



**HAL**  
open science

## Internationalization and dissemination of rural territorial development public policies: model hypotheses for Latin America

Gilles Massardier, Eric Sabourin

► **To cite this version:**

Gilles Massardier, Eric Sabourin. Internationalization and dissemination of rural territorial development public policies: model hypotheses for Latin America. *Sustentabilidade em debate*, 2013, 4 (2), pp.83-100. 10.18472/SustDeb.v4n2.2013.9489 . hal-02803236

**HAL Id: hal-02803236**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02803236>**

Submitted on 5 Jun 2020

**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.

# Internationalization and dissemination of rural territorial development public policies: model hypotheses for Latin America

Gilles Massardier\*, Eric Sabourin\*\*

\*Researcher of CIRAD (France)  
gilles.massardier@cirad.fr

\*\*Researcher of CIRAD (France); visiting scholar and associate professor of Centro de Desenvolvimento Sustentável of Universidade de Brasília (UnB)  
eric.sabourin@cirad.fr

Received: 30 October 2013  
Accepted: 18 November 2013

DOSSIER

## Abstract

This article proposes a theoretical and methodological reflexion to analyse the recent and almost simultaneous expansion of national Rural Territorial Development policies in Latin America. The paper therefore puts forward three main hypotheses: The first is that of the existence of Latin American macro-regional models for these public policies. The second is that of the overlapping of three internationalization processes for these policies: inter/transnational circulation of norms, especially via international organizations and arenas; policy transfers; a regionalization process “by below”. The third hypothesis considers an atypical regionalization of this continent which is undergoing a process of internationalized sectoral public policy dissemination. The general purpose of the paper is therefore to understand the types of overlapping existing between these internationalization processes and the ways Rural Territorial Development policies are nationally, regionally and territorially adapted in Latin America.

**Keywords:** Circulation of public policies; territorial development; regionalization; Latin America.

## Resumo

Este artigo propõe uma reflexão teórica e metodológica para analisar o notável desenvolvimento quase simultâneo das políticas nacionais de Desenvolvimento Territorial Rural na América Latina. O trabalho considera três principais hipóteses para explicar essa tendência: a primeira é a existência de modelos latinoamericanos de políticas públicas; a segunda é o imbricamento de três processos de internacionalização de políticas públicas: a construção e a circulação transnacional de normas, o enfoque pela transferência de políticas e os processos de regionalização “por abaixo”; a terceira hipótese considera uma regionalização atípica, baseada em processos de internacionalização de políticas setoriais. O objetivo geral do trabalho é entender, caracterizar e analisar os modos de imbricamento entre os processos de internacionalização, assim como as modalidades de adaptação nacional, regional e territorial das políticas de Desenvolvimento Territorial Rural na América Latina.

**Palavras-chave:** circulação de políticas públicas; desenvolvimento territorial; regionalização; América Latina.

## 1 Introduction

This paper focuses on the guidelines of a research project currently being drawn up. It therefore takes the form of a theoretical and methodological guide, based on a review of the literature and the compilation of initial empirical elements.

It proposes to discuss the ‘global governance’ concept by cross-analysing: i) international relations; ii) analysis of policies and public action (policy process); iii) internationalization of public policies (PP), which is a major aspect in the transformation of the policy process. By internationalization, we mean here the relatively recent process whereby the policy process, which was once exclusively national, is stretched across national boundaries and transnational circulation of policy paradigms and instruments.

The idea here is to show the limitations of an approach in “globalization” terms, notably of a “hyperglobalist” posture (MCGREW, 2011, p. 16), taken as being “the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa” (GIDDENS, 1990, p. 21), and of “de-territorialization” (SCHOLTE, 2000, p. 46): definitions that unfortunately erase sub-global scale stakeholders and political processes. Whilst it is clear that the distinction between “domestic” and “international” needs to be reviewed, state and territorial dynamics nonetheless still take on considerable importance in the policy process. Furthermore, this paper seeks to draw attention to the fact that, on the Latin American continent, regional dimension is taking shape between territory, state and international scale.

Firstly, this paper briefly presents the theoretical and historical context of the problem, describing the temporality of the emergence of Latin American RTD policies (1). Then, it will express the sense of dissatisfaction with the approach in terms of “globalization” for the policy process and the need to re-inject the political variable into the analysis, notably by bringing together world politics and the analysis of policy process (2). Lastly, the issue of Latin American specificity will be raised: can one not see a very particular regionalization process developing there, namely bottom up regionalization through sectoral policies that are themselves derived from international circulation of public policy paradigms and instruments (3).

## 2 Problematic, historical and empirical context

### 2.1 State of the art and hypothesis

Empirically, the research project, for which this paper is seeking to construct this existing theoretical framework, focuses on the internationalization of Rural Territorial Development (RTD) programmes. This subject is ideal for observing the phenomenon wherein the policy process is stretched from international to territories, and vice versa<sup>1</sup>.

