

# The EU's agricultural policy and its effect on food security and small-scale farming

**A comparative study on the impacts of the CAP in Africa and Latin America**

By: Sara Langefors

Supervisor: Rickard Lalander

Södertörn University | School of Natural Sciences, Technology and Environmental Studies

Bachelor Thesis 15 credits | Spring 2019

Development and International Cooperation



SÖDERTÖRNS HÖGSKOLA | STOCKHOLM  
sh.se

## **Abstract**

This study examines and problematises how the European Union's agricultural policy impact small-scale farming and food security in developing countries. The focus of the study is on the *Common Agricultural Policy* (CAP) and how this EU policy affects small-scale farming and food security with Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda as case examples. The CAP has affected the agricultural sectors in developing countries negatively since its launch, with particularly damaging effects on small-scale farmers. This problem is theoretically framed within a political ecology approach, backed up by environmental justice and a food sovereignty approach. The results are found using a qualitative comparative literature study, and critical reading is used to analyse previous research and EU reports. Based on the previous research and the theoretical framework the study concludes that Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda have all experienced some extent of negative impacts of the EU's agricultural policy. The tariffs and subsidies from the EU policy have affected the countries in different ways, resulting in mostly negative impacts on small-scale farming and food security.

**Keywords:** Common Agricultural Policy, European Union, small-scale farming, food security, Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique, Uganda

## **Table of contents**

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Problem	6
1.2 Purpose	7
1.3 Research questions	7
1.4 Disposition	8
<b>2. Theoretical framework</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Political ecology	9
2.2 Environmental justice	10
2.3 Food security and food sovereignty	11
2.4 Theoretical summary	12
<b>3. Method</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1 Comparative method	13
3.2 Critical reading	14
3.3 Case selection	14
3.4 Justification	16
<b>4. Impacts of the CAP in Africa and Latin America</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1 Argentina	20
4.2 Brazil	21
4.3 Mozambique	23
4.4 Uganda	24
<b>5. Analysis</b>	<b>27</b>
5.1 Argentina	27
5.2 Brazil	29
5.3 Mozambique	30
5.4 Uganda	32
5.5 Final analytical discussion	34
<b>6. Conclusions</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>39</b>

## 1. Introduction

The European Union and the *Common Agricultural Policy* (CAP) have generally had a negative impact on agriculture and food security in developing countries since it was launched in 1962. Because of this policy the world market has been influenced, to the advantage of the EU farmers' (European Parliament 2018, p. 7). This is a study on the EU's agricultural policy, small-scale farming and food security. It aims to examine and analyse the impacts that the European Union's agricultural policy has on food security and small-scale farming in developing countries. A comparison of the impacts is made between cases from countries in Africa and Latin America. The cases are Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda. This study examines the issue through a political ecology framework, backed up by environmental justice theory and a food sovereignty approach. These theories are applied in the analysis of the results.

The European Union's Common Agricultural Policy was launched to support European farmers and rural areas in general. The policy formally aims to give farmers improved working conditions, to make sure consumers get affordable food and to promote sustainable use of natural resources (European Commission n.d.). However, all these aims are focused on Europe. As the European Union is a very big actor in agricultural import and export, their agricultural policy also has significant impacts on the international markets (European Parliament 2018, p. 22).

The EU is working to minimise the negative impact the CAP has on developing countries and one of their goals is global food security. Other focus areas for their *Policy Coherence for Development* are climate change, trade and finance (European Commission 2015, p. 7). Yet several studies have been made in developing countries, and they show the negative effects of the CAP on environment, agriculture and farmers (Boysen, Grinsted Jensen & Matthews 2015, pp. 377-378; Khatun 2012, p. 99). There is also a concern that the competitive market caused by the CAP leads to decreased environmentally sustainable development and reduced food security. The impacts that the CAP has on food prices have been found to have a negative effect on food security in developing countries (European Parliament 2018, p. 7).

Because European farmers get subsidies for their production, farmers in developing countries have more difficulties selling their products. Due to the EU subsidies the European farmers can sell their products for cheaper prices, and sometimes even prices below the cost of production. This makes it extremely difficult for small-scale farmers in developing countries to compete with the imported goods and make a living (Curtis 2011, p. 4). The cheap prices and overproduction of food in the EU thus marginalise small-scale farmers and it has also been contributing to the spread of hunger and poverty (Fritz 2011, p. 5). The European Union and the CAP have accordingly been encouraging overproduction, for example of milk and dairy products, and it has had devastating effects on the livelihoods of farmers in developing countries. It has created an unfair market where small-scale farmers from developing countries cannot compete with the cheap prices that European farmers can put on their products (Fowler 2002, p. 1). This puts farmers and local markets at risk, and it is also threatening the food security in developing countries (Bertow 2009, p. 8).

Another issue with the European Union's agricultural policy concerns the land investments that actors from the EU makes in developing countries. About 60% of the land that is used to provide the EU with products from agriculture and forests is in developing countries. A lot of this land is used for production of biofuels and food for animals (Antonelli, Siciliano, Turvani & Rulli 2015, p. 106). These land investments lead to resource depletion, loss of biodiversity and a marginalisation of the local population's livelihood activities (Ibid, p. 108). In this way the EU also harms the food sovereignty for the people in the areas of the land investments, by restricting their right to food. This is a consequence of the EU's agricultural policy, and small-scale farmers are the ones most affected by this (Sage 2014, pp. 195-196).

This study analyses and compares the results using a theoretical framework made up from three different theoretical components. The foundation of the theoretical framework is political ecology, which is backed up by environmental justice and a food sovereignty approach. Both political ecology and food sovereignty have a critical view on institutions and policymaking, calling for a more participatory approach (Carney 2012, p. 72; Escobar 2006, p. 11). Political ecology and environmental justice both have a focus on environmental conflicts and the relationship between North and South. Apart from that the differences

between local and global, rich and poor are important parts of the theories (Escobar 2006, p. 7; Martínez-Alier 2009, p. 91). Political ecology also has a focus on the dimensions of environmental conflicts and how different cultures can exist equally, without a pressure for smaller groups to fall into line (Escobar 2006, pp. 7-8).

The method of this study is a qualitative comparative literature study, where critical reading is used to analyse previous research and EU reports. The study examines, analyses and compares the impacts of the CAP in Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda. These countries help answer the research questions and give different perspectives to how the EU's agricultural policy affects different developing countries. The focus on these countries provides the study with examples and insights to the impacts of the CAP and it contributes to the material that is used to find similarities and differences between the countries and regions.

### **1.1 Problem**

The European Union's agricultural policy has been accused of having a negative impact on developing countries. Studies have found that the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) had a negative impact on producers and agriculture in developing countries (e.g. Boysen, Grinsted Jensen & Matthews 2015, p. 377). Primarily, small-scale farmers in developing countries have experienced the most detrimental impacts of the CAP. Poverty and food insecurity have increased in some developing countries as a consequence of the negative impacts on small-scale farmers (Fritz 2011, p. 4).

Critical political ecology tries to explain how ecological issues are interconnected with politics and science and that if these factors are separated it will be harder to get a holistic view of an issue (Forsyth 2003, p. 20). Political ecology describes how the politics and power structures of institutions control how the institutions behave and what kind of decisions they make. The structures then determine whether the institutions decisions will contribute to a more sustainable world or not. (Peet, Robbins & Watts 2011, pp. xiii-xiv). The Common Agricultural Policy has changed over time, becoming more aware of the problematic effects on developing countries. However, the policy is still a part of the cause for many problems, including the competitive market and the low prices (Curtis 2011, p. 4; Fritz 2011, p. 4).

Food security and small-scale farmers in developing countries have been negatively affected by the CAP (European Parliament 2018, p. 7). This shows that the EU and the CAP is also causing a decreasing food sovereignty in developing countries, since food sovereignty is about the right to food and the process of how food security is achieved (Carney 2012, p. 78; Patel 2009, p. 665). Another aspect of this problem is the concept of ecological debt that is prominent in the theory of environmental justice. Ecological debt means that countries in the North have a debt to countries in the South, because of the environmental space they fill (Martínez-Alier 2009, pp. 93-94). In this case, the EU would be indebted to the countries where the CAP causes environmental and social damage.

## **1.2 Purpose**

This study aims to examine and problematise how the EU's agricultural policy impact small-scale farming and food security in developing countries, through a comparative analysis of Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda. The purpose is also to see if there is any difference between how food security and small-scale farming are affected by the agricultural policy in the four countries, and which factors affect the different impacts in these countries. This study is not an in-depth analysis of all the impacts of the CAP in developing countries, instead it has a macro perspective on the effects. The results and the analysis identifies the general consequences of the EU's agricultural policy, specifically on food security and small-scale farming. The study highlights differences and similarities in developing countries, with Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda as examples.

## **1.3 Research questions**

- How does the European Union's agricultural policy (CAP) impact food security and small-scale farming in developing countries, in this study exemplified by Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda?
- How does the impact differ between the countries?
- Which factors explain the different impacts of the CAP in the examined countries?

## **1.4 Disposition**

After the introductory contextualisation above, the outline of the text is as follow. A theoretical framework that includes political ecology, environmental justice and food sovereignty will be presented. The theoretical framework is followed by a methodological clarification. Next, the results will be presented, both more broadly and specifically for each of the four countries. The analysis that follows views the results from the perspective of the theoretical framework. This is later discussed and compared before the study presents its conclusions.

