



International
Institute of
Social Studies

Ezafun



EL FUTURO DE LA ALIMENTACIÓN Y RETOS DE LA AGRICULTURA PARA EL SIGLO XXI:

Debates sobre quién, cómo y con qué implicaciones sociales, económicas y ecológicas alimentará el mundo.

THE FUTURE OF FOOD AND CHALLENGES FOR AGRICULTURE IN THE 21st CENTURY:

Debates about who, how and with what social, economic and ecological implications we will feed the world.

ELIKADURAREN ETORKIZUNA ETA NEKAZARITZAREN ERRONKAK XXI. MENDERAKO:

Mundua nork, nola eta zer-nolako inplikazio sozial, ekonomiko eta ekologikorekin elikatuko duen izango da eztabaidagaia

***Labour and food production in Southern Europe
between class dynamics and racialization
processes***

Alessandra Corrado

Paper # 30

Apirila - Abril - April

24, 25, 26

2017


elikadura²¹

NAZIOARTEKO HIZKETALDIA
COLOQUIO INTERNACIONAL
INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM

www.elikadura21.eus

Labor and food production in Southern Europe between class dynamics and racialization processes

Alessandra Corrado

Abstract

Migrations and immigrant labor are structural elements of the restructuring process of agri-food production within the Mediterranean basin. Value production is based on the exploitation and of the specific forms of differentiation interesting migrant labor due to mobility regimes within long supply chains dominated by food retailers or suffering competition pressures on final markets. The same reproduction of small scale agriculture and food production – that characterize many Southern European contexts – depends on migrant labor exploitation. This paper will focus on Southern European case studies illustrating class dynamics, production models and process of accumulation. It will consider and compare different systems of food value production, involving in different ways migrant labor.

Introduction

This paper aims at developing an analysis of the dynamics of transformation of agriculture and the rural world in Southern Europe. The perspective of political economy has put in evidence common developments and tendencies in the region in its integration process within the world economy as a "semiperipheral" zone, since the nineteenth century, so describing the specificity of the relationships center-periphery and of the political process that interest particular states. After almost forty years, nowadays, such analysis results extremely useful, for understanding the specific problems of the area, according to a long durée perspective and within the development dynamics of a world market, that is the process of capital accumulation and international division of labor. The dynamics of internal colonialism have conditioned the development and the dynamics of accumulation, inside the single states (see the analysis by Gramsci about Italy), but then also in the European Union (Arrighi 1985; Arrighi and Piselli 1987; Halperin 1997; Pedaliu 2013). The processes of agrarian transformation are enrolled in broader processes of economic restructuring and accumulation of capital, in function of the development of the industrial sector first, and then of the service economy, of networks of enterprises and the financial system. The combination of production factors and the redefinition of class relationships and struggles have been given along combined coordinates: on one side, farmers proletarianization and the formation of wage labor, class transformations, migrations -within single states and Europe first, and then on an international scale - and from the other, the transformations of agriculture and the territories, the restructuring of the markets and the commodity chains. The analysis of the transformation of agri-food system have to be placed inside capitalistic restructuring, considering changes in the role of the State in the long period. Nevertheless, it is important to bring to the light and to underline the resistances emerging and redefining themselves inside these processes. These resistances are those that oppose the different actors to the process of "peripheralization" inside

the capitalistic system, activating from time to time struggles and conflicts, that are characterized by a socio-economic as well as an epistemic dimension.

The contribution of coloniality of power perspective is important in order to catch elements that concern the new composition of the work force and class struggles, but also to appreciate, "as parts of the structural heterogeneous process, the multiple relationships in which the cultural, political and economic processes are embedded inside the capitalism as an historical system" (Quijano 1993, our translation). Quijano introduces the notion of 'coloniality' (different from that of 'colonialism') for two reasons essentially: to underline the historical continuity among the periods of colonialism and post-colonialism; and then to notice as the colonial relationships of power are not limited only to the economic-political and juridical-administrative dominion of the centers on the peripheries, but they are also characterized for an epistemic and cultural dimension (Castro-Gómez and Grosfoguel, 2007). So the concept of decoloniality underlines as the international division of labor between center and peripheries and the ethnic-racial hierarchization among groups and populations, originated from the colonial expansion, endure even after the end of colonialism and the formation of nation-states in the peripheries, or in that described as the "transition from modern colonialism to global coloniality". The decoloniality perspective redefines therefore the forms of exclusion and hierarchy developed by modernity (Quijano 2007).

This contribution aims at analysing the processes of agrarian change in Southern Europe, pointing out its specificity and highlighting the current forms of struggle and resistance. The paper is organized in three parts: the first one reconstructs the dynamics of peripheralization and formation of a wage work force through the processes of agrarian change articulated in phases through the analysis of "food regimes", the second one illustrates the restructuration in the processes and the relationships of production, since the '90s, through the production of racialized hierarchies of class and gender; the third conclusive part will finally deal with the movement for food sovereignty illustrating the forms of "anti-colonial" struggle against oppression and exploitation in the agri-food system.

Peripheralization and inside colonialism: the political economy of the south Europe

By analysing the process of progressive integration in the world economy, Arrighi and others have underlined a socio-economic and political convergence of Southern European countries, especially after the second world war. Southern Europe is identified as a semiperipheral zone (Arrighi 1985a). The relationships center-peripheries don't connect national or regional economies but economic activities structured in commodity chains that go beyond the state borders. "Core activities are those that command a large share of the total surplus produced within a commodity chain and peripheral activities are those that command little or no such surplus" (Arrighi and Drangel, 1986: 11-12). The semiperipheral states are those that contain in its own borders together central and peripheral activities. For this reason is assumed their "resistance" to peripheralization, although without enough power of movement toward the center (Arrighi 1985a p. 34).

In the region different processes of agrarian transformation are given inside the process of peripheralization that is proper of capitalistic development. By analysing the differences among the three ways of transformation undertaken by a region of the Italian Mezzogiorno, Calabria, between the XIX and the XX century, Arrighi and Piselli (1987) build a model of three ideal-typical way toward capitalistic development: the "Prussian" way (that of the crotonese area), the "American" way (in the Plain of Gioia Tauro) and the "Swiss" way (in the cosentino area). The "Prussian" way or of the Junkers produces a middle class landowners of the means of production and a proletariat without land; the "American" way or of the farmers produces a stratified structure semiproletarized; finally, the "Swiss" way or of the peasant-migrant produces a levelling of the social structure as that of the alpine shepherds analyzed by Casparis (1982, 1985). Every way is characterized by a different form of social conflict. The authors write:

By "peripheralization" we understand a process whereby some actors or locales, that participate directly or indirectly in the world division of labor, are progressively deprived of the benefits of such participation, to the advantage of other actors or locales.²⁶ This redistribution of benefits can take different forms, and each of our three roads to wage labor-as they unfolded in Calabria-illustrates a specific form of peripheralization: transfer of surplus, unequal exchange, and direct surplus appropriation" (Arrighi e Piselli, 1987: 687).

The transfer of surplus is through the mobility of capital, unequal exchange is done through the mobility of goods, direct surplus appropriation is through the mobility of labor.

The peripheralization of Southern Europe agriculture in the economy world is produced as a common tendency since the second half of the XX century and particularly in the last thirty years, following the process of integration in the European Union. The appropriation of produced surplus, the temporary isolation through migrant labor, the increasing competition from the other souths have contributed to this process (Arrighi 1985a).

We can read transformations in capital accumulation, of the production system, of labor and migrations through the analysis of food regimes in a regional scale, or looking at the Mediterranean area. Three moments or phases can be identified.

