a regulation of the markets, a regulation of the productions. Whenever necessary, protection and shelter from the world market must be put in place in order to guarantee these remunerative prices.

I conclude by telling you how this policy is in solidarity with the countries of the South:

1. Firstly, no subsidy, no public aid can be used to export to the world market,
2. This would mean the end of support for agrofuel programs, the implications of which are known in terms of land grabbing in the South,
3. This would entitle local enterprises in that area to get involved as long as not involved in land grabs elsewhere,
4. It would put an end to free trade agreements and the support to countries that implement food sovereignty policies,
5. For all products for which there are fair trade channels, such as coffee or cocoa, we can say that, for example, for five years, having a fair trade label will be condition to allow import into the national or European territory.

Mario BUZZALINO, National Commission on Rural Development (CNFR), Coordinating Body of Mercosur Family Producers (COPROFAM), Uruguay.

We must understand that we have two problems.

First, we only have one world.

Second, we must live on this one.

Here we have academics and senior officials involved. We have been involved in such discussions for years, we are right, we are numerous and yet, at this very moment, there are surely some comrades who are expelled from their land somewhere in the world. So I would say that we have not advanced at all! Everything continues the same.

But I venture to suggest that we lack two fundamental elements:

1. Proposals,
2. A very strong self-criticism!

We already have all the diagnoses. We already know almost everything. But we do not move forward. Charles Darwin said long ago "The species that will survive

is not the strongest nor the greatest but the one that adapts the best".
Let's think about that. Thank you.

Verónica HERNÁNDEZ, Mesoamerican Alliance of Peoples and Forests (AMPB), Guatemala.

I would like to congratulate our Brazilian brother on the rostrum for the contributions he has given us to have a better world.

Second, I would like to say here that we are in Valencia, Spain, and we have seen that on March 30th there was this persecution of our friend from the Andalusian Workers' Union, (Sindicato Andaluz de Trabajadores), SAT, and this does not only happen in Spain but also in other countries. I think we need to emphasize that.

In Guatemala the Counter Terrorism Foundation was recently created. It affects our comrades, our peasant leaders who struggle for all these resources we have on the planet. It's a call I want to make.

The proposal I want to make in this forum is to seek to strengthen ourselves by making global alliances through new international conventions and treaties on human rights.

We see that despite ILO Convention 169 on indigenous and tribal peoples, these rights are violated in different countries. I therefore ask for support on this call. Thank you.

Sidy BA, National Coordinating Council for Rural Coordination (CNCR) of Senegal and Network of Farmers Organizations and Producers of West Africa (ROPPA), Senegal.

My concerns are particularly on the Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security, that have been largely taken into account by my colleague from GRET working in Senegal, Mr. Iba Mar FAYE.

Thank you.

Adriana do NASCIMENTO SILVA, National Confederation of Agricultural Workers (CONTAG), Brazil.

Thank you, I am Adriana do Nascimento, a family farmer in the state of Pernambuco in Brazil. We are debating access to land, conditions of security, food sovereignty, sustainable development.

In Brazil, we work with youth for agroecology education and agroecology-based production. We consider that young people are people who must contribute to the process. We could not participate in this forum without emphasizing the importance of placing young people at the heart of the process of changing

a mode of production that does not value life, the life of plants, animals and animals. people and there. The involvement of young people is a condition for the success of this movement, this effort to change the system. We think this is important for all countries.

Thank you.

Michel DAVID, Farmer, Peasant Confederation, France.

I think that at this stage we need to move to proposals on the conclusions, including the Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security, (VG).

What Marcel Mazoyer and Laurent Levard said, I repeat. As Michel Buisson said. I think we need to be able to make a number of things that are in the VG into requirements. One has to ask how to make this happen. It will not be enough to ask Monsanto whether he wants to make small farmers survive. So I think we have to work on that by the end here.

On the one hand, the peoples of the South have explained how peasant agriculture has to survive and, on the other hand, we have explained how we in the North can fight for, first, maintaining agriculture peasant and secondly not to plunder the South. The climate can serve us in this respect because, indeed, we export our industry, our agriculture.

To conclude, we must see how not to make immigrants out of the peasants, new refugees, how we will stop importing the soy that plunders the natives, expels the peasants in the South, to make farms of 1 000 cows in France who at the same time suppress peasant agriculture.

We must therefore work on this, we must formulate proposals for concrete actions so that the will to change become a sanction for the president of agrofuels in France who is, at the same time, the president of the largest agricultural union, and for Monsanto and so to defend small farmers and stop land grabbing.

Michel BAYLAC, President of the European Association of Rural Development Institutions (AIEAR), France.

I am president of IAEA. I take care of regulations at European level.

What I feel at the end of this conference is a feeling of love for the earth.

I believe that here everyone is truly militant, whatever his background, whatever he does in his life. I believe that we are all driven by a fierce desire to regulate land by controlling enlargements, controlling the price.

I believe that there needs to be real solidarity between family farmers around the world. We must also assume our differences, our regional differences, our cultural differences.

My friend Hope of the Democratic Republic of Congo, Mamadou Cissokho,

Michel David who has just spoken, Emmanuel Hyeyst may have another concept. We need to find ourselves. Above all, we must not be fooled by opponents.

Today we are all together, even if we sometimes have different situations. And all of us can fiercely fight against the financialisation of land, against the grabbing of economic land, sometimes political too.

But we have to expand our bases. If we want to get out of here by saying that we represent a real force of proposal, a political force too, we must expand our bases, not a caricature, as we do not want to caricature exploitation and family farming, and so to achieve a triple economic, social and environmental performance.

Thank you.

Maria HEUBUCH, dairy cattle farmer, MEP, Germany - Moderator.

Thank you very much. I have again received other requests for intervention, but as we have no more than a few minutes, we will use them to enable our panellists reactions to these inquiries and answer questions that have been posed to them.

Rukka SOMBOLINGGI, Coordinator Alliance of Indigenous Peoples of the Archipelago (Masyarakat Adat Nusantara Aliansi, AMAN), Indonesia.

No creo que haya muchas preguntas que esperen respuestas. Todas eran ideas I do not think there were many questions waiting for an answer.

All were shared ideas and proposals. One I think we need to answer is the situation in Spain and the actions to be taken here. Which brings me to answer on the actions at the national level. We can build solidarity from different parts of the world, we can move.

But everything must be based on your requests, because you know the best strategy. We can not come and say "do this and that". I believe there is no single solution. I think that's the way we have to work together. I think the market paradigm shift is just a reality and that's what we really need to know.

On the participation of young people, yes, and on disobedience to the laws, yes, we disobey bad laws. And we continue to respect good laws because not all laws are bad. But we disobey bad laws.

Again, I think one thing we must remain convinced of is that food sovereignty is not an old concept. It is an existing concept that we practice. It is also a concept of the future that we must continue to practice. This is how we must see food sovereignty. This is not new. We have been practising it for centuries and that is why we are still alive.

So do not call it old, it's just the present and the future.

Marcel MAZOYER, Professor Emeritus, AgroParisTech, France.

I wanted to thank the people who intervened and the richness of the interventions. Obviously we were short on time and necessarily very reductive in our interventions.

I would just like to say what I feel after all this debate:

1. The liberal policies applied to agriculture are indeed catastrophic,
2. United Nations consensus-building measures, be it the Millennium Development Goals, the MDGs, the Sustainable Development Goals, SDGs, and today the Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Governance of Land Tenure, fisheries and forests in the context of national food security (VG), are undoubtedly very useful and cushion the damage of the liberal globalization of agriculture, but this is not enough. The situation is improving a little, but hardly. Sometimes even, in many areas, it regresses. And so there is no alternative but to seek to find policies that:
 1. stop land grabbing,
 2. make agrarian reform wherever it has become necessary or necessary,
 3. implement policies radically favourable to peasant farming, starting with the poorest, most precarious,
 4. implement policies that are of course structural and land access policies, but also remunerative pricing policies.

It has been said that for peasant agriculture to work everywhere, it must feed those who work well. We must constantly fight against the reconstitution of inequalities in land, equipment, productivity and income in agriculture. Otherwise, the machine to accumulate differentially in peasant agriculture works, inequalities are redeveloped. This has been well said and emphasized.

Finally, we need development policies, okay. But let us not fall back into the panel of agro-mechanics and agrochemistry. We must really engage radically in this call to simplify agro-ecology.

One last point: all this is wishful thinking on which we will agree once again, no doubt. It is useless as long as there is no mobilization of sufficient political forces to return the majorities that continue to operate, in different countries and globally, unilaterally for the benefit of capitalist agriculture.

There are many possible allies: the landless peasants, the peasants at large, the poor peasants, the rich peasants, the unemployed, the precarious workers around the world, the middle classes who are threatened by the poverty trap and then also all the useful economy that is literally asphyxiated by this policy.

Thank you.

Javier MOLINA CRUZ, principal agent tenures, division of climate, energy and tenure regimes (Climate, Energy and Tenure Division, NRC), United Nations Organization for Food and Agriculture (FAO), Colombia.

I would like to reiterate again that the Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Governance of Tenure Systems for Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security, VGs, are an instrument and not the only one.

So it's not fair to expect VGs to solve everything. On the other hand, it is important to know that it is a useful instrument that allows us to shape the legislative frameworks, policies and institutions that have to do with the tenure of the land and that include water, fisheries, forests, and not only the earth.

So VGs are an instrument that, if used appropriately, can influence legislative frameworks, policies and institutions. On the other hand, it can be frustrating not to see immediate results, but they are time consuming processes.

These are medium-term processes. For this, advocacy work in forums like this one is key. Here we have people who can access the African Union, others in Asia, the Association of South East Asian Nations, ASEAN, etc..

These are organizations that are aware of the importance of strengthening the regulatory frameworks, the policies that have to do with the land, the water, the sea. It is possible to create spaces that allow to go in the direction of strengthening the legislative frameworks that allow to confront companies that concentrate, expropriate and exploit natural resources in an unsustainable manner.

It is an instrument and I invite that we make use of it.

William Clementino DA SILVA MATIAS, National Confederation of Agricultural Workers (CONTAG), Coordinator of Family Organizations producers of Mercosur (COPROFAM), Brazil.

