



**THE EUROPEAN UNION POST-2013  
ENVIRONMENTAL COMMON  
AGRICULTURAL POLICY REFORM**  
**Contested representations of biodiversity**

A Research Paper presented by:

***ANNE-CECILE GALLET***

(France)

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for obtaining the  
degree of

MASTERS OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Specialization:

**Agriculture and Rural Development**

(ARD)

Members of the Examining Committee:

Bram Büscher

Ingrid Nelson

The Hague, The Netherlands  
December 2012

***Disclaimer:***

This document represents part of the author's study programme while at the Institute of Social Studies. The views stated therein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Institute.

***Inquiries:*****Postal address:**

Institute of Social Studies  
P.O. Box 29776  
2502 LT The Hague  
The Netherlands

**Location:**

Kortenaerkade 12  
2518 AX The Hague  
The Netherlands

Telephone: +31 70 426 0460

Fax: +31 70 426 0799

# Contents

<b>Chapter 1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 The European Union's project of biodiversity conservation	2
1.2 Reactions and interactions with social movements	2
1.3 Research objectives and delimitations	3
<b>Chapter 2 Politics and discursive constructions in policy process</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 The politics behind the environmental Common Agricultural Policy reform: an interactive approach between European institutions and society	7
2.1.1 Politics at the core of policy-making	7
2.1.2 The European Union conceptualized as a state	7
2.1.3 Towards an interactive approach of the Common Agricultural Policy reform	8
2.2 Power	8
2.3 The political interactions between the European Union and social movements	9
2.4 Placing the Common Agricultural Policy reform in its discursive contents	10
2.4.1 Discourse	11
2.4.2 Biodiversity discourse	11
<b>Chapter 3 The Common Agricultural Policy reform: Interplay of actors and power</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1 Historical context of the Common Agricultural Policy reform	13
3.1.1 The porosity between change and continuity	13
3.1.2 Policy narratives serving continuity	15
3.2 The post-2013 CAP reform: renewed dynamics between the European Union and social movements	17
3.2.1 The European Union	17
3.2.2 Social movements	19
<b>Chapter 4 Contested representations of biodiversity in the context of the environmental Common Agricultural Policy reform</b>	<b>21</b>
4.1 Embedding the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy into a specific framework	21
4.1.1 The European Commission project of greening: internalizing continuity into a discourse of change	22

4.1.2 Slow Food's propositions: questioning the fundamental roots of the Common Agricultural Policy	24
4.2 Integrating biodiversity conservation into agriculture	25
4.2.1 Combining biodiversity conservation and agriculture through economics	25
4.2.2 Combining biodiversity conservation and agriculture through culture	28
<b>Chapter 5 Conclusion</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>57</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1.1 Discourse analysis European Commission	47
Table 1.2 Discourse analysis Slow Food	52

## List of Appendices

Appendix 1: ‘The CAP towards 2020: Meeting the food, natural resources and territorial challenges of the future’	33
Appendix 2: ‘The CAP beyond 2013 – challenges and opportunities for European agriculture’	35
Appendix 3: ‘Towards a new common agricultural policy’	42
Appendix 4: ‘CAP proposals don’t go far enough’	44

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my supervisor, Bram Büscher for his wonderful lectures, presence, patience and reliability. Thanks to my second reader, Ingrid Nelson for her professionalism, useful insights and help with language. Thanks to my convenor, Jun Borrás to have given me the chance to live this experience and thanks to my Quebecois Professor, Dominique Caouette, to have introduced me this field and give so much care and time to his students.

To my family who transmitted me the love of gastronomy and “good, clean and fair” food. Thanks to support me and trust me whatever I do, wherever I go.

To Pedro for his care, presence, patience, optimism, imperturbable good mood and inspiring melodies which accompanied me during this process. Thanks to have accepted my recurrent frustration!

To my ISS friends and other friends who gave me human warmth and intellectual effervescence, especially to Baboun for her example of determination and daily support.

Finally, thanks to the member of Slow Food whom I interviewed and all the anonymous I met during the Good Food March who gave me the final motivation.

In such critical time, I do not forget to honour the memory of the Fathers of Europe, people who made the European Union and are still making it, to build a marvellous peace project.

## List of Acronyms

ARC 2020	Agriculture and Rural Convention 2020
CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
EC	European Commission
EP	European Parliament
EU	European Union
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
SF	Slow Food
WTO	World Trade Organization

## Abstract

This research paper investigates the politics behind the European Union (EU) post-2013 environmental Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) reform. It especially analyses biodiversity conservation and its integration into agriculture as a specific form of greening. This process is explored through two complementary perspectives: an interactive power analysis between actors and a comparison of discursive constructions.

The greening propositions of the CAP reform are presented in their historical context and embedded in interplay of particular political narratives: productivism, multifunctionality and neoliberalism. The current CAP reform reflects an interesting policy process since social movement influence is growing. Therefore, the focus is put on the power relations between the EU institutions and social movements, illustrated by the movement Slow Food. This interplay of power impacts on the design and legitimacy of the CAP reform.

Among these interactions, contested representations of biodiversity and confrontation of discourses on integrating biodiversity conservation and agriculture are considered as one of the main expressions of politics behind the CAP reform and drivers of this policy process. The EU economic and market-based approach is not inevitable since alternatives exist, such as the Slow Food proposition of combining biodiversity conservation and agriculture through culture.

## Relevance to Development Studies

This research paper contributes to Development Studies in five senses. First, it takes part in the global questioning on the place of agriculture in development. It argues that agriculture is of central importance.

Second, by selecting a European case, it stresses that development studies concern the whole world, around different issues and is never achieved.

Third, this paper adds to the current debates on sustainable development. Indeed, agriculture is considered as the main responsible for biodiversity destruction and climate change.

Fourth, this research attempts to give a voice to integrated projects of development from the bottom-up. Indeed, Slow Food's alternative to the model of integration of biodiversity conservation and agriculture proposed by the EU institutions, links many aspects of life, is culturally-based and reconfigures power relations.

Finally, this paper affirms that discursive constructions are not neutral and produce new realities to serve specific interests, fact that development studies should always remember to address the root causes of development issues.



## **Keywords**

Biodiversity Conservation, Common Agricultural Policy Reform, Culture, Discourse, Economics, European Union, Greening, Power, Slow Food, Social movements

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

Diversity is not for governing but for loving, and the sharing of ideas is an act of freedom. Union and diversity, therefore, can run together and progress together (Slow Food 2012).

The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) has been one of the strongest European-wide policies in the history of the European Union (EU). It has also been one of the most criticized policies, because of its social and environmental impacts that affect the EU and beyond. These impacts include environmental destruction, social inequity and loss of farmer power in the food chain. These outcomes have led many to argue that the CAP is environmentally unsustainable. In response, the EU began a process to *green* the CAP. This paper explores the political and discursive dynamics behind the environmental reform of the CAP.

Three major and recent changes to CAP indicate that the policy is undergoing significant *greening*. First the CAP has moved in 2003 from direct market intervention through price support (subsidies) to direct payments decoupled from production, meaning independent from levels of production. This evolution has withdrawn the incentives to always produce more intensively without regards towards environmental impacts (Stoate et al. 2009). Second, the introduction in 2005 of cross-compliance or environmental conditionality links direct payments to basic environmental requirements, to encourage farmers to adopt eco-friendly practices. Finally, the Agri-environment Programme under the Rural Development Program offers, since 2005 and on a voluntary basis, support to environmentally-friendly methods of production. Despite these efforts, the issue of enabling market and allowing farmers to better respond to market signals have more consequently weighed, leaving environmental concerns at the end of the priority list (EC 2009).

The current post-2013 reform which will take effect in 2014 seeks to further green agriculture and to deepen environmental conditionality and incentives. Greening agriculture groups together several different issues: biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and water management. For the purpose of this paper, I focus on the biodiversity conservation aspect of the greening process. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) stresses the tremendous impact of agriculture on biodiversity loss and the critical role of agriculture in maintaining ecosystem functioning (MA 2005). The European Environmental Agency (EAA) argues that 76% of habitats linked to agro-ecosystems are threatened (2010: 29). Indeed, monocultures and the abandonment of crop rotation/diversification or the “simplification of cropping systems results in reduced crop diversity and loss of non-crop habitats such as grassland, field boundaries, water-courses and trees, all of which can form an integral component of arable ecosystems” (Stoate et al. 2001: 340). Since the Green Revolution in the 1960’s<sup>1</sup>, European countries have been favouring intensification of agriculture through intense use of chemicals (Green et al. 2005: 550), polluting eco-systems and destroying soil and species diversity. Therefore, I focus on the issue of integrating biodiversity conservation into agriculture, as a particular form of greening.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Green Revolution” refers to the modern revolution of agriculture after the Second World War. On the contrary of the current use of the word “green”, it did not entail the idea of sustainability.

## 1.1 The European Union's project of biodiversity conservation

The EU has developed a new discourse on biodiversity conservation and agriculture. A discourse is defined in the Foucauldian sense as, the general domain of production and circulation of knowledge which shapes and structures reality (Kendall and Wickham 1999: 34-47). Legal documents, legislative propositions, reports, press releases, speeches and websites take part in this discursive construction, presenting the greening of the CAP in a specific way, reflecting particular representations of reality, and contributing to the production of new realities.

The EU discourse on biodiversity conservation and agriculture adopts a biological and economic approach structured around the concepts of *public goods* and *green growth*. The concept of *public good* is defined by its non-rivalry of its consumption and non-exclusion (Cooper and al. 2009; Desjeux). In the context of agriculture and environment, it refers to the ecosystem services or “the benefits that humans recognise as obtained from ecosystems that support, directly or indirectly, their survival and quality of life” (Anton and Young 2010. 84). This language of the CAP reform reflects broader so called *green economy* in international planning. Green growth refers to “the increasing use of farming practices and technologies that simultaneously: maintain and increase farm productivity and profitability while ensuring the provision of food and ecosystem services on a sustainable basis; reduce negative externalities and gradually lead to positives ones; and rebuild ecological resources (i.e. soil, water, air and biodiversity natural capital assets) by reducing pollution and using resources more efficiently” (UNEP 2011: 42).

However, the biological and economic approach favoured by the EU sparked reactions from other actors engaged in the CAP reform (See for example; ARC2020 2011; Friends of the Earth 2011b and Slow Food 2011a). I argue that policy-making in the context of the CAP reform is highly political, displaying lots of actors with conflicting interests.

## 1.2 Reactions and interactions with social movements

The main influential actors criticizing the CAP reform are social movements. Social movements addressing agricultural and environmental issues have obtained important political influence, carrying a growing part of public opinion message and cannot be ignored (Edelman and Kay 2008). By social movements, I mean “collective challenges, based on common purposes or social solidarities, in sustained interaction with elites, opponents and authorities” (Tarrow 2011: 9).

The field of contention between the EU institutions and social movements interested in the CAP reform is structured around two main tensions. On the one hand, they deplore the superficial market-based forms of greening at the expense of more fundamental changes to agricultural production needed to hold biodiversity destruction. On the other hand, at the discursive level, they propose different conceptions of biodiversity.

First, on the lack of ambition, one example comes from Friends of the Earth who argue:

The legislative proposals tabled by the Commission show a continued bias towards intensive agriculture and supporting the export market for subsidised European food at the cost of the environment and stable food prices. Export subsidies will continue enabling Europe to dump food on developing country markets at very low prices. Despite the Lisbon treaty setting a clear target for stabilising agricultural markets through CAP measures, the proposals don't offer any mechanisms to achieve this. The lack of a coherent vision for the future of European food and farming means the tools offered in the proposals speak very different languages (2011b: 1).

As shown by this quote, not yet completed, the CAP reform arouses criticism because the proposals are considered contradictory. No legal proposition from the EC directly focuses on environmental concerns<sup>2</sup>. They only deepen environmental conditionality and lack a broader coherent strategy in terms of integrating biodiversity conservation into agriculture.

Second, biodiversity is very difficult to define because scientists, policy-makers, activists, farmers and businessmen understand biodiversity differently. In biology, biodiversity is defined as “the variability among living organisms from all sources including terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part, this includes diversity within species, between species and ecosystems” (CBD 1992). This definition is contested. According to Takacs, “conservation biologists have generated and disseminated the term *biodiversity* to change the terrain of your mental map, reasoning that if you were to conceive nature differently, you would view and value it differently” (1996: 1). Biodiversity is socially constructed and I argue that it can only be conceptualized through knowledge and “epistemologization”. Anyone who uses the word of biodiversity gives to it a specific meaning through his own world view. Hence it is unsatisfactory to define biodiversity without replacing it in a specific discourse or particular set of representations (Dingler 2005) which are the object of the second part of this research.

These critiques towards the lack of ambition towards greening and the existence of contested representations of biodiversity show that the reform of the CAP is not consensual and homogeneous. Agricultural reform is a “socio-political project” (Potter and Tilzey 2005: 584). Policy-making reveals contentious politics and conflicting representations of reality. The greening of the CAP involves negotiations, protests, transformations, adaptations driven by an elaborate institutional game and muddled power relations. Politics between the EU institutions and social movements as well as contested representations of biodiversity and their consequences on the environmental CAP reform are the main objects of this paper.

### 1.3 Research objectives and delimitations

My primary research question therefore is: What are the main elements of the *greening* of the post-2013 reform of the European Union’s Common Agriculture Policy and how is this influenced by political dynamics and contested representations of biodiversity?

My main objective is to analyse the deeper political process and representations of biodiversity behind the CAP reform. To that purpose I will develop a clearer understanding of the interplay of power between actors and analyse the meaning of biodiversity used by the EU and social movement actors such as the Slow Food movement that are driving the shape of the environmental CAP reform.

With this objective in mind, I address two major debates in the literature – politics and power relations in policy-making and political discourse - which I consider to be complementary. I look at politics in policy-making with a specific angle: the interaction between the EU, conceptualized as a state, and social movements. Thus, I will first consider the interaction between the EU

---

<sup>2</sup> The European Commission has transmitted seven proposals: direct payments; common market organization, rural development; financing, managing and monitoring; certain aids and refunds; application of direct payment in respect of the year 2013 and regime of the single-payment scheme and support for vine-growers.

institutions and social movements following Jonathan Fox's framework on interactive policy process (1993: 10-40) and some analytical tools from social movement literature (forms of mobilization and identity construction) (2003: 38-58) before devoting a full chapter to the discursive character of policy-making with a special look at biodiversity representations.

To combine both approaches, I have selected two distinct methodologies. I apply Fox's methodology (1993: 9-40) on the interaction between state and society to the interaction between the EU institutions and social movements. This method "begins with the units of analysis – the key actors – and then begins to "map" the state and its constituent structures. This discussion emphasizes the opportunities and constraints faced by different state actors allied or in conflict with other state actors as well as with social forces. The key actors in an interactive approach are defined in part by their relations with one another" (1993: 31). To that purpose I rely on secondary-data analysis, the results of three semi-structured phone interviews and some participant observation and informal talks during the closing event of the Good Food March on the 19<sup>th</sup> of September 2012. I interviewed one European deputy (14 September 2012), one employee of the French Ministry for Agriculture, Agri-Food and Forests (3 October 2012), and one member of Slow Food (8 October 2012) who is conducting a deep reflection on the movement.

Of course, the EU and social movements are plural and diverse. First of all it is useful to remind that the EU has full competences in the domain of agriculture, above member states. I will focus on two European institutions: the European Commission (EC) and the European Parliament (EP). They are the two main institutions to interact at the European level, since the Council is made of European heads of state who interact with social movements more at the national level. Moreover the Council is closer to diplomacy than policy-making.

Second, in the context of the reform of the CAP, it is impossible to highlight a common position of social movements. There is a coalition of more than 150 Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs), called Agriculture and Rural Convention 2020 (ARC2020) grouped around common issues but coming from diverse backgrounds. As mentioned on its website, its objective is, despite diversity, to give to the grassroots a strong voice, organise common actions and mobilise beyond stake-holder interests (ARC2020 2012). To make my analysis stronger and evaluate the interaction between social movements and the EU institutions, I have selected one ARC member organization as an example. Slow Food is one of the main stakeholders in ARC 2020. Slow Food was created in Europe in 1986 by Carlo Petrini, a sociologist, gastronome and journalist from Italy, to advocate for "good, clean and fair food" (Slow Food n.d. a). The group stands "at the crossroads of ecology and gastronomy, ethics and pleasure" (Slow Food n.d. a), combining agrarian, environmental and cultural claims which cannot be separated from each other. Slow Food's scale is difficult to analyse. Located between the local and international levels, the group is a network of local communities which give it an international dimension. Slow Food international is assimilated to Slow Food Italy and only recently gets involved in international or European politics such as the reform of the CAP.

Slow Food's project is plural, reflecting natural and cultural diversity which cannot exist without one another. Slow Food is above all a cultural movement which allocates a central place to food, gastronomy, tradition and the "right to pleasure", or "cultivating taste" (Slow Food 1989). Because of the agricultural origins of food, they are campaigning for "good, clean and fair" agricultural and food system. Food is related to soil fertility, salubrity of water, salubrity of air, defense of biodiversity, landscape, health knowledge and memory, pleasure, social relations, conviviality and sharing (Slow Food 2012a). Slow Food respectively defines "good, clean and fair" as "a fresh and flavoursome seasonal diet that satisfies the senses and is part of our local culture; food production and consumption that does not harm the environment, animal welfare or our health; accessible prices for consumers and fair conditions and pay for small-scale producers" (Slow Food n.d. a). One of way of achieving these goals is to slowdown, hence the name Slow Food, as shown by the

first sentence of its original manifesto: “Born and nurtured under the sign of Industrialization, this century first invented the machine and then modelled its lifestyle after it. Speed became our shackles. We fell prey to the same virus: ‘the fast life’ that fractures our customs and assails us even in our own homes, forcing us to ingest ‘fast- food’” (Slow Food 1989).

Slow Food has developed several initiatives to materialize its ideas. Slow Food is made of a network of local communities, called *convivium*, which work in their region. Slow Food Europe settled a foundation for biodiversity in 2003, with two main projects: the Ark of Taste which catalogues products at risk of extinction and the Presidia which builds network of producers to sustain endangered agro-biodiversity. In 2004, Slow Food created Terra Madre, a huge network of food communities (producers, cooks, academics, consumers...). More than 2500 food communities and 1500 *convivia* from about 130 countries constitute the movement (Slow Food 2012a: 3).

I examine Slow Food’s position on CAP reform for three reasons. First, Slow Food has developed its own position on the reform of the CAP (Slow Food 2011a) and works at the same time on biodiversity conservation in Europe (Slow Food 2011b). Second, Slow Food is considered as a cultural movement, which allows for moving the debate away from pro or against. Slow Food uses other canals of intervention than the one of opposition. Third, Slow Food adopts an interesting conception of biodiversity which goes beyond biological and economic considerations (Petrini 2012, Slow Food 2011a,b). Slow Food stresses the concepts of *agrobiodiversity* or *food biodiversity*, claiming that “biodiversity – and its ties with the characteristics of the local area – allows agriculture, its technique, harvesting and processing methods, cooking and food consumption and convivial rites to develop and evolve. Biodiversity is closely connected with community identity” (Slow Food 2011a: 9).

