

working paper

6th International
Conference of the
BRICS Initiative for
Critical Agrarian
Studies



Peasant Plan: standing territorial dispute

Agrarian question and territorial development

Authors: Gerson Antonio Barbosa Borges and Bernardo Mancano Fernandes



Peasant Plan: standing territorial dispute - Agrarian question and territorial development

by Gerson Antonio Barbosa Borges MPA/UNESP and Bernardo Mancano Fernandes, UNESP, Brazil.

Published by: BRICS Initiative for Critical Agrarian Studies (BICAS)

in collaboration with:

Universidade de Brasília - UnB
Brasília, Brazil

Website: <http://www.unb.br/>

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul
Porto Alegre, Brazil

Website: www.ufrgs.br/

Universidade Estadual Paulista - UNESP
São Paulo, Brazil

Website: www.unesp.br

College of Humanities and Development
Studies
China Agricultural University, Beijing, China
E-mail: yejz@cau.edu.cn
Website: <http://cohd.cau.edu.cn/>

Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian
Studies (PLAAS)
University of the Western Cape
Cape Town, South Africa
E-mail: info@plaas.org.za *Website:*
www.plaas.org.za

International Institute of Social Studies
The Hague, The Netherlands

E-mail: information@iss.nl *Website:*
www.iss.nl

Future Agricultures Consortium
Institute of Development Studies, University
of Sussex, England
E-mail: info@future-agricultures.org
Website: <http://www.future-agricultures.org/>

The Russian Presidential Academy of
National Economy and Public Administration
- RANEP
Moscow, Russian Federation
E-mail: information@ranepa.ru *Website:*
www.ranepa.ru

Transnational Institute
The Netherlands
E-mail: tni@tni.org *Website:* www.tni.org

Terra de Direitos
Curitiba, Brazil
E-mail:
terradedireitos@terradedireitos.org.br
Website: terradedireitos.org.br

©Brasília, UnB, November/2018 All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means without prior permission from the publisher and the author.

Abstract

The Peasant Plan is a practical and theoretical elaboration that the Small Farmers' Movement (MPA) has worked as an innovative process in the construction of a development model for peasant agriculture as opposed to the agribusiness development model. In the conception of the MPA, the Peasant Plan is centered in three principal axes: ALIMERGIA (Food, Environment, and Energy); Peasant Production Systems; and Territorial Cooperation Centers. These axes configure new productive bases through new sociability and territorial integrity. This article is a theoretical reflection on territorial development in the light of the Peasant Plan and territorial disputes. The Peasant Plan is based on the concept of territory in the perspective of inseparability, multi-scalarity, and multi-dimensionality. This conception goes beyond territory as a space of governance, as an area or surface, and comprises a typology of territories in which land ownership is at the center of the dispute over development models. Theories and policies are immaterial territories that produce the contested models and their territories. The construction of a Peasant Plan constitutes a territorial dispute in the movement of the class struggle in the 21st century.

We will present experiences built by the MPA in the states of the South, Southeast, Northeast and North regions from the founding axes and base demonstrating the diversity of projects that the MPA is developing as a form of resistance to agribusiness and innovative creation for peasant agriculture. We will associate the results of these experiences and disputes of models of territorial development with the credit policies of the State.

Keywords

Peasant Plan, Territorial Dispute, Paradigmatic debate, Agribusiness, Conflictuality

Acronyms

ALIMERGIA – Alimento, meio ambiente, energia (food, environment, and energy)

ATER - Technical Assistance and Rural Extension

Cisternas Program - National Program to Support Rainwater Harvesting and Other Social Technologies

IBGE - Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics

MPA – Movimento dos Pequenos Agricultores

MST – Movimento Trabalhadores Rurais sem Terra

PAA - Food Acquisition Program

PC - Peasant Plan

PNAE - National School Feeding Program

PNHR- National Rural Housing Program

PRONAF - National Program for Strengthening Agriculture

PSC - Peasant Systems of Production

TCC - Territorial Centers of Cooperation

UNESCO – United Nations Educational Organization, specialized UN agency.

UNESP – Universidade Estadual Paulista (São Paulo State University)

I. Introduction

Capitalist agriculture has built agribusiness as its model of territorial development that has dominated or deterritorialized peasant and indigenous communities throughout the world. In Brazil, the agribusiness and latifundia corporations are represented in the National Congress and in 2016 elected 2017 of the 513 federal deputies and 32 of the 81 senators, according to Medeiros & Fonseca (2018a, 2018b). This representation guarantees the formation of lobbies and influence in the elaboration of laws and public policies, which contribute to the deterritorialization of the peasantry (FERNANDES, 2013).

