

MANAGING TOWARDS FAIRER INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL TRADING (FIAT)

John Wibberley

Professor of Agriculture, Royal Agricultural College Cirencester, UK and Team Member of RURCON Africa

Abstract

Both political extremes of stifling communist control and unregulated extreme greed capitalism have proved unsustainable. This paper argues that the arts of management should be applied, rather than leaving farmers to drown in a tsunami of liberalisation, exacerbated by Trade War storms whenever large producer-trader countries choose to erect ad hoc tariff barriers within their avowed 'free trade' philosophy. The paper pleads for a consideration of the need for an international framework within which sustainably-informed private enterprise creativity can operate to the mutual benefit of farmers and consumers. A Highway Code for Fairer International Agricultural Trading (FIAT) is proposed as a top-down means of guiding this, while examples of farmers trading collaboratively, such as Mole Valley Farmers (MVF) in England, are cited as the bottom-up approach towards the same goal. The need for planned boundaries in sustainable management is discussed in the light of the recent lessons from the combined global financial and food crises. It argues that Food Trading needs limiting boundaries as recognised necessary for over-fishing, rainforest felling, and traffic management.

Introduction

Globally, there has been too high a rate of marginalisation and loss of farmers. Meanwhile, 925 million remain in chronic hunger worldwide (FAO, 2010). In Africa, Malawi and Ghana are shining examples of how supporting small-scale farmers is key to halving hunger (Wijeratna, 2010). In 2007, worldwide, those working in farming (38% of all employment) became, for the first time since UN records began, outnumbered by people employed in the service industries (40% of all employment). Countervailing forces against innovation, co-operation and leadership in agriculture are stagnation, conquest and drift. In order for management to foster the former, positive aspirations, it must first recognise and analyse the existing threats within agriculture from the latter negatives. Such analysis begins with internationally valid objectives of agriculture followed by an assessment of the actual trends occurring in reality (Table 1).

Table 1. OBJECTIVES (expected and required outcomes) of AGRICULTURE

FOOD – with still 925 million (15%) of people hungry in the world in 2010 (www.fao.org)

NON-FOOD RENEWABLE RESOURCES – timber, fibre, rubber, medicines, fuel by-products

CREATIVE EMPLOYMENT – still supplying over one third of all global jobs

CONSERVATION/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT – of soil, landscapes

BIODIVERSITY – maintenance of range of living species, breeds and cultivars

ECOSYSTEM SERVICES – catchments for clean water, carbon sequestration etc.

SOCIAL/COMMUNITY COHESION – of Farm-Households in rural economy

RECREATION - through farm-based tourism, access to well-managed countryside

THERAPEUTIC VALUES – for rehabilitation of those with illness, and ex-offenders

REASONABLE PROFIT - to sustain needed investment inter-generationally

STRATEGIC/POLITICAL ROLE – stored food reserves against war/attack, famine

Some current trends, issues and questions related to agriculture

‘Developing’ countries (three-quarters of the world’s population) have cheap labour but lack trading infrastructure. Around one fifth of the world’s population still tries to live on around US\$ 1 per day. This is an equity issue. Persistent injustice is not only immoral but also politically dangerous. Simply ‘zapping’ each others’ markets is the route to livelihood and environmental ruin. Displaced farm families and local food security are major casualties worldwide. India is currently suffering acutely with some 200,000 farmer suicides there since 1997 (Nagaraj, 2010) for reasons including the following:-

- predatory commercialisation of the countryside
- massive decline in investment in agriculture
- withdrawal of bank credit at a time of soaring input prices
- crash in farm incomes combined with an explosion of cultivation costs
- shifting of millions from food crop to cash crop cultivation
- corporate hijack of every major sector of agriculture, including and especially seeds
- growing water stress and moves to privatise that resource.

Though particularly acute in India, similar reasons for undue pressure on farm businesses are encountered by farmers globally. With appropriate help, two or three of those factors that farmers can combat themselves include buying inputs together so reducing cultivation and other production costs, and by organising themselves into Trading Groups they can better resist corporate hijack.

