

Abstracts

AUBERT, F., D. LÉPICIER, P. PERRIER-CORNET and Y. SENCÉBÉ: "The Construction of Micro-Regional Territories and their Economic Relevance: The Case of the *Pays* in France." [« La construction de territoires micro régionaux et leur signification économique : Le cas des « pays » en France. »] This paper reports on multidisciplinary research into the setting up of local development areas in France known as *pays*. Under the impetus of the 1999 blueprint legislation on territorial development, the *pays* policy is designed to encourage local economic actors to put together a development project. These structures have two distinctive characteristics in the context of French institutions: they are devised for the micro-regional scale and are to be established on a voluntary basis through the free association of local councils. *Pays* are more obviously suited to rural areas but they may also bring together urban and periurban councils. This means that those *pays* that have been formed exhibit a wide variety of sizes and structures. First, a snapshot of this diversity is presented by proposing a typology of all the *pays* in France. This is then extended to a sociological and economic analysis of the corresponding territories. The sociological analysis focuses on the role of local councillors in constructing *pays* and on the roles of other categories of actors. The economic analysis raises the issue of just how relevant the areas thus delimited are for local and regional development.

The method adopted combines two complementary approaches: the statistical analysis of a national data base and the in-depth analysis of four study areas in Burgundy. The data relate to the delimitation of the *pays*, the characteristics of the local councillors and the socio-economic characteristics of each council area (size, social make-up, employment, demography, among other characteristics). The field-study areas are representative of the variety of *pays* in Burgundy and are studied through direct surveys.

From the data collected, a map of the *pays* has been drawn and a typology established. The 291 *pays* formed as of 1 January 2004 involve more than two-thirds of French local councils and 40 % of the population, with the major cities remaining apart. The typology was constructed by classifying councils as belonging to predominantly rural areas (i.e. towns with 1500–5000 jobs (rural employment centres) and employing more than 60 % of the resident working population) or predominantly urban areas (i.e. towns with more than 5000 jobs (urban employ-

ment centres) and council areas where more than 40 % of the working population work in the employment centres), by counting the number of employment centres in each *pays*; in the urban area category, periurban councils were also distinguished.

Cluster analysis identified five types of *pays*: (i) urban, (ii) peri-urban, and (iii) rural *pays*, with a subdivision of this latter class into (iiia) sparsely populated areas with one market town at most, (iiib) *pays* with two or more market towns and (iv) composite *pays* combining rural and urban areas structured by a medium-sized town or a network of such towns. It is observed that the *pays* policy covers all categories of territory, that the internal heterogeneity of the *pays* is a relative matter (4 out of 5 groups are connected with a dominant territorial category) and, lastly, that rural *pays* are predominant. The role of towns is not negligible since 160 *pays* (more than half the total) contain at least one urban employment centre with more than 5000 jobs.

The sociological analysis revealed that the involvement of local councillors in delimiting the *pays* can be explained by their role in earlier development actions and their understanding of groupings among councils. In all cases, the opening up of the *pays* to actors from the business and community spheres has relied on local councillors and on their local support networks and apparatus. *Pays* are a breeding ground for professional politicians, bringing together traditional and modern political notability based on competence (qualifications, occupations). This professionalization is leading to a standardization of the social profiles of local councillors.

The development council is a participative democracy body devised to involve members of local civil society in defining the development plan for the *pays*, in conjunction with the public body of elected representatives which takes the decisions and ensures the financial and administrative management of the *pays*. The role of local councillors also appears to be decisive in the creation of development councils, but by delegation as they confer its leadership on commercial law officials or consultants. Such delegation of authority nonetheless involves close control by the elected representatives of the designation of development council members, and this body is often seen as a potential check on power in the exercise of representative democracy.

This general picture of the make-up of local elites displays specific features related in particular to the position of these new territories in urban-rural relations. To extend the enquiry, we try to grasp from local accounts the way different types of *pays* fit in with the patterns of socio-political interplay.

