The Politics of Transnational Agrarian Movements

(Via Campesina and IFAP)

on

Genetically Modified Crops and Agrofuels

A Thesis Submitted to
Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts in International Development Studies

April 4th, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Approved	Dr Saturnino Borras Jr Supervisor
Approved	Dr Henry Veltmeyer First Reader
Approved	Dr James Brittain External
Date	April 4th, 2011

Your file Votre référence
ISBN 978-0-494-79645-0
Our file Notre référence
ISBN 978-0-494-79645-0

Table of Contents

Abstract

The Politics of Transnational Agrarian Movements (Via Campesina and IFAP) on Genetically Modified Crops and Agrofuels

By Stacey J. Menzies

Mainstream agricultural development policy, in regards to alleviating hunger and poverty, has been biased in favour of the industrial model of production The promotion of genetically modified (GM) crops and agrofuels following an industrial model, among others, is being part of the mainstream strategy to alleviate poverty and feed the world Transnational agrarian movements such as the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) and La Via Campesina have taken policy and political positions on these two controversial and highly debated issues Their positions are different, yet often they are conflated in the policy, political and academic literature, explicitly and implicitly treating transnational agrarian movements as a monolithic bloc Yet these two movements at least are highly differentiated based on social class origin, ideology and political standpoint This thesis argues that the implications of their differentiated take of IFAP and Via Campesina on GM crops and agrofuels have significant implications for both the rural poor and development policy

April 4th, 2011

List of Abbreviations

AoA	Agreement on Agriculture
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
COCOCH	Honduras' National Coordinating Council of Peasant Unions
COPA	Comité des Organisations Professionnelles Agricoles de l'Union Européenne
FAAFOP	Associations of Settled Family Farmers Federation
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FIAN	Food First Information and Action Network
Food First	Institute for Food and Development Policy
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GM	Genetically Modified
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFAP	International Federation of Agricultural Producers
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPRs	Intellectual Property Rights
KRRS	Karnataka Rajya Ryota Sangha or Karnataka State Farmers' Association
MOP	Meeting of Parties
MPA	Movement of Small Farmers - Movimento dos Pequenos Agricultores
MST	Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra
NGO	Non-governmental organization
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programs
TNC	transnational corporation

TAM	Transnational Agrarian Movement
TRIPS	Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights
WB	World Bank
WTO	World Trade Organization

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr S "Jun" Borras for his guidance and patience in this academic process I would also like to thank Dr Henry Veltmeyer and Dr James Brittain for their comments and questions My gratitude also goes out to my fellow IDS colleagues who have helped me and inspired me in many ways I have to thank Dr Robert Whitney and Dr Katherine Frego who have both given me the tools and the support to follow this path in International Development I would particularly like to thank my family for their love and support and the belief in me You are always my inspiration

Chapter One

Introduction

Agriculture is an essential and controversial topic in development Food is a basic human need and as such the reactions and tensions are intense in reference to its uses, production, and trade Agriculture has evolved over centuries to be what it is today In most countries of the world, there are traditional / subsistence agricultural practices performed alongside industrial model agriculture According to the 2008 World Development Report, "three out of four people in developing countries (883 million people lived in rural areas in 2002 Most depend on agriculture for their livelihoods, directly or indirectly So a more dynamic and inclusive agriculture could dramatically reduce rural poverty" (World Bank, 2008 26) Bernstein (2010) notes that those involved in the agricultural sector are often transient in their roles, individuals can be small, but poor farmers who sell their labour for wage In this thesis the rural poor is defined as the millions in developing countries who are directly or indirectly involved in agriculture to maintain a livelihood

Some development agencies such as the World Bank and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) have seen agriculture as a way out of poverty and hunger More specifically, these institutions have seen an industrial model suited to small farmers as a way out of hunger and poverty for the large number of small farmers in the world This model of industrial agriculture is embedded in a neoliberal[1] economic regime that has transformed how farmers engage, and (not) benefit from the sector In the past, development efforts in the agricultural sector have been between governments, international development agencies, and increasingly the private sector Subsequently, due to emphasis on accountability and transparency pressure has increased to have more civil society in partnerships in the development process to help alleviate hunger and poverty

Partnerships in Development

Participation from civil society has increased in the agricultural sector in the midst of the emergence of transnational agrarian movements (TAMs)[2] There are numerous transnational movements, some which are engaged in left-wing politics, while others are less radical (Edelman, 2003) The power of these movements is in the mobilization of the masses to influence the bearers of political and economic power (O'Brien et al , 2000)

[1] Neoliberalism stresses the importance of the efficiency of private sector, and liberalized trade
[2] According to Borras et al (2008 170-71), Transnational Agrarian Movements (TAMs) is taken to mean "movements, 'organizations, coalitions, networks and solidarity linkages of the rural poor"

These TAMs have become quite influential, yet this influence should not be presumed to be beneficial to the rural poor in a uniform way

Borras (2010) explains that the FAO acknowledges that there are differences between TAMs, but it is unable to name the differences and explain why they matter Borras further explains that TAMs are socially differentiated, they should not be grouped together as civil society as this will have serious adverse implications for development in terms of agenda setting, policy-making and political orientation Catherine Eschle argues that social movements need to be disaggregated or it might lead to "ignoring the hierarchical and oppressive relations that exist with civil society" (quoted in Desmarais 2007 21)

O'Brien found that certain factions in civil society have the ability and desire to engage with development agencies (Desmarais, 2003) This is the trend happening especially with the economic institutions such as the World Bank (WB), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Trade Organization (WTO) Those who are able to gain and maintain access to the WTO were those who were more ideologically aligned to accept globalization (Ibid) Desmarais (2007) argues that some movements are willingly 'inside' -- willing to reform the system and some are willingly 'outside' 'ready to change the current structure Desmarais points out the reformists movements are more likely to be accepted within the WTO while the radical movement, with more critical views, have little if any access to such institutions and forums It is also believed that the degree to which a movement can put "pressure upon key states and the degree to which its concerns can be accommodated without challenging the most powerful interests are key to

determining its relationship with these institutions" (Desmarais, 2003 16) As a result, the nature of TAMs, either as reformist or radical or in between, will determine how the rural poor are affected

Research Objective

Borras (2010 773) explains that the "differences among TAMs are underpinned by the social class origin and base, the ideology and politics, and the organizational/institutional make-up of the TAMs" This thesis, therefore, is interested in how the transnational agrarian movements within civil society are differentiated and what are their implications for development policy This thesis will look at the two largest and politically influential transnational agrarian movements the reformist International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) (which was established in 1946 and was recently liquidated in 2010) (Montemayor, 2011) and the radical La Via Campesina, more commonly known as Via Campesina Using two important issues of agriculture and development—genetically modified (GM)[3] crops (referred in this thesis as GMs) and agrofuels[4]—the central focus of this thesis is to determine if IFAP and Via Campesina

[3] According to Herring (2007), transgenics is the actual moving of "a specific sequence of DNA from one place, or species to another- [it] expands the scope of plant breeding "(5) He declares that transgenics is the biological term whereas GMs is a political term that is used interchangeably to mean transgenics GMs are used for a political purpose, and as such this thesis elects to keep it as a politicized issue and will refer to transgenics as the more commonly known GM

[4] Agrofuels is the term that is used to describe biofuels They are both the same transformation of plant material into a source of energy However, agrofuels is used to emphasize the diversion of the use of agrofuels to bring to light the implications of the food over fuel debate

affect the changes that are needed in helping rural producers alleviate hunger and poverty Therefore the question of this thesis is whether and to what extent transnational farmers' movements are differentiated, and why and how does it matter?

This thesis is interested in where the movements converge and diverge, and more importantly why they differ and what are the implications for development policy in alleviating poverty and hunger This thesis will examine the following issues surrounding GMs general acceptance, regulation, research and development and intellectual property rights On the topic of agrofuels, this thesis will examine its general acceptance, use of "marginal lands" for its production, and its support and regulation

Conceptual Framework

The transition from an agrarian society to an industrialized society has for the most part, always been seen as a way forward in the progression of human society Bernstein (2010) uses the word agrarian to describe the social relations and practices of farming, societies based on farming and the process of changes that occur in farming Agrarian transformation is seen, especially by modernization theorists, as the way to a better economic and social life compared to earlier times in history

According to Staaz (1998) agrarian transformation is the

process by which individual farms shift from highly diversified, subsistence-

> oriented production towards more specialized production oriented towards the market or other systems of exchange Agricultural transformation is a necessary part of the broader process of structural transformation, in which an increasing proportion of economic output and employment are generated by sectors other than agriculture

In summary, the point is to decrease the importance of agriculture relative to industry, while the sector still provides cheap raw material to facilitate industrialization

Agrarian transformation is carried out through capitalism Capitalism, as Bernstein (2010 1) defines it "a system of production and reproduction based in a fundamental social relation between capital and labour capital exploits labour in its pursuit of profit and accumulation, while labour has to work for capital to obtain its means of subsistence"

In capitalism, this transformation is carried out through capital accumulation, whereby agricultural producers are expropriated from the means of production (land), and at the same time, a class of workers is created and compelled to sell their labour for wages As such, class in this thesis is defined as the relation to the means of production rather than by defining class by income generation or social mobility The capitalist pathway seeks the following evolution

> the commodification of subsistence, where then these largely self-sufficient farmers come to rely increasingly on markets for their reproduction They come to

> depend on a money income and to buy consumption goods they can no longer produce with their own labour or obtain from the local economy, and to buy their means of production such as seeds, tools and other farm equipment (Bernstein, 2010 75)

Agriculture is carried out by different class base including (the persistent) pre-capitalist peasants and capitalist farmers According to Bernstein, the word peasant signifies household farming that is organized for simple reproduction or to supply its own food, it is often associated with the sense of solidarity, reciprocity and egalitarianism within villages and a commitment to the values of this type of life Shanin (1996) states that it is with the help of simple equipment, family labour, peasants produce for their own consumption and fulfillment The definitions of the word peasant, in this thesis, follows the idea that peasants are people of the land and are very much connected to the land as part of their identity (Desmarais, 2007), as such includes those who own land, have access to land, are near landlessness and who are landless, and work the land to sustain their livelihood

According to Karl Marx, it is the exit of the pre-capitalist peasantry from the agricultural sector, through capitalism that can bring about the social benefits that are needed to bring about a just and humane society Marx had in mind two main pathways that could unfold with this agrarian transformation Both outcomes are largely dependent on the actions of the pre-capitalist peasants The first is that capitalism could bring about the elimination of the peasants in this way transitioning into a complete capitalist mode of

production, and as such bringing about socialist conditions of equality However, Marx also had concerns that these same pre-capitalist peasants would resist the transition and become an impediment to a complete capitalist transition, thereby continuing the struggle between the peasant and more differentiated power wielding class (Akram-Lodhi and Kay, 2010)

The model of capitalism has changed overtime from neoclassical to Keynesian to its current dominant neoliberal form Peasants and capitalist farmers have been engaged in this transformation in different opposing mannerisms The peasants have organized themselves to resist the assimilation and to preserve the peasant way of life, they have organized themselves into structures in which their objective is to address the social

structures that are working hard to advance their very social, political and economic existence Capitalist farmers have organized themselves to better adapt to the forces of capitalism and expand capital accumulation, the capitalist farmers have opted to organize themselves as organizations focusing on improving the conditions for capitalist farmers to benefit in the neoliberal model without trying to carry out any structural changes In resisting or adapting to the neoliberal assimilation, both factions have organized at the local, national and international levels For the purpose of this thesis, transnational agrarian movement is used to incorporate both types of organization and agrees with Borras et al in defining Transnational Agrarian Movements (TAMs) as "movements, 'organizations, coalitions, networks and solidarity linkages of the rural poor" (2008 170-71)

TAMs have to deal with more complex problems as capitalism has expanded its reach with the movement of capital The neoliberal economic model focuses on promoting the freedom and mobility of capital across international border, while rolling back the function of the state (Bernstein, 2010) Veltmeyer and Petras (2008) point out that the neoliberal economic model favours capitalist enterprise in agriculture They argue that this economic model is expressively to the demise of the peasantry, peasants do not have the resources or government support to engage in the markets and the further divide leaves them further in debt, poverty, questionable food security and an unstable livelihood McMichael (2008) adds that the neoliberal economic model is causing a de-peasantization in the global South under the pressure of declining public support of agriculture, the gene revolution (the second Green Revolution), market-led land reform, and unfair WTO trade rules

As a result of the squeeze of the Neoliberal program, this thesis examines two of the largest and most influential TAMs, the International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) and La Via Campesina IFAP sees itself as a farmer organization that is progressing cautiously but clearly with the neoliberal model Via Campesina sees itself as a peasant base social movement working to change structure of the sector so that its base is not assimilated or eliminated, preserving the peasant way of life It is important to review the two largest TAMs to determine whether their agenda works towards helping the rural population As mentioned, three-quarters of the population in developing countries are directly or indirectly involved in agriculture, hence the development strategies promoted by these TAMs will have benefits or disadvantages for the rural

population

In development efforts in the sector, IFAP has achieved and been given enormous social and political clout As a result, IFAP sees itself as speaking on behalf of the world's farmers on issues that will help facilitate capital accumulation As representing itself as the world's farmers, IFAP is giving the impression that their agenda works for all farmers In actuality, IFAP is targeting just capitalist farmers rather than pre-capitalist farmers Via Campesina has also gained an effective platform for carrying out its campaigns of changing the changing the sector, but these efforts have been against strong opposition from international institutions

IFAP, with its aim of capital accumulation, is focused on the industrial model of agriculture whereas Via Campesina focuses on a peasant based agricultural model that has received lesser attention, investment, etc Since international institutes are engaged in a neoliberal model, they are more interested in helping farmers adapt to the forces of capitalism rather than to help peasants remain in a pre-capitalist phase as it hampers the complete realization of a capitalist mode of production This thesis examines the promotion of genetically modified crops and agrofuels as one of the ways to fasttrack capital accumulation and the eventual absorption of the peasantry leaving behind only efficient capitalist famers who help with the agrarian transformation

Methodology

Class analysis of IFAP and Via Campesina is one way of determining whether they respectively facilitate or reject the forces of capital accumulation However, due to logistical limitation of collecting empirical data on all the organizations that make up both IFAP and Via Campesina, this thesis is based on a discourse analysis of their literature While it is important to look at the structure of the TAMs, this thesis is interested in analysing how TAMs portray themselves, overall, in claiming to represent the world's farmers This thesis therefore uses discourse analysis to determine if IFAP and Via Campesina is facilitating or rejecting the forces of capital accumulation Discourse is usually referred to as the written or spoken communication or debate and it is specifically critical discourse analysis (CDA) that is helpful in this thesis

According to Mikkelson (2005 185), "a broad source of data in development research is text, i e , text of many sorts from official documents, archives, historical records, newspaper to web-based texts and folkloristic narratives " Therefore, a part of the methodology in this thesis is the examination of the primary literature from both IFAP and Via Campesina This literature includes their website, policy statements, position papers, press releases and commentaries The primary literature was reviewed in order to carry out a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Discourse is defined by the Oxford dictionary (2011) as written or spoken communication or debate Discourse analysis is then a theoretical examination of written or spoken communication or debate Discourse analysis has many forms but

they have in common the perspective the "rejection of the realist notion that language is simply a neutral means of reflection or describing the world, and a conviction in the central importance of discourse in constructing social life" (p 186) An important component of discourse analysis is that it takes a critical view of taken-for –granted knowledge and it recognizes the ways in which the world is understood is shaped by specific and relative history and culture (Mikkelsen, 2005)

According to Blommaert and Bulcaen, discourse is socially conditioned and it is "an opaque power object in modern societies" (448) that can be made more transparent by the use of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analysis that studies the way social power, abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted reproduced and resisted by text in the social and political context CDA takes an explicit position and thus wants to understand and expose and resist social inequality (Van Dijk, 2003) CDA works to uncover the ways in which social structure impinges on discourse patterns, relations and models in the form of power relations, ideological effects etc It advocates intervention in the social practices it criticizes

According to Van Dijk (1995), much of the work in CDA is about the underlying ideologies that play a role in the reproduction of or resistance against dominance or inequality One of the practical roles of CDA is to uncover, reveal or disclose what is implicit, hidden or not immediately obvious Therefore CDA specifically focuses on strategies of manipulation, legitimation and the manufacture of consent in the interest of the powerful (Van Dijk, 1995) Examination of the primary literature of both IFAP and

Via Campesina focussed on what was implicit within the literature as a way to facilitate the promotion of the neoliberal agenda Also the literature was examined to determine if some inherent tensions within the literature would be played out in reality

Why IFAP and Via Campesina?

IFAP and Via Campesina are chosen in this thesis as they are both large, political, competing movements who both claim that they represent the small farmers of the world IFAP and Via Campesina have a history of competing with each other for political influence Although IFAP was established first, the founding member organizations of Via Campesina did not feel represented by IFAP and so went ahead to form Via Campesina Since then Via Campesina has grown manifold Now bringing together close to 148 organizations formed in 69 countries, and a membership into the millions, it makes the legitimate claim of being the voice of the smallholder 'peasant' agricultural producer, which IFAP failed to do Therefore this thesis will determine if IFAP or Via Campesina has benefits for the small farmers that make up a large percentage of the rural producers

Why GM crops and agrofuels?

GM crops and agrofuels are both being touted as the solution for hunger and poverty interestingly by governments together with the private sector and similar minded other organizations to rid the world of hunger and poverty Warning bells are sounded

when the private sector—whose main goal is profit at the expense of the poor—are promoting ways out of poverty This rise out of poverty would surely cut into the private sector's profit Therefore, this thesis is interested in seeing how GM crops and agrofuels play into the private sectors role in 'decreasing' poverty and hunger, with the help of other development agencies including governments, farmer's organizations and multilateral agencies

Thesis statement:

IFAP and Via Campesina are working in oppositional roles in the context of the accumulation of capital that is needed for a full capitalist agrarian transformation, IFAP is working with the neoliberal economic model helping farmers to adapt to the forces of capitalism and in doing so trying to complete the capitalist mode of production, whereas Via Campesina is resisting the forces of capitalism to remain as peasants working the land for their livelihood and thus creating impediment to the full function of the capitalist mode of production

Chapter One highlighted the problem of lumping civil society as an undifferentiated group participating in development The conceptual framework lays out the working ideas that agriculture is being transformed through capitalism so that capitalist farmers dominate the sector to fulfill a complete capitalist mode of production In reaction to the increasing commoditization of agriculture, TAMs are working to either facilitate or reject the forces of neoliberal capitalism Through CDA, this thesis predicts

that IFAP will help capitalist farmers to engage in the markets and hence adapt to the forces of capitalism, whereas Via Campesina stands against the neoliberal model and as a result conserve the peasant way of life

Chapter Two explains the differentiation of the peasantry based on the relationship to the mode of production and briefly outlines the persistence of the peasantry The Global Food Regime follows and gives the context of the current agricultural sector at a global level, setting the stage for the focus on the use and promotion of GMOs and agrofuels The Global Food Regime is examined to show how specific aspects of agriculture, such as research and development, regulation, the role of the government, private sector and international institutions, help TAMs in their respective objective of either rejecting or adapting to the neoliberal economic model IFAP and Via Campesina are introduced showcasing their motivation, goals, political and economic inclinations

Chapter Three is the analysis chapter It highlights the ways in which IFAP and Via Campesina are differentiated in terms of who it represents and it delves into each of the TAMs stance on the issues of GMOs and Agrofuels ranging from when they are conceived, promoted, regulated and supported Chapter Four concludes with the general findings on IFAP and Via Campesina on the issue of GMOs and agrofuels Here it is concluded whether IFAP and Via Campesina work to facilitate or reject capital accumulation

Chapter Two

The Formation and Politics of Transnational Agrarian Movements

Differentiating rural producers

Walden Bello argues that the ability of a movement to be effective depends on its capacity to correctly and collectively analyze the global context, define strategic goals and work on relevant strategies and tactics (Desmarais, 2007) These capabilities are influenced by the social make-up of such movements According to Bernstein, "activist movements need an effective analysis of the complex and contradictory social realities they seek to transform In a capitalist world, understanding class dynamics should always be a point of departure and a central element of such analysis" (2010 123)

In understanding class dynamics that leads to differentiation in the agriculture, it is important to use a political economy framework Bernstein (2010 1) defines it as investigating "the social relations and dynamics of production and reproduction, property

and power in agrarian formations and their processes of change, both historical and contemporary" In this framework, four essential questions are used to disaggregate classes "who owns what?", "who does what?" "Who gets what?" and "what do they do with the created surplus wealth?"