Agriculture faces a crisis everywhere. Switzerland has been losing 5 farm families per day. Since 1990 there has been a loss of over 25% of those engaged in farming. More than 70% of Swiss farm income now comes from State funding, yet 91% of Swiss believe care of the countryside is important and 97% favour ecological farming (Rigi, 2006). The price of one third of all agricultural products coming into Switzerland from abroad is artificially raised by over 100% by imposition of import tariffs, without which the situation for most Swiss farmers would be impossible. Thinking Swiss farmers fear the consequences if they were to enter the EU under present conditions. Farm numbers in Switzerland have fallen by 20% since 2000 to around 60,000 (Eckert, 2010). Since the cheese market was liberalised in 2007, cheese imports have increased by 8%, while exports have only risen by 2%. Milk prices are low and production per farm has doubled to try to compensate while dairy farmer numbers have halved in the past twenty years to some 26,000. Switzerland has only 58% self-sufficiency in food and the average consumer there spends only 7% of income on food by contrast with 30% spent 30 years ago. Farmers are needed to care for the countryside, for Switzerland's key tourist trade.

Globally, the idolatry of 'least-cost production' and 'grab markets' can be neither justified nor sustained. An international agricultural trading *Highway Code* is urgently needed. What about livelihood destruction through the WTO cheap imports policy? How might protocols (NOT micro-management of business by governments!) within a *Highway Code for Agricultural Trading* be formulated? How might we rediscover 'enough' and the true meaning of *oikonomia* (economy)? What are the roles of ethics and equity in attaining lasting Rural Vitality? Can 'development' really be called 'sustainable' if it fails to engage with ethics in order to reconcile ecology, economy, energy-efficiency, employment and equity considerations? What part do education, expectation, enterprise, enthusiasm, enjoyment and effort have to play in attaining Rural Vitality? How do we equitably share the world's resources inter-generationally without destroying each other? Does it matter that there are more migrant workers on British farms now than British farm workers (87% of UK fruit and vegetables are now picked, packed and processed by non-British labour) – and that countries like Lithuania and Poland are suffering rural depopulation, including loss of such active workers and family farms?

The population of the UK became predominantly urban as long ago as the 1851 census, and farmers now occupy under 1.5% of the working population. From a UK perspective, the future of farming there, and perhaps internationally, involves consideration both of likely future income streams and of potential business and policy threats to them (Table 2.).

Table 2. Analysis of UK Future Farm Income: Business and Policy Threats to it.

Sources of future UK Farm income?:-

- A) Food
- B) Non-food products – biomass for fuels?? – such as from anaerobic digestion of ‘wastes’
- C) Landscape/habitat management (conservation and biodiversity) for recreation/tourism
- D) Ecosystem services – such as clean water , carbon sequestration
- E) Diversification – various farm-based activities

Some Business threats to UK family farms:-

- A) Lack of skilled workforce – UK needs entrants of some 6,000 per year over the next decade
- B) Bureaucracy deterrence – paperwork is a great stressor, and fear of getting it wrong
- C) Low income per the effort and commitment required to attain it is a serious deterrent
- D) Lack of public recognition of the strategic importance of farmers ‘in place’, ‘there to care’ for land and food security etc.
- E) Lack of farmer recognition by others as the multi-skilled professionals they are.

Some Policy threats to UK family farms (also applicable internationally):-

- A) If there were to be continuance of the recently poor relationships between farmers and governments
- B) WTO unregulated trading without protocols, especially regarding staple foods (cereals, chicken...)
- C) Absence of properly developed market valuation for ecosystem services
- D) Low prioritisation of farming when actually it should be central to the real economy given that the virtual, speculative one is demonstrably defective
- E) Lack of adequate modulation to take account of the proportionally more marginal income/effort returns and difficulties of managing hillier land (could be done on actual surface area of land via maps, if more carefully and straightforwardly administered than UK’s recent RPA payments!).

Within the UK, farm holding size varies considerably from around 100 acres (40 ha) in Wales and N Ireland, to some 250 acres (100 ha) in Scotland. English farms average some 125 acres (50 ha). EU farms on average are only about 50 acres (20ha) in size. UK agriculture employs some 535,000 people, 1.5% of the total workforce, and produces about 0.6% of UK Gross Value-Added (GVA), two-thirds of it from livestock and one-third from crops. A ‘Family Farm’ in Europe provides work for 1 to 2.5 FTE (full-time equivalents). However, much bigger businesses are often still in family control.