The economic analysis reveals that the economic relevance of the *pays* is ambiguous. In 'urban' *pays*, employment centres control the zone of influence. The chosen form of construction, centred on the town but including functionally inseparable spaces, leads to the delimitation of *pays* along boundary lines that are coherent in terms of residence and employment. The economic and political power of the urban centre suggests that the territorial arrangement forms an operational unit of management for town-planning and economic development alike. 'Periurban' *pays* are economically dependent on urban centres but exhibit

the political intent to set themselves apart. These *pays* lie on the edge of the periurban fringes and encroach on the nearest predominantly rural areas. The lack of any new economic prospects for these 'periurban' *pays* may lead to their formation being construed as something of a defensive action with respect to the town. It seems uncertain what the economic outlook is for this non-cooperation strategy.

The 'sparsely populated rural' *pays* are often historical *pays* whose shared identity factors help to mobilize actors but whose economic advantages, related above all to the zone's pulling-power, may be rather slight. Development is conditioned by the scale of public transfers from central government and by political drive. The *pays* in the other category of 'rural areas' are similar to the previous ones, but the presence of market towns and medium-sized towns gives them more structured economic characteristics.

Lastly, the 'composite' *pays* combine town and country within boundaries which, *a priori*, allow some scope for solidarity and complementarity. It is this sort of *pays* that is most obviously consistent with the legislator's expectations. However, its economic relevance is conditional upon local cooperation being able to overcome competition among towns and to tie local projects in with projects for the encompassing urban areas.

AZNAR, O., M. GUÉRIN and P. JEANNEAUX (with the collaboration of C. ROCHE and S. HERVIOU: "The Implementation of Environmental Policies by Local Actors: A Study of a Zone Located in France." [*« La mise en œuvre de politiques environnementales par des acteurs locaux. Étude sur une zone d'étude située en France. »*]) Public actors at the local level have been increasingly requested to participate in public intervention in the environmental domain. Thus, in France, 'communes' (the smallest administrative subdivision in France) and their different groupings have become more and more important in the field of environmental protection. In this context, this article aims to characterize local environmental policies constructed by local public actors (communes and groups of communes). Attention is focused on a particular indicator – 'environmental services' that represent tangible examples of environmental intervention by local public actors. The two following questions are tackled:

- Which environmental problems lead local public actors to produce environmental services?
- Which environmental services are produced by local public actors?

An analysis of environmental services allows us to identify public choices in relation to the environment, in particular by highlighting the extent of the public funds implicated and their use in operations to maintain the environment. An analysis of environmental conflicts provides an indicator of environmental problems. This indicator is complementary to environmental diagnoses.

The first part of the article presents the analytical framework. First, this makes it possible to compare environmental services to other environmental

policy instruments (incentives, regulation...). Then, it allows a ranking of the central state/local state relationship which underlies these policies. As a result of this, three types of environmental policies are identified: centralized policies, territorialized policies and local policies.

In the second part of the article, an exploratory empirical study on a periurban and a rural area in France is presented. The rural and periurban districts of Montrevel en Bresse (12 600 inhabitants) located 75 km north of Lyon (France) were chosen because the area has a great diversity of use (production, residential, leisure, tourist, environmental). A systematic identification of environmental problems and conflicts in this area is undertaken. Similarly, an inventory of environmental policies and environmental services produced in the area is undertaken, based on both oral and written sources of information. To estimate the production cost of environmental services, the funds allocated by public actors with environmental policies were ascertained. In terms of results, three major environmental problems were identified: water pollution, floods and reduction of the *bocage* landscape. Water pollution abatement involves all three types of policies (centralized, territorialized and local). Flood control involves territorialized policy. And maintenance of the *bocage* landscape involves all three types of policies. Few initiatives relate to the development of positive external effects and local public actors focus their action on limiting negative external effects. Thus, environmental services related to aquatic environments (water pollution and flood control) mobilize important financial flows. Maintenance of the *bocage* landscape constitutes a significant operation. These interventions are presented as the means of supporting dialogue concerning the environment between different social and economic groups.

The research reported on confirms the more general observation that local public actors have appropriated more and more environmental issues and act upon them. However, communes and the different groupings of communes possess limited abilities in relation to taxation for environmental issues, so they mobilize other tools which correspond more to their own fields of competence and their own know-how. Based upon the objects of intervention, the policies used in the district of Montrevel have a local dimension to greater or lesser degrees. The differences can be explained in part by the importance of the issues (e.g. pollution), the extent to which the public goods involved can be characterized as 'local', and also by the manner in which public policy is constructed.