The liberal-mercantile phase: peasantization, forced commercialization and internal colonialism

Throughout the nineteenth century, the countryside took the form of a "battle field" brought on by malaise and discomfort for the peasant classes in Germany, France and Spain. The agrarian crisis in the last quarter of the XIX century is linked to the long-term dynamics of transformation at the international level: the new relationship between industry and agriculture and between the political and social forces, the expansion of the credit system and opening up of economic exchanges, the new geography of international trade and the affirmation of national bourgeois states. The first agricultural revolution and the grain crisis already had important repercussions for continental and Mediterranean agriculture . Britain

dominated internationally, as well as in Europe; in fact the model of British *mixed farming* – based on cereals, fodder and livestock – brought north the agricultural supremacy that for millennia had its centre in the Mediterranean, throughout the XVIII and much of the XIX century. In the second half of the XIX century however, population growth, expansion of international markets, steam navigation and iron ships gave Russian, American and Argentinean grains a chance to invade European markets and give continental grain culture an edge, resulting in a crisis of overproduction. The big capitalist owners were most adversely affected. Garrabou (1993) looks at the time cycles of technological change and talks of the "delay" of Mediterranean countries to participate in industrialized society, illustrating much lower agricultural growth compared to Atlantic Europe. Technological ruptures gave impulse to grain production and formed the basis of important Atlantic agricultural results, while Mediterranean countries sought other ways to increase production and productivity. Mediterranean agricultures responded to this crisis by leveraging the rich environment and agronomics, exploiting them to maximize production. Monoculture planting, functional specializations, uniformity and mass production of crops became the new modes of agricultural production. During the XIX century and the early decades of the XX century, the Mediterranean countryside strengthened, selected and specified their agricultural vocations, openly shaping them to fit local and international markets. The protagonists became the small family farm (mini-parcels) and the estates of the agrarian bourgeoisie. Compared to this phase, Petruszewicz (1991) defined as «agricultural innovators on the European outskirts» the landowners of areas that had experienced, compared to the more dynamic centres of the European economy, relatively deprived conditions (as part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Poland, the Russian Empire, Spain, Ireland, southern Italy and also the states of northern Italy), who were in a semi-suburban or peripheral position in relation to industrializing countries, from which manufactured goods were imported and foodstuffs were exported (raw materials and semi-processed products from the primary sector). From at least the mid 1800's, there was a growing strategic awareness; Italians invested in tree crops, adding value to even the most difficult lands. Olive trees, almond trees, vines and citrus were planted, and the production was oriented to the processing industries of northern Europe and international trade (Bevilacqua, 1989, Garrabou, 1993; Lupo, 1990; Pinilla, Ayuda 2006).

A key aspect of southern Italian agricultural production- in more general terms that of many Mediterranean regions- is the fragility of comparative advantage which is continuously threatened by competition from new producers, because of the expansion of the market and the "democratisation of consumption". The weakness of local industry further complicated the existing dependence on more advanced economies and the weight of an economic and social structure favouring land revenue and commercial speculation (Aymard 1995). At the turn of the century we witnessed the expansion of agriculture in California entering progressively into competition with the Mediterranean, in US as well as other European markets, while progressively introducing protectionist tariffs (Rhode, Olmstead, 1995)¹. Some authors evidence a striking contrast at this stage of

¹ “Una queja habitual contra todas estas naciones, era que California no podria ni deberia competir contra el trabajo barato, servil, de esos paises. Como ejemplo, “el descascarillado de almendras en Europa es realizado a mano por mujeres y ninos, y por familias durante la noche” Ademas de ofrecer los datos de salarios expresados en dolares, los defensores de la tarifa describian las

liberal-mercantilism whereby "violent fluctuations" coexist with the "slowness of changes in the rural world" (Fradera and Garrabou 1990). While reviewing the effects of the first processes of land reform in Southern Europe we find differing views. While Gramsci criticizes the liberal reform in terms of a "failed revolution"-denounced as internal colonialism- other analysis look primarily at the effects of *Desamortizacion-Desvinculacion* (confiscation) in Spain, from the sale of Bienes Nacionales (national properties) in France and Italy, and from the agrarian reform in Greece, in terms of peasantization (*campecinizacion*). These reforms give an advantage to the bourgeois, the urban middle class and descendants of oligarchies of property owners as well as small farmers - although individually owned properties are almost always reduced in size². If the process of land reform in Spain and Italy was realized within the framework of bourgeois revolutions and socio-economic national balance, the process of change in other Mediterranean countries would take place in relation to other factors as the Ottoman heritage and the process of independence for occupied territories, as in Greece and in the Balkans (Dertilis 1995. Petmezas 2006; Perez Picazo 1993).

In Spain and Italy family farming earned its hegemonic position thanks to the development of indirect management, whereas in the French Mediterranean, the expansion has been especially in the small proprietary. Therefore the different processes of institutional change related to the new liberal order were joined to the modest strengthening of the peasant property. There are other ways in which family farming reigned supreme until the mid-twentieth century: the accelerated commodification of the sector came from the pressure of internal/external demands, together with institutional change and modern means of transport; the increasing tax burden caused a process of "forced commercialization" to achieve liquid assets, so generating a growing monetization of the rural economy. The market-orientation was clearly boosted by an expansion of new and highly profitable crops - vines, olive and almond trees as well as other fruits and nuts - continuously changing in response to demand. The small farmer retains capital by reducing the costs of hired labour, and as much as possible through indirect management strategies. Capitalist development in the regions penetrated by market forces through the establishment of small and family units. The accumulation of significant capital was generated based on these processes, mainly in the areas of vineyards and irrigation perimeters (such as the Spanish Levante), and excluded other regions such as Western Andalusia, Sicily, Calabria and part of Egypt, where the latifundium continues to be a structural factor in agrarian relations (Perez Picazo, 1995, 335-37.).

"miserables" condiciones de trabajo en España, Italia, Grecia, etc., y las contrastaban con los "altos" salarios y las "buenas condiciones de trabajo concentradas en los campos y plantas envasadoras de California. En este frente, los californianos enfatizaban que ellos empleaban hombres y mujeres "blancos" (Rhode, Olmstead, 1995. pp. 183-184).

² Gonzalez de Molina spoke about peasantization, noting that from the Liberal Revolution proletarianization had not occurred as predicted in the classical theories. He aims at reclaiming *the role of the peasantry in the economic, political and social transformation of the country* as a social subject, and not as an object without the slightest relevance to historical change. However the process of commodification had eroded the socio-economic, environmental and cultural foundations of the peasantry and degraded its most distinctive features. That is why, according to the author, the definition of "petty commodity producers" or family farms for small farms that were configured as dominant from the sixties, and proprietarization, the process by which many of the producers were accessing the land (1998, p.67-68). Cfr. González De Molina Navarro Y Sevilla Guzmán 1991.

In Europe, the pressure on land, together with an increase in population -in contrast to the lack of investment in agriculture and in local businesses- finds a release; if not in direct collective mobilization against the conditions of social malaise³, in emigration abroad (towards which investment turns to infrastructure, plantations and manufacturing firms), as in the case of Italy.

Relations in the Mediterranean as well were characterized by colonial rule at this time, and this strongly influenced the agrarian transformation, driving a process of expropriation and land privatization, intensification of agriculture and proletarianization, at the base of migration processes, which continued to develop after the Second World War. The pattern of extraverted development for commercial specialized agriculture in North Africa - oriented towards overseas markets and in particular to the French metropolis - caused by colonial dominance will make it vulnerable.

