

Spaces and ethics in the Common Agricultural Policy

Abstract

The “moral turn” in Geography, recognized by David Smith in 1997, is now established in geographical research, articulating in the different approaches of investigation. It has also encouraged studies on ethical choices in agricultural practices, crop and livestock farming; such studies are demonstrating, for example, important changes in the distributive patterns of agriculture, in terms both of sale of products, and in consumption.

We propose to examine the Common Agricultural Policy in ethical terms, and to consider their effects in the choices of farmers and consumers.

Keywords: *Geography and ethics, Common Agricultural Policy, Multifunctionality.*

Ethics within territories in geographical research

Geographers are questioning with always more conviction on ethical aspects of the way in which research is done, on ethical dimension of spaces, on behavior regarding them. Moreover the traditional discipline places great attention on the diversity of spaces, that contextualizes, on the basis of territorial features, human groups that live therein, historical events, types of lifestyle, environmental aspects, and exposing them allows the differences to emerge and induces evaluations (Ley, 1994).

Territories are open realities, dynamic within space and time, profoundly linked in systematic wefts on the inside and with relations on the outside, able to express spatial processes in continual change and movement. They reveal the technological, creative, social and economic capacities of the population that organize them to respond to their needs, and on the basis of their respective principles, enterprise and ability. At the same time, territories project beliefs, convictions, lifestyle, visions of inhabitants, with relation to reciprocal soliciting, and can be read, represented and shaped in spaces that they manifest and tell. Within this viewpoint the recognition of the differences between places and regions becomes a recognition of the cultural heterogeneity besides the local specificity defined by the identity, and accompanies the territorial sentiments of their residents. It is precisely for the meaning and the importance that they have for human beings, all the territories (and the spaces that they rep-

resent), are ethical and as such they must be respected and appreciated (Varraso, 2013, 2014).

The specifically geographic method of comparing, furthermore, gives ulterior added value to the research in that, by comparing between different areas, the relations between regional situations emerge, so avoiding simple generalizations and categorical affirmations that can cause stereotypes and encourage disrespectful behavior.

Even the epistemological capacity of geography, that reasons in multiscaling and transcaling terms, constitutes another aspect of relevant ethical value. Observing facts and phenomena on the Earth's surface with relation to more ample territorial situations where those realities are inserted, helps pointing them out without absolutizing situations, experiences and evaluations. Moreover, meanings and roles done by the territories at diverse scales become one of the first indicators of ethical value attributed to it. In fact, the normative and economic aspects, ethical and non ethical, of the territorial organization, often imposed or induced by national and/or supranational administrative levels, are interpreted at the local scale according to the each own cultural value schemes; reciprocally, the choices taken at a local level, both ethical and non ethical, need to be recognized. They interrogate the most elevated levels of governance.

All those are disciplinary aspects that attribute to the geography, in particular economical, a recognized contribution regarding the growing requests for reflection and ethical evaluations within the study of the present processes of glo-



balization, of the recent economic and financial crisis and consequently the new developmental territorial logics (Silva, 2011; Tamàs, 2006).

Precisely these reflections, in the last ten years, have imposed on the discipline a new research trend. The “moral turn” imprinted on the territorial research in the 90s by scholars (Smith D.M., 1997, was one of the first who theorized it) look at “geography of everyday moralities given by the different moral assumptions and supporting arguments that particular people in particular places make about ‘good’ and ‘bad’/ ‘right’ and ‘wrong’/ ‘just’ and ‘unjust’/ ‘worthy’ and ‘unworthy’” (Philo, 1991, p. 16). The approach “with more obvious geographical appeal is to accept the universality of certain grand moral values, but also to recognize the spatial (and temporal) particularity of their application” (Smith D.M., 1997, p. 586). Above all, it takes into account relational aspects of territorial behavior even when involving ambits of intervention tied to sentiments and to affection, more or less close in function to the distances time and again considered, and subject to the conditions, historically mutable, in which they manifest themselves. For example, on the international scale, calamitous events can initially induce ethical behavior of solidarity that later weaken, or at the local scale the sentiment of citizenship can lead to eliminating physical and psychological barriers with lasting results (Massey, 2004).

The attitude of curing and paying attention towards anthropic, physical and historical facts and phenomena, therefore attributes a large importance to temporal ties between human groups and territories, within the awareness that precisely “in understanding how our past continues in our present we understand also the demands of responsibility for the past we carry with us, the past in which our identities are formed. We are responsible for the past not because of what we as individuals have done, but because of what we are” (Gatens, Lloyd, 1999, p. 81, cit. in Massey, 2004, p. 9).

