

Applying Stavenhagen's Analytical Approach to Research on Argentine Agrarian Social Structure

by
Adriana Chazarreta
Translated by
Mariana Ortega Breña

Rodolfo Stavenhagen's analytical approach, as laid out in his 1965 "Seven Erroneous Theses about Latin America," prioritized a dialectical perspective and relationships of functionality between two dynamics within a single structure and crystallized in fundamental conceptual proposals such as internal colonialism and a focus on the analysis of agrarian social structure. Application of the approach to current research problems in Argentina sheds light on the changes in agrarian social structure that have taken place in recent decades, in particular changes in dominant forms of land tenure, the relations of production, and the functional relationships between areas at different levels of development.

La perspectiva analítica que Rodolfo Stavenhagen desarrolla en "Siete tesis equivocadas sobre América Latina" prioriza la perspectiva dialéctica y las relaciones de funcionalidad entre dos dinámicas de una misma estructura y cristalizada en propuestas como el concepto de "colonialismo interno" y en el análisis de la estructura social agraria. La actualidad de este abordaje para definir algunos problemas de investigación que remiten a los cambios ocurridos en las últimas décadas en la estructura social agraria de Argentina arroja luz sobre cambios a las formas dominantes de propiedad y tenencia de la tierra, a las relaciones de producción en el agro y a las relaciones de funcionalidad que se establecen entre zonas o áreas de diferentes niveles de desarrollo.

Keywords: *Relational perspective, Internal colonialism, Agrarian social structure, Argentina*

This paper applies Rodolfo Stavenhagen's analytical approach in "Seven Erroneous Theses about Latin America" (1967 [1965]) to current research problems. It first reviews this approach, which prioritizes a dialectical perspective and the functional relationships between two dynamics within a single structure. Secondly, it addresses the main theories disputed by Stavenhagen. Thirdly, it highlights the fact that his approach crystallizes in some fundamental conceptual proposals: "internal colonialism" and a focus on agrarian social structure (see Chazarreta, 2010, for a previous version of this theoretical analysis). Finally, it reflects on some current research problems regarding changes that have occurred in Argentina in recent decades—problems regarding the modes and degree of development that characterize the deepening of capitalism in the agrarian social structure.

Adriana Chazarreta is a postdoctoral fellow with the Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas and the Instituto de Altos Estudios Sociales, Universidad Nacional de San Martín. She thanks Germán Rosati for the multiple readings of this article and suggestions made for improving it. Mariana Ortega Breña is a freelance translator based in Canberra, Australia.

LATIN AMERICAN PERSPECTIVES, Issue 219, Vol. 45 No. 2, March 2018, 166–179

DOI: 10.1177/0094582X17749459

© 2018 Latin American Perspectives

A RELATIONAL ANALYTICAL PERSPECTIVE

Stavenhagen's approach to Latin American social, economic, and cultural processes is based on the structural unit and the interrelationship between different parts of the social whole. Its focus is on a single structure rather than on two or more theoretical sets or systems independent of each other. Thus it addresses not just the difference between the parts but the relationships between them, especially their functional relationships. In short, it seeks to understand why the object of study is structured in a particular way. This, in turn, suggests two interrelated analytical levels—a theoretical approach linked to the dimensions employed to understand relationship matrices and a processual approach to specific modes of operation and transformation within those matrices. This view of the social whole enables an analysis of apparently dichotomous and contradictory pairs of categories and of processes and relationships between different regions, groups, and production systems (rural/urban, underdeveloped / developed regions, indigenous people/state institutions, community/nation, peasants/small urban and rural elites, estates/smallholdings, etc.).