After analysing the interactions between the EU and social movements such as Slow Food, I document the discursive part of policy-making using critical discourse analysis, backed by secondary-data. Critical discourse analysis aims to analyse the formation and use of concepts, the use of tropes as “figures of speech, where words are not used in their literal sense”, the framing of problems and the solutions that are associated to them and explicit or implicit rules of validation (Gasper and Arthorpe 1996: 7). At the end, it offers indications on the real consistency of discourse. Since, this methodology is deeply rooted in theory; the concept of discourse will be further presented in the next chapter. This quote summarizes the ideas behind CDA:

CDA sees discourse – language use in speech and writing – as a form of ‘social practice’. Describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation(s), institution(s) and social structure(s), which frame it: The discursive event is shaped by them, but it also shapes them. That is, discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned – it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people. It is constitutive both in the sense that it helps to sustain and reproduce the social status quo, and in the sense that it contributes to transforming it. Since discourse is so socially consequential, it gives rise to important issues of power. Discursive practices may have major ideological effects – that is, they can help produce and reproduce unequal power relations between (for instance) social classes, women and men, and ethnic/cultural majorities and minorities through the ways in which they represent things and position people (Fairclough and Wodak 1997: 258).

I selected four texts that are central to the broad framework of the discourses espoused by the EU and Slow Food regarding the CAP<sup>3</sup>:

- European Commission (2010) 'The CAP towards 2020: Meeting the food, natural resources and territorial challenges of the future', Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the regions. Brussels: European Commission.  
→ Introduction
- Giolos, Dacian (2011) 'The CAP beyond 2013 – challenges and opportunities for European agriculture', Oxford Farming Conference. Oxford, 6 January.  
→ Full text
- Slow Food (2010) 'Towards a new common agricultural policy', Slow Food Policy Paper on CAP. Bra: Slow Food.  
→ Introduction
- Slow Food (2011b) 'CAP proposals don't go far enough'. Bra: Slow Food (press release, 27 October).  
→ Full text

It is worth noting that the selection of some European institutions, Slow Food and specific texts limits the scope of the research. This selection of Slow Food also reflects my own bias towards critical position and interest in food culture. Moreover, the predominance of secondary-data analysis is another limitation. However, because of shortage of time and for the reasons explained before, this choice remains relevant and reflects growing tendencies in agrarian and environmental studies. In such papers, the most important point is not the data in themselves but the way concepts are linked together to contribute to development studies. Finally, using secondary-data also gives a chance to have time for deeper conceptual analysis.

The paper is divided in five chapters, including this introduction. The second chapter gives a theoretical background to understand politics behind the CAP reform between the EU institutions and social movements as well as its discursive part. The third chapter presents the context of the CAP reform and the interplay of power relations between actors, focusing on the EC, the EP and Slow Food. The fourth chapter compares the EU and Slow Food's representations of biodiversity and two ways of integrating biodiversity conservation and agriculture: through economics and through culture. The last chapter offers my conclusions and suggestions for future research.

---

<sup>3</sup> The four texts are in Appendices as well as their table analysis. In the analysis, the numbers in brackets correspond to the line number of the quoted word.

## Chapter 2

### Politics and discursive constructions in policy process

The environmental reform of the CAP is a highly political process. It results from the interaction between many actors. Relations are cloudy because the EU represents a singular form of governance that displaces the state at the supranational level but at the same time cannot be easily mapped onto the idea of the state. The different actors act and organize their claims according to their own interests and power differentials. Indeed, power stands at the core of their interactions and conditions outcomes. Beside they bring different representations of reality. I argue that contested issues and their representations in discourses, as one form of politics are central is the process of policy-making and can be identified through discourse analysis.

To analyse the politics behind the CAP and the role played by contested representations of biodiversity in shaping the policy, I first adopt an interactive perspective on policy-making, drawing on Jonathan Fox (1993). Second, I present one conception of power inspired by Foucault. Then I focus on one kind of political and power relation shaping the current CAP reform: the interaction between social movements and the EC and EP, two key European institutions. Finally, I explain how discourse analysis contributes to unveil the politics behind the CAP reform.

#### **2.1 The politics behind the environmental Common Agricultural Policy reform: an interactive approach between European institutions and society**

##### ***2.1.1 Politics at the core of policy-making***

Politics stands at the core of social relations. By politics I refer to “all activities of conflict, co-operation, negotiation involved in the use, production and distribution of resources whether material or ideal, and whether at local, national or international levels” (Leftwich 1994: 365). Societies are characterized by many different interests, preferences, values and ideas which structure social relations in four ideal-types from consensus to coercion: communication, exchange, manipulation, and domination (McFalls 2006), all of them ruled by specific power relations. I argue that policy process is conducted by political dynamics between many actors.

##### ***2.1.2 The European Union conceptualized as a state***

In the process of policy-making, the state remains in principle the main actor. State is defined as “the ensemble of political, social, economic, and coercive institutions that exercise ‘public’ authority in a given territory” (Fox 1993: 11-12). For the purpose of this paper, the EU is conceptualized as a state. Although I acknowledge that the EU as a regional entity presents specific governance characteristics, I think that its purposes and organization can be assimilated to the one of the state. Indeed economic integration and the ongoing attempt to political integration have transposed some state attributes, such as agricultural policy, at the European level.

The EU is not a homogeneous entity but is characterized by an interaction between different institutions and is influenced by interplay of interests in society. This environment makes policy process very political.



### ***2.1.3 Towards an interactive approach of the Common Agricultural Policy reform***

The critical character of policy-making has been analysed through three different angles: state-centered approach, society-centered perspective and state-society interaction. To present the state-society interaction approach that I retain, it is first relevant to understand the limits of the two other models.

The well-known thinker of the state-centered approach, Weber, has shown that policy-making results from the logic situated within the state, victim of its own struggles between administrations (McFalls 2006: 189-232). Policy change is influenced by technical analysis, bureaucratic interactions and political support to which policy-makers are subjected (Grindle and Thomas 1989). This perspective emphasizes “the attitudes and organizations that shape the goals and capacities of state actors themselves” (Fox 1993: 17). This way of considering state as a discrete entity misses the broad context and social forces in which the state is embedded. Another way of explaining the outcomes of policy-making is through a society-centered lens. Marxists argue that the state arena is not autonomous from the rest of society but grasped by the dominant class (McFalls 2006: 163-188). Policy projects are distorted by the dominant class in society to meet their accumulation objectives. This perspective situates the core of conflicts within the interaction between classes. The pluralists advocate another society-centered perspective, less class-based, according to whom “public policy results from the conflict, bargaining, and coalition formation among a potentially large number of societal groups, organized to protect or advance particular interests common to their members” (Grindle and Thomas 1989: 218). Finally, society-centered approaches conflate state with society without separately considering their own logics.

Drawing on this line, Fox comments that “a full explanation of state action requires determining not only its proximate cause in the context of intrastate conflict, but also how the external environment may have made it possible for some actors to exercise more power than others and how the responses of non-state actors shape their eventual impact” (1993: 19). He argues that “state action is the result of a reciprocal cause and effect relationship between changes in the balance of power within the state and shifts in the balance of power within society” (1993: 22). He adds that “reform possibilities are not determined by a static prior distribution of power alone; strategic interaction can make a difference” (1993: 12). Fox tries to reconcile state-centered approach with society-centered approach by placing state dynamics into their broad societal environment without conflating both. Moreover, he analyses the interaction in terms of power which explains policy outcomes.

The value of Fox’s model is its relational character that allows for analysing, in a dynamic way, constraints, opportunities of actors and power relations at the same time. He gives two instruments to analyse the role of state in a relational way that I can apply to the EC and EP: autonomy and capacity. Moreover, he stresses the role played by power that I need to define.

## **2.2 Power**

Following Foucault, I adopt a dynamic conception of power. Power is exercised in every social encounter, dispersed from bottom-up and productive of reality (Kendall and Wickam 1999: 50). Instead he stresses that power is “a machine in which everyone is caught, those who exercise power just as much as those over whom it is exercised” (Foucault 1980: 156), thus it is a social practice with produces reality. On the same line, Ferguson shows that “social interventions can end up coming together into powerful constellations of control that were never intended and in some cases never even recognized, but are all the more effective for being ‘subjectless’” (Ferguson 1990: 19). It means that the outcomes of power cannot be situated in one single actor but circulate between lots of stakeholders.

Actors in policy process know different levels of power. Some are subjected to the suppression of counter-ideologies and counter-power that is legitimated through a depoliticization process. Depoliticization or “technology of politics” in Foucauldian words (as cited in Sutton 1999: 8) refers to the idea that policy is presented in a neutral irrefutable language, backed by technical or legal evidences. This technical way of presenting policy issues as unproblematic allows dominant discourse for gaining broad acceptance and renders alternatives invisible. Discourse comes as a package and has the ability to integrate new components but in its own framework. For example, environmental discourse has been integrated into the growth package (Gamson and Modigliani 1989).

In sum, through this perspective, “policy can be conceptualized as being constructed on a field of power struggles between different interests” (Sharp and Richardson 2001: 198). Thus, the CAP reform results from an interaction between the European institutions and society characterized by power differentials and various interests.

## **2.3 The political interactions between the European Union and social movements**

The debate in society on agriculture and environment has largely overcome the strict agricultural sector and been extended to many other social actors: social movements, farmers, private companies, lobbyists, consultants, etc. I focus on social movements and consider their interaction with the EU as a specific form of politics in the context of the CAP reform.

I previously used in the introduction Tarrow’s definition of social movements, as “collective challenges, based on common purposes or social solidarities, in sustained interaction with elites, opponents, and authorities” (Tarrow 2011: 9). At this point, social movement definition needs to be more elaborated. According to Li, social movement claims are a reaction to a challenge which “often starts out as refusal of the way things are. It opens up a front of struggle. This front may or may not be closed as newly identified problems are rendered technical and calculations applied. Government, from this perspective, is a response to the practice of politics that shapes, challenges, and provokes it” (2007: 12). Fox adds two other conditions located within social movements for collective action to take off: “the perception of shared interests or identities and the opportunity to act as a group” (1993: 24). Social movements stand therefore at the core of policy-making. They are a kind of shield moving according to state project evolution and advocate for alternatives addressing their own interests. They react to change in power differential through their interaction with the state or other supranational entities such as the EU.

The analysis of the interaction between the EU and social movements as a specific form of politics is relevant for four reasons. First it is the first time that social movements are deeply involved in the CAP reform and make a difference in the broad debate<sup>4</sup>. Second the CAP reform is embedded in very critical time for agriculture and environment, “in a context where polarization within agriculture between the small and the big, between local markets and mass markets, between the well-off and the less well-off accentuates so much that a rupture is possible” (Lafleur 2010: XVII). These changes arouse public interest in agricultural and environmental issues at any levels and open more political space to social movements.

---

<sup>4</sup> I got this information from the phone interview with the employee of the French Ministry for Agriculture, Agri-Food and Forests and the one with the European deputy.

Third while European institutions, especially the EC and the EP tend to mimic state structure, social movements express another aspect of the regionalization process in the EU that cannot be assimilated to the dynamics of state. They reflect the construction of new identities through a process of *glocalization*, defending local way by networking regionally and internationally. They propose local solutions to regional issues. Glocalization refers to “the twin process whereby, firstly, institutional/regulatory arrangements shift from the national scale both upwards to supra-national or global scales and downwards to the scale of the individual body or to local, urban or regional configurations and, secondly, economic activities and inter-firm networks are becoming simultaneously more localised/regionalised and transnational” (Swyngedouw 2004: 25). To this definition can be added the glocal character of actions and identities of social movements. It transcends the debate on homogenization versus heterogenization which are considered as “complementary and interpenetrative” (Robertson 1995: 40) and “mutually implicative” (ibid.: 27). Glocalization of social movements and the impact it has on their interaction with the EU is an important form of politics behind the post-2013 CAP reform.

Fourth the politics shaping the interactions between the EU and social movements are interesting because there is a growing part of social movements reacting against the one-size-fits-all or technical approach and developing a more cultural-based perspective which shape political relations in a different way. Although I acknowledge that social movements as well as their modes of operation are plural and diverse, I focus on culturally-based social movements and use the example of Slow Food. They favour local level embedded in a specific cultural context (Escobar 1998). Culture embraces a set of values, ideas, beliefs. In agrarian and environmental politics, culturally-based social movements oppose universal and dualist models of policy change that cannot address the complexity and diversity of life, nature and culture. Instead, they propose to situate policy-making in a specific cultural context, rooted in local ecosystems and knowledge.

In sum, I analyse politics behind the CAP with a predefined angle. I focus on the interactions between the EU and social movements as a specific kind of politics. Then I closer consider glocal and culturally-based social movements like Slow Food and explain how they develop and take part in singular forms of politics that impact on the CAP reform. To that purpose, I use some tools of analysis inspired by social movement literature. Although social movement actions are many, several common characteristics conduct my analysis. Drawing on McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly’s framework (2001), I will consider the nature of mobilization and identity formation of social movements in the context of the CAP reform, illustrated by the case of Slow Food. Mobilization is defined as the process whereby “people who at a given point in time are not making contentious claims start doing so” (2001: 34). On the second hand, identity construction is constantly created, appropriated, activated and transformed and is one essential step in claim making, interest of the next paragraph (2001: 55-56).

## **2.4 Placing the Common Agricultural Policy reform in its discursive contents**

I am interested in a particular aspect of the CAP reform. I focus on the claims elaborated on biodiversity conservation and agriculture, as a particular form of greening, both from the EU and social movement point of views (example of Slow Food). I consider that this aspect of the reform is embedded in the framework previously presented but is also better informed through discourse analysis.

I mentioned in the introduction that biodiversity is a constructed term. Actors have been developing different meanings of biodiversity. One way to understand such a construction is through the concept of discourse. Ideas matter because it makes differences in policy process.

According to Hajer and Versteed, “the meanings affect the outcomes, laws and institutions and indeed become the context in which the environment can be discussed” (2005: 177). Policy problems are created in a certain way. The way problem and question are framed implies certain pre-established solutions. Critical discourse analysis is a way of identifying construction of discourse. Interactions between the EU and social movements are indeed not punctual and need to be placed into their broader discursive claims. This kind of analysis “allows for analyses of the interaction between different actors and types of claims making” (Koopmans and Statham 1999: 219) and offers a broader horizon seen on a continuum.

### **2.4.1 Discourse**

Discourse can be conceptualized in many different ways. Two main approaches have been developed, one inspired by Habermas and one by Foucault. The Habermas discourse focuses on linguistic and construction of meaning at the micro-level. Discourse is understood as the “sum of communicative interactions” (Sharp and Richardson 2001: 195). Foucault is more interested in a “complex entity that extends into the realms of ideology, strategy, language and practice, and is shaped by the relations between power and knowledge” (Sharp and Richardson 2001: 195). Foucauldian discourse has thus a foot both in ideas and practice.

Discourse refers first to an oral or written text. However, discourse cannot be taken in isolation and the meanings “do not emerge ‘out of the blue’, but come into politics channeled through a particular set of operational routines and mutually accepted rules and norms that give coherence to social life. Language does not simply ‘float’ in society, but should be related to the particular practices in which it is employed” (Hajer and Versteed 2005: 177). Several aspects have to be taken into account at the macro-level of discursive construction: “ideology, with forms of societal and cultural stratification and reproduction, and with enactment and legitimation of power” (Van Dijk 1990: 8). More specifically, the context is composed of institutional settings, culture, technologies, power differentials, division of labour, etc. Then the link between the text and its context shows how the text “express, describe, enact, legitimate and reproduce more global levels of societal structure and culture” (Van Dijk 1990: 9). The context surrounding political discourse analysis is called “narrative”. According to Sutton, a narrative is “a story, having a beginning, middle and end, outlining a specific course of events which have gained the status of conventional or received wisdom. [...] Narratives are an attempt to bring order to the complex multitude of interactions and processes” (Sutton 1999: 12). These stories are very persuasive because serve as context to support the textual component of a discourse.

### **2.4.2 Biodiversity discourse**

Applied to biodiversity, the concept of discourse is a useful analytical tool. I argue that the meaning of biodiversity is subjected to different interests, values, representations and agendas (Büscher forthcoming; Takacs 1996).

Takacs explains this idea in a straightforward way (as cited in Büscher forthcoming: 3): “the term *biodiversity* makes concrete – and promotes action on behalf of – a way of being, a way of thinking, a way of feeling, and way of perceiving the world. It encompasses the multiplicity of scientists’ factual, political, and emotional arguments in defense of nature, while simultaneously appearing as a purely scientific, objective entity”. Thus he lists the numerous values that are attributed to biodiversity: scientific value, ecological value, economic value, social amenity value, biophilic value, transformative value, intrinsic value, spiritual value, aesthetic value and choosing value (for more details, see 1996: 194-287). These multiple meanings and values result from a historical construction.

The idea of biodiversity dates back from many centuries but the concept in itself has first been created in the 1980's to designate biological diversity. E.O Wilson chose this word as the title of his book in 1988, based on a symposium held in 1986 (Haila and Kouki 1994: 7). The emergence of a new term nowadays neutrally used by international organisations, national government, research agencies, NGO's, media, etc. asserts that biodiversity has been conceived to embody a new project of conservation with specific purposes. This single concept is used by actors interested in biodiversity in many different ways, creating a discourse.

The widest accepted definitions remain biological, such as the CBD's definition. Other authors include in their definition a social aspect. For example, according to Lévêque and Monolou, "biodiversity became a framework for considering and discussing the whole range of questions raised by human relationships with other species and natural environments – a kind of 'mediator', as it were, between ecological systems and social systems" (2003: 6). Takacs stresses the complexity of the biodiversity concept which "does not only mirror the natural world it supposedly represents; it is that plus the complexity of human interactions with the natural world, the inextricable skein of our values and its value, of our inability to separate our concept of a thing from the thing itself. Don't know what biodiversity is? You can't" (1996: 341). Complexity and diversity characterize biodiversity. This approach can help to understand how contested biodiversity representations underlie policies and, in our context have framed the CAP reform. Narratives about biodiversity in the context of the EU will be further developed in the next chapter.

## Chapter 3

# The Common Agricultural Policy reform: Interplay of actors and power

### 3.1 Historical context of the Common Agricultural Policy reform

History matters and is at the core of the understanding of current relationship between actors involved in the CAP reform. Fox stresses that “this process of interaction is recursive, meaning that the rules of engagement with the state apparatus are shaped by past struggles with social forces” (1993: 12). I argue that the history of the CAP is a history of integrating change and new social demands into continuity which explain the nature of interactions between the EU and social movements in the context of the post-2013 CAP reform.

#### *3.1.1 The porosity between change and continuity*

The policy negotiations around agriculture bound member states together, but at the same time spark off the most serious tensions because “as this policy is seen as one of the few truly common policies in the Community, it has been invested with a psychological symbolism out of all proportion to its economic significance” (Fennel 1985: 259). The CAP has been the most achieved common policy in terms of degree of integration but is also imbued with nationalism and financial interests.

Elaborated by the Rome Treaty in 1957 in the context of the Cold War, and implemented in 1962, the CAP aims to ensure European independence and achieve food security (Zobbe 2002). This was also a time of valorization of modernity and technology. Article 39.1(a) of the Rome Treaty stipulates that the first objective is “to increase agricultural productivity by promoting technical progress and by ensuring the rational development of agricultural production and the optimum utilization of the factors of production, in particular labour”. This main objective has been reached through direct intervention on market and price support policy. The initial needs have even been overcome, leading to an overproduction crisis in the 1980's. The first three decades of the CAP neglected social and environmental aspects. International, social and environmental pressure compelled the EU to rethink its agricultural policy.

