

# **New Directions in Food Sovereignty: A South-North Youth Perspective**

---



**The South-North Youth Policy Project  
May 3-7, 2009**

Jamaican Self-Help (CAN)  
Horizons of Friendship (CAN)  
Seaview Garden Youth Council (JAM)  
Caribbean Youth Summit (JAM)  
Oscar Arnulfo Romero Community Centre (NIC)

---

# Table of Contents

---

South North Youth Policy Project.....	1
The Document.....	2
Food Sovereignty.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Manifestations of Food Insecurity.....	5
Barriers to Food Sovereignty.....	8
Policy and Civil Society Recommendations.....	16
References.....	24



# South-North Youth Policy Project

---

In May 2009, youth from Nicaragua, Canada and Jamaica converged outside of Peterborough, Ontario to discuss the global food system. The conference, titled “New Directions in Food Sovereignty: A South-North Youth Perspective”, was the result of nearly two years of international coordination and research. The South-North Youth Policy Project, with participants from Jamaican Self-Help (Peterborough, Canada), Horizons of Friendship (Cobourg, Canada), Caribbean Youth Summit (Kingston, Jamaica), Seaview Garden Youth Council (Kingston, Jamaica) and the Oscar Arnulfo Romero Community Center (Nandaime, Nicaragua) aimed to facilitate dialogue between the North and South and begin contributing to the movement to end global poverty. Leading up to the conference, each country delegation researched their own national agricultural policies and presented a “country overview” at the beginning of the conference. An understanding of the international food system was driven by these presentations as well as the input of experts on gender, multinational corporations, international food systems and the environment. The conference was participatory and aimed at understanding and finding collective solutions to the global challenge of food insecurity. It was recognized that each country had multiple roles within the food system as consumers, producers and players in a complex international food system.

# The Document

---

One of the key goals of the conference was the creation of an inclusive document that could be shared with decision makers and civil society. In order to achieve this goal a participatory process was used to synthesize the research and expert opinions that were shared throughout the conference.

The sections of the document were agreed upon; and then tri-country teams were created to write each section. The small teams produced drafts of each section that were shared with the larger group in round table discussions.

This document is the product of those discussions and includes the perspectives of Nicaraguan, Jamaican and Canadian participants.

It is our hope that both governments and citizens will reflect on the problems and possible solutions presented in this document.

# Food Sovereignty

---

Food is a vital requirement, fundamental right and an overall universal need. Proper nutrition and access to high quality food is imperative for the survival and development of all humans.

Food sovereignty refers to the rights and responsibilities of all people regardless of race, gender, culture, or geographic location to access appropriate food of the highest quality. It involves the use of traditional, innovative, adaptive, environmentally friendly and ethical technology to increase localized and sustainable food production.

Food sovereignty involves the protection, preservation and distribution of our global agricultural resources. An equitable food system based on the principals of food sovereignty would include the diverse opinions of all places and social sectors. In order to ensure food sovereignty, governments, multinational corporations and multilateral organizations from all nations must work together to formulate policies that are safe, economical and accessible to all. A commitment to food sovereignty would therefore ensure stability within the global food system and provide a promising solution to hunger and malnutrition.

**“Food sovereignty refers to the rights and responsibilities of all people regardless of race, gender, culture, or geographic location to access appropriate food of the highest quality...”**

# Introduction

---

Between 2007 and 2008, people all over the world, from Bangladesh to Panama, from Egypt to Russia, took to the streets to protest record-high food prices. Within a few months, the price of rice, corn, wheat and various other staple diet items had risen so high as to make purchasing food unaffordable for

**The current food system has contributed to an overall increase in: mass hunger, malnutrition, volatile prices and civil unrest.**

an additional 50 million people (Akram-Lodhi, Presentation, May 5, 2009). Upon an initial glance, many attributed the food crisis to not enough food being produced, however according to global statistics the supply of food has outstripped the human population since the Green Revolution (Akram-Lodhi, Presentation, May 5 2009). The cause of hunger is not how much food is produced, rather the system in place to distribute food. The current food system has contributed to an overall increase in mass hunger, malnutrition, volatile prices and civil unrest. The system is based on a neoliberal market which encourages corporate monopoly and the industrialization of agriculture while simultaneously removing ownership from small scale producers and undermines consumers capacity to make real choices about how their food is produced. As stated in the Pacific Ecologist, the current food crisis faced by the world is the "result of the long-standing refusal of governments and intergovernmental organizations to respect, protect and fulfil the right to food, and total impunity for systematic violations of this right among others" (Pacific Ecologist, 2009). Since access to food is a basic human necessity, it can and must be a right that is enforced and protected by governments.

