



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Wine trails as an organizational pathway toward landscape coherence

Citation for published version:

Oles, T 2016, 'Wine trails as an organizational pathway toward landscape coherence: The case of the Finger Lakes region, New York, USA', *Geografisk Tidsskrift-Danish Journal of Geography*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00167223.2015.1111767>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1080/00167223.2015.1111767](https://doi.org/10.1080/00167223.2015.1111767)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Geografisk Tidsskrift-Danish Journal of Geography

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Wine trails as organizational pathway toward landscape coherence: the case of the Finger Lakes region, New York, USA

Thomas Oles
Edinburgh School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture
University of Edinburgh
74 Lauriston Place
Edinburgh EH3 9DF
Scotland UK

+44 131 6515795 (O)
+44 7711 585000 (M)
t.oles@ed.ac.uk

NB:

Author's final pre-print version. Not for reproduction without author consent.

© Thomas Oles, 2015

Abstract

This paper explores the role of so-called wine trails as planners and managers of viticultural landscapes, using the case of the Finger Lakes region in New York, USA. Using key informant interviews it assesses the current capacity and the future potential of these non-governmental, fee-based ‘clubs’ to mediate between global markets and the local agricultural landscape in the absence of policy frameworks designed for this purpose. Though it finds little evidence of such mediation today, the paper argues that the structure and institutional position of wine trails, organizations whose members’ livelihoods depend substantially on long-term landscape coherence, position them to play a more assertive role in doing so in the future, particularly in places marked by lax planning regimes and scarce resources.

Keywords

- 1 Landscape Management
- 2 Agricultural Landscapes
- 3 Viticulture
- 4 Cultural Heritage
- 5 Collaborative Planning

1 Introduction

Planning agricultural landscapes ‘at the landscape scale’ (Selman 2006) is more urgent than ever. Rapid urbanization, changes in global climate, sea level rise, and perennial problems related to nutrient loading, pollution of waterways, and intensification or extensification of production all illustrate the pressing need to manage agricultural landscapes in ways that are both sustainable and operational. And yet, despite a profusion of research on the subject, true coherence remains a distant goal in most places (Hamilton et al. 2005; Kidd 2000; Oles & Wolf 2015; Selman 2006).

This lack of success is due in large part to a scarcity of mechanisms. Policymakers wishing to influence landscape management across parcel boundaries have in essence only three ‘levers’ at their disposal: state coercion (‘fear’), moral duty (‘love’), and economic interest (‘money’). Each of these has been proven effective under certain circumstances and in aid of particular goals, but none on its own can be said to deliver landscape coherence in every situation and at every scale. Reliance on voluntary initiative assumes that the values of ‘landscape managers’ are simple, predictable, and consistent. Yet it is clear that, generally speaking, they are no such thing, with people often evincing quite different preferences and allegiances in the ‘space of flows’ and the ‘space of place’ (Castells 1996; Primdahl & Swaffield 2010; Primdahl et al. 2013). Coercion and incentive may get better results in the short term but, because they require ongoing—and often substantial—public monies, they are highly vulnerable over long periods.

For these reasons it is now widely agreed that successful schemes will necessarily pull all three levers in different measure at different times (Oles & Wolf 2015). There is growing interest among scholars and policymakers in non-governmental organizations that appear to build a landscape management ethic around a set of shared concerns, practices, and economic interests (MacFarlane 2000; Ploeg 2008). Such collaboration has most often taken the form of so-called ‘landscape cooperatives,’ member organizations that provide a platform for deliberating, organizing, and coordinating the actions of individual landowners according to a set of larger aspirations and values. These organizations have enjoyed considerable success in the Netherlands where they originated and now cover nearly every area of the country (Wiskerke et al. 2003).

