UDC:

Rita Pauli
Federal University of Santa Maria
Brazil
Contact: joreiro@unb.br

Type Of Work:
OSP

Received: **14.11.2024.** ✓
Accepted: **27.12.2024** ✓

FAMILY FARMING AND FOOD SOVEREIGNTY IN CONTEMPORARY BRAZIL

Abstract: Stimulating family farming is crucial for promoting food security and sustainable rural development in Brazil, especially due to the productive orientation of the dominant agricultural model following a different trend that is focused on the export of commodities for international trade. This study seeks to highlight elements that link family farming to agri-food sovereignty and sustainability in Brazil. To achieve the proposed objective, a methodology involving an interdisciplinary approach is used, including economic, social and environmental analyzes and some data from secondary sources on government incentives for family farming via PRONAF and those allocated by Rural Credit to employer agriculture. It is concluded that family farming stands out in the sustainable food supply for the domestic market, and the country's recognition of its promotion from the 1990s onwards was an important milestone in encouraging agroecology. Recent data show that there is a lack of stable and increasing maintenance of resource allocation for this social segment, which is an important factor, but not the only one to guarantee greater food sovereignty.

Keywords: FOOD SOVEREIGNTY, FAMILY FARMING, FOOD SECURITY, AGROECOLOGY

Introduction

In Brazil, family farming plays a central role in promoting food sovereignty, whose importance increases especially in the current context of new social and economic challenges and the intensification of environmental emergencies. Food sovereignty as a principle was originally postulated by the international La Via Campesina movement at the World Forum on Food Sovereignty held in Cuba in 2001 (Brandeburg, Bezerra; Giordani, 2016). The notion of food sovereignty transcends the food security approach and refers to the right of people to define their own policies and strategies for the production, distribution and consumption of food, respecting their cultures and traditions. Linked to this concept is the right of each people to decide their own agricultural policies and define food, protect and regulate domestic markets in order to achieve development goals with national agricultural production and sustainability (LCV, 2015).

In fact, the concepts of sovereignty and food security are recent, however agriculture as a socio-cultural practice dates back around 10,000 years. The diversity and richness of this ancestral knowledge are especially relevant in Brazil and throughout Latin America, as they are home to a variety of biomes interconnected with culturally diverse human groups (Brandeburg, Bezerra; Giordani, 2016). Such knowledge, in addition to preserving cultural traditions, offers viable and effective solutions for sustainable agriculture. In the theoretical field, the debate is expanding that agriculture of the future must be both sustainable and productive enough to feed the growing population with quality. To this end, a new approach to agriculture and agricultural development is required , which prioritizes aspects linked to the conservation of natural resources from traditional local agriculture, and at the same time modern ecological knowledge and methods are explored (Gliessman, 2013, 56). For the author, agroecology should be emphasized as it would be capable of promoting integration between natural and agricultural ecosystems, sustainability and social equity.

Although the Brazilian territory presents a great diversity of socioeconomic-environmental-cultural regions, a threat is perceived in terms of biodiversity and harmful implications for agri-food sustainability due to the increasing introduction of chemical inputs into the agricultural production system. There is an incentive to the hegemonic agro-export model, which is important for generating surpluses in the trade balance, but encourages the intensive use of natural resources, in addition to the increasing use of pesticides that can harm the environment and the health of local populations. Furthermore, this trend reduces the ability to produce food sustainably, violating the principles of food sovereignty. This is not only due to direct damage caused to agricultural areas, but also due to cross-contamination, resulting from the type and form of application of pesticides that end up contaminating sustainable agriculture production territories.

As a result, commercial agriculture for a large part of social segments presents itself as a contested model, due to the productive technology adopted, and because it worsens the concentration of land and resources in the hands of large agricultural producers, and corporations, aggravating social inequalities and harmfully affecting human health due to food contamination. Organizations that bring together a significant portion of family farming, social movements (MST), indigenous people, non-governmental and environmental organizations and conscious consumers are the main social actors who contest this model and call for healthy food, social justice, territorial rights and environmental preservation.