Stavenhagen's approach was framed in the mid-1960s, when, among other important considerations, the United States was a hegemonic power in the global capitalist economy and had increasing influence on the internal policies of Latin American nations; the cold war was under way; decolonization in Africa and Asia had led to discussions of the difficulty of development in post-colonial situations; socialism was gaining strength, expanding beyond the (then) Soviet Union; Keynesian economic thought was on the rise; and the creation of the United Nations and other multilateral agencies (the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, etc.), as well as regional ones (the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean), was promoting global and regional research (García Rabelo, n.d.: 3–4). As a result, development studies in developing nations had come to occupy a prominent place on the political agendas of capitalism and economics, “prompting growing interest in the causes behind the obvious economic and social gap that separated developed capitalist countries from the rest” (García Rabelo, n.d.: 4). In “Seven Erroneous Theses” Stavenhagen disputed contemporary notions of Latin American development (Zapata, 2012), and in *Social Classes in Agrarian Societies* (1975 [1969]) he addressed the causes of underdevelopment on the continent, a problem that he saw as requiring examination of the developed countries. He believed that underdevelopment was a historical condition associated with the establishment of capitalism and the colonial relations between underdeveloped countries and developed ones, relations that benefited the latter and were based on inequality, political and economic dependence, and economic exploitation.

THE THEORIES AND THESES UNDER DEBATE

Stavenhagen began by contesting the idea of dual societies, according to which Latin American countries were composed of two societies that were to some extent independent, each with its own dynamics: an archaic, traditional, agrarian, stagnant or retrograde society and a modern, urbanized, industrialized,

dynamic, progressive and developing one. While recognizing the vast economic and social gaps between groups and regions across the Latin American nations, he suggested that, rather than being dual societies, these apparently separate societies or areas were produced by a single historical process whose interrelations were part of the workings of a single society in which the two poles participated. Rather than focusing on the contrasts between the poles of backwardness and development, he looked at their relationships. The two "worlds" were linked by the specific functions fulfilled by underdeveloped regions in national societies—such as providing labor and cheap raw materials to urban centers and foreign countries. Underdeveloped areas were not merely areas that for some reason had not developed; rather, the functional relationships between them and the developed areas created a tendency for them to become increasingly underdeveloped. It was in this connection that he proposed the concept of "internal colonialism."

He went on to challenge diffusionist theses and modernization theories for their Western notion of linear, evolutionary progress. Diffusionist theories held that Latin American progress required the dissemination in backward, archaic, and traditional areas of the products of industrialization (cultural guidelines as well as capital, technology, and institutions). Theories of modernization, in which, as described by Stavenhagen (1968 [1965]: 29), "the 'transition' from traditionalism to modernism is a current, permanent and inescapable process that will eventually involve all traditional societies," were based on an evolutionary premise, holding that development toward an industrialized, capitalist economy should be the aspiration of every nation. From this viewpoint, countries could be placed along a continuum the poles of which were tradition and modernity. Proponents of this theory also argued that underdevelopment in poor countries was due to the persistence of archaic systems, institutions, and traditions. So, underdevelopment is an internal factor that can be overcome by acceleration of the modernization process.

Stavenhagen opposed these theories on the basis of his analysis of the "diffusion of progress" in backward areas and sectors of Latin America. He argued that, after more than 400 years of "diffusion," except for a few dynamic growth locations these areas were more underdeveloped than ever. Specifically, the arrival of consumer goods in underdeveloped areas had not led to development in the sense of increased social well-being, nor had progress been encouraged by the arrival of industry. On the contrary, industrial manufacturing had replaced local productive activities and destroyed the productive base, causing "rural proletarianization, rural exodus, and economic stagnation in these areas" (Stavenhagen, 1968 [1965]: 19).

He further stressed that not only had these processes failed to foster development in backward areas but the archaic, backward, and traditional areas had made possible the progress and development of the modern urban and industrial areas. This was a kind of reverse diffusion: backward areas provided the capital, raw materials, food, and cheap labor that made possible the rapid development of "growth poles," furthering local stagnation and underdevelopment. It was "not the presence or absence of factory-made goods, but this unfavorable outward flow from the backward zones" that determined the level of development or underdevelopment of these areas (Stavenhagen, 1968 [1965]: 20). Backward areas

could modernize without becoming less backward. These unfavorable exchange relationships occurred between modern urban centers and backward rural areas just as they did between underdeveloped and developed countries.

