

Torre A., Traversac J.B. (eds), 2011, *Territorial Governance. Local Development, Rural Areas and Agrofood Systems*, Springer Verlag, Heidelberg & N. York.

Introduction

André TORRE & Jean-Baptiste TRAVERSAC

UMR Sadapt, INRA & Agro ParisTech

torre@agroparistech.fr

traversac@agroparistech.fr

As custodians of tradition, entrusted with the mission of ensuring the continuing survival of memorial areas and the permanence of social and productive relations, rural areas and farming activities occupy a special place in the imaginations of nations. Nevertheless, rural specialists have long stressed that the changes that affect contemporary economies and societies also run through these spaces and contribute to their evolution, sometimes in a radical way (Cloke *et al.* 2006, van der Ploeg *et al.*, 2000).

The transformation of farming methods, the mutations in the agrifood industries and their links with distribution, the demographic repopulation of rural areas and the new activities taking place there, the demand for nature and protected areas, the increasing role played by agricultural activities in sustainable development: these are all changes the reality of which nobody today disputes. The socio-economic upheavals in rural zones and changes in people's conception of the countryside and of nature are a subject of consensus for sociologists and economists, as well as for specialists in town and country planning. All agree on the need to reconsider the place of rural areas, to rethink their dynamics and to ponder their metamorphoses, their future and the role they play in contemporary society.

But these changes are also a source of contradictions. The vision of "new rural territories" is a result of the desire expressed by an increasing number of consumers, often from urban areas, anxious about environmental issues, to preserve natural areas. But at the same time, this fantasy of a countryside made up of open spaces echoes other preoccupations of the self-same actors. They want to consume authentic food products, products from "good" farming practices with sustainability as a vocation. And there is also a wish to develop the use of rural areas for leisure activities: not so much to produce anything in these places, more to create a space for residential, recreational or tourism purposes.

These opposing Manichean visions do not stand up to deeper analysis. Rural areas are no more homogeneous than the populations that live there; both are subject to major changes, tensions and diverse and often contradictory evolutionary processes (Perrier-Cornet, 2002). The processes of development depend on a complex assemblage of planning projects introduced by local decision makers and local authorities, as well as the actions of various groups of private participants or associations, not to mention the projects of the populations living there, visiting or adopting them as reference areas. And they further involve remote participants and rules and laws from the national and international spheres. The resulting effects: agglomeration on the one hand, centrifugal forces on the other hand, combine and sometimes clash. The need for governance of these territories is then clearly felt within spaces that have been fragmented by divergent motivations and usages, and in rural and peri-urban areas wrought by power struggles for public and economic management of natural, productive and landscaped infrastructures.

Rural areas today, places of profound changes

In all the industrialised countries, and particularly in Europe, rural areas have shared the same evolutionary tendencies since the Second World War. They first of all find themselves increasingly dependent on urban areas, with a process of peri-urbanisation (urban sprawl) and linking with neighbouring towns, and by a greater and greater submission to decisions taken by urban populations, including those far from rural zones, whether it be tourists, migrants or consumers of agricultural spaces and products. Furthermore, the rural areas are themselves becoming more and more urbanised, as we can see from the increase in small towns, and the diffuse process of urbanisation that is affecting many areas still classified as rural. Two striking results emerge: a downward trend in their traditional productive roles – as revealed by losses in value and in employment in the primary sector, and the increasing assignment of rural areas to housing and recreation.

Rural areas, in the heart of the driving development in industrialised countries

Despite a strong tendency toward the urbanisation of areas, strong migratory flows toward towns and a reallocation of non-agricultural uses tending to transform rural areas into urban-style developed areas, the countryside is holding a predominant place in terms of the occupation of space in industrialised countries,

particularly within the European Union¹². Rural areas, defined as the sum of predominantly rural regions (here after PR) and intermediate regions (IR), today occupy 91% of the surface area of the Union of 27 and hold more than half the population (EC, 2009). The position of the countryside is strong in all the member-states and all the regions – even without taking into account the figures for the 12 new members from the East, with their accentuated rural character – though comparison between member-states does show large divergences. Some countries are highly urban (Belgium, the Netherlands, Malta, where more than half of the population lives in a predominantly urban region - PU), while others are mainly rural (Cyprus, Luxemburg, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Estonia, where more than half the population live in mainly rural areas – PR + IR) (EU, 2009).

What are rural areas as defined by the European Community?

The definition of rural depends on a unit of measurement of the area and how it is made up. European Commission reports on the evolution of rural areas take the OECD definition for defining rural areas, viz. the population density of the smallest spatial units, the rural communes, taking the region as a scale of statistical aggregation (e.g. NUTS3 or NUTS2) (OECD, 1994) (OECD, 2005).

- Predominantly rural region - PR: if more than 50% of the population live in rural communes, defined as having fewer than 150 inhabitants per km²
- Intermediate region - IR: where 15% to 50% of the population lives in rural communes. If there is an urban centre of more than 200 000 inhabitants representing more than 25% of the regional population in a predominantly rural region it is reclassified as an intermediate region
- predominantly urban region - PU: where less than 15% of the population lives in a rural communes. If there is an urban centre of more than 500 000 inhabitants representing more than 25% of the population of the region in an intermediate zone, it is reclassified as a predominantly urban region

In demographic terms the main characteristic of rural zones is the low population density: 41 inhab/km² on average in predominantly rural regions against 561 inhab/km² in predominantly urban regions. For rural regions, large divergences exist, from 10 to 12 inhab/ km² on average in predominantly rural regions in

¹ The Corinne Land Cover base shows up profound changes in the land usage in Europe. between 1990 and 2000, 2.8% of areas changed usage with a substantial increase of urban zones, up to 10% in some regions.
(<http://terrestrial.eionet.eu.int/CLC2000/docs/publications/corinescreen.pdf>).

² As an example, France has lost on average 52600 ha/year of agricultural land over the last 50 years (INSEE 2008).

Finland and Sweden against 83 to 185 inhab/ km² in PRs in Germany and the Netherlands. There are no great differences in the presence of elderly populations in the PRs compared with the PUs (a deviation in the proportion of over 65s of 0.2 points on average in 2007 and a progression of the order of +1.5% between 2000 and 2007), apart from in certain countries: Greece, Bulgaria, Portugal, Sweden. Moreover, regions that are relatively dynamic demographically have a more marked urban or rural character (EC 2009).

Centrifugal forces are at the origin of the development of rural zones. The low level of migration between urban and rural labour markets, local property tax differentials, land consumption by companies and housing and the cost of moving assets allow expansion in industrial activities. To these factors can be added the differential in the cost of labour in favour of rural regions. Incomes in PRs are lower than in PUs, from 21% to 46% less according to the Member-States, essentially through differences in levels of remuneration and qualifications (Huiban *et al.*, 2004). While finance, real estate, commerce and industry services remain essentially urban, agriculture and food activities together with intermediate goods industries are preferentially implanted in rural areas.

Many rural regions, sometimes under pressure from local residents, are turning deliberately toward recreational and service activities. The growing clusters of inhabitants within small country towns, the ageing of the population and the greater attention given to health care are driving the creation of a large number of personal service activities. At the same time, the attraction of rural areas leads to the creation of many jobs linked to tourist, nature or leisure activities. This is the case in countries where the activities of those who produce and rural development policies are clearly directed towards a diversification in the activities of farmers, as in Great Britain, the Netherlands, Belgium and Denmark.

Nevertheless, there does exist a strong agricultural strategy in a group of countries that may be called the agricultural hub of Europe – France, Spain, Italy and, in a lesser measure, Germany, Poland and Romania, who remain attached to an orthodox way of increasing productivities. This is born out by the choices of agricultural policy made during the budget planning of the second pillar of the CAP. In France the contribution of axis 3 to the diversification of activities is of the order of 8% of the total budget, while in the Netherlands it is 28% and in Romania 25% (EU 2009).