It is vital to ponder the alternatives to family farmers internationally ‘there to care’ for land and all its resources. We further lose them at our peril. There are unwelcome indicators already, such as the spectacle of depopulation in Bulgaria (predicted to be 35% down from 2005 to 2050) while hunger increases, plus the growing suicide rate internationally among farmers and their displacement by inequitable farm product returns. One fifth of all maize grown in the USA in 2009 was for biofuel production, while hunger increases. When harvests fall short (e.g. 2009 in Australia, Brazil & elsewhere) ‘free’ trade stops. In 2008/09, maize to eat became too costly, and world maize prices ‘spiked’ affecting the poor – a justice issue. Aksoy and Ng (2010) note that agricultural prices fell 23% in the 1980s, and fell 15% during the 1990s to a record low in 2001 but rose some 60% between 2002 and the record spike in 2008, putting agricultural trade back on the international policy agenda.

Furthermore, international land-lease deals between countries with money and those with under-used farmland threaten to jeopardise local farmers and food security. This amounts to a neo-colonial land grab. China is active in thus acquiring land in sub-Saharan Africa, as are the oil-rich Gulf States – targeting Mozambique, Senegal, Sudan and Tanzania. In Ethiopia, the Central Statistics Agency predicts that the country's 13.3 million smallholder farmers will open up more than one million hectares of virgin land to outside investors (Franklin, 2010 p.115).

There is hope in the recent Report by the UK All Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) that concludes (Birch *et al*, 2010):-

1. Agriculture & Food Security must be at the heart of the fight against international poverty;
2. We must re-focus on Agricultural Education and Extension to enable this;
3. We must legislate for change swiftly to implement the above two points.

Interestingly, in the UK one of the most successful businesses through the recession has been the John Lewis Partnership including its farmer-friendly *Waitrose* supermarkets. This appears to owe much to its founder's philosophy of 'fairer shares for all' industrial democracy whereby all employees are treated as partners rather than employees (Lewis, 1954). Yunus (2009; the 2006 Nobel Laureate) also proposes a similar international approach of 'social businesses'. Yunus founded the Grameen ('village') Bank in 1983 in Bangladesh after loaning just US\$ 27 to 42 poor people. The Grameen Bank now has some 2,520 branches with 27,000 staff serving over 7.5 million micro-loan borrowers in all villages of Bangladesh. It lends over US\$ 1 billion annually; 97% of borrowers are women and over 98% of loans are repaid without problems (Weber, 2009, p.149). The model has inspired similar micro-finance schemes all over the world (Kyamuwendo & Wibberley, 2011) though Uganda had a 'co-operative movement ... left highly stigmatised among potential farmer co-operators' (Kisamba-Mugerwa & Lemma, 2010).

Agricultural Policy Changes required: Protocols and Management

The establishment and maintenance of law and order is the fundamental role of government. Law and order are basic to the satisfactory operation of civil society. Law and order are about the establishment and maintenance of boundaries within which mutually suitable, morally acceptable conduct of life can proceed. Of course, 'suitable' and 'acceptable' are very subjective terms. Rather than allowing a 'Trade War' to develop as countries selectively abandon their supposed commitment to liberalisation and impose tariffs in response to their bad harvests or economic straits – as is currently happening between China and the USA – planned protocols are here proposed. These would operate as they do towards over-fishing, or in seeking to combat rainforest losses. A protocol is a formal agreement, treaty or convention providing a mutually suitable and morally acceptable code of behaviour in regard to a particular thing. We have protocols proposed and partially agreed among nations for global climate change, use of the oceans and aspects of environmental management on land. We accept that freedom on the roads consists in mutual observance of the protocols embodied within *The Highway Code* for traffic. Notwithstanding the alarmingly rising divorce statistics, the protocols of monogamous marriage have stood the test of time as the proper context for family life and the raising of children. Among other effects, violation of marriage protocols parallels the spread of HIV/AIDS. Incidence of HIV/AIDS is also particularly high in areas of

great poverty – as both a cause and an effect perhaps of economic distress – and poverty correlates with loss of livelihoods. The case for protocols in principle seems overwhelming.