However there has been little attention, in the literature thus far devoted to landscape cooperatives, to variation across cultures. Models of cooperation that work in the Netherlands, with its strong corporatist and interventionist tradition, are less likely to meet with success in societies marked by liberal economic attitudes and a weaker social fabric. There is thus a need to catalogue and evaluate alternative models of landscape collaboration whose legitimacy derives, not from their similarity to an ideal established under very different conditions, but rather from their emergence in, and allegiance to, the same places they purport to manage. Many if not all these organizations will bear little resemblance, in either their internal structures or their institutional fields, to ‘landscape cooperatives’ as they have thus far been described.

This paper examines one such structure in a distinctive agricultural and viticultural landscape in the northeastern United States, the Finger Lakes Wine Trails of central New York state. Its object is to assess the degree to which these organizations, whose membership is restricted to wine growers and makers in specific areas, might represent one possible path toward sustainable landscape management

and ‘territorial development’ (Storper 1997) in a context where state policies are manifestly insufficient. The discussion is based primarily on in-depth semi-structured interviews of individuals with operational experience, institutional knowledge, and policy interest in wine trails as regional organizations; these key informants are listed in Appendix A.

The paper is divided into five parts. The first part provides a brief history of the Finger Lakes agricultural landscape since European colonization. The second part traces the expansion of small-scale wine production since the 1980s, and the emergence of the three ‘wine trails’ in the 2000s. The third part discusses the challenges the region currently faces with respect to landscape coherence and economic development. The fourth part considers the extent to which these complex challenges might be partially met by the wine trails. It describes the activities, structure, and institutional field of these organizations, and assesses both their current role in coordinating landscape management practices across their membership, and structural impediments that might hinder the expansion of this role in the future. The fifth part concludes with directions for further research and remarks on the difficulty of attaining landscape coherence in a neoliberal context.

2 The Finger Lakes agricultural landscape: a brief history

The Finger Lakes region is located in the approximate geographical center of New York state, halfway between New York City and Toronto (Figure 1a). The region was settled in the mid-eighteenth century by settlers from New England, who displaced the indigenous Cayuga, one of the so-called five nations of the Iroquois. It was among the richest agricultural landscapes in the early United States,

with heavy soils and a climate more moderate than surrounding areas due to the presence of the lakes. Its economy was originally based on silviculture, with rich native stands of ash, hickory, and pine going toward the cities and shipyards of the northeast coast in the last decades of the eighteenth century. By 1800 the region was almost completely deforested (Engeln 1961). Cut over areas were brought under the plough by veterans of the American War of Independence, awarded land grants by the New Military Tract of 1782, the first grid land subdivision undertaken in the United States (Johnson 1976).

The real impetus to the territorial development of the Finger Lakes, however, was the opening in 1820 of the Erie Canal, which linked the region to the growing urban markets of New York, Philadelphia, and Buffalo. A period of prosperity followed, and the Finger Lakes became a major summer retreat for wealthy residents of these and other northeastern cities. During this time the agricultural economy expanded rapidly, an expansion whose physical traces still dot the landscape today (Figure 2).

This early prosperity was not to last. Almost immediately, the new United States colonized the Ohio Valley and Great Plains, and the rich soils and long growing seasons of these areas began to draw recent settlers of the Finger Lakes westward. US Census Bureau data show a sustained population loss in the region beginning in the late nineteenth century and stabilizing only in 2000. The number of small-scale dairy operations, the base of the region's economy for many decades, plateaued in the late nineteenth century and began to decline after World War II. Abandonment of farms subsequently led to reforestation of the landscape, which went from under 10% forest cover in 1860 to approximately 60% one hundred years later (Engeln 1961).

These above changes did not necessarily correspond to declining agricultural production overall. Even as small-scale, diversified farming was abandoned, other types of agriculture arose in its place. In

particular, as early as the mid-nineteenth century it was discovered that the steep slopes around the lakes, scoured by multiple glaciations, had a moderating effect on climate. This enabled the cultivation of a far wider variety of crops than elsewhere in the interior northeast with its long and severe winters (Newman 1992). In particular, farmers around Keuka Lake began to cultivate the native North American ('Concord') grape, *Vitis lambrusca*, which they used to produce devotional and kosher wine for Irish and Jewish immigrant markets in the cities of the northeast. The industry expanded rapidly to the remaining lakes, and by the late nineteenth century the Finger Lakes was the prime viticultural and vinicultural region in the United States, supplying nearly all the nation's grapes and wine.