In Brazil, at the same time that the existence of structural heterogeneity is recognized, both between groups of farmers and between regions of the country (Fornazier & Vieira Filho, 2013), the participation of each productive segment in total production is diverse, and resulting especially from subsidies that particularly privilege groups that are involved in production for foreign trade. Historically, there seems to be a vocation in Brazil for large production aimed at exports and throughout the entire trajectory of agricultural development in Brazil, the dominance of the agro-export model is noticeable. The large geographical extension, the presence of agricultural land and government incentives have reinforced this trend especially since the mid-1960s, being made possible by the broad subsidies offered by the financial market following the creation of the National Rural Credit System (SNCR) . This process resulted in a greater concentration of land and income in the countryside and, despite promoting an increase in the quantity of food offered, it has had a negative impact on the environment and has an impact on food quality. The consolidation of the modernization of agriculture in Brazil had the main known impacts at the end of the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s, in which specific research denoted: i) the existence of erosion in Paraná; ii) the Adolfo Lutz Institute found the presence of organochlorines in the milk of pregnant women in São Paulo; iii) the Institute of Food Technology (Ital, SP) identified pesticide residues in dairy products, sausages and other industrialized products; in the analysis of vegetables and fruits, toxic residues were identified in a large number of samples (Costa, 2017).

In the 1980s, the crisis in the Brazilian economy was noticeable due to the drop in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and unemployment that devastated the country. There was also an external debt crisis that increased even more as a result of the rise in oil prices in the 1970s, and the solution found by the government was to stimulate commercial agriculture with the aim of generating surpluses in the trade balance. At the end of the 1990s, Brazil once again sought solutions to the external debt crisis and weak economic growth. The choice was to stimulate agriculture by promoting exchange rate devaluation in 1999, which stimulated exports. This process resulted in the reprimarization of the export agenda, exactly at a time when the process of deindustrialization of the Brazilian economy intensified.

Despite the recurring incentives for commercial agriculture, a paradox can be observed in the country, since the large agricultural production capacity occurs concomitantly with high levels of food insecurity. The main causes are structural, and in the recent period adverse shocks have been worsening food insecurity: i) the Covid 19 pandemic and, ii) the emergence of extreme weather factors. It is worth remembering that food insecurity in its most extreme form is hunger, whose genesis in Brazil lies in the historical-political process of the formation of our society. Based on the denunciation made by Josué de Castro, a pioneer in the systematized approach to hunger as a product of underdevelopment, in his book "Geography of Hunger – The Brazilian dilemma: bread or steel", published in 1946, began a discussion about the real food problem that was plaguing the country and which concerned an event of a social and not a natural nature. Therefore, hunger is the result of men's actions, their choices and the economic development they bring to their countries (Aranha, 2010).

In turn, family farming in Brazil is responsible for a significant portion of the production of food consumed internally. According to the 2017 Agricultural Census from the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE), family farming represents approximately 77% of rural establishments and accounts for around 23% of the gross value of agricultural production. Family farming is made up of social actors responsible for supplying basic foods for the domestic market, such as beans, corn, cassava, milk, vegetables, which make up the basic diet of the Brazilian population.

Given this situation, this study proposes to bring to light elements that link family farming to food sovereignty in Brazil, show some recent data on monetary incentives allocated to commercial and family farming in order to understand a dichotomy in which there is a prioritization of agriculture focused on for the foreign market. From now on, it is worth stating that the areas where family farming operates are mainly in sustainable food production, being primarily oriented towards the internal consumption of a growing population and, to meet institutional purchases from programs created by the federal government, especially after the 2000s.

The first section defines and discusses the links between sustainable food systems and food sovereignty, the second section presents the specificity of Brazilian family farming, promotion via Pronaf and government programs and, in the end, final considerations are presented.

Sustainable food systems, sovereignty and agroecology

The food sovereignty highlights autonomy and local control over food systems. The challenges of the transition to fair, sustainable and healthy food systems cannot be restricted to proposals focused solely on the areas of production and marketing

or consumption, as these only offer partial solutions, as they do not consider the conditions of inequalities in food systems (M aluf; Burlandy, 2022). On the contrary, proposals based on a more "systemic" perspective allow reconfiguring and acting directly on the determinants of inequalities as they include processes and types of knowledge that are politically and socially constructed in the analysis (Maluf, Burlandy, 2022). For the authors, "systemic interventions" make it possible to simultaneously change the modes of production and consumption of food in an integrated way, potentially affecting the three pandemics that make up the global syndemic: obesity, malnutrition and climate change.

