

Poverty and Food Insecurity in the Brazilian Rural:

evidence for Rio Grande do Sul from an analysis of the Entitlements

A Pobreza e a Insegurança Alimentar no Rural Brasileiro:

evidências para o Rio Grande do Sul a partir de uma análise dos intituleamentos

Karen Beltrame Becker Fritz¹

Álvaro Sánchez Bravo²

Luiz Fernando Fritz Filho³

Abstract

Entitlements, present in the rural area of Rio Grande do Sul, associated with the presence of family farming; wealth or the initial allocation of factors; territorial integration; demographic factors and access to education, together, contribute to the reduction of food insecurity in Rio Grande do Sul. Especially in rural areas, promoting a differentiated situation when compared to the Brazilian case, and which make it possible to alleviate situations of food insecurity in the rural area of this state, aiming to promote food security, promoting the development of capabilities of social agents, expanding the role of the agent of the individual, as a member of the public space and as a participant in economic, political and social actions.

Keywords: Capabilities approach. Family farming. Entitlements.

Resumo

Intituleamentos, presentes na área rural do Rio Grande do Sul, associados à presença da agricultura familiar; à riqueza ou à dotação inicial de fatores; à integração territorial; aos fatores demográficos e ao acesso à educação, em conjunto, contribuem para a redução da insegurança alimentar no Rio Grande do Sul. Especialmente na área rural, promovem uma situação diferenciada quando se compara ao caso brasileiro, e que possibilitam amenizar as situações de insegurança alimentar na área rural deste estado, tendo como fim a promoção da segurança alimentar, promovendo o desenvolvimento de capacitações dos agentes sociais, ampliando o papel da condição de agente do indivíduo, como membro do espaço público e como participante de ações econômicas, políticas e sociais.

Palavras-chave: Abordagem das capacitações. Agricultura familiar. Intituleamentos.

¹ Pós-Doutora em Direito. Professora do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Direito da Universidade de Passo Fundo (PPGDireito/UPF).

² Doutor em Direito. Universidade de Sevilla.

³ Professor Colaborador do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Direito da Universidade de Passo Fundo (PPGDireito/UPF). Coordenador do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Administração da Universidade de Passo Fundo (PPGAdm/UPF).

Introduction

The literature that studies the persistence of poverty and food insecurity has shown that the stimulation for the modernization of large traditional property, has led to a premature reduction of agricultural labor, an abandonment of the family production, an intensification of land conflicts and to an increase of urban poverty. This development project, with the almost exclusive goal of the physical increase of products, obeyed to what could be called "capitalist logic", with a tendency to concentrate the production. The consequences of the implemented Rural Development model did not only affect the countryside, but also the cities, due to the increase in population with the aggravation of infrastructure problems in terms of housing, sanitation, health, schools, security, etc.

The analysis of the situations of poverty and food insecurity in the Brazilian countryside necessarily involves the consideration of the characteristics of the agricultural sector. In countries with high rates of human development, agriculture is a family activity, while in Brazil, although family farming predominates, in terms of the number of establishments and personnel employed, and only recently has been valued, the patronal agriculture prevails in the occupied area. According to Guanziroli et al.,⁴ The prevalence of family production as the main basis of agricultural production in advanced capitalist countries can be explained by their ability to incorporate technical progress and respond to the demands of the expanding urban-industrial sector. A second explanation is the recognition of their political-strategic importance in non-excluding national development projects.

However, the perception of this importance changed greatly according to the specificities of the different countries. On one side is the Japanese case, where the strategic importance of modernizing agriculture without producing a mass of the unemployed persons was perceived as vital. In addition, the permanence of feudal community relations represented a specific cultural trait that facilitated the articulation of a set of policies aimed at the modernization from the family farming.

⁴ GUANZIROLI, C. E. et al. **Agricultura Familiar e Reforma Agrária no Século XXI**. Rio de Janeiro: Garamond, 2001.

On the other side is the American case, a nation of immigrants where the opening of the agricultural frontier gave rise to a prosperous family-based agriculture. The image of the entrepreneurial farmer in the founding ideology of the nation, as well as the political/economic weight of these farmers played a decisive role in defining the set of agricultural policies that would consolidate the family characteristic of modern agriculture in the United States.

In Europe in the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century, the strategic considerations were also important in shaping policies that provided some protection and support to family farming, although to a lesser extent when compared to the case of Japan. On the other hand, the peasantry, representing the majority of the economically active population, had significant importance in the political game, facilitating the implementation of such policies.

It is important to note that the recognition of the political-strategic importance of family production would not have been sufficient to justify the support policies implemented, other than their ability to produce in an economically efficient way, to absorb technical progress and meet the demand fiber and, above all, the cheap food from the urban-industrial sector. The Family farming was able to join the economic efficiency with the social efficiency.⁵

Internationally the concern with what would be technologically appropriate for small production grew with criticism of the social implications of the diffusion of the Green Revolution. Although the technological center (selected varieties, agrochemicals and irrigation) was neutral from the perspective of the optimal scale, the resources available for the purchase of these inputs by the peasants were scarce in the poor countries, generating a dispute for these resources, which was won by the local elites. This process resulted in the exclusion of poor farmers from the barrier to entry, represented by a lack of access to credit.

In the Brazilian case, about 75% of the area used by the agricultural sector belongs to half a million farmers employing almost five million pawns, with only a quarter of this area (25%) being provided to thirteen million other

⁵ VEIGA. J. E. da. **O Desenvolvimento Agrícola: uma visão histórica**. São Paulo: Edusp/Hucitec, 1991.

people employed in the sector, which at least one quarter is in a situation of self-consumption.⁶

It is also well known that poverty is proportionately higher in the rural areas of all Brazilian regions and, among the regions, the worst situation of poverty is in the Northeast. Veiga⁷ reveals that in the most miserable region of the country - the Northeast - the spatial differences are tenuous, while in the Southeast/South the proportion of rural poor is twice as high as the urban poor.