## **2. Theoretical framework**

In this paper a political ecology approach is used to frame the problem theoretically. This study examines how food security and small-scale farmers in developing countries are affected by the agricultural policy from the European Union. Political ecology analyses the connections between developing and developed countries and global issues, like environmental protection (Eden 2011, p. 169). Critical political ecology presents a critical view of current discussions about environmental issues and it wants to see a more diverse and local approach (Forsyth 2003, p. 22). For this reason, political ecology is the perspective from which this study looks at the impacts of the Common Agricultural Policy. Environmental justice theory, closely intertwined with political ecology, and a framework for a food sovereignty approach complement the political ecology approach.

### **2.1 Political ecology**

Environmental problems exist all over the world and they only seem to be increasing. Along with the environmental issues social movements are emerging in great numbers to protect local and global natural resources. Arturo Escobar argues in his political ecology framework that the problems caused by environmental factors often result in additional struggles beyond the environmental effects. The rich and the poor are set up against each other, the local cultures are protected by social mobilisation and the capitalist model is questioned (Escobar 2006, pp. 6-7). Joan Martínez-Alier brings up the same issues, discussing the conflict between economy and environment. Rich countries in the North consume more and create more waste, but the negative effects of it is usually displaced to countries in the South (Martínez-Alier 2014, p. 240).

Escobar argues that conflicts over natural resources often contain three dimensions that can be used to understand the conflicts. These three dimensions are economic, ecological and cultural. Social movements are mostly working towards an equal importance of the three dimensions, where local cultures in developing countries do not have to change into models of Western cultures. An ongoing trend seems to be for rich countries to use their access to possibilities and resources to create a pressure for subordinate groups to suppress their

cultural differences. An important question that Escobar addresses is how we can reach equality without giving up cultural diversity. He asks in what ways equality differences in the three dimensions are enabled or denied. In cases where differences and equality are denied, unequal resource distribution seems to be a key issue. Escobar also asks how the hierarchy within the dimensions of economy, ecology and culture has an impact on equality and what kind of conflicts that emerge from this (Escobar 2006, pp. 7-8). The global and capitalist world economy is the reason of a lot of conflicts regarding natural resources between North and South, global and local (Martínez-Alier 2014, p. 239).

The political ecology framework advocates both a study of ecological and cultural distribution conflicts. The study of cultural conflicts is presented in Escobar's framework as equally important as the more generally studied ecological conflicts. He argues the importance of it by explaining that cultural differences can through definitions of what is normal be a cause of social inequalities (Escobar 2006, p. 10). One significant factor in the framework is the cultural dominance in policymaking and institutions where Escobar means that cultural differences need to be introduced, especially in institutions that handle global policies. The framework wants the local, subordinated groups to no longer be ignored and it aims to be a tool for analysing the struggles and differences of the subordinated groups (Ibid, p. 11). In this study political ecology is used to analyse the findings from the previous research because of its critical position to power structures. The three dimensions and the perspective of global and local groups help the study analyse the articles and the relationship between the EU policy, local communities and farmers in developing countries.

## **2.2 Environmental justice**

Similarly to political ecology environmental justice deals with the relationship between global and local, rich and poor. Environmental justice focuses on the ecological issues, environmental movements and the inequalities of ecological distribution (Martínez-Alier 2009, p. 91). Joan Martínez-Alier is an important scholar within both environmental justice and political ecology. One important part of environmental justice that Martínez-Alier writes about is ecological debt. He argues that the rich countries in the North has an ecological debt to the countries that are using less environmental space, and towards future generations. The

countries in the North use environmental resources and cause emissions beyond their region and as a result countries in the South are exploited and suffer the consequences of it (Martínez-Alier 2009, pp. 93-94). This theory is relevant to the study because of its perspective on environmental issues and the relationship between North and South. It is used as a complement to political ecology to analyse the articles and policies from a critical standpoint, and the concept of ecological debt is applied to the consequences of the CAP.

In this essay land investments and land acquisitions are discussed as impacts of the EU's agricultural policy, this can also be called land grabbing. Land grabbing has increased since the food crisis 2007-2008 and it is most prominent in developing countries. Land grabbing is a cause of natural resource and land conflicts, when small-scale farmers lose their land and livelihoods. The land grabbing is often made possible by a lack of legal protection for landowners (Porsani, Börjeson & Lehtilä 2017, pp. 1181-1182).

### **2.3 Food security and food sovereignty**

In this study the concepts of food insecurity, food security and food sovereignty are used. Since the two latter are sometimes incorrectly used interchangeably a framework for social equity in food systems is helpful to keep this study from making that mistake. In an article by Megan Carney she underlines that food insecurity means that a household has a difficulty feeding themselves and that "Food insecurity is defined as prolonged lack of access to enough food to meet basic needs". She also mentions different degrees of this. Just because a family is not suffering from food insecurity does not mean that they always have enough to eat (Carney 2012, p. 72).

As for the definition of food security, it seems to have changed over time since it was first defined in 1974. Raj Patel argues that the definition has shifted with the global political climate. In 1974 the definition was more focused on production of food while definitions from the 21st century has a bigger focus on social and dietary issues. Patel also argues that this wider definition is making the concept of food security more irrelevant. How food security is achieved is not a part of the definition, meaning a dictatorship can be completely food secure (Patel 2009, pp. 664-665).

The importance of how food security is achieved has a bigger role in the concept of food sovereignty. The food sovereignty approach is more about rights, more precisely the right to food, than the food security approach (Carney 2012, p. 78). Another factor that sets the two concepts apart is the participation of the people. Food sovereignty is focused on people's participation in the shaping of agricultural policies. The food sovereignty movement *Via Campesina* means that long-term food security cannot exist without food sovereignty (Ibid, p. 72). This argumentation is useful in this study, both for the discussion of the results and for the perspective of the previous research that is analysed. It creates a debate about food security that is useful in the comparative part of this study. Food security is the issue that is studied, but from reading these articles about the two concepts it is clear that a food security approach alone is insufficient in addressing the impact that the CAP has on food security and small-scale farming.

#### **2.4 Theoretical summary**

To answer the research questions and analyse the results the theoretical frameworks above are merged. The critical views of political ecology and environmental justice contributes to the analysis of the impacts caused by the EU's agricultural policy and the North-South dimensions of the problem. The food sovereignty framework contributes to the perspective of food security and small-scale farming. All three components have a focus on the global and local dynamics and the importance of local actors and movements. Together they provide a perspective for this study that helps answer the research questions and frame the results with a local and small-scale focus.

### **3. Method**

To answer the research questions a qualitative comparative literature study is carried out. Moreover, critical reading is used when the previous research and the EU reports are studied. The results from previous research are analysed using the theoretical framework of the study and compared using a comparative method. The comparison is not a completely systematic one, instead it is made by highlighting specific differences and similarities from the different cases. Scientific articles about the topic are used to find out what kind of impacts the EU's agricultural policy has on small-scale farming and food security in selected countries in Africa and Latin America. The agricultural policy and its goals are studied as well as reports from the EU concerning the impacts of the CAP on developing countries. The findings of the sources are then analysed and compared.

The study uses secondary data, from previous studies and reports, which is analysed and compared. The fact that results from multiple studies over time can be used gives the study a broad perception of the subject. The previous research provides material for comparison and the study looks for similarities and differences between the different studies (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias 1996, p. 306). The search and choice of articles have been made using certain criteria. Only scientific articles written in the last twelve years have been used in the results and all the articles focus on the EU and the CAP. The articles have been found with keywords like "food security", "EU agricultural policy", "CAP impact" and more. These words and phrases have been chosen based on the research questions of this study.

#### **3.1 Comparative method**

A qualitative comparative method is used in this study. This method provides factors and connections that might not be found in one case study (Sundstøl Eriksen 2018, pp. 343-344). A comparative method provides the tools to find causal relations between different cases which is beneficial for this study (Ibid, p. 328). The comparison of countries in order to highlight particularities, differences and similarities helps the study in providing contrasting settings of why these countries experience different consequences of the CAP. It contributes to an approach where the study can link the different situations of the countries to certain

impacts of the CAP (May 2013, p. 290). One of the biggest issues that can emerge with a comparative method is the researchers lack of knowledge or understanding about the studied societies. To avoid this problem the researcher needs to obtain an understanding about the studied societies and about how they work at the studied time period (Ibid, p. 301).

Case studies from Africa and Latin America are used as examples and the results are analysed using the comparative method. Additionally, the theory is used to further analyse the findings with a political ecology and an environmental justice approach, as well as with a perspective from food sovereignty. These approaches are used in the comparison between the cases from Africa and Latin America. Both the previous research and the studied policy are viewed from the perspective of the theory, to make sure that the study is not just a description of the secondary data (Desai & Potter 2006, p. 107).