INTERNAL COLONIALISM AND THE ANALYSIS OF AGRARIAN SOCIAL STRUCTURES

Stavenhagen and others, such as Pablo González Casanova, analyzed Latin American and other underdeveloped societies through the lens of internal colonialism. This concept was influenced by theories of imperialism, colonialism, and dependency and the historical context of national liberation struggles and postwar decolonization. It conflicted with concepts of progress and dualistic development, whether via modernization or diffusion. It also contributed to classic Marxist theory, which was previously limited to class relations and did not account for factors such as ethnicity. This approach was in line with dependency theory, which was also based on a dialectical view of the totality of social processes and the relationships between developed and underdeveloped countries or areas. Internal colonialism's incorporation of interethnic relations was the central difference between the two perspectives.

Dependency theory argued that underdeveloped, dependent, and peripheral economies maintained unequal (asymmetric) relations with developed, dominant ones. This was because of unequal exchange: underdeveloped countries had less bargaining power than developed ones because of the nature of their products (raw materials). In this way, dependency, which was not merely economic or commercial but cultural, political, technological, and capital-based, had limited and deformed development in dependent economies.

The premise of the concept of internal colonialism was that, during colonial times, indigenous society as a whole confronted colonial society. Colonial and class relations were intertwined throughout this period, with the former being associated with commercial interests and the latter with capitalist ones. "These two kinds of socioeconomic relationships in which the Indian ethnic groups were involved received moral sanction through the rigid social stratification in which the Indian (biologically, culturally, and juridically defined) was always at the bottom (with the exception of the slave)" (Stavenhagen, 1975 [1969]: 202). But the expansion of the capitalist economy and its ideology of economic liberalism during the second half of the nineteenth century transformed ethnic relations between indigenous and ladino populations¹ into something that could be considered a second form of colonialism, called "internal colonialism." Colonial society became national society, gradually extending its control over its territory, and indigenous communities were incorporated into expanding regional economic systems (Stavenhagen, 1975 [1969]). These communities were precisely in the "archaic" or "traditional" areas of what were once colonies, and these areas established links with a few growth poles just as a colony did with its colonial metropolis: mainly, they ensured the provision of raw materials and cheap labor (Stavenhagen, 1967 [1965]).

During colonial times, colonial relations in indigenous areas served the interests of a well-defined ruling class that, insofar as its relations with Spain

allowed, dominated colonial society. Colonial relations (ethnic discrimination, political dependence, social inferiority, residential segregation, economic subjection, lack of legal standing, and class relations defined in terms of labor relations and property) constituted the basis of ethnic relations. Instead, in internal colonialism relations four interrelated elements could be identified: colonial relations, class relations, social stratification, and the process of acculturation. As a result, class relations were more complex in a global society.

As class relations become more clearly defined, socioeconomic stratification, which already existed among *ladinos*, was gradually extended to indigenous groups. "The status symbols of the *ladinos* are beginning to be valued by the Indians too" (Stavenhagen, 1975 [1969]: 206), giving interethnic relations a role in class dynamics: they ensured the stability of a given social structure while diluting class conflicts (Zapata, 2012). Internal colonialism thus allowed for a full explanation of the persistence of backward regions in relation to developed areas and of the dynamics between interethnic relations and classes. Some debates regarding this concept refer to its relationship to social class theory. Zapata (2012) explained that the idea of internal colonialism has been criticized for minimizing the importance of class conflict in a peripheral area or society by privileging the conflict between the core and the periphery as a whole. Frank (1973) thought that the internal colonialism suffered by indigenous peoples was neither social nor cultural but economic and highlighted the central link between internal and external colonialism or imperialism. These critiques, however, seem directed at González Casanova rather than Stavenhagen, who understood "class conflict to be the fundamental variable" (Zapata, 2012: 8) regardless of where those classes were located (the center or the periphery, the international or the national economy). Other critics argue that the concept makes sense only from the Eurocentric perspective of the nation-state (Quijano, 2000), while still others focus on more methodological aspects, underscoring that, while emphasizing interlinked areas, internal colonialism does not specify to what extent these areas or so-called subsistence societies are "open"—in other words, the extent of commercialization in the domestic market (Rutledge, 1987).

