Abstract

In the political theoretical debates on animal and environmental ethics, in contrast to wider agricultural policy debates, it seems that the position of the traditional family farm is not considered. The overall tone in these debates is that altering nature for human purposes is not tenable anymore. This article concentrates on the position of the traditional family farm in political theory. By applying the method of virtue ethics I will investigate whether the traditional family farm is morally legitimate. Derived from these debates, I develop a framework of three (representative) farm role models: the sustainable farmer, the steward farmer, the organic & ecological farmer. Additionally, these theoretical role models are collated with empirical reality through the method of interviewing. The development of this framework is highly relevant to study and to evaluate the role of the contemporary family farmer in order to properly justify the case of European farm support.
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Introduction

Context – European Union – Family Farming

The European farmer and his practices of animal husbandry and plant cultivation are increasingly questioned and publicly criticized, at least with regard to conventional agricultural practices as for instance practiced in factory farming.

Since the end of World War II agriculture has changed dramatically. Agriculture of the 21st century is characterized by an enormous technological progress, with regard to the productivity of soil (biological-technical progress), as well as the productivity of work (mechanical-technical progress) (REF: Business Ethics Encyclopedia). Due to the application of fertilizers and pesticides, the mechanization and the breeding of efficient and powerful animals as well as cultivation of plants, this enormous progress was facilitated (REF).

European policies even encouraged this agricultural development (massively), primarily aimed at intensification and maximization of production (termed Common Agricultural Policy – CAP) (REF: Alons Article). The European Union (EU) justified these policies by using the discursive power of stabilizing food-supplies (REF: J. Candel 2014, ICPP, Milan). These changes allowed fewer farmers with reduced labour demands to produce the majority of food and fibre.

However, the EU is often criticized for having a (highly) protected market for agricultural products; and therefore distorts competition in developing countries, especially (REF). The EU distorts competition because the surplus production, fuelled by policies, leads to an oversaturated domestic market for food products. These superfluous/redundant food products are sold on the world market for ‘dumping’ prices. Thus, farmers, especially family farmers in so-called developing countries, are not able to compete with these ‘dumping’ prices on their markets. Thus EU policies on food security contribute to the growing inequality between industrial and developing countries. To put it in other words, these policies hinder farmers (in developing countries) of becoming internationally competitive (REF).

For, especially European citizens, the EU policies favouring agricultural production have had positive effects. Many risks associated with farming (food prices and weather conditions) have been reduced, as well as agricultural products (of high quality) have been sold at favourable prices. (Übergang zu Factory Farming)

Nevertheless through the focus on maximization of agricultural output by EU policies, primarily produced by factory farming, leads to serious environmental problems. Thus concomitantly the
ability of future generations to produce food is threatened (source Paul Thompson Encyclopedia of Business Ethics and Society, p. 55). If factory farming merely follows the single-minded and rather short-termed pursuit of profit by setting up market-oriented mass production of agricultural products, it may lead to the suffering of millions of (invisible) animals, upset of ecological balances through insensitive pest control, and the creation of boring mono-cultural landscapes (Dobson, 2007, p. xx).

However not all European farmers are considered factory farmers (FAO, 2013). There is another more traditional form of farming, namely family farming. Actually xx% of EU farmers are considered family farmers (REF). Family farming is, in many respects more sustainable and sound compared to the practices of factory farmers (FAO, 2013). It is not only about producing food, it is also about the attitude of people and their relation to land and animals. Family farming, (other than) factory farming, binds people to the natural processes of the Earth and creates a sense of harmony with its environment (Dobson, 2007, p. 13). The family farm integrates a virtuous lifestyle, and thus provides the most favourable environment and surrounding for the moral development of individuals and their families (FAO, 2013). The definition of family farming I use in the scope of this article is that family farming combines a variety of agricultural practices. Indeed, it is a combination of animal husbandry and plant cultivation. Different animals are kept, as well as different plants are cultivated. This leads to a higher degree of self-sufficiency from external supplies. Animal husbandry and plant cultivation are only exercised to the extent that farmers and their family members are able to cope with and handle the workload, in order to live a flourishing life. However the farming practices of family farmers differ, because they are derived from different historical backgrounds and different value and belief systems. Even though the family farmer's farming practices differ, it is all based on virtues. I state that there are three types of virtue ethical family farmers.

