MARKETIZATION OF RURAL RESOURCES IN POLAND

Abstract

The collapse of the communist system and the process of transformation process changed macro-social and institutional environment of rural communities in Poland. Market economy and democracy opened new prospects for rural communities and farmers. Sociological research proofs that farmers tend to be victims of the changes rather than winners. Rural transformation in Poland could be perceived in terms of the process of marketization of local resources and desagrarianisation of rural space. Multifunctional agriculture produces market products and public goods which could be also commodified.

Factors of rural space desagrarianisation and development of its new functions are discussed. Rural space is becoming a space of consumption, which enables transforming its material and cultural heritage into market products. Factors supporting marketization of rural resources in Poland include: CAP reform, rural and agriculture development policy, governance in production and consumption of food. Differentiation of rural economy enables capitalization of local social and cultural resources and using them in diverse local development strategies.

Key words: marketization of rural resources, multifunctional agriculture, post-productive countryside, rural sustainable development, desagrarianisation of rural space.

1 The term marketization is used by M. Buravoy, see References p. 123.
INTRODUCTION

In the analyses of the transformation process in Poland made so far, the researchers’ attention was focused on identification of barriers hampering the development of civic society and limiting social participation. Smaller interest rates both resulted from and promoted a market economy and market mechanisms. It was concluded, in fact, that Poles accepted market rules more quickly than the rules of democracy (Rychard 2006, 2004), but little is known about how that almost enthusiastic acceptance of market rules is affecting the adaptation strategies of various social actors and what will be the consequences of the market expansion in rural areas. That problem was made a subject of interest and empirical research by K. Gorlach (2009; 2001; 1995) several times, while he was documenting the impact of market mechanisms on family farms and analyzing the defense strategies adopted by them. The research results help to create a certain picture of the restructuring of Polish agriculture. In the opinion of the quoted author, it consists of “a more and more visible presence of medium and high capitalized farms, of which the number regularly grows in the analyzed period” (Gorlach 2009: 107). This conclusion can also be interpreted as a manifestation of concentration of resources in the most effective farms which have managed to defend their market positions.

Descriptions of the transformation process in Poland usually present farmers as the great losers in the process of changes (Domański 1997) and a social class which lost rather than gained in the process of transformation, and they have even been mentioned as an example of communities affected by the transformation change trauma (Sztompka 2000; Kocik 2001). Such views are supported by numerous statistical data that show the distance dividing rural households from urban households in both the economic situation and the level of income, or incomes of farmers versus the incomes of other social-professional categories. The social and economic situation of farmers in fact improved after accession of Poland to the EU, but the rural areas still lag behind and gain less from the results of the development processes. This causes fears that the disproportionate social development between urban and rural areas (Halamska 2009; Raport Polska 2000) will hamper modernization processes and will put social cohesion in jeopardy.
MULTIFUNCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND TURNING
OF THE RURAL AREAS INTO NON-AGRICULTURAL AREAS

In the global economy, the significance of agriculture in economic life changes both in the villages and in the whole society. As noticed in many works (such as Ward 1993, Wilson 2001, Wilkin 2005, Van Huylenbroeck 2006), agriculture in developed societies and globalized economies enters another developmental phase, defined as post-productive. The result is its diminishing role in the generation of GDP and the creation of jobs along with the fall of incomes of people employed in that sector and, as a consequence, a shrinking of the number of inhabitants in rural areas. Post-productive agriculture (Wilkin 2005) is not only oriented to an increase in productivity, efficiency, and effectiveness, it is concentrated on fulfillment of high quality criteria and on a production process that is less burdensome for the natural environment, i.e., with respect to the rules of sustainable development. Also the rural economy is differentiated, as its development depends on local resources, not just material ones, and possibilities of their capitalization.

The multifunctional model of agriculture constitutes the third proposal compared to the dependent model and the competitive model of agriculture, both regulated by market mechanisms only (Van Huylenbroeck 2006). It assumes that agriculture produces not only marketable goods, but also other values that are not priced by the market. It is expected that the policy of rural development will also support farmers ability to produce non-market goods and services that are consumed by other users of the rural area, which can also bring income to farmers (Van Huylenbroeck 2006). Some goods can be supplied to public markets where the main buyer is the state and other representatives of the public sector. This would require a change in rural area development policy, which has been oriented toward development of the local economy oriented to strengthening local capital rather than be focused on the development of agriculture (Refsgaard 2009). Achievement of those objectives requires the creation of new social networks that embrace representatives of both private and public sectors and would enable distribution of such local public goods. A multifunctional agriculture thus enables a transformation of the local non-marketable goods into local resources that, by becoming marketable, gain economic value and stimulate the local economy.