Another recent theoretical approach, which emphasizes a holistic approach that considers local and regional contexts, derives from ecological economics, geography and rural sociology and concerns City-Region Food Systems (SACR). SACR, due to its integrative operational method, has the capacity to contribute to tackling complex challenges such as climate change, water availability and poverty (Blay-Palmer., Santini., Dubbeling., Renting., Taguchi & Giordano, 2020). A sustainable and resilient city-region food system aims to improve sustainability at all levels and sectors: expands access to food, generates decent employment and income, increases the region's resilience, fosters urban and rural links, promotes the ecosystem and management of natural resources, supports participatory governance (Blay-Palmer.,. Santini., Dubbeling., Renting.,Taguchi & Giordano, 2020).

The local sustainable food systems can strengthen social cohesion and promote community development by emphasizing the importance of traditional agricultural practices and local identity (Goodman, D.; Dupuis, EM; Goodman, M. K, 2012). In this work, the authors address alternative food networks, which comprise a wide range of initiatives and practices, such as family farmers' markets, community-supported agriculture programs such as (CSAs), food cooperatives that in many countries are represented by practice of solidarity economy and other alternative movements. Therefore, these innovative and creative forms are constructed due to the lack of prevention and planning of national states.

Altieri, one of the greatest advocates of agroecology, shows that peasant agriculture throughout the world is going through a process of systematic impoverishment, on the one hand there is a population increase and on the other, rural properties reduce their physical size. "(...) the environment is degrading and, per capita, food production has stagnated or is declining. In view of the deepening food crisis, an important measure in rural development programs should be to prevent the collapse of peasant agriculture, making it more sustainable and productive. Such transformation can only occur if projects realize the potential of agroecology contributions and incorporate them into development strategies" (Altieri, 2009 p.109).

Thus, encouraging agroecology in family farming is one of the most important reactions to commercial agriculture. This is because it constitutes a sovereign practice and has not been corrupted / affected by the modernization imposed by

large foreign companies upstream. Despite being an old movement, advocates of agroecology understand that natural resources are less and less as abundant as they were in the distant past, which is why they are concerned with producing while reducing the use of scarce materials such as water. Agroecology is a science that rescues traditional agricultural knowledge neglected by modern agriculture, and seeks to systematize and validate it so that it can be reapplied on new scientific bases (Assis & Romeiro, 2005). Agroecology proposes alternatives to minimize the artificialization of the natural environment by agriculture, for which it presents a series of principles and methodologies to study, analyze, direct, design and evaluate agroecosystems (Assis, 2006).

As a result, the lack of prevention and planning itself constitutes limits for the development of healthy foods, and this is requiring innovative and creative ways in the global world.

It must be ensured that for agriculture to meet the dual challenge of being sustainable and productive, which becomes possible from a new approach to agricultural development, which builds on resource conservation aspects of traditional local agriculture, whilst, at the same time, modern ecological knowledge and methods are explored (Gliessman, 2013). Agroecology allows the knowledge and methodology to develop agriculture that is environmentally consistent, highly productive and economically viable (Gliessman, 2013), and modern agriculture is unsustainable because it deteriorates the conditions that make it possible (Gliessman, 2013). The argument for the “effectiveness” of the conventional model is a narrative of the interests of the chemical industry, technology and financial investors (Costa, 2017).

The agroecology has a critical view of current agricultural processes, as it contributes to overcoming the socio-environmental problems inherent to agriculture, particularly its negative externalities that are not taken into account in the calculation of the agricultural Gross Domestic Product (GDP), but that society as a whole pays for them (Costa, 2017).The agroecological approach considers a holistic investigation and analysis in which agricultural ecosystems are the fundamental units of study and these systems include mineral cycles, energy transformation, biological processes, and socioeconomic relations (Altiere, 1989). In agroecology, the concept of agroecological transition is central, as it provides the scientific and methodological bases for the promotion of sustainable agricultural styles, having as one of its central axes the production of food in adequate quantities and of high biological quality, for all society (Caporal & Costabeber, 2015).

