

# CERESAN

Reference Centre on  
Food and Nutrition Security

cpda  
UFRRJ

MNS  
uff

etinho  
iBase

## Towards an alternative multilateralism? Trade, food, health, and development across the global food system proceedings of a debate

Renato S. Maluf

Working papers, 2

September - 2008

**CERESAN** - O Centro de Referência em Segurança Alimentar e Nutricional é um núcleo de estudos, pesquisa e capacitação voltado para congregar pesquisadores, técnicos, estudantes e outros profissionais interessados nas questões relacionadas com a segurança alimentar e nutricional no Brasil e no mundo. O CERESAN possui sedes na UFRRJ/CPDA e na UFF/MNS.

**Coordenador:** Renato S. Maluf (UFRRJ)

**Coordenadores Associados:** Luciene Burlandy (UFF)  
Francisco Menezes (IBASE)

**ACTIONAID** é uma organização não governamental que atua há mais de 30 anos – está no Brasil desde 1999 – buscando a superação da pobreza através do empoderamento das pessoas pobres e de suas organizações. Sediada no Rio de Janeiro, participa em projetos no Sudeste, Norte e Nordeste, bem como de campanhas nacionais e internacionais com destaque para as relacionadas com o direito humano à alimentação. (**[www.actionaid.org.br](http://www.actionaid.org.br)**).

**Towards an alternative  
multilateralism?  
Trade, food, health, and  
development across the global  
food system – proceedings of a  
debate**

*Renato S. Maluf, CPDA/UFRRJ<sup>1</sup>*

Rio de Janeiro, Brazil  
September, 2008.

---

<sup>1</sup> Economist, professor at the Federal Rural University of Rio de Janeiro (CPDA/UFRRJ), Coordinator of the Reference Centre on Food and Nutrition Security (CERESAN). President of the National Council on Food and Nutrition Security (CONSEA).

## CONTENTS

<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Putting the discussion into context</b> .....	3
<b>The debates held in Paraty</b> .....	8
<b>Lines for future discussions</b> .....	27
<b>Background papers</b> .....	33
<b>Annex</b> .....	33

## **Introduction**

This document presents the main issues dealt with in the preparatory texts and in the debates that took place during the workshop Towards an alternative multilateralism? Trade, food, health, and development across the global food system, which brought researchers from different countries to the city of Paraty (RJ, Brazil), from 2 to 4 July 2005<sup>2</sup>. Although it may seem outdated, reporting the workshop is still meaningful due to the importance of the issues covered, many of them have been highlighted in present debates on the global food system in the context of the so-called global food crisis. Participants have assumed that the global food system is a central component in the formatting of the world geopolitical and economic order. Therefore, it is an excellent object for debating the “multi and bilateral alternatives that connect people, rather than countries or private interests”.

The Paraty workshop was the third in a series of meetings of researchers that work in the fields of agriculture, food security, health, trade and development. Those meetings were an effort to facing the need for a paradigm change in the academic and political debates on international food trade and its links to development, health, and food and nutrition sovereignty and security. By reviewing fundamental assumptions of the international organization of food systems, the group intended to contribute towards putting together a new perspective of how to deal with the diversity of the international food system and, consequently, of intervening in the contemporary political debates surrounding agricultural food trade and systems. Whereas trade is usually presented as an answer, it is up to groups such as this one to look at things in a different way and find out what is the right question to be asked in view of the perspective described herein. The debates held during the workshop led to its definition with respect to the actual conditions that would be required for long-term social and ecological sustainability based on re-establishing the ties between economic, social,

---

<sup>2</sup> The workshop was supported by ActionAid-Americas and ActionAid Brazil. The list of participants and the workshop programme are annexed.

health, cultural and environmental aspects as a condition for an alternative multilateralism.

From this point of view, the purpose of the workshop was to contribute to the design of an analytical perspective which questions the approaches that are limited to focusing on the rules and organizations that govern trade flows, by introducing elements that blend issues related to food sovereignty and security, public health, environment, governance and development. This text begins by briefly reviewing the issues that came up at the two earlier meetings that were attended by several of the researchers who had come to Paraty. Next, the main points that were discussed during the workshop sessions are presented, followed by the outcomes in terms of issues and guidelines for future discussions. These include three issues that are related to other ActionAid initiatives, namely, (i) multilateralism and development with food sovereignty and security, (ii) governance and adequacy of the institutional framework, and (iii) the case of large middle-income countries. In the final two parts of the text, some links are established between the debates that took place in Paraty three years ago and the current food crisis at the global level.

Finally, it is worth explaining that this document was not conceived as a faithful record of the contributions and the debates; its format puts it half-way between a record of an event and an academic essay based on it. Be it as it may, the organization of the text and, obviously, its content are the responsibility of the author, in spite of his concern for identifying those responsible for the main contributions.

## **Putting the discussion into context<sup>3</sup>**

For a long time, especially since the GATT Uruguay Round which began in the middle of the 1980s, the debates surrounding issues related to the international food trade have been characterized by their concentrated focus on the various and high-level subsidies granted by rich countries to their farmers. The dominant perspective was to evaluate the repercussions of these subsidies on the access to the internal markets of these countries and, especially, their impact on farmers in southern hemisphere countries. The echoes of this focus on farming subsidies could still be heard in the two researchers' meetings that came before the Paraty workshop. Nevertheless, if discussions about subsidies were at the source of the first meeting, held in Toronto, Canada (April 2002), the question of "what to do about subsidies" was soon seen not to be enough and led to the incorporation of three other key subjects, namely, (a) food security and democracy, (b) health and the environment, and (c) trade rules.

Amongst the international context elements that were brought up at the first meeting, the strengthening of unilateralism on the part of the United States, the rapid adaptation of multinational corporations to the changing scenario and the problems in global trade, and the manifestations of the strong power relationships between states, corporations and farmers in northern countries were given special importance. The discussion of alternatives to the trading rules put together under the World Trade Organization umbrella was, in turn, pushed to one side by successive failures of the Doha Round negotiations, which began in 2001 and have yet to be concluded, and compounded by suggestions that future of the WTO itself was shrouded in uncertainty. This was the main point of the second researchers' meeting held in Ithaca, USA (November 2003), soon after the resounding failure of the WTO ministerial meeting in Cancun (Mexico).

The Cancun meeting saw the emergence of the G-20 to counterbalance the transformation of the WTO into an instrument of power to be used by the northern hemisphere countries, especially the United States and the European

---

<sup>3</sup> Based on the notes prepared by E. Peine (2005).

Union. The effectiveness of the WTO as a governance institution was questioned, which opened up the possibility for new ways of reconfiguring the power between nations multilaterally, regionally and bilaterally. Besides this, the absence of ready replies to the “crisis” on the part of the social movements left room for large NGOs to operate as “speakers” for the dissatisfaction of civil society, and required thinking about how these movements understood food sovereignty and trade issues. Later events revealed a world that was, apparently, more capable of handling these issues. Nevertheless, the need to identify the interests involved and (re)define the surrounding themes and categories, on which the discussions were to be built, remained. The following paragraphs present the suggestions in this direction that came out of the abovementioned meetings which, in fact, make up an agenda for debates and intervention.

