

Background:

Below is a report prepared by the World Agriculture Learning Group (WALG) of the Baltimore County and Baltimore City League of Woman Voters. The impetus for establishing WALG was the LWVUS 's recent effort to update its national position on agriculture. Despite the fact that U.S policies and programs are highly instrumental in shaping the world's agricultural system, the League's update study did not address international agricultural concerns. In September 2015, our group decided to educate ourselves about these broader concerns and have been meeting monthly to discuss readings on a board range of world agricultural issues.

Examples of some of the things we learned are: 1) how Ted Turner's much applauded gift of a billion dollars to the UN ultimately has led to altering the structure of the UN and paving the way for outside corporate interests to influence the priorities of UN agencies and programs including those related to agriculture; 2) how the North American Fair Trade Agreement devastated a large sector of Mexico's farming community; 3) how power is rapidly being concentrated among the world's largest producers and/or marketers of seeds, fertilizers and pesticides, many of which are U.S. based; 4) how the G8's New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition in Africa, promoted by Pres. Obama, may be undermining the ecological and socio-institutional foundation of small holder farming systems.

We hope you will take the time to read our report and to learn more about the issues noted above as well as many others that our committee has explored this past year. We will be continuing to educate ourselves next year. Everyone is invited to attend our learning sessions. We welcome your questions and comments (Contact: Ruth Smith, kujawa@mindspring.com).

Contents:

Background:.....	1
Introduction:.....	2
The United Nations' Impact on World Agricultural Issues.....	2
Part II: Agricultural Trade Issues.....	4
Agriculture Land Use and Farming Systems	6
Feed the Future	8
G7 New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition in Africa (NAFSN).....	8
Water for Agriculture.....	9
Land Grabbing	9

2015-2016 Report from the World Agriculture Learning Group

Introduction: How can the countries of the world address the pressing need to meet the nutritional requirements of an increasing global population and to do so in a humane, equitable, and environmentally appropriate manner? This is the issue that WALG, initiated in Sept 2015 as an activity of LWVBC's International Relations/UN/Trade Committee, has been exploring in its monthly reading/discussion sessions. WALG is a joint activity of both the county and city LWV.

WALG Members are: Ruth Smith and Cindy Farquhar (Co-Chairs), Tina Carr-Wells, Roberta Sharper, and Richard Smith.

Below are summaries of what WALG members have learned about a number of relevant topics during our first year of study.

The United Nations' Impact on World Agricultural Issues

The UN has played an important role in promoting sustainable agriculture beginning in 1949 with the establishment of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), an entity that identifies and promotes strategies to increase food production and food security especially in developing countries. Other UN entities involved in agriculture/hunger issues include the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the World Food Program. (WFP).

In addition, in September 2015, the UN General Assembly adopted the global Sustainable Development Goals for 2030. "Goal One," seeks to "end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and *promote sustainable agriculture.*"

There is considerable concern about how the goals, including Goal One, will be financed. The UN's previous efforts to reduce poverty and end hunger, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) for 2000-2015, were supposed to have been financed by the developed countries allocating 0.7% of their annual Gross National Income to the effort. According to a 2015 UN report (UN. MDG Gap Task Force. Taking Stock of the Global Partnership for Development. Executive Summary. 2015), during the early years of the program, this goal was met by many of the developed countries. However, by 2014 developed countries as a group were contributing less than 0.3 % of their GNI toward meeting the MDGs. In addition, throughout the period, funding was allocated primarily to middle income countries and to conflict areas rather than to the world's poorest countries.

The degree to which the earlier MDG hunger reduction was achieved was assessed by the World Bank in 2015. The study found that among the world's 145 developing countries, only 35 met the goal, 62 were seriously off target, and for 33 of the countries, data was too insufficient to assess the outcome. (The World Bank Data Blog. Neil Fatom, New 2015 edition of World Development Indicators, 4/15/2015).