I would like to say that democracy is fundamental. If there was no democracy, we would not be here. Democracy guarantees our participation in this forum, our discussions, our debates. I think it is important to say that for us the WFAL is fundamental, but it is necessary that the United Nations Agriculture and Food Organization, FAO, and the other organizations make a proposal with us to organize a second International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development and to have a commitment beyond this forum, to continue to work for the change of the life of the peasants. To support this, I'm going to read a sentence from a writer in my country, Clarice Lispector: "I'm in danger, like anyone who lives. But the only thing that makes me hope is the unexpected, the strength, the unity in the struggle for peasant and indigenous family farming, always."

Brendan BURNS, President of the Section for Agriculture, Rural Development and Environment of the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) United Kingdom.

Change will not happen just because you are right. The change will not happen because you have logical arguments. How many people here have a mobile phone? Raise your hand. How many of you are on Twitter? On Facebook? I'm there. I searched on my phone "Land grabbing and Global Forum on Access to the Earth" nothing!

I can tell you where you are right now. You are exactly where big business and governments want you to be. You are in a room talking to yourselves. The doors are closed and no one is listening!

Please be aware that the only way to change things is to get your message out. You can do it right now with a simple mobile phone! If you do not have this, you can do it with a computer. If you are like me stuck on an island with a rotten network you will still have access at least the end of the day. People need to know what you are saying. From my phone, I spoke, sent messages to a few thousand people during this debate.

How many of you have done the same? Please, use the technologies.

Stop talking to each other and start talking to your customers, your politicians.

That's how we fight against big companies. You will only change things if your consumers understand why this is necessary.

WORKSHOP 10: Voluntary Guidelines on responsible governance of tenure of land, fisheries and forests in the context of national food security (VG): actions that have been applied in the field

Review

General considerations

VGs are not irrevocable. It is a useful reference tool for evolving governance policies and practices related to the tenure of tenure systems for land, fisheries and forests.

Their recommendations have a strong legitimacy since, at the end of 2012, they gathered the signatures of the Member States of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS), following a process of elaboration that gave an important place to the expression of global civil society and thus VGs legitimize the participation of civil society in land tenure governance reform processes.

They have in fact favoured it in cases where the will of the governments to organize this participation was acquired. VGs can also be an upstream reason to open a dialogue between actors with divergent interests and to provoke the will of governments to apply the recommendations.

VGs call for recognizing, respecting and protecting the rights - formal as well as informal - of majorities (individuals and collectives) over natural resources and that transfers of these rights take place in exchange for a fair counterparts. They do not indicate the need to favor one form of agriculture over another.

Capitalist agriculture with large-scale wage earners is growing at the expense of family farming. To ensure that the recommendations of the VGs for rural majorities are well implemented, while preventing the use of VGs to legitimize the expansion of large-scale agriculture, depends on the expression of this

requirement by civil society.

In many countries, improving the access of rural families and communities to land and natural resources is inconsistent with the immediate interests of government stakeholders. Even though the latter have signed the VGs, or even initiated a political process around the VGs, their willingness to apply them to protect the rural poor can be very limited.

More generally, capitalist and salaried agricultural production companies exert a heavy weight on land and agricultural policy choices. The mobilization of civil society is essential everywhere to change the governance of land tenure in the service of greater social justice.

To reinforce the demands of rural majorities, VGs must first be known by rural people. This is not yet the case everywhere, including in countries where there is direct concern and competition from large-scale farms with evictions.

The FAO has taken steps to share knowledge of VGs since the end of 2012, but this is a long-term task that is not yet done in all countries. Information and training tools are available to all on FAO's websites.

Feedback from experiences

Guatemala, Madagascar, Mauritania and Uruguay were presented.

In these cases, the VGs allowed:

1. to legitimize the choice to open the dialogue on the theme of access to land between actors whose interests differ in this field, including in contexts where their divergences go as far as conflict, and in particular to legitimize the participation of social movements in this dialogue;
2. to provide a benchmark for evaluating measures taken in the context of previous reforms: validating certain method and content choices, identifying gaps;
3. in cases where the VGs served as a guide for political reforms (Colombia, Scotland, Guatemala, Madagascar, Uruguay), sometimes with support from FAO (Colombia, Guatemala, Madagascar), they led to the development of supporting legal and administrative initiatives for family farming, indigenous communities and women.

The effects of these measures often remain to be realized, as these reforms have been finalized recently or are still under discussion. In cases where they have begun to be implemented by governments which also favor large-scale land concentration, the latter have not ceased to act in this direction.

Discussions around VG within the Specialized Meeting on Family Farming, REAF, members of MERCOSUR (Common Market of South America) have been reported. They enabled participating States and civil society organizations to gauge the importance of regulating for family farmers, indigenous communities

and women. For example, they validated the choice of the National Institute of the Colonization of Uruguay to regulate the transfer (by the farmers) of the rights of use of the lands that it administers, in order to guarantee their family vocation in the long term. These discussions led REAF to adopt a common definition of family farming and to create a register of family farmers to facilitate their access to support schemes dedicated to them in each MERCOSUR member country.

Proposals

The avenues proposed may be citizen action alone, but they can also usefully mobilize local, national and international governmental institutions, and in particular the FAO:

- The way in which VGs can help to promote the political choice of a development path based on family farming and family and community use of natural resources in general could be the subject of in-depth reflection and documentation for large-scale sharing of experiences.

- In the perspective of promoting responsible governance of land tenure but also the political choice of family farming, and given the need for social movements to be drivers of change, a method could be developed to guide these in the development of strategies to open multi-stakeholder dialogues, with a view to creating the effective will of governments to act in favor of rural majorities.

- In addition to the recommendations formulated by the VGs, guides could be produced to develop the discussions on the issues and the possible political measures in certain key governance fields. Firstly, the importance of regulating land rights (use and ownership) markets with a view to maintaining farmers' and rural communities' long-term access to natural resources and their autonomy of use, and relevant tools in this area would deserve specific documentation. In the same way, the methods of recognition of communal / community rights and their protection could usefully be the subject of further study and complementary guide-books. Also, agrarian reform processes would need to be documented.

- Promoting the dynamics of regional intergovernmental exchanges, open to civil society, to allow the exchange of political and practical experiences, and emulation in the area of responsible governance of tenure systems.

- To build internal and international alliances involving not only civil society but also academic sectors and supportive government institutions to support dialogue approaches to foster development that emphasizes peasant agriculture and other family / community uses of natural resources. International alliances are absolutely essential to go in this direction in countries where the right of expression of rural people is reduced or even nil.

Three expectations were expressed by the civil society organizations present:

- Means to translate and disseminate VG in countries where they are little known

by rural majorities, in particular because national governments refuse to relay them;

- The communication by FAO of its implementation strategy for VGs in the framework of climate change action projects involving a large land areas with which it is associated (project of maintenance and creation of carbon sinks by the conservation and plantation of forests, conservation project and soil restoration);

- That the report of the dissemination and the implementation of the VG at the next session of the CFS in October 2016 is not only through the presentation of success stories) but also gives governments opportunities to learn from the difficulties that may have been encountered in other cases so as in order to find solutions.

Interventions

The following list is not exhaustive. We apologize to the speakers and participants of the workshop, if they find your information we invite you to contact us at the following email address to edit a new version of this summary:

secretariat@landaccessforum.org

Introducing interventions:

GAMBOA, Klemen, United Nations Organization for Food and Agriculture (FAO), Latin American Delegation.

OUSMANE CAMARA, Jean, National Coordinator of the Unit for the Coordination of Agrarian Reform, Ministry of the Presidency in charge of presidential projects, Planning and Public Works, Madagascar.

GOMEZ, Jacqueline, President of the National Institute of Colonization, Uruguay.

LEON AYALA, Yvan Felipe, Representative of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in Colombia.

Interventions of participants:

BA, Elhadj Mamadou, Mauritanian Association for the Self (WADA), Mauritania
BINYUKI NYOTA, Espérance, Union for the Emancipation of the Native Women (UEFA), Democratic Republic of Congo.

IMOBIN JINNAH, Shah, Community Development Association (CDA), Bangladesh.

MOLINA, Javier, liaison officer with the United Nations, United Nations Organization for Food and Agriculture (FAO), Colombia.

KEMANDA, Bienvenu, House Pygmy children and women, Central African Republic.

MACHART, Yves-Rocher, Agronomists and Veterinarians Without Borders (AVSF), France.

MANCHOLA RUIZ, Olga, Colombia.

PEACOCK, Peter, Community Land Scotland, United Kingdom.

Ravindra Gunawardana, MAPALAGAM HEWARUPPAGE KARIYAWASAM, Center for the Study of the Environment and Nature, Sri Lanka.

SABLE, Anne-Laure, Catholic Action Committee Against Hunger and for Development CCFD - Terre Solidaire, France.

SAMPHORS, Doung, Star Kampuchea, Cambodia.

VETTRAINO, Jean, Secours Catholique, France.

WARTENA, Sjoerd, Terre de Liens, France.

Moderator:

SANCHEZ CURIHUENTRO, Rubén, Citizen Observatory, Chile.

Relator:

TAYLOR, Michael, Director of the Secretariat of the International Land Coalition (ILC), Botswana.

WORKSHOP 11: Food security and sovereignty, land rights (individual and collective), common goods

Review

The food crises of 2007-2008, causes of "hunger riots" in several so-called developing countries, was revealing, not of a food shortage, but of problems of access to food.

These were the consequence of the development of an agricultural model, capitalist exploitation with wage earners, which does not meet the nutritional needs of people who have little money. The expansion of this model is an obstacle to achieving food security and sovereignty¹⁸.

In recent years, the acceleration of the processes of land grabbing and concentration of land and natural resources (water, seeds, fishery resources, forests, etc..) has put into question their good use by the majority of families and rural communities. In particular, these processes endanger the agricultural production of hundreds of millions of peasants who feed themselves and already cover more than 70% of the global food requirements despite all of the constraints it faces.

In line with the policies pursued during the colonial period, and in line with the recommendations of international institutions, many States formalize the rights to land and natural resources according to juridical schemes foreign to the representations of the populations and communities.

The model of the absolute individual right over all the resources of a parcel of land, exclusive and transferable to the highest bidder on a market, is largely imposed. It upsets the systems of organization of space and uses of natural

¹⁸ Food security, as defined by the FAO, exists when "all human beings have, at all times, access to food in sufficient quantity and quality." The term food sovereignty emerged from the peasant movement La Via Campesina, in particular to refute the liberalization of agricultural trade, and to influence the right of people to define and implement agricultural and food policies of their choice and ensure the living conditions of farmers. This freedom to choose food production methods justifies the right to protect and regulate agricultural production and trade.

resources. For many communities and individuals, land is not a commodity. The users of the resources of the same place can be diverse and order their uses according to a collective management.

