TOGETHER, WE HOLD THE FUTURE IN OUR HANDS

2011-2016 PROGRAM
CHANGE AND CONTINUITY

This year’s campaign marks the beginning of DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE’s new education program for 2011–2016.

For the past five years, we have focused our efforts on the exploitation of natural resources. Whether related to the mining industry, to the conversion of farmland for agroindustrial use, or to the threats posed by the privatization of water resources, these issues are at the heart of the challenges faced by people in many countries of the world.

This new program is an opportunity for DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE to take a new approach to these issues.

This new approach, centred on the concept of ecological justice, will allow us, among other things, to make the connections between ecological issues, agricultural production and the exploitation of natural resources.

In order to do that, we must acknowledge the historic and current responsibility of developed countries for the environmental destruction that we see today. The countries most affected are those least responsible for that destruction. Our western way of life must become more ecologically sustainable.

We are called to be in solidarity with people in the Global South who want to improve their standard of living by sharing the knowledge and technical resources that they need, while at the same time, not imposing a model of development that is based on consumption and economic growth at any cost.

These are some of the issues we will address in our 2011 to 2016 education program under the banner of ecological justice.

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

The concept of ecological justice implies the recognition that our planet’s resources are finite and that there is a moral obligation to make fair, responsible and sustainable use of those resources so that they can meet the basic needs of all people as well as those of future generations. Among those needs, the ability of people to feed themselves is a priority.

By 2050, with an estimated population of nine billion human beings, food production will have to increase by 70 percent to ensure food security for all.

Today, more than two billion people are undernourished. Will we be able to meet the challenge of feeding the world while trying to address the ecological health of our planet and the catastrophes already happening because of climate change?

This year, we will explore the models of agricultural production at use in the world today and their impact on both the environment and the living conditions of the people who practise them.
Repeated droughts, more frequent torrential rain, rising sea levels, melting glaciers. The effects of human activity on the health of our planet are increasingly visible.

In 1988 the United Nations (UN) established the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to co-ordinate the growing body of scientific research linking human activity and climate change.

In 1990, the IPCC delivered its first report. In response to its alarming conclusions, the UN established a framework for negotiations to develop a global convention to address climate change.

Two years later, 154 countries (now 192) signed the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, which makes recommendations to countries about reducing their greenhouse gas emissions. It established an annual global conference called the “Conference of the Parties” (COP).

Rio, The Hague, Marrakech, Montreal, Copenhagen, Cancun—all cities which have hosted international negotiations to find a solution to the crisis of climate change. The best known is Kyoto, where the protocol bearing its name established the goal for developed countries to reduce their levels of greenhouse gas emissions by 5 percent from their 1990 levels by 2012. The international community is far from achieving this goal today, and must now focus on the post-Kyoto era.

The slow pace of decision-making may seem surprising. The negotiations are complex, in part because all of the countries must agree on a treaty that will limit their sovereignty in defining their own development, a treaty that will force them to limit their level of greenhouse gas emissions and, therefore, the use of fossil fuels and pollution-producing industrial processes.

But the urgent need for action requires a strong political will and it means that members of civil society must make their voices clearly heard. Only then can we hope to achieve a post-Kyoto agreement and to develop mechanisms to effectively reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

**NOW IS THE TIME FOR ACTION**
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**CLIMATE CHANGE NEGOTIATIONS**

**THE OPPOSITION**
The economies of Russia, Saudi Arabia and the Sudan are based on the exploitation of fossil fuels. These countries are the most opposed to any binding agreement and are asking for financial compensation to convert their economies.

**THE NON-COMMITTED**
The United States and China say that they are committed to the Kyoto Protocol even though the United States has not ratified it. They are opposed to limiting their greenhouse gas emissions and will not accept any measures that interfere with their sovereignty.

**THE BYSTANDERS**
Canada, Australia, India and Brazil are not particularly active in reducing their emissions. Although the populations of these countries are aware of the importance of reducing their greenhouse gas emissions, the governments are not doing anything to promote policies that would enable them to do so.

**THE VICTIMS**
The G77 unites the countries of the Global South that are the least responsible for climate change but the most threatened by it. Within this group, 43 members of the Alliance of Small Island States are likely to see much of their territory disappear under rising sea levels. That is the case for the Maldives, which has already decided to protect only a quarter of their 1200 islands, abandoning the rest to the sea. These countries are in favour of drastic cuts to greenhouse gas emissions.

