

Boivin, Nicolas; Traversac, Jean-Baptiste

Conference Paper

The territorial governance of organic food and farming in mainstream agriculture spaces: The case of Paris Region

50th Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "Sustainable Regional Growth and Development in the Creative Knowledge Economy", 19-23 August 2010, Jönköping, Sweden

Provided in Cooperation with:

European Regional Science Association (ERSA)

Suggested Citation: Boivin, Nicolas; Traversac, Jean-Baptiste (2010) : The territorial governance of organic food and farming in mainstream agriculture spaces: The case of Paris Region, 50th Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "Sustainable Regional Growth and Development in the Creative Knowledge Economy", 19-23 August 2010, Jönköping, Sweden, European Regional Science Association (ERSA), Louvain-la-Neuve

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/119199>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

The territorial governance of organic food and farming in mainstream agriculture spaces The case of Paris Region

Abstract

This paper examines the role of organic food in the territorial making of. Drawing upon recent regional policies in Paris Region, we argue that these policies are a base of territorial governance. The focus is explored by the linkage between actors. These actors belong at vertical level or horizontal level. However, the interviews with principal actors show it is more complex. The territorial governance depends, so, the power and the biopower. Now, the challenge to Paris Region is to make accepted the organic food development in its economic policy. The organic farming creates new territorial form and a new territorial management. There is increasing evidences convergence between two systems: mainstream agricultural model and alternative food systems. Organic food system becomes a fundamental stake for the Paris-Region Council as a thriving economic policy, an alternative to the rural as a residential space and urban sprawl and a politic symbol of a sustainable development programmatic.

Keywords

Territorial governance, Regional governmentality, Alternative food systems, Suburban development

Organic farming is a form of agriculture which forbids chemicals on the elaboration of products. The concept has existed for 80 years and European Union legitimizes since the 80's. This farming was enforced by the law in 1993 (Stolze, Lampkin, 2009). The first common law to harmonize the technical systems and the certifications process was vote last year, in January 2009. France aims a development and has a regulation (*Grenelle de l'environnement*). For consumers and producers organic food is conceived not only as a techniques' but as safe and care food. These activities structure news spaces near Paris. The Region wants to develop organic farming in the farming territories and to introduce organic food in catering (Poursinoff, 2008). It believes an argument to the regional elections.

This paper investigates the complex impact of organic farming on the territorial governance, more exactly the territorial governance on suburban spaces around Paris. It's a tribute to the understanding of the impact of the renewal of the farming policy on the governance of agricultural sphere and suburban territories. We confront the concepts of actor-network, governance and the Foucault's concept of *governmentality* and propose a framework for understanding of the effect of merchant and non merchant links between actors on the manufacture of the territory. Following Trewavas, our hypothesis are that organic food profit from a positive perception of the population who live in town and suburb spaces. Organic is a "territorial label of quality" (Trewavas, 2001). Further complicating this point-view, many people see organic food and farming as a good thing for the society, a means to develop alternative consumption society by intermediary the AMAP (Association pour le Maintien de l'Agriculture Paysanne, comparable to the Community Supported Agriculture in USA or Teikei in Japan) or cooperative distributors (Abbott Cone, Myhre, 2000). The renewal of the

technical systems is not only a challenge for conventional farming systems but change also the territorial frameworks.

In order to explore the territorial governance of organic food and farming, this paper considers the paradigms used as actor-networks, agro-food networks, territorial governance and regional governmentality. This presentation addresses the role of institution in the implementation of regional alternative economy. The paper ends with discussion about problems which are appearing.

Organic food and farming: paradigm of actor theory

The purpose of the demonstration is to understand the place of networks in actor strategies. Scholars place food in the centre of rural studies (Murdoch, 2000, Sonnino, Marsden, 2006) segmenting the relational framework in vertical and horizontal networks (Marsden, Lowe, Whatmore, 1990). The actor-network theory (ANT) is an approach that focuses upon the status of actor (natural, technological...). With commodity chains analyses, ANT form the vertical network of the agro-food studies (Murdoch, 2000). In the territorial construction to leave organic food, the vertical actor-network re-groups actors of production (producers as cereal growers, truck farmers or poly cultural growers), processing, industrialisation and consumption. These actor related typology enact the commodity chains (Friedland, 2001). These chains display the increasing complexity of food chains as a system variety of social, economic, natural and technical components are unified together (Murdoch, 2000). The shape of vertical food network is only not the sum of all parts but the whole with all links between the different entities.