N. BERTRAND, P. FLEURY and C. JANIN: "Planning Policy and Agricultural Multifunctionality in Alpine Sillon." [« Politiques d'aménagement et multifonctionnalité agricole dans le sillon alpin. »] The *Sillon Alpin* is an attractive and dynamic area in the Rhône-Alpes region. Due to important economic and demographic growth, but also to topographic constraints related to the mountain environment, the increasing land consumption by urbanization poses a challenge for its sustainable development and spatial coherence. This has consequences for the attractiveness and future economic competitiveness of the *Sillon* and calls for

some form of regulation. Agriculture has been experiencing important challenges in relation to its production function, but has found new functions in the context of land management processes which raise the issues of multifunctionality of agricultural land. A comparative analysis of two city regions in the *Sillon Alpin* – Chambéry and Grenoble – has permitted us to identify the evolution of land management issues from the 1970s (SDAU) to the more recent period (SCOT), and the place of agriculture in such processes. In conclusion, the paper debates the relevance of the concept of multifunctionality in order to better understand the place of agriculture today in land planning.

M. BERRIET-SOLLIEC, H. DELORME, C. LAURENT, M.-F. MOURIAUX, P. MUNDLER and D. PERRAUD: "Regulation of Agriculture: The Regions as a New Locus for Working towards Territorial Coherence between Agricultural Policies? The Rhône-Alpes Region in the European Context." [« Régulation de l'agriculture : les Régions comme nouveau lieu de mise en cohérence territoriale des politiques agricoles ? La région Rhône-Alpes dans le contexte européen. »] In the European Union (EU), two major recent changes have been framing the development of agricultural regulation. First, a decentralization trend can be observed in most of the member states, resulting from both national and EU policies: the modernization of state apparatus combines with the 'subsidiarity' principle of the EU which assumes that policy decisions have to be decentralized as much as is rationally and functionally possible. Second, changes in agricultural policies, shifting from market support to rural development (the 'Second Pillar' of the CAP) and then to multiple forms of support for the multifunctionality of agriculture, are resulting in a renewed policy framework, generally directed by the EU and implemented differently in the member states and regions. A cross-examination of these parallel trends is necessary to answer some basic questions, mainly: is there a change in the regional frameworks which organize the regulation of agriculture? What kind of differences can be observed in several European regions and how can these differences be explained? What is the particular shape of this evolution in the regions of a semi-centralized country like France? To answer these questions, field and institutional data have been collected in several European regions: Rhône-Alpes (France) as a central reference for the analysis, and other regions located in Germany, Spain and the United-Kingdom.

The implementation of European policies in the regions and the creation of specific regional policies show that the regionalization process actually results in a growing involvement of the regions in the regulation of agriculture. This process must be accurately analyzed because of the major issues which are at stake: increasing risks of new inequalities in the EU, an uncertain future for sector policies, the possible shift from a Europe 'of the states' to a Europe 'of the regions', and the possible evolution and diversity of support for the multifunctionality of agriculture. Even in France, where the regions have little power to influence agricultural policies, their role is real and growing. Yet generally, beyond regionalist discourses, the European regions do not always appear to be a key level for the coherence of multilevel policies. The regional level often tries to

integrate rural development, agro-environment and most territory-centred regulations, but in many cases it does not represent a coherent level of general regulation. A good example can be observed in the support for and marginalization of agricultural pluri-activity at regional level.

In highly decentralized regions of federal (Germany) or quasi-federal (Spain, UK) countries, the regions play a key role in implementing both sector ('First Pillar') and rural ('Second Pillar') policies. This results in extensive diversification of regional policies, primarily for the implementation of the EU Rural Development Policy (RDR regulation): the EU, State and Region financial support and institutional reorganization are oriented either towards support to farmers, in a close relationship with the dominant farmers' unions as in the past, or towards more innovative policies centred around new actors involved in rural development, and organized through new local institutions.

