



HAL
open science

Allowing for the projective dimension of agency in analysing alternative food 1 networks

Ronan Le Velly

► **To cite this version:**

Ronan Le Velly. Allowing for the projective dimension of agency in analysing alternative food 1 networks. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 2019. halshs-02081399

HAL Id: halshs-02081399

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-02081399>

Submitted on 27 Mar 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Allowing for the projective dimension of agency in analysing alternative food**
2 **networks**

3

4 Ronan Le Velly

5 UMR Innovation, Univ. Montpellier, Cirad, Inra, Montpellier SupAgro, Montpellier, France

6 2 place Viala, 34060 Montpellier, France

7 levelly@supagro.fr

8

9 **To be published in *Sociologia ruralis***

10

11 **Allowing for the projective dimension of agency in analysing alternative food**
12 **networks**

13

14 **Abstract**

15 This article argues for including the projective dimension of agency in research into
16 alternative food networks. Starting from a review of the literature, I show that referring to the
17 notion of project is useful to answer the questions raised by the use of the term “alternative”
18 and to reinforce analyses of hybridisation and conventionalisation processes. I argue that
19 alternative food networks are characterised by a “promise of difference” in the projects of the
20 actors who promote them. To clarify this notion of project, I rely on the work of French
21 sociologists concerning the creation of “organised action”. I posit that taking account of the
22 project amounts to recognising human beings' abilities to imagine and to construct new
23 collectives such as those that are studied in research into alternative food networks. I also
24 underscore the need to envision the project not as a clear determinant of action, but rather as a
25 fuzzy landmark, meaning that negotiation and arbitration are required to set the rules involved
26 in its implementation.

27 **Key words**

28 Agency, Alternative food networks, Conventionalisation, Fair trade, Food utopias,
29 Hybridisation

30 **Introduction**

31 Even though alternative food networks are currently a dynamic field of rural studies research
32 (Goodman et al. 2012), the very use of the term “alternative” continues to cause discomfort.
33 For example, whereas the subtitle of their book explicitly talks about “exploring alternatives”,
34 Moya Kneafsey and her co-authors justify themselves by explaining that they see this term as
35 a “useful shorthand” (Kneafsey et al. 2008, p. 30). Other authors remind their readers that
36 “alternative” as a concept is problematic and apologise for sticking to it by explaining that it
37 is the term adopted in other articles (Milestad et al. 2010). The reasons for this discomfort are
38 well known. Alternative and conventional food networks are not separate worlds, functioning
39 in radically different ways (Hinrichs 2003, Sonnino and Marsden 2006). Alternative

40 initiatives deserve to be analysed as “hybrid spaces” involving actors and infrastructures of
41 the conventional networks (Ilbery and Maye 2005). Some of these initiatives also tend to
42 adopt a portion of the ways in which conventional food systems function, a trend that has
43 been summed up by the catchword “conventionalisation” (Guthman 2004) and has suggested
44 sorting alternative food networks according to their levels of alternativeness (Watts *et al.*
45 2005). On the basis of these findings other researchers even call for dropping and replacing
46 the notions of “alternative” and “conventional”. According to Larsh Maxey, thinking in terms
47 of “hybrid spaces” is not enough. This can leave “alternative' and 'conventional' food intact,
48 as distinct entities with distinct logics and implications” (Maxey 2007, p. 58). To avoid this
49 danger of essentialisation, Maxey recommends speaking of “sustainable food” instead of
50 “alternative food”. Henk Renting, Markus Schermer, and Adanella Rossi argue that "the main
51 shortcoming of the alternative food network concept is that it has no clear normative content
52 of its own, since it is ultimately defined in terms of its distinction from ‘mainstream’ food
53 networks" (Renting *et al.* 2012, p. 291). They therefore claim it would be more appropriate to
54 speak of “civic food networks” and study the place of civil society in food system
55 governance. Amanda DiVito Wilson (2013) argues similarly that even studying levels of
56 alternativeness remain unsatisfying, as this relies on abstract and fuzzy notions of alternative
57 and conventional. She proposes accordingly to call the initiatives known up to now as
58 “alternative” “autonomous food spaces” and to study how these initiatives build non-capitalist
59 and non-market exchanges.

60 Should these authors' reluctance to use the term “alternative” be shared? The argument that I
61 shall defend is that introducing the notion of a “project” offers a way out of this discomfort.
62 More fundamentally, I shall posit that taking account of the project provides a solid
63 theoretical foundation for using the term “alternative” and reinforces analysis of the
64 phenomena of hybridisation and conventionalisation.

65 The first part of this article will explain the circumstances in which the term “alternative” has
66 been used in rural studies and the reasons why its use has prompted questions. I shall then
67 advance the idea that explicitly taking account of alternative food network proponents'
68 projects (plans, reasons and aims) makes it possible to answer these questions. Fair trade,
69 organic agriculture, and short food supply chains can be analysed as alternative networks not
70 because their practices truly break with conventional systems, but because of the promise of
71 difference that is contained in the projects of the collectives that are implementing them. Seen
72 from this angle, hybridisation and conventionalisation are phenomena related to the actors'

73 projects. The divide that the researcher establishes between the “alternative” and
74 “conventional” components of “hybrid spaces” (Ilbery and Maye 2005) does not refer to
75 abstract or essentialised notions but, rather, relates to the projects that the actors put forward.
76 Similarly, assessment of the deterioration or upholding of alternativeness must be done in
77 relation to the projects' asserted ends rather than a general ideal.

78 In the second part I shall refine the notion of “project”. That is necessary because the notion is
79 absent from rural studies and has been defined little in sociological research. Most of the
80 theoretical references on which I shall rely nevertheless come from French sociological
81 research into the constitution of “organised action” (Crozier and Friedberg 1980, Friedberg
82 1997, Reynaud 1997). These researchers consider both organisations and markets to be
83 collectives created by the establishment of rules. The rules that the actors set themselves are
84 the conditions of their collective action. The sociology of organised action thus shares with
85 the economy of conventions and actor-network theory (ANT), which are better known in rural
86 studies, a concern for the actual conditions under which actions are coordinated. Without
87 written rules, material devices, or quality conventions, agri-food networks could not exist
88 (see, for example, Le Velly and Dufeu 2016, Ponte 2016). Several investigations in the
89 sociology of organised action have, on this basis, also emphasised the importance of the
90 project (Reynaud 1997, Terssac and Lalande 2002, Reynaud 2003, Segrestin 2004, Bréchet et
91 al. 2009). In their view, the ongoing changes in the rules indicate the existence of projects, in
92 the sense of “plans for the future”, by means of which the actors assert their ability to imagine
93 new ways of organising the collectives in which they participate. In this same vein, I shall
94 define the project as the reasons and ends that a collective gives itself to turn its action toward
95 a desired future.

96 This article is mostly theoretical in nature. It is nevertheless rooted in thorough knowledge of
97 fair trade, short food supply chains, and organic agriculture – fields in which I have been
98 working since the early 2000s (Le Velly 2017). I shall refer to the findings of surveys in these
99 fields throughout the article, especially in the third part, in which I shall present two short
100 case studies revolving around fair trade, the first one concerning the diversity of fair trade
101 supply chains set up by the federation Artisans du Monde, which is the main alternative trade
102 organisation in France; and the second one concerning the way the standards committee of
103 Fairtrade International sets fair minimum prices. Through these two case studies we shall see
104 that the project is indeed a central reference, the hub around which rules are set and practices

105 are assessed. However, we shall also see how fuzzy a reference it is, one that leaves the door
106 open to negotiation and arbitration.