Another of Stavenhagen's contributions addressed the changes in the agrarian structures of developing countries fostered by the establishment of the colonial system and the expansion of capitalism. This contribution was consistent with the major debates of the late 1960s and early 1970s regarding the role of the peasantry (often associated with precapitalist forms of production) in capitalist expansion. This issue has a long tradition in both the social sciences and politics. Kautsky (1974) is one of its best-known exponents: looking at capitalist expansion in the countryside, he argued that small farms were not necessarily destined to disappear but could even maintain functional relationships with large ones. Others (e.g., Dobb, 1999; Marx, 2006) were concerned with internal stratification among rural smallholders. This meant that, beginning with a relatively homogeneous peasant stratum, capitalist penetration of the countryside was fostering differentiation, as a result of the differentiation process, social types similar to capitalist classes: agricultural capitalists (as a result of the appropriation of resources such as machinery and labor) and rural workers (as a result of an expropriation process). This entailed first the transformation of the peasant economy into a commercial economy (subordination to the market)

and then the penetration of capital-based relations into the agricultural productive process itself (disarticulation of the peasant economy).

For Stavenhagen (1975 [1969]), the processes that accelerated the disintegration of traditional structures and gave rise to new categories and social classes included the introduction of a monetary economy, private landownership, and commercial monoculture, seasonal labor migration, both internal and international, and the rural exodus and urbanization. While industrialization was the main factor behind the change in traditional class structures and the national integration of underdeveloped countries, in Latin America regional and ethnic differences took precedence.

Class structures and stratification in rural areas were particularly dependent on agrarian structures and the agricultural enterprises that served as the basic economic units. Latin America had seven types of agricultural enterprise: plantations (large commercial companies that produced crops for export and utilized wage labor), latifundia or traditional haciendas (based on peasant and indigenous peonage), livestock ranches or *estancias*, small family properties (developed by immigrant settlers), communal indigenous lands, *ejidos* (a specific communal land tenure system created during the Mexican agrarian reform), and smallholdings (very small properties with limited production that could not fully meet the needs of a peasant family).

Agrarian structures were socioeconomic systems that arose from the combination of a number of factors, mainly dominant forms of land tenure and property and of relations of production in the countryside (Stavenhagen, 1975 [1969]). This notion linked the countryside to the city and opened up the former to a variety of external influences. For this analysis Stavenhagen resorted to concepts such as class and relations of production and exchange. He argued that a social-class-based analysis differed from a study of social stratification in that it looked at the driving social forces and social dynamics, moving from mere description to explanation. While social class was a historical category linked to the evolution and development of society, social stratification (categorization on a scale of superior and inferior) was a simple static description that shed light on stereotypes but did not help us understand structures.

The fundamental Marxist criterion of social class was relation to the means of production; the forces and relations of production shaped every socioeconomic structure and historical stage. Stavenhagen proposed a systemic view of society involving a class system in which classes were defined by the relations between them, which might be complementary, oppositional (the fundamental relationship), or antagonistic. Regarding the relationship between social stratification and class structure, as noted above, Stavenhagen (1975 [1969]) commented on the conservative role played by social stratifications, which represented value systems of presumed universal validity meant to integrate and consolidate a given socioeconomic structure, as opposed to class oppositions, which led to conflicting value systems.