With reference to *financing the new goals*, that is for the SDGs, an international conference was held in July 2015 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Although civil society groups had called for improving the world's finance system by creating an international tax body, their suggestion was ignored by

the conference participants. The final agreement did include: 1) the recommitment by the developed countries to once again contribute 0.7% of their GNI to developing countries from 2015-2030 and 2) pledges to improve tax collection and prevent tax evasion in developing countries. Currently "the tax-GDP ratios in low-income and lower-middle income countries are around 15 and 19 per cent respectively, compared to over 30 percent in high income countries" (Jomo Kwame Sundaram, "No Aid, No Tax, No Development," IPSNews.net, 8/7/2015).

Dominant capitalistic political and financial forces have succeeded in convincing many UN organizations and leaders that the most feasible way to ensure that the SDG's are met is to promote the development of *private/public partnerships*. That is, private sector entities will work directly with governments of middle and lower income countries to develop and undertake development projects expected to mutually benefit both the private and public sector.

A 2015 study (Barbara Adams and Jens Marten, *Fit for Whose Purpose*. New York. 2015) describes how the influence of corporate interests at the United Nations has been gradually increasing since 1998 when businessman, Ted Turner, offered to give \$1 billion dollars to the UN over the course of a ten-year period. Given that the UN had prior to that always been strictly funded by the governments of member countries, a new mechanism had to be created to facilitate the transfer of Turner's gift. Consequently, Turner created the UN Foundation (UNF) and the Better World Fund (BWF) as not for profit 501(c)(3) charities. At the same time, and with Turner's help, the UN Secretary-General established the UN Nations Fund for International Partnership (UNFIP) as a new UN entity that could legally accept grants from UNF and BWF.

Turner's UNF then identified its priorities and UN departments were requested to submit relevant proposals to the UNF for its consideration. According to the authors of the study this process now allows the UNF to influence the priorities of a wide range of UN agencies. They found its increasing participation in UN affairs not only unique but troubling. The UNF, in addition to advocating private-public partnerships, promotes corporate engagement in SDGs activities. For example, Coca-Cola and UNDP just recently established "Every Drop Matters." (UNDP. *The SDGs: The World's Post-2015 Agenda*. Nov 9, 2015). "Every Drop Matters" is described as "a partnership to improve water supplies and promote responsible ways to manage water resources around the world despite Coca Cola's prior record of its bottling facilities drying up the water resources of poor farmers in India and other parts of the world. (See for example: [Financial Times](#). April 22, 2015. Amy Kagmin. Coca-Cola forced to abandon India bottling plant plan).

In addition, the UNF itself also uses its funds to leverage money from other sources including foreign governments, business interests, and other foundations such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF). UNF is now set up in a way that allows it to fund, in addition to UN programs, many non-UN project. Most of its funding is devoted to health, education, and agricultural projects and related research. With reference to agriculture, UNF's funding appears biased toward large-scale farming projects. For example, the BMGF is closely associated with Monsanto and highly supportive of GMOs, large scale agriculture projects, and heavy reliance on commercial farm inputs (chemical fertilizers and pesticides).

A recent Oxfam examination of agricultural projects in Burkina Faso, Malawi and Tanzania found that "mega agricultural PPPs are by and large unproven and risky, and appear likely to skew the benefits of investments towards the privileged and the more powerful, while the risks fall to the

poorest and most vulnerable." (Oxfam Briefing Paper, Sept. 1 2014. Moral Hazard? Mega Public Private Partnership in African Agriculture).

In contrast, several UN programs and agencies are helping small scale farmers retain their land rights and adopt appropriate farming techniques to improve the quality and productivity of their land. In addition, a 2013 UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) report, compiled by more than 60 experts, "called for an ecological intensification approach to farming to replace the existing industrial system." (UNCTAD. Wake up before it is too late. 2013). The final document, was rejected by the U.S. and Australia and therefore is not classified as an official UN document. However, after being removed from UNCTAD's website for several months, the document has now reappeared on the site.