107 **1. The projects upon which alternative food networks rest**

108 I shall start with what I shall call, very simply, “the 'alternative' problem”. Why do people
109 speak about “alternative” schemes and systems to refer to initiatives as diverse as fair trade,
110 organic agriculture, and short supply chains? And why does this adjective raise questions in
111 the minds of the very researchers who use it (Section 1.1)? Despite the risk of “dualistic” or
112 “binary” thinking associated with the use of the alternative/conventional pair, I shall reassert
113 how central the challenge to the idea of alternativeness is because of a promise of difference
114 specific to alternative food network projects (in the sense of “plans”) (Section 1.2). After that,
115 I shall show that taking account of these projects strengthens the analysis of hybridisation and
116 conventionalisation phenomena (Section 1.3).

117 *1.1. The “alternative” problem*

118 Why are schemes as different as short food supply chains, fair trade, organic agriculture, and
119 farm products seen as “alternative” networks? In the late 1990s, the idea behind the first
120 colloquia and the first publications that put this subject on the research agenda was to use this
121 term to identify a set of initiatives that diverged from a globalised, capitalistic, industrial
122 agricultural model that was considered to be dominant. The research stakes at the time were to
123 be able to account for the existence of more marginal, but nevertheless developing, forms of
124 organisation of food networks (Goodman and Watts 1997, Murdoch et al. 2000). This work
125 also had more normative goals. Many of the authors denounced the effects of the conventional
126 system and put forward the need to turn to systems that operated in different ways, even
127 independently from the conventional system. For example, initiatives such as Community
128 Supported Agriculture were described as enabling consumers and farmers to “resist”, “to
129 secede from”, and to “protect themselves from” the dominant trends in the global food system
130 (Kloppenburg et al. 1996, Hendrickson and Heffernan 2002). The first publications on fair
131 trade show us a very similar line of reasoning. They presented fair trade as an alternative that
132 took shape in “the interstices of globalisation” (Renard 1999) by establishing “re-embedded”
133 relations between producers and consumers (Raynolds 2000). Similarly, articles published
134 during the same period in Europe described short food supply chains, agritourism, on-the-
135 farm processing, organic agriculture, and registered designations of origin as contributing to a

136 “new rural development paradigm” that would be an answer to the multiple crises plaguing
137 the dominant paradigm of agricultural modernisation (van der Ploeg et al. 2000). They then
138 highlighted the great differences between conventional and alternative agriculture. Whereas
139 the former was deemed to be responsible for farmers' impoverishment, ecological
140 degradation, and health crises, the latter was presented as a source of increased added value
141 on the farm, of environmental conservation, of closer ties to the locality, and of renewed trust
142 between producers and consumers (Marsden et al. 2000).

143 This type of analysis quickly triggered criticism within the very research community that
144 identified with a programme of research into alternative food networks. Its critics pointed to
145 the risk of “binary” or “dualistic” thinking that tended to postulate the existence of a great
146 divide between alternative and conventional food networks (Hinrichs 2003, Goodman 2004,
147 Ilbery and Maye 2005, Morgan et al. 2006, Sonnino and Marsden 2006, Kneafsey et al. 2008).
148 This criticism was based on a number of findings.

149 First, research showed that alternative and conventional food networks were not separate
150 worlds. Typically, researchers found that most of the consumers and producers involved in
151 alternative food networks also participated in conventional schemes, with the consumers
152 doing the majority of their shopping in supermarkets and the farmers producing and/or selling
153 part of their output in conventional networks. Next, the motivations of the participants in
154 alternative food networks were not necessarily very different from those expressed in
155 conventional systems. For example, in the case of short food supply chains, consumers look
156 for tasty products, pay attention to price, and ask for a diverse product line, whilst farmers
157 strive to sell their produce at a good price and do not always want to engage in lengthy
158 discussions with consumers (Hinrichs 2000, Weatherell et al. 2003, Kirwan 2004, Jarosz
159 2008). They also underscored the fact that many alternative food networks mobilised some
160 infrastructure and actors stemming from the conventional system, e.g., industrial
161 slaughterhouses, wholesalers, supermarkets, market price lists, and so on. Far from
162 functioning like a separate space independent from conventional systems, the initiatives under
163 the “alternative” heading presented themselves more as “hybrid spaces” mixing alternative
164 and conventional elements (Ilbery and Maye 2005, Cleveland et al. 2014).

165 A second set of publications, in a continuation of the first wave, stressed the tensions
166 generated by the relationship with the conventional system. The research into the
167 conventionalisation of organic farming that began with Julie Guthman's study of organic
168 farming in California (Guthman 2004), like more recent investigations of the mainstreaming

169 of fair trade (Raynolds et al. 2007, Jaffee 2010), emphasised the presence of actors from the
170 conventional system: Capitalistic plantations, agribusiness multinationals, trading companies,
171 and mass distribution brands are currently involved in fair trade and organic agriculture
172 supply chains. This research also showed that alternative food networks were not immune to
173 the industrial production, insecure jobs, price competition, consumer non-information, and
174 other logics attributed to the conventional systems. This inflection of the researchers' views
175 may be explained in part by an inflection of practices, especially in the fair trade sector.
176 However, they also resulted in part from better empirical knowledge and more refined
177 analysis. For example, the literature began showing how omnipresent competitive behaviour
178 was not only amongst fair and non-fair trade products but also amongst the various farmers'
179 organisations involved in fair trade only once in-depth field studies of fair trade farmers'
180 organisations were carried out (Shreck 2002, Taylor et al. 2005).

181 *1.2. The promise of difference made by the projects underlying alternative food*
182 *network*

183 Given such findings, might it not be better to stop using the “alternative/conventional”
184 dichotomy? This risk of “binary” or “dualistic” thinking is what led the authors mentioned in
185 the introduction to defend the idea of abandoning these terms (Maxey 2007, Renting et al.
186 2012, DiVito Wilson 2013) or to apologise for using them (Kneafsey et al. 2008, Milestad et
187 al. 2010). I plead, on the contrary, in favour of continuing to use this
188 “alternative/conventional” pair, not for reasons of facility, but because it reflects a central
189 characteristic of the initiatives that are associated with alternative food networks.

190 No longer reasoning in terms of alternative and conventional would amount to losing sight of
191 the very sense of the approaches taken in alternative food networks. Researchers are not alone
192 in thinking of fair trade, CSA, and organic farming as “alternative”. For those who promote
193 such initiatives and those that practise them, they are what I call “promises of difference”:
194 Promises of other ways of organising production, trade, and/or food consumption and the
195 promise of the associated benefits (Le Velly 2017). When school cafeteria managers decide to
196 buy locally and to reorganise the cafeterias' ways of working accordingly, nothing enables us
197 to say that they do so with the idea of taking part in an alternative food network. However, if
198 they take such action, it is indeed because they hope that such a change will lead to
199 differences for themselves and/or the school children and/or local farmers and/or the
200 environment, etc. The same holds for consumers who decide to take part in a CSA scheme
201 rather than to continue buying their fruit and vegetables at the supermarket, for volunteers and

202 professionals who invest in the construction of fair trade supply chains based on specific
203 principles, and so on. Next, researchers, like many other actors, can express reservations as to
204 the likelihood of such promises being realised. However, in so doing, they merely reassert the
205 importance of such promises as references against which the schemes must be evaluated. So,
206 for example, the conventionalisation of organic farming will be assessed as a function of the
207 expected differences between organic and conventional farming.