As small farmers are locked into commodity production Bernstein points out that there is a "tendency of differentiation into classes [which] Lenin (1964a) termed rich, middle, and poor peasants" (i2010, 104) Rich peasants are those "able to accumulate productive assets and reproduce themselves as capital on a larger scale, engaging in expanded reproduction" (2010 104) Middle peasants are those "able to reproduce themselves as capital on the same scale of production, and as labour on the same scale of consumption" (2010 104) Poor peasants are "struggling to reproduce themselves as capital, hence struggling to reproduce themselves as labour from their own farming and subject to a simple reproduction squeeze" (Bernstein, 2010 104) Poor farmers are the ones who experience the contradiction of "reproducing themselves as both labour and capital and reduce their consumption to extreme levels in order to retain possession of a small piece of land or a cow, to buy seeds or to repay debts" (2010 104) Poor peasant can also be marginal famers who are "too poor to farm" They may not lack access to land, but they lack sufficient quality land, resources to purchase the means of production such as seeds, or even the ability to command their own labour These poor farmers often engage in "survival" activities (2010 107)

Because the nature of small farmers can shift to partial wage earner, and because there exists large numbers of land less labourers it is important to look at what Bernstein

(2010) labels as "classes of labour" Although not dispossessed of all their means of production, this demographic has to pursue their livelihood in conditions of income insecurity The working poor have to pursue their livelihood

> through complex combinations of wage employment and self-employment Additionally, many pursue their means of reproduction across different sites of the social division of labour urban and rural, agricultural and non-agricultural, wage employment and marginal self-employment The social locations and identities the working poor inhabit, combine and move between make for ever more fluid boundaries and defy inherited assumptions of fixed and uniform notions of "worker," "farmer," "petty trader," "urban," "rural," "employed" and "self-employed" (Bernstein, 2010 111)

According to Bernstein, 'modernizing' policymakers have predicted the partial or complete elimination of the peasantry at several transitional moments first, with the shift from low input to mechanized agriculture, then, with the coming of the Green Revolution, then later with the imposition of Structural Adjustment Programmes, economic liberalization and the reversal of state-led agrarian reforms, and, with the signing of free trade agreements

Bernstein points out that the elimination of peasant is considered a necessity, but a painful one, by those who follow capitalist or socialist modernization They believe that the progression to modernity involves major upheavals It started with primitive

accumulation and now progresses with what David Harvey calls accumulation by dispossession (an updated version of primitive accumulation) (Ibid) The disappearance of the peasantry is viewed as a negative occurrence by those associated with populism Populist concepts and ideas are the response to the major upheavals caused by capitalism and especially the neoliberal agenda It is specifically agrarian populism that defends the peasantry against the threats of capitalism to their mode of production Agrarian populist are against capitalism as a model and also against its agencies

Many authors such as Petras (2007), McMichael (2008) argue against Hobsbawm's prediction of the disappearance of the peasantry Bernstein (2010 89) gives three broad explanations of why the peasantry has not been completely forced out due to capitalism "the "obstacles" to the investment of capital in farming, the interests of capital in allowing, or encouraging, the reproduction of small-scale farming, and the resistance by small-scale farmers to dispossession and proletarianization"

Peasant farms absorb risks and can delay the realization of the value of agricultural commodities while in capitalist this would hamper the cost/benefit ratio that is dependent on reduced production time Another reason is that family labour is much cheaper, and hence a "labour-price" advantage, to use than wage labour in the capitalist model Peasant farming can be viewed another way, small-scale farming is more competitive, in that it can absorb costs and risks that capitalist farmers are not willing to bear Therefore, small-scale farmers might be able to supply agricultural commodities cheaper, relative to capitalist farmers, who might find it more their while to invest in

upstream and downstream activities (Bernstein, 2010) In other cases, the penetration of capitalism has by-passed some regions in the past, but are now being swept away by waves of agriculture development projects which are causing accumulation by dispossession (ibid) Resistance to the capitalist program has been an ongoing strategy and has reworked its strategies whether it is covert, or organized Resistance has been organized at different levels and as the neoliberal agenda expands, social resistance has also crossed borders

Differentiation of TAMs

Newell (2008) notes that the outcome of civil society mobilization is dependent on "who mobilizes and how, and about the strategic dilemmas that arise when movements with different histories, membership bases and cultures of protest attempt to work together" (p 346)

According to Borras (2010 773) TAMs are "underpinned by the social class origin and base, the ideology and politics and the organizational/institutional make-up of the TAMS", it is an understanding of class dynamics that helps in the understanding of the similarities and differences in ideology and it also helps in understanding the issues that unite and divide movements Borras et al (2008) explain further that

> [t]he strategic implications of ideological and political differences within and between TAMs – in movement-, alliance- and coalition-building, representation and accountability, issue framing and demand making—cannot be taken for granted They do matter They play important roles in the rise or fall, strengthening or weakening of transnational movements, networks and coalitions (p 195)

As Scoones (2008) observes that in the case of anti-GM mobilization, "the well-educated, urban, middle-class profile of many activists meant they were also well-connected, and able to articulately put a case to senior ministers, civil servants and others (p 328) Holt-Gimenez (2010) notes for some distinct movements "the political and institutional origins of these movements are different, and this has at times led to contradictory, competitive, and even adversarial relations" (p 203) Borras (2010) warns that class structure should not be assumed to be static within movements, it is by nature ambiguous and shifts, changing dynamics of alliances and actions

By carrying out a discourse analysis of both IFAP and Via Campesina, this thesis will unpack how ideology and the institutional make-up shapes the outcomes for the rural producers based on the use of GMs and agrofuels It will be determined if IFAP and Via Campesina are able to correctly voice the concerns of the rural producers This thesis looks to see how well both IFAP and Via Campesina represent the rural producers or, and how this representation leads to benefits that are socially inclusive, and beneficial for the rural producers poor in the long term

The Food Regime

In order to determine how TAMs are differentiated, it is important to understand the agricultural context in which governments, the private sector, research agencies, multilateral agencies and the rural population, including the poor, operate It is therefore important to examine what Harriet Friedmann and Phillip McMichael coin the "global food regime" The food regime analysis was first devised in the early 1980s and it follows the path of how capital accumulation shaped global power arrangements through the circulation of food (McMichael, 2009) Although this thesis is not focussed solely on food production, the global food regime nonetheless, gives the agro-industrial context in which GMs and agrofuels are being promoted The first food regime (1870s–1930s) occurred under European colonial rule and saw tropical imports from settling colonies that included basic grains and livestock to facilitate the emerging industrial classes (Friedmann, 1982) The second food regime (1950s-1970s) occurred at the change of hegemonic powers, namely a change from British dominance to that of the United States As McMichael (2009) points out there was a reverse in the flow of food from South to the North in the form of food aid, which was essentially U S agricultural surpluses Food aid was given to convince newly independent countries not to follow a Social path of development (Ibid) Friedmann (1982) points that food aid

> reduced the necessity to choose among difficult alternative development

strategies investment in increasing agricultural productivity, which both uses scarce capital and expels the rural population, higher food prices or rationing, which increases the costs of reproduction of the labourforce or creates political and administrative problems, or the use of foreign exchange for food imports, which limits import of investment goods" (p s268)

Friedmann (1993) explains that "As third world states sought to develop national economies, their agrarian strategies were shaped by the opportunities and limits of world food markets These gave little reason to question the dominant ideologies—capitalist and socialist, modernization and dependency—which all encouraged states to downplay agriculture except as a contribution to industrial development" (p 37)

In this period, the global spread of industrial agriculture through the 'Green Revolution'[5] was carried out in the Global South According to Liodakis (2003) the Green Revolution was also carried out to quell land reform that would potentially increase self-sufficiency for the rural poor National governments worked along with the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and implemented the Green Revolution technologies

Friedman (1993), in this connection, notes that "[d]espite the Green Revolution, which *replicated* in the third world the hybrid maize revolution of US agriculture, and *integrated* national agriculture into world markets for equipment and chemical inputs, the third world as a whole became the main source of import demand on world wheat

[5] The Green Revolution is the use of high-yielding varieties of a few cereals (wheat, maize, rice) used with obligatory heavy use of subsidized fertilizers, pesticides, irrigation and machinery

markets Import policies created food dependence within two decades in countries which had been mostly self-sufficient in food at the end of the Second World War" (p 38)

The Green Revolution brought many disparities with its implementation, although it was suppose to be a scale neutral technology only farmers with access to credit were able to utilized this technology, large landowners were able to increase their productivity and sell at depressed prices pushing small landowners out of the market, mechanization caused a loss in employment and also migration into urban areas for work, (Conway, 1997, Liodakis, 2003, Holt-Gimenez et al , 2006) Not only was domestic agriculture neglected, but also "[o]n the export side, tropical crops faced the notorious problem of declining terms of trade, even when export states tried to manage world supplies (Friedmann, 1993 38) By the early 1970s then, Friedmann notes, "the food regime had caught the third world in a scissors One blade was food import dependency The other blade was declining revenues from traditional exports of tropical crops" (1993 38)

McMichael (2009) argues that the third regime—from the late 1980s to the present time—is a "corporate food regime"[6] The aim of the corporate food regime is "to focus attention on how instituting the full-scale dispossession of an alternative agriculture" (McMichael, 2009 152) The third regime emerged from a period that experienced the global economic shocks of the 1970s and 1980s and was ushering in neoliberal capitalist expansion through globalization (Holt-Gimenez & Shattuck, 2011) In this regime the public sector in agriculture had its capacity diminished Governments

[6] Friedmann disagrees and argues that "we have not yet seen the full-scale (hegemonic) establish of a food regime, with 'implicit rules' (framed by social forces) imprinted in the production and consumption of traded food (which currently divide between industrial and affluent/fresh food" (quoted in McMichael, 2009 148)

that wanted to sign up for development loans from the World Bank had to carry out Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) These SAPs broke down tariffs, dismantled national marketing boards, eliminated price guarantees and destroyed national agricultural research and extension systems in the Global South (Holt-Gimenez & Shattuck, 2011) Pistorius and van Wyk summarized the state's capacity in agricultural research as

> a tendency for the state as the pivot of crop development to be replaced by private industry Since the 1980s, the growth of public investment in agricultural R&D has declined, private industry has obtained a greater say in the allocation of public agricultural R&D funds, while private investment in agricultural research has risen rapidly This development has been accompanied by a thorough restructuring of the organisation of the plant breeding sector, which has given rise to the formation of industrial crop development conglomerated, based in OECD countries Given the accumulation of unrivalled financial and technological capacity within these industrial conglomerates, they seem to become the central actors and dynamic force of crop development (quoted in McMichael, 2009 150)

The establishment of the WTO in 1995, and specifically its Agreement on Agriculture (AoA), institutionalized the process of agricultural liberalization on a global scale by freeing the movement of capital and at the same time restricting the rights of sovereign states to regulate food

Developing countries were forced to open their barriers to compete with heavily

subsidized imports and low prices for exports on the global market (Weis, 2007) Oligopolistic market structures and strategic alliances within the agro-industry contributed to the higher prices for agricultural inputs (McMichael, 2009) It has been estimated, McMichael notes, that only two corporations hold 65 per cent and 44 per cent respectively of world seed markets for maize and soya, and six corporations control 75-80 per cent of the global pesticides market Developing country farmers received relative small percentage of profit from the retail prices for their products With globalization transnational corporations that were increasingly becoming powerful in the previous food regime were now full throttle expanding their markets and control of the sector The AoA undoubtedly facilitated such control, for example, coming out of the AoA was the Trade Related Intellectual Property (TRIPs) that has serious implications for the regulation of GM crops

In the current neoliberal driven food regime, transnational corporations (TNC) have come to dominate the agricultural sector through international trade (Desmarais, 2003) They have considerable market power and have been able to do this through a combination of corporate strategies, which include horizontal and vertical integration, consolidation and concentration, production and marketing contracts and globalization (2003) TNCs also have considerable political power to match their market power As an example Desmarais (2003 15) shows that in "the United States—one of the most powerful players in the WTO—the business community has direct links to US trade negotiators through their Washington-based lobbyists and their prominent representation at the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations McMichael (2009) states

that the

> paradox of this food regime is that at the same time as it represents global integration as the condition for food security, it immiserates populations, including its own labour force The perverse consequence of global market integration is the export of deprivation, as 'free' markets exclude and /or starve populations dispossessed through their implementation In turn, disposed population function as reserve labour, lowering wages and offering the possibility of labour casualisation throughout the corporate empire (McMichael quoted in McMichael, 2009, p 154)

According to Holt-Gimenez and Shattuck (2011)

> The corporate food regime is currently characterized by the unprecedented financialization of food, agribusinesses monopoly, globalized animal protein chains, growing links between food and fuel economies, a 'supermarket revolution,' liberalized global trade in food, increasingly concentrated land ownership, and a shrinking natural resource base, and growing opposition from food movements, worldwide (p 111)

Genetically Modified (GM) Crops

The United States and the United Kingdom were the two main centers for molecular biological research (Andree, 2007) As mentioned when the food regime began to shift to a more neoliberal agenda, transnational corporations began to invest in more research The incentive for TNCs to invest included the limited number of crops that were targeted that would provide the bulk of the world's food and fodder, hence a larger share in the global market (Andree, 2007) Therefore, TNCs became the decisive agents determining the rate, character and orientation of agricultural technological development Another incentive for research and development was that GM would still be dependent on Green Revolution technological inputs such as fertilizers and pesticides This allowed the agri-chemical industry to become more involved and build up their business with the potential for further capital accumulation (Liodakis, 2003)

As early as 1988, the "US government was using the threat of trade sanctions as a device for ensuring that countries sign, and then enforce, bilateral agreements protecting IPRs [Intellectual Property Rights] of all types" (Andree, 2007 59) In 1994 the result was the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) being institutionalized in the then General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) now known as the WTO (Andree, 2007) TRIPs exists to manage the patent process of GM crops GM crops are regulated by a series of intellectual property laws aimed at protecting the inventors and owners of the crops

According to Josling and Babinard (1999 31) all members of the WTO are

required to grant patents for "inventions whether products or processes, in all fields of technology, provided that they are new, involve an inventive step and are capable of industrial applications" They relay that patents give companies exclusive property rights on organisms, genes or processes for up to 20 years Patent owners can license patent rights in exchange for royalty payments or license fees, royalties can be paid for the use of a transgenic crop seed and even on all subsequent seed produced for as long as the patent lasts (Nottingham cited in Josling & Babinard, 1999) Josling and Babinard add that cross-licensing and "inter-firm cooperation agreement" is vast becoming the norm, where these companies that have complementary and similar market interests cooperate on a selective basis and develop alliances and joint ventures (1999)

According to Weis (2007), TRIPS was used not only to secure patent rights globally, but to force governments to enforce the rules, and more importantly it helped to gain market access for GM globally The industry sees multilateral rules as a way to "override popular resistance to GM by legally containing trade barriers and labelling requirements- in other words, moving debates away from consumers and elected governments and locating decision-making in the shadowy world of trade negotiations and corporate lobbyists "(Weis, 2007 133) It was in the mid-1990s that the first attempts to introduce GM crops were made in developing counties such as Brazil, South Africa, and India (Scoones, 2008) In India, Monsanto's Bt cotton was first imported in 1995, but was not improved until 2002 for commercial The illegal planting of Bt was taken by Monsanto as the desire for the particular crops In Brazil, in 1997 the first trial of Monsanto's 'Roundup Ready' herbicide-tolerant GM soya was approved It was only

after a long battle in court that it was formally approved for sale in 2002 (ibid) The leaders in genetically engineered crops are China, Argentina, and of as of 2007 Brazil was also increasing its implementation (Scoones, 2008)

Europe and Japan have carried out adamant opposition to GM crops especially in their imports (Weis, 2007) There are also developing countries which have resisted GM crops In 2002, Zambia and Zimbabwe rejected food aid, during its famine, coming from the United Nations as it contained transgenic maize kernels (Herring, 2007a) Herring comments that "those at the bottom of the global hierarchy could, however and sometimes do, see transgenics as a new dependency trap—or a risk to exports to Europe and Japan rather than a source of progress" (p 3) Paarlberg (2008) insists that opposition to GM crops are nothing more that western elitist activists imposing their views on vulnerable countries and causing major blockage to raising productivity which is essential to ending hunger and alleviating poverty

Newell (2008 347) notes that

> activists have made important gains, opening up the debate about biotechnology to a plurality of voices, challenging the regulatory structures set up to manage the technology and constructing alternative arenas to debate its risks and benefits, the close alignment of state strategies, despite their broader social base and strong international connections, have not been able to shift the debate about biotechnology from one about bio-safety and responsible handling to one about land ownership, property rights and the unequal relations of power which sustain

them

The debates of GM crops are numerous but the thesis will focus on the following general acceptance, research and development, regulation and intellectual property rights (IPRs) IFAP, on one hand, sees GM crops as an opportunity for its farmers to gain better access to markets in order to increase profitability Via Campesina, on the other hand, sees GM crops as a threat to the access of natural resources and adamantly denies that this type of manipulation has any chances of changing the outcomes of farmers who are already marginalized or trying to compete for a livelihood The analysis chapter will delve into the stance that each movement takes on GM crops, how it benefits the rural poor, and the subsequent implications for policy

Agrofuels

As seen from the food regime, the commodity chains are set up and controlled in such a manner that the focus of agriculture production can shift relatively easily from one "commodity" to another The international movement of capital in the agricultural sector dictates the focus of production As such, farmers and labourers have to follow the trend if they are to survive in the neoliberal market The shift from production of grains for food to fuel is an example of such a shift

