ECVC Analysis of the Impact of EU-Mercosur Free Trade Agreement on Farmers

June 2025

Table of contents

1. Introduction

In the European Union, small- and medium-scale agriculture is in crisis. Farmers' mobilisations are happening increasingly across Europe, farm numbers are constantly decreasing[1], extreme weather episodes are intensifying, soils are being degraded[2], biodiversity is collapsing and year after year, European food sovereignty is becoming weaker. This crisis is also social. Agricultural income in the EU remains significantly lower than average wages across the economy, at just 60% in 2023[3][4]. Peasant farmers and agricultural workers both in Europe and Mercosur experience structural discrimination at different levels. In 2018, UN General Assembly adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas (UNDROP) to address these issues and alert the states that is now time to make their agricultural and trade policies consistent to the need to respect peasant farmers rights including economical right to have a decent income (art. 16 of the UNDROP).

During the wave of farmers protests in 2024, farmers clearly denounced the European Union's free trade agenda and called for an end to the negotiations of the EU-Mercosur FTA. To calm the protesters' anger, the European Commission (EC) put the negotiations of this FTA on hold. Yet, just a few months after the electoral period, they ignored the strong criticism voiced in several European countries, announcing the conclusion of negotiations for the agreement on the basis of the mandate that the 27 Member States had given it on 1999 and which was never withdrawn. In this trade agreement, farmers and agricultural workers are being used as a simple adjustment variable to conclude agreements for the sake of the international geopolitical interests, the EU hunger for cheap raw materials and the interest of the powerful food industry. People working in agriculture (crop and animal production, hunting and related service activities) account for about 4.2 % of total employment in the EU. The EC is ready to sacrifice this employment and disregard the rights of people living in rural areas, using them as bargaining chip for the major interests outlined above.

The trade wars launched by the United States since the start of 2025 have shaken the foundations of the global trade system. This disruption forces us to confront a critical question: What kind of trade model do we need to ensure that our basic needs are met in an increasingly unstable world? The recent exposure of the vulnerability of globalized food supply chains to wars, pandemics, and trade policies demonstrates that a trade framework grounded in food sovereignty and global solidarity is urgently required[5].

[1] https://www.farmersjournal.ie/news/news/800-eu-farmers-quit-the-sector-every-day-between-2010-and-2020-740899

[2] https://joint-research-centre.ec.europa.eu/jrc-news-and-updates/urgent-action-needed-reverse-soil-degradation-europe-2024-10-22_en

[3] https://agridata.ec.europa.eu/Qlik_Downloads/Jobs-Growth-sources.htm

[4] 40-60% of EU agricultural income comes from CAP subsidies. Without these, the gap would be even greater (European Commission, 2022)

[5] https://viacampesina.org/en/2023/09/press-release-la-via-campesina-is-determined-to-build-an-alternative-framework-for-global-trade-in-agriculture-written-by-the-peasants-for-the-people/

2. Why are we against the treaty

A threat to the resilience of our agricultural system

This agreement aims to open up new markets for European industrial and service exports, mainly provided by multinational companies, and thus enable the EU to maintain or increase its trade balance. The Commission also hopes that this will contribute to the EU's reindustrialization. Paradoxically, its strategy follows the same model that led to the continent's deindustrialization: increase global competition and the tendency to prey on other territories resources. However**, it is not possible that farmers, one of the most vulnerable group in EU society and more importantly, a group that play a vital role in feeding Europe's population, are sacrificed for other sector interests.** Instead, we must focus on building a truly sustainable and resilient economy for European communities in the long term, using our proposed agricultural models that are rooted in peasant agriculture, adapted to each territory's biophysical capacity to produce, while enhancing this capacity through a transition to agroecological practices.

An omission of agricultural diversity

By claiming that this agreement would be beneficial for agriculture, the Commission fails to recognize that the agricultural sector is not homogeneous, it is a sum of particularities: though certain export sectors may emerge as economic winners (wines and spirits, specific PDO cheeses, etc.), according to the Commission's questionable criteria (such as the trade balance), many others will suffer greatly (cattle, pigs, poultry, honey, etc.). **Free trade agreements inherently place sectors with differing levels of competitiveness in direct competition: those sectors that are not export oriented (but rather feed people locally, for example) and are thus not competitive in the world market will lose market shares and will enter into an even deeper crisis, leading to increased numbers of farmers abandoning the activity**. Those sectors that are considered competitive on international markets will be pushed towards more intensified and industrialised models in order to increase competitiveness at the expenses of climate, biodiversity and environment, criteria which are not taken in consideration in the EC assessments[6].