Rural spaces are areas for both living and employment, and provide 55% of jobs in the Union and 27% to 43% of added value. The rate of unemployment is higher on average (8.3% in 2007) than in PUs (7.7%). The difference in incomes is also very large, in whichever state in the Union. For an incomes index of 100 in the Union, the average for PUs is 130 whereas it is only 70 in PRs. There, the tendency is toward an increase in the proportion of industrial employment to the detriment of agricultural employment, in particular by the development of tourist and

residential activities. The “mature” zones in the centre of Europe³ are seeing the proportion of turnover of industry and services remaining constant or progressing moderately (from – 1.2% to 1.8%), whereas the peripheral⁴ regions, in a catching-up effect, are increasing at a rate of 2.2% to 3.3% par year. This old trend, which began with a rural exodus to supply labour demand in urban zones, is continuing with a loss of jobs in agriculture, following a strong increase in the productivity of agriculture labour.

The weakening of the preponderant position of agricultural activity in rural areas

In most countries of the EU, rural areas were for a long time mainly agricultural, despite large variations, for example when comparing the situation of France, under the strong grip of agriculture, with that of the Netherlands or Belgium, where there has historically been a sharing of space with other activities and occupants. The assimilation of rural space to agricultural space, incarnated for example in policies concerning farming activities above all, was primordial. Not only did farming occupy the main part of rural areas and model the landscape and land use, but farmers dominated these areas, whether by activity or decision making, for example in local councils or government of rural zones.

With the end of the Second World War came a strong balancing movement in the industrialised countries, limiting the place and the role of farming, including in rural areas. It was first of all the farming economy that saw profound changes. The quest for productivity increase through heavy investment led to an increase in farmed surfaces, to the setting up of standardised food production and the massive introduction of mechanisation, fertilizers and phytosanitary products with heavy consequences on jobs and the environment. There resulted a dual movement of increasing size of farmed land areas and a steady decline in their number. With the increase in farm work productivity there were fewer and fewer farmers in the countryside. Eventually farming lost its dominant position in the rural world, faced with the rise of new activities such as industry, services and tourism, brought about by changes in tastes and people’s expectations of rural areas.

Various studies have shown that although farming today still plays a structuring role, it no longer has a preponderant role in the growth of developed regions (Shucksmith, *et al.*, 2005) (Rodriguez-Pose, 2004). Its position is continuously weakening while at the same time the farming profession inclines to become transformed under the impact of changes in methods of production induced by agricultural policy orientation and globalisation of markets. In most European regions the

³ Denmark, Germany, Austria, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, France and Portugal.

⁴ Spain, Greece, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Poland, Baltic States, Sweden and Norway.

large drop in agricultural employment has been partially compensated by an increase in rural employment in industry and services. The share of industrial employment – manufacturing employment and industry services – has even increased in rural zones while diminishing in urban centres (EU, 2009).

The primary sector (*i.e.* agriculture, forestry) today contributes a very small proportion to the total added value of the developed economies. Its added value represents less than 5% of the total added value in the PRs of the European Union, while its contribution is now only 3.1% in intermediate regions (EU, 2009). Nevertheless, its contribution to the GDP of the Union of 27 remained 182 billion euros in 2005, of which 145 billion euros came from the Europe of 15, being 0.8% of the total GDP of the Union. To this must be added 213 billion euros from the food and farming industries sector, very unevenly distributed, 191 billion euros being produced by the Union of 15.

The decline in the size of the primary economic sector can be ascribed first of all to the fall of the agricultural sector. From a statistical point of view, the contribution of agriculture to the economy of the Union is still decreasing. The shrinking of the production of value took place at a rate of -1.4% per year in PRs between 2000 and 2005, and was accompanied by a sharp drop in employment. However, farming remains a job-providing sector, representing 15.1% of the total employment in the PRs and 8.2% in IRs in 2005. The shrinking in farming employment is a little less than the diminishing of value, resulting in high structural inertia in the sector, particularly pronounced in New Members States (NMS). Thus, the number of jobs in the primary sector decreased less rapidly than in the secondary sector (-0.9% against -1.8% between 2000 and 2005) (EU, 2009).

Although on the decline in all countries, there are some bastions of farming. In France, Italy and Spain, the agricultural sector contributes more than 25 billion euros to the national GDP, compared with 15 billion euros for Germany and the Ukraine. For these five countries, farming may represent less than 2.5% of the total GDP, but it has for some regions a non-negligible knock-on effect on the secondary and tertiary sectors (Doucet, 2002). For some NMS farming makes a weighty contribution to employment and to GDP, particularly in Bulgaria and in Romania (nearly 30%). For these countries, much more than for the rest of the Union, farming employment is a compensatory variable.

But the mutation in farming is not limited to a lowering of the farm number; it is seen also in the agronomic practices and in the landscape. Gains in productivity and the increasing cost of labour have transformed farming systems. These have become more and more specialised and labour density has become greatly reduced. These transformations have had a considerable impact on rural landscapes: the space given over to permanent meadows have shrunk while farmed fields and large-scale farming have spread. But there are major ecological impacts. The ploughing up of meadows considerably reduces the biodiversity, and soils become

fragile with the application of chemical fertilizers. The disappearance of hedgerows exposes soils to erosion from rain and wind and profoundly modifies agroecosystems, with consequences on their sustainability and human well being.

However, farming activities still play a crucial role in rural areas, as they shape the landscape. Thus today, in a region like Ile de France, the largest industrial and urban region in Europe, farming takes up nearly 60% of the surface. Farming activity remains inescapable, especially in terms of its grip on land, of style, of forms and of the unavoidable landscape dimension that it imposes on areas where it is present.

The importance of the spatial dimension

These social and economic transformations have important effects on the spatial structures and modes of organisation in rural and peri-urban areas, as well as on the actual organisation of districts and the geography of local economies. For they cause mutations that perturb both local regulations and the relations between the rural world and its national and international environment. They lead to large changes at a local level, influencing the emergence of new territories or by playing a part in the recognition of the features of “terroirs” beyond the original area. They also have an impact on the territorial embeddedness of food industries and agricultural enterprises. And lastly, these mutations do not spare the spatial layout of the rural world, influenced by the presence of towns and the increased mobility of people and goods, and by residential development, source of tension and conflict.

The new rural territories

Mutations affect rural areas, and the most striking way in which this can be seen is in the process of creation and/or the appearance of new rural territories, differing from traditional agro-food territories. Claiming the existence of, and rights to, particular territories by certain categories of the population is nothing new in rural regions. We just have to remember that there have always existed localised agro-food production systems characterised by the way they are organised between local people and the outside world, systems that can still be seen in numerous developing countries and designated as Local Agro-Food Systems (Sanz-Canada and Macias-Vazquez, 2005).

⁵ Following on from Bernardy and Debarbieux (2003), we note three major characteristics of the notion of territory: a geographical base, referring to localisation; reference to groups of participants who exert a hold on that geographical area; the methods used for the pursuit of economic, social, political and cultural activities taking place there.

In any case, an awareness of the territorial dimension, which was patent in the surge of literature and public policies in the 90s, has today been joined by the interest of local participants in the heritage, cultural and economic issues impinging on their life-style. There are for example crop areas accredited as organic farming, or places dedicated to tourist services, natural parks with nature protection, ecologically protected zones, wet zones, peri-urban areas with a mixture of urban and rural life. These areas are shaped under the effect of local planning, consumer demands from near or far afield and by the application of public policies.