Friedland (2001) proposes a scale reading in three parts to understand the agro-food system; commodity scales, sector-based organisation and commodity cultures. ANT succeeds on actor network methodology which advocates a methodology based on scales, by facilitating the local. Finally, for Friedland, ANT brings more a methodology for an empirical reading than a theory. The reasoning of this author ends in the implementation of a methodology which establishes itself on scales. In the modern societies, the space is not physical but the space is relational, vast, indirect and imbricate in a multitude of interactions of social groups. Dixon (1999, 2000) shows that the power is located between the upstream (producers) and the approval (consumers) of a food network. In France, the market power is shared by merchants from the National Market of Rungis (a huge national food hub near to Paris), a big retailer-cooperative named Biocoop and the consumers of alternative food. In Region Paris, there are approximately 300 firms involved partially or totally in organic food, this conglomerate represents a great concentration for this country. These companies are part of international companies or state-based companies.

Horizontal networks are the level of innovation and learning process (Murdoch, 2000). The spatial approach considered local like to horizontal scales in the game of actors (You, Wood, 2006). The learning and innovation networks argue that forms of rural specialisation should be local emerging. Traditional form networks live with modern network of knowledge produced by alternative agro-food systems. In Paris-Region, the specific knowledge for producing organic raw materials is hold by farmers and extension services, both actors of the first level. The meeting, on the exploitation, between farmers and technical engineers of local agricultural departments make the base of knowledge and know-how. It is a particular case of agriculture because the producers don't like exchange their knowledge with the

neighbourhood in the mainstream farming know-how. We think that organic farming system is based upon several natures of values (human, technical and ideological values). This hypothesis condition this paper and that is why, we can analyze the organic system by the alternative agri-food networks (AAFN's). They are defined by Higgins, Dibben and Cocklin (2008).

AAFN's focused on the local production as a base of globalization regulation. In British and North-American literatures, AAFN's is a turn, is a new paradigm to look that the alternative from productivist farming and their chains. Two way are drew (Dupuis and Goodman, 2005, Goodman, 2003). In first, the localisation of (organic) food read by the actor confrontations on local scales (farmers, markets, proximate selling...). Secondly, the role of quality in the territorial framework and environmental certification is analyzed. The proximate is the alternative way of live to the local farming production (Sonnino, 2007). In this balance of power between different scales, the social processes become the spatial and economic stakes. In the same time, the AAFN's influence the conventional supply chains (Higgins et al., 2008). The alternative food networks are perceived and marketed as solutions for sustainable development by economic agents, political actors and engaged researchers. Their spaces of this AAFN's win to good livelihoods (Morgan et al., 2006). A problem remains. The development of this social alternative network is "mainstreaming" thanks to policy. Indeed, Paris-Region Council of *Ile-de-France* (the regional institution which governs the Paris Region) decides to base their agriculture policies on environmental practices, in particular organic farming, with five years of delay with regard to the other European Urban Region (Munich, Firenze, Roma, Madrid, etc.). This policy is the core of the policies for the rural regions. This council presents the new territorial governance.

What is Governance?

Governance is essentially used by many disciplines in human sciences, economist, political analysts, sociologists and geographers. They don't agree with a unique definition. Geographers prefer to add it "territorial" when economists and politists explore its institutional forms. The governance unite social researchers by the different levels of analyse and the interaction of public and private actors.

Territorial governance is a combination between countries political, institutions, national regulation, and economic actors. The institutions and policies affecting territorial performance must be referred as a territorial governance of a region (Globerman, Shapiro, 2002). The primer aspect of governance consists in the conformity of behaviours to the rules selected by local power (Lio, Liu, 2008). Agents are embedded in a set of concrete formal and informal institutions. The second dimension of governance is the regulation. This consideration allows us to consider separately the action of a state and of local powers – regional council, associations, and lobbies. The governance is not the disappearance of authority, appears a political stability by a selection of authority. The division of action capacities between territorial actors which have many different form of power in accordance to their role form an array of power. Governance shows the actor networks on a territory made by policies. Increasingly the local policy networks observed in Paris-Region differentiate the territorial development with a plurality of policies and powers towards organic food (Reed, 2009). The organic sector (growers, processors, distributors) is known by different epistemologies: bad reading because of the dominance of the growing of the multiple retailers (Smith, Marsden, 2004), marketing reading of the organic food (Munday, 2006), behaviour of actors (AAFN's).