The first significant shift occurred in 1992 with the Mac Sharry reform. It endeavoured to avoid out-of-control surpluses and introduced instruments like direct income aid to replace price support. This evolution was further consolidated with the “Agenda 2000 reform” which brought in a new pillar, rural development, to encourage rural economy. The CAP is organised around two pillars: the first one dealing with the common market organization and payments, and the second one addressing more diversified issues related to rural development. Re-examined by the 2003 reform, the CAP of the XXIst century sought to foster a market-oriented strategy and further raise concern over environmental depletion. This evolution finally led to the 2008-health-check which again revealed structural weaknesses and tremendous environmental impacts. Locked in an increasingly tight stranglehold in the context of systemic food crisis, World Trade Organisation (WTO) negotiations deadlock and urgency of significantly addressing environmental degradation, the EU has now to take up the challenge of making the CAP more sustainable by 2013. The EU is indeed facing a crisis of legitimacy, not only because of economic recession but also democratic deficit and lack of transparency. The CAP is submitted to this broad dynamic all

the more so the EU dedicates 40% of its yearly budget to agricultural sector and powerfully steers the direction of ways of farming, quality of food and natural resource use.

Concerning environment and especially the impact of agriculture on biodiversity, several strategies have been developed to counteract biological diversity loss. The EU developed two kinds of policies. On the one hand, land sparing and species protection are encouraged under the Bird directive (1979), the Habitat directive (1992) together with the Natura 2000 network. However, they do not specifically address biodiversity loss resulting from agricultural practices. These environmental policies are only legal frameworks and have not significantly solved biodiversity depletion in the agro-ecosystems because of lack of funding, weak enforcement and synergic capacity with agricultural sector. Some efforts have already been pursued under the CAP to integrate agriculture and biodiversity conservation (Juntti 2006; Feindt 2010; Matthews 2012). There are two main policy instruments: cross-compliance or conditionality under the first pillar and rural development agri-environmental measures under the second pillar.

Cross-compliance concerns five groups of environmental standards, put together in the Statutory Management Requirements (SMR), or 18 standards addressing environment, food safety, plant health and animal welfare (EC 2012a). The Bird and Habitat Directives are part of this regulation. A second set of measures are grouped under the name of “good agricultural and environmental condition” and addresses soil protection, habitat maintenance and water management. Complying with these criteria is mandatory for those receiving direct payments. Cross-compliance is a first step and a baseline for farmers willing to enrol into the agri-environmental measures in the second pillar.

Rural development measures support, on a voluntary basis, eco-friendly farming initiatives which are developed over a period of at least five years and which go beyond cross-compliance (EC 2012b). Farmers receive payments for their provision of environmental services. Examples are the extensification of farming, low-intensity pasture systems, crop rotation, conservation of high-value habitats in terms of biodiversity or soil conservation. Agri-environmental measures currently comprise 24% of the land eligible for payments (Matthews 2012: 27).

To further push this evolution, the EC has proposed new rules in favour of greening. Direct green payments conditioned by crop diversification, maintaining of permanent grassland and ecological focus areas are one of the main novelties in the environmental CAP reform. The idea of paying for environmental goods first appeared in 2009 in the Article 68 of the Regulation 73/2009: “Members States may grant specific support to farmers [...] for specific types of farming which are important for the protection or enhancement of environment” (Council of the EU 2009). Since the market does not take into account environmental goods, the EU is increasingly willing to provide economic incentives. The project of reform proposes that 30% of the total amount of payments are dedicated to payments for ecological services. Farmers entitled to the basic-scheme payments can apply to receive more payments per hectare in exchange of implementing crop diversification (three crops, no one shall be less than 5% or exceed 70% of the land), permanent grassland (maximum 5%) and ecological focus area (at least 7% of the reference area and excluding permanent pasture) to allow biodiversity for flourishing. These measures are regulated in the draft of the Chapter 2, Article 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33 of the EC “Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and the Council establishing rules for direct payments to farmers under support schemes within the framework of the common agricultural policy” (EC 2011b). Beside, the agri-environmental measures will also be improved under the second pillar, presented in the EC “Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development” (EC 2011c). It is worth noting that these propositions are still in examination and are the object of multiple amendments from the EP and rectifications from the Council.

### 3.1.2 Policy narratives serving continuity

The history of the CAP is marked by the development of three narratives – productivism, multifunctionality and neoliberalism – which have been influencing environmental policy integration into agriculture and biodiversity conservation as well. Initially driven by a productivist line, the CAP is now turning into a neoliberal policy, which reproduces the roots of productivism, disguised in multifunctionality. Productivism in agriculture is characterized by its “often environmentally destructive nature [...] based on the drive to maximise food production through the application of even more intensive farming techniques and biochemical inputs” (Wilson 2002: 78). I will only present multifunctionality and neoliberalism. Indeed although productivism has a great impact on biodiversity, it is not directly the object of this paper. I focus on the more recent paradigms driving biodiversity conservation.

#### Multifunctionality

Literature broadly agrees on the roots of multifunctionality, born in the wake of the over-production crisis in the 1980's (Garzon 2005; Potter 2007, Dibden et al. 2009). Multifunctionality takes two forms: “the protection of ‘valued’ environments from the pressures of human economic activity and the reduction of market pressures on specified groups of agricultural producers, to enable them to act more ‘sustainably’” (Goodman and Redclift 1991: 223). According to Garzon, “multifunctionality was clearly used as a transformative concept to adjust agricultural policy to new social demands and therefore restore its legitimacy”. It has been “promoted as a way to address social, cultural and ecological concerns like cultural heritage, farm abandonment and biodiversity loss through domestic agricultural policies” (Erjavec 2009: 221). The multifunctional approach proposes to include food security, food safety, cultural and historical identities, animal welfare, environmental protection, rural development (Cahill 2008). The necessity to highlight environmental and rural development concerns (Garzon 2005) and the reaction against neo-liberalism (Dibden et al. 2009) have been first materialized during the 1990's. The Cardiff process in 1998, from the name of one European Council, gives the framework to integrate environmental concerns into other policies. The second pillar of the CAP, “rural development” coming with the Agenda 2000 and the generalization of agri-environmental schemes with decoupling and cross-compliance bring the effective tools for environmental protection.

The multifunctional approach, despite its post-productivist discourse (Evans et al. 2002; Wilson 2002) did not give up the economic logic. This discourse is indeed structured around the concept of *public good*, defined in introduction (Cooper and al. 2009). Nature is associated to a good and valued because its benefits exceed the sole agricultural sector. Concepts like *high nature value* or biodiversity as *insurance life* are used. Environment has to be protected through state intervention to regulate market failures, mitigate negative externalities and steadily ensure the delivery of its public goods.

The multifunctional approach is scientifically and materially expressed in ecology. This science establishes a link between diversity and ecosystem proper multifunctionality (Lévêque and Mounolou 2008; Hector and Bagchi 2007). According to Hector and Bagchi, “biodiversity can sometimes have an insurance value by buffering ecosystem level processes in a way analogous to that in which diverse investment portfolios spread financial risk and improve average performance in the longer term” (2007: 188). The focus is put on agrobiodiversity, eliminating the land-sparing strategy and stressing the positive impact of agroecosystem biodiversity conservation over wildlife. This discourse therefore gives whole legitimacy to biological science, politicians asking for “‘scientific sound’ boundaries, thresholds and carrying capacities of landscape functions” (Otte, Simmering and Wolters 2007).



The multifunctional approach is still underneath broadly influential but seems to have disappeared from the EU language since the years 2000, passing to a discourse on internalizing environmental externalities.

## Neoliberalism

Neoliberal globalization increasingly drives conservation strategies (Igoe 2007; Brockington 2008; Arsel and Büscher 2012; Münster and Münster 2012). Neoliberalism is defined as a “political ideology (and related practices) that attempts to subordinate social and political affairs to capitalist market dynamics” (Bücher 2011: 92). Arsel and Büscher comment “an intensifying friction in the relation between capitalism and nature: that between change and limits”, meaning that “ecological and social limits, as well as the idea of limits, seem to increasingly — albeit inherently unevenly — shape contemporary changes (i.e. institutional and organizational forms) in global capitalism and, vice versa, that continuous and dynamic change in global capitalism seems to be responding to or thriving on (overcoming) ecological limits and the idea of limits” (2012: 56). Characterised by its propensity to encourage capitalism to further penetrate into nature, neoliberal globalisation has opened new opportunities in the domain of biodiversity conservation. This process has to be replaced in the context of global capitalist crisis. Since capitalism is always grounded on a material basis (Harvey 2006: 77-90), capitalist self-regeneration begins upon nature. Biodiversity are courted as valuable natural resources with applications in chemical, energy, pharmacy industries.

In the context of the CAP, the neoliberal discourse has “simultaneously been both resisted and integrated” (Dibden, Potter and Cocklin 2009: 306). Neoliberalism is criticized for its lack of social or environmental concerns but adulated for its capacity to internalize externalities into the system through market (Arsel and Büscher 2012). The market in fact plays the most important role, converting nature into exchange value.

This trend is materialized in the transformation of what has been called in the past hostile nature into helpful *ecological services*. Ecological services are “the benefits that humans recognise as obtained from ecosystems that support, directly or indirectly, their survival and quality of life” (Anton and Young 2010: 84). Examples are crops, fresh water, medicines, pollution mitigation, pollination or nutrient cycling. It comes back to the EC and EP expression of *insurance life*. Efforts to conserve biodiversity measure and evaluate services given from nature, calculate the costs of their loss, take measures that can preserve their contribution to human life, pay for their services. To that purpose researches are initiated like The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) (TEEB 2010) and indicators developed like the Streamlining European 2010 Biodiversity Indicators (SEBI) (European Environment Agency 2010). This approach is concretized in the post-2013 CAP reform with green payments.

Moreover, the neoliberal discourse is linked to the concepts of *ecological modernization* or *green economy*, sometimes also referred as *new green revolution* or *ecoagriculture* (Jeffrey and Scherr 2002; Bonny 2011; Horlings and Marsden 2011). The idea behind this is to sustain economic growth by internalizing negative externalities. According to Evans, Morris and Winter,

ecological modernization retains the centrality of production while recognizing the fluidity of production relations and changes in the nature of market. Ecological modernization recognizes that economic activity continually causes environmental harm and presents solutions involving: sustainable development in place of growth, a preference for anticipation rather than cure (the precautionary principle), equating pollution with inefficiency; treating environmental regulation and economic growth as mutually beneficial; and exerting the rights of future generations over market forces (2002: 327).

This project involves an intensification of agricultural practices, like the development of biotechnologies which raises questions concerning the efficiency of protecting biodiversity in such a way.

In sum, productivism, multifunctionality and neoliberalism are narratives, meaning they tell a story in a specific way. It is worth noting the non-linearity of the process and the interplay of perspectives serving different and sometimes conflicting interests at the same time. The EU reacted to the social and environmental effects of the CAP through multifunctionality. Multifunctionality recognises that agriculture embraces more than economics. Neoliberalism came along on top of this philosophy and offered new market instruments in order to internalize social and environmental externalities into the market, but by keeping the same productivist logic, what Evans calls “From productivism to post-productivism ... and back again” (2002). However, despite this impression of continuity and even if the current CAP reform brings little uncertainty and does not seem ready to bring a significant shift in terms of biodiversity conservation, dynamics between actors involved in policy-making are changing. The second part of this chapter presents the interactions between the EC, EP and social movements that are quickly evolving, probably the most promising change for the future of agricultural policy in Europe.

## **3.2 The post-2013 CAP reform: renewed dynamics between the European Union and social movements**

### ***3.2.1 The European Union***

The role played by key actors of the CAP reform – EU institutions and social movements, such as Slow Food – can only be identified in relation with one another. The power extent of one is necessarily identifiable through the scope of power of other actors. Since power is not measurable as a stock but made of fluid circulating flows, the power of an actor can only be isolated upon the result it has on another actor and through the attribution of opportunities and constraints mediating this process. Following Fox’s analytical framework (1993: 9-40), I first analyse the autonomy and capacity of two main European common institutions: the EC and the EP. Second, drawing on McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly’s framework, I consider the nature of mobilization and identity formation of social movements in the context of the CAP reform, illustrated by the case of Slow Food.

The Treaty of Lisbon (2007) has deeply modified the rules attributed to policy-making in agriculture (Crombez and Swinnen 2011). The power of decision is now shared and open to the Parliament, while in the past the EC and the Council were the only institutions endowed with room for manoeuvre and enforcement force. The EP which used to have a purely consultative role is now allowed to further intervene in budget and participate in the decision process. Co-decision has been recently extended to agriculture. Thus the powers are currently distributed as follow. The Commission initiates the process and writes legislative proposals that can be amended by the EP and the Council. The EC chooses to include them or not. At the end, a text is approved if the Council and the EP agree on the same version.

Following Lisbon novelties, the calendar of the CAP reform is a calendar of shuttle between the different institutions of the EU (EC 2012c). On the 12<sup>th</sup> of April 2010, EU citizens have been invited to share their ideas for the next reform. This broad public consultation was new in the history of policy-making in agriculture and ended up on the 18<sup>th</sup> of November 2010 in a Com-

munication “The CAP towards 2020” written by the Commissar for Agriculture and Rural Development, Dacian Cioloș. It serves as an outline of further debates between different actors. The Commission published a set of legal proposals on the 12<sup>th</sup> of October 2011 that are currently examined and amended by the EP. Two of them are matter of interest for my purposes: the proposition on direct payments (EC 2011b) and the one on rural development (EC 2011c). This is currently the time and the space for social movements to pressure deputies in order to make their voice hear. An agreement is expecting to be reached at the end of 2013 to launch the new CAP at the beginning of 2014.

Despite the growing influence of social movements, the EU has still a huge room for manoeuvre in this reform, both in terms of autonomy and capacity. 40% of the budget is allocated to agriculture, meaning that the EU has a large capacity to steer agriculture in one direction or another. The EC knows a real autonomy in terms of deployment of power, as the most important European institution setting the agenda, making legal propositions and orienting the lineaments of debates. The EC has even the choice to include amendments or not and at the end, does not really have to answer to society for what it decides, since members are not elected but appointed. One would say that the EU has even too much autonomy and capacity, relatively to other actors involved in the CAP reform, and denounce a democratic deficit (Campbell 2012).

Another factor plays in favour of the EC in terms of prestige. Dacian Cioloș, Commissar for Agriculture and Rural Development since 2010, has a key role in building consensus (Alexe 2011), and thus at the same time, in justifying the huge autonomy and capacity from which the EC benefits. Coming from rural Romania, he managed to impose his charisma and pacify debates around agriculture. Very accessible, he daily interacts with European deputies and civil society and was the first one to really initiate a debate with civil society.

The EP, on its side, won more autonomy and institutional capacity since the settlement of the co-decision process. However, at the same time, it became since the Treaty of Lisbon the main democratic institution, space for debates and open interface for interaction with lobbies and social movements. Since deputies are elected, they are constrained to a certain extent by lobby and social movement claims.

It is worth noting that the autonomy and capacity of the two main common institutions of the common Europe – the EC and the EP – is decreasing at different levels, alongside their legitimacy. This loss of influence certainly impacts on their interaction and balance of power with social movements. First, the CAP has undergone a process of globalization since the 1990's (Daugberg 2011) which has two impacts. The international context and in particular WTO rules act as a constraint. Since the CAP and notably its support policies impact in the trade partners countries and in global agricultural and environmental issues, the EU is not only pressurized by third countries but also by transnational agrarian movements, which inhibit the CAP legitimacy.

Second, the EC and the EP are also constrained by the growing diversity of voices in the EU since enlargements towards Eastern Europe and Central (Gorton, Hubbard and Hubbard 2009). Although some new members benefit from special and adjusted schemes, the EC and the EP have to increasingly integrate and respond to different stakeholders engaged in different processes of agricultural and rural development. While some countries are still rural like Romania or Poland and are structured around small or medium farms, some others have developed fully industrial agriculture, like The Netherlands. Concerns over environment and claims vary a lot and are critical to synthesize.

Third, lobbies restrict the extent of the reform. Locked between distinct projects, the EC and the EP have to manage a tension between capital accumulation and legitimacy (Fox 1993). On the one side, interest groups like COPA-COGECA push for green growth within the same productivist logic (COPA-COGECA 2011). On the other side, the loss of legitimacy and the at-

tempt to recover it are of central importance during this reform process, reason to open the dialogue with social movements and attribute them more political space.

### **3.2.2 Social movements**

In the context of the CAP reform, social movements know very different trajectories. I focus on Slow Food movement to deeper inform my topic<sup>5</sup>. It is worth noting that this movement has developed an interesting project that inherently opposes the CAP model and, because of its work with people at a very local level enriches my paper through its original but touching conceptions, related to everybody's life. Slow Food's vision is nevertheless not necessarily representative of current social movements in Europe.

Slow Food stands at the crossroads of institutionalized and non-institutionalized politics whose boundaries are not clear as expressed by McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly: "the two sorts of politics interact incessantly and involve similar causal processes" (2001: 7). Thus its mobilization strategies and attribution of opportunities are spread over a long spectrum. Broadly, Slow Food's politics is quite informal and favour diversity of canals, variety of initiatives, to represent diversity of people.

The first way for Slow Food to participate in the debate of the CAP has been through *everyday politics* at a very local level. Slow Food's networks and food communities, agrobiodiversity conservation projects are, in Scott's words "a form of individual self-help" (1986). Local communities, as key actors undertake *everyday politics* which include "resource production and distribution practices within households and families and within small communities in ways that rely primarily on local people's own resources with little involvement from formal organisations" (Kerkvliet 2009: 232). The community builds his own agrarian and environmental structures opposing outsider's structures, as the one set by the state, here the CAP. The grouping of food communities and convivia comes under Slow Food International in Italy but is not really subjected to a formal structure. This lack of institutionalization is a powerful mean to obtain political space upon the bottom without direct confrontation. The movement managed to develop very good knowledge on people, their culture and their territory, what adds to its legitimacy.

Second, Slow Food has grasped political space due to a scale shift. Slow Food first spread in Italy at a time of a virtuous synergy between intellectual and gastronomic platforms. Since its foundation in 1986, the movement has essentially flourished through the multiplication of local convivia. The growing of food communities under the umbrella of Terra Madre has consolidated this trend. Slow Food is now present in the 27 countries of the EU and overseas as well. Launched by Slow Food Italy, its international and European involvement is very recent and needs to be put into perspective since everyday politics remain the main mode of action. Indeed, Slow Food Europe is an entity of Slow Food international which is actually Slow Food Italy, the only team to have full-time paid staff. The staff in Italy published a lot of documents related to the issues addressed in the CAP reform: its position on the CAP reform (Slow Food 2010), biodiversity (Slow Food 2011b) and small-scale farmers (Slow Food n.d. b). The movement rushed into the opening political space, on the one hand by the EU at the time of both the EC and the EP were trying to establish a dialogue with social movements and, on the other hand the movement benefits from a loss of legitimacy of the CAP as well as a growing legitimacy of its ideas.

---

<sup>5</sup> My information on Slow Food is mainly based on the interview of the Slow Food member. Because of the high diversity of the movement, his ideas are not necessarily representative of all members of Slow Food. Besides I use two written documents (Gana 2011) and (Gana 2012). I also took part at the end of the Good Food March on the 19<sup>th</sup> of September and had some informal talks.

Moreover, it is worth noting that this shift of scale and purpose has principally been driven by the person of Carlo Petrini, Slow Food's founder, true icon in Italy and who regularly dialogues with Dacian Ciolos. He also took part in the synthesis conference of the CAP public debate which took place on the 19<sup>th</sup> of September 2012.