In Senegal, for example, national law does not recognize family ownership. By denying the basic social institutions of local systems such as this, these transformations affect the ability of rural people to control the use of food-related resources, that is, to exercise their food sovereignty.

Compliance with individualistic and liberal formalism is often long and costly. Most farmers are economically excluded from access to land titles guaranteed by the State, as is the case in Madagascar. Many examples show that the distribution of land titles actually create situations of land insecurity and facilitates the concentration of land. In a system where the rights are redistributed to the highest bidder, the use of resources is precarious or impossible for the poor, especially young people. Intermittent uses such as for grazing, which is crucial for nomadic pastoralists, are particularly precarious.

In failing to effectively recognize local norms for natural resource management, States take over customary land and return it to the inventory of "available" land for potential "investors" after eventually converting it to State land (as was the case in India, for example). They contribute to the eviction of rural communities from their territories by actors seeking short-term profits. Frequently, people who experience these forms of eviction are not compensated.

The original collective management methods established in various places (customary or traditional law, more recently commons) were born from the experience of local conditions (climate, resources, etc.) and the culture of the groups concerned. They can provide users with the security of access to resources while ensuring a consistent and agro-ecological implementation of uses (pasture, crops, gathering, hunting, fishing, etc.). They hold keys for sustainable management of natural resources and equitable sharing of their benefits within societies.

It is not a question of making sacred all the existing modes of community management. Some forms, especially traditional, maintain strong inequalities of power and generate exclusion. The challenge is to protect the existing commons to put an end to the disappearance of the communities that depend on them and maintain them.

It is therefore necessary to find organizational arrangements around land and natural resources that provide security of use for family users who are being evicted while benefiting everyone.

Political and legal frameworks and powers, National or International, must evolve to make room for local collective power and organization systems. The articulation of individual and collective rights best able to protect family and community uses of natural resources must be sought.

It is a condition of security and food sovereignty.

Proposals

Citizen action

- advocate for recognition and protection by governments of local standards for land and natural resources.
- Support (by participating or by providing material or financial support) the concrete collective experiences of organization of uses conducive to peasant agriculture and other family / community uses of natural resources;
- Develop, within citizen forums of land users and natural resources, open to urban, researchers, etc., political and legal proposals specific to tenure systems that:
 - Are inspired by the existing modes of organization of the practices favourable to peasant agriculture and other family / community uses of the natural resources (among the customary / traditional operations, but also the actions of the States whose forms of regulation of the private property individual guaranteeing the general interest);
 - Organize the coexistence between the sources of norms / local powers (customary, traditional community systems, etc.) and national and international law to guarantee security and food sovereignty from local to global;
 - Emphasize the interest of all members, men and women, of local communities in the definition of the general interest, especially before any decision to implement a project (mining, infrastructure, agricultural, forestry, etc.) affecting their territory;
 - Fully integrate the ecological, economic and social issues: land rights and affecting natural resources generally subject to compliance with standards in these areas, incentives for better performance in these areas through the granting of benefits related to the exercise these rights.
- Build wider alliances, especially with urban people, so that political power plays out in favour of land tenures that are conducive to peasant agriculture and other family and community uses of natural resources.

To forge these alliances, one must:

- Develop and communicate strong arguments for these categories of rural people in the fields of food, the creation and maintenance of jobs and living conditions, and the preservation of the environment (agroecology, fight against agro-toxins and other pollutants, against climate change, etc.);

- Analyse and explain the implications of legal models such as private individual property, registration, cadastral, etc. according to their various application

modalities in order to warn public opinion against the discourse of States and international institutions that justify these transformations in the name of the greater security of land tenure that they are supposed to bring. Question certain terms that make the bed of political orientations not conducive to peasant agriculture and other family and community uses of land (agricultural "exploitation", "resources", for example);

- To question the way in which the general interest is defined and in particular who defines it. Wondering how it should be defined to be truly general; to recall the meaning public property and private State property as a consequence;

- Defend, if necessary, against the restrictive legal frameworks, the conditions of peasant agriculture: developing peasant seeds, peasant markets, peasant food, etc.

Political and legal measures needed

- Recognize and effectively protect local traditional and customary land tenure systems up to the latest;
- Protect family farming against capitalist salaried agriculture through a special status;
- Redistribute grabbed land and limit land and / or logging rights transfers to preserve and expand peasant agriculture and other family and community uses of natural resources;
- De-clutter and democratize decision-making: rural people, men and women, young and old, must participate in resource allocation decisions (agricultural, forestry, tourism, mining projects, etc.);
- Facilitate the relocation of agricultural and food systems (processing and consumption).

Interventions

The following list is not exhaustive. We apologize to those who participated in this workshop and participants who do not find their name, and we invite you to express to you, at the following address, to allow us to publish a new version of this summary to the full list: secretariat@landaccessforum.org

Introductory statements:

CASTILLO HUERTAS, Ana Patricia, agrarian Feminist, Guatemala.

CISSÉ, El Hadji Thierno, Assistant Coordinator of the Technical Support Unit,

National Council for Consultation and Rural Cooperation (CNCR), Senegal.
KOUAMA, Georges, Researcher, University Felix Houphouet Boigny, Ivory Coast.
ROMERO BORRALLO, Eugenio, Member of Parliament of Extremadura, Podemos, Spain.
SHARMA, Ramesh Chandar, Campaign Coordinator, Ekta Parishad, India.

Interventions of participants:

ANDRIANTIANA, Rija, Chairman of the National Committee for the defence of the Rights of the Earth, Madagascar.
BASTERRETxea, Txaran, Consultant, United Nations Organization for Food and Agriculture (FAO), Spain.
CHAUVEAU, Jean-Pierre Emeritus Director of Research, Technical Committee "Land and Development", France.
DOUWE Ploeg, Jan, Professor, University of Wageningen, Netherlands.
FAYE, Iba Mar, Head of Mission Family farming and land, GRET, Senegal.
LOUW, Carmen, Women Farm Project, South Africa.
MONREAL GAINZA, Borja, Rural Development Consultant, United Nations Organization for Food and Agriculture (FAO).
NASCIMENTO SILVA, Adriana. National Confederation of Agricultural Workers, Brazil.
NEVES Vitor Carlos, Central of Cooperatives and Solidarity Enterprises UNISOL, Brazil.
THOMSON, Frances. University of Sussex, UK.

Moderator:

MAMALO, Abdoul Karim, former Permanent Secretary of the Rural Code in Niger.

Witness:

MELLAC, Marie, Researcher, National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS), France.

WORKSHOP 12: Fiscal Policies, regulation of financial markets and the size of production units

Review

The first conclusion from this workshop is that, everywhere in the world, there is a strong expansion of inequalities in the distribution of land, with increasing concentration of land in the hands of a small number of actors.

This phenomenon of land concentration inevitably leads to the exclusion and marginalization of small production units and their workers. A bipolar agricultural model is developing which opposes family farming in favour of large-scale agriculture in an imbalanced struggle.

It is clear that many agrarian reform processes that took place in the 1970s, in Latin America in particular, failed. Indeed, in the majority of cases, Chile and Peru, for example, we observe that latifundism has managed to re-impose itself in the space of a few decades after the implementation of agrarian reforms. The development of neo-liberalism has played a central role in this systematic re-concentration of land. For example, the injunctions of the international financial institutions to create a "favourable investment climate" have led various national governments to put in place very advantageous policies for investors (tax exemptions, business creation facilities, guaranteed profits, etc.), particularly encouraging the arrival of large agribusiness companies to which access is offered, sometimes almost free, for large land extensions.

In the vast majority of countries, the productive model of agro-holdings, also favoured by the free-trade treaties in force, tends to become widespread at the expense of peasant and family farming. The analysis of the distribution of land rights goes hand in hand with that of the forms of use of natural resources. The current phenomena of land concentration are inseparable from the generalization of the agricultural model of the large specialized farm.

In the light of a return to world agrarian history, it is possible to say that the concentration of the land systematically leads to the impoverishment of the peasants and that the crisis of the rural sector generally brings national economies to ruin.

Today we see the emergence of new holders of land rights (of property or of use:

granted as a right or short term leases), namely corporate organisations who often come from other countries than those in which they settle and sometimes even from sectors foreign to agriculture.

During the last three decades, the number of agricultural cooperative companies has increased dramatically. Today, the great latifundists are no longer individuals but companies. This phenomenon is related to the openness to foreign investment. Capital from all over the world can be invested in a country's agriculture to create new businesses or acquire existing shares in agricultural holdings. These acquisitions and the concentration by the same shareholder of shares of multiple companies put into question security and food sovereignty. The financialisation of agriculture throws a veil over those who have the real power to choose the uses of the land and derive the benefits. Where they exist, the tools for regulating land uses are outdated.

In France, for example, the Land Development and Rural Settlement Societies (SAFER) do not have the power to control the sale of shares.

All of the participants concluded that the idea of the "self-regulating" market, pivot of the classical economy, is a fiction in the field of land tenure. An equitable distribution of property or use rights in society, which allows the implementation of activities that guarantee good living conditions for the majority of individuals and families, cannot be established spontaneously.

While most participants expressed the need for effective regulation of land markets and shares of agricultural enterprises, others argued that land can not be considered a commodity since it is a fundamental resource for all human life and that it must, as such, escape the market mechanisms, whether or not it is regulated.

Proposals

Recognize the importance of family farming in each of our countries and identify the specific problems it faces in order to give them appropriate answers:

- Support the policies of redistribution of the land by other public policies, allowing the producers to establish themselves sustainably and guaranteeing them good living conditions. Some participants call for an "integral agrarian reform" including the redistribution of land and clear measures of support for a small-scale farming model: measures to support agro-ecology, development of farmers' markets and other short circuits marketing, facility aids, etc..;
- Promote the return of land to indigenous / indigenous peoples in each country and act to recover their stolen land during colonization;
- Capping agricultural subsidies, especially in Europe, to help curb speculation on land and reduce the proliferation of large farms whose operation is not in keeping with the interests of the population as a whole.

Put in place effective regulation of land markets:

- Use tax policies to regulate the land market and limit the size of farms;
- Put in place mechanisms for regulating transfers of shares so as to be able to effectively regulate the evolution of farm structures;
- Look for a better articulation between the different frameworks that regulate the land, national and supranational. Some participants argued that it would be essential to put in place regulations also at the global level.