**Three Different Types of Family Farmers**

I classify three different types of family farmers. These are the sustainable, the steward and the organic & ecological farmer. The sustainable farmer is the one who tries to manage all his farming activities as efficiently and effectively as possible, in order to leave 'enough' for his offspring and future generations. His farming approach is a combination of technological advancement with (traditional farming) experience and insights. The steward farmer is the one who acts based upon religious, catholic, values and beliefs. He sees himself as God's steward on earth. He tries to manage and especially to preserve the divine creation including land and animals. In contrast to the sustainable and the steward farmer, the third type of family farming is
the organic & ecological farmer. He acts from an inner belief, that nature in itself is valuable and therefore needs to be preserved; not owing to the benefit for future generation (the sustainable farmer), or owing to the pleasure of God (the steward farmer). I claim here, that all three types of family farmers stick to the same type of virtues, however to different degrees.

**RQ and Outline of the Article**

This is why in the remainder of this article I will focus on answering the question:

*How can a virtue ethical framework of family farmers help to provide a normative basis for a leading/dominant policy paradigm of the CAP, and contribute to foster a more harmonious relation between society and nature?*

An answer to this question helps the European Union, national governments and local authorities to better grasp the societal relevance, function and situation of family farmers, in general. The insights gained from my political theoretical exercise, offer a normative fundament for favouring public policies addressing the (vital) institution of family farming, and additionally lead to reviewing public policies promoting factory farming.

The political theoretical exercise I am conducting in the scope of this article is two-fold. First, I will present the three types of family farmers, in more detail. I will explain the virtues associated with the three farmer role models, and summarize it by presenting my virtue ethical framework. Second, I will link the three different types of family farmers to the three dominant policy paradigms of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). I will compare them, and state similarities and differences, followed by a presentation and discussion of my findings.

**General Notes**

In the following parts, the word ‘farmer’ will be used interchangeably with ‘family farmer’, unless specifically stated otherwise. I particularly concentrate on farming practices and policies in the European Union. Further, I will announce here for all feminists among us, that when I say farmer, I mean female as well as male farmer, equally. However, I will use the male from now on, because it will simplify reading.

**Main Part**

In the main part of this article, I will first concentrate on the different farmer role models which are the sustainable, the steward and the organic & ecological one. I will briefly explain the
political theoretical notion of virtue ethics, before I go on with associating different degrees of virtues to the three farmer role models. Second, I will briefly introduce the three policy paradigms dominant in the EU. Finally, I will compare the three farmer role models with the three policy paradigms, and state similarities and differences.

1. Virtue Ethics

General Overview

In this section I will describe the political theoretical debate on virtue ethics and its most important contributors. I will especially emphasize Martha Nussbaum and her capability approach. It is important to familiarize the reader with the concept of virtue ethics because it is the only political theoretical approach which offers a possible solution for the farmer in his current situation. His current situation can be described, as to handle the ever growing public criticism concerning his practices, and the institution of a farmer in general. A virtue ethical approach helps me to assign and to evaluate the virtues associated with contemporary farming practices.

There are three strands of thoughts in normative ethics in political theory, which are deontology, consequentialism and virtue ethics. Virtue ethics initially emphasized the virtues or moral character, in contrast to the approach of deontology, which emphasizes duties or rules, or consequentialism, which emphasizes the consequences of an action (Hursthouse, 2013). A virtue ethicist would give moral advice similar to ‘act as a virtuous person would act in your situation’ (Hursthouse 2013, p. 168).

The founding fathers of virtue ethics are Plato and especially Aristotle. Most virtue ethics take their inspiration from Aristotle (Athanassoulis, 2000).

A virtuous person in Aristotelian terms is someone who has an excellent character, or better to say, disposition. A virtuous person, in contrast to the ideal person of consequentialism or deontology, is excellent in many situations over a whole lifespan, not because we want to maximize utility or gain favours (consequentialism) or (simply) to do our duty (deontology), but because it is our genuine and inner disposition. Behaving excellently in the virtue ethical context means to use our own moral, intellectual and physical skills appropriately in (all) situations and circumstances (Hursthouse, 2013). Theories of virtue do not aim to identify universal principles, yet they deal with broader questions, which are rather context-dependent: ‘How should I live?’
and ‘What is the good life?’. Living virtuously is the attempt to find a morally correct answer to these questions, as well as to find the balance for our own attempt to live virtuously. It is about the proper and appropriate behaviour in any kind of context and in any kind of situation (Hursthouse, 2013). It is about finding the ‘right’ benchmark in any kind of context and in any kind of situation (Hursthouse, 2013). The ultimate benchmark of a virtuous life is nature. Therefore living virtuously is living in harmony with nature in any kind of context but also in any kind of situation.

