Abstract: Although often we read in the literature that the beginning of the Rural Development concept and policies is linked to the emergence of the Basic Needs paradigm in Economic Development Theory, formulated by Seers in the early seventies of the past century, this is only a partial truth, because previously some countries had implemented rural development policies, such as the Rural Development Programme of 1955 in USA and the Rural Community Development laws of the United States and the first free government of India in the fifties and sixties. In fact, the term already appears in English texts in the decade of the forties. Moreover, the genesis of rural development policies is different depending on whether countries are developing or industrialized, because while in the former rural development is an attempt to combat poverty, and normally has a strong agricultural component, in the latter emerges more as a corrective instrument of spatial imbalances previously generated by the fordist industrial urban concentration development and, usually, has a certain approach initially anti-agrarian, or at least not preferentially agrarian, emphasizing the necessary economic diversification. The paper deals with the evolution of the concept and policy of Rural Development with emphasis in its early years (1955-1980) trying to identify and analyse the factors behind this evolution, which have modulated the gradual shift from the first participatory (local population-administration) rural development policies, with a focus, to some extent, still sectoral, and often acting over administrative spaces, to the current policies of endogenous development of rural territories, managed by various forms of social partnerships.
1. Introduction

From the mid-eighteenth century began to take place an unprecedented phenomenon in the history of mankind: For the first time the GDP of a country, England, grows steadily and this process not only benefit emperors, nobles, large traders or church, but their benefits reach, to a certain extent, the different social classes: businessmen, industrialists, workers and indirectly employed artisans and peasants. To explain this phenomenon, which was initially called Economic Growth, and its consequences, some of the social sciences such as Economics and Sociology were born. It was a process of urban industrial concentration, based on strong accumulation of capital, application of technological innovation and mass production of very uniformed goods (commodities). Schumpeter, in 1911, studying the role of innovation in Economic Growth, used, for the first time, the term “Economic Development”, a term minted quickly, and that will remain as such until after World War II, and subsequently it will vary, because firstly it will lose its purely economic nature, and secondly will be complemented by various adjectives that qualify its changing goals, objectives and strategies.

Indeed, after the Second World War sign are perceived, in most developed countries, of certain perverse effects of Economic Development, particularly as regards social inequities (unequal distribution of the wealth generated), lack of territorial equity (many rural areas, and even minor non-industrialized urban areas have been left out of the process, and suffer depression and rural exodus) and subsequently environmental damage. Then they begin to appear new goals and strategies, which crystallize in different development models and paradigms. As regards achieving greater territorial equality one of these strategies would be Rural Development, ie specific development for rural areas.

The literature on the genesis of Development and the evolution of its paradigms is abundant over the last century, and especially since the end of World War II, while the writings concerning Rural Development (RD) are also abundant but mainly concentrated in the last three decades. The works dealing with RD use to be quite consistent in conceptual aspects, planning techniques or strategies, but they are not so in regard to the RD genesis, and the evolution of its objectives and strategies, where existing works often present different views: Some consider, for example, that RD is a relatively recent European invention, for others is an idea born in France in the mid-sixties, others share the common opinion that RD was born in the seventies linked to World Bank programs to developing countries, inspired by the Basic Needs paradigm, other texts state that it is really a result of territorial equity objectives applied to development after the crisis of fordist production model, and also there are authors who argue that the origin is older and can be found USA at the beginning of the fifties. In my opinion these differences are logical, and not necessarily inaccurate, it depends on what you mean by Rural Development, and if we are talking about developed or developing countries. Is the RD conceptual diversity that leads to the diversity of opinions about its genesis.

This work aims to provide a schematic overview of the evolution of the RD concept and policies, with greater emphasis in its early years (1955-1980) trying to identify and analyse the causes that have favoured such evolution, characterizing each of the stages by their level of certain characteristics of the type of development as: sectorality or integrity, application basically to administrative spaces or to rural territories with high degree of natural, historical and cultural identity, descending or ascending approach to planning, role of agriculture in the process, process endogenism level, level of process sustainability, etc.