One of the organizing themes of the discussions – in fact, another approach – concerns **ecological public health** (T. Lang), which was suggested as an organizing theme that could bring together agriculture, food, ecology, health and public responsibility in a wide-ranging public policy objective. This idea is based on the assumption that there are inseparable relationships between the ways of producing food and the environment and, at the end of the line, the health of the people that eat this food. The examples of actions to this end range from the incorporation of food into health policies, up to the inclusion of farming and food issues in the environmental debate in order to expand the relevance of this approach to other fields.

Naturally, the **World Trade Organization** is another organizing topic for international debate. As has been mentioned earlier, the very relevance of this organization was called into question as a consequence of G-20’s success in removing it from the almost exclusive diplomatic arsenal of the United States and the European Union. Added to this is the fact that the failure in Cancun concentrated the focus on the nation-states and left other powerful players to one side, since the WTO is only a part of a wider system. By the way, the discussions held at the workshop showed that there was a need to find out more about the true power brokers in this system, beyond nation-



states, incorporating the role played by auxiliary organizations (research and other institutions) into this analysis.

The uncertain future of the WTO necessarily draws attention to the theme of **multilateralism** and other geopolitical configurations that have become relevant, such as regionalism and bilateralism. Of course, the question of the nation-state is always to be found at the heart of the matter, given that the three configurations assume that nation-states operate as points of intervention, depositaries of power, and players that represent interests in ways that may exclude or, at least, reduce the importance of some of them. Still on the subject of multilateralism, new forums or configurations, such as the G-20, and bodies such as FAO, could form fulcrums for the balance of power. However, regionalism – as expressed in the European Union and the Mercosur – appears as being, maybe, the most important geopolitical configuration in the absence of an effective global mechanism such as the WTO, as well as possibly forming a new potential space for democratization. However, as far as bilateral agreements are concerned, there is a certain skepticism which leads to considering these as short-term answers to the failure of multilateralism, even though we can discuss if the two of them are mutually exclusive. It is important, above all, to shine a light on the new multilateral forms and spaces that give priority to values other than those of neo-liberalism.

The observations above do not withdraw **agricultural prices and subsidies** from the debate agenda. However, as has been said, they expand the focus of the approach to a theme which is, above all, controversial. On the one hand, one knows that these subsidies are one of the main reasons behind the South's demands against the North at the WTO. Therefore, they are an easy target for those who, for reasons that are not always similar, aim to reduce the northern hemisphere countries' domination in this field. Nevertheless, the argument against subsidies also acts as a cover for the neo-liberal agenda of the Southern Hemisphere countries. It is true, however, that the inherent inequalities of global subsidy-based farming contribute towards perpetuating the inequality between countries. This is why a zero tolerance position with respect to subsidies has emerged, that is, either all farmers have

a right to them or none of them do, regardless of the respective nation-state or regional bloc's capacity.

On the other hand, we recognize that subsidies are still an important political and economic tool for the survival of agriculture in the United States and Europe, meaning that it may be necessary to talk about it in a different way, in line with the idea that public support for farming may be a good thing. It is equally important to improve public understanding of subsidies, making an effort to differentiate between their different types and purposes, and also to establish links to consumer issues. The role of subsidies, as we understand it, takes on new significance only in the context of the current trade system, which makes this a complicated matter for the reason given below, amongst others.

The existence of **double standards** when dealing with the farming sector in the North and South has been highlighted in the discussions about subsidies, as has already been mentioned, but also concerns the approaches of multifunctionality and diversification. Multifunctionality and diversification are, almost always, prescriptions for the most marginal producers in the South as well as the small producers in the North, and are not included amongst the solutions for the commodity producers of the North who compete under the same market conditions as those in the South. Here, too, there is a question of language such as, for example, the contrast between subsidies and public investment in agriculture. It is obvious that public investment in agriculture can cause the same problems when it is not specified who it is intended for and for what purposes; the hijacking of the United States' land grant system by the multinationals is one piece of evidence for this.

Another theme – which also involves an important question of language – concerns the priority that is given to **trade**, in such a way that its rules are considered as being of central importance. There are those who argue that, as far as the international food system is concerned, this focus on trade could be diverting attention away from issues of power and property relationships. Take, as examples, the growth in intra-continental trade and the regional power and strategies of corporations, phenomena that cannot be captured by focusing on the rules of international trade. To sum up, the focus on trade

should be challenged and the components of the food system that it fails to address should be highlighted; in other words, a critique should be made based on what the trade-focused paradigm actually obfuscates.

There are three other themes on the proposed agenda. The first one deals with the studies on **other institutions, organizations or agencies** that have been generating knowledge and mobilizing political power in favor or in the name of the neo-liberal system. Returning to the question of language, this field has, up to the present time, used an efficient public policy language which has made its ideological project sound like common sense. A second set of issues covers the **relationship between food sovereignty and subsidiarity**. It is very clear that food sovereignty requires suitable decision-making levels; however, it is still necessary to reflect more deeply on the role or position occupied by subsidiarity in the analyses and prescriptions on this subject. The third theme refers to the **producer/consumer and rural/urban binomials**, which are to be reconsidered and reconciled with a view to expanding the agenda to beyond agriculture and to include questions concerned with health, environment and community development, thus providing a real alternative to the wide-ranging, all-encompassing logic of neo-liberalism.

Finally, an initiative of this type necessarily leads to a debate on **alternatives**; in this case, both in institutional and pragmatic terms. This perspective includes, amongst other things, the conceptions of subsidiarity or of fair trade as an effective alternative. There are countless examples of models that have been successful in re-embedding the agricultural economy in a constellation of relationships and/or regulations loaded with social meaning. In fact, the entire set of themes presented above leads up to the ultimate question of suggesting alternative commercial rules or components of an alternative food system. This effort was preliminarily made in the form of a list of characteristics of the processes and results targeted, which are presented below:

- i. **processes:** flexible, robust or resilient, environmentally sustainable, compassionate, holistic or non-reductionist, democratic with strong popular support, innovative, diverse, multidimensional benefits, dialog-based, empowering, pragmatic, interdependent;
- ii. **results:** right to suitable food, food citizenship and civic agriculture, ecological diversity and sustainability, health, “a place in the space” and self-realization, territorialized food, fair occupation of farming areas, recovery of common assets, agriculture in the center of the social system (reference point for monitoring and focal point of health), link between the urban and rural populations, fair prices for farmers, self-definition of rights, decommodification, agricultural literacy, eating as a moral act.

### **The debates held in Paraty**

The presentations that were made and the debates that were held during the Paraty workshop, as described in the event programme (Annex), returned to the earlier subject of the development of the international context, especially with respect to the WTO trade negotiations, which suffered a major setback with the collapse of the Cancun meeting held shortly before. However, besides these multilateral negotiations, an analysis of the international context highlighted the characteristics taken on by the public and private forms of worldwide food system governance and their implications on the flow of food and on trading rules. In parallel, a very varied set of questions and approaches was raised which would make up an alternative, wide-ranging, diverse agenda which is present in the international debate, with its internal convergences, tensions, conflicts and coalitions as would be expected. To do this, contributions were sought which focused on fair trade, the multifunctionality of agriculture, food sovereignty, ecological farming, public health, diet and cultural components.