Thus, concretely, Slow Food joined the coalition ARC2020, adopted some of its means of action and went more into confrontation and protest. For example, certain Slow Food members took part in the Good Food March between the end of August and the 19<sup>th</sup> of September 2012 (Slow Food 2012c and d). This event is a project of farmers, citizens and youth who decided to march to Brussels and organize along their way actions to call for *good food*. Marchers handed a book of pictures of citizens from all over Europe delivering a special message to Dacian Ciolos. The movement has inserted itself in more conventional and non-routine ways of protests. This last comment needs to be nuanced because Slow Food is still favouring informal pressure, far away from technical and politician issues by using cultural canals. Slow Food does not sell black or white but colours.

Slow Food's new involvement in European politics is challenging. Renewed forms of mobilization bring a new obstacle to the definition of its identity. Its past identity construction was already complex because of the high diversity of themes, people, and angles of approach. No clear-cut opinion can be highlighted in Slow Food identity. Slow Food treats complexity; therefore, its identity is complex. Slow Food identity is above all based on local identities and cannot be defined in a different way than attached to a specific territory. The high diversity, although it is also an indirect canal of entering political space, acts as a constraint and creates divisions.

Finally, mobilization and construction of identity is also hindered because Slow Food does not propose the new Eldorado but gives incentives to build alternatives at the local level. This aspect which makes its wealth, also results in a lack of means and financial resources. It is besides interesting noting that the project of Slow Food's involvement in the CAP reform is partly financed by the European Commission, which can raise questions regarding its autonomy. The advanced age of Carlo Petrini can also bring issues concerning the future of mobilization capacities of the movement.

In conclusion, this is a good illustration of the power relations and growing caesura in the agriculture between two opposite worlds – conventional farming and peasant local agriculture – which impact on the environmental CAP reform. Even if the differentials of power are huge, it is relevant to exemplify the renewing forms of social movements, far from confrontation but through everyday politics, by rebuilding and valuing local identities attached to a specific territory. Slow Food does not fight to build a system to replace the current one. The movement wants to construct a rainbow of projects. Therefore, among political interactions, contested representations of reality play a crucial role. Studying discourse is of central importance. The project of rainbow as well as its inherent characteristics which oppose the EU propositions is too subtle to content itself with the interpretation of what is visible and needs deeper discursive analysis and critical analysis of the frames used. This is what I propose to do in the next chapter.

## Chapter 4

# Contested representations of biodiversity in the context of the environmental Common Agricultural Policy reform

## 4.1 Embedding the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy into a specific framework

The objective of the Chapter 4 is to study contested representations of biodiversity behind the CAP reform. Biodiversity conceptions cannot be taken in isolation because they belong to a broader system of thought. Therefore, the aim of the first part of this chapter is to study through discourse analysis the broad framework where the EU and Slow Food embed their project in. I argue that the broad framework determines and can explain numbers of EU's or SF's statements on biodiversity conservation. The world views shaping it determine the kind of greening advocated. Since biodiversity conservation integration into agriculture is a cross-cutting issue, the first step is to fully understand the different dimensions covering the debate. On the EU side, I focus on the EC because this organ initiated the reform. The comparison of this approach, presented as mainstream, and the Slow Food's alternative helps to understand that the EU approach is constructed and that there is certainly scope for debate.

I use textual analysis in order to grab the conceptions, ideas and representations behind the CAP reform. Language is not innocent but reflects world views. I follow Gasper's methodology and realized table analysis upon themes that I think reflect the main messages (Gasper 2000). For each extract I concentrate on clarification of meanings, assumptions, conclusions and omissions. On the EU side, I first stress how the EC plays between challenges and opportunities. Then I analyse the contradiction between the expression of action and underlying continuity and finally, I have a special look at the kind of greening promoted. On the Slow Food side, I study how it opposes the EC project before showing that it questions fundamental roots of the CAP and closer presenting few aspects of its greening project. I selected the four texts mentioned in the Introduction.

The EC1 is the initial document published on the post-2013 CAP reform, synthesis of public debates and first propositions. The Introduction is carefully produced because it stresses the main ideas that the EC wants the reader to remember. It is the most complete document to represent the general philosophy shaping the CAP reform. The EC2 is the transcription of an oral speech. Discourse analysis of this document is relevant to grab a good idea of what the EC chooses to convey in little time, with the constraints of a speech. The main messages are particularly highlighted in order for the audience to quickly understand them. The SF1 is the only document to introduce Slow Food position on the CAP reform. The Introduction is as well the most achieved part and a good summary of Slow Food vision. The SF2 is interesting because it is a reaction against the EC legislative proposals. Therefore it places Slow Food position in an interactive way.

Of course, the analysis reveals my own interpretation and focus on certain aspects that I selected. This study is far from exhaustive. Another limitation comes from the limited length of the texts. After having analysed such short texts, the aim is not to say *this is the EU's project* or *this is the SF's project*. What is important to retain is what the actors decided to highlight in such little space, and how it is determinant for the scope of the reform.

#### ***4.1.1 The European Commission project of greening: internalizing continuity into a discourse of change***

##### **Pushed by challenges but pulled by opportunities**

The EC has been trying to convince public opinion that the CAP reform and its greening have been sparked off by crucial challenges but is going to take advantage of new opportunities. It tends to normalize the process. The tone is either dramatic or broad, not to say sometimes turned into a new source of benefits. The strong evaluative adjectives like “unique in nature” (EC1: 1-2), “unforeseen” (EC1: 2), “major” (EC2: 14), and the occurrence of the word “challenge” (EC: 1, 3 and EC2: 8, 14, 35, 37, 61, 62, 211) seem to compensate the very broad allusions to the challenges summarized at the beginning of the Introduction by a pleonasm, “long-term future” (EC1: 2-3).

The evocation of challenges that the greening of the CAP is willing to face is based on several technical and fatalistic assumptions, whose logic do not address at their roots economic, social or political structures. This approach tends to falsify the relationship between evidences and claims throughout both texts because the main evidences are externally-driven and not seen as inherent to the system. For example, Malthusian assumption which links the increase of the global population and the capacity to feed the world is influencing the reform (EC1: 15-20 and EC2: 50-61). Another postulate wants that food security is threatened (EC1: 15-20), agricultural productivity “latent” (EC1: 48) or that the EU is facing a severe crisis (EC1: 55). These statements are not inaccurate but based on evidences that are seen as coming from outside the system or fruit of very abstract events like “price volatility” (EC2: 41, 190, 197, 199), “market instability” (EC1: 18) or “climate change” (EC1: 18, 26, 42, 47 and EC2: 38, 60, 173, 197, 209). Following this logic, environmental degradation is no more than collateral damages.

Finally, one of the main conclusions from these two texts underlines that environmental pressure of agriculture is not a fate. Dacian Ciolos sees this reform “as a chance to lay ground for a new public contract between agriculture and society” (EC2: 100). The CAP has to be invested with several tools which allow farming for internalizing environmental protection. The way of doing it is by rewarding public goods usually ignored by the market (EC2: 81, 116, 120). Biodiversity protection thus becomes a potential for “inclusive growth” (EC1: 43). That is probably why Dacian Ciolos chose Oxford and future business leaders to proclaim one of his major reform speeches.

##### **Greening: which project?**

Despite the acknowledged pressure exercised by the CAP over environment and the apparent will of the EU to green the CAP, the space allowed to greening in these two texts says a lot on the real intentions of the reform. Regarding Dacian Ciolos’ speech, on a discourse of about 2800 words, only 100 words related to environmental issues are plugged in different contexts throughout the text, in addition to a more structured paragraph of about 150 words (EC2: 162-174). It is worth noting that this paragraph comes almost at the end of the speech and is inserted in the part on payments. In the Introduction of the EC document, about 50 words are devoted to environmental issues in a text of 700 words, stressing “our environmental, water, animal health and welfare, plant health and public health requirements” (EC1: 21-27). The emphasis on law helps to give an impression of consistency but is it relevant to compliment current standards while they have been unable to counteract environmental degradation? Therefore, it raises questions concerning the nature of the greening promoted by the new CAP.

Moreover, biodiversity conservation is hardly mentioned. The focus is put on climate change. Indeed, climate change is nowadays more visible, scaring and more covered by media.

Climate change is presented as a justification and a problem that seems impossible to manage. The EC uses this strategy to divert attention from the more creeping problems like biodiversity depletion.

Finally, these two texts clearly integrate the greening process into the framework of sustainable development and put environment alongside economic and social issues. Dacian Ciolos follows the definition coming from the Brundtland report in 1987: “We have a legacy to leave to future generations. We cannot guarantee our food security on a production model that puts at risk the capacity of future generations to meet their own needs” (EC2: 76-77). The title given by the EC cleverly summarizes this idea “meeting the food, natural resource and territorial challenges of the future”. The new reform is about to reproduce the same multifunctional approach to agriculture, developed since the middle of the 1980’s and adopt the surface language of environmentalists, coolly reproduced with many recycled words around “sustainable” (EC1: 4, 15, 22, 43 and EC2: 74, 75, 82, 92, 177) or “future” (EC1: 3, 13, 46 and EC2: 15, 16, 51, 76, 77, 188, 212). It omits what should be kept in mind in a greening process, *nature*.

### **Torn between action and continuity**

In Dacian Ciolos’ speech, the occurrence of determination verbs like “must”, “should”, “need” is evocative in terms of will to change: 9 “must”, 10 “should” and 16 “need” or “needs”. Moreover, in the Introduction, the emphasis is put on *action* and in his speech, Dacian Ciolos often employs the first person “I” or “we”, what gives an impression of energy. The adjectives or expressions qualifying the CAP like “strong” (EC1: 13 and EC2: 148, 211), “never been written in stone” (EC2: 26), “fundamental shift” (EC2: 34), and the repetition of the words “efficient” or “efficiency” (EC1: 40, 51 EC2: 87, 134, 149) make people believe that a deep change is happening. The metaphor “a policy is a vehicle taking us on a journey” (EC2: 220) confirms this tendency towards change and this sense of motion.

However, with another glance, the vocabulary of action is often incredible, mimicking military lexis and referring to power like “combat” (EC1: 25), “fighting” (EC2: 40, 171, 173, 190) “strategic” (EC1: 2, 14 and EC2: 63, 195), “confronted” (EC1: 1). Once again, I think that plugging such strong words is a way of giving consistency to very broad and obfuscated texts. General statements help to lessen the drivers and implications of the reform but they need to be accompanied by determination words to create an overall universe of change and action.

If Ciolos use 10 times the word “reform”, the other document totally ignored this lexis, preferring “strategic choice” (EC1: 2) or “long-term choice” (EC1: 20). Making public opinion believe that the CAP reform is a choice and not a constraint is a way of avoiding the reality of challenges and at the end integrating change into continuity.

Finally, the unveiling of the real objectives behind the CAP reform and its greening process raises doubts regarding the angle or degree of the shift. The reform is steadily used as an instrument of legitimization of the CAP. Dacian Ciolos calls for a “renewed legitimacy and credibility to the CAP” (EC2: 102). The project “inclusive growth” (EC1: 43) is the best example of turning change into continuity. The consequences of the food system crisis are hardly mentioned; neither are the current system, its dynamics and structures questioned. Environmental degradation and protection are tackled from one single angle: economics. This continual faith in economics shows that the EC has adopted the environmental discourse but transformed it with its own lens, and tried to frame new opportunities to satisfy the actors who made the CAP yesterday and will build it in the future.



### ***4.1.2 Slow Food's propositions: questioning the fundamental roots of the Common Agricultural Policy***

#### **Rejecting the European Commission's propositions**

As key actor of social movements, Slow Food expresses its critics towards the current CAP, the project of reform. It also denounces whom they consider as responsible for the present stalemate and the lack of involvement for the future. Several textual indicators show that Slow Food is disappointed or even rejects the EC project of reform despite the growing dialogue with social movements. It is particularly obvious in the Press release published in the aftermath of the legislative propositions. According to the redactors, “the Commission has not managed to keep its promises” (SF2: 4), “the future CAP does not change the current scenario” (SF2: 6), the reform is a simple “declarations of principle” (SF2: 11) and adopts “misguided basic framework” (SF: 22). The multiplication of negations or adjectives which denote a negative meaning is quite illustrative throughout the text.

However it is interesting to note that Slow Food does not directly attacks the EC. Acknowledging the political dynamics in the EU and its power relations, they make lobbies and state members responsible as shown in the sentence “the initial positive intentions for the CAP reform, expressed on many occasions by Commissioner Dacian Cioloș, have likely been hindered by the actions of the major agricultural lobbies and certain governments” (SF2: 20-22). Slow Food considers policy-making as a conflicting interaction between state and society.

#### **Redefining the Common Agricultural Policy**

Slow Food situates the origins of the problem that the reform of the CAP is willing to address differently: “the EU needs to rethink the structure of the agricultural sector and the food system in general” (SF1: 24-25). The level of contestation is pushed much deeper than the one of the EC. Although Slow Food shares the same concerns, redefining the CAP comes also hand in hand with a global questioning of our current economic model. There is an effort to analyse the root causes of the present stalemate and make the responsibility explicit. The first use of the word “challenge” (SF1: 2) is singular. This lexical choice lessens the EC idea that challenges are coming from outside as a package.

The gap between the origins of the problem seen by the EC and by Slow Food is textually obvious. The CAP and its outcomes are clearly criticized. In the Introduction of the position paper, consequences of the CAP are negatively expressed: “has revealed all its shortcomings” (SF1: 13), “far removed from the needs” (SF1: 18-19), “incapable of offering convincing answers” (SF1: 21). Slow Food qualifies the economic system where the CAP is embedded in by stressing the negative consequences of liberalism: “the current economic paradigm based on the domination of finance and production” (SF1: 12-13); “geared to liberalising market and privatisations”; “structured solely to benefit agribusiness” (SF1: 14-15); “slave to the rules of a hollow liberalism” (SF1: 21). In the Press release, Slow Food is still more indignant and denounces that the CAP “has brought devastating environmental exploitation, injustice for both virtuous farmers and consumers and a concentration of economic advantages in a few hands” (SF2: 17).

The CAP is considered as the main responsible for the situation in the EU. Its origins and root causes are situated intrinsically to the system. These last extracts show that Slow Food adopts a political economy perspective by questioning the distribution of wealth within the agricultural sector. Slow Food argues that the system in itself contains destructive social and political dynamics which has led to perverse outcomes. Therefore the reform has to considerably redefine the agricultural sector to ensure food security or even food sovereignty, tackle environmental de-

pletion and reinvigorate economy. On the contrary, the EC tends to deresponsibilize the EU by rejecting the fault on abstract and technical phenomenon like global population growing or price volatility. Finally, it is worth noting that the economic objectives are not situated at the same level. While the EC seeks to give a new breath to capitalism as a whole by using agriculture, Slow Food aims to revitalize farming for itself and its actors and promote change at a deeper level. It calls for a “paradigm shift” (SF2: 12).

### **Greening: which project?**

The greening of the CAP stands at the core of Slow Food’s project as an end and not a mean towards other objectives. It should be one of the main drivers of the reform. It deplores the lack of ambition of the EC regarding a significant paradigm shift: “Courageous CAP reform would have required every cent paid out to be linked to the provision of important environmental services” (SF2: 44-45). At the end, Slow Food welcomes debates that have been initiated but deplores the objectives and targets that remain weak and insufficient. For example the movement regrets that “the criteria on which the new green payment will be based do not include the essential practice of crop rotation” (SF2: 46-47).

The main actors should be the small and medium farmers who are not enough taken into account and considered as more eco-friendly (SF1: 19, 25, 37 and SF2: 68-70). Slow Food proposals are “founded on a rethinking of the food system based on sustainable small- and medium-scale production” (SF2: 38-39). Slow Food defends an approach whereby traditional knowledge and farmer innovation find a genuine space.

## **4.2 Integrating biodiversity conservation into agriculture**

The second part of this chapter goes beyond discourse analysis and focuses more on biodiversity conservation integration into agriculture. It critically analyses the ideas behind the EU and Slow Food’s projects of biodiversity conservation that are also present in debates on the post-2013 CAP reform. The analysis of canals of integration reveals their representation of biodiversity. My study is based on secondary-data analysis with some examples from documents produced by the EC and Slow Food. I present two different approaches that are respectively dominant in the EC or Slow Food positions: combining biodiversity conservation and agriculture through economics (EC) and combining biodiversity conservation and agriculture through culture (Slow Food). I highlight the dominant aspects but do not pretend that they are sufficient to explain all the arguments of these actors which are highly complex.

### ***4.2.1 Combining biodiversity conservation and agriculture through economics***

#### **Governing with the market**

Classical economics and former agricultural policies see environment as external to the market, thus not able to take into account in its price mechanism negative externalities on biodiversity engendered by agricultural activity. The EU adopts this representation of biodiversity saying that “because it escapes pricing and is not reflected in society’s accounts, biodiversity often falls victim to competing claims on nature and its use” (EC 2011a: 2). In the EU biodiversity strategy to 2020, biodiversity is designated under the name of “our life insurance, our natural capital”, economic vocabulary. The post-2013 CAP reform considers biodiversity as a public good which gives ecological services and should be economically valued through market because of the vital

services it offers to humans. It is the market which has to define biodiversity according to its exchange-value. This economic and even financial way of defining biological diversity gives a narrow framework in which biodiversity conservation should occur. In the CAP reform, the concretization happens with direct green payments under the first pillar, and the payment for eco-friendly practices under the second pillar.

According to McMichael, “the question of pricing nature is quite problematic insofar as markets in natural ‘services’ necessarily separate and simplify interactive cycles and processes that express considerable variation across time and space. [...] Such fractioning of natural processes and assignment of interest via pricing mechanisms compounds the externalisation of environmental costs by reducing nature to an economic ‘service’” (2011: 805). Lockie argues that “it is not species richness per se that underwrites the resilience and productivity of agro-ecosystems but the functional relationships between organisms and ecosystem components at a variety of scales” (2009: 407). As shown by these quotes, governing biodiversity with market implies nature fragmentation which inhibits ecosystem resilience. While environmentalism was considered at its premises as a reaction against the system (Adams 2004: 277), this approach tends to pursue past trends of nature commodification. This practice is not neutral and physically impacts on how nature looks like.

### **“Refashioning nature”<sup>6</sup>**

The rationalist project of biodiversity conservation redefines space (Adams 2004). Adams argues that biodiversity conservation has followed a process of rationalization, what Scott calls “taming nature” (1998: 262). This “way of evaluating nature [...] only accounts for its utility for human use and does not give any acceptance to the idea of protecting nature for its own sake, or any conception of a nature that cannot be managed” (Hart-Kristan 2011: 3). Nature is seen as a resource that necessarily needs to be managed.

In the case of the EU, the EC project of biodiversity conservation tends to organize nature in a specific way to remedy land fragmentation resulting from industrial agriculture. The combination of agriculture and environmental protection draws landscapes and shape new kinds of natural networks. Extending Natura 2000 design, the integration of biodiversity conservation into agriculture through crop diversification, permanent pasture and ecological focus areas aims to create communication networks between species or ecosystems that allow for encouraging positive synergies. The EC is trying to integrate biodiversity conservation through agriculture as a new form of spatial planning willing to alleviate land fragmentation. Biodiversity is treated as “green infrastructure” that needs to enhance its “functional connectivity” (EC 2011a: 5). Although this practice is necessary to generalize biodiversity protection without leaving full part of land, it is an entrepreneurial way of managing nature.

According to Murphy (as cited in Adams 2004: 278), “the rationalist goal of mastery of nature cannot be achieved because rationalization is based on 'the erroneous premise of a plastic natural world’” (Murphy 1994, 27). Biodiversity conservation is thus the expression of human control over environment which physically affects nature. Adams adds that “management was a form of surgical intervention: stringent but effective, leaving the patient physically reconfigured (sometimes drastically) but on a planned road to recovery” (2004: 284).