# 1.0 Manifestations of Food Insecurity

## 1.1

### Hunger, Food prices and Civil Unrest

Hunger has always existed, however, it has been exacerbated during the past few years due to rising food prices. Hunger is a function of poverty – people become hungry because they lack the resources to purchase or grow food; therefore, marginalized and poor populations are more likely to suffer from hunger and malnutrition. It is estimated that 852 million people around the world are undernourished, and 815 million of them live in developing countries (Gonzalez, 2004). When food prices rise, those living on the brink of food insecurity become unable to afford food for themselves and their families, increasing the rates of malnutrition and hunger. Malnutrition often leads to stunted physical and mental development, and death; 24,000 children die from hunger related diseases every day.

**“The median income of the poor in Nicaragua currently covers only 24% of the cost of the basic food basket, resulting in an inability to purchase required food, therefore resulting in higher levels of hunger...”**

#### **Example 1.1 - Nicaragua - ‘Hambre 0’**

Example 1.1 - Nicaragua - ‘Hambre 0’

The program going by the emblematic name of “Hambre Cero” (hunger zero) is a food program that is attempting to reenergize local small scale agriculture. The programme gives “protein goods” or “goods generating proteins” (seed or livestock) to 75,000 rural families. The capital goods delivered to every poor family are worth \$1,500US and include goods, training and the execution costs of the program. The goods could include: animals (cows, pigs, and chickens); seeds and vegetative material as pasture or other animal food (mulberry, moringa, or blackwood trees, among others); fruit trees, trees meant for reforestation or medicinal plants; prepared food for the first months, especially for the pigs; materials to build stalls and henhouses; a biodigestor to produce gas from the animals’ manure; a multi-nutritional block (lasting ten month per cow) to supply minerals and energy concentrates; training for the profitable food program’s various activities (rural economy, agricultural practices to increase performance/capacity, business culture/knowledge, animal health and food, direct democracy at home and within the community, agro ecology and environment, environmental hygiene, associatively and self-management, credit, commercialization and agribusiness.

Why 75,000 families? Because, according to the most recent farming census, there are 75,000 families of producers active in the country who own land in a way or another but own no cow nor pig. The proposal is to deliver 15,000 goods per year to an equal number of families until all 75,000 families have received one in about five years.

# 1.0 Manifestations of Food Insecurity

---

In describing the current context in Nicaragua the delegation shared UN statistics which state that 46 per cent of the Nicaraguan population live in poverty and 15.1 per cent live in extreme poverty. The median income of the poor in Nicaragua currently covers only 24 per cent of the cost of the basic food basket, resulting in an inability to purchase required food, leading to hunger.

In Jamaica, the problem manifests itself differently as the majority of food that is consumed is imported from abroad and many Jamaicans are unable to purchase nutritious

**“60 nations are currently facing food shortages and high food prices, and in some places, people have to spend close to 80 per cent of their income on food...”**

food such as fresh produce. Thus, due to the consumption of unhealthy and cheap alternatives, Jamaica is witnessing increasing rates of obesity amongst its population. Canada, the richest country of the three case studies, is not immune to hunger. Like Jamaica, Canada is facing increasing rates of obesity. In all three countries the most marginalized populations are targets for food insecurity – indigenous populations, single mother households, children, the disabled, and the unemployed are often hungry, or rely on food banks. According to Food Banks Canada, reliance on food banks has increased 6 per cent between 1997 and 2008: 14.5 per cent of food bank clients in Canada represent the working poor, and 37.1 per cent of food bank clients are under 18 years of age (Food Bank Canada, 2009).