Consequently, the diversification of policies at the basic political level of regions (and of 'departments' in some countries) results in opposing trends which shape different policy models in Europe. The determining factors of this dichotomy are: i) the huge inequality of regions' resources and especially of those available for agricultural policies; and ii) the ability of every region to decentralize itself and to build sub-regional regulation levels.

Decentralization appears to be a new and growing part of public regulation of agriculture. This leads to a new pattern of relationships and competencies between the EU, State and Region levels. It would nevertheless be risky to overestimate the regional role. The region is frequently not the main regulating level. In France, even a creative and 'rich' region like the Rhône-Alpes plays only one of the regulatory roles, without really co-ordinating the supra-levels, the State and the EU, and the sub-levels, the departments. Moreover, diverse and sometimes contradictory regional policies shape a number of possible ways to develop agriculture, or not develop it, and to include it in new structures such as rural development and the multifunctionality of agriculture. Therefore, an analysis of regional policy trends is important, not because the European regions are ruling the new CAP (Common Agricultural Policy) – which they are not – but because they may be outlining future forms of involvement of agriculture in the general trend towards liberalization.

E. CHEVASSUS-LOZZA and K. DANIEL: "Market Openness and Geographical Concentration of Agricultural and Agro-Food Activities: The Challenges for French Regions." The aim of this article is to analyze the impact of market openness on the geographical concentration of agricultural and agro-food activities between various regions of France. Production which is the most exposed to international competition tends to be concentrated between regions. In prospective terms, the increasing openness of markets seems to lead to geographical concentration of activities, with products which benefit particularly from the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) being especially sensitive to this phenomenon.

C. KEPHALIACOS, G. NGUYEN and P. ROBIN: "Institutional Arrangements and Public Policies: What Types of Interaction to Enhance the Contribution of Agriculture to Local Development?" [*« Formes de coordination et politiques publiques : quelles articulations dans une perspective d'ancrage territorial de l'agriculture en France ? »*] In French rural areas, many collective actions associating farmers have emerged in the last five decades more or less through the impetus given by public policies. The aim of the new Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) is to promote multifunctional agriculture, not only by changing the relationship between the State and farmers, individually or collectively, but also by trying to give a new content to collective actions at the local level. This change in the CAP can be justified by the fact that the many of the resources used and produced by multifunctional agriculture present the characteristics of public goods. First, they concern different groups of actors on a given territory and these are not only farmers; they are part of the production process as well as the consumption process. Second, it is well known that their use generates conflicts and that their production at a satisfactory level requires institutional arrangements. The main objective of our study is to analyze the role of public policies in the emergence and articulation of different institutional arrangements developed by farmers and known for their joint production of standard marketed agricultural goods and of public goods, in particular environmental goods: In general, how can collective action produce public goods? How is collective action mobilized by agricultural policies to achieve objectives linked to multifunctionality? How does this affect the efficiency of the policies implicated?

To answer these questions, we have developed a theoretical framework using concepts from institutional economics. We start by discussing the concept of externalities in the light of work by Commons and Callon. In a given rural territory, a farm can produce, along with standard goods and services, flows of physical and non-physical products with either positive or negative effects on the production and consumption activities of other economic agents. These phenomena result from the interaction of agents and are commonly called externalities. Some of these flows come from the phenomenon of joint production, which are associated with the use of particular assets and with the production technology. It is important to distinguish joint production from the phenomenon of jointness, which involves the more or less intentional coordination of multiple agents. The example can be given of farmer organizations which promote quality labeled products. To what extent can such an organization also contribute to multifunctionality by producing environmental and social goods, along with marketed quality labeled goods?

Commons and Callon's work indeed go further and suggested that externalities could be analyzed as a result of an incomplete negotiation process among actors who are trying to achieve a consensus with limited rationality about what one can do and not do. The coordination of economic agents is, therefore, not a matter of exchanging goods but rather a negotiation on the definition of individual rights and duties regarding the other, in other words, what Commons called the 'working rules'. At a given time, in a given society, one can associate a set of