Part II: Agricultural Trade Issues

The World Trade Organization (WTO) was established in 1995 to promote the development of global trade rules that insure trade flows smoothly, predictably, and as freely as possible. Currently, 162 of the world's 195 countries have signed on as members. Since 2001, WTO has been involved in trying to negotiate the Doha Development Round, an effort to reduce agriculture trade barriers and subsidies. This process is currently on hold because developed countries want to continue subsidizing their domestic agriculture while developing countries want substantiation of fair trade on agricultural products. (www. WHO.org. WTO, 8 March 2016. Agriculture Negotiations Informal Meeting).

Given this current impasse, countries have been developing their own bilateral free trade agreements. Currently, the U.S. is party to 15 of these treaties. We examined several of these including the North American Fair Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and its impact on Mexico. Many sources documented the negative impact to this agreement on Mexico's small-scale farmers.

The following is an example: "NAFTA ... had a severe impact on agricultural employment, as U.S. subsidized corn and other products wiped out family farmers in Mexico. From 1991-2007, there were 4.9 million Mexican family farmers displaced; while seasonal labor in agro-export industries increased by 3 million. This meant a net loss of 1.9 million jobs." (Did NAFTA Help Mexico? An Assessment After 20 Years. Center for Economic and Policy Research. Feb. 2014. By Mark Weisbrot, Stephen Lifevre, Joseph Sammut.)

Many Mexican farmers who were displaced now work as migrant farm laborers. In December of 2014, The Los Angeles Times published a series of articles on the plight of thousands of these migrants who work on large scale industrial farms located in the northwestern region of Mexico. Much of the produce and meat raised on these farms supplies several major supermarket chains in the U.S. The authors found that while the operations themselves are high-tech and often pristine, the living and working conditions and payment processes for the migrants on many of these farms are deplorable. (Hardship on Mexico's farms, a bounty for U.S. Tables, Richard Marosi and Don Bartletti, Los Angeles Times, Dec. 7-30, 2014). The LA Times also produced on site videos of some of these conditions (See: www. graphics. latimes.com/product-of-mexico).

Recently, Public Citizen in a report on the impact of the Central American Fair Trade Agreement (CAFTA) that the U.S. made with other Central American countries noted that: "Before passage of

CAFTA, development organizations warned that the deal could lead to the displacement of the family farmers that constitute a significant portion of Central America's workforce, by forcing them to directly compete with highly-subsidized U.S. agribusiness. Indeed, agricultural imports from the United States in Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala have doubled since the deal went into effect, while those countries' agricultural trade balance with the U.S. has dropped, spelling farmer displacement." (CAFTA's Decade of Empty Promises, Public Citizen, July 19, 2015).

In 2000, the U.S. enacted the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA). It enhanced access to U.S. markets for several qualifying Sub-Saharan African countries: South Africa, Nigeria, Angola, Ghana, and Togo. It allows these countries to export goods to the U.S. duty free. In 2013, U.S. imports from Sub-Saharan Africa totaled \$39.3 billion. Agricultural imports made up only a small amount of the total and included cocoa beans, paste and butter as well as unroasted coffee, in other words, mostly non-value added food products.

With respect to the two treaties currently under considered, the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership and the Pacific Partnership, critics have express concern about the lack of transparency and also about how these partnerships might challenge or inhibit the establishment of food safety and labeling laws put into place by governments.

"The Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) is an international agreement, adopted in 1994, that establishes and controls patent policies including those for plants and seeds. The U.S. with the support of several other developed countries insisted that any country wanting to participate in WTO be required to enact strict Intellectual Property Rights (IP) policies.