Fordism: modernization, proletarianization and agriculture path dependency

In 1947 the aid system defined the Marshall Plan (*European Recovery Program*) which had the explicit intention of supporting NATO's southern flank, in line with the doctrine of "containment" by US President Harry Truman. It therefore served to remove communist groups from government positions, influenced by reform processes in Italy - similar to those in Germany and Japan - to halt the peasant movement and secure the dominance of anti-communist groups (Bernardi); also to promote the reconstruction of the productive fabric, and above all to develop agriculture in the context of the Western bloc. Post-conflict reconstruction of Western Europe in fact occurred following the American model of intensive cropping with stock farming in complex transnational agro-food chains dominated by large conglomerates (Friedmann, 1982; Friedmann and McMichael 1989). Marshall aid to Europe simultaneously established the basis for Atlantic agro-food relations, and invented the specific mechanisms of foreign aid which were later adapted for application in the third world (Friedmann 1993).

The remaking of the rural European landscape, through the mechanization of agriculture, the introduction of new and high-yielding varieties of crops and the increasing use of chemical fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides, exhibited as well a dramatic decline in the number of individuals employed in agriculture. The increased productivity of agriculture relieved chronic rural unemployment and provided a large army of previously non-proletarianized workers for expanding industries at the top of fordist development (Palat 2004). The food regime era sees the maximum development of the Ford model in Europe requiring large contingents of workers to be integrated through the reconstruction process first, and then into the booming industrial development complex, those from the countryside, particularly those of southern Italy (Bevilacqua 1991; Mottura and Pugliese 1975) then Southern Europe, and also from former now independent colonies (King 2002 Noiriél 2006).

³ In northern Italy, beginning in the last decades, a movement the largest labour movement in Europe was formed, and made a first order contribution to the political culture of growing socialism and the future of Italian democracy. (Crainz, 1994 Cazzola 1996)

The Common Agricultural Policy officially went into effect on January, 1st 1958 as a part of the 1957 Treaty of Rome. Its objectives were laid out explicitly, and in essence encompass five main goals, including: (i) *increased agricultural productivity*; (ii) *a fair standard of living for farming communities*; (iii) *stable markets*; (iv) *guaranteed security of supplies*; and (v) *an assurance of reasonable consumer prices*. The main instrument of the chosen common policy was a price and market policy. The CAP was determined by the agricultural policies of the six founding countries influenced by previous periods of crisis - for the influx of cheap overseas grain in the 1880s, the great depression in the 1930s and the two world wars – and considering the priorities of production and income. After the Second World War, the main type of European farm, was a fairly small-scale family-owned farm featuring to a greater or lesser extent, structural problems. Increased production through increased productivity was seen as a solution to the farmers' income problems, and in all six of the countries, a price policy combined with various structural policy measures was chosen as the means to achieve this goal (Tracy, 1982 pp. 5-17).

From its inception, the European Community was characterized by significant structural differences. Italy in particular, by the low productivity and backwardness of agriculture, the entire production system of the South, namely the southern regions, were able to be included in the common European project thanks to US sponsorship. Inside economic dualism and the dynamics of internal colonialism which have characterized it since unification have endured. It was substantially incapable of negotiating a CAP more suited to the farm specifics of southern Europe⁴. The expansion of the livestock sector in the north of Italy, based on imported grains, linked its interests with that of Northern European countries such as the Netherlands, and subsequently, Italy was allowed to maintain imports of feedstuffs at a lower tariff than northern countries. The CAP dedicated 90% of the budget to the guarantee of prices for producers of grain, beef, dairy products, and oils, which effectively granted a considerable advantage to northern agriculture. This was the least troublesome method of obtaining consensus from the member countries.

In the 1960s and 1970s the EEC achieved self-sufficiency in terms of mass consumer goods, but the related structural changes were dramatic. Employment in the primary sector fell from 18.2% to 7.8%, while income from agriculture fell from 11% of total income in 1958 to 3.4% in 1980. At the same time, the levels of mechanization and part-time employment in agriculture doubled⁵. The total number of farms decreased from 7.3 million to 4.7 million, and simultaneously the percentage of farms with more than 20 hectares grew from 14.7% to 25%. About 5 million hectares were removed from production completely and specialization was accentuated. Agriculture became much more integrated in the overall European economy as its growth was accompanied by greater dependency on external credit, labor markets, and production inputs from farms⁶. Individuals

⁴ The CAP is basically the sum of the requests from the three member states with agricultural interests and schemes related to stronger national intervention: an agricultural policy based on strong intervention and protectionism (France), higher domestic prices (Germany), and the modernization of production and agricultural specialization (The Netherlands).

⁵ On part time farming see Cavazzani and Fuller, 1982.

⁶ On the role of banks and agricultural debt see Hennis 2001.

working in agriculture increased their standard of living and consumed a wider range of goods, and the EC achieved a strong position in the world agricultural market (Freire, Parkhurst 2002).

Some structural measures were issued in 1972 and remained in force until 1985⁷. Their aim was to support farms that were able to modernize, agricultural restructuring (unifying dispersed holdings, irrigation, etc.), farmers associations, the retirement of farmers over 55 years old, and the development of information systems for the rural population. . Though limited by a small budget, the structural policy targeted regions and sectors with conjunctural problems or those with the most promise of fulfilling the efficiency criteria imposed on agriculture by the “second green revolution” (Freire, Parkhurst 2002). Greece made its entry into the EU in 1981, Portugal and Spain entered in 1986, after a transitional period which followed the end of authoritarian regimes in the mid 70s. Freire and Parkhurst (2002) ask what effects did European integration have on southern European countries and find a shorthand response in the Report of the European Commission for 2000: “The member states with higher average revenues are generally those with large farm enterprises specializing either in field crops or in the more competitive sectors (pork and/or poultry, dairy products, or truck gardening). With a high number of enterprises based in mixed agriculture, or in “other permanent crops,,” the southern member countries have average revenues below the mean for the EU as a whole (Commission Européenne 2002:21). Panoramically the situation takes on lineaments closely comparable to those we recognize from the 1960s and 1970s.

The neoliberal regime: Post-productivism and supermarketization

The third phase is characterized by the neoliberal restructuring, the reorganization of agri-food chains according to an oligopolistic concentration by transnational corporations, global sourcing, and the flexibilization of labor (Bonanno et al. 1994; Marsden 2006), under the influence of new structures of governance at a global level (WTO) and the 'denationalisation' strategy of neo-liberal class fractions (Tilzey 2006). Transition from productivism to postproductivism come after the crisis arising from overproduction, environmental, socio-economic and food security problems, and because of the growing concern of public opinion about sustainability, quality and health issues (Cfr, Commission of the European Communities, 1988). PAC reforms worked for reductions in production and subsidies, the promotion of competitiveness on international markets and a growing environmental and health regulation. The focus shifted from food production to rural development and environmental sustainability (Marsden et al. 1996;), from quantity to quality of production (Murdoch, Marsden and Banks 2000). In the process of “deagrification of rurality” (Cfr. Camarero) or in the production of a “new rurality” as a consumption space too (Kay 2008),

⁷ In front of the distortions produced by the CAP and structural problems especially for Mediterranean regions (before for Languedoc in France and Mezzogiorno in Italy, then for Greece, Spain and Portugal too), structural interventions were promoted, progressively addressing not just the agricultural sector (*Integrated Mediterranean programmes*) with the aim to complete the Single market and to improve economic and social cohesion in the EU, stimulating the regions lagging behind developmentally . See the Communications by EU Commission since the middle of '70s in the Archive of European Integration: <http://aei.pitt.edu>.

pluriactivity, diversification and multifunctionality are acknowledged as fundamental strategies for ensuring incomes from family farming, but as expression of re-peasantization too, that is of resistance (Ploeg, 2009). The tension between regulation and free market is solved by an embedded neoliberalism reflexing the balance among class interests (Tilzey 2006). (Papadopoulos 2005, 2015).