Protocols proscribe the parameters within which management is to be exercised. Sidney Arnold Press, South African Businessman of the Year 1980, described management as ‘the greatest of the arts since its medium is human talent itself’. There should thus be no area of our life on earth and in civil society where the challenge of proper management does not apply. There is a clear distinction between true freedom managed within protocols and the false freedom assumed to lie outside them but which actually leads to anarchy and havoc as extreme greed rampages. Management is needed to strike the balance between legalism and licence, between excessive regulation and unrealistic liberalisation. Equally, there is a clear distinction between management of frameworks within which mutually suitable and morally acceptable enterprise can flourish and the crass interventionism in micro-management of markets with bureaucratic interference, which is characteristic of communism and its near relatives.

Enterprise with Responsibility in Place

Genuinely free enterprise actually requires the sort of boundaries which are at present largely lacking in international trading both in fact and in policy aspiration. A ‘*Highway Code*’ protocol is urgently needed to rectify this situation. The World Trade Organisation (WTO) has - since its inception in 1995 and in its prior form as GATT from 1947 - as its guiding principle ‘non-discrimination against imports’; it appears to dream of unhindered movement of goods across international borders. There are parallel calls for unhindered transnational mobility of labour and the electronic revolution has allowed unregulated, speculative movements of capital with now known disastrous consequences since 2007/08. Such liberalisation is already having dire consequences for those seeking to start out in private enterprise and for those smaller business-folks swept aside.

This Paper calls for a rediscovery and celebration of place (as in rogation from *rogare* = ‘to ask a blessing on place’). It calls for recognition and celebration of the ingenuity of management and of entrepreneurship to blend land, labour and capital sustainably in each place. Why do we still have the prevailing assumption that markets do not need management when it is obvious that management is crucial in the case of traffic, marriage, children, household budgets, businesses, and sports events? Markets can deliver and enable the sharing of many good things but they are not self-determining, beneficent panaceas for global harmony. Unregulated, they can be quite the reverse. Then, the livelihoods of producers in one place are adversely – though often inadvertently - affected by the activities of producers elsewhere. There is an inexorable logic from the basic WTO aspiration for ‘non-discrimination against imports’ at the heart of trade liberalisation; it is an invitation to producers to grab markets wherever they are and whoever is serving them there already. Least cost production is the means of grabbing other people’s markets. Least cost production puts the larger-scale producer on a treadmill of downward costs and thus ever squeezed margins; this leads to even larger scale to try to gain economies of scale, with consequences for capacity of managerial care and welfare implications for rural communities, livestock and the soil. Meanwhile, the smaller producer at the destination of those cheap imports is forced out of business, and the environment is damaged by derelict farms and neglected land as well as by fuel wastage in processing, packaging and transport over increasing distances as ‘food miles’ mount up. The WTO does not need to be scrapped

but it urgently needs reform to take account of the pressing need to manage an international marketing framework. Fair trade whereby the producer and the consumer get fair prices from ethical production and marketing practices product by product represents a step in the right direction. However, what is needed is a radical reform of the whole trading context towards fairer international agricultural trading (FIAT). That is, trading which is fair for people now and in future, and for the planet as a whole ecosystem. Sustainable production methods in agriculture are only half the process; agricultural trading needs sustainable management as well.

Markets & Trading

Lest it be thought that this paper is intrinsically anti-trade, it is necessary briefly to review the role of trade in agriculture. 'Optimal Agricultural Trade is a biodiversity-sharing, deficit-correcting activity that must be sustainably profitable but NOT maximised, nor allowed to swamp viable communities and diverse food cultures' (Wibberley, 2005). Individual cases of innovative, enterprising marketing will emerge among the strongly placed farmers with ample national infrastructures. There is a contradiction between an admirable individual short-term achievement and it becoming disastrous on aggregate when considered in relation to all relevant factors – notably economy, ecology, energy-efficiency, employment, equity, and ethics.

As stated in Wibberley (2005 – and see Table 3) 'trade is a means to attain objectives, not an end in itself to be maximised at all costs. Questions should arise when trade goes beyond goods that cannot be produced locally.