According to Stavenhagen (1975 [1969]), underdeveloped countries were characterized by the coexistence of different economic structures and different stages of economic and social development; for this reason, social stratification was more complex and multifaceted than in developed countries. Underdeveloped nations had two kinds of structures, capitalist and semicapitalist. In the

semicapitalist structure, smallholders were linked to the rural commercial and landowning bourgeoisie via relationships of market dependency, commerce, usury, and income. The capitalist structure was linked to the commercial and agricultural exports sector and characterized by an opposition between agricultural laborers, big landowners, and foreign companies that owned large plantations. There is another type of agrarian structure in Latin America: latifundia and peonage.

RESEARCH PROBLEMS OF THE ARGENTINE AGRARIAN SOCIAL STRUCTURE

Stavenhagen's proposed relational analysis leads to new questions regarding the ways in which agricultural structures and rural populations have changed in developing countries. Fifty years ago (when "Seven Erroneous Theses" was written), the changes under study were related to colonial domination and the expansion of capitalist social relations and modes of production in Latin America. The changes that have taken place in Argentina in recent decades relate to the deepening and intensification of capitalism and relations within the agricultural sector.²

An important feature of the Argentine agrarian structure is the distinction between the so-called Pampeana Region (the provinces of Buenos Aires, Córdoba, Santa Fe, La Pampa, and Entre Ríos) and the rest of the country (known as the Extrapampeana Regions). Most of Argentina's agricultural production (currently, mostly grains and oilseeds) is concentrated in the former, and it has historically been geared toward exports. The Extrapampeana Regions can be divided into subregions built around raw materials such as sugarcane in Tucumán and Salta and wine grapes around Mendoza and San Juan. These areas have historically supplied the domestic market.

Another distinctive Argentine feature is its small indigenous population³ compared with those of Latin American countries such as Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru, and Mexico. This is the result of its subordination and extermination through military campaigns, carried out mainly since the mid-nineteenth century, aimed at gaining control of the indigenous territories in the Pampeana Region and Patagonia, or, in the Northeast and Northwest, through its incorporation into a totally or partially proletarianized workforce for the developing regional capitalist production systems.

Among the many research questions with regard to the recent evolution of the Argentine agrarian structure are the following: What are the modalities of the recent capitalist development in the agricultural sector? How have agrarian structures and social groups been reconfigured? What kinds of functional relationships exist between different social areas and groups? The relevance of Stavenhagen's approach to answering these questions lies in the fundamental importance of his studies of agrarian structures and social classes, the applicability of his conclusions to the current situation, and the particular characteristics of the capitalist deepening and intensification in the countryside, which allow for a nuanced approach to claims made with regard to the rest of Latin America.

RECENT TRANSFORMATIONS IN THE ARGENTINE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR

For about two decades Argentine agriculture, along with other economic activities, has been undergoing transformations linked to economic deregulation, economic opening (the transnationalization of the input market and the significant presence of financial capital), and technological innovation. Agricultural activities have gradually replaced livestock raising, leading to a tremendous increase in agricultural production, and soybeans have replaced other crops (Rosati, 2013). At the same time, national agricultural productivity has increased, mainly because of the introduction of genetically modified seeds (e.g., wheat, soybeans, corn, sunflowers), and with the opening of the market in transgenic seeds Argentina became the world's second-largest exporter of transgenic crops in 2001. The soybean production model, fully or partially replicated across a variety of other crops, is characterized by a technological package that includes genetically modified seeds, agrochemicals, and specialized machinery for direct sowing and, while requiring no field tillage, calls for vast areas of land. Agricultural management has incorporated new communication and information technologies, and business innovation, a global vision, and flexibility prevail. The soybean sector engages in massive exports and plays an important role in the nation's total exports and foreign currency supply.⁴ While these processes are centered in the Pampeana Region, they extend across the country. Cultivation of soybeans, corn, and wheat has expanded to other areas, either new ones or those formerly planted with other crops. In addition, some provincial agrarian economies have experienced conversion and modernization while others have seen the introduction of crops different from those of the Pampeana Region. Addressing these issues from Stavenhagen's perspective raises questions about the dominant forms of land tenure and property and the relations of production.