The current process of constructing new rural territories is based on a stated desire and meeting of minds of local people. It is original, for two reasons. Firstly there is a mass movement which can be accounted for by two factors: a change in the pattern of rural development policies at local and European levels, and the expressed desire of local populations to gather and find their identity around common representation, put into action as part of a collective social edifice managed at a local level. Secondly, people in rural territories are increasingly finding themselves involved in projects that differ widely from the traditional farming and food industries (see the Leader Community Initiative of the Rural development policy 2007-2013 or the policy of the *Pôles d'excellence rurale* – Centres of Rural Excellence – in France). Although zones explicitly devoted to industrial production remain in a minority, numerous projects in rural areas testify to the predominance of leisure and tourism activities, aimed at attracting permanent residents and occasional visitors.

The evolution of the “town-country” relationship and the “renaissance” of rural areas

The last century's disaffection of rural areas has given way today to a renewal of dynamism in the countryside, to the advantage of industrial, residential and leisure activities. Since the 1990s, the deserting of these areas has been succeeded by new planning in which farming is giving way to a diversification of activities. Alongside the repopulating by new residents, rural areas are being seen as attractive, whether because of lower local taxes or of the availability of cheaper labour, especially in non-agricultural sectors. This attractiveness is linked to the movements of people between towns and the countryside (van Leeuwen & Nijkamp 2006), which raises the question of the increase in, and types of, mobility.

The first type of mobility is commuting, with daily trips of town centre workers who live ever more distant peri-urban zones. Rural areas are no longer separate from towns, but are taking on the features of an “intermediate” zone, neither fully urbanised nor completely rural, or sandwiched between urbanised zones (Verwijen & Lehtovuori 1999). The cohabitation of part-time urbanites and rural inhabitants confers more complexity to these areas and raises the question of different expec-

tations about land development and local infrastructures. Schools, swimming pools, cultural centres are at the core of preoccupations and demands of new arrivals, while the older residents see above all a rise in local taxes. In parallel with this is an evolution in the kind of environment people want to live in, from demands for green spaces to a domesticated nature, where trees and open farmland are important to some. For others, these areas must remain reserved for traditional activities such as hunting, where the sharing of space becomes difficult. These divergences in how people envision and wish to make use of nature influence the relationships that the various people in rural and peri-urban zones have with each other, and result in confrontations where each tries to impose his point of view.

Other forms of mobility are of larger scale, whether it concerns tourist visits or leisure, the number of trips having considerably increased in the last few years, while their duration has tended to shorten, favouring both close and distant destinations. Tourists go to rural areas to be in the countryside, where they practise sporting activities (rambling, mountain biking, hunting, fishing) or leisure (lakes, leisure parks etc.), in developments by local authorities or private operators, their relationship with the rural area being strongly influenced by their expectations as city-dwellers. This is the rise of the *residential* economy (Davezies 2002). Many conflicts arise from the way the uses or envisioning of space differ between permanent and temporary users of rural areas. Particularly concerned are conflicts of access, which control whether or not it is possible to enter or cross certain areas, but it can also be issues of biodiversity or the degradation of beauty spots by over-intensive usage.

The last type of mobility is the permanent displacement, being the definitive settling of new residents in country areas where the climate is milder or by the sea. This movement, one of the most striking among recent demographic tendencies (Schmitt *et al.* 1998), is a sign of the progress of the residential economy and the growing role that it is playing outside urban areas. The process of peri-urbanisation, characteristic of the 1970s and 1980s, is thus tending, in certain European regions such as Belgium, Denmark and the Netherlands, to give way to areas characterised by a mixture of housing and open spaces.

With offers of land, a necessary support for the new activities, come conflicts for the control of space, conflicts that take shape around urbanism documents. Other conflicts result from the urbanisation of communal spaces: neighbours' disagreements about the usage of rural spaces; rejection of farm buildings; theft of crops; demands for facilities, and the associated local taxes, which oppose those who want facilities of an "urban" quality and those who find this too expensive.

Territorial de-anchorage and re-anchorage of agricultural production processes

Another consequence of the mutations that affect rural territories resides in changes in the spatial embedding of farms and the food industry. After a period of delocalisation of production and activities, characteristic of the industrialisation and production phase that marked the development of the agro-industrial complex, the pendulum is slowly swinging back, as shown by the re-embedding of farming organisations. Seeking to profit from the emergence of new social schemes in the areas, enterprises and farming operations want once more to invest at a local level.

From the end of the nineteenth century to the period after the Second World War, there was a process of delocalisation of the activities of food production from farms, which had two origins. On the one hand, the pursuit of productivity gains caused an increase in capital requirements and accelerated the integration of farming and the food industry, under the pressure of national and world markets. The stated objectives of cost-effectiveness and profitability led to the setting up of industrial and financial styles of management, which contributed to the linking of farming to other economic sectors, upstream and downstream. On the other hand, the growing influence of distribution, downstream, had important repercussions on commodity chains, which had to adapt to producing bigger amounts of transformed food, especially following a series of concentration of operators, transformers and distributors. These new participants, located outside of rural areas, developed commercially rational procedures that had no relationship to the local character of operations or firms. Production processes of food were standardised, with the aim of removing the link between product and place of origin.

But today these processes are reaching their limits. Serial health crises and the emergence of new problems in public health linked to obesity and the increase in life expectancy have caused changes in consumers' behaviour toward diet, accompanied by a demand for the traceability of products and a renewal of interest for local items (Henneberry and Armbruster, 2004, Tregear, *et al.*, 2007). A substantial proportion of demand is shifting from mass consumption, satisfied by a production strategy of generic food at low prices, toward a demand for variety calling for a segmentation of the supply and a search for quality. This new factor impinges both on the identification of products and on the production processes in the field and in the factories. This being so, we see a territorial re-anchoring of activities and enterprises accompanying new ways of producing.

For consumers looking for products linked to a particular place, the geographical origin is meaningful information, and so the locality-linked reinvestment of enterprise activities operates with identification signs linked to a geographical origin, be these to indicate the origin in a formal and precise way, as with the PGI (Protected Designation of Origin / Protected Geographical Indications) and the French AOC (*Appellation d'Origine Contrôlée*) and, or more vaguely as with

made in, ethnic information or labels associated with religious rites. Producers organize themselves so as to place value on their resources and to transform them within well identified areas. This is the case for SMEs who set up in business in market sectors corresponding to a strongly regional identification, the geographical origin of produce becoming a marketing tool leading them to favour specific geographical production sites (Schamel, 2006). This is also the case for the marketing of local products, which is carried out through local systems of wine roads or flavour roads type, which within a single basket strongly associate local production and environmental characteristics (Getz and Brown, 2006).

Finally, the emergence of issues related to the relationship between local farming and regional rural or urban development is the result of pressure by “local” consumers and farmers. The locavore movements, taken up by distributors when they refer to food-miles, bear witness to the increasing concern about ethical and spatial issues. Organisations such as Community Supported Agriculture (CSO) are a concrete application of solutions put forward by ecologist movements. The proximity of food producers and consumers, advocated by environmental and locavore movements, is beginning to make sense (Higgins and al, 2008).

This general movement of re-embedding cannot, though, be interpreted as a return to the past: it reflects a re-invention of what it is to be local. Political orders and territorial representations are designed through a search for specific images and a refinement of specific resources that are intimately entwined. The locality remains very strongly linked to the exterior through the continual exchanges between it and the outside world:

- to make the best use of local resources, farmers are constrained to develop specific assets. Thus, mastering farmland traceability procedures requires parcels to be defined, which involves investment for the territory qualification, investments composed by information technology together with advanced technical skills. The certification of production processes and the logistic constraints imposed by demand are not possible without ever heavier and more specific technical, financial and human investment;

- but the development of activities and policies in partnerships at an international level, the development of centralised logistics platforms, the control of costs and delivery times are non-negotiable imperatives in the relations with people located in other geographical areas: salad can only be delivered from France to Switzerland if the locations of logistics hubs are taken into account, which in turn affects where the items are produced and where the distributors are localised. Exploiting a regional or local image thus means associating accessibility and locality with modifications to global systems of production and distribution (Watts, et al., 2005).