TRIPS gives large seed businesses the right to impose "patent protections and high licensing fees on new seed products" while these same seed companies can acquire, at no cost, the seeds that have over the years been selected and saved by generation after generation of small farmers in developing countries." Recently there have been some efforts to improve public access to seeds. Two entities, CGIAR (not an acronym), a system of 12 research centers, and PIPRA (Public Intellectual Property Resources for Agriculture) are to some extent trying to promote a more equitable system for making seeds and technology more readily available to farmers in developing countries. (Intellectual Property and Genetically Modified Seeds: The U.S., Trade, and the Developing World. Northwestern Journal of Technology and Intellectual Property. Haley Stein. Volume 3 Issue 2 Article 4 Spring 2005). An international seed bank has also been established in Sweden, however efforts to ensure fair access to this resource have not as yet been identified and instituted.

Most world governance frameworks, including the UN's Sustainable Development Goals, call for *both* sustainable agriculture and trade liberalization. These two norms are considered by most authorities to be mutually supportive. However, a steadily growing number of experts are questioning this compatibility claim. For example, in a paper, "Trade and Sustainability Challenge for Global Food Governance," delivered at an international colloquium at The Hague in The Netherlands in February of 2016, the author, Jennifer Clapp, questioned the comparative advantage argument used to support trade liberalization. She argued that given that our current global food system is characterized by complex global supply chains under the control of only a few transnational corporations obviates the comparative advantage argument for trade liberalization. In

addition, Clapp and many other investigators point out that the type of farming being promoted by transnational corporate interests, is also associated with high externalities that are *not* being taken into account. These externalities include "land degradation, water depletion, biodiversity loss, carbon emissions, and chemical pollution."

Agriculture Land Use and Farming Systems

According to Wikipedia, in 2011 agricultural land covered 28.4% of the world's land area. Of this, only 20% was devoted to raising food for people while 10% was used to grow food for livestock and a whopping 69% was devoted to pasture for livestock. It is also important to note that a large portion of the world's agricultural land is devoted to the production of palm oil and soybeans. For example, in South America, soybeans are now grown on huge areas of [fragile ecosystems](#) such as the: 1) Brazilian Cerrado (a relatively flat, mixed woodland and savannah area of central Brazil), 2) the Amazon, 3) the Chaco, and 4) the Atlantic Forests of South America.

Soybean Production in the Cerrado: The Cerrado is a vast, biodiverse, savannah (wooded grassland) region in the central Plateau region of Brazil. Up until the 1960s, the land was considered too acidic to farm, but then entrepreneurs began burning large sectors of the savannah to create and sell charcoal. Others discovered that the quality of the burned land could be markedly improved and made fit for agriculture by treating it with large quantities of lime. This land is now mainly devoted to industrialized farming and mono-cropping with maize, rice, beans, but predominately with soybeans. Most of the latter is destined for use as animal feed.

A report (Autumn Spanne, *Industrial Farming Plows Up Brazil's 'Underground Forest'*. November 15, 2014. [The Daily Climate](#)), found on Scientific America's website, described how a field investigation conducted by two Brazilian biologists noted that "two-thirds of the demand for Brazilian soy comes from China and the European Union" but also that "a wide variety of products imported and consumed in the United States – everything from meat and dairy products to cosmetics, soaps and chocolate – depends on Brazilian soy." In addition, the report noted that "several of the leading multinational commodity traders that drive soy production in Brazil are headquartered in the U.S., including Monsanto, Cargill, Archer Daniels Midland and Bunge. Currently only about 20% of the original Cerrado remains in its natural state. The undisturbed Cerrado had been a major sink for carbon dioxide.

Palm Oil Uses and Concerns: Palm oil is used in a vast array of products. It serves as a cooking oil and as a shortening ingredient in a broad range of bakery items and snack foods. It is also used in the production of bactericides, shampoos, cosmetics, pharmaceuticals, cleaning products, detergents, and toothpaste. In addition, much of it is used to produce biodiesel fuel. Palm oil production has often been associated with land grabs, deforestation, and serious violations of human rights especially among indigenous populations. Many efforts are being made to encourage manufacturers who use palm oil to require their suppliers to respect the property and human rights of all those involved in the palm oil production line.