According to Pye (2010) agrofuels have become a phenomenon in a relatively short time Interest in agrofuels as an alternative (transport) energy source surged in the

late 1990s Although its research and development had been underway throughout the twentieth century, a combination of concerns in the 1990s over climate change, energy security, and declining oil reserves sparked further interest in the potential for agrofuels to contribute to clean development (Dauvergne & Neville, 2010) According to Dauvergne and Neville (2010), the initial support for agrofuels came from a wide range of proponents-from industrial and environmental groups to climate change activists Many governments had been keen on the challenge of using agrofuels to help them meet climate change commitments Although there were cautionary voices, there was little co-ordinated resistance against this alternative energy source and the prevailing optimism led to the EU and the US enacting policies to develop biofuels (ibid) Despite claims that the US could grow the agrofuels that is needed for its consumption, the cost and capacity of its production is insufficient It is estimated that the US can produce only 12-14 per cent of what it needs (Friends of the Earth, 2007) Investments are happening where the cost of production is less and the conversion of 'marginal land' is conducive to agrofuel production

In 2007, agrofuels received attention as it highlighted "the multiple pressures on agricultural and financial systems, with in which purchasing power and food availability were affected the rising prices of staple crops (rice, wheat, and corn), and market speculation in food commodities following the collapse of housing markets" (Dauvergne & Neville, 2010 636) Simultaneously, Dauvergne and Neville, note, uncertainty about agrofuels and its environmental benefits were increasing "[r]esearch was beginning to show that agrofuels derived from crops were producing higher environmental costs than

from the traditional fossil fuel creating a carbon debt rather than a saving (p 637)

The FAO 2008 report "The state of food and agriculture" finds that while biofuels would offset only a "modest" share of fossil energy, it would have much bigger impacts on agriculture and food security (FAO, 2008) Although, the response to emerging doubts made for more cautious actions, these did not stifle all growth in the sector (Dauvergne & Neville, 2010) McMichael (2010) raises the question of whose consumption the agrofuels boom is catering to and concludes that it is for the consumption of the minority in developed countries He sees it as "biofuelling poverty, a polite term for the agrofuels project, also means deepening forms of rural dispossession in the name of the market, and on behalf of this minority and its dependence on agribusiness imperialism" (p 615)

There are many debates that surround agrofuels but this thesis will focus on the following the general acceptance, the use of 'marginal lands' for agrofuel production, and the effectiveness of support and regulation to protect the rural poor IFAP is promoting agrofuels as an opportunity for small farmers-jump starting a revival of the rural economy, whereas Via Campesina is adamant that agrofuels production is a disastrous pathway that is diverting food for fuel and the only top beneficiary is the private sector

IFAP

The International Federation of Agricultural Producers (IFAP) was founded in 1946 in the UK by major national farmers' organization in developed nations to "secure international cooperation of national organizations of agricultural producers "in meeting the nutritional and consumptive requirements of the peoples of the world and in improving the economic and social status of all who live by and on the land" (IFAP, 2010a) IFAP's focus has shifted overtime from the reconstruction of agriculture after the Second World War, to policy proposals for international commodity agreements in the 1980s, to its current proposals on international rules for fair competition (2010a)

According to IFAP (2010a), its membership has evolved since 1946 Currently, developing countries have become the majority of the membership During the 1990s, IFAP became increasingly concerned about the growing number of organisations of family farmers in the developing countries that were not strong enough to participate in its activities In response IFAP created a new membership structure that allowed into IFAP, all farmers' organisations from developing countries that met the requirements of the IFAP constitution to be substantially representative of the family farmers of their country (2010a)

In regards to addressing poverty and hunger, IFAP believes that "there are many reasons for hunger and poverty However, fight against poverty must be based on market opportunities, fair prices for agricultural products, appropriate technical support and a favourable political, agricultural and commercial environment" (2004 9) At a broader

level, IFAP believes that the

> UN should provide a basic institutional framework and policy incentives to facilitate the building of partnerships between farmers organizations, the private and public sector, and with government (local authorities), to ensure that national governments work effectively and in a transparent way with the representatives of farmers' organizations with their respective countries" (IFAP, 2004 5)

Therefore, IFAP encourages that farmers' organizations that "should be involved in discussions concerning trade agreements at national, sub-regional, and international levels e g WTO to ensure that farmers' issues are not only well articulated but properly entrenched in the final agreements to address their concerns and interests" (IFAP, 2004 4)

IFAP promotes that "farmers' organizations are critical in rural development They preserve cultural and traditional values and solidarity, and also ensure that farming is modernized and sustainable so that it is able to provide a decent livelihood for farmers and induce economic growth" (IFAP, 2004 4) No doubt IFAP sees itself as facilitating this role in assisting farmers to gain a decent livelihood

According to IFAP, its concerns center around the global food system that is reducing farmers into subcontractors for food companies and retail chains (IFAP, 2002) IFAP recognizes that over the last few decades that there has been the concentration of power by transnational companies over agricultural inputs and that international trade has

not been in favour of the farmer Therefore, it is IFAPs objective to work in the neoliberal system to address the unfair trade and better organize farmers so that they have bargaining power within the system (Ibid) Increasing farmers' power in the market can be helped by the technology According to IFAP

> [n]ew technology will have an important contribution to make to achieving world food security Developments in appropriate technology, biotechnology, information technology need to be encouraged In the process of new technology generation and application, including its legal framework such as patenting rights and access to genetic resources, care must be taken by governments to discuss with farmers' representative organizations, the consequences for farmers both in the short and long term (IFAP, 1996)

For IFAP, it is critical for the sustainability of the family farm system of agriculture that farmers receive a reasonable share of the value added generated by the global food and agricultural system, otherwise convincing another generation to carry on farming will be futile IFAP believes that in the interests of both efficiency and equity, the agrifood system must operate in an open, fair, and transparent manner, with a maximum of confidence between the various partners in the system

Governments have a role in regulating the agrifood system in order to ensure that this transparency exists, and to ensure that the system functions in a way that is consistent with the aspirations of their consumers and citizens (IFAP, 2002) IFAP supports

initiatives by government bodies to enforce competitive behaviour among agricultural input and processing firms, as well as in the distribution sector

Desmarais (2003) states that as it promotes itself as the organization of "world's farmers", IFAP has succeeded in carving a space for itself with a significant number of international institutions

> IFAP has Category I consultative status with the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) of the United Nations and actively participates in consultations with a number of institutions such as the World Health Organization (WHO), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the World Bank (WB), the WTO (Karl 1996, p 131) (Desmarais, 2003 21)

Through this level of participation, IFAP believes that it is succeeding in influencing international deliberations and ensuring that farmers' interests are met IFAP prides itself on being the voice of the "world's poor" and sees at it contributed to helping the worlds famers by promoting GMOs, and agrofuels as a way to help small farmers

Via Campesina

Via Campesina was formed partly in response to the lack of representation from

IFAP (Desmarais, 2003) According to its historical overview, Via Campesina (2008a 40) states that it "emerged in a particular economic, political and social context that was undermining the ability of peasants around the world to maintain control over land and seeds It emerged during a time when a particular model of rural development was altering rural landscapes, threatening to make local knowledge irrelevant and denigrating rural cultures In 1993, forty-six representatives (of both men and women) of organizations of peasants, small farmers, indigenous peoples and farm workers from various regions formally created La Via Campesina The common objective (Via Campesina, 2008a 41) is

> an explicit rejection of the neoliberal model of rural development, an outright refusal to be excluded from agricultural policy development and a fierce determination not to be 'disappeared' and a commitment to work together to empower a peasant voice Through its strategy of 'building unity within diversity' and its concept of food sovereignty, peasant and farmers' organizations around the world are working together to ensure the well-being of rural communities "

Via Campesina further states that

> the goal of La Via Campesina is to bring about change in the countryside—change that improves livelihoods, enhances local food production for local consumption, and opens up democratic spaces change that empowers the people of the land with

> a great role, position, and stake in decision-making on issues that have an impact on their lives The movement believes that this kind of change can occur only when local communities gain greater access to and control over local productive resources, and gain more social and political power (p 41)

As a founding member, Borras (2010) points out that Via Campesina is both "an actor and an arena of action" (p 779) It is an actor in the sense that it plays a major role among the transnational movements and the struggle against neoliberalism It is also an arena of action as it serves as a medium for debate and exchange among national peasant and farmer's groups Via Campesina looks to food sovereignty[7] as a way to change the social relations of agricultural production such that it can be free of oppression and inequality between men and women, peoples, racial groups, social and economic classes and generations (Via Campesina 2008) The relationship between Vía Campesina and the State, rather than the government, is emphasized Via Campesina (2008*b*) points out that the State has a more national scope, it is the political parties and governments that assume the administration of the "common good" They have the view that states and parties promote and defend a neoliberal economy where the market reigns, and this principle is in opposition to the interests of Vía Campesina

[7] Food sovereignty is the right of peoples, countries, and state unions to define their agricultural and food policy without the "dumping" of agricultural commodities into foreign countries Food sovereignty organizes food production and consumption according to the needs of local communities, giving priority to production for local consumption Food sovereignty includes the right to protect and regulate the national agricultural and livestock production and to shield the domestic market from the dumping of agricultural surpluses and low-price imports from other countries Landless people, peasants, and small farmers must get access to land, water, and seed as well as productive resources and adequate public services Food sovereignty and sustainability are a higher priority than trade policies (www viacampesina org)

Via Campesina is against the corporate control of agriculture, it states that

> transnational companies have as a declared goal to destroy peasant based agriculture in order to industrialize agricultural production, turning peasants and farmers into agricultural workers on their plantations and controlled properties, and into consumers of their products and slum dwellers They deliberately seek the complete vertical integration and full domination and control over food and agriculture from the seed to the plate in order to take in huge profits This exploits workers, concentrates economic and political power, and destroys rural communities (2008b 58)

Via Campesina's is vocal on their stance of development agencies

> The World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) are the key institutions that implement these neoliberal policies through trade liberalization (such as Free Trade Agreements), the dumping of surpluses that destroy local markets, the patenting of life, the corporate led privatization of land, water and seeds, and the introduction of Genetically Modified Crops and agrofuels These bodies have been conceived and used solely as instruments of domination by large firms and transnational corporations and by governments of the industrialized countries, especially the US, the EU and Japan (2008b 58)

Via Campesina concludes that "we should get rid of international institutions that are violating people's rights such as the WTO, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund We need a redefinition of the roles and the functioning of all international bodies, based on equality, justice, people's participation and human rights (2008b 62)

Since Via Campesina is hostile to multilateral agencies such as the World Bank and the WTO, its allies are similar political minded organizations Borras (2010) points out that Via Campesina works with independent, intergovernmental donor agencies and radical agrarian networks Food First Information and Action Network (FIAN) and Institute for Food and Development Policy (Food First) and environmental justice movements such as Friends of the Earth and GRAIN are some of these allies who will work for Via Campesina but not for IFAP (Borras, 2010) Via Campesina has a "critical but collaborative relationships with some groups within the (FAO) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)" (Borras, 2008a 268) Borras (2004) points out that agencies are comprised of various actors that have different and, at times, conflicting and competing agendas, some of which may support Vía Campesina's agendas at different times, others not Unlike many NGOs that advocate issues favoured by donors, Via Campesina usually sets the agenda and issues around which funding arrangements are made

Via Campesina is very selective in engaging with donor NGOs, indeed, only a handful of NGOs have been ''privileged'' to become institutional funders of Via

Campesina[8] The Via Campesina's bottom line principle in choosing donors is the existence of "solidarity relations," i e , relations that are not defined within a narrow project or funding relation Via Campesina's global secretariat has a skeletal staff that consists of a handful of underpaid employees and unpaid volunteers, and it requires significant external financing to support its staff and international activities, such as the meetings of its international coordinating commission and its regular world assembly (Borras, 2008a) The co-ordination and consensus driven process is a slow one as peasant organizations take a longer time but it builds the strong basis of trust that is essential for collective action By taking the time to build consensus Via Campesina has avoided severe internal splits that have destroyed other transnational political alliances and coalitions though differences and internal struggles do exist (Martinez-Torres & Rosset, 2010)

The structure of Via Campesina is defined during Via Campesina International Conferences which is the highest decision-making forum and it takes place every three or four years and defines the political direction and strategies of Via Campesina as well of the internal functioning of the movement (Martinez-Torres & Rosset, 2010) The leadership of Via Campesina is shared by both North and South (Borras, 2010)

[8] Certain factions within Via Campesina are vehemently opposed to any collaboration with non-governmental agencies as they do not see them representing the needs of peasants See Borras 2008b

Conclusion:

The debate on the disappearance of the peasantry still rages on, but as shown capitalism has not fully penetrated the rural areas to completely dispel the peasantry The disappearance of the peasantry is seen as a necessary process from the capitalist proponents, while agrarian populist sees this disappearance in a negative light and is resisting the change It is the reaction to the perceived inevitability of the peasantry disappearance that differentiate TAMs TAMs indoctrinated with the neoliberal framework will push for further capital accumulation thereby pushing the elimination of the peasantry, while TAMs that see the Neoliberal agenda as an assault on the peasant way of life will vehemently oppose any of its prescribed pathways The Global Food Regime demonstrates how capital has dictated the progression of agriculture through the decrease in government support for the sector, increased concentration-both market and political power of the private sector/agroindustry GMOs and agrofuels are just another way of pushing the capital poor farmers into more extreme adverse conditions in the hopes of squeezing peasants out of the sector

IFAP and Via Campesina agree that the concentration of power is too much in the hands of TNCs The point at which IFAP diverges from Via Campesina is the way in which it proposes to offer solutions IFAP sees the Neoliberal model as a solution improved technology, competitive markets, specialized commodities, and a more efficient private sector driving the business of agriculture with some regulation put in place While Via Campesina is vehemently against such a model and is working to promote and

provide an alternative -- a peasant based model that puts the peasantry at the foundation of agriculture

Chapter Three

The Politics of Transnational Agrarian Movements

Differentiation of IFAP and Via Campesina

According to its website (2010a), IFAP claims that it "is the voice of the world's farmers", representing 112 national organizations in 87 countries IFAP's website has phrases such as "represents more than 40% of the world sugar production and almost 70 per cent of the sugar produced by family farmers", "Act as a recognized spokesperson for the world's farmers, bringing concerns of agricultural producers to the attention of international meetings of governments and other bodies" (2010a)

A review of IFAP's website will show that their focus on commodities is an implicit focus on commodity producing farmers (IFAPb, 2010) Commodity producing small farmers are not the same as the peasantry, therefore IFAP cannot say they are representing the world's farmers Agricultural producers can also be rural workers and labourers Although IFAP highlights they can be affected adversely by the current economic model, IFAP never explicitly acknowledges that they support or represent

them Critics of IFAP have several reasons why IFAP does not have the welfare of the world's farmers at the heart of its advocacy

First, IFAP was developed in the 1940s by "commercially oriented small to large scale farmers mainly from industrialized countries" (Borras, 2010 778) and it was not until the 1990s (around the same time Via Campesina was being formed) that IFAP decided to open its membership to developing countries in which the majority of rural producers live It is not surprising that Edelman (2003) would suggest that IFAP has been dominated by northern European groups of farmers Borras (2010) points out that IFAP has always been dominated by leaders from industrialized countries, it was not until after sixty years of operation that it elected a president from a developing country in 2008 (Borras, 2010) This domination has lead to a focus on commodities and trade rather than a focus on improving subsistence farming

Kees Blokland, (1995), in this regard, points out that in 1995 "[h]alf the countries represented in IFAP are from the Third World, but when identifying new members, IFAP has leaned more towards agro-exporting producers as having an international interest to be represented in IFAP" (p 169) This type of organisation of wealthier producers oriented towards exports now predominates in IFAP At the same time, he adds, "some critical, radical and progressive organisations, associations of producers for domestic consumption and others who have organised cultural or indigenous identities, do not believe that IFAP can serve for the time being, or even in the long run, as their forum for international discussion, or for peasant co-ordination and exchange" (p 169)

Blockland further states that "IFAP itself has also had difficulty recognising these

organisations as potential future members (p 169) These Third World peasant organisations of a popular nature, he notes, "found receptivity and solidarity only from minor oppositional organisations in Europe and the United States This has relegated them to a marginal position in the discussions on agrarian policy, with little chance of favourably influencing the transformations needed in agrarian policies and practices in the developed world" (p 168)

Blokland also points out that "most of IFAP's members represent family businesses, which implies that organisations of landless peasants, rural labourers or production co-operatives cannot easily identify with DFAP representation, and IFAP, in turn, cannot easily identify with these organisations as future members either" (p 169)

Desmarais points out that some small farmers organizations never joined IFAP because they believed that IFAP members "were seen as those representing larger producers working in mainstream farm organizations" (2003 18) According to Desmarais, some of these organizations were known as "official" organizations—that is, "organizations that had been created by the government and/or received a large proportion of their funding from government sources These organizations often advocated agricultural policies—such as those of the GATT and the WTO—judged to be detrimental to peasant agriculture" (Alegria, cited in Desmarais, 2003 17)

At the recent liquidation of IFAP, the former vice-president Raul Montemayor (2010) expressed the view that

It is indeed a tragedy that IFAP has to be liquidated IFAP had built a very solid

and reputable name in international forums as a spokesman of farmers all over the world However, aside from the financial problems, there were also structural problems involving the governance of the organization, systems of internal control and accountability, and responsiveness of the organization to the specific needs and limitations of developing country members There was also some disagreement within the organization on how to address these concerns, which, in the end, led to the unwillingness of most members to put in additional money to revive IFAP

Although IFAP may consider that it represents small farmers of the world, their agro-exporting-commodity-producing-nature demonstrates that they actually only represent capitalist farmers and not the peasantry

As IFAP represents capital rich farmers, the implications are that their agenda will benefit this demographic rather than the peasantry This misrepresentation has adverse implications for the peasantry, if IFAP promotes certain pathways to development then it will be construed that all farmers agree with such a pathway If these capitalist farmers push for the use of GMOs and agrofuels, and development agencies make it a priority and a prerogative, then the development agenda will focus more on capital intensive agriculture and cause further divergence and support from peasant based agriculture

The formation of Via Campesina was in response to numerous peasant organizations that did not belong to IFAP (Desmarais, 2007) Desmarais (2003) states that despite "IFAP's desire, attempts, and claims to be *the* world farmers' voice, numerous

peasant and farm organizations in the North and South did not and still do not belong to IFAP" Indeed, she adds, "the majority of farm and peasant organizations that gathered in Mons in 1993 did not see IFAP as the legitimate voice of peasant and small-scale farmers Many had direct experience with IFAP organizations at the national level" (p 18)

Paul Nicholson, a founding member of Via Campesina, points out that the more critical peasant and farm organizations that were present were not interested in strengthening links to IFAP because they had diametrically opposing interests (Desmarais, 2007) Instead, these critical organizations effectively distanced themselves from IFAP by forming what is now known as Via Campesina (Desmarais, 2003) Nicholson, at the Second International Conference of Via Campesina in 1996 stated "to date, in all the global debates on agrarian policy, the peasant movement has been absent, we have not had a voice The main reason the very existence of the Via Campesina is to be that voice and to speak out for the creation of a more just society the Via Campesina must defend the "peasant way" of rural peoples (quoted in Desmarais, 2007 7)

Via Campesina (2008b 57) notes that "[p]easants, small and medium size farmers, landless people, indigenous people and agricultural workers, men and women are united in La Via Campesina to realize food sovereignty and to stop the destructive neoliberal process" They add that

