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A WORLD WE BELIEVE IN

When issues are complex and need urgent attention, like our broken global food system, dialogue can help bring people together with diverse perspectives to find solutions.

As part of our Food Dialogue Project, Oxfam Canada held two dialogue sessions this spring. These dialogues brought people together to share ideas, beliefs and opinions on ways to create a sustainable food system that respects women’s rights and enables everyone to have enough to eat.

Along with great stories of success, we found complexity, tension and trade-offs. We also found, that amidst all of this, there were core values and clear courses of action that resonated with everyone present. We called these agreements “common ground”.

Dialogue participants found common ground on four key values of highest relevance to creating a hunger free world:

- **POWER**
- **HEALTH**
- **EQUITY**
- **SUSTAINABILITY**

To create a world we believe in sustaining for the future, dialogue participants concluded that it is essential that we incorporate these values into systems designed to alleviate hunger and ensure women’s rights.

There was also common ground on the types of actions which people were willing and motivated to take to create change in our food system. The following types of actions were identified by participants:

- **EDUCATE MYSELF AND MY PEERS**
- **CREATE POSITIVE PERSONAL HABITS**
- **SUPPORT OR ORGANIZE WITH OTHERS**
- **WORK WITH THE GOVERNMENT**

The common ground identified by dialogue participants speaks to the needs and priorities of Canadians and ways of taking action which are both meaningful and have impact.
The Food Dialogue Project

The Food Dialogue Project was conceptualized to bring together Canadians—passionate and concerned individuals and influencers in different communities, organizations, occupations and networks—to discuss issues of food security and women’s rights. Oxfam Canada believes that global food issues are complex, and are often missing the important dimension of how and why women fit into the picture. Our global food system does not ensure women’s rights nor does it ensure the universal right to food. The Food Dialogue Project aimed to provide several outcomes:

- an opportunity for Canadians to bring their experience and background to the conversation about food and to explore how women’s rights, needs, priorities and voices can become central in a conversation about the right to food
- a forum for participants to deepen their understanding about women’s rights in the context of food
- an opportunity for Oxfam Canada to develop a deeper understanding of how Canadians view the connection of these women’s rights and the global food system

A workbook was developed to prepare participants and to help facilitate the dialogues. The dialogue workbook provided background on various issues relating to gender, food systems and food production. It also included three possible approaches to fixing our broken food system and working towards ending world hunger that were developed to spark discussion and facilitate conversation.

The outlined approaches are not mutually-exclusive nor are they an exhaustive description of the possible perspectives on these issues. Similarly, they are not intended to be policy options. These approaches were developed through an issue-framing workshop with a variety of experts in the field of food and women’s rights.1 The approaches reflect different values, perspectives, assumptions and experiences. The dialogue workbook can be downloaded at www.oxfam.ca.

The process and tools for the dialogues were developed in partnership with the Canadian Community for Dialogue and Deliberation (C2D2). This partnership was initiated to share the expertise of C2D2 in developing dialogue-based, participatory methods of engagement and to build Oxfam Canada’s internal capacity in these methods.

1 Issues framing workshop participants in the workshop included representatives from USC Canada, The Conference Board of Canada, the University of Ottawa faculty of Women’s Studies, Informed Opinions and Oxfam Canada.
PARTICIATION

If you look at headlines in most magazines and papers, consumer trends indicate an increased interest in organic food, local food and sustainable food. Canadians are beginning to think more about where food comes from, how it is produced, and what this means in people’s lives and the lives of others within the food system.

Oxfam decided to act on this increased consumer interest. We provided an open invitation to the public in both Toronto and Ottawa to participate in a dialogue hosted in these cities. We used dialogue to encourage diverse participation, provide a mechanism to build consensus on complex issues and to address a growing interest in food justice.

Table 1 shows the breakdown of participants by gender in each city as well as their participations as individuals or through their connection to a range of organizations.

Table 1: Public Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Toronto</th>
<th>Ottawa</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Individuals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Organizations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the strengths of dialogue is that it benefits from diversity. Notices of the event were posted on the Oxfam Canada website as well as relayed through several food and academic networks. The time between the opening of registration and the actual event was less than four weeks. This timing may have impacted the reach of the invitation and therefore the diversity of participants.