The agricultural exception

In the history of civilisation, agricultural markets have been always highly regulated, which is necessary because of "the agricultural exception": Agriculture is a critical sector, responding to a basic need for all society, and yet within the sector, the quality and quantity of harvests and productions (i.e. supply) are unpredictable from one year to the next, as they depend on many factors, including some on which neither producers nor legislators can directly intervene. This is why **the priority of agricultural policy should be to ensure a diversified and sustainable production oriented towards internal market and not to develop dependencies from third countries**: neither for food and input supplies, nor to ensure outlets for European production geared towards export.

International markets reinforced at the expense of internal market and generation renewal

Since the creation of the World Trade Organisation, the EU has been guided by an ideology of liberalising international markets, and this has highly contributed to the current situation of the agricultural sector: low income, no generational renewal, considerable environmental and sanitary

[6] https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC135540

problems. International competition allows industrialised and highly capitalised agriculture, in addition to the processing and commodity trading industries (ADM, Bunge, Cargill, Louis-Dreyfus, Lactalis, JBS,…) to capture supply chain value. It weakens the domestic market, replacing it with an economy that is reliant on poorly paid, low-quality employment. **The main focus of agricultural policies should clearly be on strengthening the internal market, as it is central to guaranteeing food security, while extending food chains across continents weakens food systems' resilience to shocks.**

Instead, however, the EU keeps increasing its strategic dependencies, making it impossible for a considerable number of farmers to live from their earnings. This policy prevents youth or new entrants considering taking up the profession and starting a farm as it is difficult to be economically and socially viable in the sector.

The main results of this are that young people do not want to farm, and the average age of the sector is 57 years old. **If the EU does not seriously rethink the way trade on agricultural products is done it will never be possible to ensure generational renewal.**

Moreover, by affecting local markets and ecosystems, while encouraging the expansion of industrial agriculture, the treaty will primarily harm Mercosur rural communities, including peasant farmers, undermining their capacity to control their food system[7].

3. The search for competitivity at the expense of small and medium-scale farmers income

Price decrease in sensitive sectors

The treaty will result in an increase in imports of Mercosur agricultural products. Since production costs are lower than within the EU (which depends on geographical and climatic conditions, health and hygiene standards, labour standards and/or costs, production standards, deforestation, environmental law, etc.), prices will decrease, further driving down farm incomes. Limiting imports through quotas in sectors considered sensitive by the European Commission (beef, pork, poultry, sugar, etc.) would not be sufficient and as showed by the EC study on the cumulative impact of free trade agreements there will be a decrease in price in many sensitive sectors[8]. **This price reduction considered by some as "limited" would add to the already problematic and difficult conditions**, **namely that prices for producers in Europe are too low to generate decent income.**

Localised shocks lead to irreversible consequences

The impact of FTAs in agriculture can often occur silently. The macroeconomic studies used by the EC to say that FTAs do not have a strong impacting on farmers overlook considerable factors since they focus on average prices on an EU scale, without looking at the economic realities on the ground. The only way to see this impact is to look at how low prices push many farmers out of business.

The arrival of imported agricultural products occurs at specific times and places. These goods are not distributed evenly across the market, but can create price or quantity shocks at certain periods. Often those imports take place, for example, during the harvest period of a certain crops. This means

[7] https://www.eurovia.org/news/peasant-and-farmer-organisations-in-europe-and-south-america-come-together-against-the-eu-mercosur-free-trade-agreement/
[8] https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC135540

that producers may have to irreversibly reduce their selling price due to competition with these goods at a critical time. **These localised and isolated impacts are not reflected in macroeconomic studies, but are enormous because each trade shock affecting a sector's production in a territory erodes its capacity to meet the food needs of its population in the long term.**