To that end, the paper sits at the crossroads of six approaches and literatures



explaining the international “new regulation” of public policies: 1) The approach in terms of world politics and transnationalization of public policies (ROSENAU, 1995, 1997; RISSE KAPPEN, 1995), for which globalization, of national economies in particular, is only one of the factors in this new regulation; 2) The approach in terms of policy transfers (DOLOWITZ; MARSH, 2000; EVANS, 2009) and of inter/transnational and circulatory production of national public policy paradigms and instruments that rehabilitate the role of states and of national elites in the concert of world politics, beyond just their ability to import instruments from the globalization process of the economy (the famous structural adjustments) in their country; 3) The approach in terms of regionalization, notably that which consists in observing the “bottom up” production of regional dynamics (PASQUIER 2004; KHOLER KOCH, 1995); 4) The approach in terms of territorialization of public policies (and not “localization” in Rosenau’s sense (1997, p. 81), i.e. the restricting of stakeholder views and practices to the local territory alone; 5) Liberal inter governmentalism (MORAVSCIK, 1997) which re-injects national stakeholders into the strategies drawn up by state players, who are still clearly present on the international stage; 6) Multi-level governance (BACHE; FLINDERS, 2004; HOOGUE; MARKS, 2001).

The purpose of this paper is therefore to propose a model for analysing the overlapping processes between internationalization, national adaptation, regionalization and territorialization of rural development policies in Latin America. Three working hypotheses are put forward here: 1) The Rural Territorial Development (RTD) policy provides a glimpse of policy and public action models that are specifically Latin American; 2) By cross-analysing the literature pertaining to world politics with an analysis of policy process and public action, it is possible to take seriously the hypothesis of the overlapping of the different international logics: regionalization, public policy transfers, circulations of paradigms, multi level interactions; 3) The appearance can be seen of a composite regionalization process made up of assemblages, innovations and, especially, disseminations of sectorial Latin American public policy models. One of the strong hypotheses supported here is the existence of regionalization specific to Latin America, which stands out from classic regional intergovernmental integration and based on sectorial policy making that is disseminated on a continental level (multi-level circulation of ideas, experiences and stakeholders), all of which is incorporated into the previously described context.

However, these models are applied in a variety of non-converging adoptions: regionalization takes place from below. Echoing these transfers, it seems appropriate to examine the ways in which the recipients take on board or adapt the models depending on national conditions and constraints, and how some references that claim to be universal either fit in, or not, with local specificities.

Seen thus, Latin America is worth a specific look which would enable “a prospect for renewal of the theoretical approaches” in order to analyse “the regional dimension of the new international regulations” between internationalization, regionalization and the incorporation of policies from elsewhere in rural territories.

## 2.2 Political, economic and social contexts and their implications for the approach

This approach is taking place in a context of strong challenges surrounding the future of the rural world, illustrated here by the case of Latin America, that are fuelling the scientific literature as much as the international expert debates: i) the challenge of the future of agricultural production in a context of uncertainties concerning world food security, and global, climatic and economic changes; ii) the challenge of competition between development models for rural zones: competitiveness of production intended for world agricultural markets versus the sustainable rural development of territories and poverty alleviation for small farmers; iii) the challenge of the desectorization of policies supposed to be integrated with each other for global management of rural territories (environment + agrarian development + escape from poverty).

In order to contribute to an understanding of these phenomena, this research project deals with the issue of the construction of international circulation of RTD policy models, proposing methods to analyze the integrated and territorialized governance of these challenges, and more especially the issue of production of regional policy models.

The economic context is marked by the social and economic impacts of liberalizing agricultural policies, whose perverse effects particularly affect peasant and family farmers, who have to adapt to the demands of increasingly competitive and standardized supply chains (LOSCH *et al.*, 2011; BERDEGUÉ; FUENTEALBA, 2011).

The regions with a high concentration of family or peasant agriculture are thus among the most vulnerable and are often marginalized. The social challenges are, for their part, those of poverty alleviation and the fight against inequalities through support to family agricultures, capacity building for stakeholders and organizations involved in family agriculture and forestry management, particularly through support for the participation of local populations in decision-making and in the management of public actions.

In order to try and moderate or reverse these trends, several Latin American countries opt for territorial rural development policies. The declared objective is both to re-balance marginalized rural zones and utilize the specific attributes of rural territories by concentrating strategic productive investments and by strengthening the abilities of stakeholders to take action and reach decisions by way of systems for the organized participation of civil society (VELUT, 2007; 2008; SABOURIN; TEIXEIRA, 2002).

The political context of these rural development and environment reforms is very specific to Latin America and it is one of the objectives of this project to more effectively decipher the various processes: i) it involves policies with often dissimilar ambitions and dimensions, but which are formally integrated with each other within the territories, ii) these policies have primarily international, plural origins and are applied in an interlocking dynamic process (policy transfers, etc.). These transfers



are operated by states (primarily Brazil here) and by international and inter-American institutions, particularly the Inter American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture (IICA) and the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), more recently the Economic Commission for Latin America (CEPAL), which have also helped to adapt territorial development instruments set in place in Europe via European structural funds.

But global governance is not limited to a mere globalization logic. This methodological proposal also deals with globalization in the sense of recent attempts to manage “problems” through a global or integrated approach (and no longer sectoral). The territorial rural development approach, thus qualified as sustainable and participatory, thus finds itself required to propose the integration of these different sectoral instruments, namely decentralization, state devolution, territorial development, environmental conservation and poverty alleviation, or even education and healthcare in rural areas (Sabourin, 2007).