208 There are two strands to the promise of difference that alternative food networks extend. The
209 first strand concerns the promise of other ways of organising the production of, trade in, and
210 /or consumption of food compared with those of the dominant conventional systems. The
211 second strand concerns the tangible and intangible benefits of these changes. Gaëlle Balineau
212 and Ivan Dufeu make a clear distinction between these two strands in the case of fair trade.
213 The promise of difference offered by fair trade is not kept if the networks are organised
214 similarly to conventional trade networks. However, it is also not kept if, despite a different
215 organisation, the promised benefits in terms of the producers' development or environmental
216 protection are not achieved (Balineau and Dufeu 2010).

217 This promise of difference is situated in what I call the project. Fair trade, short supply chains,
218 and so on, benefit from being seen as alternative food networks. This is not because their
219 practices truly break with conventional systems, but due to the promise of difference that their
220 projects for the future offer. Oppositions such as fair trade v. conventional trade, organic
221 farming v. conventional farming, slow food v. fast food, short supply chains v. long supply
222 chains, artisanal production v. industrial production, chemistry v. nature, and so on should be
223 taken serious. These oppositions must not be considered to be mere caricature-like short cuts.
224 As elements of such projects they are vectors of change, and the turn-of-the-21st century
225 publications presented above must consequently be reread from this perspective. Highlighting
226 a “new rural development paradigm” (van der Ploeg et al. 2000) does not simply boil down to
227 describing and analysing what exists. It also means moving towards desirable changes.

228 The second part of this article will describe the project as the reasons and ends that a
229 collective gives itself to orient its action towards a desired future. However, before delving
230 into this definition, I should like to stress how the collectives' projects are presented and
231 observable in alternative food networks. Many alternative network initiatives give rise to
232 relatively general documents that express the grand purposes and broad lines of their action
233 (examples include the International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movement's (IFOAM)
234 Principles of Organic Farming, the charter of the National Federation of Organic Farming in

235 France, etc.). The promotional materials that the actors use to present their approaches (press
236 files, Internet sites, advertising, etc.) are also good ways to observe their projects. The
237 promise of being different from “conventional trade” is asserted and omnipresent in the fair
238 trade world and incarnated in a series of oppositions. Boosting the development of the “small
239 farmers” who are the victims of the “big multinationals” of conventional trade; paying a fair
240 price that allows for the farmer's situation rather than a market price set by the blind forces of
241 supply and demand; establishing ties that are as direct as possible to prevent a series of
242 middlemen getting rich at the farmers' expense; engaging in partnerships aimed at
243 development rather than choosing suppliers based on a purely profit-seeking rationale; and
244 acting as a “consum'actor” rather than passively taking in the messages of a consumer society
245 are all promises of difference at the heart of the fair trade project.

246 One might retort that such messages are merely examples of skilful, more-or-less cynically
247 distilled communication that should not be given undue importance. My lengthy experience
248 with fair trade initiatives, but also with short supply chains and organic farming, prompts me
249 to contest this argument. The highlighted oppositions must not be considered to be discourse
250 aimed simply at putting the initiatives concerned in a better light. They are components of the
251 collective projects underlying alternative food networks. These promises of difference are not
252 empty promises, as attested by the fact that the actors themselves refer to them constantly in
253 assessing their actions. For example, even though the principles laid down in the AMAP
254 Charter (AMAPs being the French equivalent of North American community-supported
255 agriculture (CSA) groups) are implemented in very wide variety of ways (Mundler 2007), the
256 AMAPs' participants all refer to them to judge their practices. For example, they may rue the
257 fact that their market gardener's cropping system is not very agroecological, but will accept it
258 in light of another principle, that of helping a farmer to get through an economic rough patch
259 and survive.

260 *1.3. Hybridisation and conventionalisation are relative to the projects*

261 Taking account of AFNs' projects and promises of difference makes it possible to back up the
262 analysis of hybridisation and conventionalisation. Since we consider that these two
263 phenomena relate to the alternative food network promoters' projects, the “alternative” and
264 “conventional” categories to which they refer are no longer abstract or essentialised notions,
265 and the criticism made on this point by researchers wishing to abandon this vocabulary is not
266 valid anymore (Maxey 2007, Renting et al. 2012, DiVito Wilson 2013).

267 Speaking of “hybrid spaces” (Ilbery and Maye 2005) to describe alternative food networks
268 speaks volumes, but is not sufficient for their analysis. So, once it has been ascertained that
269 alternative food networks mix actors and rules that are in part “conventional” and in part
270 “alternative”, it is also necessary to justify how the researcher establishes the boundary
271 between the two sets. In working on various initiatives to relocalise the food supplies of
272 collective catering (sourcing them locally again), I suggested tackling this question from the
273 standpoint of the organisational innovation processes that were activated (Le Velly 2017). I
274 call the rules aimed specifically at implementing the project's promise of difference
275 “alternative rules”. These alternative rules differ from the pre-existing rules, some of which
276 are replaced by the new rules and others of which remain in the new organisation. So, in the
277 case of collective catering, implementing a project to source food supplies locally entails
278 drawing up specific alternative rules. It will be necessary, for example, to forge new trade
279 relations with farmers or distributors able to provide local produce, but also to change the
280 quality of the produce ordered, menus and recipes, organisation of work in the kitchen,
281 service given to the children in the school cafeterias, and so on (Le Velly 2017; see also
282 Morgan and Sonnino 2008). Some existing conventional rules will be dropped as a result, but
283 others will remain in effect (e.g., public procurement rules, hygiene standards, industrial
284 equipment already on site, price levels set by prior negotiations with former suppliers, etc.)
285 (Le Velly 2017; see also Klein 2015). Such an analysis backs up the idea of the hybridisation
286 of alternative and conventional practices, but also strengthens the analysis by making the way
287 the researcher establishes the divide between alternative and conventional rules more explicit
288 (in the same vein, see, for a complex system of subscriptions to fish boxes: Le Velly and
289 Dufeu 2016).

290 This reasoning applies as well to conventionalisation. Conventionalisation must also be seen
291 in relation to the project. Several researchers into the conventionalisation of organic
292 agriculture do indeed refer to the principles of IFOAM – the main international organic
293 agriculture movement – to determine on which points and to what extent conventionalisation
294 takes place (Padel et al. 2009, Darnhofer et al. 2010). This type of analysis can already raise
295 the following question: Do these principles make sense to all the actors in the organic sector?
296 It is already more convincing to refer, as Guthman did, to a list of principles set by the organic
297 farmers in the surveyed region (Guthman 2004). Still, referring explicitly to IFOAM's
298 principles already makes things more explicit than many of the research projects that assess
299 conventionalisation according to criteria that do not refer to an explicit project. If the project

300 as a function of which conventionalisation is assessed is not made explicit, analysis tends to
301 turn the alternative and conventional references used to assess practices into essentials. Under
302 such conditions, it is possible to wonder, along with Angela Tregaer, whether the research that
303 is most critical of conventionalisation refers more to the researchers' projects than to those of
304 the actors concerned (Tregear 2011).

305 **2. Definition and properties of the notion of project**

306 The arguments broached in the first part of this article plead in favour of taking account of the
307 project in analysing alternative food networks. To continue in this direction, it is now
308 necessary to specify the properties that I associate with this notion. For this, I shall rely on the
309 work of French sociologists involved in a more general questioning of “organised action”. I
310 shall start by giving a definition of the project (Section 2.1.), and then clarify the respective
311 contributions of projects and rules in constituting collective action as I see them (Section
312 2.2.).

