

8 Locality, Identity and the Reshaping of Modernity. An Analysis of Cultural Confrontations in Two Villages

Henk de Haan

Introduction

Much sociological and anthropological theory and research is concerned with how concrete social practice and events are connected with the 'wider context' or represent broader empirical categories. This partly results from a limitation inherent to all social science research: it is mostly based on a relatively small number of observations, drawn from specific places at specific times. These observations must therefore be contextualized within wider social and historical patterns and submitted to questions of representativeness. A representative sample, a telling case study, well-chosen examples, or a characteristic community are all methodological devices aimed at legitimating the step from partial observation to an aggregate empirical level. Theory plays an important role in bridging this gap between the specific and the general. It guides empirical research and provides clues for interpretation and knowledge about general social processes, which may be used as a background for analyzing specific data. With theory, partial empirical observations may be put into a wider concrete and abstract contexts and thus enrich our knowledge of society in general.

Although the relationship between research and theory is far more complex, I will limit myself here to the problems associated with research that focuses on the significance of the 'local level'. It is clear that much sociological research does not belong to this category. Survey results, for instance, reveal nothing about an individual's lifeworld and how, for that reason, attitudes and behaviour are socially formed and culturally meaningful. The local character of data is dissolved into aggregate categories and thus decontextualized. Even if the local context is taken into account, it is often seen as basically structured by general processes, which deprive the local of its singular character. Lifting individual and group behaviour out of their context and integrating them into an imaginary mass society, or demonstrating the penetration of mass society and culture into the smallest micro worlds are but two extremes of a general tendency in sociology to disregard the specificity of locality. The local is either used as a source for sampling data, or seen as a spatial expression of general

tendencies, without a history and an identity of its own. Although it is true that developments in rural areas are increasingly determined by transnational processes and structures, we also need to analyse how the general and the abstract are transformed into concrete local practices by the distinctiveness of local social structure and culture.

This chapter first describes the decline of local studies in rural sociology and argues the case for revitalizing the local perspective. This might seem illogical when current debates are dominated by such concepts as globalization and the international food system. I will show, however, that knowledge about general developments can only be collected (and theoretically constructed) by analyzing local realities. The main part of the chapter consists of a comparative analysis of agricultural modernization in two villages. By using the concepts of locality and identity, I will try to show how generalized developments are recontextualized locally, and how this colours people's views of history.

The Decline of Community Studies

The general disregard of locality in rural sociological studies can partly be explained as a reaction to the believed failure of community studies to acknowledge the disintegration of community life and its dependence on the wider context. According to Day and Murdoch (1993), community 'was generally agreed to be a confused and chaotic concept, impossible to define clearly, and carrying all sorts of dangerous and unacknowledged cargo' (p. 295). Despite anthropological reconceptualizations of community studies (see Boissevain and Friedl 1975), and the introduction of fresh concepts (Cohen 1982, 1986), rural sociologists themselves turned to macro-political-economic processes, thus disregarding the situatedness of practice.

Pahl's (1966), and later Newby's (1980) profound attacks on the old legacy, which included the rural-urban continuum, resulted in a radical reformulation of rural sociology (see also Lobao 1996). According to Miller (1996, p. 95), the rural world 'was no longer to be regarded as *sociologically distinct*, nor would it be *conceptually defined* antithetically to the city, but instead would fall within a more theoretically informed and holistic focus where the notions of change, class and social conflict eclipsed those of continuity, community and social cohesion'. The 'new rural sociology' mainly focused on agriculture and class relations and derived its theoretical inspiration from neo-marxist political economy. Rural space was conceptualized as the site of primary production and its development was mainly coupled with national and international movements of capital and labour. This emphasis on the embeddedness of local agricultural systems in 'advanced capitalism' limited the focus on human agency and the impact of local social structure and culture. With the decision that rural is synonymous with agriculture, and that agriculture is being transformed

by forces far beyond its local setting, the concrete and differentiated concept of place was replaced by the much more abstract and homogenizing idea of a collection of related spaces, created, reproduced, and transformed by the uneven impact of capitalism.

According to Day and Murdoch, this direction of rural studies left a 'considerable vacuum'. Although there have been frequent attempts (Marsden *et al.* 1993; Murdoch and Marsden 1994; Marsden, Lowe and Whatmore 1992) to restore the balance, subsequent waves of new theoretical perspectives, such as globalization and regulation theories, have left rural sociology with a weak insight into local socio-cultural life. Locality studies are consequently very much on the defensive for charges of particularism and naivety. Recent studies of the significance of locality are very valuable (see, for instance, Gray and Philips 1996 and Salamon 1992), but I think that there are even more promising lines along which they can be developed.

First, the concept of locality should be emancipated from its 'big brother' of globality. It sometimes seems as if locality is somehow only tolerated as a concept if it is clearly indicated that it is in fact a variety of globality. Any suggestion of local specificity must immediately be nuanced by referring to the all-encompassing presence of globality. It may be time to examine globalization studies more carefully, and challenge their assumptions from a local perspective.

Second, locality studies are too much focused on political issues, the farm labour process and the use of natural resources. These approaches sometimes underestimate the socio-cultural components of locality, especially in its capacity to encompass politics, economics and other aspects of daily life in mutually inclusive, non-separable terms. The concept locality focuses exactly on the wholeness of social life, not on individuals or group interests.

Third, locality-based research permits standard social science explanations to be juxtaposed with explanations given by local actors (see Boyer 1990; Gudeman 1986). How local people perceive and explain local events is of great importance for understanding how they confront global forces. According to Pred and Watts (1992), the articulation between local and extralocal through new economic linkages involves 'cultural articulations,' including ' . . . some form of symbolic discontent, some form of cultural contestation, some form of struggle over meaning deriving from the . . . experience of the 'modern' shockingly displacing the 'traditional'' (p. xiii). The local discourses and practices through which capitalism and modernism are experienced, interpreted, and contested may not result from a 'correct' class analysis, but are instead couched in already existing social relations and forms of consciousness. Analyzing these forms of 'local theory' may help us in understanding why much of the agricultural revolution was in fact a 'quiet revolution'.