> [w]e represent almost half of the world population and are capable of producing food for our families and all the people living on this planet! Together with the

> fisher folk, indigenous people, pastoralists and others who live in the rural areas we have the right to exist, to be respected and to live a dignified life! We want to build close links with people living in the urban centers in order to provide them with healthy food from people to people, without the destructive interference of transnational corporations (p 57)

They further argue that its "success" is due to the fact that "it is balancing—with great care and effort—the diverse interests of its membership as it openly deals with issues such as gender, race, class, culture and North/South relations, which could potentially cause divisions" (p 43) It is further argued that

> the conflict is not between farmers of the North and peasants in the South Rather, the struggle is over two competing – and in many ways diametrically opposed—models of social and economic development On the one hand, a globalized, neoliberal, corporate driven model where agriculture is seen exclusively as a profit making venture and productive resources are increasingly concentrated into the hands of agro-industry (Via Campesina, 2008a 43)

The very nature of the themes that Via Campesina advocates and mobilizes on, is telling of the demographic they represent According to Martinez-Torres and Rosset (2010), the work of Via Campesina is carried out and coordinated through International Working Commissions A commission is made up of a man and a woman peasant leader that is elected as representatives from each of the nine regions, and they work to co-ordinate the work of the Via Campesina on each of the issue groups

The current commissions are (i) Agrarian Reform, (ii) Food Sovereignty and Trade, (iii) Biodiversity and Genetic Resources, (iv) Climate Change and Peasant Agriculture, (v) Human Rights, (vi)Sustainable Peasant Agriculture, (vii) Migration and Farm Workers, (viii) Women and Gender Parity, (ix) Education and Training, and (x) Youth In addition, Via Campesina has campaigns that address some of the following issues (i) the Global Campaign for Agrarian Reform, (ii) Seeds Heritage of Rural Peoples in the Service of Humanity, (iii) the Campaign to End All Forms of Violence Against Women, and (iv) The Campaign for an International Charter of Peasant (Martinez-Torres & Rosset, 2010)

In contrast, where IFAP is focussed on maintaining status quo of the social relations and focussing on commodity production, Via Campesina is focused on retaining the means of production for the peasantry in all aspects from land reform, seed preservation, the promotion of peasant rights over TNCs, the protection of migrant workers, the promotion of agroecological peasant based research and farming etc

Holt-Gimenez (2010) highlights that Via Campesina has "been remarkably successful in creating the political space in which to advance its platform of food sovereignty, getting the WTO out of agriculture, women's rights, sustainable agriculture, a ban on genetically modified organisms (GMOs), and redistributive agrarian reform and mounted successful resistance campaigns to the World Bank's market-led land reform programmes" (p 204) The accomplishments so far has been more or less working towards not only voicing the concerns of the poor but also accomplishing benefits that benefit the rural poor

As much as Via Campesina has worked diligently and accomplished many feats, there is still the need to stay aware of power dynamics Borras (2004) explains that "while it is important for the cause of poor peasants and small farmers that Vía Campesina advocates positions that favour the marginalised social classes and groups more generally, it is important to be critically aware of the gap between the groups of peasants and farmers within the transnational reach of the Vía Campesina movement, and the greater number of rural people that are not" (p 24) Borras further elaborates that "a key challenge to Via Campesina and its member organisations is to continuously seek to increase actual representativity, to be as inclusive as possible, while carefully tracing the contours of the different, sometimes overlapping, sometimes competing, channels and mechanisms of representation involving the same marginalised rural sectors of the world" (Borras, 2004 24)

An example of the tension between classes in Via Campesina is that of Karnataka Rajya Ryota Sangha or Karnataka State Farmers' Association (KRRS) The main base of KRRS is middle and rich farmers but despite this fact, their discourse and actions have been frequently radical and dramatic (Borras, 2008a) This organization has been engaged since the 1980s in anti-TNC and later anti-GMOs campaigns (Ibid) It has become an extremely influential group in the global movement and as such has earned itself the role of gatekeeper in accepting or rejecting organizations in South Asia As a result a significant portion of farmers's organizations in South Asia were excluded from the Vía Campesina process, either because KRRS blocked their entry into Vía Campesina or they refused to participate in the process where the 'gatekeeper' was KRRS (Ibid) Some of

these organizations were able to gain entry into Via Campesina much later To date, a significant number of organizations of the landless rural poor in India have remained outside Vía Campesina, partly due to the continuing influence of KRRS and partly due to the political and ideological complications that emerged and developed in the late 1990s (Ibid)

KRRS also consciously evades issues that could bring sharper class issues Against major influential groups in Via Campesina such as Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra (MST) in Brazil, Honduras' National Coordinating Council of Peasant Unions (COCOCH) in Honduras and movements from the Philippines and Indonesia, KRRS initially objected to land reform as a major campaign but was decisively overruled M D Nanjundaswamy, the leader of KRRS explained earlier that 'we cannot divide ourselves into landlords and landless farmers, and agitate separately, for the agitation will have no strength nor will it carry any weight' (quoted in Borras, 2008a 275) Borras concludes that "[w]hat the KRRS case reveals is that serious class-based differences exist within and between movements that are (un-)affiliated with Vía Campesina These class-based differences have profound implications for the way campaign demands are framed and representation is constructed within a movement (p 275)

IFAP is therefore determined to be pushing the agenda of the Neoliberal economic model with a heavy emphasis on commodity production It is allied with development and economic institutions and sees the market as a place where capitalist farmers can strengthen their positions in the market economy Via Campesina is representing peasants

and as such is focussed on retaining the means of production, it is vocal against the institutions that are promoting the neoliberal agenda over the welfare of the peasantry and it is at the same time advocating a central role for the peasantry in agriculture

IFAP and Via Campesina on GM crops

Here, analysis of IFAP and Via Campesina's stance is carried out for the following fundamental issues of GM crops general acceptance, research and development, regulation and intellectual property rights IFAP sees GM crops as key in strengthening farmers' market power yet it does promote it with caution In contrast, Via Campesina rejects GMs as part of a suitable solution for the agricultural sector and sees it as an attack on the livelihood of farmers especially when it prohibits farmers from freely accessing the means of production —the seed

IFAP sees GM crops as an acceptable means of production that can benefit farmers, the environment, consumers and the private sector IFAP is promoting more farmer participation in research and development of GMs, as they see that it will benefit their farmers in becoming more effective in competitive markets and agrees that TNCs must have an incentive through intellectual property rights so that they can continue, along with the public sector, to drive a strong research and development agenda that benefits the rural poor IFAP sees that regulation will help to protect farmers and keep the private sector in check Therefore, IFAP is trying to promote the environment in which

they think farmers' will have success with GM crops

Whereas IFAP cautiously but willingly supports GMOs, Via Campesina rejects the use of GM crops as part of the agriculture they envision for the future especially for the rural producers Via Campesina sees it as an attack of farmers' means of production They do not support efforts to further research into such a problematic entity and they vigorously reject the idea of intellectual property viewing seeds and other natural resources as the inheritance of the human race Via Campesina speaks out against the institutions that are guided by agro-industry rather than geared to doing research and development for the poor Via Campesina promotes that support has to be channelled to efforts that are genuinely tailored to farmers needs over market needs

A matter of general acceptance

According to the policy statement adopted at its 1998 World Farmers' Congress in the Philippines, IFAP proposed that GM crops or gene transfer technology is

> a new and important tool for plant and animal breeders It will not replace traditional selection methods, but it does open new opportunities Thanks to this technology, a researcher can transfer directly a desirable gene into the genome of the plant or animal that he wants to improve Gene transfer technology will allow researchers to make improvements in plants and animals more rapidly, more precisely, and for a broader range of attributes than in the past The potential of

this technology is considerable (IFAP, 1998)

IFAP goes on to state that "farmers wish to have access to the fruits of this progress At the same time they have misgivings They are concerned about the effects of genetically-modified organisms on food quality on human health and on the image of their products generally" Therefore IFAP, notes, "as the representative organization of the world's farmers, has a responsibility to propose balanced and reasonable policy responses to these issues" (IFAP, 1998)

In the same policy statement, IFAP promotes the benefits of GM crops in regard to the following categories

The farmer

For farmers GM crops can be of several types and can result in (1) reduced costs due to lower fertilizer and pesticide applications, (2) reduced labour costs, (3) reduced energy costs, (4) improved yields, (5) improved quality of agricultural products and products better adapted to the needs of the food industry, and (6) greater tolerance to climatic conditions, e g drought

Agroindustry

It is stated that in the future, chemical companies and industry will make more use of molecules from plants and that it will be possible to develop plants tailored to the specific needs of the chemical, pharmaceutical and other industries

The environment

GM crops can result in (1) the reduced use of pesticides and herbicides through the development of plant varieties becoming resistant to diseases and pests, (2) less pollution due to plants that make better use of soil nutrients, fix atmospheric nitrogen, (3) increased use of biomass as an energy source to replace fossil fuels and industrial products which are more polluting and non-renewable, and (4) increased use of raw materials to produce biodegradable products However, IFAP's view of GM crops is not entirely positive It is aware of the potential risks and has several other concerns about the use of transgenic plants, which, IFAP argues, should be 'studied as objectively as possible and without complacency'

Farmer concerns

For farmers concerns include (1) risk of control of genetic resources and seeds by a minority of seed or plant protection companies, (2) interference by these companies in farming operations (this is already underway in some countries), (3) the risk of a loss in in biodiversity through the concentration of activity on a small number of species, (4) the risk that farmers in developing countries may not have access to GM plants because of their cost will be too high or because traditional crop plants will be neglected by research laboratories, (5) access to this new technology that may be only available in the richer countries, as a consequence placing developing countries again at a competitive disadvantage and cause a negative impact on the incomes of the poorest farmers

Via Campesina on GMO Crops

In contrast to the position articulated by IFAP, Via Campesina in its position paper entitled "Family farming, a solution to the challenge of biodiversity and climate change" states that

> contrary to the general discourse of seed companies, industry GMO[9] and hybrid seeds are not a miracle solution, which can tomorrow guarantee seeds which will have the capacity to respond to profoundly disrupted climatic conditions, assuring the feeding of future generations In effect, these 'stable and uniform' seeds of the industry—the only seeds authorized in most industrialized nations—are incapable of adapting themselves, since they can only be reproduced as identical specimens (Via Campesina, 2008a 2)

In this connection, Via Campesina argues that

> peasant seeds, thanks to their variability and their inter-variety diversity, can evolve and adapt to drastic climate changes and to different types of terrain by being replanted each year in the field and being continuously improved through

[9] Used interchangeably with genetically modified (GM)

participation selection by the rural communities themselves (Via Campesina, May 2008a 2)

In the publication "Proposal for family farm based, sustainable agriculture" Via Campesina argues that "genetic engineering bring a whole category of new risks into the food system without producing any benefits to consumers or farmers Through patenting industry is making farmers (and consumers) more dependent on their inputs " (Via Campesina, 2002) Via Campesina points out that "the risks of genetic pollution and loss of biodiversity, the threat to food safety and quality, and the anti-democratic corporate control over an essential good combine to make genetic engineering a technology which undermines the key component of sustainable agriculture" (Via Campesina, 2002)

Due to the nature of GM crops it is highly unlikely that the rural poor will benefit Holt-Gimenez et al (2006) explains that when transgenic varieties are used in the complex, diverse and risk-prone cropping systems of peasant farmers, the risks are much greater than in large, wealthy farmer systems A number of uncertainties as well as perceived potential threats to the environment are associated with the use of GM crops such as Bt cotton (Holt-Gimenez et al , 2006) A major concern with GM crops is the possibility of unpredictable crosses with other species As plants hybridize and exchange genes in the process, there is the potential that genes will be passed from crops to weeds (Ibid) A related fear is that hybridization with wild relatives could lead to the appearance of herbicide resistance weeds (ibid) Weeds with built-in in resistance become impossible to control and thereby constitute a threat to agricultural and natural habitats (Josling &

Babinard, 1999) The most common transgenic varieties available today are those that tolerate proprietary brands of herbicides, and those than contain insecticide genes (Holt-Gimenez et al , 2006)

Herbicide tolerant crops are less relevant to peasant farmers who plant a diverse mixture of crop and fodder species which would be affected by these chemicals Another point of concern is the contamination of non-GM crop varieties, contamination has the potential to contribute to the genetic deterioration of local crop varieties that are crucial for food security In the U S , the Environmental Protection Agency has mandated that farmers set aside a 'refuge' or a certain percentage of their land where non-Bt varieties are to be planted This is done to slow the rate of evolution by insects of resistance However, it would be impossible for most poor, small peasants in the Global South to set aside precious land for such a purpose, as a result, resistance could occur much more rapidly under such circumstances (ibid) In addition the same authors point out that

> [d]ue to the nature of the biotechnology smallholders will lose their agroecological flexibility in fertilizing, controlling weeds or managing pests because these production steps will all be contained within the genetic information of the GE seeds distributed to them Damage to other farmers who do not use GMOs is a potential threat Contamination of non-GE crops by GE neighbours is impossible to control on the small plots that small farmers work on The problem with introducing transgenic crops into high diversity regions is that the spread of characteristics of genetically altered grain to local varieties favoured by small

farmers could dilute the natural sustainability of these races (Jordan, 2001) Once GE is introduced to a region dominated by smallholders, all farmers will eventually have to adopt or else pay heavy fines to seed companies for "stealing" the genetic material that crosses over into their fields (Holt-Gimenez et al , 2006, 7)

Even the FAO (2004) states that

> "biotechnology is not a panacea "It cannot overcome the gaps in infrastructure, markets, breeding capacity, input delivery systems and extension services that hinder all efforts to promote agricultural growth in poor, remote areas Some of these challenges may be more difficult for biotechnology than for other agricultural technologies, but others may be less difficult (p 4)

Regulation

IFAP sees the importance of regulation[10] of GM crops as it believes that its use is inevitable but strategic for its farmers It notes that in 1996, almost three million ha were planted with transgenic crops This figure rose to 12 million ha in 1997 (IFAP, 1998) Within 15 years, most crops could be from transgenic plants Therefore IFAP proposes

[10] Regulation can relate to testing, to the introduction of GMOs in domestic agriculture, to the authorization of the use of GMO material and to the patenting of the rights to the intellectual property embodied in the seed or the process (Josling & Babinard, 1999)

that "IFAP and its member organizations will be vigilant and attentive in defending the freedom of farmers"

IFAP promotes that an adequate regulatory framework needs to be put in place to guide GM crops implementation In response to an increasing number of questions on safety of genetically modified crops, IFAP proposes that the scientific bodies of the different countries responsible for the authorization of GMs come up with a common international regulatory framework to synchronize testing, licensing and control procedures, in addition they should establish a 'reasonable' time frame to test for any possible side effects Safety requirements should be based upon broadly accepted scientific principles with the precautionary principle as the general rule (IFAP, 1998)

IFAP also proposes that farmers' organizations all over the world should contribute to, transparency and objective information for farmers, consumers and political decision makers Farmers' organizations, including cooperatives, must be in a position to assure the public that their products based on genetically modified seed are safe for human and animal health, and are not harmful to the environment According to IFAP a credible, independent scientific body will be a significant asset for assuring consumers (and farmers) that a new product is safe and acceptable (IFAP, 1998)

In contrast, Via Campesina sees regulation as an invasion and more specifically as a corporate invasion (Via Campesina, 2001) Via Campesina argues that before transnational companies sought to commoditize and privatize genetic resources, they were considered humanity's heritage, and this was reflected in international agreements, granting producers the concept of farmers' rights over genetic resources Via Campesina

warns that a great deal of the work in biotechnology is being conducted under a protected patents by the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the WTO, under which living materials come under regimes similar to those controlling industrial property Via Campesina argues that as peasants they should have the sovereign right their own resources an environmentally healthy way (Via Campesina, 2001)

Via Campesina believes that the institutions that are supposed to protect farmers are in many ways betraying the same Via Campesina has had a "critical collaborative" relationship with the FAO, yet it has been was disappointed with the FAO's stance on GM crops In their May 2004 press release, Via Campesina adamantly states, "FAO promotes GMOs as solution for the world hunger problem, a slap in the face of those who defend food sovereignty" (2004 1) This was in reference to the FAO's high profile annual report that turns out to be "blunt propaganda for the multinationals like Monsanto and Syngenta who are imposing GMOs against the will of peasants and consumers" (p 1)

Via Campesina explains that after the World Food Summit the FAO engaged in a dialogue with the NGO Forum on Food Sovereignty in which in the FAO committed itself to strengthening the principle of food sovereignty Via Campesina feels the 2004 report was a betrayal of this dialogue Via Campesina further specified that

> Via Campesina demands a public retraction by FAO regarding this issue and a clear prioritisation of investment and public support for agroecological methods and peasant-based agriculture Otherwise, we believe that further dialogue is useless because it makes civil society accessory to a policy of introduction of

GMOs, a technology in which we see no solution at all and against which we will have to increase our struggle and resistance" (p 2)

Again, in March 2010 Via Campesina saw it as an "act of aggression" that the FAO was meeting at the "International technical conference on Agricultural Biotechnologies in Developing Countries" in Guadalajara, Mexico (FAO, 2010) According to the FAO (2010) the purpose is "reviewing past successes and failures of biotechnologies across the different food and agricultural sectors in developing countries The meeting is not focused on genetically modified organisms (GMOs)" and that "the international community should play a key role in supporting developing countries by fostering partnerships and providing a framework for international cooperation and funding for the generation, adaptation and adoption of appropriate biotechnologies" (FAO, 2010)

In reference to the Convention on Biodiversity, which IFAP has signed as a collaborative agreement, Via Campesina urges the signatories to recognize the long standing role of peasant/community based farmers and as such they demand that governments critically reassess the policies that are wiping out rural communities around the world (Via Campesina, 2008)

Since its use there have been many instances of GM crop contamination Via Campesina highlights the Meeting of the Parties (MOP) on Biosecurity Protocol, in Germany in 2008 The aim was to discuss the issue of compensation for farmers affected by GMO contamination However, Via Campesina objects to the entire process

> We, the peasant farmers of Africa, Europe, the Americas and Asia, categorically refuse to discuss compensation We do not want GMOs at all We will not exchange our autonomous agriculture, our health and the quality of our environment for a few dollars of compensation Those responsible for genetic contaminations are perfectly identifiable Monsanto, Dupont, Syngenta, Limagrain, Bayer and Pioneer are attempting through the use of genetically modified and other patented seeds to create a worldwide seed monopoly To do so, they destroy and actively fight against the diversity of small scale farmers' seeds that are in the hands of rural communities and put seeds protected by intellectual property rights on the market that contaminate the rest of the plants Rather than debating the amount of compensation to give to the victims of contamination, member States of the Biosecurity Protocol ought to prevent contamination by dismantling these transnationals and by affirming the prohibition of the patenting of living things (Via Campesina, 2008a 1)

Even the FAO in its 2003-2004 "The state of agriculture" admits that "the safety and regulatory concerns associated with transgenic crops constitute a major hurdle for developing countries, because many lack the regulatory frameworks and technical capacity necessary to evaluate these crops and the conflicting claims surrounding them Although the international scientific community has determined that foods derived from the transgenic crops currently on the market are safe to eat, it also acknowledges that some of the emerging transformations involving multiple transgenes may require

additional food-safety risk-analysis procedures There is less scientific consensus on the environmental hazards associated with transgenic crops " (p 4)

