Manufacturing a Multifunctional Countryside:

Operational Landscapes, Urban Desire, and the French State, 1945–1976

Venus Bivar

Abstract

In "Manufacturing a Multifunctional Countryside: Operational Landscapes, Urban Desire, and the French State, 1945–1976," I argue that rural France was instrumental to the experience of *les trente glorieuses*. Not only did rural France fuel economic growth and urbanization through increases in agricultural efficiency, but it also served as an imaginary counterpoint to the hustle and bustle of a new mass consumer society. In the first two decades of the postwar period, a productivist logic of agricultural output dominated rural land use policy. By the 1970s, however, after experiencing surplus problems, the state turned toward a multifunctional approach. Rural lands were used to create regional parks, environmental preserves, and vacation properties. As both a site of agricultural production and urban consumption, rural France was operationalized in order to further the economic growth that defined *les trente glorieuses*.

Keywords: agriculture, operational landscapes, regional parks, rural tourism, *trente glorieuses*, urban-rural relations

The story of postwar France, of *les trente glorieuses*, is typically imagined as a story of economic growth and urban modernity. At the end of the Second World War, France was still a largely rural and agricultural nation. Farming employed a full 36 percent of the active adult population (as compared to just 5.5 percent in Great Britain, 16 percent in the United States, and 20 percent in the Netherlands).[1] The urban population, modestly defined by those living in

agglomerations of more than two thousand people, hovered just above the 50 percent mark. By the end of *les trente glorieuses*, however, France was thoroughly urban. Just 6 percent of the active adult population was engaged in the agricultural sector and a full 73 percent lived in urban areas.[2] This process of postwar modernization has been well documented from the perspective of French cities.[3] Scholars Sara Pritchard and Michael Bess, however, have begun to demonstrate that the role of rural France was equally important.[4] Capital might have been concentrated in urban areas, but without the resources of the countryside, it would not have grown to such dizzying heights.

In this article, I explore how the territorial logic of the postwar French state mobilized rural France in order to achieve the economic growth that defined *les trente glorieuses*. In particular, I will examine how decisions regarding rural land use led to the remapping of the boundaries, both real and imagined, between urban and rural France. As a scarce resource, land was a highly contested battleground where the interests of urban and rural France were pitted against each other. Urban residents looking to fulfill pastoral fantasies with weekend getaways, environmentalists lobbying for conservation, and farmers defending themselves as producers, were all fighting to fashion the rural landscape to their own image. Through an examination of the interrelated developments of rural tourism, the regional parks system, and environmentalism, I will demonstrate how new patterns of production and consumption worked together to fundamentally remap the ordering of the French landscape.

I argue that the pursuit of economic growth led the French state to transition from a productivist model that emphasized agricultural production to the exclusion of all else to an approach that favored a multifunctional countryside in which agricultural production was just one among many strategies for extracting profit from rural lands. Some have argued that this

transition is best understood as a move from Fordism to Post-Fordism.[5] But that construction suggests that Fordism came to an end in the 1970s, replaced by a new though not unrelated model of production. I would argue, however, that Fordism, or rather productivism, continued to be the primary mode of production. The multifunctional approach was introduced not to replace the productivist model, but rather to rescue it when it was threatened by agricultural surpluses. In the first decade following the end of the Second World War, rural productivity was pursued strictly through the application of an industrial logic to agricultural production (i.e., by mechanization, standardization, and scale).[6] Rural France was in this period operationalized in order to produce the material resources required for urbanization. Enormously successful in terms of productivity, this model quickly led to problems of surplus.

The emergence in the late 1960s of urban consumers in search of rural recreation and environmentalists demanding conservation presented the state with a means of reorienting land use policy that promised to curb agricultural output. As a result, rural lands were set aside for the enjoyment of urban residents, and the environment was recognized as an end in itself, to be protected from unchecked agricultural development. The claims on rural lands made by urban consumers and emerging environmentalists were given equal weight to those made by the nation's farmers—an approach to land use that would have been unthinkable just thirty years earlier. By the 1970s the goal had ceased to be the maximization of farmland and agricultural productivity, and had become instead the development of a multifunctional countryside that could produce leisure opportunities for the increasingly well-off residents of urban France. While the countryside was still primarily operationalized as a site of profitable resource extraction, it had also become an object of urban consumption.[7]

As urban theorist Neil Brenner has demonstrated, the experience of urbanization, and by extension of modernity, is not limited to the physical space of the city itself.[8] Countering mainstream currents in urban studies, Brenner has argued against the examination of cities in isolation from their larger geographical contexts. Rural areas provide the resources required for cities to grow: raw materials, energy, food, and the transportation networks required to move these goods from sites of production to sites of consumption. For Brenner, the urban condition exceeds cityness and extends into what he calls operational landscapes—those rural areas that service urban agglomerations. This is why the tar sands of Alberta, perhaps the most important of North American operational landscapes, serves as the cover image of his recent edited volume, *Implosions/Explosions: Towards a Study of Planetary Urbanization*.[9] When the ability of urban capital to reproduce itself is entirely contingent on the production and consumption of fossil fuels, this might in fact be a better visual representation of the urban condition than the ubiquitous images of the skylines of Manhattan, São Paulo, or Shanghai.

Environmental historian William Cronon makes a similar argument with his *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West*.[10] Taking on the classic frontier thesis of Frederick Jackson Turner, a thesis that posited the rural frontier as distinct from the cities that eventually grew to replace it, Cronon argues that the city and the frontier grew together. In order to understand the growth of capital in the American midwest at the turn of the nineteenth century, the city of Chicago cannot be separated from its hinterlands.

Brenner and Cronon are arguing for an analysis of urban growth and the expansion of capital that takes both city and country into account. To be sure, they arrive at this argument from opposite poles; Brenner highlights the role played by operational landscapes in the development of urban areas, while Cronon stresses the importance of cities to the history of the

American frontier. But ultimately both Brenner and Cronon arrive at the same place. The urban and the rural are inseparable.

There is, however, one key difference in how Brenner and Cronon view the hinterlands. For Brenner, they are engulfed in the process of urbanization. Simply by designating these regions as nothing more than operational landscapes, he strips them of their specificity and transforms them into an urban appendage. To flatten the differences between urban and rural by theorizing a "planetary urbanization" creates a homogenous space in which the rural loses its specificity. Capital, defined as urban, runs roughshod over the landscape. For Cronon, however, the rural midwest retains its own character. It is certainly shaped by urban forces, just as it in turn influences the urban condition. But it nevertheless remains distinct precisely because it is held apart in the imagination of urban and rural inhabitants alike. Whether the distinction between rural and urban is real in any material sense, the symbolic power that the rural, and by extension the natural, continue to hold on the imagination gives the distinction real power.