Virtue ethics has been regarded as the dominant approach in Western moral philosophy until the Enlightenment. During the nineteenth century it virtually disappeared from the scene, because the deontological approach of Kant (Germany) and Hume (England) became very popular. During that time, the standard of nature was translated to ‘sein & sollen’ and respectively to ‘is & ought to’. However, the problem with their approach was (and still is) that nothing can be construed and derived from nature. Nature cannot be the universal guideline, because it does not explicitly tell us how to appropriately act in certain situations. Nevertheless, with the political theoretical approach of virtue ethics, the (individual) situation is examined and on that basis it is determined how to appropriately act and behave. In the 1950s it regained popularity, especially in Anglo-American philosophy (Hursthouse, 2013). In the famous article of Gertrude E.M. Anscombe ‘Modern Moral Philosophy’ (Anscombe, 1958) virtue ethics experienced its revival. In this article, Anscombe expressed her dissatisfaction with consequentialism and deontology, because neither of them was able, at least at that time, to address virtues themselves, such as having moral character, moral education, moral wisdom or discernment. Most importantly, they were not able to find an answer to the fundamental questions of ‘What sort of a person should I be?’ and ‘How should we live?’.

The Capability Approach

More recently, Martha Nussbaum (at the end of the 1980s, beginning of the 1990s) introduced the capability approach, which has its roots in virtue ethics. I stand still at her capability approach, because I consider it to be relevant for the (proper) development of the farmers’ virtues, which I will present in the next section. The basic idea of and Nussbaum’s capability approach is that the conception of human beings is a life that contains ‘truly human functioning’ (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 74). The capabilities approach is centred on the protection of human dignity by supporting and enabling the use of certain capabilities which are needed to perform essential
functions that make a life worth living (Amartya and Nussbaum, 1993). The capabilities approach initially served as an amendment to John Rawls deontological *Theory of Justice* however it is now regarded as an proper theory in itself.

The capability approach consists of *functionings* and *capabilities*. *Functionings* and *capabilities* in themselves can be used as explanations of social phenomena (for instance assessing the quality of life) (Robeyns, 2011). *Capabilities* are a person’s real freedoms, or opportunities to achieve *functionings* (Robeyns, 2011). Nussbaum is in line with the Kantian tradition, that each and every person should pursue *capabilities*, and these should not be regarded as a mere tool of the ends of others but as an end in themselves (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 70). The capability approach concentrates on the ends, rather than the means, because people differ in their ability to convert means into valuable opportunities (*capabilities*) or outcomes (*functionings*) (Sen 1992, pp. 26–28, pp. 36–38). People need to be empowered to achieve their ends by having all the same capacities or powers to convert those means into equal capability sets.

Summarizing, this is why *capabilities* are not understood as instrumental to a life with human dignity: they are understood, instead as ways of realizing a life with human dignity, in the different areas of life with which human beings typically engage. The guiding notion is not that of dignity itself, as if that could be separated from capabilities to live a life, but rather, that of a life with, or worthy of, human dignity, where that life is constituted, at least in part , by having the capabilities, on the list (see endnotes). In this way they right and the good seem thoroughly intertwined (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 162).

### 2.3 Farmer Role Models

**History & Virtues**

After the brief outline of the political theoretical debate on virtue ethics, this section is devoted to the description of the different farmer role-models and their associated virtues, which originate from the political theoretical debates on environmental, animal and agricultural ethics. I developed a virtue ethical framework. This framework allows distinguishing between the different farmer role models based on their associated virtues. These role models are the sustainable, the steward and the organic & ecological farmer.
I will start with the description of the role model of the sustainable farmer. First the farmer’s relationship with animals will be elaborated on. In the following section his relationship with the environment will be explained. This structure applies to all farmer role-models listed below.

He, the sustainable farmer, cares for animals, and can therefore be categorized as an animal welfarist in the broadest sense. However his sense for animal welfare should be considered in the context that his care for animals is limited to the production of qualitative meat. His premise is to produce meat from animals which live under reasonable conditions. He is of the opinion that animals, which live under reasonable conditions, in order to ultimately get high-quality meat (REF – animal ethics).

His relationship with the environment can be described in similar terms. The sustainable farmer is concerned about the environment in a rather anthropocentric way. He makes use of the environment in a mere instrumental way by managing his natural resources as effectively and efficiently as possible (REF – environmental ethics).

Sustainability, in both respects, should be regarded as effective and efficient management of the (natural and animal) resources available.

The concept for the steward farmer is derived from religious, catholic, thought. He should be regarded as steward of God on earth, in order to ensure good management of the divine resources.