For the more modest states, those which through their small size have not had to undertake decentralization (Central America) or those who have launched it with a view to sub-national regionalization different from the territorial approach (andean countries), this new adaptation is complex. Some instruments and regional platforms are thus set in place to support the institutionalization of these new dynamics, generally by reutilizing resources from international or bilateral cooperation, or even new cycles of policy transfers. This is the case of the Centro-American Strategy for Territorial Rural Development platform (ECADERT) in Central America and the PROCISUR (agricultural research programme in the countries of the southern cone). Lastly, globalization occurs in the sense of an increasing overlapping of the levels for managing these problems: inter/transnational/regional, national, territorial. The challenge is therefore to understand by what processes the governments of the Latin American states have tried, almost concomitantly, over the 1990-2000 period, to satisfy both these international injunctions and strong claims from social, rural and environmental movements, by inventing hybrid forms of environmental, territorial and rural development policies

### **2.3 Characteristics and temporality of RTD policies : a common agenda in Latin America**

Between the end of the 1990s and 2011, Latin America saw the dissemination of a frame of reference and instruments for territorial development, notably rural (see Table 1). The ingredients for this parallelism in national agendas arising from a “model” are as follows: a) Frame of reference: endogenous and sustainable development of territories, participation of territorial stakeholders; b) Instruments: national and regional planning, territorial zoning, territorial participatory committees and integrated management (rural development, poverty alleviation, public health, education, etc.), credit attributed by projects.

**Table 1: Territorial rural development policies in Latin America**

Country	Policy	Law	Date
Argentina	Programa Federal de Apoyo al Desarrollo Rural Sustentable PROFEDER		2003
	Programa Nacional de Apoyo al Desarrollo de los Territorios PNADT		2006
Brazil	PRONAT - National Programme for Territorial Development		2003
	PTC -Territories of Citizenship		2008
Chile	INDAP Instituto de Desarrollo Agropecuario		2000
	Política Regional y territorial SECODIR (Ministerio del Interior)		2006
	Programa de Desarrollo Local (INDAP-PRODESAL) Programa de Desarrollo Territorial Indígena (INDAP-PDTI).		2008
Colombia		Ley 388 ordenamiento territorial rural	1997
	INCODER (in Ministry of agriculture)	Ley 1152	2007
	Plan Nacional de Desarrollo 2010-2014 Prosperidad para Todos		2009
Costa Rica		Ley Fomento Producción Agropecuaria y Orgánica del MAG FODEA	1995
	INDER Instituto de Desarrollo Rural GAT – Grupos Acción Territorial		2006 2010
El Salvador	Red Solidaria		2002
Mexico	PRONASOL Programa Nacional de Solidaridad	Ley de Desarrollo Rural Sustentable	1990 2001
	Consejo Mexicano para el Desarrollo Rural Sustentable		2008
Uruguay		Ley 18.308 ordenamiento territorial y desarrollo sostenible	2010
	Programa de Mesas de Fomento Rural (Ministerio ganaderia y Agricultura)		2011

This 'model' is a hybridization of several influences: democratic transitions which have opened up windows of opportunity to local social movements, notably indigenous, conditionalities linked to projects funding by International Organisations (IO), notably World Bank (WB) and its push for decentralization), continental organizations, which through their interest in small-scale agriculture, have focused on rural development, and the European model of structural funds, notably the LEADER program of European Union agricultural policy. There can be no doubt about the dissemination of a Latin American model. However, while some countries have been the subject of very detailed research on the implementation of these frames of reference and instruments, notably Brazil (SABOURIN; TEIXEIRA, 2002; SABOURIN,

2007), there has not been any attempt to understand the set of processes involved: circulation of the model and consequences of its establishment on the continent. This paper proposes an analytical framework.

### 3 Reading the circulation of norms: the example of RTD policies

An initial section deals with the limitations of the approach in terms of globalization in Latin America. A second section shows that, in effect, beyond the effects of the globalization of trade, political and social phenomena complicate the policy internationalization process.

#### 2.1 The limitations of “globalization”: moving beyond the postulate of domination of the political by the economic

This section sets out the reasons for choosing to relativize “globalization”, whose approach remains too solely concentrated on the globalization of national economies (ROBINSON, 2008; GWYNNE; KAY, 1999; GILPIN, 2001).

Beyond this relatively monolithic take on the evolutions of the world (“hyperglobalist”), a second aspect calls even more for it to be relativized: its economicism. Starting from the observation that the increase in international trade<sup>1</sup> in agriculture, services and industry permits the reorganization of national and local economies, along with specialization in export supply chains (specifically for Latin America: Robinson, 2008, chap. 2 & 3), it is as though this literature “naturally” extended its conclusions to all sectors and institutions, notably political. The ultimate consequence is that of a “homogenized world of global firms” (GWYNNE; KAY, 1999, p. 8). This literature therefore takes it more or less explicitly for granted: that the economic governs the political and the social; the internationalization of capitalism governs the world politically and renders it uniform (ROBINSON, 2008, p. 17); that the “fit between ideas and institutions” (M. Weber) places international organizations in agreement with the neoliberal approach to the world; those organizations automatically integrate the precepts of economic and financial trade (ROBINSON, 2008, p. 17).