Structural dualism affects all four countries of Southern Europe and pertains similarly to agriculture (large scale against small-scale family farming), regional development (main development axes against remote-peripheral areas) and cross-sectoral mixtures (locally-successful entrepreneurship against marginal-survivalist practices) (Etxezarreta, 1992; Kasimis and Papadopoulos, 1994). At the agricultural level, the polarization of interests is between the larger, more capitalised businesses able to respond to the demands of processors, distributors and retailers and those labour intensive family-run holdings, many of them still dependent on state assistance and the ability to secure other non-agricultural sources of income in order to be able to continue farming.

According to Papadopoulos (2015) the CAP has not overcome many of the pitfalls related to the uneven agricultural/farm and socio-economic structure of the EU member states: “there are different ‘peripheralities’ within Europe... these peripheralities lead to the consolidation of an economic hierarchy between the rural regions that struggle to survive and seek ways to increase their resilience against the expansion of market mechanisms” (p...). ... There are significant differences which are demarcated by the land consolidation process, the diminishing number of small-farm holdings, the decline of agricultural employment, the substitution of family by non-family labour, and the increasing role of migrant labour in agriculture. The majority of the EU-15 holdings with low economic size are mostly concentrated in the four Southern European member states (Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain). These four member states, which account for two-thirds of the holdings of the EU-15, contain the vast majority (88.5 per cent) of the holdings with low economic size and only one-third of the holdings with large economic size. This implies that the Western and Northern European member states have two-thirds of EU-15 holdings with large economic size. The large farms predominate in the western-northern old member states, and they become an increasingly prominent feature in the southern old member states and in a handful of new member states. This indicates that the CAP has probably accentuated the pre-existing inequalities and peripheralities within the EU, rather than offering a smooth way for increasing the resilience of farm holdings/rural economies in rural regions.

Over the last two centuries, and in contrast to the rest of Europe, southern European agriculture has been characterized by distinctive features with regards to the structure of production and agrarian relations: greater land fragmentation; a higher rate of permanent crops such as olive trees, vineyards and orchards; smaller farms, with low levels of technological development, and, from the 1970s onwards, managed by part-time or elderly farmers. Nevertheless, over the last three decades, the region has undergone significant agrarian change. The number of farms has steadily decreased, as has, to a lesser extent, the utilized agricultural area (UAA), while the average size of farms has grown (Arnalte-Alegre and Ortiz-Miranda, 2013; Papadopoulos, 2015). A few figures can offer a general idea about these transformations. Between 1990 and 2010, average farm size grew from 5.6

ha of UAA to almost 8 ha in Italy, from 4.3 to 7.2 ha in Greece, from 6.7 to 12 ha in Portugal, and from 15.4 to 24 ha in Spain. In comparison, the average UAA in 2010 was 24 ha in the EU-15 countries and 15 ha in the EU-27 countries. Over the same 20-year period, the number of holdings fell from 2,665,000 to 1,621,000 in Italy, from 861,000 to 723,000 in Greece, from 599,000 to 305,000 in Portugal, and from 1,594,000 to 990,000 in Spain. In France, a dramatic decrease in the number of farms had occurred already in previous decades, and remained at around 500,000 between 1990 and 2000 (Eurostat, 2014a, 2014b; see also Arnalte-Alegre and Ortiz-Miranda, 2013). This reduction is largely due to the drop in the number of small farms (Corrado et al. 2016).

The adaptation of the rural population and of agriculture of Southern Europe to external conditions and globalization is related to off-farm employment, to the use of immigrant labour, to the flexible use of the labour force as well as to the utilization of some forms of non-wage, contract labour, self-employment, non-taxed and non-declared activities. Informality, income diversification and labour flexibility may be considered as survival and resistance strategies of rural households, particularity in the agricultural sector (Mottura and Mingione 1991; Papadopoulos, 1998; Kasimis, Papadopoulos 2013). In Southern Europe productivist and post productivist (based on quality) dynamics integrate themselves very often, producing distortions and negative consequences in terms of environmental, social and economic sustainability (Moreno Perez 2013). Quality production is often associated to intensification, to medium-large farms and especially oriented to Northern markets (Germany, UK, France) (Arnalte-Alegre e Ortiz-Miranda 2013); to social dumping against immigrant workers. Some areas are still very characterized by productivism and intensive agriculture as in the case of southern Italy or Southern Spain, based on the model of “mobile production of fruit and vegetable factories” (Pedreño Cánovas 2001; Aznar-Sánchez, et al. 2014). In this context migrant labour is not just a strategy for resistance by farms, it is also a leverage for innovation and resilience in order to cope with the many pressures at downstream and upstream levels all along global value chains.

In his analysis of internal colonialism in Italy, Gramsci (1977) linked the Southern question - namely the accumulated disadvantage of the South with respect to the North - to the agrarian question, which in turn is the outcome of the unification process under the Nation-State, from which the northern industrial bourgeoisie and southern Italian landowners benefited⁸. By food regime analysis this process can be translated at the EU level, highlighting the benefits for large farms, agribusiness and industry, financial capital deriving from the CAP and political economy, and in the meantime class transformations and social conflicts. Food regime analysis enables to grasp political and social aspects related to world historical value relations.

Labour, value chains and global coloniality

⁸ Sereni (1968) emphasizes further the role of agrarian reform in the Southern underdevelopment. See also Zitara, 1971, 2011.

Pablo González Casanova (1965) and Rodolfo Stavenhagen (1965) applied the Gramsci's concept of internal colonialism to the racist/ethnicist power within the Nation-State, stressing the "indigenous question" as well - together with the "peasant question" – and the destructuring process in social and economic terms, within the colonized society of Latin America. Quijano criticizes the eurocentrism implicit in this analysis. Introducing the concept of coloniality of power he suggests to overcome the State-nation perspective and to understand the international division of labor following colonization/decolonization and modernization processes in the world economy system relations (Quijano 1991; 1993, 1994, 2000; see also Quijano and Wallerstein 1992). Coloniality 'encompasses the transhistoric expansion of colonial domination and the perpetuation of its effects in contemporary times' (Moraña, Dussel, Jáuregui 2008). Coloniality focuses on the historical and renovated role of racialization in constructing laboring classes in a globalizing economy, and in justifying their work conditions: we can speak of a global coloniality (Grosfoguel, 2002). A deep understanding of class dynamics and racialization processes in Southern European (and European) agri-food system can be supported by this perspective. Agri-food restructuring process and mobility regimes are vectors for coloniality: political economies of labor and exploitation continue through racialized hierarchies of class and gender.

Agri-food value relations have been grounded on inter-continental and inter-hemispheric 'switch' in agri-food exchange, where European wheat and processed food are exchanged with fresh air-freighted foods originating from the South; private foreign investments in the South extend control to crucial nodes in export oriented horticulture commodity chains; migration policy regimes work to control the flexible labour supply. Farmers joining value chains become dependent on a production chain "where the choices of inputs and the use of the harvest are predetermined by agro-chemical and food-processing firms".