### **3.2 Critical reading**

While reading the EU reports as well as previous research, the study uses critical reading to interpret the studied material. This means that the discourse that is used in the material is examined. A discourse can put emphasis on certain things and leave other things out in order to make a point, meaning that the language that is used in a text can show the author's personal values. Using this knowledge to stay critical of both the language of this study and the discourse of the studied material helps the study see the reality that is created by the discourses (Börjesson 2003, p. 19). Critical reading of previous research means that the reader stays aware of the authors situation and their values. The authors of an article may not have all the information, they may have unknowingly made assumptions, or they may have missed something. Critical reading helps the study detect which parts of a text are supported by evidence and which parts are not (Wallace & Wray 2016, pp. 4-5).

### **3.3 Case selection**

This study uses two countries from Africa and two from Latin America as examples where the impacts are studied more thoroughly. Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda are the cases. These countries were selected for this study because they have all experienced impacts of the Common Agricultural Policy on agriculture and food security. Both Africa and Latin

America are of course very diverse continents, and no results are general for an entire continent. That is why this study has chosen four countries that are the studied cases and that provide the paper with different perspectives and impacts of the EU's agricultural policy, rather than trying to find a general view of the impacts. The four countries alone cannot evidently be representative of the entire areas, although together they can provide the study with some universal conclusions of the impacts of the CAP.

The comparison between the countries in this study is, as mentioned, not a systematic comparison. Instead it is made with the specific history and circumstances of the countries in mind. The differences between the four countries is what gives the study a broader view of how the impacts of the CAP affect developing countries. The diversity provides the study with the possibility of finding a wider variety of impacts, and reasons for those impacts.

Argentina is chosen as one of the countries in this study, because it is one of the largest agricultural exporters in the world and it is a country with a lot of small-scale farmers (Michelini 2013, p. 108). Argentina also exports a lot of animal food and biofuels to the EU (Khatun 2012, p. 102). Brazil is chosen because of the high amounts of agricultural exports from Brazil to Europe (Janssen & Ruts 2011, p. 5723), and for being one of the countries often studied in articles about the CAP. Mozambique is chosen because small-scale farming constitutes the principal livelihood in Mozambique (Nkala, Mango & Zikhali 2011, p. 758). Mozambique is also a country with a lot of land investments from actors in the European Union (Antonelli et al. 2015, p. 101). Uganda is chosen because it is a developing country with a high number of small-scale farms and an economy depending on agriculture (Kaweesa, Mkomwa & Loiskandl 2018, pp. 1-2).

In the four countries the study examines whether and how the EU's agricultural policy affect food security and small-scale farming. The aspects of the policy that are studied are the environmental goals, the subsidies for European farmers and import and export related to developing countries. These aspects were chosen because they affect food security and small-scale farming. Food security in the selected countries is viewed through a food sovereignty approach and the study primarily focuses on conditions for small-scale farming, the possibilities for small-scale farmers and the right to food. In addition to this, the study

considers the differences and similarities between the four countries. Differences in availability to natural resources and types of governance can, for instance, be a cause of different impacts of the Common Agricultural Policy.

This study has a macro perspective on the central problem.<sup>1</sup> A micro perspective could have provided interesting details from farmers and local societies, but due to the limited extent of this essay the choice was made to focus on the macro level. The focus is on the European Union and how the CAP affects developing countries. This perspective is prioritised because of the critical approach of the study towards institutions and global actors. This perspective can be found in the theoretical framework for political ecology, where policymaking in institutions is questioned (Escobar 2006, p. 11). The impacts of the CAP on small-scale farmers is considered although the focus is on what the big actors like the EU does, and how they affect small-scale farmers. The study aims to find similarities and differences of the impacts of the CAP. A macro perspective was accordingly chosen to help the study find the more general conclusions related to the African and Latin American countries in relation to the EU, as opposed to individual experiences unveiled by a micro perspective.

### **3.4 Justification**

The research questions studied in this paper have been chosen based on the problems that the study aims to examine. The first question "How does the European Union's agricultural policy (CAP) impact food security and small-scale farming in developing countries, in this study exemplified by Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda?" helps the study explore the negative impacts that the EU's agricultural policy is said to have on developing countries. The study specifically looks at food security and small-scale farming to understand what consequences the agricultural policy has for the lives of the people in the affected countries. The second question "How does the impact differ between the countries?" was chosen to add the comparative element to the study. This gives a further understanding of the factors that

---

<sup>1</sup> While focusing on the above mentioned aspects and countries it is possible that the study misses other factors or connections that might be of interest to the study. Because of this, other countries and aspects of the CAP are to some extent considered as well, as the ones stated above to reduce the risk of neglecting important factors. The other countries and aspects are used as examples contributing to the results of the study.

contribute to sustainable small-scale farming and food security or insecurity. The third question “Which factors explain the different impacts of the CAP in the examined countries?” provides the study with a more complex perspective of the different countries. It makes the study look beyond what is written in previous research to search for conclusions about the different factors.

To problematise food security as a concept this study uses a food sovereignty approach. Food sovereignty focuses on the process of food security and the right to food. A food sovereignty approach is because of this a helpful tool, since the study aims to explore how small-scale farmers and livelihoods are affected by agricultural policies (Carney 2012, p. 78). The impacts of land investments, subsidies and other related issues are viewed through a political ecology and an environmental justice framework. The political ecology framework helps the study analyse the economic, ecological and cultural dimensions of the impacts of the CAP and answer the research questions (Escobar 2006, p. 7) and the environmental justice perspective brings the concept of ecological debt as well as the divergence between North and South (Martínez-Alier 2009, pp. 93-94).

#### **4. Impacts of the CAP in Africa and Latin America**

Since this study aims to explore and analyse what impact the Common Agricultural Policy has on food security and small-scale farming in Africa and Latin America, previous research on the subject is a necessary foundation for the results of this study. This section presents the impacts of the CAP more broadly in developing countries, and thereafter the impacts of the CAP in Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda are presented.

Ever since the Common Agricultural Policy was founded it has been subject to several reforms and changes to regulate the world market and improve conditions for European farmers. Most recently, in 2013, a reform was made with the goals of encouraging sustainability, supporting rural areas and increasing the competitive force of the EU farmers (European Commission n.d.). Food security has been on the political agenda a lot the last ten years and it has resulted in a bigger presence of food security issues in many areas in the Common Agricultural Policy. Recent changes in the CAP have mitigated the negative impact that it previously caused but there are still harmful consequences of the policy, an example of this is the impact on food prices (Boysen, Grinsted Jensen & Matthews 2015, p. 397; Candel & Biesbroek 2018, p. 206). While the EU and the CAP claim to focus on food security issues, their policy reforms do not reflect this expressed focus. Agricultural subsidies given to European farmers results in food insecurity in developing countries. This is because farmers from developing countries cannot compete with the European market (Candel, Breeman, Stiller & Termeer 2014, p. 57; Torayeh 2011, pp. 362-363). The use of export subsidies in the European Union causes an unstable world market, it sustains import dependency and prevents agricultural development for small-scale farmers in developing countries (Revoredo-Giha, Philippidis, Toma & Renwick 2013, p. 1671).

Policy coherence has been studied in previous research to see if the European Union's development goals are incoherent with the Common Agricultural Policy, as it has been criticised for this in the past. The results in the studies suggest that some of the CAP reforms have had marginally positive effects on agriculture in developing countries, but that a lot of the incoherence still remain. This is mostly due to the export subsidies and other factors in the CAP still causing food insecurity and unfair conditions for small-scale farmers (Carbone

& Keijzer 2016, p. 37; Matthews 2008, pp. 397-398). The CAP has also been found to have negative effects on the possibilities for farmers and foresters in developing countries. The CAP has changed over time, but the support for agriculture in Europe is still causing harm to developing countries (Khatun 2012, pp. 103-104).

Some of the EU's environmental goals lead to an increased interest in biofuels and that can be a cause of land grabbing. Land grabbing from European actors occurs primarily in Africa and Asia (Carroccio, Crescimanno, Galati & Tulone 2016, pp. 6-7) The land acquisitions are driven by agriculture and energy policies and they are used for fuel production. The move towards more sustainable policies in the EU might therefore increase the land investments (Antonelli et al. 2015, p. 109). Since the land in the European Union is not enough to meet the needs for biofuel, the production has been outsourced to countries in the Global South (Franco et al. 2010, p. 661). In Africa, large-scale land investments from transnational actors, such as the European Union, are increasing. This affects small-scale farmers in developing countries negatively because of the limited access to land that follows (Carroccio et al. 2016, p. 3). The European biofuel production in African countries is also a cause of increased greenhouse gas emissions and it adds to the increase of food insecurity. The production of ethanol for biofuel requires a huge quantity of water which contributes to water scarcity in the affected countries (Schuenemann, Thurlow & Zeller 2017, pp. 311-312).

Many countries in Latin America contain sources for renewable energy and is because of this, and the relatively low prices for workers, attractive for biofuel production. The production of biofuel is increasing due to environmental goals and programmes, for example from the European Union, and this has both positive and negative effects in Latin America (Janssen & Ruts 2011, p. 5717). The EU also imports a lot of animal food from countries in Latin America, causing Latin American farmers to grow soybeans for export instead of growing food for domestic markets. The increasing production of crops for biofuel and animal food is also a driver for deforestation in the Latin American countries (Khatun 2012, p. 102).

Onwards the study will summarise the impacts of the CAP in the four countries with a focus on small-scale farming and food security.