Agribusiness did not end hunger in the world (ZIEGLER, 2011), despite continually using this discourse, and increased inequality through territorial, political and economic hegemony. In Latin America and the African continent, the number of people with diseases acquired through the alteration of local food diets has increased. The consumption of industrialized products from the food empires (PLOEG, 2013) has dramatically increased the number of obese, and, as a consequence, correlated diseases (LE MONDE, 2017). Commodity production has raised the price of land and the level of tension in territorial disputes. The land dispute is a strategy of territorial development projects, which requires the construction of multidimensional development plans for the territory conquered from the logic of the production model.

The hegemony of capitalist agriculture is expressed by the agribusiness complexes that control all commodity chain systems (COSTA NETO & FERNANDES, 2017). In this context, a group of scholars from the agrarian question and the peasant movements

is analyzing, through research, the changes of the agrarian reality and thinking of ways of development from the familiar mode of production.

It is in this context that we present and discuss the Peasant Plan, a territorial development plan in a multidimensional and multiscale perspective that is happening in all regions of Brazil. We consider this plan from several scholars of the paradigm of the agrarian question. Conflict is one of the concepts used to understand the dispute over territories and development models among the classes studied.

Paradigmatic debate and territory typology

The paradigmatic debate and the typology of the territories are references that Fernandes (2013), discusses as a strategy in the dispute of projects, practices and narratives around the territorial development. These theories are associated with Ploeg's (2013) elaborations on the food empires and McMichael (2016) on dietary regimes in order to understand the forms of resistance and alternatives thought since the peasantry. It is through these references that we discuss the subjects, projects and territories involved in the elaboration of the Peasant Plan (PC).

The paradigmatic debate (FERNANDES, 2013) presents ideas and paths of territorial development from the Paradigm of Agrarian Capitalism and the Agrarian Question Paradigm. He adds that the paradigms are different world views, explanatory models, distinct paths that lead to conflicting analyzes and actions. In this way, the author brings to the debate different positions and intentions, thinking about territorial development in its various dimensions, scales and classes.

The Paradigm of Agrarian Capitalism, developed by agribusiness advocates, argues that agriculture is a space that must be exploited by capitalist corporations and entrepreneurial professionals. In this paradigm the agrarian question is not relevant, because the problem is not in capitalism, but in the peasantry. Agrarian problems would be conjunctural and overcome by the development of the capitalist mode of production. The existence of the peasantry is limited to their capacity to enter into capitalist relations, through the transformation into family farmers. Another destination of the peasantry would be the abandonment of the land, since their way of producing and living would represent an incomplete productive system, not compatible with modern times. The conflict between social classes and their territorial development projects is also ignored in the analysis of this paradigm.

In the Paradigm of the Agrarian Question, there are other perspectives regarding the development of agriculture and the future of the peasantry, starting from the contradictions and the unequal development of capitalism, in which the peasantry's existence is as much a part of its daily struggle as a result of contradiction of the capitalist mode of production. Then "the peasantry is created, destroyed and recreated by the contradictory development of capitalism" (FERNANDES, 2013, p.232). The paradigms are in constant conflict, since its developers defend antagonistic territorial development projects.

The impacts of these debates are felt in the territories, mainly through public policies.

The concept of territory is fundamental to get closer to the organizational structures of the CP. Fernandes says: The territory

is a political space par excellence. The creation of territory is associated with relations of power, domination and political control. Territories are not only physical spaces, but they are also social spaces, cultural spaces, where relationships and ideas manifest themselves, transforming even words into words (FERNANDES, 2013, p.248).

This multidimensional view constitutes a typology of territories from the multiscalarity and surpasses the reduced conception of territory, only as a space of governance, (FERNANDES, 2013). However, governments and private institutions use the reduced definition because such reading makes it difficult to perceive conflicts and reality. Fernandes points out that:

Territorial disputes are, therefore, of significance, of social relations and of control of the different types of territories by social classes. Territory understood only as a space for governance is used as a way of hiding the various territories and ensuring the maintenance of the subordination between dominant and dominated relations and territories. The territory comprised by the differential can be used to understand the diversity and conflicts of territorial disputes (FERNANDES, 2013, p. 171).