Such distortion is evidently a historical heritage whose essential mark was the contempt and intolerance of elites for the familiar forms of land ownership and use. According to Jungmann,⁸ rural poverty has its origin unequivocally in the unequal distribution of lands, and that this bad distribution is the main matrix that generates rural and urban poverty. The arguments that are presented, directly or indirectly, against agrarian reform have their origin in the belief of the superiority of the great production and in the vision of the role of agriculture in the process of economic development, which worked as an intellectual justification for its non-realization in the 1960s and for the successful efforts to abort the attempts to accomplish them in the following decades. In relation to Rio Grande do Sul, it is necessary to make an exception regarding the colonizing flow that, starting from the southern end, allowed a certain affirmation of the familiar agriculture until the southwest of the Paraná. In other Brazilian regions, the agrarian pattern was similar to that which prevailed in Eastern Europe, where elites preferred to prevent their rural populations from gaining access to land ownership.

For Basso,⁹ it would be quite different if the goal of physical growth of agricultural production was linked to the objective of generating employment. In this case, economic policy, in order to be consistent with the development objectives, should give priority to family-type farms. The same author reveals

⁶ VEIGA, J. E. da. Pobreza Rural, Distribuição da Riqueza e Crescimento: a experiência brasileira. In: TEÓFILO, E. et al. (Org.). **Distribuição de Riqueza e Crescimento Econômico**. Brasília: Núcleo de Estudos Agrários e Desenvolvimento Rural, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Rural Sustentável, Ministério do Desenvolvimento Agrário, 2000.

⁷ VEIGA, 2000.

⁸ JUNGSMANN, R. Erradicar a Miséria: Missão Essencial do Desenvolvimento Rural. In: TEÓFILO, E. et al. (Org.). **Distribuição de Riqueza e Crescimento Econômico**. Brasília: Núcleo de Estudos Agrários e Desenvolvimento Rural, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Rural Sustentável, Ministério do Desenvolvimento Agrário, 2000.

⁹ BASSO, D. **Produção Familiar e Desenvolvimento Agrário**: algumas reflexões. TEXTOS para discussão. 12. Ijuí: UNIJUÍ, Departamento de economia e contabilidade, 1993.

that this type of production unit, when properly supported, responds positively in terms of surplus generation. Agriculture, in this perspective, assumes a main role, both because it shelters a significant portion of the families that do not have access to the urban labor market, and because it is the sector from which one of the basic components of citizenship is removed: food - subsistence, as well as contributing to the production of surplus, increasing the supply of agricultural products.

According to Kageyama,¹⁰ food insecurity still affects almost half of the Brazilian rural population, reaching 65% in the Northeast and in the extreme North (Roraima and Amapá). In these areas, severe food insecurity is also greater than in the rest of the country, reaching between 11% and 18% of the rural population. Only São Paulo and the southern region stands out in the opposite direction, obtaining the lowest values for the proportion of people with food insecurity in the rural area (Table 1).

Table 1 – Food insecurity in rural areas, Brazil and UF classes, 2004

UF Classes	% of people with food insecurity	% of people with serious food insecurity
1 (RO, PA, TO)	58,2	15,0
2 (SP)	32,2	2,6
3 (AC, AM)	56,9	13,7
4 (MS, MT)	34,9	4,4
5 (MG, ES, GO)	36,6	4,1
6 (MA, PI, BA)	65,4	18,0
7 (PR, SC, RS)	21,6	2,5
8 (RR, AP)	64,5	11,2
9 (RJ)	38,5	4,9
10 (CE, RN, PB, PE, AL, SE)	64,1	15,9
(DF)	36,2	12,0
Brazil	49,7	11,1

Source: Kageyama.¹¹

¹⁰ KAGEYAMA, A. **Desenvolvimento Rural: conceitos e aplicações ao caso brasileiro**. Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Desenvolvimento Rural, 2008.

¹¹ KAGEYAMA, 2008.

The results found by Kageyama¹² allow us to identify that food insecurity is less intense in the rural environment of Rio Grande do Sul. To make an analytical effort on other entitlements that contribute to the reduction of food insecurity in the rural area of Rio Grande do Sul is the goal of this study.

The Food insecurity in Rio Grande do Sul is analyzed from the notion of entitlements, which shows the influence of factors not directly controlled by the social agents for the solution of eventual "capacity failures". That is, in the case of hunger, for example, access to food may not be a vector available to the social agent experiencing the problem. This lack of access to food is not due to the choice of people (as in the case of those individuals who fast), but because of a structural circumstance (lack of welfare programs, lack of access to monetary resources, for example) that does not allow this is a possibility of realization. In this sense, the social agent has no opportunity to acquire food and be able to perform an operation (being properly nourished).

The availability of socially-valued entitlements for the realization of choices generates an extension of the freedoms of the social agent, which in the case of this study can perform the functioning of being adequately nourished. In the analysis of the problem of hunger, Dréze and Sen,¹³ show that the title of a person is composed of the options available in the legally established means for the acquisition of the goods. The approach of entitlements focuses on the ability of people to access food through the legal methods available in society, including the use of production possibilities and commercial opportunities, rights, state-provided means, and other methods of acquisition of food.

This study reflects on the entitlements that explain the lower intensity of food insecurity in the rural area of Rio Grande do Sul, when compared to the urban area, reaching food security in 80.7% of these households. Recognizing the multidimensionality of this situation, which can't be seen solely due to the insufficiency of income, the following are presented entitlements in connection with the presence of family farming; wealth or the initial allocation of factors; territorial integration; demographic factors and access to education that together

¹² KAGEYAMA, 2008.

¹³ DRÈZE, J.; SEN, A. Introduction to The Political Economy of Hunger. In: DRÈZE, J.; SEN, A.; HUSSAIN, A. **The Political Economy of Hunger**: selected essays. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

contribute to the reduction of food insecurity in Rio Grande do Sul, especially in rural areas, promoting a differentiated situation when compared to the Brazilian case.

1 Entitlements associated with the presence of family farming

In addition to people occupied in agriculture as members of the family of the producer, other aspects are also associated with family farming and are factors that benefit the development, contributing to the reduction of food insecurity, such as agricultural diversification (in contrast to monoculture and economies of scale associated with the agricultural modernization model) and the reduction of land concentration.

Kageyama¹⁴ emphasizes that the association between family farming and rural development, and specifically in this work, the relationship between family farming and reducing food insecurity, stems more from empirical facts than from some intrinsic superiority of this way of organizing production. Successful cases of this association are evidenced in Italy of diffuse industrialization, in the Midwest of the United States and in the South of Brazil. In addition, due to the fact that it operates on a smaller scale and uses the intensive work of its members, family farming is positively valued in the face of situations where large extensive property or the latifundia-minifundium system still prevails in the most backward regions in Brazil.