Table 3. Trading: The Case for Optimization and Against Excess

The case **for trading** is at least fourfold:-

1. Contrasting natural products grow in specific parts of the world, so **share biodiversity**.
2. Uneven distribution of overall supplies occurs in relation to demand, so **supply deficits**
3. The exchange of goods potentially promotes friendship and **peace** ('cupboard love'!)
4. It offers scope for **enterprise** enabling people to use skills for **legitimate business**.

The case **against excessive trading** is at least fourfold ('free' trade is not free!) :-

1. It becomes extremely **wasteful** of energy in processing, packaging and transport.
2. It **separates** producers and production resources from consumers and their responsibilities to respect and conserve the production resource base (land, sea and air).
3. Its **opportunistic** short-term gain goals with their tendency towards 'monoculture' cannot long co-exist with genuine earth-care and pursuit of sustainable livelihoods.
4. It fosters **greed** in access to **production** as well as to **consumption**, which is ethically unacceptable as well as politically naïve - since it leads to vulnerable overspecialisation.

Ethics and Fairer International Agricultural Trading

Ethics is the discipline required to reconcile the key related elements for a sustainable future. This, by definition must address food security in a world where still 925 million suffer chronic hunger

(www.fao.org 2010). The whole discussion towards a *Highway Code* for Agricultural Trading is driven by a quest for more equitable relationships. 'Fair' is, of course, a relative, imprecise term. Nevertheless, it concerns the vital matter of equity or justice issues. In the present paper, 'fairer' proposes progress towards more equitable trading (FEC, 2010 – p.86). When considering a comparative improvement in fairness, the question 'fairer for whom?' arises. This paper proposes an inclusive definition based on the original meaning of 'economy' (*oikonomia*) which implies caring management of the whole creation for the benefit of the whole creation. Equity underpins the core discipline of ethics. Ethics asks, 'What is just, what is right, what is fair?' – as in Micah 6:8, 'What does the Lord require of you but to act justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly with your God?' Its focus is on 'responsibilities', not 'rights'. Trade is here distinguished from 'trading'. **Trading** refers to the general movement of goods and is at issue whereas 'trade', particularly with the adjective 'fair' in front of it, tends to be used product-by-product as components of the wider trading picture.

❖ **Trading Opinions** : Creatures offer us possible **metaphors** for different trading opinions:-

1. **Ostriches**: think there's no problem because they have their heads buried in the sand
2. **Snails**: have their own house OK and don't want to change anything too quickly!
3. **Lemmings**: think we can all carry on as never before and haven't seen the cliff edge yet!
4. **Sharks**: want to swallow up others to achieve 'economies of scale' said 'business utopia'
5. **Camels**: think that cargo swapping is *the* way to help the poor in Africa and elsewhere
6. **Squirrels**: think one should hold onto or bury everything and trade nothing
7. **Figs**: 'blossom where planted' but don't mind causing some product movements elsewhere!

Many **consumers** appear to be either ostriches or snails. Many **traders** are operating as if they are lemmings or sharks. The sharks have the current WTO philosophy backing them, although some inside the WTO appear to have naïve optimism that they are encouraging camels – and moreover, that camels can triumph through the markets!³² Some of the more reactionary **NGOs and other lobbyists** appear to be advocating for squirrels. However, the balanced position appears to lie beyond the animal metaphors altogether – with the figs! The 'figs' metaphor implies **local production but with limited trading** of especially the higher value, lower density, non-staple but unevenly distributed goods, such as spices and beverage crops (with processing near production to add value there and to reduce bulk for transport). Elements of a proposed *Highway Code* for Sustainable Trading Management are outlined in Appendix 1.

Each nation needs to optimise its food security and have some greater control over its own national food policy i.e. to exercise a greater degree of food sovereignty (see Rozel Farnworth *et al*, 2008). Food sovereignty was originally proposed at the UN World Food Summit as a political aspiration by South American Farmers' Organisation *La Via Campesina* in 1996. It has since been taken up by many (Windfuhr & Jonsén, 2005; Mulvany, 2007). We need managed farmer conservation (Wibberley, 1992), not the 'tsunami' of production greed that is being stimulated by the drive for least-cost production. This is being done to satisfy the 'grab markets' philosophy encouraged by current WTO advice to all its member countries to 'trade your way out of the economic doldrums of recession'.

³² 'Camels' perhaps represent the predominant viewpoint in *Commission for Africa: our common interest – an argument*. (Anon, 2005; Penguin, 184 pp.).