313 ***2.1. Definition of “project”***

314 In everyday French, the word “projet” echoes a wide range of different types of reality that
315 are also expressed by terms such as plan, programme, intention, strategy, idea, etc. Most
316 important, the notion of “project” as a “plan for the future” is not a well-established
317 sociological concept. For example, it is not found in any of the major dictionaries of sociology
318 published by Oxford, Cambridge, Routledge, Blackwell, and Sage. Introducing the notion of
319 “project”, with its implications of creativity, vision, and purposiveness, into the analysis of
320 alternative food networks thus requires starting by specifying the properties of this notion.

321 In French sociology, a substantial effort was made to do just that in the founding texts of
322 Jean-Pierre Boutinet and Jean-Daniel Reynaud (Boutinet 1990, Reynaud 1997) and the more
323 recent publications of Jean-Pierre Bréchet and his co-authors (Bréchet et al. 2009, Bréchet and
324 Prouteau 2010). The latter defined the project as “a fuzzy operative expectation of a desired
325 future” (Bréchet et al. 2009, p. 41). The project is an operative by means of which individuals
326 imagine a future that they deem desirable and conceive of its broad characteristics. The
327 project that is so defined can be individual or collective. It can be a personal project or a
328 corporate plan. However, in the second case, one must add issues of coordination. To be able
329 to act together, people must have common landmarks that give meaning and direction to the
330 creation and evolution of the collective.

331 The definition used herein belongs to this vein of work. I see the project as the reasons and
332 ends that a collective gives itself to orient its action towards a desired future. Let us consider
333 this definition in three steps.

334 First, this definition puts the notion of project in the realm of the general questioning about
335 the inception of collective action, for the “collective” in the definition can be a business,
336 trades union, NGO, or any other organisation. However, it is interesting to go beyond this
337 strictly “organisational” vision to include observable phenomena of more “market-related”
338 collectives, such as supply chains and market places, in its scope. Such a broadening of the
339 notion does not lack theoretical foundations. For the sociology of organised action, both
340 organisations and markets are plagued by common coordination problems: It is necessary to
341 distribute labour, set wages, determine desirable and unacceptable behaviours, agree on the
342 principles of evaluating people and goods, etc., in both cases (Friedberg 1997). The
343 perspective adopted is thus close to that of pragmatist sociology, a current developed in the
344 economy of conventions in particular. To deal with the many coordination issues linked to
345 carrying out collective action, be it in an organisation or on a market, the collective must be
346 organised on the basis of shared landmarks (Thévenot 1984). Stated in the terms of actor-
347 network theory (ANT), organisations and markets alike share the property of being “hybrid
348 collectives”, “agencements” in which human and non-human actors (rules, laws, devices, etc.)
349 act in concert (Callon and Law 1995, Çalişkan and Callon 2010). Reasoning in these terms is
350 particularly relevant for working on alternative food networks. A CSA network, fair trade
351 network, relocalised supply chains, slow food convivium, and so on are all initiatives that can
352 be considered good examples of “collectives” informed by their actors' projects.ⁱ

353 Second, this definition of the project leads us to look closely at the “reasons and ends”, the
354 simultaneously interpretive, cognitive, and normative frameworks underlying the inception of
355 collective action. The fair trade project as expressed repeatedly in the various “charters” and
356 “statements of principles” and promotional materials alike illustrates this point. It includes
357 denouncing the malfunctions of “conventional trade” (low prices paid to farmers, poor
358 working and living conditions, etc.), identifying the causes of this situation (greediness of
359 trade intermediaries, speculation on agricultural commodities, etc.), asserting the aims of fair
360 trade (making farmers autonomous, establishing a “fair price”, etc.), and identifying some
361 major principles (guaranteeing a minimum price, creating long-lasting partnerships, etc.). This
362 whole determines the meaning and direction of work. The project is the engine: The discourse
363 that it generates justifies doing something, acting in favour of fair trade. Next, it is a reference

364 that orients action, a guide for establishing “alternative rules” that set the promise of
365 difference in motion. Finally, it is a framework for assessment. As we shall see in the third
366 part, the performance, be it good or bad, of fair trade networks is judged according to the ends
367 that are stated in the project.

368 Third, writing that the project is turned toward conceiving of a more desirable future is aimed
369 at thinking of the project as being relevant to a specific dimension of agency or mode of
370 action. “What is agency?” (Emirbayer and Mische 1998; see Bréchet and Prouteau 2010) is an
371 article that must be read for its invaluable contributions in this regard. In it, Mustafa
372 Emirbayer and Ann Mische identify three major dimensions of agency. They make a first
373 distinction between the "iterative" and "practical evaluative" dimensions of agency, i.e.,
374 routine versus reflective action. Then, referring in particular to the work of Hans Joas (Joas
375 1996), they underline human beings' creativity, their abilities to imagine new states of the
376 world and to launch their construction. They call this third dimension of agency “projective”.
377 Each mode of action belongs to a different time frame: Whilst iterative agency takes the form
378 of a reiteration of past actions and practical evaluative agency involves assessing current
379 actions, projective agency marks the ability to imagine and to conceive broadly of other
380 actions for the future. Recognising this third dimension of agency thus leads one to think of
381 the collective's ability to initiate its own transformation through its projects for the future.
382 According to Mische, the project is like a magic rope: Once the actors have thrown it in front
383 of themselves, their project becomes the ladder of their own ascension (Mische 2009).

384 Such a notion of the project can contribute considerably to the study of “food utopias” such as
385 researchers in rural sociology have recently embarked upon (Stock et al. 2015). Just as in
386 these investigations, referring to the project allows one to study how the criticism levelled at
387 conventional systems fuels experiments and processes of change. In addition, by emphasising
388 the actors' creativity and possible transformations of food systems, such reference to the
389 project shares with this vein of research a scientific stance that is deliberately a vector of hope
390 (Carolan 2013, Forney 2016, Kristensen and Kjeldsen 2016; see also Gibson-Graham 2008).

391 *2.2. Projects and rules*

392 After this first effort to define the notion of a project, I shall continue to rely on the sociology
393 of organised action to show how rules and projects are connected. Such clarification is
394 necessary in order not to overestimate the place of the project in the scheme of things.

395 First it is necessary to point out that the creation of a collective involves both projects and
396 rules. This point has been stressed most particularly in the sociology of organised action by
397 Reynaud and sociologists following in his wake (Reynaud 1997, Reynaud 2003, Terssac and
398 Lalande 2002, Segrestin 2004, Bréchet et al. 2009). Denis Segrestin, for example, stressed the
399 importance of the “founding utopias”, of the “projects set by their actors” that were
400 instrumental in the development of numerous organisational innovations in France in the
401 1980s (innovations regarding quality management, outsourcing, partnerships, and so on). In
402 his opinion, all these developments have to be understood as occurring at the intersection of
403 changes in rules and changes in projects. For example, skills management was promoted and
404 the rules governing salaried employment were revised in the name of a new way of
405 considering the value of labour and the career. Such an approach prevents overestimating the
406 centrality of rules and of projects alike: Without a project, rules have no meaning, but without
407 rules, projects cannot be implemented. Projects and rules make interwoven contributions to
408 the creation and development of collectives.