I would like to call on both Brenner and Cronon to reconceptualize the period of *les trente glorieuses*. First, to borrow from Brenner, the countryside was essential to economic growth and the development of a particular urban condition that came to define French modernity. For example, Kristin Ross' housewives who labored under postwar gender norms were able to prepare food for their families in their new American-style kitchens because farmers were chasing higher yields in order to feed a growing number of consumers.[11] Moreover, efficiencies gained in agricultural production, coupled with subsidies, kept food prices low and provided families with more disposable income to spend on things like kitchen appliances. Rural France literally fueled the growth of *les trente glorieuses*. The stunning transformation of the farm sector, which went from being a backward also-ran to a global powerhouse, was therefore

fundamental to the experience of postwar urbanization. In short, without the postwar boom in agricultural production there would have been no postwar boom in urban France—no car craze, no Yé-Yé, and no New Wave.

Secondly, I would like to draw on Cronon in order to understand the very complicated relationship that arose in the postwar period between urban and rural France. As it was with Chicago and the great west, postwar French urban interests came to dominate those of the countryside. Through this process of domination, rural France was transformed not only into a site of resource extraction, but also into an object of urban desire. As French cities grew and density increased, the so-called natural world of rural France was turned into an escape hatch for those who had grown weary of the urban condition. As Sarah Farmer has demonstrated, nostalgic urban residents consumed rural memoirs and sought out second homes in the countryside in an effort to reconnect with a set of imagined traditions.[12] As *la France profonde* became increasingly celebrated as a space of authenticity and meaning, the real rural France was increasingly subjected to the whims of urban interests, forced to shrink its agricultural population, to produce more with less, and to make do with fewer services as rural out-migration forced the closing of schools and local businesses. The respective experiences of rural and urban France were absolutely interconnected, but they also remained distinct.

While urban women and men enjoyed a progressively higher standard of living with rising incomes, most farmers experienced stagnating, if not declining, relative purchasing power.[13] As a result, many farmers resented the demands that were placed on them in order to drive the growth of urban modernity.[14] Some fought back with roadblocks, using organized protest to demand higher incomes from the state. Others sought to improve their situation by taking advantage of the new productive capacities of the rural landscape, by offering trail rides or

converting old barns into rustic inns. Many farmers played up the characteristics of rural life—barn dances, folk centers, antique furniture—that they assumed urban consumers were looking for when they visited the countryside. But as urban desire, whether real or imagined, came to shape rural life without significantly closing the gap between rural and urban standards of living, relations between town and country grew even more strained.

The degree to which the countryside was obligated to service the needs of urban areas was a highly contested issue. To mitigate the conflicts that erupted between rural and urban France, the state sought to create the right balance between their respective interests by adjudicating the various competing claims that were made on the countryside. This objective was largely pursued through *l'aménagement du territoire*. The term is literally translated as territorial management, and somewhat approximates the English-language regional planning, but in the French case is scaled up to extend to the entire nation. This wing of policy, which was in 1949 incorporated into the Ministère de la Reconstruction et de l'Urbanisme, concerned everything from housing and communications to large-scale land management initiatives that were set up in order to further economic growth.[15] In a nutshell, *l'aménagement du territoire* was designed to pursue the complete rationalization of the French landscape. Every square inch would be managed in the pursuit of productivity.[16]

Maximizing Productivity through Reclamation

Postwar plans for economic growth hinged on both European integration and the development of agricultural exports. It was anticipated that the sale of agricultural goods on foreign markets, including those of the member states belonging to the European Economic Community, would both remedy an enduring balance-of-payments problem and generate the reserves necessary to

purchase those items required for economic modernization. However, given that the productivity of French farmers lagged well behind that of their European neighbors, the French agricultural sector had to be brought up to speed. In advance of the creation of the common market, the French state initiated a wide variety of programs designed to modernize agricultural production. Land reform was introduced in order to consolidate smaller holdings into larger, well-organized operations. Favorable credit terms were made available in order to acquire industrial farming equipment (e.g. tractors, automatic feeders, combine threshers). Subsidies were created to incentivize older farmers to retire and sell their lands to younger producers who had been trained in modern methods. These efforts proved enormously successful. By the end of the 1980s, just 6 percent of the active French population was still working in agriculture—compared with 33 percent at the end of the war.[17] Whereas one French farmer had fed seven people in 1960, a generation later he was feeding forty.[18] In just one generation, France had become the world's second largest exporter of agricultural goods. The sale of food stuffs on foreign markets generated so much capital that the French took to comparing their farm sector to the oil fields of the Middle East, calling it the "green gas" of the economy.[19]

In its pursuit of the increased agricultural productivity necessary to fuel economic growth, the French state instigated the physical alteration of the rural landscape, transforming previously unusable lands into productive holdings. Large-scale drainage and irrigation projects, for instance, were an important component of Marshall Plan aid and postwar planning. In a meeting held in 1948 to discuss agricultural productivity and the technological improvements necessary to its amelioration, it was concluded that roughly one million hectares of French land would have to be drained in order to convert it to agricultural purposes.[20] The profit potential of rural France in this first decade after the war was rooted in an obsession with productivity. The

transformation of previously unproductive lands into profitable operational landscapes were therefore of primary importance.

As part of this mandate, the French state dramatically overhauled the Vernier Marsh in Normandy, reclaiming five hundred hectares of land for area farmers.[21] Paid for with Marshall Plan counterpart funds, the project became something of a showpiece for what government aid and technological know-how could achieve. The project involved large-scale clearings, as well as the construction of complex irrigation systems. Engineering expertise coupled with the totalizing ethos of *l'aménagement du territoire* allowed the French state to dramatically overhaul the landscape, transforming a natural marshland into productive agricultural soil: "On what was once a desolate marsh, we will cultivate wheat, corn, potatoes, and other vegetables, in order to increase the food supply of France."[22]

While the French state pursued the reclamation of unused lands, it applied the same industrial logic of efficiency and rationality to the use of already existing agricultural holdings. As farmers were forced to expand their operations in order to keep up with state expectations for productivity, competition in the market for agricultural lands grew precipitously. In response, the government introduced the Orientation Laws of 1960 and 1962—an omnibus legislative package that included a wide variety of measures designed to support the modernization of the farm sector. With respect to *l'aménagement du territoire*, and the negotiation of competing claims on rural lands, the most important of these measures was the creation of the Société d'aménagement foncier et d'établissement rural (SAFER). The SAFER had offices throughout France and each was tasked with overseeing the real estate market in farmland in its local area. One of the functions of the organization was to secure farmland for enterprising young farmers who might not be able to compete with the deeper pockets of already established peers or urban landlords.

Meanwhile, a sister program offered incentives to older farmers to retire early and cede their lands to the next generation. The assumption behind this mandate was that young farmers were eager to modernize while old farmers remained mired in outdated methods. Every hectare that changed hands between generations was a hectare that served the twin purposes of agricultural productivity and economic growth.