The following text is not a record of the presentations and debates that took place at the workshop and does not necessarily follow the organization of the sessions. Instead, issues which are beyond the scope of the workshop and

continue to be present in international debates were selected. Although the records of the participants' interventions were used<sup>4</sup>, a decision was made to use a format which did not identify the contributors, except in specific cases, invariably making reading the text more personal and releasing the workshop participants from any responsibility for any bias.

### *Trade negotiations and the role of G-20*

It should be highlighted that the ministerial meeting in Cancun was a moment when the establishment of different groups of countries (the G's) mainly focused on agricultural trade agreement negotiations, but whose actions have repercussions on other international agreements, gained visibility. The identification of the common points of interest which enabled these groups to be formed is difficult to establish, leading to tensions both between and within these groups. For the G-20 to be viable, the predominant group in this context, it was important to restrict it to being an alliance opposed to agricultural subsidies, in view of the members' differences of opinion on matters beyond this common point of interest. This restriction did not prevent the G-20 from acting as a significant counterpoint to the earlier Cairns Group which had been set up with the almost sole agenda of promoting free trade and access to markets. In spite of this difference, agricultural exports form a major common point uniting the majority of the governments in the southern hemisphere, even those that lie further to the left.

The emergence of these groups was also an expression of the increased participation of nation-states in defining the trade agenda, which had been strongly dominated by representatives of large corporations and the so-called agribusiness. This participation brought with it, because of this very characteristic, among other reasons, an attempt by governments to get public support, for example, for the involvement of civil society by G-20 members. This involvement had, however, clear limitations since neither the perspective of combating subsidies nor that of expanding access to markets are enough for confronting poverty or promoting fair, sustainable development, which are

---

<sup>4</sup> The main source of this summary was the session record made by R. Patel.

the issues that move social organizations and movements. By the way, it must be noted that the Doha Round, in spite of its official name, is not focused on development as a goal, but rather on free trade as a mechanism for development, an approach whose ideological substrate cannot be ignored.

The importance of the role of the G-20 and the countries that lead it (Brazil and India) has been widely recognized, as has the important, though not entirely clear, role of China in view of its specific weight and the implications of its growing participation in international trade for southern hemisphere countries also. It is known that the USA and EU have made movements towards building up bilateral agreements outside the WTO. However, up to the present time, the different positions of the countries and groups of countries have not reached the point of contesting the WTO's legitimacy for regulating international trade in agriculture, no matter how much the capacity of this organization to promote agreements in this area has been weakened. Furthermore, there is the general question that underlies the controversies and comings and goings of the multilateral negotiations that relates to the confrontation of agricultural policy standards which, therefore, requires an evaluation of on what basis will it be possible to bring them closer together and what will be needed to do this.

An exploratory exercise for bringing agricultural policies closer together was outlined from a distinct trade liberalization perspective, in this case from a food sovereignty viewpoint. This would require reconstruction of the USA and EU policies based on "food sovereignty without dumping" (J. Berthelot), since it was also a sovereignty-based perspective (productive self-sufficiency and farmer protection) that led to the design and implementation of the policy instruments that are currently being contested. The approximation of agricultural policies on these bases would depend, amongst other aspects, on pressure applied by the southern hemisphere countries, whether grouped together in the G-20 or otherwise, whose interest in the abovementioned policy reformulation is not, however, clear. This would, on the one hand, imply an increase in domestic agricultural prices and the protection of their respective markets by the USA and EU, whilst maintaining export opportunities for the most competitive of the G-20 countries. On the other

hand, the G-20 countries would protect access to their own markets, and take care that the perspectives of accessing the developed countries' markets (through increased exports) did not imply environmental risks and losses of the "cross" concessions with agreements on services and investments, amongst other aspects. An additional complicating factor concerns the large differences between farmers; however, some analysts understand that there are no differences between farmers in the North, especially the Europeans, and those in the South that are relevant to the proposed discussion; hence, all these farmers could join the bloc that would apply pressure in the suggested policy reformulation direction.

### *Food quality, standards and regulations*

Dealing with the international trade flows of food produce involves taking into consideration a component that has acquired increased importance since, at least, the time when agricultural trade policies (GATT) started to be developed. That is, the quality of the food produce and the corresponding regulations and standards that regulate the international trade of these goods and have repercussions or are reproduced in the national market regulations. The establishment of regulations and quality standards goes beyond the mere adaptation and compatibility of the technical content in force in the different countries, and plays a more important role in policy, more specifically, food policy, with implications on the inter-governmental relationships inside the trade agenda. The existence of double standards between the northern and southern countries is a food policy expression, to which the controversies surrounding the very idea of food quality, that is, what needs to be included in this concept, are added<sup>5</sup>.

National governments were traditionally responsible for regulating the trading of food produce in the domestic environment and with respect to other

---

<sup>5</sup> As known, the question of food quality goes far beyond the commercial regulations and would require, amongst other measures, the establishment of a connection between the known nutritional problems due to poor diet and trade. With this in mind, there is the paradox of having industrialized products as food for the poor who can access the markets and are the main source of obesity and other eating disorders, whilst at the same time economic imperatives require that countries in the South set aside land and labor for growing fresh fruit and vegetables for export purposes (H. Friedman).

countries, based on the public standards that coexisted with the brands and trademarks of the private corporations. The expansion of international trade and transnational chains has resulted in a need to adopt uniform standards built in multilateral forums such as the Codex Alimentarius<sup>6</sup>. This perspective, however, clashes with consumer and cultural diversity. The perspective of uniformity leads distinct standards resulting from this diversity to be classified as trade-restricting factors in cases of high-requirement standards or as minimal, or even dangerous, in low-requirement standards. The precautionary principle – a resource that originated in the environmental field which is intended to be adapted to the risks associated with food produce – involves a long-running dispute about the meaning of the term and its application, under the general principles of the Codex Alimentarius Committee.

Disputes about standards and regulations, especially with the European Union and the United States, may point in the direction of lower standards than those required by the Codex, resulting in a food system where the general Codex standards apply for countries in the South, and different standards are adopted for high-income countries in niche markets. The government standards laid down in Codex would form a base level where private quality standards for products are established which, in turn, cannot be applied through the WTO, since they come from private corporations. Thus, meeting the reliability requirement, which is essential in this matter, may come about through government standards and also through private standards. By the way, retail networks have been developing distinct standards for each country, with a wide range of strategies in this aspect, for example, amongst the North American chains (quality differentiation by price, or by consumer income band) and between them and the Europeans (arduous definition of common standards). Exporters from the South are faced with different standards, therefore, with different requirements in terms of investments.

A third source of quality standards and regulations beyond the governmental and private-initiative spheres, consists of cooperative

---

<sup>6</sup> It is important to note that the Codex rules become law in many countries in the South.



community initiatives or other different forms of networked organizations. There are many examples, in different parts of the world, which move in the direction of giving value to locational specificity, countering uniformity, coordinating consumer and production units, building up reliability and accountability through organization, focusing on the ecosystem as a whole, etc. Even though the definition of quality may, in these cases, be almost product-specific, which is a procedure that limits its production and price, the role of these entities represents, at the same time, certification and support for expanding the sale of products<sup>7</sup>.