---

<sup>6</sup> D. Goodman and M. Redclift (1991) 'Refashioning Nature: Food', *Ecology and Culture*. London: Routledge.

## Science or knowledge to serve power

The EC project of biodiversity conservation is knowledge-based and designed by ecological science. According to Adams, “within the specific sphere of nature conservation, ecological science has served this function and provided knowledge about nature that has served to classify and objectify it, to predict environmental change and to provide a technocratic recipe book for directing and controlling that change” (2004: 278). Following this line, the EU biodiversity strategy which sets the objectives that are recreated in the CAP, calls for better “monitoring and reporting”.

Science builds environmental indicators to make nature manageable. According to McCarthy “since broad ecosystem functions, very difficult to disaggregate, are often at issue, indicators must be selected and measured. Also, since payments are being made for them, it seems inescapable that they must also be weighted and ranked” (2005: 777). On this line, the EC encourages the “mapping and assessing ecosystem services in Europe, which will help improve our knowledge of the links between biodiversity and climate change, and the role of soil biodiversity in delivering key ecosystem services, such as carbon sequestration and food supply” (2011a: 4). The legislative proposals of the new CAP define specific quantified criteria and ceilings. For example, to be eligible to green payments, farmers must keep 5% of their land under permanent grassland or 7% under ecological focus area.

However these indicators are very arbitrary and classification of nature is constantly questioned. Science is a way of depoliticizing and focusing on science-policy interface without looking at how science is produced. Takacs expresses the relationship between biodiversity and knowledge in an original way:

The term biodiversity symbolizes biologist’s lack of knowledge about the natural world. Endangered species can be identified, counted, and planned for [even if a daunting task], but biodiversity stands for biological wealth and complexity whose depths biologists have scarcely begun to plumb. Such opacity is not necessarily problematic: when they employ the concept of biodiversity, biologists mean to turn the depth of their ignorance from a seeming weakness into a unique strength. They seek to use this ignorance as a lever, not only to promote their conservation goals, but to advance the privileged position from which they speak for those goals. Ignorance adds to the luster of the biologist’s expertise, it becomes his domain, a source of his authority (1996: 83).

Knowledge is constructed to serve specific interests and the complexity of the idea behind biodiversity summarized in one single concept give authority to these interests.

Finally, it is worth noting that biodiversity conservation has been developed by ecological science but is also challenged by this science itself, turning from equilibrium theories and manageable ecosystems to non-linearity and chaos theory (Adams 2004).

#### ***4.2.2 Combining biodiversity conservation and agriculture through culture<sup>7</sup>***

##### **Biodiversity beyond nature**

Biodiversity is usually defined in restricted terms according to biological criteria established by modern and scientific rationality. As seen before, biodiversity can be fragmented into several parts and classified according to predetermined systems of thought which serve particular interests. However, critiques consider biological diversity hand in hand with cultural diversity. Cultural processes maintain or not biological diversity. McMichael affirms that environmental protection in agriculture involves “reorienting the social meaning and environmental contribution of agriculture” (2011: 805). One way of giving back social meaning to agriculture is to take into account cultural context because biological diversity is necessarily attached to a specific territory and culture.

Biological diversity depletion is above all a consequence or contingency of the extinction of the high diversity of cultures. Cultural standardization irreparably leads to biological diversity withdrawal. Biodiversity shapes culture which, at its turn pushes itself a way through existing biological environment and leaves its mark. This dialectical relationship survives as long as the frail equilibrium is maintained. Strict economic and scientific approach can maybe bring interesting results in terms of productivity but carry on at the same time threatening ecosystems because of the break from culture it involves. Culture traditionally gives the general shape to biodiversity and ensures its subsistence while biodiversity conditions cultural features. Therefore, only a multidisciplinary and comprehensive approach can bring effective results in terms of biodiversity conservation and cultural preservation. Slow Food argues that this kind of approach “may sometimes be less productive in an absolute sense, but do possess great capacities, matured over thousands of years of evolution, to adapt to a given organic and soil and climate conditions” (2012: 11). To that purpose, this conception of biodiversity focuses not only on wild species but also domestic and food diversity.

Slow Food denounces biodiversity degradation because “together with genetic pools, we also lose skills, knowledge, and languages” (Slow Food 2011a: 4). This cultural movement realized a list of endangered species including their link to “traditional knowledge and farming, rearing and processing techniques, ecosystems (the relationship between varieties and breeds to their territory, and their particular adaptation to climates, soils, altitudes), local cultures (languages, dialects, rituals, crafts, architecture)” (Slow Food 2011a: 4). Slow Food’s foundation for biodiversity website is particularly illustrative in this regard (Slow Food n.d. c): people from all over the world are represented, in traditional clothes, expressing cultural diversity linked to biological diversity. This perspective on biodiversity also gives particular attention to processed food products like bread or cheese which are the traditional ways of preserving local breeds and express local cultures. This way of integrating biodiversity conservation and agriculture through culture overcomes agricultural policy and open the way towards food policy (Slow Food 2010: 18-19).

##### **Diversity is living: repoliticizing biodiversity conservation**

Because biodiversity encompasses biological living and its cultural context which is highly diverse, its protection cannot be coolly rationalised by technical and standardized methods. Biodiversity conservation policies need to treat complexity to reflect the diversity in biological and

---

<sup>7</sup> Many ideas of this paragraph come from the interview with the member of Slow Food (08 October 2012).

cultural diversity that cannot be separated from each other. Slow food argues that “biodiversity is not an abstract concept. It is life itself: the life of people, nature and our planet. It is composed of human beings, wild and cultivated plants, wild and domestic animals, natural climates and environments, languages and cultures, as well as food” (Slow Food 2007: 5). This diversity necessarily implies a dialogue between different values, various interests that have to be reflected in policies. Therefore, biodiversity conservation policies should assume that they rule a political issue and should only offer a framework, not technical solutions. Human relation stands at the core of politics. Therefore bringing politics back into biodiversity conservation also means including human relations. The further quote is illustrative to explain what is meant by re-humanizing biodiversity conservation and beyond, food policies:

All who have spent a night in a bakery, seen the sun rising on a fishing port and on the men who animate it, shared sowing and harvesting, the coolness or the warmth of transformation workshop, the proximity of the gesture, of the body which regularly and precisely moves in order to sublimate a living product know what is at stake here: everything that is not quantifiable in a carbon footprint, in a statistic table, but that however expresses our humanity and our identity, our envies and our contradictions, our little compromises and our compromise, our madness and our little justifications, faith and reason, our fears as well, everything that make us women and men within this world (Gana 2010: 3).

Although one would say that this thought is idealistic, it is relevant for academic studies which should systematically learn to treat life and complexity that cannot be understood without considering politics.

### **The ecoregional approach**

Integration of biodiversity conservation and agriculture through culture is marginal and hardly conceptualized. Therefore the best way to explain this approach is by using an example which has been progressing not only in social movement circles but also public policy. An illustration can also move away critiques who could consider integrating biodiversity conservation and agriculture through culture idealistic.

The ecoregional approach (Bailly 2005) imagined in France by Emmanuel Bailly offers a general framework to set development policies that can be adapted to specific ecoregions. Agriculture is at the core of development and biodiversity conservation is one aspect of this approach. While he does not oppose the European project agreeing that “the key issue consists of turning a monolithic conception into a multi-territorial conception made of independent territories” (DATAR 2002: 21), his proposition implicitly reacts to centralized policies such as the CAP. Bailly suggests creating a “domestic regionalized agriculture”, under the competence of local entities (2005: 111-116), guided by a European or even world framework setting coherent strategies. The current system has ushered in an “organized disorder”, justified by very complicated economic and scientific models. However, what Bailly wants to show is that things are simple at the level of the ecoregion. Good sense, exploitation of local resources and knowledge with a good balance are enough.

An ecoregion is defined as “a quite large geographical zone distinguishable by a set of similar characteristics (physical environment, resources, population and way of living)” (Nascimento 2006: 2). The idea is to create at the regional level a genuine ecosystem which integrates both natural and human resources. This system is articulated with other ecosystems at a larger level. On the contrary of centralized policies like the CAP or biodiversity conservation policies at the European level which tend to separate elements of a same ecosystem, for example the nature/culture di-

vide, the ecoregional approach is grounded on the principle of interdependence between all the aspects of an ecosystem. Moreover the entrance and exit of flows of energy, agricultural products, and transformed food should be kept under control and coherent. This coherence ensures a certain “immune system capacity” of the region, meaning the “set of biological and economic mechanisms allowing the ecosystem for maintaining the coherence within the constitutive life basins and ensure its integrity” (Nascimento 2006: 4).

Concretely, the ecoregional approach begins with the inventory of needs and assets of a region. Then, the ecoregion is structured around seven perimeters: the food sovereignty perimeter, the agricultural economic viability perimeter (economic activities have to be sustainable), the perimeter of guarantee volume absorption (local production is absorbed by local consumption), the social recognition perimeter (which values farmers) and the perimeter of solidarity towards future generations.

In sum, the ecoregional approach is an attempt to reconnect to a specific territory, biodiversity and the culture attached to it. Local knowledge and traditions are valued and give sense to regional economy. This is a good illustration of an alternative to the biodiversity conservation project proposed by the EU.

In conclusion, this chapter presents by a comparison of discourses the discursive dynamics in play behind the CAP reform: biodiversity conservation through economics and biodiversity conservation through culture. These interactions largely go beyond the simple debate on the CAP and biodiversity conservation, and reflect recurrent questioning in development studies.

## Chapter 5

### Conclusion

Who could believe that gastronomes would one day influence agricultural policies, modes of food regulation, preservation of savoir-faire and biodiversity?

Nobody.

Who can only imagine that individuals driven by their food pleasure can make this pleasure resonate with a larger conscience embracing the entire humanity?

Nobody.

Gastronomes are beyond suspicion (Gana 2010).

This paper investigates politics and discursive constructions in the context of the post-2013 environmental CAP reform. The EU has set a renegotiated policy in motion to address, among other challenges, tremendous impact of agriculture on environment. I focus on biodiversity conservation as a specific form of greening. Legislative proposals make some progress in terms of integrating biodiversity conservation and agriculture through direct green payments under the first pillar and agri-environmental schemes under the second pillar.

I approach this process in an interactive way and consider that the CAP reform is a critical process made of flows of power relations between many actors. Power relations between actors are cloudy and cannot be understood in a conventional way, hence the relevance of using Foucault's definition of power, flowing everywhere, in any direction. Drawing on Jonathan Fox's model on interactions between state and society in policy process, I adopt a specific angle to politics behind the CAP reform and favour the interactions between the EU, conceptualized as a state, and social movements, such as Slow Food.

In the context of crisis of conventional agriculture, social movements are gaining audience and legitimacy. Beyond it is the entire development package that is questioned because of its depoliticized technical and economic character, neglecting human and cultural relations and leading to a rupture between nature and culture. Slow Food especially as a glocal and culturally-based movement proposes an integrated way of comprehending agriculture and environment. This group considers that biodiversity cannot be taken in isolation from its cultural context that is attached to specific territory. Biological diversity and cultural diversity are intimately interlinked. Its forms of mobilization and identity construction, conceptualized as everyday politics in an articulated network of local and global, open new political spaces and give legitimacy to different kinds of actors (farmers, craftsman, gastronome, etc.).

The gap between the EU and Slow Food's power and their scope of action is huge. One would say that this difference makes the comparison impossible or irrelevant. The direct interaction remains in fact limited. However, this kind of social movements is truly redefining the European map of power in agricultural policy-making. Since the EU keeps an uncontested power and still leaves little political space to social movements, they react to the continuity history of the CAP through original forms of action and construction of new identities. The interesting part of the interaction between the EU and social movements in the context of the CAP reform is not the direct impact of social movements on the reform process and decisions but their impact on



society as a whole. This phenomenon necessarily redesigns the map of power and legitimacy throughout Europe. Social movements invite society to take control over its agriculture according to local culture and knowledge. Biodiversity conservation should not occur through centralized policies but build upon a specific cultural and territorial context, such as the ecoregional approach.

Thus, new kinds of social mobilization and identities from the bottom-up and articulated with upper levels of governance are flourishing. Slow Food is representative of these trends. They stay in institutional limits but practice informal and everyday politics through indirect mobilization in society. Their main success in the context of the CAP reform has been to increase public awareness and make every European citizen have a word to say about this reform. Slow Food especially wanted to draw attention to the CAP reform (Slow Food 2012e).

The interactions between the EU and social movements in the context of the CAP reform do not come out of the blue. They are embedded in discursive constructions from both sides. I argue, following Foucault's conception that discourse is not neutral and contributes to the production of new realities. Moreover, power differentials determine the place granted to a discourse compared to another one.

In the case of the environmental reform of the CAP, contested representations of biodiversity impact on the way biodiversity conservation and agriculture are combined. The analysis of the EC position through discourse analysis reveals that the EU has assimilated the contours of biodiversity conservation discourse but in its own economic and market-based framework. Textual analysis shows that the EC conveys a message turning challenges into opportunities and attempts to internalize change into continuity. Science backs and legitimizes this economic approach. While the EC project is coolly presented and seems apolitical, the comparison with Slow Food conception shows that this process is not inevitable but constructed to serve specific interests. Indeed, while the EU proposes to integrate biodiversity conservation and agriculture through economics, Slow Food opts for integrating biodiversity conservation and agriculture through culture and human relations.

The politics in agricultural and environmental policy-making in the EU could be deeper investigated in order to closer understand the interplay of actors and levels of governance. The evolution of interactions between the EU and social movements is the one susceptible to bring change in the future. Research should not be afraid of putting in a same line, actors with huge differentials of power, such as the EU and Slow Food. Believing that a reconfiguration of power is possible is the first step to succeed. I selected such a marginal system of thought, Slow Food, to put it in value despite the power deployed by mainstream institutional setting and its discursive construction. At a time of environmental protection becomes urging, Slow Food could be the future of agrarian and environmental social movements: take the best of local and global and value culture to ensure diversity without omitting pleasure. It fights against any kind of rationalization and standardization that academics should more actively support.

# Appendices

## Text European Commission (EC) 1

### **COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS**

#### **The CAP towards 2020:**

#### **Meeting the food, natural resources and territorial challenges of the future**

##### 1. INTRODUCTION

1 The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) is confronted with a set of challenges, some unique  
2 in nature, some unforeseen, that invite the EU to make a strategic choice for the long-term future  
3 of its agriculture and rural areas. To be effective in addressing these challenges, the

4 CAP needs to operate within the context of sound economic policies and sustainable public  
5 finances contributing to the achievement of the objectives of the Union.

6 In preparation for this Communication, the Commission organised an extensive public de-  
7 bate earlier in 2010 that concluded with a conference in July 2010<sup>8</sup>. The Council discussed during  
8 four successive Presidencies the reform, the European Parliament (EP) adopted an own initiative  
9 report on the post-2013 CAP<sup>9</sup>, and its link with the Europe 2020 Strategy and both the Econom-  
10 ic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions (CoR) have come forward with posi-  
11 tion papers.

12 In the course of these discussions, the overwhelming majority of views expressed concurred  
13 that the future CAP should remain a strong common policy structured around its two pillars.

14 In broad terms, the views expressed recommended the following strategic aims:

- 15 • To preserve the food production potential on a sustainable basis throughout the EU, so  
16 as to guarantee long-term food security for European citizens and to contribute to grow-  
17 ing world food demand, expected by FAO to increase by 70% by 2050. Recent incidents  
18 of increased market instability, often exacerbated by climate change, further highlight the-

---

<sup>8</sup> 5,600 contributions were received in the public debate and the Conference assembled over 600 participants.

<sup>9</sup><http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P7-TA-2010-0286&language=EN&ring=A7-2010-0204>

se trends and pressures. Europe's capacity to deliver food security is an important long term choice for Europe which cannot be taken for granted.

- To support farming communities that provide the European citizens with quality, value and diversity of food produced sustainably, in line with our environmental, water, animal health and welfare, plant health and public health requirements. The active management of natural resources by farming is one important tool to maintain the rural landscape, to combat biodiversity loss and contributes to mitigate and to adapt to climate change. This is an essential basis for dynamic territories and long term economic viability.
- To maintain viable rural communities, for whom farming is an important economic activity creating local employment; this delivers multiple economic, social, environmental and territorial benefits. A significant reduction in local production would also have implications with regards to greenhouse gases (GHG), characteristic local landscapes as well as more limited choice for the consumer.

Agriculture is an integral part of the European economy and society. In terms of indirect effects, any significant cut back in European farming activity would in turn generate losses in GDP and jobs in linked economic sectors – notably within the agri-food supply chain, which relies on the EU primary agricultural sector for high quality, competitive and reliable raw material inputs, as well as in non-food sectors. Rural activities, from tourism, transport, to local and public services would also be affected. Depopulation in rural areas would probably accelerate. There would therefore be important environmental and social consequences.

Reform of the CAP must also continue, to promote greater competitiveness, efficient use of taxpayer resources and effective public policy returns European citizens expect, with regard to food security, the environment, climate change and social and territorial balance. The objective should be to build more sustainable, smarter and more inclusive growth for rural Europe.

To achieve this, in line with the Budget Review Communication<sup>3</sup> and with its market orientation, the future CAP should contain a greener and more equitably distributed first pillar and a second pillar focussing more on competitiveness and innovation, climate change and the environment. This would allow EU agriculture to release its latent productivity potential, notably in the new Member States, and contribute to the Europe 2020 objectives. Targeting support exclusively to active farmers and remunerating the collective services they provide to society would increase the effectiveness and efficiency of support and further legitimize the CAP. Ensuring controllability of measures proposed together with continued work on simplification of the policy are other essential elements in achieving these aims. All this needs to happen within the constraints of limited budgetary resources and taking into account the severe impact of the economic crisis on agriculture.

## Text European Commission (EC) 2

**Dacian Cioloș Member of the European Commission - Responsible for Agriculture and Rural Development**  
**The CAP beyond 2013 – challenges and opportunities for European agriculture**  
**Oxford Farming Conference Oxford, 6 January 2011**

Reference: SPEECH/11/3 Event Date: 06/01/2011



### Oxford Farming Conference

#### Oxford, 6 January 2011

- 1 Ladies and gentlemen,
- 2 Thank you very much for inviting me to this key event for the farming world.
- 3 It seems that there is no better way to start a pleasant afternoon in Oxford, but to be here at the
- 4 Examination schools, in the examination halls...
- 5 I know that your programme says that I am going to give my advice to business leaders in prepa-
- 6 ration for 2013... but we have a saying in Romania – if you want good advice, ask an old man!
- 7 And I do not feel old enough!
- 8 Therefore, allow me to use the time we have together to give you an outline of the challenges and
- 9 opportunities facing the Common Agriculture Policy beyond 2013.
- 10 There are three elements in any public-policy making: the problem, the players and the solution
- 11 to the problem, that is, the policy itself, which is rarely able to address all the issues, even less to
- 12 satisfy every request or concern.
- 13 But that does not mean we cannot be ambitious.
- 14 We must be, if we are to play our part in addressing so many major challenges:
- 15 - the future of farming and farmers in Europe;
- 16 - the future of our rural landscapes and our countryside;

17 - global food security.

18 The policy tool available to us is the CAP, together with the financial resources which underpin  
19 it.

20 This Conference, which brings together so many of those affected and interested in this reform,  
21 is clearly amongst the players and I am committed to listening.