The rural area and its link with the global world

The mutations affecting the activities of the food and farming industries and rural territories do not only have an impact on the internal life of the regions; they also help to reinforcing the link between the global and the rural, a link that for a long time remained exogenous, or even completely unknown to the players in those areas.

For the self-subsistent farmer in the first half of the twentieth century, exchanging goods in local markets, globalisation remained for a long time an abstract idea, decisions taken elsewhere having only a weak or very indirect impact on his daily existence (Loulidis and Maraveyas, 1997). But things have greatly changed with the evolutions of the last forty years, especially with the introduction of the CAP in its successive mutations. Decisions taken at a national, then a european level, have begun to impose themselves on farmers. They have introduced a burden of constraints in terms of efficiency, first of all on prices and quantities produced, then today by land set-aside injunctions and agro-environmental measures involving the monitoring of production conditions (Lynggaard, 2007). More or less well accepted, these constraints have marked the sustained intrusion of an “elsewhere” into the daily life and strategic decisions of farming enterprises.

To these injunctions and prescriptions have been added the growing effect in the production domain of the requirements and behaviour of private players who may be outside the region, but which bear heavily on the fortunes of the region. This is the case with the increasing role played by industry and mass distribution affecting prices, or the increasing complexity of specifications and partner agreements that seek to respond to the concerns raised by the health crises of the 1990s by associating products with rural areas, symbols of authenticity and quality, and quality-assurance and traceability procedures. Awareness of food-related risks and an increasing reluctance to accept these risks has led to a profusion of traceability procedures for food products (Giraud-Héraud and Soler, 2006). The public authorities and their services have put into place various types of tracking, which initially affected "traditional" production before being extended to industry (Reed, 2009).

An example of how rural areas have come under the power of external forces is the agri-environmental measures in the reform of the CAP in 1992, which introduced a regime of aid to farmers who agreed to use environmentally friendly practices; these measures have an impact not only on how farmers go about their business, but also on relations between farmers and other users of the land, and in a general way on the life of the region and its inhabitants. They prefigure future utilisations, the transforming and marketing of natural and rural spaces.

By having the farmer responsible for the maintenance of the countryside or the heritage, these measures have helped to change the status of the farmer in society

and to bring about face to face relations with other local people. The measures are specialised; first of all because they apply to zones that have been defined in partnership with the various people involved: catchment areas, production zones, wet zones, natural parks. Next, because they are managed at a local level, thereby associating decentralised services of the state, local institutions such as water authorities, and local farmer groups such as producer unions. The territorial dimension arises from this combination of a defined geographical area and a group of participants who try to organise it in terms of objectives decided in concert. Farm operators have discussions to define the methods and procedures that will be used, and also to establish the working rules and the rules for the sharing of profits from their actions. They must also seek local allies, not only among the public sector but also among partners or competitors working in the same area (whether producers or residents).

Dependence on outside intervention of the resident populations in rural areas is particularly noteworthy in the case of the Natura 2000 network. The aim of this scheme is to contribute to preserving bio-diversity within the territory of the European Union, through a survey of birds' natural habitats and the wild flora and fauna. It aims to ensure the protection of sites listed in the "Birds" and "Habitats" directives (1979), without necessarily banning all human activity, with the object of promoting a suitable management system for natural habitats and their wild flora and fauna while respecting economic, social and cultural requirements and special regional and local features. All of the human activities taking place in these zones, whether productive or related to leisure pursuits or residence, are thus bound to these regulations and their limits to activities. The directives for the utilisation of rural areas are thus drawn up outside these areas on a two-fold scale, European and national, sometimes unconnected with the demands of the local users. The inhabitants of rural zones thus find themselves depending on decisions taken outside their area, particularly decisions concerning laws and regulations.

The difficult question of the governance of rural areas

Today the question of the governance of rural and peri-urban areas arises with force, for three main reasons. The first arises from the manifest complexity of the people present in the territories: the relative homogeneity of farming populations is giving way to a mosaic of interested parties, such as suppliers of services or industrial goods, and to new residents, to tourists and visitors. The second reason is the greater and greater involvement of the populations, who want to take part in the decision making processes and in local projects, through various pressure groups such as associations and formal or informal lobbies of suppliers. The third reason stems from levels of governance: to the local (or regional) and national

(federal) echelons is added the European echelon, with its trail of decisions and regulations.

From territorial administration to territorial governance

The notion of governance is rather blurred and ambiguous; Pasquier *et al.* (2007) define it as “a set of rules and styles making possible the conduct of a public action” in a context where society is becoming more and more differentiated (and autonomous) and where there are more and more interested parties. Or the notion is sometimes presented as a government of compromise or as a process of multi-level and multi-polar coordination in a strongly asymmetric context where there are many decision centres.

Following institutional innovations brought about by decentralisation and contractualisation in many countries, the participants have been led to try out new forms of public action and involvement in decision making, passing from a pyramidal or hierarchic organisation, founded on the public institutions, to a network type organisation (Kooiman 2000; Powel 1991) that combines public-private partnerships (Wettenhal 2003) and involves a highly varied group of players (Pierre 2000) and multiple territorial levels (Hooghe & Marks 2001).

Yet government must continue. The tools of governance are therefore aimed at easing the participation of a more and more varied public of parties or of those with interests (public representatives versus private lobbies, political agents versus members of associations) in decision processes that are more and more fragmented and dispersed and at the same time less and less certain. This is the rupture of the government approach to public affairs by hermetic administrative and political devices, and the upsurge of questions of local democracy in the management procedures of people and organisations.

Governance involves the participation of players with heterogeneous preferences in the decision process, people from different groups each with their particular incentives. It becomes a focal point focusing the numerous contributions in coordination, interaction, collective action, empowerment and learning – with a special emphasis on participation and consultation. In some human sciences – institutional economy, political science, sociology, management – discussions may be about a specific object, but much interdisciplinary work revolves around a few key themes: expertise and public action, the general interest, participative governance, property rights, community governance, development, public policies, governance *vis-à-vis* the issue of proximity (Torre & Zuindeau 2009), voluntary schemes, equal access to resources, as borne out by the terms of world, European, urban, or environmental governance, etc.

Thinking in terms of territorial governance refers to concrete objectives in terms of local and rural development:

- favour the setting up of territorial development projects;
- contribute to the design of wide consultation schemes;
- facilitate the coordination of heterogeneous groups of players;
- limit the spatial exit of people with certain profiles;
- avoid sterile confrontations;
- decide on development pathways.

Through this stance there also appears a renewal of the methods whereby a representation or a common project is constructed. It shakes up the schemes to be set up and calls for a reinforcement of the processes of local democracy or deliberative democracy.

The definition of territorial governance then comes down to the territorialisation of standards and the relevance of administrative territories, together with the modes of participation of multiple players in a collective process of decision making or economic development. It leads to a questioning of issues of rural governance (Welch 2002) and sustainable development (Lowe and Ward, 2007) and their application to territories, and to issues of multi-level governance and coordination between territories. Talking about territorial governance comes down to considering them as places for the construction of collective projects, the expressing of global/local relations and the taking into account of sustainable development issues (Rey-Valette & al. 2008).

Elements of territorial governance: the role of the various stakeholders

For a broad view of the governance of territories, we have first to consider the components of public action that contribute to the decision making of local or extra-local public authorities. In particular these include:

- laws, edicts at a national level (civil law, criminal law, rural law, environment law etc.) that apply both to particular territories and to the whole administrative territories (regions, districts, municipalities etc.) of a nation;
- regulations, both from national regulations (concerning safety, labour legislation, discrimination) and from the regulations and directives from the EU, and they apply indifferently in theory in the various States of the EU;
- tools for public, national or decentralised policies at the level of the main European regions: economic policies for industrial development, services, agriculture or energy; social policies concerning work, housing, health, education; territorial development policies, often linked to infrastructure issues and local taxation, a highly sensitive area today;

- financial instruments (national or community aids and transfers, taxes, user contributions) which, by enablement or the setting of limits, contribute to an orientation of policies and projects undertaken by players in the territories.