To facilitate the chronological overview, commenting stages for decades has been tried, although obviously the changes in the concept and rural development policies do not match within a decade, because, as Ellis and Biggs (2001) indicate, the ideas and their implementation does not appear "encapsulated" in time, but often, as will be indicated, an idea or paradigm
appears at a time, unfolds and institutionally crystallized much later; thus, for example, the transcendental concept of sustainable development (or sustainable welfare), appears in the scientific literature already in 1972, it did not pass to the political arena until the Brundtland Report in 1987, and it was institutionalized as a development goal from the next decade.

2. Genesis of rural development: the pioneers

The embryo of specific actions for development in rural areas is to be found in the US in the early twentieth century with the appearance of the Country Life Movement (CLM), a social movement concerned with improving the standard of living in rural areas. The CLM had, to some extent, rooted in the tradition of existing Community Development in the US since the last third of the nineteenth century. Phifer (1990). The actions of this movement soon crystallized into the constitution by President Roosevelt, in August 1908, of the Country Life Commission (CLC), which included agricultural and forestry scientists, social scientists and representatives of the federal government, under the chairmanship of the known agronomist and writer Liberty Hyde Bayle. The CLC had the task of advising the president analysing the problems of rural areas and suggesting solutions. Roth (2011). The CLC made in 1909 a famous Report (Report of the Country Life Commission to the President), in which various causes of the situation in rural areas were pointed out, among which one of the major problems detected of rural populations was the lack of organization to exploit their own resources to generate wealth and enhance the quality of life of the community. The CLC urged the US Department of Agriculture to coordinate with the Land Grant Universities to start programs with the aim of helping to organize rural populations in order to play an active role in improving their own quality of life. In my opinion, this report is still today, after over one century, a valid benchmark for analysis and diagnosis of rural issues.

Programs to generate development in rural communities began in some states of the Union. Extension Agencies were responsible for starting these programs locally. Such activities will grow enough in the early twenties, and much slow down with the Great Depression of 1929, which leaves also high levels of poverty in rural populations, but greatly help to facilitate, from 1932, the work of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, that was responsible for alleviating the effect of the Crisis in rural areas. Also they help to design the methodological basis for the realization, in the context of the New Deal, of development programs with more territorial dimension and scale, being the best known the Tennessee Valley Community Development, which began in 1934, where the population was organized to take the lead in its development and assume most of the program’s actions. The success of this program, which in just a decade significantly increased the level of income and quality of life of the inhabitants of the Valley, led other governments to consider developing similar actions on specific territories.

These pioneering actions of development in rural areas were usually planned and executed on administrative spaces, counties or groups of counties, with the participation of the population involved, and were much focused on the aspect of organization and animation of people for development and the improvement of the local institutions. While these actions also potentiating non-agrarian activities had sectoral approach, since it was the Department of Agriculture with Land Grants Universities Extension Services that promoted the development of such programs. It was common to create a local Task Force or Action Group, to promote and implement the initiatives and projects, but not always operated like that, and sometimes the promoters were the extension agents themselves, which clearly represented a top-down approach. In the case of the Tennessee Valley, given their territorial dimension and complexity, this promoter role was carried out by a public body created for this purpose (TVA: Tennessee Valley Authority).
The CLM was very heterogeneous concerning the origin, mentality, objectives and strategies of its members: including urban agrarian people, partisan to improve living conditions in rural areas, where they found, linked largely to farming, values that urban societies were missing, and thought that this improvement would slow the exodus to the cities and thus maintain the positive social values of rural life; reformers, rural or urban, as they thought that only a live and active rural areas could provide adequate food to growing urban populations, and were for that supporters of reforms of urban nature, especially organizational and institutional, in rural societies; patriots, who considered, as president Roosevelt did, that the rural society was the backbone of American society, and therefore understood that rural development was key to the nation, and innovative farmers that, wishing to modernize their profession, thought that rural development could facilitate technological and managerial innovations to agriculture. The only common thing among those groups was really a desire to improve the living conditions of rural communities.