In its first decade of existence, the SAFER focused on maximizing the amount of agricultural lands that could be made available to French farmers. The Commissariat général du Plan was clear in its productivity mandate. As part of the industrial logic, the SAFER assisted farmers in stripping their fields down to the soil. Rural engineers drained marshlands, irrigated arid lands, and cleared forests. They removed hedgerows, stone walls, and other structures, both natural and man-made, that divided up the territory. Historically, these breaks in the landscape had served important functions. Trees and hedgerows offered protection against erosion, root systems provided drainage for waterlogged lands, and physical barriers furnished protection to the soil against strong winds. Just one decade later, those in charge of land use policy would reason against this wholesale destruction of the natural environment. But in the early 1960s, the modernizing ethos of agricultural science and management dictated that the risks associated with drainage or tree removal could be managed without sacrificing a single square inch of productive farmland.

Tourism, Rural Development, and Regional Parks

Making matters worse for farmers who were already in competition with each other for agricultural lands, a new set of claims began to emerge in the 1960s, forcing the SAFER to rethink its mandate, and paving the way for a multifunctional approach to rural land use. By the

end of the decade, urban tourists in search of relaxation in the French countryside, along with environmentalists, began to challenge agricultural claims on rural lands. These new demands on the countryside dovetailed with state plans to convert to other productive purposes those rural areas that were not keeping up with the agricultural modernization mandate. These areas were redesigned in order to make them productive by meeting the needs of urban residents and environmentalists.[23]

Efforts in the 1950s to ramp up productivity in advance of the common market had proven to be extraordinarily successful, possibly too successful. Surpluses in some foodstuffs—particularly wheat, sugar, and wine—were already a problem by the 1960s. In spite of greater productivity, however, French farmers were not improving their revenues. Input prices continued to rise while the state kept food prices low in order to satisfy the needs of a growing number of consumers. As a result of both the surpluses and lagging agricultural incomes, the French state began to rethink its productivist approach to the farm sector, choosing instead to sustain those areas that had successfully modernized while seeking to convert to non-agricultural purposes those areas that had failed to do so. The assumption was that removing these less productive rural areas from the agricultural system would address the surplus problem, while simultaneously creating new opportunities to extract profit from the countryside.

Tourism in particular caught the attention of the state as an alternative means to operationalize those rural areas that were failing to meet the modernization mandate. By injecting rural communities with cash from urban visitors, tourism could supplement rural incomes and incentivize struggling farmers to diversify their revenue streams. Through the 1960s the state published one report after another on how best to harness the economic potential of rural tourism, a phenomenon that was becoming increasingly popular with urban residents.[24] One

representative study from 1963 claimed that the Haute-Loire would be especially well suited to tourism because of its regal mountains and impressive rivers and forests. The same study indicated that an estimated 150,000 to 200,000 vacationers visited the area in July and August of 1961. The report then projected that if 25 percent of the French population had taken a vacation in 1955–1956, rising incomes would mean that up to 40 percent would do so in 1965 and 47 percent in 1970.[25] As the urban population increased, and as the middle class grew more affluent through the boom years of the postwar era, it was anticipated that more French women and men would take vacations and that many of them (presumed to be over-worked by the daily grind of urban living) would look to spend these vacations in the countryside.

These holiday-makers made it possible to reimagine the productive potential of the countryside and to seek new forms of profit extraction in rural France. Accordingly, the Ministry of Agriculture began to reconceive its role within the larger context of economic planning and *l'aménagement du territoire*. Given the new claims being made on rural lands, which were no longer strictly associated with agriculture, the Ministry slowly adopted a new model of intervention, a model that was later dubbed "rural development." In a 1965 article about rural tourism, the major regional daily *Sud Ouest* described the changing priorities of agricultural policy:

> Since it was created by Gambetta, the Ministry of Agriculture has had two priorities: to feed the French and to maintain the countryside in such a way as to allow rural residents to work, move about, and live there as comfortably as possible. Today, this is no longer enough, as recreational activities and the search for relaxation occupy an increasingly important part of the lives of over-worked urban residents, jostled about and poisoned by the smoke and fumes of industry.[26]

Whether the men and women of urban France actually understood themselves as victims of professional burnout and industrial pollution is of secondary importance. What matters is that this is how the state and developers imagined them, and it was this imaginary that justified the expansion of infrastructure for rural tourism.

False assumptions and miscommunication was operating in both directions. While rural boosters imagined an urban population that was overtaxed by the hustle and bustle of city living, urban residents imagined a countryside that was devoid of industrial agriculture, a green oasis that offered rest and recreation. All things peasant had become enormously popular by the 1970s. Shaken by the rapid modernization of the postwar period, urban residents looked to the countryside for a sense of continuity and stability. As Sarah Farmer has argued, rural France "appealed to city dwellers who feared that increased urbanization, the rise of mass consumption and growing dependence on technology was cutting them off from nature."[27] Memoirs about rural life were eaten up by urban readers. Anthropologists and sociologists produced one study of peasant life after another, while Parisians began visiting the Musée national des arts et traditions populaires in droves.[28] Memoir-reading urban residents wanted to visit a countryside that was steeped in traditional folkways, rather than a countryside that was dotted with combine threshers and concentrated animal feeding operations.

The same *Sud Ouest* article revealed that, when surveyed, 83 percent of urban respondents wanted parks to be created in order to facilitate better contact with nature. These respondents envisioned a rural landscape in which certain areas were removed from agricultural production in order to fulfill their desires for peace and quiet. The Ministry of Agriculture, realizing the potential profits involved in turning poorly producing farm areas into picturesque

vacation spots, took it upon itself to transform various rural areas into sites of repose in order to accommodate the disposable-income-spending urban middle classes.[29]

Farmers had mixed feelings about the reorientation of the Ministry of Agriculture and the expansion of rural tourism. Many viewed the arrival of urban visitors as a threat, and worried that increased development would add to competition for lands.[30] For example, when the SAFER of Centre was faced with the possibility of losing good farmland to a second-home owner who wanted to establish a horse-breeding facility, it promptly intervened to safeguard the land for agricultural purposes. SAFER officials maintained that there was simply no way that they were going to allow a second-home owner to acquire new holdings when there were plenty of local farmers in search of lands to improve their operations. Madame Marquenet, the would-be horse breeder, filed a complaint with the Ministry of Agriculture, which prompted the director of the SAFER to explain why he had prevented her from acquiring the land: "We must be aware that, in a commune where farmers are very much in need of expanding their farms, the transformation of a 'résident secondaire' into a [horse breeder], even on a small parcel, might in the future become a threat in the competition to acquire lands."[31] Expecting competition for lands to increase, the SAFER of Centre viewed the Marquenet case as a means of establishing a principled opposition to urban encroachment on agricultural lands.