Territory only as a space for governance concerns the Paradigm of Agrarian Capitalism, by reducing space to a one-dimensional plane. The territory as a whole is multi-scalar and multidimensional. The first territory, considered a governance space, on national, regional, state and municipal scales, on these scales is where the second and third territories form. The first and second territories are fixed, and the third is flow. The second territory is understood by the diversity of private, community, capitalist or non-capitalist properties. The third territory has

movement as one of its main characteristics, on the local and body scale, of sociability and, therefore also of conflictuality. (FERNANDES, 2013).

These territories, according to Fernandes (2013), are supported by immaterial territories:

The immaterial territories are the bases of sustentation of all the territories. They are built and disputed collectively. Territorial disputes are fueled by organizations and their think tank. It is impossible to think of the various territories without thinking about the immaterial territories and the people and groups that think the territories (FERNANDES, 2013, p. 184).

In the book "Peasants and Food Empires: Struggles for Autonomy and Sustainability in the Age of Globalization," Ploeg (2013) presents an analysis of the main territorial development projects and their influences on the effective agricultural practices today.

Regarding development, the author understands that there are "deactivation" initiatives, which, although not predominant, end up in agrarian activities, mainly in territories of Africa and, to a lesser extent, in regions of Europe. This artifice is applied mainly in periods when capital means to be more attractive, that is, profitable, to direct investments to non-agrarian sectors. The process of "industrialization" is another path investigated by Ploeg (2013). The regency of this path is guided by the demands of capital, in this case, represented by the empire.

The Empire is here understood as a mode of order that tends to become dominant. At the same time, the empire is embodied by a variety of specific expressions: agribusiness groups, large

retailers, state mechanisms, but also laws, scientific models, technologies, etc. (PLOEG, 2013, p.20).

The set of expressions of the empire is constituted by what Costa Neto & Fernandes (2017) are calling a complex of systems and compound in agribusiness network. This organizational form of empire disconnects agricultural production from local ecosystems and their regional societies, artificializing crops and separating producers from consumers (PLOEG, 2013). This development model currently maintains hegemony in the first territory, resulting in the control of the production of official knowledge and the elaboration of agricultural policies. The third path of the "recampesinization" Ploeg (2013), has been titled as a modern concept of the struggle for autonomy in the face of dependence, marginalization, and empire imposed by the empire, which results in an environment hostile to peasants. This struggle conditions what the author calls "peasant principle" and reaches all the dimensions and scales of the territory.

These development paths analyzed by Ploeg (2013) interact and conflict with each other, with business, capitalist and peasant agriculture. These farms are not static and relate through their contradictions in territorial disputes. Business agriculture, according to Ploeg (2013), moves on the scale between small units and large units, organizing their territories with financial and industrial capital resources. The production is oriented to satisfy the demands of the market, that is, of the food empires.

Peasant agriculture is organized to meet primarily the food needs of social groups that carry it out with interactions with the capital markets. The work is carried out by families and local communities through reciprocity, cooperation and coproduction

relations (PLOEG, 2013), essential elements in the distance from the conceptions of capitalist and business agriculture.

In Ploeg's view (2013) it is through the practices and values of peasant agriculture that we can recharge our hopes for sustainable agriculture since this way of doing agriculture connects with regional ecosystems and societies, a "peasant principle" with emancipatory potential against food empires.

Researcher McMichael (2016), in his book "Diet Regimes and Agrarian Issues," has dealt with the subject of territorial development from the reorganization of food production in the second half of the nineteenth century to supply the new dynamics of capital accumulation. These regimes reorganize the production, trade, and consumption of food. From 1870 until the present day, three great dietary regimes were structured: Imperial food regime (1870 - 1930), obedient to the interests of England; (1950 - 1970), controlled by the United States of America and corporate diet (1980-2000), vassal to the private interests of large corporations linked to the food sector.

The imperial diet was under the aegis of British interests. The production of cereals in the English colonies of the African and Asian continents began to be organized according to the demands of the metropolis, as well as the production of meat and cereals in the USA, Canada, and Australia. Under the free trade alibi, these foods anchored in England at low prices, resulting in a cheap labor force, and thereby increasing the profitability of the industrial sectors. This food regime, organized to nourish the interests of the empire in the colonies and the metropolis, caused a distancing between food and its local ecosystems, eliminating rich diversity and creating, for the first time in human history,

frequent occurrences of severe famine in Africa and Asia (MCMICHAEL, 2016).

The collapse of the imperial diet was the result of a change in several protectionist manifestations, incited mainly after the First World War. The crisis was roaming the fields and cities of Europe, determining the structuring of a new organization of agricultural production, focused on the internal market. As European national states reorganized after the crises and horrors of World War II, the United States forged the intensive diet regime. This food regime has drastically changed production systems, making agriculture dependent on industry and the so-called underdeveloped countries, subordinated to their food and technological aid (MCMICHAEL, 2016).