**THE COMMITTED**
The European Union, Japan and Norway are the most active countries in the fight against climate change. The European Union is on track to meet its Kyoto target of an 8 per cent reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 2012. Along with Japan and Norway, the European Union is going even further by setting a target of a 25 per cent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020.
The food crisis, which is still ongoing, has whetted the appetites of multinational agribusinesses and certain players in global finance. In the turmoil of the economic crisis, agriculture has emerged as a new El Dorado. Speculation on staple foods is causing artificially high prices that make it impossible for an increasing number of people to eat properly.

Several false solutions are being advanced to respond to the climate crisis. One of them is the case for the production of agrofuels. Far from solving the problem, agrofuels are costly on both social and environmental levels.

For example, people are being displaced so that their land can be transformed into monoculture plantations of palm oil for agrofuel production, or soybeans to feed livestock in response to the worldwide growth in meat consumption.

Countries such as Saudi Arabia that want to ensure their food security are using their financial power to buy up fertile land in countries looking for foreign funds, chiefly in Africa and Latin America.

Having agriculture back among government priorities is a good thing, but the question now is what kind of agriculture are we talking about? Do we have to increase industrial-style production, or is it better to rethink our methods of food production and our consumption habits? The position of our partners on this question is quite clear.
**SMALL-SCALE AGRICULTURE: A SOLUTION FOR THE FUTURE**

Did you know that small-scale farmers around the world feed 70 percent of the world’s population? There are 1.5 billion small farmers spread over 380 million farms. They are the ones who feed the hungry of this world and we cannot do without their resources if we are to meet the challenge of feeding 9 billion people by 2050.

Unlike industrial agriculture, small-scale agriculture protects the integrity of the soil, seed diversity and the survival of thousands of breeds of animals. Yet, when one speaks about investment in agriculture, small-scale farmers receive but a small amount. The majority is invested in industrialized countries and in farming methods based on the use of chemical inputs.

For **DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE** and its partners in the Global South, agro-ecological practices can help small-scale farmers improve their crop yields and thus increase their food security and income. At the same time, these practices allow them to reduce the risk of crop and livestock loss due to climate change. Here are a few examples that illustrate this point.

**HAITI: COFFEE GARDENS, A SOURCE OF LIFE**

In the northeastern part of the country, in the community of Sainte-Suzanne, people are seeing a new kind of garden take shape. The Institute of Research and Technical Support in Environmental Planning (IRATAM) is supporting farmers’ efforts to improve their living conditions.

“The coffee gardens set up by the farmers enable them to meet their needs. Through their cooperatives, they earn a fair return from the sale of coffee. Mixing food crops with market crops like coffee allows small-scale farmers to aspire to food sovereignty. In addition, compost produced from plant and animal matter provides a fertilizer that doesn’t harm the environment. Finally, each cooperative has a number of nurseries to ensure preservation of local seeds, which are later distributed equitably.”

Émil Éma, agronomist, IRATAM

**PARAGUAY: LAND REFORM COULD STOP THE SOYBEAN INVASION**

Today, monoculture plantations of genetically modified soybeans occupy half of the country’s farmland and are significantly depleting the soil. The chemicals used are also contaminating water sources.

The Paraguayan Peasant Movement (MCP) is calling for land reform to fight against the soybean invasion and help the 30 percent of the population that lives on less than $2 per day.

“Land reform is the only way to reduce the depopulation of the countryside and curb the exodus abroad of our country’s youth. It is also the only way that Paraguay can guarantee the food sovereignty of its people.”

Elvio Trinidad Quiroga, MCP member

**MADAGASCAR: IMPROVED RICE YIELDS A HEALTHY FUTURE**

The Liaison Office of Rural Training Institutions (BMITT) unites Christian training centres that work with the island’s rural population. In the Vatovavy Fitovinany region, the lives of more than 1,000 families have changed as a result of BMITT. Using selected seeds, organic fertilizers and thanks to a system of replanting younger and younger rice plants, crop yields have increased considerably. Today, thousands of families are free from hunger and the model is being exported to other parts of the island.

These examples, among many others, support our call for international policies to consider the needs and abilities of small-scale farmers around the world in both the fight against hunger and the fight against climate change.