While over the course of the 1960s the countryside became increasingly bound up with urban fantasies of escape, the end of the decade in particular, served as a major turning point. As historian of agricultural policy Gilbert Noël has noted, 1967 served as a watershed year in which "rural development" supplanted agriculture as the primary means of approaching policy in the French countryside.[32] The link between rural France and agricultural activity was weakening and the state was reorienting land use policy in order to reflect the new uses of rural resources that

had emerged in the former part of the decade. In 1967 Prime-Minister Pompidou formalized this transition to a multifunctional rural economy by announcing a new rural development policy that would approach the rehabilitation of several economically depressed areas through a combination of agricultural and non-agricultural projects.[33]

Perhaps the most important of the new rural development policies was the creation of the regional parks. France had already established in 1961 a national parks system. But those parks were designed to act as preservation areas, and were therefore located in the more remote corners of the nation, largely closed off from both agricultural communities and the public. Regional parks, conversely, would be embedded within rural communities and would create new commercial opportunities for local residents. As a result, regional parks developed a much stronger presence in the French countryside; there are currently forty-nine regional parks covering a full 15 percent of metropolitan France, as compared to just seven national parks covering 2 percent of the hexagon. Their purpose at creation was threefold: 1) "To preserve the flora and fauna indigenous to our natural regions"; 2) "To permit urban inhabitants, whose numbers increase daily, to recover on a regular basis a real connection with the rural environment"; and 3) "To help certain agricultural regions to establish a new development path."[34] As hybrid environments, the parks would attract urban inhabitants, who would in turn infuse cash into a local economy that might not be able to support its local inhabitants otherwise.[35] Viewed as major development opportunities, regional parks were enormously popular with local administrations right from the get-go. Before the parks were even formalized, the commissioner of regional parks had already received from all corners of the hexagon eighteen applications for five slots.[36] Five years later a full 1,966,800 hectares had been classified as regional park land (3.6 percent of the national surface area).[37]

One of the first regional parks was established in the Morvan. Covering 172,000 hectares, the park straddles four different departments in Burgundy. Leading up to the creation of the park in 1970, numerous studies and reports enthusiastically promoted the potential benefits it would bring to the area. The Morvan was a poor region that had suffered acutely as its inhabitants had left for greater economic opportunities in the cities. Its population had fallen a full 23.3 percent since the mid-1930s.[38] The residents who did remain were aging, and their farms were badly structured. Agricultural productivity was low, and there was little hope that farms in the region might ever be classified as viable by the standards of the Ministry of Agriculture. A regional park would improve the economy through tourism and recreation, and moreover would reduce the isolation of local farmers by filling in some of the settlement gaps in the area.

Attracting visitors would require both savvy marketing and the improvement of tourism infrastructure. Given that the Morvan did not boast the beaches of Normandy or the mountains of the Savoie, marketing would have to focus on how the region was unique: "The Morvan does not offer a wild, grandiose, impressive nature. It offers instead a contoured landscape free of excess, measured and cared for, a region that is pleasant to visit over the weekend, to get away from the noise and the hustle and bustle."[39] In other words, a visit to the Morvan would be light and breezy, an effortless romp through the verdant hills of Burgundy. Developers could install recreational areas for volleyball and boules. Area schools could work with outside parties to establish summer camps for kids. New and well-appointed camping sites could attract families vacationing on a budget.

These reports were not free from their own brand of hyperbole. In these various studies, just about every region in France was heralded as a wonderland of natural beauty that would appeal to young and old alike. In an attempt to play up the possibilities for family-oriented

tourism in the Morvan, the report stated, "From the purifying air of its mountains to the magnitude of its landscapes, the Morvan appears to be an ideal region for children. With every summit, one discovers a kind of Disneyland, where nature is a vast playground."[40] One can only imagine the faces of disappointed Parisian children, expecting the thrill of a roller coaster only to find the peace and quiet of the relatively tame French countryside.

The perspective of those rural men and women hosting urban visitors was of course often quite different than that of the local boosters. While the property taxes on the urban-owned second homes were certainly welcome by the locals, relations with part-time residents were often strained. Conflicts erupted over livestock odors, the aesthetic integrity of farm buildings, and rights and privileges regarding the gathering of mushrooms. Urban second-home owners, along with tourists, wanted farming to look a certain way. Men clad in berets, women in aprons, and neatly organized fields were the expectation. Noisy farm equipment, compost heaps, and the stink of livestock production did not comply with the urban imagination of rural repose.[41] In other words, the industrial aesthetic of the operational landscape interfered with the bucolic fantasies of urban tourists. The clash between locals and urban visitors stemmed from these contradictory relationships with the landscape; while the former argued that they relied upon it, as they always had, to reproduce themselves, the latter viewed it as a site for leisure and relaxation.[42]

The opinions of disgruntled farmers were often expressed in *La France Agricole*, the nation's major agricultural daily, which featured regular articles on the new parks and the communities in which they were established. As discussed in a piece from 1970, some welcomed the parks as a means to draw a secondary income, by getting involved in the tourism industry. For the majority, however, the parks were an unwelcome limitation on their ability to practice

agriculture. These farmers feared that "under the pretext of protecting the natural environment (which for visiting urban residents signified relaxation and folklore, and for farmers an instrument of labor), the parks would forestall agriculture by holding up indispensable modernization efforts."[43] These farmers worried that having to contend with competing claims on the landscape would make it more difficult for them, if not impossible, to enlarge their operations.

The pressure on small-scale producers was intense. The industrialization of the farm sector that had begun two decades earlier called for economies of scale. Moving goods to foreign markets required larger distribution systems, which in turn required larger producers in order to operate efficiently. With the common market promising to provide France with a major opportunity for growth, there was little room in state plans for farmers who failed to expand. Indeed the price support system that lay at the foundation of the common market's agricultural policy favored large-scale cereals producers, while smaller-scale dairy and poultry operations were left to fend for themselves. The parks were intended as a safety net for these farmers, as avenues for creating secondary income streams. But after two decades of being told to scale up or fail, farmers living within areas slated for regional park development were understandably skeptical when they were told that rural tourism could offset the exhortation to expand.

Rural tourism and the creation of the regional parks system were highly contested aspects of state plans for devising new forms of productivity in a multifunctional countryside. While those whose incomes stagnated might discover new means of sustaining themselves through the increased economic activity urban visitors would create, those who were ahead of the curve worried that their efforts would be curtailed by the new environmental and aesthetic limitations that tourism would demand. One of the most symbolically salient results of this conflict was the

birth of a new method of agricultural protest—the August roadblock. In order to protest the claims made by urban holiday-makers, farmers physically barred their entry into rural France. Writing about this practice in the south of France, rural sociologists Alain Guillemin and Patrick Champagne astutely interpreted this act as a symbolic reclamation of agricultural land: "to obstruct roads and railways, to block ports, is to interrupt the diseased flows of tourism and commerce, carriers of pathogenic germs into the Midi."[44] Farmers no longer enjoyed a privileged status with respect to the resources of rural France; they were being forced to share with urban day-trippers. Viewing the seasonal arrival of summer tourists as a threat to their autonomy and their ability to practice their profession, farmers did their best to stand their ground.