Now, scientific personalities specialize on this notion and become scientific spokesmen of governance as, for example, Stoker (Stoker, 1998). For him, the governance is a group of institutions and actors which don't belong at the governmental sphere. The governance translates interdependence between institutions' powers associated with the collective action at a local level. The governance makes to take place autonomous actor networks. For scholars the governance made the link between public and private actors (Stoker, 1998). The reading of governance pulls a deepening by a territorial entrance. The geographers envisage the territorial governance by three poles (Lewis, Moran, Barker, 2002). The first is the industry governance, managed mainly by firms (corporate governance, family enterprise, industry network, industry knowledge, industry rules, set of contracts). The second represents the administrative governance structured by social struggle, ideology, power exercises by university, bureaucracy and social regulation. The third pole of territorial governance assimilate at "people in place" in interaction with local knowledge, physical environment, local norms, local obligations, trust and local government (Lewis, Moran, Barker, 2002). The territorial governance is a complex geosystem.

To make a synthesis, the territorial governance is a group of process linked and integrated at the management of political societies by several (elected or not) actors. The purpose of the linkage is to solve societies' problems and pilot expectations on a space. The territorial governance focus on three points: a horizontal coordination, a co-optation of actors' speech and a making of a control of conflicts (power) by a set of idiosyncratic preventive tools. The geosystem give responsibilities at the actors on the principle "delegation". The territorial governance is based on a collective mediation for the weakened territory. It sends back to another reading: the regional governmentality.

What is the governmentality? To answer this question, it is necessary to analyze the class that M. Foucault gave to the College de France. He has the peculiarity to not steep himself in his ideas. Throughout his lessons, he evokes notions, tried to conceptualize his reflections (Fall, 2005). As soon as he noticed that he became prisoner of his idea, he changed direction, abandoning it to take « another road ». So numbers of delivered concepts were abandoned during his teaching. The governmentality is one between others. During his first teaching, he based his reflection on the power, in particular in « territory, safety and population » in 1977-78 and in « birth of biopolitics » in 1978-79. His courses made echo, and after they were published in various languages, they are now published in French under the title « Governmentality ». This is conceives as the self government of individuals in its articulation with others. Unfortunately this definition wasn't convenient for Foucault. He improved it by the adjunction of the « *subjectivation* » which arises from the notion of government. At the same time, the governance is, for him, a kind of grouping of the « *ethical practices* ». To be understanding, it is necessary to include that the individuals who know that they possess some power govern subjects by means of the knowledge. This governmentality is different from the combination between the power, the knowledge and the subject (the one). So, the definite knowledge pulls resistances on behalf of the persons under the control of the objectified power. The decisions are taken with the agreement of the actors who evolve within the same spaces lived by themselves.

The functioning presupposes, obviously, a crucial element in this system of management: the freedom. As the power is held by everybody, every individual is free to use his power within society. Their regulation by the standards and the codes centre these actions by favouring those who are the most beneficial for societies. More simply, they don't make anything. Why would the actors destroy a system which allows such person? For the best (or in the worst), they are going to choose to modify it and not to damage it. The central element in this

territorial management is the knowledge. All the actors of the world of organic food possess a common knowledge on the organic farming and additional knowledge. They become useful for one another, thus allowing governmentality. Foucault accentuates connections within the different scales of governmentality. « No local foyer, no plan of transformation could work if, by a series of successive chains, it didn't join finally a strategy of group. And conversely, no strategy could assure global effects if it didn't take support on precise relations which wouldn't be consequences but anchorage point »¹. The decisions are all bound some to the others through their existence on several geographic levels.

Territorial governance and territorial governmentality... applied theory and concept

This notion of governmentality influences the Hudson's works, a geographer who works on the exercise of power at the regional level (Hudson, 2005). He transposes the Foucault's notion into the wave of globalization. For him, it is a way of re-imagining the relations between the economy, the State and the society. Hudson calls it « *the new autonomy* ». He suggests a new feature of the region: a subject of politics. The region should not be only a territorial support any more but it has to be a political unity above all. This denationalization of the region establishes a new governance of a political and policy system where the power would belong to cities and to regions. It was a perfect application of the governmentality concept. The devolution enters a strong power at local level and an economic success passes by an important role of the region. It becomes a geographic inescapable entity. For the moment in France, this territorial meshing is only a geographic fiction so much the opinions diverge on this question. The governmentality supposes an assent of the actors, a choice made by them and not a choice imposed at an « inquisitive » level. Foucault's governmentality is, finally, a technology of the power. It's a sort of "guidance". The purpose of this governmentality is to make the interests of the citizens and those of government coincide. The region becomes then the centre of a microphysics of the power.