According to Thies and Devare (2007), there is a major limitation in issuing regulatory frameworks because there is a lack of any clear sense of what constitutes environmental harm They argue that despite the considerable debate, there are no guidelines that establish the magnitude of change that would trigger concern over ecosystem impacts Also there are practical questions of how to access long-term risk(s) and how much risk the public are willing to accept This makes it even more difficult to develop and appropriated environmental risk assessment for subsistence agriculture (Thies & Devare, 2007)

At the international level however, while efforts have been made in examining the potential of harmonizing regulations, specific legal instruments for GM crops remain unarticulated (Josling & Babinard, 1999) Regulations continue to differ greatly in scale, and implementation and are restrictive in some industrialized to non-existent in some developing countries In the future, reducing such differences will become even more difficult as GMs is not limited to national boundaries (Josling & Babinard, 1999)

Research & Development

In IFAP's publication "How to improve farmers' influence on Agricultural

Research" (n d), IFAP believes that "[t]he consequences of concentration of the upstream and downstream of agriculture constitute a real challenge for preserving the profession and lifestyle of family farmers as entrepreneurs responsible for their own decisions and their own choices" Therefore, "research can be a major asset in the development of solutions for farmers so they can pick up strength and be able to adapt themselves to these new socioeconomic organizations, in order to increase their revenue, to strengthen their power in the market, to improve agricultural production and to look after food security of all households in the world" (IFAP, n d)

IFAP sees the role of farmers' organization as having the capacity to play an effective role in influencing research agendas, such as through participating in the decision making bodies that set agricultural research priorities Research agenda must address the real needs of the small scale farmers, by building on local knowledge and adding value to local resources IFAP promote that cooperation with indigenous populations is essential in terms of using adequate technologies in accordance with their traditional knowledge More research should be directed towards nonconventional commodities and especially indigenous food crops (IFAP, 2004 7)

IFAP points out that several research centers do include local farmers in the research, but it admits that "only a few collaborated on a regular basis with farmers organizations in their countries, giving them the possibility to be ready to contribute soundly and continuously in the research" (n d) IFAP insists that such collaboration is important to "reconnect to agricultural research with farmers' need and concerns" IFAP also proposes that "agricultural research must go well beyond the development of new

plants and the improvement of some agricultural processes research should deal with socio-economic issues such as the economic organization of farmers, initiatives to sell their produce in the markets, necessary legal and political frameworks, etc " (IMAF, n d *a*)

IFAP believes that sufficient funding has to be dedicated to "real current priority need" as IFAP sees that "there is tendency not to address real on-farm research problems" (n d *a*) IFAP sees that it is important that "public funding for research in the field of biotechnology remains significant, parallel to the large investments made by private companies" Importantly also IFAP believes that governments should not "cede their responsibilities in agricultural research to the private sector (Ibid) It is thought that this must be done so that farmers do not become dependent on the private sector In regards to the private sector, IFAP believes that they

> should be left free to develop technologies that they see fit, for profit or other objectives, using where applicable whatever basic technologies have been developed by public research institutions These private groups should be allowed to freely compete with each other so that farmers can makes choices based on their needs and capacities" (IMAF, n d *a*)

In contrast, Via Campesina believes that current agricultural research is "more and more alienated from farmers' realities it is carried out in laboratories and effectively excludes famers (Via Campesina, 2000a) The purpose of the research is "focussed on

increasing production, creating varieties that are less dependent on climate, and development of species that are resistant to pesticides and herbicides (p 2) As a consequence Via Campesina points out that "for farmers this means purchasing more inputs and greater dependency on imported technology all of which on benefit industry" (p 2) Via Campesina highlights that "research programmes are increasingly influenced and dictated by the interests of the agro-industry Very little independent and public research is being carried out, public aid is shrinking and private funding influences that nature of public research (Ip 2) Via Campesina uses the specific example of genetic engineering, "one of the concrete illustration of this trend is the enormous amount of funds allocated to genetic engineering and export crops whereas the development of low input methods or environmental-friendly agriculture are ignored" (p 2) Via Campesina concludes that "current agricultural research is first and foremost geared to increase ownership and control by agro-industry (p 2)

Via Campesina speaks out against the international research centers or the CGIAR It claims that although the CGIAR says it is focussed on research for the poor, small farmers and peasants "do not have a positive role to play in their vision" (2002 1) Via Campesina states that the CGIAR sees the diverse and complex nature of production systems as more of a problem, whereas, Via Campesina sees their complex systems "at the heart of efficient food production and sustainable agriculture" (p 1)

Via Campesina believes that "agricultural research must be farmer-driven" (Via Campesina, 2002b 1) They feel that farmers must be involved as equal partners with research institutions, non-government organizations and government agencies in

developing and implementing the research It is stressed that "agricultural research cannot be restricted to academic institutions, on-farm research led by farmers themselves is an important and necessary contribution" (Via Campesina, 2002b 1-2)

Via Campesina believes that the current agenda of international agricultural research centres such as the (IRRI) and (CIMMYT) are to impose genetic engineering on the farming community (Via Campesina, 2002b) By teaming up with the corporate sector CGIAR seeks to attract funding for implementation of this program Subsequently, Via Campesina urges that the CGIAR, IRRI, CIMMYT and similar national research institutions to not only to stop research on genetic engineering and but also to denounce the introduction of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) through food aid as attempted in the past (Via Campesina, 2002b)

Via Campesina argues that "instead of investing millions of dollars in the ex-situ conservation and laboratory research on genes, it is urgent to support field-based conservation and participatory selection" (Via Campesina, 2008a 6) They believe that the work of "renewing biodiversity in the fields can only continue with the presence of numerous men and women farmers in all the regions of the world through models of diversified production" (p 6) The FAO (2004 4-5) agrees on the state of research and development

Public- and private-sector transgenic crop research and development are being carried

> out on more than 40 crops worldwide and dozens of innovations are being studied, but there is clear evidence that the problems of the poor are being neglected

> Barring a few initiatives here and there, there are no major public- or private-sector programmes to tackle the critical problems of the poor or targeting crops and animals that they rely on Concerted international efforts are required to ensure that the technology needs of the poor are addressed and that barriers to access are overcome

According to Lipton (2007), research policy response in agriculture has to be pro-poor in order to reach small farmers, there has to be high national adaptive capability to be able to spread the benefits to poor farmers (Lipton, 2007) Pray and Naseem (2007) point out that the public agricultural research in general and especially the international centers are facing declining financial support The public sector capacity to meet the poor's needs from agriculture has been undermined since the Green Revolution due to the collapse of aid to this sector It fell dramatically in the 1980's and again in 1988-1998 by approximately 65 percent (Lipton, 2007) According to Pray and Naseem (2007), "public agricultural research and especially the international IARCs (International Agricultural Centers) are facing declining financial support" (p 213) Pray and Naseem explain that the competition for the allocation of biotechnology research fund is at a low because the poor do not have well organized groups that can lobby on their behalf Lipton sees that the existing public sector can still create incentives for the private sector

Although IFAP may think that collaboration of the poor's need in biotechnology research is necessary, Pray and Naseem highlight the possibility of such collaboration They argue that the evidence shows that biotechnology has not been focused on meeting

the needs of the poor in developing countries According to Lipton (2007), 90 to 95% of applied GMs research is managed by a few private corporations that seek profit opportunities The private sector uses what is termed 'appropriability' to determine its investment in agricultural investment If corporations cannot capture some of the social benefits of their research, they will stop investing

Multinational corporations are unwilling to make the necessary investments in biotechnology research that is specific to developing countries because of the limited market nature of crops, fear of the piracy of their intellectual property and the high cost of meeting regulatory requirements (Pray and Naseem, 2007) Together these would mean a low return on private profit and therefore less incentive for private corporations to invest If the private sector did invest then it would have to rely heavily on the legalities to prevent imitators from using the technology (Ibid) Hence the use of patents, plant breeders' rights and trademarks, would be essential in enforcing intellectual property rights (Ibid) It is questionable if farmers who are already struggling with paying for increasingly costly inputs can continuously pay for such protected inputs

Intellectual property

In its policy statement entitled "Farmers and new concerns on biotechnologies" IFAP states that

farmers appreciate that plant and animal breeders need to seek a reasonable return

on the large capital investment made in biotechnological research The mechanism for breeders to obtain a return on their investment is through protection of intellectual property rights Indeed new germplasm will not likely be provided to those nations where it is not protected (IFAP, 1998)

Even though IFAP promotes that it is important to promote famers' rights relative to TNCs, IFAP insists that "farmers accept that they must pay a fair price for genetic improvement, if these increase farm profits, but they do not accept, however, any interference in their freedom to farm" (Ibid) IFAP weakly states "intellectual property do not authorize their holders to make checks and investigations on farms, as it seems has happened in some countries"

As part of the solution, IFAP believes that "a fair balance must be struck between the length of time of patent protection or the duration of plant breeders rights, so that companies can receive a return for their investment on the one hand and the need for adequate competitions in the seed market for supplying the farmers on the other hand (IFAP, 1998) IFAP specifically points out that "in developing countries, farmers are concerned that local material is being plundered and then patented" (1998) IFAP proposed that this indigenous knowledge should be protected through a "heritage intellectual property right" Yet IFAP at the same time, expresses that "the cost of taking out patents for developing country farmers, or their cooperatives is prohibitive, being as much as US$500,000 each"

IFAP highlights that the function of the United Nations Convention on

Biodiversity and the FAO Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources is to protect farmers' rights Its main function is to maintain "sovereign rights with access restriction for foreign developers and sharing benefits" (IFAP, 1998) Unfortunately, IFAP states that the applications of such rights have been either unresolved or still subject to negotiation

IFAP believes in the conservation of germplasm in the gene banks of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and also FAO's efforts in conserving genetic resources for the benefit of the international communities They also encourage that many private companies and some farmers hold such collections of plant varieties and they must be encouraged to share their collection (IFAP, 1998)

In contrast, Via Campesina (2008a) assert that whether through patents, certificates of plant acquisition or GMs, the objective of multinational seed companies is to impose their property rights on all existing seeds, by eliminating the inherent biodiversity of cultivated crops which could compete with them (Ibid) Via Campesina sends a clear message that the small-scale farmers of the world, do not need Monsanto or Limagrain to provide seeds them with seed, throughout history, farmers themselves have conserved, exchanged, replanted and adapted their own seeds Via Campesina strongly believes that "rural communities have the collective right to the usage of their seeds, and their privatization by fraudulent means is pure and simple robbery" (p 3)

The neoliberal model commodifies and monopolizes the natural wealth with technologies and legal instruments like the system of intellectual property rights (Via Campesina, 2006) On the matter of intellectual matter, Via Campesina is adamant

> We oppose intellectual property over any form of life We want to elevate to a universal principle the fact that genes, as the essence of life, cannot be owned The only owner of life is the holder of that life, who lives it, sustains it, feeds and preserves it It is an aberration that genetic materials which peasants and indigenous people have kept alive, cared for and protected for more than 10,000 years could now be the property of corporate business (Via Campesina, 2001 49)

Via Campesina clarifies that it is not the advances in knowledge that they oppose, but its monopolization and inappropriate use (Via Campesina, 2001) Via Campesina points to the concentration of food patents- 95 percent of the world's food patents are held in only seven countries which happen to be developed countries, and the other 5 percent of patents are distributed among the 180 remaining countries (Ibid) As such, the patenting of plants, animals and their components means that peasant and indigenous communities lose control of the resources that they have traditionally used and known

Use of patented material by farmers can mean that purchased seed comes with a technological package which leads to a lack of sustainability in the agricultural ecosystems and in the family economy Via Campesina implies the switch to GMOs can mean the loss of peasant autonomy and greater dependency on the transnational corporations, both technologically and economically Via Campesina points out that proof of this lies in the legalities of GMOs use (Via Campesina, 2001)

According to Via Campesina, the companies that promote GMO varieties demand a contract with the farmer in which, in addition to the seed, there is also a commitment to

buying inputs Penalties are established if the farmer lends this seed to someone else, and the responsibility for possible ecological risks that the GMOs may entail is assigned as the farmer's responsibility (Via Campesina, 2001)

Intellectual property rights break rural traditions like the keeping of seed for later cycles of cultivation, exchange of seeds among farmers and communities, and the development of knowledge linked to practice in the management of natural resources (Via Campesina, 2001) Via Campesina elaborates on the implications

> And that we have to pay royalties for those seeds which were gathered from our lands and homogenized or modified abroad Ownership of knowledge about forms of life carries a grave risk the monopolization of patents This phenomenon could be beyond the control of governments, and the inappropriate use of genes by TNCs could cause severe problems of biosafety by promoting the use of large homogeneous populations susceptible to pathogens (Via Campesina, 2001 49)

Instead of relying on GMs, Via Campesina carries out the SEED Campaign to promote the tradition of farmers collecting, saving and sharing seeds For one thing, according to Altieri (2004), because they are under corporate control genetically modified seeds , are expensive to small farmers

> since many developing countries still lack the institutional infrastructure and low-interest credit necessary to deliver these new seeds to poor farmers, biotechnology

will only exacerbate marginalization The few impoverished landowners with access to biotechnology will become dangerously dependent on the annual purchase of genetically modified seeds These farmers will have to abide by onerous intellectual property agreements not to plant seeds yield from harvest of genetically engineered plants Such stipulations are an affront to traditional farmers " (Altieri, 2004 20)

According to Herring (2007a), "property rights are not self-enforcing" (p 17) and argues the irony of intellectual property rights The following example is given

Monsanto expends great energies trying to collect technology fees in Latin America, with spotty results, high prices of Monsanto's Bt cotton in India spurred development of the stealth-seed market, and led to demands to ban Monsanto's varieties, with success on in one state Some transgenes have spread so widely underground that they resemble open-access or open-source technology more than monopoly, more Linux than Microsoft The transgenic is out of the bottle Even in strong property regimes such as the US, Monsanto is forced into compliance with otherwise unenforceable claims Since it is impossible to catch everyone who violates contracts prohibiting replanting of transgenic seeds, Monsanto seeks to make examples of a few farmers for deterrence Such strong manifestations of intellectual property have not proved practicable on a global scale for reasons of transactions costs, politics and law (Herring, 2007b 17)

Herring concludes that "to date, biotechnology has invigorated a vigorous anarchic and artisanal agrarian capitalism through the spread of stealth seeds, whereas global monopoly power of multinational property in biota is difficult to discern on the ground" (Herring, 2007b 17) Herring (2007b) highlights that unless one thinks of farmers as irrational, there is strong evidence that small farmers are adopting GMO stealth seeds to gain higher yields, better protection against pests and higher profits Herring presents the idea that the "refusal to believe that farmers might have some valid experience on which to base a preference for transgenics is disagnostic of representational problems in rural movements headed by metropolitan elites" (2007b 139)

As Scoones (2008) points out "the very same farmers mobilized by organized farmer movements – whether the KRRS in Karnataka or the MST in Brazil – are the same farmers planting GM crops illegally, or would try them out if they could" (p 334) Rejection of GMs by movement leaders sits uneasily with its widespread adoption by the members of the movement and perhaps points to an absence of internal debate over the movement's position on this particular issue (Newell, 2008)

Scoones (2008) offers the suggestion that "in Brazil the MST is able to mobilize farmers around the GM issue by linking it to the wider question of agrarian reform"(p 334) The Vía Campesina movement, to which the MST is linked, "talks, for example, of food rights and food sovereignty and the need for peasants to be independent of the clutches of global agribusiness For the marginalized rural poor in Brazil this chimes well with many of their concerns Even when they often know little about GM

crops, seeing Monsanto as the enemy, allied to a Brazilian state reluctant to engage in any meaningful rural reform, produces a convincing storyline to which people have signed up in numbers" (p 334)

Therefore, in countries like Brazil, India and South Africa, the GMO debate has been "characterized by the strategic development of alliances and the linking of actors and organizations in new, often fragile, coalitions" (Scoones, 2008 335) It is argued that in Brazil, a crucial strategy of the anti-GMO network was the enlistment of the MST Initially MST was sceptical but soon saw the advantages of joining the movement Thus, MST was able to raise their international (and therefore local) profile and forge links with the famous international anti-GM activism (Scoones, 2008)

Another example of the discrepancy in GM crops campaign versus action on the ground is the example of KRRS According to Scoones (2008) the KRRS in Karnataka has been at the forefront of anti-GM struggles in India, yet interested in pushing their claims for farm subsidies and price control, the issue of GMOs are not of critical importance to them However, engaging in wider campaigns such as the anti-globalization, WTO and patents or GMO crops have been add-on concerns at the prompting of the charismatic leader Nanjundaswamy Scoones goes further to explain that knowing the importance of rural vote blocs, the state government must take them seriously The large turnout of farmers at anti-GMO demonstrations are perhaps evidence to importance of the organization as more of an influential lobbyist on other issues, rather than a genuine commitment to getting rid of GMO The GMOs debate in this case is used a vehicle for a wider political cause

These occurrences do bring up the question of whether GMs have a role in development Can the GMs (modified into stealth seeds and more in the hands of the public) benefit the rural poor and would the private sector still invest in creating such seeds knowing that they would go underground and be improved by local famers?

