

UDC: 631:330.567.2:316.42(4)
review paper

Acta Agriculturae Serbica, Vol. X, 19 (2005) 61-77



Globalisation, European Extension And Family Farming Challenge For Sociology

Eric Sabourin

Cirad, France & University of Brasilia, Brazil

Savo Trifunovic

*Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Kraljevo &
Faculty of Agronomy, Cacak, Serbia and Monte Negro*

Abstract: In all European countries, family farm peasant units coexist with small or medium agricultural enterprises. In spite of several modernisation theories announcement, peasant agriculture (partially integrated to non perfect markets) has not disappeared, especially in Eastern Europe countries. By the way, in Eastern Europe, peasant family agriculture is faced to the double challenge of globalisation and UE extension. Smallholders and family farmers will be confronted with rapid change and new forms of competition. Some of them are afraid by the small farmers exclusion process, that western Europe countries have experimented during the 60's and 70's, in a quite more favourable context, in terms of income and job opportunities in other sectors. This paper examines which kind of rural sociology theories, categories and methods can help to analyze these processes and challenge. Is it in terms of resistance, of survival or in terms of mutation of peasant societies? Is there still any place for a new "peasant based" project? On another hand, is there any real issue with the complete evolution of family agriculture to a market integrated firm-like model? What about the new condition of rural life and rural activities? What are the possibilities and the limits of the alliance and links between family farmers and other stakeholders, in order to renew co-ordination mechanisms and to redefine a new place for agriculture in the society? What could be, specifically, the sociological contribution of the notion of multifunctionality of agriculture and rural spaces?

Key words: Globalisation, European Extension, Family Farming, Rural Sociology, Multifuncionalidad.

Introduction

Family farming systems provide most of the world's agricultural production; they supply markets with raw and processed products and have an important role in the natural resource management (Cirad, 2002). In spite of several modernisation theories announcement, peasant forms of agriculture - partially integrated to non perfect markets (Ellis, 1988)- have not disappeared in the southern countries and even in Europe (Scott, 1976; Ellis, 1988, 2000). In Eastern Europe, family farm units coexist with family agricultural small or medium enterprises (Tepitch, 1973, Shanin, 1990). Family farming is innovative and can be found all over the world because of its capacity to adapt to different situations, showing resistance and resilience potential which can be associated to a social capacity of mutation and adaptation (Scott, 1986; Lamarche, 1992). By the way, both in western and in eastern European countries, family agriculture is faced to the challenges of globalisation in a liberalised environment marked by the end of State support and the opening of markets to external competition (Benko & Strohmayr, 1997). Smallholders, peasants and family farmers are being confronted with rapid changing environment as they are increasingly faced to global economy processes and to their local effects: decentralisation, privatisation, economical integration (Sabourin & Trifunovic, 2004).

Which kind of rural sociology theories, categories and methods can help us to analyze these process and challenge? The authors propose three methodological issues to approach such a new European agriculture reality. The first element, due to the context, has to do with the relevant importance of rural population and rural activities in main of European countries, even western ones. These facts call to the second point which is the necessity of an approach in terms of territory or of rural spaces, because of urban-rural *continuum*. Thirdly, it has to do with the question of the social and economical integration link through territory identity. One answer can be found in the sociological contribution to the notion of "multifunctional agriculture", which offers a renewed outlook about the role, the place and the functions of agriculture and rural spaces in the whole society (Aldington, 1998; FAO, 1999).

1. Family farm transformation in Europe: the context

1.1. What about globalisation?

How to characterize the diversified and differentiated aspects and impacts of global processes among the different forms of agriculture in Europe?

Globalization is more or less used as a context or as a pretext to point some legitimate question expressed by farmer's movements or by peasant population. We need to characterize better the processes of globalization (Benko, 1997; 1999) and their impacts on family agriculture in Eastern Europe (Sabourin & Trifunovic, 2004; Trifunovic, 2004) as it was made for western Europe agriculture (Jollivet, 1997).

1.2. Mutation of family farming face to globalization and UE extension

First of all, we must consider which aspects of globalization are involved? Obviously the two main factors are the market global integration and the opening of communication mechanisms (Benko, 1997, 1999). But they diversely affect the different rural regions of Europe, even inside each country. In Western Europe, by the way, the impact of public policies, especially Common Agriculture Policy, can be considered as a part of globalisation process, but also as an important factor able to limit certain effects of globalisation or liberalisation: competition, price instability and volatility, sanitary quality, etc. Several aspects, linked to specific country situation, have to be considered:

The patterns of land/resources access and management are still differentiated: strictly private property regime in UK, mix property regime (private, common and public) in Austria, France Germany and Greece (particularly for forest and mountain areas) (Glauben *et al.*, 2004; Vounouki, 2004). These configurations have to see with the specific history and identity of people and territories, with the attachment to the land and to the place.

Different forms of organisation of family labour and new household configurations still subsist, particularly in France, Ireland, Greece and in Eastern countries (Duggan, 2004; Sabourin *et al.*, 2004, Vounouki, 2004).

Different forms of common management of labour force, of land and of natural resources, or also of material and immaterial redistribution, show the existence of reciprocity relationship. Reciprocity practices produce a number of human values, which are quite hard to measure and to "value", but which are reproduced through these reciprocity economical and social structures (Temple, 1998; Sabourin, 2005). We can observe an updating process of reciprocity practices/structures through new forms of productive organisation: cooperative, association, marketing groups, mutual-help groups, farmer's experimentation group, direct selling or marketing networks (Sabourin, 2000; 2005). Obviously, such evolutions also produce tensions, conflict or contradictions with the capitalist exchange economy extension global process. But, by the fact, between old European Union countries and new Eastern countries the main source of differentiation and inequality is link to the difference of income, due to the difference of public support. In such a context, UE extension can be considered has a limitation to globalization effect for Eastern Europe family and peasant or family forms of agriculture.