The agroecology is the action-oriented approach to engaging in this process of change, where the science of ecology links to the practice of agriculture and together the two join forces with social movements in our food systems seeking food justice, democracy food, food autonomy, and food sovereignty (Caporal & Costabeber, 2015). An agroecosystem is ecological and social, and truly transformative changes to our food and agricultural systems are based on social (and political) changes, so

changes should not be restricted to the system, but to society as a whole.

Sustainable agriculture is fundamental to achieving sustainability, however, it is not a sufficient condition and, if the idea is to make it truly sustainable, then it needs to include all aspects of food production, distribution and consumption (Gliessman , 2013). Therefore, it must evolve towards a more comprehensive concept that goes beyond the agricultural production unit, it must consider the many and complex social and economic conditions that affect productive units and agricultural communities, and agroecology provides the bases that they allow the expansion of the focus of analysis and intervention by including food systems as a whole (Gliessman, 2013).

Family farming and the promotion of food and nutritional security in Brazil

The family farming contributes decisively to promoting food and nutritional security, generating income in the countryside and local economies, preserving traditional foods and agrobiodiversity. In 2014, the "International Year of Family Farming" was launched by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, with the aim of highlighting the global importance of family farming and small producers, considering their recognized capacity to reduce hunger and promote food security (Food and Agriculture Organization, 2014). Family farmers are responsible for producing 1/3 of the food produced on a global scale (FAO, 2022) In Brazil, despite the theoretical discussion involving this social category dating back to a previous period, it was only in the mid-1990s that the Family farming was recognized by the federal government as an important segment for promoting rural development (Schneider, 2010; Grisa & Schneider, 2015), guaranteeing the allocation of financial resources for its productive promotion.

Thus, despite the recognized importance of family farming for promoting food sovereignty and rural development, specific public policies for this social segment are recent. Recomposing historically, we will see that policies for the development of Brazilian agriculture had a general character until the end of the 1970s, through the National Rural Credit System (SNCR). There was a perception of lower risk associated with large-scale activities and a belief in greater efficiency in the use of financial resources made available by the credit system (Silva & Souza, 2020). Therefore, employer agriculture concentrated the majority of financial resources due to the greater guarantees for the payment of financing granted and, due to the government policy that privileged export agriculture, considering its ability to generate surpluses in the trade balance.

Therefore, despite the importance of family farming for the domestic food supply, until the second half of the 1990s, the country did not have any type of

SOCIAL HORIZONS
Vol. IV / Issue. 8 / DECEMBER 2024

public policy, with national coverage, for this important productive segment. In 1995, the National Program for Strengthening Family Agriculture (PRONAF) was created, whose main lines of the program consist of PRONAF-M credit, intended for infrastructure and services, and PRONAF-C credit, intended for funding and investment. Abramovay and Veiga (1999) show that the existence of a credit policy aimed at family farming finds its justification in what economists call market failure. From this perspective, the contribution of this sector to occupation and income generation in the countryside would be limited by the absence of infrastructural conditions to value its work, and by the difficulties that the banking sector imposes on a segment that imposes risks, as it has a precarious base patrimonial and unable to offer compensation

In order to make investments in infrastructure using PRONAF resources, the project must meet three guidelines: (i) act in accordance with the demands formulated by family farmers and/or their organizations; (ii) decentralize personnel and work processes, bringing them as close as possible to local realities; and (iii) concentrate efforts on finding comprehensive answers for production systems typical of family farming (Abramovay & Veiga, 1999). PRONAF-M aims to promote investments based on commitments negotiated between beneficiaries, municipal and state authorities, and civil society, enabling: a) the implementation, expansion, modernization, rationalization and relocation of infrastructure necessary to strengthen agriculture family; and b) the expansion and coverage of support services, such as agricultural research and technical assistance and rural extension.

The Pronaf C, which is intended for credit for costs and investments, began to admit family farmers who employed up to two permanent employees, which generated two relevant consequences: the first is that farmers with the capacity to offer to banks become candidates for PRONAF credit, real guarantees and counterparts, and which will tend to absorb a significant part of the resources, mainly investment. The second is that the participation of employer unions in the local implementation of PRONAF increases (Abramovay & Veiga, 1999).