'working rules' with a particular institutional arrangement. Institutions comprise unorganized forms of customs as well as organized forms of collective actions, including the market and the State. They are being set to ensure the provision of diverse resources, and in particular of public goods. Under this framework, externalities in agriculture can be redefined as the result of institutions failing to achieve a consensus on a set of property rights and satisfactory 'working rules' necessary to solve conflicts over the use and the production of public goods associated with multi-functional agriculture. This means that the promotion of multifunctionality should involve a process of institutional change in which the State, as one of the highest governance levels, can play an important role. According to Commons, every institutional change relies on three types of 'trans-action': the 'bargaining transaction', the 'managerial transaction' or organizational transaction, and the 'rationing transaction' or distributive transaction. By giving to economic agents, both farmers and non farmers, the opportunity to renegotiate the distribution of property rights over resources used and/or produced by agriculture, agricultural policies promoting multifunctionality fall within the distributive type of transactions. The question becomes not only who does what, but also who bears the costs and who gets the benefits.

With the question of multifunctional agriculture being posed in that way, the efficiency evaluation of public intervention gains a new dimension. Market mechanisms no longer constitute the main criteria and the measure of efficiency goes beyond the best allocation of resources permitted by public policies. The question of efficiency depends indeed on the type of collective rules elaborated by a group of agents at a given moment in time and in a given place. More precisely, it depends on the capacity of these rules to reduce negative externalities and enhance positive externalities. The role of public policies is to create conditions for institutional changes and for the emergence of such rules.

PIRAUX, M., E. CHIA and M. DULCIRE: "From Management Situations to 'Action-Territories': Lessons for Territorialized Policy. The Case of Territorial Farm Contracts in the French Departments Overseas." [« De la situation de gestion au territoire actionnable : Des enseignements en matière de politique territorialisée. Le cas des Contrats Territoriaux d'Exploitation dans les Départements d'Outre Mer français. »] Although public action always uses the term 'territory', it has difficulties in integrating social issues cast in territorial terms. The territory, defined as a space which has a 'sense' and which gives a 'sense' to those who live in it and which acts as a space of coordination at the local scale between civil society and public authority, is the basis of the French agricultural law of 1999. Highlighting the multifunctionality of agriculture, the law proposes a new contract between the State and farmers through the CTE (*Contrat territorial d'exploitation* – Territorial Farm Contract) which is the tool of choice. It is constructed from the identification of agro-environmental and economic measures developed at the regional level and based on a diagnosis undertaken by project initiators within a local territory. Today, the Agricultural Sustainable Contracts (CAD- *Contrats agricoles durables*) have replaced these.

In order to study the territorialization of public policies, the application of the CTE was analyzed in Reunion (Indian Ocean) and in Guadeloupe (French West Indies - FWI) (two Overseas French Departments) using comprehensive surveys. In this article, we argue that public policies would gain in effectiveness if they can integrate the action system at the local level (an action system being a structured human unit able to coordinate the actions of those who participate in it and manage the stability of its actors and their interrelationships at a given time and place). We show, indeed, that modes of appropriation and practices of use of a public policy instrument (here, the CTE) are different according to the action systems in the two islands. In Reunion, where the agricultural profession is more active and better organized, where the institutions and organizations of producers are more numerous and the forms of coordination more diversified than in Guadeloupe, the professional organizations seized the tool quickly and used it to reinforce their projects, contrary to Guadeloupe where the public institutions have maintained an important role throughout the process. In terms of results, socio-technical and organizational innovations are more important and more diversified in Reunion than in Guadeloupe. But in both cases, it has not led to a questioning of the regional development model focused on exports, and there are thus still difficulties. The territory or area of the initiators of local projects, which is the territory or action space of collective action under the law, was also weak in both situations even though both have quite strong local social and ecological diversity.

In order to better take account of the territorial dimension in public policies, we have drawn upon concepts from management sciences. Thus, we show that, under the injunctions of public policies and in the context of the action system in place, local actors do construct and participate in management situations. To associate a management situation with a territory, it is pertinent to focus on the process of development of consensus, on the actors' strategies, and the tools and instruments they mobilize, and on the space delimited by the actors in order to respond to a particular problem. We show that in Reunion, the public policy related to the CTE introduced a management situation initiated by the State at the regional level. It allowed a collective action between actors who did not share the same vision of the development of the island but who shared the broad goals of the CTE tool. Common tools and particular devices were thus created. If the actors succeeded in giving a direction to the application of the CTE, it was because they knew perfectly well that they were going to be the subject of very strong external or internal social assessments. On the other hand, the management situations were much rarer at the local level, and practically non-existent. This reveals the difficulty for actors in translating regional policy to the level of the territory of local actors' projects.