1.3. The importance of rural population and activities

In spite of a general slow diminution of rural population, European countries are still marked by rural life and rural spaces. From 1980 to 2005, the average of rural population for nine western countries, has passed from 31% to 24,6% of the total population (table 1). Even if some four countries show very lower proportion: UK & Germany (11%); Belgium and Luxembourg (3%), a quarter of the total population is still living in rural area, and the agriculture active population represents between 2% (UK) and 10% (Greece & Portugal) of the total population (FAO, 2005). If we consider eastern Europe five countries, the proportion of rural

population is higher (42% in 1980; 34,5% in 2005) even if the diminution rate is a little higher than for western countries (7,7% for 6,4%).

Table 1 : Rural/Total Population in some western and eastern European countries
(source: FAO, 2005) = Number of habitants x 1000

Countries	1980 total	rural	%	1995 total	rural	2000 total	rural	2005 total	rural	%
Austria	7 549	2 613	34	8 047	2 752	8 102	2 771	8 120	2 777	34
Belg. + Lux.	10 223	532	5,2	10 542	371	10 686	335	10 824	319	2,9
France	53 880	14396	26,7	58 139	14596	59 296	14339	60 711	14157	23,3
Germany	78 289	13606	17,4	81 661	11028	82 882	10247	82 560	9 516	11,5
Greece	9 643	40 76	42,2	10 454	4 261	10 903	4 351	10 978	4 239	38,6
Netherlands	14 150	5 948	42	15 459	5 906	15 898	5 668	16 300	5 404	33
Portugal	9 766	6 991	71,6	9 916	4 917	10 016	4 704	10 080	4 471	44,3
Spain	37 542	10215	27,2	39 935	9 642	40752	9 674	41 184	9 611	23,3
UK	55 723	6 819	12,2	57 913	6 630	58 907	6 630	59 319	6 552	11
Medium O E			31							24,6
Bulgaria	8 862	3 441	39	8 406	2 762	8 099	2 529	7 763	2 290	29,5
Hungry	10 707	4 618	43	10 214	3 779	10 012	3 606	9 784	3 334	34
Poland	35 574	14962	42	38 595	14938	38 671	14826	38 516	14625	38
Rumania	22 201	11973	54	22 681	10229	22 480	10206	22 228	10074	45,3
Czech Republic	15 260	5 024	33	10 331	2 615	10 269	2 662	10 216	2 602	25,5
Medium E E			42,2							34,5

These figure, even if there is a global and general reduction of the number of active agriculture population, call for a special attention and approach of rural activities, of the place of agriculture and rural areas in the society and, at least, of the relation between urban population and rural population. Territory approach is useful, by the fact, because it considers a “continuum” between rural and urban spaces, rural and urban activities, local and global markets. Obviously, rural sociology have to face a new forms of rural activities, rural way of life and rural transformation, which are not all associated to globalization processes (Jollivet, 1997; Benko, 1999; Trifunovic, 2004).

1.4. Adaptation and diversification processes: the role of public policies

Which conditions, characteristics and mechanisms can explain the diversification of family farmer's activities: multi-activity, acknowledgement of multifunctionality ?

We observe, at the same time, a globalization of standard market for industrial processed products and a diversification of markets, consumption and shopping modes for agriculture production: agro-food processing and the leading of oligopolistic firms in the distribution sector. Associated to this diversification of production and marketing, local and specific innovations processes can be triggered or, on the contrary, inhibited by globalisation. It's the case of identity product (wine, fruits, cheese, etc) but also of old manufactured

products (wool, fish, beef, etc) or also, of specific quality certificated products (regional origin, green, organic, fair trade, etc) (Sabourin & Trifunovic, 2004).

In terms of innovation, public policies for infrastructures and human capital training capacities can explain some of the successes of Western European family farming. But, at least, market & prices protectionism, on one way and the acknowledgement of the multifunctional role of agriculture and rural spaces, on the other way, are also important issues of this process.

There are, obviously some important limits to family farm reproduction in Europe: Agricultural work is too hard and still, comparatively, poorly remunerated. It could be also badly seen and valorised by the local society. Socio-cultural, institutional and market environment are not favourable and not in the same terms, in all the regions. There is still an important part of risk and uncertainty for small autonomous units of production (Callon *et al*, 2001). These elements, probably, can explain the fears or the legitimate question of Poland or Rumania peasants sectors which are mainly dealing with hand labour or animal traction farming systems. By the way, and that is the difference with the first UE countries during the 60's and 70's, now days, there is no so much alternative, speaking of secondary or thirdly sectors job's opportunity (Sabourin *et al*., 2004).

This quick outlook about the evolution of family agriculture in Europe does not pretend to be exhaustive, nor sufficient to characterize the complexity and the diversity of the local and national situations. It just permits us to point some relevant questions for sociological analysis of family farm transformation and trends for future. It also helps us to identify some methodological or theory approaches in order to anticipate the limits of the actual dominant economical and analytic model, and, may be, some issues for future analyses.