These dynamics also have to face questions of trust and property rights, especially the possibility of confronting them in a class-free way. Are these network dynamics capable of abolishing the right to property? Geographical indication, for example, is an interesting form of location-based protection; however, its origin (French wine producers) has made it a prisoner of traditional practices and of the logic of intellectual property rights, making the necessary innovations for it to adapt to the social and natural conditions difficult. The perspective of implementing participative certification processes, in turn, implies the internal separation of technical assistance and auditing. It must also be considered that as part of this approach, which aims to be alternative, the debate about quality standards should be accompanied by other aspects, such as the union of "organic production and fair trade", and the incorporation of labor and environmental standards, amongst others.

### *Transnationalization of the food system*

Another feature of the involvement of private players in the reorganization of the worldwide food system is the adjustment of institutional structures to encourage direct foreign investment which has brought with it a reorientation of the farming in so-called Third World countries, with the incorporation of non-conventional farming products into processes that are supported by changes in consumption standards in the richer nations towards what has been called a "post-modern food system" (J. Wilkinson), with

---

<sup>7</sup> Municipal or regional governments may be involved in building brands, as has been seen in

segmented markets, etc. In fact, the transnationalization of the food system combines the growth in more sophisticated demands from consumers in richer countries with the enormous expansion of the market for traditional produce. Amongst the implications of this trend is the adoption of the requirements of the TRIPS Agreement, as well as the redefinition of domestic companies to include transnational corporations under this umbrella and to facilitate the repatriation of profits and the movement towards creating global oligopolies. More than this, the meaning of the international market is altered on being internalized by intra-firm trade, through which the main part of international food product trade now flows, as is the case in other sectors.

Another important factor is the technological change in the industry brought about by biotechnology, with the consequent collapse of the public sector and the advance of private control over the seed industry (together with agrochemical groups), jeopardizing the genetic base of the food system, but causing the same reactions as GMOs.

The denationalization of the main part of the food system as part of the transnationalization process has affected the industry and also retail operations, leading to a reorganization of the system as a whole. A more highly concentrated retail system has created giant companies with their own brands and distribution channels which are in a position to demand royalties and concessions from other economic agents. It must be stressed that there are no measures that discipline the dominant sectors in the food system in the developing countries, in relation to what is seen in the richer countries. One of the reasons for this is that these sectors have a positive image as modernizing factors in these countries.

Supermarkets have started to play an active role in defining market access conditions, including in the case of non-commodity, organic and fair trade products. They are not only present in the big cities but have expanded into the smaller towns and even into the districts occupied by poorer workers in the metropolitan regions. As the commercial strategies of the large supermarket networks have sought to incorporate social, health,

environmental and cultural criteria, an ambiguous situation has been created where these networks represent a risk of expropriating the content of the movements that sustain these perspectives, whilst at the same time offering them a marketing opportunity. It should also be mentioned that this scenario does not exclude small-scale retailing as represented by the so-called traditional forms of retail operations or specialist establishments which account for a significant fraction of trade in several food products.

The reference to the size of the scale in productive terms of the transnationalization approach to the food system obliges us to take the scale in spatial terms into account. Both of these enable us to introduce a further question into this subject relating to so-called "food miles" at the time of the oil peak which has, nevertheless, become expensive and has entered its terminal stage. This question is, once again, on the order of the day with the recent debates on climate change and global warming. It is assumed that the oil peak and the end of the oil era would help promote an organizational principle and a lever for making the world agrifood system fairer and more sustainable, putting an end to food miles and stimulating local initiatives and dietary changes in the direction of a diet that combines high nutritional input and low energy, with domestic or local production of less processed food (C. Dann). It cannot be expected, however, that this viewpoint will be globally adopted in the strategies of the G-8 or of other groups or blocs of countries which, above anything, bet on the capability of capitalism to resolve the crisis caused by its own expansion.

Another important argument that needs to be faced is that which claims that local production is not competitive, in opposition, therefore, to strategies that are guided by efficiency criteria defined in terms of private productive terms. This brings back the dichotomy of efficiency versus fairness (to which we can add sustainability) stimulated by standard economics, without letting this underestimate the need for considering the impact of improvements in product quality standards on consumer prices since it can be supposed that consumers will resist paying more for the food that they buy. This "localism" also clashes with the real situation found in the large urban areas and, more generally, with the challenges laid down by the urbanization process to

strengthen rural development and agriculture itself. By the way, some of the issues that have been raised are mainly defined in the context of the relationship between rural and urban areas, rather than between the North and South. If we go beyond the food and agriculture sphere, we come to the issue of building alliances between rural movements and urban movements, where the emphasis on food sovereignty could contribute; more specifically, it could contribute to increasing the value of the connections between food sovereignty and territorial identities.

Finally, the spread of degenerative illnesses throughout the southern hemisphere is part of the food sovereignty transnationalization scenario – part of the “new food imperialism” (R. Patel) – a factor that reaffirms the focus on ‘ecological public health’ and makes it applicable in global terms, albeit with adjustments in the terms in which it is defined. The means proposed for promoting this ecological public health are just as important, since even the large economic agents can allege that they are capable of providing it, as the ability of capitalism to co-opt and redesign even the most radical ideas is well known. This capacity can be seen in the appropriation of the focus on food security which has been defined as “having access to”<sup>8</sup>, resulting in recent resistance to food sovereignty which, by stressing the “right to decide”<sup>9</sup>, gives rise to citizenship questions. This point is covered again in the next topic.

### *Food sovereignty and security and the roles of agriculture*

Food sovereignty issues have been highlighted in the group meetings, but this time the debates focused on their connections to food security and the roles of agriculture, in the face of the changes that are taking place in the world food system. Starting from the first point, the emergence of a focus on food sovereignty has become a component of the international agenda which

---

<sup>8</sup> The food security definitions commonly used by FAO and the World Bank stress everybody’s access to sufficient food for guaranteeing a healthy, active life.

<sup>9</sup> “Food sovereignty is the right of peoples to define their own sustainable food production, distribution and consumption policies and strategies which guarantee all the population the right to food based on small and medium-scale production, whilst respecting their culture and the ways used by the farmers, fishermen and indigenous people to farm, trade and manage rural areas, where women play a fundamental role [...] Food sovereignty is the path to eradicating

has, amongst other characteristics, the perspective of opposing the focus on food security adopted by international organizations and several governments since the 1970s, and managed by large corporations and the so-called agribusiness. The Via Campesina peasant movement has become the main international mouthpiece for food sovereignty as resistance to globalization. Sovereignty implies, on the one hand, strategic diversity (with social community rights) and, on the other hand, refashioning food security in political, rather than market, terms. Producing, like eating (for 'enlightened' consumers) has become a political act (P. McMichael).

As is well known, concepts have histories rooted in social contexts, as well as being the subject of disputes surrounding their meanings, especially when they refer to the actions of the state and public policies as in this case. In these circumstances, we fell back on the example of the idea of food and nutritional security as it has been developed in Brazil ever since the second half of the 1980s to suggest that the appropriation of food security referred to above would not be sufficient reason to abandon it and substitute it with food sovereignty. More specifically, the Brazilian experience would contribute towards joining both ideas, since its formulation positions food and nutritional security as a public policy objective, guided by the principles behind the human right to food and food sovereignty (R. Maluf)<sup>10</sup>. This understanding – which is the basis of the term 'food sovereignty and security' – does not ignore the fact that food sovereignty has arisen as resistance to food security according to the terms of the globalized food system, which grants a central role to the flow of international trade with the implications discussed earlier in this report.