Forge alliances with different sectors of society:

- continue and step up efforts to build a strong connection between urban consumers and agriculture;
- Attempt to rally to the "peasant cause" a fraction of the politicians in power today by convincing them that the defence of family farming is essential for the balance of society as a whole;
- Join and act alongside agrarian social movements. Build a strong social movement with proposals;
- Continue reflections and discussions around the following questions:
 - How to influence governments and public policies?
 - What types of agrarian reforms should we promote in our countries?
 - What should be the role of states in these agrarian reforms?
 - What do we really mean when we talk about family farming?
 - Can the land be considered a commodity or not?

Interventions

The following list is not exhaustive. We apologize to those involved at the time of the workshop and participants who do not find your name here, and we invite you to contact the following address, to allow us to edit a new version of this synthesis with the full list: secretariat@landaccessforum.org

Introductory statements:

EGUREN, Fernando, Director, Peruvian Center for Social Studies (CEPES), Peru.
GONZALEZ CORRAL, Pablo, Councilman, Andalusian Union of Workers (SAT), Spain.

HYEST, Emmanuel, President of the National Federation of the Society of Rural Planning and Establishments (FNSAFER), France.

LEVESQUE, Robert, Agronomist, Lands Scafr Europe, France.

MAZOYER, Marcel, Professor Emeritus, AgroParisTech, France.

SOMBOLINGGI, Rukka, Alliance of Indigenous Peoples of the Archipelago, AMAN, Indonesia.

Interventions of participants:

BUISSON, Michel, Agronomist, Association for the Taxation of Financial Transactions for the Aid of Citizens (ATTAC), France.

LOYAT, Jacques, Agronomist, Association for the Taxation of Financial Transactions for the Aid of Citizens (ATTAC), France.

MACZ, Maria Josefa, Deputy National Coordinator of Campesino Unity Committee of Guatemala (CUC), Guatemala.

MUNTING, Monique, consultant and documentary filmmaker, AGTER, SCAM, Amnesty International, COTA, Belgium.

ROUX, Bernard, Academy of Agriculture of France, France.

SUAREZ, Victor, Mexico National Association of Commercialization Enterprises (ANEC).

VAN Tschärner, Severine, Greenhorns, United States.

Moderator:

Arnalte Eladio, Professor, Polytechnic University of Valencia, Spain.

Witness:

ROBLES, Hector, Executive Coordinator of the website "Subsidies Campo" Mexico.

WORKSHOP 13: **Strengthening farmer organizations, pastoralists, indigenous peoples and fishermen. Expand partnerships in society**

Review

Every day, more and more women and men, family and community users of land and natural resources, are put in precarious situations, dispossessed of their resources and evicted from their lands: peasants and farmers, nomadic pastoralists, pastoralists, fishermen, forest dwellers, etc.. (workshops 1, 2, 3, 5).

This development is dramatic for all of humanity: its direct human consequences concern the vast majority of rural people, who provide the bulk of food production and contribute to the maintenance of ecological balances. The considerable economic, socio-cultural and environmental problems raised strike both cities and the countryside and penalize future generations (workshops 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9).

This development is the consequence of the current general political orientation that promotes the large-scale capitalist exploitation of land and natural resources and makes its competition more and more direct with the activities of the majority of the rural population.

For many years, voices have been raised, strategies have been identified and actions taken by civil society. Successes are to be applauded, such as those of Ekta Parishad in India, the March of CONTAG in Brazil, and that of the West African Caravan organized as part of the "Convergence of struggles for land, water and the peasant seeds" taken by La Via Campesina.

To globally reverse the prevailing trend, a broad global alliance against peasant evictions and the expansion of large-scale capitalist exploitation of natural resources is essential. It can take shape only around claims elaborated collectively from the particular requirements of local struggles and concrete actions, and integrate the points of view of all those, urban and rural, who want this change of direction.

Which alliances?

To take strength in the face of the power of the private lobbies and the power of the States that defend their interests, we must overcome the divisions between urban and rural, between peasants, pastoralists, rural farmers, fishermen and indigenous communities, between social movements, researchers and policies. All those who share the previous observation would usefully act by combining their forces to change the situation:

- Peasants, pastoralists, rural farmers, fishermen, indigenous and pastoral communities. They produce 70% of the agricultural products consumed in the world. They contribute to the dynamism of rural areas, thereby curbing rural exodus. They have demonstrated their ability to preserve ecosystems while creating significant employment opportunities and economic and cultural wealth,
- Among them, women. They carry more of the agricultural load than men in many parts of the world and they are very often the true guarantors of the well-being of families. But they are not recognized for that and are still under-represented in decision-making bodies and social movements, including peasants,
- And young people. They are the future and also the present: it is on them that rests the generational renewal essential to the maintenance of peasant agriculture and other forms of family and community uses of natural resources,
- Researchers and experts. They can provide scientific arguments in favor of the practices and proposals of peasants, pastoralists, rural farmers, indigenous and pastoral communities,
- Local elected representatives, local authorities, members of government institutions. Some are receptive to the problems faced by rural people and the solutions proposed by their organizations, and their support would allow the establishment of local policies favourable to family producers or the development of far-reaching, detailed and effective policies.
- Urban citizens. They now represent half of humanity, and their food and therefore their lives depend directly on rural people. Many have known having lived the serious problems that weigh on the rural world that they had to leave more or less recently. They suffer from mass unemployment resulting from the rural exodus. Their acts of consumption can affect the supply of food products, but above all, their voice is essential to weigh as much as necessary on policies.

The participants in the workshop called on each other to overcome their differences to bring a body of common demands to face the block. They stressed that it was first of all necessary to rally the organizations of the urban civil society

to the rural cause, as the political leaders will change only for their greatest majority, only under a very strong popular pressure. They emphasized that this alliance must give a very important place to the most vulnerable populations, namely rural women and indigenous local communities.

Organization, operation and missions of the alliance

Participants called for the strengthening of local organizations and movements and their networking with each other at the national, regional and international levels.

Putting together demands and experiences is essential to bring, with the greatest possible political weight (the citizens), to the proposals that will make it possible to respond to real problems, to protect and support the user family and community agro-ecologists land and natural resources.

At each of these levels (local, national, regional, international), all the actors mentioned above should participate democratically in the development of common demands.

Strengthening local movements

Family and community-based natural resource user organizations that are resilient to threats to their agro-ecological practices should be supported and helped in structuring new ones where they have not yet created them. Training can be useful in this sense, especially in the forms of structuring (unionisation, association, etc.), on the methods of organization and claim actions, but also in legal matter to develop the knowledge of the rights of each one.

Strengthening or creating national platforms

Open spaces to all components of society, where family and community users of natural resources can assert their plans for the life and organization of the lands in which they live, must be supported and others opened when they are not or do not exist yet.

These places should bring together, beyond the rural areas, representatives of the other categories of actors indicated above to build, in alliances, specific political proposals to support the struggles and the actions of the organizations, to promote these policies and implement them.

These places should be used to give the strongest echo to local struggles against land and resource grabbing and to enable the formulation and promotion of policies to support land projects of local organizations.

The participants also cited, among other examples, citizens and / or "elected representatives" initiatives that have succeeded in developing a supply to community restaurants (schools, retirement homes, public administrations,

etc..) by local producers, or acts in this direction.

Exchanging experiences and thinking together about supra-communal political measures (at provincial, federal or national state level, etc.) that are relevant to fostering and multiplying them is one of the challenges of these national spaces.

Strengthening or creating regional and international platforms

The participants pointed throughout the forum at the global nature of the policies that promote the large-scale capitalist exploitation of natural resources and the transnational nature of the companies that often implement it. A change of focus and alternatives are absolutely necessary at this level.

Representatives of local organizations from different categories of allies who participate in the work of national platforms, as well as representatives of their regional federations (for example: Mesoamerican Association of Forest Peoples, AMPB, Network of Farmers' Organizations and West African Producers, etc.) should be able to meet and develop desirable common responses at this level.

The idea was launched that all these platforms feed databases in order to pool experiences and struggles: by firstly compiling experiences of concrete alternatives for use of natural resources and secondly by listing the struggles currently in progress and the levers of action to which they have resorted (legal, occupation, march, armed struggle, etc..). The example of the website www.porlatierra.org has been given. The platforms could thus be called upon to massively support a local struggle. It was recalled that the support of the international community has for example made some progress in the field of logging in Cambodia, now officially under a moratorium.

The idea of organizing regional courts against land grabbers was also put forward. The aim would be to bring the perpetrators of violations of rights of access to land and natural resources and other fundamental rights to the widest possible audience where the official justice system refuses or fails to do so.

Desirable of contributing to this global alliance dynamic, the participants of the WFAL propose to create a coordinating committee to link to all national, regional and international spaces where common proposals and alternatives are developed and to organize, in two years, a Global Forum in Africa to allow their stakeholders to take stock of their progress over the two years.

This committee should be made up of numerous organizations directly affected or supporting organizations fighting against land grabs. It was suggested to build a common budget (0.2% of the budget of each organization wishing to support this idea for example) in order to provide the International Organization Committee of the WFAL with means of action.

The participants have identified three upcoming International events where the cause of family and community users of land and natural resources must be strongly defended.

They invite those to join them who have set themselves the goal of being present

for this purpose during:

- The signing of the Paris agreement on COP21 to be held in New York. The movement must be able to assert its demands when signing the Paris Agreement;
- COP13 on biodiversity of Cancun;
- The COP22 which will be organized in 2016 in Marrakech. The Association of World Mountain Peoples (APMM) has called for the organization of a great march and days of action around this event. Organizations must be armed with proposals on the management of these spaces so as not to let governments, politicians and experts decide instead of the local communities concerned.

Interventions

The following list is not exhaustive. We apologize to the participants in the workshop whose name does not appear, and we invite you to send us your data, to the following address, so we can edit a new version of this synthesis with the full list:

secretariat@landaccessforum.org

Introductory statements:

BAUTISTA Durán, Ruth, Institute for Rural Development in South America (IPDRS), Bolivia.

BOURLIAUD, Jean, Association of the Peoples of the World Mountains (APMM), France.

COSTA LUNAS, Alessandra, National Confederation of Agricultural Workers (CONTAG), Brazil.

OEUR, Il, Executive Director, Center for Analysis on development issues (ADIC), Cambodia.

SANCHEZ, Gustavo, Red Mexicana de Forest Campesino Organizations (Red MOCAF), Mexico.

Interventions of participants:

BAYLAC, Michel, President of the European Association of Institutions for Rural Development (AEIAR), France.