If care is taken to ensure that resources allocated to PRONAF C are not granted to employer farmers or self-employed professionals who have areas of less than four rural modules, one of its main rules is that 80% of family income must come from agriculture, thus reducing the chances of resources being diverted from farmers to landowners who do not produce. The authors emphasize that most of the resources are destined for states and municipalities where family farming has greater economic strength, and which have greater agro-industrial integration (Abramovay & Veiga, 1999). If, through PRONAF-C, the number of farmers able to increase their income based on agro-industrial integration is increased, its objectives, in this regard, will be fulfilled. (Abramovay & Veiga, 1999, p. 31). The main changes to PRONAF occurred from 1999 onwards, when beneficiary farmers were divided into distinct groups, based mainly on annual gross income, with the intention of better meeting the reality of each group, such as agroecology, and for specific groups (women, young people and fishermen), and other institutional changes enabling a greater number

of family farmers to have access to the program.

The Ministry of Agrarian Development (MDA) was converted into the Special Secretariat for Family Agriculture and Agrarian Development of the Civil House of the Presidency of the Republic (Sead) in 2016, being extinguished in 2019 and recreated in 2023. Currently, the MDA specifies nine subprograms, which can be financed via PRONAF with specific destinations, as, explained in BOX 1.

BOX 1.

Pronaf Costing: Financing of cost items related to the agricultural or livestock activity carried out.
Pronaf Agroindústria : financing for family farmers and rural producers, individuals and legal entities, and cooperatives for investment in processing, storage, processing and marketing of agricultural, extractive, artisanal and forestry products; and to support the exploration of rural tourism.
Pronaf Mulher : financing for female farmers who are members of a family production unit covered by Pronaf, regardless of marital status.
Pronaf ABC+ Agroecology : financing for family farmers and rural producers, individuals, for investment in agroecological or organic production systems, including costs related to the implementation and maintenance of the enterprise.
Pronaf ABC+ Bioeconomy : financing for family farmers and rural producers, individuals, for investment in the use of renewable energy technologies, environmental technologies, water storage, small hydroenergy plants, forestry and the adoption of conservation practices and correction of soil acidity and fertility , aiming at its recovery and improvement of production capacity.
Pronaf Mais Alimentos : financing for family farmers and rural producers, individuals, for investment in their production structure and services, aiming to increase productivity and increase family income.
Pronaf Jovem : financing for family farmers and rural producers, individuals, for investment in production activities, as long as beneficiaries are over 16 years old and under 29 years old, among other requirements.
Pronaf Microcredit (Group "B") : financing for family farmers and rural producers, individuals, who have obtained a gross family income of up to R$ 23 thousand, in the 12 months of normal production that preceded the request for the Declaration of Aptitude to PRONAF (DAP).
Pronaf Quotas-Partes : financing for the payment of quotas-parts by Pronaf beneficiaries associated with rural production cooperatives; and application by the cooperative in working capital, funding, investment or financial restructuring.

It should also be noted that only municipalities that have the Municipal Rural Development Plan (PMDR), (official document of the municipality, which should help obtain the necessary resources for the implementation of actions aimed at strengthening family farming), approved by the Municipal Council for Rural Development (CMDR), are able to request financing via PRONAF. Caixa Econômica Federal is the financial agent responsible for transferring resources to municipalities. The creation of PRONAF resulted in the need for other differentiated policies for rural development, as well as the creation of the Ministry of Agrarian Development (MDA) in 1999, and within this scope the creation of the Secretariat of Family Agriculture (SAF) in 2001 (Grisa ;Schneider, 2015).

Between the years 2015 and 2023, the financial resources allocated via Rural Credit to agribusiness and PRONAF to promote family farming can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1: Financial resources allocated via rural credit and Pronaf (2014-2023).