This responsibility makes us look at history with different eyes, and attributes also a political responsibility of interventions that, in order to respond to moral needs, must open up to observing each regional system in synergy with others, near and far, also considering the strong connections of systems for which each one of us is in fact tied to and involved in the life of all those who live in every part of the world. This requires an operative change, besides the effort of delivering to future generations a reality in which diversified territories are saved, within the point of view of the sustainable ethics of environment and terri-

tory (Kotlyakov, Tishkov, 2009). Thus, one of the aims of the ethics research consists in reflecting on both values and principles that induce ethical actions reciprocally, and on the impact of the socio-economic initiatives as well as behavior and human group values (Bissanti, 1990; Racine, 2010; Ghorra-Gobin, 2012).

In particular, the attraction of the ethical approach is in the awareness that Geography is able to provide, at all spatial scales, the pedagogic resources that can demonstrate to those who are in a privileged position, that they must feel these responsibilities and that knowing what happens at a distance is a prerequisite for taking a responsible action in the place where one lives (Barnett, Land, 2007, pp. 1067-1068).

Ethics in agriculture and Common Agricultural Policy

Therefore, all the aspects of the human activities, have an ethical value, because they fall back on territorial organization. Agriculture, for the ample spaces that it uses, in terms of occupied land, and for the incidence of production and transformation activity for food and industrial purposes, has a strong importance on the ethical choices, economical and political. It has an important role even in the formation and communication processes of antique and new values, because of its strong relations with the land and for the rural landscape that it makes. The countryside draws attention through all the agricultural practises.

The recent economic tendencies, unfortunately, have almost completely moved the attention of the operators of the sector on the structural aspects and management. The level of adopted chosen operatives influences the entrepreneurs’ decisions, the single undertakings as the regional agricultural systems, ethically characterizing them: for example, practices more or less productive, type of cultivations, forms of breeding, ecological respect, food security etc. It concerns behaviour that, studied with a territorial viewpoint, and with different approaches – distributive, behavioural, of regional organization, or as market logics etc. – reveal the intensity and the process dimensions involved through the way in which values are transmitted and respected in all the parts that are involved (farmers, food consumers, breded animals and nature).

“In the late twentieth century, systematic thinking about the values and norms associated with the food system – farming, resource management, food



processing, distribution, trade, and consumption – came to be referred to as *agricultural ethics*” (CAST, 2005, p. 1, cursive of authors), even though the explicit recognition of ethic value of decisions in agriculture is quite recent. “The absolute requirement for safe, nutritious food in order to survive and flourish, coupled with uncertainties about its universal supply in adequate and affordable amounts, predicate a crucial role for ethical deliberation in agricultural decision-making” (Mepham, 2012, p. 86). Moreover, the morality of the interventions in the sector isn’t only about food security. “In fact, agriculture is about much more than food supply. Its major products may be classed as food, feed, fiber, fuel, flowers, pharmaceuticals, and raw material; and ethical issues are sometimes critical in consideration of the relative priority that each merits. Of course this alliterative list obscures the great variety of products within the identified categories (including, for example, crops, meat, milk, eggs, wool, and biofuels) and the wide range of practices involved, such as plant breeding, animal husbandry, use of agrochemicals, genetic modification, and organic systems. There are also uncertain boundaries between agriculture and closely related activities such as forestry, fisheries, horticulture, and environmental conservation” (*ibidem*, p. 87). On the other hand the essence of agriculture is modifying or manipulating natural ecosystems for human needs and the dimensions of the intervention depends on subjective judgement, so that the choices are tied to many variables that regard the vision of the world of human groups that practice it. “Agriculture can thus be viewed from many perspectives. It is a technology, an economic activity, an essential component of public health, a fundamental basis of sustainable life-support systems, and an esteemed way of life” (*ibidem*, p. 88) and places ethical problems for each of these aspects.

In 2000 the Dutch Minister of Agriculture, Management of Nature and Fishing, Hayo Apotheker, reflecting precisely on the question “*Is agriculture in need of ethics?*”, in synthesis observed that “changing norms and values in society, the influence of new technologies (such as biotechnology) and the international trade liberalisation (WTO) provide arguments for a positive answer on this question” (p. 9), so explicating how even the market logics and economical orientation, that play a fundamental role in the so-called “moral economy”, will ever more influence the economic processes and the consequent territorial transformations.