Animals are seen from the perspective of the steward farmer also in this regard, as part of God’s creation. Humans ‘benefit’ from animals. However the steward farmer is also concerned about high standards of animal welfare and holds the belief that all creatures are made in the image of God and therefore deserve proper treatment (REF – animal ethics).

When it comes to the environment, the steward farmer just like the sustainable farmer is also concerned with the environment, but in an anthropocentric sense. Catholicism regards humans as the superior beings on earth, thus can make use of the environment (in the broadest sense) in order to survive and develop (REF – environmental ethics).

The difference between the sustainable and the steward farmer lies mainly in their world view. The sustainable farmer works in an economic manner in order to ensure the future existence of
his descendants and himself, whereas the steward farmer is motivated by his inner belief in the preservation for the divine creation.

In this part I would like to mention that the organic and ecological farmer are theoretically two types of farmers, but in this article is combined to one farmer role model. They are both very similar and differ from each other in a few details only.

I chose to call this role model ecological and organic farmer, because it is difficult to differentiate clearly between organic and ecological farming. In the literature, there is a clear distinction between the two concepts however in reality I claim there is no pure ecological farmer. Ecological farming does not exist, because basically farming implies to make use of animals and/or land, however in the ecological perception there is no room for making use of animals and/or land. One can only make use of it, if a harmonious cooperation between humans, animals and land is possible.

In the ecological perception a harmonious relationship, and here I make use of Dobson’s differentiation between ‘environmentalism’ and ‘ecologism’, is characterized by ‘giving and taking’. ‘Environmentalism’ argues for a managerial approach to environmental problems, secure in the belief that they can be solved without fundamental changes in present values or patterns of production and consumption. ‘Ecologism’ holds that a sustainable and fulfilling existence presupposes radical changes in our relationship with the non-human natural world, and in our mode of social and political life (Dobson, 2007, pp. 2–3).

We, as human beings, have to adapt our (farming) practices to the natural life-cycle, which means effectively, to minimise resource use, to emphasize conservation and recycling, to avoid pollution and waste in order to become sustainable in the sense of self-sufficiency (Dobson, 2007, p. 91) Furthermore I claim that it is nearly impossible to support one’s (farm) family with ecological farming, at least in the 21st century. This is why I introduce an integrated approach of organic & ecological farming. The ecological & organic farmer applies the method of organic farming with an ecological mind-set. That means that this farmer role model strives for a harmonious co-existence with animals and/or land. Yet, at the end of the day, he also has to ensure his family’s and his personal well-being, which means that he has to earn money to make a living from it for his family and himself.
Now, I will give a short overview of the organic & ecological farmer role model, in order to give a first impression.

The organic & ecological farmer is mainly concerned with the natural conservation of the environment. He tries to adapt his farming practices to the natural environment and the rhythm of nature. This stands in stark contrast to the ideas of the sustainable farmer.

Animals are creatures which deserve a species-appropriate husbandry. This is why the organic & ecological farmer tries to establish a natural habitat for his animals. Furthermore, he is concerned with rearing ‘enough’ animals. ‘Enough’ should be understood in the sense that (agricultural) surplus is refused at any time by the organic & ecological farmer. ‘Enough’ signifies to produce enough natural resources in order to survive and develop, not more, not less (REF – animal ethics).

The preservation and conservation of an intact ecosystem is the highest objective for the organic & ecological farmer. Accordingly, he regards the environment in a more ecological way. Even so, he has to ensure his existence after all and that is why he ‘utilises’ the environment, as well. Consequently his principles also ground on an anthropocentrism. He tries to adapt his farming practices to the natural life-cycle and avoids any application of chemical means in order to increase natural growth (REF – environmental ethics).

The main difference with the sustainable and the steward farmer is that the organic & ecological farmer tries to adapt his farming practices to the natural life-cycle, and strives for (continuous) adaptation to the natural environment.

The ideological roots of the sustainable farmer lie in Agrarian romanticism, the steward farmer’s derive partly from Agrarian conservationism, and the organic & ecological farmer’s from Agrarian romanticism, Agrarian conservationism, as well as modern forms of Critical Agrarianism. (Kampmann, 2015, p. 21)