Agroecological Farming Systems (AFS)--Alternative to Industrialized Systems: AFS are a set of methods and tools that take into account the complexities of local environments. "Performance criteria include ecological sustainability, resource conservation, and social equity as well as increased production." For example, an agro ecological farm may grow multiple crops and

varieties, it may include fisheries and livestock to provide more efficient use of nutrients. The field may be surrounded by live fences that provide habitat for beneficial insects that control pests and provide pollination. It may be large or small, organic or nonorganic. (<http://food.berkeley.edu/dfs>).

Genetically Modified Seeds (GMOs) can play a positive role in ensuring an adequate and nutritionally appropriate source of food for the world's growing population and they may be able to do so in a more environmentally appropriate manner than they do at the present time. However, in our current world agricultural system, GMO research, development, and marketing activities are increasingly dominated by a handful of powerful corporations. In developing countries, these companies not only promote GMO seeds but also encourage the development of large-scale industrialized farms on lands generally owned or leased by outside interests and devoted to the production of food, flowers, and biofuels for export primarily to developed countries. In other words, scarce land and water resources in developing countries are often devoted to raising non-value-added crops for export.

We are also concerned about the increasing worldwide use of herbicides and especially glyphosate, an ingredient in Monsanto's widely used Roundup weed killer. Although GMO crops when initially planted require less herbicide use, after a while, weeds become stronger, develop resistance to glyphosate, and farmers then increase their herbicide use. (See for example: Carey Gillam. Not Just for Corn and Soy: A Look at Glyphosate Use in Food Crops. Truthout, 5/5/2016.)

Recently WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classified glyphosate as a Group 2A substance, that means it is "probably carcinogenic to humans." (WHO. International Agency for Research on Cancers. Q&A on Glyphosate, March 1, 2016.) The WHO review was "based on the systematic assembly and review of all publicly available and pertinent studies, by independent experts, free from vested interests." WHO's IARC's classification system is a well-recognized and widely respected reference. Nevertheless, on April 29, 2016, the U.S.'s Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a rebuttal entitled "Final Report. Glyphosate - Not Likely to be Carcinogenic to Human" to counter WHO's position. But then, three *days later*, EPA recalled its own report. The report had immediately been condemned by the Center for Biological Diversity that noted that the EPA report, in contrast to the IARC's report, was based on "findings from non-peer, unpublished regulatory studies and from industry-funded studies." (Center for Biological Diversity. EPA uses industry funded studies. May 2, 2016). For an impartial view of this controversy see: www.greenfacts.org/en/glyphosate.

On a more positive note, Bt corn, cotton, soybeans seeds that have been genetically engineered to express genes that perform as insecticides have to some extent reduced the use of externally applied insecticides on fields where these crops are planted. Also researchers have not substantiated any significant risk to humans from Bt crops. (www.sitn.hms.harvard.edu.) Yet Bt crops do raise other types of concerns. BT soybean and corn seeds are *now also being coated with insecticides, usually neonicotinoids before packaging*. Generally, these coatings are not counted when computing insecticides usage in fields. In addition, many researchers consider these coatings to be both unnecessary and environmentally detrimental especially for bee populations. (See for example: *Publication recaps academic research on neonicotinoid. Purdue University. Agriculture News. Jan 7, 2016*). Bayer and Syngenta are the major makers of coated seeds and they vigorously promote their use around the world.

Seed, Fertilizer, Pesticide and Food Processing Companies: Worldwide, in 1981, there were over 7,000 seed companies (www.counterpunch.org/2016/01/08/Monsanto). Whereas now, three companies (Monsanto, DuPont, and Syngenta) account for well over 53% of all of the world's *seed sales*. (www.counterpunch.org/2016/01/08/Monsanto). These companies are currently seeking further mergers with some of the few remaining smaller seed sellers.