Participants noted in post-session evaluations that they thoroughly enjoyed the conversations and were surprised at how easily consensus came on such complex issues. Although this was seen as a benefit to some participants in terms of ease of conversation, other participants suggested that a more diverse group of participants would benefit considerably from the deliberative dialogue process.
Last spring **Ekos polled Canadians** on issues related to food and women’s rights. Ekos found widespread concern among Canadians about global hunger and food shortages, and that Canadians recognized the specific role that women play in our food system.

Nearly two thirds of Canadians polled said they are extremely concerned with the rights of women in the developing world. What we may have tapped into through the dialogue process is not that our participants were lacking in diversity, but that a great deal of common ground already exists in Canadian attitudes and beliefs.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

The dialogues surfaced different views, experiences and assumptions about food and women’s rights. A summary of the discussions is outlined below—highlighting the group’s overall perspectives on each individual approach in the two dialogue locations (Toronto and Ottawa). Full notes from each of the dialogues are included in the appendix at the end of this report.

Each of the approaches outlined below begins with a short outline of the approach (in italics) as it was presented to participants within the workbook. In addition to the outline, participants were provided with a two-page write up of each approach, detailing potential strengths and weaknesses in the concepts.

Following the summary of discussion on the approaches, we will look more in depth at the points of common ground, which both groups agreed were essential to consider in creating a food system which incorporates the rights of women. This section also highlights stark points of divergence surfaced during the dialogue.

**APPRAOCH 1: PRODUCE ENOUGH FOOD TO FEED EVERYONE**

Today 925 million people will go to bed hungry. Based on current trends, demand for food could increase by 50 percent by 2050. When people go hungry, women and girls suffer the most. We have to find ways to produce more food, more efficiently and more sustainably. This will include increasing the productive capacity of women farmers.

---

2 Ninety seven per cent of Canadians express concern about a potential increase in the frequency and severity of hunger and food shortages - see a full summary of the Ekos report at: [http://www.oxfam.ca/sites/default/files/EKOS%20-%20Oxfam%20Survey%20-%20Summary%20of%20Findings.doc](http://www.oxfam.ca/sites/default/files/EKOS%20-%20Oxfam%20Survey%20-%20Summary%20of%20Findings.doc)

3 Over half (54 per cent) of Canadians are aware that the majority of food production is done by women.

4 Nearly two thirds (63 per cent) say they are extremely concerned about the rights of women in developing countries.
This approach was supported by dialogue participants because of the manner in which it values producers and their need for resources to produce food. There was concern about whether production capacity was actually an issue and whether the effect of focusing on women producers would simply increase their already heavy workload.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ottawa</th>
<th>LIKES</th>
<th>DISLIKES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on training and capacity</td>
<td>There is enough food already</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of power dynamics</td>
<td>Concerned about power dynamics still reflecting inequality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlighting women’s role</td>
<td>Doesn’t address North American impact – what role do consumers play?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s access to land</td>
<td>Focused on women, but not women’s rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toronto</th>
<th>LIKES</th>
<th>DISLIKES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We want to feed everyone</td>
<td>Women’s role in this approach increases workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic and understandable goal</td>
<td>Producing more food may not mean women and girls have access to it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing women’s voices regarding policy and programs, empowering women</td>
<td>Power dynamic regarding education and training [us vs. them], not erasing traditional knowledge and experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgency</td>
<td>Gives control to corporations over whole system, lowers biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase access to land</td>
<td>Dilemma is that this approach supports the worst of the food production cycle, making food in labs, not lands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased capacity of women farmers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPROACH 2: KEEP THE ENVIRONMENT HEALTHY**

Many of the ways we produce and distribute food are destructive to our environment. Our food production and distribution systems create greenhouse gases that increase climate change. Women in the developing world are disproportionately impacted by climate change. We must change the ways we produce and distribute food and consider the health of people and the planet first.