We can resume these main points:

1. The unilateral and only model of development of a neo-liberal integration of family farm agriculture to a more and more competitive market, represents a very limited way in term of production (quality and identity crisis), in term of marketing (standardisation and super production), in term of rural life (crisis of job and employment in rural areas) and, obviously in term of preservation and reproduction of finished natural resources. This model is not any more sustainable (Ellis, 2000; PNUD, 2000).

2. Such a model, even if it cans works a certain time, will do it, producing more and more exclusion. Without new opportunities of job in other sectors, it will need every time, more and more assistance and compensatory measures. But, without enough public resource to assure such social assistance, it will ensure the social and identity crisis, which not only touches rural population, but all the European popular and middle classes.

3. By the way, the fact that family farm systems, and locally, peasant farming systems, have been subsisting in Eastern Europe, even in not so favourable conditions (succession of communist and neo-liberal regimes), bring us a part of the answer, in terms of capacities and capabilities of resistance and adaptation, linked to rural labour and rural human values production.

To analyse these hypothesis and their epistemological consequences, we propose to examine three categories of rural sociology approaches and their joint contribution to deep the issues in terms of alternative, not only for rural population and rural spaces, but in order to re-think the place of agriculture and in the society.

2. Three approaches in rural sociology: teaching and limits

2.1. Revisiting the peasant model

Family farming, family agriculture, are they still relevant notions? The notions of family agriculture/farming and peasant agriculture/farming seem no to be well shared or even defined and understood. The scientific accepted common notion would be peasant economy (Tchayanow, Shanin) and peasant societies (Redfield, Wolf, Mendras). But which is the heuristic capacity of this notion in order to analyse any continuity and transformation of peasantry farming system and rural societies?

We see at the same time, interests and limits to characterize and analyze the actual situation of European agriculture using the notions of peasantry, peasant farming, peasant society or even peasant economy.

Peasant terminology seems to be considered as populism - in the sense of Mikhailovsky, (Billington, 1958) - or political ideology category when used in developed Northern countries and not when used in Africa (Chauveau, 1994), Asia or Latin America, where there is, generally, no other qualification. For example, in Latin America, the term "family farming" is only use in Brazil (Lamarche, 1992; Caron & Sabourin, 2001)

Family farmers in most of the developed countries (Australia, New Zealand, USA and Northern Europe) are assimilated to family capitalistic entrepreneurs. So, there is a difficulty to qualify a no completely capitalistic family farm production unit, partially linked to local, regional or international (non perfect) diverse forms of markets (Tepitch, 1973; Ellis, 1988)

Is there a place for a new "peasant based project" in Europe? If we strictly consider the ideal type model build by Mendras (1976, 2000) based on the works of Redfield (1960), Tchayanow (1966) and Wolf (1966), the first answer would be "certainly not !". By the way, this model supposes the existence of a peasant society, as a partial society (in a global society), politically, socially and economically dominated by the elite of this global society.

Peasant society model join five main characteristics (Mendras, 2000):

- relative autonomy of local the collective group from dominant global society that respect this originality;
- household group that structures economic life and social life, letting a few importance to parent relationship;
- economical autonomy oriented to family consumption: exceeding surplus are taken by dominant authority or sold on the market ; family labour is not counted and remunerated;
- relation ship of mutual or inter recognition;

- Mediation ship from “notables” local political and economical elite which assure the political and socio-economical relationship with the global dominant society.

At least, being serious, and without any idealization of a “past” peasant model, where is the progress? Considering the more negative aspects of this “model “ - the political and economical domination of producers - what is the real difference with the dependant situation of European family farmers today : assistencialist dependence from state and UE commission help in western Europe, dependence of communist administration and political organisation before in the ex socialist states, and now dependence of an asymmetric market, dominated by multinational firms, intermediaries, when not mafiosi networks ? The agro-industry integration of certain family farm sectors (pigs, calves, chicken production) represents quite more dependence than peasant system. What about the new “mediators” and go-between?

Obviously, considering the permanence of dependence and exploration do not justify any back to the past. We just try to formulate the hypothesis of a “modern” or actual peasant value and practices base project. Some of these practices are surely link to the quality of the rural life, the quality of the products and their process. Another kind of practices is associated to the inter cognition and proximity relation ship, the relationship between producers and consumers. We defend the thesis that these relationships of reciprocity and redistribution, produces human values such as friendship, trust, responsibility and justice (Temple, 1998, Sabourin, 2005).

These values production or reproduction can still be observed in Europe in three kind of situation:

i) *Share resources management*. It could be the case of mutual help practices and labour cooperative or Cooperative for Common use of Agriculture Machinery, as the CUMA in France (Sabourin, 2005). It is the case of common or public natural resource management in several Europe Mediterranean and European countries: water, forest, graze land, etc (Bourbouze & Rubino, 1992; Sabourin et al, 1995, Sabourin & Coudel, 2004);

ii) *Quality of farm products*: a recent form to update peasant value and practices is link to the need for safety and tasty food products, and to farmers’ efforts in order to assure and to certificate such quality in terms of process, origin, contents guarantee.

iii) *Proximity markets*: one of the consequences of the precedent point is, by the fact, the preoccupation of farmer to control the marketing process, with several initiatives: agri-food short chain, local rural or urban proximity markets places, direct sale, on farm sale, institutional markets, etc.