Between 2007 and 2008, the price of wheat doubled and the price of rice tripled in four months. According to the United Nation’s Food and Agriculture Organization, the food price index, which measures the movement of wholesale prices of meat, dairy, cereals, sugar, and oils and fats reached its highest price in August 2008, and has risen 82 per cent in two years (BBC1). As stated earlier, the result of higher food prices means that people are unable to purchase food, causing them to become food insecure. As prices rise, people must spend a larger portion of their income on food, however all too often they are unable to afford it and are forced to do without; according to a UN World Food Program official, “there is food on the shelves, but people are being priced out of the market” (CBC1). Sixty nations are currently facing food shortages and high food prices, and in some places, people have to spend close to 80 per cent of their income on food. The level of frustration and concern among those unable to access food has been rising and has reached a boiling point.



---

People have begun to protest the inequality in access to food. Riots and protests have broken out around the world the civil unrest is causing strain and tension within and among nations (Rosset, 2009).

**Example 1.2 - Gender and Food**

Currently over 50 per cent of the world's food is produced by women. The majority of this food, however, is not produced to enter the market, but to be consumed at the household and community level (Storey). A large portion of the human population would become even less food secure if this food were not available. Female farmers, while constituting the majority of farmers worldwide, are often underfed, and undervalued in the decision making process (Jackson, Mitchell). Due to the female role of caring for their families, women are usually the first to sacrifice their own needs and usually bear the brunt of the burden felt by a lack of, or inability to access, food. Often women are the last to eat and the first to suffer from malnutrition, which leads to decreased maternal health.

# 2.0 Barriers to Food Sovereignty

---

## 2.1 Neoliberal Market

In recent decades, an international regime has been created which promotes the ideology of free trade and neoliberalism. The creation of international institutions such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) have worked to institutionalize the main ideas of neoliberalism:

- promote free markets by increasing trade,
- decrease subsidization,
- decrease tariffs and quotas on imports,
- and decrease government control

Impositions on developing countries through Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) by the World Bank and IMF, and internationally binding agreements by the WTO all promote the conditions listed above. They are, however, drastically different from the measures in place in developed countries, whose governments highly subsidize farmers, control tariffs and quotas, all in order to protect their national markets. More precisely, as stated by Gonzalez, free trade, is a misnomer. It is a “double standard that permits protectionism in developed countries while requiring developing countries to open their markets to highly subsidized foreign competition” (Gonzalez, 2004).

**“Free trade is a misnomer; it is a double standard that permits protectionism in developed countries while requiring developing countries to open their markets to highly subsidized foreign competition...”**

In the Global South, institutions such as the World Bank, IMF and WTO have forced countries to “close marketing boards and shut down mechanisms for market stabilization and price guarantees for food producers...[and]..forced [them] to abolish food reserves and eliminate import controls” (Rosset, 2009). In the 1980s, the World Bank and the IMF forced any country in need of a loan to restructure their economy according to neoliberal

## 2.0 Barriers to Food Sovereignty

---

principles: the conditionality of aid “undermined local and national economies, eroded the environment and damaged local food systems” . As well, it “facilitated [the] development of corporate oligarchies and oligopolies and break-neck corporate concentration along the entire food chain; allowed predatory commodity speculation and financial market adventurism; and enabled international finance institutions and bilateral aid programmes to devastate sustainable food production and livelihood systems” (Pacific Ecologist, June 22, 2009).

Due to free trade, food has increasingly become a commodity on the market and countries have become increasingly specialized, producing only certain crops. These cash crops are especially vulnerable to the market fluctuations inherent to the neoliberal economic system. Developing countries are subject to aid and loan conditionalities and do not have the fiscal leverage to protect their farmers can do very little to deal with this problem. In developing and developed countries alike the fluctuations of the neoliberal markets effect the small scale, often poor, farms the most; effectively pushing them out of the market. Thus, as neoliberalism continues, the number of family farms continues to decrease, even in Canada, where the “number of Canadians described as “primarily employed” in agriculture had fallen by 26 per cent between 1998 and 2001” (Storey, 2002).