This is not management but anarchy in the market place as the strong swamp the weak. The damage affects both the richest and the poorest countries. A recipe for vulnerability is large-scale food production by a few (which would inexorably transfer to countries with least cost labour but reasonable infrastructure leaving British and other farms as a Park and many African, Asian and Latin American small farmers displaced). With sustainable trading management, 'enough for all' is possible. More than that, it is politically imperative in the serious pursuit of sustainability. It is the role of governments to pursue policies for the common good - for community and environmental well-being – globally to feed some 2.5 to 3 billion more people than the present 6.75 billion by 2050.

Fairer trading from the bottom up: Farmer Collaboration

Farmers generally do not co-operate as much as is in their own interests to do. Often, those 'upstream' of farm businesses (suppliers) benefit more financially than do the farmers who bear most of the toil, and so do those 'downstream' of farm businesses (processors, grocers). Both businesses 'upstream' and those 'downstream' of farms (such as supermarkets) are more inclined to have aggregated power than are farmers. Most farm businesses are micro-businesses vulnerable to extinction. Farmers operating collaboratively can create value for themselves and partners by increasing scale and achieving efficiency and effectiveness (Ranford, 2008).

In England, Mole Valley Farmers (MVF) founded in 1960 has celebrated its Golden Jubilee (Wibberley, 2010 and www.molevalleyfarmers.com). In 2008, MVF became the country's largest rural retailer and turnover in 2009 reached £270M. In 2010, MVF still has a Board of non-Executive Directors who all derive their main income from farming. However, it also has a professional management seeking to avoid the danger of many ultimately failing farmers' co-operatives where farmers try to run them and lack requisite specific business skills. MVF has grown its rural retail business not as a new core business but in order to help sustain its founding commitment to put its nearly 7,000 farmer shareholders first. MVF believes that farmers need to see the value of all it does as a Company. MVF shareholders are rewarded by getting the best products at small margins, rather than by getting dividends. Their agricultural purchases can also qualify for a retrospective rebate. Altogether, MVF's total contributing membership is over 30,000 so its influence for good is extensive. MVF appears to have succeeded owing to a series of factors, which together may constitute what might be termed principles of farmer/rural collaboration:

1. Maintain simple, transparent objectives through solidarity under contrary circumstances
2. Maintain prompt payment for acquisitions, and from farmer members for their purchases
3. Communicate regularly and honestly with members by Newsletter and website
4. Keep independence, with a Farmer-dominant Board and dedicated, skilled staff
5. Develop capacity to provide blended feed, vet, fertiliser solutions using different ingredients
6. Develop customer services as to diversity of requisites and collection points for them
7. Develop extension services via technically competent staff giving honest advice per farmer
8. Support innovative Research & Development (neglected by government & others latterly)
9. Be generous towards others in the agricultural community at home and overseas.

Discussion and Conclusions

Collaboration that puts farmers at the heart of rural vitality is needed worldwide. Only farmers can deliver food security and countryside care (for biodiversity maintenance and ecosystem services provision). Farmers and farms themselves need to be conserved (Wibberley, 1992). Proper farmer collaboration increases the likelihood of farmer survival to be 'there to care' for land in future.

Considerable thought and negotiation would be needed to establish the proposed *Highway Code for Fairer International Agricultural Trading*. It should be kept as straightforward and simple to operate as possible. The first step is to agree that it is necessary and that debate has yet to be won. The case has largely been won regarding the need for global climate change protocols, and the case has been won against communism and apartheid within the past two decades. *The Highway Code for Agricultural Trading* case for protocols needs to be won for the sake of farming communities and sustainable food supplies everywhere. This must notably recognise concepts of 'boundaries' and 'local' – especially in relation to staple foods such as cereals and chicken. Once the principle is accepted, then mechanisms will follow through innovation, co-operation and leadership! Meanwhile, farmers also need to overcome their frequent reluctance to collaborate and gain the benefits of doing so in their rural communities, emulating other farmers who are already collaborating.