ED Daoudi Mohamed, Association of the Peoples of the World Mountains (APMM), Morocco.

HUAYHUA, Margarita, Socio-Cultural anthropologist, Rutgers University (USA), Quechua Community Pampamarca, Peru.

KAMEL Said, President of the Population Association of mountains in the world

[APMM), Morocco.

KARIYAWASAM Majuwana Gamage, Thilak, Sri Lanka Nature Group, Sri Lanka.

LERAS, Gérard, ex-dairyman, former Vice President of the Rhône Alpes by land, AGTER, France.

OETTLE, Laurel, Director of the Association for Rural AVGancement (AFRA), South Africa.

SOW, Elhadji Samba, Collective for the defence of Ndiael (CODEN), Senegal.

TZI, Ernesto, Association for Welfare Action (APROBA-SANK), Guatemala.

YAYO ABA AMI, Sanaya, livestock, ramidus - Afardacarsitoh Eglä, Ethiopia.

Moderator:

PALEBELE, Kolyang, National Council of Coordination of rural producers Chad (CNCPR) and Regional Platform of Peasant Organizations of Central Africa (PROPAC), Chad.

Witness:

KONÉ, Massa, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Union of Associations and Coordinators of the Association for the defence of the Rights of the Poor (UACDDDD), Speaker of the Malian Coalition against land grabbing (WCPA) and Novox Afrik, Mali.

Plenary Session VI

Final synthesis

Reading of the summary proposed by the editorial board

Henri ROUILLE D'ORFEUIL, Academy of Agriculture, France - Moderator

We are slightly delayed. As you can imagine, with such rich and diverse input that this is not a simple exercise of writing a final declaration. The declaration is a common point amongst all of us, and tries to show that with such diversity there is a unity of proposals to our movement. We must also think of the actors who have the ability to change these often deplorable situations.

Here reunited is the drafting committee consisting of the three main movements: ROPPA for West Africa, CONTAG and COPROFAM for Brazil and South America, and Ekta Parishad for India, with Hubert Cochet and Michel Merlet who have followed the whole process from the beginning and obviously have the notes of all previous changes.

Hubert Cochet will read the statement. This is the final declaration, which we do not have the means now to negotiate in detail here, but regardless, we will ask you all to enrich and illustrate it after with your actions and your projects. We will not have time to listen to everyone, of course, so we will ask you to send us in your notes and certainly after to write to the WFAL secretariat to provide more information, illustrations and proposals. The line remains open.

Reading of the declaration by Hubert COCHET, Professor, AgroParisTech, member of the International Organizing Committee WFAL 2016, France

This text is composed of two parts. The first part attempts to make a diagnosis of the situation on which we reflected during these three days and the second part announces a series of propositions:

The Global Forum on Access to Land and Natural Resources (WFAL 2016) was held in Valencia, Spain, from March 31 to April 2, with the support of over 1,200 peasant organizations and civil society, national institutions, internationals, experts and professionals from more than 70 countries. It has brought together more than 400

people, coming from all continents, who have freely shared their testimony in the various debates established.

Diagnosis

Twelve years after the World Forum on Agrarian Reform (GFAR, Valencia, Spain, 2004) and ten years after the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD / FAO, Porto Alegre, Brazil, 2006) the participants of this Forum found that land redistribution policies had been abandoned and that the policies put in place do not take into account the local reality of grass roots communities.

Lack of access to land and productive resources is still a major cause of poverty, loss of food sovereignty, and the marginalization of most rural and urban populations in the world. They have also testified that, in many countries, this deplorable situation has worsened further as a result of the various processes of land grabbing of the best farmland, water, forest and pastoral areas, fisheries and small number of people who have accumulate more and more power.

For more than thirty years, big agricultural companies with salaried workers are gaining ground at the expense of family and peasant farms. By the late 1970s, these companies took advantage of the liberalization of capital flows to begin expanding in some Latin American and South East Asian countries, attracted by the low prices of land and labour and the benefits offered by governments. In the 1980s and 1990s, they took advantage of neo-liberal globalization (opening of markets linked to structural adjustment plans, agreement on agriculture in the WTO, various international free trade agreements and financial deregulation) to expand in all countries of the world. These companies are benefiting from the weakening of family farms and peasants, following the abandonment of agricultural policies that were favourable to the family farms, to expand. Natural resources have been considered as commodities, to the detriment of the environment, food sovereignty, and the rights of people to food.

These specialized agricultural enterprises based on the employment of salaried workers do not always produce more food and added value per unit of area than the family and peasant agriculture to which they replace. The participants emphasized, as an extension of the International Year of Family Farming (2014), the productive, social and environmental efficiency of family and peasant production units, particularly when public policies are favourable to them.

On the contrary, the efficiency of large private companies is limited to generating financial profits. These profits come from the very low cost of access to land, water and natural resources, low wages and the absence of taxation. They do not come from a real agronomic or economic efficiency.

In the environmental field, the allocation of large areas of land to investors goes hand in hand with the promotion of monoculture-based production systems that rely on the massive use of fossil energy and industrial inputs with risks of soil and water pollution. These projects contribute to the degradation of biodiversity, the ecological

crisis and climate change.

The sidelining of hundreds of millions of farmers, lacking sufficient access to land, irrigation water and other means of production, is now fuelling an overall process of marginalization and loss of dignity, carrying major imbalances. The current situation - persistent hunger and malnutrition, growing inequalities between and within countries, exclusion, structural violence, massive unemployment, environmental crisis and loss of food sovereignty - is intolerable. Indigenous peoples as well as women and youth are particularly affected by this situation.

The adoption in 2012 by the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) of the "Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security" was the main result of the ICARRD. But their concrete application runs up against the lack of political will of States.

The WFAL denounces and condemns the crimes, violence and intimidation committed against those who struggle to gain access to land and natural resources in fairer conditions, or who struggle to maintain their rights. It condemns the pressure on organizations defending these rights and their frequent criminalization. It reaffirms democratic principles, freedoms and respect for human rights.

The WFAL supports the many initiatives that are emerging in the world to find solutions to these problems.

Proposals

Faced with this situation, the WFAL-2016 affirms that access to land and natural resources is the basis of food sovereignty of the people. As a result it calls:

1 / to stop the processes of land grabbing and land concentration wherever they occur in the world,

2 / to return as soon as possible unjustly looted land to the displaced and uncompensated populations up to the level of the damage suffered,

3 / to correct the inequalities of access to land and natural resources (water, forest and pastoral resources, fishing grounds) by the revival of distributive policies and in particular of the Agrarian Reform,

4 / to recognize the essential role of women, to ensure their effective participation in decision-making, and to eliminate all forms of inequality of access to resources from which they are still too often victims.

5 / to facilitate access to land and natural resources for young people to live with dignity; and to promote a dialogue between generations in order to reconcile the transmission of local knowledge and the empowerment of young people,

6 / to put in place regulatory tools to discourage land concentration: tax policies, intervention mechanisms on the land, lease and capital markets markets,

7 / to ensure that governments commit to implementing the Voluntary Guidelines for Responsible Governance of Tenure on Land, Fisheries and Forests now in the context

of national food security (VG); and to promote the establishment of autonomous land observatories,

8 / to initiate immediately a process to transform these Directives into binding commitments of States and international institutions,

9 / to discourage the creation of very large, highly mechanized, specialized production units that make extensive use of synthetic inputs and fossil energy and rely on the exploitation of the salaried labour force.

10 / to put family and peasant farming back at the center of public policies, to recognize its effectiveness, its capacity to increase food production, to generate employment and to reduce poverty while preserving ecosystems,

11 / to ensure that land, which is available in limited quantities, can have the social function of sustainably producing as much food and wealth as possible per unit area,

12 / to reorient all direct and indirect public support towards family and peasant agriculture, particularly towards agro-ecological production systems,

13 / to promote trade policies enabling small producers to live with dignity from their work,

14 / to consult citizens on the desirability of setting up free trade agreements that risk ruining producers the least well endowed of land, natural resources and equipment, and that could violate the right of populations to ensure their food sovereignty,

15 / to promote the governance of territories by the people who live there (in particular indigenous peoples) by enabling communities to define the rules and rights of use of their commons, and to implement the most in accordance with their technical, ecological, economic and cultural choices,

16 / to put an immediate end to the repression of those still struggling for more equitable access to land and natural resources, and to support, wherever they occur, the movements of poor peasants, landless peasants, fishermen, indigenous peoples, women and young people fighting for their rights,

17 / to continue and unify the struggles that have been expressed during this forum,

18 / to broaden citizen, rural and urban alliances, and to organize a broad mobilization of civil society, the only one likely to lead to the establishment of governance mechanisms capable of stopping the concentration of resources by a minority, and the extremely difficult conflicts that arise,

19 / to create, within the United Nations and their specialized agencies, an independent institution guaranteeing the interests of future generations,

20 / The WFAL requests that the international institutions (FAO, CSA, UN) convene, in the continuity of ICARRD 2006 and WFAL-2016, a new world conference of governments and civil society on the issue of access to the land and natural resources.

Thank you.

Comments from members of the drafting committee

Henri ROUILLE D'ORFEUIL, Academy of Agriculture, France - Moderator.

You can already, I think, congratulate the drafting committee. I think we have a list of very consistent and strong proposals. This statement has the potential to become a tool for everyone in their actions, wherever it may be and in diverse situations. We have not characterized geographic or very specific situations. It is clearly a statement that should be able to be agreeable to all the players who gather here. Before opening a little debate, I would initially like give the floor to members of the drafting committee who will explain their feelings about this process and this statement.

Alessandra LUNAS COSTA, National Confederation of Agricultural Workers (CONTAG), Brazil.

Thank you. I would like to point out that these international meetings in which we take part put us before the great challenge of translating into the documents all the forces and ideas that each of you brought to the debates.

The process of constructing the summary has been an immense effort.

I would like to propose that in addition to this public statement, we make an effort to summarize all the debates, all the discussions that took place both in the workshops and in the plenary sessions, to show, as much as possible, all the forces that has been brought by everyone. It may be necessary to produce a more substantial document, to seek support for a publication that will fully relay the contributions of the participants.

In the final summary, it was impossible to do that, but we must not lose this material.

The second thing I would like to do is convey a bit of the feeling of women in this forum. Here, I'm not talking about a personal impression, but about that of many colleagues including a comrade from Spain who said to me: "here the door is open for women to participate but, in many organizations, in other places in Spain, women could not even go into meetings".