Consequently, the literature on globalization emphasizes: 1) The impact, “pressures” or “penetration” of the global in the national (DAVILA ALDAS, 2011, p. 39-50). This *liberal world order* would seem to imply “integral restructuring and global integration in each national economy” (ROBINSON, 2008, p. 18). The same applies for the sub state scales which are “increasingly integrated in the global market” (GWYNNE; KAY, 1999, p. 19). Moreover, the literatures of Marxist and liberal leanings seem to agree on these two postulates: the unilateral penetration process and domination of the economic over the political; 2) In this perspective, *Transnational States* (TNS) are considered as simple domestic adapters to the new economic order: they adopt compliant fiscal and monetary policies; they provide the basic infrastructures for international trade; they provide stability and social order (ROBINSON, 2008, p. 33-36; see also *The State in a Changing World*, WB report on world development in 1997 and its slogan “globalization begins at home”).



Deregulation policies and policies for the recomposition of capital/labour relations would apparently be the proof of this; 3) The same applies for regional integrations which would seem to be a simple instrument for accompanying economic globalization which “would make it more bearable at national level” (SACHWALD, 1997, p. 260) or “should facilitate integration in the globalization process” as would seem to be the case for the regional spaces of Latin America established as “walkways towards globalization” of the economy (NICOLAS, 1997, p. 300; ROBINSON, 2008, p. 195); 4) Lastly, according to this paradigm, national elites seem to be just simple relays for ‘globalization’. Robinson (2008) sees in the Latin American ‘polyarchy’ an instrument for promoting what he calls the oxymoron of the *market democracy* and of the regionalization process. The expression of “TNS agents” (ROBINSON, 2008, p. 196) is indicative of this representation of the role of the administrative elites in globalization. This “polyarchy” has forged itself as a capitalist transnational elite (ROBINSON, 2008, p. 18-29) based on a logic of “cross border strategic alliances” (ROBINSON, 2008, p. 30), or as a ‘transnational business community’ organized in transnational networks (KENTOR, 2005, p. 30). The general conclusion of this literature is, ultimately, that this “new elite has constructed and imposed a free market and democracy paradigm” (ROBINSON, 2006, p. 97; GWYNNE; KAY, 1999, p. 18).

### **3.2 Internationalized and incremental policy-making: bringing together world politics and the analysis of policy process**

The observation of RTD policies in Latin America calls for a relativization of “global governance” by reinjecting the political issues, notably national and sub-national, into the analysis. While we endorse the findings of the literature on *world politics* in the 1990s, rather than ‘governance’ and ‘globalization’, we shall speak here of a fragmented and trans/internationalized and regionalized incremental construction of public policies.

In describing the RTD *policy process*, which does not come directly from the logic of the globalization of production and finance, the analysis actually delves into political logics other than just economic “pressure”: transfers, internationalization and regional dissemination of models, but also a phenomenon of “bottom up” regionalization and of bilateral relations, in brief, an overlapping of actual political processes.

Beyond the parameter of the pressure of economic flows on states and economic players, the approach in terms of *world politics* has fine-tuned and expanded the tools for analysing the move from a ‘state centred state’ to a ‘multi centric world’ (ROSENAU, 1997, p. 66). It cross analyses many more parameters, notably those of paramount importance for RTD policies: ‘proliferation of players’, ‘emergence of interdependent solutions’, ‘State weakness’, ‘diffusion of poverty in the developing world’ (ROSENAU, 1997, p. 66). This literature also emphasizes the fragmentation of the international arenas and the complexity of their organizational architecture (BIERMANN *et al.*, 2009). Along the lines of Risse Kappen (1995, p. 6), we shall start out from the postulate of the overlapping of these processes: national,





intergovernmental, inter and transnational, regional, continental and territorial. As also pointed out by Rosenau, “global” and “local” logics (even though we do not adopt these terms) go hand in hand. For his part, Kehoane (2002) spoke of a theory of the complex interdependence of inter-State, transnational “multiple channels in relations”. To do this, referring again to Risse Kappen, it is a matter of going beyond binary considerations (national/international, national-State/global, etc.) by adopting theoretical and empirical tools making it possible to read the overlapping of the processes mentioned in order to empirically decipher the “degrees of international institutionalism, i.e. sectoral regulation through bilateral agreements, multilateral regimes or international organizations” (Moravcsik, 1997: 5) proposed incorporating the theories of domestic politics and of international politics in what he called liberal inter governmentalism. Likewise, Risse Kappen (1995) proposed understanding internationalization through the “socialization of international norms in domestic practices”.

The analysis of *policy processes* is also an ideal base for observing recompositions of policy process and public action, notably their internationalization. Beyond the finding of a move “from national to transnational public policies” (HASSENTEUFEL, 2008, p. 16), the same findings have been established for around twenty years: the “galloping demography” of public action operators (MASSARDIER, 2008) and the fragmentation of powers – international, territorial, private, public, expertise, political (ROSENAU, 1997, p. 99; CAMAU, MASSARDIER, 2009). These elements call for a re-reading of policy process: “collective construction of public action”, which calls for a “contextualized analysis of interactions of multiple players overlapping on several levels, from local to international and including the European Union, making it possible to consider the transformations of contemporary states” (HASSENTEUFEL, 2008, p. 23). Reading via the “joint” (DURAN, 1999) and overlapping construction between levels of action, hence necessarily incremental (according to Lindblom’s now time-honoured concept, 1959), is thereby reinforced. It is precisely on the complexity of the overlapping of processes observed in Latin America that will depend the enigma to be solved through research on the circulation and implementation of RTD policies on the Latin American continent.

#### **4 Overlapping terms of internationalization and regionalization through a bottom up sectorial policy without integration**

The internationalization processes for environmental and rural territorial development policies in Latin America are of three types that allow us to tick off the hypothesis of atypical regionalization: it would seem to be without integration but based on the dissemination of a bottom up sectorial policy.