References & Further Reading

- Aksoy, M.A. & Ng, F. (2010) The Evolution of Agricultural Trade Flows. Policy Research Working Paper No.5308, World Bank, Washington DC, USA.
- Appleby, M. Cutler, N., Gazzard, J., Goddard, P., Milne, J.A., Morgan, C. & Redfern, A. (2003) What Price Cheap Food? *Journal of Agricultural & Environmental Ethics*, 16 (4) 395-408.
- Birch, J. –ed. (2010) *Why no Thought for Food? : a UK Parliamentary Inquiry into Global Food Security*. (APPG on Agriculture and Food for Development, Houses of Parliament, London, UK, 38 pp. January 2010). www.agricultureandfoodfordevelopment.org
- Brown, H. & Geldard, J. (2008) Supplying local food to mainstream customers. (Westley, 80 pp.) – adb@westleyconsulting.co.uk
- Eckert, H. (2010) Interview with the President of the Swiss Farmers' Union, Hansjörg Walter. *Swiss Review* 2, 18-19.
- FEC (2010) *Food Justice* (2010 Report of the Food Ethics Council, London, 106 pp.) www.foodethicscouncil.org
- Franklin, D. – ed. (2010) *The World in 2010*. (The Economist, London, 154 pp.)
- Head, T. (2010) *Envisioning a Moral Economy*. (Pendle Hill Publ'ns No.405, 35 pp. Wallingford PA, USA).

- Hodges, J. (2005) Cheap Food and Feeding the World Sustainably. *Livestock Production Science* 92, 1-16.
- Karner, S. – ed. (2010) Local Food Systems In Europe: case studies from five countries and what they imply for policy and practice. (FAAN – Facilitating Alternative Agro-Food Networks – www.faanweb.eu , IFZ, 49 pp.).
- Kisamba-Mugerwa, W. & Lemma, T.A. (2010) Developing Contract Farming Systems in Uganda. *World Agriculture* 1 (1) 20-28.
- Lang, T. & Heasman, M. (2004) *Food Wars: the global battle for mouths, minds and markets*. (Earthscan, London & USA, 365 pp.).
- Lewis, J.S. (1954) *Fairer Shares for All*. (Staples, London, 244 pp.).
- Mulvany, P. (2007) Towards a Food Sovereignty Action Agenda: a digest of the Nyéléni Forum for Food Sovereignty Proceedings (February 2007, Sélingué, Mali) – for UK Food Group (www.ukfg.org)
- Ng, F. & Aksoy, M.A. (2008) Food price increase and net Food-importing countries: lessons from the recent past. *Agricultural Economics* 39, Supplement: 443-452.
- Pimbert, M., Tran-Thanh, K., Deléage, E., Reinert, M., Trehet, C. & Bennett, E. (2006) *Farmers' Views on the Future of Small-scale Producers: reclaiming diversity & citizenship*.(IIED London 75pp)
- Ranford, B. (2008) The Role of Farmer Collaboration in Creating Supply Solutions. Report to Nuffield Farming Scholarships Trust, sponsored by Australian Wool Innovation. (see http://www.nuffieldinternational.org/rep_pdf/1270502449Ben_Ranford_2008_Report.pdf)
- Rigi, R. (2006) The Future of Swiss Farming. *Swiss Review* 2, 8-11 (April edition).
- Rozel Farnworth, C. , Jiggins, J. & Vaughan Thomas, E. – eds. (2008) *Creating Food Futures*. (Gower, UK, 246 pp.)
- Soros, G. (2008) *The New Paradigm for Financial Markets*. (Public Affairs/Perseus Books, New York, 162 pp.).
- Stiglitz, J. (2002) *Globalisation and its discontents*. (Penguin, London 288 pp.)
- Stiglitz, J. & Charlton, A. (2005) *Fair Trade for All*. (OUP, 315 pp.).
- Toumlin, C. & Guèye, B. (2005) Is there a future for family farming in W.Africa? *IDS Bulletin* 36(2) 23-29.

Toye, R. (2010) *Churchill's Empire: the world that made him and the world he made*. (Macmillan, London, 423 pp.).

US Government (2010) Feed the Future: the global commitment to Food Security. (www.feedthefuture.gov/commitment.html)

Vander Stichele, M., van der Wal, S. & Oldenziel, J. (2006) *Who reaps the fruit?: critical issues in the fresh fruit and vegetable chain*. (Somo, Amsterdam, 190 pp.)