Environmentalism as Economic Opportunity

In addition to the influx of tourists, by the mid-1960s farmers were forced to contend with a budding environmentalist movement.[45] Indeed to separate the two is something of an impossible task, as rural tourism and appeals to the therapeutic power of nature often went hand in hand. At the same time, however, environmentalism extended well beyond the desire of urban residents to touch base with nature from time to time. The rise of environmentalism in France, as a popular movement with widespread support, has been well documented. The Torrey Canyon oil spill, which took place off the coast of Brittany in 1967, is often cited as a turning point in popular concern for the environment.[46] The political movements of 1968 built on that momentum. The rejection of consumer society dovetailed with criticisms of industrial and urban pollution, as well as with demands for a better quality of life.[47] Lastly, protests in 1969 against the development of a ski resort in the Vanoise offered the movement an opportunity to put its ideas into practice, the end result of which was the decision on the part of the state to disallow the development.

National news media coverage of the construction plans and the protests likewise offered the general public a crash-course in environmentalist concerns.[48] Together, these events and developments worked to create a coherent understanding of what constituted the "environment" and how it should be cared for.

This greening of French consciousness was reflected in the institutional makeup of the state. In 1970 the government created the General Directorate for Environmental Protection (Direction générale de la protection de la nature), housed within the Ministry of Agriculture, and then in 1971 created a ministry of its own—the Ministry for the Protection of Nature and the Environment (ministère de la Protection de la nature et de l'environnement).[49] Additionally, in order to further the program of rural development that increased interest in the environment and nature-based tourism had precipitated, the Crédit Agricole began in 1971 to offer favorable loans to small rural businesses (e.g. restaurants, hotels), second-home buyers, and private tourism initiatives. As a result of this diversification in the Crédit Agricole portfolio, it became increasingly difficult for farmers to access loans.[50] With institutional measures such as these in place, it was clear that the countryside was no longer primarily a site of agricultural production.

Concerns about rising agricultural surpluses dovetailed with the emergence of environmentalism, reinforcing calls for a less productivist approach to the landscape. In 1968, both the Mansholt Plan, produced by the European Economic Community, and the French Vedel Report called for a massive reorientation of agricultural policy aimed at reducing output. Surpluses in cereals, sugar, and dairy had begun already to appear in the early 1960s.[51] By 1968 they were out of hand. In 1955, for instance, the average French cow produced roughly 2,000 liters of milk per year. By 1972 that same cow produced roughly 2,900 liters.[52] In order to remedy these problems, the Mansholt Plan suggested a radical reduction in the amount of

farmland and in the number of farmers. Between 1970 and 1980, it was recommended that five million farmers be eliminated and that 12.5 million hectares of land be removed from cultivation.[53]

The Vedel Report made similar recommendations, but was instead focused on the financial situation of French farmers and of the agricultural sector as a whole. Farm incomes had failed to catch up to non-farm incomes in spite of enormous progress in terms of productivity. French policy makers worried about how to devise the 1969 budget in such a way that would effect positive changes in agricultural revenues without further bankrupting state coffers.[54] It was estimated that for every one hundred francs that a French farmer took home, the state spent thirty-three francs in order to subsidize that income.[55] Moreover, in the eight years prior to the release of the Vedel Plan, spending on agriculture had risen a full 240 percent. It was of primary importance that the state curb expenditures on agriculture.

The twin rise of environmentalism and rural tourism offered solutions to the growing surplus and expenditure problems. Moving land out of agricultural circulation would cut back on output, while diversifying local economies in order to develop rural tourism would provide farmers with money-making alternatives. While the Mansholt and Vedel Plans had nothing to do explicitly with the creation of the new Ministry for the Protection of Nature and the Environment, agricultural policy makers quickly seized on the opportunities presented by a movement that called for a reorientation of the nation's land use priorities.

As the state began to adjust its land use policy in light of the surplus problem and the creation of the Ministry for the Protection of Nature and the Environment, administrators in the central office of the SAFER were forced to rethink their approach. In the 1970s the SAFER began to handle cases that involved the transfer of farmlands to non-agricultural purposes, an

adjustment that would have been unthinkable at the time of its creation just one decade earlier.[56] By 1973 it had removed twenty thousand hectares of farmland from agricultural production, an absolutely staggering development given the original objectives that had led to its formation.[57] Caught between the new priorities of a multifunctional approach to land use and its existing responsibility to farmers, the SAFER fought to hang on to its original mandate while adjusting its operations in order to reflect the new ethos of rural development.

Forced to contend with environmentalist demands on the landscape, the SAFER began working alongside developers and conservationists in order to create multifunctional rural spaces. In 1975 the Frogère estate, located on 946 hectares in the Sologne (a marshland at the intersection of the Loire and Cher rivers), was put on the market and local agricultural and environmental representatives came together to acquire the lands and to convert them into both agricultural operations and recreational and conservation areas.[58] In a letter to the Ministry of Agriculture, the director of the local SAFER explained how the acquisition of these lands would serve multiple purposes: "The project would not be limited simply to redistribution activities beneficial to farmers; it would be accompanied by the exemplary development of the region's character, exceptional in its originality and in the wealth and fragility of its ecology."[59] Agricultural, ecological, and recreational values were given equal weight.

This new approach of the SAFER, and of the Ministry of Agriculture more broadly, was documented in the pages of *Le Monde* as part of an article about the new Sologne venture.[60] The article focused on efforts to integrate ecology into agricultural and recreational development, highlighting plans to establish simultaneously an improved system for monitoring environmental pollution, a winter sport station, riverside bicycle paths, and pedestrian walkways.[61] A quintessential example of the multifunctional countryside, the Sologne project sought to

introduce into an agricultural landscape a combination of environmental protections and tourist attractions.

This new equivalence between the needs of farmers, urban residents, and the environment marked a sea change in both land use policy and urban-rural relations. Sections of the landscape were quartered off and removed from the productivist system in order to satisfy new (largely urban) environmentalist desires. But this did not mean that these spaces were no longer operational landscapes or that they were no longer expected to contribute to the growth of the national economy. As historian Michael Bess has argued, French environmentalism prizes stewardship and interaction over wilderness and preservation.[62] In this respect, it was relatively easy to fold environmental protections into the new rural development model and to create new forms of profit extraction by creating consumable experiences of the natural environment, such as, the new regional parks system and the Sologne project. The previously productivist rural landscape of agricultural production therefore gave way to a multifunctional system in which capital was generated by a variety of markets that catered to a variety of interests.

