

# DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

## Chapter 1 : Holdings : Latin American peasant movements. | York University Libraries

*Includes bibliographical references (pages ) and index.*

The concept, of course, includes the narrower term "land tenure systems," but has a wider application. In anthropological literature the concept "peasant society" is often preferred when reference is made to a special kind of agrarian structure. Rural sociologists, in turn, have long been writing about "rural social systems. Not only do they overlap, but the choice of one or the other frequently expresses no more than the specific viewpoint of the author who uses the term, with its attendant theoretical and methodological assumptions, rather than discrete social reality. In the Latin American context, *estructura agraria* refers to a general situation familiar to millions of people. It affects their conditions of work and life, their position in the labor market, in the social hierarchy and in the political system; it determines their life chances and those of their children for generations to come; and it is deeply rooted in the history of the Latin American countries. *Estructura agraria* was an essential part of Spanish colonial policies; it has played an important role in civil wars, rebellions and revolutions; and it is today one of the burning issues that in no small measure contributes to the rise and fall of political parties and of governments, to the relative dependence of the Latin American countries vis-a-vis the United States, and to the hopes or desperation of entire peoples. So, regardless of the semantic refinements and scientific typologies, the present volume deals with agrarian structures in the sense that the campesinos of Latin America are living them. The traditional agrarian structures in Latin America have evolved over a period of several hundred years. They have their roots in Spanish and for Brazil, Portuguese colonial policy as well as, for some countries, in pre-Hispanic society. In some parts of the subcontinent quite elaborate agrarian structures existed before European colonization. This was particularly the case among the Incas in the Andes and the Aztecs in Mesoamerica. In fact, there are some surprising parallels between Incas and Aztecs as far as social structure is concerned. In both areas, the basic social and landowning unit was a localized extended kinship group known as *calpulli* among the Aztecs and *ayllu* among the Incas. Within these groups land was communal property, but it was periodically subdivided among its members and tilled on a family basis. Besides the cultivable area there existed common lands to which everybody in the group had indiscriminate access. These forms of basic communal tenure coincided with similar medieval European institutions that the Spaniards were familiar with, which is one of the reasons why after the Conquest the new overlords did not do away with them. Local communal land tenure systems have thus been able to survive to the present day, though in modified form, in those countries where they were once the basic form of agrarian structure. Besides communal lands, other systems of tenure existed in pre-Hispanic society. The king or emperor possessed land which served for the maintenance of the royal family and the court. The common peasants of the *calpulli* and *ayllu* were required to render service to their king by cultivating these plots. Occasionally, slave labor was also used, but slavery was not an important economic institution among native Indian peoples in America. The nobility or aristocracy which occupied the upper echelons of the state structures possessed their own lands, as did the priestly class which played an important role both in Inca and Aztec cultures. Various forms of forced collective or servile labor were used for their cultivation. In the later stages of the early empires, shortly before the Spanish Conquest, a class of professional warriors became increasingly important, and they received land from the emperor in the conquered areas which was worked for their benefit by the local population. Among the Incas, the state bureaucracy which grew up in relation with the administration of the conquered provinces also received the right to exact tribute in labor for the cultivation of the land which the emperor set aside for them. The private property of land had not developed among the pre-Hispanic populations, but some students suggest that incipient forms of private appropriation could be seen in some of the tenure classes that have just been mentioned. However this may be, there does not appear to have existed a market for land. Among the Incas, the peasants who lived in the *ayllus* had to render tribute to the state, either in kind or in services. Surplus agricultural produce was then redistributed by the bureaucracy to the nonagricultural classes of the

## DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

society. Tribute in services took the form of labor obligations at periodic intervals not only for the cultivation of land, but also for the construction of public works roads, temples, terraces. Similar collective labor, both for the common welfare and the benefit of the ruling groups, existed among the Aztecs. In other areas of Latin America, where no higher civilizations such as these had evolved, there was a great variety of situations concerning the use and ownership of land. Among most Indian groups, particularly those in the tropical forests, access to land was not a problem because it was widely available and the population was small. Among the more sedentary tribes, particularly the circum-Caribbean peoples, several forms of intensive horticulture had developed, and here fairly well established societal norms and rules for the distribution and use of productive land became common, even though complex state structures such as those described previously did not exist. The native agrarian structures suddenly suffered the impact of the Spanish Conquest in the sixteenth century. Both the nature of the Conquest and the "model" of agrarian structure that the Spaniards brought with them were to set the characteristics of rural society in Spanish America for the next four hundred years. One of the important features to keep in mind is that the conquest of America by the Spanish Crown was not so much a state policy, such as the more recent colonial conquests of Africa and some Asian countries, but rather a series of private undertakings, subscribed to by important mercantile interests, with the participation of the state. The private companies involved very often invested considerable sums of money, some of which were financed by Dutch and English interests, and, of course, they wanted quick and substantial returns. The Crown was content to reap the "royal fifth" of all the new wealth, and only later, once the military conquest had been completed, did it take on an active role in the administration and government of the vast new empire. As soon as it became obvious that pillage and trade would not go very far the ornamental gold accumulated by the Aztec and Inca kings simply whetted the appetites of the avid conquistadores, new sources of wealth were found in the gold and silver mines of the central highlands in Peru as well as in Mexico, and in the tropical lowland cultivation of sugar cane for the expanding European market. Three main factors were thus involved in the need to develop an agrarian policy: The agrarian structure that evolved during colonial times in answer to these three needs had two main ingredients: The soldiers and adventurers had conquered this vast continent from the Rocky Mountains to Tierra del Fuego in the name of the cross and the crown. To compensate them the Spanish king set up a system of land grants *mercedes reales*, which form the basis of the large private properties *haciendas*, *fincas*, *estancias*, as they are variously known that came to characterize rural Latin America in later centuries. Some of the conquerors were also rewarded with *encomiendas*, whereby they had the right to exact tribute in kind, money and services from the native peasants, without however directly taking over their land. After a few generations the original purpose of the *encomienda* had been forgotten and it may be considered as another principal source of the *hacienda* system. Sugar-cane production took place mainly in the Caribbean and in Brazil. But sugar was only the first of a long series of highly marketable products which determined the various economic cycles that most Latin American countries have experienced. Over the years, cacao, coffee, cotton, bananas, wheat, rubber, hides and meat became the decisive factor, for a shorter or longer period, in the economies of the different countries. Most of these crops or animal products came and still come from the large *haciendas* or plantations. Their production required not only the concentration of land and water resources in the hands of a small landowning class, but also -- and especially -- the constant flow of an adequate supply of labor. This was achieved through the establishment of a number of labor policies, the first of which was the attempt by the colonizers to enslave the native Indian population. When this became impracticable, for a number of reasons, and after the enslavement of the Indians was banned by the Spanish Crown, several alternatives were used. One of them was the importation of African slave labor for work on the tropical plantations, where a native local labor force was unavailable. The African slave trade continued for three centuries and became the very basis upon which the agricultural economies of the coastal areas flourished. Slavery was only abolished after the wars of independence early in the nineteenth century in most countries, and in some of them it lingered on till the second half of that century. In the highland areas, which were more densely populated than the tropical

## DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

lowlands, the *encomienda* was only the first of a series of institutions whereby servile Indian labor became available to the large landowners. It was soon supplemented by the forced collective labor of entire Indian populations, under the management of local administrations. It was for this purpose that the Spaniards maintained and took advantage of similar institutions which had existed among the Incas *mita* and the Aztec *catequitl*, but they transformed them to suit their own interests regardless of the needs of the local native communities, and turned them into forms of virtual slavery. Finally, the system of peonage evolved known under different names in the different countries, whereby the peasant became attached to the estate and was obliged to render a certain number of days of labor per week or month, in exchange for the right to cultivate a plot of land for himself, and various other minor rewards. Whereas the other forms of labor eventually disappeared or changed their nature, peonage, in its various manifestations, became rooted in the agrarian structure of Latin America, and has endured to the present day. The local landowning aristocracy and the Spanish administration did not always see eye to eye on agrarian matters. In fact, all through the colonial period, the royal government attempted to limit the economic and political power of the *hacendados*, by furthering, on the one hand, rural settlement of small Spanish agriculturists the freehold or homestead, and on the other, by protecting and attempting to strengthen the landowning Indian community. In the long run, however, the small freehold and the Indian community were no match for the monopolistic *hacienda*, which was able to effectively reduce their resource base by taking over a good part of their land and to maintain them as additional suppliers of labor, thus in fact making both the Indian community and the small independent freehold dependent upon occasional or periodic employment by the large estates. Thus arose the *latifundio-minifundio* complex in Latin America, the organic structure through which up to the present day the greater part of the rural population is integrated into the prevailing agrarian system. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the largest single landowner was the Church, and in view of the fact that the Church-owned lands had become a dead weight by being subtracted from the land market, the *laissez faire*-minded reformers and the nascent bourgeoisie of that period decided to expropriate the Church and to throw the land on the free market. This provoked a number of conflicts and civil wars, but instead of promoting the formation of a progressive rural middle class, as the liberal statesmen had hoped, it merely led to a renewed concentration of land in private hands. The process likewise affected the remaining Indian communities, whose land was expected by the reformers to become the private property of its individual members. Nevertheless, the growth of the *haciendas* plus the sudden importance of new commercial crops such as coffee, led to the disappearance of many of these small proprietors and their incorporation into the peonage system. This process was of course more pronounced in some countries than in others. Those that did not have important Indian populations still underwent a tendency toward the concentration of private landholdings, in some cases through the private appropriation of large expanses of publicly owned lands. This, briefly, has been the nature of the process leading to the traditional agrarian structures of contemporary Latin America. To be sure, variations and special situations exist. In Brazil, due to Portuguese policies which differed somewhat from those of the Spaniards, slavery played a much more important part in the development of the country and, on the other hand, the massive immigration of European Portuguese, German, Italian and, more recently, Japanese, agriculturists has marked the rural picture in some areas. In a few countries, such as Argentina and Uruguay, the special characteristics of an extensive cattle economy with reduced labor requirements makes for quite a different situation. In the frontier areas where spontaneous settlement or directed colonization has taken place, the small freeholder or squatter, not linked to a *hacienda* economy, finds himself in still another kind of agrarian situation. The articles in this section deal with the traditional agrarian structures, that is, with those systems that are the result of the processes described and that have not yet been deeply affected by recent changes such as the mechanization of agricultural production or, particularly, land reform. Nevertheless, as will be seen, it would be a mistake to believe that these traditional structures have been completely immutable or marginal to the broader economic and social changes of society. Despite some of their permanent or recurrent characteristics, they have been sufficiently flexible to adjust to changing

## DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

historical situations. Andrew Pearse, a British sociologist, draws attention to the way in which different neighborhood groups either smallholder communities or large estates have reacted to changing trends in the countryside. He provides comparative material drawn from several South American countries. Finally, Barraclough and Domike, two agricultural economists, summarize the findings of an ambitious study carried out by the Inter-American Committee for Agricultural Development in seven Latin American countries, and develop a solid case for the need to carry out land reforms.

# DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

Chapter 2 : History of Latin America - The independence of Latin America | [calendrierdelascience.com](http://calendrierdelascience.com)

*Get this from a library! Structures of domination and peasant movements in Latin America. [Peter Singelmann].*

Never in the history of the 20th Century has an economic crisis caused so much loss to so many workers, employees, small businesses, farmers and professionals with so little large-scale public protest. To explore some tentative hypotheses of why there is little organized protest, we need to examine the historical-structural antecedents to the world economic depression. More specifically, we will focus on the social and political organizations and leadership of the working class; the transformation of the structure of labor and its relationship to the state and market. The conversion of Western Social Democratic parties to neo-liberalism, and the subordination of the trade unions to the neo-liberal state are seen as powerful contributing factors in diminishing working class representation and influence. We will proceed by outlining the decline of labor organization, class struggle and class ideology in the context of the larger political-economic defeat and co-optation of anti-capitalist alternatives. The period of capitalist boom and bust leading up to the current world depression sets the stage for identifying the strategic structural and subjective determinants of working class passivity and impotence. The final section will bring into sharp focus the depth and scope of the problem of trade union and social movement weakness and their political consequences. History of Economic Depression and Worker Revolts: Numerous other mass and armed uprising took place in response to the Depression in a great number of countries, far beyond the scope of this paper to cover. The post-World War II period witnessed major working class and anti-colonial movements in the aftermath of the breakdown of European empires and in response to the great human and national sacrifices caused by the imperial wars. In Asia, mass socialist revolutions in China, Indo-China and North Korea ousted colonial powers and defeated their collaborators in a period of hyper-inflation and mass unemployment. Under the combined impact of dictatorial rule, blatant US intervention, chronic stagnation, deepening inequalities, mass poverty and the pillage of the public treasury, a series of popular uprisings, guerrilla revolts and general strikes toppled several US-backed dictatorships culminating in the victory of the social revolution in Cuba. In Brazil, Bolivia, Peru, Nicaragua and elsewhere, nationalist presidents took power nationalizing strategic economic sectors, re-distributing land and challenging US dominance. The advance of the popular movements and the electoral gains however did not lead to a definitive victory the taking of state power except in Cuba, Grenada and Nicaragua nor resolve the crisis of capitalism the key problem of chronic economic stagnation and dependence. US corporate dominance, oligarchic political successes and pervasive private pillage of national wealth accelerated and deepened the boom and bust process. Civilian Rule, Neo-liberalism, Economic Stagnation and the New Social Movements Prolonged stagnation, popular struggles and the willingness of conservative civilian politicians to conserve the reactionary structural changes implanted by the dictatorships, hastened the retreat of the military rulers. While the new neo-liberal order failed to end stagnation it did facilitate the pillage of thousands of public enterprises, their privatization and de-nationalization. During the ascendancy of the military dictatorships and continuing under the neo-liberal regimes, while social movements and trade unions were suppressed, non-governmental organizations NGOs flourished. The theorists embedded in the NGO-funded feminist, ecology, self-help groups and micro-industry organizations eschewed the question of structural changes, class and anti-imperialist struggles in favor of collaboration with existing state power structures. These class-based mass movements had emerged in response to the imperial pillage of their natural resources and naked land grabs by powerful elites in the agro-mineral-export sectors with the full support of voracious neo-liberal regimes. Tens of billions of dollars were literally siphoned off and transferred, especially out of Ecuador, Mexico, Venezuela and Argentina, to overseas banks. The predictable economic collapse and crisis following the blatant looting of the major economies in Latin America provoked a wave of popular uprisings, which overthrew incumbent elected neo-liberal officials and administrations in Ecuador three times, Argentina three successful times and Bolivia twice. In addition, a mass popular uprising, in

## DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

alliance with a constitutionalist sector of the military, restored President Chavez to power. The deep economic crisis and repudiation of neo-liberalism marked the emergence of the social movements as major players in shaping the contours of Latin American politics. The principal emerging movements included a series of new social actors and the declining influence of the trade unions as the leading protagonist of structural change. The Crisis of The Rural Landless Workers Movement MST , with over , active members and over , peasant families settled in co-operatives throughout the country, represented the biggest and best organized social movement in Latin America. Pachacuti, in alliance with the rightist populist former military officer Lucio Gutierrez in the elections, briefly held several cabinet posts, including Foreign Relations and Agriculture. By the end of the first year, the Gutierrez regime allied with multi-national oil companies, the US State Department and the big agro-business firms, promoted a virulent form of neo-liberalism and forced the resignation of most CONAIE-backed officials. By the end of , widespread discontent and internal divisions were exacerbated by an army of US and EU-funded NGOs, which infiltrated the Indian communities. Major popular revolts in and culminated in the election of Hugo Chavez in Chavez proceeded to encourage mass popular mobilizations in support of referendums for constitutional reform. A US-backed alliance between the oligarchy and sectors of the military mounted a palace coup in April , which lasted only 48 hours before being reversed by a spontaneous outpouring of over a million Venezuelans supported by constitutionalist soldiers in the armed forces. The failed US-backed assaults on Venezuelan democracy and President-elect Chavez radicalized the process of structural changes: Mass community-based organizations, new class-based trade union confederations and national peasant movements sprang up and the million-member Venezuelan Socialist Party was formed. Social movement activity and membership flourished, as the government extended its social welfare programs to include free universal public health programs via thousands of clinics, state-sponsored food markets selling essential food at subsidized prices in poor neighborhoods and the development of universal free public education including higher education. At the same time numerous enterprises in strategic economic sectors, such as steel, telecommunications, petroleum, food processing and landed estates, were nationalized. The movement-state relationship is fluid and reflects the ebb and flow of the conflict and the threats emanating from the US-backed rightist organizations. The regime-movement relationship deepened during the crisis period of and was further strengthened by the rise in oil prices during the world commodity boom of With the unfolding of the world economic crisis in late , the positive relationship between the state and the movements will be tested. Bolivia has the highest density of militant social movements of any country in Latin America, including high levels of mine and factory worker participation, community and informal market vender organizations, Indian and peasant movements and public employee unions. The new nexus for direct action challenging the neo-liberal regimes emerged from the coca farmers and Indian communities in response to the brutal implementation of US-mandated programs suppressing coca cultivation and the displacement of small farmers in favor of large-scale, agro-business plantations. In the cities, public sector employees, led by teachers, students and factory health worker unions fought neo-liberal measures privatizing services, like water, and cutting the public budgets for education and health care. Before being driven from power, the Sanchez de Losada regime murdered nearly seventy community activists and leaders. Hundreds of thousands of impoverished Bolivians stormed the capital, La Paz, threatening to take state power. Only the intervention of the coca farmer leader and presidential hopeful, Evo Morales, prevented the mass seizure of the Presidential palace. In May-June , a new wave of mass demonstrations filled the streets of La Paz with workers, peasants, Indians and miners forcing Carlos Mesa to resign. Once again, Evo Morales intervened and signed a pact with the Congress calling for national elections in December in exchange for calling off the protests and appointing a senior Supreme Court judge Rodriguez to act as interim President. This resulted in his election as President in December The strongest relationship between a severe economic crisis and a mass popular rebellion took place in Argentina in December , and continued throughout The conditions for the economic collapse were building up in the s during the two terms of President Carlos Menem. The entire financial sector of Argentina was de-regulated, de-nationalized,

## DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

dollarized and opened up to the worst speculative abuses. The national economic edifice, weakened by the massive privatization policies, was further undermined by rampant corruption and gross pillage of the public treasury. In December , the people of Buenos Aires staged a massive popular uprising in front of the Presidential palace with the demonstrators taking over the Congress. They ousted President De la Rúa and subsequently three of his would-be presidential successors in a matter of weeks. Hundreds of thousands of organized, unemployed workers blocked the highways and formed community-based councils. Impoverished, downwardly mobile middle class employees and bankrupt shopkeepers, professionals and pensioners formed a vast array of neighborhood assemblies and communal councils to debate proposals and tactics. Banks throughout the country were stormed by millions of irate depositors demanding the restitution of their savings. Over factories, which had been shut down by their owners, were taken over by their workers and returned to production. The entire political class was discredited and the popular slogan throughout the country was: *Que se vayan todos!* While the popular classes controlled the street in semi-spontaneous movements, the fragmented radical-left organizations were unable to coalesce to formulate a coherent organization and strategy for state power. After two years of mass mobilizations and confrontation, the movements, facing an impasse in resolving the crisis, turned toward electoral politics and elected center-left Peronist Kirchner in the Presidential campaign.

**Low Intensity Social Movements: Peru, Paraguay, Colombia, Chile, Uruguay, Central America, Haiti and Mexico**

The entire Latin American continent and the neighboring regions witnessed the significant growth of social movement activity of greater or lesser scope. What differentiated these movements from their counterparts in Brazil, Argentina, Ecuador, Bolivia and Venezuela was the absence of political challenges and regime change and the limited scope of their social action. Nevertheless significant outbreaks of mass popular movements raised fundamental challenges to the reigning neo-liberal hegemony. In Haiti, a mass popular rebellion to reinstate the democratically elected President Jean Bertrand Aristide, who had been taken hostage and flown into exile by a joint US-EU-Canadian military operation, was brutally repressed by a multinational mercenary force led by a Brazilian general. Mexico witnessed a series of localized rebellions and mass uprisings against the neo-liberal regimes dominating Mexico. With the entry of many thousands of Mexican Federal troops, and in the absence of a wider network of support, the Zapatistas withdrew to their jungle and mountain bases. An unstable truce was declared, frequently violated by the government, in which an isolated EZLN continued to exist confined to a remote area in the state of Chiapas. Faced with the repressive power of the state, the insurgent popular movements shifted toward the electoral process and succeeded in electing center-left Andres Manuel Lopez Obrador in in the midst of the neo-liberal economic debacle. Their victory was short-lived, with the election results, overturned through massive fraud in the final tally of the votes. Subsequent peaceful protests involving millions of Mexicans eventually lost steam and the movement dissipated. With the election of Alvaro Uribe, the Colombian regime decimated peasant, trade union and human rights movements as it advanced its neo-liberal policies. Since these rural movements lacked nation-wide support, especially from the urban centers, their struggles failed to make a significant impact even as their economies crumbled under neo-liberal policies.

**Social Movements in the Time of the Commodity Boom**

The sharp rise of agricultural and mineral commodity prices between , along with the election of center-left politicians, had a major impact on the most active and dynamic social movements. Instead, Da Silva embraced the entire neo-liberal agenda of his predecessor, President Cardoso, including widespread privatization and tight fiscal policies, which, with the rise of agro-mineral prices, led to a narrowly focused agro-mineral export strategy centered exclusively on large agro-business and mineral extractive elites to the detriment of small businesses and rural producers. While retaining its mass base and continuing its land occupations, the MST no longer had a strategic political ally in its quest for social transformation. With the recovery of employment and the return of their savings, the middle class assemblies rapidly disappeared. Kirchner offered subsidies to the unemployed and co-opted their leaders, which led to a sharp reduction of road blockages and membership in the militant unemployed workers organizations. Kirchner won over part of the human rights movement with his policies, which included his public purge of some of the more notorious

## DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

military and police officials and the granting of subsidies to certain sectors of the human rights movement, including the Madres de la Plaza de Mayo. He quickly moderated movement demands as he moved to the center-left. Likewise he answered peasant and Indian demands for agrarian reform by opening up mostly uncultivable public lands in the Amazon to the landless peasants. Avoiding structural change, Morales was able to use the windfall of state revenues from the high prices of Bolivian minerals and gas to co-opt movement leaders, provide incremental increases in the minimum wage, finance subsidies to Indian communities, encourage legal, political rights and recognize indigenous jurisdiction over their local communities. Morales retained his leadership of the coca farmers union and, through his Movement to Socialist Party MAS, exercised hegemony over the major community-based movements. The extreme right gained ascendancy in the latter region and launched a violent racist frontal assault on the Morales government, polarizing the countryside while guaranteeing Morales the continued mass support among the popular classes and movements throughout the country. In Ecuador, the powerful Indian movement CONAIE and its allies in the trade unions supported the neo-liberal regime of Lucio Gutierrez and suffered a severe decline in their power, support and organizational cohesion. Correa adapted center-left political positions, financing incremental wage and salary increases and state subsidized cheap credit to small and medium size businesses. He adopted a nationalist position on foreign debt payments and the termination of US military basing rights in Manta. The Chavez government was able to generously fund a whole series of progressive socio-economic changes that enhanced the strength and attraction of pro-government social movements. The social movements played an enormous role in defeating opposition referendums, which had called for the impeachment of the President. Peasant organizations were prominent in pressuring recalcitrant bureaucrats in the Chavez government to implement the new agrarian laws calling for land distribution. Trade union militants organized strikes and demonstrations and played a major role in the nationalization of the steel industry. During the economic boom and the rise of the center-left, the only major mass mobilization took the form of right wing movements determined to destabilize the center-left governments in Bolivia and Venezuela. A comparison of the social movements in countries where they played a major role in political and social change Venezuela, Ecuador, Brazil and Bolivia and movements in countries where they were marginalized reveals several crucial differences. First of all, the differences are not found in terms of the quantity of public protests, militant direct actions or number of participants. For example, if one adds up the number of social movement protests in Mexico, Peru, Colombia and Central America, they might equal or even surpass the social actions in Brazil, Argentina and Bolivia. What was different and most politically significant was the quality of the mass action.

# DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

## Chapter 3 : The peasantry and the state in Latin America

*Structures of Domination and Peasant Movements in Latin America [Peter Singelmann] on calendrierdelascience.com*  
\*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. Book by Singelmann, Peter.

Bring fact-checked results to the top of your browser search. The independence of Latin America After three centuries of colonial rule, independence came rather suddenly to most of Spanish and Portuguese America. Between and all of Latin America except the Spanish colonies of Cuba and Puerto Rico slipped out of the hands of the Iberian powers who had ruled the region since the conquest. The rapidity and timing of that dramatic change were the result of a combination of long-building tensions in colonial rule and a series of external events. The reforms imposed by the Spanish Bourbons in the 18th century provoked great instability in the relations between the rulers and their colonial subjects in the Americas. Many Creoles those of Spanish parentage but who were born in America felt Bourbon policy to be an unfair attack on their wealth, political power, and social status. Others did not suffer during the second half of the 18th century; indeed, the gradual loosening of trade restrictions actually benefited some Creoles in Venezuela and certain areas that had moved from the periphery to the centre during the late colonial era. After hundreds of years of proven service to Spain , the American-born elites felt that the Bourbons were now treating them like a recently conquered nation. In cities throughout the region, Creole frustrations increasingly found expression in ideas derived from the Enlightenment. Imperial prohibitions proved unable to stop the flow of potentially subversive English, French, and North American works into the colonies of Latin America. Creole participants in conspiracies against Portugal and Spain at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century showed familiarity with such European Enlightenment thinkers as Thomas Hobbes , John Locke , Montesquieu, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The Enlightenment clearly informed the aims of dissident Creoles and inspired some of the later, great leaders of the independence movements across Latin America. Still, these ideas were not, strictly speaking, causes of independence. Creoles selectively adapted rather than simply embraced the thought that had informed revolutions in North America and France. Leaders in Latin America tended to shy away from the more socially radical European doctrines. Moreover, the influence of those ideologies was sharply restricted; with few exceptions only small circles of educated, urban elites had access to Enlightenment thought. At most, foreign ideas helped foster a more questioning attitude toward traditional institutions and authority. European diplomatic and military events provided the final catalyst that turned Creole discontent into full-fledged movements for Latin American independence. When the Spanish crown entered into an alliance with France in , it set off a series of developments that opened up economic and political distance between the Iberian countries and their American colonies. By siding with France, Spain pitted itself against England , the dominant sea power of the period, which used its naval forces to reduce and eventually cut communications between Spain and the Americas. Spanish Americans now found themselves able to trade legally with other colonies, as well as with any neutral countries such as the United States. Occurrences in Europe in the early 19th century created a deep political divide between Spain and its American colonies. The immediate effect of that concession was to send the Portuguese ruler, Prince Regent John , fleeing in British ships to Brazil. Arriving in Rio de Janeiro with some 15, officials, nobles, and other members of his court, John transformed the Brazilian colony into the administrative centre of his empire. When Napoleon turned on his Spanish allies in , events took a disastrous turn for Spain and its dominion in the Americas. Shortly after Charles had abdicated in favour of his son Ferdinand , Napoleon had them both imprisoned. With these figures of legitimate authority in his power, the French ruler tried to shatter Spanish independence. In the process he set off a political crisis that swept across both Spain and its possessions. The Spanish political tradition centred on the figure of the monarch, yet, with Charles and Ferdinand removed from the scene, the hub of all political authority was missing. Yet the Creoles who participated in the new Cortes were denied equal representation. Moreover, the Cortes would not concede permanent free trade to the Americans and obstinately refused to

## DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

grant any degree of meaningful autonomy to the overseas dominions. Having had a taste of freedom during their political and economic isolation from the mother country, Spanish Americans did not easily consent to a reduction of their power and autonomy. Two other European developments further dashed the hopes of Creoles, pushing them more decisively toward independence. The year saw the restoration of Ferdinand to the throne and with it the energetic attempt to reestablish Spanish imperial power in the Americas. Rejecting compromise and reform, Ferdinand resorted to military force to bring wayward Spanish-American regions back into the empire as colonies. The effort only served to harden the position of Creole rebels. That concession divided and weakened loyalist opposition to independence in the Americas. Many supporters of the crown now had doubts about the monarchy for which they were fighting. The wars of independence ,

â€”26 The final victory of Latin American patriots over Spain and the fading loyalist factions began in with the political crisis in Spain. With the Spanish king and his son Ferdinand taken hostage by Napoleon, Creoles and peninsulars began to jockey for power across Spanish America. During â€”10 juntas emerged to rule in the name of Ferdinand VII. In Mexico City and Montevideo caretaker governments were the work of loyal peninsular Spaniards eager to head off Creole threats. Not all of these governments lasted very long; loyalist troops quickly put down Creole-dominated juntas in La Paz and Quito. By , however, the trend was clear. Without denouncing Ferdinand, Creoles throughout most of the region were moving toward the establishment of their own autonomous governments. Transforming these early initiatives into a break with Spanish control required tremendous sacrifice. Over the next decade and a half, Spanish Americans had to defend with arms their movement toward independence. After difficult conquests of their home regions, the two movements spread the cause of independence through other territories, finally meeting on the central Pacific coast. From there, troops under northern generals finally stamped out the last vestiges of loyalist resistance in Peru and Bolivia by . In a British expeditionary force captured Buenos Aires. When the Spanish colonial officials proved ineffective against the invasion, a volunteer militia of Creoles and peninsulars organized resistance and pushed the British out. In May prominent Creoles in Buenos Aires, having vied with peninsulars for power in the intervening years, forced the last Spanish viceroy there to consent to a *cabildo abierto* , an extraordinary open meeting of the municipal council and local notables. Although shielding itself with a pretense of loyalty to Ferdinand, the junta produced by that session marked the end of Spanish rule in Buenos Aires and its hinterland. After its revolution of May , the region was the only one to resist reconquest by loyalist troops throughout the period of the independence wars. Central authority proved unstable in the capital city of Buenos Aires. An early radical liberal government dominated by Mariano Moreno gave way to a series of triumvirates and supreme directors. More troubling still were the bitter rivalries emerging between Buenos Aires and other provinces. At stake was not only political autonomy per se but also economic interest; the Creole merchants of Buenos Aires, who initially sought the liberalization of colonial restraints on commerce in the region, subsequently tried to maintain their economic dominance over the interior. A constituent assembly meeting in adopted a flag , anthem, and other symbols of national identity, but the apparent unity disintegrated soon afterward. Distinct interests and long-standing resentment of the viceregal capital led different regions in the south to pursue separate destinies. By Artigas and this force dominated Uruguay and had allied with other provinces to oppose Buenos Aires. Buenos Aires achieved similarly mixed results in other neighbouring regions, losing control of many while spreading independence from Spain. Other expeditions took the cause to Upper Peru , the region that would become Bolivia. After initial victories there, the forces from Buenos Aires retreated, leaving the battle in the hands of local Creole, mestizo, and Indian guerrillas. The main thrust of the southern independence forces met much greater success on the Pacific coast. After establishing naval dominance in the region, the southern movement made its way northward. Its task, however, was formidable. Having benefited from colonial monopolies and fearful of the kind of social violence that the late 18th-century revolt had threatened, many Peruvian Creoles were not anxious to break with Spain. Final destruction of loyalist resistance in the highlands required the entrance of northern armies. The north and the culmination of independence Independence movements in the northern regions of Spanish

## DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

South America had an inauspicious beginning in 1793. The small group of foreign volunteers that the Venezuelan revolutionary Francisco de Miranda brought to his homeland failed to incite the populace to rise against Spanish rule. Creoles in the region wanted an expansion of the free trade that was benefiting their plantation economy. At the same time, however, they feared that the removal of Spanish control might bring about a revolution that would destroy their own power. Creole elites in Venezuela had good reason to fear such a possibility, for a massive revolution had recently exploded in the French Caribbean colony of Saint-Domingue. Beginning in 1791, a massive slave revolt sparked a general insurrection against the plantation system and French colonial power. The rebellion developed into both a civil war, pitting blacks and mulattos against whites, and an international conflict, as England and Spain supported the white plantation owners and rebels, respectively. By the first years of the 19th century, the rebels had shattered what had been a model colony and forged the independent nation of Haiti. Partly inspired by those Caribbean events, slaves in Venezuela carried out their own uprisings in the 1790s. Just as it served as a beacon of hope for the enslaved, Haiti was a warning of everything that might go wrong for elites in the cacao-growing areas of Venezuela and throughout slave societies in the Americas. Creole anxieties contributed to the persistence of strong loyalist factions in the Viceroyalty of New Granada, but they did not prevent the rise of an independence struggle there. Creoles organized revolutionary governments that proclaimed some social and economic reforms in 1793, and in Venezuela they openly declared a break with Spain the following year. Forces loyal to Spain fought the Venezuelan patriots from the start, leading to a pattern in which patriot rebels held the capital city and its surroundings but could not dominate large areas of the countryside. Some saw the earthquake that wreaked particular destruction in patriot-held areas in 1795 as a sign of divine displeasure with the revolution. That year certainly was the onset of a difficult period for the independence cause. With loyalists displaying the same passion and violence, as well as obtaining significant support from the common people of mixed ethnicity, the revolutionists achieved only short-lived victories. By the late 1790s, independence movements in Venezuela and almost all across Spanish South America seemed moribund. The following year a larger and revitalized independence movement emerged, winning the struggle in the north and taking it into the Andean highlands. While laying out sharp criticisms of Spanish colonialism, the document also looked toward the future. Although liberal in some respects, in the Jamaica Letter and elsewhere, he expressed strong doubts about the capacity of his fellow Latin Americans for self-government, revealing his socially conservative and politically authoritarian side. He believed that a virtuous governing system would not be possible if the nation was divided by ethnicity. The Liberator emerged as a strong military and political force in the struggles that began in 1808. At this point he expanded the focus of the movement, shifting his attention to New Granada and courting supporters among the *casta* majority. Consolidating victory in the north proved difficult. Furthermore, loyalist supporters still held much of Venezuela, parts of the Colombian Andes, and all of Ecuador. Still, the tide had turned in favour of independence, and further energetic military campaigns liberated New Granada and Venezuela by 1813. There the southern and northern armies came together in a pincer movement to quash the remaining loyalist strength. From that point on, the northerners took charge of the struggle in Peru and Bolivia. While he organized the government there, his lieutenants set out to win the highlands of Peru and Upper Peru. Within two years independence fighters mopped up the last of loyalist resistance, and South America was free of Spanish control.

# DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

## Chapter 4 : Structures of domination and peasant movements in Latin America

*Peasant movements, social exchange, and power in Latin America: explorations of a theoretical model / by Peter Marius Singelmann. HD Z63 S56 A Agrarian problems and peasant movements in Latin America.*

The second meeting was in Mexico. The 1960s saw many women, such as Aleida March, gain prominence during the revolutions of Mexico, Cuba, and Nicaragua. Additionally, Amelio Robles, born in 1915, was a notable man in a peasant army and the Confederation of Veterans of the Revolution who by modern United States standards would be considered a trans man. A prominent international figure born during this time was Gabriela Mistral, who in 1954 won the Nobel prize in literature and became a voice for women in Latin America. It was the beginning of the suffragist movement for many Latin American women. Initially those women were from the middle class; a significant part came from the various left groups. These facts could be regarded as the sharpest experience and numerous movements of urban and rural guerrilla came to the scene. It is for those reasons that Latin American feminist theorists, such as Ros Tobar, say that Chilean feminism is closely tied to socialism. They discussed recent accomplishments, strategies, possible future conflicts, ways to enhance their strategies and how to establish through such ways varied, rich and immense coordination between the national and transnational levels. However, the 1970s saw the decline of such movements due to the policy of neoliberalism in the region. Then came dictatorial regimes that settled over the majority of the continent and prevented the development of feminist movements, not only due to the establishment of a reactionary ideology based on the defense of tradition and family, but also due to the political persecution and state terrorism with its consequences such as torture, forced exile, imprisonment, disappearances and murders of political, social and trade union activists. It also was during this time that leftist feminist organizations gained attention for their efforts. However, a lot of marginalized women began questioning hegemonic feminism in the 1980s. These women, whether they were Afro-descendant, lesbians, Indigenous, transgender, sex workers, domestic workers, etc. Feminists of the 1980s, e. Nancy Fraser, referring to violence against women, questioned the established limits of discussion and politicized problems which before had not ever been politicized, expanded their audiences, created new spaces and institutions in which the opposing interpretations could be developed and from where they could reach wider audiences. These movements organized to denounce the torture, disappearances, and crimes of the dictatorship, were headed mainly by women mothers, grandmothers and widowed. In order to understand the change in the language of feminist movements, it is necessary to bear in mind two things: Latin American feminist movements had two forms: At the IV meeting in Mexico in [19] there was signed a document on the myths of the feminist movement impeding its development. This document has a great impact; it states that feminism has a long way to go because, it is a radical transformation of society, politics and culture. The myths that were listed are: This is important because each country in Latin America was able to push feminism in different ways “for example, through democracy, socialism, and even under authoritarian regimes although this was less common. Many women began to work in multilateral organizations, finance agencies etc. It was around this time that many feminists, feeling discomfort with the current hegemonic feminism, began to create their own, autonomous organizations. They are used as inspiration and symbolic tools to feminists throughout the world, and are often referred to in scholarly essays and articles. Peru had an authoritarian regime, but they had a quota for at least thirty percent of candidates in race to be women. With the rise of globalization and international policies, many feminist political and academic organizations have been institutionalized. Many Afro-Indigenous women have also created organizations, such as the Fraternal Black Organization of Honduras, that advocate for more land rights. Members of the organizations are predominantly from European - Native American backgrounds with some members being completely descendants of Native American people. Since the 1990s, lesbians have become a viable group in Latin America. However, because of many military coups and dictatorships of Latin America, feminist lesbian groups have had to break up, reinvent, and reconstruct their work. Dictatorships in the 70s and

## DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

80s in Chile and Argentina were examples of the resistance to these feminist lesbians groups of Latin America. Other goals overall look to change smaller domestic policies that in any way discriminate to members of the LGBT community. They also aim to have more people on office, to network better with the broader Latin people. His work, "Global Communities and Hybrid Cultures: Early Gay and Lesbian Electoral Activism in Brazil and Mexico" explains the gay communities and puts them in context to coincide with the history of those countries. Rafael has also introduced the idea of normalizing LGBT issues in patriarchal conservative societies such as Mexico and Brazil to suggest that being gay should no longer be considered taboo in the early s. For example, they have little to no political representation across all of Latin America. Not until the s, have indigenous feminists leaders gained any political power. By , Bolivia elected Evo Morales for president in Morales spearheaded a new movement in Bolivia, called the Movement for Socialism. This new movement had allowed for Indigenous working-class women to become members of parliament and serve for other branches of the government as well. This important transition of power was more peaceful and much more inclusive than any other country in Latin America. In other countries, obstacles remain for indigenous women to have any representation or political identity. The Mayan women that live in Guatemala and parts of southern Mexico have struggled to gain any political mobility over the last few years due to immigration crises, economic and educational disadvantages. These soldiers are fighting in the civil war in El Salvador. Julie Shayne argues that a revolutionary feminism is one born of revolutionary mobilization. Lety Mendez, was at the forefront of the Salvadoran Civil War, and she knew from direct experience how necessary women are to any revolution. However, she believed women are completely forgotten about. Mendez explained that women were one of the sole reasons the Left had support and was able to move through El Salvador. Figueroa and her mother worked alongside Castro during the dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista. Figueroa also described an experience of women essentially carrying a revolution on their backs, but being undermined in the role they played in the revolution or not being to progress past the machismo and sexism, still rampant after their respective revolutions. This feminism born out of the fight against oppressive regimes has given way to a new look of feminism that can be found throughout Latin America. These biannual meetings brought together grassroots and professional feminists that allowed these women to discuss their experiences and the progression of their countries. In recent years, the Latin American feminists have also challenged Eurocentric feminist frameworks, promoted literature and art by women of color, and establish their own social groups. Latin American feminist theorists have been known to not only get their sources from Western countries, but also from Latin American history, personal accounts, and research on the social sciences.

# DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

## Chapter 5 : Latifundia | calendrierdelascience.com

*Latin American peasant movements, thus, have to be understood in terms of their conditions, their accomplishments in terms of potential class emancipation, and alternative outcomes such as repression, reform, and calendrierdelascience.com 1: The theoretical problem.*

See Article History Alternative Titles: Thousands of Brazilian families live in its land-occupation settlements in an effort to redistribute land to rural workers for small-scale farming. Ideologically, the movement is influenced by Marxism and liberation theology and thus emphasizes equality, the transformation of capitalist society, sustainable agriculture, cooperativism, and protection of the environment. As of , the movement has led more than 2, land occupations with about , families and has won nearly Brazil is characterized by extreme inequality, with nearly 2 percent of landowners controlling approximately half of all agricultural land. The rural poor, whose numbers increased during the 20th century owing to agricultural mechanization, among other factors, often rely on unpredictable day labour on the large estates or move to urban areas, frequently ending up in the favelas shantytowns. MST aims to bring a radical transformation of land distribution with the support of Article of the Brazilian Constitution of , which states that unused farmland should be expropriated and used for redistribution. MST pressures the government into fulfilling that constitutional obligation, since government-led initiatives have been slow and ineffectual. The movement organizes marches, demonstrations, and awareness-raising campaigns to bring the issue of agrarian reform to public attention, but its principal form of direct action is land occupation. An MST land occupation involves a group of landless people usually numbering 3, entering a large estate and occupying a piece of unused land. The acampamentos are highly organized, with the families taking on responsibility for various areas, such as health, education , and food. MST considers the process of learning to live and work cooperatively fundamental to the development of and allegiance to the political struggle. If the rights to the land are won, an assentamento settlement is formed, and each family gains a plot of land of a minimum of 25 acres 10 hectares. MST originally hoped that all communities would farm the land collectively, though financial problems and resistance from some residents led to a change of policy in the mids. Those receiving an assentamento may now choose between collective , family, or individual farming, as long as some collaboration is maintained. MST is also particularly active in education. Concern with the number of idle children in the first acampamentos and assentamentos led to the creation of rudimentary schools, staffed by the few community members who had completed basic schooling. Adult education classes were also developed to address the high levels of illiteracy among the landless workers. With time, those educational activities were given impetus by the realization that agrarian reform involved more than just the acquisition of land. Technical competency was necessary to make the agricultural production and administration of cooperatives viable. As of , MST had more than 1, primary schools in its communities. Those schools are funded and formally administered by municipal or state governments but follow the distinctive educational philosophy of the movement. Although the movement is legal, MST is often depicted as undemocratic and revolutionary. Other criticism has emerged from sections of society and academia that are sympathetic to the aims of the movement but question its methods. Some have drawn attention to the apparent ideological split between the leadership—characterized as Marxist revolutionaries—and the mass of the landless—predominantly conservative , traditional, and religious. Criticism has also been directed at the authoritarian nature of the organization. To reflect its belief in liberation theology and reduce the risk of leadership that is vulnerable to corruption or assassination, MST is organized into nonhierarchical collective units that make decisions through discussion and consensus.

# DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

## Chapter 6 : Communism: Latin America | calendrierdelascience.com

*The traditional agrarian structures in Latin America have evolved over a period of several hundred years. They have their roots in Spanish (and for Brazil, Portuguese) colonial policy as well as, for some countries, in pre-Hispanic society.*