409 Next it is necessary to establish clearly that the projects do not determine the rules
410 mechanically and the rules are not the direct application of the project. To underscore this
411 point, the researchers defending the notion of the project usually point out that projects are
412 “blurry”, “vague” references. Reynaud explains that the project must be understood not as
413 “well-determined objectives and a plan to achieve them” but rather as “a social adventure
414 with a horizon that remains vague” (Reynaud 2003, p. 112). Let us remember as well that
415 Bréchet and his colleagues define the project as “a fuzzy operative expectation of a desired
416 future” (Bréchet et al. 2009, p. 41). Similarly, Emirbayer and Mische explain that the project's
417 sights are set on “an often vague and indeterminate future horizon” (Emirbayer and Mische
418 1998, p. 989). Finally, whilst Segrestin sees himself as echoing the cultural frames that inspire
419 organisational innovations, he is far from making them the only determinants of change. On
420 the subject of management software packages, for example, he writes, “the tool is saturated
421 with more or less antinomic utopias. It is thus in a weak state and forced to let its users choose
422 between contrary causes whenever they come up” (Segrestin 2004, p. 316).

423 I concur with this position that projects are fuzzy references. Insisting on this is by no means
424 an attempt to criticise them for a lack of robustness. That would be a classical type of
425 reasoning in the sociology of organised action identical to the reasoning used with regard to
426 the ambiguousness of the rules that apply (Crozier and Friedberg 1980): In the same way as
427 the rules do not determine the action completely, but always leave some room for manoeuvre,

428 the project does not determine the rules completely. Consequently, setting the project in
429 motion can only be the result of arbitration and negotiation.

430 **3. From the project to the rules: Two brief fair trade case studies**

431 To illustrate these theoretical developments, let us refer to two surveys carried out on two fair
432 trade organisations, namely, the federation Artisans du Monde and Fairtrade International.
433 Like other alternative food networks, fair trade has been described as a hybrid space, mixing
434 alternative and conventional devices (Whatemore and Thorne 1997). Research also
435 highlighted some conventionalisation trends and observed different levels of alternativeness
436 amongst various fair trade organisations (Raynolds et al. 2007, Jaffee 2010). It is useful to
437 identify the fair trade project clearly as the reference against which such judgements are
438 made. This reference is present, more or less explicitly, in researchers' work, but it is also
439 present in fair trade promoters' minds. In this third part, I shall show that the fair trade project
440 is an important landmark for the establishment of fair trade rules. But, I shall also show that
441 the project's fuzziness generates arbitration and negotiation. With the Artisans du Monde case
442 we shall see how the rules that govern fair trade networks are the result of arbitrating amongst
443 the various goals of the fair trade project (Section 3.1). The Fairtrade International case also
444 heads in this direction, with a focus on one central rule, namely, setting a fair minimum price
445 (Section 3.2.).

446 *3.1. Artisans du Monde: Rules that result from arbitrating amongst the goals of the* 447 *project*

448 The federation Artisans du Monde carried out a survey in the first half of the 2000s to assess
449 the impact of its action on the producers' organisations with which it had long-standing fair
450 trade relations.ⁱⁱ A major result of this study was to highlight how diverse the supply chains
451 established with these farmers/producers were. The federation's activists were informed of
452 this result at national or regional general meetings, training sessions, new product range
453 presentation days, and so on, and I attended quite a few of those events at the time. The
454 federation's leaders emphasised the findings that might appear to be upsetting. It was thus
455 interesting to see how the attending activists received these findings. These situations gave
456 insights into how the activists referred to the fair trade project to assess the various supply
457 chains that had been set up. Their feeling was that it was impossible to comply with all the

458 principles and aims of fair trade simultaneously. The rules that were established were the
459 results of arbitrating amongst and ranking the various components of the project.

460 The ways that the various fair trade supply chains did or did not make it possible to work with
461 highly marginalised producers were the crux of the discussions. Asserting the ability to
462 provide outlets for organisations of “marginalised producers” that are unable to develop in
463 conventional trade supply chains because of their members' disabilities or discriminations of
464 all sorts is an important objective of the fair trade project. Yet, for all that, in practice this
465 principle frequently comes up against two other principles of fair trade, to wit, (1) achieving
466 autonomy for the producers through the market and (2) providing quality products. The
467 project thus affirms the objectives of reinforcing the producers' organisations so that they do
468 not depend on fair trade purchases and ensuring an egalitarian North/South partnership
469 (“Trade, not charity”). When the findings of the study of their work's impact were shared with
470 the base, the latter observed with regret that while the long-standing relations that had been
471 established with highly marginalised groups of farmers and craftsmen had indeed improved
472 these groups' daily lot, they had not generated any development processes. In particular, the
473 marginalised producers had not become autonomous players, given the poor quality of their
474 products and small sales volumes. On the other hand, the attending activists learnt, with just
475 as much uneasiness, that the commercially most dynamic supply chains, those from which the
476 network bought the largest amounts, involved organisations that had numerous outlets,
477 including outside the realm of fair trade. In such cases, was it possible to continue speaking of
478 “marginalised producers”? So, even though certain activists were personally more
479 comfortable with one or the other of these two types of supply chain, none of them seemed
480 completely happy with these findings. On the contrary, everyone saw quite clearly that the
481 fair trade project was not fully achieved in either of the two cases.

482 If truth be told, certain supply chains seemed to have solved this problem. However, they
483 managed to do so only by moving away from another aim of fair trade, that of establishing
484 direct, personalised relations with the producers' organisations. An important conclusion of
485 the study of Artisan du Monde's impact was that it was possible to work with marginalised
486 producers whilst engaging autonomisation processes by means of the market. However, that
487 entailed the intervention of development organisations and central export offices to support
488 the producers' efforts to organise and to raise the quality of their produce or goods. This type
489 of supply chain thus led to the establishment of relations involving a large number of
490 intermediaries between the activists manning the points of sale and the “small

491 farmers/craftsmen”, to the point of making the latter invisible behind the development
492 organisations that represented them (Ballet and Carimentrand 2010). What is more, it could
493 also be marked by a strong tendency to adjust product design to meet Western consumers’
494 tastes, even to the point of going against one last fair trade principle that is frequently asserted
495 with regard to handicrafts, namely, respect for local know-how and cultural authenticity
496 (Grimes and Milgram 2000).

497 The fair trade project is “fuzzy”, “vague”, and “ambiguous” (for comparable findings for a
498 domestic fair trade project, see Feyereisen et al. 2017, and for food sovereignty, see Wald
499 2015). Implementing it through specific rules entails arbitrating and establishing a hierarchy
500 of its various components. In no way does showing this mean denying the importance of the
501 project. All the arbitration that is done continues to be guided by the project. The mixed
502 feelings of Artisans du Monde’s activists in respect of the impact study findings attest to that.
503 Even if the project is not a perfect template for their collective action, it nonetheless is indeed
504 a landmark, a source of intelligibility and structural guidance for it.

505 *3.2. Fairtrade International: setting a fair minimum price*

506 The fuzziness of the fair trade project is also important to determine in which interpretive and
507 normative framework a central rule is established, that of setting the minimum prices at which
508 Fairtrade International buys from producers. Whilst such minimum prices are not set in all fair
509 trade supply chains, they are for most of the agricultural commodities certified by Fairtrade
510 International, which is the principal global fair trade standards body.ⁱⁱⁱ

511 Fairtrade International’s minimum price standards are updated periodically according to a
512 specific procedure that goes from an official request by a stakeholder to the decision taken by
513 the Standards Committee. Between these two points, Fairtrade International organises a public
514 consultation, commissions studies, and drafts proposals for modifications. The Standards
515 Committee then arbitrates amongst the various options. A Fairtrade International document
516 sums up the principles that are supposed to guide the setting of these minimum prices as
517 shown below. This text is remarkable in that it seems to say everything and its contrary!