Participants supported this approach because it values the planet as an essential part of our human existence and it takes a long-term perspective on developing solutions to hunger. Challenges with this approach included its feasibility, the narrowly-focused environmental approach and public apathy to talking about environmental issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LIKES</th>
<th>DISLIKES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Views food system as integrated with environment</td>
<td>Shouldn’t say “Keep the environment healthy” but “heal” the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We need to include externalities into the cost of food production</td>
<td>Too environmentally-focused: Need to focus on cultural and systematic inequalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We have privilege that should be used to focus on environment</td>
<td>Practicality for people in poverty: it doesn’t matter about short term or long term environmental impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highlights intergenerational equity</td>
<td>The three pillars of sustainability - environment, economy and social inequalities - need to be looked at together, rather than just environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### APPROACH 3: ENSURE ACCESS TO FOOD

Poverty and access to food are directly linked, globally and in Canada. Those living in poverty are the same people who suffer from chronic hunger and malnutrition. We need to respect access to healthy and adequate food as a human right. This will mean ensuring women can produce their own food and/or have an adequate income to purchase food.

This approach was supported because of the affirmation of food as a right, not solely a commodity, and the focus on equity as a value that underpins solutions. Challenges to this approach include: not speaking to the real challenges of food access in Canada such as food deserts—areas where food is hard to access; food marketing; and the need to address larger scale cultural shift through education.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LIKES</th>
<th>DISLIKES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>Focuses on all of women’s rights – not just food</td>
<td>Doesn’t address access to healthy food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highlights food as a right – not just a commodity</td>
<td>Doesn’t tackle processed food issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Looks at how to change power structures</td>
<td>Consider marketing of food - geared towards women, target of advertising of cheap, processed foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential trade-off of consumer choice vs. access to food for everyone</td>
<td>Role of education and culture change is not addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Women’s right to produce own food provides options regarding income</td>
<td>Distinguishes women and girls and men and boys; need better integration of perspectives to avoid collision/confrontation, need to partner men and women together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Especially relevant in emergency situations</td>
<td>Need “enforceable” laws regarding access to land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addressing root causes - systemic rather than band-aid</td>
<td>In Canada, we talk about local production but we don’t extend this to the global south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reaffirms food as a right, not commodity</td>
<td>Women are responsible for children and families and need to perceive food as “fuel” because of the distances traveled and the time that transportation takes away from time to cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal distribution</td>
<td>We now live in places that cannot produce enough food and places that do not have access to good food</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMON GROUND AND RECURRING THEMES

To conclude the discussions, various themes that seemed to resonate for all or most participants were brought forward for further exploration. Groups were asked to discuss these issues and to identify whether the group could come to common ground on the components needed to develop a solution for global hunger that considers women’s rights.

The following concepts were supported by all members of a discussion group (both in Toronto and Ottawa) and put forward as key components of a development agenda that addresses both the right to food and women’s rights.

POWER
Participants agreed that an examination of power dynamics was essential in assessing whether a solution was viable. Key considerations on the issue of power included:
- analyzing gender relations;
- comparing the influence of agribusiness and small-scale farmers;
- providing equal voice for north and south, within communities and within countries;
- respecting the need for accountability for Canadian citizen’s behaviour;
- recognizing the need for individual action and policy change;
- and the ability of different actors to influence changes.

HEALTH
Participants strongly agreed that any solution must consider food in a holistic way—not only solving hunger through sufficient calories, but also considering nutrition, cultural appropriateness and long-term health.

EQUITY
Dialogue participants identified aspects of all approaches that considered equity as a core value. They supported the idea of intergenerational equity (creating systems which ensure future access to resources and needs as equal to current day needs), gender equity (in terms of rights), and equity of needs and rights between people around the world, regardless of race, citizenship, religion or any other defining factor. Participants stated the need to emphasize equity in the treatment of people within the food system as well as equity in terms of access to food.
SUSTAINABILITY

Participants identified sustainability as a concept that should be the basis of any solution. Sustainability was defined as recognizing interconnections among the environment, economy, society, and culture. It also ensures that any solution considers people, planet and prosperity as the bottom line. There was much discussion about sustainable livelihoods and identifying a broader definition of economy than participants believed existed in our current cultural context, in particular the need to understand and take into account women’s contribution of unpaid labour.

AREAS OF DIVERGENCE

There was space within the dialogues to explore issues which participants found challenging to develop common ground on. For example, two key issues where participants’ perspectives diverged are highlighted below.

