Revista TOMO, São Cristóvão, v. 44, e22700, 2025
DOI:10.21669/tomo.v44.22700
Special Issue - Coastal Squeeze: Beaches under Socio-Economic and Ecological Pressure
E-ISSN:2318-9010 / ISSN:1517-4549

REVIEW REPORT (C)

ID number: 22700
Completed on: 2025-06-02 10:14 AM
Decision: Accept

The article “The Making of the Concession Apparatus: A Socio-historical Study of Pampelonne Beach (France, 1912–1972)” provides a detailed account of the socio-historical construction of the Pampelonne beaches. It is centered on a comprehensive understanding of the social and political configuration that has generated what the authors term the concession apparatus. Starting from the question “Who owns the beach?” and engaging with the sociological body of knowledge that conceives of beaches as contested terrains or contentious territories, the text traces the history of disputes and the social production of beach space. The article is well-structured, clearly written, and coherently presents the process through which the concession apparatus was formed, showing the tension between legal discourse (public ownership and access) and the de facto privatization of space.

There are a few aspects that could strengthen the argument.

First, it would be interesting to have more information about the entrepreneurs involved. A closer look at who these actors are might help to better understand the processes of appropriation and the contestation over public space.

Second, a quantitative perspective could also enhance the argument. For example, tracking the growth of tourism and how this growth contributed to the emergence of a “business” model could shed light on how both the beach and the city were transformed. This would include commercial exploitation as well as the broader urban infrastructure required to sustain beach tourism. While the article does touch on this, further data would add depth.

Together, these two perspectives would contribute to a better understanding of how the concession apparatus and a new space were co-produced.

Third, I believe it would be fruitful to further investigate how the concession disputes and the behavior of both entrepreneurs and the state contributed to the production of space—not only as a political site but also as a social and legal one. What I mean is that the reconfiguration of the beach for economic purposes was likely accompanied by moral regulations and other forms of dispute over access. This has happened in other parts of the world, where beach access has been shaped not only by legal frameworks but also by moral norms.

This would enrich the analysis of the central question: “Who owns the beach?” In other words, the beach as a tourist space requires a socialization of use, clothing, and of the public itself. I’m not suggesting a direct parallel between forms of leisure and beach use, but rather emphasizing that these processes are interrelated.

Fourth, there is a very interesting point to be made regarding the relationship between law and

contestation. The article notes that: “From the mid-1960s, conflicts over the use of the beach were intensified by the permanent presence of beach restaurants that tended to operate beyond the limits set by law, or at least took advantage of a legal grey area.”

The disputes over the legality of actions and the use of law as a strategy have been central in Latin American contexts. The article rightly argues for moving “beyond legalism and from rules to strategies” (Bourdieu, Lamaison, 1986).

In this line of thought, scholars have emphasized processes of illegalization rather than merely illegal practices, as well as how actors produce law through its use. This involves understanding disputes over rights and the construction of legality—for example, through concepts such as political commodities. The article notes: “The state’s granting of concession rights was based on the existence of counterparts.” This raises the question: who or what is the state?

Adopting this approach would allow for a deeper understanding of how legal frameworks are mobilized for demands, and how entrepreneurs negotiate across multiple dimensions to exploit beach space. For instance: “Local representatives had thus to negotiate with owners of land adjacent to the beach to secure their consent, achieving amicable agreements that state authorities would likely have been unable to obtain. The second dimension involved not only access but occupation, stemming from commercial exploitation of the beaches.” At the same time, this framework would help analyze the use of legal claims as political acts.

In other words, beyond moving from legalism to strategy, it would be useful to explore these strategies as contested and as constitutive of multiple ways of making the beach.

The article shows originality in its conceptualization and empirical material. It might strengthen its contribution by explicitly positioning itself in relation to existing literature on beach privatization and neoliberal coastal policies.

This is a key aspect of the process: the multiple uses and forms of occupation that shape the exploitation of the beach. It also helps develop the notion of a legal grey area, as a zone not only of informal occupation but also of claim-making capacities—by users, state actors, and entrepreneurs alike. For example: “These demands collectively represented a more general protest against what beach operators perceived as the ‘precariousness’ of their professional situation.”

In this regard, some references (e.g., Chardeaux, Rosa, Thomas) are introduced in the conclusion and could be more productively integrated earlier in the text to build the theme of commons vs. property.