Due to these characteristics, Buainaim¹⁵ maintains that family farming can have important economic contributions (wealth generation), social (distributive effects) and political (distribution of power). However, the same author emphasizes that the simple presence of family farming is not enough to improve the conditions of rural development, because in the Northeast, where 50% of the people are employed in family farming, income generated by most family establishments forms an important rural poverty in Brazil.

In order to characterize the presence of family farming in Rio Grande do Sul and to differentiate it from the results for Brazil as a whole, six indicators were selected, presented in Table 2. The characteristics of the land distribution

¹⁴ KAGEYAMA, 2008.

¹⁵ BUAINAIM, A. M. **Agricultura Familiar, Agroecologia e Desenvolvimento Sustentável: questões para debate**. Brasília: IICA, 2006.

were described through three indicators: Gini, the proportion of area belonging to the 50% lower agricultural establishments and the average area of the establishments.¹⁶ The Gini index and the average area tend to vary in the same sense of the presence of large property and, as a consequence, are negatively associated with family farming. The greater the fraction of the area belonging to the smaller establishments, the greater the presence of small production and possibly the expected effects on rural development and the reduction of food insecurity will be positive. In order to differentiate the dynamic family farming from unproductive smallholdings, an indicator of production was used in small establishments (proportion of the value of agricultural production corresponding to establishments smaller than 100 hectares).

The presence of family farming was captured by the relative importance of the workforce of the head of the rural establishment and unpaid members of the family. The diversification of agricultural activity was measured by the proportion of area planted to crops, excluding the main permanent crop and the main, temporary crop. The larger the area occupied with a single crop (permanent or temporary) the less diversification. The indicator shows the difference between the area of monoculture and the total area planted with crops, that is, it works in the opposite sense of the specialization. The higher the value of the indicator, the greater the diversification. The indicators used in Table 2 aim to indirectly capture the predominant form of production in rural areas and were extracted from Kageyma,¹⁷ which used the 1995-96 Agricultural Census and the 2005 Municipal Agricultural Survey (PAM).

Table 2 – Indicators of presence of family farming and agricultural diversification, Brazil and Rio Grande do Sul

UF	Gini index for the distribution of land ownership	% of area of 50% lower establishments	Average area of establishments (ha)	% of unpaid family labor	% of area planted with crops other	% of production value in establishments less than 100 ha
----	---	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------------	--

¹⁶ HOFFMANN, R. Distribuição da Renda e da Posse da Terra no Brasil. In: RAMOS, P. et al. **Dimensões do agronegócio brasileiro**: políticas, instituições e perspectivas. Brasília: MDA, 2007. NEAD Estudos 15.

¹⁷ KAGEYAMA, 2008.

					than the two main crops	
Brazil	0,857	2,3	73,1	75,9	59,9	46,5
RS	0,763	6,9	50,8	85,7	48,7	61,0

Source: Kageyama.¹⁸

Rio Grande do Sul, accompanied by the other states of the South Region, Rondônia and Acre, appears with maximum values for the factors associated with family production and agricultural diversity, which in turn represent important entitlements associated to the reduction of food insecurity, differentiating the familiar agriculture of Rio Grande do Sul from other Brazilian states. Buainaim¹⁹ reveals that the differences between family farmers are associated with the very formation of groups throughout history, the various cultural heritages, particular professional and life experience, access and variable availability of a set of factors, among which resources natural resources, human capital, social capital, among others. This differentiation is also associated with the insertion of the groups in agrarian landscapes differentiated from each other, the differentiated access to the markets and the socioeconomic insertion of the producers, which result both from the particular conditions of the groups and from the opportunities created by the movement of the economy as a whole, through of public policies, etc.

In Rio Grande do Sul, the family farming, according to Gazolla,²⁰ is a social form of work and production belonging to the social and economic environment marked by the increasing commercialization of its reproductive strategies, mainly by the commodification of food consumption.

In addition, family agricultural production is taken as a form of production and work that generates certain entitlements (land, workforce and the methods of production), which are combined with each other by the family producer through their social relations of production, determine a type of agricultural product which, in turn, is the material and concrete result of an agricultural production process. This agricultural product can be both free circulation and exchange value in the market,

¹⁸ KAGEYAMA, 2008.

¹⁹ BUAINAIM, 2006.

²⁰ GAZOLLA, M. **Agricultura Familiar, Segurança Alimentar e Políticas Públicas: uma análise a partir da produção para autoconsumo no território do Alto Uruguai/RS**. Dissertação (Mestrado em Desenvolvimento Rural)–Programa de Pós-Graduação em Desenvolvimento Rural, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2004.

or, have use value that, in the context of market circuits, has no value, other than to be used by its owner for his own benefit. This is the case of food, which the family farmer produces for the sole purpose of feeding the domestic group, which, in the context of the family production unit, has no exchange value, since it is serving only to quench family hunger (value of use) and generate and food security.

The process of agricultural production can lead to two different strategies of production of family farming in different socioeconomic formations, which are defined and differentiated by the degree of commodification of social relations, called Production for Domestic Consumption and Food Consumption through Markets. These strategies, described below, are not static but dynamic in the sense that a farmer who is at a certain level of commodification of consumption can assume an upward or downward trajectory in his productive levels.

Buainaim²¹ reports that family farmers seek diversification and maximum food and productive self-sufficiency aimed at reducing food insecurity and economic risks, but this is not due to any intrinsic attribute of family production, but to objective market conditions that (imperfections in the marketing process, sharp price variations, distances from markets, isolation in periods of rain, lack of mechanisms to protect against natural risks). When conditions become objectively more favorable, there is a tendency among family farmers for greater openness and market integration and greater specialization in the most profitable products.

2 Family farming and Production for Domestic Consumption

A first social production/reproduction strategy is one that develops where production for domestic consumption is not vulnerable within the production unit. Production for family consumption can be defined as the fraction of the agricultural production that takes place in the establishment and is destined to the food consumption of the members of the families of those in charge, including animal feeding and other uses of the productive activity.²² In this way, the family farmer first produces what is necessary for food and food security of the domestic group, and the commodification of food consumption is present, but to a degree that does not compromise the family's social and food reproduction. This strategy provides the family farmer with a social reproduction

²¹ BUAINAIM, 2006.