This unbalanced and partial (due to some protections still operating in EU) liberalization is closely linked with what has been called the 'retailing revolution' (McMichael and Friedmann, 2007), which, over the last 30 years, has seen numerous agri-food chains become retailer-driven. Supermarket chains not only control distribution, but also shape decisively the production, processing and consumption of food (Burch and Lawrence, 2007) as a result of their enormous buyer power. European supermarkets have influenced the international policy environment in favour of supermarket investments as well as the liberalization of retail distribution markets in developing countries under the WTO General agreement on trade and services (GATS) negotiations, and they have also accumulated buying power by setting up alliances between retailers, in the form of buying groups (Vorley, 2007)⁹. Supermarket chains can buy (cheap) agricultural products in various parts of the globe, thus exacerbating the competition between farmers in different countries. A number of mainly European corporations produce or simply trade in different countries, in order to meet the year-round demand of seasonal and counter-seasonal fresh products among the European

⁹ Europe's top 10 retail groups are headquartered in three countries: the UK, France and Germany. For example, in 2010, Carrefour (France) – Europe's largest retailer ahead of the Metro Group (Germany) and Tesco (UK) and second only to US-based Wal-Mart at the global level – employed 475,000 workers and had 15,600 company-operated or franchised stores in 34 countries across the world, with 57 per cent of its turnover coming from outside France (Fritz, 2011).

supermarket chains (Gertel and Sippel, 2014). The power of retailers over suppliers comes mainly from the growing rate of food trade that, at a national and supranational level, passes through corporate supermarkets and from the growing concentration in the sector¹⁰. Financialization has also played a major role in agri-food restructuring. Some of the retail corporations are among the most important financial actors and pivot for financial capital in contemporary capitalism. (Arrighi, 2007, pp. 171–2; Vorley, 2007; Burch and Lawrence, 2013; Burch et al. 2013).

The response of many southern European farms to the pressure of vertical food chains has been the growing use of a cheap and flexible labour force. In Southern European enclaves of fresh fruit and vegetable production, the employment of over-exploited migrant labour represents one of the factors that has allowed the survival of a number of small and medium farms, notwithstanding their incorporation into global supply chains. Thus, the over-exploitation of migrant labour appears to be one of the strategies employed by southern European farmers in resisting the liberalization of international markets and the retailer-driven transformation of supply chains. However, this strategy is at the same time increasingly inadequate as farmers become more dependent and marginal in supply chains. As statistics demonstrate, a huge number of mainly small and medium farms have closed or have been sold to the biggest production units, while corporate supermarkets in the meantime are able to buy (cheap) food where they wish and, ultimately, appear to benefit the most from the lowering of labour costs through the employment of a migrant workforce (Corrado et al. 2016).

A further relevant feature of the transformation of Mediterranean agriculture is the ‘defamilization’, or individualization of family farming, the growth of wage labour and the structural dependence on a non-local labour force.⁶ In this context, internal and/or transnational migrants not only allow farmers to replace the withdrawal of family labour, but most of all, constitute a reserve of vulnerable, cheap and flexible labour force to meet the downward pressure on costs and the requests of just-in-time production by the agri-food chains.

The presence of foreign farm workers in southern European countries become a significant and noticeable phenomenon since the 1990s. The number of foreign farm workers in these countries has since grown steadily. They represent 24 per cent of agricultural wage labourers in Spain, 37 per cent in Italy, and 90 per cent in Greece, not counting those who are hired irregularly (Moreno-Perez et al., 2015; Corrado, 2015; Papadopoulous, 2015; see also Arnalte-Alegre, Ortiz-Miranda 2013;). As Bonanno and Cavalcanti (2014) argue, non-market mechanisms (such as feminization and illegalization) play a part in agricultural labour regulation. In agri-food we have seen the ‘multiplication of labour’ and ‘differential inclusion of migrants’ due to the different levels of subordination, command, discrimination and segmentation defined by the current border and migration regimes, which rather than exclude, aim at ‘filtering, selecting, and channelling migratory movements’, through ‘a huge amount of violence’ (Mezzadra and Nielsen, 2013, p. 165). Migrant farm workers in southern European countries are segmented by their legal status, nationality, gender, type of work contract and form of

¹⁰ A few statistics reflect this development. In Italy, large retailers’ share of the food market grew from 44 per cent in 1996 to 71 per cent in 2011 (AGCM, 2013). In Greece, the four largest retailers (three foreign chains and one national company) accounted for 55 per cent of the sales and more than 80 per cent of the profits of the national grocery retail market in 2009 (Skordili, 2013). In Spain, big retailers controlled 63.7 per cent of the food market in 2014 (ANGED, 2014, p. 36).

recruitment. The workers include Maghrebi, eastern European, sub-Saharan African, South Asian and Latin American migrants. These migrants are undocumented or documented, are recruited through seasonal workers programmes, temporary employment agencies, informal networks or brokers, possess different types of permits and may sometimes have even received citizenship in the country of arrival. In extreme cases, they are trafficked and subject to quasi-slavery conditions (Corrado et al. 2016).

As the effect of a “multiple crisis” – in agricultural productions requiring cheap labour to reduce production costs, in manufactures and urban economies expelling wage labourers, in war and grabbed zones of the South – we have assisted to a progressive agrarization of migrant labour, to the growth of migrant wage labour in agriculture, in a process of rururbanization of foreign migrations (see Dines and Rigo about refugization of agricultural labor in Italy). Nevertheless, it is important to noting as foreigner labor is by now a fundamental structural element, in virtue of an increasing involvement in all the business phases and in different activities, and not just in those seasonal and less structured. It is recorded in fact a growth of the occupation in multifunctional agriculture (i.e. agri-tourism), in the processing and marketing phases; in activities of stall and care of the milk cattle.

Southern European rural areas can be analysed as places of conflict, entrapment and escape. Farmers require an abundant cheap, flexible and often seasonal workforce, and foreign citizens are usually the best candidates to fill such needs. However, migrants usually consider agriculture only as a source of temporary employment, due to the low salaries, the hard and seasonal work and the difficult housing conditions, and they move away from rural areas as soon as they find better employment opportunities or get a residence permit. Due to the high turnover and increasing cases of resistance and conflict, new labourers are needed to meet the agricultural labour demand. To this end, European governments have supported their farmers in different ways.

Arrighi and Piselli, through the analysis of the model Calabria, have underlined the role of the processes of agrarian transformation and migrations in the formation of wage labor according to different ways and forms of social conflict¹¹. Arrighi

¹¹ “The experience of Calabria also seems to suggest that social conflict is the key intervening variable, to use that language, in the process of social change. It intervened in the determination of the initial differentiation of Calabria along three divergent paths of social change. It intervened in disrupting the viability of the Junker road at the end of the Second World War, and therefore in initiating the convergence of the three paths toward a new single pattern. And it intervened at the very end of our story in bringing to a halt mass migration. These “interventions” underscore the fact that the peasants of Calabria, and their semiproletarian and proletarian successors, have not at all been passive pawns in the hands of state and capital. Their history is in fact a history of resistance against all kinds of exploitative tendencies. Sometimes they lost and sometimes they won, and the outcome determined the path of social change for generations to come”. (Arrighi and Piselli 1987, 736). “Generally speaking, we may therefore say that social conflict is an integral part of developmental processes, and that its role lies not so much in determining the economic regress (progress) of the locale in which it occurs as in determining the distribution of the costs (benefits) of economic regress (progress) among the residents of that locale. Social conflict, however, is not the only weapon available to peasants and proletarians in their struggles against exploitation and peripheralization. The historical experience of Calabria is instructive also because it shows the importance of migration as a substitute for and a complement of social conflict in shaping developmental processes. In the phase of regional differentiation, short- and long distance migration played a key role in promoting social change, but along directions largely determined by the outcome of social conflict”. (737).

had already observed in Africa how the engagement of migrants to undertake themselves in class struggle in the places of migration depended from how much they considered their condition as a permanent solution, that is how much perceived wage labor as unique source of their subsistence. However in the case of foreign migrations the administrative status or the permission limitations are often elements affecting the possibilities of mobilization.