This new productive organization was planned and subsidized by the American State. A new technological standard was created, based on expressive agricultural mechanization and artificialization of the soil fertility for Fordist production of commodities. Transformed into weapons in geopolitical strategies (MCMICHAEL, 2016), the surplus of prepared and durable food was spawned in emerging countries, with subsidized prices. On the other hand, the governments of these countries committed themselves to move away from the governments of socialist ideology.

The rise of a third food regime is related to the end of the Bretton Woods system in 1971. The dollar, becoming the standard reserve international currency, consolidates a new hegemonic system of capital accumulation through the financialization of economies and practices neoliberals. Markets serving national

states reverse logic; now, national states serve markets (MCMICHAEL, 2016).

The corporate diet is organized to satisfy the needs of the markets, and to that end, agricultural development policies follow the guidelines of the former General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The adoption of these guidelines has made the national states of the South, their peoples and agriculture vulnerable to capital markets, causing constant food and nutritional insecurity. (MCMICHAEL, 2016, ZIEGLER, 2012)

McMichael (2016, p.81) points out that through "corporate subsidies and transnational food routes they have combined into one large attack on small landowners," leading to peasant deterritorialization. The reproductive system of "food empires" (PLOEG, 2013) develops in the "intensive and corporate diet" (McMichael, 2016). The process of capital accumulation of this system takes place in the actions of deterritorialization and subordination of the peasantry (FERNANDES, 2013).

Peasant Plan

The Peasant Plan is a practical, theoretical elaboration proposed by the Small Farmers Movement - (Movimento dos Pequenos Agricultores - MPA) (GÖRGEN, 2017). It presents a set of alternatives to the food empires (PLOEG, 2013), through new productive formats and non-capitalist social relations of production. It is the representation of an innovative way to think and realize territorial development from the peasants.

The peasants organized in the MPA dispute the various scales and dimensions of the territory to build the Peasant Plan. Movements developed in properties, communities, regions,

states, and country illustrate this dynamic, which materializes both in the act of producing and in the choice of political representatives. The actions of these subjects are mediated by a constant conflict (FERNANDES, 2013), since agribusiness operates with the objective of controlling as many territories as possible, including those of the peasantry. The performance of these social classes in the first and second territories will intensify socio-territorial conflictuality because their interests are heterogeneous and antagonistic.

For the MPA, the public policies are fundamental in the construction of the Peasant Plan. The central axes of the plan are Territorial Cooperation Centers, ALIMERGIA (food, environment, and energy) and Peasant Production Systems (SILVA, 2016). They represent an alternative path, becoming territories of the struggle for autonomy (FERNANDES, 2013, PLOEG, 2013).

According to Görgen (2017), the preparation of a Peasant Plan from the peasantry arises from a need to demonstrate that peasants exist and have a development project to carry out their initiatives. Silva (2016) points out that the plan "is the strategy capable of leading the peasantry to play a fundamental role in the democratic and popular transformation of Brazilian society."

Given that the food empires are inclined to disconnect agricultural production from their ecosystems and regional societies (PLOEG, 2013), the concept of ALIMERGIA aims to integrate all the dimensions and scales of the territory. By proposing new production formats, based on food production, energy, and environmental preservation, the concept is presented, according to SILVA (2016), as a new agrarian paradigm. Görgen (2017)

states that the subjects of this new productive matrix are peasants, through new ecologically based farming systems.

The realization of an integral and popular land reform is fundamental, since it is with land tenure that peasants can strengthen their strategies in the socio-territorial disputes against dependence, marginalization, and deprivation (PLOEG, 2013), and at the same time, expand the territories that can develop cooperation and coproduction practices, concepts so dear to the Peasant Plan.

Building food and energy sovereignty in a balanced way with the local biomes is one of the great pillars of ALIMERGIA (GÖRGEN, 2017). To this end, it is necessary to build new technological production bases, which have come to be known as "Peasant Systems of Production" (PSC), in opposition to the agribusiness production chains and their respective technological packages.

PSCs present innovative ways of producing and controlling natural resources (SILVA, 2016), generating greater territorial autonomy on the part of peasants. Unlike the productive chains of agribusiness, the production in PSC is diversified, supported by agroecological methods, according to the reality of each managed biome. Cooperation in the construction of this new socio-territorial technological base has a strategic purpose because it has the potential to elevate the family's wishes to the community (PLOEG, 2013).