The microphysics of the power is, according to Foucault « *all the details and the devices of power in the foundation of the regimes of the truths* » (Foucault, 2001b), in other words in societies of Occident, the power takes the same direction as what is considered as the social truth. The microphysics of the power collects three great categories of territorial powers:

- The first one, the sovereign power is embodied by symbolic figures. It establishes a hierarchy which the power stops calling back to avoid the contesting. The sovereign power does not individualize the governed masses. It is a power of groups. It becomes famous for the powerful actors who dictate rules for all the actors on the territory.
- The second power is discipline. It represents exactly the opposite of the sovereign power. It is a bilateral power. It is the military power for example, where each has a place and has to stay by making defined tasks there.
- Finally, the biopower: to caricature, it's the extreme disciplinary power; it is the power of the standards that press on the body of the one who undergoes it. This biopower sets up controls which are established because of deceits like phases of food crises. It structures a marginal space which is all the same integrated into the global system.

1 Personale translation




Fig 1: The microphysics of power in production territories

This microphysics of the power allows seeing various overlapping spatial strata. By applying the concept of Foucault's governmentality to the farming spaces of Paris Region, we observe a « broken spatial report » by the use of the powers within the decisions. The governmentality is the reading of the governance by factors of the chaos. However, the governance is not simply an expression of power; it is also a place of listening. The governmentality is a part of the « territorial governance » system.

The governmentality is similar to the *impolitique* (Esposito, 2006). The *impolitique* is one border of politics and policies; it is not the apolitical or the end of politics. On the contrary, it is « *politics considered since its outside border. It is its determination* »². That is the non-theological thought of the political realism. Certainly, the power is everywhere. It is one of exceptional geographical objects which possess the gift of ubiquity. It structures spaces, builds them, destroys them according to the events. It is the source of the territory. The power consists in several poles in the political and policy complex systems. It expresses itself as well through the speech through the competence, through the decisions that through the action through

2 Personale translation, ESPOSITO R., 2006.

the undergone that though the live. It is the hard core of the territorial governance. The actions remain at the heart of the territorial construction. The appropriation is so several orders (institutional, individual, collective or symbolism). The governance passes by the consideration of the multiple choices which actor possesses and roles. The stake is territorial. With the institution of new spatial links, the territorialisation of the spaces of the organic food is not finished. The territorialisation is an unlimited phenomenon because it is based on actors' dynamics. Thus, the territorial governance passes so by the institutional powers.

Organic food system in Paris-Region: What governance for what territories?

In Paris Region, in 2010, 115 organic farmers produced by furnish the local selling. They sell to others regions also, peripheral regions. This farming is thinking as a form of family agriculture. That's not truth. Really, the organic food in Paris Region is produced by agriculture firm, technology. Organic farming appears as a force of changing the mainstream model for alternative policy showing at the producers that it is a profitable production technical (fig. 2). Qualitative research interviewing during one years (March 2009 – February 2010) in 8 departments - the territorial French levels below the Region give us explications of technical innovations, growers' profiles and sales practices. Bio food is mainly sells directly (on farm shop, group of consumers, associations of alternative sales). Part of the production is selling in supermarket (Carrefour, Monoprix) trough distributors' logistical hubs. Part is also sells in the National Market of Rungis - commodity market for the city retail shops and supermarkets. Paris Region invests in a specific place for organic food in Rungis. The growers have power because they are the first link of the organic chain. Those organic farmers engaged in the process in direct and local sales think that participate at the local development. They feel as minority but also as useful people. The organic growers form informal networks with extension on the others peripheral regions. The Paris-Region support their environmental service by a regional subsidies (151 €/ha for crop, 600 €/ha for vegetable farming and 900 €/ha for fruits).

The second part of the governance of the organic food in Paris Region is symbolizes by the certification networks. The certification in France is decentralized. In fact, the government have the power of certification for the AB label (*Agriculture Biologique*, in French). In France, a State agency, the INAO (Origin and Quality National Institute) is the effective arbitrator between the private propositions. This organism propose the rules, the legislator promulgates the basic law for the organic production. The national regulation takes the texts of the European laws of organic farming. It is a certification to standards set at EU level (Reed, 2009). INAO produce work-papers to help the firm of certification. Indeed, the INAO is simply an up-institute which delegates the ground-work at private firms, *Qualité France*, *Eco Cert*. The agents of this enterprise go on the organic exploitations and checks the realizations by producers. This service is paid by growers. Certification for the getting of the label is of significant cost for farmers.