### 2.2 Food Aid and Food Dumping

Two key characteristics of the neoliberal food system that have had a detrimental impact to the food system are food dumping and food aid. Food aid is the giving of money or food to a country, which is usually bought from outside the country in question and imported, especially when the “food aid” is tied. As seen before, hunger is a function of poverty, not simply food security or access to food. Food aid, while able to assist in a crisis, cannot solve the issue of hunger. The effects of food aid on the developing country is often locally depressed prices, undercutting local farmers, which in turn reduces domestic food production and eventually creates a dependence on cheap imports. While food aid creates immediate markets through donor government financing for corporations, the recipient country becomes totally dependent on foreign food supplies, harming local farm economies (Rosset, 2009).

**“The effects of food aid...  
reduces domestic food  
production and eventually  
creates a dependence on  
cheap imports...”**

## 2.0 Barriers to Food Sovereignty

Food dumping has very similar effects on local or national food production levels. Food dumping occurs when subsidized farmers in developed countries produce more than the demand for their products – the surplus is then sold through the global market at artificially low prices because of the subsidies, effectively flooding the market and greatly decreasing the price of the produce. This in turn hurts local farmers who are unable to compete with the artificially low prices, essentially pricing them out of the market. Food dumping and food aid “destroys local systems” (Rosset, 2009), and “reinforces pre-existing patterns of trade and production that undermine the livelihoods of rural small-holders, [and] degrade the natural resource base necessary for food production” (Gonzalez, 2004).

### **Example 2.1 - Trade Imbalances**

In Nicaragua, liberalized trade has had significant ramifications as evident in the bean market. Currently most of the beans produced in Nicaragua are being shipped to El Salvador where they undergo processing before re-entering Nicaragua’s market. This poses as an economic loss for Nicaragua who is unable to gain the potential profit of value added products.

In Jamaica, circumstances are similar to Nicaragua. Fresh coconuts are exported out of the country, manufactured into Coconut oil, and re-imported at a higher price. Farmers in Jamaica find it difficult to break even because the amount of resources that they invest significantly exceeds their returns. Imbalances in trade limit Nicaragua and Jamaica’s economic growth, while simultaneously undermining their food sovereignty.

Although not immediately recognizable, Canadian farmers suffer from similar processes. This is demonstrated in the apple industry, where Canadians are now spending 75 per cent more on imports than they are earning on exporting apples. Partially, this can be attributed to the flood of low cost imported apples.

### **Example 2.2 - Canada’s Agricultural Policy**

In the 1980s, Canada began to reformulate its agricultural policy in light of a new era of liberalized and global trade – trade became the key priority, as well as the solution to agricultural problems. Agreements such as CUSTA, NAFTA, and those under the WTO have been serving as Canada’s prescription to farmers, even though Canadian farmers (as well as farmers all around the world) have found it increasingly difficult to get fair prices for their crops. Canada doesn’t have an agriculture policy; traditional farm

**continued on next page...**

## 2.0 Barriers to Food Sovereignty

---

infrastructure such as transportation assistance, and central desk marketing for produce such as pork, oats and staple items have been dismantled. Instead Canada has a trade policy posing as an agricultural policy. The benefits of a system reliant on trade are felt primarily by corporations who receive the main portion of the profits, while small Canadian farmers struggle to make a profit. (Storey, p. 190).

### 2.3 Biofuels

In recent years, a markedly prominent example of the commodification and industrialization of food by the international market has been the use of crops and land for agriculturally-derived biofuels. In light of growing international concern circling the environment, climate change and energy security, there has been a demand for more innovation in the development of alternatives to fossil fuels. Energy converted from biomass – a term which refers to any biological (sugar-based) material - fits the bill: biofuels are by definition a renewable resource, and, by some arguments, produce less net carbon emissions.