By the mid-twentieth century, however, years of overproduction, changes in public taste, and development of viticulture and viniculture in California had caused the Finger Lakes wine industry to go into sustained decline. Production of grapes and wine from *V. lambrusca* was on the verge of collapse when two events—one scientific, one political—occurred that would ultimately transform both the commercial prospects of the Finger Lakes wine industry, and the character of the Finger Lakes landscape (Newman 1992).

3 The Finger Lakes Wine Industry, 1960-2015

The first wine growers in the Finger Lakes thought that only *V. lambrusca* could survive the region's cold, dry winters and short, wet summers. But in the early 1960s Konstantin Frank, an oenologist originally from Ukraine, demonstrated that the species *V. vinifera*, from which all European wine is derived, could be grown under carefully controlled conditions within a narrow band immediately above

the lake shores. At that time few growers other than Frank himself had the botanical or technical expertise necessary for such cultivation, and it remained a footnote to *V. lambrusca* for many years. With the crisis of the 1970s, however, New York state legislators had begun to take an active role in promoting commercial and agricultural innovation in the wine industry. In 1976 they enacted a seminal piece of legislation, the Farm Wineries and Cider Mills Low-cost License Law. This law allowed farms producing less than 50,000 gallons of wine per year to sell directly to the public on the farm property, even on Sundays when retail liquor stores were forced to close (Newman 1992).

The effect of this legislation was dramatic and almost immediate. It spurred existing growers to establish small-scale *V. vinifera* operations to compensate for income lost from falling profits on *V. lambrusca*, and it began to attract new growers to the industry with the prospect of viable returns on their investment. The years following passage of the law saw many farms established with public ‘tasting rooms’ as a key part of the enterprise. Unlike their predecessors these new operations were small and focused, concentrating on high-quality production of just one or two white *V. vinifera* varietals, particularly Riesling. Thus, in the space of only a few decades, the Finger Lakes wine industry changed in three fundamental ways: the *nature* of the agricultural commodity; the *scale* of production; and the *method* of distribution and sale (Newman 1992).

Taken together these three changes have driven substantial growth in the industry. In 1975, just before the License Law was passed, it is estimated that there were fewer than ten small wineries in the entire Finger Lakes region. Today that number has grown to over one hundred, with a further ten added every year and approximately 10,000 acres (4500 hectares) under vine (Martinson 2013). The Finger Lakes wine industry has returned from the brink of extinction to produce, in the words of one food

writer, ‘seriously good world-class’ wines (Asimov 2011). It is widely viewed as one of the prime drivers of territorial development in the Finger Lakes today (Roberts 2013).

4 The Finger Lakes: Current Challenges

The Finger Lakes region nevertheless faces many challenges. Though more prosperous than surrounding areas, it is burdened by economic and social privation, with a large share of its population living in poverty and the majority of its towns continuing to decline in population (US Census Bureau 2010). Despite the success of the wine industry, the region offers relatively few economic opportunities to its young people, many of whom, like their counterparts in declining rural communities throughout the world, leave in search of better opportunities elsewhere.

In this context one of the Finger Lakes’ main assets is the landscape itself, arguably among the most appealing and iconic in the northeastern United States. The Finger Lakes combine a rich cultural and social history, with easily legible traces of both indigenous and European settlement; a highly unusual geomorphology marked (in addition to the lakes themselves) by shale outcroppings, deep gorges, and high waterfalls; and a pleasing variety of land uses, with villages, farms, and vineyards near the lakes and forest and pasture on the broad ridges between them (Figure 3). This variety, along with an array of cultural opportunities and cooler summer climate, attracts a reliable flow of summer visitors (Linehan 2013).