The direct achievements of CLM were scarce, perhaps by the heterogeneity of their members, but indirectly the movement had an enormous influence on public authorities to raise awareness about the need for action in rural areas, at both state and federal levels, Hyde (1911). This influence was manifested, in the short term, with the creation of the CLC mentioned, and later with several actions as a result of the realization of the three main recommendations in its Report: increasing knowledge about rural, based on improve statistics and make continued detailed studies of the situation and diagnosis of rural societies, leading to a strong impetus to agricultural and rural social sciences in the country; make an effort of expansion and coordination of federal Cooperative Extension Services, and a growth of the administrative apparatus and public bodies to carry out actions aimed at improving rural life. Those measures, undoubtedly, prepared well the country for public policies of rural development and rural communities development, that would begin after the Second War World.

Another achievement of CLM was the fact that the interest in rural issues crystallized in a rural abundant literature in the first third of the past century, that is unparalleled in any other country in the world. Sanderson (1939).

3. Rural Development and rural communities development: decades of 50’s and 60’s

At the end of World War II poverty in rural areas of the United States was substantial and widespread. To combat it, in 1955, President Eisenhower instructed the Secretary for Agriculture D. Morse, the design and start of an ambitious Rural Development Program, which, since agriculture was by far the dominant activity in areas rural, it had, despite its name, a basically sectoral approach, because the plan was focused mainly on improving the living standards of farmers and their families, particularly those with the lowest incomes. This name, which probably constitutes the oldest institutionalized use of the “Rural Development” term was justified by the administration because it consider that actions to improve the lives of farmers and their families amounted, actually, to an improvement of the entire rural society. During the sixties, with the continuous fall of the relative weight of agriculture in the economy of rural areas, the on-going rural development programs will change its goal of fighting poverty of farmers to the revitalization of rural society as a whole. Covан (2014).

The Rural Development Program also gave a boost to the involvement of the federal government in Rural Communities Development (RCD) activities inspired by the CLM, and, successive laws (Rural Community Development Acts) were proclaimed by which especial funds were authorized by Congress mainly to employment of agents through the Extension Services of the Land Grant Universities, so that acted in the animation and organization of rural people
for development. RCD activities could cover all rural areas, particularly those located in backward regions.

The difference between the Rural Communities Development (RCD) and Rural Development (RD) in USA, which can be considered complementary policies, lies in the fact that the former is basically focused on the animation and organization of the rural population and the creation of certain local infrastructures, while RD programs and projects involved more productive actions.

RCD policy was in fact the specific application to rural areas of the Communities Development strategies, existing in the US since the last third of XIX century that initially had its full application to the emerging small cities (Farrington 1915). The DCR term was coined by Ogden (1947) and its application to concrete programs materialize in the second half of the next decade. US RCD policies shall apply in the sixties and seventies basically to most backward rural areas, such as the Appalachian and Ozark (Nebraska, Arkansas, etc.), which also benefit from the federal RD Programs. Initially, the induced development process is characterized, as will happen shortly in the most advanced countries in Europe, by some anti-agrarian schemes. It was necessary to build the "Non-farm rural America" as actually claimed the politicians. This refusal of politics to agriculture as the main economic activity in rural areas, was not new in the literature. Hoover (1948) had called "primitive" those rural areas dependent only on agriculture, hunting, fishing and other natural resources-based activities. However, as indicated by Irwin et al (2010), the idea that “rural” was not longer just “farm”, that would have sounded alien to most agricultural economists in 1950, was, in the 1970’s, the dominant view among then. Indeed, this idea is, as we shall see, one of the features of Integrated Rural Development in this decade.

At this time, and linked to this phenomenon, begins all the literature on recreational activities in rural areas, diffuse rural industrialization, management of natural resources in rural areas, and even the design of the first natural resources and environmental impacts valuation methods.

In the type of development that aims to induce RD and RCD actions are the inhabitants themselves who designed and implemented, with public support, its projects, which had basically a sectoral approach applied to spatial units of administrative nature. Although its basic philosophy is the use and enhancement of local resources, the process was not exactly endogenous in the modern sense of the term, as it still took place under the current fordist productive system umbrella.