518 The Fairtrade minimum price (FMP) is based on the principle of covering average costs
519 of sustainable production of the products, while enabling the average producer to
520 produce in an economic and financial [sic] sustainable way without systematic
521 economic losses. This requires not only covering the average costs of sustainable
522 production but also considering market acceptance to ensure that the FMP does not

523 compromise the ability to sell the product. The FMP is thus designed as a floor price
524 which covers the average costs of sustainable production (which can be calculated by
525 use of the sheet in Annex 1) of producers and at the same time allows these producers to
526 have access to their product markets. This can imply that the FMP is fixed below the
527 average costs of sustainable production. (Fairtrade International, Standard operating
528 procedure development of Fairtrade minimum prices and premiums, January 2015)

529 In practice, the setting of a minimum price can indeed refer to one (“covering costs of
530 sustainable production”) or the other (“considering market acceptance”) of these two
531 rationales. In 2007, Juliane Reinecke spent six months observing the way the Standards
532 Committee worked (Reinecke 2010). At the time of her investigation, this committee was
533 composed of two representatives of producers organisations, two representatives of the
534 importers, and two representatives of the network's “national initiatives”. The committee had
535 to respond at the time to the request of the Latin American Confederation of Certified
536 Producers^{iv} to increase the minimum price of coffee. To back up their request, the South
537 American coffee farmers produced detailed data on their rising costs and falling purchasing
538 power. However, Reinecke explains, some of the Standards Committee members contested
539 the relevance and objectiveness of the computations. It was also argued that a high price
540 policy could help to keep economically inefficient producers organisations in the system.
541 Finally, the risk of losing outlets was also put forward. In other words, imposing a high
542 minimum price was seen as possibly generating sales prices that were too high for consumers
543 but also carrying the risk of prompting some market operators to leave the Fairtrade network.
544 These arguments prevailed, and the committee finally decided to raise the minimum price, but
545 by a smaller amount than requested by the Latin American producers' confederation (Bacon
546 2010).

547 Such negotiations within the bodies of Fairtrade International can obviously be interpreted as
548 the expression of conflicts and balances of power amongst the various actors in the system
549 (Renard 2005, Reynolds et al. 2007). Yet, for all that, these conflicts gain from being
550 examined in detail in light of the ambiguousness of the fair trade project and the bargaining
551 space that it allows. Increasing a minimum price to allow for the rising costs of sustainable
552 production and not increasing it to allow for market restraints are two contrary positions that
553 refer to the same project. Whilst the search for high prices is justified by the desire to support
554 the efforts made by more ecological production systems and to improve the producers' living
555 conditions, the possibility of setting prices below these same costs cannot be ruled out if the

556 end result is to generate sales and trigger more extensive development processes. The
557 fuzziness of the fair trade project is precisely what enables the various parties to refer to one
558 or the other of its dimensions to justify and develop its strategy.

559 **Conclusions**

560 This article argues in favour of introducing the notion of project in the analysis of alternative
561 food networks. I believe that this notion fills a gap in existing research. It provides a solid
562 foundation for the very use of the term “alternative”, to wit: Fair trade, short supply chains,
563 organic agriculture, local produce, etc., deserve to be studied as “alternative” systems because
564 these collectives are motivated by the promise of difference that their projects harbour.
565 Working on the alternative/conventional hybridisations that make up alternative food
566 networks then amounts to identifying the rules that are specifically established to set this
567 promise of difference in motion, i.e., “alternative rules”, and to analyse how these alternative
568 rules connect with the pre-existing conventional rules. Similarly, and still from this
569 perspective, the degree of conventionalisation of an alternative network will be measured by
570 the yardstick of the alternative ends that the project asserts rather than by referring to a
571 general ideal of alternativeness.

572 After putting forward these arguments, I clarified the properties of the notion of project and
573 proposed a definition that restores the importance of the cultural and cognitive frameworks
574 that support the creation of collective action and recognises the agents' creative ability to
575 imagine and to construct new states of the world. I also stressed the way the project and rules
576 participate jointly in constituting the collective. I explained that the project must not be seen
577 as a clear determinant of the rules but rather as a fuzzy landmark, a “vague horizon”. Setting
578 the rules must not be mistaken for implementing the project directly, which results instead
579 from the interpretation of and negotiations that take place around the project (.

580 Other contributions will be necessary to further our understanding of the role of the project in
581 alternative food networks. In particular, field surveys are required to grasp better how their
582 projects take shape. Several sub-questions on this point can be identified. Recognising human
583 beings' ability to act projectively, as Emirbayer and Mische (1998) urge us to do, must not
584 lead to losing sight of the actors' unequal abilities to envision new states of the world. The
585 ability to contest existing rules in order to draw up new collectives is a sociological property
586 that must be understood better. Which networks and knowledge are necessary to imagine new
587 states of the world (Goodman et al. 2012)? How do the multiple socio-technical lock-ins that

588 constrain action prevent the emergence of projects that promise alternatives (Lamine et al.
589 2012)? Finally, how are the projects affirmed in action, through experiments and learning
590 processes in which projects and rules are constantly being redefined?

591 It is also necessary to improve our understanding of how the various scales of projects are
592 embedded in each other. Concretely, fair trade and organic agriculture alike are subtended by
593 a general project that is expressed in “charters” or “principles” by the collectives of
594 organisations that operate on the international (World Fair Trade Organisations, International
595 Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements) or national (French Fair Trade Platform,
596 National Federation of Organic Farming in the case of France) scale. However, whilst they
597 identify with these general projects, organisations also assert their own fair trade or organic
598 agriculture projects. This is, for instance, the case of the French fair trade federation
599 Fédération Artisans du Monde and Norabio, an organic agriculture cooperative in the north of
600 France. What is interesting in these two cases is that the overall project remains a reference
601 that exerts a very strong attractive force, to the point that organisations with opposing
602 strategies regarding, for example, selling through supermarkets continue to refer to the same
603 ends and general principles. The mobilising force of the project does not require the
604 individuals who identify with it to adopt it totally. Once again, thinking of the project as being
605 fuzzy, and thus having the ability to unite actors whose aims are not identical, avoids the
606 pitfall of an overly culturalist perspective.

607 Finally, it is also important to grasp how a general project can produce an economic sector
608 such as fair trade or organic agriculture when the project itself is a vague or fuzzy reference.
609 On the one hand, the fuzziness of fair trade and organic agriculture is a strength in that it
610 allows the construction of economic sectors that include a great variety of actors and positions
611 (Kjeldsen and Ingemann 2009, Rosin and Campbell 2009). But, on the other hand, it is also a
612 weakness, in that the different interpretations of the project can lead to such divergent rules as
613 to jeopardise the unity of the sector. By no means does including the project in the analysis
614 overestimate its power in social processes. Its power as much as its weakness is precisely
615 what must be explored.

616 **Acknowledgements**

617 I gratefully acknowledge the help provided by Stéphanie Barral, Jean-Pierre Bréchet, Ivan
618 Dufeu, Olivier De Schutter, Sophie Dubuisson-Quellier, Frédéric Goulet, Moya Kneafsey,
619 Diane Rodet, Bettina Bock and Sociologia Ruralis’s reviewers for comments on earlier

620 versions of this paper. I also thank Gabrielle Leyden for the quality of her translation. This
621 research has been funded by the French National Research Agency (grant ANR-15-CE21-
622 0006 'Institutionnalisation des agroécologies').