As a conclusion: Re-Valuing labour and nature in the agrarian question

Commodity chain (system)/Global value chain analysis have raised critics because of the “strict economic determination of inequality”, “their bias toward industry-, firm-, or buyer-level analysis and for their lack of attention to particular, place-based, historical and cultural contexts”, lack of attention to particular, place-based, historical (gender, class, citizenship...) and cultural contexts and inequalities” (Thomas 1985, Ortiz 2002), the scarce attention to the “micropolitics of differentiated groups of workers” (Wells 1996). “Food regime analysis [too] has had a tendency to privilege value relations in such a way as to understate the social face of commodity relations on the ground” (McMichael 2013). Bair and Werner (2011) call for attention to “dis/articulations” in the analysis of value chains: reorienting attention to “the layered histories and uneven geographies of capitalist expansion, disinvestment, and devaluation” in particular locales, and the “place-making and subject-making which make their production possible”, “to the cultural, linguistic, and gendered nature of the agricultural workplace”. We have to pay attention to the multiple forms of difference that have sustained systems of labor control, at the same time that they have produced possibilities for collective action and resistance (community and family ties, networks of cooperation and solidarity, informal economies) (Besky and Brown 2015).

According to McMichael,

“The contemporary agrarian question, then, concerns how to transcend the exchange-value calculus, as applied to agriculture. This is a methodological issue, concerning Marx’s theory of value as a social relation represented by price, which objectifies social (and ecological) relationships. Value is not intrinsic to labor, or nature, rather it is produced through social combinations of labor/nature as commodities with exchange value. Capital’s language of valuation is monetary value alone (determined by commodity exchanges at any one time), but value theory demystifies this alienated language, opening up the possibility of critique and counter-alienation. What appears to be a universal rationality is in fact an abstraction and form of denial of space-based practical value. In other words, value theory implies (but elides) other relationships embodying distinctive forms and understandings of value.”.

Some experiences of mobilization and resistance of labor in Southern Europe have relied on reflexive consumers of organic products or alternative food networks. This is the case of the mobilization of the Sindicato Obrero de Campo (SOC) against Bio Sol Portocarrero, an organic producer company in Almeria (Spain),

certified by Leading Organic Alliance/GlobalGAP/GRASP). The SOC in collaboration with antiracist movements, NGOs, foreign trade unions and journalists organized demonstrations in Swiss so causing the intervention by Bio Suisse, Swiss Coop and Campinia Verde Ecosol that worked for the reinstatement of the workers, wage payment, the stabilization of seasonal workers, and the opening of a SOC branch within the company. The SOC as an example of “social movement unionism” is characterized by an horizontal organization, broad social coalitions, the recruitment of vulnerable subjects, non-professional grassroots activism, direct action and an anti-bureaucratic approach (Caruso 2016).

In Italy, after the 2010 riots of African labourers of Rosarno (in Calabria), a process of cooperation among consumers and producers sustained the birth of Sos Rosarno, an association involving local small agricultural producers, anti-racist/environmental activists and migrant farmworkers. Today Sos Rosarno sells its products to around 400 Gas (Solidarity Purchase Groups) in Italy and to social centers in different cities. Sos Rosarno is member of Ari (Associazione Rurale Italiana), that is member (as the SOC) of the European Coordination of Via Campesina and is engaged in the fight for food sovereignty. During the last years other social justice projects have been organized to combat work exploitation in intensive fruit and vegetable production, to support migrant workers mobilizations and involve them in new ethical and ecological forms of agriculture and production: apart from Sos Rosarno, we can cite SfruttaZero, Funky Tomato, Contadinazioni.

Some critics highlight the limits of the experiences of resistance which find expression in the sphere of consumption connected to alternative production, yet, in many cases do not question the neoliberal regime and free market ideology), are co-opted by corporate powers, exclude the weakest segments and do not take into account the power of labor relations (Cavalcanti and Bonanno, 2013, 281-284). But these practices demonstrate how labour justice and food justice can find a convergence: the respect of workers’ rights becomes a condition for the construction of fair consumption-production relationships. The recent alliance between peasant organizations and the Unione Sindacale di Base (Basic Trade Union or USB) supports the joint struggle of peasants, farm labourers and other workers in the agri-food system by sustaining unionization on the one hand, the workers’ access to quality food on the other hand. This is an important step toward a reformulation of social conflicts and the construction of a collective movement that can affect the agri-food system from a vantage point of questioning class relations and the social conditions of reproduction. The alliance between peasants, labourers and other workers can serve to powerfully re-socialize and traverse the agri-food question, taking into account labor rights (in field operations, processing and distribution logistics), the rights of migrants (structural components of the food system, and its logistics), the possibility of providing quality food for working classes and therefore the chance to reproduce social forces in a way that is integrated with the agro-ecological system. The construction of a Coordination of Peasant Agriculture and Workers for Food Sovereignty at national level highlights a convergence of class interests seeking to boost a legal framework for peasant agriculture, to reclaim farmworkers and immigration rights, and joining the fight at the European level to change CAP. So apart from introducing practical innovations for equity and sustainability to the food system, they seek to change the structural conditions in which these

innovations operate contrasting the outcomes of corporate food regime (cfr. McMichael 2013).

The second Nyéléni Europe Forum for Food Sovereignty held in Cluj-Napoca (Romania) in 2016 demanded strategies that ensure the equitable rights of farmworkers (migrant workers, in particular) together with public policies that put natural resources in the hands of local people, food distribution systems that focus primarily on local, sustainable food, and agroecology as the fundamental approach to agriculture (FIAN, 2016). Food sovereignty is intended as the 'continuation of anti-colonial struggles in ostensible post-colonial contexts' (Grey and Patel 2015). Decolonizing means 'deconstructing what we've been domesticated to think'... food, health, economy, public policy, livelihood, consciousness, community (Bradley, Herrera 2015; Graddy-Lovelace 2017), as well as agriculture and labour.

References:

Arrighi G. (1985), Introduction, in Arrighi G. (ed), *Semiperipheral development. The Politics of Southern Europe in the Twentieth Century*, Sage publications, Beverly Hills, London, New Delhi.

Arrighi G. and J. Drangel (1986) "The stratification of the world economy: An exploration of the semiperipheral zone", *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, 10 (1) 9E74.

Arrighi G. and F. Piselli (1987) "Capitalist Development in Hostile Environments: Feuds, Class Struggles, and Migrations in a Peripheral Region of Southern Italy", *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 10 (4): 649E751.

Arrighi G. and B.J. Silver (2001) *Capitalism and world (dis)order*, *Review of International Studies*, 27: 257E279.

Arrighi G. (1990) "The Developmentalist Illusion: A Reconceptualization of the Semiperiphery", in W.G. Martin, ed., *Semiperipheral States in the World Economy*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, 11E42

Arrighi, G. (2007), *Adam Smith in Beijing*. London-New York: Verso.

Arrighi, Drangel, *The Stratification of the World Economy: An exploration of the Semiperipheral Zone*, *Reviwe*, X, 1, 1986, 9-74

Arnalte-Alegre E., Ortiz-Miranda D. (2013), *The 'Southern Model' of European Agriculture Revisited: Continuities and Dynamics*, pp. 37-74), in Ortiz-Miranda D., Moragues-Faus A., Arnalte-Alegre E.(Eds), *Agriculture in Mediterranean Europe: Between Old and New Paradigms*, Emerald.

Aznar-Sánchez, J.Á., Belmonte-Ureña, J. and Tapia-León, J. (2014). 'The industrial agriculture: A 'model for modernization' from Almería?' in Gertel, J. and Sippel, S.R. (2014). *Seasonal Workers in Mediterranean Agriculture. The Social Costs of Eating Fresh*. London: Routledge, pp. 175–199.