NEED TO INCREASE FOOD PRODUCTION

While there was strong support for the idea that food security was more an issue of distribution than production, there was a fairly significant conversation about whether this has always been, and would always be, the case. Questions were raised about whether food production needed to continue to increase in line with an increasing population size and about how significant a change in production processes would be needed to support, or ensure, a continuously sufficient supply of food globally. Participants were critical of current industrial-scale food production and wondered about the importance of scale in food production in order to ensure food security.

ROLE OF LARGE CORPORATIONS IN RELATION TO FOOD CHOICES

There were two divergent perspectives on the role of large corporations. The first was that our choices as consumers are being manipulated by the agendas of the food and beverage industry through marketing and advertising, and therefore affecting not only the purchases that consumers make, but also the entire supply and demand elements of the food system. The other perspective was that consumers are independent, free-thinking beings whose choices are directed by personal preference, independent of corporations. Both of these perspectives underscored the need for additional dialogue about whether and what role corporations should have within the food system. Questions were raised in this discussion about corporate social responsibility, voluntary guidelines and regulations as ways of making changes.
PARTICIPANT LEARNING AND PERSPECTIVE CHANGE

Participants were surveyed before and after their participation in the dialogue on their perspectives of various aspects of the global food system. In reviewing the data from these surveys, there did not appear to be a dramatic shift in perspectives. Rather, participants fine-tuned their understanding of specific issues and interconnections between issues discussed.

The following question was presented to participants before and after their participation in the dialogue:

How important are women’s rights in ensuring a global food system to feed the world’s population in an environmentally sustainable fashion?

Participants were asked to respond to this question by indicating on a scale of 1 to 10 the level of importance they attributed to women’s rights in this scenario.

In the Ottawa dialogue, both pre and post evaluations saw a range of scores from 5 to 10. In Toronto, the lowest score, both before and after the dialogue, was a 7, with the majority of people indicating 9 or 10.
There was a slight shift in both cases, indicating an increase in the value of women’s rights as a central pillar to ensure sustainable food production to feed the world.

The nuances of participant perspective change are highlighted through participant open-ended feedback noted below. The following responses, collected from participants, indicated that the sessions introduced a number of new concepts to participants and allowed participants to dive more deeply into their own understanding of the issues.

“The conversation in general was very informative and helped me formulate my own ideas a lot better. I found the discussion around free trade/fair trade and the local food movement very interesting because I didn’t understand the connection before.”

“I have never been introduced to the concept of food as a right—very interesting.”

“There are some very different opinions on sustainability. It was interesting exploring these different opinions and was helpful to have an open dialogue.”

“There are a lot of people/women in the Ottawa area who are highly passionate and knowledgeable about these issues.”

Participants were also asked to list three insights that they had over the course of the discussion, helping to pinpoint issues that emerged in the consciousness of participants. The most commonly listed insights were:

- The challenge of dealing with the deep ideological divisions within our society on the role of both the state and the private sector
- The fact that individuals view sustainability as environmental sustainability rather than a process that takes into consideration the environment, society and the economy
- Solutions need to be driven by specific communities in order to consider what to do in light of local rules, traditions, etc. which can be known only by being there
- How to fit our interests with the interests of multinational stakeholders that influence the course of world development
- There are variations of privilege and marginalization/oppression (i.e. persons with disabilities) within the framework of food and women
MOVING FORWARD

Oxfam Canada views dialogue as a springboard to support citizens to dive deeper into issues related to the global food system. Through this initial learning together, we want to inspire Canadians to reach out.

The dialogue sessions raised awareness on the links between women’s rights and food and they also encouraged participants to think about how they can play a role in continuing to increase this awareness throughout Canada.

We encourage all those who participated, and all those who read this report, to continue this conversation and to help bring issues of food security and women’s rights into the mainstream of Canadian consciousness.

The dialogue sessions concluded by encouraging participants to consider what types of action each of us could take to support women’s rights in the global food system.

Examples included changing personal actions and considering our everyday choices and the impacts they have on women around the world. Participants also included action individuals can take to mobilize others, to advocate for change within communities, and to approach governments about necessary changes.

We have highlighted several trends that surfaced in order of priority identified by participants.