Moreover, in India after independence in 1947, the first governments strove to initiate policies to combat poverty. As 80% of the population lived in rural areas, the development of the country could only be done by improving their standard of living, leading to the creation and implementation over the next decade (50s) of the Rural Community Development Program, which was intended to increase the standard of living of rural populations, taking main, but not exclusive strategic goals, to improve rural structures and increasing agricultural productivity. Chatterjee (1957).

While RD and RCD surge in USA aiming to correct spatial imbalances created by the industrial development model of urban concentration, which had increased the relative impoverishment of rural areas, in India emerges as a poverty reduction instrument, with similar philosophy and theoretical model, but with logical differential elements, especially concerning financial resources and implementation strategies, and also, particularly, the different role for agriculture to play in the process, that in the Indian case was crucial, whereas for the US, although important, is much less relevant.
The Indian RCD Program had a quite sectoral approach, as it could not be otherwise for the urgent priority of improving food production at the local level. Its main interesting trait was that its strategy aimed to help people in rural areas turn into active players of their own development. The program encouraged the association as a basic tool to achieve the joint generating wealth and awakening of the rural population to participation in change processes not only economic but also institutional and political, Sharma (2015). During the last years of the colonial era, there had already been attempts to perform training and organizational activities for development in rural areas. Gupta (1998).

The Indian government had for its program, along with other minor international donors, with financial support and advice of the United States, which undoubtedly had a dual purpose: to really cooperate to reduce poverty and hunger, on one hand, and expecting that the reduction of poverty in the poorest rural areas of India was an opportunity to stem the possible spread of communism, on the other (Sackley 2011, quoted by Sharma 2015). For reasons that, in my opinion, have not been well studied, the program, after a decade of operation, did not lead to the expected results, and the Indian government decided to cut the RCD program, and initiate policies, of purely sectoral nature, aimed at encouraging the modernization of agriculture focused more to markets than to attend the needs of local people. This new institutional and political context was the ideal substrate for the implementation of the Green Revolution in the late sixties. The ideas and strategies coming from the experience of RCD programs in India were forgotten by the political class and had to be reinvented after several decades, Sharma (2015), when were re-institutionalized in the so-called Programme of Integrated Rural Development in the eighties.

In my opinion, this RCD Indian program was a clear precedent, in practice, of what would later be the theoretical body of Basic Needs paradigm, born under the shelter of the International Cooperation, and in which context, for many authors, will arise, in the seventies, the concept and rural development policies to be applied to developing countries. (Ceña 1994)

Concern for the development of rural areas in this period was not unique to India and USA. In Western Europe, countries like Britain, with some previous tradition of public action on rural areas, coordinated by the Rural Community Councils (RCC) and the ACRE (Actions With Communities in Rural England) and France, begin to institutionalize actions aimed at rural development. We make here some comments on the French case for their peculiarities, and because some authors believe that the concept of rural development emerged in this country by 1965 (Hernández 2014). In France the sixties began with the Agricultural Guidance Laws (Lois d’Orientation Agraire) of 1960 and 1962, which had as specific objective "narrow the gap between rural and urban areas". Although they had a clear sectoral approach, performances of various kinds are conducive to different types of predefined rural areas (Special Areas of Rural Action, Rural Renewal Areas and Mountain Areas). Moreover, throughout the decade French governments were running development and land management plans at natural region level. Were integrated plans applied to natural regions of a certain size, with rather a top-down approach, and managed by a joint body whose public part was inter-ministerial; the most known of them was the Lower Rhone-Languedoc, managed by the so-called Mission Interministerielle pour l’Amenagement du Littoral Languedoc-Rousillon. In the mid-sixties it begins to raise in scientific circles the need to transfer these actions for regional development at rural district (petite region) level, on the idea that the rural should no longer be basically agrarian ("On a besoin d’un divorce rural-agraire"), promoting activities on basic services, rural tourism and rural industrialization; the latter goal had just shortly crystallized in the Law to Promote Industrialization of Rural Areas, in which context a National Commission on the subject was created. Chavanne (1975). As far as recreation is concerned, France was one of the European pioneers in the promotion of rural tourism and agro-tourism: In 1951 had appeared
in the region of The Low Alps, under the auspices of senator Emile Eubert, the Gites Ruraux (Rural Lodging) movement that was consolidated in 1955 with the creation of its National Federation, with 146 seats, and quickly generalize. In 1969, coinciding with the period of concern and interest in the development of rural areas mentioned above, this movement to promote rural tourism becomes gained official recognition and receives a constant institutional support. By then it is already in force in thousands of locations across France, and urban and foreign population is fully familiar with its use. In this special interest for rural development in France the influence of the utopian idea of returning to nature, arising from the movement of May 1968, cannot be ignored. The rural world was claimed as a place of economic and social renovation and as an ideal place for coexistence: Referring to rural world ideologues of the movement then said "There, the future is being built, ie the overcoming of modernity..." Hervieu (1997)