How the Global Becomes Local and the Local Becomes Global

Human behaviour is situated in different, overlapping contexts, ranging from concrete face-to-face relationships to abstract 'systems,' and cannot therefore be understood without examining different modes of embeddedness. There is a whole array of sociological concepts to acknowledge this reality. The most familiar is probably the opposition between micro and macro. Other concepts used are internal-external, lifeworld-system, horizontal-vertical, small scale-large scale, particular-general, part-whole, and so on. The implicit assumption is that observed behaviour and events at one 'level' should be connected with a sort of aggregate, often abstract encompassing level. Concepts such as 'integration,' 'articulation' and 'dependency' are used to express the relation between the specific and the general, the micro and macro world.

What all these linkage concepts have in common is the idea that the 'real world' is made up of people living in specific places, but that their lives are subject to invisible, external forces. This opposition between a concrete and an abstract world is coupled with a topological idiom (space, scale), suggesting distanced levels of reality. However, the topological reference is often dissolved theoretically in contrasting the empirical reality of the local with more encompassing 'units' or systems, which are somewhere 'out there'. Thus, the 'global' turns out to be a constructed theoretical model, based on observing regularities in local-level developments. This model is in turn objectified and reified as something tangible beyond its local manifestations. These scientific constructs may be useful as theories for explaining and describing general trends, but should not distract us from the fact that 'global' or 'macro' forces are generalizations based on observing real encounters between actors representing specific interests.

To illustrate the complexity of local-global relations, it may be instructive to contrast two ways of approaching the process of agricultural restructuring of recent decades. Everywhere in Europe this involved a drastic decline in the number of farms, a reduction of the agricultural labour force and a concentration of land in bigger farms. This process is generally attributed to macro-economic, political and technological developments, leading to the integration of agriculture in commodity markets and exposure of farms to global trends. Each local study can serve as an example of this general trend, which is conceptualized in terms of delocalization, integration and externalization or other concepts describing the dissolution of farming as an activity mainly structured by local factors.

The picture emerging from this sort of description is of course not completely wrong, but it is one-sided, ignoring the significance of local social and cultural conditions, and how this process is experienced by farm families themselves. It may therefore be interesting to turn the perspective upside-down and look at agricultural restructuring as a local process. The

questions that then emerge are of a quite different order. It is not the process differentiation itself which needs to be explained, but the way in which it was actually structured and locally perceived. At local level, the differentiation process involves a struggle over access to limited natural resources and thus over property relations. The central issue is not how the local is integrated into the global system and how farming is becoming delocalized, but how global trends are integrated and internalized locally and thereby deglobalized. Does the transformation of the farm context fundamentally change the rules governing access to resources, or is it incorporated into existing patterns of resource management and transmission?

Seen in this way, local developments are not mere expressions of global trends, but complex, hybrid forms, reflecting the assimilation of globality (see Picon 1986; Rogers 1991). Furthermore, this contradicts any simple opposition between local and global, because the 'global' only exists to the extent that it becomes an integral element in patterns of farm reproduction, and is as such adopted as an element in local strategies. Only by comparing the process of differentiation in many rural communities, can the general character of the process be depicted; however, such an abstraction does not necessarily make sense if our focus is not on the general but on the specific.

In addition, local perception of the global is very much personalized and familiarized, demonstrating the concrete character of connectedness between localities. Salazar (1996), in his study of farmers in County Clare, convincingly argues that 'capitalism' and the 'food system' are associated with specific places and practices. Farmers 'meet' capitalism at the local cattle market, where they negotiate prices with cattle traders. Cattle traders epitomize profit maximizers and, although farmers understand that those traders act in a wider market, the association of capitalism with concrete actors, places and principles diverges from a perspective which relates local cattle prices with an internationally structured food system.

Papadopoulos (1997) has demonstrated that EU regulation in Greece is not an anonymous force to which farmers adapt their strategies and through which they become part of extra-local processes. EU regulation measures are quickly internalized and transformed into a resource that can be locally manipulated and used. The application of the rules is integrated into existing social relations, not least because the bureaucrat deciding about subsidies and development plans adopts local criteria for his judgements. The money channelled to the most remote rural areas thus strengthened local processes, rather than provoking externally induced change.

The 'local' character of 'globality' can be further demonstrated by carefully deconstructing the concept of globality itself. Globality can be used in a number of different senses. Sometimes it refers to 'interconnectedness,' implying that local processes are mutually related by some

overarching force with a global impact. At the political level it points to the decline of the state as an agent of regulation. Globalization is also used to indicate the generalization of cultural patterns, from very localized lifestyles to global identities and uniform taste. What all these meanings have in common is the idea that the scale at which social practices and events should be interpreted is unlimited, because there are no cultural, social, economic and political boundaries. As such globality and globalization are purely analytical, abstract concepts, which should not be confused with the nature of empirical reality itself.

If globality exists, it can only be shown by demonstrating that what happens locally is in some way connected to the same general process. But that does not mean of course that the same transformative forces at the local level produce the same results, or have the same meaning locally. It is necessary, in other words, to analyse the place-specific way in which general trends are integrated, or how abstract principles are translated into a multiplicity of concrete forms and meanings.

Such research is sometimes dismissed as being an interesting academic exercise without any relevance for understanding how the regulation of social life really works. Hoggart, Buller and Black (1995), for instance, admit that local processes are important, but weaken their admission by asserting that they have no major causal effect on wider national and European contexts. Viewed in this way, the importance of locality is measured by assessing its capacity to structure international trends. This seems an unfair approach, because locality is by nature specific and characterized by heterogeneity, and does not seem capable of restructuring globality. However, the idea that global developments are in fact hybrid models originating from numerous local processes is certainly worthwhile considering.

Take the following example of how national economic processes indeed reflect local factors, from Greece. It was expected that exposure to Common Market principles and special government intervention would reform Greek agriculture in accordance with specific technological and market standards. However, the effort to transform the peasantry in line with the approved model for agricultural development has so far failed. According to Damianakos (1997, p. 206), 'it is as though the peasantry . . . has managed to establish wise compromises with room for change while preserving what is essential . . . Wide open to change, the Greek peasantry accepts being closely integrated into global society, only if this integration does not, as certain forms of modernity tend to do, break up elementary social structures'.

Fascinating in the Greek experience is not only the place-specific resistance by the peasantry to modernity, but also the capacity of local culture to impose its interpretation of modernity at national level. Locality, in its diverse manifestations, has become a major factor in shaping Greek society as a whole, thus recreating its own conditions of existence.

Pushing the argument a bit further, we might ask whether global trends are anything other than the 'macro effect' of numerous micro-level developments. And do most global phenomena not originate from specific local contexts, from which they manage to 'escape,' become decontextualized and reembedded elsewhere? (see Clark and Murdoch 1997). These processes produce only superficial connections between localities, because seemingly similar material and social changes may camouflage completely different experiences and forms of local integration.