## 4.1 Argentina

In Argentina waves of poverty has affected the former middle-class since the 1970s, increasing the amount of people living in poverty. Unemployment is also a big problem in the country (Kessler, Di Virgilio & Yaroshenko 2010, p. 253). In the rural areas of Argentina there is a lot of small-scale farmers and producers, but policies beneficial to larger agricultural companies is resulting in marginalised small-scale farmers (Michellini 2013, p. 108). The agricultural sector is important for the economy in the country. Argentina is one of the countries in the world that export the most agricultural products. The areas of land used for agriculture has expanded over time and recently a lot of land that was previously used for livestock is now used for growing crops. Soybeans is one of the most grown crops in Argentina (Castesana, Dawidowski, Finster, Gómez & Taboada 2018, p. 294). 5.6% of Argentina's GDP in 2017 came from the country's agricultural sector (The World Bank 2019).

Because of the Common Agricultural Policy countries in the EU import cheap animal food from Argentina. The lack of tariffs on these products in the policy is an incentive for the EU to import instead of produce. The increasing consumption of meat leads to more demand for soy to use as animal food. The soybeans are planted on large areas of land, instead of using the land for forestry or for producing food for the domestic markets. Biofuels is another export product from Argentina to the EU, which also needs a lot of land to grow on (Khatun 2012, p. 102). Argentina has a well established biofuel production that is increasing. The biofuels are mostly made from soybeans and they are an important export from Argentina (Janssen & Ruts 2011, pp. 5717-5718). Argentina is one of the world's biggest exporters of biofuels. The EU policy and its support for sustainable fuels result in a higher demand for biofuels which results in an expanded production of certain crops (Naylor & Higgins 2018, p. 80). Around 50% of the soy export from Argentina goes to the European Union. The increasing demand for soy has negative impacts on environmental and social factors. As an example biodiversity loss, soil erosion and displacement of indigenous populations are among the impacts of the expanded soy production (Janssen & Ruts 2011, pp. 5723-5724).

In Argentina the government has been promoting production of biofuel with the help of tax reductions. The tax reductions were specifically targeted to small- and medium-scale farmers, but instead the large-scale producers took the opportunity to provide the soy for biofuel production. Studies have shown that the production of crops for biofuel do not have a significant impact on food security in the country. This may be due to the fact that biofuels are mostly produced by large-scale producers in Argentina, and that these producers deal with the risks of the changing market prices (Naylor & Higgins 2018, p. 80).

To summarise, Argentina is affected by the EU's agricultural policy because of the promotion of biofuel production and the indirect effect this has on deforestation and displacement of food production. The lack of tariffs on animal food is also affecting agriculture by increasing the demand for exported soy from Argentina. Consequences of the expansion of the soy production, that the EU is contributing to, is biodiversity loss, soil erosion and displacement of indigenous communities.

#### **4.2 Brazil**

Brazil is a country with big inequalities between its inhabitants. It is a country with a history of great economic growth, but the differences in the livelihoods between the rich elites and the people living in poverty still remain (López 2013, p. 355). Policies with a focus on social development have been implemented to reduce hunger and poverty in Brazil. These policies aimed to reduce food insecurity and the extreme poverty that is still prominent in the country (Paes-Sousa & Vaitsman 2014, p. 4352). Land inequalities have been a problem in Brazil for a long time. The agrarian reforms have made promises of land redistribution, but continued promoting large-scale, corporate farming (Robles 2018, pp. 1-2). This leaves rural workers and small-scale farmers without land. The expansion of large-scale farming has led to displacement of indigenous people, environmental damage and poor working conditions (Ibid, pp. 28-29.) 4.6% of Brazil's GDP in 2017 came from the agricultural sector (The World Bank 2019).

Brazil has for a long time produced biofuel both for the global and the domestic market. Following the positive example set by Brazil, other countries in Latin America have invested

in biofuel production. The countries in Latin America have good conditions for growing biofuel crops (mostly soybeans and sugarcane) and Brazil have had a growing biofuel production since the 1980s. The positive effects of biofuels that are emphasised are the environmental benefits and the economic aspects for the country (Janssen & Ruts 2011, p. 5717). Out of the export of soy from Brazil around 60% is exported to Europe. However, the high tariffs from the European Union makes it less profitable for Brazil. Because of this Brazil has started collaborations with the EU and other countries to find cheaper options for exporting biofuels. Brazil has multiple partnership with European countries, ensuring cheaper trade relations and regulations for sustainability (Franco et al. 2010, p. 680; Janssen & Ruts 2011, p. 5723).

The EU land investments for biofuel production in Brazil have showed some of the negative social and environmental impacts caused by biofuel production. The negative effects include displacement of local food production, pollution of water, soil degradation and deforestation. The land investments also have negative impacts on the livelihood of farmers. Farmers have lost their land and workers have been exploited with dangerous working conditions. The loss of farmland for small-scale farmers also leads to food insecurity. Production of sugarcane for biofuel has expanded in Brazil. Sugarcane plantations need big areas to grow on and this results in deforestation and displacement of food production (Franco et al. 2010, pp. 680-681).

Other products imported to the EU from Brazil are animal food, which is primarily soy. The EU countries buy it for a low price instead of producing it themselves, due to the fact that animal food is excluded from tariffs in the EU's agricultural policy. Countries in Latin America have, therefore, started prioritizing growing soybeans for export instead of growing food for the local people. Another effect of the production of animal food is the deforestation it leads to in Brazil (Khatun 2012, p. 102).

To conclude this section, land inequalities and expanding large-scale farming has contributed to poverty and displacement of indigenous people in Brazil. The CAP has led to land investments, by the promotion of biofuels and the high demand for soy. The demand for soy

is partly caused by the lack of tariffs on animal food. The land investments also contribute to deforestation, pollution, food insecurity and lost livelihoods for small-scale farmers in Brazil.

### **4.3 Mozambique**

Mozambique is one of the poorest countries in the world and it has high numbers of poverty, especially in the rural areas. Mozambique also has a relatively low life expectancy and a high prevalence of HIV (Victor et al. 2014, p. 2). Land scarcity and land conflicts are affecting the many small-scale farmers in the country. This has negative effects on food security and the livelihood of the rural farmers (Nkala, Mango & Zikhali 2011, p. 758). The agricultural share of the GDP in Mozambique has declined over the last twenty years, but it is still an important part of the country's economy (Grabowski 2018, p. 576). In 2017 21.3% of the GDP in Mozambique was from the agricultural sector (The World Bank 2019).

The biofuel production in Mozambique was inspired by the success of Brazil's biofuel production and the two countries started a cooperation to make the production in Mozambique a success. The production was supposed to help the economy of the Mozambicans and it was supposed to avoid creating a conflict between producing food or fuel. Conflicts have however appeared, and water resources and large areas of land have been relocated from food production to biofuel production (Franco et al. 2010, p. 684). One of the main arguments for biofuel production in the EU's agricultural policy is that the production will lead to rural development. However, in Mozambique land conflicts have been a consequence of biofuel plantations and local food production has been displaced. Another argument for the biofuel production is the notion that locals will get employment on biofuel plantations. The reality is that a lot of Mozambicans lose their farmland because of land acquisitions and only a few of them get employment on the biofuel plantations (Ibid, p. 690).

Countries and investors from the EU invest in land all around the world, but mostly in countries in Africa. The highest number of land deals from the EU actors in Africa take place in Mozambique (Antonelli et al. 2015, p. 101). Actors from the European Union make land investments in countries where the land quality is good and where the natural resources has not already been exploited. Another common quality in the targeted countries, including

Mozambique, is a high rate of rural inhabitants that are depending on agriculture for their livelihood (Antonelli et al. 2015, pp. 108-109). One of the impacts of the Common Agricultural Policy in Mozambique is thus a growing biofuel production. With the large-scale land investments that is a consequence of this, food security and local food production is in danger. These concerns are however not very present in the EU policy. The policy seems to be focusing on the positive effects and possibilities. The positive effects being environmental goals and possible rural development (Di Lucia 2010, pp. 7401-7402, 7395).

The European Union is using trade incentives to apply their model of sustainable biofuels in Mozambique, by making biofuel production more appealing. The EU's rules have therefore been applied in companies producing biofuels in Mozambique, but the economic gain of this has been found to be unstable (Di Lucia 2010, p. 7402). The CAP also lacks a social sustainability perspective and the guidelines for environmental sustainability only cover some of the important areas. The EU policy focuses mostly on greenhouse gas emission and biodiversity. The large-scale biofuel plantations are however a cause of polluted air, water and soil in the affected areas. The local food production is also negatively affected by the large-scale biofuel production (Ibid, p. 7397). Conflicts over land and water resources have emerged in Mozambique because of the land acquisitions for biofuel production. The government has acquired land areas because the areas are seen as available, which has led to small-scale farmers and pastoralists losing their livelihoods (Franco et al. 2010, p. 688).

To summarise, increased land investments for biofuel production have been an impact of the CAP in Mozambique. Land conflicts are causing food insecurity in the country and the EU's agricultural policy contributes to loss of land for small-scale farmers. The inadequate sustainability guidelines in the CAP contributes to pollution, resource conflicts and a decrease of local food production in Mozambique.