- For example, in 2025, following the EU-Israel Association Agreement, potatoes were imported in Spain at harvest time by large retailers, in regions where local production is sufficient to cover demand, in order to force producers to either accept lower prices or exit the market. The arrival of cheaper imported products serves as a means of pressure in price negotiations.[9]
- In France, during Easter 2024 and 2025, a sensitive period for lamb sales, lamb farmers faced competition from New Zealand lamb, which is 2-3 times cheaper and quotas for which have been increased with the 2024 free trade agreement. Despite a limited quantity of imported lamb, consumers will use the cheapest price as a reference, driving prices down. These conditions discourage farmers from continuing or starting sheep farming, indirectly leading to a need for imports due to these poor market conditions.[10]

Unfair competition because standards can't be controlled

Many products imported from the industrial agricultural sector in Mercosur countries use substances banned in Europe (pesticides[11], hormone-treated meat[12], growth stimulators[13], etc.), meaning these substances end up on the European market through the food imported from Mercosur countries. In the specific case of maize, a CEPM study[14] shows that 52% of the active substances authorized for use by Mercosur producers who export maize to the EU are prohibited in the EU (for example neonicotinoids or atrazine[15]).

Often standards cannot be controlled, due to the specificity of agricultural productions. The claim that the trade agreement has strong reciprocity measures does not work in practice. For example, an EU audit from 2024 found that Brazil cannot reliably trace or guarantee hormone-free beef[16]. Furthermore, it is impossible to detect if Antibiotic Growth Promoters have been used on imported beef from Mercosur when the animal was younger. In addition, controls must be carried out by the Member States, and it has been proven that it is impossible to control all agricultural products currently entering the EU and thus ensure compliance with food standards. See the example of the honey below; half of the honey imported to EU at present should simply not be on the market according to standards and regulations. With the increase in import quotas, this will be even more difficult. Therefore, **the promises that controls and fines will guarantee fair competition is simply not true.** These products having been forbidden in the EU for environmental and sanitary reasons,

[9] https://coag-cyl.org/noticias/tortilla-de-patata-con-sabor-a-oriente-medio-los-supermercados-dan-la-espalda-a-los-productores-espanoles/
[10] https://www.confederationpaysanne.fr/actu.php?id=14333
[11] https://www.greenpeace.de/publikationen/Report.%20A%20Toxic%20Cocktail.%20EU-Mercosur%20Deal.pdf
[12] https://www.safefoodadvocacy.eu/brazilian-hormone-beef-a-major-stumbling-block-ahead-of-mercosur-talks-at-g20/
[13] https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/antimicrobial-use-resistance-and-economic-benefits-and-costs-to-livestock-producers-in-brazil_27137b1e-en.html
[14] https://www.maizeurop.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/CEPM_SUMMARY_MERCOSUR_EN_2025.pdf
[15] Herbicide banned in the EU since 2007, dangerous for humans and the environment
[16] Estradiol 17ß ,a substance banned in the EU for 20 years , is still widely used in Brazilian cattle farming. https://www.safefoodadvocacy.eu/brazilian-hormone-beef-a-major-stumbling-block-ahead-of-mercosur-talks-at-g20/

and it is consumers who will pay the price for this, also alongside rural communities in Mercosur countries who will be affected by the pollution of those substances.

Analysis of specific sectors

Beef

The European Commission and other defenders of the treaty claim that sensitive sectors of EU agriculture are protected. One such sector to be examined is the beef sector, where farmers will face increased competition from Mercosur beef exporters. Based on EC analysis, it will drive down beef prices[17]. Production costs from Mercosur countries are on average 40% lower than those of European livestock farms (and even nearly 60% lower for Brazilian farms).

A new tariff quota is granted for 99,000 tons of Mercosur beef (55% refrigerated, 45% frozen). It is sometimes argued that, as these quantities represent only 1.6% of European production, the impact on the beef sector would be low. This analysis omits several elements. First, it must be emphasized that this additional quota already represents a 50% increase compared to current imports from Mercosur. Furthermore, the customs tariffs are also removed on Hilton quotas concerning 58,147 tons of beef which have been imported up to now on the European market with tariffs of 20%. This will have a much greater impact than generally mentioned for the least competitive European beef production, which is not protected from global competition: the localized impact of these imports will result in successive irreversible shocks for breeders.