Sovereignty is an essentially relative idea, that is, the assumption of the right to choose cannot materialize in cases where this constrains the access of others to the same right; for example, sovereignty principles can be alleged to

---

hunger and malnutrition and to guaranteeing long-lasting, sustainable food security for all peoples". (World Forum on Food Sovereignty, Havana, Cuba, 2001).

<sup>10</sup> Food and nutritional safety is compliance with the right of all to have regular, permanent access to quality food, in sufficient quantity, without jeopardizing access to other essential necessities, based on health-giving food practices, that respect cultural diversity and are socially, economically and environmentally sustainable (2<sup>nd</sup> National Food and Nutritional Safety Conference, Olinda, Brazil, 2004).

justify policies which cause harm to other countries, as is the case of the USA and the EU with respect to their agricultural policies<sup>11</sup>. Putting the food sovereignty issue into context requires recourse to the concept of the “food regime” (H. Friedman & P. McMichael) which describes models of farming and diet, agrifood policies and ways of regulating. This resource is even more important when one considers the current crisis of the “surplus system” built up during the post-World War II Period and which prevailed at least until the 1970s. In spite of this crisis being clear and the fact that we are witnessing conflicts that are indicative of transition periods, the characterization of the new food system and the analysis of the process that will lead to the consolidation of a new configuration are more controversial.

Some of the components of the new food system can be mentioned, such as the power of supermarkets to command the vertical and horizontal integration of the globalized, transnational food system, increased “desagrarization” and “depeasantization” and the focus on nutraceutical products and on nanotechnology, among others. Another contributory factor for conformation with the new food system was the structural adjustment program that has had major implications for the developing countries. In fact, the conflicts and aspects to be balanced can exist whilst a food system is in force, besides the fact that food systems develop unequally. It is also legitimate to ask questions about the possibility of the new system that is being put together failing to work for health or ecological reasons. In any case, an important question deals with the role of national spheres in the new food system, bearing in mind that national regulations were, at the same time, a constituent part and a source of conflicts during the recently abandoned system of surpluses. Likewise, the connections between food sovereignty and the food system need to be better dealt with, in the event that the former is taken to be a means for building a food system on distinct bases. By the way, it is worth observing that the meaning attributed to food sovereignty depends on the scale to which it refers. Usually, one talks about national sovereignty,

---

<sup>11</sup> It has been sustained that there is no chance of building food sovereignty without the reform of the European Common Agricultural Policy and the American Farm Bills, because these

but in the case of food sovereignty there is also the challenge of identifying the relevant meanings that it would acquire at the sub-national (regional, territorial, etc) and community (including ethnic communities) levels<sup>12</sup>.

Multilateralism seems to provide the best institutional framework for promoting food sovereignty in southern countries and protecting their interests. The WTO is the main multilateral body in the trade area, apart from forums where agreements are negotiated in other fields (investments, intellectual property, biodiversity, etc.), but with crossovers between the different agreements. Several, well-known factors limit the possibilities of an organization such as the WTO from benefiting these countries, especially a special, differentiated treatment mechanism which is biased by the focus on trade distortions, the limited scope of what are admitted as non-trade considerations and the terms used to define dumping. The prevalent nature of the WTO definitions has caused the implosion of the ideals of the United Nations' system, whose review, along with the description of the multilateral agencies, appears to be necessary in terms of the institutional framework of an alternative multilateralism. It was stressed that countries have not committed themselves to building these agencies and that they relate to them, in the best of cases, by following the "menu shopping" logic, where countries try to get whatever is possible, when they are not directly attacking these organizations (H. Friedman). In spite of this, these agencies are still arenas where multilateral organization can occur more closely connected to domestic contexts.

An alternative multilateralism would obviously have to consider a diverse, complex range of interests implying, from the start, going beyond the boundaries of the agreements negotiated between governments and by groups (the G's) of countries, especially particularly exclusive groups, such as G-8. This type of agreement is certainly accompanied by and not unusually

---

legislate in favor of agrifood corporations (J. Berthelot). These reforms should, furthermore, be tied in with domestic food policies (L. Davis).

<sup>12</sup> The Via Campesina model was mentioned, which is based on the strategic diversity in relational and operational terms, with autonomy as an organizational principle; this model brings the challenge of globalizing whilst enhancing the local bases and building a new paradigm based on self reliance on the national and community scale (P. McMichael).

promoted by the large economic agents involved. To counterbalance these “hegemons”, it would be necessary to encourage the lower and medium level countries to cooperate. The efforts to establish agreements on trade flows, whilst obviously important, would be completed and even overridden by the perspective of establishing cooperative links. However, it was reminded that the role of the G’s is affected by the make-up of the domestic blocs, with the complicating factor that domestic policies are now influenced by the same players, especially by interconnected agribusiness multinationals which are not simply traders anymore.

We are then faced with the challenge to build relationships between social players that, despite the fact that they can be classified in an alternative field in relation to governments and large companies, do not always have non-coincident interests, as mentioned at the beginning of this part of the text. This challenge would become clear right at the start of the efforts necessary to invert the logic of putting together a new international agenda, which is nowadays imposed using the WTO as a starting point. Contributions that establish the links between the technical debate and the real impacts caused by these alliances on the restructuring of the global food system in the different national cases are of great help in building these alliances.

Building a new multilateralism also demands discussing the new food system as a whole and not dealing with its components as compartmentalized questions. It is worth saying that joining the intended multilateralism to a new food system, which is also an alternative in relation to the one that is being managed in the transnationalist core of the current food system, would be a part of this process. The establishment of a new diet model, out of the several that could occur, has to do with ecological public health and should break the standard of intensive meat- and petroleum-based diets, as well as being expressed in social and spatial terms. Focusing on people in the interior of complex food chains is suggested, so that small farmers and artisanal producers are included, along with the ingredients for domestic preparation and prepared foods. This model, which is tied in with the multifunctionality of agriculture, determines diets democratically and supports people who live in rural areas.



Nevertheless, the difficulty mentioned above of congregating social players whose interests are not always coincident begins with those who are considered to be family farmers in the North and the South, where there is a significant contrast in their living conditions and social insertion, not to mention the consumers and other segments. Even though it too is highly diverse, so-called family farming in southern hemisphere countries consists of a vast contingent of pluriactive rural families with high poverty rates, where a large part of these families is “invisible” to conventional farming policies (production credits and price guarantees) and are served by social policies. Farming activities have represented a declining portion of family income, even though it continues to be the main factor for social identity. This brings us to the question of the role of agriculture and the contributions of focusing on agricultural multifunctionality.

Although it is not the only one, agriculture is considered to be the most multifunctional of sectors, a characteristic which may have a positive or negative impact. It was argued that the multifunctionality of agriculture is not exactly a new agenda; on the contrary, it is a stale political subject, however, in the face of a paradigm change (B. Losch). Defined in reference to its amenities and beneficial services for the economy and society as a whole, this focus emerged at the beginning of the 1990s in Western Europe in reaction to the consequences of the hegemonic productivist model, disconnected therefore from any commercial issues. The central idea of multifunctionality is not to restrict the primary function of producing agricultural goods, but rather a paradigm change for agriculture, where the perspective is no longer productive excellence but emphasizes the statute, the place and the roles of agriculture recognized by each society. It will no longer be a discussion about a productive sector, but rather a global discussion of values. International debate of this approach has, however, been seen to be compromised because it is being used by the EU to justify farming subsidies in trade negotiations at the WTO. There have also been strong reactions from European farmers and those on other continents when faced with government initiatives to adopt environmental measures, as well as the opportunist use of the new perspectives to claim additional public payments. The controversial character

of the recognition of the multifunctionality of agriculture by public policies, as well as the redirectioning of French domestic policy, have led to abandoning this idea even in this country, which had advanced furthest in this direction, and returning to a more accepted focus that is limited to environmental aspects and ignores the social question.