623 **References**

624 Bacon, C.M. (2010) Who decides what is fair in fair trade? The agri-environmental
625 governance of standards, access, and price. *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 37 (1) pp. 111-147

626 Balineau, G. and I. Dufeu (2010) Are fair trade goods credence goods? A new proposal, with
627 French illustrations. *Journal of Business Ethics* 92 (2) pp. 331-345

628 Ballet, J. and A. Carimentrand (2010) Fair trade and the depersonalization of ethics. *Journal*
629 *of Business Ethics* 92 (2) pp. 317-330

630 Boutinet, J.-P. (1990) *Anthropologie du projet* (Paris: PUF)

631 Bréchet, J.-P. and L. Prouteau (2010) A la recherche de l'entrepreneur. Au-delà du modèle du
632 choix rationnel : Une figure de l'agir projectif. *Revue française de socio-Economie* (6) pp.
633 109-130

634 Bréchet, J.-P., N. Schieb-Bienfait and A. Desreumaux (2009) Les figures de l'entrepreneur
635 dans une théorie de l'action fondée sur le projet. *Revue de l'entrepreneuriat* 8 (1) pp. 37-53

636 Çalişkan, K. and M. Callon (2010) Economization, part 2: A research programme for the
637 study of markets. *Economy and Society* 39 (1) pp. 1-32

638 Callon, M. and J. Law (1995) Agency and the hybrid «collectif». *The South Atlantic quarterly*
639 94 (2) pp. 481-507

640 Carolan, M.S. (2013) The wild side of agro-food studies: On co-experimentation, politics,
641 change, and hope. *Sociologia Ruralis* 53 (4) pp. 413-431

642 Cleveland, D.A., N.M. Müller, A.C. Tranovich, D.N. Mazaroli and K. Hinson (2014) Local
643 food hubs for alternative food systems: A case study from Santa Barbara county, California.
644 *Journal of rural studies* 35 (1) pp. 26-36

645 Crozier, M. and E. Friedberg (1980) *Actors and systems: The politics of collective action*
646 (Chicago: Chicago University Press)

647 Darnhofer, I., T. Lindenthal, R. Bartel-Kratochvil and W. Zollitsch (2010)
648 Conventionalisation of organic farming practices: From structural criteria towards an

649 assessment based on organic principles. A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*
650 30 (1) pp. 67-81

651 DiVito Wilson, A. (2013) Beyond alternative: Exploring the potential for autonomous food
652 spaces. *Antipode* 45 (3) pp. 719-737

653 Emirbayer, M. and A. Mische (1998) What is agency? *American journal of sociology* 103 (4)
654 pp. 962-1023

655 Feyereisen, M., P.M. Stassart and F. Mélard (2017) Fair trade milk initiative in Belgium:
656 Bricolage as an empowering strategy for change. *Sociologia Ruralis* 57 (3) pp. 297-315

657 Forney, J. (2016) Enacting Swiss cheese: About the multiple ontologies of local food. Pp. 67-
658 81 in R. Leheron, H. Campbell, N. Lewis and M. Carolan eds., *Biological economies:*
659 *Experimentation and the politics of agri-food frontiers* (London and New York: Routledge)

660 Friedberg, E. (1997) *Local orders: Dynamics of organized action* (Greenwich: Jai Press)

661 Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2008) Diverse economies: Performative practices for 'other worlds'.
662 *Progress in Human Geography* 32 (5) pp. 613-632

663 Goodman, D. (2004) Rural Europe redux? Reflections on alternative agro-food networks and
664 paradigm change. *Sociologia Ruralis* 44 (1) pp. 3-16

665 Goodman, D., M. DuPuis and M. Goodman (2012) *Alternative food networks. Knowledge,*
666 *practice and politics* (London: Routledge)

667 Goodman, D. and M.J. Watts (eds.) (1997) *Globalising food: Agrarian questions and global*
668 *restructuring* (London, Routledge)

669 Grimes, K.M. and B.L. Milgram (eds.) (2000) *Artisans and cooperatives: Developing*
670 *alternative trade for the global economy* (Tucson, University of Arizona Press)

671 Guthman, J. (2004) *Agrarian dreams: The paradox of organic farming in California*
672 (Berkeley: University of California Press)

673 Hendrickson, M.K. and W.D. Heffernan (2002) Opening spaces through relocalization:
674 Locating potential resistance in the weaknesses of the global food system. *Sociologia Ruralis*
675 42 (4) pp. 347-369

676 Hinrichs, C.C. (2000) Embeddedness and local food systems: Notes on two types of direct
677 agricultural market. *Journal of rural studies* 16 (3) pp. 295-303

678 Hinrichs, C.C. (2003) The practice and politics of food system localization. *Journal of rural*
679 *studies* 19 (1) pp. 33-45

680 Ilbery, B. and D. Maye (2005) Alternative (shorter) food supply chains and specialist
681 livestock products in the Scottish - English borders. *Environment and planning A* 37 (5) pp.
682 823-844

683 Jaffee, D. (2010) Fair trade standards, corporate participation, and social movement responses
684 in the United States. *Journal of Business Ethics* 92 (2) pp. 267-285

685 Jarosz, L. (2008) The city in the country: Growing alternative food networks in metropolitan
686 areas. *Journal of rural studies* 24 (3) pp. 231-244

687 Joas, H. (1996) *The creativity of action* (Cambridge: Polity press)

688 Kirwan, J. (2004) Alternative strategies in the UK agro-food system: Interrogating the alterity
689 of farmers' markets. *Sociologia Ruralis* 44 (4) pp. 395-415

690 Kjeldsen, C. and J.H. Ingemann (2009) From the social to the economic and beyond? A
691 relational approach to the historical development of Danish organic food networks. *Sociologia*
692 *Ruralis* 49 (2) pp. 151-171

693 Klein, K. (2015) Values-based food procurement in hospitals: The role of health care group
694 purchasing organizations. *Agriculture and human values* 32 (4) pp. 635-648

695 Kloppenburg, J., Jr., J. Hendrickson and G.W. Stevenson (1996) Coming in to the foodshed.
696 *Agriculture and human values* 13 (3) pp. 33-42

697 Kneafsey, M., L. Holloway, L. Venn, E. Dowler, R. Cox and H. Tuomainen (2008)
698 *Reconnecting consumers, producers and food: Exploring alternatives* (Oxford: Berg
699 Publishers)

700 Kristensen, D.K. and C. Kjeldsen (2016) Imagining and doing agro-food futures otherwise:
701 Exploring the pig city experiment in the foodscape of Denmark. *Journal of rural studies* 43 pp.
702 40-48

703 Lamine, C., H. Renting, A. Rossi, J.S.C. Wiskerke and G. Brunori (2012) Agri-food systems
704 and territorial development: Innovations, new dynamics and changing governance
705 mechanisms. Pp. 229-256 in I. Darnhofer, D. Gibbon and B. Dedieu eds., *Farming systems*
706 *research into the 21st century: The new dynamic* (Springer Netherlands)

707 Latour, B. (2005) *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory* (Oxford:
708 Oxford University Press)

709 Le Velly, R., 2017. *Sociologie des systèmes alimentaires alternatifs. Une promesse de*
710 *différence*. Presses des Mines, Paris.

