Pierre Gasselin · Sylvie Lardon · Claire Cerdan ·
Salma Loudiyi · Denis Sautier
Editors

Coexistence and Confrontation of Agricultural and Food Models

A New Paradigm of Territorial Development?

Foreword by Jan Douwe van der Ploeg
With the Editorial Support of Sylvie Zasser

éditions Quæ
Éditions Cirad, Ifremer, INRAE
www.quae.com

Springer

Editors
Pierre Gasselin
UMR Innovation
INRAE
Montpellier, France

Claire Cerdan
UMR Innovation
CIRAD
Saint Pierre, Réunion, France

Denis Sautier
UMR Innovation
CIRAD
Montpellier, France

Sylvie Lardon
UMR Territoires
INRAE and AgroParisTech
Aubière, France

Salma Loudiyi
UMR Territoires
VetAgro Sup
Lempdes, France

Section Editor
Sylvie Zasser
INRAE
Castanet-Tolosan, France

Translated by
Kim Agrawal
SAICE
Pondicherry, India

ISBN 978-94-024-2177-4 ISBN 978-94-024-2178-1 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-2178-1

Jointly published with Éditions Quæ
Éditions Quæ, RD10, 78026 Versailles cedex, France

Translation from the French language edition: "Coexistence et confrontation des modèles agricoles et alimentaires" by Pierre Gasselin, Sylvie Lardon, Claire Cerdan, Salma Loudiyi, and Denis Sautier,

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature B.V.
The registered company address is: Van Godewijckstraat 30, 3311 GX Dordrecht, The Netherlands

The Challenge of the Territorial Governance of Coexisting Models. Introduction to Part V

Pierre Gasselin, Sylvie Lardon, Claire Cerdan, Salma Loudiyi, and Denis Sautier

The first four parts of this book examine the situations of coexistence and confrontation of agricultural and food models according to the four dimensions of the territorial development analysis framework proposed in the general introduction: diversification/specialisation, innovation, adaptation and transition. This fifth and final part has a threefold ambition of an opening up, a more detached analysis and a conclusion. The first sub-section comprises the contributions of three researchers (Jérémie Forney, Kae Sekine and Gilles Allaire) whom we have invited to present new perspectives on the coexistence and confrontation of agricultural and food models based on their personal work. The second sub-section consists of chapters by Ronan Le Velly and Patrick Caron, whom we warmly thank for agreeing to share their personal and critical reflections on the contents of the entire book. We conclude by examining the title question of the book: Do the coexistence and confrontation of agricultural and food models open the way to a new paradigm of territorial development?

New Perspectives in Switzerland and Japan and in the 'Quality' Economy

The first three chapters of Part V extend the geography of the book's case studies with situations of coexistence in Switzerland and Japan and offer new theoretical perspectives for studying these situations.

In the first chapter, Jérémie Forney (Chap. 15) uses the diversity of forms of dairy production in Switzerland to question the relevance of the usual categories that are defined as models (plains and mountains, industrial and artisanal, conventional and organic, etc.). He emphasises that it is the local, legal and economic conditions that largely determine these models. They are interdependent, and their fates are 'inevitably linked', both in Switzerland and internationally (dependence of part of Swiss milk production on soya imports from Brazil). Furthermore, the dynamics of these models pose real analytical difficulties (e.g. when does one model start and end). Jérémie Forney, therefore, suggests considering models as an assemblage of elements

P. Gasselin et al. (eds.), *Coexistence and Confrontation of Agricultural and Food Models*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-2178-1

(production, processing, distribution, consumption) defined by the interactions that compose it and by its links to other models. In doing so, the boundaries of assemblage are blurred, weakening the notion of hybridisation, on the one hand, and calling for an examination of 'transformative forces' and the inconstancy of the model, on the other.

In the second chapter, Kae Sekine (Chap. 16) reports on the coexistence of contrasting agricultural models in Japan in the context of neoliberalisation of agricultural policies that has led to a decline in agricultural commodity prices and an economic crisis of the family farming model created in the context of post-Second World War land reforms. Kae Sekine examines the coexistence of family farming with, on the one hand, the multinational Dole Food Company, and, on the other, the US and Japanese multinationals involved in the process of reconstruction of the Fukushima region after the March 2011 tsunami. These two case studies reveal the agro-environmental, socio-economic and cultural tensions generated between agricultural models at the territorial level, which result in manifestations of resistance from local actors. Furthermore, there now exists a crisis of legitimacy of neoliberal agricultural policy.