²² LEITE, S. (Org.). **Políticas Públicas e Agricultura no Brasil**. Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS, 2001.

based on his internal production assumptions, reducing the externalization of domestic consumption on a real basis, in which the family farmer starts to depend less on the social and economic context and, mainly, reduces commodification of domestic consumption, since social and food production/reproduction is ensured within the family unit itself.

In this way, the family farmer guarantees his food and reproductive security, since he has his production for the family consumption guaranteed internally to the production unit, thus also producing, in the same social process, his partial autonomy and relative to the market conditions, the price mechanisms and the conditions of exchange that it imputes to it.

It is the production itself that ensures social reproduction and forms a kind of support "ballast", whereby the family farmer can react to their social situation, seeking to diversify the strategies of living through the expansion of the productive activities, income, assets and abilities to obtain them.²³ The strengthening of this production allows the family farmer to diversify his/her livelihood strategies, and represents one of the viable ways to combat rural poverty.

Grisa²⁴ discusses the hypothesis that production for subsistence is one of the explanatory factors of the social and economic condition of the family units and is configured as a strategy to strengthen autonomy, generating to the family units greater control over the productive process and, consequently, on its social reproduction. The same author highlighted the following functions of family production: (1) internalize tasks of the productive process and assert food security; (2) diversifying production and giving greater stability to social reproduction; (3) to economize monetary resources and potentiate other idle ones; (4) reuse and reproduce resources by establishing co-production; (5) to meet household food demand and the creation of exchange values; (6) promote sociability; and (7) contribute to the social identity of families. Each of these functions will then be further explored.

²³ SEN apud ELLIS, F. **Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries**. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

²⁴ GRISA, C. **A Produção "pro gasto": um estudo comparativo do autoconsumo no Rio Grande do Sul**. Dissertação (Mestrado em Desenvolvimento Rural)–Programa de Pós-Graduação em Desenvolvimento Rural, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2007.

The internalization of tasks (1) in family farming is related to the reduction of food insecurity, as the family units seek to increase their control over the production process. Thus the production for the family consumption performs the important function of maintaining internally the family unit the satisfaction of one of the main necessities for the social reproduction, the feeding. In addition to the access and availability of food, by keeping the production unit internal to producing food for own consumption, another principle of food security is achieved: quality and appropriateness to local eating habits. To ensure sanity and quality of food, family consumption production is generally free of pesticides and other chemicals. In addition to the use of animal manure, ash, food remains and other materials that do not compromise health are used. Animal husbandry also has differentiated management, with food coming from the establishment itself, such as maize and bran, in addition to the expansion of the breeding period, ensuring quality and flavor of the meat. In addition to sanitation and quality, these practices guarantee sustainable management, using resources available locally, in a form of co-production, without harming the environment, the future capacity of production and consumption and thus strengthening the socioeconomic condition of the family.

In relation to cultural diversity, the production for the consumption of the family respects the food preferences of local communities, their preparation and consumption practices, serving as an instrument of preservation of culture, since many practices are passed from the parents to the children, according to with socio-environmental conditions and local history itself.

A second function related to family production is the diversification of production (2), generating greater stability to social reproduction, in the face of the process of agricultural specialization, in which families are exposed to the markets and the relations established by them.

Another survival strategy may be 'reaction and need' in a context of rural poverty, risks and shocks of the domestic group, according to Ellis.^{25,26} In this case, the social and material conditions that undermine the social reproduction of the domestic unit are in the process of disintegration and it is necessary to

²⁵ ELLIS, F. Household Strategies and Rural Livelihood Diversifications. **The Journal of Development Studies**, v. 35, n. 1, Oct. 1998.

²⁶ ELLIS, 2000.

use strategies to continue to survive even in a context of economic crisis, risks and threatened reproduction, of food insecurity, as in the case of the vulnerability of the self-provision dimension due to the privilege to the commercial sphere.²⁷ In this case, the strategies of necessity refer to an involuntary action towards the diversification of assets and types of capital.²⁸ In the case of the disintegration of the domestic group and the threatened social reproduction in which the farmer is subjected, the strategies of living by necessity and by reaction will be put into practice to lead him to diversify the strategies of living, which to the process by which family units build a diversified increase in their investment portfolios, activities and assets to survive, and to improve living standards.

For Gazolla,²⁹ the subsistence production is the sphere of the domestic unit that provides the basis and the ballast for the diversification of the strategies of living in family farming. It is with a production for domestic consumption strengthened internally in the production unit that, in turn, the domestic group can launch in other activities and obtain other sources of income. This is justified by the fact that, without self-provision, the family farmer can't diversify living strategies, since with the income from the activities that he will need, he will need to buy products for the family's food in the market with market prices. Without production for consumption by the family, the objective and material conditions are not generated to make a process of diversification of sources of income and productive activities. Thus, it can be seen the breakdown of the domestic unit in the face of a crisis or shock, which may be represented by situations of food insecurity due to the lack of production of its own food.

Therefore, it is the strengthening of production for family consumption that leads to diversification of living strategies and food security by reducing the degree of vulnerability of production units to food insecurity.

Another function of subsistence production refers to how to take advantage of the idle time and labor force of the establishment (3), producing

²⁷ LEITE, S. Autoconsumo y Sustentabilidad em la Agricultura Familiar: uma aproximación a la experiência Brasileira. In: BELIK, W. **Políticas de Seguridad alimentária y nutrición em América Latina**. São Paulo: Hucetec, 2004.

²⁸ MALUF, R. S. et al. **Caderno Segurança Alimentar**. 2001. Disponível em: <<http://www.zooide.com/>>. Acesso em: nov. 2006.

²⁹ GAZOLLA, 2004.

for the family consumption, saving monetary resources, for the own production of the goods that could be acquired in the markets. That is, it is a strategy of maximizing the resources available in the family unit, especially land and labor, generating a production that avoids the purchase in the markets of the necessary food for the domestic group. Although family farmers recognize, according to Grisa,³⁰ that this is an important source of income, most households can't estimate it in values.

Maluf et al.³¹ stands that subsistence production plays an important role in the fight against poverty, and is the main determinant of food insecurity. Producing for family consumption is a way found by family farmers to improve their quality of life and their socioeconomic condition, a strategy that is not available for many other segments of the population living in poverty.³²

Production for family consumption also has the function of utilizing the resources available in the establishment (4), and at the same time strengthens and recreates them for future cycles, contributing to the autonomy of family units. Santos and Ferrante³³ point out that vegetable production for family consumption usually uses residues of agricultural production (straw, manure, etc.) and resources offered by the environment itself (natural soil fertility, for example).