#### **4.4 Uganda**

In Uganda a series of reforms have had a positive impact on poverty reduction. However, a lot of people still live with insecure incomes on the verge of poverty. Other problems affected by the political situation is the extensive corruption, lack of power for women and social

mistrust (King 2015, pp. 743-744). Uganda has a high population density and a growing population. This is putting a strain on both the environment, the economy and the livelihoods in Uganda. The majority of Uganda's inhabitants work in agriculture, mostly on small farms. The agricultural sector is an important part of the economy, both for the country and for the families (Kaweesa, Mkomwa & Loiskandl 2018, pp. 1-2). However, Uganda's economy has shifted the past decades. Earlier agricultural products were the country's biggest export, but recently they have been surpassed by manufactured goods. Uganda mostly trades with countries in the EU (Anderson & van der Mensbrugge 2007, p. 532). In 2017 24.6% of Uganda's GDP came from the agricultural sector (The World Bank 2019).

Agriculture in developing countries in Africa can be affected by the EU's agricultural policy both through direct trade as well as through terms of trade, that has changed because of the CAP. The change in terms of trade can be different for different countries depending on the EU tariffs and the countries own imports and exports. In Uganda, the EU policy affect the trade and agriculture of the country through the subsidies in the European Union. The beneficial conditions for the farmers within the EU results in an impact on the world market. The impact causes lower food prices which leads to a decreasing demand and lower prices for agricultural products and other exports from Uganda (Boysen, Grinsted Jensen & Matthews 2015, pp. 389-390). Export refunds given by the EU to European farmers have also been a cause of falling prices in developing countries. This has had a big impact on the livelihood of farmers in Uganda (Revoredo-Giha et al. 2013, p. 1651). The refunds have contributed to weak domestic markets and an agricultural sector in need of strengthening (Ibid, p. 1670).

As a result of the Common Agricultural Policy, developing countries can import subsidised surpluses for cheap prices. This positions the EU as a big competitor for both exporters and domestic markets in developing countries (Boysen, Grinsted Jensen & Matthews 2015, pp. 377-378). In Uganda the export subsidies given to European farmers have been found to cause decreasing incomes from agricultural exports, especially on dairy exports (Revoredo-Giha et al. 2013, pp. 1659-1660). This mostly affects small-scale farmers, since most of the Ugandan milk is produced by small-scale farmers (Garcia, Balikowa, Kiconco, Ndambi & Hemme 2008, p. 1).

Ole Boysen, Hans Grinsted Jensen and Alan Matthews have studied the impacts of the common agricultural policy in Uganda. The results of the study are that the removal of agricultural support for European farmers would have a minor but positive impact on poverty in Uganda. (Boysen, Grinsted Jensen & Matthews 2015, p. 397). In a report from the EU concerning the impacts of the CAP in developing countries, this article is commented. They explain in the EU report how studies cannot examine the CAP alone because the situation in a country is always affected by multiple factors (European Parliament 2018, p. 20). In the article, the authors argue that the important result of their study may not be the impact of the CAP on poverty but instead the insight of how the CAP can affect developing countries, like Uganda, in many ways. Not only the agricultural sector is affected by the EU's agricultural policy, but other sectors and the consumers as well (Boysen, Grinsted Jensen & Matthews 2015, p. 398).

In summary, the CAP has indirectly affected the agricultural sector in Uganda because of the subsidies given to European farmers. The subsidies have caused a decreasing demand for Ugandan export and price dumping in markets in the country. The subsidies on European dairy products have had a negative effect on the small-scale producers in Uganda. Since Uganda mostly trades with countries from the EU the tariffs and subsidies have a big influence over the Ugandan agricultural sector.

## **5. Analysis**

The analysis in this study is made with the perspectives of the theoretical framework, which contains components from political ecology, environmental justice and food sovereignty. The study will analyse the results for the separate countries before making a comparison between them. The impacts and factors found in the analysis have connections to the Common Agricultural Policy, however the study cannot assure that the impacts are caused by the CAP alone. Many actors and countries affect each other, and it is difficult to isolate one specific driver in the global political economic system. As an example, USA and China also have land investments in these countries and have trade relationships with them. The impacts of the CAP that follows are based on the research presented in the previous section and analysed with the perspective of the theoretical framework.

### **5.1 Argentina**

In Argentina small-scale farms are getting marginalised by policies favouring large-scale farms and companies. These policies are implemented by the government in Argentina (Michellini 2013, p. 108). From the limited findings in this study on impacts of the CAP in Argentina, it seems as though the agriculture in the country is not very affected by the CAP (Naylor & Higgins 2018, p. 80). In the previous research related to the CAP, Brazil is the most studied country in Latin America. There may of course be multiple reasons for this, but one of the reasons could be that the European Union's agricultural policy does not affect Argentina to the same extent as the other countries. However, as Argentina exports around 50% of their soy to the European Union (Janssen & Ruts 2011, p. 5723) it is hard to believe that the agricultural policy has no effect at all on small-scale farmers and food security in Argentina.

As the government in Argentina promotes large-scale farming with agrarian policies, the negative situation with environmental damage and social inequalities (Janssen & Ruts 2011, p. 5723) would be similar even without the involvement of the EU. However, the policies made by the EU and the Argentinean government both seem to lack the input of the affected people. The cultural dominance in policymaking needs to be challenged for a more

sustainable agricultural sector (Escobar 2006, p. 11). Even when the Argentinean policies for reduced taxes on biofuel production were directed at small-scale farmers, the large-scale producers seized the benefits (Naylor & Higgins 2018, p. 80). This indicates that the policymaking is non-functional.

Kaysara Khatun argues that the EU policy is one cause of the big demand for animal food from Argentina. These exports result in an increased production of soybeans, which leads to deforestation and less production of food for local markets (Khatun 2012, p. 102). From a food sovereignty perspective this is working against the people's access to food and their livelihoods (Carney 2012, p. 78). The fact that one study found that the EU policy had no significant effect on food security in Argentina (Naylor & Higgins 2018, p. 80) may be correct, but in this situation a food sovereignty approach would be more useful. The concept of food security implies nothing about the process of food production or about how food security is achieved (Patel 2009, pp. 664-665). For a society to be long-term food secure, food sovereignty is a must. For this to happen, a focus on small-scale farming and the participation of the people in policymaking needs to be a priority (Carney 2012, p. 72). While the EU policy still promotes large imports of biofuels and animal food into Europe (Khatun 2012, p. 102), this will be hard to achieve.

From a political ecology perspective, the relationship between actors in the North and the South can be viewed as environmentally unequal (Martínez-Alier 2014, p. 240). The displacement of local livelihoods and the deforestation in Argentina can partly be blamed on the EU and their agricultural policy (Khatun 2012, p. 102), leaving the Southern countries with the negative effects and the Northern actors with the benefits. In this case the concept of ecological debt can also be applied to the impacts of the CAP in Argentina. This would mean that the EU and European actors are in debt to the rural farmers of Argentina, and the future generations depending on forestry and agriculture (Martínez-Alier 2009, pp. 93-94).

Summing up, the dominance in policymaking is one reason for the impacts of the CAP in Argentina. Policies from Argentina's government that are beneficial to large-scale farmers are probably an important reason why small-scale farmers are marginalised. However, a more diverse participation in policymaking would benefit both the Argentinean government and

the EU. The CAP contributes to the high demand for soy in the country, the deforestation and the decreased production of food for local markets that this leads to displays the EU's ecological debt to the small-scale farmers in Argentina and it is also negative for the local food sovereignty.

## **5.2 Brazil**

As mentioned previously, Brazil is a country with numerous land inequalities, land conflicts and with agrarian reforms supporting large-scale farming. With these reforms already in place the CAP might have less to do with the negative effects of large-scale farming and land investments in the country. However, as the EU is supporting this kind of agrarian sector they also become part of the problem. The struggle for a more equal distribution of land has been in progress in Brazil for a long time with social movements fighting for the cause (Robles 2018, pp. 1-2). Social movements are a central part of political ecology. Escobar explains in the framework that social movements protects the environment and the local cultures in conflicts (Escobar 2006, pp. 6-7). In the land conflicts in Brazil the landless and the small-scale farmers are protected by the movement for landless workers, MST, that is fighting for land redistribution in agrarian reforms (Robles 2018, pp. 1-2).

The high tariffs on biofuels from the EU have resulted in Brazil making trade deals with countries in the EU and other countries, Mozambique for instance. These deals with the EU are supposed to ensure that the biofuels are produced in Brazil in an environmentally sustainable way. However, crops produced for biofuels usually need big areas of land resulting in deforestation in Brazil. The deforestation and land investments also lead to small-scale farmers losing their land and displacement of food production (Franco et al. 2010, pp. 680-681).