The role of the state with regard to the peasantry is deeply influenced by the type of production unit which is dominant and its relation to the market. In the latter half of the 20th century, the rise of a quasi-industrial bourgeoisie, sharing power with labor and sectors of the agricultural elite, redefined the relation of the state: The role of the peasantry within this scheme of "subordination of agriculture to fuel industrialization" is to supply cheap labor to the cities and low cost food for the urban labor force without commensurate reforms. With the advent of neo-liberalism during the latter part of the 20th century saw a new turn in the relationship between the state and the peasantry. Under neo-liberal doctrine a process of reversal of previous reforms is accompanied by massive displacement of small and medium rural producers and rural workers at a time of declining urban-industrial employment engenders a new set of conflicts and confrontations between the peasantry and the state. The second section of the essay will explore the relationship between the state and the peasantry along three dimensions: The general repressive role of the state will be contextualized to identify its particular forms and content. The displacement of the peasantry from the land, from the agricultural sector and increasingly across national boundaries is not simply an "individual choice" but a forced system imperative driven by state policy, defined by its dominant classes. The long-term, large-scale direct and indirect involvement of the state in the exploitation, repression and displacement of the peasantry has engendered rebellions, reforms and revolutions in which the peasants have been major protagonists. In colonial Peru, Haiti and Mexico the enslaved, indentured and en-serfed rural labor force challenged colonial state power during the 18th and early 19th century. In the 20th century, social revolutions in Mexico , Bolivia , Cuba , Nicaragua , the peasants played a major role in overthrowing the state. The peasant based reforms and revolutions have been vulnerable to reversals, peasants have suffered harsh repression and forced to massively migrate from their communities as the result of changes in the configuration of state power. The third section of the paper will examine the power and limitations of peasant movements in their struggle with the state. The key issues raised by the discussion will be how the state affected the peasantry and the degree to which the state has been a friend or enemy at different times and different countries over the last half century. The State and Agricultural Systems The state is essential to the operation of markets and the defense or transformation of social relations of production. In each specific agricultural system the state is instrumental in the foundation, extension, reproduction and transformation of agricultural systems, benefitting some classes -- usually the landowners -- and prejudicing other classes. The origins of the earliest form, the hacienda or latifundio, was based on forced seizure of land by the colonial state, the coerced conscription of small producers or importation of slaves and the development of markets and transport infrastructure to facilitate exports. The keystone of the whole system was the availability and exploitation of labor via state coercion id labor of native peoples or African slaves. Given the abundance of lands over people and the terribly exploitative conditions of labor, the only manner by which the latifundio could operate and expand and with it the whole export-mercantilist system was through a system of overwhelming force and total control. Everyday appearances were maintained by the threat and occasional reality of a machete beheading. Two theoretical points need to be understood. The plantation system functioned with slave, indentured and wage labor. In all these systems, its monopoly over state violence and land limited the possibilities of an independent peasant economy. The peasant economy served as a huge reserve army of labor, subsisting on tiny plots of land adjoining the larger productive units, providing for what might be called by neo-liberal ideologues "flexible production". Employed during planting and harvesting they subsisted on their own plots in the "dead season" saving their landlords the cost of their social reproduction. Nevertheless, the small holdings served as a meeting ground for organization and occasional large-scale land seizures and protests -- the social advantages to the landowners had a political price. Given

## DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

the fact that the plantations were largely foreign owned -- particularly by investors from the imperial country -- the state operated as a "compradore" institution: The plantation system was so successful that it spread from one empire to another, leading to overproduction and crisis. In effect, the ascendancy of the urban bourgeoisie and petit bourgeoisie involved a trade-off in which the agro-export classes accepted their subordination in exchange for continued control over the rural sector. Agrarian reform -- a supposedly "democratic demand" of the "progressive bourgeoisie -- was excluded from the social pact between the urban bourgeoisie and the agrarian oligarchy. The federal state channeled resources into industry, allocated foreign exchange earned by the primary sector to the importation of capital and intermediary goods for the burgeoning consumer goods industries. At the regional or state and local level, the landlords retained control over state power to pass the "costs" of their subordination onto the peasantry. While formally the Marxist parties spoke of a worker-peasant alliance in fact they were aligned with or seeking alliances with the so-called "national" bourgeoisie or engaged in strictly "workerist" struggles and organizing. The emergence of peasant based movements owed little to the urban based left and populist parties, at least their mainstream leaders and organizations some local organizations and individuals excepted. Rural workers, particularly sugar workers in modern plantations in Cuba, the Dominican Republic and Puerto Rico engaged in class warfare. In each instance, extremely violent and repressive measures were taken to destroy the rural rebellions, or as in the exceptional case of Mexico, President Cardenas deepened and extended the agrarian reform to hundreds of thousands of families. In El Salvador the peasant uprising was crushed and 30, were killed. This proposition is evident today in the transition to neo-liberal export economies. Among the numerous classes prejudiced by the application of neo-liberal measures in Latin America, the peasantry and rural workers are the most adversely affected. The world today is divided into three competing and cooperating empires, headed by the U. The nature of these empires is essentially neo-mercantilist, though their interests are cloaked in the rhetoric of "neo-liberalism" or "free market" economies. Neo-mercantilism puts the imperial state in the center of economic activity -- much to the disadvantage of rural producers in Latin America, particularly the peasants and rural workers. The essence of neo-mercantilism is imperial state protection of domestic capitalists who are not competitive and the forced opening of markets in the Third World under conditions that prejudice the other imperial competitors. Among the most protected and state subsidized sectors stands agriculture. Imperial policy makers spend tens of billions of dollars, Euros and yen directly and indirectly subsidizing producers and exporters, while establishing a variety of protective measures, from explicit quotas on agro-imports to so-called "health concerns" to curtail or exclude imports from competitors and Third World countries. Peasant and rural laborers have been devastated by the neo-mercantilist system. First of all, the subsidies allow agro-exporters to sell cheaper, via subsidized electricity, water, extension programs, etc. Cheap food imports supposedly produced by more "efficient" subsidized U. The state imposed overt and covert quotas on farm imports by the EU and the US undermines potential agro-exporters who, in turn, cut back on the use of rural workers, increasing the number of rural destitute. The colonized states play a crucial role in raising the gate for foreign imports, cutting credit and investment funding in the rural sector except for a few specialized sectors that complement EU and US agriculture. Policing certainly involves repression, but that has been a constant in the history of state-peasant-landlord relations, punctured by occasional shifts in state-power to pro-peasant regimes. The context, content and purpose of state policing has changed with the dominant form of rural production. State policing under the latifundio system was essentially local, supplemented by state power in case of emergency widespread rebellion. The purpose was to maintain the "closed social system" of the latifundio, in which tenants and laborers only interacted with the patron, minimizing external communications. The only exception being military conscription of peasants, who not infrequently because of their contacts with the urban centers became carriers of dissident views. In a word, policing under the latifundio system was directed to immobilizing the peasantry and confining them to a closed social system. The local military officials, judges and prosecutors were politically and socially entwined with the plantation owners and frequently were used to violently intervene in employer-worker disputes. This fact was understood by rural

## DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

organizers of plantation workers. Plantation markets were largely international, U. Market dynamics led to intensified conflict between expanding plantation owners and peasants, as well as between the former and plantation workers. In this context the state played a crucial role. Foreign owners sold out to local elites, some sub-contracted to local farmers, others abandoned their lands in part to squatters. All faced insurgent rural uprisings. The state played a crucial role in the bloody suppression of rural uprisings but equally important facilitated the transition to new forms of agricultural production and urban sites. The crisis and breakdown of the liberal agro-export sector had a major impact on the peasantry and rural workers. While the forms of popular rebellions varied and on the surface took on the appearance of "archaic" or "millenarian" movements by "primitive rebels", the realities are much more complex, both in substance and motivation. The early rebellions, symbolized by the uprisings led by Tupac Amaru, were attempts to oust the Spanish colonial rulers and restore elements of pre-Colombian society. The key element here is not the inviability of the latter, but the modern thrust of a mass popular based rural uprising against imperial power. One cannot simply juxtapose upon this rebellion, the archaic restorationist symbolism, since a peasant rebellion free of the constraints of the *encomienda* system has the possibility of constructing a peasant based subsistence agricultural system. The clearest and most advanced example of the inherent modernist tendencies among the enslaved rural labor force is found in the Haitian Revolution. The anti-slavery revolution was also anti-colonial and, at least among the masses, strongly influenced by egalitarian land redistribution sentiments. The subsequent wars of independence in Latin America operated on two levels: The post-independence 19th and early 20th century is a period of primitive repression and modern rebellion. The reclaiming of territory and defense of pre-existing native claims was a dress rehearsal of modern claims for self-determination. The key point here is that in substance the peasant-peon revolts were blows against the liberal export model of agricultural development linked to world markets as opposed to production and trade of foodstuffs for local markets. The savage repression that accompanied the seizure of land and control of post-slavery labor, was met by mass resistance in Mexico and elsewhere. The successful repression of these mass collective efforts had as its aftermath the fragmentation and dispersal of the expelled peasantry and the formation of bands who were later dubbed "primitive rebels" -- a label which obscures much more than it reveals about the sequencing of collective action. While there is no question that the armies of the oligarchical government were formed by peasant and peon conscripts, and that there were varying lapses of time between revolts and rebellions, nevertheless there were oral traditions that transmitted tales and legends of earlier periods of emancipatory struggle between generations, throughout the region. The modernist nature of rural revolts is confirmed by the Mexican peasant revolution of Mexico had gone furthest in terms of integration in world markets, penetration by foreign capital and in the formation and dissemination of liberal ideology -- *los científicos* cultivated by the *Profiriató*. The brutal and savage forms of torture and labor control -- graphically portrayed in the novels of B. Traven -- were not part of an archaic dynastic order, but the means of maximizing profits for modern capitalists in Europe, North America and Mexico City. The Mexican revolution -- at least among its popular sectors -- then is not merely a land reform movement but anti-imperial -- the first major revolution against the burgeoning U. The trajectory of the Mexican revolution highlights the tremendous revolutionary potentialities of the peasantry and their strategic weakness -- particularly in relation to the question of state power. While the peasantry formed the backbone of all the revolutionary armies, its basic economic interests found expression in only a few regional armies -- namely the *Zapatistas*. While the peasant armies were successful in overthrowing established power, they constantly resorted to "pressuring" the next urban based political regime to implement political pacts. The state became a point of "mediating" competing bourgeois and peasant demands, not a strategic resource to be reconfigured and transformed in the service of a political-economy reflecting a new peasant based economy. At the peak of peasant revolutionary mobilization, the bourgeois state responded by concessions, radical legislation and promises. When the bourgeois social forces and military regrouped and peasant mobilization weakened, the state reverted back toward reversing reforms or failing to implement them. The phenomenon of mass collective peasant movements mobilizing against the

## DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

state, displacing incumbent office holders and securing concessions, via pressure on the state without changing the class configuration of the state has been characteristic of peasant movements throughout the 20th century. Nevertheless, the nature, leadership and demands of rural based movements has changed over time. Peasant Revolts and Socialist Revolutions: In Bolivia, the revolution of miners and peasants led to a sweeping agrarian reform that expropriated most large estates. However, with the exception of the Cuban Revolution, these peasant and landless worker advances suffered severe setbacks over the medium and long run. The key problem was the relation of the peasant movements to the state. In practically all the revolutions, agrarian reforms listed above were reversible. In Mexico, Bolivia and Peru a prolonged process of state disinvestment in the reform sector culminated in legislation providing incentives to agro-export monopolies, alienating community lands the ejido in Mexico and stimulating cheap subsidized imported foodstuffs. The politics of alliances in which the peasantry was subordinated to urban petit-bourgeois and bourgeois forces secured the initial redistributive reforms and state assistance. Only in the case of Cuba was the peasantry able to consolidate its position and prosper, largely due to the socialist nature of the urban leadership and its efforts to invest and develop the countryside as the "motor of development".

# DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

Chapter 7 : Landless Workers Movement | Brazilian social movement | calendrierdelascience.com

*Structures of domination and peasant movements in Latin America / Peter Singelmann. HD S55 Agrarian reform in Latin America / [by] Robert J. Alexander.*

Latin America Latin America in the s was a society primed for the dissemination of socialist ideologies. It was ruled by autocrats and oligarchs who were exploiting an increasingly discontented peasant populace and perpetuating a sharply divided two-class social structure. During this time, increased productivity and foreign investment ushered in the earlier stages of exploitative capitalism as well as a wave of European immigrants advocating the Marxist philosophies upon which socialist and communist movements were being built in Europe. The spread of this ideology was acutely evidenced by its recurrent presence in Latin American literature and art, most notably in the Mexican mural movement in the s and s. Anticommunism in Latin America A period of increased productivity and foreign investment in Latin America during the latter part of the nineteenth century attracted a wave of Italian, German, and Spanish immigrants who spread Marxist ideas throughout Latin America. This feudal, medieval, Catholic, and patrimonial region translated these ideas into a movement against its hierarchical two-class agrarian-based system. Following the Great Depression of the s, leftist political parties emerged that promoted a strong role for the state in directing change, a leftist ideology, and anti-American nationalism. The next two decades were marked by instability and conflict as authoritarian, democratic, and communist groups vied for power. In the United States intervened in Guatemala to overthrow a leftist regime that the United States said was communist. Four years later Fidel Castro led the successful Cuban Revolution. Cuba became the first openly socialist country in Latin America, the first to ally itself with the Soviet Union , and the first to openly turn its back on the United States. As a result, anticommunism in the region gained powerful U. Cuba added a new Marxist-Leninist "model" for Latin America and consequently made the prevention of "another Cuba" the central focus of United States policy. The United States chose time and again to support anticommunist military regimes over unstable democracies that believed in freedom for leftists. As workers, peasants, and guerrillas mobilized throughout the region, the traditional elite power-holders turned to their armies for support and received the backing of the United States, thereby ushering in twenty years of conflict and military "authoritarian rule. The most famous U. In , the Cuban Missile Crisis brought the world to the brink of nuclear war, when the United States discovered that the Soviet Union was attempting to assemble nuclear missiles in Cuba. In , the United States intervened in the Dominican Republic to prevent what it thought was a communist uprising. Internal anticommunist movements also emerged throughout the region. One notable example of this was in Chile. In General Augusto Pinochet, head of the Chilean army, overthrew democratically elected, but Marxist, Salvador Allende in an attempt to save the country from communism. Leftist parties were banned and their supporters exiled, tortured, or killed. Pinochet subsequently shut down the old political system and established a personalist dictatorship that maintained power through violent repression for more than a decade. In Nicaragua , a Marxist guerrilla movement known as the Sandinista Liberation Front gained much domestic and international support by the late s. It forced the powerful Somoza family from power and established the second openly socialist regime in Latin America. The contras emerged as an armed anti-Sandinista resistance movement and were strongly supported by the United States. Internationally supervised elections were held in As in the majority of Latin American states that had democratized since the s, the Marxists did not win a majority of the vote in Nicaragua but continued to participate as a significant player in the democratic political process. The twenty years that followed were plagued with instability as communist, authoritarian, and democratic groups vied for power. Cuba became an active participant in regional politics and engaged in extensive revolutionary activism abroad. Its alliance with the Soviet Union led to the Cuban Missile Crisis of , with the American discovery of Soviet nuclear missiles being assembled in Cuba leading to the brink of nuclear war. Like other Latin strongman leaders caudillos of his generation, Castro, a socialist caudillo, claimed to personify his country, led

## DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

through repression, and had no tolerance for political dissidence. What began as a popular revolution deteriorated into the last communist dictatorship in the region, one mired in poverty and oppression. Guerrilla Insurgents However, in the s, at the height of its regional influence and revolutionary appeal, Cuba joined with the Soviet Union in funding and training Marxist guerrilla groups throughout Latin America. What followed in many countries were two decades of civil wars and military-authoritarian rule as powerful elites turned to their armies, as well as to the anticommunist strategies of the United States, to repress the guerrilla insurgents. The most successful guerrilla insurrection was the Sandinista Liberation Front in Nicaragua, which eventually established the second officially socialist regime in Latin America. Although this regime was ousted through elections in with the help of an economic boycott and support of anticommunist Contra forces by the United States, Marxists remained a powerful force in the newly democratic system. As a wave of democracy began to overtake the continent by the late s, many communist and guerrilla movements transitioned into political parties and contested for power through the democratic process. Diverse forms of Marxism and communism developed in other countries, reflecting their diverse histories, sociologies, and levels of development. Indeed that was a major problem for Marxist movements, how to adapt a quite rigid ideological formula to different nations and circumstances. In Peru the socialist Aprista movement and the more rigid communist groups were bitter enemies for decades. Nicaragua had Christian socialists as well as independent Marxists and Leninists. Colombia has four different Marxist and guerrilla movements. Throughout the continent, rivalries between socialists and communists, and various types of each, have been intense. Democratic Transition As the twentieth century came to a close, a phenomenal shift occurred in Latin America from authoritarian and “in the case of Nicaragua but not yet Cuba” communist regimes to incomplete democracies. With the fall of the Soviet Union and the poor economic and social conditions of the four remaining communist states in the world China , North Korea , Vietnam , and Cuba , the Marxist-Leninist model was less appealing than ever. The nineteen Latin American democratic states, with Cuba remaining the only nondemocratic one, each had a unique experience with a liberal transition, but the region as a whole changed from a rural peasant-agricultural society to a modern, urban, industrial, and diversified one. While it experienced improved economic conditions, better human rights records, and political liberalization after its transition from authoritarianism, Latin America was still far from stable in the early s. The gap between rich and poor was the largest in the world and still widening. Economic development was continuing at a slow pace, with major collapses in several states. Political participation and civic engagement were not entirely free; patrimonialism, cronyism, and corruption continued, with most governments closely monitoring and regulating political parties and associational life. In the view of most Latin Americans, democracy had yet to deliver on its promises, and polls indicated declining support for it. This disillusionment, exacerbated by the continued two-class system and the dire straits of the poverty-stricken masses, made a return to authoritarianism increasingly appealing to many Latin Americans and led to a revival of Marxist language, but a resurgence of communism or communist parties is highly unlikely. With globalization, new openings in free trade , and numerous successful models of liberal economic and political systems worldwide, it is unlikely that Marxism-Leninism will be revived or that even the Cuban regime will remain communist for long after the eventual passing of the resilient Fidel Castro. Conclusion While the turn of the nineteenth century ushered in a wave of socialist ideology that gained much momentum in the art, culture, and politics of Latin America, with the new millennium came a waning tide for socialist ideals and movements. The twentieth century witnessed varieties of communist movements in Latin America, including international Marxists, Fidelistas, guerrilla insurgents, and communist parties participating in the political process. Although democracy seems to have outlasted the alternatives, the book is not closed on the future of the partially consolidated and still transitioning democratic regimes of the region. With continued economic and political instability and an exceptionally large income gap, Latin America might be ripe for renewed Marxist appeals, as it was in the late nineteenth century. Although guerrilla insurgents and socialist parties remain and leftist coalitions may be securing power in states such as El Salvador , the future may likely see a rise in new forms of statism and authoritarianism, but a return

## **DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA**

to the failed model of Marxist-Leninism or even a resurgence of strong Marxist movements is unlikely. Marxism and Resistance in the Third World. Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century. University of Oklahoma Press, Marxism in Latin America from to the Present: Comparative Democracy and Democratization. Fort Worth , Tex.: Harcourt College Publishers, Latin American Politics and Development.

# DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

## Chapter 8 : AGRARIAN PROBLEMS

*The peasantry and the state in Latin America. James Petras and Henry Veltmeyer. Introduction. In the first setion of the paper we will discuss the relation between the peasantry and the state in.*

It is a form of property as well as a mode of production that for centuries has determined the socioeconomic structures in many parts of the world, even through to the present day. Historically, latifundia were owned by members of the aristocracy, conferring upon them considerable social and political power and providing them with the income needed to support a lavish lifestyle. To become the owner of a latifundium did not require much capital. Through ways more or less legal, latifundisti appropriated lands from the public domain and took over the holdings of poor peasants. The size of latifundia varied: From the beginning, latifundia were commercial enterprises dedicated primarily to growing produce and livestock for profit, both for distant and nearby urban markets. In *On Agriculture*, Cato the Elder (c. 234–169 BCE) emphasized the importance of latifundia being located near good roads and waterways so as to get the crops to their markets. All later forms of latifundia—haciendas, plantations, and Balkan chifliks—followed the same model and reproduced the same form of class domination: Latifundisti maintained political control in the provinces as well, despite being absentee landlords who resided in urban centers and left management of their estates to villici, or hired administrators. The term latifundium is synonymous with other terms commonly used for large estate systems: The black legend was famously summed up by Pliny the Elder (23–79 CE) as *latifundia perdidere Italiam*, causing the ruin of Rome, together with its provinces—Egypt, North Africa, Gaul, Spain, and Sicily. Latifundia were originally a Roman phenomenon. Extensive holdings first appeared in the fourth century BCE when Rome converted part of its newly conquered territory in Italy into state domain and then rented it out to wealthy people. These first latifundia, some 1,000 acres in size, became common in Etruria and southern Italy. Wars with Carthage further enriched a Roman patriciate who excluded from trade and commerce—invested their war booty into large latifundia so as to make profits along capitalistic lines. Prolonged warfare and centuries of conquest eventually concentrated the land in the hands of a few and pushed small peasants off the land. Before long, the city of Rome was overrun with dispossessed paupers. By 23 BCE the newly formed Roman Empire was one hundred times larger than the republic had been at the time of the Punic Wars, and latifundisti were cultivating the soil of their immense estates with armies of slaves. But it was an ultimately oppressive system that gave rise to slave revolts, like the one famously led by Spartacus in 73 to 71 BCE. In the final years of the Roman Empire, these slave workers were replaced by coloni, small tenant farmers who became permanently attached to the estates *glebae adscripti* and evolved eventually into feudal serfs. Latifundia persisted in Italy, Gaul, Spain, southern Britain, along the Rhine, and in the eastern Byzantine Empire for centuries after the fall of Rome; in Sicily they survived until the 18th century. Even if, after the German invasions, a new class of landowners began to emerge as different groups adapted the Roman agrarian system to their particular needs, there still existed considerable continuity over the centuries, from the Roman latifundium and its slaves to the manor and its serfs. The conquest of the Americas and the expansion of the world economy in the sixteenth century created ideal conditions for exporting the European manorial system. While vast commercial estates emerged in the New World, agrarian capitalism also began to flourish throughout much of Europe. Beyond the Elbe River, for example, and in the eastern part of the Austrian Empire, feudal lords transformed their large properties into *Gutsherrschaften*. In Poland, especially in the Ukraine and Lithuania, immense lands and power became increasingly concentrated in the hands of the magnates. In Spain, the south was turned into large latifundia, established on formerly Moorish land they had virtually abolished the manor system. All these market- and profit-oriented latifundia were farmed by peasant-serfs through a system of compulsory labor. There were no market economies or commercial estates in the New World before the Europeans arrived and only the merest hint of a landed aristocracy in the Aztec and Incan empires. The profit-oriented latifundia system came with the colonists, and it carefully reproduced

## DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

the European model. With few exceptions, the haciendas traced their origins to the sixteenth century, when viceroys divided up the Indians and the land encomiendas among the conquerors. In time, with a minimum outlay of capital, encomenderos became latifundisti hacendados, the Indians became their peons, and the latifundium hacienda the most highly visible social and economic institution of the countryside. The traditional monolithic model of the Latin American latifundium emphasized its continuity with late-medieval Spain. The landowner had aristocratic pretensions and displayed ostentatious patterns of consumption. He tied the laborers to the estate through debt peonage, built his great house to resemble a fortress, made the estate self-sufficient, and paid lip service to a kind of unproductive mentality. Similarly, the North American plantation system, based on African slave labor, must be seen as a capitalist enterprise. Similar patterns existed in Asia as well. In Vietnam, latifundia arrived with the French, who wanted to turn the colony into a major exporter of agricultural products. In India, it was the British who established an abusive and irresponsible absentee landowner system. Only in China had the system existed independently for centuries, until the 19th century, when it gave way to tenancy. Associated with serfdom and debt-peonage, the institution came under harsh criticism from scholars and bureaucrats who espoused physiocratic doctrines, while estates were the target of violent peasant attacks. Despite calls for change, nearly all agricultural production for the world market was still controlled by latifundia in the nineteenth century, and the concentration of land had significantly increased. In Bohemia, Hungary, the Balkans, Poland, Germany, Ireland, Chile, and Mexico, more than half of the land belonged to large estates, some of which achieved truly princely dimensions. The secularization and subsequent sale of ecclesiastic property gave rise to new latifundia in southern Italy and Spain, as well as in Latin America. Many economists saw small-scale farming as economically wasteful, and even some social democrats like Karl Kautsky argued in favor of the modern latifundium. The nineteenth-century latifundia system survived the abolition of slavery and serfdom, replacing them with various contractual arrangements and modes of labor control. Junker land was now being cultivated by day laborers and seasonal Slavic workers. While the Balkan chifliks were regulated by the bailiff system, the system of rent-racking landlords raising rents exorbitantly upon expiration of leases in Ireland did not change at all. The development of industrial capitalism in Europe created new market conditions and new possibilities for agrarian systems in Latin America—a development that political independence from the Old World only served to promote. Coffee, cereal, and sugar plantations expanded, these often owned by Creoles and mestizos. Latifundia also expanded exponentially following the confiscation and sale of the vast holdings of the Catholic Church. And finally, as the nonrural sectors declined during the Latin American wars of independence, latifundisti gained an unprecedented degree of political power, often running their own private regional states. Not only did they control the conservative parties and the military, but they often had the support of the liberals as well. As new market opportunities opened up in the nineteenth century, latifundisti moved effortlessly with the times, acquiring credit from banks to purchase more land and expand the number of laborers. This new commercial growth was accompanied by the emergence of an impoverished and embattled landless proletariat. Their plight placed latifundia, once again, at the center of the so-called agrarian question. Circa 1900, latifundisti still owned and cultivated one-fourth of the total agricultural land of Germany and half of the arable land of Romania and Hungary, employing a full one-third of the population six million workers in this latter country. It was then that peasant movements and progressive parties joined forces to declare war on the latifundia, calling for the expropriation of vast tracts of land. Following World War I, the old order seemed doomed at least in Europe and Mexico, and national agrarian reforms began expropriating land belonging to absentee owners and corporations. The last vestiges of latifundism definitively vanished from Europe in the second half of the twentieth century, while still maintaining a toehold as late as the 1950s in Italy and the 1960s in Spain. In Latin America, however, the latifundium remains a dominant and even expanding form of productive organization that has profitably adjusted itself to the modern, dynamic, and export-oriented economy of late capitalism. With the exception of Mexico, Latin American agriculture is twice as large a sector as manufacturing, and three times as large as commerce. The greater part of the national

## DOWNLOAD PDF STRUCTURES OF DOMINATION AND PEASANT MOVEMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

wealth of many of these countries depends upon the production of coffee, sugar, bananas, cotton, and beef. It was also the fundamental cause of civil wars and social uprisings in Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua during the 1950s and 1960s and more recently in Brazil and in the Mexican state of Chiapas. *La formation des grands domaines au Mexique: Land and Society in Colonial Mexico*: University of California Press. *The Logic of the Latifundio*: University of Michigan Press. *Tasks Ahead for Latin American Historians*. *Hispanic American Historical Review* 41 3: *Du latifundium au latifondo*: Wolf, Eric, and Sidney Mintz. *Haciendas and Plantations in Middle America and the Antilles*. *Social and Economic Studies* 6: Marta Petrusiewicz Pick a style below, and copy the text for your bibliography.

### Chapter 9 : The Peasant Path: Sowing Revolutions | Latin America & Caribbean | calendrierdelascience.com

*In several other Latin American countries, namely Peru and Paraguay, as well as in Central America, powerful rural-based peasant and Indian movements engaged in rural road blockages and land occupations against their governments' neo-liberal 'free trade' agreements with the US.*