A multifunctional process of development of rural areas leads to their integration and deep restructuring. Just like every process of change, it is territorially differentiated, and particular places within a geographical area
lose their agricultural character at different rates and develop non-agricultural functions. That depends on many factors, such as:

- situation in the geographical space, where the distance to the city and to main roads is of importance,
- density of population,
- character of the local economy, degree of its dependence on agriculture, which is decisive with regard to availability of non-agricultural jobs,
- character of the local labour resources and social capital,
- character of the value systems of the inhabitants of villages, how the abandonment of agricultural activity is perceived, and the place in the system that is occupied by traditional peasant values.

The multi-functional model of development is the reason why development opportunities in rural societies depend not only on the condition of agriculture, but, more and more, on the ability to initiate and exploit the less mobile local resources (e.g., economic, social and cultural capital) and on the synergy between mobile and immobile resources (Bryden and others 2008: 4).

Concluding that the economic activity and behaviour of social actors are rooted in the natural environment and in the social system, it is assumed that the relations shaped between them are of a dynamic and complex character. As a result of empirical research, six interrelated structural factors have been identified, which determine local development in rural areas. They include:

- The transformation of local culture and society towards market regulations;
- Development in the geographic periphery and the level of development of technical infrastructure;
- Governance, character of the public institutions, and size of investments;
- Development of entrepreneurship;
- Character of economic structures and active organizations;
- Human resources and relationships (Bryden i in., 2008: 5).

These factors determine the character and course of the economic activities that have been undertaken, through which the natural and cultural resources are commercialized and economic capital is created. Their activity also allows for an explanation of the observed differences in levels of local development and living conditions of inhabitants of particular places.

The multifunctional model of rural development, the observed structural changes and differentiation of Polish rural space create its new image and require a new conceptualization. So far, rural space has been defined in substantive categories according to what was grown, which was created and reproduced
mainly as a result of farmers’ co-operation with nature, by way of carrying out specific production practices. Such a definition of rural space narrowed its meaning to agricultural space.

Integration brings about development of new functions to rural space; new functions require that the different types of activity and practices carried out there are taken into account to a greater extent. The types of activities and practices mentioned above may have only loose connections with agricultural activity or have no connection with it at all. An example of such practices can be the marketing of tourist services, natural environment protection programmes, realization of the goals of EU Common Agricultural Policy, or the life style of the urban service class, which highly values rural dwelling space and willingly consumes it.

MARKETIZATION OF RURAL RESOURCES

Rural areas subjected to restructuring become predominantly a consumer’s space with residential, recreational and leisure time functions. Development of those new functions requires that the rural resources be get marketized. While being commercialized, rural areas and their natural and cultural heritage are transformed into market goods that become part of the global turnover. Goods need a buyer, a consumer who will pay and provide profit for the one who offers them. Commercialization of the resources of a rural area is also supported by the development of a service economy, which entails a change in the nature of work. Commercialization also results in growth in the demand for dwelling spaces free from the burdens of the big-city environment and a life-style which highly values the so called “green consumerism” or “green life-style”. That idea embraces a wide variety of phenomena such as vegetarianism, care of animals, shops offering healthy food, open-air festivals, bicycles, demonstrations, marches and other activities which need a lot of free space that rural areas have in abundance.

The observed desagrarisation of rural areas and the multi-functional character of its development give a new meaning to the country and its resources, including material, natural, social and cultural ones. They can be, and more and more often are, treated as unique resources which the market helps capitalize. Hence, marketization of rural resources will mean creation and expansion of the scope of activity of market mechanisms and ownership rights, which decide about allocation of those resources. It also means that there will be competition for
access to various goods and services and a need for external development funds by local country communities.