Environmental justice uses the concept of ecological debt to explain the differences between countries in the North and the South, in usage of natural resources and amount of greenhouse gas emissions (Martínez-Alier 2009, pp. 93-94). Looking at the EU's impacts on agriculture in Brazil, ecological debt is a useful tool to analyse the environmental effects of the EU outside of its borders. The Brazilian example shows clearly that the EU is using resources

beyond its borders, indicated by the animal food and biofuels that are imported from Brazil. The deforestation this leads to, partly because of European imports, is another negative environmental impact enlarging the EU's ecological debt to the people in Brazil (Khatun 2012, p. 102). The European land grabbing in Brazil is another indicator of negative impacts on natural resources outside of the EU's borders (Porsani, Börjeson & Lehtilä 2017, pp. 1181-1182). However, the conflicts regarding natural resources is, as Martínez-Alier argues, a result of the global and capitalist world economy (Martínez-Alier 2014, p. 239) making the ecological debt a part of a bigger system which functions beyond the EU and is very difficult to change or measure.

The positive impacts of biofuel production are, according to the examined articles, sustainable fuels and economic growth (Janssen & Ruts 2011, p. 5717), but the question that follows is who benefits from this? The negative effects biofuel production have been found to have on soil and water supplies as well as small-scale farmers shows that the positive impacts may be overshadowed by the negative (Franco et al. 2010, p. 680). Small-scale farming is a vital part of food sovereignty, as well as the participation of the people in agricultural policies (Carney 2012, p. 78). In the case of Brazil, it seems as the Common Agricultural Policy is not contributing to food sovereignty in the country. The land investments for biofuel production in Brazil, that the EU is partly responsible for, have led to food insecurity and small-scale farmers losing their farmland (Franco et al. 2010, p. 680).

To summarise, Brazil's government has implemented policies supporting large-scale farmers which can be a reason for how small-scale farmers are affected by the CAP. Ecological debt can be applied on the impacts of the CAP in Brazil, because of the import of cheap soy to Europe and because of the deforestation the demand for soy leads to. The land investments in Brazil has led to food insecurity and small-scale farmers losing their land, showing that the CAP is not contributing to food sovereignty in the country.

### **5.3 Mozambique**

In Mozambique conflicts over land and resources have become a problem, land grabbing is one cause of these issues (Porsani, Börjeson & Lehtilä 2017, pp. 1181-1182). The EU

agricultural policy's promotion of biofuels have led to land investments in Mozambique, resulting in less access to land for small-scale farmers in the country (Di Lucia 2010, p. 7395; Franco et al. 2010, p. 684). Looking at this problem from the political ecology perspective this is an example of environmental issues causing conflicts between North and South (Martínez-Alier 2014, p. 240). Because this is a problem where countries in the South have to deal with most of the negative consequences the concept of ecological debt can be applied, concluding that the EU has a debt towards the rural people in Mozambique (Martínez-Alier 2009, pp. 93-94). It could also be argued that Escobar's three dimensions are visible in these conflicts with the investors and the local groups in conflict over land, income and rights. Escobar uses these dimensions, the ecological, economic and cultural, to understand conflicts over natural resources. He also argues for the importance of equality of cultures in conflicts involving smaller groups (Escobar 2006, pp. 7-8). The local groups in Mozambique do not receive equal say in the decisions and policies affecting them. The EU policy's idea of promoting rural development is one example of this, where the locals are promised employment on biofuel plantations but in reality very few people are given jobs (Franco et al. 2010, p. 690).

Another aspect in the political ecology framework that is useful in this analysis is cultural equality. The question that Escobar asks, about how equality can be achieved without sacrificing cultural diversity, seems important in this situation (Escobar 2006, pp. 7-8). The European Union puts pressure on actors in Mozambique to follow their rules about how to produce sustainable biofuels. The European model is forced on Mozambican farmers, if they want to be able to trade with the EU (Di Lucia 2010, p. 7402). The sustainability guidelines however only apply to some factors while others, like work conditions on biofuel plantations and pollution of natural resources, are not regulated by the EU policy (Ibid, p. 7397). This brings up the question about how policies are made. The EU rules for biofuel production are disregarding the situation in Mozambique. A local participation in policies affecting the farmers and other inhabitants of the affected areas in Mozambique would contribute to more holistically sustainable policies. As it is now, small-scale farmers are losing their land and their incomes due to the biofuel production in Mozambique (Franco et al. 2010, p. 688).

The framework for food sovereignty argues for the importance of participation of the people in shaping agricultural policies (Carney 2012, p. 72). Similarly, in the political ecology framework the fact that policymaking needs a more diversified approach with increased local participation is highlighted (Escobar 2006, p. 11). The cooperation Mozambique has with Brazil and the EU is another example of local groups being neglected by policymakers and governments for the benefit of the economy (Franco et al. 2010, p. 684). The cooperation between the European Union and the government of Mozambique could, if improved, make sure that the policy focus shifted from biofuel production to related issues like food security and land management (Di Lucia 2010, p. 7402). This would also contribute to the food sovereignty in Mozambique.

In summary, the CAP has caused land grabbing in Mozambique which negatively affects small-scale farmers. This and the EU actor's biofuel production shows the conflict between North and South, and the ecological debt from the EU to Mozambique. Viewing from a political ecology perspective, and from a food sovereignty approach, the study finds an unequal cultural dimension, due to that the local farmers in Mozambique do not have an equal part in the creation of the policies that are affecting them.

#### **5.4 Uganda**

Uganda is a country with many inhabitants supporting themselves through agriculture, mostly on small-scale farms (Kaweesa, Mkomwa & Loiskandl 2018, p. 1). It is also a country with a lot of people living in, or close to, poverty (King 2015, p. 744). Viewing the results found in the previous research from a political ecology and an environmental justice approach the opposition between North and South becomes clear. The conflicts over natural resources that both these theories are centred around are visible in the impacts of the EU and the CAP in developing countries. The benefits for European farmers given by the CAP affects the world market in a way that is disadvantageous for the Ugandan small-scale farmers. The global world and the trade relationships it results in favours the big actors in cases like this, where the small-scale farmers in developing countries cannot compete with the subsidies from the EU (Revoredo-Giha et al. 2013, p. 1651). This is a sign of the cultural dominance in policymaking that Escobar argues against in his political ecology framework. Policies with a

global impact need a more multicultural participation for an equal outcome (Escobar 2006, p. 11).

Since the CAP affects small-scale farmers negatively in Uganda (Revoredo-Giha et al. 2013, p. 1651) it also has negative effects on food sovereignty. According to the study made by Boysen et al. the CAP only has a minor influence on food security in Uganda (Boysen, Grinsted Jensen & Matthews 2015, p. 397) but, as argued in the theoretical framework of this study the concept of food security is sometimes too wide to be useful on its own (Patel 2009, pp. 664-665) and true food security cannot be achieved without food sovereignty. Looking at the CAP's impacts in Uganda through the food sovereignty approach it seems as though the CAP is not contributing to food sovereignty in the country. Food sovereignty is about the participation of the people in policymaking and the people's right to food (Carney 2012, pp. 72, 78), the negative effects on the livelihood of small-scale farmers shows that the CAP is not considering these aspects. As an example, small-scale farmers in Uganda is producing the majority of the milk in the country (Garcia et al. 2008, p. 1). The EU subsidies on milk production in Europe results in price dumping on markets in developing countries. This leads to cheap imported milk on developing country markets and low incomes for the local farmers trying to sell their milk. This is also a cause for less profitable exports from Ugandan farmers, as they compete with the European exports (Revoredo-Giha et al. 2013, p. 1659).

The fact that the EU itself is observing and responding to the criticism of the CAP is a necessary part of improving the policy. However, the way the EU report *The impact of the Common Agricultural Policy on developing countries* argues makes it seem like they are diminishing the impacts of the CAP. They cite the article by Boysen et al. to make a point, but miss some important conclusions from the study. The EU report brings up the results that show a small negative impact of the CAP in Uganda and they argue that the impacts of the CAP is very hard to isolate and study (European Parliament 2018, p. 20). The article concludes, however, that while the CAP only has a minor negative effect on poverty in Uganda, the policy can affect people and agriculture in developing countries in other ways. They explain how the CAP affects the sectors of both agriculture, manufacturing and service in Uganda (Boysen, Grinsted Jensen & Matthews 2015, p. 398).

Summing up, the subsidies given to European farmers are positioning the EU as a big competitor for both exporters and domestic markets in Uganda. Viewing from the theoretical framework the opposition between North and South is visible. This results in a favourable market for the European farmers while the small-scale farmers in Uganda struggle with falling prices. Small-scale farmers in Uganda do not have a say in the EU policy that is affecting them. From a political ecology and a food sovereignty perspective, the EU is not contributing to diverse and local participation in policymaking.

### **5.5 Final analytical discussion**

This section will discuss and compare the results of this study from the two previous sections. The results from the different countries will be compared using a non-systematic comparative method that will highlight the similarities and differences between the countries and regions. This study identifies underlying reasons for the impacts of the CAP in Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda. The previous research that has provided the information for this study covers the impacts of the CAP in developing countries. This is however a hard thing to study since it is nearly impossible to isolate the impacts of the CAP from impacts of other global policies and agreements. Other countries and actors influence the situation in the four countries and the countries themselves have policies, reforms and other factors affecting the impacts of the CAP on food security and small-scale farmers.