And yet, the Finger Lakes landscape as it exists today is a happy accident, its patchwork of forests, fields, and pastures not the product of systematic planning or integrated management of the

kind that characterizes, for example, ‘areas of outstanding natural beauty’ in the United Kingdom, but rather a temporary condition produced by a great many piecemeal decisions made against a backdrop of uncoordinated structural change (agricultural abandonment, economic decline, demographic transformation). Landowners in the Finger Lakes, as elsewhere in the United States, enjoy substantial rights to determine the character and management of parcels in their possession, and their decisions are subject to public review only when they appear to violate specific statutes, for example those relating to road setbacks, water runoff, and ‘public nuisances.’ Land use policy is scarcely less fragmented. Planning ‘at the landscape scale’ is essentially absent, decisions being made mostly at the level of individual towns or villages (Stein 2013).

One might respond to the above by noting that every landscape is simply an endless series of transformations perceived or experienced at a particular moment. Even under the most favorable conditions, most of these transformations will be driven by human preferences, values, and needs that elude planning altogether. Certainly it is now widely acknowledged that a landscape that stops changing stops living (Fairbrother 1970). But such acknowledgement need not mean giving up every attempt to maintain the continuity of a particular landscape as distinct from all others, to assure a ‘degree of permanence’ (Jackson 1984) without being tethered to the past. On the contrary, this would seem essential in places—like the Finger Lakes—where the character of that landscape will likely influence substantially the economic prospects of the people who inhabit it.

The Finger Lakes region today thus faces a major challenge: *promoting territorial development* while *managing landscape change*. These two agendas are now increasingly seen as interdependent (Thomas 2013), but as yet neither the state nor the ‘third sector’ possesses the tools to coordinate them alone (Frantz 2013). New structures and institutional relations are therefore needed that enable

individuals and enterprises to escape the ‘landscape vacuum’ within which they currently operate, and ground management decisions in an integrated vision of the Finger Lakes landscape as a whole.

5 The Finger Lakes Wine Trails: Structure, Role, Prospects

Though wine growers comprise only a small minority of landowners in the Finger Lakes region, the location, symbolism, and market value of their holdings suggest that they are likely play an important role in the formation of these structures. In particular, organizations founded to advance the interests and improve the technical and professional know-how of the industry can be seen as marking out one potential ‘pathway’ toward resolving tensions between territorial development and sustainable landscape management. Among these organizations, the ‘Wine Trails’ ringing Keuka Lake, Seneca Lake, and Cayuga Lake (Figure 1b) would appear most promising.

The Wine Trails are essentially ‘clubs’ whose members share common interests and concerns, and who receive a set bundle of ‘club goods,’ largely without cash payments, in exchange for membership (Cornes & Sandler 1986; Sandler & Tschirhart 1997). Like all clubs, they restrict entry to those meeting specific requirements. These requirements vary by organization, but generally members must have at least 5 acres (= 2 hectares) under vine, operate a production facility located within the official lake appellation, and derive at least 60 per cent of their output from grapes grown within that same appellation (Thomas 2013). Members must also have (or build) a weatherized ‘tasting room’ for year-round sample and purchase of farm production, and provide facilities such as car parks and toilets in sufficient number to accommodate the wine tasting bus tours that constitute the Trails’ main source

of external income. In addition to accommodating these tours, members must open their entire facility (not only the tasting room) for all Wine Trail special (ticketed) events. Members also pay yearly dues and a one-time initiation fee ranging from 500 and 3000 USD, respectively, for the Keuka Lake Wine Trail (Linehan 2013), to 1400 and 2500 USD, respectively, for the Seneca Lake Wine Trail (Thomas 2013).

In exchange for these costs members receive two principle ‘club goods.’ The first is national advertising. The Wine Trails provide market access and analysis within a very large geographical catchment, one that spans 500 miles in every direction and contains six major cities (New York, Boston, Montréal, Toronto, Cleveland, and Philadelphia). This access, which would be impossible for most producers to purchase alone in the form of advertising or website development, offers Wine Trail members the possibility of entry into a competitive national market dominated by California and Washington state.