Such practices led to take in account the diversification processes: not only of farm product and farming systems, but also the diversification of rural activities systems. Behind pluriactivity reality, which is quite developed in Eastern Europe countries (Szurek, 1982, Hadyński, 2001, Duggan, 2004), the public recognition and support to the multifunctionality of agriculture and rural

spaces (FAO, 1999; 2000), has open a new field for public policy and for rural sociology research.

2.2. Interest and limits of the concept of multifunctionality of agriculture

In Europe, recent research programs as “Market and non market functions of agriculture” (Barthelemy, 2002; Goupe Polanyi, 2003; Sabourin 2003, Blandford *et al*, 2003) or Multagri SSA Project (2004) have brought the question of the diverse definitions of multifunctionality and the question of social, economical and political implications of the recognition of multifunctional agriculture (Hinckle & Renting, 2000, Ploeg & Roep, 2000; Losch, 2004).

First of al Multifunctionality is considered as a joint production of commodities and public goods (Brindabran *et al*. 1999). Theis economical definition, even if partial, is quite well recognized.

A second entry would be to consider the multiple impacts and contributions of agriculture/rural areas to society, local community and environment. This theme deals with the contributions of holdings, of a rural territory or of woodlands, which may be positive or negative, and may affect a community, a territory or a society as a whole. Those aspects of multifunctionality are often analysed by some economists and agronomists or agricultural engineers, regarding at issues such as the assessment of the impacts / contributions (on employment, landscape, income, etc.), how to promote farming diversification in agricultural and non- agricultural activities (important issue in Eastern countries like in Poland) (Ploeg, 2001).

A third consideration is link to farmers strategies and practices: multifunctionality, technical change, livelihood systems: “For researchers interested in the analysis of farming choices and decision making processes as research objects, it brings a new paradigm. Multifunctionality leads to the need for new methods to be designed in assessing the way and procedure for farmers to make their decisions by taking into account a wide range of functions, the trade-offs that have to be addressed and the consequences that derive from them. Some researchers are for example interested in knowing to what extent the recognition of multifunctionality (in public policies or in local institutions) has led to a change in farmers’ practices, or again to changes in farming strategies toward multifunctionality” (Multagri Project, 2004)

A fourth enter for multifunctionality has to see with the multiple use of rural space and regional planning: “In Spain or in the Netherland, multifunctionality is interpreted by policy-makers as a policy approach intended to complement the main drive towards agricultural modernisation and competitiveness, providing a basis for redirecting funds to less-favoured areas, or reinforcing the diversification of economic activity, or to promote alternative values of agriculture like the landscape protection” (Multagri project, 2004,).

A five position, important in eastern countries, is to consider multifunctionality as a way toward sustainable agriculture and rural development : Multifunctionality is defined here in as a holistic concept, as a way toward sustainable agriculture and rural development. This entry deals generally with the specific contributions of agriculture to rural development or to sustainable development, like its ability and potential to fulfil new societal goals (the

Netherlands), its contribution to rural employment (Poland), its ability to improve its competitiveness (Poland), its importance for the maintenance of rural population in less favoured areas (Spain), etc.

At least, the diversity of extended European Union agriculture situations, call for diversity of consideration and of application for the notion of multifunctionality (Perraud, 2003).

The risk, which does actually exist in some motions proposed by the OECD concerning multifunctionality and natural resource management, is that environmental measures become uncoupled from agricultural policies (OECD, 2001; Delorme, 2003).

These proposals go towards a financial evaluation of the positive externalities produced by agriculture (Angel, 1988; Weber, 2003). What is at stake here is not the principle of merchandising these services. It is rather the risk of a financial over-bidding and that these services will never more be ensured without retribution. These are rich country measures, associated to the protectionism policy of European agriculture, which allows no way back. The second negative element is that the end of voluntary and free services with mutual help and reciprocity or distribution practices (sharing resources and labor for example) might endanger the perpetuation of human values such as responsibility, justice, equity, which are produced by these structures. That are not only social structures, they are also economic ones, inherited from the reciprocity principles of rural or peasant local societies.

One could imagine modern systems of redistribution and reciprocity, encouraged by public authorities, and which would at the same time leave local actors autonomous and responsible, so as to foster the perpetuation of these human values.

Such structures would appear as real examples for Eastern European countries, much more convincing than the current protectionism and its subsidy blows, disguised or not.

In Eastern countries, it is not the concept of multifunctionality that is enhanced but that of sustainable agriculture and sustainable development (Hadyński, 2001).

This is probably why interactions between collective action of peasants and of civil society and public action, in particular of public research and development services, would be most relevant and efficient at this level.

Such dynamics of public acknowledgement of common resource management is not yet generalized, even though they are increasing in number. However, there exist many cases of public support to collective action dedicated to the production of collective goods (instead of the management of commons) (Ostrom & Ostrom, 1978; Bindabran et al, 1999): information, education, innovation, technical references, etc. This is for example the case of rural extension programs ensured by peasant organizations (rural schools, family schools, union schools) or collective structures for production of innovation through experimental peasant groups or seed banks for participatory selection. Through these structures, peasants or their organizations endorse on local or regional level responsibilities in the general interest, such as research, experimentation, extension, education, freely and generally without any public support.