EDUCATE MYSELF AND MY PEERS

The majority of responses fell under this category. Additionally, the concept of education came up a significant number of times. Examples of education-focused actions noted by participants include:

- Educate myself and disseminate this information to my family and friends
- Continue to have these types of discussions
- Educate myself more and continue to encourage my peers to do the same
- Keep spreading the message that women’s rights must be reinforced
CREATE POSITIVE PERSONAL HABITS

This category was a close second in terms of number of responses. Examples of personal habit-focused actions noted by participants include:

- Think about my own food choices
- Think about the source of food and the treatment of women who produced it and buy accordingly
- Look more closely at my own consumption
- Buy local and use that to promote/support international development that has a gendered perspective and focuses on women’s rights

There was a significant drop in the number of actions listed in the following two categories.

SUPPORT OR ORGANIZE WITH OTHERS

Approximately six responses were aligned with the category of supporting or organizing with others. A few notable responses include:

- Create more opportunities for local women to increase food production
- Support local organizations that provide support to women/people who produce food

WORK WITH GOVERNMENT

There were only two responses related to the role of government in issues of food:

- Find out what my government is doing to promote women’s rights in agriculture
- Advocate for issues with leaders
SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

The first grouping held by far the most examples of possible actions – indicating the importance of education for the participants. The personal habits category has a significant amount of suggestions as well, while the third and fourth have only a few.

This breakdown speaks to the level of commitment required of these types of action and of an interesting ladder of engagement. The public is concerned first and foremost with having a clear understanding of an issue, then changing their own behaviour, then organizing with others to create change, then calling for changes in government policy.

We are excited by participants’ ideas and commitments to make changes in their own lives and in the community around them. Within these groups it is clear that education is highly valued, and that there can be clear and tangible results from further education on issues of food security and women’s rights.

Food issues can speak deeply to the hearts and minds of Canadians. Our findings will help inform us as we continue to develop our in-Canada work and our ways of collaborating with other organizations and the Canadian public at large.

We look forward to continuing this work, and we hope you’ll join us.

Kelly Bowden
Policy and Outreach Team
Oxfam Canada

May 2012
APPENDIX 1:
PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

• ADRA Canada
• C4D
• Canadian Federation of University Women
• CBM Canada
• Climate Action Network Canada
• Counsel, Gowlings
• Department of Sociology, Ryerson University
• Environment and Development
• Family Service Toronto/ Campaign 2000
• Free Lance photographer
• Hidden Harvest Ottawa
• HRSDC
• Meal Exchange
• One World Inc.
• Rooftops Canada
• Ryerson University
• Toronto Permaculture Project
• Trent University
• University of Toronto
APPENDIX 2: FULL NOTES ON TORONTO DIALOGUE

APPROACH 1: PRODUCE ENOUGH FOOD TO FEED EVERYONE

LIKES

Focus on women
- Increased capacity of women farmers
- Female heads of households: informing next generation, reducing vulnerability
- Hearing women’s voices regarding policy and programs, empowering women
- We want to feed everyone

Tangibility
- Urgency
- Realistic and understandable goal
- Making good decisions-awareness of options
- Higher definition of ‘food’, know what actual needs are

Role of environmental resources
- Increase access to land
- Sustainability and environment
- Need to reduce crazy consumerism-waste, meat, recycling, storage distribution

DISLIKES

Women’s roles
- Load is on women
- Need to think about 15% of women with disabilities
• Crisis is not lack of capacity—it is Western meat eaters “ownership of land”, land grabs
• Winners: Corporations. Losers: The poor, women and children
• Women are dominant farmers and have all other responsibilities—increased push would reduce opportunities
• Need to bring understanding of men and women’s roles—balance via information
• Not assuming women will pass on information—ensure direct connection
• Value of time/workload—women’s work

Food production/distribution system

• Confusing—enough food/not enough food
• More about distribution and access than production
• Need to focus more on youth and agriculture, direct contributions
• Power dynamic regarding education and training (us vs. them), not erasing traditional knowledge and experience
• Developing and valuing expertise and cultural/social difficulties
• Producing more food may not mean women and girls have access to it
• Huge structural task
• Misconception regarding moving to cities: Maintain farms, rural settings
• There isn’t a shortage, already produce enough food. Access is the issue
• What are we producing food for? Biofuels? Livestock feed? Waste?
• Need to focus on policy and increase autonomy of farmers
• Farmers pressured to focus on production, not on how to produce
• Subsidized big farming kills local small farming
• Policy premise for “free trade” is cheap food
• GM crops are supposed to feed more people, but there is no proof
• Control to corporations to control whole system, lowers biodiversity
• Consumer society required disposable income cannot be independent/self-sufficient, tried to monetary system—must grow food to make money
• Dilemma is that this approach supports the worst of the food production cycle, making food in labs, not lands
• No food sovereignty
• Action-push nations to produce own food only. Is return to own production possible?