This section needs to be further continued. Here I will explain in more detail my virtue ethical framework of the different farmer role models.
### Theoretical Ranking Farmer's Virtues (Kampmann, 2015, p. 44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtues:</th>
<th>Sustainable Farmer</th>
<th>Steward Farmer</th>
<th>Ecological &amp; Organic Farmer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Life Ethic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Simplicity</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Living acc. to the rhythm of nature</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Sense of Community</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Work Ethic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Entrepreneurial Spirit</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Craftsmanship</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Sense of Property</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Environmental Ethic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Depth of Concern for the Environment</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Animal Ethic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Depth of Concern for Individual Animals</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Societal Surroundings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Societal Reputation</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Societal Status</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Societal Impact</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Theoretical Ranking Farmer’s Virtues*
Comparison Theory vs Practice Farmer's Virtues (Kampmann, 2015, p. 72)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtues:</th>
<th>Sustainable Farmer</th>
<th>Theoretical Assumptions</th>
<th>Steward Farmer</th>
<th>Theoretical Assumptions</th>
<th>Organic &amp; Ecological Farmer</th>
<th>Theoretical Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative:</td>
<td>Mr. Johannes Venne</td>
<td>Ms. Judith van Dijk</td>
<td>Mr. Wilhelm Gerwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Life Ethic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Simplicity</td>
<td>MEDIUM/LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>LOW/MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Living acc. to the rhythm of nature</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Sense of Community</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Work Ethic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Entrepreneurial Spirit</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH/MEDIUM</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Craftsmanship</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW (technical focus)</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOW (technical focus)</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Sense of Property</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Environmental Ethic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Depth of Concern for the Environment</td>
<td>MEDIUM increase of awareness</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH more egalitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Animal Ethic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Depth of Concern for Individual Animals</td>
<td>MEDIUM increase of awareness</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH more egalitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Societal Surroundings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Societal Reputation</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>MEDIUM/LOW</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Societal Status</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Societal Impact</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>MEDIUM</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Comparison Theory vs Practice Farmer's Virtues
3. Policy Paradigms

There are three dominant paradigms in relation to agricultural policy, especially to the CAP: first the ‘dependent agricultural’, second the ‘competitive market’ and third the ‘multifunctional agricultural’ paradigm (Alons and Zwaan, 2015, p. 3).

First, the ‘dependent agricultural’ paradigm represents farming as a unique and hazardous enterprise (REF: Daugbjerg and Swingbank, 2009). Farmers are confronted with unstable natural conditions, as well as the price elasticity of the goods they sell is limited. The price mechanism is therefore considered to be a suboptimal means of achieving an efficient and productive agricultural sector (REF: Alons and Zwaan, 2015, p. 3). The agricultural sector is regarded as the sector contributing to the national goal of providing secure and safe food supply. As x Coleman states, the farmer, particularly, is seen as the institution producing food for the nation (Coleman, 1998). This paradigm was dominant in the EU until the 1980s legitimating a CAP based on instruments as price support and export subsidies.

Second, the ‘multifunctional agricultural’ paradigm, which was rather prominent in the EU during the 1980s and 1990s, emphasises the multiple environmental and social functions of farming for which farmers are not rewarded by the market (REF: Alons and Zwaan, 2015, p. 3). State intervention is therefore considered legitimate, using public money to support the multiple functions or public goods the agricultural sector supplies (REF: Coleman et al., 2004). The MacSharry reform in 1992 was based on a multifunctional discourse. The shift from market intervention to direct income payments as the main instrument of farm support was conducted (REF: Alons and Zwaan, 2015, p. 3).

Third, the ‘competitive market’, or ‘liberal agricultural’ paradigm considers the assumed ‘particularity/specialness’ of the agricultural sector, arguing that it is similar to any other economic sector. Market forces should therefore take precedence over state intervention and be the prime determinant of income and production. To put it in other words, farmers who are not able to compete should not continue farming, and they should insure themselves (meaning insurance coverage) against income losses due to natural disasters beyond their control (Coleman, 1998; Djaubjerg and Swinbank, 2009). This paradigm is especially prominent in the United States (US) and in international organisations such as the World Trade Organisation, as well as the (EU) Commission, which also increasingly uses a more liberal discourse (Alons and Zwaan, 2015, p.3).

Here, I will further make a comparison between the virtues of the three farmer role models with the three dominant European policy paradigms. This section needs to be further revised.
4. Comparison

**Conclusion (Presentation/Summary of Results AND Discussion)**

1. **Summary on actions done in this article**

I developed a virtue ethical framework derived from political theoretical debates (environmental, animal, agricultural and virtue ethics) in order to assess the virtues of contemporary farmers, with regard to closing the normative/ideational gap between farmers and society.

2. **Market Paradigm – Factory Farming not legitimate**

3. **Normative basis for policy paradigms with regard to the CAP is necessary in order to legitimate farmer’s support, as well as to investigate whether we need to choose between current policy paradigms, to revise current policy paradigms, or to start a new one/s.**
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