Harvest (year)	Costing and marketing (R$ billion)	Investment (R$ billion)	Rural credit / total (R$ billion)	Variation (%)	Pronaf / total (R$ billion)
2014/2015	112	44.1	156.1	14.8	s/a
2015/2016	149.5	38.2	187.7	20	28.9
2016/2017	149.8	34	183.8	-two	53.61
2017/2018	150.25	38.15	188.4	2.5	30
2018/2019	151.1	40	194.37	3	17.45
2019/2020	169.33	53.42	222.75	14.6	31.22
2020/2021	179.38	56.93	236.31	6.1	33
2021/2022	177.78	73.44	251.22	6.3	39.34
2022/2023	246.28	94.6	340.88	36	24.4

Source: MAPA

According to Table 1, it is possible to note that there was a growing and sustained evolution of financial resources for rural credit in the period under analysis, with only the 2016/2017 harvest showing a slight drop of two percentage points in relation to the previous harvest. The 2022/2023 harvest presented the most significant accumulated variation in rural credit (+36%). The data on the allocation of resources to family farming, in addition to being significantly lower, also presents strong instability as large inflections are observed, like the 2017/2018 harvest, resulting from attempts to promote fiscal adjustment by the Temer government. The 2018/2019 harvest was the one that received the smallest volume of financial resources from PRONAF in the last ten years. Despite this, this drop was not followed when considering the resources allocated via rural credit to commercial agriculture, which

in the same harvest increased (14.6%) in relation to the previous harvest.

If the idea is to encourage sustainable agriculture represented by family farming, then the promotion must be increasing and continued, to especially guarantee the encouragement of agroecology in family farming, as seen previously. This is because it is one of the most important reactions to commercial agriculture, as it is a practice that has not been affected by the modernization imposed by large companies upstream. The agroecological movement recognizes that natural resources are no longer as abundant as they were in the distant past, which is why it is concerned with producing while reducing the use of scarce materials such as water. Agroecology is a science that rescues traditional agricultural knowledge neglected by modern agriculture, and seeks to systematize and validate it so that it can be (re)applied on new (scientific) bases (ASSIS & ROMEIRO, 2005). Agroecology proposes alternatives to minimize the artificialization of the natural environment by agriculture, for which it presents a series of principles and methodologies to study, analyze, direct, design and evaluate agroecosystems (ASSIS, 2006). Agroecology is identified with a practice that has not been affected by the modernization imposed by large companies upstream, and is therefore non-conservative, in essence, being preservative by privileging sustainable technologies.

The lack of prevention and planning requires more and more innovative and creative ways in the global world. Altieri shows that peasant agriculture around the world is going through a process of systematic impoverishment, on the one hand there is a population increase and on the other, rural properties reduce their physical size. "(...) the environment is degrading and, per capita, food production has stagnated or is declining. In the face of this crisis, which has been deepening, an important measure in rural development programs should be to avoid the collapse of peasant agriculture, making it more sustainable and productive. Such transformation can only occur if projects realize the potential of agroecology contributions and incorporate them into development strategies" (Altieri, 2009 p.109).

According to Nierdele and Marques, the importance that the agroecological movement has assumed in Brazil has led to the institutionalization of the implementation of the organic compliance system. This represents a new institutionality and creates hope for greater development of agroecology and markets for agroecological and organic foods in Brazil (Nierdele & Marques, 2016). The authors describe the four fundamental milestones in the process of institutionalizing organic food production in Brazil: "In December 2003, law nº 10,831 established the need for certification of organ production, the qualitative aspects of organic animal and vegetable production. Then, normative instruction nº 19, of May 28, 2009, defined technical and organizational determinations to comply with the previous law. Finally, in January 2011, a new regulation defined the three quality assurance mechanisms: social control in direct sales without certification; Certification by external audit. Participatory guarantee systems, although not fully accepted by different types and marketing channels, are still the most used by farmers, as they have lower costs, for example in relation to external auditing (Nierdele & Marques, 2016).

Together with almost two hundred countries, through the UN Sustainable Development Agenda (ADS), Brazil committed to eradicating the problem of hunger by 2030, with sustainability and resilience and to this end, expanded a set of public policies to strengthen the family farming. In the recent period, in 2012, the National Policy for Agroecology and Organic Production (PNAPO) was created, instrumentalized in 2013, by the National Plan for Agroecology and Organic Production (I Planapo) updated and revised in 2016 (II Planapo) (Nierdele; Sabourin; Schmitt; Ávila; Assis, 2019). For the authors, these policies act to expand efforts to establish dialogue between civil society and the various levels of government (union, federated states, municipalities and territories), giving rise to various dynamics of institutionalization of agroecology.