Today, 58% of all beef imported by the EU currently comes from Mercosur[18]. **Setting new quotas will open the door to even more significant imports of meat from this source: these new quotas will contribute to the structuration of the industrial tool around these low-cost meat exports.** Consequently, this could lead in the long term to much greater increases in beef imports from Mercosur than what is announced.

Honey

The EU is dependent on honey imports since internal production covers only around half of European consumption. The massive imports of honey, in particular from China and Ukraine, at lower prices than local honey, make it impossible for EU producers to receive a fair price for the honey produced locally. In 2019, 31,386 tons of honey were imported into the EU from Mercosur with an average import price of €2.27/kg, 33% lower than the honey price produced in Spain. This is happening in a moment in which Spanish farmers see an increase in production costs, for example due to the spread of invasive species such as Asian hornet, which preys on bees and impacts their winter mortality rates. This means that beekeepers are forced to accept lower prices due to the dumping effect, reducing the potential to substantially increase local production despite the massive investments within EU agricultural policy.

In addition, nearly half of the honey imported into the European Union is suspected of being fake, according to an EC study[19]. This shows how EC promises to block illegal imports of agricultural products are in fact not at all reflected in reality. The current agreement with Mercosur foresees a new 45,000-ton tariff quota for honey, which will become duty-free in five years, enhancing unfair competition for European beekeepers. Undoubtedly, this will have disastrous consequences for European beekeepers.

[17] https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC135540
[18] IDELE: https://idele.fr/detail-article/accord-ue-mercosur-quels-risks-pour-la-filiere-bovine-europeenne
[19] https://www.euronews.com/culture/2023/03/27/buzz-off-nearly-half-of-honey-in-european-markets-is-fake-according-to-eu-investigation

Tariffs should be designed to ensure that imported honey enters the market at a minimum price based on local production costs in the EU, thereby securing a fair future for our beekeepers.

4. Small- and medium-scale farmers are disappearing because of deregulation and international trade

Impact on employment

This report shows, farmers are highly sensitive to price volatility and they represent one of the most discriminated-against professions in terms of pay, working conditions, and hours worked, despite their fundamental role of feeding populations. Successive economic, climate, biodiversity and health crises are weakening their already precarious position.

> **Between 2005 and 2020, 4.5 million full-time equivalent (FTE) agricultural jobs were destroyed (i.e., a loss of 36% of agricultural jobs)[20] and it was smaller-scale farmers who suffered the most.**[21]

The effect of price cuts in response to the implementation of the EU-Mercosur FTA will exclude farmers who cannot compete with the lower production costs of Mercosur farms, particularly small- and medium-sized farmers producing for the domestic market. This will intensify the ongoing loss of agricultural employment in the EU.

Farmer protection mechanisms are not working

In order to claim that the treaty is not a threat to farmers, the agreement contains a series of mechanisms that, according to the European Commission, would be activated when the agricultural sector enters a crisis. The very presence of all these mechanisms clearly illustrates the risks that farmers face and confirms that the Commission is using agriculture as a mere bargaining chip**. A common problem with these mechanisms is that the EU in reality has never had the capacity to anticipate crises but intervene only after. Therefore, any mechanism always arrives too late, when farmers have already been severely impacted by the crisis.** Closer analysis of how these mechanisms work follows below.

Bilateral Safeguarding Mechanism

It allows the EU or Mercosur to put in place temporary import regulation measures "in the event of an unexpected and significant increase in imports, which causes, or threatens to cause, serious injury to their domestic industry. These safeguards also apply to agricultural goods."[22].

First of all, this mechanism does not prevent the localised shocks as explained above. **The EC will not propose safeguard measures to address localised crises. In the end, the cumulative impact of all the local crises will go largely unseen, except for the farmers forced to abandon their job, until it is too late.**

In addition, as explained above, experience shows that such kind of mechanisms are very rarely activated in practice and, when it occurs, it is always too late. One of the rare cases in which safeguard

[20] https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Farmers_and_the_agricultural_labour_force_-_statistics

[21] Unlike other farm size categories, the number of farms larger than 100 hectares has increased in this same period. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Farms_and_farmland_in_the_European_Union_-_statistics

[22] https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/fr/qanda_19_3375

measures have been used in recent history has been in 2024 on some Ukrainian agricultural imports. It happened in the context of the understandable temporary suspension of import duties and quotas on Ukrainian agricultural exports to the EU to support Ukraine amidst Russia's continuing war of aggression. What is surprising is that despite it was obvious that such imports would have a massive impact on EU prices, the EC and member states have been totally incapable of anticipating them and setting up mechanisms to protect EU farmers. Ultimately, the EU only activated safeguard mechanisms after farmers protested en masse due to the severe consequences they were already facing.