A simple alternative, in terms of multifunctionality policies, consists in facilitating or ensuring the maintenance and continuance of these collective structures for the general good. This kind of articulation between public action and peasant organizations is yet another example of the positive interface between economic principles based on capitalist exchange and economic principles governed by reciprocity. Such practices are of course ensured by peasants through individual necessity (and sometimes even survival), and at the same time, they depend on social structures and rules of proximity and reciprocity, constructed over time during centuries, and that have undergone several evolutions and adaptations (Sabourin, 2000). Recovering these practices means preserving social and economic structures of reciprocity (mutual help, shared management of resources, etc.) and of redistribution that allow them, as well as the human values which proceed from them (Sabourin & Djama, 2003). Maintaining and reproducing these human values requires that the name, the knowledge and the gestures of the local actors, peasants, fishers and craftsmen be acknowledged. Their social being, their statute and their prestige depend on this. On the contrary, the application of a multifunctional system founded on the individual remuneration of environmental and social services linked to agricultural production leads to a monetary and merchandized system of previously free services. However, this free production of services is what guarantees the production of universal human values (Barthélémy & Nieddu, 2002). Transforming the nature of these practices, free and voluntary, might accelerate their disappearance (particularly if such a remuneration should come to disappear) or simply lead to the dismantling of social and economic structures of reciprocity and shared managing which regulate them by modifying the nature of rules and values.

2.3. Identity, reciprocity and territory approach

Multifunctionality of agriculture or multifunctionality of rural spaces? This question is not innocent. FAO and most southern countries associate the concept of multifunctionality to rural spaces and not only to agriculture (FAO, 1999; 2000). The territorial dimension of multifunctionality is incontestable. In the North, farmers are becoming increasingly insignificant in rural spaces. They must cohabit with many other actors and activities. This is one of the reasons why the issue between multifunctionality of agriculture or rural territories is at stake: since farmers must ensure services in the general interest, they must interact with other actors, including public authorities.

We can observe examples of territory economical and social integration by proximity markets and short chains in eastern as in western European countries. Agri-food short chains controlled by farmers or their partners (small commerce, handcraft manufactures, etc) offers, many time, the characteristic of a qualification process (farm or green product,) even without normative or official certification stamp.

The territory integration through non market practices or transactions is first of all, an economical process and not only a social one. (Polanyi, 1944; 1975 ; Polanyi & Arensberg, 1975). Such practices are still developed in eastern

countries, where we can find it in the land and natural resource management forms or through alimentation (specific aliments and specific knowledge and know how). In western UE countries, non market territory integration is also expressed by the reduction of market competition, with product qualification and certification processes or with the quotas measures (production rights) (Barthélémy *et al.*, 2002).

Cross outlook between western and eastern situation help us to verify the diverse effects on diverse functions of agriculture: production of goods, of culture, social integration, social and environmental services (Bonnieux & Vermersch, 1999).

Such observation shows the permanence of practices, typical of peasant agriculture, in terms of common and multifunctional resource management associated to farm production (forest, graze land, pasture, water, biodiversity, landscape). At the same time, many observers conclude that such practices and structures are link to collective and local identity patterns.

The question of sociability and identity in collective action was studied by Mary Douglas (2004). Looking for an explanation to collective action between individualism and holism, and based on Durkheim, she proposes the notion of identity (of the groups) and the cognition relationships as foundations of the institutions which rule collective action. She recognize as Temple (1998) the existence of structured relationships and social links

These relations of cognition exist through parent relationship, mutual or inter cognition and learning, particularly rules' learning. Ostrom (1998), as Douglas call to human values : trust, responsibility, solidarity, reputation and prestige to explain the regulation of social and economical relations associated to structures of general or collective interest and producing common good.

Territory and identity approach led to new interpretation of multifunctional agriculture recognition. One of these interpretations of multifunctionality of agriculture is link to a complementary and conflicting connection between commodities and identity goods. "Multifunctionality here designates the multiple market (e.g. the provision by way of competition) and non-market outputs (e.g. maintaining and managing natural resources, preservation of communities and the status of individuals) of agriculture or of geographical areas and the interconnection among these output productions. Identity-related goods can be defined as 'the states of things which society wishes to produce or reproduce', which are part of the heritage of social or community groups and which, as such, are produced outside market relationships. The main research issues are the conditions for producing and allocating such goods, and the determinants/rationalities of public-policy reforms or practices. Usually, authors work within the framework of institutional economics wherein, it is above all the institutional background in the broad sense which determines the decisions made by economic agents and the type of relations prevailing among them" (Multagri, 2004). According to the lack of social and economic stability and continuity resulting from this process, the non market exchange dimension of agricultural production is precisely assigned to restore identities and reciprocity relationships (concerning community and resource management, culture territory, intergenerational link...). In other words, two

separate economic rationalities (market exchange economy and identity or reciprocity economy) take place in the field of agricultural multifunctionality, and conflict, which means each one sets the limit to the other.

The question of supporting the practices and structures which ensure share resources management is at stake both in the western and eastern European countries. The traditional management systems have practically disappeared in western countries replaced by new kind of institutional devices (township associations or comities, managed by the different territorial structures, or in France Sustainable Agriculture Contracts which offer a individual remuneration through contracts with the farmers) so they insure different environmental services on their farms. This experiment, implemented as part of a policy recognizing agricultural multifunctionality, remained marginal. The idea of a territorial contract between farmers, other actors and the State is relevant, but the type of contract and remuneration seems still too fragile.

Beyond the wide institutional gap that still may separates the diverse situations, it seems like the solution of a contract that would not be individual (for each farm) but collective (a local structure for resource managing) might be the most viable for both countries. This kind of interaction between collective action and public action has the advantage of coinciding with different types of sustainable agriculture, be they implemented through policies taking into account agricultural and rural multifunctionality or through agri-environmental measures.