Other important local resources used in production for family consumption are seeds and know-how. Seeds usually come from previous cropping cycles. According to Grisa,³⁴ "there is the care to collect, select and store the seeds, on which future production depends". In addition, family consumption uses the knowledge and experience accumulated over the generations. The author also emphasizes that the possession of this knowledge is one of the factors that allows that the attendance of the food needs of the family is satiated by itself. Knowing the potentials and limitations, how and when to plant each crop are elements that allow better management of resources in the family unit.

³⁰ GRISA, 2007.

³¹ MALUF, et al., 2006.

³² NORDER, L. A. C. A Construção da Segurança Alimentar em Assentamentos Rurais: questões, contextos e métodos. **Cadernos de Debate**, São Paulo, v. 6, 1998.

³³ SANTOS, I. P. dos; FERRANTE, V. L. S. B. (Org.). **Da terra nua ao prato cheio**: produção para consumo familiar nos assentamentos rurais do Estado de São Paulo. Araraquara: Fundação ITESP/UNIARA, 2003.

³⁴ GRISA, 2007, p. 144.

There is also the exchange of know-how through the new artifacts produced by agroindustries, based on the relationship already established between man, nature and production, providing the most appropriate use of inputs. Production for family consumption, as a form of co-production, uses locally available material and social resources and, at the same time, reproduces them, guaranteeing future cycles and a self-controlled resource base, resulting, in the end, in greater autonomy on the production process.

The production for family consumption also reveals autonomy for the flexibility that certain foods have (5), that is, they allow the farmer either direct consumption or sale, according to the demand of the family. Gazolla³⁵ shows that the characteristic of the alternative allows to attend the vital food minimum and still to reverse the production in monetary resources, without provoking the alimentary insecurity.

It is also emphasized that family food production is an important form of sociability (6). These foods are part of many moments of social life, such as parties and gatherings, as well as part of this production, destined to exchange and donations between neighbors, relatives and friends. According to Grisa,³⁶ through social exchanges, donations, meetings and meetings with the presence of food, characteristic of family production, families socialize knowledge and experiences, renewing community sentiments, generating a solid social structure, an important component for the autonomy of families.

Finally, producing for the maintenance of families means more than simple food production, as it also reveals pride and demarcation of social position (7).^{37, 38} According to Seyferth,³⁹ producing for family consumption integrates the identity of the settler who is characterized by work family, sufficient land ownership, allowing the cultivation activity, production focused on domestic consumption (polyculture with breeding) and participation in solidarity activities.

Although agriculture undergoes transformations, such as the commodification of agriculture, being a family farmer and producing for

³⁵ GAZOLLA, 2004.

³⁶ GRISA, 2007.

³⁷ BRANDÃO, 1981; WORTMANN; WORTMANN, 1997 apud GRISA, 2007.

³⁸ GARCIA JUNIOR, A. R. **Terra de Trabalho**: trabalho familiar de pequenos produtores. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1983.

³⁹ 1991 apud GRISA, 2007.

consumption, they remain inseparable. Not having production for domestic consumption, in addition to weakening its social reproduction, compromises social identity, identification as a farmer. Unlike other production functions for family consumption that are conspicuously a source of autonomy for family farming, social identity results from this autonomy. With the satisfaction of food needs (at least in part) through the sweat of the family itself, the identity of a farmer is maintained.⁴⁰

Besides demonstrating that subsistence production is a recurrent strategy of family farming, it is shown that this production contributes greatly to the socioeconomic condition and the autonomy of the farmers.

3 Family farming and Food Consumption Through Markets

The second strategy of social production is the commodification of food consumption. This path is characterized by a growing commercialization of the agricultural production process, in which the degree of outsourcing of family farmers is high. Food consumption is heavily commodified and farmers constantly carry out their food and social reproduction by seeking a large part of domestic consumption in local city markets, thus generating a loss of food autonomy and a situation of food insecurity. the family consumption is not based on the supposed internal of the unit of production.

The commodification of consumption, in some cases, leads to food insecurity in the domestic group, since it is necessary to increase monetarization of the family to make purchases in the market, at prices and conditions imposed by it, aiming at the food consumption needed by the family. This situation creates a situation in which the domestic group is vulnerable to the market, by its function of defining the prices and conditions of movement of goods. The commodification of consumption causes the family farmer to experience a dilemma because, on the one hand, he has to obtain monetary surpluses to deal with the purchase of food consumption outside the production unit. However, for this, it needs to obtain increasing monetary balances in the year within the production unit, and possibly increasing the market insertion through productive specialization. However, the logic of the productive

⁴⁰ GRISA, 2007.

specialization of the farmers generates a social situation that can increase the degree of vulnerability of self-provisioning.

Productive specialization leads to a reproductive "crossroads" for farmers, in that the more they specialize, the more intensely the production for domestic consumption is spatially and temporally displaced within the production unit, becoming "marginal" in many cases and in others, to the point of being totally extinguished. This movement towards specialization leads to a greater dependence on the social and economic context, with a tendency towards increasing financial expenditure for the family's food consumption and the vulnerability of the social and food reproduction of the family.

In this context of productive specialization and activities that generate greater profitability, the family farmer loses the alternative of production as Garcia Junior^{41,42} mentioned, because crops such as soy and tobacco, which are among the main products of family farming, do not have another "function" other than commercial. In the context of the production unit, no important role in terms of food safety is played by these products, which is valued only in the market sphere.

In this context, there is scarcely any room for diversifying family-based strategies as defined by Ellis,⁴³ who are in such a situation of vulnerability (which in some cases is embodied through rural impoverishment) that any extra income generated, assets or products obtained through networks of exchanges with neighbors (family reciprocity), are used primarily to guarantee the domestic group's diet, as formulated by Graziano da Silva et al.⁴⁴ Diversification of living strategies is only possible when families are able to generate assets, income and the ability to obtain a monetary surplus to meet other needs and possibilities of social reproduction. That is why the strengthening of production for family consumption, in contexts of commercialized family farming, is so important. It is, to a large extent, the basis for the diversification of livelihood

⁴¹ GARCIA JUNIOR, 1983.

⁴² GARCIA JUNIOR, A. R. **O Sul – O Caminho do Roçado**: estratégias de reprodução camponesa e transformações sociais. Marco Zero. São Paulo; Brasília, DF: Editora Universitária de Brasília; MCT-CNPq, 1989.