Compensation fund

To compensate expected negative impacts on farmers, proving they do indeed exist, a reserve of more than one billion euros has been set aside.[23] **However, if farmers receive money but can no longer even sell what they produce because the prices of imported goods are too low, then their work is no longer worth anything** and they no longer consider themselves farmers.

The agreement is opposed by all European Farmers unions and also agricultural workers unions. Therefore, this is simply a clear attempt to silence them and convince member states to adopt such unbalance agreement. The very existence of this fund acknowledges the impending negative impact of the FTA on one of the most vulnerable – and critical – social groups and economic activities of EU society.

5. Obstacle to the agroecological and climate transition

Climate crisis will be accentuated

This agreement will exacerbate the climate crisis, against which farmers are on the front lines, both as victims of the consequences and as actors who help mitigate and adapt to climate issues through agroecological models and transition. According to the Climate Action Network, the main problem is that the agreement will increase the trade in high-carbon goods and encourage their production[24]. This is in addition to the problems of deforestation intensified by the treaty[25], for which protection mechanisms are weakened (cf. part on rebalancing mechanism below). Additionally, AITEC reports that the essential clause in the FTA promising to uphold the Paris Agreement "provides few guarantees, has only limited operational scope and does not transform this free trade agreement into a climate-compatible agreement"[26].

In addition, what is happening in Palestine shows the arbitrariness used by the EC and Members states in applying clause mechanisms within Free Trade Agreements. Despite Article 2 of the EU-Israel trade agreement states the importance of respecting human rights among the parties, this article has not been used yet to suspend the treaty despite the proven structural violations by the Israeli state toward Palestinian population.

Rebalancing mechanism

If the EU or a Mercosur country considers that a measure taken by the other party undermines its advantages and limits trade between the two parties, arbitration can be requested. Rebalancing measures, such as an increase in customs duties, could be taken to compensate for the losses suffered

[23] https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ac_24_6279
[24] https://caneurope.org/legal-analysis-eu-mercosur-agreement/
[25] https://friendsoftheearth.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/FoEE_TheLastAgriculturalFrontier_nov23_EN.pdf
[26] https://www.maximecombes.fr/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Note-decryptage-Accord-Dec2024.pdf?utm_source=brevo&utm_campaign=CP_Mercosur_Splitting&utm_medium=email

by economic actors. According to European law professors Christina Eckes, this mechanism could obstruct the enforcement of existing environmental and health regulations (such as the ban on neonicotinoids or deforestation rules) and pose even greater barriers for future regulations[27].

Inconsistency with Green Deal

A common argument presented by the EC for the treaty is the access to cheaper raw materials in order to achieve the ecological transition formalized in the Green Deal. However, the treaty's ecological impact would seriously undermine the Green Deal, conflicting with the farm-to-fork strategy, the EU Climate Law and the Glasgow deforestation commitment[28]. Worse still, this FTA will be used to justify the abandonment of these environmental goals. **The level of hypocrisy from the EU has to be pointed out: they want to sign a treaty that weakens Green Deal in order to secure raw materials supposedly needed to implement it.**

Agroecology is weakened

Agroecological farming provides sustainable answers to the pressing challenges of climate change, biodiversity loss, and rural employment. **Although the EU has recognized the need to develop agroecological practices, the price competition driven by this agreement directly threatens its viability. Agroecological farms often operate with higher labour input, more diverse crop rotations, and fewer external inputs.** These choices increase resilience and ecological performance but raise short-term production costs. Therefore, it makes agroecological farmers particularly exposed to the pressure of international competition such as in the EU-Mercosur agreement[29]. IDDRI[30] and FAO[31] support these arguments by expressing the market disadvantage faced by agroecological models in globalised and unregulated market. Moreover, as previously mentioned, the enforcement of sanitary and environmental standards in trade agreements is extremely weak, disproportionately affecting agroecological farmers who already produce in compliance with these higher standards. Hence, it must be acknowledged that such pressures will reduce the standards and quality of European food.