Within the research, the Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST, 2005) has pointed out three traditional types of surveys tied

to ethics that can be regarded as theories: “rights theory”, that considers the options from the individuals rights point of view; “utilitarian theory”, for which behaviours cannot be considered in an absolute sense but it is necessary to take into account the consequences that actions produce (“the greatest good for the greatest number of potentially affected living beings”) and to look at their net benefits; “virtue theory”, for which human beings react in accordance with a whole of ideals in which one recognizes oneself (p. 3). There is an ulterior approach that refers to the so called “care theory”, whose main focus is the attention towards another person and that person’s needs for which “obviously, any system must be economically viable, but this is not the only acceptable characteristic. They must also be chosen based on whether they enhance the relational aspect of reality. This means building them in such a way that they express our best moments of caring and being cared for” (Curry, 2002, p. 129).

The difficulty of evaluating the ethical value of the agricultural choices and their impact on the territory remains, and scholars give different answers according to different approaches. For example, Curry makes a list of behavioural ethics that express the meaning of taking care of the agricultural practices and that can be translated into morally acceptable actions, in terms of attention to reciprocal relations, in a positive man-nature relation. Thus, “agricultural systems must be built on increased understanding, and attentiveness to local complexity rather than the reductionism of universality. Universality inevitably cannot incorporate attachment, nor the relational aspect of reality, into its methods and conceptual framework” (*ibidem*, p. 130). And therefore it is easier to pursue, but even to evaluate, ethical choices in the local ambit and so operate in the direction of a sustainable territorial development, but above all integrated and durable.

Mepham, instead, to surpass the subjectiveness in the analysis, proposes a methodological instrument tied to the observation of each of the situations being subject research work. He adapts a qualitative matrix that considers three principles which he believes to be fundamental within the common morality such as “well-being, autonomy, and fairness. If these principles were applied to the interests of different groups, such as farmers, food consumers, farm animals and wildlife, a full ethical analysis would need to consider how (proposed) alternative practices (might) impact on the principles for each interest group and the relative impacts on the different interest groups” which, in the case of breeding, can be “farmers, consumers,



farmed animals and wildlife. ... While it does not prescribe any particular decision, the main advantages of this conceptual tool are: clarification of the ethical basis of decision-making, especially by committees; provision of a means of explaining and justifying ethical judgements; and facilitation of the identification of areas of agreement and disagreement" (2012, p. 90).

Even in this case, as in the previous, the geographic scale of research concerning productive processes as well as the impact of agricultural choices on the territory and the spatial ambits of evaluation, influence the judgement on the behavior and on the construction of ethical environments for human beings, animals and plants.

All choices regarding agricultural spaces, therefore, interrogate the territorial politics and request adequate answers in a various way and with different accents.

In Europe the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) strongly influences the choices connected to the agricultural sector. The French group of scholars that take the pseudonym CHAMPI has observed: "what today is called 'agricultural politics' is more than a politics of accompaniment of the agricultural production. In effect it's about agricultural, food, environmental and territorial politics aimed to ensuring a regular food supply of consumers in quantity and quality, at stable and reasonable prices, preserving the future. It must consequently subscribe itself to a global political vision, based on the needs of the consumers and the expectations of their citizens, taking into account the agriculturiers' interests and particularities of the agriculture" (2007, p. 134). These finalities, that underline those of the treaty of Rome of 1958, can be certainly shared and ethically appreciated. Obviously, in the years they have been applied in different forms and in ways at times subject to criticism. Above all, more attention is placed on the environment and the consequences in the territorial organization, even because of the effect of the increasing sensibility of the population in this field (Salazar-Ordóñez, Sayadi, 2011).

"The new policy continues along this reform path, moving from product to producer support and now to a more land-based approach. This is in response to the challenges facing the sector, many of which are driven by factors that are external to agriculture. These have been identified as economic (including food security and globalization, a declining rate of productivity growth, price volatility, pressures on production costs due to high input prices and the deteriorating position of farmers in the food supply chain), environmental (relating

to resource efficiency, soil and water quality and threats to habitats and biodiversity) and territorial (where rural areas are faced with demographic, economic and social developments including depopulation and relocation of businesses)". The orientations refer to "three long-term CAP objectives: viable food production, sustainable management of natural resources and climate action and balanced territorial development" (European Commission, 2013, p. 2).

The current debate on the new CAP 2014-2020 remains intense and articulated. There is a constant look at relations outside the European Union and on the needs inside and between the State members (Jambor, Harvey, 2010). Both the enlargement of the European Union, and the consequent diversification of the markets, give rise to the request for integration of agricultural politics with the local territorial politics, and strategic politics at the european scale is more urgent, reacting in a coherent way in function with the agricultural transition processes, rural development and environmental conservation.

The appeal for adapting needs for liberalizing with the need for agricultural assistance and new ways of support continues to remain, because the method used till now for direct payments is not considered effective or justified to guarantee fixed income (Bortzmeyer, Leblé, Racaté, 2004).