##### **4.1 Transfer from a country or an international organization to another country**

This is the case for territorial development, which has been an important political and policy challenge in Latin America since the mid-1990s. The trigger was the circulation of the European “model” of structural funds, in three ways. Firstly, within the intergovernmental framework of Mercosur, the creation of the *Fondo para la*

*Convergencia Estructural del Mercosur* (FOCEM) in 2005 directly inspired from the European structural funds. Likewise, in 2004, Mercosur created a *Foro Consultativo de Municipios, Estados Federativos, Provincias y departamentos del Mercosur* along the lines of the EU Regions Committee. It should also be noted that the creation of the rural development territories in Brazil was concomitant with these two Mercosur initiatives (2004). Moreover, the Brazilian expert and/or scholarly literature establishes this link by seeking a remedy for (non)existing political dissatisfactions in the model of the European Structural Funds (Posada, 2009), concurring, in doing so, with the logic of public policy model importing described by Rose (1991). This parallelism of agenda is therefore worth investigating to more effectively establish the conditions of European Union (EU) Mercosur and EU Brazil transfers. As highlighted by H. Théry (2009) and G. Coufignal (2010: 105), the relations between the EU and Latin America in these fields (decentralized cooperation, cooperation for development) “are important and unclear”. In addition, in the case of RTD policies in Latin America, the involvement of the European Union in transferring the model of the Leader program (CHAMPETIER, 2003; DE JANVRY; SADOULET, 2004; MUSIALKOWSKA, 2006; THÉRY, 2009) was relayed via the sectoral agencies (FAO, WB, Interamerican Development Bank – IDB, and International Fund for Agriculture Development – IFAD) and then the sectoral continental or inter-American regional agencies: CEPAL (2010), particularly the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) which plays a leading role in the matter, and various networks or programs: ECADERT, PROTERRITORIOS, PROCISUR, DTR/RIMISP, (SEPULVEDA *et al.*, 2003; MIRANDA; TIBURCIO, 2010). These initiatives were transferred to the inter-American scale by IDB, IICA and FAO.

Secondly, the European Structural Funds model was transferred under the influence of national cooperation policies (notably Spanish<sup>2</sup> and French<sup>3</sup>, relays of the European model). In the case of Bolivia and Peru, for example, the programs funded by the countries of the European Union (Denmark which opened an Embassy in Bolivia specially devoted to these projects, PADEP program of Germany) promote, as in Brazil, a model of integrated territorial development policy, combining an injunction of decentralized governance of policy projects, support for food security, participatory policy, project monitoring instruments; international organizations participate in the same project trajectory, notably the WB (VALDERRAMA, 2004).

Lastly, another type of transfer, internal one into Latin American continent this time, has been implemented: an effect of “model” feedback that is specifically Latin American, notably on the part of Brazil whose experience in the Sustainable Territorial Rural Development Program is closely watched by the other Latin American countries. In the case of Brazil and Argentina, innovation in the field of rural development is reflected in the territorialization of a policy that is both sectoral (family agriculture) and with an integrating vocation (sustainable development and poverty alleviation) (CEPAL, 2010). Under the influence of an innovating Brazil, a large number of Latin American countries have tried out the integrated territorialization of policies, notably in rural zones affected by poverty and the rural exodus. This type of transfer seems to correspond to what the literature on policy



transfers qualifies as “bandwagoning”, a phenomenon of imitating neighbouring countries’ policies by tagging along (WALTZ, 1979).

Three conclusions can be drawn from these few elements. On the one hand, the great diversity of processes in play: various types of transfers of a model (between Europe and States, between States), transnationalization, but also intergovernmentalism in a logic of clearly understood State logics (on the part of Spain and France, but also on the part of a country like Brazil).

This process therefore operates through production/dissemination under the influence of transnational arenas, notably networks of researchers and experts, and of “transnational configurations” (Hassenteufel, 2008: 134; Dumoulin, 2010). The case of RTD would seem to resemble that of environmental policies. Various authors confirm a dissemination by international regimes (BRETMEIER *et al.*, 2011). It is accepted that one of the specificities of these policies is their technicality linked to the scientific uncertainties surrounding the major debates (sustainable development, climate change, ecological modernization, water pollution standards, etc.), which have been taken up by some experts who have constructed or have called upon international arenas geared towards these challenges (Meyer et al, 1997). These relatively autonomous entities, between national and inter/transnational, ensure the circulation and dissemination of ideas, causes (biodiversity, ecosystem, etc.) and of policy instruments that are readapted and then nationally “politicized”.

#### 4.2 Regionalization<sup>4</sup>

Mercosur is attempting to supra-nationalize some policies, infrastructures, energy, but also in recent times, territorial policies, with the founding of FOCEM and the direct transfer of “structural funds”, its European big brothers. This is the embryo of regional territorial policies, to which needs to be added the initiative of the PROCISUR program (which brings together the agricultural research institutions of the 6 southern cone countries) which marginally integrates territorial development concerns. For Central America some regionalization attempts can be found through sectoral regional organizations, including for the environment and territorial development (Integration System in Centro-America, SICA, ECADERT). It would also seem that this is a deliberate strategy on the part of the Latin American states, judging from the example of the Initiative for the Integration of Regional Infrastructure in South America (IIRSA) derived from the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) created in 2008, which, too, remains a barely supra nationalized organization (ROUQUIÉ, 2011).