Power is also being increasingly concentrated among the world's largest agrochemical producers and marketers of fertilizers and pesticides. Currently Syngenta and Bayer are in contention to be the world's largest agrochemical company. This may soon change given that Syngenta is currently engaged in negotiations that could result in it being taken over by the state-owned Chinese firm, ChemChina. It is interesting to note that in this particular case, the U.S. government is opposing the merger (ChemChina& Syngenta, Eurasia Review. May 3 2016). If the deal falls through Monsanto has also expressed interest in merging its agrochemical production with that of Syngenta. **News Update: 5/23/16**. Bayer is now considering taking over Monsanto. If it does, it will make Bayer the world's biggest combined seed and agrochemical company in the world. (www.reuters.com/article/us-monsanto/5/23/16).

Feed the Future

In 2009, in response to the Global Food Crisis of 2007-2008, President Obama urged G8 Nations to develop programs addressing hunger issues in developing countries. His administration at the time was developing the U.S. program, Feed the Future (FtF), aimed at improving agricultural systems in 19 countries. The US Agency for International Development (USAID) is in charge of the program and works jointly with US Departments of Agriculture, Treasury, Commerce, and the U.S. Office of Trade Representatives. FtF strongly promotes private sector participation (See FtF's website).

In 2015, Oxfam America commissioned an evaluation of the program. (OxfamAmerica. Promise and Potential. March 4 2015). Although the report was largely positive and called upon the U.S. Congress to provide increased and predictable funding for the program, the analysis pointed to areas where FtF needs to improve. It found that the program had made progress on women's empowerment and in natural resource management but that overall the program tended to benefit mainly "producers who already have the resources, capacity, and relationships to take advantage of new market opportunities." It said that FtF needs "to place more emphasis on helping smaller producers overcome barriers to market access, and to improve their bargaining power and strengthen their access to and control over land and water resources."

G7 New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition in Africa (NAFSN)

In 2012 President Obama urged the other G8 countries to develop programs similar to the US's Feed the Future program. The suggestion was met with a positive response -- the formation of the G7 NAFSN. There are now NAFSN programs in 10 African countries. To participate in the program, African governments are required to formally meet numerous conditions that provide considerable security for investors. Critics point out that the over-promotion of corporate business goals "has in some cases undermined the ecological and socio-institutional foundation of small holder farming.... systems." (Sally Brook (2016) *Inducing food security: financialisation and development in the post-2015 era*, Third World Quarterly, 3715, 768-780, DOI.).

Recently, the European Parliament's Committee on Development, requested Olivier DeSchutter, a legal scholar and UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food from 2008-2014, to write a report on NAFSN. In his conclusion he noted that "the professed objective of the NAFSN is to encourage reinvestment in agriculture in order to allow low income food-deficit countries to improve agricultural productivity and thus reduce their dependency on food imports and on food aid.' Noting the appropriateness of the objective itself, the author then went on to conclude that "unfortunately, the agreement;" 1) says nothing about "the need to shift to sustainable modes of agricultural production." 2) " refers "only selectively to existing international standards" for "responsible investment in agriculture." 3. promotes swift land titling processes but fails to take into account "the dangers associated with the establishment of a market for land rights, particularly for land-poor farmers." 4) fails to recognize the need to regulate contract farming despite the fact that such contracts " are a major part of the overall project vision." 5) promotes seed regulation to strengthen "the protection of plant breeder rights but fails to support farmers' seed systems," 6) pays scant attention to the need to ensure that the system provides "healthy and diversified food," and 7) "while report 'pays lip service" to the needs of women, it fails to do so in practice." The author concludes by saying: The above "deficiencies should be addressed as a condition for the continued support of the EU and its Member States to the process."