Fig 2: Governance, simplification and functioning

Another pole of governance is the promoting. Three institutions are in charge of the campaign on the organic food. First, the *GAB* (*Groupement des Agriculteurs Biologiques*) is a regional farmers-union created for the defence of the interest of the organic farmers in the region. The *GAB* proposes technical and administrative help at the farmers. It is financed by the Paris

Region. The *FNAB* (National Federation of Organic Farming) group all GAB of France. It is financed by the basis and State and farmers dues. The *FNAB* is more a lobby than a technical assistance. The *FNAB* is represented on national institutions (agriculture ministry, national farmers' assembly, national cooperatives unions, etc.). Finally, the promotion is made of *Agence Bio*. Its role is promoting organic food in all types of media. *Agence Bio* is a national framework completely financed by State budget. This lobby have for mission to promote the quality of organic food with mainstream farmers and all consumers. These three actors were questioned during the investigation period.

Regional policy is the nodal point in the framework of organic farming governance. Scholars use the term "policy network" as a metaphor to design a system with hierarchy of decision (Moschitz, Stolze, 2009). The policies of Paris region embody a "policy network" itself. The policies of Paris Region mobilize different actors and actions (agricultural service, environmental service, elected persons, administrative persons, etc.), linkage between actors (interaction of money circuits, information and knowledge, for example), network structures to constrain the actors involved and relation of politics and policies. The regional context influences the Regional Council policies. The regional farming is an intensive and productivity agriculture which doesn't accept the alternative farming. The policy takes organic practice for environmental service considering its potentiality in reducing the water pollution. In practical terms it is a loan of 150 € by hectare. Organic farming is less polluting than the conventional agriculture and the Paris Region chooses this solution for its environmental policies to become the first Ecoregion of EU. Despite the influence of the regional characters of the organic network presented here, the paper does not neglect the general context of organic farming development in other European countries (Stolze, Lampkin, 2009). The competition is imperfect, the transparency is not real in market functions and markets lead to an income distribution within a society which is considered unacceptable (Stolze, Lampkin, 2009). Indeed, the organic food breathes a social movement, a positive social movement for intended regional elections.

Certification, policies networks, system of sales to build AAFN beyond localities and region and enabling alternative production to satisfy urban voters and urban consumers (Higgins, Dibbens, Cocklin, 2009). The Paris Region should create a food democracy (Reed, 2009). The Paris Regional Plan of Development 2009 – 2013 decline in four themes, represented by 28 actions. The programmatic of the regional policy for organic development is centralized in the accompaniment of the farmers. The measures subdivide on four targets:

- Facilitate the access to the land for organic farmers
- Support the installations of organic farmers in suburban spaces
- Develop territorial project as installations of organic exploitations in natural parks
- Help the technical development and finance the conversion and the preservation of organic farming

The second hub to facilitate the organic food implantation focuses on the embeddedness. This axe consists to improve the competitiveness of the sectors, improve the organisation and facilitate the cooperation between growers. The third action pole is the financing of research and the teaching. Finally, the fourth action block is constituted by the realisation of this action plan and the communication by facilitating the participative governance. The Paris region establishes governmentality because these actions pull a microphysics of power for elected persons of this region and for the producers around Paris. However, problems appear in the network solidification.

Territories, governance and policies: future and discussion

The regional policy aims an intensification of organic farming and food. The political will don't be enough. The "pragmatism reality" is again favourable to the mainstream model of agriculture. The ordinary functioning is observable because there are producers, system of sales, subventions and consumers. Nevertheless, the functioning can be to improve if the problems are resolved. The practices form the base of exchanges between producers and consumers. The central stake at the moment is the overtaking of the passion and the moral sentiments (Clarke, 2008). The interviewed persons (growers, truck farmers, elected persons, consumers) speak of organic food with "fury". They are not rational. They oppose, always, the good and the bad, the sanitary food and the industrial food, the quality and the non-quality etc... The dialogue is weak between organic and conventional farmers. The conventional farmers must inspire to organic farming practices and they must stop think that the organic farmers like to post-68's producers. The organic growers interviewed desire to be considered as the other farmers by the public agency and farmers unions. The economic balance sheet of visited exploitation is good and the growers win between 25 and 250 % in more that the same exploitation in conventional agriculture. The organic farms face regular problems for suburban agriculture. Firstly, they saw a workforce shortage in the Paris Region. The work on organic farming is not personal developing because there are the also the same spot, essentially the weeding. The workforce is not more paid that in the conventional with more painful labour. Another problem resides on the lacks of organic seeds and plants. NICT reduce the distance and local networks of organic farmers contribute to the exchanges, but the lack of seeds and plant producers in the Region is a real handicap.