Bain, C., Ransom, E. and Higgins, V. (eds) (2013). 'Private agri-food standards'. Special issue. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, 20, pp. 1–2.

Bair J., Werner M. (2011), "Commodity Chains and the Uneven Geographies of Global Capitalism: A Disarticulations Perspective," *Environment and Planning A* 43, no. 5: 988–97

Besky S., Brown S. (2015), *Looking for Work: Placing Labor in Food Studies*, *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas*, Volume 12, Issue 1–2

Bevilacqua, P. (1989). 'Tra Europa e Mediterraneo. L'organizzazione degli spazi e i sistemi agrari dell'Italia contemporanea' in Bevilacqua, P. (ed.). *Storia dell'agricoltura italiana in età contemporanea*, vol. I, Spazi e paesaggi. Venezia: Marsilio.

Bonanno, A. and Cavalcanti, J.S.B. (2014). 'Introduction' in Bonanno, A. and Cavalcanti, J.S.B. (eds). *Labor Relations in Globalized Food*. Bingley: Emerald. pp. xiii–xlix.

Bonanno, A., Friedland, W.H., Llambi, L., Marsden, T., Belo, M. and Schaeffer, R. (1994). 'Global post-Fordism and the concept of the State'. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, 4, pp. 11–29.

Braudel, F. (1985). *La Méditerranée*. Paris: Flammarion.

Bush, R. (2007a). 'Politics, power and poverty: Twenty years of agricultural reform and market liberalisation in Egypt'. *Third World Quarterly*, 28(8), pp. 1599–1615.

Bush, R. (2007b). 'Mubarak's legacy for Egypt's rural poor: Returning land to the landlords.' in Borrás, S.M., Kay, C. and Akram-Lodhi, A.H. (eds). *Land, Poverty and Livelihoods in an Era of Globalization: Perspectives from Developing and Transition Countries*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 254–283.

Caruso (2015), *La politica dei subalterni. Organizzazione e lotte del bracciantato migrante nel Sud Europa*, Roma, Derive Approdi.

Caruso F.S., Corrado A. (2012), *Crisi e migrazioni nel Mediterraneo. I casi del Poniente Almeriense e della Piana di Sibari*, *Agriregionieuropa*, n°31, [link].

Caruso F.S., Corrado A (2015). *Migrazioni e lavoro agricolo: un confronto tra Italia e Spagna in tempi di crisi*, in Colucci M., Gallo S. (a cura di), *Tempo di cambiare. Rapporto 2015 sulle migrazioni interne in Italia*, Donzelli, Roma [link].

Casparis, J. 1982 *The Swiss Mercenary System: Labor Emigration from the Semi-periphery*, in «Review. Fernand braudel center», V, 4, pp. 593-642.

Casparis, J. 1985 *Core Demand for Labor from Southern Europe. The Case of Switzerland*, in *Semiperipheral Development: the Politics of Southern*

Castro-Gómez S., Grosfoguel Ramón . (2007), *Prólogo. Giro decolonial, teoría crítica y pensamiento heterárquico*, in S.Castro-Gómez y R. Grosfoguel, *El giro decolonial: reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global*, Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores; Universidad Central, Instituto de Estudios Sociales Contemporáneos y Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Instituto Pensar.

Commission of the European Communities (1988). *Green paper, The Future of Rural Society*, Com (88) 371 final, Brussels.

Commission Européenne (2002). *La situation de l'agriculture dans l'union européenne. Rapport 2000*, Bruxelles/Luxembourg.

Colloca, C. and Corrado A. (a cura di) (2013). *La globalizzazione nelle campagne. Migranti e società rurali nel Sud Italia*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

Crainz (1994). *Padania. Il mondo dei braccianti dalla fine dell'Ottocento alla fuga delle campagne*. Roma: Donzelli.

Cruz, J. (1993). 'El futuro de las agriculturas del sur de Europa' in Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación (ed.). *Agriculturas y políticas agrarias en el sur de Europa*. Madrid: Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación, pp. 517–537.

Gonzalez Casanova, P., "Colonialismo interno (una redefinición)", en Boron, Afilio A.; Amadeo, J. y Gonzalez, S. (comps.), *La teoría marxista hoy: problemas y perspectivas*, Buenos Aires, Clacso, 2006, pp. 409-434.

Caruso, F.S. (2016) 'Unionism of migrant farm workers: The Sindicato Obreros del Campo (SOC) in Andalusia, Spain', in A. Corrado, C. De Castro and D. Perrotta, *Migration and Agriculture Mobility and change in the Mediterranean area*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 311-331.

Corrado, A. (2016) 'Agrarian change and migrations in the Mediterranean from a food regime perspective', in A. Corrado, C. De Castro and D. Perrotta, *Migration and Agriculture Mobility and change in the Mediterranean area*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 311-331.

Corrado, A., De Castro, C. and Perrotta, D. (eds) (2016), *Migration and Agriculture Mobility and change in the Mediterranean area*, Routledge, London and New York.

Dertilis, G.B. (1995). 'Grecia, siglos XVIII–XX: la tierra, los campesinos y el poder' in Morilla, J. (eds). *California y el mediterráneo: estudios de la historia de dos agriculturas competidoras*. Madrid: Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente, pp. 371–400.

Extezarreta, M. (2006). *La agricultura española en la era de la globalización*. Madrid: Ministerio de Agricultura Pesca y Alimentación.

FIAN (2016), *Food sovereignty takes root in Eastern Europe*, http://www.fian.org/es/noticias/articulo/food_sovereignty_takes_root_in_eastern_europe/

Fort, F. (2012). 'Traditional Mediterranean products: Markets and large-scale retail trade' in Mombiola, F. and Abis, S. (eds). *Mediterra 2: The Mediterranean Diet for Sustainable Regional Development*. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, pp. 305–324.

Freire, D. and Parkhurst, S. (2002). 'Where is Portuguese agriculture headed? An analysis of the common agricultural policy'. Working paper PRI-5, Institute of European Studies. Berkeley: University of California.

Fritz T. (2011), *Globalising Hunger: Food Security and the EU's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)*, FDCL-Verlag Berlin [link].

Garrabou, R. (1993). 'Revolución o revoluciones agrarias en el siglo XIX: su difusión en el mundo Mediterráneo' in *Agriculturas mediterráneas y mundo campesino: cambios históricos y retos actuales: Actas de las Jornadas de Historia Agraria*. Almería, 19–23 April, pp. 95–109.

Gertel, J. and Sippel, S. (2014). 'Super/markets: Beyond buyer-drivenness in southern France' in Gertel, J. and Sippel, S.R. (eds). *Seasonal Workers in Mediterranean Agriculture. The Social Costs of Eating Fresh*. London: Routledge, pp. 58–72.

Gertel, J., Sippel, S.R., (eds.) (2014). *Seasonal Workers in Mediterranean Agriculture. The social costs of eating fresh*. London. Routledge.

Graddy-Lovelace G. (2017) *The coloniality of US agricultural policy: articulating agrarian (in)justice*, *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 44:1, 78-99,

Gramsci, A. (1977). *Quaderni del carcere*, Vol. I. Torino: Einaudi.

Grey S., Patel R. (2015), Food sovereignty as decolonization: some contributions from Indigenous movements to food system and development politics, *Agric Hum Values*, 32:431–444

Halperin, S. (1997). *In the Mirror of the Third World: Capitalist Development in Modern Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hennis, M. (2001). 'Europeanization and globalization: The missing link'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 39(5), pp. 829–850.

Hennis, M. (2005). *Globalization and European Integration: The Changing Role of Farmers in the Common Agricultural Policy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Kasimis C., Papadopoulos A. (2005). The Multifunctional Role of Migrants in the Greek Countryside. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31(1), 99-127.