Agroecological practices around the control and management of natural resources can create greater relative independence of peasants from the capital markets. The acts of realizing diversified productive systems, cultivating native seeds and

producing natural inputs are beautiful examples of the constant struggle for the territorialization of these new agrarian systems. We can say that the SCP is the materialization of the productive arrangements coming from the concept ALIMERGIA. The link between the various dimensions and scales of the territory of these new forms of socio-territorial sociability will be the Territorial Centers of Cooperation (TCC).

TCCs constitute peasant reference territories to carry out socio-territorial disputes. These centers are planned by cooperatives linked to the MPA and are located in central regions with a significant presence of the peasantry (SILVA, 2016). As the main link in the articulation of the various dimensions and scales of the territory, it will be in this space that the central experiences of production, industrialization, commercialization, environmental preservation, and recovery, training and education of peasant families will be organized (SILVA, 2016). Therefore, it is a territory that produces emancipatory movements (PLOEG, 2013, FERNANDES, 2013).

According to Silva (2016), the cooperatives in the TCC carry out technical, economic and legal support activities. It is through them, for example, that the production of inputs, seedlings, and seeds for the productive arrangements is organized.

At the same time, they offer guarantees of absorption and purchase of products from these systems, creating a flow of information, services, materials and sustainable energy in the territory, forming an economic and social unit of peasant reproduction (SILVA, 2016, p.30).

These practices develop the "peasant principle" (PLOEG, 2008), creating conditions for a new food regime, supported by a peasant-based economy, in non-capitalist territories. In the Northeastern, North, Southeast, Midwest and South regions, we can find actions to build the PC in the areas where MPA operates. These experiences have as economic support, certain public policies conquered in the struggles of the peasantry in the last decades. Conflicts connected with land and water access and use.

Northeastern Region

According to the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE), the northeastern region of Brazil covers an area of 1,554,257 km², equivalent to 18.3% of the national territory (BRASIL, 2007). This region has 53,078,137 million inhabitants, representing 27.8% of the Brazilian population (IBGE, 2010). For centuries, work on the large farms was carried out by indigenous and African slaves. Official slavery ended in the second half of the nineteenth century, but the land still remains under the control of the great landowners. In territorial disputes, corporations with a strong presence in the control of the first territory, direct their actions towards the production of commodities, increasing the participation of agribusiness. The transposition of the São Francisco river is an example of favoring policies for capitalist agriculture, MALVEZZI (2017).

In contrast to agribusiness, the construction of the CP in this region begins with learning to live together in the face of constant rainfall. Some public policies in the areas of Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (ATER), National Rural Housing Program (PNHR), National Program to Support Rainwater Harvesting and

Other Social Technologies (Cisternas Program), National Program for Strengthening Agriculture (PRONAF), Food Acquisition Program (PAA) and National School Feeding Program (PNAE), won by peasant struggles in 1990 and 2000, are strengthening new socio-territorial configurations. The construction of cisterns illustrates the examples of the peasantry in the struggle for survival and territoriality of PSC. With stored rainwater, the peasants meet the needs of the house, the animals, and produce small irrigation systems to produce food, and the surplus of that production is marketed in open markets, and in government programs.

The consortium of perennial and annual crops, with animal husbandry, adopted in agroforestry systems is a productive arrangement by which the production of the northeastern peasantry is diversifying, and the entry of monetary resources into the properties. Through these innovative initiatives, the CP is gaining materiality and strengthening the peasant territories in their visible and invisible struggles against the food empires (PLOEG, 2009).

North Region

The North region comprises most of the Amazonian territory with an area of 3,853,327 km², equivalent to 45.3 of the national territory (BRASIL, 2007). About the Dantesque territory, there is a low population density in the 2010 census; the population reached 15,865,678 inhabitants, equivalent to 8.3% of the Brazilian population (BRAZIL, 2010). Capitalism has been territorializing in this region, since the first incursions of extraction of wood, rubber, and gold, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In the last decades, it has advanced with more

voracity, in water resources, minerals, extensive cattle breeding and production of agricultural commodities (COSTA NETO & FERNANDES, 2017). This territorialization of capital has caused a constant conflict with peasants and indigenous peoples.