There is certainly an agreement on the profound change that involved the agricultural practices, even for the effect of the technological innovations, but the problem remains of how to further on adjust the sector, making it more competitive without upsetting the local peculiarities and adapting it to the new markets and to the new commercializing product forms. Moreover, the agro-environmental problem is becoming more crucial following the popularity of the energetic choice that requires political answers and accurate researches to approach the difficult questions regarding energetic balance, competition for use of land, management of common goods and price politics.

Certainly in time the CAP has profoundly influenced the rural spaces and, to use Gray's expression (2000), it has "re-invented" them. In fact, "since its inception, the European Community has conflated these two modes of conceiving rurality and alternately adopting them first in producing agricultural policy on the basis of an image of rurality and then in analysing the concrete rural localities that are the effects of its agricultural policy" (p. 32).

The persistence, the changes and the profound transformation of the agricultural systems on the rural spaces from post-war till today are, for exam-



ple, well documented in Italy in the *Thematic Atlas of Italian Agriculture* (Grillotti Di Giacomo, 2000).

Rurality, conservation of nature, respect for biodiversity, landscape protection, solicitate affirming ecosystem services, that are, according to the definition of the American research group denominated Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA, 2005, p. V), “the benefits people obtain from ecosystems. These include *provisioning services* such as food, water, timber and fiber; *regulating services* that effect climate, floods, disease, wastes, and water quality; *cultural services* that provide recreational, aesthetic, and spiritual benefits; and *supporting services* such as soil formation, photosynthesis, and nutrient cycling” (cursive of authors).

They are services which can have a strong ethical identity value in that it takes into account the “key features such as links to human well-being, balanced provision of ecosystem services, treatment of ecosystem services bundles, site specificity and regionalization, appropriate spatial scales, funding permanence, tackling uncertainties via adaptive approaches, or cross-sectoral policy coherence” (Plieninger *et Al.*, 2012, p. 286). For example, an ecosystem based on an approach of the green infrastructure type (that is “as a network of natural and seminatural areas and green spaces”) “to cultural landscapes offers an alternative starting point for analysis and policy formation. It shifts attention from a single sector toward a more integrated approach. Agricultural outputs become one category of service among a variety of others. Policy makers, based on public consultation, need to find a balance among the range of ecosystems services that can be generated within a given territory from a given area of rural land and to promote the mix of services that generates the greatest social benefit” (Hodge, Hauck, Bonn, 2015, pp. 1002-1003). It regards however a logic not yet fully acknowledged and upon which CAP solicits major attention.

An operative form – that the agricultural policies have instead favored and it is largely consolidated so much so as to become a solution for interests even for the ethical meanings that it has taken – is the agricultural multifunctionality that, though studied in different point of views, it is said to not yet have its complete theoretical expression (Renting *et Al.*, 2009).

Ethical choices and multifunctionality in agriculture

In the choices of agricultural multifunctionality the values of the countryside find an ulterior moti-

vation and economic expression, along with a rich ethical communication of meanings and practices. The new spatial acceptance of the concept allows for applications which are more aware and territorially more integrated with the other economical activities, with the actions of rural development and with the normative indications at the diverse intervention scales.

The agricultural multifunctionality concept is developed, as known, in the European Union in the 90s, to allow agricultural operators to be open to the market furnishing products cultivated and transformed by them, along with goods and diversified services, so as to favour the formation of supplementary incomes and, in addition, to assure their presence on the territory and cure of the countryside.

Its connotation is “the result of a complex dynamic between different agendas: the political liberalization agenda – which questioned the legitimacy of agricultural subsidies ...; the economic agenda – which explicated new concepts such as joint production or the co-production of private and public goods ...; the research agenda – which has a particular emphasis on the modelling of the interrelations between land use and environmental quality, together with increasing attention being paid to questions related to policy formulation and assessment” (Cairol *et Al.*, 2009, p. 271). It has acquired thereafter an increasing territorial valence so much so as to assume a prevailing meaning precisely for its role on the territory. In particular it is connotated for its ties with the sustainable development that according to Tait (2001, pp. 2-3) “is based on the ‘triple bottom line’ approach, involving environmental, social and economic components or ‘functions’ “.

In this accepted meaning there is ample recall in the Common Agricultural Policy, in rules and norms that frame it in precise applicative encumbrances.

The multifunctionality in time and in the experience has utilized and favored, in an always more conscious and explicit way, as a consequence besides its characteristics, the positive externality inherent in the agricultural processes. It guarantees, in fact, important returns not only for the technological aspects and pecuniary but also for the valorization of human capital. It takes on this way an ulterior economic meaning which increases the value, making it applicable not only at the primary sector, but even to other economic sectors and the entire economy.