According to Uphoff (2007)

> agroecological approaches to agricultural development do not make genetic improvements unimportant or unnecessary Transgenic interventions can produce a variety of benefit, and may indeed be needed to deal with certain problems of crop production and protection However, there are understandable concerns about the ways in which much of the current transgenetic research is being undertaken, driven largely by private investments and incentives that need not take public and environmental interests into account systematically and transparently (p 221)

Discussion of the GM issue

Both IFAP and Via Campesina agree that the concentration of agricultural inputs, especially for GM crops, is in the hands of a minority of transnational corporations and this is where the agreement ends On the issues of GMs, IFAP is a proponent even though it proceeds with caution IFAP sees it as a way forward to strengthen farmers' market access and hence tries to positively cover the issues that surround GMs IFAP not only stresses the benefits for its farmers but also advocates the ways in which farmers and

famer organization can be more involved in the business of GMs so that this can lessen the concentration of power that TNCs currently hold especially in agricultural inputs division Overall, IFAP believes that GM crops will bring benefits to farmers, consumers, the agro-industry, the agricultural sector and will help to eliminate hunger and poverty

IFAP sees multilateral organizations such as the WTO, the FAO and research institutes such as the CGIAR as helping in the safe handling and promotion of GMs IFAP, entrenched in its commodity driven agenda, promotes that agriculture is a business and famers have to expect to pay on the resources that the agro-industry are providing for them Overall, while IFAP may present concerns over the concentration of power in the agro-industry or the unknown affects on biological population, IFAP in its literature is pushing the agenda for more and more farmers to adopt GMs as the new model of agriculture that will modernize the sector Having consultative status with the UN implies that IFAP's stance will have implications for the promotion of GM crops as a valid component of development

In its publications, IFAP is presenting the benefits of GMs to its farmers, yet there are some very important omissions that reveal the nature of IFAP as a farmer organization In stating farmers should recognise that they must pay for GMs, IFAP is targeting and assuming the co-operation of capitalist farmers In asking to pay for GMOs, IFAP is targeting farmers that have access to credit or the credential to access credit

Because GMs are geared for industrial production, IFAP is targeting farmers that are more interested in large scale operation that are geared for intense competition in the markets Although IFAP is promoting themselves as the "voice of the world's famers", by

promoting GM crops they are actively silencing the voice of the peasantry Referring to IFAP's literature there is little to no mention of poor farmers will benefit from the use of GMs IFAP's literature also lacks any detailed interest in labourers (who can be marginal farmers needing to supplement their income) or landless labourers who are very much affected by the nature of technology that is implemented on farms Overall, although IFAP mentions "family farm" and "small farm", it is only interested in supporting capitalist farmers integrating them further into the neoliberal program

In contrast, Via Campesina is adamantly opposed to the use of GM crops Via Campesina sees it as another way of imposing on farmers means of production and increasing the concentration of power in the agro-industry Via Campesina is adamant that it is not opposed to new knowledge, but it adamantly rejects the notions that natural resources should be patented Via Campesina is vehemently opposed to the use of GMs because of its adverse effects on the rural poor Via Campesina points out the promotion of GMs commoditizes natural resources that have been-until the recent past- accessible to the rural population especially poor and marginal farmers

The instability and the unknown effects of GMs on natural populations can be detrimental to the peasantry GMs will change the nature of the public access and collection of seeds Since success of GMs will be dependent on financial capital, plus the instability of its nature, the peasantry will will face more risks in agricultural production Via Campesina sees that migrant workers will be heavily affected in the cycle of displacement Where there are more people displaced labourers will tend to gain less of a wage for their survival

Via Campesina sees that uniformity of GMs will destroy the livelihood of many farmers who have complex farming systems and who rely on a variety of crops and agricultural by-products for a livelihood Richer peasants, if they are able to access and maintain access to capital for the inputs, will more than likely become dependent on inputs, indebted, and may even be pushed off farms Via Campesina sees that GMs and the focus on the increase productivity is a way to keep farmers in continuous cut-throat mode in the current market system Via Campesina acknowledges and supports the model of agriculture that has been derived over time through farmers work and experimentation, and promotes that these are much better suited not only to agronomical situations but also to the socio-economic context of farmers

Via Campesina speaks out against multilateral organizations such as the FAO, the WTO, and the WB as they these institutions working against the peasantry instead of on their behalf Via Campesina points out that instead of focussing on low input agriculture these organizations are pushing the agenda of GM crops that is geared toward increase in production for global markets Via Campesina sees that these multilateral organizations have similar agendas as the agro-industry

The complex nature of GMs will create the situation where there is a larger role for molecular biologist in laboratories than farmers in fields As the focus becomes more on capital intensive biotechnology (as driven by the private sector), the peasantry will have less say in what they grow and for whom they grow In removing peasants from the innovations process they become more of a demographic of clientele consumers The decrease in public funding for research and development helps to push farmers more into

the clout of the private sector, which now have even more power to make decisions on the nature of agricultural practices

Based on intellectual property rights, TNCs technically will stand to gain the most from the profits of GMs and their counterpart chemicals Not only are local contracts that are suppose to enforce the fine of saving seeds, but through the TRIPS agreement of the WTO, countries are legally required to prosecute the offenders This has detrimental implications first for the peasantry If and when investigations are carried out and found to have 'private' or 'stolen' property farmers already have little to no capital to be paying legal fees Although it has been argued that the famous cases were carried out to make an example this argument does not guarantee that other farmers will not be held reliable In addition, although these companies may not be receiving a high percentage of their profit, they are still running a business that makes money so as not to go bankrupt, whereas the rural poor is trying to feed themselves on a daily basis

In summary, GM crops do not offer a solution to rural producers many of which are poor As Via Campesina points out the call for ownership of genetic resources should act as a warning sign that at the core of its promotion is not the well-being of the peasantry, but an intensive effort to further integrate peasants into a capitalist system where transnational corporations have more control not only at a local level where farmers have to purchase seeds, but at a national and international level where farmers can be legally harassed to compensate the very transnational corporations that are essentially robbing rural producers and the poor

In some ways IFAP is facilitating the transition of agriculture to be carried out by

everyone else but the people whose livelihoods are intimately intertwined with its progression From IFAPs language it seems that small farmers have to accept the inevitability of more concessions to industrial model, although IFAP asserts that is against the concentration of power into the hands of TNCs Via Campesina has and continues to fight against not only the system that promotes GMs but actively advocates an alternative that centers the rural poor as the main protagonists in their own development It is important to note that within Via Campesina, there are tensions in terms of how certain organizations are willing to preserve the peasant way of life but still being interested in engaging in some aspects of the Neoliberal program The manner in which Via Campesina deals with these instances will have implications for how well they can maintain strong campaign support as a transnational movement and will also have some implications for the strength of character that is associated with their name

Agrofuels

Agrofuels have become a "phenomenon" in the agricultural sector and as well a contentious topic in development The focus, primarily in developed countries, has been on agrofuels as a renewable energy source to decrease the dependence on fossil fuels However, as its development has progressed debates over its benefits and who it benefits from its have increased The debates in this thesis are focussed on the general acceptance of agrofuel production, the use of 'marginal land' for agrofuels production and the

support and regulation of agrofuel production Although IFAP promotes that caution should be taken, it nonetheless supports agrofuels production IFAP sees that producing a "value-added product" (Haddad, 2008) will help farmers out of poverty and hunger In contrast, Via Campesina adamantly rejects agrofuels production as a livelihood strategy out of poverty and hunger, they emphasize that the industrial nature of agrofuel production will do more harm to farmers livelihood, replace food production and likely cause more displacement for the rural poor

The question of general acceptance

In its contribution as 'civil society' to the FAO 2008 report "The state of food and agriculture", IFAP promotes "the production of food and feed remains paramount for the farmers of IFAP, however, biofuels represent a new market opportunity, help diversify risk and promote rural development With oil prices currently at record levels biofuels[11] also support fuel security" (IFAP, 2008 97)

In the context of the Global Food Crisis of 2008 IFAP is insistent that "the misconceptions about biofuels are important to overcome for a farming community that has long suffered from low incomes" (IFAP, 2008) IFAP continues on to state "Bioenergy[12] represents a good opportunity to boost rural economies and reduce poverty, provided this production complies with sustainability criteria" IFAP concludes

[11] IFAP does not use the politicized word 'agrofuel', instead they use the less problematic 'biofuel'
[12] [12]IFAP promotes that bioenergy is energy from any biotic source, but their focus is specifically agrofuels and not other sources, for example they are not promoting cow manure

"sustainable biofuel production by family farmers is not a threat to food production It is an opportunity to achieve profitability and to revive rural communities"

Farmers going into agrofuels will be able to access a lucrative market (Haddad, 2008) Haddad, IFAP's representative from France states that the main argument in venturing into the production of agrofuels is that the "farmers need to become providers of value added products, instead of raw materials and buyers of energy" (2008 35) Therefore, farmers should increase their influence in the value chains from production to distribution, avoiding the result of the majority of benefits going to the private sector

IFAP points out that "since energy consumption in developed countries is higher than in developing countries, farmers in the latter maybe able to take advantage of this opportunity by producing for export, thus selling value-added products rather than raw material (IFAP, n d *b,* 6) IFAP also adds that 'in addition to income generation, processing domestic bioenergy in rural areas leads to job creation and diversification of rural employment opportunities, providing livelihood alternatives thus acting as a deterrent to rural exodus (p 7) IFAP believes that agrofuels produced by family farms will provide farmers with the opportunity to boost economic growth and rural development

In contrast, at the International Conference on Peasant Rights in Jakarta in 2008, Via Campesina presented the idea that the "massive wave of investment in energy production based on cultivating and industrial processing of vegetal materials like corn, soy, palm oil, sugar cane, canola, etc, will neither solve the climate crisis nor the energy crisis (Via Campesina, 2008c, p 1) Via Campesina adds that agrofuels "will also bring

disastrous social and environmental consequences It creates a new and very serious threat to food production by small farmers and to the attainment of food sovereignty for the world population" (p 1)

Via Campesina sees that the "new extensive monoculture plantations for the production of agrofuels are increasing greenhouse gases and dismantling communal lands" (Via Campesina, 2008c, p 1) Via Campesina states that "expansion of agrofuels contributes to the massive concentration of capital by landowners, large companies and TNCs, provoking real counter land reform throughout the world" (p 1) And as a result, "it contributes to increased speculation on food products and land prices" (p 2)

According to Via Campesina, "agrofuel production has already started to replace food production Its ongoing extension will drive even more small scale farmers and indigenous people off their land"

The plantation model of agrofuels is in contrast to traditional use of biomass for energy In this connection Via Campesina notes that

> [t]hroughout the history of farming, villagers have obtained energy from their farmland to meet their daily needs Peasant families are using coconut or sunflower oil, biogas, firewood, wind and water to generate electricity for local use Such methods are sustainable and integrated into the food production cycle on the farmland It is imperative to design and adopt responsible attitudes to food consumption and to adjust our way of eating, in the knowledge that the industrial model of production and consumption is destructive, while the peasant-based

model of production uses responsible energy practices (Via Campesina, 2008c 3)

Via Campesina (2008c) argues that agrofuels do not have the potential to replace fossil fuels Via Campesina points out that the latest estimates show that agrofuels will "only cover the future rise in consumption from now until 2020" (p 1) Also, Via Campesina highlights that there is insufficient land in the world to generate the fuel that is necessary for an industrial society growing energy needs In addition, Via Campesina points out that small farmers and agricultural workers, working in extremely harsh conditions with damaging effects on their health, with very poor income have no say in the way their production is used (ibid) Many are working under contract farming with large agribusiness companies that process, refine and sell the product

Via Campesina argument that fuel is replacing food production is well founded According to Houtart (2009), "the impact of agrofuels on the food crisis has been proven Not only is the production of agrofuels in conflict with food production in a world where, according to the FAO, more than a billion people suffer from hunger, it has also been an important element in the speculation about the production of food in 2007 and 2008" (p 38) Houtart explains that

> A report from the World Bank confirms that in these, years, 85% of the increase in food prices that forced more than 100 million people below the poverty line (an indicator of hunger) was influenced by the development of agrofuels For this

reaon, Jean Zıelger, durıng hıs term as UN Specıal Rapporteur on the Rıght to Food classıfied agrofuels as a <<crıme agaınst humanıty>> and hıs successor, the Belgıan Olıveıer De Schutter has asked for a five-year moratorıum on agrofuel productıon (Houtart, 2009 38)

Even though IFAP promotes that agrofuels have opportunıtıes for small farmers, Eıde dısagrees

> Productıon of feedstock for agrofuel ıs by ıts very nature best suıted for large holdıngs, and ıt ıs to an extreme degree a monoculture productıon, wıth all ıts negatıve ımplıcatıons It opens up [opportunıtıes] for foreıgn and outsıde ınvestors on an unprecedented scale Tradıtıonal, small-scale agrıculture ın developıng countrıes ıs not attractıve for ınvestors, but agrofuel ıs—as long as there ıs a guaranteed market The ımplıcatıon of thıs ıs omınous It may lead to a process of margınalısatıon or evıctıon of smallholders to an unprecedented degree (quoted ın Whıte and Dasgupta, 2010 600)

Houtart (2009) also hıghlıghts "ıt ıs equally necessary to note that the salary of workers ıs very low, and the general ınhumanıty of workıng condıtıons ıs caused by these demands of productıvıty" (p 39) Franco et al (2010) add out that "agro-ındustrıal plantatıons may create 'employment' but then also degrade ıts condıtıons and readıly undermıne other lıvelıhoods ın the ınformal economy" (p 691)

Dauvergne and Neville (2010) points out that differential access to capital may influence farmers' abilities to invest in different crops to enter into the market Agrofuels may provide opportunities for high economic returns for some farmers However, potential returns can vary widely across agrofuels crops and may prove polarising as land- and capital-poor community members find themselves unable to capitalise on these opportunities (Dauvergne & Neville, 2010) It is pointed out that there is variation across agrofuel production

> Jatropha, for example, is estimated to be twice as land intensive as sugar for biofuels, but sugar is three times more capital intensive (Arndt et al 2009) Consequently, farmers with greater initial access to capital can invest in sugarcane crops that have a higher return per unit of land, while those lacking such funds may be excluded from these opportunities Although at various times returns from some crops may be high, farmers may be faced with bearing the costs of failed efforts, and those already living at the margins can find themselves unable to take such risks (p 652)

In addition, the increasing corporate control of industrial-scale biofuel production and its supplementary processes increases the doubt that there will be widespread positive results for the poor (Dauvergne & Neville, 2010) Dauvergne and Neville, (2010) explains this in terms of "the distributional consequences of biofuel production", which "appear set to leave behind those states – and especially groups within states—that are

already at a disadvantage in the international system" (p 655)

They continue

> The production and consumption patterns of biofuels will benefit, at the international level, states with existing experiences of success in the global economy, and, at the domestic level, groups already integrated into commercial production systems States and rural and indigenous people already struggling to cope with globalised markets and industrialised production will be left even further behind, with even well-intentioned efforts to mitigate climate change and support development through biofuels likely to accelerate deforestation and further marginalise vulnerable people and ecosystems (Dauvergne and Neville, 2009 655)

Dauvergne and Neville (2010), point out that the diversion of crops from food to fuel production has little chance of changing industrial-scale systems The production scale is a key component in having profitable agrofuel production, which implies that it will mostly be carried out on large-scale plantations Smallholders will likely occupy only a minor space in this type of production, which requires "an integrated industrial/agricultural organization of production, factory processing, transport and distribution" (White & Dasgupta, 2010 599)

As agrofuels follow the Green Revolution model, it certainly will not be a 'green' process Instead it will depend on fertilizers, pesticides, and as noted by its proponents,

the use of GMOs Holt-Gimenez and Kenfield (2008) agree that far from being "clean and green," agrofuels simply replicate the agro industrial model which has consistently been a major contributor to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, pollution, and water depletion (p 8) The set-up, production and processing is done at a large scale Just as in the food regime, the private sector is maximizing its use of commodity chains to benefit from agrofuel production According to McMichael (2010) the focus on agrofuels is bringing about the food-fuel complex/regime and as the food regime demonstrates, agricultural production is hostage to the function of capital and agrofuels are just another way in which agriculture is profited from

The world's food processing companies and traders have already wedged a solid foot in the agrofuels door According to Holt-Gimenez and Kenfield (2008), "[t]he prospects for consolidating corporate monopolies through the agrofuels boom are staggering New corporate partnerships and mergers are being formed at a dizzying rate" (p 8) Holt-Gimenez identifies the concentration of power in the biofuel industry as 800 percent increase in venture capital into agrofuel sector by TNCs and it is highlighted that that Cargill and Archer Daniels Midland control 65 percent of the global grain trade, and Monsanto and Syngenta control one-quarter of the gene tech industry (Dauvergne & Neville, 2010) GRAIN (2007) points out that

> [c]ompanies such as Cargill and ADM already control agricultural commodity production and trade in many parts of the world, and for them agrofuels represent an opportunity for a major expansion of their business and profits The

biotechnology companies, such as Monsanto, Syngenta and others, are already investing heavily to deliver crops and trees that fit the requirements of the agrofuels processors (p 3)

The question of 'marginal lands'

In its 'Statement by the farmers of the World' publication entitled "Facing climate and energy challenges through sustainable bioenergy", IFAP highlights the point that

> [m]ost sources of renewable energy require large land areas within which to gather relatively large collectors in order to produce meaningful amounts of energy Farms are generally the only places to construct large wind generators and large solar powered photovoltaic arrays and cultivate large areas of biomass for energy" (IFAP, n d 2)

Therefore, IFAP concludes, "famers are therefore well placed to take advantage of the growing attention to renewable energy supplies (p 2) Implicit in this promotion is the notion that these large tracts of land are owned or controlled by farmers who are richer and thus able to position themselves into the production system Even though IFAP promotes that all stakeholders should be involved to determine a suitable land use policy- IFAP goes ahead and promotes that 'marginal lands' should be used in the agrofuel production

IFAP believes that agrofuels allow the re-cultivation of land, making use of set aside or 'marginal lands' for agrofuels (Haddad, 2008) 'Marginal lands' are those often occupied but those who are resource-poor IFAP is aware that "it is usually the resource-poor sections of the farming community that may not be able to access legal and market-based instruments, and thus be in the weakest position to defend their rights" (IFAP, 2000 1) It seems that IFAP is in some ways promoting only richer farmers who can access land and superficially promoting agrofuel production to any other group of small farmers Even if IFAP were thinking they were promoting the benefit of the poor, this is problematic for a number of reasons Historical legacies of land tenure and control influence whether rural communities can take advantage of these opportunities (Dauvergne & Neville, 2010) It is not a stretch, therefore, to consider the potential displacement of subsistence farmers, and other groups such as indigenous communities, and other marginalised groups for agrofuel development

As IFAP is representing a richer group of farmers the issue of "marginal lands' will most likely not be a concern Richer famers have no need to be wary of the use of marginal lands because they own or have access to premium land Indicative of the "marginal lands" being a non-issue for IFAP, is the lack of an in-depth discussion in its literature on the nature of these lands IFAP, just as many investors, see marginal land as an economic opportunity

As agrofuels in general have the connotation of being a 'green energy' source in the agro-industry sector and among multilateral organizations, its expansion is justified Via Campesina, on the other hand, sees that the current expansion of agrofuel production

contributes "to the massive concentration of capital by landowners, large companies and TNCs, provoking a real counter land reform throughout the world" (Via Campesina, 2008c) When the TNCs are unable to find farmland for agrofuel production, Via Campesina expresses that "deforestation is forced on areas that are necessary for the preservation of life on earth" (p 3) Thousands of farmers have no alternative but to accept to grow agrofuels as they need an income to support themselves till the next season

According to Via Campesina (2008c) agrofuel production has already started to replace food production Its ongoing extension will drive even more small-scale farmers and indigenous peoples off their lands Instead of dedicating land and water to food production, these resources are being diverted to produce energy in the form of diesel and ethanol Today peasants and small farmers, indigenous people, women and men, produce the huge majority of the food consumed worldwide If not prevented now, agrofuels will occupy these lands and undermine food production (I(2008c)) Via Campesina estimates that five million farmers have been expelled from their land to create space for monocultures in Indonesia, five million in Brazil, four million in Colombia (Ibid) Via Campesina concludes that industrial agriculture generates much less employment than sustainable family farming (2008c)

Via Campesina states that "[t]oday peasants and small farmers, indigenous people, women and men, produce the huge majority of the food consumed worldwide If not prevented now, agrofuels will occupy our lands and food will become even more scarce and expensive" (Via Campesina, 2008c, p 2) Via Campesina disagrees with the efforts to

encourage the production of agrofuels especially in the manner that displaces people from their homes and the few places that they can access resources (Ibid) Via Campesina argues that if food and energy needs are to be met, then this should be done locally for local needs on a small scale so that the marginalized are not further pushed off the land (p 2)