We note in the literature concerning the EU a type of Europeanization that can easily be transposed to the Latin American case: “bottom up” Europeanization (BAISNÉE; Pasquier, 2007; PASQUIER; WEISBEIN, 2004). Some authors note that in Latin America too, territories are not merely sponges soaking up the imperatives of economic globalization (MEYER, 2009) but would also seem to be places of “reappropriation” (MEYER, 2009, p. 155). Bottom up regionalization also prizes the

aspirations of rural social movements for reform and the pressing claims of those left behind by economic and agricultural growth. In addition, some work on regionalization in Latin America had already pointed the fact that regionalization cannot be summed up as international dynamics alone, but that it is also necessary to consider the ability of the economic and academic elites in particular to deal with issues in arenas that extend beyond state boundaries and international institutions (DABÈNE, 2009). To this need, have to be added the international strategies of territorial collectivities which also implement “by below” sub-national international strategies.

Basing ourselves on earlier surveys (notably the PROPOCID 2010 report) we find that the political models transferred to Latin America are reinterpreted and readapted according to specific national or regional challenges, though always with reference to the European territorial development model of structural funds and the LEADER or LEADER+ programmes. International circulation of models does not mean there is convergence or homogenization of those policies.

There appears, here, one of the main hypotheses of this paper on Latin American regionalization: looking back over the last fifteen years, it is possible to see continental regionalization mechanisms for sectoral policies. While there may be international organizations (IICA for example which is answerable to the Organization of American States-OAS), they are appendages of International Organisations and have freed themselves from the intergovernmentalist will of States. This could correspond to the *spill over* phenomenon, described for European construction: regionalization would seem to become all the more efficient as it manages to gain skills by circumventing intergovernmentalism. The working hypothesis is therefore as follows: while Latin American regional international organizations are struggling to regionalize public policies through a lack of supranationalization and excessive jealous surveillance by states favouring intergovernmentalism (GIRAULT, 2009; DABÈNE, 2009), the policy model we are studying would seem to extend over the continent, partly escaping the States.

It is a matter here of proposing a hypothesis of the existence of a specific and novel mode of regionalization in Latin America: it consists in producing a regional unit through the bottom up dissemination and adoption of policies through the sectoral driving forces (such as IICA) of classic IO and/or NGO and/or bilateral cooperation and/or policy transfers, which all goes to produce a highly sectoral Latin American regionalization process via policy internationalization. It is then possible to speak of a regionalization process without regional integration, even though the latter is not totally absent from this regionalization.

## **5 Conclusion: analysing the sectorial coalition of RTD regionalization in Latin America**

The methodology here proposed to analyse this specific phenomenon of policy internationalization is to reconstruct some Latin American policy coalitions that display it.





This reconstruction process is based, on one hand, on the junction between the world politics approach and the analysis of policy process and public actions approaches; on the other hand it integrates the reading of the overlapping of processes.

In empirical terms, this methodology would consist to observe which is the share of each one of the three approaches (policy transfer, circulation of international standards, institutionalized or “bottom up” regionalization) applying this scheme to the various public policy devices and frameworks for each country case.

In term of analysis grids, it’s first important to identify the origin of the terms of internationalization and their delivery systems. Secondly, it would be necessary to explain how each one of these three modalities operates, according to the different levels. Thirdly, we should analyze how each internationalization modality is mobilized and used or worked by the various stakeholders.

It could be important to analyze the forms of hybridization (assuming integration or complementarity), or the cases of juxtaposition (assuming aggregation between various modalities). At least it’s necessary to check the tension, contradictions and forms of compromise between the different regional or national policies.

At least, such an empiric approach should lead to characterize de different types of entanglements of these terms of internationalization. A complementary issue could be to mobilize the approach of policy coalition framework (SABATIER, JENKINS-SMITH, 1993; BOSCARINO, 2009).

By public policy coalition we mean a network of stakeholders (from the most international to the most territorial) that is more or less open or closed (CONSIDINE, LEWIS, ALEXANDER, 2009) and multi level (BACHE; FLINDERS, 2004; LAZEGA; JOURDANA, MOUNIER, 2007; DUMOULIN. 2010) and whose members guide policy making and policy implementation, sharing a common representation. These coalitions may comprise elected representatives, technocratic experts and consultants, donor IOs or NGOs, representatives of agricultural or industrial interests, etc., activists (ecologists, fishermen, farmer communities, etc.).

Methodologically, these coalitions are reconstituted by way of a quantitative analysis (stakeholder centrality indices, measurement of interactions between them, analysis of relevant political, expert and activist resources, etc. for joining and acting within the coalition (SANDSTRÖM, CARLSSON, 2008; CONSIDINE, LEWIS, ALEXANDER, 2009) and a qualitative analysis (textual analysis of discourse, analysis of stakeholder trajectories). It is therefore a matter of identifying stakeholders who, from territories to IOs/NGOs and including national bureaucracies, form coalitions and enable: the circulation and reappropriation of terms of reference and instruments of this policy; the parallelism of national agendas on the subject in America Latina; sectoral process of regionalization.