The promotion of spaces for dialogue between different movements, social organizations, academics and public managers is an important path towards consolidating agroecology in the country and, the National Agroecology Meetings (ENAS), for example, are linked to several other movements, one of which is the Brazilian Forum for Solidarity Economy (FBES) (Nierdele; Sabourin; Schmitt; Ávila; Petersen; Assis, 2019). The importance of this perspective arises from the need to guarantee access to knowledge on sustainable agricultural practices and knowledge exchange. And the result of this and many other articulations contribute to Brazil's prominent position in the international context, in the construction of public policies for agroecology.

Final considerations

Throughout the work it was seen that family farming needs increasing and regular incentives to guarantee food security and sovereignty, especially in the Brazilian case where the hegemonic model is commercial agriculture. It is concluded that family farming stands out in the sustainable food supply for the domestic market, and its recognition and promotion via PRONAF by public authorities in the mid-1990s was an important milestone in the expansion of sustainable food production and agroecology. It is worth emphasizing that the agroecological movement in Brazil has transformative potential at different levels, being developed mainly by family farming. However, data from recent years show that there is a lack of stable and increasing maintenance of resource allocation for this social segment, which is central – but not the only reason – to guarantee greater sovereignty and food security.

The Contemporary environmental challenges require holistic and integrative approaches in such a way that the Sustainable Food Systems approach provides effective theoretical elements to understand the theme of this study in a broad analytical scope. It appears that encouraging family farming through the channeling of financial, technical and rural extension resources, in addition to being crucial for food sovereignty, also contributes to social justice and the reduction of socio-environmental conflicts in the country.

REFERENCES

1. Abramovay, R. & Veiga, JE da. (1999) New institutions for rural development: the case of the National Program for Strengthening Family Agriculture (PRONAF) . . Brasilia: IPEA. Available at: http://www.econ.fea.usp.br/zeeli/. Accessed on: 28 Jul. 2024.
2. Altieri, M. A. (1989). Agroecology: the scientific bases of alternative agriculture. 2nd ed. Rio de Janeiro: PTA-FASE, 240 p.
3. Aranha, AV (Org.). (2010). Zero Hunger: A Brazilian History. Brasília: Ministry of Social Development and Fight Against Hunger, Assessoria Fome Zero, v. 1,. Available at: https://ifz.org.br/fome-zero-uma-historia-brasileira-v1-4/ . Accessed on: Jun 19 2022.
4. Assis, RL & Romeiro, AR (2005). Agroecology and family farming in the Center-South region of the State of Paraná. Journal of Rural Economics and Sociology - RESR. v.43, n.01, p.155-177.
5. Assis, RL (2006). Sustainable rural development in Brazil: perspectives based on the integration of public and private actions based on Agroecology. Applied Economics Magazine, v.10, n.1, p.75-89.
6. Brandenburg, A,. Bezerra, I., Giordani, RCF, (2016). Food sovereignty, territorial development and sustainability: perspectives and contexts. Guaju, vol. 2, p. 2-13. Available at: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/328079345.pdf
7. Caporal & Costabeber (2015). Agroecology: concepts and principles for building sustainable agricultural styles. In: Agrarian Question, Cooperation and Agroecology. Novaes, Mazin and Santos (Org.) 2nd Ed.
8. CEPEA. Center for Research in Applied Economics (2021). The GDP of Brazilian Agribusiness. Available at: < https://cepea.esalq.usp.br/br/pib-do-agronegocio-brasileiro.aspx >. Accessed on: 20 Jul. 2021. COSTA, Manoel BB da. (2017). Agroecology in Brazil: history, principles and practices. 1st ed. São Paulo, Popular expression.
9. Coast. MBB (2017). Agroecology in Brazil: history, principles and practices. 1st Ed. São Paulo: Expressão Popular.
10. Food and Agriculture Organization – FAO. (2014). International year of family farming. In Proceedings of the 38th Conference . Rome: FAO.
11. FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. (2022). The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2022. Repurposing food and agricultural policies to make healthy diets more affordable. Rome, FAO.
12. Fornazier A, & Vieira Filho, JER (2013). The Structural Heterogeneity in the Brazilian Agricultural Sector: evidence from the 2006 Agricultural Census. In: Discussion text, v. 1819, p. 1-37. Brasilia. IPEA.
13. Gliessam, SR (2013).Agroecology: ecological processes in sustainable agriculture. 4th ed., Porto Alegre: Editora UFRGS.
14. Goodmann, D., Dupuis, E. M., & Goodman, M. K,.(2012). Alternative Food Networks: Knowledge, Practice, and Politics Routlege.
15. Grisa, C.; Schneider, S. (2015) Three generations of public policies for family farming and forms of interaction between society and the State in Brazil . In: Public policies for rural development in Brazil. Porto Alegre: UFRGS Publisher.
16. LA VÍA CAMPESINA (LVC). Declaration of the International Agroecology Forum. Available at: https://viacampesina.org/es/declaracion-del-foro-internacional-de-agroecologia/ Accessed on: 06/29/2024.