DOMINANT FORMS OF LAND TENURE, PROPERTY, AND RELATIONS OF PRODUCTION

Land tenure and property have been extensively discussed in Argentina in recent decades. One view of the situation is that the land has gradually become concentrated (at least since the end of the 1960s) in the hands of large producers (Basualdo and Khavisse, 1993). Another view is that what is under way is deconcentration of ownership and the strengthening of a category of medium-sized producers (Barsky and Pucciarelli, 1997; Lódolla and Fosatti, 2004; Pucciarelli, 1991). Discussions have been based on empirical data coming from the Pampeana Region (specifically the province of Buenos Aires), and the two perspectives draw on different data and sources (basically, the national agricultural census and cadastral data).

Beyond the theoretical and methodological divergences between these two positions, there are some apparently clear trends regarding land tenure. Data from the national agricultural census provide initial information. Between 1988 and 2002, the number of farms decreased while average farm size increased, and smaller-scale units' contributions to total output decreased while

large-scale units' contributions increased. The proportion of the total area represented by larger farms increased, with units exceeding 1,000 hectares accounting for nearly 80 percent of the total in 2008 (Chazarreta and Rosati, 2016). This concentration entailed a mass exodus from agriculture, with the expulsion of producers and a crisis of family farming following a classical process of expropriation/proletarianization/depeasantization. At the same time, a rentier sector consisting of people who had been driven out of production but whose lands had not been expropriated and were being leased by large producers or companies. This development reflects, to some extent, changes in landownership, since the proportion of land owned by its users decreased from 1988 to 2008 while the area leased or combining ownership with some other form of tenure increased (Chazarreta and Rosati, 2016). According to these data, it appears that capital's tendency to favor production control over landownership prevails, and this suggests production concentration but not necessarily property deconcentration.

The predominant relations of production and social groups can also be gauged from population census data. The number of people working in the agricultural sector fell between 1991 and 2001, and the proletariat and semiproletariat declined from 61 percent to 55 percent of total employed. This decline is explained both by the growth of the poor petit-bourgeoisie (from 28 percent to 35 percent) and a notable exodus from the sector (33 percent). Self-reliant owners who hired or controlled their own workforces remained relatively stable, amounting to about 10 percent (Chazarreta and Rosati, 2016).

The first question from a long-term perspective is why labor in agriculture and livestock raising peaked during the 1950s and 1960s and saw a gradual decline thereafter, deepening during the 1990s with technological intensification and organizational and productive changes that significantly reduced the need for labor. Although harvest mechanization in the Pampeana Region occurred toward the middle of the twentieth century, the technological package linked to soy production, along with biotechnology, reduced workforce needs in other stages of the production process. Labor mechanization in other regions took place around the 1990s, with cotton being one example.

These data refute the theory that backward areas will develop with the dissemination of modern capitalist processes. The deepening of capitalism in the agricultural sector has in fact led to a decrease in waged workers and the growth of the poor petit-bourgeoisie alongside an exodus from agriculture. A large proportion of the poor petit-bourgeoisie produces agricultural products on a small scale to compensate for the lack of salaried work and the reduced productivity of its holdings. Some of those expelled from the sector are beginning to constitute a reserve army of the unemployed. Others have migrated to the city, where they are likely to find jobs characterized by poor working conditions, low wages, and precarity.

While most of the data refer to the Argentine agrarian social structure as a whole, capitalist deepening has taken place primarily in the Pampeana Region, and this raises questions with regard to structural and relational unity that can be addressed with Stavenhagen's approach. Thirty years after writing the "Theses," Stavenhagen (1997: 21) updated his thinking in the context of what he called the "uneven process of globalization and economic flexibilization." It

had become evident that modern and archaic or underdeveloped areas could not be considered independent of each other and analysis had to become more complex because of the "fragmentation and increased diversification of Latin American societies." Areas could not be seen as autonomous and internally homogeneous because the relationships between them entailed a variety of linkages on different levels.