22 The reform must be based on dialogue, and that is why last July I organised a broad based con-  
23 ference, to make sure all the views could be voiced, before sitting down to draft the Communica-  
24 tion.

25 This is why, instead of providing advice, I am here to discuss the Common Agriculture Policy  
26 with you and – to the extent possible, given the timing of this reform – to look together with you  
27 at some possible answers.

28 The Common Agriculture Policy has never been written in stone – it is a living policy, which has  
29 changed enormously over the past 25 years. These changes have already fundamentally altered  
30 the relationship between farmers, Governments and markets.

31 Well over 90% of European agricultural payments are decoupled from production. In 2010, ex-  
32 port subsidies were well under 1% of the CAP budget.

33 It is the markets which are now the key driver in production decisions, not European subsidies.  
34 And meanwhile European farmers have turned to new tasks, producing secure and high quality  
35 food, based on stringent production standards.

36 So there has been a fundamental shift in the CAP to make it market sensitive. We must now  
37 build on this, so that the CAP stays in tune with changing times and responds to new challenges.

38 Once more, we are engaged in a fundamental reform process of the Common Agriculture Policy.

39 My conviction is that at the end of it, this policy needs to be well equipped to address the chal-  
40 lenges of food security and climate change, to preserve natural resources and to maintain territo-  
41 rial balance across Europe.

42 It should offer farmers more stability and a coherent tool-box to fight economic downturn and  
43 price volatility.

44 It has to be more equitable, simpler and easier to understand.

45 This reform is a choice that our society needs to make.

46 It is a choice about our food; a choice about our environment; a choice about our territorial di-  
47 versity.

48 It is also a choice about jobs.

49 The CAP is about millions of farmers and millions of employees in the agri-food sector, and ad-  
50 dresses the needs of the 500 million citizens in Europe's internal market.

51 These are the elements at the heart of the policy blueprint that I launched last November, these  
52 are the decisions the Member States and the European Parliament are called to make.

53 You know as well as I do - and I know this was one of the themes of discussion here yesterday -  
54 we cannot isolate our debate on the future CAP from the **global food issues**.

55 We have a duty towards our European citizens to provide for them quality, healthy food; and we  
56 also have a responsibility towards the world at large. Never been

57 Not only is the world population growing, dietary patters are also changing, especially in the  
58 emerging economies, with more meat and dairy consumption, in particular.

59 We can expect a 50% increase in food demand by 2030.  
60 According to the FAO estimates, by 2050, the Earth will probably have to feed 9 billion people.  
61 Some other estimates say that we could be more than 10 billion in 40 years.  
62 This means that every day, we have to provide food for one hundred and forty thousand more  
63 people.  
64 Combined with the effects of climate change, with drought and extreme weather conditions, it  
65 seems that feeding the world will be a challenge in itself.  
66 This is a challenge for all countries; a challenge that Europe has to be ready to address, as part of  
67 the global response, but also – and we should not be shy to say so – because it is a strategic secu-  
68 rity imperative for Europeans.  
69 If we do not take account of this now, for the period up to 2020, we may well be leaving all this  
70 far too late.  
71 So, food production is the number one objective of agriculture and for farmers. But it would be  
72 simplistic to limit the CAP to just that. The CAP also deals with helping farmers preserve our  
73 natural resources and maintain a countryside people want to live in.  
74 **Natural resources** are not unlimited.  
75 To give you just one example: a quarter of Europe's water is used by agriculture – up to 80% in  
76 some regions.  
77 We cannot win the battle of food security at the expense of permanent damage to our environ-  
78 ment.  
79 European agriculture needs to sustain and reinforce its competitiveness on the basis of a produc-  
80 tivity model that combines economic, environmental and social sustainability.  
81 We have a legacy to leave to future generations. We cannot guarantee our food security on a pro-  
82 duction model that puts at risk the capacity of future generations to meet their own needs.  
83 So we must work to minimize the impact agriculture has on the environment and maximize its  
84 positive effects.  
85 But if this is to be done, there is a clear role for public funding, so as to reward farmers for  
86 providing public goods which the market rarely rewards.  
87 If we want our food to be produced sustainably, rather than in the cheapest way possible, if we  
88 want our farmers to do more to preserve soils and water, to reverse the steady loss of biodiversi-  
89 ty, than YES, the CAP is the best way to do it!  
90 Why?  
91 Since subsidies are clearly needed across European agriculture - and indeed a vast majority of  
92 Member States are of this view - a European policy is the only way to deliver a fair and efficient  
93 agricultural market for producers and consumers.  
94 Our purpose must be to encourage farmers across Europe to make the same efforts/focus on the  
95 same priorities/objectives.  
96 And here, I would like to bring in the third crucial element of this reform: **territorial balance** -  
97 our ability to sustain agricultural production on all our territories.  
98 Since the beginning of my mandate in February last year, I have visited nearly all member states,  
99 from North to South, from East to West.  
100 And everywhere I hear the same tune: *Agriculture is the foundation of our rural economy.*

101 Of course, we have to go beyond agriculture into rural development; we have to diversify agricul-  
 102 tural and non-agricultural activities.

103 But we need to preserve agriculture as the fundamental social and economic fabric of our rural  
 104 societies, including in those regions where farming is difficult.

105 On one hand, I see this reform as a chance to lay the ground for a new public contract between  
 106 agriculture and society;

107 - a contract where we are called to provide food and to manage more than half of Europe's  
 108 land;

109 - a contract that gives a renewed legitimacy and credibility to the CAP.

110 On the other hand, since the economic situation of the world has changed, opportunities availa-  
 111 ble for producers a couple of years ago are not there anymore.

112 We have to improve and refine our policy measurers and, when needed, provide our farmers with  
 113 safety belts and extra airbags.

114 Ladies and gentlemen,

115 Empowering farmers to meet the expectations of European citizens is crucial.

116 We have now the opportunity to reshape our policy so that taxpayers can understand better what  
 117 this policy is doing for them.

118 I believe that the CAP **direct payments** ne certainly be maintained.

119 Some of you will have read the Pack Report, examining the reform options from Scotland's per-  
 120 spective. What I can tell you is that the importance of public support for so many Scottish farm-  
 121 ers, underlined by this report, is shared in most of Europe. Yes, direct payments can deliver  
 122 more in terms of public goods than they do today. But their income supporting function is a  
 123 must.

124 However there is a definite need to redefine the system, in order to link payments more closely to  
 125 their role as

126 - income support for farmers

127 - recognition for the provision of public goods not remunerated by the market.

128 We should also base our system of direct payments on objective criteria, equally applicable to all  
 129 member states.

130 We are thinking about economic, social, and environmental criteria. There could be others as im-  
 131 pact assessments are on-going.

132 This way, we should make the system more understandable and more credible to the taxpayer,  
 133 with the same rules applicable everywhere.

134 We are now working towards a balanced, pragmatic legislative proposal, on the principle that we  
 135 cannot afford to support some sectors of agriculture by destabilizing others.

136 We must make sure that the support is given on the basis of objective criteria, reflecting what  
 137 agriculture provides to European society and citizens, rather than on the basis of what farmers  
 138 have received in the past.

139 The historical references for the distribution of payments have lost their relevance. For the long-  
 140 term health of the CAP, we cannot run this policy in two different gears.

141 The policy must be fairer and more efficient.

142 The CAP tools need to be more inclusive and to better take into account the diversity of agricul-  
 143 tures in Europe.

144 To be credible, direct payments should be fairly divided between member states, regions, differ-  
 145 ent types of agriculture and categories of farmers. This does not mean a flat rate payment across  
 146 the whole of Europe.

147 Most probably, with the application of these criteria, payment will vary – but the criteria we ap-  
 148 ply should not!

149 So there is change in preparation in the first pillar. In doing so, there is a key principle I have  
 150 asked my Services respect, and that is simplification. For farmers and administrators. The same  
 151 will hold true for the second pillar.

152 But in fact, in the UK, many of the changes to the first pillar have already started, in England in  
 153 particular. So there will also be lessons learnt here which can benefit others – both in the UK, in  
 154 Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales, and more widely.

155 To accomplish its multiple functions, European agriculture needs a strong Common Agriculture  
 156 Policy, more efficient and better targeted.

157 To maintain its legitimacy, this policy needs to be focused on **active farmers**.

158 I believe we should avoid making payments to people or organizations whose activity has no rela-  
 159 tionship to farming or land management. This is one of the most common criticisms that we hear  
 160 from our citizens, and indeed one of the most frequent problems highlighted in last year's consul-  
 161 tation. We must address this.

162 The role of this policy is not to pay bonuses to companies unrelated to agriculture.

163 Justifying payments above a certain level is also difficult, unless we talk about the creation of a  
 164 high number of jobs.

165 We are currently paying large landholders, who may not actually be in need of the same level of  
 166 income support as small or medium sized farmers. The proposal to establish upper limits for di-  
 167 rect payments to individual farms ("capping") will address this.

168 This is why, with the member states, we have started a reflection process on these subjects.

169 The aim of this reform is also to improve the **overall environmental performance** of the  
 170 Common Agriculture Policy.

171 Direct payments – the basic support for farmers, will continue to be linked to cross compliance  
 172 rules.

173 The new element is that on the top of the basic payment, we will provide incentives for farmers  
 174 to apply production methods that preserve natural resources.

175 It is not a penalty but an incentive.

176 An impact assessment is currently underway to determine the most relevant techniques. But we  
 177 could think of measures such as ecological set-aside, green cover on arable land, preservation of  
 178 grassland, crop rotation.

179 The aim is to fight soil erosion and improve water and carbon retention in the soil.

180 In the second pillar, via the rural development measures, the member states will have the oppor-  
 181 tunity to support farmers who want to do even more to fight climate change and to protect the  
 182 environment and natural resources.

183 More emphasis will be put on **research and innovation**, making a better link between research  
 184 and its applications in production methods.



185 An Innovation Partnership for Sustainable Agriculture is under preparation by the Commission.  
 186 This should provide the boost for research in this area which we know is needed.  
 187 This is about more resources but above all I believe it is about better linkages between the farm-  
 188 ing and research communities, in both directions. We need to accelerate technology transfer  
 189 from the laboratory to the field.

190 One of our general aims is to maintain agriculture in all regions of the EU where there are still  
 191 people wanting to do farming, including in **regions with particular natural handicaps**.

192 At the same time, we will continue to push for greater competitiveness – and for farmers to look  
 193 to the market for their main source of income.

194 Finally, I would like to discuss with you the **security features** of our policy: name them safety  
 195 belts or airbags ...

196 Market intervention measures will continue to be part of the future Common Agriculture Policy.  
 197 They will remain important as a safety net.

198 The dairy crisis showed that we need tools to fight market volatility; we need tools to avoid the  
 199 collapse of entire sectors.

200 The CAP of today has changed enormously from the CAP of the 80s and the 90s. Structural sur-  
 201 pluses are a thing of the past and our prices in many sectors are not much different from world  
 202 market levels. Successive changes have made the CAP more market-oriented.

203 However, the market alone is not always sufficient for something that is as cally important as  
 204 food security.

205 More than ever before, in the context of climate change and price volatility, we need to maintain  
 206 a back-up when market fails.

207 The new CAP will provide member states with tools to deal with excessive volatility of farmer's  
 208 income.

209 So these are the broad outlines of what I have proposed.

210 But of course, very little can be done without a **budget** reflecting the ambitions of this reform.

211 Every time I am getting this question – and believe me, I get it very often, I remember an old  
 212 Yiddish proverb which says that “with money in your pocket, you are wise and you are handsome  
 213 and you sing well too”.

214 I am of course well aware that it will not be easy task to negotiate the budget for the period after  
 215 2013. But again, this is one of the vital reasons why we need to change our policy and to highlight  
 216 the broader benefits that agriculture provides to society.

217 If food security, biodiversity loss and climate change are all very important issues for decision  
 218 makers – and I understand that these were issue which did figure in the UK general elections last  
 219 year -, then it should also be reflected in a strong budget for a CAP that provides solutions to all  
 220 these challenges.

221 At the end of the day, the decision on the future of the Common Agriculture Policy resides with  
 222 the member states and the European Parliament – under the co-decision rules foreseen by the  
 223 Lisbon treaty.

224 The timing of a political agreement depends on how Ministers and the MEPs respond to our  
 225 proposals.

226 Certainly, my intention is to reach political agreement in 2012 so that we can finalize the imple-  
227 menting rules in 2013 – and member states can define their options before the new system enters  
228 into force in January 2014.

229 The European Commission’s legislative proposals will be ready this summer.

230 We are already working on this, having in mind that a policy is a vehicle taking us on a journey –  
231 a journey defined by the expectations of our fellow citizens.

232 Thank you for your attention. I am looking forward to the debate to follow.

# Text Slow Food (SF) 1

## Towards a New Common Agricultural Policy

### Slow Food Policy Paper on CAP

#### 1. Introduction

As the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) undergoes a wide-reaching reform process, the European Union is facing a challenge that will be vital for its future. In autumn 2011, the European Commission will submit its draft legislative proposals, and at the start of 2014 the new CAP will enter into force. The months leading up to the conclusion of this process will be fundamental for the definition of agrifood production methods and understanding of the EU's role over the next decade.

In the years to come, the EU—indeed the whole world—will have to face challenges the like of which it has never seen before. The need to continue to ensure food security will be compounded by the more immediate one of solving problems such as climate change, environmental and natural resource protection, energy provision and so on once and for all. These questions have to be answered within the context of the last century's broader economic, environmental and social crisis. The current economic paradigm, based on the domination of finance and production as an end unto itself, has revealed all its shortcomings, and the time has now come to identify new policies that are not exclusively geared to liberalising the market and privatisations.

Though the CAP played a vital role in driving off the spectre of famine in the postwar years, it now arrives at the appointment with reform with critical difficulties on its plate. In Europe, the policy is shrouded by a great lack of confidence. Many see it as being far removed from the needs of contemporary society and citizens and the demands of sustainable small- and medium-scale agrifood production. It is also accused of being structured solely to benefit agribusiness, a slave to the rules of a hollow liberalism that has proved, *de facto*, incapable of offering convincing answers to the problems we discuss below (see section 1).

If it is to break free from the rule of agribusiness and the large-scale distribution sector and at last offer solutions to the contemporary crisis, the EU needs to rethink the structure of the agricultural sector and the food system in general. At the same time, citizens and the small- and medium-scale agrifood world have to seize the opportunities offered by the great democratic process of CAP reform, mobilising to demand changes capable of solving the serious problems that await European society for good.

This is why Slow Food, which believes that the current agrifood system is environmentally, socially and economically unsustainable, has decided to bring its experience and vision to bear in the debate on CAP reform and help develop a juster, fairer, more ecological policy.

This document sets out Slow Food's vision of the major issues at stake in the ongoing reform process. After outlining the present state of the CAP and European agrifood production, it describes the values, goals and experiences of the Slow Food movement (section 2). The docu-

34 ment goes on to list the guidelines Slow Food believes the CAP should follow over the next few  
35 years and it then concludes by focusing on two specific subjects— young people and agriculture;  
36 support to small- and medium-scale agrifood production— which Slow Food sees as being par-  
37 ticularly close to its own philosophy and of top priority in the drawing up of the new CAP (sec-  
38 tion 3). Over the coming months, Slow Food will be particularly active on the two subjects, or-  
39 ganising general mobilisation initiatives and awareness-raising activities at Community level and  
40 in the European Union’s 27 Member States.

## Text Slow Food (SF) 2

### CAP Proposals Don't Go Far Enough

**Slow Food's response to the legislative proposals for the new CAP highlights the need for more focus on sustaining small-scale farmers**

**Belgium - 27/10/2011**

On October 12, the European Commission presented the legislative proposals for the revised Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) for 2013.

After careful review, it is Slow Food's view that the Commission has not managed to keep its promises to promote a more sustainable, equitable and fair CAP. In particular, while the proposals anticipate ways of supporting small- and medium-scale production, the overall formulation of the future CAP does not change the current scenario significantly and continues to favor big agri-businesses.

At a theoretical level, the Commission emphasizes the need to create "a new partnership between Europe and its farmers", to be able to best confront the serious challenges of our times: food security, the sustainable management of natural resources and the fight against climate change. However, beyond the declarations of principle, the framework outlined by the Commission lacks that paradigm shift that would benefit small-scale farmers - our most resilient food producers due to their use of sustainable production techniques and their undeniable role in safeguarding biodiversity and the landscape.

Renewing support for the agro-industry powers will prove disastrous. In the past decades, the industry has dragged Europe away from a model of sustainable and fair agricultural development, and towards a model that has brought devastating environmental exploitation, injustice for both virtuous farmers and consumers and a concentration of economic advantages in a few hands. The initial positive intentions for the CAP reform, expressed on many occasions by Commissioner Dacian Cioloș, have likely been hindered by the actions of the major agricultural lobbies and certain governments. In addition to the misguided basic framework, the proposals do not include in any significant way many of the suggestions made by civil society, nor do they seem able to contribute to responding to the many crisis factors that characterize the current food production system.

It is important to emphasize that the goal of this reform process, as strongly demanded by civil society, must be to prepare European agriculture to tackle the challenges of the coming decades, to dismantle the domination of agro-industry and to promote a more sustainable and fairer agricultural model. It should not be to protect the anachronistic and damaging interests of a few.

Slow Food will continue to follow the reform process closely, in an attempt to bring the post-2013 CAP back onto the path of environmental sustainability, fairness and quality.

**The following aspects of the Commission's proposals for a new CAP concern Slow Food the most:**

Surface area as a criterion for the new basic payments: Though the abandonment of historical criteria should be welcomed, defining the new basic payments based only on surface area is disappointing. This system will continue to financially favor large-scale food production. Slow Food is not happy about the introduction of this measure, as it goes against the spirit of the association's proposals, founded on a rethinking of the food system based on sustainable small- and medium-scale production.

Lack of greening: One of the main changes civil society is demanding of this reform process is to make the European food system more sustainable, however the Commission's proposals largely ignore this aspect. The most significant environmental measure included is the new "green payment", which will take up to 30 percent of the resources available for direct payments. Courageous CAP reform would have required every cent paid out to be linked to the provision of im-

portant environmental services.

The criteria on which the new green payment will be based do not include the essential practice of crop rotation. We welcome the Commission's expressed intention to integrate the directives on water and sustainable pesticide use into the criteria soon, however stress that this integration must happen as quickly as possible. The new possibility for certain countries to divert a percentage of the funds destined for the second pillar to the in is entirely negative in terms of the greening of the CAP. Equally deplorable is the lack of an increase in the resources available for agricultural environmental measures under the second pillar.

More generally, there is a lack of sufficient measures to stop the loss of biodiversity and to reach the target of halving the rate of biodiversity loss by 2020. Certainly the measure that requires leaving 7 percent of land as "environmental focus areas" is positive, but this alone can never be enough. Along the same lines is the measure aimed at maintaining permanent pastures and the consequent ban on converting them to agricultural production. In itself the measure is positive, but the protection will come into force only after 2014. In the intervening period, many of these pastures will almost certainly be converted to agricultural production.

Price control and the fight against speculation: There is no doubt that one of the main problems with the contemporary food system is the dramatic volatility of prices. Instead of proposing market measures to help control price fluctuations, the Commission has chosen to propose ex post measures, aimed at compensating damages caused by price variations (see, for example, insurance programs). This approach seems paradoxical; it would be considerably more effective to try to avoid prices fluctuating so much in the first place, primarily by curbing speculation.