For a development to organic food, the mentality must evolve, on particular the policy mentality. The urbanisation is a matter of conflict between farmers and others and between farmers. Land use planning is a *sine qua non* condition to develop the implantation of organic farm in Paris Region. The elected persons work with the regulation instruments as the planning documents. The Paris-Region Council acts on the free fields privilege the organic farming and not the suburban buildings. The Paris region finances every year the *SAFER* (the institution which possesses the power to distribute the fields at the farmers). Paris Region give 300 000 € a year. So, this council is the institution which has right of way to install organic farmers on these free fields. This action allow making a sustainable city, it is in connection with the "natural" agriculture. The place of nature is rediscovered thanks to AAFN. The last problem is the sales. To make profit organic farmer must sell on different circuits, especially on direct sales. Most of them associate local sales (association, directly sales) with GM sales. The farmer want his product will be recognised for his quality. To go up to the supermarket, the product is forwarded by a transporter. Finally, the organic farmers don't like see their products on GM because the stake in shelf damage the product. However, this marketing brings them a good payment.

Conclusion

This paper has explored the territorial governance of organic food system in Paris Region. The territorial governance is a form of spatial management from a resource, here, the organic farming. This text contributes to literature on alternative food network (Higgins, 2008, Friedland, 2001, Sonnino, 2008) which analyse the process of the organic food in a large alimentary system, a system which invites to consume otherwise. The AFN's relies on other mechanism of proximate because they form a linkage on a lot of levels. In fact, the local is re-invented by the new trusts, the new sales. The AMAP and local sell are the symbol of this

renew of alternative consumption. The local actors are the important level to build an alternative farming system which translates by the organic food. The producers choose conversion because they prefer become good-production makers. They feel more responsible in the farming and global society. The regional level structures the territorial development. The Paris Region Council want make a really embeddedness. It finances producers, transformers and the sellers to strengthen the regional network. France and EU appear as political actors.

We have show that any consideration of alternative network shapes in mainstream farming spaces can attend to the way of network forms act with pre-existing structures (technical, socio-economic and symbolical frameworks). The network have considered as Manichean reading. Firstly, we have examined “vertical” networks in the organic farming chain. The level constitute by general actors which make of the base of organic food system. The vertical level group producers, sellers but, so, the National Market of Rungis (the food platform supply), big cooperative shops as Biocoop Shop and the social demand to the alternative food at the mainstream agriculture model during food crisis of 1990 – 2000’s. In Region Paris, there are near 300 firms of transformation in organic food. The upstream (producers) and the approval (consumers) of a food network symbolize vertical networks. It is translated by the mass-market retailing (distribution), the researchers in marketing and in symbolic manipulation. In France, the organic food system is so composed to horizontal level. This level is the network of innovation and teaching (Murdoch, 2000). The horizontal networks identify territorial areas as the group of producer in a small territory to share their know-how. A new economic network is born by organic food and it changes the mainstream farming economic. These two levels give at the actors a power, an action power.

This structuralization make of territorial governance which is a group of process linked and integrated at the management of political societies by a lot of actors. The purpose of the linkage is administrated societies' problems and expectations on a space. The territorial governance focus on three points: a horizontal coordination, a co-optation of actors' speech and a making of a control. The system gives responsibilities at the actors on the principle “delegation”. The territorial governance articulates around a collective mediation for the weakened territory. It sends back to another reading: the regional governmentality. This last one is composed to microphysics of power (Foucault, 2001). The actors in AFN's share the sovereign power, the power of disciplinary and the biopower. The creating of a new farming process as organic farming in great level involves a regional governmentality.