⁴³ ELLIS, 2000.

⁴⁴ DA SILVA, G. et al. O Brasil Rural Precisa de uma Estratégia de Desenvolvimento. In: **Ministério do Desenvolvimento Agrário. Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Rural sustentável/Núcleo de Estudos Agrários e Desenvolvimento Rural**, 2001.

strategies and reduces the vulnerability of the domestic group to situations of rural poverty and food insecurity.

Thus, the occurrence of food insecurity among family farmers can be seen to a large extent as effects of the commodification of consumption, which causes the family farmer to have an increasingly narrow social and food reproduction threshold, in which the boundaries between poverty and "starving", as the farmers refer, are very tenuous. Thus, the issue of rural poverty, food insecurity and production for family consumption are correlated themes so that, to understand one of them, it is necessary to understand others.

4 Entitlements associated with wealth or the initial allocation of factors

According to Kageyama,⁴⁵ a starting point for the understanding of inequality among Brazilian states, including to explain why food insecurity is less intense in rural Rio Grande do Sul, is linked to the historical path of occupation and development that conditions development of rural areas. Considering only the regional inequalities of agricultural modernization, Kageyama and Silveira⁴⁶ point out that the process of income convergence observed between countries or regions would hardly occur among Brazilian states. In Brazil, the modernization process aimed at the exploitation of the natural resource base and the development of an infrastructure, including agroindustry, unevenly distributed in the different regions of the country. Other factors also contributed to generate strong regional segmentation of the level of development, such as the existence of significant differences in the forms of organization of agriculture. Some of its configurations are related to a given regional specialization pattern of agroindustry activities, with impacts on interregional integration coefficients of trade and on foreign trade coefficients.

Table 3 presents the participation of the state of Rio Grande do Sul in the value of GDP for the years 1970, 1975, 1980, 1985, 2000 and 2004, in order to illustrate the economic size of the unit of analysis.

Table 3 – Participation of Rio Grande do Sul in the Gross Domestic Product (in %)

⁴⁵ KAGEYAMA, 2008.

⁴⁶ KAGEYAMA, A.; SILVEIRA, J. M. J. Agricultura e Questão Regional. **Revista de Economia e Sociologia Rural**, v. 35, n. 2, abr./jun.1997.

UF	1970	1975	1980	1985	2000	2004
RS	8,6	8,5	7,9	7,9	7,7	8,1

Source: Kageyama.⁴⁷

In the case of the state of Rio Grande do Sul, the largest losses of participation occurred between 1975 and 2000, once again increasing participation in 2004.

In order to characterize the influence of the original inequality of the state of Rio Grande do Sul, the value of GDP per capita (Table 4) was used in relation to the recent process of rural development, assuming that this indicator synthesizes the result of the historical development process and its current situation. The choice of the year 2000 is due to the fact that it is close to the reference period of the other variables used to describe the entitlements that reduce food insecurity in Rio Grande do Sul. It is important to note that the indicator is not specific to the rural area, but according to Kageyama,⁴⁸ the idea is that it represents the broader context, which conditions rural development.

Table 4 – Gross Domestic Product per capita, Brazil and Rio Grande do Sul, 2000
(in current values)

UF	PIB per capita (R\$)
RS	8.302
Brazil	6.430

Source: Kageyama,⁴⁹ from IBGE, Directorate of Research, Coordination of National Accounts.

The GDP per capita between the states ranged from a minimum of R \$ 1,616 in Maranhão to a maximum of R \$ 9,919 in São Paulo. The lowest values are found in the Northeastern states, and the only states with GDP per capita above the country average are the Amazonas, Southeastern states (except Minas Gerais) and the states of the Southern Region, including the analysis unit - Rio Great South.

⁴⁷ KAGEYAMA, 2008.

⁴⁸ KAGEYAMA, 2008.

⁴⁹ KAGEYAMA, 2008.

5 Entitlements associated with territorial integration

According to Kageyama,⁵⁰ the lower the isolation of a region (in terms of economic distances, contacts and accessibility in general) the greater the possibilities of rural development with diversification, multifunctionality and social progress. A dense and well-distributed network of cities in the territory is a positive factor for the development of adjacent rural areas. Already the concentration of the population in the capital or in few big cities acts in the opposite direction. An adequate transport and communications infrastructure, in turn, favors territorial integration and extends the accessibility of rural areas. With these assumptions established, the following are presented six indicators to represent the greater or lesser territorial isolation in Rio Grande do Sul.

The first two indicators refer to the density and dispersion of the urban network, which positively affect rural territorial development. These indicators, represented by the population density (hab/km²) and the resident population outside the state capital (proportion of the total population residing in the interior), are valid for the population as a whole, and not only for the rural population, both having as source the Demographic Census of 2000.

The second group of indicators relates to the transport infrastructure, represented by the extension of the road network and the motor vehicle fleet, with data from the year 2004 of the Ministry of Transport. The indicators were calculated in relation to the territorial area of Rio Grande do Sul (total road network measured in kilometers per 100 km² of surface and number of motor vehicles per km² of state surface area) and its expected effect on rural development is positive, insofar as the greater the availability of transport, the less territorial isolation.

The third group of indicators as a factor of isolation refers to the communicability in the rural territory of each state, represented by the Internet access (proportion of the rural population with Internet access) and the fixed or cellular telephone (proportion of the rural population with telephone), with PNAD data for 2005.

Table 5 presents the values of the isolation indicators for Rio Grande do Sul as well as for Brazil as a whole.

⁵⁰ KAGEYAMA, 2008.

Table 5 – Indicators of territorial isolation, Brazil and Rio Grande do Sul

UF	Percentage of the resident population in the interior	Demographic density (people per km ²)	Road network in km per 100 km ² of surface	Number of vehicles per km ²	Percentage of rural population with Internet access	Percentage of rural population with telephone
RS	86,6	36,16	54,49	11,65	5,6	80,1
Brazil	76,2	19,94	18,91	4,61	3,4	31,7

Source: Kageyama,⁵¹ a partir de IBGE e Ministério dos Transportes.

For Rio Grande do Sul, the isolation factors are significantly different from the results found in Brazil, with high demographic density, high values for the road network, vehicle fleet and communicability, revealing territorial integration that favors rural development.