To escape from the trap set by the terms under which the debate is held at the WTO, which is chained to tariffs and market access, it would be necessary to provide evidence that the productivity differential between different types of agriculture makes it impossible for there to be a process where everybody wins, compromising the survival of 95% of the people who work in agriculture all over the world (around 2.5 billion) and who live in the developing countries, in a context of international competition. As mentioned earlier, the seriousness of the situation has been appeased by the high level of public transfers in poverty combat and environmental programs, plus the transfer of income sent by family members living abroad. This situation results in the need for greater protection and higher subsidies for low productivity farming, since the simple end to subsidies would benefit the more productive of the developing countries.

This takes us to the different meanings assumed by the multifunctionality of the farming activities in countries in the northern and southern hemispheres, given the contrasts between the family-based farming activities in the two regions and the insertion of these farmers in society. The differences in the non-market components (public assets) that are associated to agricultural activities and in their financing (through the prices paid by consumers or transfers in public programs) almost take on the character of a special case of double standards, when attempts are made to make the approaches used in the two situations compatible. In South countries, beyond what is happening in rural areas and in the agricultural activity itself<sup>13</sup>, family

---

<sup>13</sup> Research carried out in Brazil has identified four functions associated with family farming in the country: (i) the socioeconomic reproduction of families; (ii) the food security of the rural families themselves and of society ; (iii) preservation of the social and cultural fabric; (iv) conservation of natural resources and the environment (Maluf *et al.*, 2003). The mentioned reduction in the role of agricultural activities in countries such as Brazil leads to the assumption that the multifunctionality approach in these countries, unlike in Europe, better cater to the new

farming and the food production that comes from this activity are strongly dependent on the social model (income distribution and market creation) and there are only limited possibilities of public financing of the non-market functions referred to.

### *Brazilian experience with food and nutritional security*

It is worth mentioning three of the components of the recent Brazilian experience in the food and nutritional security (SAN) field which contemplate the objectives of this text. The first and most important of these concerns the National Food and Nutrition Security Council (CONSEA) initiative to present a proposal to apply the SAN approach in international commercial negotiations. CONSEA, which was reformed in 2003, has an intersectoral composition and majority participation of civil society and it operates as an advisory body to the President of the Republic's Office with the role of proposing and monitoring public policies related to the SAN<sup>14</sup>. The Council, the recently created Inter-ministerial Food and Nutrition Security Chamber and the periodic holding of National Conferences are the National Food and Nutrition Security System's three organizing forums at national level in an early implementation stage in Brazil.

By looking at SAN in the light of the principles of the human right to food and food sovereignty, the Council's agenda covers a wide range of questions, including those of international agreements. The initiative to prepare a document with proposals for applying SAN criteria in international trade negotiations was aimed at incorporating this topic into the national debate and to influence the Brazilian government's position, giving rise to a significant counterpoint in relation to a liberalizing vision which is still homogenous within the Brazilian government. This document also addresses food sovereignty issues related to seeds, genetically modified products, biodiversity and food culture, as well as non-trade agreements. Attempts have

---

rural situations and rural poverty than the configurations resulting from changes in agriculture (B. Losch).

<sup>14</sup> CONSEA is made up of 19 Ministers of State from different areas of the Federal Government, 39 representatives of civil society drawn from a very wide range of social sectors and regions, as well as Brazilian and international observers.

been made to conceptualize 'food security products' that should be granted trade protection or should be promoted with differentiated domestic policies, based on entirely different criteria from the 'sensitive product' criteria that is common in trade agreements<sup>15</sup>. The conceptual efforts also aimed to provide content for the new "special products" category and the special safeguard mechanisms.

This proposal blends two points of view. On the one hand, it considers the consumer's viewpoint to identify the agrifood products that are considered to be basic components of the national diet or which are commonly consumed in the country. It is not an exaggeration to observe that food consumption trends, even amongst the lowest income groups, make it difficult to use the idea of basic foods combining their three traditional factors (mass consumption, nutritional importance and little preparation necessary). On the other, it adopts a production viewpoint which is different from the one that usually gets almost exclusive attention in countries like Brazil, a major exporter of food products which behaves aggressively in defense of trade liberalization. The negotiations of tariffs and other negotiations are conventionally carried out product by product (or by product chain), without differentiating the forms of production. This procedure obscures or overrides the socio-environmental aspects required by the SAN's focus, because it fails to distinguish between family-based farming and large agricultural production or exporting agribusinesses. Reviewing this viewpoint implies selecting the products where family agriculture provides a larger part of the internal supply and which are important contributors to the farmers' income.

---

<sup>15</sup> The initial stimulus in this direction came from the European Union/Mercosur, whose criteria led to powdered milk being classified as a product that was not sensitive to a tariff reduction, whereas cosmetic products were considered as sensitive to open trade. Later, the discussion covered the ongoing WTO Doha Round negotiations.

This last criterion is complex to put into operation due to the fact that both the family and agribusiness forms of farming contribute towards the production of the main agrifood products; therefore, the same product can be associated to family farming which requires protection or differentiated promotion for food security reasons, and at the same time be a commodity whose trade large exporters want to liberalize resorting to the fallacious argument that free trade promotes global food security. This ambivalence required a filter that excluded exported products, resulting in a small list consisting of milk, rice and beans, leaving out some important family farming products (corn, soy and coffee).

Internally accommodating this heterogeneity is a typical characteristic of Brazilian agriculture. It is, in fact, one of the manifestations of the high level of social inequality in the country. This coexistence carries political weight in the Brazilian government's internal conflicts where it is very well recognized that strengthening family farming runs alongside the predominant view of agribusiness. It must be pointed out that family farming is now a social, rather than an analytical category, and has managed to be recognized by public policies in Brazil. The most important event was the creation in the mid 1990's of the National Program to Strengthen Family Farming (PRONAF).

This leads us on to the second component of the Brazilian SAN experience, which was the creation, in 2003, of the Family Farming Food Acquisition Program (PAA). It adopts the same approach of providing differentiated support to family farming and originated from a CONSEA proposal, which was initially based on the idea of channeling part of the increased demand generated by income transfer programs to these farmers. The PAA ended up being a program that acquires food from family farmers to supply food programs and, even so, it has become notorious and is the target of increased demand of farming organizations. It is often the case that the differentiated prices established by the program become reference prices in local or regional markets, since it does not follow the traditional logic of setting minimum prices. The program led to a debate on issues such as stimulating the construction of differentiated markets (organic or ecological), the

difficulties brought about by the interministerial approach and by a history of market deregulation, and the guarantee of resources, amongst other topics.