Rural tourism and environmentalism worked together to solidify the transition to a multifunctional French landscape. As urban residents began to build an idealized French countryside, replete with picturesque villages and historical rehabs, they became more sensitive to maintaining its integrity as a natural environment. Concerned citizens began to demand that waterways be cleaned up and protected, that lands be set aside for conservation, and that farmers be more environmentally aware in their production methods. While the environmental checks that followed suit left much to be desired from an ecological standpoint, given that they tended to focus more on human interest than on the needs of nature, they nevertheless marked a sea change in state policy regarding economic development and rural land use policy. Capitalizing on this

emerging preoccupation of urban France, the state was able to incorporate environmentalism and rural tourism into its new rural development approach, mobilizing the natural world in order to curb surplus production and improve agricultural incomes through a reorientation of rural land use priorities.

Conclusion

The agricultural productivism that fueled the first decade of *les trente glorieuses* gave way in the 1970s to a multifunctional approach to rural land use policy. This is not to say, however, that rural lands ceased being productive, or that "productivity," as an economic objective lost any of its saliency. Rural France continued to feed economic growth with its "green gas," and cities continued to rely on the resources of the hinterlands. There was simply a shift in how productivity was understood and pursued. With the introduction of rural development in 1967, the French state no longer believed that it was in the best interest of the nation to reserve the countryside for agricultural production. The setting aside of as much land as possible for agricultural purposes had exacerbated surplus problems and had failed to improve revenues for most farmers. New opportunities for extracting profit from the countryside arose as urban women and men began to desire greater contact with nature. The hinterlands would no longer simply produce food and natural resources—the material infrastructure of economic growth. Thereafter they would also supply urban residents with psychic and emotional sustenance.

The drive toward environmental protections was bound up with these plans for grooming a rural landscape that would be attractive to urban women and men in need of relaxation. To be sure, there was a component of environmental protections that was genuinely about conservation and not just tied to efforts to build a rural playground for city dwellers. But in a nation that prized

inhabited landscapes over uninhabited wilderness, environmental protections have always been tied to the human hand.

The end result was a relationship between urban and rural France that was rich in contradiction. On the one hand, state planners in Paris sought to rationalize the landscape, confident in their ability to manage each and every square inch of the territory. On the other, urban residents came to view the countryside as a natural milieu that offered escape from the concrete jungle. William Cronon captured this ambivalence between the human and the pristine in his discussion of Chicago and its hinterlands: "We 'moderns' believe ... that we have the power to control the earth, despite our deep ambivalence about whether we know how to exercise that power wisely. On the other hand, our nostalgia for the more 'natural' world of an earlier time when we were not so powerful, when the human landscape did not seem so omnipresent, encourages us to seek refuge in pastoral or wilderness landscapes that seem as yet unscarred by human action. Convinced of our human omnipotence, we can imagine nature retreating to small islands—'preserves'—in the midst of a landscape which otherwise belongs to us."[63] At least since the time of Marie Antoinette, when her "natural" and "wild" hobby farm co-existed with the hyper-rationalized gardens of Versailles, the French have oscillated between the poles of power and surrender that Cronon so deftly articulates. Through aspirations of omnipotent control, *l'aménagement du territoire* operationalized the rural landscape in order to maximize profit extraction, while urban desire insisted on the otherness of *la France profonde* in order to feed their Antoinette-like fantasies. Regional parks and other rural tourism offerings had to cater to urban needs (better roads for scenic tours, tighter restrictions on the aesthetic appearance of farms), while at the same time pretending to be authentic representations of rural France.

The extraction of profit from the countryside, absolutely essential to postwar growth, turned out to be a highly malleable enterprise. Where agricultural production fell short, urban consumption was able to sweep in and create new forms of productivity. Setting French land aside for any purpose other than that of agricultural production would have been unthinkable to the majority of state planners prior to the 1960s. But surplus problems, ailing agricultural incomes, and ballooning state expenditures on agriculture led them to reconsider their assumptions about rural productivity. Growing interest on the part of urban French men and women in rural recreation opportunities and environmental protections provided the Ministry of Agriculture with a new blueprint for operationalizing the landscape. Urban and rural France were forced into new, and not always easy, relationships. While contemporary urbanization, as suggested by Brenner, might best be captured by an image of tar sands, I would like to suggest that we visualize *les trente glorieuses* not as fast cars and rehabbed kitchens, but instead as combine threshers, regional parks, and rural roadblocks.

Venus Bivar is an assistant professor of History at Washington University in St. Louis, where she pursues research and teaching in three broad fields; European, economic, and environmental history. Her first book, *Organic Resistance,* charts the meteoric rise of the farm sector in postwar France. She is currently working on a new project that examines the social consequences of port development and urban planning in Marseille. Professor Bivar received her doctoral training at the University of Chicago, and spent two years at the University of California at Berkeley on a Mellon Postdoctoral Fellowship.

[1] CAC (spell out), Fontainebleau, 800401 ministère de l'Agriculture, Art. 7, "General Conditions of Agricultural Production in the Different Countries," 15 December 1952.

[2] Pierre Barral, *Les Agrariens français de Meline à Pisani* (Paris: Presses de la Fondation nationale des sciences politiques, 1968), 217; Mark C. Cleary, *Peasants, Politicians and Producers: The Organisation of Agriculture in France Since 1918* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 11.

[3] For example, see Georges Duby, *Histoire de la France urbaine* (Paris: Seuil, 1985); Henri Lefebvre, *La Révolution urbaine* (Paris: Gallimard, 1970); Kristin Ross, *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies: Decolonization and the Reordering of French Culture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994); Rosemary Wakeman, *Modernizing the Provincial City: Toulouse, 1945–1975* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997).

[4] Sara B. Pritchard, *Confluence: The Nature of Technology and the Remaking of the Rhone* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011); Michael Bess, *The Light-Green Society: Ecology and Technological Modernity in France, 1960–2000* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

[5] For example, see Christophe Bonneuil and Frédéric Thomas, "L'Introduction du maïs hybride en France: une technologie fordiste," in *Sciences, chercheurs et agriculture: Pour une histoire de la recherche agronomique*, ed. Christophe Bonneuil, Gilles Denis, and Jean-Luc Mayaud (Paris: Quae-L'Harmattan, 2008), 155–180.

[6] For the concept "industrial logic," see Deborah Fitzgerald, *Every Farm a Factory: The Industrial Ideal in American Agriculture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003).

[7] For more on how nostalgic urbanites viewed rural France, see Sarah Farmer, "Memoirs of French Peasant Life: Progress and Nostalgia in Postwar France," *French History* 25, 3 (2011): 362–379; and Susan Carol Rogers, "Farming Visions: Agriculture in French Culture," *French Politics, Culture & Society* 18, 1 (Spring 2000): 50–70.