Water for Agriculture

All agriculture is dependent on rainwater. Scientists estimate that each year 57% of rain that falls on the continents' surfaces is quickly evaporated from land surfaces or evapotranspired back into the air by the world's nonagricultural plant life. Another 5% is quickly evapotranspired back into the world's air by agricultural plantings. The remaining 38% of continental rainfall ultimately enters lakes, rivers, and aquifers. It is from these resources that we humans then withdraw water for our own purposes (69% for irrigating crops, 19% for industrial use, and 12% for municipal use). Unfortunately we are withdrawing more water from some of these resources than is being replenished. (Above information is from: www.FAO.org/origin/aquastat.waterwithdrawal) We must use our rainfed water resources much more efficiently than we do at the present time if we want to be able to feed the world.

Land Grabbing

The native American has a story to tell about land grabbing, as do many indigenous people in Africa, China, India, the Pacific Island, the West Indies, Alaska, and the aborigines of Australia. This is not an old story. It continues today.

Governments in developing countries often lease large plots of land to foreign investors for commercial or industrial purposes such as agricultural and bio-fuel production, mining and logging or tourism without taking into account indigenous land claims. Frequently, land is acquired with limited local community consultation, often with little or no compensation, and often with no regard for environmental sustainability, equitable access or control of the natural resources. The major donor or land grabbing countries in rank order are United Kingdom, U.S., India, Canada, Malaysia and China.

Between 2000 and 2011 the International Land Coalition, a global alliance of civil society and farmers' organizations, United Nation's agencies, NGOs and research institutes, reported that large

plots of land acquired or negotiated on behalf of foreign governments world-wide totaled 203 million hectares. This is equal to eight times the size of the United Kingdom or the whole of Northwest Europe. These land grabs affect indigenous peoples' livelihood, denies their access to a primary source of income and often alters the biodiversity of their lands. Indigenous people seldom hold formal title to land.

In 2007, the United Nations Declaration on Rights of Indigenous People was adopted by the General Assembly. Article 25 affirms that indigenous people have the right to maintain and strengthen spiritual relationships with traditionally owned, occupied and used land, territory, water, coastal sea and other resources and to uphold their responsibilities to future generations in this regard.

In addition, the C169 Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention of the UN's International Labor Organization, Article 14.2 states: "Governments shall take steps as necessary to identify the lands which the peoples concerned traditionally occupy, and to guarantee effective protection of their rights of ownership and possession." In addition, the convention proposed the following actions: States should review legislation to ensure compliance with indigenous peoples' rights as set forth the UN Declaration and the ILOc169 memorandum; States should address legacy issues such as violence, dispossession, forced evictions; States should include requirements for free, prior and informed consent as a condition in all agreements with investors; States should facilitate participatory community mapping of indigenous peoples to empower them to assess their land rights and provide land titles; States should develop data bases to record and publish land deals.

Finally, the C169 Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention of the UN's International Labor Organization, Article 14.2 states: "Governments shall take steps as necessary to identify the lands which the peoples concerned traditionally occupy, and to guarantee effective protection of their rights of ownership and possession." In addition, the convention proposed the following actions: "States should review legislation to ensure compliance with indigenous peoples' rights as set forth the UN Declaration and the ILOc169 memorandum; States should address legacy issues such as violence, dispossession, forced evictions; States should include requirements for free, prior and informed consent as a condition in all agreements with investors; States should facilitate participatory community mapping of indigenous peoples to empower them to assess their land rights and provide land titles; States should develop data bases to record and publish land deals."

The Gambella locale of Ethiopia is of particular interest. Nearly half of its land is leased or available for lease to investors who are creating vast plantations of agro-fuel and food crops mostly for export using bull-dozers and draining and filling in wetlands. The Ethiopian government has violated the rights of indigenous people through displacement and villigazation. (David Smith. Ethiopians talk of violent intimidation as their land is earmarked for foreign investors. The Guardian. April 14, 2015). To deprive people of land and water rights will in time deprive us all.