Usages of Locality

The first meaning of locality is purely descriptive. It refers to a geographical or administrative unit, for instance a region or a village. Depending on the approach, the boundaries may vary. If an administrative unit is taken as a starting point, its characteristics may not be limited to that region. If, however, a regional unit is defined on the basis of common features, like economic structure, population density or landscape and ecological aspects, locality acquires the meaning of territorial uniqueness. In practice, both meanings of locality are used. For social scientists studying social processes at the local level, locality is considered as the background setting; whether or not some local characteristics are part of a broader regional pattern is not significant. If, however, research is focused on explaining the typicalities of a region, location variables are very important. Locality is then no longer a descriptive category, but an analytical one, connected with local development. In this sense, locality became an especially popular concept during the 1980s. Regional development was interpreted as the result of capitalist restructuring. In search of space to expand its domination, capital allocates different functions to different regions, resulting in uneven development (Massey 1984; Bradley and Lowe 1984). Locality, thus conceived, is the concrete, place-specific outcome of economic processes.

The second way in which the concept of locality is used is as 'local social system' (Crow and Allen 1994). Local social system refers to the spatial coordinates of social relations and social processes. Locality in this sense arises out of the fact that people live together, sharing the same physical space. Physical proximity is not in itself a sufficient condition for the development of a local social system. Physical space must be transformed into social space, and this only happens through prolonged face-to-face interaction, shared experience, shared practices and dependence on local resources. This implies that not all people living in the same locality belong to a local social system (see Mayerfeld Bell 1994).

The local social system is relevant in two complementary ways. First, as a significant frame of reference, a microcosmic world of meaning and reflection. This subjective connotation of locality implies that identity,

status, reputation and power are shaped in and through local social relations. It means that the concrete sense of power and subjection, of being male or female, having land or not are shaped by local experiences (Cohen 1987). The second sense in which the local social system is relevant, especially in farming communities, concerns interdependencies through kinship, neighbourhood, property and labour relations. This practical side of locality implies that people's dependence on place is rooted in social relationships giving access to material and human resources. The interconnectedness of social relationships is often expressed in terms of a 'moral economy' (Popkin 1979), paternalism (Newby and Bell 1987) or clientism (Campbell 1964).

It is clear that simply sharing the same place of residence and even participation in local social life has nothing to do with locality. Locality is primarily a frame of reference and a network of social relations that can be mobilized for practical purposes. The local social system may well be internally divided into classes or other types of groups. In most cases there is a clear-cut social hierarchy, which is commonly based on land and associated criteria for social placement in farming communities. But it is the actor's subjective point of view that determines the 'boundaries' of the social system, something which is best described by Elias and Scotson's (1965) 'established' and 'outsiders,' or Strathern's (1981) 'real' and 'not real' villagers. Even if local networks become less important for practical purposes, the local social system may still keep its importance as a 'symbolic community'.

The social aspects of locality overlap with the cultural meaning. Locality as a local social system is unthinkable without a specific local culture. Local culture and society are inseparable elements of shared experience and place; ideas about what is valuable and how it should be achieved, the whole realm of normative ideas is expressed in and through social structure. Practice is embedded in culture and through practice social structure is reproduced.

Since the 'great transformation,' local culture has been conceptualized as a disappearing phenomenon. The view expressed is that local culture has lost its integrity as a result of the breakdown of self-contained village societies (Weber 1976; Williams 1973; Gross 1992). This is only true if culture is understood as 'folklore'. Folklore, as expressed in all kinds of ritual and traditional wisdom, can easily lose its significance with the advance of science, education and economic development. This view of local culture not only ignores continuity in the ideological sphere, but also overlooks the fact that local culture may change, while retaining its own specificities (see, on different aspects of 'tradition,' de Haan 1996; Heelas, Lash and Morris 1996). Analytically local culture can be seen as a means of orientation in local *and* global society, and as such its significance is more important than ever. It not only colours the interpretation of what happens locally, but also translates 'modernity' in a locally specific

direction. In other words, the multiplicity of 'authentic' traditions has not been removed by one form of modernity, but by a new mosaic of modernities. One important aspect of this orientation of local culture is that it is becoming more reflexive, with important implications for both self-identity and social identity. This brings us to the association of locality with 'otherness' and 'sameness,' of the experience of belonging to a local social system and to a larger society.

In association with locality, identity has a variety of related connotations. It refers, in the first instance, to all kinds of attributes ascribed to a person (or a family) in the local social context. A local identity is as much as a person's reputation, measured and valued by local social and cultural standards. Some of these attributes are ascribed, such as belonging to a certain family. Others may be achieved, for instance being locally known as 'a good farmer'. Personal identities are closely connected with local history and face-to-face interaction, and have therefore hardly any significance outside the local context. Thus, the local concept of a 'good' farmer, may not correspond with the standards used by the agricultural extension service. And the 'big' local landowner may be an insignificant character in regional aristocratic circles.

Apart from the placement of individuals in a local social system, local identity may also refer to a feeling of belonging to or identification with a place and its people. This self-identity is particularly relevant when people are confronted with 'other' cultural and social systems. Within local society, reference to 'we' may be used to defend behaviour that is challenged; elsewhere, in contact with 'outsiders,' self-presentation may be framed in terms of belonging. This 'we' feeling is rooted in shared cultural ideas and history and only arises if people are conscious of 'they,' who are different, and sometimes threatening. Local identity as identification not only exists at the individual level, it can also manifest itself as a collective feeling, for instance when the social context within which people experience locality is threatened.

Contrasting Communities

This section presents two farming communities, one in the Netherlands and one in France. Both experienced major changes in the course of agricultural development from the 1960s onwards. In that respect they do not differ from thousands of other places in Europe, although there was variety in the timing and intensity of change. The French village Saint-André Goule d'Oie is located in the central, hilly part of the Vendée, in the West of France; the Dutch village, Geesteren, is in the eastern province of Overijssel. Historical research and fieldwork were done at the end of the 1970s (French village, de Haan 1981) and at the end of the 1980s (Dutch village, de Haan 1989, 1994).