[8] Neil Brenner, *Critique of Urbanization: Selected Essays* (Basel: Birkhauser, 2016).

[9] Neil Brenner, *Implosions/Explosions: Towards a Study of Planetary Urbanization* (Berlin: Jovis, 2014).

[10] William Cronon, *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1991).

[11] Ross, *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies*.

[12] Sarah Farmer, "Memoirs of French Peasant Life: Progress and Nostalgia in Postwar France," *French History* 25, 3 (2011): 362–379; and "The Other House: The Secondary Residence in Postwar France," *French Politics, Culture & Society* 34, 4 (2016): 104–121.

[13] Venus Bivar, "The Ground Beneath their Feet: Agricultural Industrialization and the Remapping of Rural France, 1945–1976" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2008), 56.

[14] For a short overview of urban-rural relations in the postwar period, see Nicole Mathieu, "La notion de rural et les rapports ville-campagne en France: des années cinquante aux années quatre-vingts," *Economie rurale* 197 (1990): 35–41.

[15] For example, the Société d'aménagement des friches et taillis de l'Est, the Société pour la mise en valeur de la Corse, and the Compagnie d'aménagement des landes de Gascogne. For an excellent analysis of the Compagnie nationale du Bas-Rhône Languedoc, see Pritchard, *Confluence*.

[16] For a comprehensive history of *l'aménagement du territoire*, see Marc Desportes and Antoin Picon, *De l'espace au territoire: L'aménagement en France XVIe-XXe siècles* (Paris: Presses de l'école nationale des Ponts et Chaussées, 1997). For an excellent article that discusses "géographie volontaire," an analogous idea that was popular with geographers, urban planners, and architects in the postwar period, see Kenny Cupers, "*Géographie Volontaire* and the Territorial Logic of Architecture," *Architectural Histories* 4 (2016): 1–13.

[17] Pierre Barral, *Les Agrariens français de Meline à Pisani* (Paris: Presses de la Fondation nationale des sciences politiques, 1968), 217; Pierre Alphandéry, Pierre Bitoun, and Yves Dupont, *Les Champs du départ: Une France rurale sans paysans?* (Paris: Éditions la Découverte, 1988), 32.

[18] Annie Moulin, *Peasantry and Society in France since 1789*, trans. M.C. and M.F. Cleary (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 181.

[19] Venus Bivar, *Organic Resistance: The Struggle Over Industrial Farming in Postwar France* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2018).

[20] Archives nationales (AN), Paris, F10 5201 Agriculture, Service d'études et de documentation, Statistiques, 1949–1957, Secrétariat d'État aux finances et aux affaires économiques, Direction des industries et commerces de l'alimentation, Service des produits industriels et de l'équipement, Commission d'investissement concernant l'hydraulique agricole, meeting minutes, 9 October 1948.

[21] On the opposite end of the irrigation spectrum, reclamation was also pursued by increasing the water supply in arid regions. See AN, Paris, F60ter 504 Secrétariat général du Comité

interministériel pour les questions de coopération économique européenne, 1944–1958, Contrevaleur, Presse information, 1948–1951, note regarding long-term projects, 1 August 1949.

[22] AN, Paris, F60ter 394 Secrétariat général du Comité interministériel pour les questions de coopération économique européenne, 1944–1958, Généralités sur l'aide américaine, Propagande Plan Marshall, press release from the Information Division of the ECA, 17 January 1950.

[23] As questions concerning how best to apportion lands became more complicated through the 1960s, the infrastructure for *l'aménagement du territoire* expanded considerably. While it had started as a wing of the Ministère de la Reconstruction et de l'Urbanisme, in 1960 it was allotted an inter-ministerial committee of its own, and in 1963 became the Délégation à l'aménagement du territoire et à l'action régionale (DATAR). For further details, see Claude Lacour, Aliette Delamarre, and Muriel Thoin, *40 ans d'aménagement du territoire* (Paris: La Documentation française, 2003).

[24] The literature on rural tourism in France is extensive. For good starting points, see Roger Beteille, *Le Tourisme vert* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1996); Susan Carol Rogers, "Which Heritage? Nature, Culture, and Identity in French Rural Tourism," *French Historical Studies* 25, 3 (Summer 2002): 475–503.

[25] CAC, Fontainebleau, 860087 Études du ministère de l'Agriculture, Art. 1: 1962–1963, "Service du génie rural; Département de la Haute-Loire—Les secteurs ruraux."

[26] CAC, Fontainebleau, 800389 ministère de l'Agriculture, Correspondance concernant les particuliers en relation ou en conflit avec les SAFER, Art. 18: Aveyron-Lot-Tarn (SAFALT), 1962–1970, newspaper clipping of *Sud Ouest*, 20 April 1965.

[27] Farmer, "Memoirs of French Peasant Life," 372.

[28] Ibid, 363.

[29] This move toward thinking about agriculture within its rural milieu and toward thinking about agricultural policy within a broader context of rural development was not unique to France. This discussion also began to take place within the committees of the EEC at about the same time. See CAC, Fontainebleau, 770412 ministère de l'Agriculture, Dossiers de M. de Vaissière, Inspecteur Général, 1959–1976, Art. 60: Regional conference for Europe, 1966, "Rapport de la deuxième session du groupe de travail de l'utilisation des terres de la commission européenne d'agriculture, tenue à Londres 3–6 mai 1966."

[30] Jacques Biancarelli, Philippe Parini, and Christian Serradji, *Aménager les campagnes* (Paris: Éditions du Moniteur, 1978), 85.

[31] CAC, Fontainebleau, 800389 Ministère de l'Agriculture, Correspondance concernant les particuliers en relation ou en conflit avec les SAFER, Art. 35: Centre, 1971–1973, letter from Robert to Taillardat, 23 November 1972.

[32] Gilbert Noël and Emilie Willaert, *Georges Pompidou, une certaine idée de la modernité agricole et rurale* (Brussels: P.I.E. Peter Lang, 2007), 25.

[33] Ibid., 254. The areas in question were: Ouest (Finistère, Morbihan, Côtes-du-Nord, Ille-et-Vilaine, Manche, and some parts of Loire-Atlantique), Limousin-Lot (Haute-Vienne, Corrèze, Creuse, Lot), Auvergne (Puy-de-Dôme, Cantal, Haute-Loire, Lozère, Aveyron, and parts of Ardèche).

[34] "Décret No 67-158 du 1er mars 1967 instituant des parcs naturels régionaux, Circulaire interministérielle d'information du 1er juin 1967 sur les parcs naturels régionaux," *Journal officiel de la République française,* 2 March 1967.