The four countries in this study have different histories and different relations to the European Union. However, Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda have all experienced some degree of negative impacts of the CAP. The different impacts of the EU's agricultural policy in these countries seems to depend on some key factors. The factors this study have identified is the EU's promotion of biofuels, the tariffs and subsidies given to different products and countries and how these factors impact export, import and market demand (Boysen, Grinsted Jensen & Matthews 2015, p. 390; Franco et al. 2010, p. 680; Khatun 2012, p. 102). How these factors affect the different countries can however differ. The differences can be attributed to several factors including climate, availability of natural resources, social movements, politics and economy. One example of this is land investments for biofuel production. Land investments from the EU are generally made in areas with natural resources

that have not yet been exploited. This has led to land investments for biofuel production in Mozambique (Antonelli et al. 2015, p. 109). These large-scale biofuel productions have caused land conflicts and lack of food for the local population (Franco et al. 2010, p. 684).

With the perspective of the theoretical framework some other factors affecting the impacts of the CAP have been identified. From the political ecology perspective cultural dominance in policymaking have contributed to detecting the lack of cultural diversity and local participation in policymaking. Also, the importance of cultural equality has been present in the relations between the big actors, like the EU and the governments, and the small-scale farmers and rural inhabitants. An example of this is the land conflicts in Mozambique, where the rural inhabitants are suppressed by the EU's opinions about rural development (Franco et al. 2010, p. 690) and sustainable production (Di Lucia 2010, p. 7402). Viewing the results from the perspective of environmental justice it could be argued that the EU is in ecological debt to Argentina, Brazil and Mozambique, because of the increased demand for biofuels and soy and the increased land grabbing that is partly caused by the Common Agricultural Policy (Franco et al. 2010, p. 684; Khatun 2012, p. 102). In all four countries the impact of the CAP on food sovereignty has been negative (Franco et al. 2010, pp. 680, 684; Khatun 2012, p. 102; Revoredo-Giha et al. 2013, p. 1651). The reason for this is primarily the relocation of small-scale farmers and food production, but also the above mentioned lack of local participation in policymaking. The effect these factors has on food sovereignty and local livelihoods is negative, and it is also contributing to food insecurity (Carney 2012, p. 72).

In the previous research Uganda stands out from the other countries. The impacts of the CAP in Uganda found in this study are not related to biofuel production or land investments. The country has experienced the more indirect impacts of the CAP on the economy. The EU's subsidies for European farmers have caused an impact on the world market, resulting in lower food prices in Uganda (Boysen, Grinsted Jensen & Matthews 2015, p. 390). Viewing this from the study's theoretical framework, the opposition between the North and the South is visible. The EU subsidies are creating an unfair market where the small-scale farmers from Uganda cannot compete with the European prices (Revoredo-Giha et al. 2013, p. 1651). In Mozambique, Brazil and Argentina many of the impacts of the CAP found in previous research are linked to the promotion of biofuels, and the land investments that follows. A

consequence of these investments found in all three countries is the relocation of food production (Franco et al. 2010, pp. 680-681, 684; Janssen & Ruts 2011, p. 5723). In Brazil and Argentina deforestation is an impact mentioned in the previous research (Khatun 2012, p. 102) and in Mozambique land conflicts are a reported consequence of biofuel investments (Franco et al. 2010, p. 684). However, the relocation of food production that is identified in all three countries indicates that land conflicts are present in all of them. The deforestation and the pollution caused by biofuel production is an indicator of the ecological debt both from the EU actors and from the governments that are promoting this.

Previous research suggests that small-scale farmers in Argentina are less affected by the CAP, compared to the other countries. The reason for this seems to be that small-scale farmers are marginalised by the government policies, resulting in that large-scale farmers are the recipients of the impacts of the CAP instead (Michelini 2013, p. 108; Naylora & Higgins 2018, p. 80). In Argentina and Brazil around 5% of the countries GDP came from the agricultural sector in 2017, compared to the above 20% in Mozambique and Uganda (The World Bank 2019). This, and the fact that large-scale farmers produce a lot of the agricultural products in both Argentina and Brazil (Naylora & Higgins 2018, p. 80; Robles 2018, pp. 1-2) could be one reason for a smaller impact of the CAP on the Latin American small-scale farmers.

A similarity between Argentina and Brazil is the impact on soy production. The EU policy excludes animal food from the tariffs and this leads to an increase in demand for imported animal food. Both Argentina and Brazil are large producers of soy, which is planted on large areas of land, leading to displacement of food production and deforestation in the two countries. This a cause of decreased food sovereignty in the two countries, because it leads to farmers losing their livelihoods (Khatun 2012, p. 102).

To summarise Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda have all experienced some negative impacts of the CAP. The key factors affecting small-scale farmers in the countries are subsidies and tariffs from the EU agricultural policy. These factors have led to different impacts in the countries, affecting import export and the agricultural sector.

## **6. Conclusions**

The aim of this study was to examine and problematise how the EU's agricultural policy impact small-scale farming and food security in developing countries, with Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda as examples. The purpose was also to identify differences and similarities between the impacts of the CAP in the four countries, and to identify which factors affect the different impacts in these countries. Theoretically, political ecology provided the study with the importance of cultural diversity and local participation in policymaking. Environmental justice helped identify ecological debt between the actors and the unequal relationships between North and South. The food sovereignty approach contributed to the discussion about food security and the right to food, and helped the study argue for food sovereignty as a more sustainable path to food security.

The Common Agricultural Policy has affected developing countries since it was launched. Despite the multiple reforms of the CAP, it still has a negative effect on food security and small-scale farming, contributing to poverty, hunger and an unfair world market. In this study the first research question: "How does the European Union's agricultural policy (CAP) impact food security and small-scale farming in developing countries, in this study exemplified by Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda?" provided the study with the impacts in the four countries. Based on the material used in this essay, it is possible to conclude that Argentina, Brazil, Mozambique and Uganda have all experienced some extent of negative impacts of the EU's agricultural policy. The negative impacts include decreasing demand for agricultural products, displacement of food production and rural inhabitants, deforestation and pollution. These factors contribute to a negative impact on food security and small-scale farming in the countries.

The second question: "How does the impact differ between the countries?" brought the comparative element to the study. The findings from previous research were that Uganda was the country that differed most from the rest. The impacts of the CAP in Uganda were more indirect, with the subsidies in Europe resulting in lower food prices in Uganda and affecting small-scale producers negatively. In Mozambique, Brazil and Argentina the CAP's promotion of biofuel impacted food production and contributed to land conflicts. The

exclusion of animal food from the tariffs in the EU's agricultural policy has caused an increased demand for exported soy from Argentina and Brazil. The expanded soy production has led to displacement of food production and deforestation.

The third question: "Which factors explain the different impacts of the CAP in the examined countries?", helped the study identify the different factors that are affecting the impacts of the CAP, backed up by the theoretical framework. Some of the implications of the CAP could be explained by differences in natural resources, climate, economy or government policies. Other factors identified in this study is the EU's tariffs and subsidies given to different products and countries, and the impacts these factors have on export, import and market demand in the countries.

The Common Agricultural Policy has affected developing countries both directly and indirectly as a consequence of the tariffs and subsidies in the policy. The impacts of the CAP on small-scale farming and food security vary between the different countries, but the consequences have been generally negative, causing increased food insecurity and displacement of food production. In order to achieve more positive implications the CAP needs to shift its focus from food security to food sovereignty and accept a more diverse participation in the policymaking process.

## References

Anderson, K. & van der Mensbrugge, D. (2007). Effects of multilateral and preferential trade policy reform in Africa: The case of Uganda. *The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development*, 16(4), pp. 529-550. DOI: 10.1080/09638190701600264

Antonelli, M., Siciliano, G., Turvani, M. & Rulli, M. (2015). Global investments in agricultural land and the role of the EU: Drivers, scope and potential impacts. *Land Use Policy*, 47, pp. 98-111. DOI: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.04.007

Boysen, O., Grinsted Jensen, H. & Matthews, A. (2015). Impact of EU agricultural policy on developing countries: A Uganda case study. *The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development*, 25(3), pp. 377-402. DOI: 10.1080/09638199.2015.1069884

Börjesson, M. (2003). *Diskurser och konstruktioner: en sorts metodbok*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Candel, J. & Biesbroek, R. (2018). Policy integration in the EU governance of global food security. *Food Security*, 10(1), pp. 195-209. DOI: 10.1007/s12571-017-0752-5

Candel, J., Breeman, G., Stiller, S. & Termeer, C. (2014). Disentangling the consensus frame of food security: The case of the EU Common Agricultural Policy reform debate. *Food Policy*, 44, pp. 47-58. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodpol.2013.10.005

Carbone, M. & Keijzer, N. (2016). The European Union and Policy Coherence for Development: Reforms, Results, Resistance. *European Journal of Development Research*, 28(1), pp. 30-43. DOI: 10.1057/ejdr.2015.72

Carney, M. (2012). “Food security” and “food sovereignty”: What frameworks are best suited for social equity in food systems? *Journal of Agriculture, Food Systems, and Community Development*, 2(2), pp. 71-88. DOI: 10.5304/jafscd.2012.022.004

Carroccio, A., Crescimanno, M., Galati, A & Tulone, A. (2016). The land grabbing in the international scenario: the role of the EU in land grabbing. *Agricultural and Food Economics*, 4(1), pp. 1-9. DOI: 10.1186/s40100-016-0056-7

Castesana, P. S., Dawidowski, L. E., Finster, L., Gómez, D. R. & Taboada, M. A. (2018). Ammonia emissions from the agriculture sector in Argentina; 2000–2012. *Atmospheric Environment*, 178, pp. 293-304. DOI: 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2018.02.003

Curtis, M. (2011). *Milking the poor How EU subsidies hurt dairy producers in Bangladesh*. <http://curtisresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/Milking-the-poor.Final-published-version.pdf> [2019-05-20]

Di Lucia, L. (2010). External governance and the EU policy for sustainable biofuels, the case of Mozambique. *Energy Policy*, 38(11), pp. 7395-7403. DOI: 10.1016/j.enpol.2010.08.015

Desai, V. & Potter, R. B. (2006). *Doing Development Research*. London: SAGE Publications.