Moreover, offering the opportunity of informing contemporarily the individual and social di-



mension of the external environment (Mann, Wüstemann, 2008), it plays an important role in the logic of agricultural ethics.

Clark (2010) has identified three principal ambits of geographical research on multifunctionality in agriculture, that he so describes in his synthesis: “the first is a broadly sociostructural view as policy discourses that communicate and coordinate new political imperatives in agriculture – increasingly global in reach. The second is an empirical characteristic of land use management and local actor-based decision-making – embedded within but extending outwards from territories and rural communities. The third and most recent is as a theoretical perspective that conceptualises agricultural/rural structural transitions. Coherent in their own right, each of these geographies however remains relatively autonomous” (p. 803).

At the last area of research (p. 810) works as those of Wilson are connected (2008, 2009, 2010; Wilson, Potter, 2007), that in particular theorize the application of multifunctionality at diverse territorial ambits of intervention within the scale action adopted.

Wilson considers the territorial expressions of multifunctionality articulated in successive hierarchical levels, as layers interconnected between each other of multifunctional decisions, that starting from the level of the single farm proceed towards the regional, national and global levels. According to this scholar, the multifunctionality concept is applied in a ‘direct’ way only to the smaller spatial ambits (that is farms, local and regional communities), for it is at this level that each concrete multifunctional action really works. It is instead applied in an ‘indirect’ way at national and regional levels, where the rules and regulations prevail, and the prescribed indications and where the network relations contribute to the spatial junction, but where the multifunctional forms are mediated by actors at a local level (2009, pp. 271-272). In particular, the regional level acts as a filter for the politics and the multifunctionality processes that operate bottom-up. The global level, at the moment, remains still external from the multifunctional dynamics, as it mainly tied to aboveall the logics of the networks and world markets.

Wilson sees the “multifunctionality as a spectrum bounded by productivist and non-productivist action and thought enables a normative conceptualisation of weak, moderate and strong multifunctionality pathways for individual farm-level transitions ... Strong multifunctionality is charac-

terised by strong social, economic, cultural, moral and environmental capital” (2008, p. 368). Moreover, he affirms, “strongly multifunctional farms are more likely to be weakly integrated into the global capitalist market, as only partial or complete disengagement from global capitalist (productivist) networks and agriculture liberalisation processes will enable on-farm implementation of strong multifunctionality. ... The ‘strongest’ level of multifunctionality can be achieved if all of the above processes and activities occur simultaneously. Weakly multifunctional agricultural systems, meanwhile, would show the inverse of above dimensions (i.e. weak sustainability, weak local embeddedness, etc.)”, and “strong multifunctionality is the ‘best’ type of multifunctionality – or, indeed, the type of multifunctionality with the best quality” (*ibidem*, pp. 368-369).

The ‘quality’ of multifunctionality, finally, consist in the capacity to interpret the local susceptibility, putting it in the network and connecting it to the other hierarchy levels, previously and/or successively integrating among them territories and weak and strong multifunctional farms (Wilson, 2010).

Social agriculture is a further example of the multifunctionality able to integrate marginal rural areas in a territory through significative ethical initiatives. It is an operative ambit promoted by the European Community precisely for soliciting and supporting environmental sustainable opportunities, which has demonstrated to be a new answer to the needs of the rural community.

The social agriculture “indicates in a broad sense those experiences which bind agriculture and social work, with particular referral to the introduction (social-therapeutical, educational, work) of those more vulnerable in the society and/or at risk of marginalisation” (Di Iacovo, 2008, p. 14). From a technical point of view, it privileges the use of low technological input, that have the effect of diminishing the negative externality of agriculture on the environment (Di Iacovo, Fonte, Galasso, 1014). “So, where the mechanisation or chemical input cannot be utilized (because too risky, or not useful in a therapeutic point of view), we return to cultivation techniques based on labor. ... It is clear that such a type of activity is feasible on reduced surfaces (otherwise the therapeutic effect would be annulled by the obvious and excessive physical fatigue) and with very slow timing as compared to that of the industrial production. ... The need that there is in social agriculture to offer to the user a multiplicity of activities, chores and duties (that are even easily de-



composable in simpler numerous steps) makes an excellent conjugation with the valorisation of the small farms that have always characterized Italian agriculture: small surfaces, very diversified from the productive point of view as well as from the landscape, difficult to mechanize, often located in disadvantageous areas” (Hausmann, Galasso, Paolini, Durastanti, 2010, pp. 219-220).