Finally, some of the challenges faced by the social participation in public policies in Brazil were debated, especially those concerned with foreign policy, public policy committees and the implementation of government programs. The stand-out role played by social movements and by civil society in general in the process of bringing democracy to Brazil was recognized. Over the last 20 years, this process has included a new Federal Constitution, a regular succession of civil governments, the expansion of social and political rights and a greater social participation in public policies and in the control of the state. These events have taken place in a country which is characterized by the great power of the elite, top-down transitions, authoritarianism, patrimonialism, patronage and corruption. Expectations developed in relation to the Lula government towards expanding participation and democracy which are yet to be fulfilled in major components and whose detailing is beyond the scope of this report.

In the context of the post-reform of the state (which intensified during the 1990s) and its bitter internal disputes, social participation can be sought for the more efficient implementation of the program or as a form of political legitimization, or it can be a part of the more general democratization of society and the advance of citizenship. The accountability approach includes the strengthening of democratic interests, practices, processes and trends within the state as opposed to its weakening, as extolled by the neoliberal agenda and materialized in the above-mentioned reform. Nevertheless, attention was drawn to the need to maintain the autonomy of civil society organizations, mobilization and social pressure, as well as rethinking the process of participation in public policies and the practices of monitoring them.

Nevertheless, the possibility of Brazilian civil-society representatives monitoring some international negotiations more closely has contributed to making some of the contradictions that usually characterize the relationships between Brazil's foreign policy and domestic policies more evident, as was the case in many other countries. The new Brazilian foreign policy has shown to be against the unilateralism represented by the hegemony of the United States,

supporting multilateralism and a stronger South-South relationship. The progressive character of this policy coexists, however, with the continuity of a good part of the components of the neoliberal agenda as shown by macroeconomic policy, payment of the foreign debt, inflation control, a reduction in public expenditure and generation of a budget surplus, social security and labor legislation reform, and the liberation of genetically modified crops.

### **Lines for future discussions**

In this part, we describe some lines for future reflections and actions based on the questions discussed at the workshop covering international trade, food, ecology and health. The first and most general of these concerns the implications of the emergence of a new food system as a result of the disintegration of the one we have been used to since the mid-20th century. Even though the roles played by big capital and multilateral organizations such as the IMF in the destruction of the old system is clear, there are several possibilities concerning the types of rules and institutions that will emerge, making it necessary to confirm what would enable the consolidation of a stable system. The assumption that food systems correspond to hegemony that institute monetary, ideological and military systems which enable temporary stability before being dissolved by conflicts and crises of growing proportion was adopted. The items to be considered as agents of the ongoing destruction and construction of a new food system include: the emergence of China; the collapse of international governance with the proliferation of nuclear weapons and an increasing number of small wars; difficulties in getting corporations to regulate themselves, government creatures that depend on them for labor contracts, rules and discipline; the fate of the European common agricultural policy and subsidies in the United States.

The debates held during the workshop indicated that whatever stability was achieved, food will be central. This conclusion can be confirmed by the current scenario where the international prices of food are high, a trend which has accelerated since 2006 and originated several diagnoses about the

emergence of a food crisis caused by a set of multiple factors whose amplitude and developments are the object of intense debates. Some of the main factors that have caused this crisis include: the increased demand for food in large developing countries (China, India, Brazil and others); the impact of oil prices on the farm production and transport costs; the integration of agrifood product markets, which were turned into commodities, in speculative financial circles; and the use of basic foods (such as corn and soy) to produce ethanol. The crisis faced by the trade liberalization model and the corresponding multiculturalism is found to underlie the situational factors and is unable to bring order to the global food system under the private regulation of the large corporations and international traders.

Once again we can confirm that international trade is not a reliable source of food security, besides the fact that its current patterns jeopardize people's food sovereignty. It is possible that social and political pressures in several parts of the world cause the maintenance, in advanced countries, of instruments for promoting the production and regulation of the agrifood markets, as well as possible readoption of these instruments by several of the countries that underwent structural adjustments in 1980-90. Regulation by national states was a distinctive characteristic of the food system during the post-World War II period. If this possibility is confirmed, once again poorer countries that lack the political and institutional wherewithal to adopt sovereign food production and supply policies would be excluded. Thus, the debate on multilateralism refers to building development strategies with food and nutritional sovereignty and security

The current world situation throws more light on the old debate about farming subsidies and the impacts of their reduction and later elimination as demanded in international negotiations. Resumed in Paraty, the debate pointed to a likely strengthening of the trend toward rising international prices if subsidies are withdrawn and the fact that this would reduce the stimulus for production in countries that use them, reducing their competitiveness, with implications for the world food supply. The subsidy systems, in general, have enabled corporations to pay less for raw materials based on the existence of concentrated national farming systems, which sell cheaply and have been



transformed into strategic instruments for corporations on the global scale. Subsidies are part of a logic where not only corporations, but also states finance the relative positions of producers in different countries. Nevertheless, some analysts suggest the existence of sectors (such as the oils sector) where corporations would be more in favor of eliminating subsidies.

The observation above leads to the question of which market regulation standards would be possible in this context, besides the regulation exercised by private agents (and by the use of force) which is in itself unstable or destabilizing. The possibility of private self-regulation is, by definition, discarded, and the hypothesis of private companies having direct access to the WTO as a way of regulating each other and bringing about greater market stability is equally improbable. In this case, the legitimacy and suitability of an organization such as the WTO for regulating private capital would be called into question, because this would involve regulating labor and other elements, not to mention the privatization of common assets which would result from this. Nevertheless, corporations have a provisional regulatory system which operates through financial relationships and is expressed in company mergers and acquisitions. This is, without a doubt, a market based regulation, but one which is premised on state; if corporations are creatures of government, this is a role reversal. By the way, mention should be made to the establishment of homogeneous levels and standards by national states which have become homogenous to the point of having the same standards of well-being, as well as the unification of operational arenas of corporations and capital, with the WTO as the last arbitrage forum.

It is worth referencing some of the elements that make up the future scenarios visualized by ActionAid: population growth concentrated in the developing countries, whilst the advanced countries will need more and more labor; a large number of people living in regions with little water; the power of the large corporations; the trend towards free trade, but with a strong demand for nationalism and protectionism; the diffusion of democracy establishing new agreement systems. Questions of governance and the domestic and international institutional framework emerge as being of prime importance. Large middle-income countries, such as South Africa, Brazil, China, India and

Russia, classified as being in-between the advanced countries and the other members on the periphery of the world economic system, must be given special attention. This differentiation has geopolitical ingredients by stressing the role played by these countries in the regional and international environment, giving importance to their performances, including the repercussions on their respective areas of influence. It is also assumed that large middle-income countries have (or have a greater possibility of developing) differentiated institutional capacity in the different fields of public action, without ignoring the very different trajectories followed by these countries in this aspect.

The situation described up to here makes it complex to build progressive solutions, especially for ecological social movements to be sufficiently supported – beyond that which they obviously need to survive – to enable them to supply the bases for alternative solutions. To approach this subject, it is necessary, right from the start, to emphasize the social side of this situation, which is expressed in the depeasantization process, amongst other developments, especially in Africa, where a primitive accumulation process has very quickly taken place, the aging of the rural population, the entry of the rural young into the monetary economy, and intense migration. The things that are happening to the young are of particular importance because, on the one hand, they are disengaging from election processes (the product of a democracy that they did not have to fight for) and, on the other, they are getting involved in local democracy actions. One of the challenges faced by decadent democracies is to revitalize civic participation, instead of becoming consumers as is promoted by globalization.