711 Le Velly, R. and I. Dufeu (2016) Alternative food networks as “market agencements”:
712 Exploring their multiple hybridities. *Journal of rural studies* 43 pp. 173-182

713 Marsden, T., J. Banks and G. Bristow (2000) Food supply chain approaches: Exploring their
714 role in rural development. *Sociologia Ruralis* 40 (4) pp. 424-438

715 Maxey, L. (2007) From ‘alternative’ to ‘sustainable’ food. Pp. 55-75 in D. Maye, L. Holloway
716 and M. Kneafsey eds., *Alternative food geographies. Representation and practice* (Bingley:
717 Emerald)

718 Milestad, R., R. Bartel-Kratochvil, H. Leitner and P. Axmann (2010) Being close: The quality
719 of social relationships in a local organic cereal and bread network in lower Austria. *Journal of*
720 *rural studies* 26 (3) pp. 228-240

721 Mische, A. (2009) Projects and possibilities: Researching futures in action. *Sociological*
722 *Forum* 24 (3) pp. 694-704

723 Morgan, K., T. Marsden and J. Murdoch (2006) *Worlds of food: Place, power, and*
724 *provenance in the food chain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

725 Morgan, K. and R. Sonnino (2008) *The school food revolution: Public food and the challenge*
726 *of sustainable development* (London: Earthscan)

727 Mundler, P. (2007) Les associations pour le maintien de l’agriculture paysanne (amap) en
728 Rhône-Alpes, entre marché et solidarité. *Ruralia* (20) online

729 Murdoch, J., T. Marsden and J. Banks (2000) Quality, nature, and embeddedness: Some
730 theoretical considerations in the context of the food sector. *Economic Geography* 76 (2) pp.
731 107-125

732 Padel, S., H. Röcklinsberg and O. Schmid (2009) The implementation of organic principles
733 and values in the European regulation for organic food. *Food Policy* 34 (3) pp. 245-251

734 Ponte, S. (2016) Convention theory in the anglophone agro-food literature: Past, present and
735 future. *Journal of rural studies* 44 pp. 12-23

- 736 Raynolds, L.T. (2000) Re-embedding global agriculture: The international organic and fair
737 trade movements. *Agriculture and human values* 17 (3) pp. 297-309
- 738 Raynolds, L.T., D.L. Murray and J. Wilkinson (eds.) (2007) *Fair trade. The challenges of*
739 *transforming globalization* (New York, Routledge)
- 740 Reinecke, J. (2010) Beyond a subjective theory of value and towards a 'fair price': An
741 organizational perspective on Fairtrade minimum price setting. *Organization* 17 (5) pp. 563-
742 581
- 743 Renard, M.-C. (1999) The interstices of globalization: The example of fair coffee. *Sociologia*
744 *Ruralis* 39 (4) pp. 484-500
- 745 Renard, M.-C. (2005) Quality certification, regulation and power in fair trade. *Journal of rural*
746 *studies* 21 (4) pp. 419-431
- 747 Renting, H., M. Schermer and A. Rossi (2012) Building food democracy: Exploring civic
748 food networks and newly emerging forms of food citizenship. *International journal of*
749 *sociology of agriculture and food* 19 (3) pp. 289-307
- 750 Reynaud, J.-D. (1997) *Les règles du jeu. L'action collective et la régulation sociale* (third
751 edition) (Paris: Armand Colin)
- 752 Reynaud, J.-D. (2003) Régulation de contrôle, régulation autonome et régulation conjointe.
753 Pp. 3-36 in G. Terssac de ed., *La théorie de la régulation sociale de Jean-Daniel Reynaud.*
754 *Débats et prolongements* (Paris: La découverte)
- 755 Rosin, C. and H. Campbell (2009) Beyond bifurcation: Examining the conventions of organic
756 agriculture in New Zealand. *Journal of rural studies* 25 (1) pp. 35-47
- 757 Segrestin, D. (2004) *Les chantiers du manager* (Paris: Armand Colin)
- 758 Shreck, A. (2002) Just bananas? Fair trade banana production in the Dominican Republic.
759 *International journal of sociology of agriculture and food* 10 (2) pp. 13-23
- 760 Sonnino, R. and T. Marsden (2006) Beyond the divide: Rethinking relationships between
761 alternative and conventional food networks in Europe. *Journal of Economic Geography* 6 (2)
762 pp. 181-199
- 763 Stock, P., V., M. Carolan and C. Rosin (eds.) (2015) *Food utopias. Reimagining citizenship,*
764 *ethics and community* (London, Routledge)

765 Taylor, P.L., D.L. Murray and L.T. Reynolds (2005) Keeping trade fair: Governance
766 challenges in the fair trade coffee initiative. *Sustainable Development* 13 (3) pp. 199-208

767 Terssac, G.d. and K. Lalande (2002) *Du train à vapeur au TGV: Sociologie du travail*
768 *d'organisation* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France)

769 Thévenot, L. (1984) Rules and implements: Investment in forms. *Social Science Information*
770 23 (1) pp. 1-45

771 Tregear, A. (2011) Progressing knowledge in alternative and local food networks: Critical
772 reflections and a research agenda. *Journal of rural studies* 27 (4) pp. 419-430

773 van der Ploeg, J.D., H. Renting, G. Brunori, K. Knickel, J. Mannion, T. Marsden, K. De
774 Roest, E. Sevilla-Guzmán and F. Ventura (2000) Rural development: From practices and
775 policies towards theory. *Sociologia Ruralis* 40 (4) pp. 391-408

776 Wald, N. (2015) Towards utopias of prefigurative politics and food sovereignty: Experiences
777 of politicised peasant food production. Pp. 107-125 in P.V. Stock, M. Carolan, C. Rosin, eds.,
778 *Food utopias. Reimagining citizenship, ethics and community* (London & New York:
779 Routledge)

780 Watts, D., B. Ilbery and D. Maye (2005) Making reconnections in agro-food geography:
781 Alternative systems of food provision. *Progress in Human Geography* 29 (1) pp. 22-40

782 Weatherell, C., A. Tregear and J. Allinson (2003) In search of the concerned consumer: UK
783 public perceptions of food, farming and buying local. *Journal of rural studies* 19 (2) pp. 233-
784 244

785 Whatmore, S. and L. Thorne (1997) Nourishing networks: Alternative geographies of food.
786 Pp. 287-304 in D. Goodman and M. Watts eds., *Globalising food: Agrarian questions and*
787 *global restructuring* (New York: Routledge)

ⁱ There are differences between the sociology of organised action and ANT. Some debates have even pitted some of their leading authors against each other. Friedberg (1997) notably challenged the human-non-human symmetry specific to ANT. Latour (2005), for his part, argued that Friedberg's joint analysis of the strategies of actors and the rules of systems fails, like many others, to give an adequate understanding of the social. According to Latour, collective action is the property of heterogeneous actor-networks, while Friedberg emphasises the constitution of "local orders", i.e. stable interaction patterns. However, these differences

should not hide strong convergences. The sociology of organised action and ANT share an endogenous explanation for the constitution of collective action (nothing is explained by exogenous forces) and recognition of the importance of rules and material devices.

ⁱⁱ In 2016, the federation *Artisans du Monde* was composed of 132 associations from all over France. The main activity of these associations is to man points of sale proposing food products and handicrafts that come exclusively from fair trade networks. To that end, rather than buying directly from producers' groups, they put in their orders with their central purchasing office, Solidar'Monde, and other operators. The local groups also conduct educational actions and do advocacy work with the help of the tools that the federation develops.

ⁱⁱⁱ Fairtrade International was founded in 1997 by seventeen “national initiatives” (Fairtrade UK, Max Havelaar France, etc.) with the aim of coordinating their activities. In 2016 it federated twenty-five national initiatives and three certified producers’ organisations from Africa, Latin America, and Asia-Oceania. Its main action consists of drawing up and constantly revising the existing Fairtrade fair trade standards for some fifteen product families. Sales of products bearing the Fairtrade logo amounted to some 7.88 billion euros in 2016 (Fairtrade international, Annual report 2016-2017, 2017).

^{iv} *Coordinadora Latinoamericana y del caribe de pequenos productores de comercio justo*