That is why in order to study different development levels in contemporary capitalism a highly disaggregated analysis is necessary. A first set of problems is identifying areas for study. What are the characteristics of capitalist expansion and intensification in each area? What kinds of agrarian structures make up the Argentine social formation? What are their similarities and differences? A second set of problems is the interrelationships among areas, in particular relations of functionality. For example, in the case of Argentina, an initial approach could focus on the Pampeana Region in comparison with and interrelation to the rest of the country. A third set of problems is the relationships among business sectors across areas at the different levels of analysis. What are the links between the local/regional bourgeoisies, the national agricultural bourgeoisie, and the metropolitan bourgeoisie? Are these relationships alliances, conflictive, or complementary? How have they changed over time? And what about the links between each bourgeoisie and foreign or transnational capital? Finally, an analysis of agrarian social structures should go beyond their internal dynamics to include the impact of these processes on other structures—for example, the spread of certain aspects of agricultural waged work (such as precarity, contingency, and flexibilization) to other economic branches.

AN ANALYSIS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF INTERNAL COLONIALISM

While the concept of internal colonialism is central to "Seven Erroneous Theses," enabling an analysis of relationships between different areas with different levels of development, it is problematic in some respects in the case of Argentina. The relations of exploitation (in terms of resource transfer, terms of exchange, etc.) between central and peripheral areas—a fundamental aspect of the theory of internal colonialism—are not clearly evident. Ian Rutledge (1987: 266), researching the development of capitalism from 1550 to 1960 in a peripheral Argentine province (Jujuy), wondered to what extent it was appropriate to argue that rural areas were exploited by their national metropolis and that this exploitation affected all social classes. He identified three levels of exploitation: the deterioration of the terms of exchange between the region and the metropolis, the transfer of earnings and payments for services from rural to metropolitan areas (and also the transfer of resources from the national government to the provinces), and the incorporation of rural areas into the capitalist economy in such a way that, rather than resulting in their development, it may contribute to perpetuating regional poverty.

With regard to the first of these levels Rutledge said that the import-substitution policies vigorously promoted in Argentina until 1976, in particular those that proposed the development of agroindustry (e.g., increased import

duties on imported products that were already produced in the country), ended up hurting the metropolitan working class, producing a transfer of income from that class to the owners of agroindustry. To some extent this argument remains valid for recent years (since 2003), when, after a steep devaluation, Argentina experimented with incipient policies promoting and protecting industry and the development of an internal market for many Argentine regional products (especially food, beverages, and raw materials).

As for where agricultural investments came from and where the earnings went, Rutledge said that a considerable amount of the income from the sugar mills and mines of Jujuy was transferred outside the province, though it was not clear whether this amount exceeded the investments received. This is a current concern because, as I have pointed out, many regional agroindustrial activities have seen the entry of new investors or owners (both national and foreign) into these activities, the displacement of others, and the emergence of new forms of capital organization and production involving new modes of investment and earnings transfers (Gras and Hernández, 2009). Additionally, in recent decades mining, particularly of metals, has grown significantly in Argentina, especially since new regulations were introduced in the 1990s. Ore deposits are located mainly in mountain provinces such as Catamarca, San Juan, and Santa Cruz. This increase in activity has been characterized by the entry of Canadian and Australian companies and has been strongly challenged by environmental organizations and social movements regarding toxic methods of operation, the limited profits assigned to local governments and populations, the high transfer of profits overseas, and the displacement of other, more labor-intensive productive activities (see Svampa and Antonelli, 2010, and Bottaro and Sola Álvarez, 2015).

Finally, beyond the particulars of the Jujuy case, Rutledge stressed the analytical importance of the classical distinction between economic growth and "development." Zapata (1995) made the same point in commenting on the thirtieth anniversary of "Seven Erroneous Theses." He noted that in those 30 years wealth had not only increased but become more concentrated and that the new or intensifying processes that had to be considered in analyzing agrarian structures included urbanization, outsourcing, informalization, the feminization of the workforce, the inclusion of business groups in the middle class, and the incorporation of new regions into national economies. While some Argentine provinces have likely experienced economic growth, this does not mean that there has been a proportionate decline in poverty or improvement in the quality of life (Guardia and Tornarolli, 2010; INDEC, 2015).