In the late sixties, and in the following decade, a distinction, in my opinion too polarized, between the US and the European approach to rural development, often appears in literature: the former characterized more by productive projects and creation of local infrastructure, and the latter by socio-cultural animation and training. In addition to the much greater availability of budget in USA for actions in rural areas, this difference could be also explained because American rural societies originally constituted, basically, from pioneer settlement, always united in a common colonization effort, had, in general, a degree of social cohesion and local institutionalization much higher than the European ones, particularly the Mediterranean; this fact undoubtedly make no necessary to prioritize specific strategies to promote social cohesion and to generate appropriate institutional innovations (Calatrava 2009) which, in addition, had been already strengthened with the actions derived from CLM in the first half of the century.

The philosophy of RCD, based on animation and organization, which was so successful in the US, seemed also well suited for the impoverished rural areas of developing countries. So, national governments and International Aid agencies implemented RCD programs in many countries, with varying success. Holdccroft (1978). These programs will begin to be replaced at the end of the sixties, by so-called Integrated Rural Development (IRD) Programs, which enjoy the support strategies of the World Bank, and that will be conducted from the perspective of Basic Needs approach and the new goals of "growth with equity".

4. The Seventies: Integrated rural Development and basic needs

During the 70’s took place the beginning of a turnabout of the theories and paradigms of development, which would affect, of course, to the practice of political actions in rural areas. A series of events, apparently independent, started to make changes in development policies that continue to this day. Main events are as follows:

.- At the theoretical level, it began to identify "Development" with "Increasing Welfare" which would generate important theoretical and analytical advances on Development Theory.

.- This implies that GDP growth was no longer sufficient as a development goal, and different new targets related with social equity and regional equilibrium had to be considered. The idea of Growth with Equity appears. (Calatrava 2007).

.- This induces the appearance, over the entire decade, of theoretical literature that attempts to replace GDP as an indicator of development, specifying different welfare functions: Concepts as Net Economic Welfare (NEW), Social Income (SI), Social Profit or Social Welfare appear. Calatrava (1993).
- Begins to institutionalize environmental concerns, most notably from the Stockholm Conference and the publication of the Report of the Club of Rome in 1972. At the beginning of the decade appear in the scientific field works trying to add environmental objectives to the Social Utility or Social Welfare functions (Saint Marc 1971, for example). At the end of the decade, in the field of paradigms, the polish economist Ignacy Sachs, with the idea of “grow without destroying”, propose the Eco-development paradigm, which did not have enough force in practice, but was a relevant precedent of the Sustainable Development idea.

- The concept of Sustainability, derived from the objective of intergenerational equity, that years later will lead to the Sustainable Development paradigm, was first defined by Nordhaus and Tobin (1972), and taken into account in practice, for the first time, by the Japanese Society of Welfare Measurement on a functional form of the new.

- On the other hand, as the “development” was no more only “economic growth”, policies with sectoral approach make no sense, and so the concept of Integrated Rural Development (IRD) emerges. The IRD was first originated to be applied to developing countries and was later introduced in Europe during the 1980s.

- The situation of poverty in the world carried Seers in 1969, to propose a new development paradigm called "Basic Needs", in which the main objective of development was the attention to the basic needs of the poorest. Development as poverty reduction actually was, to a large extend, Rural Development.

- The decade starts with the inclusion of gender issues in the theoretical corpus of development, particularly from the work of Boserup (1970) in which the "Women in Development" (WID) paradigm was exposed.