If the first benefit provides access to this ‘space of flows,’ the second is firmly grounded in the ‘space of place,’ or the farm and its immediate surroundings. Unlike growers in major wine-exporting regions, Finger Lakes wineries sell a very high volume (on average around 50 percent) of their production directly from their own tasting rooms (Martinson 2013). This renders them vulnerable to any macro-economic shocks, for example recession or commodity price rises, that reduce (or even threaten to reduce) visits to the farm property. Membership in a Wine Trail provides the individual grower a degree of protection from such shocks, assuring predictable footfall in tasting rooms even during the long winter months when cash flow is at its lowest (Linehan 2013).

Thus the Wine Trails, while not agricultural cooperatives in a legal sense, nevertheless resemble these organizations in the benefits they provide their members (Wiskerke et al. 2003). They can be seen

as a form of social insurance in a volatile industry, a pooling of resources to distribute risk (Linehan 2013). This function is reflected in their approach to advertising and marketing, which stresses not individual wineries but the ‘trail’ itself, or wine tasting as one in a sequence of visitor experiences that include both contemplative (eating, looking, learning) and active (walking, hiking, swimming, boating) activities. This resembles the approach taken in viticultural regions in Australia, New Zealand, and Spain (Hall et al. 2000).

Promotion of the Finger Lakes ‘brand’ also allies the Wine Trails with an array of other organizations, including regional tourism boards, chambers of commerce, and state, county, and town departments of economic development. These organizations routinely coordinate activities, share knowledge, and pool resources; the Keuka Wine Trail, for example, shares an office with Finger Lakes Wine Country and the Finger Lakes Tourism Alliance, regional promotion and marketing agencies that receive state funding (Milspaugh 2013). Such coordination blurs the boundary between the state and third sectors, and suggests general recognition of the close link between the wine industry and territorial development in the region as a whole (Thomas 2013).

The prospects of that industry vary depending on the source. Though the quality of Finger Lakes wine has improved dramatically in recent decades (Finger Lakes Wine Symposium 2012), the current model of diversification, in which the early focus on white varietals has been replaced by production of reds and ‘specialty wines’ designed to appeal to a wide variety of consumer palates, has not always resulted in a superior product in the view of many industry experts. Such diversification, when combined with small output and difficult growing conditions, has generally prevented Finger Lakes wine from attaining the consistent standards of quality that would enable it to compete with production from larger, more established regions (Sparrow 2013).

But such judgements of ‘quality’ concern only the liquid poured from bottles into glasses at dinner tables and bars in the ‘space of flows.’ Where Finger Lakes wines *do* compete—even excel—is in the ‘space of place,’ or the complex of landscape experiences with which they are associated (Figure 4). Unlike highly developed viticultural regions such as the Napa Valley in northern California or the Yakima Valley in eastern Washington, which are characterized by large, intensive operations based on migrant labor, the Finger Lakes remains a region of small family-owned farms that appeal to the growing appetite among the (urban) public for ‘traditional’ modes of agriculture (Ploeg 2008). This is not lost on Wine Trail directors, one of whom calls the Finger Lakes landscape ‘absolutely critical’ to his members’ livelihoods (Linehan 2013).

Wine Trails do not only have a stake in landscape. They would also appear to hold considerable power over it. While limited in geographical extent, the land parcels owned by Wine Trail members are concentrated along the lake shores and slopes above them, areas closely associated with the Finger Lakes ‘brand.’ What is more, tasting rooms and their facilities are often separated from the farm property for commercial reasons, sited instead on parcels abutting the state highways that ring each lake. As these roads are the main way most people encounter the landscape, the planning and management of these parcels is likely to play an outsized role in determining the extent to which visitors form (or fail to form) the affective attachments that make them buy Finger Lakes products, recommend the region to their friends, and return in the future.