The two communities show striking similarities in the pattern of farming. Both are traditionally directed towards mixed farming, with dairy products and meat as the main market products. Some land was used to grow commercial crops, but most of it was devoted to fodder crops for farm animals. Farms in both communities were small, with widely scattered plots, although in Geesteren there was a group of larger farmers with land concentrated around the farm. Within their national contexts, agriculture was considered traditional and backward (see Renard 1975; Maris *et al.* 1951). Farm mechanization in Saint-André only started in the 1960s, when oxen and horses were gradually replaced by tractors. The post-1960s period was characterized by the well-known pattern of modernization: fewer and larger farms, higher production, fewer people working on the land and a generally higher dependence on industrial inputs.

There are, however, also remarkable differences between the two farming communities. While in the Dutch community practically all farmers owned their land, property relations in the French community were far more complex. Very few farmers owned all their land; most rented, in addition to land they owned, offer from several different owners. In contrast to the Dutch community, where 'owner-occupier' has been practically synonymous with 'farmer' since the early nineteenth century, the French farmers have always relied heavily on renting land and a very dispersed pattern of land-ownership.

In both communities the modernization process involved considerable, and on-going, concentration of land in fewer farms. It did not, however, significantly affect the general pattern of landownership. Farmers in Geesteren invariably own all the land they farm, while the prevailing pattern in Saint-André is the dispersed ownership of farmland. Expanding farmers in Geesteren were obviously buying land, while in Saint-André farm enlargement was facilitated by renting an increasing amount of land. The transfer of land depended on farmers who gave up farming, selling land on the local land market in Geesteren, and owners withdrawing land from tenants in Saint André (thereby forcing them to withdraw from farming) and distributing it to other farmers, thus increasing their chances of survival.

The mechanisms underlying these processes were not simply based on the principle that land automatically moved to farmers endowed with substantial capital and entrepreneurial capacities. The reality was far more complex, revealing the significance of local social structure and culture in structuring the modernization process. In Geesteren, for instance, the large farmers from the 1950s showed little interest in enlarging their enterprise or in intensifying the farm according to the latest technological and scientific principles. Farmers showing the highest activity on the land market and the most dynamic entrepreneurial strategy emerged out of a group of smallholders. In Saint-André, where differences in farm size were not very significant, a small group of farmers managed to acquire most of the land

at the cost of their neighbours, and developed into a category of large, modern farmers.

Furthermore, these developments came as no surprise to local people. They were actually perceived as fundamentally local processes, corresponding with long-standing patterns regulating access to resources. In the following sections I will further explore how locality channels general processes into historically embedded structures, and how a local idiom develops to explain and legitimate these.

Kinship, Identity and the Reproduction of Property Relations

Property relations and rules governing access to land in the two communities were embedded in two contrasting types of rural social structure and culture, in much the same way that Augustins (1977, 1979, 1989) has observed in other European localities. In the French village, land and access to land were associated with extensive bilateral kingroups, nuclear families and partible inheritance. Land was owned by numerous resident- and non-resident families and mostly not attached to a specific farm. Farms were loosely organized units, composed of scattered parcels, and constantly being composed and decomposed. In the Dutch community, land was connected with narrowly defined lines of descent, multiple family households and impartible inheritance. Farms were very stable units, composed of a fixed amount of inherited land. There was a rigorous correspondence between landed property, the farm and household residence.

The Significance of the Wider Kingroup

The traditional rural community in Saint-André contained two different categories of families, each with a different relation to the land. The 'upper' stratum consisted of several kingroups, each with a substantial amount of land. Such a group was composed of mutually related individual families, with a core group living in the same or neighbouring hamlets. At the time of my fieldwork, people could easily indicate twenty to twenty-five families to which they were somehow related by kinship or marriage and which they identified as belonging to the same group. Individual families within such a kingroup could own different amounts of land, ranging from a couple of hectares to forty or fifty hectares. In Saint André I could identify five of these *parentèles* (Augustins 1989), each with a clear social and territorial identity and status (c.f. Segalen 1985).

This 'elite' group reproduced its status and kept property within the same family group by endogamous marriages. Although marriage between kin was in no way prescribed (and often not done consciously), it was the ultimate result of a type of spouse selection which prioritized setting up

an independent household endowed with a solid material basis. This was so because the inheritance of land was strictly egalitarian. All children received equal shares in kind and financial arrangements for buying out inheritors were out of the question. As no children were excluded from land, there was an in-built tendency for the fragmentation of property over an ever increasing number of owners. Spouse selection was principally based on proximity and property, uniting inheritors from the same kingroup and thus avoiding the fragmentation of property outside the boundaries of the kingroup. Marriage resulted mostly in the immediate setting up of an independent farm household.

Farms among these property-owning family groups were ill-defined units, which could change during the domestic cycle, and were eventually broken up on the death of the parental couple. Land could be added in the course of the life cycle by receiving inheritances from unmarried relatives, or by renting land from relatives who had moved out of the community, retired, or did not themselves farm. Thus there were constant rearrangements of property and tenure relations within the kingroup associated with migration, life-cycle events, marriage and death. Although it was quite possible that a farmer only owned a tiny piece of land, his status and identity were determined by belonging to a specific kingroup.

It is significant that these groups owned more land than they could actually farm until after the second world war. Farm size was limited because small domestic groups formed both the basis of the workforce and the unit of consumption. Moreover, not all offspring set up a farm. This not only resulted in ever-changing tenure relations between families within this larger kingroup, but also in leasing out land on a temporary basis to landless or near-landless farmers in the same hamlet. In fact, many small farmers depended almost completely on land originating from these property-owning kin groups.

The second group in Saint-André traditional rural society consisted of much more individualized and mobile small-property owning and landless farmers. Although their farm size often barely differed from householders belonging to the elite group, they were excluded from intermarriage with this group and much more volatile, dependent and insecure about being able to continue farming the same land the next year. They were much less attached to the community and the land, easily moving away to other villages in search for favourable tenure relations.

This group's survival as farmers mostly depended on renting land from farmers and non-farmers belonging to the elite groups. This was never on a stable basis. From one year to the next they might have to give up the land and start farming somewhere else, or leave farming altogether. Short-term decision making was often the result of being dependent on 'surplus land' and knowing that this land was actually reserved for distributing within the established kingroups. During the 1970s, when many these farmers were still present, none of them had any investment

or improvement plans. Although their position improved because of more secure tenure relations, they knew that their land was going to be withdrawn soon. Succession was therefore always ruled out, and they were simply waiting for early retirement on farms that did not differ much from their grandfathers' time.