Conclusions

Beside UE extension, beside globalization, in a very rapid changing situation of European rural world and public policy, rural sociology has to renew or to adapt its approaches. The fact show us that the reality always change quicker that the capacity of new theory and methodology to interpret it.

The examples of local rural identity dynamics, of territory and multifunctionality approaches also show that research try to go on behind social movement and public policy. In terms of politics and political sciences, the question is: how to act in an uncertain world? But submit research agenda to policy maker's agenda could not be the only answer. Our proposal is to revisit and to reconsider preexistent theories and methods, in order to verify their validity to analyze new situations or, at least, their capacity of re-adaptation to take in account new phenomena.

In this paper, we propose to adapt or to update three theory contribution to analyze the new rural forms of activities and population, the implication of multifunctionality and territory approaches and the extension of exchange and communication in an uncertain world (Callon et al; 2001)

Our first proposal is to mobilize the peasant based model of Mendras (2000) and his classical predecessors to examine the new forms of tension between autonomy and dependence, between global communication and local mutual recognition, or between food quality products and agri-food industrial standards, for farmer's local groups.

The second proposal is to consider territory and identity dynamics as supports and field of analysis in order to explain the institutional devices (Mormont,

1996) and structures (Temple, 1998) built or rebuilt by rural and farmers in terms of common or public resource production and management (Ostrom, 1998; Douglas, 2004)

At least, the third proposition is to reconsider Polanyi (1944) economical substantive categories: reciprocity, redistribution and exchange and Scott "moral economy", in order to deep their socio-economic structures. We defend the thesis, proposed by Temple (1998) that human universal values (trust, responsibility, justice, reputation, etc) are not culturally or socially given, nor only socially transmitted and learnt (Ostrom, 1998). They are socially built, produced and reproduced by reciprocity structures. These reciprocity structures are preserved, created, our readapted by reciprocity and re-distribution relationship.

Such a ternary corpus of references give us a tripod which offers theoretical, epistemological and methodological bases and tools to study and monitor territory and identity integration, not only as social or cultural integration mechanisms, but also as economical and socio-economical mechanisms. The challenge is to make the critic of non capitalistic exchange transactions and relationsship, which are still more important and decisive than classical economy and sociology have taught us. Obviously, to critic non exchange driven economical principles, we must first recognize their existence: Mauss, Polanyi and Mendras foundation contribution may help us to re-discover our human reality. Rural situation and the permanence of peasant reciprocity and redistribution values and practices, especially in Northern, Eastern and Mediterranean European regions, constitute an opportunity for rural sociologist to examine the dialectic tension, complementarities and contradictions, between exchange economics and reciprocity economics principles.

References

- Aldington T. J., Multifunctional agriculture: a brief review from developed and developing country perspectives, Roma: FAO, 1998.
- Angel M., 1998. La nature a-t-elle un prix, critique de l'évaluation monétaire des biens non-marchands Les presses de l'école des mines, Paris, 98p.
- Barthélemy D., Nieddu M., (2002): Biens marchands, biens identitaires et multifonctionnalité agricole, 28 p., Communication au colloque SFER : La multifonctionnalité de l'activité agricole, Paris, 21 et 22 mars 2002.
- Barthélémy, D. (2003) La multifonctionnalité agricole comme relation entre fonctions marchandes et non marchandes *Les Cahiers de la multifonctionnalité*, 2, pp 95-99.
- Benko, G ; Strohmayer, U (eds) (1997): Space and Social Theory : Interpretations of Modernity and Post modernity, Oxford, Blackwell, 400 p.
- Benko, G. Economia, espaço e globalização na aurora do Século XXI, São Paulo, Hucitec, 1999, 266 p
- Billington J H. (1958): Mikhailovsky and Russian populism, New York: Oxford University Press, 1958
- Bindabran P., Griffon M., Jansen H. (1999): The Multifunctionality of Agriculture: recognition of agriculture as a public good or position against trade liberalisation. unpublished paper, Cirad Ecopol, Nogent sur Marne, 1999, 8p.
- Blandford D., R.N. Boisvert, and L. Fulponi (2003): Non Trade Concerns: Reconciling Domestic Policy Objectives with Freer Trade in Agricultural products. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 85(3), 668-673.