**Some of the proposals do not yet include enough information for a full evaluation:**

Measures to support small-scale production: Slow Food has long underlined the crucial role played by small-scale production in Europe. This is why it welcomes the proposed innovations, especially concerning the simplification that will benefit small-scale producers. However we question if the guaranteed support (between 500 and 1,000 euros a year per business) is sufficient.

Definition of active farmers: The introduction of a definition of an active farmer was absolutely necessary, but the proposed definition seems too nebulous and vague.

**The following proposals, strongly promoted by Slow Food since the start of the reform process, are welcomed:**

Introduction of a ceiling on direct payments: Despite strong opposition, the Commission has proposed a maximum limit on the direct payments that each farmer can receive (up to a maximum of 300,000 euros). However, the threshold must be lowered even further.

Partnership for research and innovation: It is positive that funding for research and innovation will increase. It is however necessary to ensure research also focuses on the integration between traditional wisdom and official science. It is also necessary to make sure the term "innovation" does not include clearance for GMOs. The attention to the exchange of intergenerational knowledge is also positive.

New food production and distribution chain: It is positive that the Commission recognizes that farmers, at the bottom of the food production chain, find themselves in a weak and unprotected position. Also positive are the measures proposed to support producer organizations, inter-professional organizations and the development of short distribution chains (few steps and few intermediaries).

Supplementary direct payment to young farmers: The Commission has shown that it has understood the urgency of the generational issue. While we could have expected more, the proposed measures are a good starting point to provide extra assistance to young farmers.

Supplementary payment for farmers working in disadvantaged areas: Clearly farmers working in disadvantaged areas face many difficulties, so the Commission's proposal to make supplementary payments to people working in these areas is welcomed.

In conclusion, the proposals presented do not offer much hope for the future in their current state. In particular, the lack of consideration of 'greening' the policy is of great concern, especially

95 since it is considered the main objective of this reform process by many. Furthermore, it is prob-  
96 able that some of the most innovative aspects of the proposals will be trimmed back following  
97 discussion in the European Parliament and the Council. There is a real risk that a proposal that  
98 from the start did not set out to be particularly bold and ambitious will find itself weakened to  
99 the point of being a “non-reform,” or, worse, a step backwards compared to the current situa-  
100 tion. Slow Food will continue to publicize the CAP reform and mobilize to stop that happening,  
101 in the hope that this reform process can instead go down in history as having saved European  
102 agriculture.

**Table 1.1 Discourse analysis European Commission**

Theme	Textual reference	Text	What it means: assumptions, conclusions, omissions
Level of involvement	Occurrence of determination verbs: 9 "must", 10 "should", 19 "need"	EC2	- Action verbs are evocative in terms of change '- Choice of personal pronoms gives impression of energy and personal involvement
	Occurrence of personal pronoms "I" and "we"	EC2	
	"CAP should remain a strong common policy"	EC1	- Adjectives "strong", expressions "never been written in stone" and word "change" gives impression that something is happening, something is changing '- Ajectives have the potential to hide eventual empty statements '- "active farmers": categorization, what does it mean? attempt to legitimize farmers who are lost prestige
	"European agriculture needs a strong Common Agriculture Policy, more efficient and better targeted"	EC2	
	"The Common Agriculture Policy has never been written in stone"	EC2	
	"So there is change in preparation in the first pillar"	EC2	
	"we need to change our policy "	EC2	
	"this policy needs to be focused on <b>active farmers</b> "	EC2	
	"it should also be reflected in a strong budget for a CAP"	EC2	
	"To be effective in addressing these challenges"	EC1	- Occurrence of "effective", "efficient": gives impression of rational action and change
	"efficient use of taxpayer resources and effective public policy returns"	EC1	
	"increase the effectiveness and efficiency of support"	EC1	
	"a European policy is the only way to deliver a fair and efficient agricultural market for producers and consumers"	EC2	
	"The policy must be fairer and more efficient"	EC2	
	"a policy is a vehicle taking us on a journey – a journey"	EC2	- metaphor evocating movement to show that something is happening
	"to combat biodiversity loss"	EC1	- "fight", "combat", "confront", "strategic": strong vocabulary, close to military vocabulary => creation of universe of action '- CAP reform = security
	"to fight economic downturn"	EC2	
	"The aim is to fight soil erosion"	EC2	
	"the member states will have the opportunity to support farmers who want to do even more to fight climate change"	EC2	
	"we need tools to fight market volatility"	EC2	
	"to make a strategic choice for the long-term future of its agriculture and rural areas"	EC1	



	"the views expressed recommended the following strategic aims"	EC1	
	"because it is a strategic security imperative for Europeans"	EC2	
	"However, the market alone is not always sufficient for something that is as strategically important as food security."	EC2	
	"The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) is confronted with a set of challenges"	EC1	
	"We have to improve and refine our policy measurers and, when needed, provide our farmers with safety belts and extra airbags."	EC2	
Challenges	"The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) is confronted with a set of challenges, some unique in nature, some unforeseen, that invite the EU to make a strategic choice for the long-term future"	EC1	-Strong evaluative adjectives "unique in nature", "unforeseen" '-Pleonasm: "long-term future", very broad allusion: "changing times"
	"the long-term health of the CAP"	EC1	'-Personification of challenges
	"changing times"	EC2	seen as external: they "invite", EU is "confronted"
	"We must be, if we are to play our part in addressing so many major challenges"	EC2	'- Strong adjectives compensate broad allusion of challenges
	9 occurrences of "challenges"	EC2	'- The EU is compelled by challenges
	"to contribute to growing world food demand, expected by FAO to increase by 70% by 2050"	EC1	
	"we cannot isolate our debate on the future CAP from the <b>global food issues</b> "	EC2	- Malthusian and fatalistic assumptions '- Paternalistic and moralistics view: the EU has to take care of the rest of the world, "everyday": daily concern, reference to daily life as if every European people has the duty of feeding the rest of the world
	"Not only is the world population growing"	EC2	'- Technical approach with figures and references to the FAO that are hardly refutable
	"We can expect a 50% increase in food demand by 2030"	EC2	'- Integration of European debate into world debate => EU feels responsible to feed the world tomorrow but externalize and banalize today's responsibility as a global problem
	"we also have a responsibility towards the world at large"	EC2	
	"According to the FAO estimates, by 2050, the Earth will probably have to feed 9 billion people".	EC2	
	"Some other estimates say that we could be more than 10 billion in 40 years"	EC2	

	"This means that every day, we have to provide food for one hundred and forty thousand more people".	EC2	
	"feeding the world will be a challenge in itself"	EC2	
	"To preserve the food production potential"	EC1	
	"Europe's capacity to deliver food security is an important long term choice for Europe which cannot be taken for granted."	EC1	- Assumption that food security is threatened ' Agricultural productivity is latent and should be increased: towards more intensification ? '- The EU is facing a crisis: one more way of shifting responsibility towards broad phenomena.
	"any significant cut back in European farming activity"	EC1	
	"This would allow EU agriculture to release its latent productivity potential"	EC1	
	"taking into account the severe impact of the economic crisis on agriculture"	EC1	
	"Recent incidents of increased market instability, often exacerbated by climate change"	EC1	- Phenomena like "volatility", "market instability", "climate change" are considered as external and not inherent or consequential of the system '- Shift of responsibility '- "Incidents": understatement, presented as something banal '- Responsibility is coming from market that is personified, not simply seen as a mechanism but with its own existence
	"address the challenges of food security and climate change"	EC2	
	"fight economic downturn and price volatility"	EC2	
	"Combined with the effects of climate change, with drought and extreme weather conditions"	EC2	
	"The dairy crisis showed that we need tools to fight market volatility; we need tools to avoid the collapse of entire sectors"	EC2	
	"in the context of climate change and price volatility"	EC2	
	"to deal with excessive volatility of farmer's income"	EC2	
Opportunities	"challenges and opportunities"	EC2	- emphasis on opportunities that can be pulled from the reform '- idea of build legitimacy '- idea of green growth '- very positive way of presenting compared to urgency of issues '- raises questions regarding real objectives behind the CAP reform
	"But that does not mean we cannot be ambitious."	EC2	
	"why we need to change our policy and to highlight the broader benefits that agriculture provides to society"	EC2	
	"a policy is a vehicle taking us on a journey"	EC2	
	"build more sustainable, smarter and more inclusive growth for rural Europe"	EC1	
	"a contract that gives a renewed legitimacy and credibility to the CAP"	EC2	
	"further legitimize the CAP"	EC1	
	"a chance to lay the ground for a new public contract between agriculture and society"	EC2	

Greening	"in line with our environmental, water, animal health and welfare, plant health and public health requirements"	EC1	- Reference to law to give justification and back-up statement. '- Why do we need a reform if it exist so good standards?
	"The active management of natural resources by farming is one important tool to maintain the rural landscape, to combat biodiversity loss and contributes to mitigate and to adapt to climate change. This is an essential basis for dynamic territories and long term economic viability."	EC1	- "Active management", "tool": nature is to be managed and controlled, neutral and technical language '- "combat biodiversity loss": idea of working against something instead of working with '- final objective: economic viability
	"The CAP also deals with helping farmers preserve our natural resources and maintain a countryside people want to live in."	EC2	- idea of multifunctional agriculture and that farmers can protect environment '- "natural resources": nature is here to serve human, to give human services
	" <b>Natural resources</b> are not unlimited".	EC2	- "natural resources": nature is here to serve human, to give human services '- emphasis on this statement, bold and short sentence put apart
	"We cannot win the battle of food security at the expense of permanent damage to our environment."	EC2	- metaphor: food security is a battle, presentation of tension between food security and environmental protection
	"European agriculture needs to sustain and reinforce its competitiveness on the basis of a productivity model that combines economic, environmental and social sustainability."	EC2	- criteria of mainstream sustainable development '- " <b>sustain</b> and <b>reinforce</b> its <b>competitiveness</b> on the basis of a <b>productivity</b> model": sustain has been added to past model, but same model put forward
	"We have a legacy to leave to future generations. We cannot guarantee our food security on a production model that puts at risk the capacity of future generations to meet their own needs."	EC2	- basic definition of mainstream sustainable development '- moralistic tone, ask for everybody's responsibility and consciousness
	"So we must work to minimize the impact agriculture has on the environment and maximize its positive effects."	EC2	- same idea than microeconomic models: minimizing costs and maximizing profits, but are the costs calculable according to universal model? Which criteria are used?
	"But if this is to be done, there is a clear role for public funding, so as to reward farmers for providing public goods which the market rarely rewards."	EC2	- public good approach or internalizing externalities through market

"If we want our food to be produced sustainably, rather than in the cheapest way possible, if we want our farmers to do more to preserve soils and water, to reverse the steady loss of biodiversity, than YES, the CAP is the best way to do it!"	EC2	- voluntarist tone '- The CAP is invested of a special role, shift of responsibility, personification but concretely, not clear how to reach it '- Agriculture can contribute to environmental protection
"recognition for the provision of public goods not remunerated by the market"	EC2	- public good approach or internalizing externalities through market
"The aim of this reform is also to improve the overall environmental performance of the Common Agriculture Policy."	EC2	- "performance": economic language, how can we measure?
"The new element is that on the top of the basic payment, we will provide incentives for farmers to apply production methods that preserve natural resources."	EC2	- reference to green payments, public good approach '- "natural resources": economic approach and objectives
"An impact assessment is currently underway to determine the most relevant techniques. But we could think of measures such as ecological set-aside, green cover on arable land, preservation of grassland, crop rotation."	EC2	- The same techniques can be applied throughout the EU. '- Impact assessment: technical way of dealing with nature, results could be different according to geography, cultural specificities and social structures
"The aim is to fight soil erosion and improve water and carbon retention in the soil."	EC2	- Why isolate these three phenomena?
"If food security, biodiversity loss and climate change are all very important issues for decision makers – and I understand that these were issue which did figure in the UK general elections last year -, then it should also be reflected in a strong budget for a CAP that provides solutions to all these challenges."	EC2	- Budget of the CAP is so huge that it can really steer direction of agriculture
"In the second pillar, via the rural development measures, the member states will have the opportunity to support farmers who want to do even more to fight climate change and to protect the environment and natural resources."	EC2	- voluntary basis of the second pillar

**Table 1.2 Discourse analysis Slow Food**

The me	Textual reference	Text	What it means: assumption, conclusion, omission
Reaction to the EC	CAP Proposals Don't Go Far Enough	SF2	<p>- multiplication of negations: "don't go far enough"; "has not managed to keep its promises"; "does not change the current scenario"; "do not include in any significant way many of the suggestions"; "do not offer much hope"; "did not set out to be particularly bold and ambitious"</p> <p>=&gt; SF has a really negative reaction towards legislative proposals, it rejects and consider not ambitious enough the project.</p> <p>'- Expressions to designate the CAP reform connote negative evaluation: "declarations of principle"; "misguided basic framework"; "to the point of being a non-reform"; "a step backward"</p> <p>'- More than the EC, lobbies are considered responsible: "continues to favor big agri-business"; "have likely been hindered by the actions of the major agriculture lobbies and certain governments"; "anachronistic and damaging interests of a few"</p> <p>=&gt; interactive way of seeing policy-making and SF deplores continuity of interplay of interests that determine the CAP</p>
	After careful review, it is Slow Food's view that the Commission has not managed to keep its promises to promote a more sustainable, equitable and fair CAP.	SF2	
	In particular, while the proposals anticipate ways of supporting small- and medium-scale production, the overall formulation of the future CAP does not change the current scenario significantly and continues to favor big agri-businesses.	SF2	
	beyond the declarations of principle	SF2	
	The initial positive intentions for the CAP reform, expressed on many occasions by Commissioner Dacian Ciolos, have likely been hindered by the actions of the major agricultural lobbies and certain governments	SF2	
	In addition to the misguided basic framework, the proposals do not include in any significant way many of the suggestions made by civil society	SF2	
	It should not be to protect the anachronistic and damaging interests of a few	SF2	
	however the Commission's proposals largely ignore this aspect	SF2	
	In conclusion, the proposals presented do not offer much hope for the future in their current state	SF2	
	There is a real risk that a proposal that from the start did not set out to be particularly bold and ambitious will find itself weakened to the point of being a "non-reform," or, worse, a step backwards compared to the current situation	SF2	

Challenges	As the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) undergoes a wide-reaching reform process, the European Union is facing a challenge that will be vital for its future.	SF1	<p>- The Introduction of the position document has a dramatic tone regarding challenges: "facing a challenge that will be vital for its future": first allusion to challenge employing singular, lessens the idea that challenges are coming from outside and integrated nature of this challenge (the whole system is questioned); "challenges the like of which it has never seen before"; "critical difficulties on its plate"; "tackle the challenges of the coming decades" =&gt; challenges are severe and this time is never presented as an opportunity</p> <p>'- "the need to continue ensure food security will be compounded by the more immediate one of solving problems such as climate change, environmental and natural resource protection, energy provision": the environmental part of the reform is elevated above food security and considered as more urging, more challenging</p> <p>'- Pressure on the reform process: "the months leading up to the conclusion of this process will be fundamental"</p>
	The months leading up to the conclusion of this process will be fundamental for the definition of agri-food production methods and understanding of the EU's role over the next decade	SF1	
	In the years to come, the EU—indeed the whole world—will have to face challenges the like of which it has never seen before	SF1	
	The need to continue to ensure food security will be compounded by the more immediate one of solving problems such as climate change, environmental and natural resource protection, energy provision and so on once and for all.	SF1	
	Though the CAP played a vital role in driving off the spectre of famine in the postwar years, it now arrives at the appointment with reform with critical difficulties on its plate	SF1	
	In Europe, the policy is shrouded by a great lack of confidence	SF1	
	It is important to emphasize that the goal of this reform process, as strongly demanded by civil society, must be to prepare European agriculture to tackle the challenges of the coming decades, to dismantle the domination of agro-industry and to promote a more sustainable and fairer agricultural model	SF2	
Questioning the roots of the CAP	<p>These questions have to be answered within the context of the last century's broader economic, environmental and social crisis. The current economic paradigm, based on the domination of finance and production as an end unto itself, has revealed all its shortcomings, and the time has now come to identify new policies that are not exclusively geared to liberalising the market and privatisations</p>	SF1	<p>- The CAP reform is put into its broad context, it belongs to a specific socio-economic model, reference to industrial revolution: "these questions have to be answered within the context of the last century's broader economic, environmental and social crisis", "the EU need to re-think the structure of the agricultural sector and the food system in general"</p> <p>'- Critique of the current model, inability of addressing European needs in a sustain-</p>

Many see it as being far removed from the needs of contemporary society and citizens and the demands of sustainable small- and medium-scale agrifood production	SF1	able way: "has revealed all its shortcomings", "far removed from the needs"; "incapable of offering convincing answers"; "nor do they seem able to contribute to responding to the many crisis factors"
It is also accused of being structured solely to benefit agribusiness, a slave to the rules of a hollow liberalism that has proved, <i>de facto</i> , incapable of offering convincing answers to the problems we discuss below	SF1	'- Characteristics of this model: "the current economic paradigm based on the domination of finance and production"; "geared to liberalising market and privatisations"; "structured solely to benefit agribusiness"; "slave to the rules of a hollow liberalism"; "the rule of agribusiness and the large-scale distribution sector"; "environmentally, socially and economically unsustainable"; "a model that has brought devastating environmental exploitation, injustice for both virtuous farmers and consumers and a concentration of economic advantages in a few hands"
If it is to break free from the rule of agribusiness and the large-scale distribution sector and at last offer solutions to the contemporary crisis, the EU needs to rethink the structure of the agricultural sector and the food system in general	SF1	=> Stresses and denounces the economic and financial aspect of agricultural system => SF questions the basis of agri-business (that is never approached by the EC), goes beyond farmers by considering the whole chain of food
At the same time, citizens and the small- and medium-scale agrifood world have to seize the opportunities offered by the great democratic process of CAP reform, mobilising to demand changes capable of solving the serious problems that await European society for good	SF1	'- Dualist way of seeing the world: agribusiness / small-scale farmers => reflects the ceasure happening in the agricultural world and the conflicting nature of the reform
This is why Slow Food, which believes that the current agrifood system is environmentally, socially and economically unsustainable, has decided to bring its experience and vision to bear in the debate on CAP reform and help develop a juster, fairer, more ecological policy	SF1	
Slow Food believes the CAP should follow over the next few years and it then concludes by focusing on two specific subjects— young people and agriculture; support to small- and medium-scale agrifood production	SF1	
the framework outlined by the Commission lacks that paradigm shift that would benefit small-scale farmers - our most resilient food producers due their use of sustainable production techniques and their undeniable role in safeguarding biodiversity and the landscape	SF2	

	In the past decades, the industry has dragged Europe away from a model of sustainable and fair agricultural development, and towards a model that has brought devastating environmental exploitation, injustice for both virtuous farmers and consumers and a concentration of economic advantages in a few hands.	SF2	
	nor do they seem able to contribute to responding to the many crisis factors that characterize the current food production system	SF2	
Greening	Lack of greening: One of the main changes civil society is demanding of this reform process is to make the European food system more sustainable	SF2	- inclusive visions: "European food system", agricultural issues extended to food issues
	The most significant environmental measure included is the new "green payment", which will take up to 30 percent of the resources available for direct payments. Courageous CAP reform would have required every cent paid out to be linked to the provision of important environmental services	SF2	- "every cent paid": insistence '- "Courageous CAP reform would...": employ of subjunctive shows what has not been done by the proposals
	The criteria on which the new green payment will be based do not include the essential practice of crop rotation	SF2	- critique of the proposition: tension between crop rotation and crop diversification
	The new possibility for certain countries to divert a percentage of the funds destined for the second pillar to the first pillar is entirely negative in terms of the greening of the CAP	SF2	- "entirely negative": insistence to denounce the possibility to transfer funds between pillars
	Equally deplorable is the lack of an increase in the resources available for agri-environmental measures under the second pillar	SF2	- "deplorable": strong adjective '- interest in the second pillar, still marginal in EU propositions