I share this feeling so that we start by changing that in the meetings we organize ourselves. I heard a comrade say, "In all the sessions we went to, there were always more men in the gallery." We need to start changing that in the meetings we organize ourselves and in our own organizations as well. I take this opportunity to appeal to comrades who are here to emphasize that we are trying to strengthen a network of rural women's organizations internationally. Because, very often, we are present in these meetings but it is very difficult

to guarantee the speech of the women. We do not need men to speak for us! We want to guarantee our voice in this type of meeting. We want the effective participation of women in the meetings we organize collectively.

Finally, to conclude, here is another sentiment I have heard from young people. In this kind of meeting, we hear a lot that youth is the future, that youth is the future of family farming. I would like to say that youth is not the future, it is the present!

On this point, we also expect the efforts and the contribution of each of our organizations to change the way we do our own activities to guarantee the expression of all the diversity of voices that exist in the rural world, that of the natives, fishermen, etc.. to strengthen and make the voice of the rural world heard in all its components.

El Hadji Thierno CISSE, National Council of Concertation and Rural Cooperation (CNCR), Senegal.

I will begin by thanking the colleagues with whom we worked with on this statement. I think that what is essential for this session is to listen to the room and to perceive certain aspects that are essential to remember in the document. The essential point I would like to stress is that we, as actors here, must be the first to be responsible for implementing the recommendations that come out from our own workshops, our forum. Indeed, some recommendations concern our States, all our States and international institutions. But we should never hide our responsibility in achieving the objectives we have set ourselves. I think that at this level, in any case for the Africa group, as we have always done, we will ensure that the mobilization is effective and that the grass roots actors can be at the centre of our struggles.

We must recognize that all that we have mentioned here as difficulties, it is really the grass roots communities that suffer from this. It is therefore necessary that, in the battles that we are waging, these communities be at the centre of the actions we are conducting, as we have tried to do in many movements, one of whose recent initiatives has been the West African Caravan of struggles for the earth, water and seeds.

We should also strengthen global convergence, as we have done here. We have to meet regularly to take stock and often challenge our decision-makers with respect to the commitments they have made and which, unfortunately, when evaluated over time, we realize the implementation leaves something to be desired. I stop there, the honorary president of ROPPA will surely develop what I just said in closing session. Thank you.

Ramesh Chandra Sharma, Campaigns Coordinator Ekta Parishad, India.

Thank you to the Committee that wrote this statement and a special thank you to all of you who are here, because without your particular, articulate, committed and passionate deliberations, it would not have been possible to write something.

So thanks to you all. I agree and accept this document on behalf of Ekta Parishad which is an alliance of more than 2,000 community organizations representing indigenous peoples, fishermen, nomads, women farmers, young farmers and thousands and thousands of farm workers. I approve this document on behalf of all these people.

For me this document is very important because, in my opinion, it speaks of the land-democracy. That is, it lays the groundwork for a new model of democracy that takes shape when we talk about saving our land. For me, it is a document of hope that truly seeks to bring new ideas to the land of democracy. When I talk about land-democracy, I think of several things. The first is the hope that it gives us, me, my organization, to strengthen our cultural resistance. I mean that every day we are in resistance, every day we fight, every day we create something. This text gives us new energy to strengthen our cultural resistance. This is very important because it is a fundamental idea of democracy. It is a blessing for all these rebellions, those martyrs who lost their lives, who sacrificed their lives to save this planet, this Earth, to secure land rights for all.

This is the way to build the message of the future and for future generations of activists. All of this is extremely important because we want to create a world, a global village where hunger, inequality and violence do not exist. That's why it's important for the Earth-democracy.

The second thing that I think is very important and particularly well captured in this document is that, given the finite nature of nature, the limits of natural resources, we strongly highlight the imperative of intergenerational justice.

We, the present generation, do not want to consume all the resources necessary for us and future generations. We want to save this land, we want to save this planet, the forests and the land for future generations. This is very well transcribed in this document.

The third thing is the fight we are fighting against this violent economy. This is extremely important because every day we face violence that is sometimes structural, sometimes physical or even invisible.

In this document we speak of the destruction, the discriminatory and dangerous approach of all these multinational organizations and institutions, even even the will of the state. We do not want to divide society or the world. Also, it is very important to fight and give a new impetus to continue the fight against the violent economy.

For me this document is very important because it talks a lot about creating a new kind of democratic space. A democratic space so that we can guarantee

the dignity, identity and livelihoods of millions and millions of marginalized communities around the world. For me, this document is important because we want to build bigger and broader actions, to save Mother Earth. Save her not only for us but for future generations and tomorrow.

I approve this document on behalf of Ekta Parishad. We fully recognize and approve of it.

Comments from participants

Henri Rouille d'Orfeuill, Academy of Agriculture, France - Moderator

Thank you. I think that the three witnesses completing this summary and its recognition as a fantastic move forward. I now turn to address the Chairman of the Organization of WFAL, I think it is he who will tell me when I must finish the session. Until he stops me I'll give the floor to proposals in reaction to reading of this summary. I have been given a lot of comments on paper so there are a number of proposals that I can read.

The comment by **Luc Bonamour, International Solidarity for Development and Investment, France**, is as follows:

"it should be added that 1.5 billion households live in family farming and peasant agriculture"

The comment by **Arturo ANGULO Urarte, United Nations Organization for Food and Agriculture (FAO), Spain**, is as follows:

Various proposals among which:

"One must insist, beyond the economic value, on the sacred relationship between land, people and peoples"

The comment by **Mamy Rakotondrainibe, president of the Collective in defence of the Land of Madagascar, TANY, France**, is as follows: "The word indigenous is problematic".

The comment of **Gérard Leras, former dairy farmer, former Vice-President of the Rhône Alpes Region in charge of land, AGTER, France**, is as follows: "It is necessary to give a mandate to constitute a permanent coordination with a deadline of one or two years, give it the means and a minimum budget to give life to the 20 adopted propositions".

The comment of **Mohamed KADAMY YOUSOUF, Teacher, Afar Forum, France Ethiopia**, is the following: "A special mention must be made of the situation of pastoralists, whose land is often considered as vacant property without masters".

I have an announcement of comment by **William Clementino DA SILVA MATIAS, National Confederation of Agricultural Workers, (CONTAG), Coordination of Organizations of Family Producers of Mercosur (Coordinadora de Organizaciones de productores Familiares del Mercosur, COPROFAM), Brazil.**

We are listening to you.

[The same William da Silva Clementino Matias explains his own proposals]

Of course it is impossible for the final document to contain everything, but it must insist on the important points.

Here, it is a global forum for access to land and natural resources, so I think the main issue that the document has to mention is the issue of agrarian reform as a central focus.

I see there are people who do not like this theme, but it's not just us in Brazil who have talked about this. Many others did a lot. I speak for everyone who has spoken about this during the forum. Maybe you do not like this theme but in any case people have talked about it in the forum!

Another thing I would like to see emerge more strongly is what Alessandra has spoken about before: the question of youth can not be approached as if it were only people living in the countryside but as full-fledged people who must benefit from public policies and have income to be able to live in the countryside. No young person will live in the countryside if he has no income, if he has no remuneration. Young people would like to have the same thing as others. We would like to have health, education and money to buy clothes and many other things. Tomorrow we will no longer have family farming. People will leave to have access to health, etc.. Who will stay in the countryside?

A point on the production model: we must put in this statement that we will develop proposals for the agro-ecological transition. We must close the document by saying that all this is to ensure security and food sovereignty so that the document reflects also the opinion of people who are not from our organizations and who are not at this forum.

Henri Rouille d'Orfeuill, Academy of Agriculture, France

Thank you. I return to reading other comments that have been collected.

There is a request to integrate the countries of Oceania, not to forget the continent. Of course!

The comment by **Felix Diaz, Qarashe (Head) community Potae Napocna Navogoh, village Qom, and representative of QQPIWINI common organization of Qom peoples, Pilagá, Wichí and Nivaché, Argentina,** is as follows:

"I request that my word and my movement is heard".

I think that this has been done in the workshops where this issue has been addressed. I do not know if it's enough but in any case we have tried to put it in the declaration and we can enrich it later to give indigenous peoples the space they deserve.

Our colleague from **Sri Lanka** says the following: on the problems of grabbing, "there are also governmental actors, non-governmental institutions under the guise of trade and investment who, on behalf of state security, recover land". I think that's what is written.

Comment by **Kaul NURM, Director of the Federation of Estonian Farmers (ETK), Delegate of the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC), Estonia** is as follows: "Land is a limited resource and can not be treated as private market asset. " I think you should keep that in mind.

I have an announcement of commentary of **Klemen GAMBOA, Agronomist, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Delegation of Latin America, Guatemalan Peoples.**

We are listening:

[Klemen Gamboa reads her own comment]

I want to emphasize that we already have a global consensus document that is the Voluntary Guidelines (VGs). Why do I insist on that? It is that the birth, the origin of VG is in the recognition of land grabbing, especially in Latin America, where a study was made in 17 countries that highlights this phenomenon. Then there was the entire process of discussion of the VGs and I insist that, although voluntary, they are legitimate and that many comrades from civil society have participated in the discussions. From my experience in Guatemala, I know that it was the civil society that knocked on the door of the representation of FAO and really used the VG as an instrument of political impact.

Finally, I would like to invite you to use VG as an instrument of political influence. I commented on the implementation of agricultural policy in Guatemala in the light of the VG during a workshop, but since August we are working with eight civil society organizations and we are studying one case per organization to see how in VG we can find proposals for specific solutions. We have a case on fishing, a case on the forest, and several cases of access to land.

I wish to encourage you not to ignore this instrument constituting the VG along with other instruments of struggle that we already have.

Henri Rouille d'Orfeuill, Academy of Agriculture, France Moderator

Thank you. There are many notes that come to me that I have difficulty reading.

The comment of **Kamira NAÏT SID, President of the World Amazigh Council, Peoples Association of the Mountains of the World, Algeria**, is the following:

"The issue of land and water grabbing and land grabbing by large-scale mining activities needs to be included."

The comment of **Emmanuel HYEST, President of the National Federation of Land Development and Rural Settlement Societies (FNSAFER), France**, is as follows:

"With land regulation we must allow access to land everywhere and in a consensual way". I think the French case is behind this remark.

The comment of **Michel BUISSON, Agronomist, Association for the taxation of financial transactions and for citizen action (ATTAC), France**, is the following:

We must "give more impact to food sovereignty not only as a consequence but also as a solution". He asks for clarification of agricultural policies.