Then, we show that, in Reunion, the action systems changed as a result of the management situation that had been created, e.g. with the emergence of a new dynamic at the level of the professional organizations or by a better coordination between the services of the State and the profession. On the other hand, in Guadeloupe, the management situation also became translated into 'strategies of change' of the action system.

We then show that the management situations differ (both in terms of the level of commitment by the actors and the objectives) according to the organization's level. Thus, on a regional scale, management situations should aim to define or renew a regional agricultural project (and to create a combined territory-project) where the choices of development and the action strategies can be clearly identified, shared and validated. The regional territory should thus give more sense or meaning to public action. At the local scale, we discuss the interest in defining 'action-territories', a concept that derives from organizational learning. These are defined as territories which have a sense or meaning for the local actors in the context of their 'problem' and which can really be put into action through the public policy instruments that they mobilize. In other words, it is the portion of space within which a set of actors organize themselves around common activities to respond to the policies mandates in order to solve their problems. We give provide examples of these 'action-territories' at the level of the two islands. From these concepts, we draw some conclusions about the territorialization of public policies, which is essential in order to improve the effectiveness of the public action in rural areas and to address the critical issues: how to influence the transformation of regional space so it becomes a real 'territorial-project'; to reinforce the local conditions of collective action by fully taking account of local action systems; and to modify territorial practices to create socio-technical and organizational learnings which are linked in each management situation.

B. SYLVANDER, G. ALLAIRE, G. BELLETTI, A. MARESCOTTI, D. BARJOLLE, E. THÉVENOD-MOTTET et A. TREGEAR: "Quality, Origin and Globalization: Overall Justifications and National Frameworks: The Geographical Indications Case." [« Qualité, origine et globalisation : justifications générales et contextes nationaux, le cas des Indications Géographiques. »] This article is based on research undertaken in the context of the European project *Dolphins* (Development of Origin Labelled Products: Humanity, Innovation and Sustainability). This project (2000-2004) involved a European collaborative action, bringing together 15 research teams from 9 European countries (France, Italy, Switzerland, Germany, Spain, Portugal, the United Kingdom, Belgium and Finland). Its objectives were to: (i) better understand the characteristics and the evolution of Geographical Indications (GIs) in agri-food systems; (ii) provide tools to assess public policy concerning the markets for, and the development of, these products; and (iii) provide recommendations to the European Community in the context of WTO negotiations. The project work was structured around 7 themes: assessment of technical and regulatory aspects, the economic structure of the production chains, the impact on rural development, the relationships with consumers and citizens, a synthesis of the characteristics of GIs, the production systems of GIs, their corresponding markets and the public implications of these GI production systems, assessment of public policy, and a general synthesis and the formulation of recommendations. The work involved the identification of the production systems involved, an analysis of the literature on the question of products with their geographic origins identified and more generally on production chains of 'quality'

products, and a comparative analysis of national rules and strategies (the bibliographic base is available on the web site: www.origin-food.org). The results have been published in six interim reports and a synthesis. This article is based upon the results of this project.

Products the names of which make reference to their geographic origin are, first of all, recognized by the actors in the market place and by consumers, at least the connoisseurs. Historically, some of these products achieved broad recognition, which has raised for a long time (the 1990s onwards) the issue of the protection of Geographic Indications at the national and international levels. At the same time, the issue of the organization of producers and the protection of their collective reputation was also posed. France and other South European countries developed legislation very early on (the 1940s).

The Common Market led the European Union to develop common legislation (regulation 2081/92). This coincided with the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of 1992 and the development of local initiatives in relation to this regulation; it came to be recognized as one of the objectives of rural development. This objective has been reiterated and reinforced via various programs (measures of accompaniment in 1994, agenda 2000, and the 2003 reform). If the development of these products has become a public objective, it is important to ask the question concerning what are the conditions for success for the development of their markets and the innovation processes based on constructing value for the specific resources involved.