These are experiences which are spreading in Italy thanks to the growing sensibility towards all those economic aspects of multifunctionality which have moral motivations, such as for example agriturism solidarity, the didactic and social farms, the farms’ course of corporate social responsibility (Pascale, 2010). In fact, many interesting practices are being developed of this type on the national territory (Giaré, 2014) in some cases accompanied by specific initiatives of direction and regulation, as in the Tuscany Region (D’Alonzo, Noferi, 2010).

Significant initiatives of solidarity in Italy, moreover, regard even activities sustained by associations and people who manage the land confiscated from the mafia with ethical criteria and quality logic, respecting disciplinary specifics of production; an example is the famous ‘Terra Libera’ (‘Free Land’) that responds to the ‘Associazione Libera’ (‘Association Free’).

The social agriculture is also seen as a form of civic agriculture sustained by rural communities, cooperatives and associations (Galasso, 2012). In Italy it draws on the economists Zamagni and Bruni, that, in particular, in the principles of “*Economia Civile*” (2004) consider ethics the behavior that pursues the common good as a result of levels of well-being of the single individuals in a community. In the case of agriculture, the cure of common goods involves local communities with a system of sustainable and ethical production, taking on the responsibility of the social and environmental impact of initiatives in the farmer’s realm.

In addition, the concept of civic agriculture diffused in America by the work of Thomas Lyson (2000), for which “the name evokes many situations, but here it means a locally-based agricultural and food production system that is tightly linked to the community’s social and economic development. Farmer’s market, community gardens, and community-supported agriculture are part and parcel of civic agriculture. Since these activities are not monitored by federal or state agencies, what is known about them comes mainly from the civic agriculture industry itself” (2000, p. 42). He, moreover, observes that “the literature on industrial district, especially in Europe, pro-

vides further evidence that agriculture and food economies organized around a smaller-scale, locally oriented production and distribution systems are possible” (Lyson, 2007, p. 24). “The civic agriculture perspective, however, favors smaller, well-integrated firms / farms cooperating with each other in order to meet the food needs of consumers in local (and global) markets. ... Civic agriculture flourishes in a democratic environment. Community problem solving around agriculture and food issue requires that all citizens have a say in how, where, when, and by whom their food is produced, processed, and distributed” (*ibidem*, p. 25).

Final considerations

Daring ideas in Economy have often betrayed the spirit of places and the ethical principle that the diverse spatial ambits, product of nature and of man, are fundamental for the existence of human beings themselves and cannot be enslaved to the rules of profit; it must be reaffirmed that the main application, even economical, is to ensure the life of all human beings and of all the present and future generations in every part of the world.

Whether one operates in a multifunctional sense or wants to react for improving the conditions of the territory and favour the everyday life of the people, clear actions must be taken on those spaces that have remained on the fringes, if not absolutely spoiled, often losing their future respect at the local value system (economical, land, symbolic) (Fiori, Varraso, 2014).

To pay attention to the periphery is the traditional and new challenge that accompanies the recent CAP and to which the European Community must take on, so as to promote ethical values and solidarity for regions, agricultural productions and farms.

References

- Apotheker H. (2000), “Is Agriculture in Need of Ethics?”. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 12, pp. 9-16.
- Barnett C., Land D. (2007), “Geographies of Generosity: Beyond the ‘Moral Turn’”. *Geoforum*, 38, pp. 1065-1075.
- Bauman Z. (2012), *L’etica in un mondo di consumatori*. Laterza, Bari-Roma.
- Bissanti A.A. (1990), *Geografia attiva perché e come*. 2^a ed., Bari, Adda.
- Bortzmeyer M., Leblé D., Racaté J. (2004), “Les attendus libéraux de la nouvelle PAC”, *Mouvement*. 36, n. 6, pp. 132-140.
- Cairol D. et al. (2009), “Multifunctionality of Agriculture and