Franco et al (2010) point out that

> Attention focused on the potential of export-oriented biofuels to compete with local food production for the best land and water resources In response to such criticism, pro-biofuels arguments elaborated the notion that biofuels could be beneficially produced on so-called marginal, degraded, or otherwise idle land (p 672)

Therefore, governments are facilitating the agrofuels boom by determining 'marginal lands' For governments, agrofuels is seen as another opportunity for income generation and as well another way into which they can be part on a new global competitive market (GRAIN, 2007) Governments are designating lands as 'idle' even though these are the same lands that the rural poor utilize for their survival and livelihood The use of 'marginal lands' for agrofuel production is causing major dispossession of people's means of production and as a result, their livelihood Research has found that important ecosystems are being destroyed and hundreds of thousands of indigenous and peasant communities are expelled from their land (GRAIN, 2007) While there is a

perception that farmland is abundant and under-utilised in certain countries, these claims are not always substantiated In many cases land is already being used, these are seen as unused because the people using the land have no formal land rights or can access the relevant law and institutions (Vermeulen & Cotula, 2010)

White and Dasgupta (2010) points out that some governments have taken

steps to identify 'idle' land and to allocate it for commercial agrofuel production

> Yet growing evidence raises doubts about the concept of 'idle' land In many cases, lands perceived to be 'idle', 'under-utilized', 'marginal' or 'abandoned' by government and large private operators provide a vital basis for the livelihoods of poor and vulnerable groups [ ] The tenure status of such lands may also be complex, with governments asserting land ownership but exercising little control at local level, and local groups claiming resource rights based on local ('customary') tenure systems that may lack legally enforceable status (p 601)

White and Dasgupta (2010) also point out that the claim was made that tens of millions of hectares of 'unused' land were available in many areas of Africa, Asia and Latin America, and projected that up to one-fifth of the world's agricultural land would be planted in agrofuels by 2050

While increased investment may create new opportunities for local livelihoods and national economies, large numbers of people are vulnerable to dispossession as a result of changes in land use (GRAIN, 2007) Despite all the talk of opportunities for

local communities to benefit from energy farming and local economies being revitalised by new markets, the agrofuels revolution is firmly heading in precisely the opposite direction Part of a system of corporate-controlled plantation agriculture, the new agrofuels will destroy local employment rather than create it (GRAIN, 2007)

According to Franco et al (2010)

> As a concept, 'degraded/ marginal' land can play more subtle roles It can be a means to normalise past degradation, such that agro-industrial monocultures become an improvement, or to devalue and/or conceal land uses 'marginal' to global markets The concept can give policymakers a narrative device for imagining a benign role for biofuel production in the global South, as if experts can operationalise it by choosing the right regulatory-governance measures, whether to protect the best agricultural land for local food uses or to protect the most biodiverse or most 'high carbon stocked' land for environmental purposes The concept of degraded/marginal' land is an ambiguous normative measure for investigating, classifying and colonising land in the global South (p 674)

Franco et al (2010) further explain that "[t]he conceptual reframing of land ignores many contentious, fundamental issues related to land and how it is or ought to be used These can be summarised in the following two questions Who has what rights to use which land for how long and for what purposes? And who gets to decide these important and contentious matters? The issues involved here are complex, and the

answers are neither obvious nor easy in practice, as shown by the countless conflicts that have taken place in societies across the globe (p 674)

The question of support and regulation

IFAP, on the one hand, encourages that the "development of biofuels depend on positive policy frameworks and incentives such as mandatory targets for biofuel use and fiscal incentives that favour biofuels relative to fossil fuels until the industry matures" (IFAP, 2008) IFAP reiterates that is in "the public interest when biofuels are produced from local sources since they create employment and wealth in the country" IFAP envisions that governments can help farmers by providing investment incentives including "income tax credit for small biofuel producers, financing bioenergy plants, increasing farmers' participation through matching grants, and reducing business risks for the adoption of new technologies" IFAP warns that "biofuels are not a miracle solution, but they offer significant income opportunities for farmers If farmers are to benefit, careful long-term assessment of economic, environmental and social benefits and costs are required to identify real opportunities aimed at improving producers' incomes"

IFAP does recognise that "there is danger that bioenergy ventures use more energy than they produce thus harming the environment and causing damage to natural resources (land, water, biodiversity, forests) (Haddad, 2008) As such IFAP proposed that

" for all these reasons, the development of bioenergy should be part of a global integrated strategy which take into account the sustainable management of natural

resources" (n d *b* 14), governments should also establish strong regulatory systems such as appropriate quality control systems IFAP sees that some organizations and governments are pushing for certification standards for bioenergy with sustainability as a requirement for certification IFAP states that

> It is important that governments set up a harmonised framework for the establishment of sustainability criteria for the production of bioenergy However, certification of bioenergy should not be used as a trade barrier to protect domestic production as there are already many existing standards which create trade distortions Indeed, by establishing new standards for sustainable production, bioenergy may play an important pioneering role in the world commodity trade, with all renewable and non renewable commodities eventually subject to such criteria e g introduction of equivalent certification schemes for current fossil fuel energy However, these standards should be harmonised at the international level and should therefore follow the international principles of transparency Further, governments need to set up capacity building programs on eventual standards and certification schemes related to bioenergy (IFAP, n d *b* 12)

Via Campesina, on the other hand, argues that "agribusiness companies are aware that agrofuels produced on a large scale are not economically viable The race towards agrofuels is made possible only by subsidies from supporting governments and by speculation on the financial markets" (Via Campesina, 2008c 2) Multilateral

organizations such as the World Bank and the WTO are supporting agrofuels Since its World Development Report 2008, the World Bank has been facilitating what it sees as its 'new agriculture for development', that is, market intensification through publicly subsidized agribusiness in order to bring the market to small holders and commercial farmers (McMichael, 2010) Via Campesina denounces the passive attitude of many institutions in the face of agrofuels and its risks and adverse affects They especially denounce that these same institutions are placing the economic interests of TNCs above the needs of the very people they are meant to represent and defend They view the promotion of agrofuels as an insult in continuing to promote agrofuels in spite of the "negative energy balance in their production, processing, and transport" (Via Campesina, 2008c 4)

Via Campesina therefore demands

> [t]he end of corporate driven, monoculture-based production of agrofuels As a first step, a five year international moratorium on the production, trade and consumption of industrial agrofuels has to be immediately declared An in-depth evaluation of social and environment cost of the agrofuel boom and of profits made by TNCs in the processing and trade of the raw materials The promotion and development of small scale production and local consumption models and the rejection of consumerism Explicit support from governments and institutions to the sustainable peasant-based model of food production and distribution, with its minimal use of energy, its capacity to create jobs, to respect cultural and

biological diversity and its positive effect on global warming (fertile soils are the best way to capture CO2) Via Campesina, 2008c 4)

Via Campesina sees that the provision of energy and its aim of security energy can only be done apart from an industrial production here TNCs are in control They express the view that

> We can stipulate that agrofuels can only be produced using polycultures, from various complementary sources (sugarcane, sunflower, and castor oil, etc) respecting biodiversity and taking advantage of the least fertile lands And that fuels should be produced in small and medium-sized cooperatively-owned manufacturing units And they should be installed in rural communities, small settlements, and small cities in such a way that each town, settlement, and city cooperatively produces the energy they need (Via Campesina, 2008c 80-81)

According to White and Dasgupta (2010) "agrofuel expansion currently is not driven by environmental concerns or the needs of local populations, but by the need for developed country governments to find a 'quick fix' to their energy and environmental security needs, the attempts of developing country governments to find new ways to revive rural and agrarian development, and the search of corporate capital for (relatively) short-term profit" (p 596)

The authors go on to explain that "[g]iven the persistent government neglect of

agricultural and rural development imperatives, it is not surprising to see governments welcoming the embrace of foreign and, in some cases, domestic corporate capital offering to make large scale investments in agro-fuels production, as well as the infrastructure provision that goes with it, in exchange for secure and long-term access to large tracts of land" (White & Dasgupta, 2010 597)

White and Dasgupta conclude tha"[a]lthough the linkages between agro-fuels expansion and agrarian revival in the South are tenuous at best, it is not difficult to see why many Southern governments have jumped on the bandwagon of agro-fuels in the hope that they will make the crisis in agriculture – their unresolved agrarian questions— go away From this point of view, however, it is not agro-fuels as such but any large-scale external investment in land-based production that governments find attractive, and this is indeed what is happening (p 598)

Since the focus is on an industrial model of production, proponents who have the intent of weakening opposition take the view that agrofuels production should be governed by international standards and corporate social responsibility These standards include those similar to the phytosanitary of the AoA agreement that would put strict limitations on potential small farmers who may want to compete in the global market Holt-Gimenez and Kenfield (2008) reference what is known as "sustainable regulation "

> Theoretically, these regulations certify that participating companies do not use slave labor, do not grow feedstock on land that has been cleared of rainforest, and that they use ecologically sound production and processing practices Unfortunately, as pointed out in a recent OECD study, macro-level impacts such

> as the relocation of production to lands outside the scope of certification cannot be addressed through these schemes Likewise, certification cannot deal with other macro-level impacts, like the competition with food production, and access to land, water and other natural resources vital for human life Historically, certification schemes have failed to ensure Free Prior and Informed Consent of affected communities and indigenous peoples (p 10)

Although these regulations may sound like a practical solution, the authors further explain that

> [t]he development of agrofuels is proceeding faster than certification can be implemented Many countries lack the regulatory capacity to ensure the implementation and monitoring of safeguards and accountability mechanisms Further, certification on a country-bycountry basis leads to market segmentation rather than a significant reduction of unsustainable practices and a uniform and globally enforceable certification scheme is not likely Under the current agrofuels context, sustainable agrofuels will likely develop into a niche market for consumers of fair trade product (p 10)

The authors conclude that "an agrofuels niche market will not ensure sufficient agribusiness compliance at the global scales needed to prevent global warming, the destruction of the planet's forests and conservation lands, and food and water rights for local populations" (p 10) Without changing the context, "certified agrofuel plantations

will be small, sustainable islands in a globally unsustainable sea Or worse, specialty niches for an affluent, environmentally-conscious, but globally irrelevant percentage of the planet's energy market" (p 10)

Keeping in mind O'Laughlin's question "Can regulatory governance, backed by pressure from civil society, persuade (transnational) corporate capital that promoting the reduction of poverty and inequality and promoting environmental sustainability are consistent with the pursuit of profit and corporate legitimacy?"(quoted in White and Dasgupta, 2010 597), Dauvergne and Neville (2010), highlights the issue of corporate social responsibility (CSR) in agrofuel regulation

As corporate control increases while state regulatory capacity decreases in many sectors, the private sector has responded to civil society pressure for equitable practices by developing corporate social responsibility initiatives These initiatives focus on the environmental and social impacts of the industries (Dauvergne & Neville 2010) However, according to analyses compiled by Utting and Clapp, the private-sector voluntary programs have proven not to be an effective regulatory method within the corporate sector The oversight and implementation of the CSR have been weak especially when there has been an absence of sanctions for noncompliance In addition, the study shows that only a small percentage of TNCs and their affiliates that have actually adopted CSR principles When some legal mechanisms have emerged to reign in TNCs, these corporations also have highly skilled legal teams to defend them Another avenue of regulation might be that consumer pressure may influence sustainable biofuel production However, it is highlighted that the strong control of the private sector of the

agrofuel industry, functioning without strong state oversight, leads unlikely to optimistic outcomes (Dauvergne & Neville, 2010) The authors conclude that

> [i]n light of the already-concentrated power of MNCs in the agrifood sector, and the limitations of voluntarism in sustainability initiatives, public-private and local-multinational alliances for biofuel production seem far more likely to further entrench corporate control of the processes of production and distribution, and lead to further environmental degradation and social inequities (Dauvergne & Neville 2010 647)

Even within Via Campesina the debate on agrofuel production is played out to the point it caused divisions in farmers' organizations in Brazil According to Fernandes et al (2010) Via Campesina-Brazil takes a critical position on agrofuel due to its contention with food production

The MST has generally aligned with this thinking, "daring only to flirt with agrofuel production" (p 808) However, some movements allied with Via Campesina have argued against this campaign and have proceeded towards participation in the agrofuel industry Although it is stated that Via Campesina "does not impose strict discipline on member organisations, such differences of opinion have stimulated considerable internal dissent" (p 809)

As a result, in 2007, in part due to the agrofuel debate, the MST formally separated itself from "a historic leader in the Pontal—Jose´ Rainha Junior" (p 794) He

founded the Associations of Settled Family Farmers Federation (FAAFOP) to take advantage of participating in agrofuels production In another case, in 2008, the the Movement of Small Farmers Movimento dos Pequenos Agricultores (MPA) similarly also underwent a split due to the agrofuesl debate

> while the main body voted to establish a cooperative to develop an agrofuels business, from farm to mill, a smaller group of members left the organisation in protest They formed a dissident movement called the Popular Peasant Movement (Movimento Campone^s Popular, MCP), strictly committed to Via Campesina's anti-agrofuel position, despite not being a member of the international group The MPA, ironically, maintained its leadership role in Via Campesina (Fernandes et al , 2010 809)

This point raises the question of whether some organizations are more welcoming to agrofuel production if they have a higher degree of autonomy and is this type of production a reality without the private sector?

Discussion on agrofuels

As seen IFAP and Via Campesina have opposing views on the issues agrofuel production IFAP sees agrofuels as a "lucrative" opportunity for small farmers especially for famers in developing countries Yet as shown, the vertical and horizontal commodity chains are geared for industrial agrofuel production rather than small-scale production Again it is noted that the farmers that IFAP are targeting with the promotion of agrofuels, are those farmers who are well within the means of having capital to commit to large scale or industrial production The agro-industry is not interested in dealing with small individual farms therefore farmers either have to get into co-operatives and follow the terms dictated by the agro-industry or they have to be sufficiently large to garner interest from the private sectors Farmers will have to invest capital and also follow guidelines that may become restrictive especially in trade This can lead farmers into another boom gone bust

IFAP is promoting agrofuels as a solution for income generation, yet as it is once again embedded in an industrial large scale model it is doubtful whether the outcome will be different IFAP seems to be in false hope with the expectations Even though they look to strengthen farmers role in the market, this is strongly opposed by the concentration of TNC in the various structures of agrofuel production and the growing consensus that agrofuel production will be carried out predominantly on an industrial scale that does not necessarily and more times than not, leave farmers more unsuccessful and entrenched in the competitive markets

IFAP believes that agrofuels will make use of lands in a positive way and that this usage will drive the rural economy It is thought the production including processing of agrofuels will help with diversifying the rural economy and afford the small farmers to provide a value-added product IFAP argues that by growing agrofuels, small farmers will also achieve energy security and they will not have to rely on fossil fuels which can have unstable peak prices Whereas, IFAP believes the government and development agencies need to have a positive role in establishing a supportive environment to produce agrofuels IFAP warns that agrofuels should not be treated as a miracle solutions and states that regulation should be set up to protect farmers, and it also states that regulation should not act as a barrier to farmers in getting their product out into the market

In contrast, Via Campesina sees that agrofuel boom cannot help the peasantry and indirectly the rural poor They see fuel production replacing food production and a further displacement of rural poor as well another attack on the means of production Via Campesina promotes that it is the peasants with small scale production that will secure food and energy sources This emphasis on small scale, if well supported by governments and development agencies has the potential to reduce hunger and poverty, rather than the unstable and unsustainable new trend of producing agrofuels

Via Campesina sees the use of "marginal lands" causing the displacement of many poor people and indigenous groups Via Campesina speaks out against the multilateral organizations such as the FAO and the WB who are promoting agrofuel production in a time when the rural population is trying to hold on a livelihood and where food production is being sacrificed so that energy demands can be met in developed

countries many miles away Via Campesina has little reassurance that regulation will stop the injustice that is taking place with agrofuel production It feels the multilateral organizations are more interested in economic profit and are in mutual beneficial relationship with industry Where regulatory support is called for, the state that has been minimalised, has little to offer to the small farmers who are held captive by hostile markets Efforts in regulation that are suppose to prevent ecological damage and social inequalities are not expected to offer more than lip service to these goals as any other actions would work against the logic of further accumulation

As with experimentation with GMOs, there is tension between organizations in Via Campesina that do want to engage in agrofuel production They are interested in engaging with the new wave of agriculture, it can be argued that some organizations want to engage in the type of production but in a different and more autonomous manner The question then becomes, is it possible to have a more middle of the road type of agriculture that takes into consideration the peasant way of production while increasing the scope of the operation

Chapter Five

Conclusion

The central question of this thesis is whether and to what extent transnational farmers' movement are differentiated, and why and how does it matter? To answer this question, we looked to the class basis, ideologically and politics of the two most important transnational agrarian movements today IFAP and Via Campesina, around two of the most critical rural development issues GM crops and agrofuels From here, there is a better clarification of how each TAM will advocate for the rural poor GMs and agrofuels have been debated as development tools for the rural poor, therefore the TAMs stance on these will help to highlight if their advocacy helps or hinders the rural poor

This thesis finds that IFAP and Via Campesina are differentiated in their opposition to neoliberal capitalism as an overall economic model especially when it comes to agriculture On the one hand, IFAP is working to facilitate the accumulation of capital that drives the process of realizing a complete capitalist mode of production IFAP engages and works in collaboration with the drivers of neoliberalism to further the expansion of capital accumulation, these proponents are essentially international

institutions such as the FAO, and especially economic institutions such as the World Bank, the IMF, etc , and the private sector that makes up the agro-industry IFAP looks to reform current inequalities within the system

IFAP sees itself as the oldest farmer organization in the World as it was formed in 1946 and has been bring farmers issues to the international forum. It is proud to call itself the voice of the world's farmers IFAP is representing capital rich farmers, and believes in the industrial model of agriculture and in the market to rid the world of hunger and poverty Although there are always cautionary words on the issues they promote, IFAP more or less is driven by the notion that the industrial model through Neoliberal policies will make farmers more competitive in the market and by creating better ways to be integrated in the commodity chains, agricultural will be a more efficient producer of wealth In believing that the market is the way to exit hunger and poverty, IFAP will try to feverishly push policies so that the 'small farmers' have a 'positive" environment to engage in the business of agriculture In essence, IFAP is weeding out poor farmers making the medium to rich famers compete among them while hiring the disenfranchised to work as wage labourers, thus feverishly facilitating steps in agrarian transformation

In promoting both GMs and agrofuels, IFAP is only concerned with farmers who are sufficiently wealthy to engage in such capital-intensive processes As shown for both issues, capital and assets are needed to enter into the type of industrial model Even though IFAP knows that there is unbalance of power between the public and private sector, IFAP still sees that these farmers can benefit As inequitable as the markets have been shown to be, IFAP still has enthusiasm to encourage farmers to engage in the

neoliberal market at the expense of the rural poor So not only are the wealthier farmers in a highly competitive-cut throat system, the implosion will none the less affect the rural poor even more Often not a topic of concern in their literature is the attention paid to agricultural workers

In the long-term, where research and development and regulation have the potential to help the poor, IFAP is promoting path ways that put the private sector in charge From IFAP's literature there is an underlying theme that IFAP believes that the agro-industry is better and efficient at carrying out agriculture than farmers themselves If IFAP promotes that the agro-industry knows best in agriculture then farmers will be pushed out of many aspects of agriculture such as research and development, and as it becomes more profit driven and competitive the government will also have less input and control in the sector itself or have to bend to accommodate the markets The control of the private sector on research and development and the weakness of regulation for both GMs and agrofuels highlight that the rural poor have the potential to be continually under the thumbs of the private sector's agenda