Despite this power, Wine Trails impose virtually no land use or land management requirements on their members. Membership conditions with a site planning dimension (tasting room size and construction, parking capacity, roads or paths providing access to fields and production facilities) are not seen as landscape requirements *per se*, but rather as matters related to operational and commercial

viability whose details are best worked out by individual enterprises. The same director who acknowledges landscape as ‘critical’ for this viability thus insists that Wine Trails are ‘marketing organizations, not landscape organizations’ (Linehan 2013). Interviews suggest similar attitudes among his colleagues.

There are a number of possible explanations for this. One is the transactional burden these organizations already impose on their members. The balance between ‘club dues’ and ‘club goods’ is arguably optimized, and directors fear that any shift toward the former risks provoking a fall in membership that ultimately compromises operations (Milspaugh 2013). This fear appears reasonable on its face: even under current arrangements no Wine Trail includes all producers in its appellation, and at least one struggles to maintain a membership rate of 50 percent (Linehan 2013). While there are any number of reasons why a given producer might elect not to join a Wine Trail, the costs of membership are surely foremost among them (Thomas 2013).

Another explanation is the cultural or ‘mesostructural’ (Strauss 1978) context within which Wine Trails operate. Unlike most parts of Europe, even in its densest regions the United States is still a country where land is plentiful, fungible, and cheap. This has allowed the reproduction of a series of powerful myths that have been noted since the country’s founding (Crèvecoeur 1782; Tocqueville 1835). Like any ideology, these myths are exceedingly difficult to challenge, to say nothing of change. The United States today remains a society where land is primarily a market commodity and where land ownership is seen as conferring almost unlimited rights on the holder. While this idea does not, and never did, correspond to the legal status of property as a ‘bundle of rights’ that could be granted or taken away depending on wider social needs, it continues to exert profound influence on both private practices and public debate (Freyfogle 2003). This emphasis on utility and right corresponds to a

widespread tendency to strike off or undervalue the cultural, historical, or spiritual values of land— exactly those values, in other words, that are central to *landscape* as a concept.

This ‘externalization’ of landscape is the most likely explanation for the failure of Wine Trails to embrace a wider land management remit. These organizations exclude landscape from ‘club goods’ not because they are unaware of members’ dependence on landscape, but rather because they treat landscape as a free public good, a ‘common’ for the enjoyment of all (Ostrom 1990). The Wine Trails are thus ‘free riders’ in the classic political sense, annexing the benefits of landscape while excluding the costs associated with its planning and maintenance (Olson 1965; Cornes & Sandler 1986). This impression of landscape as an externality is the main reason why Wine Trails do not transfer these costs to their members.

Yet a situation that obtains today need not always do so. There is nothing in the legal structure of Wine Trails that prevents them from imposing new requirements should their leaders and members perceive a common interest in doing so. A sudden change in political or economic conditions thus might well lead these organizations to play a more active role in landscape planning and management than they do today. Though such change is of course impossible to predict, three scenarios are readily imaginable, corresponding to the three ‘levers’ mentioned at the beginning of this paper.

The first is renewed public enthusiasm for state intervention (‘fear’). In this scenario state legislators might choose to use their regulatory and police powers to exact particular behaviors or goods from Wine Trails, for example threatening to remove these organizations’ valuable tax-exempt status for non-compliance. While even the prospect of such coercive action would likely produce immediate results, for both ‘mesostructural’ and ‘macrostructural’ reasons it would seem unlikely in the short term.

The second conceivable scenario is a change in morals ('love'). This is less fantastic than it might sound. Many of the wineries established in the Finger Lakes during the past two decades were founded by educated urban migrants. If these migrants are similar to their counterparts in 'reverse migrations' elsewhere (Emmet Jones et al. 2003), the resistance to landscape management encountered among Wine Trail directors is not necessarily echoed by members at large. It is thus eminently possible to imagine new leadership that promotes a dramatically different set of organizational priorities from those that obtain today.