Governance is becoming multi-level and is increasingly carried out by hybrid mechanisms, partly from above with European and national financing, and partly local. Thus the combination of programmes benefiting from Leader funds associated with local structuring operations, typified in France by the *Pôles d'Excellence Rurale* (Rural Centres of Excellence), is an example of combined endogenous and exogenous contributions (High and Nemes, 2007): the logistical and financial means at national and community levels are based on local resources and the capacity for innovation in the territories. The hybrid approach extends to European regulations, with the recognition of inter-professional systems in some Common Market Organisation (CMO)⁶ or the model of Geographical Indication based on the double intuition of a heavy link between GIs development and rural development and of a strong attention of the consumer for GI (Rangnekar, 2004).

But governance also springs from a more local level, through concrete instruments of local planning. In France for example it is incarnated in urbanism documents determining how areas should be inhabited and developed, in land occupancy Plans and local urbanism Plans, in planning schemes carried out at a regional level and in the various types of zonings resulting from public policy. This means in particular territorial zoning resulting from the many layers of policies and multi-level governance processes (Districts, *Communautés de Communes* (Federations of municipalities) and urban agglomerations, natural parks, wet areas etc.), together with environmental zones (Natura 2000, the Birds acts, Habitats and Znieff Directives, ecological corridors etc.), with their complex exclusions and areas of coverage and involvement.

Lastly there should be added the role played by the various categories of territorial, private or semi-public actors and by associations (Jordan & al. 2005 ; Berger 2003). This is a question of participative democracy and the involvement of numerous local actors in decision processes that is no longer being left in the hands of the representatives of the Public Authorities alone. These actors wish to carry out development projects complementary to, or opposing the Public Authorities; they wish to be part of decision making bodies and to dispose of the resulting means (pour moyens conséquents ?) for their own projects. They especially manifest themselves between elections on the principle that the power delegated to the elected representatives is insufficient to give them and their administrations a uni-

⁶ cf. EC Regulation 1493-1999 on the Common Organisation of the vine-growing and wine-producing Market of 17 May 1999 ; CE Regulation 2002-1996 on the Common Organisation of the Fruit and Vegetable Market of 28 October 1996

versal competence and the rationality to respond to all the questions, nor to approach new issues in any relevant way.

In the sphere of production there are the old and strongly embedded lobbies of farmers and agro food industries and networks for innovation and the transfer of technologies and knowledge (Torre 2006). In addition, there are diverse local systems that are the voices of private players: Clusters, Industrial districts, GI unions catchment area management syndicates (pour Syndicats de bassins versants)... Closer to territorial development and the public good is the increasing role played by the Associations, marking the lively presence of citizens in the decision making process and their growing participation at a local level, whether to introduce or to contest projects. There are for example associations for the protection of nature (*e.g.* the RSPB, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, in Great Britain), some of which extend their action to the national level or even beyond, and to residents or neighbourhood associations whose main concerns are local.

The mechanisms of territorial governance

The mechanisms of territorial governance are not completely stabilised, though they have in the last few decades given rise to all kinds of inventions that have in common the fact that they make it easier to introduce opportunities for the exchange of views (pour Paradigme de la concertation). Political players have generally agreed that allowing various forms of participation by private or semi-public players in debates or in public decision making enables advances to be made in harmonious and democratic territorial governance processes.

Beuret (2006) lists various types of participation as a function of their intensity: communication (transmit a message and obtain the public's adhesion to a proposition), information (advise a group about intentions or decisions made), consultation (collect the opinions of players, without any guarantee that these will be taken into consideration), dialogue (set up horizontal interactions between players on an equal footing), discussion meetings (working to put together elements aimed at a solution) and lastly negotiation (arrival in common at a decision).

Designed to facilitate the making and adopting of public decisions, the set of processes, with its arsenal of tools for participating and informing, is today causing procedures to become quite heavy and provokes contrasting reactions from people, who tend sometimes to react to and strongly oppose public projects, especially involving the building of infrastructures. We are seeing arise of contestation and conflict, directed especially at projects introduced by the public authorities in terms of transport infrastructures (roads, motorways, high speed railway lines etc.), energy (nuclear and conventional power stations, wind farms etc.) and waste (final waste disposal installations, disposal sites etc.). Here arises the problem of

the collective good, since these infrastructures are necessary to the life of the populations, particularly in peri-urban areas, but are at the same time rejected or contested by the latter.

Our research on the conflicts in rural and peri-urban areas shows that this dimension of ensuring the collective good is essential in land development processes or in the management of various local functions; it appears in the form of tribunals, media campaigns, or violent demonstrations. Land use Conflicts are a form of expression of opposition to decisions that leave part of the local population unsatisfied (Darly & Torre, 2010). Some local innovations provoke resistance which can give rise to conflicts. Major changes, which involve reconfiguration of the use of space (introduction of transport or waste treatment infrastructures, new local urbanism plans, territorial or environmental zones) generate conflicts whose spatial and social extent can become very considerable.

Conflicts are thus one way of entering into the discussions on the stakes and ways of territorial development, and of affecting the decisions by involvement in processes from which one had been excluded (Dowding *et al.*, 2000). This is the reason why they bear either on the decisions that have been taken on development (arbitrated negotiation) or on the composition and representativeness of the bodies in charge of the decision (arbitration). The conflict is also an integral part of the process of deliberation at the local level, allowing an expression of local democracy and the re-integration of players who were forgotten or left aside in a previous phase of project design.

Territorial governance is not limited to an idyllic vision of economic and social relations, *i.e.* to forms of cooperation and common constructions (Torre *et al.*, 2006). It is also about interaction between forces promoting cooperation and other forces promoting conflict. The processes of territorial development and their progress over time do not in any case resemble a long and tranquil river. They are made of phases of negotiation, collaboration or appeasement, and of much rougher periods when certain groups or categories of players clash, sometimes violently, in defining the steps to be followed and the options to be adopted. The process of the governance of territories thus has two complementary sides, the reciprocal importance of which varies with periods and situations. It feeds on opposing tendencies, (Glazer & Konrad, 2005), whose reconciliation leads to a definition of path development.

Rural development policies

All of the changes mentioned above plead for the setting up all over the world of new rural policies (Drabenstoff *et al.*, 2004) aimed at the development of these

areas and participation in the process of territorial governance. The development of multi-level rural areas involves various types of player (van der Ploeg *et al.*, 2000) and can adopt different organisational design according to the areas concerned. As noted by Marsden (1998), we can identify different spheres of development according to the categories of rural areas and their development preferences, whether it be large-scale agriculture, quality food products, residential developments or tourist activities.

The OECD (2009a) has shown the change in paradigm between the old rural policies and the new actions undertaken since the 1990s. Instead of policies essentially centred on farming aids and the maintenance of activities there is now an approach that takes into account the variety of activities present in rural areas: new industries, tourist activities, new technology establishments, cultural enterprises etc. At the same time, the principle of top-down hierarchy with regulation and aid coming from the top is being progressively replaced by collective arrangements involving actors both from the state and various interested stakeholders, in the front rank of which are the local public authorities and the associations. And lastly the link between the rural world and urban zones is fore-fronted, to the detriment of an approach targeting remote rural areas or areas cut off from cities.