In August 2002 in the EU, there were 597 labels registered as AOP (*Appellation d'Origine Protégée* – Protected Label of Origin) and IGP (*Indication d'Origine Protégée* – Protected Geographic Indication); there were 696 in 2005 (405 AOP and 291 IGP) (in addition to the roughly 2,500 labels related to wine production). Italy and France are the countries with the greatest number, followed by Portugal and Spain. It should be noted that Greece, Germany and the United Kingdom, countries where this tradition had not been important, have been submitting more and more requests for approval of such labels.

Placing the geographic origin on the name of products is first of all a commercial practice; in the first stages of marketing, the categorization of products by geographic origin is the approach most frequently met, in the absence of other certified characteristics. But, the mention of origin is embedded in the construction of 'quality', and various actors play a role in this. Throughout the history of the 19th and 20th centuries, the motives and forms of identification of origins has evolved, and has given rise to different sets of reasoning in the specialized literature. Public intervention has varied as a function of the commercial and agricultural history of the different countries and also in relation to their particular social customs and according to different justifications.

In this article, four types of justification are distinguished: (1) the regulation of exchanges and competition (intellectual property rights (industrial production) and consumer protection); (2) supply control of agricultural markets; (3) territorial, local, regional and rural development; and (4) resource conservation (natural and cultural heritage protection). The analysis is based on a characterization of the

networks of political action and of policies and their instruments, and it demonstrates that they have been applied differentially, by country and temporally.

A first justification involves the market, on the one hand, and the protection of just and fair competition; this involves first the producers and the merchants. Then, on the other hand, it also is based on consumer protection, a dimension that has become more and more important over time. As part of industrial property rights, GIs can be considered an investment oriented at establishing the reputation of a product; although this investment is realized collectively and over several generations, it can be associated with the assets of firms which benefit from them in a legitimate manner. Unfair competition involves usurping this investment, generally based on lower production costs on the part of the 'unfair competitor' (to the detriment of certain specific qualities). From the instrumental perspective, putting in place legal protection systems involves the definition of the rightful owners of intellectual property rights.

A second justification is based on supply control of agricultural markets. Faced with the well-known difficulties of adjusting supply and demand for agricultural markets, States have put in place systems of sectoral regulation in the context of agricultural policies. The identification of differences in quality, to the extent to which it is correlated with yield, is an instrument that has been used to control agricultural supply coming onto these markets in certain market contexts. The reasoning based on quality as an instrument of control of agricultural supply has been invoked by national policies, or even by regional policies when regions have been attributed the appropriate competency, or if, as in the case of Languedoc, we are dealing with a specialized region. But this argument has also been invoked by the actors involved in a production chain. The issue of supply control has also been important for local actors in territorialized production chains. In effect, control over the volume of production provides power over the market, a domain regulated by competition policies. In this respect, a tension appears between quality and quantity.

The third justification is related to rural development. Policies of protection and promotion of GIs can be justified because of their impact on rural development. From this perspective, GIs become one of the components of rural policies, and as well, assess the different orientations (AOC/IGP) and adaptations in each case. This reasoning is based upon externalities, or territorial public goods, linked to local production systems of specific qualities. This justification is advanced by different private sector actors within public action networks. This justification has also been used to promote 'endogenous development' (in different countries since the 1970s), regional development (particularly in Italy and Spain in relation to regionalization), and for 'rural development' (the Cork Conference in 1996, and Agenda 2000). Measures to support local initiatives related to quality production and to the adaptation of marketing channels and infrastructure have been programmed by the Regulation for Rural Development (Regulation 1257). The political networks corresponding to these different movements have been developed through several successive phases.

The final justification is based on heritage and the conservation of resources.

Policies of protection and promotion of GIs can be considered as part of the means of conserving certain biological resources, such as certain breeds of livestock, various vegetal species and fermentation agents, and biological diversity, not to mention human *savoir-faire*, both individual and collective, that are tied to the very existence of these resources (an ethno-biological perspective). The mobilization of these resources brings into play various social arrangements. BY considering GIs as rights of intellectual ownership, a collective know-how is recognized which has a heritage value.