## 6 Bibliography

Bache I., Flinders M. (eds), *Multi Level Governance*, Oxford University Press, 2004

Berdegue J ; Fuentealba, R. *Latin America: The State of Smallholders in Agriculture*, IFAD , Conference on New Directions for Smallholder Agriculture, Roma, 24 25/01/ 2011

Biermann F., Philipp Pattberg P., H. van Hasselt, F. Zelli, *The Fragmentation of Global Governance Architectures: A Framework for Analysis*, *Global Environmental Politics* 9, 2009:14 40

Bonnal P. et al., *La production des politiques et compromis institutionnels autour du développement durable. Rapport final du projet Propocid*. Paris, ANR. 2010.

Boscarino J.E., "Surfing for Problems: Advocacy Group Strategy in U.S. Forestry Policy", *The Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 37, n° 3, 2009 : 415-434

Breitmeier H ; Vonderdal A ; Young O.R., *The effectiveness of international Environmental Regimes : comparing and contrasting findings from quantitative research* *International Studies Review*, v 13, n°4, 2011: 579 605

Camau M. ; Massardier G. (dir.), *Démocratie et autoritarisme. Hybridation et fragmentation des pouvoirs*, Paris, Karthala, 2009.

CEPAL, *Panorama del desarrollo territorial en América Latina y el Caribe*, Santiago de Chile, CEPAL Colección Documentos de proyectos, 2010.

Considine M., Lewis J. M., Alexander D. *Networks, Innovation and Public Policy. Politicians, Bureaucrats and the Pathways to Change Inside Government*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009

Champetier, Y. *La Estrategia de Microregiones: une nouvelle stratégie de lutte contre la pauvreté dans les territoires les plus en difficulté du Mexique* Washington D.C.: Inter American Development Bank, 2003

Coufignal G., *Les relations UE AL: simple routine ou prolégomènes d'une politique étrangère européenne ?*, *Mondes Emergents*, « Amérique Latine. Une Amérique Latine toujours plus diverse », La Documentation Française, 2010, p. 99 112

Dabene O. *The Politics of Regional Integration in Latin America: Theoretical and Comparative Explorations*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Dàvila Aldàs F., *América Latina y la globalización*, *Revista de Relaciones Internacionales*, n° 101 102, 2011: 33 56

De Janvry A. ; Sadoulet E. *Toward a territorial approach to rural development:*

International experiences and implications for Mexico's Microregions Strategy, University of California at Berkeley, 2004.

Dolowitz D., Marsh D., Learning from Abroad: The Role of Policy Transfer in Contemporary Policy Making. *Governance an International Journal of Policy Administration and Institutions* 13, 2000: 5 24

Dowbor L., Intellectual in a Network. A New Generation Faces the Challenges of Development, *Latin American Perspectives*, vol. 38, n°3, 2011: 78 98

Dumoulin D., Configurations sociales transnationales : quelles compétences pour les passeurs d'échelles ? Exemples des politiques de la conservation de la nature. La fabrique multi niveaux des politiques. Les passeurs d'échelles, colloque international « Les approches " multi niveaux " des politiques publiques, CIRAD. Montpellier. 6 10/09/2010

Duran P. Penser l'action publique, Paris, LGDJ, 1999.

Evans M. Policy transfer in critical perspective, *Policy Studies* 30, 2009 : 243 68

Gwynne R.N., Kay C., Latin America Transformed. Globalization and Modernity, Arnold, Oxford University Press, 1999.

Giddens A., The Consequences of Modernity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age, Polity Press, Stanford University Press, 1990.

Gilpin R. Global Political Economy, Princeton University Press, 2001.

Girault, C. Intégration et coopération régionale en Amérique du Sud dans C. Girault (ed.), L'intégration en Amérique du Sud, Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2009 p. 39 61

Hassenteufel P. Sociologie de l'Action Publique, Paris, Armand Colin, 2008.

Hooghe L., Marks G., Multi-Level Governance and European Integration, Bruxelles et New-York, Inc. Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2001.

Kehoane R. Power and Governance in a Partially Globalized World, London: Routledge, 2002

Kentor J. The growth of transnational Corporate Network 1962 1998, *Journal of World System Research*, vol. 11, n°2, 2005,

Kentor J., Jang Y. S., Yes, there is a (Growing) Transnational Business Community, *International Sociology*, vol. 19, n°3 2004



Kohler Koch B., *The transformation of governance in Europe*, London : Routledge, 1995.

Lazega E., Jourda M., Mounier L., *L'analyse de réseaux multi-niveaux : Une étude de cas*, *Revue française de sociologie*, 2007

Lindblom C.E., *The Science of 'Muddling Through*, *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 19, n°2, 1959 : 79 88

Losch B., Fréguin Gresh S.; White, E. *Rural Transformation and Late Developing Countries in a Globalizing World: A Comparative Analysis of Rural Change*. Final Report of the RuralStruc Program, Washington, DC: World Bank, 2011.

Massardier G. *Politiques et action publiques*, Armand Colin, collection U, 2008.

McGrew A., *Globalization and Global Politics* in Baylis J., Smith S., Owens P., *The Globalization of World Politics. An Introduction to International Relations*, Oxford University Press, 2011.

Meyer J. W., *The Structuring of a World Environmental Regime, 1870 1990*, *International Organization*, Vol. 51, N° 4, 1997 : 623 651

Miranda C ; Tiburcio (Coord). *Políticas de Desenvolvimento Territorial Rural no Brasil Avanços e Desafios*, Brasília, IICA Brasil, 2010, 26p

Moravcsik A., *Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics*", *International Organisation*, Vol.51, n°4,1997 : 513 553.