The comment of **Victor SUAREZ, National Association of Marketing Companies of Rural Producers (ANEC), Mexico**, is as follows:

"There needs to be a stronger unity and articulation of leaders at the regional and global level and to more strongly specify the opposition to trade treaties, the TTP, the TTIP, TISA, among others". Of course it's very important.

The comment of **Laurent LEVARD, Agronomist, Party of Left, France**, is the following one:

"I call on international organizations to do a systematization and comparison of types of agriculture".

I have an announcement of commentary from **Michel DAVID, Campesino, Peasant Confederation, France**.

We are listening

[Michel David reads his own comments]

During this forum, a man was imprisoned, here in Spain, for a trade union action for the right to land. His name is Andres Bódalo. I will not read the statement. But I think it would be incongruous, if not contradictory, that we are talking here about peasants fighting for the right to land and that tomorrow, when the Spanish press will probably talk about the imprisonment of this man, put in prison yesterday. while we were talking here, we do not have a particular gesture of support.

We can name two or three other people recently imprisoned or murdered and he is not the only activist we defend. But we can not be here in Spain, without naming and saying that we bring support and solidarity to this man who has been imprisoned for a struggle for the right to land.

Knowing that the SAT / SOC has a long experience and a long struggle where it has proved its credibility to defend the right to land. It is a union of Spanish

workers but has entered into the union La Via Campesina, union of the workers of the land with the Andalusian peasants. I think we can only provide support, thank you for applauding, the committee can rectify a possible support but just to make a small statement that is not in the summary but is more specific. Thank you!

Henri Rouille d'Orfeuill, Academy of Agriculture, France - Moderator

I think it is a symbolic conclusion. I give you some more sample comments:

Our colleague from Cambodia He wants the government of Cambodia to participate in the next forum. It will be welcome.

Another proposal is to "take into account more clearly corruption issues around land transactions"

Another proposal is "Insist on the problem that grabbing of sea resourcing and fishing communities deteriorate fisher folk"

Generally speaking, I invite you to send in your notes to the drafters of the declaration. Some comments need clarification of their authors.

Clearly the two following: The comment of **Monique Munting, Researcher and documentary, AGTER, SCAM, Amnesty International, COTA, Belgium**, which says:

"They are missing essential things".

The comment of **Juana Maria BARBER SANCHO, CONOSUD, Center for Rural and International Agricultural Studies (CERAI), Spain**, is: "Something is missing in the statement"

It is therefore good that they contact Hubert Cochet or one of the members of the editorial board.

Here I am going to stop reading the comments received. If you want, you can continue to react, to send these notes. You can also write to the secretariat of the WFAL all your proposals.

Obviously, these proposals are the raw material, for what will happen in the coming weeks and months, especially if you report events, actions that could benefit from the support of other movements.

I will now close for us to move to the official closure. I thank you for this session which was extremely lively and I leave with piles of papers, you see, that have not yet been sorted.

Closing Session

PUCHADES Rosa, Vice-Rector in charge of Social Responsibility and Cooperation, Polytechnic University of Valencia, UPV moderator

These three intense days of work, during which we analysed the inequality of the distribution of natural resources and land grabbing, made it possible to diagnose the situation of the rural world and to discuss the problems posed more than ten years ago, such as hunger, exclusion or access to land of small producers. They have made it possible to assess the current situation and to develop proposals such as those compiled in the manifesto that has just been read.

As expressed by the President of the Valencian Generalitat in the opening act of the forum, ending poverty is necessary, possible and urgent. I hope that this forum will mark a step towards overcoming inequalities and that government leaders will make their conclusions at the global level from these three days of intense debate, and that they will pave the way for change in the world via the different political agendas. For the Polytechnic University it was an honour to host this forum and to open its doors for such a necessary debate.

Javier MOLINA CRUZ, principal agent land tenure, Climate, Energy and Tenure (NRC), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Colombia.

Thanks again, I reiterate what I said at the beginning of this forum three days ago, the FAO support the efforts we are all making to promote and ensure responsible governance of tenure of land and its resources, water, forests and fishing. The discussions that have taken place here, and the conclusions we have reached contribute and point to actions we must take in the future in order to continue working in that direction: to value an equitable, just and sustainable use of land and its resources. FAO is present with all of you in this.

Richard TORSIANO, National Institute of Colonization and Agrarian Reform, INCRA, the Ministry of Agrarian Development of Brazil, MDA, Brazil.

Thank you very much, I would like to thank you for this opportunity to express

myself and strengthen the content of the final summary.

We expect international organizations to invest in the organization of an international land conference and agrarian reform to enact government commitments on all the issues we have debated in this Forum.

Let's continue to defend the importance of responsible land governance as a key point of all the issues we face. It is fundamental that governments and international organizations engage with the societies of their country in such a way that governments make progress in knowing their lands and resources. Agrarian reform and respect for the social function of the land is not possible if we do not know the land. It is a necessity for society to know the land. It is a necessity for States to protect the people, guarantee their rights, protect the vulnerable communities and to make the agrarian reform. For this reason, it is fundamental to deepen the issue of responsible governance. As well as to protect the environment.

We must curb the neo-liberalism that is unfolding in various parts of the world right now with foreign land grabbing and the actual process of grabbing land. We must guarantee and move forward with the agrarian reform process.

For that, it is necessary that we deepen the question of the respect of the social function of the earth in the whole world. For that, it is fundamental that at the international conference all the governments present adopt a commitment to deepen the questions which have been identified and united in the final summary presented by this Forum.

Finally, I announce with great joy that according to the press a million people took to the streets in Brazil this week and it seems that, thanks to the strength of the people, we are beginning to change the situation in Brazil.

It is possible, it is very possible that a coup will not happen in Brazil.

Mamadou CISSOKHO, Honorary President of the Network of Peasant Organizations and Producers in West Africa (ROPPA), Senegal.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to make here a little historical reminder.

After Porto Alegre¹⁹, the social movement found in this room has obtained the revitalization of the Food Security Committee, CSA, of the United Nations Organization for Agriculture and Food, FAO, which made it possible to win the Battle of the Voluntary Guidelines for Responsible Governance of Tenure of Tenure for Land, Fisheries and Forests, VG.

It must be remembered, it is thanks to us, to our joint action at political level. And we are now members of the CSA. We are currently fighting over the problem of financing too. It's important to understand this.

¹⁹ International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development, ICARRD, March 2006, Porto Alegre, Brazil, ed.

We have achieved recognition of the family farm through the International Year of Family Farming that we have just celebrated.

We have obtained that the Indian government adopts a refusal position within the framework of the negotiations in the World Trade Organization, WTO, against the proposed prohibition of institutional purchases.

We supported India's fight to help small farmers in institutional buying. It has been a great fight that we have supported and we think that India will win this battle.

We were also present with the Indians at Nairobi, because we cannot understand that what the West has used for 50 years, institutional buying, to defend its peasants, we cannot use it.

Today we have on record the recognition of peasants at the United Nations in Geneva. We will be there in June so that the word "peasant" and its recognition, be included in the United Nations charter. It's a fight that continues.

That is to say a multitude of fights. You can not ask for access to land if the trade is unfair. We can not ask for access to land if we are not taken into account in international charters. We can not ask for access to land if the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund continue, in the name of the Washington consensus, to create difficulties for countries that want their autonomy while claiming to solve the problems with the Millennium Goals for Development (MDGs), and Sustainable Development Goals, (SDGs). It does not work. We want justice! We have said it.

To obtain this justice, we should fight within our States, because it is our governments who find themselves signing on our behalf and that is also something we need to take care of. This at international level.

Now, at the level of Africa: 54 States have committed since 2003 a program of change through the New Partnership for Africa's Development, (NEPAD), which is the commitment of Heads of State to have an African vision, by Africans, of the future. From 2003 to 2013, we made the first decade of the African agriculture development program where heads of state are committed to putting 10% of their national budgets in agricultural finance. And what agriculture? Small farming.

After taking stock, the objectives were respected at 40%. About 25 governments made a major effort. In 2013, we found ourselves in the new decade. But before talking about the new decade, Africa has set a deadline, 2063, to achieve its development. This is borne by NEPAD.

That is why, at the level of West Africa, ROPPA and the entire civil society of this region, we have enshrined in our agricultural policy the realization of food sovereignty, the implementation of regional security stocks and financing for agriculture, especially women and young people.

This to say that, globally, Africa is at the forefront of the fight to enable change. It is for this reason that Africa invites you, together, and to organize with FAO,

with the United Nations, the next International Forum for Access to Natural Resources and the right of peoples to manage their future.

Thank you.

Ramesh Chandra SHARMA, Campaigns Coordinator Ekta Parishad, India.

Excuse me in advance because, at the end of these three beautiful days of world forum, I will say something very philosophical.

In India, whenever we, activists, leaders, have the chance to speak, we think we can be seeds of hope, of revolution. We can take the example of seeds. If a seed refuses to sacrifice its life, there will be no new plant. Only if each of us is ready to sacrifice our life for greater causes, for greater actions, for much greater purposes, can we hope for a greater revolution, a better future. This is the first idea I would like to submit to you.

We are fighting in our continent, in our countries, but we are inspired by so many rebellions. Sometimes we take our inspiration from Marx, sometimes from Martin Luther King, or from Nelson Mandela and sometimes from Mahatma Gandhi. As I said, it is high time for us to build bridges between the continents and the countryside. The movements are rising in temperature. They are gaining strength in the struggle in Africa, Latin America, Asia, Europe.

But if you really want to boil the water, you have to reach 100 degrees in one place. Are we ready to put our one or ten degrees together in one place for global action? If the answer is yes, then we can consider a much bigger action, like a global campaign for example. To bring our efforts together in one place is a means to a broader action.

Finally, I would like to quote a well-known tribal rebel in India, Birsa Munda, who took up arms against the British Empire and said beautiful things. He said,

"As a parent you have to give love to your children. Even if you cannot give them material well-being, make sure you give them love. It's very important for their life. But if you do not give them love, at least make sure that their rights are respected, which is more important than love. And if you fail to give them love and rights, then please show them how to fight for their rights."

This is the biggest message we received from Birsa Munda and we wanted to bring to this forum.