6 Entitlements associated with demographic factors

Some demographic factors represent advantages or disadvantages for families in terms of their productive engagement or their access to the results of production, labor and development in general, such as fertility, age distribution, spouse presence or family type, among others. Kageyama,⁵² in Table 6, considered the dependency ratio expressed as the ratio of the number of children (14 years or less) to the number of elderly (65 years or more) and the number of young and adults (aged 15-64) in the resident population:

Ratio of dependency = (under 15 years + over 64 years) / (people aged 15 to 64)

Defining demographic dependency ratio as the ratio between the number of non-adult members and the adults of a family, the author states that "the low per capita income of a family can come from only two immediate factors: a) a low average income of adults; or b) a high dependency ratio".⁵³

⁵¹ KAGEYAMA, 2008.

⁵² KAGEYAMA, 2008.

⁵³ KAGEYAMA, 2008, p.133.

Table 6 – Reason for demographic dependence in rural areas, Brazil and Rio Grande do Sul, 2000

UF	Average Dependency Ratio
Brazil	0,691
RS	0,526

Source: Kageyama,⁵⁴ from the 2000 Demographic Census, IBGE.

The dependence ratio in the rural area showed a great variation in the several Brazilian states, but Rio Grande do Sul obtained a minimum of 0.53 (practically two adults for each dependent).

7 Entitlements associated with access to education

One of the most important factors for improving living conditions and for development in general is education, including for people employed in the agricultural sector. According to Hoffmann,⁵⁵ despite the significant positive effect of wealth (measured by land tenure) on the income of people employed in agriculture, education is one of the key determinants of income.

In the relationship between education and income inequality in the Brazilian rural area, Ney⁵⁶ observes that in addition to the problem of the low supply of education, there is an expressive participation of small schools and multi-series classes (first to fourth grade students in the same class) in the primary education in rural areas, compromising the quality of education. In addition, school dropout in rural areas is higher than in urban areas in all initial grades of elementary school. There is a strong inequality of educational opportunity in rural areas, characterized by significant school dropout rates in the first grades, due to the great heterogeneity of education generated by the poor access of the poor to school and by the poor quality of education resulting from multiseriate, workload of teachers and the difficulty of obtaining school reinforcement in the home, in the face of low parents' schooling. As a result, in addition to land scarcity, rural youth tend to inherit low schooling, which limits

⁵⁴ KAGEYAMA, 2008.

⁵⁵ HOFFMANN, 2007.

⁵⁶ NEY, M. G. **Educação e Desigualdade de Renda no Meio Rural Brasileiro**. Tese (Doutorado em Economia)–Instituto de Economia, UNICAMP, Campinas, 2006.

their ability to perform non-agricultural activities and even more modern and profitable agriculture.

Taking into account the importance of access to education, especially for the population of developing rural territories, six indicators were used (Table 7), most representing the states as a whole, due to the difficulty of obtaining data specific to the rural environment and considered the concrete facilities of displacement of the students of the rural areas to study in the next cities. In order to capture the availability of schools and teachers, a necessary factor for the population's access to education, we selected indicators related to elementary, middle and higher education. The availability of teachers was measured by three indicators: the first for primary and secondary education, the other for higher education and a third for primary education in rural areas. The average number of "teaching functions" (which is slightly higher than the number of teachers, since a teacher can teach in more than one course, therefore each activity is counted as a teaching every 1000 people 18 to 24 years of age; the availability of primary school teachers for every 1,000 rural inhabitants from 5 to 14 years of age and, in order to characterize the size of educational establishments, the average number of teaching functions per primary and secondary school was also calculated.

The internalization of higher education is also fundamental to make the rural population accessible and was captured by the indicator of presential courses located in the interior of the states. Two other indicators were associated with the quality of elementary education: the relative frequency of schools with more than 30 students and the frequency of classes that were not multiserries, that is, the frequency of serial classes in elementary school.

All indicators were found in Kageyama,⁵⁷ based on data from INEP, referring to the School Census (Statistical Synopsis of Basic Education of 2000) and the Census of Higher Education (Statistical Synopsis of 2001), found on the website of the Ministry of Education.

Table 7 – Indicators of access to education, Brazil and Rio Grande do Sul, 2000 and 2001

UF	Teachers	by	Primary	school	% of elementary	% of serial	%	of	Teachers	in
----	----------	----	---------	--------	-----------------	-------------	---	----	----------	----

⁵⁷ KAGEYAMA, 2008.

	elementary and middle school	teachers in rural areas/1000 people aged 5 to 14 years in rural areas	schools with more than 30 students	classes in elementary school	presential undergraduate courses within the state	higher education/1000 people aged 18 to 24
Brazil	9,80	37,92	68,9	89,2	64,7	9,41
RS	11,85	60,01	60,6	92,4	87,6	14,48

Source: Kageyama,⁵⁸ from MEC/INEP and IBGE.

Rio Grande do Sul, including also the southern half of Brazil, shows the maximum values for almost all indicators, reflecting the best condition for access to education. The availability of teachers at all levels of education is twice or more than in some units of the federation of the North and Northeast. In these two regions there is less availability of teachers, more multi-grade classes and fewer higher courses outside the capital.

As already pointed out, the relationship between education and malnutrition has represented a virtuous cycle of feeding bodies and minds, hailing education as a powerful mechanism for reducing hunger and poverty. Lack of education undermines productivity, employability and capacity gains, leading directly to poverty and hunger. Investments in education have resulted in higher returns than investments in physical capital.

For FAO,⁵⁹ in rural areas where the vast majority of the hungry in the world live, research shows that farmers with four years of primary education are on average almost 9% more productive than farmers who did not attend school. When combined with the availability of inputs, such as fertilizers, new seeds or machines, their productivity is raised to 13%.

This study, when comparing the Brazilian states, aimed to justify the lower intensity of food insecurity in the rural area of Rio Grande do Sul, in the perspective that the entitlements need to be multiple, so that families have adequate access to food.

Final Considerations

⁵⁸ KAGEYAMA, 2008.

⁵⁹ FAO. **The State of Food Insecurity in the World. 2005.** Disponível em: <<http://www.fao.org/>>. Acesso em: out. 2006.