**APPROACH 2: KEEP OUR ENVIRONMENT HEALTHY**

**LIKES**

**Holistic nature of the approach**

• Emphasis on health (people and planet)
• Longevity
• Holistic approach – emphasis on how environment affects everything
• Agriculture and ecology-permaculture
• Sustainable: addresses the fact that it will be a disaster if we don’t do anything
• The way we treat the environment is the same as we treat women: Domination, Control, ownership, mold it to OUR needs
• How do we treat the land? Resources i.e. Water and fertilizer
• Reaffirms value of women and environment

**Opportunities for engagement**

• Includes trade knowledge
• Engaging civil society
• Emphasis on education regarding where food comes from
• Everyone is a loser, we are all affected by the environment
• Get kids involved, excited by connecting to food production i.e. recycling behavior

**DISLIKES**

**Corporations**

• Big missing piece
• Manipulating seeds, cutting forests
Chain of destruction—limits access to native seeds
Need rules that are not only profit based
Canada had to ensure welfare of local people

Policy
Need to change policy frameworks
Need to change approach governments regarding better food production, health and environment
Franchising/regulations if environmental policies by big corporations
Individuals need to take action

Developing countries vs. developed countries
Push/pull e.g., Cattle farming to feed hamburger industry
Educational process regarding environments, sense of global environment
In developing nations there are also issues of class, race, power, privilege, etc.
Avoid one size fits all policy approach

Too many challenges to this approach
Multinational corporations
Climate change
Agribusiness in North America
Land ownership, seeds, pesticides
Information regarding where food comes from
More people equals a larger voice
How to do more with information we have, need to keep people in farming
Fatigue: People are tired of hearing about it—the issue is overwhelming
Action is unpalatable—don’t want to make changes to our comfort zone
Out of sight, out of mind—we don’t see chickens therefore we can’t see the impact
Environment is abstract, until it is made real/specific (or connected to health)
Need to find ways to lower sense of helplessness
**APPROACH 3: ENSURE ACCESS TO FOOD**

**LIKES**

Focus on livelihoods

- Women’s right to produce own food, options regarding income
- Addressing root causes-financial (deep rather than band-aid)
- Amounts and quality throughout life cycle
- Reaffirms food as a right, not commodity
- Recognizes the challenges to commodification-tied to money and economy
- Cooperatives connect well to this-focus on community and the environment and do play still in the market
- Is realistic
- Don’t export, use locally and foster multi farming focus

Role of equity

- Equal distribution
- Access to healthy and adequate food
- Intentional, regarding women with disabilities in UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
- Especially regarding emergency situations
- Including in planning process to ensure access
- Hungry people need food-adequate can come later
- Strive from balance-recognize priorities and context
- Improved relationships, improved equity: big theme throughout

**DISLIKES**

Division of men and women

- Distinguishes women and girls and men and boys, need better integration of perspectives, avoid collision/confrontation, partner men and women together
- Women as stakeholders [also men], men want to know this
Challenges of enforceability

• Not all countries are signatories to conventions
• Need “enforceable” laws regarding access to land
• Dilemma: idealism/pragmatism

Complex role of policy

• Approach needs more layering/identifying priorities from local to policy
• Not talking about means of production, land distribution/access need land for money
• Look to existing policies, traditional approaches, growing appreciation

Challenges in Canadian context

• In Canada, we talk about local production but we don’t extend this to the global south
• We now live in places that cannot produce enough to be balanced, this happens in cities-food deserts
• Some people have no choices—junk food, McDonald’s, differing realities
• Access to nutritious food
• Transportation: Women are responsible for children and it’s therefore hard to get around. Lots of women are not malnourished
• Must convince privileged that better access to food is better for everyone. How can we do this?
• Reduce consumerism, increase minimum wage
• Change for the better—education—to shift mentality
**APPENDIX 3: FULL NOTES ON OTTAWA DIALOGUE**