At a European level, rural development policies are increasingly taking account of the multi-purpose nature of territories and the growing diversity of actors living there (OECD 2009b). Today, they aim to compensate social handicaps, especially the differentials between urban and rural areas in income, education and basic commodity access. The three generations of Leader programmes have since 1991 played a determining role in setting up development procedures in rural areas and contributed to a dissemination of multi-player governance, around three principles: a partnership approach involving the participation of private players alongside public players, a territorial approach favouring the emergence of project territories with the inclusion of municipalities, an integrated and transversal approach around themes reinforcing the strategic capacities of the players, the use of networking and the sharing of experiences favouring territorial openness and experimentation. They have also contributed to developing local engineering enabling the recruitment of development agents able to support local endeavours and put together applications, and have confirmed the operational character of very diverse groups of actors, united in their mutual recognition of their ability to set up a local project. In this respect, these programmes have been recognised as key factors in the restructuring of agriculture and the diversification of rural zones as part of the Lisbon strategy (EC, 2004) for the development of historically disadvantaged zones.

For all this, this diversification of European aid destined for rural areas is not completely uncoupled from the activity of agricultural enterprises, but comes in more and more tightly designed forms, combining the high added value afforded by the addition of services, packaging, delivery and, concomitantly, labour. This is

the case with farm restaurants, mail order sales or vegetable baskets (Pretty *et al.*, 2005). Diversification can also bring more radical transformations to the farm orientation, when it involves maintenance of the landscape and recreational activities, and personal services, which may seem widely different from agricultural basic activities. Along with rural development come the factors of resistance of fragile agriculture and renewal of the food offer (Renting *et al.*, 2003). The privileged places of growth – peri-urban agriculture, protected areas of the natural park type, coastal areas – show to advantage the numerous externalities resulting from these vertically integrated farms.

The principle of subsidiarity applies fully to rural development issues. The political framework is common but the Member States have considerable room for manoeuvre, beginning with the way community directives are transcribed in national regulations, sometimes quite restrictive, denaturing the scope of a text. We cannot really speak of a European rural development policy, but rather of interventions which combine elements of community and national support with local initiatives, the key discretionary features of the CAP. The socio-economic disparities in European rural areas, labour markets, jobs and also social protection and housing measures remain large between states, rendering the assessment of rural development policies a tricky exercise that is at all times contextualised (Guérin, 2008).

The CAP and rural and agricultural policies in question

The European Commission has been proposing adjustments to the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) since 1992. The corrective measures to the “first pillar” (price and market support) have on the whole borne fruit allowing a partial reduction in the main imbalances, especially in the cereal, beef and milk markets. But they have not afforded a solution to the structural problems in agriculture; some sectors are going through an endemic crisis due to great instability in price levels, while the overall cost to budgets is high for UE budget (55 billion euros, *i.e.* 40% of the total), creating tensions between Member States. While there is anger about the leaking of money to beneficiaries for whom it was not intended, first among whom are the owners of primary factors (land owners predominantly), and about a concentration of direct payments to a minority of farms, uncertainty remains on the capacity of those farms who receive the most direct aid to produce public goods (starting with care for the ecological and landscape heritage) to match the level of aid received (Bureau and Lepetit, 2007).

Doubts about the effectiveness of agricultural policies have led to the steering of aid toward direct action in favour of territorial policies through the “second pillar” of the CAP (Midmore *et al.*, 2008), concerning rural development. But the initial objectives have remained unchanged, with three fundamental principles:

produce safety and sufficient food, use natural resources in the best possible agro-ecological way and provide a viable economic base to the populations of rural areas. Now these objectives are not entirely in tune with what society wants. Food safety is still one of the consumer priorities, but in the sense of health concerns, not of the ability to deliver the quantities required. Citizens expect agriculture not to degrade the environment and to take into consideration ethical questions as evidenced by anti-GMO movements and the strong demand for organic food. And with the consolidation of agricultural farms come not only a rise in productivity and in competition, but also a geographical concentration of production with perverse effects as illustrated by pig or poultry farming in Brabant or Brittany.

Agriculture has a poor environmental record. It is a main source of water pollution and of the destruction of biodiversity in soils; its water consumption is accompanied by contamination by nitrates and chemical pesticide residues. The good intentions of reforms have not had very significant effects, often because of lack of follow-up applied by Member States, and transfers of funds to payments more environmentally favourable remain limited. The overall total of funding for the second pillar is relatively low, and only some countries are making the environment a key priority in rural development policies. While for Sweden, Finland and Great Britain it is central to their intervention policy (~ 50% of the budget of the second pillar), Spain, France and Italy only devote 20% of the envelope.

There is no denying that the primary instrument in favour of the environment, the agro-environment measures (AEM), is now beginning to play a significant part in public action toward agriculture. Its principle is to compensate the losses incurred by Good Agricultural Practice, by direct aid to farmers who subscribe for at least five years, complemented by an incentive supplement or by compensation of the costs of private administration. In 2002, the AEMs represented 16% of the European farming budget and 30 million hectares, i.e. 25% of the agricultural production area. Co-financed by the European Community and the member States, they put questions in terms of the governance of territories; most of the players in the Member States have sought a reduction in the influence of ministries and professional agricultural organisations, with the aim of bringing in rural players other than farmers.

Among the schemes for the preservation of the environment, support for organic farming is along similar lines to support for conventional farming, and benefits from special credit facilities. At six million hectares, it only represents 4% of the agricultural land in use in the EU of 25, the share being very different according to the country (from 0.5% in Poland to 11% in Austria) (Abando and Rohner-Thielen, 2007).

But the key scheme in the preservation of the environment must be cross-compliance, on which is based the compensatory CAP aid. In view of the contribution of this support to farming incomes, these measures offer a potential incentive to farmers to fulfil their obligations. But they are subsidiarily, and therefore

very unevenly, applied, and lobbying by producers to reduce the obligations, monitoring and sanctions has up to now diminished their effectiveness. But in any case, in view of the sums involved, it is probably this mechanism that offers the best hope in the future for a change in environmentally bad practices in supported farming.

The purpose of the book is to review recent research on territorial governance in rural areas, with particular emphasis on the role and position of agriculture and activities related to the food industry in these areas.

The first part is devoted to the question of structural trends in productive structures.

Chapter 1, by Aliye Ahu GÜLÜMSER, Tüzin BAYCAN-LEVENT and Peter NIJKAMP, is devoted to a study of rural self-employment in the EU countries, with particular emphasis on the question of rural self-employment in Turkey. The study focuses on self-employment trends in the agricultural sector on the basis of changing motivations and participations of males and females. The data used for comparison and evaluation are based on Eurostat and Turkstat data. The results show that agricultural employment and self-employment exhibit a slight decrease over time and that the impact of this decrease in male and female employment differs among countries. The results also show that the motivation of Turkish women towards self-employment is higher than that of European women and of Turkish men.

Chapter 2, by Marie RAVEYRE, deals with the question of new forms of small industrial business in rural area, especially rural SMI in good health. Two kinds of recommendation are usually advanced to support industrialization in a rural setting: recourse to exogenous factors (establishment of businesses, subcontracting); and promoting the value of endogenous factors, providing the incentive to set up local production systems. Her observations of SMI in a non peri-urban rural setting outline a new way forward. The SMI studied rely on local factors, but are not limited by them – it is the linkage of the local and global scales that gives them their strength. These businesses define the contours of a distinctive type of SMI, characterised by: an entrepreneur profile specific to former urban executives; operating centred on quality and specialisation; flexible working and membership of networks both local and national/international.

The third chapter, by Maryline FILIPPI, Olivier FREY and André TORRE, aims to analyse the modalities followed by agricultural groups seeking to implement a territorial embeddedness process, with a focus on French cooperative groups. The text attempts to clarify issues relating to the significance of this territorial dimension along with cooperative groups' strategies and behaviour. It demonstrates that territorial embeddedness reflects three main criteria, to wit: where the agricultural cooperative runs its operations; where its members are lo-

cated; and where they receive the outputs and services that they are offered. It shows that cooperative groups construct territorial embeddedness on the basis of a joint activation of relationships with their members – but this construction varies depending on the extent of a group's integration into particular branches and markets.