The most probable scenario, however, is a change in wine producers' perception of the economic value of the Finger Lakes landscape itself ('money'). As matters stand, tensions are quickly emerging between territorial development and landscape coherence, regional success in the 'space of flows' and regional identity in the 'space of place.' Many parts of the Finger Lakes have already been transformed by speculative housing, and newer wineries resemble more and more their counterparts in other American (and world) viticultural regions, in many cases even emulating them in architecture, scale, and materials (Figure 5). Should this transformation lead to a growing perception of the Finger Lakes as just one more 'non-place' (Augé 1995), and should this begin to affect profit margins in their industry, wine producers may well begin to see individual advantage in collaborative arrangements to manage landscape for the long term. They may, in short, decide to reclassify landscape from 'public good' to 'club good.' The extent to which they do this will substantially determine the extent to which Wine Trails advance or fail to advance the coherence of the Finger Lakes landscape in the coming years.

6 Conclusion

New institutional and organizational pathways will be needed to resolve the tensions between territorial development and landscape coherence that will continue to mark agricultural regions throughout the industrialized world in coming decades. These pathways will differ with the particular challenge and with the culture where it emerges, but all will likely run along the ever-more blurred boundary between state and third sector, and all will likely rest on various combinations of fear, love, and money. This approach will almost certainly prove more effective given the nature of advanced agriculture today, where farmers move constantly and effortlessly between the ‘space of flows’ and the ‘space of place,’ between the global markets where they sell their products and the local landscapes where they make their lives.

For this reason it would seem important to study those entities whose configurations or activities can provide blueprints for such pathways. Despite the provisional findings here, the Wine Trail arguably represents one such entity. An associated study is therefore now underway to track attitudes toward landscape management, and measure receptivity to a ‘landscape remit,’ among Finger Lakes Wine Trail members over time. A related area of possible study concerns the quantity and quality of the hypothesized exchange of ‘landscape dues’ for ‘landscape goods,’ insofar as any additional requirement of club membership would almost certainly necessitate greater transactional benefits to farmers than those currently on offer. Finally, should Wine Trails one day begin to demand landscape management of their members, another line of research would examine the relative efficacy of different ways to monitor compliance and punish violations (Thomas 2013).

Nothing in the above scenario is inconsistent with either the organizational structure or institutional field of Wine Trails as they exist right now. Nevertheless, the idea of these entities emerging as landscape management organizations appears remote, even fantastic. This apparent remoteness suggests the nature of the ‘pathway’ that must be built if the ‘space of flows’ and ‘space of place’ are ever to be linked. For the fundamental challenge facing agricultural regions (and landscapes everywhere) today is not procedural or technical but moral and ethical. As has been widely noted for decades, true landscape coherence will be gained only by transforming people’s relationship to the land, its products, and one another. In the short term this requires ending the pervasive ‘externalization’ of landscape described here; in the long term, it will mean placing *non-market* and *market* exchange on equal footing. However distant this prospect seems, it is difficult to imagine the social and ecological problems associated with landscape fragmentation being solved without it. Whether in the Finger Lakes region or anywhere else, the pathway to landscapes that are ‘sustainable’ in anything approaching the word’s original definition—‘development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’ (Brundtland 1987, 41)—will need more than just new armor. It will require a whole new road bed.

7 Appendix A: Key Informants

Frantz, G. Visiting Lecturer, Department of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University. Austin, Texas, 21 March 2013.

Jarvis, S. Executive Director, Finger Lakes Wine Alliance (wine industry marketing group). Ithaca, New York, 20 July 2013.

Linehan, M. Executive Director, Keuka Lake Wine Trail. Ithaca, New York, 02 July 2013.

Martinson, T. Chair Emeritus, Viticulture Program, Cornell Cooperative Extension, Cornell University. Seneca Falls, New York, 05 August 2013.

Millspaugh, C. Executive Director, Cayuga Lake Wine Trail. Ithaca, New York, 10 June 2013.

Rickard, B. Assistant Professor, Horticultural Business Management and Marketing Program, Cornell University. Ithaca, New York, 17 July 2013.