**APPROACH 1: PRODUCE ENOUGH FOOD TO FEED EVERYONE**

**LIKES**

Focus on training and capacity

- Likes the focus on women—should be increasing capacity, not productivity
- Training is beneficial—especially when linked with environment
- People should have right to produce for themselves

Change of power dynamics

- Both at a macro and micro level
- Need to distribute more efficiently
- Focus on production addresses producers voice in face of exporters/traders, importance of local dimensions
- Local production removes middle people
- Important role of tech—even for small scare (understanding of appropriate)

Empowerment of women

- Highlights women’s role (rural)—seen as opportunity
- Growth=sustainability
- Forefronting hunger
- Women’s access to land
- Feminism applied globally
- Is “efficient” important? Or is “equity” important? Thinks equity is more important
- Intergenerational equity
DISLIKES

Concerned about power dynamics/inequality

- Efficient does not mean equal
- Just because there is more food doesn’t mean women and girls will have access-how would this work? Need to address the inequality in the food system
- Control of food system: By whom? For whom? Producing more food won’t change power brokers

There is enough food

- Focus on production when we already produce enough
- Builds on myth of not enough food
- Need to focus not just on food but “Why are people hungry?”

Doesn’t address North American impact

- Doesn’t address needed culture shift in Canada: Need education because of influence of purchasing on developing world doesn’t look at “power in food production”
- Middle class/affluent class left out of conversation
- Land grabs because of “efficiency” idea
- Education=everyday level=link cloudy ideas
- Education insufficient because needs policy support
- Women need to represent themselves

Not focused on women

- Not thinking about everyday rights of women
- Concerned about increasing women’s workload
- Micro credit as example of women responsibility
- Not isolating women, but providing space, what about household education? Enforces gender norms
- Social change theory: The idea that change has to come from person lacking rights/the oppressed
APPRAOCH 2: KEEP OUR ENVIRONMENT HEALTHY

LIKES

Views food system as integrated with environment

• Planet is integral
• Need to see whole system—integral whole system
• Problem is length/temporality
• Doesn’t look at access—could increase cost of food
• If done properly it will be okay, but that is unlikely
• Needs to include externalities into cost
• How do you break the cycle of connection to the unsustainable production system?
• Poverty plays a large role—hard to make choices
• Government should have role
• We have privilege that should be used to focus on environment
• Intergenerational equity

DISLIKES

We need to heal the environment

• Shouldn’t say “Keep the environment healthy” but “heal” the environment

Too much focus on environment

• Trade off—divide in environment e.g., Biofuels as “environmental solution”
• Too environmentally focused—need to focus on cultural/systematic inequalities
• Find ways to take integrated approach—economy, society, environmental
• Practicality: For poor it doesn’t matter about short term or long term environmental impacts
• We need a balance of rights and environment
Sustainability is too complicated

- Sustainability as broad analysis—look at environment, economy and social inequalities
- Sustainability is loaded—different perceptions of it

**APPROACH 3: ENSURE ACCESS TO FOOD**

**LIKES**

*Inclusive of all women’s rights*

- Focuses on all of women’s rights—not just food

*Food as a right*

- Highlights food as a right—lunch programs
- Food not just a commodity
- Subsidizing a system that supports access to food, need government response

*Power dynamics*

- Goes back to power—how to change power structures
- It’s transforming the system—not just “tinkering”
- Is it too radical? Not political salient because of corporate control

*Recognizes trade-off*

- Consumer choice vs. access to food for everyone
- Priorities and desires vs. praxis

**DISLIKES**

*Potential negative affects on families*

- Forces women into industrial agriculture system
- Affects family farms
Doesn’t address access to healthy food

- Not talking about nutrient-rich foods
- Question access: Access to what “food”? Does this include healthy and adequate food?
- Doesn’t tackle processed food issue
- Who defines what is “healthy food”. Canada’s food guide?
- Consider marketing of food- geared towards women, target of advertising of cheap, processed foods
- Food labeling is not addressed
- Role of education and culture change is not addressed