Access to land was thus clearly defined by kinship and marriage, on the one hand, while the less well-off group depended on 'surplus land'. It is clear that status and identity here were not measured on the basis of farm size. Farms did not differ much in size. The social hierarchy was much more based on priority access to inherited land, associated with kinship. Identity and status were ascribed on the basis of belonging to a group, rather than on individual or family characteristics. Status maintenance depended on kinship strategies and alliances.

Patrimonial Strategies and the Domestic Group

The situation in the Dutch community of Geesteren was entirely different. The rural stratification system was not based on belonging to an extended kingroup, but on the historically defined position of the household. Landed property was an important asset in the local hierarchy, but closely connected with how this property was acquired and which role it played in patrimonial and economic strategies. On the basis of these criteria, three groups of farmers can be distinguished.

First there was a group of 'established farmers,' the original settlers of the community, who lived there long before the division of the common lands in the mid-nineteenth century. Before the enclosure of the commons, they held a privileged position as 'shareholders,' which implied access to the common fields and political power over their management. When the commons were divided they became full owners of very considerable properties. Their political and legal status was translated into material wealth, which gave them substantial power over the course of rural development.

However necessary, ownership of land was only one element defining membership of this group. Equally important was the cultural performance of these farmers, in particular with respect to defending the honour of the family. It was not property as such that was important, but the successful application of a model of patrimonial management (c.f. Bourdieu 1962; Rogers 1991; Zink 1993). Through historical research I discovered that the reproduction of this group followed a pattern of lineal succession, maintaining the unity between the domestic group and the land. Inheritance was strictly impartible, favouring only one of the children as successor to the farm and patriarch of the domestic group. Most of the original settlers from the nineteenth century managed to reproduce the 'house' (see, on this concept, Lévi-Strauss 1983; Chiva 1987; Carsten and Hugh-Jones 1995) in an unbroken sequence to the

present day. Their land and place of residence were practically identical with some 200 years ago. High status was derived here from belonging to a household that could trace its origins along direct lines of succession, and status maintenance depended on the successful transfer of property and domestic responsibilities to one member of the next generation and the exclusion of non-heirs. The greatest threat to this group has always been the breakup of the 'house' as a result of internal conflict. But fragmentation of the original landed estate was carefully prevented.

These farmers nonetheless provided new farmers with continuous access to land throughout the nineteenth century and until the second world war. This did not contradict patrimonial policy since it concerned uncultivated land that had been acquired after the division of the commons, which was clearly distinguished from ancestral land belonging to the domestic group. Practically all this land was gradually sold to mostly landless settlers, who took great pains in bringing it under cultivation.

This experience has certainly marked the people living in the community. It created the image of an elite group that was not primarily interested in land as a material asset, to be exploited for profit and expansion. From the perspective of lineal reproduction and maintenance of a core patrimony, they were also uninterested in setting up more than one of their own children. However, by selling land to enterprising small farmers, they certainly contributed to the growth of a new group of rural producers, who were not concerned with patrimonial strategies and family status, but mainly motivated by the desire to create a subsistence base and escape a proletarian existence. The emergence of this group (the third in our schema, to which I return below), with its mentality of independence, used to struggling for survival with a purely materialist perception of land, proved to be an important element in the postwar modernization process.

The second group of farmers were the small owner-occupiers. These farmers were already present in the community before the division of the commons, but they had no rights or privileges. They benefitted from the land division, but received only small portions of arable land and some wasteland, which they gradually reclaimed. Although endowed with sufficient land to survive, they did not try very hard to enlarge their farms by buying additional land on the land market. And even if they had tried, they would probably not have been very successful.

It became clear from a reconstruction of the small owner-occupiers' properties that these were very stable, not significantly adding or losing land. In fact, they copied the model of the elite farmers by rigorously maintaining the integrity of the 'house'. They clearly sought to achieve the same goals and thus identified strongly with the elite group. They shared the same symbols, mentality and patrimonial preferences, although they never managed to achieve the same status. It is likely that the elite group deliberately excluded families from this group from buying their surplus land, thus preventing them from upward mobility into the

enchanted circle of the traditional elite. Conversely, the former landless farmers, who actually acquired most of the land, explicitly excluded themselves from this local frame of reference and were therefore not seen as possible intruders into the relatively closed world of local 'aristocrats'

It is certain that, by the twentieth century, these property owners had become a relatively comfortable group with medium-sized farms. In the 1850s they still belonged to the marginal farmers with no historical rights in the community and minuscule farms. With the division of the commons they were endowed with a resource for upward mobility from which they fully benefitted. All their energy was focused on gradually incorporating the wasteland into the farm, and by the 1940s their farms were mostly in excess of 10 ha. During this period numerous new farmers settled on much smaller acreages, thus constituting a new class of smallholders, with a much lower status.

The third group of farmers, already mentioned, were very active on the land market throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, thus contributing to an increase in the number of farmers and the growth of a new lower class. Their attitude to land was unlike that of the 'older' farmers. They were not devoted to a patrimonial 'house' and its associated form of reproduction. The way in which they reproduced themselves was more erratic, not following any preestablished line of succession. Farms were split up, dissolved and recomposed, new people entering the farming scene and others leaving the community. They had a reputation for being hard-working pioneers, mostly starting with nothing and mainly motivated by self-sufficiency and independence. Land was seen as a material resource, as a source of income and, if possible, a source of profit and expansion. Many of them combined the farm with off-farm work and small crafts. This category of farmers defined life as a struggle for survival in which they could not rely on their own resources to achieve an independent livelihood. This explains their activity on the land market, and also their greater ability to step out of farming when comparable conditions for making a living emerged in some other sector.

Reconfiguring Locality or Reworking Globality?

Having described the two contrasting local systems of how access to productive resources is embedded into local structure and culture, we now come to the question of how these sedimented forms channelled the immense changes in the farm economy after the second world war. Was farming indeed disembedded from its local context and did global forces impose new rules on the transfer and management of property? Could farmers escape from local constraints and historically shaped mentalities and identities and simply become independent actors operating in a wider

economy? Or was the disposition to benefit from new technologies and expanding markets marked by local forces? Was the global deglobalized?

Mobilizing Kin Networks and Reproducing Status in a New Context

Agricultural modernization was in full swing during my fieldwork in Saint-André. New farmhouses with high-tech kitchens and white-washed walls were abutted on old stone-built houses with tiled roofs and clay floors. Modern milking parlours could be seen in operation next to a farmer's wife struggling with buckets in an old cow shed. Big herds of Frisian cows consuming industrial products faced the sturdy dark brown local race freely grazing in an adjoining pasture. Huge tractors were ploughing through the fields, while at the same time horses and left-over jeeps from the second world war transported fresh loads of sugar beet.