- Rural Areas as Reflected in Policies: the Importance and Relevance of the Territorial View". *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 11, pp. 269-289.
- CAST (Council for Agricultural Science and Technology) (2005), "Agricultural Ethics". *Issue Paper*, n. 29, pp. 1-12.
- Champi J. (2007), "Quella politica agricola per l'Europa?". *Économie Rurale*, 300, pp. 134-140.
- Clark J. (2010), "Geographies on Multifunctional Agriculture: Developing Governance Explanations", *Geography Compass*, 4, pp. 803-818.
- Curry J.M. (2002), "Care Theory and "Caring" Systems Agriculture". *Agriculture and Human Values*, 19, pp. 119-131.
- D'alonzo R., Noferi M. (2010), *Guida per l'agricoltura sociale in Toscana. La buona terra: lavoro, inclusione, accoglienza*. ARSIA - Regione Toscana, Firenze.
- De Filippis F., Sandali P. (Ed.) (2013), *La nuova PAC. Un'analisi dell'accordo del 26 giugno 2013*. Gruppo 2013, Working Paper n. 21, Roma.
- Di Carlo P., Moretti L. (Eds.) (2004), *Nuove politiche per il mondo agricolo: multifunzionalità e sviluppo integrato del territorio*. Pàtron, Bologna.
- Di Iacovo F. (Ed.) (2008), *Agricoltura sociale: quando le campagne coltivano valori*. Angeli, Milano.
- Di Iacovo F., Fonte M., Galasso A. (2014), *Agricoltura civica e filiera corta. Nuove pratiche, forme d'impresa e relazioni tra produttori e consumatori*. Gruppo 13, Working Paper n. 22, Roma.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2013), "Overview of CAP reform 2014-2020". *Agricultural Perspectives Brief*, n. 5.
- Fiori M. (2012), *Identità territoriale per lo sviluppo e l'imprenditorialità. Applicazioni geoeconomiche d'una metodologia quali-quantitativa*. Bari, WIP Ed.
- Fiori M. (2014), "Ricerca e formazione per contrastare la discriminazione delle periferie". In Fiori M., Varraso I. (Eds.), *op. cit.*, pp. 11-21.
- Fiori M., Varraso I. (Eds.) (2014), *Periferie d'oggi e nuove realtà territoriali. Riflessioni ed esempi*. Bari, Wip Ed.
- Galasso A. (Ed.) (2012), "Dall'agricoltura sociale a quella civica: percorsi di agricoltura responsabile nella provincia di Roma". In *Sistema Agricolo Roma. Indagine sullo stato dell'agricoltura romana 2011*, Azienda Romana Mercati, Roma, pp. 285-300, www.sistemaagricoloroma.wordpress.com.
- Gatens M., Lloyd G. (1999), *Collective Imaginings: Spinoza, Past and Present*. London, Routledge.
- Giarè F. (Ed.) (2014), *Agricoltura sociale e civica*. Quaderno, INEA.
- Ghorra-Gobin C. (2012), "L'éthique, nouvelle frontière de la géographie? Géographie et éthique à l'heure de la mondialisation". 19^e biennale de Géographie - Géopoint, Avignon, Archives-Ouvertes HAL, ID: halshs-00825813.
- Gray J. (2000), "The Common Agricultural Policy and the Re-invention of the Rural in the European Community". *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40, pp. 30-52.
- Grillotti Di Giacomo M.G. (2000), *Atlante tematico dell'agricoltura italiana*. Società Geografica Italiana, Roma.
- Grillotti Di Giacomo M.G. (2012), *Nutrire l'uomo vestire il pianeta. Alimentazione - Agricoltura - Ambiente tra imperialismo e cosmopolitismo*. Angeli, Milano.
- Grillotti Di Giacomo M.G., Pollice F. (2006), *Politica agricola comune ed organizzazione degli spazi rurali*. In Bonaverò P., Dansero E., Vanolo A. (Eds.), *Geografie dell'Unione Europea*, UTET, Torino, pp. 143-165.
- Hausmann C., Galasso A., Paolini S., Durastanti F. (2010), "L'agricoltura sociale per il benessere umano". In ISPRA, *Multifunzionalità dell'azienda agricola e sostenibilità ambientale*, Rapporti n. 128, Roma, pp. 216-225.
- Hediger W., Knickel K. (2009), "Multifunctionality and Sustainability of Agriculture and Rural Areas: a Welfare Economics Perspective". *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 11, pp. 291-313.
- Hervieu B. (2002), "La multifonctionnalité de l'agriculture: genèse et fondements d'une nouvelle approche conceptuelle de l'activité agricole". *Cahiers Agricultures*, 11, n. 6, pp. 415-419.
- Hodge I., Hauck J., Bonn A. (2015), "The Alignment of Agricultural and Nature Conservation Policies in the European Union". *Conservation Biology*, 29, pp. 996-1005.
- Hoekveld G.A. (2008), "Applied Geography and Ethics in Spatial Planning: the Dutch National Spatial Strategy 2006", *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 99, pp. 223-237.
- Jambor A., Harvey D. (2010), *Review of the Challenges of CAP Reform*. Centre for Rural Economy Discussion, Paper Series n. 27, Newcastle University, Newcastle.
- Kotlyakov V.M., Tishkov A.A. (2009), "A Strategy of Sustainable Development: the Ethics of the Geographical Approach". *Herald of the Russian Academy of Science*, 79, pp. 501-508.
- Ley D. (1994), *sub voce* "Ethics, Geography and". In Jonsthor R.J., Gregory D., Smith D.M. (Eds.), *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, 3^a ed., Oxford, Blackwell, pp. 170-172.
- Lyson T.A. (2000), "Moving Toward Civic Agriculture". *Choice*, 15, pp. 42-45.
- Lyson T.A., *Civic Agriculture and the North American Food System*. In Hinrichs C., Lyson T.A. (Eds.), *Remaking the North American Food System*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln and London, 2007, pp. 19-32.
- MA (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment) (2005). *Ecosystem and Human Well-being: Synthesis*, Island Press, Washington DC.
- Mann S., Wüstemann H. (2008), "Multifunctionality and a New Focus on Externalities". *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 37, 293-307.
- Massey D. (2004), "Geographies of Responsibility". *Geographiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 86, pp. 5-18.
- McCarthy J. (2005), "Rural Geography: Multifunctional Rural Geographies - Reactionary or Radical". *Progress in Human Geography*, 29, pp. 773-782.
- Mepham B. (2012), *sub voce* "Agricultural Ethics". In Chadwick R. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics*, 2^a ed., Elsevier Store, Amsterdam, pp. 86-96.
- Paalberg R. (2009), "The Ethics of Modern Agriculture". *Society*, 46, pp. 4-8.
- Pascale A. 2010, *Fattorie sociali e percorsi di RSI in agricoltura*. In ISPRA, *Multifunzionalità dell'azienda agricola e sostenibilità ambientale*, Rapporti n. 128, Roma, pp. 226-230.
- Philo C. (Ed.) (1991), *New Word, New Worlds: Reconceptualising Social and Cultural Geography*. Department of Geography, St. Davids University College, Lampeter.
- Plieninger T. et Al. (2012), "Mainstreaming Ecosystem Services Through Reformed European Agricultural Policies". *Conservation Letters*, 5, pp. 281-288.
- Pollice F. (Ed.) 2012, *Rapporto annuale 2012. I nuovi spazi dell'agricoltura italiana*. Roma, Società Geografica Italiana.
- Racine J.-B. (2010), "Géographie, éthique et valeurs. Invitation à la réflexion et à l'action". *Géographie et Cultures*, 74, pp. 27-42.
- Rentig H. et Al. (2009), "Exploring Multifunctional Agriculture. A review of Conceptual Approaches and Prospects for an Integrative Transitional Framework". *Journal of Environmental Management*, 90, pp. S112-S123.
- Salazar-Ordóñez M., Sayadi S. (2011), "Environmental Care in Agriculture: a Social Perspective". *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 24, pp. 243-258.
- Silva J.A. (2011), "Economics, Morality, and Method", *Geography Compass*, 5, pp. 825-837.
- Smith D.M. (1997), "Geography and Ethics: a Moral Turn?". *Progress in Human Geography*, 21, pp. 583-590.



