

KENNETH DUNCAN/IAN RUTLEDGE (EDS.)

### **Land and labour in Latin America**

Essays on the development of agrarian capitalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries  
Cambridge: University Press 1977, 535 S., 17,51£

Die Edition ist eine hervorragende Sammlung von zusammen 16 empirischen und zwei theoretischen Beiträgen über die agrarkapitalistische Entwicklung im 19. und (meist nur beginnenden) 20. Jahrhundert in Lateinamerika, die zum größten Teil 1972 auf einem Symposium in Cambridge präsentiert worden waren. Die Thematik kreist dabei in erster Linie um die Problematik, welche Konsequenzen die verstärkte Weltmarktnachfrage und Produktion auf Besitzverfassung und Arbeitsorganisation hatte, insbesondere in welcher Weise und in welchem Umfang es dabei zur vollen Proletarisierung der Landbewirtschafter („peasants, tenants, sharecroppers, free communities of subsistence cultivators“) und ihrer Umwandlung in lohnabhängige landlose Arbeiter kam. Die einzelnen empirischen Beiträge sind danach gegliedert, ob die expandierende Marktproduktion 1. durch Mobilisierung der Arbeitskraft auf den Hacienden selbst (durch Umwandlung derselben in kapitalistische Betriebe) ermöglicht wurde, mit je zwei Beiträgen über Mexiko (D. Brading, J. Bazant) und Chile (A. Bauer/A. H. Johnson, C. Kay) sowie über Peru (J. M. Alier) und Costa Rica (C. F. S. Cardoso), 2. ob zusätzliche Arbeitskräfte aus „peasant communities“ rekrutiert wurden, mit zwei Beiträgen über Peru (P. Klaren, H. Favre) sowie über Argentinien (I. Rutledge) und Kolumbien (M. Deas); oder 3. gar europäische Immigranten ins Land geholt werden mußten, mit Beiträgen über Brasilien (T. H. Holloway) und Argentinien (E. Gallo). Der 4. Abschnitt beschäftigt sich schließlich mit dem Transformationsprozeß von Sklavenhaltern zu kapitalistischen Plantagen in Brasilien (P. L. Eisenberg, J. Reis), Kolumbien (M. Taussig) und Trinidad (B. Blanquet). Es handelt sich um ein für agrarhistorisch wie auch entwicklungstheoretisch interessierte Leser gleichermaßen interessantes Buch.

Rolf Hanisch

ROLF HANISCH

### **Land Reform in the Philippines**

Decision-Making Processes and Problems of Implementation

Bruxelles: Centre d'Etude du Sud-Est Asiatique et de l'Extrême Orient, 1977, 56 p., 100 B.F.

The scope of this study on land reform in the Philippines by R. Hanisch goes well beyond what might be expected from its title. Hanisch does not only deal with the important administrative issue of 'decisionmaking processes' and the connected 'problems of implementation' in relation with the recent land reform campaigns in the Philippines though he has devoted the larger part of his study to this topic, but he puts the whole land reform policy into its proper historical and political context of a changing class structures. Moreover he examines the role of state and its political goals and limitations which characterize the Martial Law-Society of the era Marcos. Hence, he enlarges not only the scope of his analysis but also the amount of problems arising from such an ambitious approach.

The fundamental problem of Filipino society is rural poverty. The fundamental problem of the Marcos administration, however, is the legitimation and extension of centralized power and control over the people which links up closely with governmental efforts to eradicate rural poverty thereby broadening its "rural base" again. According to R. Hanisch, the land reform issue became therefore an instrument of quite disparate objectives:

“The ML (Martial Law) regime had need of the land reform for the substantive justification and legitimation of the centralisation of power. Moreover, it had come to realise that the solution of the food crisis must be given a high rating in overall economic (and industrial) development. It looked on the land and agrarian reform as an important means for such a solution“ (p. 44).

But, as Hanisch explains further, the Marcos administration “discovered much to its surprise that a very large part of the tenanted land was controlled by small landowners, most of them members of the urban middle class. To liberate their tenants would alienate a class scarcely inferior in numbers but politically and socially much more important“ (p. 45). Thus, the attempt to coopt another supporting class (poor peasants and landless rural cultivators) would “automatically“ endanger the support of the relatively prosperous urban middle class which is considered to be the mainstay of the Marcos-regime.

Having explained the functions of the agrarian and land reform policy under Martial Law, Hanisch analyses in detail the process of agrarian policy decisions, the land reform programme and its administration, the complicated process of implementation and finally the counter-techniques of the landowners.

If the agrarian reform policy in the Philippines will be the panacea for rural poverty and malnutrition as the Marcos government claims in its propaganda oriented mass-media, remains to be seen. It is not only limited in its scope (rice and maize cultivation only) but also in as much as productivity is concerned: Larger agrarian units which share machinery and technological know how and distribute the returns from sales evenly among their members could provide a feasible alternative to the prevailing “dualism“ of small-holders on one hand and large-scale capitalist enterprises on the other. In other words: a crucial problem is whether the tenancy reform can help to increase productivity and hence provide more food for the people or if it is merely a “counter-reform“ designed to contain rural unrest but not able to satisfy basic needs? And if this “popular programme“ fails, will there be alternative sources for the legitimization of the present Martial Law regime and its policy of survival?

Hans A. Luther