In Paris Region, the Regional Council invest in organic farming to become the first Ecoregion of Europe. The organic farmers are “subventioned” to make a “good world”. It is a strategy, a political strategy to apply EU decision and national policies. It is not only that! The regional organic policy allows controlling the suburbanisation, the sprawl of Paris and satisfying urban voter which are favourable at the progression of organic food. Spatially, the organic farming development has termed a scale free network in regional level (Clarke et al., 2008). The local “ethicalities” the regional policies and creates a development by expansion from the “place effect”. It is a base of territorial governance with success and problems. This governance constitutes an environmental consciousness in the greening urban sphere of influence.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge Paris Region Council and INRA in funding the research on which this article is based. They would like to acknowledge the intellectual support of our colleagues in the projects discussed, Christine Aubry and Leïla Kebir.

References

- ABBOTT-CONE, C., MYHRE, A., 2000, Community-Supported Agriculture: A Sustainable Alternative to Industrial Agriculture?, *Human Organization*, vol 59 (2), p. 187 -197
- AMILIEN, V., FORT, F., FERRAS, N., 2007, Hyper-real territories and urban markets: chaining conventions for local food – case studies from France and Norway. *Anthropolgy of food*, from local food to localised food, S2
- ASHEM, B., COOKE, P., MARTIN, R., 2006, Clusters and Regional Developpement, Critical reflections and explorations. Regional Studies Association, Oxon, Routledge
- BATHELT, H., 2005, Geographies of production: growth regimes in spatial perspective – knowledge creation and growth in cluster, *Progress In Human Geography*, vol 29 (1), Arnold, p. 204 – 217
- BATHEKT, H, MALMBERG, A., MASKELL, P., 2004, Clusters and Knowledge: local buzz, Global Pipeline and the Process of Knowledge Creation, *Progress In Human Geography*, vol 28 (1), Arnold, p. 31 - 57
- BELL, D., VALENTINE, G., 1997, *Consuming Geographies: We are where we eat*. London, Routledge
- BERTSCH, C., 2000, the voice of authority: Michel Foucault’s problematization of the intellectual. Badeserver, <http://bad.eserver.org>
- CHIFFOLEAU, Y., 2009, From Politics to Co-operation: The Dynamics of Embeddedness in Alternative Food Supply Chains. *Sociologia Ruralis*, Vol 49 (3)
- COLLETIS-WAHL, K., PECQUEUR, B., 2001, Territories, Development and Specific Resources: What analytical Framework?. *Regional Studies*, vol. 35 (5), p.449 – 459
- CORPATAUX, J., CREVOISIER, O., 2007, Economic theories and Spatial transformations: Clarifying the space-time Premises and Outcomes of Economic Theories. *Journal of Economic Geography*, p. 285-309
- COX, K., 2002, *Political Geography. Territory, state and society*, Ohio State University
- COCKLIN, C., DIBBEN, J., MAUTNER, N., 2006, From market to multifunctionality? Land stewardship in Australia. *Geographical Journal*, vol 172 (3), p. 197 – 205
- DIBBEN, J., COCKLIN, C., 2005, Sustainability and agri-environmental gvernance. In HIGGINS, V., LAWRENCE, G., *Agricultural Governance: Globalisation and the New Politics of Regulation*. Routledge, Abingdon, p. 135 - 152
- DIXON, J., 2000, *Chooks, Cooks and Culinary Cultures: A Cultural Economy Model for the Study of Food Commodity Systems*, Melbourne Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, Department of Social Science and Planning, Ph.D dissertation
- DIXON, J., 1999, *A Cultural Economy Model for Studying Foods Systems*, *Agriculture and Human Values*, vol 16, 2, p. 151-16
- DUPUIS, M., GOODMAN, D., 2005, Should we go “home” to eat? Toward a reflexive politics of localism. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 21, p. 359 - 371
- ESPOSITO, R., 2006, *Catégories de l'impolitique*, Paris, L'ordre philosophique, Editions du Seuil
- FALL, J.J., 2005, Michel Foucault and francophone geography, <http://www.espacestemps.net/document1540.html>
- FOUCAULT, M. 2001a., *Dits et écrits 1954 – 1975*, Tome 1, Paris, Gallimard, coll Quarto