- The global Crisis at the early seventies, which marks the beginning of the end of fordist system of production and the emergence of post-fordist one, induced a general increase in unemployment in both rural and urban areas, and, of course, the rural exodus slows. To find ways to keep people in rural areas by creating in them employment opportunities and wealth generation was urgently needed.

There is no room in this work to analyse thoroughly the significance of this key decade in thinking and practice of development. It is easy to see in the light of the above facts its importance on changes and future trends of the concept and policies of global and rural development. Because of the interest that they have for the object of this work only a few brief comments on the integrated approach to development, and the so-called paradigm of Basic Needs, will be made.

Integrated Rural Development (IRD): Reviewing the literature is not easy to find a precise definition of IRD, although there is often coincidence in identifying it as "cross-cutting" or integrator of sectoral policies in a common strategy. Other definitions point-out to the fact that development is no longer only an economic issue (increase of GDP) but is about improving the standard of living and welfare of rural populations involving also social, cultural and environmental goals (in this respect it sometimes appears in the literature as Harmonic Development. Etxezarreta-1988).
IRD can be easily identified by the following characteristics:

- Inter-sectoral approach with territorial base.
- Refusal to admit the role of agriculture as the only possible engine for the development of rural territories. (Particularly in developed countries).
- Decentralized policy scheme.
- *Growth with Equity* and attention to *Basic Needs* in developing countries.
- Increasing importance of local decisions (social participation).
- Development based on the use and enhancement of local both human and material resources.

With IRD really starts the most radical change in the nature and strategies of Development. The IRD was opposed to the main previous streams of thought on rural development policies of fordist type, based on the *Expanding Capitalist Nucleus* paradigm, and the strategy of modernization with its dualistic schemes, in force in the previous two decades. Lewis (1955), Fei and Ranis (1961). (See Hunt 1989 for details). In my opinion the IRD was a big step forward in the evolution toward the paradigm of Endogenous Local Development, as, in my opinion, anticipated some of its key features. In fact in 1982 the European Union began an IRD Program in various regions as a pilot project to be later extended to other European rural areas. but quickly this policy was exchanged for a new model of endogenous rural development designed from 1986 and that will become operational in early the next decade.

The IRD was born under the influence of two factors: the low efficiency of sectoral policies previously applied to rural areas and the emerging of Basic Needs (BN) paradigm, in addition to the objective of *growth with equity*. The BN paradigm, first exposed by Seers (1969), and initially supported by the ILO, for which Seers had worked, (ILO-1976, see Calatrava 2009 for details) promotes IRD programs in developing countries under the auspices of the World Bank and International Aid Agencies. (World Bank 1975 and 1988)

The BN paradigm, argues that development cannot be merely economic growth but a measurable progress towards the elimination of poverty and sustained expansion of income and employment opportunities among the poorest. The paradigm emerges as a result of growing evidence of the increasing poverty in the world, and awareness of the effects of hunger, possibly increased by the disclosure of the terrible consequences of currents famines in Sahelian Africa. (Sing 1979 and Singer 1979). Supporters of this paradigm not only propose it as an issue of social equity, but mainly because they postulate that "market growth generated by increased demand in the mass of the population of lower income levels will have, in the long term, greater positive effect, considering growth and structural change, than an increase in demand in the upper income strata".Lefeber (1974). For more details see, for example, Hunt (1989).

5. Since the beginning of the decade of 80’s: local endogenous development and sustainability

In this decade the global development, and the rural one in its context, changes radically of strategy, crystallizing many of the key changes initiated in the 70’s, and the fordist productive model of economic modernization and dualistic economy, is replaced by the so-called postfordist one. For the Economic Theory of Development the postfordism is reflected by the Local Endogenous Development, or simply, Endogenous Development (ED), paradigm, which is
characterized by economic diversification and specialization, diffuse industrialization, quality of both product and process, and use and enhancement of endogenous resources of the territories (urban or rural), the latter somehow inspired in Marshall’s idea of “industrial districts”, retrieved and updated. Godard (1987). On the other hand, the concept of Sustainability, coined in the scientific literature at the beginning of the previous decade, began to crystallize as a key development goal in the late eighties, and sits in the next decade. Sustainability requires the development process to increase the welfare of society without compromising that of future generations, which, strictly speaking means maintaining for the future the natural capital stock.