Most biofuels in production are derived from corn, soy or sugarcane. However, the amount of crop needed for fuel conversion is staggering: by one figure, the amount of corn needed to produce enough fuel to fill the gas tank of a mid sized car would feed one person for a year (Akram-Lodhi, Presentation, May 5 2009). Because of growing industry demand, large areas of land are needed to sustain mass mono culture for these crops, not only discouraging biodiversity and encouraging the industrialization of agricultural land, but designating agricultural capacity away from the production of food to the production of raw material for biotechnology. In current agribusiness, a semantic shift has been made in how agricultural product is viewed as commodity. The term "food" has been increasingly replaced by "biomass," (Mooney, Presentation, May 6 2009) a word which not only suggests more versatility in patents and in commercial prospects, but which emphasizes that - according to the global agricultural market - crops are not, by priority, something to eat. According to a 2008 World Bank report, biofuels pushed global food prices up 75%, playing a prominent role in the development of the food crisis.

This manifestation of agribusiness also threatens local agricultural practices and rights, especially in the Global South where crop production for biofuels is concentrated. Land designated as "marginal" and therefore suitable for large-scale mono culture is often already in use by indigenous pastoralist or small farmers (Pacific Ecologist, 2002), displacing local food producers and communities. Deforestation, erosion and industrial runoff threaten ecosystems and future agricultural capacity. In addition, genetically modified crops designed for conversion into fuel are inedible, and are grown with the inherent risk of transgenetically contaminating local edible crops (Ribeiro, 2006).

# 2.0 Barriers to Food Sovereignty

---

## 2.4 Corporate Control

Another cause of food insecurity is the growing corporate control of food production and the food system. Multinational corporations (MNCs) increasingly control land, seeds, pesticides and the market. In 2007, the top 3 MNCs were Monsanto, Dupont and Syngenta, at which point they controlled 44 per cent of the seed market (Mooney, Presentation, May 6 2009). During recent years, investors have put more and more money into food-based MNCs and expect to see investment results – corporations, therefore must maximize their profits (Jackson & Mitchell, 2009). To do so, MNCs must make sure that they occupy as large a space on the market as possible, sometimes using dubious practices, and all too often at the expense of small farmers and consumers. The “hoarding and price speculation by private grain-trading corporations like Cargill [has] played a big role in increasing costs

**“Canadian farmers (as well as farmers all around the world) have found it increasingly difficult to get fair prices for their crops...”**

of food” (Rosset, 2009). For example in Mexico, the MNC Cargill bought large shares of the corn harvest at 1,650 pesos per ton, and after having done so they with-held the corn from the market, therefore creating a false shortage which drove prices upwards, in excess of 3,500 pesos per ton, at which point they resold the corn at artificially high prices; Cargill made profits, but consumers paid the price (Rosset, 2009).

MNCs also gain control of the market through patenting their products, including seeds and pesticides, and by influencing institutions such as the WTO to secure their control of seed and food production. For example, the WTOs Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures Agreement precludes countries that ban or restrict genetically modified (GM) seeds (Gonzalez, 2009). According to the agreement, any country that does not allow GM seeds to be purchased or produced are in violation of the WTOs internationally binding agreement, and therefore can be sued by MNCs. This agreement, which gives favour to MNCs and ‘free trade’, removes sovereignty from the people in question by not allowing them to choose which products enter the country. MNCs hold an iron grip “over our food systems, [which was] made possible by the runaway trade liberalization and privatization during the neoliberal decades of the 1980s and 1990s” (Gonzalez).

## 2.0 Barriers to Food Sovereignty

---

MNCs, which think of food production as the production of biomass, have the ability and resources necessary to flood and control markets, damaging local food production and making communities and nations dependent on imports. Corporate control has a devastating impact on nations; approximately \$35 billion per year is lost in developing countries due to “declining market share for agricultural products as a consequence of the subsidies and import barriers” (Gonzalez, 2009). As well, corporate control and the commodification of food has decreased the number of small scale farmers around the globe as they are either unable to afford the corporate fees for patented goods, as well as to buy the machinery and pesticides necessary to compete in the market, or get trapped in a cycle of loans and debts. Moreover, large scale farms are pressured to only purchase and produce agribusiness’ products, locking them into a costly payment cycle and reducing the genetic diversity of the cash crops that were originally grown.