These contrasts clearly showed two sides of the modernization process: the decline of traditional practices and the growth of mechanized, industrial agriculture. This process was coupled with the gradual disappearance of small farmers and the emergence of *grands agriculteurs*. Although many small farmers were still active, they had no illusions about the future. Most of them were waiting to be of an age when they could apply for an early retirement scheme and the definitive handing over of the land to a neighbouring farmer. Their children had already given up hope of ever becoming farmers, increasingly finding employment in expanding local industrial enterprises.

The general attitude among the villagers was positive. The overwhelming feeling was that the process of modernization was chosen, channelled and initiated locally. There was a great desire to transform old farmhouses and embrace new patterns of consumption. Technological innovation, agricultural markets and government policies were hardly problematized or understood. These were taken-for-granted and considered as challenges to set into motion a process that was highly regulated by local factors. Markets and technology were, moreover, not considered anonymous forces but experienced concretely by what the local grain dealer offered for their grain, what the dairy cooperative paid for their milk, and what local tractor dealers and extension agents had on offer. That agricultural restructuring was a European phenomenon, regulated by distant political centres, and financial interests was irrelevant.

What struck me most was that I could not discover any feeling of discontinuity or uncertainty. People seemed to be able to predict what was going to happen and each family anticipated accordingly an almost pre-mediated future. Why was the transformation of farming perceived in terms of historical continuity? Why did farmers understand the process of differentiation not in terms of the unequal access to productive resources, but in terms of traditional status attributes and privileges? In fact, the opportunities offered by 'modern' agriculture were translated into terms

of the local social system and culture. Although from a distance the process of agricultural differentiation may appear to have been the classical outcome of global processes, it was locally perceived as a unique event, embedded in community time and place.

As mentioned before, rural society had long been characterized by two groups, which had reproduced themselves over a long time-span in a sort of symbiotic way. The families who controlled most of the land, systematically began to withdraw it from their tenants, making it available to a small number of farmers who were considered the best representatives of the kingroup. These families thus had abundant access to valuable resources when agricultural modernization offered the chance to farm more land and to earn more income. The pattern of farm concentration thus simply resulted from established patterns of resource endowment, and was therefore not seen as a result of rising competition, or as an effect of unequal chances in a market economy; it was personalized and localized. The large families had always seen land as something to be farmed primarily by their own kin. New opportunities were simply translated into well-established patterns of support, favouritism and solidarity.

For the well-off families, taking advantage of the new opportunities was not just a matter of professional preference or economic gain. They were expected and were respected for doing so. Having a dynamic farm and being 'big,' giving your sons an agricultural education and sending your daughters to college, were new ways of expressing distinction, thus replacing the old clientist and paternalist displays from the past.

This sense of local self reliance also revealed itself in the sphere of industrial development. People in the parish relied completely on agricultural employment and small crafts until the 1960s. Out-migration was the typical strategy for young people who were unable to become a farmer or craftsman. These people mostly moved permanently to not too distant urban centres. This trend was gradually reversed when, in the 1960s, major industrial firms settled in the region. The new industries were not located in urban agglomerations, but in small towns and villages that had been previously non-industrialized.

When I first visited the site of one of these firms, I thought I recognized the pattern of industrial location then becoming common in peripheral rural areas with an abundant, cheap and submissive labour force. However, it soon became clear that the complex of buildings near the village I studied was developed by a local farmer's son, who had invested all his savings and later profits in setting up his enterprise.

Apart from providing employment to a growing number of mostly unskilled labourers, the industry also initiated important innovations in the farm economy. This firm, a chicken slaughterhouse, started as a one-man enterprise collecting farmyard chicken all over the village for delivery to larger middlemen. With his knowledge of the local farm economy, combined with the foresight that the market for prepacked slaughtered

chicken would expand quickly, this farmer's soon began to process the chicken for mass consumption markets. At the local level he mobilized farmers to produce chicken on a larger scale, offering them contracts which included the delivery of chicken fodder. At the same time he established contacts with supermarket chains all over France and in other European countries. It was a great success. At the time of my fieldwork, practically all farmers were engaged in chicken farming as a side line, and some as their main line of production.

The effect on the local economy was twofold. On the one hand, the declining farm population could find employment without moving away from the home village, while on the other, numerous farmers had found an extra on-farm income, which they combined with dairy farming. The character of this export-oriented industry was firmly embedded in local society. The raw material was produced by farmers in the immediate environment of the farm, and processing was in the hands of local managers and employers. People often drew my attention to the fact that production relations in a way replicated traditional divisions of labour as they existed when the smallest farmers and their children used to work for bigger farmers as agricultural labourers and domestic servants. The analogy to industrial wage labour while engaged in processing local farm products was clearly felt, and this again strengthened the feeling that even industrial development was built upon preexisting patterns of stratification and power relations. The blossoming chicken industry was not seen as being connected with global changes in food consumption, or with the logic of industrial location in an environment where the farm population is declining and farmers are eager to expand production on a non-land basis. Even though the contracts were demanding, working conditions in the slaughterhouse disagreeable and wages low, the chicken firm was seen as a product of and a blessing for local society.

The Historical Character of Status and Mentality

In Geesteren, the period after 1950 differed substantially from the previous periods. The possibilities for enlarging farm size or creating new farms by bringing new land under cultivation were exhausted. While land was becoming scarce, changing economic and technological conditions increasingly pressed farmers to reconsider the now obsolete concept of viability. Rising living standards outside agriculture and growing possibilities for achieving a decent livelihood in other sectors drove many potential successors to opt for a living away from the farm. Those who remained in farming could only realize an acceptable income by considerably raising output. Farmers with only a few hectares of land were at an obvious disadvantage. They either had to buy more land, or be prepared to invest heavily in intensive livestock rearing in order to guarantee the viability of the farm. Lack of capital often excluded these farmers from any of those

possibilities. Farmers with a large acreage were in a better position. The use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides and the introduction of high-yielding grass and corn allowed them to multiply the number of cows. Labour input could simultaneously be reduced by mechanizing most of the work in the fields and milking parlour.