Musia<sup>3</sup>kowska, I. *Transfer of the European Regional Policy to Latin America* , European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), Colchester, University of Essex, 2006.

Nicolas F., *Mondialisation et régionalisation dans les pays en développement. Les deux face de Janus*, *Politique Etrangère*, N°2, 1997 : 293 306

O'Brien, P. *Global financial integration/ the end of geography*, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, 1992

Pasquier R., *L'eupéanisation par le bas : les régions et le développement territorial en France et en Espagne* », in J. Fontaine, P. Hassenteufel, *To change or not to change? Le changement de l'action publique à l'épreuve du terrain*, Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2002

Pasquier, R. *La capacité politique des régions. Une comparaison France/Espagne*, Rennes, Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2004.

Pasquier, R. ; Weisbein J. *L'Europe au microscope du local. Manifeste pour une*

sociologie politique de l'intégration communautaire, *Politique européenne*, n°12, 2004 : 5 21

Posada E. V., les scénarios d'intégration sud américains, in C. Girault (ed.), *L'intégration en Amérique du Sud*, Paris : Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2009 : 121 132

Risse Kappen T., *Bringing transnational relations back in: Non state actors, domestic structures and international institutions*, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Robinson W.I., *Promoting Polyarchy in Latin America : The Oxymoron of 'Market Democracy'* in E Hershberg, F Rosen, *Latin America After Neoliberalism. Turning the Tide in the 21st Century*, Nacla, 2006, p. 96 119

Robinson W.I. *Latin America and Global Capitalism. A Critical Globalization Perspective*, Baltimore. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008.

Rosenau J.N. *Along the Domestic Foreign Frontier. Exploring governance in a Turbulent World*, Cambridge University Press, 1997

Rosenau J.N., *Thinking Theory Thoroughly: Coherent Approaches To an Incoherent World*, Westview Press, 1995

Rose, R., *What Is Lesson Drawing?*, *Journal of Public Policy*, 11; 1991: 3 30

Rouquié, A. *L'Amérique Latine dans un ordre mondial en mutation*", *Mondes émergents*, «Amérique Latine. L'Amérique Latine est bien partie», La Documentation Française, 2011, p. 15 27

Sabourin E. *Les débats de politique agricole et de développement rural dans le Brésil de Lula*, in *Lusotopie* n° XIV 2, 2007,: 61 85,

Sabourin, E ; Teixeira O. (Edit) *Planification du développement territorial au Brésil Actes du séminaire, 28 30 septembre 1999*, Cirad, Ufpb, Montpellier, Colloques, 2002, 116p.

Sabatier P. A., Jenkins-Smith H,C., *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*, Westview Press, 1993

Sachwald F. *La mondialisation comme facteur d'intégration régionale*, *Politique Etrangère*, N°2, 1997 : 257 276

Sachwald F. *Réactions et réponses à la mondialisation. Mondialisation, innovation et inégalités*, Les notes de l'IFRI, 2002, n° 48

Sandström A., Carlsson L., *The Performance of Policy Networks: The Relation*

between Network Structure and Network Performance, *The Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 4, 2008 : 497-524

Sepulveda S; Rodriguez A.; Echeverri R.; Portilla M. El enfoque territorial de desarrollo rural, San José, C.R. : IICA, 2003. 180 p.

Scholte J. A., *Globalization : A Critical Introduction*, N York : McMillan, 2000.

Théry H., Les relations bilatérales décentralisées France Brésil dans leur contexte Europe Amérique Latine, *Mondes émergents*, « Amérique Latine. La nouvelle donne politique et économique », La Documentation Française, 2009, p. 81 104

Valderrama M., Los procesos de descentralización en América Latina y la cooperación europea, in J L Rhi Sausi, *Desarrollo local en América Latina. Logros y desafíos para la cooperación europea*, Recal Cespi, 2004 p. 49 62.

Velut. S. Mondialisation et développement territorial en Amérique latine Argentine Chili. HDR de géographie, Université Paris III Sorbonne Nouvelle. 2007.

Velut. S. Développement et mondialisation dans le Cône Sud : le territoire en débat.in *Bulletin de l'Association de Géographes Français* 85, 3 , 2008 : 338 350

Waltz K.. *Theory of International Politics*, McGraw Hill, 1979.

## Endnotes

**1** The following definitions illustrate this: “operations within an integral whole’ since ‘truly global services know no internal boundaries, can be offered throughout the globe, and pay scant attention to national aspects” (O’BRIEN, 1992, p. 5); “ever closer integration of national markets on a world scale” (SACHWALD, 2002).

**2** See the different reports of the Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo (AECID)

**3** For example: Mission des chambres de commerce et d’industries en Amérique Latine (CHAMPETIER, 2003) or the San Jose Workshop on ‘rural territorial development policies’ organized and funded by CIRAD, an international scientific player and broker of public policy paradigms, 21-25 November 2011 (Universidad nacional, CINPE & CIRAD).

**4** The Latin American process is intentionally less integrated since it is only geared towards constructing a market between certain countries of Latin America. Its supranational nature is marginal to the benefit of ‘inter governmentalism’, which would seem, moreover, to be detrimental to its efficiency and be the cause of numerous impediments (ROUQUIÉ, 2011, POSADA, 2009 ; DABÈNE, 2009)