17. Maluf, R. S. & Burlandy, L. (2022). Food Systems, Inequalities and Health in Brazil: Challenges for the Transition Towards Sustainability and Promotion of Adequate and Healthy Food. Discussion Text nº 81. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Oswaldo Cruz. Available at: https://www.arca.fiocruz.br/bitstream/handle/icict/52188/TD_81.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y
18. Nierdele PA, Sauborin E., Schmitt CJ, Ávila ML de,. Petersen P. Assis, WS de. (2019). Redes Magazine (Santa Cruz do Sul. Online), v. 24, no. 1. Available at: https://online.unisc.br/seer/index.php/redes/article/view/13035
19. Nierdele, PA & Marques, FC (2016). Ecological food production and institutional changes: implications for the construction of new markets. In: Marques, FC and Conterato, MA and Schneider, S. (Orgs.). Construction of markets and family farming: challenges for rural development. 1 ed. Porto Alegre: UFRGS, v. 1, p. 275-310.
20. Schneider, S. (2010). Situating rural development in Brazil: the context and issues under debate. Journal of Political Economy, vol. 30, no. 3 (119), pp. 511-531, July-September.
21. Silva JP & Souza MR (2020) Rural credit policies and agricultural development in Brazil. Journal of Agricultural Economics, 67(3), 233-247.

Rita Pauli
Federal University of Santa Maria
Brazil

ПОРОДИЧНА ПОЉОПРИВРЕДА И ПРЕХРАМБЕНИ СУВЕРЕНИТЕТ У САВРЕМЕНОМ БРАЗИЛУ

Апстракт: Подстицање породичне пољопривреде је кључно за промовисање безбедности хране и одрживог руралног развоја у Бразилу, посебно због продуктивне оријентације доминантног пољопривредног модела који прати другачији тренд који је фокусиран на извоз робе за међународну трговину. Ова студија настоји да истакне елементе који повезују породичну пољопривреду са пољопривредно-прехрамбеним суверенитетом и одрживошћу у Бразилу. Да би се постигао предложени циљ, коришћена је методологија која укључује интердисциплинарни приступ, укључујући економске, социјалне и еколошке анализе и неке податке из секундарних извора о владиним подстицајима за породичне фарме преко ПРОНАФ-а. Закључено је да се породична пољопривреда истиче у одрживом снабдевању домаћег тржишта храном, а признање његове промоције од 1990-их па надаље представљало је важну прекретницу у подстицању агроекологије. Последњи подаци показују да недостаје стабилно и све веће одржавање алокације ресурса за овај друштвени сегмент, који је важан фактор, али не и једини који гарантује већи прехрамбени суверенитет.

Кључне речи: ПРЕХРАМБЕНИ СУВЕРЕНИТЕТ, ПОРОДИЧНА ПОЉОПРИВРЕДА, БЕЗБЕДНОСТ ХРАНА, АГРОЕКОЛОГИЈА