- Smith D.M. (2000), *Moral Geographies: Ethics in a World of Difference*. Edinburg, Edinburg University Press.
- Tait J. (2001), "Science, governance and multifunctionality of european agriculture". *Outlook on Agriculture*, 30, pp. 91-95.
- Tamàs C. (2006), "Ethics in Economic Geography". *Geojournal Library*, 86, pp. 201-204.
- Tollis C. (2010), "Éthique, espace, action: un triptique à activer". *Géographie et Cultures*, 74, pp. 97-110.
- Varraso I. (2013), *Spazi etici ed etica degli spazi*. In Di Iasio D. (Ed.), *Principi di economia solidale*, Pensa MultiMedia Ed., Lecce, pp. 181-197.
- Varraso I. (2014), *L'etica degli spazi nell'organizzazione di territori periferici e marginali*. In Fiori M., Varraso I. (Eds.), *op. cit.*, pp. 23-39.
- Zamagni S., Bruni L. (2004), *Economia civile. Efficienza, equità, felicità pubblica*. Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Wilbanks T., "Sustainable Development Requires an Ethical Revolution". *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 84 (1994), pp. 541-556.
- Wilson G.A. (2008), "From 'Weak' to 'Strong' Multifunctionality: Conceptualising Farm-level Multifunctional Transitional Pathways". *Journal of Rural Studies*, 24, pp. 367-383.
- Wilson G.A. (2009), "The Spatiality of Multifunctional Agriculture: a Human Geography Perspective". *Geoforum*, 40, pp. 269-280.
- Wilson G.A. (2010), "Multifunctional 'Quality' and Rural Community Resilience". *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35, pp. 364-381.
- Wilson G.A., Potter C. (2007), "RGRG Sponsored Session Reconceptualising Multifunctionality: Neoliberalism, Agricultural Transitions and Agendas for Future Research". Conference Report, *RGRG Newsletter Winter*, pp. 4-6.