Sadly IFAP is a facilitator of marginalization of the rural poor, even though it has the ironic claim of representing the world's farmers Therefore it is not only important to stop the marginalization of the rural poor, but also important to stop IFAP from claiming to be representing the world's farmers Marginalization of the rural poor by IFAP is demonstrated in its relations with the multiltilateral organizations As pointed out by Desmarais (2003), IFAP has consultative status the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) of the United Nations and participates in consultations with the WHO, IFAD,

ILO, FAO, OECD, WB, and the WTO These institutions continually promote strategies of development that have adverse effects on the rural poor, even though they admit these affects to be a side effect rather than the intention These organizations welcome IFAPs stance as they are synchronous with their own, and in this way they can demonstrate that a 'peaceful' relationship exists between "civil society" and development organizations By using IFAPs approval of GMs and agrofuel production, these agencies can justify why these technologies are being placed high on the development agenda

IFAP's promotion of GMOs and agrofuels has several implication for the rural poor The first is that IFAP has political power and status in the arena of development agencies If IFAP as it has done promotes and rallies for GMs and agrofuels then it sends a boisterous message that both are beneficial to farmers everywhere This can cause a dangerous chain of events for farmer organizations across the globe The second is that because IFAP claims to represents the global civil society, development agencies and increasingly the private sector will have more justification in implementing disastrous plans with GMs and agrofuels as they have gained the consent of IFAP', a farmers' organization, and therefore have more political leverage and influence on their side IFAP's consent would work to deflect criticism that farmers were not consulted on development issues

In contrast to IFAP, Via Campesina is rejecting the neoliberal economic model that is trying to make the peasantry especially poorer demographics of the rural population a relic of history Via Campesina works against proponents of this current model, and works to promote an alternate model to represent the interests of the peasantry

and ultimately the rural poor Via Campesina is not interested in reformation of the current system, it is interested in furthering the efforts for an overall structural change Relative to IFAP, this thesis finds that Via Campesina would benefit the needs of the population who are directly and indirectly linked to agriculture Via Campesina interest are aligned with the issues that are crucial to the concerns of the marginalized sections of agrarian society Via Campesina sees itself as the voice of the peasantry that in the past has not been represented especially by IFAP Via Campesina feels that it represents marginalized groups and therefore advocates and mobilizes on their behalf

Via Campesina is against the neoliberal project as it sees that it is finding more and more ways of destroying the means of production for the peasantry Be it the seeds that peasants will need financial capital to purchase or the land that they are denied accessed to, Via Campesina is vehemently fighting against the structure that is promoting and implementing such strategies Via Campesina is advocating a different model that puts people at the center of agriculture in the context that they themselves work to contribute to securing and maintaining a livelihood in agriculture as they determine As such Via Campesina is set against the privatization of the means of production especially by the agro-industry and vigorously condones any of the means of privatization especially through intellectual property rights and the means of dispossessing people from the land to produce fuel denying them the means to produce food

The influx of corporate control is trying to legally remove the means of production from the rural poor Via Campesina is reiterating that the progress that is needed is not this adherence to industrial agriculture, but should be in peasant driven

agriculture so that they are the ones in charge of their progression rather than molecular biologists, and financial venture capitalists Via Campesina feels that not only that the agro-industry is out to destroy peasant agriculture, but it working to integrate richer peasants into the commodity chains the proletarize the rural poor into a workforce for the specialized labour that is required for this agrarian transformation

Via Campesina is not only vocal against the agro-industry control, it is vocal against the almost-blind faith that is shown by international agencies such as the FAO in the promotion of industrial agriculture and its practices Via Campesina sees that the institutions, such as the FAO, WB and the WTO that are supposed to be protecting the rural poor are actually facilitating even more adverse situations Via Campesina sees that these institutions are fixated on neo-liberal policies that have led to the promotion of destructive strategies-GMOs and agrofuel production just to name a few-as a means to promote development and sees that institutions have been co-opted to serve the purpose of the private sector While Via Campesina does call upon these institutions to make a take a stronger stand against the current system, Via Campesina is not a passive onlooker waiting for a change, it is an agitator trying to turn the wheels of change It understands that when the situation is dire as it currently is, mobilization and structural protest is essential key in pushing the issues Via Campesina still calls on governments and these institutions to reverse the commoditisation of agriculture and support alternatives to get the rural poor out of hunger and poverty

Attention has to be paid to the tensions in Via Campesina As Via Campesina represents a heterogenous mix of the peasantry, fragmentation is inherent in their

strategies Therefore their fight will continue to be two-fold, one in trying to change the structure of neoliberalism so that they can create space for an alternative model and to create the alternative model that is not hampered against the backdrop of neoliberal model For example improving seeds for the peasantry in developing countries may not be helpful if the peasantry still has to increase productivity to stay competitive against subsidized grains from developed countries

Solutions to the problems of neoliberalism are not as black and white as the examples of KRRS and GMOs and the MST splitting over agrofuels demonstrate Caution should be given not to pit the traditional or industrial model as the only two viable options Peasant based agriculture based on agroecological principles works with the traditional model and uses the science of agronomy and ecology as a more sustaining system than the industrial model and more productive than the traditional It has the potential of sustaining and maintaining food and fuel security as well as involving a more democratic process of access to the means of production Efforts to promote this type of agriculture have been pushed by Via Campesina and its allies, yet it has received less attention and funding relative that GMOs and agrofuels

Recommendations

The findings from the analysis in this thesis would propel one to give support to Via Campesina in championing the peasantry and hence the rural poor out of poverty and hunger It is therefore the recommendation that governments both in developed and

developing countries to support the campaigns that Via Campesina are pushing including substantive land reform Governments should also channel trade to promote domestic self-sufficiency in food and fuels over competitive international trade The promotion of GMOs should be stopped among development priorities, but experimentation through farmer led processes should be promoted and supported It is recommended that the peasant agriculture be more generously funded so that more of the rural and urban population is tied to their food systems It is recommended that Via Campesina campaign of stopping agrofuels be supported, the North has to deal with its issues of overconsumption and rework its priorities It has to do this with not only the consumption of fuel, but also the consumption of grains for processed food that leads only to overeating but malnutrition populations As for the private sector, there are those that argue for the freedom of capital across borders to help the poor, I would challenge this and promote free of labour across borders and in this way there is a much more competitive environment that works to equalize between the rich and the poor

Less support, if any, is warranted for IFAP in helping the rural poor out of hunger and poverty Although it is hoped that sufficient evidence has demonstrated that IFAP is a hindrance to such an endeavour, the latest news of its disbandment is in itself a reflection of its ineffectiveness at representing who it claims to represent Writing to elaborate on the recent liquation of IFAP, former Vice President of IFAP Raul Montemayor (2010) wrote

However, aside from the financial problems, there were also structural problems

involving the governance of the organization, systems of internal control and accountability, and responsiveness of the organization to the specific needs and limitations of developing country members There was also some disagreement within the organization on how to address these concerns, which, in the end, led to the unwillingness of most members to put in additional money to revive IFAP

I am confident however that something positive will come out of this Perhaps it was necessary for IFAP to "die" so that it could rise up again as a much stronger organization In the meantime, we maintain our contacts with each other and remain ready to participate in international activities to the extent possible

It is recommended that further research be carried out on IFAP-like farmer organizations that will inevitably replace it as the new "civil society" with consultative status with international agencies They may have another name but if their agenda is the same pushing the Neoliberal agenda then the same reformist attitude and objectives will continue to adversely affect the peasantry and indirectly the poor

Bibliography

Akram-Lodhi, A H, and C Kay (2010) "Surveying the agrarian question (part 1) unearthing foundations, exploring diversity" *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(1) 177-202)

Andree, P (2007) *Genetically Modified Diplomacy* UBC Press Vancouver

Altieri, M A (2004) *Genetic Engineering in Agriculture The myths, environmental risks and alternatives* (2nd ed) Oakland Food First Books

Bernstein, H (2010) *Class Dynamics of Agrarian Change* Fernwood Canada

Blokland, K (1995) "Peasant Alliances and 'Concertation' with Society" *Bulletin of Latin American Research,* 14(2) 159-170

Blommaert, J and C Bulcaen (2000) "Critical Discourse Analysis" *Annu Rev Anthropol* 29 447-66)

Borras, S Jr (2010), "The Politics of Transnational Agrarian Movements," *Development and Change*, 41(5) 771-803

Borras, S Jr, M Edelman and C Kay (2008), "Transnational Agrarian Movements Editors' Introduction," *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 8 (2/3)

Borras, S (2008a) "La Via Campesina and its Global campaign," *Journal of Agrarian Change,* 8(2/3) 258–289

Borras S (2008b), "Reply solidarity Re-examining the ''agrarian movement-NGO'' solidarity\ relations discourse," *Dialect Anthropol*, 32 203–209

Borras S (2004) "La Vía Campesina An Evolving Transnational Social Movement," *TNI Briefing Series* No 6 Amsterdam Transnational Institute

Desmarais, A (2007) *La Vía Campesina Globalization and the Power of Peasants* London Pluto

Desmarais, A, (2003) "The WTO will meet somewhere, sometime And we will be there!" Ottawa The North-South Institute

Conway, G (1998) *The Doubly Green Revolution Food for all in the 21st century* Cornell University Press Ithaca New York

Dauvergne, P and K Neville, (2010), "Forests, food, and fuel in the tropics the uneven social and ecological consequences of the emerging political economy of biofuels," *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(4) 631-660

Edelman, M (2003), "Transnational Peasant and Farmer Movements and Networks," pp 185-220 in Mary Kaldor, Helmut Anheier, and Marlies Glasius (eds), *Global Civil Society* London Oxford University Press

FAO--Food and Agriculture Organization (2010), "Biotechnologies should benefit poor farmers in poor countries Mexico conference takes stock of conventional biotechnology applications in food and agriculture" Retrieved from http //www fao org/ news/story/en/item/40390/icode/ (Sept 24 2010)

FAO (2008) *The State of Food and Agriculture-Biofuels Prospects, Risks and Opportunites* FAO Rome

FAO (2004) *The State of Food and Agriculture-Agricultural Biotechnology Meeting the Needs of the Poor?* FAO Rome

Fernandes, B M , C A Welch and E C Goncalves (2010), "Agrofuel policies in Brazil paradigmatic and territorial disputes," *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(4) 793–819

Franco, J , L Levidow, D Fig, L Goldfarb, M Honicke and M L Mendonca (2010), "Assumptions in the European Union biofuels policy frictions with experiences in Germany, Brazil and Mozambique," *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(4) 661–98

Friedman, H (1982), "The political economy of food the rise and fall of the postwar international food order," *American Journal of Sociology*, 88S 248–86

Friends of the Earth (2005), "Greasy Palms The social and ecological impacts of large-scale oil palm plantation development in Southeast Asia" England

GRAIN (2007) "Agrofuels special issue Biodiversity, Rights and Livelihood" Seedling Spain

Herring, R J (2007a), "The Genomics Revolution and Development Studies Science, Poverty and Politics," Pp 1-30 in J R Herring, (ed), *Transgenics and the poor Biotechnology in Development Studies* New York Routledge

Herring, R J (2007b) "Stealth seeds Bioproperty, Biosafety, Biopolitics" In J R Herring, (ed), *Transgenics and the poor Biotechnology in Development Studies* (p 130-157) New York Routledge

Holt-Gimenez, E and A Shattuck (2011) "Food crises, food regimes and food movements rumblings of reform or tides of transformation?" *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38(1) 109-144

Holt-Giménez Guest Editor, Eric , Bunch, Roland , Irán Vasquez, Jorge , Wilson, John ,

Pimbert, Michel P , Boukary, Bary and Kneen, Cathleen (2010), "Linking farmers' movements for advocacy and practice" *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(1) 203-236

Holt-Gimenez, and I Kenfield (2008), "When Renewable Isn't Sustainable Agrofuels and the Inconvenient Truths Behind the 2007 U S Energy Independence and Security Act," *Food First Policy Brief*, No 13

Holt-Gimenez, M Altieri, and P Rosset (2006), "Ten Reasons Why the Rockefeller and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundations' Alliance for Another Green Revolution Will Not Solve the Problems of Poverty and Hunger in Sub-Saharan Africa," *Food First Policy Brief* No 12 Oakland Food First

Houtart, F (2009) "The scandal of agrofuels in the countries of the South" in La Via Campesina's "Industrial Agrofuels Fuel hunger and poverty " Notebook 1 La Via Campesina Jakarta

IFAP--International Federation of Agricultural Producers (2010a), "About IFAP" Retrieved from http //www ifap org/about-ifap/en/ Accessed Oct 5th 2010

IFAP (2010b) "Commodities" Retrieved from http //www ifap org/ Acccessed Oct 12th 2010

IFAP (2008), "Biofuels a new opportunity for family agriculture," in FAO The state of Food and Agriculture Biofuels Prospects, risks, and opportunities Rome

IFAP (2004) "IFAP recommendations for eliminating rural poverty and achieving food security"

Retrieved from www ifap org Accessed Oct 5th 2010

IFAP (2002) "Industrial concentration in the agri-food sector" Retrieved from

www ifap org Accessed Oct 5th 2010

IFAP (2000) "Land Issues and Property Rights" Retrieved from www ifap org Accessed Oct 5th 2010

IFAP(1998), "Farmers and new concerns on Biotechnologies," Policy statement adopted at the 33rd World Farmers' Congress of IFAP Manila, Philippines

IFAP (1996), "Farmers' strategy for agricultural development and World food security" Retrieved from www ifap org Accessed Oct 5th 2010

IFAP (n d), "Statement by the farmers of the World on 'Facing climate and energy challenges through sustainable bioenergy' Retrieved from www ifap org Accessed Oct 5th 2010

Josling, T and J Babinard (1999), "The Political Economy of GMOs Emerging disputes over food safety, the environment and biotechnology" Institute for International Studies Stanford University

Liodakis, G (2003), "The Role of Biotechnology in the Agro-Food system and the Socialist Horizon," *Historical Materialism*,11(1) 37-74

Lipton, M (2007) "Plant Breeding and Poverty Can transgenic seeds replicate the 'Gree Revolution' as a source of Gains for the poor?" pp 31-62 in J R Herring, (ed), *Transgenics and the poor Biotechnology in Development Studies* New York Routledge New York

Martínez-Torres, M and P Rosset (2010), "La Vía Campesina the birth and evolution of a transnational social movement" *Journal of Peasant Studies,* 37(1) 49-175

McMichael P (2010) McMichael, P 2010 "Agrofuels in the food regime" *The Journal*

of Peasant Studies, 37(4) 609-29

McMichael, P (2009), "A food regime genealogy," *Journal of Peasant Studies,* 36(1) 139-169

McMichael, P (2008) "Peasants make their own history but not just as they please ", *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 8 (2/3) 205-228

Mikkelsen, B (2005) *Methods for Development Work and Research a new guide for practioners* 2nd Edition Sage Publications California

Montemayor, R (2010), "Response to "Liquidation of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers" Retrieved from http //dgroups org/ViewDiscussion aspx?c =7233a2e1-1b39-407f-8479-296fa57edf28&i=69a265f0-db36-4b03-a352-67e7c9ef02e6 Accessed March 2nd 2011Newell, P 92008) "Trade and Biotechnology in Latin America Democratization, Contestation and the Politics of Mobilization" *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 8(2/3) 345–376

O'Brien, Robert, Anne Marie Goetz, Jan Aart Scholte and Marc Williams (2000) *ContestingGlobal Governance Multilateral Economic Institutions and Global Social Movements* Cambridge Cambridge University Press

Paarlberg, R (2008) *Starved for Science Biotechnology is being kept out of Africa* Harvard University Press

Pray, C E and A Naseem (2007) "Supplying crop biotechnology to the poor Opportunities and Constraints" Pp 192-217 in J R Herring, (Ed), *Transgenics and the poor Biotechnology in Development Studies* New York Routledge

Pye , O (2010), "The Biofuel Vonnection, Transnational activism and the palm oil boom

The Journal of Peasant Studies, 37(4) 851-74

Scoones, I (2008) "Mobilizing Against GM Crops in India, South Africa and Brazil" *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 8(2/3) 315–344

Shanin, T (1966) "Peasantry as a Political Factor" *Sociological Review* 14(1) 5-27

Staaz, J (1998) "What is agricultural transformation?" http //www aec msu edu/fs2/ag_transformation/Def_Trans htm Acccessed April 11th 2011

Thies J and M Devare (2008) "An ecological assessment of transgenic crops " Pp 97-129 in J R Herring (ed), *Transgenics and the Poor Biotechnology in Development Studies* New York Routledge

Uphoff, N T (2007) "Agroecological Alternatives Capitalising on existing genetic potentials " Pp 218-36 In J R Herring (ed), *Transgenics and the poor Biotechnology in Development Studies* New York Routledge

Van Dijk, T (2003) "Critical Discourse Analysis", Pp352-71 In D Schiffrin and H Hamilton (eds), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* USA Blackwell Publishing

Van Dijk, T (1995) "Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis" *Japanese Discourse* 1 17-27

Veltmeyer, H and J Petras (2008) "Peasants in an era of Neoliberal Globalization" *Revista Theomai* 18 (4-29)

Vermeulen, S and L Cotula (2010), "Over the heads of local people consultation, consent, and recompense in large-scale land deals for biofuels projects in Africa," *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(4) 899–916

Via Campesina (2008a) "Protocol on Biosecurity and the Convention on Biodiversity No to the privatization of biodiversity! Family Farming, a solution to the challenge of biodiversity and climate change" Retrieved from www viacampesina org Accessed Oct 5th 2010

Vía Campesina (2008b), "La Via Campesina Policy Documents," 5th Conference 16-23rd Mozambique

Via Campesina (2008c), "Small farmers feed the world Industrial agrofuels fuel hunger and poverty" Retrieved from www viacampesina org Accessed Oct 5th 2010

Via Campesina (2006), "La Vía Campesina says no to the Legalization of Death" Retrieved from www viacampesina org Accessed Oct 5th 2010

Via Campesina (2002), "Proposals of Via Campesina for sustainable, farmer based agricultural production Published at the occasion of the WSSD summit in Johannesburg" Retrieved from www viacampesina org Accessed Oct 5th2010

Via Campesina (2001), "The Position of Via Campesina on Biodiversity, Biosafety and Genetic Resources," *Development* 44 (4) 47–51

Via Campesina (2000a), "For a farmer-driven research and real dialogue in the GFAR" Retrieved from www viacampesina org Accessed Oct 5th 2010

Via Campesina (2000b) "Biodiversity and Genetic Resources" Retrieved from www viacampesina org Accessed Oct 5th 2010

Weis, T (2007) *The Global Food Economy The Battle for the Future of Farming* Halifax Fernwood Publishing

White, B and A Dasgupta (2010) Agrofuels Capitalism a view from political economy *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(4) 593–607

World Bank (2008) *World Bank Development Report Agriculture for Development* Washington DC World Bank