We know that it was during the 20th century that people moved from the countryside to the cities, bringing to a close a long-running process that is, however, not sustainable in material terms and demands rethinking our relationship to the land and to food, which has not been the case in our technological relations. Otherwise, the growing of grains to produce energy and climate change itself have aggravated the question of knowing who will grow food and using what production methods. Part of this discussion involves confronting the incompatibility between the income obtained by the small

agricultural establishments and the costs of being a citizen and part of society. Continuing to live and work on the land cannot be an effect of poverty, as is the case with the majority of rural families in the poor countries and even in those at the middle-income level. In this connection, strategies that are directed at special niche markets emerge as being the only ones that are sustainable, given that it is always possible for public policies to be interrupted. From another, albeit complementary, angle it has been suggested that the global trends, which in the 1990s pointed towards the end of family-based agriculture, are confronted with what people are saying and the resistance with which they oppose these trends. At the end of the day, people want somewhere to live, with having to constantly move about. In spite of the speed of cultural changes being somewhat slower, there is room for these changes.

We speculated about the hypothesis that we were going through a Polanyian change by paying more attention to daily life, or even about the existence of a Polanyian protective impulse, which was the fruit of the combination of global movements for justice that have brought pressure to bear on the nation-states so that they provide such protection. To this end, the World Social Forum has become a permanent forum, which contributes to meeting one of the present contextual requirements which is the existence of a coordinated group of transnational movements. In this case, groups such as this network of researchers could take on the role of midwives, giving voice to people and, possibly, helping to strengthen a genuinely alternative multilateralism.

Finally, summarizing the debates on reflection and action prospects led to the following four lines of continuity suggested by the group, namely:

*i. Beyond the WTO game*

Unmasking or exposing the real meaning of trade, knowledge, investment and regulatory system, especially the fetishization of goods instead of the social relationships that make them possible. Revealing the hidden frauds behind the operations of the WTO. Monitoring the "Cairnsization" of the G-20 and learning lessons from NAFTA. Approaching the multifunctionality of

agriculture based on what it really is. Reaffirming the civil content of social rights and regulating global corporations.

*ii. Rethinking governance*

Rethinking governance in the domestic and international planes, considering that it is part of the WTO system. Discussing how to resocialize standards and rules, as well as states. Dealing with social participation in places and public policies.

*iii. Anticipating or naming harming emergent crises*

Providing evidence for, amongst other things: challenges to social democracy under the shield of privatization; the occurrence of hunger in the midst of abundance (and not scarcity); the movement of rural populations due to lack of services and jobs; economic and environmental refugees; the petroleum apogee and crisis and climate change; threats to agriculture and food crops; water crisis.

*iv. Anticipating or naming emergent alternatives*

Focusing on alternatives to the model of corporations that emerge, particularly from social movements. Making sense of what is happening in the world today, especially, establishing connections between the global and the local based on comprehensive analytical work. Giving voice to the main stakeholders involved in these change processes. Connecting the present to the past with a view to understanding and confirming how it affects today (not only how it used to work in the past). Structuring information for the Agribusiness Accountability Initiative Matrix.

## **Background papers**

Berthelot, J. *From Cancun to Hong-Kong : assessment, challenges and strategies*. Paris, ENSAT/Via Campesina, 2005.

Dann, C. *Turning up the heat: how the approaching end of the Oil Age provides an organising principle and a lever for making world food systems more fair and sustainable*. Christchurch (NZ), Green Party/Univ. of Canterbury, 2005.

Friedmann, H. *Discussion points on private and public standards*. Toronto (Ca), Toronto University, 2005.

Losch, B. Debating the multifunctionality of agriculture: from trade negotiations to development policies by the South. *Journal of agrarian change*, 4(3), 2004.

Maluf, R. *Food sovereignty and security, multilateralism and the multifunctionality of agriculture: some discussion points*. R. Janeiro, CPDA/UFRRJ, 2005.

McMichael, P. *The food sovereignty question*. Ithaca (US), Cornell University, 2005.

Patel, R. Global fascism, revolutionary humanism and the ethics of food sovereignty. *Development*, 48(2), 2005.

Peine, E. *Anticipating Paraty*. Ithaca (US), Cornell University, 2005.

## **Workshop programme**

*Towards an alternative multilateralism? Trade, food, health, and development across the global food system.*

Paraty (RJ), Brazil, July 2-4, 2005

Reference Centre on Food and Nutrition Security (CPDA/UFRRJ)  
Supports: ActionAid-Americas / ActionAid-Brasil / Ford Foundation-Brasil

July 2

9:00 - *Introduction*: from Ithaca to Paraty

Chair: P. McMichael & R. Maluf

9:30 – Personal introductions

10:00 - *Panel 1*: Post-Cancun developments

Chair: P. McMichael

First speeches: Jacques Berthelot & Adriano Campolina

12:30 – Lunch

14:00 - *Panel 2*: Food flows and trade rules: public and private governance

Chair: Renato Maluf

First speeches: Harriet Friedman & John Wilkinson

July 3

9:00 - *Panel 3*: New agenda – convergences, tensions, coalitions and conflicts: fair trade, multifunctional food systems, eco-agriculture, food sovereignty, cultural issues, dietary transitions, public health, ...

Chair: Harriet Friedman

First speeches: Christine Dann, Bruno Losch, Renato Maluf, Philip McMichael, Rajeev Patel

12:30 – Lunch

14:00 - *Panel 3*: continuation

Chair: John Wilkinson

July 4

9:00 - *Panel 4*: Brazilian experience on food security policies: principles, contents and social participation

Chair:

First speeches: Renato Maluf, Jorge Romano, Rafael Cedro

12:30 – Lunch

14:00 - Summary: International trade, food, ecology and health

Chair: Harriet Friedman

16:00 – Break

16:30 – *Outcomes and follow-up (from Paraty to ...)*

Chair: Philip McMichael

## **List of participants**

1. Jacques Berthelot (Via Campesina/ENSAT, France)
2. Adriano Campolina (ActionAid-Americas, Brazil)
3. Rafael Cedro (MDA, Brazil)
4. Christine Dann (New Zealand Greens, New Zealand)
5. Laura Davis (Warwick University, UK)
6. Harriet Friedmann (University of Toronto, Canada)
7. Bruno Losch (CIRAD, France; World Bank)
8. Renato Maluf (CPDA/UFRRJ, Brazil)
9. Philip McMichael (Cornell University, USA)
10. Rajeev Patel (Land Research Action Network, South Africa)
11. Emilie Peine (Cornell University, USA)
12. Jorge Romano (ActionAid-Brasil, Brazil)
13. John Wilkinson (CPDA/UFRRJ, Brazil)

# CERESAN

Centro de referência em  
segurança alimentar e nutricional

Av. Presidente Vargas, 417/8º andar  
20071-003 - Rio de Janeiro, RJ - Brasil  
Tel/Fax:(21) 2224-8577 Ramal: 215  
E-mail: [ceresanufrj@gmail.com](mailto:ceresanufrj@gmail.com)  
Home Page: <http://www.ufrj.br/cpda/ceresan>