- Bonnieux D., Vermersch H. (1999): La dimension environnementale dans la réforme de la PAC, *Economie Rurale*, n°249, p.88-91
- Bourbouze, A.; Rubino, R. (1992): Grandeur, décadence... et renouveau sur les terres utilisées en commun dans les pays de la Méditerranée. In: *Terres collectives en Méditerranée*, Bourbouze et Rubino Ed., Roma: FAO/Réseau Parcours Euro-africain, 1992, pp. 9-24.
- Caron, P., Sabourin, E (Coord) Paysans du Sertão. Mutations des agricultures familiales dans le Nordeste du Brésil. Cirad, Embrapa, Montpellier, coll. Repères, 2001, 243p
- Callon, M., Lascoumes, P., Barthe, Y. (2001): *Agir dans un monde incertain. Essai sur la démocratie technique*, Paris, Seuil, 358p.
- Chauveau J.P. (1994): Participation paysanne et populisme bureaucratique. Essai d'histoire et de sociologie de la culture du développement. In : Jacob, J.-P., et Lavigne Delville, Ph. Eds, *Les associations paysannes en Afrique*, Apad, Karthala, IUED, p. 25-60
- CIRAD (2002): Family Agriculture and Globalization Research Programm, Montpellier, France, CIRAD, 3p.
- Delorme H. (2003): Ambiguïté et richesse de la multifonctionnalité. Paris: CERI/FNSP, <http://www.ceri-sciences-po.org>.
- Douglas M. (2004): Comment pensent les institutions. Paris, la Découverte Poche, 220p.
- Duggan C. (2004): Resistance to Globalisation in the context of Pluriactivity: more choices or more problems? (Ireland) in XI World Congress of Rural Sociology, IRSA, Trondheim, Norway, 25-30 July 2004 (WG 18 paper)
- Ellis F. (2000): "The determinants of rural livelihood diversification in developing countries" *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 51 (2) 289-302
- Ellis F. (1988): *Peasant Economics: Farm households and agrarian development*, Cambridge, UK, The Cambridge University Press, 1988. 309p.
- FAO *Multiples fonctions de l'agriculture et des terres: l'analyse / l'état des lieux* FAO, Maastricht, 1999
- FAO, (2000): *Le caractère multifonctionnel de l'agriculture et des territoires* point 9 de l'ordre du jour de la 22^{ème} conférence régionale de la FAO pour l'Europe, Porto, 24-28 juillet 2000, <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/x7073f.htm> access on 2-04-2004
- FAO, (2005): Statistics <http://faostat.fao.org/faostat/collections?> Access on 21 June 2005
- Glauben T., Tietje H., Vogel, S. (2004): Farm Succession Patterns in Northern Germany and Austria: A Survey Comparison. XI World Congress of Rural Sociology, IRSA, Trondheim, Norway, 25-30 July 2004 (WG 18 paper)
- Groupe Polanyi (2004): La multifonctionnalité agricole comme relation entre fonctions marchandes et non marchandes in *Cahiers de la Multifonctionnalité*, N° 6 Paris, Inra, Cemagref, Cirad,
- Hadyński J. (2001): Rolnictwo województwa wielkopolskiego w warunkach integracji z Unią Europejską (Analiza regionalna), Poznań 2001 s.156
- Jollivet. M. (dir), (1997): *Vers un rural postindustriel. Rural et Environnement dans huit pays européens*. L'Harmattan, coll. « Environnement », 371p.
- Knickel, K.; Renting H., Methodological and conceptual issues in the study of multifunctionality and rural development. In *Sociologia Ruralis*, volume 40, October 2000.
- Lamarche H (dir) (1992): *L'agriculture familiale 1. Une réalité polymorphe: comparaison internationale*. Paris, l'Harmattan, 320p.
- Losch B. (2004): Debating the multifunctionality of agriculture : from trade negotiation to development policies by the south. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, vol 4, N°3, July 2004, 336-360.

- Mendras, H. (1976): Sociétés paysannes, Eléments pour une théorie des sociétés paysannes, Paris, Gallimard, Folio Histoire 265 p.
- Mendras H. (1967): La fin des Paysans, Actes Sud, Aix en Provence, reed 1992, ed. Babel, Paris
- Mendras H. (2000): L'invention de la paysannerie. in *Revue Française de Sociologie*, 41-3, 2000, 539-552.
- Mormont M. Agriculture et environnement : pour une sociologie des dispositifs, *Economie Rurale*, 1996, 236 : 28-36.
- Multagri Project, (2005): Capitalisation of research results on the multifunctionality of agriculture and rural areas, WP1 Definitions, references and interpretations of the concept of multifunctionality and its contributions to a sustainable development Paris, December 2004, 51p.
- OCDE, (2001): A synthesis of country reports on jointness between commodity and non-commodity outputs in OECD agriculture, *Proceedings of the Workshop on multifunctionality*, Oecd, Paris 2-3 July 2001.
- Ostrom E. A. (1998): Behavioral approach to the rational-choice theory of collective action *American Political Science Review* 92 :1-22.
- Ostrom V., Ostrom E. (1978): Public goods and public choices. In : *Alternatives for Delivering Public Service : Toward Improved Performance*, E.S. Savas (Ed.), Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado, pp 7-49.
- Ploeg, van der, J.D, D. Roep: Multifunctionality and rural development: the actual situation in Europe. In G. van Huylenbroek and G. Durand: *Multifunctional agriculture; a new paradigm for European Agriculture and Rural Development*. Ashgate, Hampshire, 2003.
- Ploeg, van der, J.D: *The Virtual Farmer*, Van Gorcum, Assen, 2001.
- Ploeg, van der, J.D. et al. Rural Development: from practices and policies towards theory. In: *Sociologia Ruralis*, volume 40, 2000.
- PNUD, (2000): Sustainable livelihoods concept paper, UNDP, access 30-04-2004 http://www.undp.org/sl/Documents/strategy_papers/concept_of_SL.htm.
- Polanyi K *La grande transformation, : aux origines politiques et économiques de notre temps*, Gallimard, Paris, [1944] 1983, 420p.
- Polanyi, K ; Arensberg, C. (1957): Trade and Market in the Early Empires. *Economies in History and Theory*, The Free Press New York , 360p.
- Polanyi K. (1994): *El sustento del hombre*, Barcelona, Mondadori, [1975] *The Livelihood of Man*, ed. by Pearson H. W. New York, Academic Press, Inc
- Redfield, R. (1960): *The little community*; and, *Peasant society and culture* Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 1960. V, 182, 92 p.
- Sabourin E. (2000): Peasant reciprocity practises in Brazilian Northeast rural communities and recognition of agriculture multifunctionality X World Congress of Rural Sociology, Rio de Janeiro, 1-5 august 2000, 15p.
- Sabourin E. (2005): Organização dos produtores e produção de valores humanos in IX Congress of Brazilian Society of Sociology, Belo Horizonte, 1-3 june 2005, 15p.
- Sabourin, E., Coudel E. (2004): Multifunctionality of rural spaces and natural resource management. In IASCP 2004 Conference: *The Commons in a Age of Global Transition : challenges, risks and opportunities*, Oaxaca, Mexico, 8-13 august 2004.
- Sabourin, E; Caron P. Silva, P.C.G. (1997):. Enjeux fonciers et gestion des communs: Le cas des vaines pâtures dans la région de Massaroca (Bahia, Brésil). *Cahiers de la Recherche Développement*, n° 42, Montpellier, pp 5-26
- Sabourin E. ; Djama, M. (2003):. Pratiques paysannes de la multifonctionnalité : Nordeste brésilien et Nouvelle Calédonie. *Economie Rurale* 273-274 pp120-133