Kasimis C., Papadopoulos A. G. (2013), Rural Transformations and Family Farming in Contemporary Greece, in A. Moragues Faus, D. Ortiz-Miranda and E. Arnalte Alegre (eds), *Agriculture in Mediterranean Europe: Between Old and New Paradigms*, Emerald Publications, pp. 263-293.

Knudsen, D.C. (2007). 'Post-productivism in question: European agriculture, 1975–1997'. *The Industrial Geographer*, 5(1), pp. 21–43.

Lupo, S. (1990). *Il giardino degli aranci. Il mondo degli agrumi nella storia del Mezzogiorno*. Venezia: Marsilio.

Marsden, T. (2006). 'Pathways in the sociology of rural knowledge' in Cloke, P. Marsden, T. and Mooney, P. (eds). *Handbook of Rural Studies*. London: Sage, pp. 3–17.

Marsden, T., Munton, R., Ward, N. and Whatmore, S. (1996). 'Agricultural geography and the political economy approach: A review'. *Economic Geography*, 72(4), pp. 361–375.

McMichael, P. (2013) *Food Regimes and Agrarian Questions*, Fernwood Publishing, Halifax and Winnipeg.

Mezzadra, S. and Nielsen, B. (2013). *Border as Method or the Multiplication of Labor*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.

Moreno-Pérez, O., Gallardo-Cobos, R., Sanchez-Zamora, P. and Ceña-Delgado, F. (2015). 'La agricultura familiar en España: pautas de cambio y visibilidad institucional'. *Agriregionieuropa*, 11(43). Available at <http://agrireregionieuropa.univpm.it/it>

Murdoch, J., Marsden, T. and Banks, J. (2000). 'Quality, nature, and embeddedness: Some theoretical considerations in the context of the food sector'. *Economic Geography* 76(2), pp. 107–125.

Morice A., Michalon B. (ed), (2009). *Travailleurs saisonniers dans l'agriculture européenne*, Études rurales, 182.

Ortiz S. (2002), "Laboring in the Factories and in the Fields," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31: 395–417;

Papadopoulos, A.G. (1998). 'Revisiting the rural: A southern response to European integration and globalization' in Kasimis, C. and Papadopoulos, A.G. (eds). *Local Responses to Global Integration, Rural Transformations and Family Farming In Contemporary Greece*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 245–271.

Papadopoulos A. G. (2015), *The Impact of the CAP on Agriculture and Rural Areas of EU Member States*, *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy* 4(1) 1–32.

Pedreño, A. (coord.) 2014, *De cadenas, migrantes y jornaleros: los territorios rurales en las cadenas globales agroalimentarias*. Editorial Talasa.

Pedaliu, E. (2013). 'The making of southern Europe: A historical overview' in *A Strategy for Southern Europe*. LSE Ideas Special Report SR017. London: London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), pp. 8–14.

Pedreño, A. (1999). *Del Jornalero Agrícola al Obrero de las Factorías Vegetales: Estrategias Familiares y Nomadismo Laboral en la Ruralidad Murciana*. Madrid: Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación.

Pedreño, A. (2001). 'Efectos territoriales de la globalización: el caso de la ruralidad agroindustrial murciana'. *Revista de Estudios Regionales*, no. 59, pp. 69–96.

Perez Picazo, M.T. (1994). 'La disolucion de las sociedades campesinas tradicional en el mundo mediterráneo' in Sánchez Picón, A. (ed.). *Agriculturas mediterráneas y mundo campesino: cambios históricos y retos actuales*. Almería: Instituto de Estudios Almerienses, pp. 15–43.

Perez Picazo, M.T. (1995). 'Pequena explotacion y consolidacion del capitalismo en las agriculturas mediterraneas, 1856–1939' in Morilla, J. (ed.). *California y el mediterráneo: estudios de la historia de dos agriculturas competidoras*, Madrid: Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente, pp. 335–337.

Petmezas, S.D. (2006). 'Agriculture and economic growth in Greece'. XIV International Economic History Congress, Helsinki, Finland.

Petrusewicz, M. (1996). *Latifundium. Moral Economy and Material Life in a European Periphery*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Pinilla, V. and Ayuda, M.I. (2006). 'Horn of plenty' revisited: The globalization of Mediterranean horticulture and the economic development of Spain, 1850–1935' *Documentos de trabajo, DT-AEHE No. 0606*.

Ploeg, J.D. van der (2009). *The New Peasantries. Struggles for Autonomy and Sustainability in an Era of Empire and Globalization*. London: Earthscan.

Reardon, T., Timmer, C.P., Barrett, C.B., and Berdegue, J. (2003). 'The rise of supermarkets in Africa, Asia and Latin America'. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 85(5), pp. 1140–1146.

Rhode, P. and Olmstead, A. (1995). 'La competencia internacional en productos mediterráneos y el auge de la industria frutícola californiana, 1880–1930' in Morilla, J. (ed.). *California y el mediterráneo: estudios de la historia de dos agriculturas competidoras*. Madrid: Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente, pp. 173–232.

Sánchez Picón, A. (2005). 'Vecinos ignorados: brechas y encuentros en la historia económica desde las dos orillas (el Magreb y España)' in Nadal, J. and Parejo, A.

(eds). *Mediterráneo e Historia Económica*, Alicante: Caja Rural Intermediterránea, Cajamar.

Sippel, S. and Gertel, J. (2014). 'Shared insecurities? Farmers and workers in Bouches-du-Rhône' in Gertel, J. and Sippel, S.R. (2014). *Seasonal workers in Mediterranean Agriculture. The Social Costs of Eating Fresh*. London: Routledge, pp. 31–49.

Tilzey, M. (2006). 'Neo-liberalism, The WTO and new modes of agrienvironmental governance in the European Union, the USA and Australia'. *International Journal of Sociology of Food and Agriculture*, 14(1), pp. 1–28.

Quijano A. (2007), *Colonialidad del poder y clasificación social*, in Castro-Gómez y Ramón Grosfoguel, *El giro decolonial: reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global*

Thomas R. (1985), *Citizenship, Gender, and Work: Social Organization of Industrial Agriculture* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Wells M. (1996), *Strawberry Fields: Politics, Class, and Work in California Agriculture* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

Nazioarteko Hizketaldia

ELIKADURAREN ETORKIZUNA ETA NEKAZARITZAREN ERRONKAK XXI.

MENDERAKO:

Mundua nork, nola eta zer-nolako inplikazio sozial, ekonomiko eta ekologikorekin elikatuko duen izango da eztabaidagaia

2017ko apirilaren 24 / 26. Europa Biltzar Jauregia. Vitoria-Gasteiz. Araba. Euskal Herria. Europa.

International Colloquium

THE FUTURE OF FOOD AND CHALLENGES FOR AGRICULTURE IN THE 21st CENTURY:

Debates about who, how and with what social, economic and ecological implications we will feed the world.

April 24th - 26th. Europa Congress Palace. Vitoria Gasteiz. Álava. Basque Country/Europe

Coloquio Internacional

EL FUTURO DE LA ALIMENTACIÓN Y RETOS DE LA AGRICULTURA PARA EL SIGLO XXI:

Debates sobre quién, cómo y con qué implicaciones sociales, económicas y ecológicas alimentará el mundo.

24 / 26 de Abril, 2017. Palacio de Congresos Europa. Vitoria-Gasteiz. Álava. País Vasco. Europa.

GUNTZAILEAK/COLABORAN/COLLABORATING ORGANIZATIONS



LAGUNTZA EKONOMIKOA/APOYAN/WITH SUPPORT FROM