Regulation through the market mechanism eventually leads to reduction in the number of participants and increasing density in their inter-relationships (Aldridge 2006). Hence, the country resources may be analyzed along a new dimension which is their marketization. Here, I refer to the concept of goods and social relationships (Ziółkowski 2005: 185), according to which “marketization” […] is a process of turning into goods, getting a price and entering the market”. Such a process embraces not only the natural rural resources, such as land, water, free space, but also social and cultural resources, such as local traditions or cultural heritage. Preparation of a complete list of elements which may be subject of marketization is not really possible, so I will just paraphrase the four different categories selected by Perkins (2006: 245):

– Agricultural and gardener’s products and activities, well known, with a well established market position, which increase their market shares by way of popularization, e.g. Lisiecka sausage in Poland;

– New products and activities which become popular as a result of changes in the life-style, fashion, popularization of good nutrition, such as ecological food, cheeses or smoked products made with the use of traditional methods, or horse riding;

– Old, abandoned village households and farming facilities used by inhabitants of cities as second homes, hobby farms;

– Elements of country space and country traditions used for recreational purposes, or traditional regional cuisine or traditional activities enjoyed by a city dweller who spends his holidays at his vacation farm can participate.

Commercialization of these resources, which in part are public goods, leads to a deep restructuring of rural areas. When the historical significance of an area is lost, some people begin to ignore the local context and start functioning outside of it. This turns some things into market products that are subject of market transactions. These products may be offered to anyone including visitors from far-away places who live in a different cultural context. As a result of commercialization, the “countryside” and “rurality” lose their spatial and social-cultural characteristics that have so far reflected a set of measurable indicators, such as density of population, share of agriculture in the local economy, size of the village (town). The terms “village” and “rurality” start to function as cognitive structures, as social representations (Halfacree 1993; Halfacree 2006), or as a “rustical style” (Macnaghten, Urry 2005: 231). The change of categories “countryside” and “rurality” causes various social consequences, such as:
– aesthetization of rural areas and idealization of the countryside landscape,
– idolization of country space which begins to be treated as something particularly valuable, the access to which can be limited and from which economic profits can be gained by way of collecting of charges,
– conversion of elements of the local culture into goods attractive to buyers,
– calling for protection of the landscape and cultural and natural heritage of the countryside, deemed to be valued treasures which should be preserved for future generations.

Rural space is starting to be perceived as a “lost paradise”, an idyllic place as opposed to the inhumane conditions prevailing in an industrial city (Macnaghten and Urry 2005: 235). In a long-term perspective, that may mean a rationing of access to those commonly desired values by charging for access to rural landscape, air, and open space.

The process of commercializing rural resources can be the cost modernization that rural residents, governed by different rules in the pre-industrial societies, bear when included into wider social systems.

Commercializing of rural resources significantly changes their character. By functioning as commodities, those resources loose their authentic character, their connection with the local place and culture. They can be multiplied without limitations become more like a social design that is subordinated to the requirements of the global market. The countryside, its unique natural resources, elements of the landscape, and local culture become just a brand that sells well. Branding of a product with the adjective “rural”, such as “rural ham” or “rural cheese” is considered a guarantee of its authenticity, taste and health values, etc. Commercializing rural resources in the way described above removes them of stigmatizing meanings and makes it possible to present the rural world as attractive to outsiders who become its consumers.

The countryside ceases to function as a real social world, becoming a picture from an advertisement, a presented, created world. It changes into a visual phenomenon created for the needs of the market which values its otherness and allows for sale of products branded as “rural”. Attractiveness can also be and is created as a result of deliberate decisions of specialists in the field of marketing of goods and services. The following advertising leaflet is an example:
The commercialization of rural areas and the development of an artificial identity, e.g., “rustic” has an impact on rural areas, causing various social consequences. They include:

- conversion of rural spaces into spectacles, articles ready for sale, which means development with a pre-devised plan,
- loss of the local unique character and detachment from the social and historical context, orientation towards the tastes and needs of outsiders, “new consumers” rather than the local inhabitants,
- potential conflicts between the existing users of the rural areas (farmers) and their new users (tourists, residents, etc)

As was mentioned earlier, both modern agriculture and rural space in European societies has become multifunctional (Barthelemy and Vidal 2006, Wilkin 2005). In developed countries, it is no longer possible to identify rural areas with just one economic function. Once agriculture lost its traditional function as the central economic factor of the rural economy, it became mostly a service provided to consumers from outside of rural areas; the functions of agriculture were reduced to the delivery of public goods (Wilkin 2005: 25). Here, one has in mind those effects of a farmer’s work, that are not sold on the market, such as maintenance of the...
natural environment in an appropriate condition, preservation of the countryside cultural heritage, maintenance of bio-diversity, prevention of depopulation of rural areas all of which economists call positive external effects. Those “positive external effects”, having partly a character of “public goods” become a subject of consumption of the whole society, not only the inhabitants of the country, and which haven't been valuated by the market, so far.