### 2.5 Industrialization of agriculture

The Green Revolution, which came about with technological advances to increase crop yields, was a supply-side oriented solution to keep food production above population growth. However, as described earlier, hunger is not the result of not enough food being produced, rather it is a result of how food is distributed. The Green Revolution increased producers’ reliance on technological innovations such as GM seeds and pesticides, therefore favour-

ing wealthy farmers due to increasing the capital investment required to grow crops. Large scale farms use pesticides and chemicals in order to opti-

**“Farmers must purchase seeds and the compatible pesticides from the patent holders, which can be extremely costly...often leading to debt...”**

mize their yield and to meet the expectations of agribusiness, governments and the international market as well as to remain competitive. Farmers, therefore, must remain on the cutting edge of agricultural technology. Among developing countries, the quantity of pesticides used has doubled every decade from 1945 to 1985, demonstrating the agricultures

## 2.0 Barriers to Food Sovereignty

---

increased dependence on technological innovation to increase yields. The technology used however, is patented by MNCs, such as Monsanto and Dupont, which means farmers must purchase seeds and the compatible pesticides from the patent holders. This can be extremely costly, and create cyclical purchasing, often leading to debt. In addition, the technology itself rarely has the long-term intended benefits: over time crop yields do not significantly rise, and the dominant production pattern of monoculture eventually erodes the quality of the soil, decreasing yields. During the past 16 years, Nicaraguan farmers have grown increasingly dependent on the use of pesticides, insecticides and improved varieties of seeds as part of the technology packages promoted by neoliberal policies, however they have not witnessed significant benefits and continually face rising costs for the inputs used in conventional farming (Rosset, 2009).

While being pushed towards industrial practices, Nicaraguan farmers often still save their creole and native seeds because they have more trust in and knowledge of the origins of such seeds. The native seeds also ensure that the farmers can diversify their crops so as not to rely on monoculture, which often results in lost strands and variety of foods and increased dependency on one or two staple items, making the crops more susceptible to diseases or drought.

### **Example 2.4 Agroecological Food Production**

Due to the industrialization of farming practices, the world is currently losing knowledge of traditional agroecological practices, which are usually less straining on the environment and humans. The current food system is unsustainable and inefficient due to its harsh use of the land and its promotion of large-scale farming and monoculture practices. In order to shift the food system to make it healthy for the environment as well as for ourselves, the system must be "based on respect for nature, local cultures and traditional farming knowledge", which, according to Rosset, is actually more productive, better drought resistances, and uses less fossil fuel (Rosset). Currently the majority of the food produced in the world is produced by small farmers providing for their families and communities, without which the majority of the world's population would go hungry. Therefore it is important to not only keep small-scale farmers, but to promote healthy practices and exchange of information, as well as ensuring that small-scale farmers have rights to the land that they farm; the right to food is an extension of the right to land, as well as the right to choose the way in which food is produced and consumed (Akram-Lodhi).



## 2.0 Barriers to Food Sovereignty

---

### **Example 2.5 - “Eat what you grow, grow what you eat”**

The Eat What You Grow Campaign has been one of the more popular messages from the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries of Jamaica. Since its conceptualization in 2008 by the Minister Dr. Christopher Tufton, hundreds of Jamaicans have been sensitized about the multiple benefits to be gained from this policy, including saving foreign exchange, promoting employment and creating a healthier population.

The campaign has been successful in reaching people through local plays, media messages, and news reports and is frequently recited by many Jamaican vendors. People have been urged to become involved in the campaign. For example the Minister has urged parents to sensitize their children to the need to eat more locally produced foods in an effort for the future sustainability of our agrarian society.

The multiplier impact of making farming sustainable and viable is believed to transcend the agricultural sector, and spins off into every other sector. The Ministry has directed much of their campaign to sensitize the younger population, as well as the older ones, to the advantages of eating local produce, and said the school garden programme has been fundamental to sensitizing the youth. In 2008 through the 4-H Clubs, 422 school gardens were established in a similar number of schools exceeding the target of 300. The objective over three years is to have a garden in every primary and high school, and to establish a 4-H Club in each as well.