In the third chapter, Gilles Allaire (Chap. 17) examines the notion of coexistence in the light of the 'quality turn' of capitalist development, which has been underway since the 1990s and is marked by the emergence of alternative production systems and value chains. He situates his thinking in regulation theory and analyses the competition (and cooperation) regime that is ensconced in systems of standardisation subject to 'the pressure of a conflicting plurality of visions of the future'. Gilles Allaire reminds us that quality 'is not the property of a thing'; it is instead a contextual judgement rooted in values and, at the same time, an institution based on doctrines (prevailing conceptions at a given moment of what is healthy, what is 'sustainable', etc.) and market standards backed by monitoring and sanctioning mechanisms. By illustrating this movement of qualification (of products, services, etc.), especially in organic farming, Gilles Allaire calls into question the coexistence of political projects. Alternative systems can, on the one hand, become conventionalised and lose their potential for radical change, and, on the other hand, renew themselves 'within the failures of the system'. The quality crisis, based on the questioning of doctrines, requires the mediatisation of criticism in a social movement in which the consumer becomes an actor in the debate (as, for example, in the case of mad cow disease). Gilles Allaire thus offers us a theoretical perspective based on institutional economics centred on quality, which has become 'an issue in the restructuring of activities and markets' and their coexistence.

These three chapters are based on theoretical propositions (assemblage for Jérémie Forney, compatibility/incompatibility between models for Kae Sekine, quality regimes for Gilles Allaire) that broaden and enrich the frameworks for analysing situations of coexistence that have been discussed in this book.

Benefits and Limitations of Models

In addition, these three chapters discuss the benefits as well as the limitations of the agricultural and food model as defined in this book's introduction. Let us remind ourselves here of its three acceptations: the model can be considered as an ideal type, an archetype of an observed reality (analytical representation); as a type of ideal (normative and programmatic representation, whether it be a desired or criticised future); or as a standard for action. This discussion is also a central element of the two chapters by Ronan Le Velly and Patrick Caron. While we do not present a summary of these chapters here, as they already put into perspective the main ideas developed in the book, we will cover a few of their central ideas.

The archetypal model requires the identification of regularities and polarities in the tumult of reality. Without an archetypal model, how can we account for the great diversity of actors' practices, discourses and positions? Our theories lead us to think about heterogeneity according to its various frameworks. To take an example from the field of agricultural studies, different currents of research have endeavoured to identify this heterogeneity, such as sustainable rural livelihoods (Chambers & Conway, 1991; Scoones, 1998; Farrington et al., 1999; Scoones, 2009), comparative agriculture (Mazoyer & Roudart, 1997; Cochet, 2011), farming styles (van der Ploeg, 2010; 2012), 'territorial pacts' (Albaladejo, 2009) and the sociology of agricultural worlds (Hervieu & Purseigle, 2013; 2015). Each of these analytical frameworks sheds light on the diversity of agricultural models with a focus on particular dimensions: labour, technical and economic performance, markets, relationship with nature, territorial integration, historical trajectories, etc. But it is also a matter of choosing scales of analysis and postures in the context of actions taking place. As Patrick Caron reminds us, 'Agreeing to look at diversity means recognising and grasping it, and this exercise in abstraction is closely tied to the intention to act'. Looking beyond this analytical diversity, we argue that the archetypal model should always be grasped in its temporality and its territorial embeddedness, and be confronted by the practical forms observed.

Indeed, several authors in this fifth part underscore the risk of cloistered thinking in terms of models that are likely to blur the complexity, diversity and dynamics of reality. Ronan Le Velly sums up the difficulty well: 'How can we not believe too much in agricultural and food models, but believe in them all the same?' The archetypal model encourages intellectual laziness or, worse, blindness in the belief of a world that is only represented by the model. The desired/criticised-future model, which organised actors use as the standard for their claims and projects, also entails the risk of obscuring the plurality of ideological currents that run through them and the practices that emanate from them. And finally, the standards-based model, such as that of organic farming, is likely to restrict social and technical transformation, hobble innovation and paralyse the capacity to adapt.

As we pointed out in the general introduction, models are often categorised by dual opposition (industrial vs artisanal, conventional vs alternative, modern vs traditional, etc.). This book is no exception to this tendency. This dualism is intrinsic to our

intellectual, political and cultural heritage. We are subject to the dualism of biology (masculine and feminine), of certain religions (God and the devil), of moral conceptions (good and evil), of philosophies (the intelligible and the sensible), of currents of thought (Descartes's body and thought) and of political organisations (the right and the left in the legislature). This dualism, widely discussed since the Renaissance, does not, however, reduce the authors' analysis to a Manichean perspective. Ronan Le Velly agrees: 'The wide range of practices within each model also makes it impossible to continue to support dualistic reasoning'. Indeed, all the authors of this book emphasise the co-evolution and interfaces between these binary models, justifying the imperative necessity of understanding their coexistence and confrontations.

Given the risks of cognitive narrowing associated with a 'rigid-model' thinking, we also believe it is necessary to examine the extent to which the three acceptations of models (archetypes, desired/criticised futures, norms for action) interact closely, draw from each other, hybridise and even overlap. The actors who define a model as an ideal to be followed are strongly inspired by the analytical ideal types, and, for their part, the researchers produce archetypes inspired by the models under debate in society. This book invites us to explore more in depth this coexistence between analytical and normative models. Patrick Caron also shows that coexistence itself can be considered in its analytical dimension (taking note of reality) or in its normative dimension, noting that 'coexistence would be preferable to uniformity. In any case, it implies being able to exist in the first instance'. However, Gilles Allaire warns us: 'We are thus moving from the coexistence of normative goals in confrontation to a normative goal of coexistence'.