- Sabourin E, Menezes, M A; Tonneau, JP. (2004):. Is there a new peasant agriculture project? An analysis based on Brazilian and French examples, *Acta Agricultura Serbica*, Vol IX, 17, 2004 –3-83 pp 19-32
- Sabourin E; Trifunovic S. (2004): Introduction note to WG 18 “Globalization and social transformation of family farm’ XI World Congress of Rural Sociology, IRSA, Trondheim, Norway, 25-30 july 2004 (WG 18 paper)
- Scott J.C. (1976): *The moral economy of the peasant: rebellion and subsistence in Southeast Asia*. New Haven and London, Yale University Press
- Scott J. (1986):. Everyday forms of peasant resistance. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 2 : 5-35
- Shanin, T. (1971): *Peasants and Peasants Societies*, Harmondsvort, Manchester
- Shanin, T. (ed.) (1990): *Defining peasants*. Basil Blackwell, Cambridge, 290p.
- Szurek, J.C. (1982): *Aux origines paysannes de la crise polonaise*. Arles, Actes Sud
- Tchayanow, A. (1966): *Peasant farm organisation*. Homewood. R Irwin (trad. By R E F Smith, edited by D Thorner & B Kerblay)
- Temple, D. (1998): *Les structures élémentaires de la réciprocité*. In *La revue du MAUSS* n°12, 2ème semestre 1998, 234-242, Paris : La Découverte.
- Tepitch, J. (1973): *Marxisme et agriculture : le paysan polonais*. Paris, Armand Colin
- Trifunovic, S. (2004):. Globalization and new rural transformations in XI World Congress of Rural Sociology, IRSA, Trondheim, Norway, 25-30 july 2004 (WG 18 paper)
- Vounouki, E. (2004): The resistance of Greek farms: a curious evolution in the European context in XI World Congress of Rural Sociology, IRSA, Trondheim, Norway, 25-30 july 2004 (WG 18 paper)
- Weber, (2003): *L’évaluation contingente : les valeurs ont-elles un prix ?* Paris: CERI/FNSP <http://ceri-sciences-po.org>.
- Wolf, E. (1966):. *Peasants*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 150 p

GLOBALIZACIJA, EVROPSKA EKSPANZIJA I POLJOPRIVREDNO DOMAĆINSTVO - IZAZOV ZA SOCIOLOGOJU

- pregledni rad -

Eric Sabourin

Cirad, France & University of Brasilia, Brazil

Savo Trifunovic

Mašinski fakultet Kraljevo, Agronomski fakultet Čačak

Rezime

U svim evropskim zemljama, porodična seoska domaćinstva koegzistiraju sa malim i srednjim poljoprivrednim preduzećima. Uprkos objavljivanju nekoliko teorija o modernizaciji, seoska poljoprivreda (delimično integrisana u nedovršena tržišta) nije nestala, naročito u zemljama istočne Evrope. Uzgred, u istočnoj Evropi, seosko poljoprivredno domaćinstvo je suočeno sa dvostrukim izazovom – globalizacijom i ekstenzijom EU. Sitni posednici i poljoprivredna domaćinstva suočiće se sa rapidnim promenama i novim vidovima konkurencije. Neki od njih su zaplašeni procesom isključivanja malih poljoprivrednih proizvođača, sa kojim su zapadnoevropske zemlje eksperimentisale tokom 60-ih i 70-ih, u mnogo povoljnijem kontekstu, u uslovima ostvarivanja dohodka i uz mogućnost zapošljavanja u drugim sektorima. U ovom radu se istražuje koje vrste teorija ruralne sociologije, koje kategorije i metode mogu pomoći da se izvrši analiza ovih procesa i izazova. Da li je to povezano sa pružanjem otpora, sa opstankom ili sa promenama u seoskim zajednicama. Da li još uvek postoji ijedno mesto za novi “na selu baziran” projekat? S druge strane, postoji li neko istinsko izdanje sa kompletnom evolucijom seoskog domaćinstva u tržišno integrisani firmoliki model? Šta je sa novim uslovima ruralnog života i ruralnim aktivnostima? Koje su mogućnosti i ograničenja udruživanja i povezivanja između poljoprivrednih domaćinstava i drugih zemljoposjednika, kako bi se obnovili koordinacioni mehanizmi i redefinisala nova pozicija poljoprivrede u društvu? Šta bi, naročito, mogao biti sociološki doprinos pojmu multifunkcionalnosti poljoprivrede i ruralnih oblasti?