The trenches of the peasantry (GÖRGEN, 2017), organized on the CP, produce new paths of agrarian development through non-capitalist social relations of production. The construction of agroecological gardens, milk production to pasture, and small agribusinesses processing native fruits and sugarcane derivatives, sustain the struggles for autonomy against the hostile environments of capital (PLOEG, 2009). This production of surplus and its commercialization in free markets and institutional markets is resulting in a decrease in the dependence on capital markets. In constant disputes over territory control, production and marketing actions, organized by the MPA peasants, create resistance shields to deal with the incursions of deterritorialization undertaken continuously by agribusiness.

Southeast Region

This region covers 927,286.2 km², totalling 10.85% of the national territory (BRAZIL, 2007) and concentrating 42.1% of the Brazilian population, totalling in 2010 the number of 80,353,724 inhabitants. Today it is the economic center of the country, mainly because it has the largest concentration of industries. (AMORIM, 2011). However, the economy of this region has roots in an agrarian issue that prevailed land concentration, slave labor and the production of goods for export (PRADO JR, 2004; MARTINS, 2017). For the success of this development model, the state's subsidy policies were essential, from the entry of slaves (16th, 17th, 18th and 19th centuries) and immigrants (19th century) to

the purchase and burning of coffee in certain periods of the first decades of the twentieth century.

Within this agro-export model, paraphrasing Ribeiro (1995), the peasantry in a struggle, emerged and came, in front of the "mills to spend people," a people are known by Candido (1982) by the denomination "caipira." A people who lived excluded and exploited in the basements and suburbs of large farms. In contemporary times, part of these peasants, organized in socio-territorial movements, struggle and resist, to the attacks of capitalist agriculture, this one, currently structured by agribusiness complexes (COSTA NETO & FERNANDES, 2017). The peasants who are part of the MPA, in Espírito Santo state, had a significant dependence on the coffee crop to reproduce, so they were chained to the capital markets (PLOEG, 2009).

With PC practices, coffee production currently serves as a sort of "savings," meaning the peasants at the grassroots MPA no longer depend on this crop to move their existence. Through actions that feedback, production is organized under the principles of ALIMERGIA and SCP practices. In productive arrangements based on agroforestry systems, coffee production has consorted with food crops.

Soil fertility is diagnosed through chromatographic analyzes, which the peasants themselves perform after having participated in "soil health" courses. Fertilization is carried out in the soil management itself, with additions of organic compounds produced in the peasant territories. These actions block the entry of technological packages, and the class struggle gains new dimensions through these initiatives.

The food produced in the MPA's technological matrix is consumed by the families, and the surplus is marketed. Autonomy, food and nutritional self-sufficiency are the major goals of these bioregional or local food systems, according to McMichael (2016). Different is capitalist agriculture, which through food empires specializes in the production of non-food, with the aim of lowering the reproduction costs of salaried families, and increasing their accumulation of capital, controlling material and immaterial territories (PLOEG, 2009; MCMICHAEL, 2016; FERNANDES, 2013).

The foods commercialized by the peasantry are mainly in the in a natural state. Krauser (2012) points out that the marketing surpluses are industrialized. The sale is carried out in government programs (PAA, PNAE), free markets, in the cities that the MPA is territorialized, direct sale (peasant - consumer) and in popular markets, which is the case of the popular market in the municipality of São Gabriel da Palha. A non-capitalist market. Fixed territory (FERNANDES, 2013) controlled by the peasantry.

Midwest Region

This region reaches 1,612.77.2 km² of national territory, representing 18.9% of the total area of the country (Brazil, 2007). With a low demographic density, the population of 14,050,340 inhabitants, is equivalent to 7.4% of that of the country (Brazil, 2010).

The exploration of this territory begins at the end of century XVII, the period that prevailed the mining. However, the tentacles of the capitalist mode of production penetrated from the construction

of the federal capital (Brasilia) in the 1950s, and especially with the subsidized policies of "modernization" and territorial occupation, undertaken by the military regime (1964-1985) mainly through the Superintendency of Development of the Center-Oeste (SUDECO), created in the year 1967.

With enormous support from the national state, the production of grains on large estates and the cattle ranching in extensive systems, the conflict between farmers, peasants, and native peoples were consolidated in this region. In the last decades, the conflict has been aggravated, through the processes of capital expansion and its agricultural frontiers in peasant and indigenous territories. The destruction of the cerrado biome has been a constant.

The MPA in the center-west of Brazil is in constant conflict with the agribusiness, in the territorial dispute. As a result of the power that capitalist agriculture exerts in this region, the socio-territorial movement is more deterritorialized than territorialized. Practices of productive arrangements, following elements of the CP, have contributed to peasant resistance. Crops through agroforestry systems and milk production to pasture are among the successful practices. The result of peasant work satisfies part of the needs of families in their territories, and the surplus is marketed in mobile fairs and government programs.