[35] For more on how the regional parks were presented to the public, see the statements of Minister of Agriculture Duhamel and the ministre délégué, chargé du Plan et de l'Aménagement du territoire, André Bettencourt, as published in *La France agricole*, "Les parcs naturels et les agriculteurs," 12 December 1969.

[36] CAC, Fontainebleau, 950529 ministère de l'Environnement, Direction de la protection de la nature, Bureau des Parcs naturels régionaux, Art. 33: Morvan, 1966-77, meeting minutes of the Commission mixte du Morvan, 25 February 1966, 10.

[37] CAC, Fontainebleau, 950528 ministère de l'Environnement, Direction de la nature et paysage, Art. 4: Protection des monuments, sites, et paysages as well as la lutte contre les aggressions de la vie moderne and protection de la nature, 1945–72. Report on regional park progress to date, n.d.

[38] CAC, Fontainebleau, 950529 ministère de l'Environnement, Direction de la protection de la nature, Bureau des Parcs naturels régionaux, Art. 33: Morvan, 1966–77, meeting minutes, 3 May 1967.

[39] CAC, Fontainebleau, 950529 ministère de l'Environnement, Direction de la protection de la nature, Bureau des Parcs naturels régionaux, Art. 33: Morvan, 1966–77, "Le Morvan: Étude d'aménagement touristique," 31.

[40] Ibid., 32.

[41] For contemporary press coverage, see J.M. Le Clair, "La cohabitation difficile de deux mondes," *Ouest France*, 24 November 1980; René Dalan, "Paysans-estivants: la guerre froide est déclarée, " *Le Monde*, 12 September 1981; and Jean Vuaille, "L'agriculture et l'environnement," *L'Opinion Agricole*, 1 April 1975. For scholarly work on these conflicts, see Muriel Bonin and

André Torre, "Typologie de liens à l'espace impliqués dans les conflits d'usage: étude de cas dans les Monts d'Ardèche," *Les Cahiers de la multifonctionnalité* 5 (2004): 17–31; Jean-Claude Chamboredon, "La 'Naturalisation' de la campagne: une autre manière de cultiver les 'simples'?" in *Protection de la nature: Histoire et idéologie. De la nature à l'environnement*, ed. Anne Cadoret (Paris: Éditions L'Harmattan, 1985): 138–151; Didier Desponds, "Les impacts d'un parc natural régional (PNR) sur les évolutions socio-démographiques de son espace rural: le cas du Vexin français," *Norois* 202 (2007): 47–60.

[42] For a masterful account of the history of second-home buyers and the neo-rural movement, see Catherine Rouvière, *Retourner à la terre: L'utopie néo-rurale en Ardèche depuis les années 1960* (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2015).

[43] Georges Kletch, "Les parc régionaux et les agriculteurs: le public des parcs reste à convaincre," *La France agricole*, 25 September 1970.

[44] Alain Guillemin and Patrick Champagne, "La Manifestation agricole entre territoire et télévision," in *Les Agriculteurs et la Politique*, ed. Pierre Coulomb, Hélène Delorme, Bertrand Hervieu, Marcel Jollivet, and Philippe Lacombe (Paris: Presses de la Fondation nationale des sciences politiques, 1990), 537.

[45] Calls for preservation pre-dated the mid-1960s, to be sure. But it was not until environmentalism became a mass movement that it had a significant effect on both where and how agriculture was practiced.

[46] For example, see Brendan Prendiville, *Environmental Politics in France* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1994), 6.

[47] Joseph Szarka, *The Shaping of Environmental Policy in France* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2002), 32, 50.

[48] Florian Charvolin, *L'Invention de l'environnement en France: Chroniques anthropologiques d'une institutionalisation* (Paris: Éditions la Découverte, 2003), 59.

[49] Minister of Agriculture Duhamel circulated a memo to all of the departmental prefects in order to brief them on the creation of this new *Direction*. He alerted them to a recent publication, put out by the Ministry, on the relationship between agriculture and the environment, how the two might sometimes come into conflict, and how that conflict might be resolved. Duhamel stated that he wanted the prefects to ensure that every elected official in their department, right down to the communal mayors, read this publication. See CAC, Fontainebleau, 800005 Ministère de l'Agriculture, Collection des circulaires, 1967–1978, Art. 21: 1970, memo from Duhamel to the departmental prefects, 3 March 1970.

[50] José-Pierre Henry and Marcel Régulier, *Le Crédit agricole* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1986), 94.

[51] François-Henri de Virieu, "Vers des surplus permanents dans l'agriculture?" *Le Monde*, 27 January 1961.

[52] CAC, Fontainebleau, 890078 ministère de l'Agriculture, Direction de la modernisation des exploitations, Art. 14: L'établissement à la terre, 1975, "Les grandes caractéristiques de l'agriculture française de 1959 à 1974."

[53] *Paysans* 55 (August–September 1965), 80.

[54] French agricultural production rose 50 percent from 1963 to 1970, and the average farm size increased from 20.4 to 27.6 hectares. But increases in productivity led to lower agricultural

prices on the market. Coupled with rising costs for industrial agricultural inputs (e.g. land, fertilizers, machinery, and fuel), this situation led farm revenues to stagnate. See Fearne, "The History and Development of the CAP," 35.

[55] Pol Echevin, "Paysans, Au Secours!" *L'Express*, 22 March 1971.

[56] A publication put out in 1970 by the central office of the SAFER highlighted how the SAFER was involved in non-agricultural transactions. The booklet stated that the SAFER may redistribute lands for the purposes of acquiring a second home, building a sports complex, or developing the tourism industry. See Fédération nationale des sociétés d'aménagement foncier et d'établissement rural, *Société d'aménagement foncier et d'établissement rural*, 42.

[57] Hubert Buchou, *Partager la terre: L'histoire des SAFER* (Biarritz: Atlantica, 1999), 64.

[58] CAC, Fontainebleau, 800389 ministère de l'Agriculture, Correspondance concernant les particuliers en relation ou en conflit avec les SAFER, Art. 36: Centre, 1965–1970, collection of letters exchanged between all parties involved, 1975.

[59] CAC, Fontainebleau, 800389 ministère de l'Agriculture, Correspondance concernant les particuliers en relation ou en conflit avec les SAFER, Art. 36: Centre, 1965–1970, letter from Gaubert (SAFER du Centre) to the Ministry of Agriculture, 12 November 1975.

[60] CAC, Fontainebleau, 800389 ministère de l'Agriculture, Correspondance concernant les particuliers en relation ou en conflit avec les SAFER, Art. 36: Centre, 1974–1976, newspaper clipping, *Le Monde*, 14 May 1976.

[61] Ibid.

[62] Michael Bess, *The Light-Green Society*: *Ecology and Technological Modernity in France, 1960–2000* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

[63] Cronon, *Nature's Metropolis*, 18.