The second part of the work is about the question of Governance of Local Development in Rural Area.

Chapter IV, by Ina HORLINGS, asks the following question: How can processes be stimulated in rural-urban areas that contribute to sustainable development? How can capacity to act be realised? Her hypothesis is: Specific (In)formal networks in the form of vital coalitions between private and public actors can contribute to innovation and sustainability in rural-urban regions. She focuses on the role of bottom-up initiatives like associations, interest groups, business communities, the coalitions they form with public actors and the strategies they follow towards sustainability, based on eight Dutch cases. The theoretical framework is derived from the Urban Regime Theory. The chapter offers insight in the conditions for creating capacity to act and stimulating vital coalitions in regional development processes.

Chapter V, by Aine MACKEN WALSH, is on the question of the governance of rural development and deals in particular with the question of Farmers' Participation in Irish Local Food Movements. It presents an Irish case-study to explore the socio-cultural factors that frame 'conventional' farmers' engagement in 'alternative' local food movements, which have gained prominence within the context of the contemporary rural development agenda. Many of the economic activities in line with the contemporary rural development agenda do not have a mainstream agriculture 'tag'. It is envisaged that the governance approach to rural development, by providing a mechanism for the participation of a variety of local sectoral stakeholders, gives rise to an increased capacity to appraise and tap into nuanced local development resources. Particular forms of economic activity, which concentrate to a large extent on high value-added food production, tourism activities and the valorisation of natural resources have emerged in line with the contemporary rural development agenda and arguably represent a new *status quo* in the rural economy.

The scope of chapter VI, by Eric de NORONHA-VAZ, Teresa de NORONHA-VAZ and Peter NIJKAMP is twofold: addressing a specific problem concerning the effectiveness of the CAP, it develops an extensive empirical and methodological framework able to serve as a model-policy lesson for the rural/agricultural European future. The chapter focuses on the Portuguese Agriculture in the Last Decade and aims to contribute to the understanding of structural land use changes that are occurring in rural environments, by using methodologies related to Geographic Information Systems. The land use change analysis is associated with a

pre-selected set of policy issues and supplies a retrospective view of the application of the CAP for the Portuguese case. The evaluation of the respective impacts from a spatial perspective raises questions such as: 1) What are the trade-offs of rural activity in different sectors and regions? 2) How do such trade-offs cope with urban proximity? and 3) Which activities or strategies are best able to balance the needs of rural and urban communities?

Chapter VII, by Séverine van BOMMEL, Noelle AARTS, Esther TURNOUT, and Niels ROLING is on the issue of Governance and contested land use with an application to the case of the Drentsche Aa, in the Netherlands. It investigates the way in which initiatives aimed at territorial governance work out in practice. By analysing the shift in governance in the Netherlands, it sheds light on what happens when the espoused shift to territorial governance is applied to concrete situations, in which different dilemmas and opposing forces are at play. It shows that territorial governance in the Drentsche Aa area is struggling with tensions between regional multi-actor practices and hierarchical policy practices. The authors conclude that shifts in governance indeed occurred in this area, but that they manifested themselves in practice as hybrids between area based hierarchy and multi actor initiatives. As such the shifts are not as straightforward and unambiguous as sometimes thought and/or aimed for in literature, but instead their manifestation in practice is complex, ambiguous and context dependent.

The third part of the work is devoted to the question of Geographical Indications, especially their role as Tools of the Governance of Agrifood Chains

Chapter VIII, by Claire CERDAN and John WILKINSON presents a review of the principal examples of GIs approved or under negotiation in Brazil. It discusses how the emerging profile of GIs in Brazil has been influenced both by the specific State and Federal legislation adopted in Brazil for GIs and by the institutional structures put into place for GI promotion and recognition. It also situates initiatives around GIs in the context of broader strategies for territorially-based development. Through a comparative analysis of the GIs already approved and those in process of negotiation the paper draws preliminary conclusions with respect to the forms of justification emerging in the Brazilian case, the profile of beneficiaries and initial implications for territorial development strategies. The analysis is conducted within an evolutionary perspective on the institutionalization of GIs in Brazil understood as a collective learning experience, which permits readjustments and even new directions.

Chapter IX, by Jean-Baptiste TRAVERSAC is on the main figures of the governance process in the food industry. From the empirical example of the wine sector it firstly reminds the mainspring of the collective governance process in this sector. The contract analysis of the bilateral relations is able to represent a limited part of the governance and unable to frame the complexity of the monetary and

non monetary exchange between the heterogeneous agents involved in the development of the multiple regional, national and international supply chains. Based on a New Institutional Economics approach, the author develops a framework of the governance of these root based industry, pointed out the vital importance of effective enforcement in the cooperation process.

Chapter X, by Bertil SYLVANDER, Anne ISLA, and Frederic WALLET question the contribution of geographical indications for sustainable development of territories from the development of an analytical framework based on a redefinition of the concept of public good. After outlining the boundaries of the traditional approach of public property as it is conveyed by the neoclassical economic literature, we propose an alternative view from the work of I. Kaul whose hypothesis is that public goods are socially constructed linking the decision, consumption and distribution issues. We then propose to strengthen the operational dimension of this grid by introducing the question of the definition and allocation of rights and the notion of public service principles. Applied to the issue of protection devices and product management in GI, this grid provides ultimately a tool for understanding how GIs contribute to sustainable development of territories through the production of environmental goods, social, economic and cultural goods.

Bibliography

Abando L.L. & E. Rohner-Thielen, 2007, *Different organic farming patterns within EU-25*, Eurostat.

Berger G., 2003, Reflections on governance: power relations and policy making in regional sustainable development. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning*, 5 (3), 219-234.

Beuret J.E., 2006. *La conduite de la concertation. Pour la gestion de l'environnement et la partage des ressources*. L'Harmattan, Paris, 340 p.

Boonstra W. & Frouws J., 2005, Conflicts about water: A case study of contest and power in Dutch rural policy, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 21, 297–312.

Bureau, J.-C., & P. Lepetit, 2007, *What Framework for Agriculture after 2013*. Vol. 62. Etudes et Recherches, Edited by Notre Europe. Paris.

Cloke P., Marsden T., Mooney P.H., 2006, *Handbook of Rural Studies*, Sage London, 489 p.

Clark D., Southern R. & Beer J., 2007. Rural governance, community empowerment and the new institutionalism: a case study of the Isle of Wight? *Journal of rural studies*, 23, 254-266.

Darby S. & A. Torre, 2010, "Land-use conflicts and the sharing of resources between urban and agricultural activities in the Greater Paris Region. Results based

on information provided by the daily regional press". In T. de Noronha Vaz, E. Van Leeuwen et P. Nijkamp (eds), *Towns in a rural world*, London, Ashgate.

Doucet, C., 2002, *Activités viticoles et développement régional (le cas de l'Aquitaine)*, PhD, Université de Bordeaux IV.

Dowding K. John P. Mergoupis T. et Van Vugt M., 2000, Exit, voice and loyalty : Analytic and empirical developments, *European Journal of Political Research*, 37, 469-495.

Drabenstott M., Novack N. & Weiler S., 2004, [New governance for a new rural economy: reinventing public and private institutions: a conference summary](#), *Economic Review*, issue Q IV, 55-70.

EC - European Commission, 2004, *Rural development: the impact of EU research (1998-2004)*, Workshop report, Luxembourg.

EU - European Union, 2007, *Europeans, Agriculture and the Common Agricultural Policy*

EU - European Union, 2009, "Rural Development in the European Union - Statistical and Economic Information." Directorate General for Agriculture and Rural Development.

Getz D. & G. Brown, 2006, "Critical success factors for wine tourism regions: a demand analysis", *Tourism Management* 13(1), 146-158.