In the literature about the topic many ways to define the endogenous development can be found. I consider appropriate, and operational for the issue we are addressing here, the left by Vazquez (2007). For this author ED is "...a territorial approach to development, which refers to processes of growth and capital accumulation in a locality or a territory with a culture and institutions that are proper, in which are based economic decisions of savings and investment.."

To generate a ED process local society has to be organized into a system of actions over its territory, able to produce common values and goods locally managed, and this has to be by constantly generating new ideas and innovations, both technological and institutional, which constitute the "local innovation system" Gaffard (1992). The local innovation systems can only emerge in what is called "Local innovative environment" which is a concept driven by Aydalot (1984 and 1986), and is based on the idea that SMEs cannot behave isolated as innovative agents, and need to be part of a set or innovative network. Murdoch (2000). This local innovative environment needs for its existence, the interaction of three elements, as follows:

- A territorial unit with effective and / or potential resources (productive territorial dimension).
- Local actors (individuals, businesses, local authorities, research institutes and training or various organizations), institutionalized through its relationships and social, commercial, technological, administrative and political contacts.
- An on-going collective process of reflection and acquisition of knowledge about their own reality, to provide and determine the permanent generation of innovations.

The combination of these three elements changes the territory into a local innovative environment. This conversion is the engine of ED.

The optimal strategy of endogenous development is that which provides the best way to generate joint action of local actors in order to give value to all the resources of a territory. The strengthening of territorial identity is necessarily part of that strategy. Marsden (1998). Promoting development with territorial identity means favouring everything that distinguishes a territory and allows it to compete with absolute, or important, advantages in the markets. Calatrava (2009) shows how it is impossible to promote an ED process without strengthening territorial identity.

On the issue of the level of territorial competitiveness in increasingly globalized markets, but at the same time more targeted, is a key to determine the potential of competitiveness of a territory. The analysis of the "factors of territorial competitiveness" is a fundamental instrument to the design of adequate programs and suitable development strategies. In general, one can distinguish between “active factors” and “resources” (factors to disclose, exploit or organize), which in turn can be divided according to their degree of specificity, since "absolute specific" to "completely generic." The more specific a resource or asset is the greater is its potential for market competitiveness. Any element of a territory can be a potential
development factor: Thus, local products, traditional modes of manufacture, landscapes, architecture, relevant historical facts, flora, fauna, rivers and water areas, gastronomic traditions, music, festivals, rituals, people, images, idioms, knowledge and agricultural work, etc. Calatrava (2007).

As Vazquez (2002) states the most original contribution of ED idea is to have shown the specific relationship between territory and innovation, showing how each territory has a specific potential for innovation, that must allow to carry out the economic activities in which it is more competitive. This is crucial for modern approaches to Rural Development.

Endogenous Rural Development (ERD) and its territorial approach arises from apply to rural areas the ED principles. OECD (1992). In any case, even within the territorial approach (understood, in principle, as not merely sectoral), the role, and with it the concept, of territory has evolved from the territory as physical support where develop activities spatially integrated, to the territory as a resource and a development factor of multiple dimensions in force today.

Moreover, as far as the evolution of development objectives initiated in the seventies, the concept of Human Development, which seeks to integrate into a concept the objectives of creating wealth, health and life expectancy and access to education and knowledge, appears at the beginning of the nineties. Human Development was postulated by the United Nations, UNDP (1990). Shortly after it joint the Sustainability concept, leading to a new global paradigm: The Sustainable Human Development (SHD), which seeks to integrate economic, social and cultural objectives with environmental ones. SHD was born from its initial approach linked to the ethics of universalism in the recognition of the vital demands of humanity. UNDP (1994). For some authors, the SHD is the end point of an evolution of the concept and objectives of development, but the SHD, while retaining that name, will continue to evolve adding new targets to the generation of wealth, health, access to knowledge and sustainability.