Van Donkersgoed, E. (2010) Personal communications and [Plumblin] *Locavore News*, Canada.

Victor, PA. (2008) *Managing without Growth: slower by design, not disaster*. (Elgar, Cheltenham UK).

Watts, D.C.H., Ilbery, B. & Maye, D. (2005) Making reconnections in agro-food geography: alternative systems of food provision. *Progress in Human Geography* 29, 22-40.

Weber, K. – ed. (2009) *Food Inc.* (Perseus, Public Affairs Books, NY, USA, 321 pp.).

Wibberley, E.J. (1992) Farmer Conservation : survival of the family-worked farm. *Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society of England*, 153, 54-66.

Wibberley, E.J. (2005) Leadership Values & Sustainable Trading Management for Food Security, Biodiversity & Equity. Vol.1 pp. 333-345 *In Developing Entrepreneurship Abilities to feed the world in a sustainable way*. International Farm Management Association 15th World Congress, Campinas, Brazil (August 2005).

Wibberley, E. J. (2010) Farmer Collaboration: Mole Valley Farmers Golden Jubilee. (RASE/RuSource)

Wijeratna, A. (2010) Personal Communication – *Action Aid Hunger Scorecard*.

Windfuhr, M. & Jonsén, J. (2005) *Food Sovereignty: towards democracy in localised food systems*. ITDG/FIAN, 57 pp.

Yunus, M. (2009) The Financial Crisis and World Hunger. pp.149-160 *In Food Inc.* (ed Weber, K., Public Affairs, Perseus Books, NY, USA, 321 pp.).

Useful websites:-

www.fairtrade.org.uk

www.fao.org

www.foodethicscouncil.org

www.ifpri.org

www.globeinternational.org

www.molevalleyfarmers.com

www.ukfg.org

Appendix 1

❖ *Elements of a HIGHWAY CODE for Sustainable Trading Management*

1. Lead international agreement to change WTO policy of *non-discrimination against imports*, negotiating and substituting a **Highway Code for Trading**. We do NOT need enterprise-stifling attempts at micro-management but we do need a common-sense framework for law and order providing boundaries within which markets can operate to reconcile simultaneous needs of environment, livelihoods, food security and land heritage.
2. Seek to raise **public awareness** in each country of the livelihood, environmental and defence importance of buying **locally grown foods** as much as possible. Landscapes should be both beautiful to look at and good for food everywhere; only enough farmers in place can deliver that in each country. Biological and ecosystem limitations of ‘comparative advantage’ not short-term financial speculation must ultimately govern food policies.
3. **Challenge trade involving delivery of products to countries where they could perfectly well be grown already** e.g. much rice in many African countries is quite unnecessarily and damagingly coming from Asia. Chickens and eggs are being traded around the world when they can perfectly well be raised in most countries. Cheap USA maize is ruinous to Mexico.
4. Encourage **fair-trade policies product-by-product**, such as with *Café Direct* as a prelude to an internationally agreed **comprehensive fair trading context**.
5. Maximise **processing of products prior to export within their countries of farm production** e.g. peanut butter *in situ*, solar-dry tropical fruits, beverage crops in-country.
6. **‘Remove agricultural products from the current WTO policy’** to offer immediate help - but other trading can be excessive also harming livelihoods and the environment.
7. Encourage **farmers** to form **FARMS - Farm Asset Resource Management Study** - Groups in which they meet from farm to farm, learn together and may come to earn together.

❖ Towards fairer trading: **Possible mechanisms to improve Food Security internationally:-**

- Trade regulation **accords** on a regional basis with trade quota ‘sieves’ to implement;
- National **strategies** to feed family first, animals second and markets third;
- Recovery of national **food sovereignty**, notably national control over **staple** food policy;
- Provision of proper **food reserve** ‘safety nets’, especially targeting the vulnerable;
- **Fuel tax** on freight for bulky products which can perfectly well be grown at destination;
- **Farmer conservation** policies to maintain strong agrarian structure; train new entrants;
- Food **production incentives** e.g. via credit unions; seed banks conserving many cultivars;
- Local **market infrastructure & consumer education** to encourage buying **local** produce;
- Encouraging farmers with **training for enterprise development** and niche marketing.