Development of division of work requires an expansion of the market which, according to A. Smith, develops significantly slower in rural areas than in urban areas. Expansion of the market in the sphere of agriculture entails a number of limitations, which are a result of both the nature of market mechanisms and the character of agriculture. Contemporary societies expect agriculture to fulfill many functions going beyond the traditionally understood production of foods and raw materials. Relations between agricultural and non-agricultural functions of rural areas are complex. According to research results (Van Huylenbroeck 2006) the presence of an open agricultural space in the vicinity is advantageous for the residential function, because it makes the residential properties situated nearby more attractive. It is to the contrary in the case of big animal farms, the proximity of which diminishes the attractiveness of residential properties.

The changes that have been discussed regarding Polish rural areas can be illustrated, at least partly, with the use of available statistical data. Undoubtedly, one of the manifestations of the desagrarisation of rural space is the structure of income of rural households, which is presented below:
The structure of income of rural households shows a diminishing share of income obtained from the farm, which has been replaced by income from employment and provision of social services.

Three facts document the development of the residential function. One is the almost tripled growth of the number of new residential buildings erected in rural areas – from 14,959 in 2000 to 42,675 in 2007 (Statistical Yearbook of Agriculture and Rural Areas 2008), which is presented by the chart below:
Similar conclusions result from NSP data showing the growth of the number of rural households in the period of 1988–2002 in the most urbanized voivodship, i.e. Silesian voivodship (by 11%) and Małopolskie voivodship (by 16%) (Gorlach, Drag, Nowak 2004: 33), which constitute the second confirmation of desagrarisation of the rural space. The third one is the share of rural households with no user of the farm, which is documented by NSP 2002 data situated on the map below:

Percentage of landless rural households in Poland

Source: Census Data 2002, GUS

In the light of Census Data 2002 data presented on the map, in 6 voivodships situated in rural areas there prevail households connected with the use of a farm. Those are Podlaskie, Lubelskie, Podkarpackie, Małopolskie, Świętokrzyskie and Łódzkie voivodships. In the Mazovian voivodship there exists an equilibrium between landless households and those connected with a farm. In the rural areas of other voivodships there dominate landless households.
Commercialization of rural space requires other conceptual approaches and new theoretical categories to analyze it. At present, one source of such categories is, inter alia, the concept of sustainable rural development, which invests the rural area with special properties and calls for the necessity to protect it and to take actions aimed at preserving it for future generations. The concept of sustainable development addresses rural areas in an integrative way, accentuating the importance of equilibrium of three dimensions – natural, economic and social, as the most important principle of development. Realization of this principle requires a participation model of rural development. The proposed rural development policy makes it possible to preserve it for future generations and allows for protecting it against degradation, depopulation, and marginalization, which principally changes its social perception. Rural space begins to be perceived as an asylum, a resort for all people tired of urban civilization, who want to use it as a result of a deliberate choice of their preferred lifestyle, “consume” its advantages, and enjoy its aesthetic character (Howe 2005: 42). The background of a sustainable development conceptual approach is the desire to maintain its present properties rather than to introduce changes.

The conceptual approach to rural space, which assumes that it is treated as a national and even all-human resource, makes that space an oasis of unique values of the natural environment, authentic and vivid interpersonal relationships, a rich symbolic sphere and almost an ideal community. This new image is very distant from the one which has prevailed so far, the one in which rural areas are the subject of modernization efforts, realization of development policies, or an area in which many social problems are concentrated, such as unemployment, poverty, aging of the inhabitants and depopulation, the solution of which assumed activities aimed at introduction of changes rather than maintaining the status quo.