South Region

The South is the smallest area among the other regions of the country, stretching 517,214, 00 km², equivalent to 6.75% of the national territory (BRAZIL, 2007). The population according to the last demographic census, for the year 2010, corresponds to

27,384,815 inhabitants, which represents 14.4% of the inhabitants of Brazil (Brazil, 2010).

The western region of the South began to be occupied even in the seventeenth century, with the intention of the imperial government to protect the extensive borders of possible Hispanic invasions. In these territories that dominate the biome pampa, the cattle raising with slave labor constituted one of the roots of the Brazilian latifúndia.

Until the nineteenth century, the South was sparsely populated. This reality began to metamorphose with the arrival of European peoples in the years of 1820 until the first decades of century XX. Immigrants, mainly of German, Italian, Polish, Russian and Ukrainian origin, became territorial and at the same time, deterritorializing the native peoples. In the cities that were emerging, mainly coastal, or near great rivers, began the manifestation of incipient industrial development. In the countryside, these immigrants in the territorialized spaces put into practice the realization of peasant-based agriculture.

Socio-territorial conflicts emerged in the seventeenth century, between hunters and aboriginal peoples. The territorial disputes between these subjects intensified in the eighteenth century, culminating in the so-called Guarani Wars. The conflict between native peoples and descendants of immigrants remains in the present day; obviously, new ingredients touch up and renew this question, because, in the current time, the advance under the indigenous lands is in the interest of the expansion and accumulation of capital.

The capitalist mode of production in the countryside gained large dimensions from the 1960s, a period that the Brazilian dictatorial government created a series of public policies that subsidized the modernization of the countryside, keeping large private property untouchable (DELGADO, 2012).

The southern region was heavily impacted by policies to modernize agriculture. Following the philosophy of the intensive diet regime (MCMICHAEL, 2016) state subsidies have opened the door to food empires.

This agrarian transformation raised socio-territorial conflicts, excluding peasants from public policies and increasing the concentration of land in the 1960s, 70s, 80s, and 90s. To face this complex reality in the new phase of capitalist agriculture in the 2000s, the MPA, in the South, conflicts with agribusiness, disputing material and immaterial territories.

No development plan is valid if it does not lead in a reasonable time to improving the people's food conditions, so that, free of the overwhelming weight of hunger, this people can produce at levels that lead to true balanced economic development, hence the importance of "food for the people", ie "the liberation of hunger". (CASTRO, 2011, p.291)

Conclusion

The Peasant Plan is a starting point in the fight against agribusiness. The conflict between peasantry and agribusiness is a dichotomy, as one wants to understand the agribusiness narrative, which tries by all means to ignore explicit class struggle. The regional examples presented in this essay demonstrate a path taken by resistance in the propositional

posture of the construction of territorial development policies. The construction of a peasant road to emancipation is a practice and a theory under construction.

Other movements, such as the Landless Rural Workers Movement (MST) are also building social relations and emancipation spaces, such as the construction of new cooperatives, popular and institutional markets. This work sought to present the experience of the MPA and its stage of development.

References

AMORIM, Daniela. IBGE: sudeste concentra mais de 50% das empresas. Disponível em <<https://economia.estadao.com.br/noticias/geral,ibge-sudeste-concentra-mais-de-50-das-empresas,68516e>> Acessado em 09 de agosto de 2018.

BRASIL. Censo 2010: população do Brasil é de 190.732.694 pessoas. Rio de Janeiro: IBGE, 2010. Disponível em: <<https://censo2010.ibge.gov.br/noticias-censo.html?busca=1&id=3&idnoticia=1766&t=censo-2010-populacao-brasil-190-732-694-pessoas&view=noticia>> Acessado em 10 de agosto de 2018.

BRASIL. Estudos sociodemográficos e análises espaciais referentes aos municípios com a existência de comunidades remanescentes de quilombos. Rio de Janeiro: IBGE, 2007. Disponível em: <http://www.seppir.gov.br/portal-antigo/publicacoes/relatorioIBGE_pdf> Acessado em 12 de agosto de 2018.

CANDIDO, Antonio, 1982. Os parceiros do rio bonito: estudo sobre o caipira paulista e a transformação dos seus meios de vida. – 6ª edição. – São Paulo: Livraria duas Cidades.

CASTRO, Josué, 2011. Geografia da fome. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2011.