- FOUCAULT, M. 2001b., Dits et écrits 1976 – 1988, Tome 2, Paris, Gallimard, coll Quarto
- FOUCAULT, M., 1984, Histoire de la sexualité, La volonté de savoir, vol 1, Paris, Gallimard, Collection Tel
- FRIEDLAND, H. W., 2001, Reprise on commodity systems methodology, *International Journal of sociology of agriculture and food*, vol 9 (1), p. 82-104
- GLOBERMAN, S., SHAPIRO, D., 2002, Global foreign direct investment flows: the role of governance infrastructure. *World development* 11, p. 1899 - 1919
- GOODMAN, D., 2003, Editorial, The quality “turn” and alternative food practices: reflections and agenda. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 19, p. 1 – 7
- HASSANEIN, N., 2003, Practicing food democracy: a pragmatic politics of transformation. *Journal of rural sociology*, vol 19, (1), p.77 - 86
- HUDSON, R., 2005, Region and place: devolved regional government and regional economic success?, *Progress In Human Geography*, vol 5, 29, Arnold, p. 618-626
- HIGGINS, V., DIBBEN, J., COCKLIN, C., 2008, Building alternative agri-food networks: Certification, embeddedness and agri-environmental governance, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 24, p. 15 – 27
- HINRICHS, C., 2003, The practice and politics of food system localization, *Journal of rural sociology*, vol 19, (1), p.33-45
- JAROSZ, L., 2008, The city in the country: Growing alternative food networks in Metropolitan areas. *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol 24, p. 231-244
- LEWIS, N, MORAN, W, PERRIER-CORNET, P, BARKER, J., 2002, Territoriality, enterprise and relementation in industry governance, *Progress In Human Geography*, vol 26, p. 433 – 462
- LIO, M., LIU, M.-C., 2008, Governance and agricultural productivity: A cross-national analysis. *Food Policy*, 33, p. 504 – 512
- MATHER, C., 1999, Agro-commodity chains, market power and territory: re-regulating South African citrus exports in the 1990's. *Geoforum*, vol 30, p. 61-70
- MARSDEN, T., LOWE, P., WHATMORE, S., 1990, *Rural Restructuring: Global Processes and their Responses*. Fluton, London
- MICHELSEN, J., 2009, The Europeanization of Organic Agriculture and Conflicts over Agricultural Policy. *Food Policy*, vol 34, p. 252 – 257
- MORGAN, K., MARSDEN, T., MURDOCH, J., 2006, *Worlds of Food: Place, Power and Provenance in the Food Chain*, Oxford University Press
- MOSCHITZ, H., STOLZE, M., 2009, Organic farming policy networks in Europe: Context, actors and variation. *Food Policy*, 34, p. 258 - 264
- MUNDAY, J., 2006? Identity in focus: the use of focus groups to study the construction of collective identity, *Sociology*, 40 (1), p. 89 - 107
- MURDOCH, J., 2000, Network – a new paradigm of rural development?, *Journal of Rural Studies*, vol 16, p.407-419
- PADEL, S., 2001, Conversion to Organic Farming: A Typical Example of the Diffusion of an Innovation?. *Sociologia Ruralis*, Vol 41, (1), p.40 - 61
- POURSINOFF, A., 2008, L'agriculture biologique : Une contribution majeure à l'Ecorégion. Pour un plan d'action. Rapport de la Région Ile-de-France
- REED, M., 2009, For whom? – The Governance of Organic Food and Farming in the UK, *Food Policy*, 34, p. 280 – 286
- SMITH, E., MARSDEN, T., 2004, Exploring the “limits to growth” in UK organics: beyond the statistical image. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 20, p. 345 - 357
- STOKER, G., 1998, Governance as a theory: Five propositions, *International Social Science Journal*

STOLZE, M., LAMPKIN, N., 2009, Policy for organic farming: Rationale and Concepts, *Food Policy*, 34, p. 237 – 244

SONNINO, R., 2007, Embeddedness in action: saffron and the making of the local in southern Tuscany. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 24, p. 61 - 74

SONNINO, R., MARDSEN, T., 2006, Alternative Food Network in the south west of England: Toward a new agrarian eco-economy?, MARDSEN, T, MURDOCH, J., *Between the Local and the Global: Confronting Complexing in the Agro-Food Sector*, Elsevier, Amsterdam, p. 299 - 322

TREWAVAS, A., 2001, Urban myths of organic farming, *Nature International weekly journal of science*, 410, p.409 – 410

WINTER, M., 2003, Embeddedness, the new food economy and defensive localism. *Journal of rural sociology*, vol 19, (1), p.23-32

YOU, L., WOOD, S., 2006, An entropy approach to spatial disaggregation of agricultural production, *Agriculture Systems*, 90, p. 329 - 347