What pictures of the rural space have been formulated so far? Let me refer to three described by Macnaghten and Urry (2005: 247). The first, which has been defined as “seeing, landscape”, presents a countryside with a healthy environment, diversified, accessible and full of beauty, “a countryside of dreams”. This vision has two aspects – deepening of the picture and access to it. Intensive agriculture and other forms of intensive economic activity threaten this vision of the countryside. Farmers are rather out of place here. They are hidden away from tourists or act as an addition to a romantic landscape. It is recommended that the landscape be passively consumed and its charms admired, rather than transformed. The second picture, defined as “management”, is built by governmental agencies and organizers of leisure time, in which effective management is perceived as a tool allowing for overcoming the conflicts of interests arising in rural areas.
One should be aware that answers to the question: “why should the countryside be managed?” can be and are very different. As formulated by Macnaghten and Urry (2005: 250), “should the countryside be managed in order to pursue its economic revival or to maintain it in its present shape?” It is difficult to answer the question, for example, whose interests should be defended and what conflicts should be avoided? The third picture, defined as a “consumer choice”, includes commercialization of rural areas and treatment of the rural environment as a positive aspects of a category of valuable resources. That means the development of an economic potential regarding the use of those resources and promotion of new activities in the rural space, such as hunting, war games, mountain cycling, fishing or golf. That also assumes a commercialization of access to rural areas by introducing parking charges, camping charges, climatic charges, etc. Social consequences of such a commercialization include conversion of rural areas into attractive entertainments, a special market set of goods for sale, which starts to function as a “tourist attraction”.

Marketization of rural resources in Poland has been included in the model of agricultural policy, realized as an element of the transformation process. So far, it has been a top-down rather than a grass-roots process. The main actor for change in the institution of agriculture was the state and its agencies. Before the accession to the EU, civic society was too weak to be able to take effective grass-roots actions. After the accession, the situation changed, as the CAP (Common Agricultural Policy) promoted a model of sustainable development of rural areas, participation of local communities in its realization (LEADER Program), and the marketization of local resources and the mobilization of local social capital were treated as tools for the change. The gradual withdrawal of the state from the public sphere created a space for new social actors, such as private entrepreneurs, consumer organizations or country non-governmental organizations.

Food production has been subjected to wider and wider public control, which is realized by special institutions, e.g., five state agencies guard the safety of food in Poland. Consumer organizations represent the public interest in food quality control. The voice of farmers, who are charged with responsibility for the sub-standard food quality and marginalized, is hardly audible in the debate concerning the food issues. Farmers maintain a dialogue with the state, taking actions in the political sphere, rather than directly with the consumers.

What are the supports for the marketization process and what are the sources of barriers? Planned reforms of CAP are one factor supporting the marketization of rural resources, provided that they are realized as planned, where it is assumed that market regulations will be extended. The activities of the state and its agencies
acting in the spheres of management of rural and agricultural development are of a similar character in their promotion of better utilization of local resources using a participative model where the inhabitants and non-governmental organizations are participants. Another factor supporting the marketization are the controls in the production, processing industry, and food trade, which means a growth of the importance of consumer organizations that act for the extension of the scope of consumer choices.

One source of potential barriers to marketization is the preference given to other mechanisms of regulation by farmers organizations and state agencies. Agricultural organizations demand that the state take direct intervention measures that would help neutralize market failures, whereas state agencies pursue a policy of expanding market regulations.

Another source of limitations is the conflict of rules governing the production and consumption of food. Production of food is subject to a growing control of the market, which means global competition. Its objective is achievement of profits and accumulation of capital. It is subordinated to the requirements of technical and technological development and to the global standards of quality, health safety, etc. The consumption of food, on the other hand, is becoming more and more reflexive (debates on admissibility of GMO), it is regulated locally and regionally where traditions, consumer patterns, social and religious norms have a deciding role. It is subordinated to the consumer’s individual satisfaction, and often serves as a manifestation of identity, realization of a lifestyle, e.g. vegetarian diet, consuming only the locally produced food.

PRACTICES AND ACTORS OF THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF RURAL SPACE

If the character of the rural space has changed, one should consider what social practices contemporarily contribute to its creation. Which groups of actors are the most important in the process? How much space is occupied among them by agricultural activity that has shaped rural areas for ages and still remains a leading practice in many regions of the world.

In the EU countries, the practices that are important for the shaping of rural space include CAP (Common Agricultural Policy) and policies regarding development of rural areas; the programmes and priorities of these policies determine the flow of financial streams and determine the success of many projects. Great importance can presently be attributed to the practice of natural
environment management, in which long-term interests are often considered to be of overriding importance compared to the current needs and objectives of the people inhabiting a given area. In order to achieve those goals, it is proposed to give preference to management and planning in the process of creation of rural space.

The marketization process gives a growing importance to marketing practices that determine what will be sold, to whom, how much and when. The final shape of rural life is now a result of marketing activities.

An increasingly important element is the role of architecture and spatial planning, as the key practices which organize the space, necessary both for creation of dwelling and recreational spaces that will keep growing in the countryside landscape.