William Clementino DA SILVA MATIAS, National Confederation of Agricultural Workers (CONTAG), Coordinator of Family Organizations producers of Mercosur (COPROFAM), Brazil

A mí me gustaría decir que no voy hacer un discurso. Me gustaría, en nuestro I will not make a speech. As far as I am concerned, on behalf of us from Brazil, I would like to present a motion for the defence of democracy and against rural

violence, which is particularly needed at this time. I will not give you a speech, but simply read the following to you quickly:

"Motion to support democracy and against the coup in Brazil.

The disorder created by the political opposition to the Brazilian government of President Dilma Rousseff in Brazil, with the support of the country's major media and parts of the judiciary, spreads hatred towards workers and threatens democracy and the rule of law.

These sectors seek to seize power by a coup d'etat to annihilate the political, civic and social rights won over by the people in recent years. The advance of this attack on the democratic process could go beyond the borders of the State and undermine diplomatic relations with Latin American neighbours and with allies in the South, and lead to a setback in the construction of strategic alliances between nations.

More than 200 organizations and social movements present at the Global Forum on Access to Land and Natural Resources, WFAL, from March 31 to April 2, 2016 in Valencia (Spain), affirm the importance of agrarian reform and the indigenous family farming to guarantee the sovereignty and food security of peoples and put an end to social inequalities, and to recognize democracy as a fundamental principle of public and social relations all over the world, and are set against the coup d'état in Brazil.

The organizations of Brazilian social movements present in this forum call on the peoples of the world and democratic governments to support the democratic regime and the rule of law in Brazil."

This is a proposal. This is not a speech, but as far as we are concerned, it is not possible for us to be out of Brazil that at this moment is under threat, to come here to speak with you, our friends, without including this. That's why I would like to consult with all the friends here to ask if it is possible for us to add everyone's signature.

Of course, I think that the position of each of our friends is free, but our speech on democracy is still far from being a reality, I am sorry. That those who wish and those who do not wish this initiative please tell us.

Vicent GARCES, Chairman of the International Organizing Committee of the World Forum on Access to Land, WFAL 2016, Spain

We discussed with friend William the approach taken by the editorial board and the International Organizing Committee of the forum. It consisted in presenting in the final summary all the proposals that were made without mentioning any particular country or person, or specific cases. This is not to attack anyone, but to forget nobody, so that nobody feels excluded from the WFAL. In this way, there is no rejection on the part of the WFAL. In this, we are faithful to the principle of inclusiveness of the WFAL.

We have arrived at the end of the WFAL. It is necessary to underline the perseverance of those who made the long road of preparation of this forum, and this in spite of some people, some organizations, some institutions which did not understand the nature of it. At the same time, the holding of this forum, these last three days in Valencia, demonstrated with force that it is possible to combine in one time and space various and sometimes divergent positions on a theme as central as the access to land and natural resources.

We have created a new meeting space, a new socio-political actor. We have demonstrated the possibility of being able to establish, in respect of the diversity of positions of each, common positions. Mamadou and I also want to make a small reminder. In 2001 in Havana, Cuba, the World Forum on Food Sovereignty was held. There, in 2001, then again at the World Forum on Agrarian Reform in 2004, it was possible to put on the international agenda the idea that there can be no food sovereignty without agrarian reform, and that can be no agrarian reform without food sovereignty. This is now widely recognized. This is part of the common heritage of all social movements and civil society as a whole in recent years.

So much so that in 2006, at the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development, ICARRD, convened at the initiative of the United Nations Agriculture and Food Organization, FAO, and the Government of Brazil, the conclusions that were signed by more than 90 governments reaffirmed that agrarian reform, food sovereignty and access to land and natural resources were fundamental to the development of the rural population and society as a whole.

This was established in 2006 and signed by more than 90 governments around the world. But what happened between 2006 and 2016? Where are we ten years later? Why did we, the members of the International Organization Committee of the WFAL, all feel the need to convene this forum? Because the time had come to put the reality of the facts back on the international agenda.

The reality of the facts amply demonstrated during these three days that the major problems faced by humanity, the rural populations, the peasantry, the women, the young people, the indigenous and the local peoples, concerning the access to the natural resources in today's world - be it fishing, forests, seeds, water or land - these problems remain.

Ten years after ICARRD, these major problems remain and affect the whole of humanity, whether rural or urban. There is always hunger and malnutrition in the world, it has always been the exclusion of women, there is always despair for the integration of young people, there are always growing inequalities, there is always, between countries, unfair international trade rules, there is always speculation about food, there is always the will to transform food into commodities, there are always intentions and acts that will pursue the logic of grabbing not only natural resources but also power by a few. They are responsible for what is happening right now in the world. That's what was established during these past three days.

Therefore, the enormous work done and carried out by all people, civil society organizations, peasant organizations, local and indigenous village organizations, women's organizations, public institutions, academics, experts, professionals, those who cooperated with the WFAL, all this work produced the result that is now before our eyes.

A wonderful result, comrades, a result that launches to the world and to the international agendas the challenge of rethinking again, from the same international bodies, those who signed the commitments of 2006, those which in 2012 have enacted the Voluntary Guidelines on the access to land, those who have committed themselves and continue to engage for food and development of humanity, to respect what they have signed and note, officially signed.

We know it will be very difficult. In recent years, there has been a great loss of confidence among rural citizens about the legitimacy of political bodies that are unable to be consistent with their verbal statements, with what they have signed but do not solve with their laws and decisions. This is the reality, comrades, the harsh reality.

The WFAL, despite its multicolored composition, cannot solve all the problems and does not claim to do so. The WFAL cannot solve here, in three days, the problems of the marginalization of women, the marginalization of young people, the exploitation of workers in rural or urban areas, the problems that revolve around production, distribution and the marketing of food. We cannot solve these questions in three days, but on the other hand we can, with new energy, with new alliances, with an ability to gather the forces, to pose these problems and whose resolution is urgent and necessary.

There is an urgent need to solve them jointly, with all the components of society affected, be they peasant organizations, civil society, fishermen, women, young people, local peoples, indigenous peoples, forestry organisations, who are numerous here. Combining all these forces with the positive will expressed here and with some national or international public institutions and the great skills that exist in universities, study centres, work centres. Joining all these forces we can try to change the balance of forces that prevent today that the problems facing humanity are solved and that on the contrary are only worsening in continents

such as Latin America, also worsening in political areas like the Mediterranean, in socio-political spaces such as Africa and in some areas of Asia. The dominant logic today is not the logic of peace, human rights and respect for others, diversity, tolerance. What is imposed is the logic of domination and this is very bad for the future of the whole of society.

The huge migratory flows of millions and millions of people, taking place not only today but for many years from the South to the Center and from the Center to the North, prove it. In the South it is the rural populations, in the Center the urban populations, and at the top it is the North, opulent, which does not seem to want to solve the situation but on the contrary complicate it more. This is one of the fundamental reflections that have arisen from this WFAL.

It should be stressed that this Forum would not have been possible without a close collaboration, at different levels, of a very vast set of social organizations, public, private, institutional and especially, individuals. It would not have been possible without that. From all the work done, this result is extremely positive. The final document that has been read will continue to be enriched with some additional contributions that we have received after reading or are in the process of arriving.

This final declaration does not mark the end of the WFAL. If we succeed in articulating the will, the skills and the social forces, the WFAL will be transformed into a stimulating element and a counterweight, a counter-power of the real forces that currently exert a hegemony on our society. This is impossible for us alone who are here today to carry out. We need to expand alliances. We will need to expand to more sectors. But here we have opened a path. We showed that it was possible.

In the coming days, there will be a more complete document, the acts of WFAL, which will bring together all the contributions made during the plenary sessions and workshops. This will be a very solid document in which the enormous mass of diagnoses, analysis, accusations and proposals that have been made during these three days will be expressed.

Last night the International Organization Committee of the WFAL, CIO, decided, among other things, that it will maintain its activity. The IOC is not dissolved today. We do not know how long it will last, but it is not dissolved today. We will continue to try to ensure that this set of analysis, diagnoses and proposals reach the largest possible number of civil society organizations, organizations of all types and all over the world.

We invite you to collaborate in this broadcast each in your field. We will try to disseminate the analysis and proposals from the WFAL to an even larger number of public, national and international institutions.

I had, a few minutes ago, a conversation with our comrade and friend MEP Maria Heubuch. We were discussing how we could approach the paradox that the European Commission is telling European governments that the issue of land

and natural resources is not its problem.

This is not tolerable. Together with our fellow MEPs, the comrades of the European Economic and Social Committee who are here, and all the social forces present here, we must succeed in bending the supporters of this position, those who are trying to to hide the reality with erroneous arguments, to avoid that this continues to prevail as the model of agrarian production, the model of social relations, the model of political behaviours which we face now.

This is our mission and we will strive to achieve it. Moreover, the IOC calls on all those present to collaborate in this immense task by sending these positions to the institutions of each of your countries, local, regional and national institutions.

The last call made by the WFAL a few minutes ago was to urge international and governmental institutions to convene an International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development, or whatever name is chosen. A conference where governments, in addition to analysing and discussing in the light of current reality will go so far as to engage seriously, with organized civil society, to implement these agreements.

We hope, with relative hope it is true, but we hope that at some point this positive energy that came out of the WFAL could change some conservative positions that prevent things from moving forward. And for that we need a lot more support.

Here, today, nothing starts or ends. Here, today, we are the result of a process. How much fear is there at this stage? How much suffering, how much violence accumulated? How many dead? This will always accompany us. We are where we are. We must go forward without ever forgetting any value, any democratic principle, without ever forgetting the permanent struggle for equality, without ever forgetting those values and principles that for centuries have inspired the peoples in their struggle.

We must follow this path, we will follow it. Compañeras y compañeros, the struggle continues.

WFAL photographic gallery index



Members of the International Organization Committee (IOC) of the WFAL, meeting in June 2015 in Brussels



The Local WFAL Support Committee was formed on January 26, 2016 in Valencia (Spain)



Inauguration of the WFAL, on March 31, 2016 in Valencia, in the presence of the local authorities and IOC representatives of the WFAL



High participation and a high level of quality in public interventions were observed during the plenary sessions of the Forum



13 workshops on the different issues related to access to land and natural resources took place throughout the three days of the Forum



Representatives of farmer organizations and civil society from more than 70 countries in Africa, Asia, America and Europe participated in this meeting



A team of nearly 30 volunteers speaking different languages, provided excellent support for the development of activities and the reception of participants



Media from around the world were present to highlight Forum debates and interview participants



Closing of the WFAL, April 2, 2016, with the intervention of Vicent Garcés, President of the CIO-WFAL

Permanent Secretariat of WFAL