<p>More generally, there is a lack of sufficient measures to stop the loss of biodiversity and to reach the target of halving the rate of biodiversity loss by 2020. Certainly the measure that requires leaving 7 percent of land as “environmental focus areas” is positive, but this alone can never be enough. Along the same lines is the measure aimed at maintaining permanent pastures and the consequent ban on converting them to agricultural production. In itself the measure is positive, but the protection will come into force only after 2014. In the intervening period, many of these pastures will almost certainly be converted to agricultural production</p>	<p><b>SF2</b></p>	<p>- deplores lack of ambition, propositions don't go far enough  '- denounce tricks that could inhibit measures: conversion of land before 2014</p>
<p>In particular, the lack of consideration of ‘greening’ the policy is of great concern, especially since it is considered the main objective of this reform process by many</p>	<p><b>SF2</b></p>	<p>- deplores lack of ambition  '- "considered": shows that public think that greening is the main object of the reform but reality is different</p>

## References

- Adams, W.M. (2004) 'Rationalization and Conservation: Ecology and the Management of Nature in the United Kingdom', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 22(3): 277-291.
- Agriculture and Rural Convention (2012) 'What is ARC2020?'. Accessed 10 November 2012 [http://www.arc2020.eu/front/arc\\_in\\_a\\_nutshell/](http://www.arc2020.eu/front/arc_in_a_nutshell/)
- Agriculture and Rural Convention (2011) 'ARC2020's reaction to the EU Commission's legislative proposals for the future CAP'. Accessed 07 October 2012 <http://www.arc2020.eu/front/arc2020s-reaction-to-the-eu-commissions-legislative-proposals-for-the-future-cap/>
- Alexe, Dan (2011) 'The European Commissioner for agriculture promises reform', *European Voices* 13 October. Accessed 20 October 2012 <http://www.europeanvoice.com/article/imported/the-farm-manager/72291.aspx>
- Anton, C., J. Young, P.A. Harrison, M. Musche, G. Bela, C.K. Feld et al. (2010) 'Research Needs for Incorporating the Ecosystem Service Approach into EU Biodiversity Conservation Policy', *Biodiversity and Conservation* 19(10): 2979-2994.
- Arsel, M. and B. Büscher (2012) 'Nature™ Inc.: Changes and Continuities in Neoliberal Conservation and Market-based Environmental Policy', *Development and Change* 43(1): 53-78.
- Assessment, M.E. (2005) *Ecosystems and Human Well-being*. Vol. 5. Island Press Washington, DC.
- Bailly, Emmanuel (2005) 'Vers une demarche écorégionale : « Le concept de l'écorégion » ou « Comment restaurer Le système immunitaire Des régions »'. Accessed 8 November 2012 [http://www.cheminfaisant2005.net/Upload/ecoregion2005\\_E\\_Bailly.pdf](http://www.cheminfaisant2005.net/Upload/ecoregion2005_E_Bailly.pdf)
- Bonny, S. (2011) 'L'agriculture Écologiquement Intensive: Nature Et Défis', *Cahiers Agricultures* 20(6): 451-462.
- Brockington, D., R. Duffy and J. Igoe (2008) *Nature Unbound: Conservation, Capitalism and the Future of Protected Areas*. Earthscan/James & James.
- Büscher, Bram (forthcoming) 'Biodiversity', in Carl Death (ed.) *Critical Environmental Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Büscher, Bram (2011) 'The Neoliberalisation of Nature in Africa', in Ton Dietz, Kjell Havnevik, Mayke Kaag & Terje Ostigard (eds.) *New Topographies of Power? Africa Negotiating an Emerging Multi-polar World*, pp. 84-109. Leiden: Brill.
- Cahill, C. (2008) 'The Multifunctionality of Agriculture', *EuroChoices* 1(1): 36-41.
- Ciolos, Dacian (2011) 'The CAP beyond 2013 – challenges and opportunities for European agriculture', Oxford Farming Conference. Oxford, 6 January.

- Convention on Biological Diversity (1992) 'Article 2: Use of terms'. Accessed 24 June 2012 <http://www.cbd.int/convention/articles/?a=cbd-02>
- Cooper, T., K. Hart and D. Baldock (2009) 'Provision of Public Goods through Agriculture in the European Union', *Institute for European Environmental Policy*.
- COPA-COGECA (2011) *The Future CAP after 2013: Copa-Cogeca proposals for 'green growth'*. Brussels: COPA-COGECA.
- Council of the European Union (2009) 'Council Regulation No 73/2009 establishing common rules for direct support schemes for farmers under the common agricultural policy and establishing certain support schemes for farmers, amending Regulations (EC) No 1290/2005, (EC) No 247/2006, (EC) No 378/2007 and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003'. Accessed 16 October 2012 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:030:0016:0016:EN:PDF>
- Crombez, C. and J. Swinnen (2011) 'Political Institutions and Public Policy: The Co-Decision Procedure in the European Union and the Reform of the Common Agricultural Policy'. Accessed 15 October 2012 [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1984572](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1984572)
- DATAR (2002) *Aménager la France de 2020, Mettre les territoires en mouvement, La société et ses territoires*. Paris: La documentation française.
- Dibden, J., C. Potter and C. Cocklin (2009) 'Contesting the Neoliberal Project for Agriculture: Productivist and Multifunctional Trajectories in the European Union and Australia', *Journal of Rural Studies* 25(3): 299-308.
- Dingler, J. (2005) 'The Discursive Nature of Nature: Towards a Post-Modern Concept of Nature', *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 7(3): 209-225.
- Edelman, M. and C. Kay (2008) 'Transnational Agrarian Movements: Origins and Politics, Campaigns and Impact', *Journal of Agrarian Change* 8(2-3): 169-204.
- Erjavec, K. and E. Erjavec (2009) 'Changing EU Agricultural Policy Discourses? the Discourse Analysis of Commissioner's Speeches 2000-2007', *Food Policy* 34(2): 218-226.
- Escobar, A. (1998) 'Whose Knowledge, Whose Nature? Biodiversity, Conservation, and the Political Ecology of Social Movements', *Journal of political ecology* 5(1): 53-82.
- European Commission (2012a) 'Cross-compliance'. Accessed 16 October 2012 [http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/envir/cross-compliance/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/envir/cross-compliance/index_en.htm)
- European Commission (2012b) 'Agri-environment measures'. Accessed 16 October 2012 [http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/envir/measures/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/envir/measures/index_en.htm)
- European Commission (2012c) 'The Common Agricultural Policy after 2013'. Accessed 20 October 2012 [http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/cap-post-2013/index_en.htm)

- European Commission (2011a) 'Our life insurance, our natural capital: an EU biodiversity strategy to 2020', Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the regions Bruxelles: European Commission.
- European Commission (2011b) 'Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing rules for direct payments to farmers under support schemes within the framework of the common agricultural policy', COM(2011) 625 final/2. Brussels: European Commission.
- European Commission (2011c) 'Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council for support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD)', COM(2011) 627 final/2. Brussels: European Commission.
- European Commission (2010) 'The CAP towards 2020: Meeting the food, natural resources and territorial challenges of the future', Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the regions. Brussels: European Commission.
- European Commission (2009) 'CAP Health check'. Accessed 07 October 2012 [http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/healthcheck/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/healthcheck/index_en.htm)
- Evans, N., C. Morris and M. Winter (2002) 'Conceptualizing Agriculture: A Critique of Post-Productivism as the New Orthodoxy', *Progress in Human Geography* 26(3): 313-332.
- Fairclough, N. and R. Wodak (1997) 'Critical Discourse Analysis', in T.A. van Dijk (ed.), *Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, pp. 258-284. London: Academic Press.
- Feindt, P.H. (2010) 'Policy-learning and Environmental Policy Integration in the Common Agriculture Policy, 1973–2003', *Public administration* 88(2): 296-314.
- Fennell, R. (1985) 'A Reconsideration of the Objectives of the Common Agricultural Policy', *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies* 23(3): 257-276.
- Ferguson, J. (1990) *The Anti-Politics Machine: 'Development', Depoliticization and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Tylorsville (NC): Vintage.
- Friends of the Earth (2011a) 'CAP reform: too little to protect environment and greener farming'. Accessed 07 October 2012 [http://www.foeeurope.org/press/2011/Oct12\\_CAP\\_reform\\_too\\_little\\_to\\_protect\\_environment\\_and\\_greener\\_farming.html](http://www.foeeurope.org/press/2011/Oct12_CAP_reform_too_little_to_protect_environment_and_greener_farming.html)
- Friends of the Earth (2011b) 'Public money for public goods, Common Agricultural Policy 2014-2020: More environmental protection and better for farmers?', Briefing Paper. Brussels: Friends of the Earth.
- Fox, J. (1993) *The Politics of Food in Mexico: State Power and Social Mobilization*. Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press.

- Gana, Frédéric (2011) 'Identité de Slow Food en France : un préalable à toute réflexion de gouvernance, un socle pour la rénovation du mouvement', Contribution à la réflexion sur l'avenir de Slow Food en France dans la perspective de l'Assemblée générale de Slow Food France 2011 4/5 juin 2011. Clermont-Ferrand.
- Gana, Frédéric (2010) 'L'écosystème Slow Food', Note (18 mars).
- Gamson, W.A. and A. Modigliani (1989) 'Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach', *American journal of sociology* 95(1): 1-37.
- Garzon, I. (2005) 'Multifunctionality of Agriculture in the European Union: Is there Substance Behind the Discourse's Smoke?'. Institute of Agriculture and Resource Economics, University of California, San Francisco.
- Gasper, D. and R. Apthorpe (1996) 'Introduction: Discourse Analysis and Policy Discourse', *The European Journal of Development Research*: 8(1): 1-15
- Goodman, D. and M. Redclift (1991) *Refashioning Nature: Food*, *Ecology and Culture*. London: Routledge .
- Gorton, M., C. Hubbard and L. Hubbard (2009) 'The Folly of European Union Policy Transfer: Why the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) does Not Fit Central and Eastern Europe', *Regional Studies* 43(10): 1305-1317.
- Green, R.E., S.J. Cornell, J.P.W. Scharlemann and A. Balmford (2005) 'Farming and the Fate of Wild Nature', *Science* 307(5709): 550-555.
- Grindle, M.S. and J.W. Thomas (1989) 'Policy Makers, Policy Choices, and Policy Outcomes: The Political Economy of Reform in Developing Countries', *Policy Sciences* 22(3): 213-248.
- Haila, Y. and J. Kouki (1994) 'The phenomenon of biodiversity in conservation biology', *Annales Zoologici Fennici* 31: 5-18.
- Hajer, M. and W. Versteeg (2005) 'A Decade of Discourse Analysis of Environmental Politics: Achievements, Challenges, Perspectives', *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 7(3): 175-184.
- Hart, K.J. (2011) 'The Art of Governing Nature': 'Green' Governmentality and the Management of Nature', Master thesis. Belfast: Queen's University.
- Harvey, David (2006) *Spaces of Global Capitalism: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development*. London: Verso.
- Hector, A. and R. Bagchi (2007) 'Biodiversity and Ecosystem Multifunctionality', *Nature* 448(7150): 188-190.
- Horlings, L. and T. Marsden (2011) 'Towards the Real Green Revolution? Exploring the Conceptual Dimensions of a New Ecological Modernisation of Agriculture that could 'feed the World'', *Global Environmental Change* 21(2): 441-452.
- Igoe, J. and D. Brockington (2007) 'Neoliberal Conservation: A Brief Introduction', *Conservation and Society* 5(4): 432.
- Juntti, M. (2006) 'Riding the green wave in the European agricultural sector? A discourse analysis of the new cross compliance mechanism', CSERGE Working Paper EDM 06-15. Norwich: CSERGE.

- Kendall, G. and G. Wickham (1999) *Using Foucault's Methods*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Kerkvliet, B.J.T. (2009) 'Everyday Politics in Peasant Societies (and Ours)', *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 36(1): 227-243.
- Koopmans, R. and P. Statham (1999) 'Political Claims Analysis: Integrating Protest Event and Political Discourse Approaches', *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 4(2): 203-221.
- Lafleur, Claude (2010) 'Préface', in M. Morisset (ed.) *Politique et syndicalisme agricoles au Québec*, pp. XV-XVII. Québec : Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Leftwich, A. (1994) 'Governance, the State and the Politics of Development', *Development and change* 25(2): 363-386.
- Lévêque, C. and J.C. Mounolou (2003) *Biodiversity*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Li, T.M. (2007) *The Will to Improve: Governmentality, Development, and the Practice of Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.
- Lockie, S. (2009) 'Agricultural Biodiversity and Neoliberal Regimes of Agri-Environmental Governance in Australia', *Current Sociology* 57(3): 407-426.
- Matthews, Alan (2012) 'Environmental public goods in the new CAP: Impact of greening proposals and possible alternatives', Note for the European Parliament's Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development. Brussels: European Parliament.
- McAdam, D., S. Tarrow and C. Tilly (2001) *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, J. (2005) 'Rural Geography: Multifunctional Rural Geographies- Reactionary Or Radical?', *Progress in Human Geography* 29(6): 773.
- McFalls, L. (2006) *Construire Le Politique: Contingence, Causalité Et Connaissance Dans La Science Politique Contemporaine*. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- McMichael, P. (2011) 'Food System Sustainability: Questions of Environmental Governance in the New World (Dis) Order', *Global Environmental Change* 21(3): 804-812.
- McNeely, J.A. and S.J. Scherr (2002) *Ecoagriculture: Strategies to Feed the World and Save Wild Biodiversity*. Washington: Island Press.
- Münster, D. and U. Münster (2012) 'Consuming the Forest in an Environment of Crisis: Nature Tourism, Forest Conservation and Neoliberal Agriculture in South India', *Development and Change* 43(1): 205-227.
- Murphy, R. (1994) *Rationality and Nature: A Sociological Inquiry into a Changing Relationship*. Boulder (CO): Westview Press.
- Nascimento, Iuli (2006) 'L'Ile-de-France et l'écorégion'. Accessed 8 November 2012  
[http://www.notre-plane-te.info/ecologie/developpement\\_durable/region/Ecoregion\\_RIF.pdf](http://www.notre-plane-te.info/ecologie/developpement_durable/region/Ecoregion_RIF.pdf)

- Otte, A., D. Simmering and V. Wolters (2007) 'Biodiversity at the Landscape Level: Recent Concepts and Perspectives for Multifunctional Land use', *Landscape Ecology* 22(5): 639-642.
- Petrini, C. (2012) *Terra Madre: Renouer Avec La Chaîne Vertueuse De l'Alimentation*. Paris : Editions Alternatives.
- Potter, C. and M. Tilzey (2007) 'Agricultural Multifunctionality, Environmental Sustainability and the WTO: Resistance Or Accommodation to the Neoliberal Project for Agriculture?', *Geoforum* 38(6): 1290-1303.
- Potter, C. and M. Tilzey (2005) 'Agricultural Policy Discourses in the European Post-Fordist Transition: Neoliberalism, Neomercantilism and Multifunctionality', *Progress in Human Geography* 29(5): 581-600.
- Robertson, R. (1995) 'Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity', in: M. Featherstone, S. Lash and R. Robertson (Eds), *Global Modernities*, pp. 25-41. London, Sage.
- Scott, James (1998) *Seeing like a state: how certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Scott, James (1986) 'Everyday forms of peasant resistance in South-East Asia', *Journal of Peasant Studies* 13(2): 5-35.
- Sharp, L. and T. Richardson (2001) 'Reflections on Foucauldian Discourse Analysis in Planning and Environmental Policy Research', *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning* 3(3): 193-209.
- Slow Food (2012a) 'The Central Role of Food', Congress Paper 2012-2016. Bra: Slow Food.
- Slow Food (2012c) 'Report from Brussels!'. Accessed 22 October 2012 <http://www.slowfood.com/slowlife/europe/eng/news/147920/report-from-brussels>
- Slow Food (2012d) 'Carlo Petrini's Address to the EU Parliament During the CAP 2020 Reform Conference'. Accessed 22 October 2012 <http://www.slowfood.com/slowlife/europe/eng/news/147430/carlo-petrinis-address-to-the-eu-parliament-during-the-cap-2020-reform-conference->
- Slow Food (2012e) 'Slow Food lance une campagne pour attirer l'attention sur la future Politique Agricole Commune'. Accessed 23 October 2012 <http://www.slowfood.fr/slow-food-lance-une-campagne-pour-attirer-lattention-sur-la-future-politique-agricole-commune>
- Slow Food (2011a) 'Preserving biodiversity, preserving the planet', A document to illustrate Slow Food's position on biodiversity in Europe. Bra: Slow Food.
- Slow Food (2011b) 'CAP proposals don't go far enough'. Bra: Slow Food (press release, 27 October).
- Slow Food (2010) 'Towards a new common agricultural policy', Slow Food Policy Paper on CAP. Bra: Slow Food.
- Slow Food (2007) *Earth and Food: Sustainability, Biodiversity, Equity*. Bra: Slow Food.

- Slow Food (1989) 'The Slow Food Manifesto'. Accessed 10 September 2012  
[http://www.slowfood.com/about\\_us/eng/manifesto.lasso](http://www.slowfood.com/about_us/eng/manifesto.lasso)
- Slow Food (n.d. a) 'Our philosophy: About-us'. Accessed 08 October 2012  
<http://www.slowfood.com/international/2/our-philosophy>
- Slow Food (n.d. b) 'Slow Food Presidia and Sustainable Development'. Accessed 22 October  
[http://www.slowfood.com/slowlife/filemanager/position\\_docs/ENG\\_risultati.pdf](http://www.slowfood.com/slowlife/filemanager/position_docs/ENG_risultati.pdf)
- Slow Food (n.d. c) 'Slow Food Foundation for Biodiversity'. Accessed 08 November 2012 <http://www.slowfoodfoundation.com/>
- Stoate, C., A. Báldi, P. Beja, N. Boatman, I. Herzon, A. Van Doorn et al. (2009) 'Ecological Impacts of Early 21st Century Agricultural Change in Europe—a Review', *Journal of environmental management* 91(1): 22-46.
- Stoate, C., N. Boatman, R. Borralho, C. Carvalho, G.R. Snoo and P. Eden (2001) 'Ecological Impacts of Arable Intensification in Europe', *Journal of environmental management* 63(4): 337-365.
- Sutton, R. (1999) 'The Policy Process: An Overview', ODI Working Paper 118. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Swyngedouw, Erik (2004) 'Globalization of 'glocalization'? Networks, territories and rescaling', *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 17(1): 25-48.
- Takacs, D. (1996) *The Idea of Biodiversity: Philosophies of Paradise*. Baltimore (MD): Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tarrow, S.G. (2011) *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- UNEP (2011) 'Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication'. Accessed 24 June 2012  
<http://www.unep.org/greeneconomy/>
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1990) 'Discourse & Society: A New Journal for a New Research Focus', *Discourse & Society* 1(1): 5-16.
- Wilson, G.A. (2002) 'From Productivism to post-productivism... and Back again? Exploring the (Un) Changed Natural and Mental Landscapes of European Agriculture', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 26(1): 77-102.
- Zobbe, H. (2001) 'The Economic and Historical Foundation of the Common Agricultural Policy in Europe', Working Paper 2001/12. Oxford: The Royal Veterinary and Agricultural University.