This process was, however, far from self-evident. Statistics on the number of farms and the number of people working in agriculture reveal that the effects of agricultural modernization were only becoming visible by the 1960s. Many small farmers were clearly reluctant to give up their source of livelihood, especially if they derived extra income from outside agriculture. Since most of them had no successor there was no point in realizing any significant investment. These small farmers simply survived and were only really motivated to retire when the state introduced a general old-age pension scheme in 1958. Furthermore, the reintroduction of a free land market in 1963, which boosted land prices, must have been an incentive for ageing farmers to sell their land. Although it took about a decade before the repercussions of modernization became visible in the structure of agriculture, the foundations of agricultural restructuring were laid much earlier.

All the long-established large landowning families from the early nineteenth century were still present in the mid-1980s. The majority was characterized by a long, uninterrupted, single line of succession, maintaining the core of the property linked to the original farm unit, with only occasional changes in farm size, evincing a very relaxed style of farming, unmarked by accumulation policies. Residential continuity combined with single succession was the dominant model of reproduction, not threatened by the dispersal of family land.

That one specific group among the farming population had managed to reproduce itself according to a set of essentially unchanging principles is quite extraordinary. After the second world war, when agriculture incorporated all kinds of commodity circuits, these families somehow managed to avoid commoditizing land and required no additional resources to maintain a viable lifestyle.

The smaller landowners, who had achieved a respectable status by carefully consolidating property in a single family line, acted in the same way as the large owners. These farmers were generally much less endowed with land, but what they had was clearly a solid base for developing a viable farm into the 1980s.

The development of these two types of landowners was the very picture of stability. Most seemed to be content with what he had, and was far removed from the prototype entrepreneur with an active interest in accumulating land. They simply restructured their farm technically and economically, but always without significantly expanding property and farm size. Land, as before, seemed to be defined as a stable resource, supporting

family values, in contrast with its meaning as an object of speculation or accumulation.

How can this non-speculative attitude towards land be explained? Why was land considered primarily a resource invested with tradition and symbolic meaning, rather than suitable for financial adventuring or exploitation for profit maximization? The fact that land was cautiously kept outside the sphere of commodity transactions (via closed inheritance), and that they did not buy additional land suggests, I believe, a conception of land as a family asset, to be protected and safeguarded. Such a primarily patrimonial view seemed to contradict accumulation strategies directed at maximizing land as an economic and financial resource. It is as if a patrimony accumulated through purchased land was conceived as 'contaminated'.

Additional reasons may be advanced for the rather relaxed style of enterprise development among these families. The postwar generation on these farms entered their career as farm operators under relatively easy conditions. Having been in a position to take over a farm without the burden of enormous bank loans, they were not confronted with a real break in farm development and the need to boost their income capacity. Generational change was hardly uprooting: the son simply acquired a different status and brought his wife into the household (for her this *was* an upsetting experience). But his father, mother and brothers and sisters were very likely to continue to live with or close by him. Work on the farm did not really change and the available labour force was abundant. This lack of cyclical change and development certainly imposed a sense of continuity and stability.

Finally, it should not be forgotten that the large farmers in particular had traditionally derived their status from the size of inherited land and the reputation of the family. Having a substantial amount of land provided the basis for a rather comfortable lifestyle. Hard toil, working every inch of land was seen as the fate of the new smallholders settling on uncultivated land. With such a socio-cultural background, it is not surprising that the entrepreneurial spirit among these landowners was not particularly strong. Even when the postwar generation took over of the farm, they continued to rely on good stewardship, not launching themselves into risky financial transactions and entrepreneurial endeavours. Although this patrimonial style of managing the land resulted in a considerable loss of status *compared with* farmers who defined their land primarily as a source of profit, many descendants of the large owners are still relying on traditional status attributes.

This description of the 'settled' farmers is, of course, necessarily simplistic. Even though they did not buy land, they certainly intensified the enterprise and made, in most cases and especially among smaller landowners, the necessary investments for modernizing the farm. But even here their efforts were modest: having a substantial amount of land, they

limited themselves to quite traditional forms of dairy farming, not exploiting all the technical possibilities of intensification. Their economic strategies of farm development and maintaining viability were thus reflections of patrimonial goals. Although of course farm viability was necessary to sustain a household, the amount of land owned by large farmers meant that an entrepreneurial strategy was not really necessary needed to achieve the continuity of the house as a cultural edifice.

The smaller owner occupiers basically followed the same pattern of consolidation. But the fact that they had less land meant that patrimonial goals needed to be underpinned by a stronger entrepreneurial strategy. Since the early nineteenth century they had intensified land use as a matter of necessity, and this had proven to be highly successful. Each succeeding generation could thus comply with changing living standards. And each generation could do this by mobilizing private resources. Their position was, however, more vulnerable after the second world war. Safeguarding continuity meant that they were obliged to continue the path of intensification. It is remarkable that most of them indeed succeeded in transforming the farm to such an extent that they could survive into the 1980s. Maintaining an undivided farm at the change of generations was certainly an important cultural ideal, but it had become an economic necessity for them as well.

If these groups of farmers maintained and stabilized their resources, then who were the farmers who disappeared massively during the postwar period, and who benefitted from the land they released? It is obvious that great changes took place within the category of 'new' settlers, mainly among those who acquired land in the first half of the twentieth century. These farmers mainly bought the wasteland alienated by the large landowners. Most of their farms were established between 1900 and 1940, when the amount of land necessary for sustaining a family was extremely small. Most of these tiny farms disappeared between 1950 and 1980, unable to cope with economic constraints. There was no question of continuity of any sort for them, and the peasantization of the prewar period was followed by rapid proletarianization in the period of agricultural modernization.

But not all these recent settlers lost their land. Some were better equipped to face the postwar process of modernization because, for instance, they had already successfully accumulated land in the prewar period, although most increased the farm from the 1960s onwards. Some even developed into the most entrepreneurial farmers of the community. These farmers initially started buying small acreages, settling on virgin land, mostly dispersed outside the main settlements. Since they did not dispose of the reservoir of wasteland as did the established farmers, their only way to guarantee continuity was by being very active on the land market. Having initially bought the land, they started without any patrimonial or family history. Their land was not invested with symbolic

meaning, and not the result of meticulously designed inheritance strategies. These characteristics clearly marked them as a distinctive group. These farmers do not appear to have been handling their property as a fixed asset, with a specific ancestral identity. They were both socially and spatially excluded from locally defined modes of identity formation and reproduction. Their house and land had been built and acquired within living memory and not bestowed on them in a highly regulative social and cultural environment.