Therefore, the EU's commitment to agroecology cannot be realised without addressing structural price competition and reforming trade policies to enforce equivalent standards. Agroecological farmers need protection from unfair competition and meaningful recognition of the value they provide.

6. Trade war and pressure to deregulate the agricultural market

US President Donald Trump constantly threatens higher import duties on the EU and other countries, fueling fear in global markets and targeted nations. The use of tariffs is encouraged when it protects food sovereignty, but it should be condemned when employed to advance deregulation or imperialist aims. Export-oriented agricultural sectors would be greatly impacted, as well as small- and medium-scale farmers who would face competition from more of these export goods coming

[27] https://caneurope.org/legal-analysis-eu-mercosur-agreement/
[28] https://www.greenpeace.de/publikationen/Rechtsanalyse%20Handelsvertrag%20EU-Mercosur%20verst%C3%B6%C3%9Ft%20gegen%20Klimagesetze%20englisch.pdf
[29] https://www.eurovia.org/publications/livestock-farming-in-the-european-union-supporting-an-ambitious-transition-to-peasant-farming/
[30] https://www.iddri.org/sites/default/files/PDF/Publications/Catalogue%20Iddri/Etude/202107-ST0821_TYFA%20World_1.pdf
[31] https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/ded6e1c7-68cf-4401-8bb6-2bde2156e144/content

back on the domestic market. In this context, the rapid ratification of new free trade agreements is presented by some as the only solution.

However, the vulnerability of the European market to US tariffs comes from decades of neoliberal policies that have increasingly integrated more economic activity, employment and production on international markets. Through the multiplication of free trade agreements, these policies are driving a race for competitiveness and the industrialization of agriculture. Social, environmental and health considerations are being abandoned due to pressures to reduce production costs. **In the current geopolitical context, back-to-back political, economic, environmental and health crises are generated and intensified by trade logic that increases our dependence on major foreign powers.** This is the case of the EU-Mercosur FTA, which will harm vulnerable sectors and impact food sovereignty with total disregard for farmers' right to a fair price and a decent income.

Faced with these facts, Europe must stand strong by demonstrating strategic autonomy in terms of its fundamental needs, in which food plays a central role. **The European Union must invest in food sovereignty everywhere by promoting policies geared towards the territorialization of food production, supporting an agroecological transition, ensuring generational renewal and protecting farmers from future economic and ecological tensions.** We must not get stuck into a race for geopolitical competition, with serious consequences for peace, for human rights, workers condition and territories.

7. ECVC's key demands:

ECVC demands that EU Member states reject EU-Mercosur agreement and instead promote an international dialogue to reform radically agricultural trade. We should build a new global trade framework that must honour countries' food sovereignty, respect biodiversity, and uphold the rights of peasants and other rural and urban workers. It should be underpinned by values of solidarity, cooperation, people-to-people exchange, and internationalism[32].

For ECVC, agriculture should not be part of trade liberalisation and multisectoral agreements, because by doing so it will lose its centrality due to the fact that it is considered a sector with low added value. Instead, EU should promote country-to-country negotiations on food based on complementing each other needs and allowing each country to develop its own food sovereignty.

Rather than sacrificing agriculture, EU institutes should protect its farmers by making sure they receive a fair income. To achieve that, we urge the EU Commission, the European Parliament and the Council to:

- **Start an urgent procedure to ban the purchasing of agricultural products under production costs, adding the practice to the black-list of the UTP directive.** Prices paid to farmers have to cover the costs of producing what they sell, as well as decent wages, social contributions and protection for them and all agricultural workers[33].
- **Design a CAP with a strong and distinct budget distributed fairly, integrating market regulation and targeting those who need it most towards an agroecological transition for numerous, diversified and resilient farm[34].**

[32] https://viacampesina.org/en/2023/09/press-release-la-via-campesina-is-determined-to-build-an-alternative-framework-for-global-trade-in-agriculture-written-by-the-peasants-for-the-people/
[33] https://www.eurovia.org/press-releases/european-farmer-and-agri-food-workers-demand-prices-that-cover-production-costs-be-urgently-included-in-the-utp-directive/
[34] https://www.eurovia.org/publications/ecvc-position-paper-post-2027-cap-building-food-sovereignty/