In this study, the results found for Rio Grande do Sul differ from the analyzes of Hoffmann and Kageyama⁶⁰ for Brazil, where food insecurity affects the rural population more strongly. It is important to highlight, at this stage of the study, that it is a set of entitlements, present in the rural area of Rio Grande do Sul, that contribute to make food insecurity less intense when compared to the urban area. Entitlements in the rural areas of Rio Grande do Sul, associated with the presence of family farming, the wealth or initial allocation of factors, territorial integration, demographic factors and access to education, together contribute to reducing food insecurity in Brazil. Rio Grande do Sul, especially in the rural area, promoting a differentiated situation when compared to the Brazilian case, and which make it possible to alleviate situations of food insecurity in the rural area of this state, with the purpose of promoting food security and enabling the development of capacities of social agents. The availability of socially valued entitlements for the realization of choices generates an extension of the freedoms of the social agent, allowing the performance of the functioning to be adequately nourished.

References

BASSO, D. **Produção Familiar e Desenvolvimento Agrário**: algumas reflexões. TEXTOS para discussão. 12. Ijuí: UNIJUÍ, Departamento de economia e contabilidade, 1993.

BUAINAIM, A. M. **Agricultura Familiar, Agroecologia e Desenvolvimento Sustentável**: questões para debate. Brasília: IICA, 2006.

DRÈZE, J.; SEN, A. Introduction to The Political Economy of Hunger. In: DRÈZE, J.; SEN, A.; HUSSAIN, A. **The Political Economy of Hunger**: selected essays. New York: Oxford – University Press, 2004.

ELLIS, F. **Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries**. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

ELLIS, F. Household Strategies and Rural Livelihood Diversifications. **The Journal of Development Studies**, v. 35, n. 1, Oct. 1998.

⁶⁰ HOFFMANN, R.; KAGEYAMA, A. Pobreza, Insegurança Alimentar e Pluriatividade no Brasil. In: CONGRESSO BRASILEIRO DE ECONOMIA E SOCIOLOGIA RURAL, 45., 2007, Londrina. **Anais...** Brasília: SOBER, 2007.

FAO. **The State of Food Insecurity in the World**. 2005. Disponível em: <<http://www.fao.org/>>. Acesso em: out. 2006.

GARCIA JUNIOR, A. R. **Terra de Trabalho**: trabalho familiar de pequenos produtores. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1983.

GARCIA JUNIOR, A. R.. **O Sul – O Caminho do Roçado**: estratégias de reprodução camponesa e transformações sociais. Marco Zero. São Paulo; Brasília, DF: Editora Universitária de Brasília; MCT-CNPq, 1989.

GAZOLLA, M. **Agricultura Familiar, Segurança Alimentar e Políticas Públicas**: uma análise a partir da produção para autoconsumo no território do Alto Uruguai/RS. Dissertação (Mestrado em Desenvolvimento Rural)–Programa de Pós-Graduação em Desenvolvimento Rural, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2004.

DA SILVA, G. et al. O Brasil Rural Precisa de uma Estratégia de Desenvolvimento. In: **Ministério do Desenvolvimento Agrário. Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Rural sustentável/Núcleo de Estudos Agrários e Desenvolvimento Rural**, 2001.

GRISA, C. **A Produção “pro gasto”**: um estudo comparativo do autoconsumo no Rio Grande do Sul. Dissertação (Mestrado em Desenvolvimento Rural)–Programa de Pós-Graduação em Desenvolvimento Rural, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2007.

GUANZIROLI, C. E. et al. **Agricultura Familiar e Reforma Agrária no Século XXI**. Rio de Janeiro: Garamond, 2001.

HOFFMANN, R. Distribuição da Renda e da Posse da Terra no Brasil. In: RAMOS, P. et al. **Dimensões do agronegócio brasileiro**: políticas, instituições e perspectivas. Brasília: MDA, 2007. NEAD Estudos 15.

HOFFMANN, R.; KAGEYAMA, A. Pobreza, Insegurança Alimentar e Pluriatividade no Brasil. In: Congresso Brasileiro de Economia e Sociologia Rural, 45., 2007, Londrina. **Anais...** Brasília: SOBER, 2007.

JUNGMANN, R. Erradicar a Miséria: Missão Essencial do Desenvolvimento Rural. In: TEÓFILO, E. et al. (Org.). **Distribuição de Riqueza e Crescimento Econômico**. Brasília: Núcleo de Estudos Agrários e Desenvolvimento Rural, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Rural Sustentável, Ministério do Desenvolvimento Agrário, 2000.

KAGEYAMA, A. **Desenvolvimento Rural**: conceitos e aplicações ao caso brasileiro. Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Desenvolvimento Rural, 2008.

KAGEYAMA, A.; SILVEIRA, J. M. J. Agricultura e Questão Regional. **Revista de Economia e Sociologia Rural**, v. 35, n. 2, abr./jun.1997.

LEITE, S. (Org.). **Políticas Públicas e Agricultura no Brasil**. Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS, 2001.

LEITE, S. Autoconsumo y Sustentabilidad em la Agricultura Familiar: uma aproximación a la experiência Brasilenã. In: BELIK, W. **Políticas de Seguridad alimentária y nutrición em América Latina**. São Paulo: Hucetec, 2004.

MALUF, R. S. et al. **Caderno Segurança Alimentar**. 2001. Disponível em: <<http://www.zooide.com/>>. Acesso em: nov. 2006.

NEY, M. G. **Educação e Desigualdade de Renda no Meio Rural Brasileiro**. Tese (Doutorado em Economia)–Instituto de Economia, UNICAMP, Campinas, 2006.

NORDER, L. A. C. A Construção da Segurança Alimentar em Assentamentos Rurais: questões, contextos e métodos. **Cadernos de Debate**, São Paulo, v. 6, 1998.

SANTOS, I. P. dos; FERRANTE, V. L. S. B. (Org.). **Da terra nua ao prato cheio**: produção para consumo familiar nos assentamentos rurais do Estado de São Paulo. Araraquara: Fundação ITESP/UNIARA, 2003.

VEIGA, J. E. da. Pobreza Rural, Distribuição da Riqueza e Crescimento: a experiência brasileira. In: TEÓFILO, E. et al. (Org.). **Distribuição de Riqueza e Crescimento Econômico**. Brasília: Núcleo de Estudos Agrários e Desenvolvimento Rural, Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Rural Sustentável, Ministério do Desenvolvimento Agrário, 2000.

_____. VEIGA, J. E. da. **O Desenvolvimento Agrícola**: uma visão histórica. São Paulo: Edusp/Hucitec, 1991.