# 3.0 Policy and Civil Society Recommendations

---

During the conference, SNYPP created country-specific recommendations, broken into actions for civil society (CS) and actions for governments, listed on the following pages. The “proper duty of government is to legislate, regulate, and enforce regulation in the interest of the citizens of the country, not to augment corporate profits” (Storey, p. 195). If the governments of Canada, Nicaragua and Jamaican are to fulfill this duty, they must rethink their place in the food system and how they can promote a system that is equitable, sustainable, and most importantly, based on food as a basic human right.

### 3.1 Canadian Policy and Civil Society Recommendations

	Government	Civil Society
Communication and Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Integrate agriculture in primary and secondary curriculum in existing subjects</li> <li>-Encourage agricultural or horticultural activities as a contribution towards compulsory secondary school volunteering</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Provide incentives for extracurricular activities within schools and communities, such as school gardens</li> </ul>
Access to Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Institute mandatory labelling of all genetically modified food products in Canadian markets (in consideration of European models already in place)</li> <li>-Enforce a clear and more all-encompassing advertisement and promotion of ingredients of food products – particularly in regards to “organic” labelling</li> <li>-Effect initiative of country of origin labelling (Truth In Labelling” bill)</li> <li>-Include travel miles (distance that product has travelled) in regulation</li> </ul>	
Environment and Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Re-consider Bill C-33 and the impact of biofuels on food production</li> <li>-Pesticides – limit use, consider safety concerns on workers, put pressure on transnational corporations to honour internationally recognized (UN, ILO) standards with regards to pesticide use (not selling pesticides and insecticides that are banned in Canada in other countries)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support the campaign to ban Terminator Seeds</li> <li>-Encourage and support local initiatives to promote “heirloom” seeds</li> <li>-Support local food cooperatives, and buy food locally whenever possible</li> </ul>
Health and Nutrition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Reconsider Bill C-27 and other efforts to privatize food inspection</li> <li>-Recognise food and water as rights, not commodities</li> </ul>	

# 3.0 Policy and Civil Society Recommendations

---

<p>Trade and Commerce</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Provide incentives for small farmers – subsidies or tax breaks for small-scale farmers as opposed to large-scale corporations</li> <li>-Waive or subsidise organic farming fees and revisit regulations around organic farming certificate to make it more accessible to small-scale farming</li> <li>-Continue moving away from “food dumping” of surplus Canadian food products in the international market, ensure that measures to untying food aid are continued responsibly and monitored.</li> </ul>	
<p>Community Ownership and Empowerment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Consult with multiple and diverse voices in agricultural policy decisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Support local and regional food charters aimed at implementing food sovereignty in a Canadian context at a grassroots level</li> <li>-Support urban agriculture</li> </ul>

# References

---

Akram-Lodhi, Haroon. (2007). "Land Reform, Rural Social Relations and the Peasantry." *Journal of Agrarian Change*. 7,4: 554-562.

"Food sovereignty key to resolving world's food emergency.(SUSTAINABLE DIRECTIONS)." *Pacific Ecologist* 17 (Summer 2009): 56(5)

Gonzalez, Carmen. (2004). "Trade liberalization, food security, and the environment: the neoliberal threat to sustainable rural development". *Transnational Law and Contemporary Problems*. 14, 2: 419-80.

Jackson, Anthony & Mitchell, Eve. (2004)"Food Sovereignty: time to choose sides".

Potter, Clive & Tilzey, Mark. (2007). "Agricultural Multifunctionality, environmental sustainability and the WTO: Resistance or accomodation to the neoliberal project for agriculture?" *Geoforum*, 38: 1290-1303.

Rosset, Peter. (2009). "Report: Food Crisis. Food Sovereignty in Latin America: Confronting the New Crisis". *NACLA Report on the Americas*.

Storey, Shannon. (2002) "Neoliberal Trade Policies in Agricultura and the Destruction of Global Food Security: Who Can Feed the World?" *Canadian Women Studies*. 21,3: 190-195.

Suppan, Steve. (2008). "Challenges for Food Sovereignty". *The Fletcher Forum of World Affairs*. 32,1: 111-123.