The Challenge of the Territorial Governance of Coexistence

Coexistence can also be a project, or rather a gamble, as Patrick Caron writes, to intentionally manage diversity and organise mediation. It is a gamble, but also a challenge. In economics, the notion of governance has its roots in the work of 'institutionalists' on the corporate world and corporate governance (Coase, 2007 [1937]). It was subsequently adopted in the field of urban governance and then by the international financial institutions, which defined 'good governance'. Governance has thus moved from the corporate level to the political field and its regulation and is now applied to nations, markets and territories (Gasselin, 2013). It presupposes the putting in place of adequate monitoring and sanctioning mechanisms (Foucault, 1975).

Applied to a territory, governance can be conceived as a process and instruments that together enable the maintenance or re-establishment of a cohesive collective and political action at the local level (Leloup et al., 2005; Lardon et al., 2008). Territorial governance brings together the processes, mechanisms and tools for coordinating various actors, social groups and institutions to achieve goals that have been collectively discussed and defined, including forms of public action. Patrick Caron prefers more voluntarist and explicit terms of management and mediation to that of governance. He also emphasises that this 'construction […] presupposes that the terms of

the confrontation between the elements present are clearly explained, whether they be actors, forms of organisation, actions, etc., and, in particular, of what may be controversial. […] As coexistence is not self-evident, it is necessary to clarify the positions of each party and to establish or re-establish the conditions for dialogue between them, and to identify the obstacles that need to be overcome'. Looking beyond the nuances of the polysemous and controversial concept of governance (Torre & Chia, 2017), we note that the governance of the coexistence of agricultural and food models in a territory is therefore also that of their confrontation, or even their hybridisation, in order that new forms of organisation adapted to territorial development issues can be developed.

Without claiming to provide a recipe for the governance of coexistence, we return in the last chapter to the question in this book's title, identify three epistemological positions of the authors and summarise the approach that we propose for further research on this front. We hope that this proposal will be widely debated and thus enriched.

References

Albaladejo, C. (2009). Médiations territoriales locales et développement rural: Vers de nouvelles compétences d'accompagnement de l'activité agricole. Les agricultures familiales dans les transformations territoriales en Argentine, au Brésil et en France (p. 304). Accreditation to supervise research (HDR), University of Toulouse, Toulouse.

Chambers, R., & Conway, G. (1991). Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st century (p. 33). IDS Discussion Paper, 296.

Coase, R. H. (2007 [1937]). The nature of the firm. *Economica*, *4*(16), 386–405.

Cochet, H. (2011). L'agriculture compare (p. 160). coll. Indisciplines, éditions Quæ.

Farrington, J., Carney, D., Ashley, C., & Turton, C. (1999). Sustainable livelihood in practice: Early applications of concepts in rural areas. *ODI Natural Resources Perspectives*, (42), 15 p.

Foucault, M. (1975). *Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la prison*, (p. 360). Gallimard.

Gasselin, P. (2013). Gouvernance foncière et dynamiques territoriales, dans une perspective de sécurité alimentaire. In *Séminaire GloFoodS, travaux préparatoires du métaprogramme Inra « Étude des transitions pour la sécurité alimentaire mondiale »*, 12 and 13 February 2013, Serris, France, 10.

Hervieu, B., & Purseigle, F. (2013). *Sociologie des mondes agricoles* (p. 320). Armand Colin.

Hervieu, B., & Purseigle, F. (2015). The sociology of agricultural worlds: From a sociology of change to a sociology of coexistence. *Review of Agricultural and Environmental Studies*, *96*(1), 59–90.

Lardon, S., Tonneau, J.-P., Raymond, R., Chia, E., & Caron, P. (2008). Dispositifs de gouvernance territoriale durable en agriculture. Analyse de trois situations en France et au Brésil. *Norois*, *2008/4*(209), 17–36.

Leloup, F., Moyart, L., & Pecqueur, B. (2005). La gouvernance territoriale comme nouveau mode de coordination territoriale? *Géographie, économie, société*, *7*(4), 321–332.

Mazoyer, M., & Roudart, L. (1997). *Histoire des agricultures du monde: Du néolithique à la crise contemporaine* (p. 505). Éditions du Seuil.

Scoones, I. (1998). Sustainable rural livelihoods: A framework for analysis, (p. 22). Working Paper 72, Institute for Development Studies, Brighton.

Scoones, I. (2009). Livelihoods perspectives and rural development. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, *36*(1), 171–196.

Torre, A., & Chia, E. (2017). Nouvelles controverses du développement territorial: Quelle gouvernance et quelles innovations? *Canadian Journal of Regional Science/Revue canadienne des sciences régionales*, *40*(2), 91–102.

van der Ploeg, J. D. (2010). Farming styles research: The state of the art. In *Keynote lecture for the Workshop on "Historicising Farming Styles"*, Melk, Austria, 21–23.

van der Ploeg, J. D. (2012). The genesis and further unfolding of farming styles research. *Historische Anthropologie*, *20*(3), 427–439.