Land for the new settlers was primarily a resource enabling an independent livelihood, an economic asset used to employ and feed a family. Successive generations had clearly not been brought up in a family tradition that elevated the patrimony into an untouchable domain. Used to this type of detached attitude to land, it was as quickly given up as it had been acquired one generation earlier, especially if the same cultural ideals could be realized in forms of self-employment outside farming. There was, however another category among these recent farmers, basically sharing the same attitude to land, who developed into real accumulators, increasing farm size from around 5 to 10 ha to well over 20 and sometimes 30 ha. Among these farmers there was a discernible entrepreneurial spirit, exemplified by huge land transactions and investments in farm development. Some of these farmers now rank among the most technologically advanced entrepreneurs. The two different strategies were seemingly based on the same entrepreneurial spirit, a market-oriented mentality, and a deeply seated conviction that everything is possible by working very hard and taking risks. Given the restricted availability of land, these attitudes could only be made to materialize in farming by a relatively small group. The ones who opted out of agriculture very often set up small businesses in trade, the building industry or agricultural equipment.

There is objective evidence of change in many aspects of local society, and people are clearly conscious of it. Change is most noticeable in farm management. Older people experienced the period after the 1960s as a great metamorphosis, while the younger generation of farmers has grown up with the idea that farming means continuous adjustment to new technology, policy measures and market forces. The collapse of agrarian society probably constitutes the greatest change ever experienced by the farming population. Immediately after the second world war, 75 percent of the total population was still dependent on agriculture, and almost 90 percent was born in their place of residence. Farmers gradually lost their leading position and became just an important minority. This transformation has been accompanied by a drastic change in the built environment. While farms dominated the hamlets in the 1950s and 1960s, they are now sentinels of the past in the midst of endless housing estates.

It is unnecessary to compile an exhaustive catalogue of the changes that have affected people's lives. More to the point is how farmers have managed to keep their bearings, retain their identity and maintain control

over their lives, in the midst of all this. The answer lies in the fact that people have not basically changed their ideas about property, family and kinship and, what is more important, that these ideas are still fully operative in managing the family patrimony. These cultural traditions are not simply survivals from another era, carried around like relics by elderly people. They are, on the contrary, basically shared by younger generations. Although the organization of domestic space has been adapted and the farm has become more central in estate continuity, certain cultural notions have retained their vitality as reference points for people in the stream of changing circumstances.

Enduring commitment to the family patrimony has not only proved an effective weapon against the potentially disintegrative forces of agricultural restructuring, it also guaranteed an enduring link between the farming and the non-farming communities. All those people who grew up in a farmhouse, but left to set up a non-agrarian household, still identify with their parental house. Their role in sanctioning the reproduction of this house should not be underestimated. The sense of continuity among the farming population is fostered by the fact that they did not really experience a cultural shock: people's conventional ways of doing and thinking did not suddenly become obsolete, nor were they obliged radically to revise their ideas or lose control over their own lives. Although aware of the contradictions, with some rejection of familialism altogether, people are capable of structuring their lives to such an extent that changing circumstances are a challenge rather than a threat.

The sense of continuity was nurtured by the fact that agricultural modernization could easily be incorporated without upsetting local cultural principles and identities. That section of the farming population among which the differentiation process was most felt, was traditionally seen as a vulnerable, dynamic and turbulent one. Their appearance and disappearance took place within living memory of most of the population. It was more or less predictable that exactly there the wave of agricultural modernization would have its deepest impact. This capacity to couch general events in local, often personal categories is one aspect of deglobalizing these events.

Conclusion

Accounts of rural social and economic change were quite gloomy during the 1960s and 1970s. They anticipated a deserted countryside dominated by a few big agro-industrial firms and envisaged not only the destruction of the peasantry, but also the end of rural society and culture (Mendras 1967; Gervais, Servolin and Weil 1965, for the Netherlands, see de Haan 1993b). Later on, several theories were advanced about the 'survival' of family farmers and the ways in which capital indirectly subjects them to

its logic (see, for instance, Whatmore *et al.* 1987a,b). More recent approaches have emphasized that farmers are not defenseless victims of modernization, but use all kinds of strategies to retain substantial degrees of freedom from markets (van der Ploeg 1994; de Haan 1993a, 1995). The emphasis in these different perspectives is either on the fate of disappearing farmers (the losers), or on surviving farmers, whether uniformly subordinated to capital or having relative degrees of freedom *vis-à-vis* markets and technology. My perspective in this chapter is somewhat different.

This chapter is concerned with how the process of differentiation is actually structured at local level, which implies taking the whole process of selection into account, including both survivors and non-survivors. In this respect, capitalism only sets the general conditions, the translation of which at local level is relatively independent from these forces. My focus has been not on individual farm families' degrees of freedom *vis-à-vis* the wider context, but on locally structured survival chance *per se*. These chances are distributed by locally defined criteria, and individual farm families are differentially endowed by local factors to take advantage of them. Degrees of freedom and room for manoeuvre for individual families must therefore be studied both as 'internally' and 'externally' defined parameters. Access to productive resources, as I have demonstrated in this chapter, is based on the ability to mobilize local cultural principles and social networks and on historically embedded identities. Global developments are thus mediated locally, resulting in specific, deglobalized patterns of development.

Although the same processes were taking place in both communities, how they occurred, and the schemes of interpretation through which they were experienced, cannot be explained from a global perspective. Agricultural modernization in itself introduced new parameters for land use and farm size, but how farmers coped with these new constraints at local level was not determined by market forces, competition, or any other patterns of accumulation derived from the capitalist market. Access to natural resources was structured by mechanisms originating far back in time, which had always regulated the distribution of land. The fundamental structure of property and land-use relations was based on inheritance, marriage and other kinship strategies. This basically explains why people did not experience agricultural modernization and differentiation as a real break with the past. The implications at the local level followed well-trodden paths, which people could fully understand.

This chapter has emphasized the significance of the concept of locality for analyzing how global trends are translated into place-specific processes. My empirical examples were drawn from rural contexts where identity and class are associated with kinship and property. Moreover, I have only analysed globalization and globality in terms of a generalized exposure to radically changing market forces. It may well be that agricul-

ture occupies such a special place that conclusions on globality and locality cannot be generalized from it. Conversely, this chapter has shown that studies of globalization in other domains of life cannot ignore the case of agriculture.