Comissão Pastoral da Terra. Assassinatos no campo batem novo recorde e atingem maior número desde 2003. Disponível em <<https://www.cptnacional.org.br/publicacoes-2/destaque/4319-assassinatos-no-campo-batem-novo-recorde-e-atingem-maior-numero-desde-2003>> Acessado em 10 de agosto de 2018.

DELGADO, Guilherme Costa, 2012. Do “capital financeiro na agricultura” à economia do agronegócio: mudanças cíclicas em meio século (1965-2012). Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS.

FERNANDES, Bernardo Mançano, 2013. Construindo um estilo de pensamento na questão agrária: o debate paradigmático e o conhecimento geográfico. Tese (livre-docência), vol.1, Presidente Prudente: UNESP.

GÖRGEN, Sérgio Antônio, Frei, 2017. Trincheiras da resistência camponesa: sob o pacto do agronegócio. Candiota, RS: Instituto Cultural Padre Josimo.

MARTINS, José de Souza, 2017. O cativo da terra. São Paulo: Contexto.

MALVEZZI, Roberto. Transposição: a hora da verdade. Disponível em: <<https://www.ecodebate.com.br/2017/03/07/transposicao-hora-da-verdade-artigo-de-roberto-malvezzi-gogo/>>. Acesso em 20 de agosto de 2018.

MEDEIROS, Étore; FONSECA, Bruno. As bancadas da câmara: maiores grupos de parlamentares são pautados por interesses corporativos, conservadores ou por ambos: mapeamos quem defende o quê. Disponível em: <<https://apublica.org/2016/02/truco-as-bancadas-da-camara/>>. Acesso em 16 de julho de 2018a.

MEDEIROS, Étore; FONSECA, Bruno. As bancadas do senado: maiores grupos da casa defendem o agronegócio e o setor empresarial e não devem ter dificuldades em se alinhar às pautas do novo governo. Disponível em <<https://apublica.org/2016/06/truco-as-bancadas-do-senado/>>. Acesso em 16 de julho de 2018b.

MCMICHAEL, Phillip, 2016. Regimes alimentares e questões agrárias. 1. Ed. São Paulo; Porto Alegre: Editora UNESP; Editora da UFRGS.

COSTA NETO, Adolfo da Oliveira; FERNANDES, Bernardo Mançano, 2017. A produção de óleo de palma a partir da subordinação de territórios camponeses em assentamentos da reforma agrária. In: Hespanhol, Rosângela Aparecida de Medeiros et al. A geografia do Pará em múltiplas perspectivas: políticas públicas, gestão e desenvolvimento territorial. Tupã, ANAP.

PLOEG, Jan Douwe Van Der, 2017. Camponeses e impérios alimentares: lutas por autonomia e sustentabilidade na era da globalização. Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS.

PRADO JR, Caio, 2004. História econômica do Brasil. São Paulo: Editora brasiliense.

SILVA, Marcelo Leal Teles, 2016. Projeto Alimergia. Candiota: Instituto Cultural Padre Josimo.

Revista Galileu. Líder mundial, Brasil pode ganhar mais agrotóxicos na comida. Disponível em <<https://revistagalileu.globo.com/Ciencia/Meio-Ambiente/noticia/2018/05/lider-mundial-brasil-pode-ganhar-mais-agrotoxicos-na-comida.html>> Acessado em 11 de agosto de 2018.

RIBEIRO, Darcy, 1995. O povo brasileiro: a formação e o sentido do Brasil. – São Paulo: Companhia das Letras..

about the authors

Gerson Antonio Barbosa Borges has a degree in History, a specialist in Economics and Agrarian Development. Currently studying for Territorial Development in Latin America and the Caribbean, by the Institute of Public Policy and International Relations of the São Paulo State University - UNESP -. Has been dedicated to the studies of territorial development and the conflicts between Peasantry and Agribusiness. gersonaabb@gmail.com

Bernardo Mancano Fernandes is a professor of Graduate Program in Geography and Graduate Program in Territorial Development in Latin America and the Caribbean. Member of the Center for Agrarian Reform Study, Research and Projects (NERA) and Land Struggle Database Network (REDE DATALUTA) at Sao Paulo State University (UNESP). Chairholder of the UNESCO Chair in Education for the Countryside and Territorial Development and member of the BRICS Initiative of Critical Agrarian Studies (BICAS). Also, he is a member of the research group Initiatives in Critical Agrarian Studies (ICAS) of the International Institute of Social Studies (ISS), in the Netherlands. mancano.fernandes@unesp.br



Terra de
Direitos