Giraud-Héraud E. & L.-G. Soler, 2006, *Retailer's Supply Chain, Product Differentiation and Quality Standards* in Quantifying the AgriFood Supply Chain JH. Wijndands, C. Ondersteijn (eds). Netherland, Springer, pp. 67-83.

Glazer A. & Konrad K.A., (eds), 2005, *Conflict and Governance*, Springer Verlag, 201p.

Guérin, M., 2008, "Evaluation des politiques de développement rural. Quelques éléments d'analyse." *Economie Rurale*, 307. Nov-Dec, 39-52.

Henneberry, S. R., & W. J. Armbruster, 2004, "Emerging Roles for Food Labels: Inform, Protect, Persuade." *Journal of Food Distribution Research*, 34 (3), 62-69

Higgins V., Dibden J. and Cocklin C., 2008 "Building alternative agri-food networks: Certification, embeddedness and agri-environmental governance". *Journal of Rural Studies*, 24:15-27.

High, C., & G. Nemes, 2007, "Social learning in LEADER: Exogeneous, endogeneous and hybrid evaluation in rural development." *Sociologia Ruralis* 47, no. 2, 103-119.

Hooghe L. & Marks G., 2001, *Multi-level Governance and European Integration*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Huiban, J.-P., F. Aubert, & C. Detang-Dessendre, 2004, "Urban versus rural firms: Is there a spatial heterogeneity of labour demand." *Environment and Planning A*, 36, 2033-2045.

Ilbery B. (ed.), 1998, *The geography of rural change*, Longman, London.

Jordan A., Wurzel A.K.W., Zito A., 2005, The rise of 'new' policy instruments in comparative perspective: has governance eclipsed government?, *Political Studies* 53/3, 477-96.

Klijn E-H. & Teisman G.R., 2000, Governing public-private partnerships, in Osborne S.P. (ed.) *Public-private partnerships: theory and practice in international perspective*, London, Routledge.

Kooiman J., 2000, Societal governance: levels, modes, and orders of social-political interaction, in Pierre J. (ed), *Debating Governance. Authority, steering and democracy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Loulidis, L., & N. Maraveyas, 1997, "Farmers and agricultural policy in Greece since the accession to the European Union.", *Sociologia ruralis* vol. 37, 270-286.

Lowe, P., & N. Ward, 2007, "Sustainable rural economies: some lessons from the English experience." *Sustainable development*, 15, vol. 5, 307-317.

Lynggaard, K., 2007, "The institutional construction of a policy field: a discursive institutional perspective on change within the common agricultural policy." *Journal of European Public Policy* vol. 14, 293-312.

Marsden T., 1998, New Rural Territories: Regulating the Differentiated Rural Spaces, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 14 (1), 107-117.

Midmore, P., L. Langstaff, S. Lowman and A.Vaughan, 2008, *Evaluating Pillar 2 Employment Impacts: Case Study Methodology and Results for East Wales*. 12th Congress of the European Association of Agricultural Economics, Ghent.

Noble G. & Jones R., 2006, The role of boundary-spanning managers in the Establishment of public-private partnerships. *Public Administration*, 84, No.4, 891-917.

OECD, 1994. Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development - *Creating rural indicators for shaping territorial policy*, OECD, Paris.

OECD, 2006, Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development - *The New Rural Paradigm: Policies and Governance*, OECD, Paris, 101 p.

OECD. 2009a. Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development - *Region at the glance*, OECD, Paris, 255 p.

OECD. 2009b. Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development – *The role of agriculture and farm household diversification in the rural economy: Evidence and initial policy implications*, OECD, Paris, 144 p.

Pasquier R., Simoulin V., & Weisbein J., 2007. La gouvernance territoriale. Pratiques, discours et théories. *Droit et Société*, vol 44, L.G.D.J. Ed. Paris.

Pierre J., 2000, *Debating Governance. Authority, steering and democracy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Powell W., 1991, Neither Market nor Hierarchy: Network Forms of Organisation. In Thompson G., Frances J., Levacic R. and Mitchell J. (eds), *Markets and Hierarchies and Networks: The Co-ordination of Social Life*, London: Sage.

Pretty, J. N., A.S. Ball, T. Lang and J.L. Morison, 2005, "Farm costs and food miles: An assessment of the full cost of the UK weekly food basket." *Food Policy* 30, 1-19.

Rangnekar, D., 2007, "The Socio-Economics of Geographical Indications - A Review of Empirical Evidence from Europe." Report for the United Nation Conference on Trade and Development.

Reed, M., 2009, "For whom? The governance of organic food and farming in the UK." *Food Policy*, 34, 280-286.

Renting, H., T. K. Marsden, & J. Banks, 2003, "Understanding alternative food networks: exploring the role of short supply chains in rural development", *Environment and Planning A*, 35, 393-411.

Rey-valette H., Lardon S., Chia E., 2008, *Special issue on Governance: Institutional and Learning Plans facilitating the Appropriation of Sustainable Development*, International Journal of Sustainable Development, vol. 11, n° 2-3-4.

Rodriguez-Pose, A., 2004. "Between Development and Social Policies: The Impact of European Structural Fund in Objective 1 Regions." *Regional Studies* 38, no. 1, 97-113.

Sanz-Canada, J., & A. Macias-Vazquez, 2005, "Quality certification, institutions and innovation in local agro-food systems: Protected designations of origin of olive oil in Spain." *Journal of Rural Studies* 21, 4, 475--486.

Schamel, G., 2006, "Geography versus brands in a global wine market." *Agribusiness*, vol. 22, no. 3, 363--374.

Shucksmith, M., K. J. Thomson, and D. Roberts, 2005, *CAP and the Regions - The Territorial Impact of the Common Agricultural Policy*. Cambridge: CABI Publishing.

Torre A., 2006, Collective action, governance structure and organizational trust in localized systems of production. The case of the AOC organization of small producers, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, vol. 18, January, 55-72.

Torre A., Zuideau B., 2009, Proximity economics and environment: assessment and prospects, *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, vol. 52, n°1, 1-24.

Torre A., Aznar O., Bonin M., Caron A., Chia E., Galman M., Guérin M., Jeanneaux Ph., Kirat Th., Lefranc Ch., Melot R., Paoli J.C., Salazar M.I., Thinon P., 2006, Conflits et tensions autour des usages de l'espace dans les territoires ruraux et périurbains. Le cas de six zones géographiques françaises, *Revue d'Economie Régionale et Urbaine*, n°4.

Tregear, A., et al., 2007, "Regional foods and rural development: The role of product qualification." *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol. 23, 12-22.

van der Ploeg J.D., Renting H., Brunori G., Knicken K., Mannion J., Marsden T., de Roest K., Sevilla Guzman E. & Ventura F., 2000, Rural Development: from practices and policies towards theory, *Sociologia Ruralis*, 40, 4, 391-408.

van Leeuwen E. & Nijkamp P., 2006, The Urban-Rural Nexus; A Study on Extended Urbanization and the Hinterland, *Studies in Regional Science*, 36, no.2, 283-303.

Verwijnen, J. & Lehtovuori, P. (Eds), 1999, *Creative Cities: Cultural Industries, Urban Development and the Information Society*, Helsinki, UIAH Publications.

Watts, D. C., B. Ilbery, & D. Maye, 2005, "Making reconnections in agro-food geography: alternative systems of food networks." *Progress in Human Geography*, 29, no. 1, 22-40.

Welch R., 2002, Legitimacy of rural local government in the new governance environment, *Journal of rural studies*, 18, 443-459.

Wettenhall R., 2003, The rhetoric and reality of public-private partnerships, *Public Organization Review*, 3, 1, 77-107.

Young D.R., 1976. Consolidation or diversity: choices in the structure of urban governance, *American Economic Review*, 66, 378-385.