6. The situation today: the endogenous and sustainable rural development with mature territorial approach

The thinking and practice of development have evolved in recent years in two directions: in terms of objectives and in terms of strategies. Regarding objectives the currently prevailing paradigm is the Sustainable Human Development (SHD). As far as strategies is concerned Endogenous Development (ED), with ever more evolved territorial approach, is still prevailing.

As Rendon (2007) indicates, the concept and, above all, the philosophy of SHD is far from the one that was in the nineties, because today is understood as the integral development of human beings in harmony with ecosystems, implying new targets as political, economic and social freedom, achieving gender symmetry, the enjoyment of self-respect, and the exercise of human rights in the broadest sense, etc.

Current approaches to Rural Development in both developing and developed countries, including the policy of the European Union based on the LEADER methodology, are, sometimes more theoretically that in practice, consistent with the philosophy and objectives of SHD and respond to the strategic schemes of ED. So the constant generation of technological and institutional innovations, is therefore one of the engines of Rural Development, as it is for any ED, although there are differential aspects to consider in the case of rural areas when implement Endogenous and Sustainable Rural Development (ESRD) processes. Calatrava (2009) identifies and analyses the following:

- Much lower population densities in rural territories.
- Specificity of the innovations required for agricultural activity at the local level.
- Traditional shortcomings of rural areas compared to urban, concerning mainly service level and institutional and organizational aspects. For ESRD institutions are major factors that causes target variables such as income and employment. Nelson (1984)

- Different dimension of business firms, typically much smaller in rural areas, representing handicaps for innovation.

- Larger surface dimension of rural territories, which contain most of the terrestrial ecosystem, with the responsibilities that this fact implies for the adequate sustainable management of environmental externalities and maintaining biodiversity.

- Different importance and impact of innovations related to new information and communication technologies (ICTs) that can break, to some extent, the traditional isolation and remoteness of rural areas towards urban, particularly with regard to access to information and knowledge, and access to markets.

- Different nature and diversity of the elements that may be factors of territorial competitiveness.

Moreover, the role of territory has undergone an evolution that is particularly relevant in the case of rural areas. In more advanced schemes of ESRD, the territory could be, at the same time, a factor of:

- Local identity.
- Wealth creation
- Trade Competitiveness
- Products diversification
- Organization and social cohesion
- Innovation
- Quality
- Production and management of public goods.
- Environmental equilibrium and sustainability.
- Generation of cultural goods and services.
- Local consumption.

Within the current policies of ERD, the one of the European Union, on which there is an abundant and thorough literature, deserves a schematic final comment.

As outstanding elements of the current European RD policy from previous stages, we would point out:

- The attempt to make the agricultural sector more involved in development processes that it was before.
- The uniqueness of design, management and control.
The excellent consolidation of the territorial approach, with a pronounced multifunctional component.

- The methodological uniqueness and consistency of approach and strategy (LEADER).

- The permanent attitude of constant reflection on its nature and functioning; that is dynamism and openness to evolution.

This attitude of reflection, self-criticism and permanent correction has led to the RD policy of the European Union to reach significant achievements that are inducing dramatic transformations in rural territories of the Union. Although these transformations have been, in some cases, not very significant in terms of generating wealth and raising living standards, they have generally been more successful inducing cultural, social and institutional changes, particularly in the most backward rural societies of the European Mediterranean countries, where have been specially fruitful creating a social environment favourable to entrepreneurship and innovation. Ceña and Calatrava (2006).

The LEADER approach, evolving from its origin (with LEADER I Program, in 1991), in a constant process of experimentation and learning about itself, has, to my mind, in the current RD European policy 2014-20, the following characteristics:

- Endogenous local development with sustainability efforts.

- Linked to the above, consolidated multifunctional territorial approach

- Bottom-up strategy.

- Wide horizontal local partnership consolidated.

- International and transnational cooperation

- Favouring network initiatives

- Clear priority for funding innovative projects.

One final thought: The ESRD, properly implemented, is today one of key tools available to humankind to tackle the major problems of poverty, social backwardness and environmental degradation.
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