Eden, S. (2011). The politics of certification: consumer knowledge, power, and global governance in ecolabeling. In: Peet, R., Robbins, P. & Watts, M. (red) *Global Political Ecology*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Escobar, A. (2006). Difference and Conflict in the Struggle Over Natural Resources: A political ecology framework. *Development*, 49(3), pp. 6-13.  
DOI: 10.1057/palgrave.development.1100267

European Commission (n.d.). *The common agricultural policy at a glance*. [https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/key-policies/common-agricultural-policy/cap-glance\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/key-policies/common-agricultural-policy/cap-glance_en) [2019-05-21]

European Commission (2015). *The EU's Common Agricultural Policy*. [https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/developing-countries/cap/coherence-brochure-2015\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/sites/agriculture/files/developing-countries/cap/coherence-brochure-2015_en.pdf) [2019-05-21]

European Parliament (2018). *The impact of the Common Agricultural Policy on developing countries*.

[http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2018/603862/EXPO\\_STU\(2018\)603862\\_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2018/603862/EXPO_STU(2018)603862_EN.pdf) [2019-05-20]

Franco, J., Levidow, L., Fig, D., Goldfarb, L., Hönicke, M. & Mendonça, M. L. (2010). Assumptions in the European Union biofuels policy: frictions with experiences in Germany, Brazil and Mozambique. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(4), pp. 661-698.

DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2010.512454

Forsyth, T. (2003). *Critical Political Ecology The politics of environmental science*. New York: Routledge.

Fowler, P. (2002). *Milking the CAP: How Europe's Dairy Regime is Devastating Livelihoods in the Developing World*.

<https://oxfamlibrary.openrepository.com/bitstream/handle/10546/114549/bp34-milking-the-cap-051202-en.pdf;jsessionid=C4EEC1108295FE385EBFB86F34B55FF9?sequence=1>  
[2019-05-20]

Frankfort-Nachmias, C. & Nachmias, D. (1996). *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. London: Arnold.

Fritz, T. (2011) *Globalising Hunger: Food Security and the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)*. [https://www.tni.org/files/download/CAPPaper-draft\\_0.pdf](https://www.tni.org/files/download/CAPPaper-draft_0.pdf) [2019-05-21]

Garcia, O., Balikowa, D., Kiconco, D., Ndambi, A. & Hemme, T. (2008). *Milk production in Uganda: Dairy farming economics and development policy impacts*.

[https://cgspace.cgiar.org/bitstream/handle/10568/24981/IGAD\\_LPI\\_WP\\_09-08.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://cgspace.cgiar.org/bitstream/handle/10568/24981/IGAD_LPI_WP_09-08.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) [2019-05-21]

Bertow, K (2009). *Consequences of the EU Trade and Agricultural Policy for Zambia's Dairy Farmers*.

[https://www.fian.org/fileadmin/media/publications\\_2015/Consequences\\_of\\_the\\_EU\\_Ag\\_and\\_Trade\\_Policy\\_in\\_Uganda\\_200.pdf](https://www.fian.org/fileadmin/media/publications_2015/Consequences_of_the_EU_Ag_and_Trade_Policy_in_Uganda_200.pdf) [2019-05-21]

Grabowski, R. (2018). Deindustrialisation in Mozambique: the role of agriculture. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 39(4), pp. 569-585. DOI: 10.1080/02255189.2018.1467829

Janssen, R. & Ruts, D. D. (2011). Sustainability of biofuels in Latin America: Risks and opportunities. *Energy Policy*, 39(10), pp. 5717-5725. DOI: 10.1016/j.enpol.2011.01.047

Kaweesa, S., Mkomwa, S & Loiskandl, W. (2018). Adoption of Conservation Agriculture in Uganda: A Case Study of the Lango Subregion. *Sustainability*, 10(10), pp. 1-13.  
DOI: 10.3390/su10103375

Kessler, G., Di Virgilio, M. & Yaroshenko, S. (2010). New Poverty in Argentina and Russia: some brief comparative conclusions. *Laboratorium*, 2(2), pp. 252-256.

Khatun, K. (2012). Reform or reversal: implications of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) on land use, land use change, and forestry (LULUCF) in developing countries. *Conservation Letters*, 5(2), pp. 99-106. DOI: 10.1080/07036330802141998

King, S. (2015). Political capabilities for democratisation in Uganda: good governance or popular organisation building? *Third World Quarterly*, 36(4), pp. 741-757.  
DOI: 10.1080/01436597.2015.1024436

López, M. (2014). The state of poverty: Elite perceptions of the poor in Brazil and Uruguay. *International Sociology*, 28(3), pp. 351-370. DOI: 10.1177/0268580913484346

Matthews, A. (2008). The European Union's Common Agricultural Policy and Developing Countries: the Struggle for Coherence. *European Integration*, 30(3), pp. 381-399.  
DOI: 10.1080/07036330802141998

Martínez-Alier, J. (2009). Environmental Justice (Local and Global). *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 8(1), pp. 91-107. DOI: 10.1080/10455759709358725

Martínez-Alier, J. (2014). The environmentalism of the poor. *Geoforum*, 54, pp. 239-241. DOI: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.04.019

May, T. (2013). *Samhällsvetenskaplig forskning*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Michelini, J. J. (2013). Small farmers and social capital in development projects: Lessons from failures in Argentina's rural periphery. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 30, pp. 99-109. DOI: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2013.01.001

Naylor, R. L. & Higgins, M. M. (2018). The rise in global biodiesel production: Implications for food security. *Global Food Security*, 16, pp. 75-84. DOI: 10.1016/j.gfs.2017.10.004

Nkala, P., Mango, N. & Zikhali, P. (2011). Conservation Agriculture and Livelihoods of Smallholder Farmers in Central Mozambique. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture*, 35(7), pp. 757-779. DOI: 10.1080/10440046.2011.606492

Paes-Sousa, R. & Vaitsman, J. (2014). The Zero Hunger and Brazil without Extreme Poverty programs: a step forward in Brazilian social protection policy. *Ciência & Saúde Coletiva*, 19(11), pp. 4351-4360. DOI: 10.1590/1413-812320141911.08812014

Patel, R. (2009). Food sovereignty. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 36(3), pp. 663-706. DOI: 10.1080/03066150903143079

Peet, R., Robbins, P. & Watts, M. (2011). *Global Political Ecology*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Porsani, J., Börjeson, L. & Lehtilä, K. (2017). Land Concessions and Rural Livelihoods in Mozambique: The Gap Between Anticipated and Real Benefits of a Chinese Investment in the Limpopo Valley. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 43(6), pp. 1181-1198.

DOI: 10.1080/03057070.2017.1377932

Revoredo-Giha, C., Philippidis, G., Toma, L. & Renwick, A. (2013). The Impact of EU Export Refunds on the African Continent: An Impact Assessment. *Journal of Development Studies*, 49(12), pp. 1651-1675. DOI: 10.1080/00220388.2013.807500

Robles, W. (2018). Revisiting Agrarian Reform in Brazil, 1985–2016. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 34(1), pp. 1-34. DOI: 10.1177/0169796X17749658

Sage, C. (2014). Food security, food sovereignty and the special rapporteur: Shaping food policy discourse through realising the right to food. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 4(2), pp. 195-199. DOI: 10.1177/2043820614537156

Schuenemann, F., Thurlow, J. & Zeller, M. (2017). Leveling the field for biofuels: comparing the economic and environmental impacts of biofuel and other export crops in Malawi. *Agricultural Economics*, 48(3), pp. 301-315. DOI: 10.1111/agec.12335

Sundstøl Eriksen, S. (2018). The Uses of Comparisons: A Critical Review of Approaches to Comparisons in Development Studies. *Forum for Development Studies*, 45(2), pp. 327-345. DOI: 10.1080/08039410.2018.1467485

The World Bank (2019). *Agriculture, forestry, and fishing, value added (% of GDP)*. <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NV.AGR.TOTL.ZS> [2019-05-14]

Torayeh, N. M. (2011). The Effects of Reducing European and American Subsidies on Agricultural Exports of Developing Countries. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 44(2), pp. 349-365. DOI: 10.1353/jda.0.0112

Victor, B. et al. (2014). Multidimensional Poverty in Rural Mozambique: A New Metric for Evaluating Public Health Interventions. *PLoS ONE*, 9(9), pp. 1-10.  
DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0108654

Wallace, M. & Wray, A. (2016). *Critical Reading and Writing for Postgraduates*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.