Roberts, C. Director of Media Relations and Marketing Programs, Finger Lakes Wine Country (regional tourism marketing and economic development group). Corning, New York, 02 September 2013.

Sparrow, D. Former Executive Director, Finger Lakes Wine Alliance (wine industry marketing group). Ithaca, New York, 24 June 2013.

Stein, S. Professor Emeritus, Department of City and Regional Planning, Cornell University. Ithaca, New York, 13 October 2012.

Thomas, P. Executive Director, Seneca Lake Wine Trail. Ithaca, New York, 13 June 2013.

8 References

- Asimov, E. (2011). Deep Lakes, Icy Climate, Great Wine. *The New York Times*, Dining Section, 11 October.
- Augé, M. (1995). *Non-places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. London: Verso.
- Brundtland, G. H. ed. (1987). *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future*. New York: United Nations.
- Castells, M. (1996). *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Cornes, R. & T. Sandler. (1986). *The Theory of Externalities, Public Goods, and Club Goods*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Crèvecoeur, J. (1904 [1782]). *Letters from an American Farmer*. New York: Fox, Duffield & Company.
- Emmet Jones, R. et al. (2003). Green Migration into Rural America: The New Frontier of Environmentalism? *Society & Natural Resources* 16:3, 221-238.
- Engeln, O. D. von. (1961). *The Finger Lakes Region. Its Origin and Nature*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Fairbrother, N. (1970). *New Lives, New Landscapes: Planning for the 21st Century*. New York: Knopf.
- Finger Lakes Wine Symposium (2012). Finger Lakes Wine Region. winesymposiumfingerlakes.com/about-the-symposium/finger-lakes-wine-industry. Accessed 18 March 2013.
- Freyfogle, E. (2003). *The Land We Share: Private Property and the Common Good*. Washington: Island Press.
- Hall, C. M. et al. (2000). *Wine Tourism Around the World. Development, management and markets*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Hamilton, K. et al. (2005). The 'landscape scale' in planning: recent experience of bio-geographic planning units in Britain. *Landscape Research* 30(4), 549-558.
- Johnson, H. B. (1976). *Order Upon the Land: The U.S. Rectangular Land Survey and the Upper Mississippi Country*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kidd, S. (2000). Landscape planning at the regional scale: an example from North West England. *Landscape Research* 25(3), 355-364.

MacFarlane, R. (2000). Building blocks or stumbling blocks? Landscape ecology and farm-level participation in agri-environmental policy. *Landscape Research* 25(3), 321-331.

Newman, J. (1992). Decline and Development in the Finger Lakes Wine Region. *Journal of Wine Research* 3:2, 79-96.

Oles, T. & S. Wolf. (2015). Landscape collaboratives: the evidence. In draft.

Olson, M. (1965). *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ploeg, J. D. van der. (2008). *The New Peasantries. Struggles for Autonomy and Sustainability in an Era of Empire and Globalization*. London: Earthscan.

Primdahl, J. & S. Swaffield. (2010). Globalisation and the sustainability of agricultural landscapes. In *Globalisation and Agricultural Landscapes. Change Patterns and Policy Trends in Developed Countries*, eds. J. Primdahl & S. Swaffield. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1-15.

Primdahl, J. et al. (2013). Guiding rural landscape change: Current policy approaches and potentials of landscape strategy making as a policy integrating approach. *Applied Geography* 42, 86-94.

Sandler, T. & J. Tschirhart. (1997). Club theory: thirty years later. *Public Choice* 93, 335-355.

Selman, P. (2006). *Planning at the Landscape Scale*. London: Routledge.

Storper, M. (1997). *The Regional World: Territorial Development in a Global Economy*. New York: Guilford Press.

Strauss, A. (1978). *Negotiations: Varieties, Contexts, Processes and Social Order*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tocqueville, A. de. (1863 [1835]). *Democracy in America*. Cambridge, MA: Sever and Francis.

Wiskerke, J. S. C. et al. (2003). Environmental co-operatives as a new mode of rural governance. *NJAS: Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences* 61(1/2), 9-26.