What social practices lead to consumption the rural areas? One can mention here living in the country, tourism and recreation, so called “green consumerism” including events organized in the open air, such as picnics, marches, camping, cycling tourism, etc. Also, one should not forget about the marketing of food, where the countryside functions as a brand of food – “country sausage”, “cottage cheese”, “country eggs”. Of equal important is the marketing of services, using the rural character as a brand of tourist products – “country landscape”, “country air”, “country customs”.

As a result of those practices, the country functions as a market product, which entails a number of social and cultural consequences, such as:

- sale of elements of tradition, material culture and everyday life of the country to visitors from outside,
- idealization of the country landscape, which is being enhanced as it disappears,
- developing a cultural heritage “industry”, offering all kinds of souvenirs and country products to consumers.

The result of these practices is a “country product of high quality, expressed through the market”.

The concept of sustainable development of rural areas creates a new framework for public discussion about the development of rural areas, namely the “sustainability discourse”, of which the participants, apart from the “ordinary” consumers of country resources, are state agencies, the European Union, local authorities, environmental organizations and business circles. This leads to new questions about the role of the hitherto existing producers and consumers of rural space resources, which include farmers and inhabitants of the rural space.
Because of the global character of environmental protection problems, the postulates include development of co-operation between various groups of actors, a dialogue, education and informing society. As Macnaghten and Urry (2005: 288) noted, the discourse is assuming an “optimistic model of a personal agency”, that completely ignores the institutional context of activity of individuals who are responsible citizens and consumers. Relations with a state which pursues an environmentally friendly policy does not provoke problems, business provides “ecological” products, and people believe in scientific opinions and reduce their current consumption in order to preserve the resources for future generations. None of that gives rise to conflicts, requires a conciliation of contradictory interests or solutions to current problems of daily life. The reality is far from such an optimistic vision and requires compromises, agreements and negotiations.

SUMMARY

Michel Buravoy (2007) identified three waves of the marketization process, of which each was characterized by another range of impacts. The first wave embraced marketization of labour, marketization of agriculture in industrialized countries and marketization of the finance. It had a local range. It entailed movements that fought against marketization and development of an association life. Building a civil society from scratch was thought to constitute a social self-defense against the effects of marketization. The second wave embraced the marketization of money and trade and had a local or national range. The third wave which can be seen now, embraces the marketization of the natural and social environments along with public goods and has a global range.

Each of the waves evoked different activities, making it possible for societies to adapt to the consequences produced by each wave. Responses to the first wave were characterized by social adjustments and reactions on the local level, of which the aim was to defend labour and agriculture against the effects of market activities. They took the form of movements fighting the marketization or of establishing associations. The social self-defense in that stage was the building of foundations of a civil society. Responses to the second marketization wave were actions at the national/state level. Fascism and Stalinism are considered examples of attempts at defense of the economic autarchy against the tyranny of the international markets. Activities at the state level led to formulation of employee and social rights, which became an element of the welfare state policy. The state and the market collaborated in favour of and were controlled by civil
society. The reactions to the third marketization wave, which had a global reach, need a return to formulation of answers on a local scale. Marketization of the natural environment, commercialization of public goods, marketization of the human body, organs and products of the human brain requires a collaboration and defense against the effects of actions of supra-national political and economic institutions which tend to destroy employee rights and social benefits. The state is withdrawing from the public sphere as it yields to the market and supports market mechanisms. Civil society is left to carry out its defensive activities on its own.

Without having data that would allow for a full evaluation of the degree of advancement of the process of marketization of rural resources in Poland, or to determine the factors deciding its course, I can only conclude that the future situation of rural areas in Poland will be determined by local responses to those global impacts of the third marketization wave. Responses can be expected to be differentiated on the local and regional levels in order to utilize the whole variety of potentials of local environments. Their formulation requires a better mobilization of social and cultural resources that inhabitants of the country have at their disposal, including those who have nothing to do with agriculture. This formulation will not be possible without building effective social networks and co-operation of various groups of actors.

The contemporary rural economy is becoming a patchwork of differentiated local economies, and it can no longer be presented as a dichotomized model of a traditional or modern economy (Marini and Mooney 2006: 96). The possibilities of enlivening local economies depend on various local resources, including social resources that are useful to economic activity. Connections between the local economy and local social and cultural resources are used for formulation of differentiated strategies of local development, which constitute answers to the activity of the global market forces.
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