A fourth element that could add a dimension to the analysis of internal colonialism in Argentina is the extent to which the survival of certain types of regional agricultural production is linked to the productivity of the Pampeana Region. In any case, with regard to functionality, the migrant workforce from backward areas contributes to modern areas such as the Pampeana Region during certain times of the year (e.g., the harvest) and provides cheap labor to the urban job market (such as Greater Buenos Aires).

Finally, a concept of less explanatory power that nevertheless provides an initial approach to the current relations between areas is the expansion of the agricultural frontier—the incorporation into agricultural production of new

areas (e.g., forests or unexploited areas), the development in areas of noncapitalist production, and the displacement of certain activities by others (e.g., the aforementioned agriculturalization and soybean production [Rosati, 2013]).

FINAL REMARKS

The value of Stavenhagen's approach to Latin American social, economic, and cultural processes lies in the relationship between apparently autonomous dynamics that are, in his view, part of "a single global society." In short, we cannot study underdeveloped countries without considering the development of the fastest-growing countries. The historical aspect is particularly important, because it is primarily the development of links that provides a glimpse of the associations that interest the researcher. Concepts like internal colonialism and the focus on social classes, the agrarian structure, and production and exchange relations are important contributions, as is the relational analytical outlook that approaches social phenomena holistically and includes, for example, not only class but also interethnic relations.

In applying Stavenhagen's perspective to the recent changes in the Argentine agrarian social structure, my intention was not to apply concepts belonging to other historical contexts and processes to the current deepening of capitalism but to use the relevant dimensions of his analytical approach (especially as presented in "Seven Erroneous Theses") as a point of departure for raising questions about this particular case. I prioritized his methodology—considering the social structure (in this case, agrarian) as a whole and examining the linkages and interactions between apparently contradictory opposing, independent, and/or autonomous areas, sectors, or zones. In my case study, the discussion and the questions raised refer to the dominant forms of property and land tenure and to the relations of production in the agricultural sector, to the different levels of analysis, to the increased complexity of the concept of internal colonialism when applied to Argentina, and to the functional relationships between zones or areas at different levels of development.

NOTES

1. The differences between the indigenous and Ladino populations are not biological but social and cultural. Stavenhagen (1975 [1969]), however, is interested in the distinctions found in the relations of production and those involving struggle, opposition, or conflict within the framework of the global society.

2. The development of capitalism is two-directional: on the one hand there is an expansion of capitalist relations into new areas that is characterized by the attraction of population toward these productive activities, and on the other there is development in depth, in which growth takes place in an area in which capitalist relations are already dominant. The latter entails a change in the development of productive forces and work processes in general and leads to the expulsion of people from productive activities.

3. This is not to deny the existence of indigenous communities that are demanding recognition of their rights, particularly those regarding territory.

4. According to data from the Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censos (INDEC, 2013) 24.5 percent of Argentine exports came from soybean production.

REFERENCES

- Barsky, Osvaldo and Alfredo Pucciarelli (eds.)
1997 *El agro pampeano: El fin de un período*. Buenos Aires: FLACSO/CBC-UBA.
- Basualdo, Eduardo and Miguel Khavisse
1993 *El nuevo poder terrateniente: Investigación sobre los nuevos y viejos propietarios de tierras de la provincia de Buenos Aires*. Buenos Aires: Planeta.
- Bottaro, Lorena and Marian Sola Álvarez
2015 "La megaminería en contextos subnacionales: Mineralo-Estado y resistencias sociales en La Rioja y San Juan," pp. 271–298 in Maristella Svampa (ed.), *El desarrollo en disputa: Actores, conflictos y modelos de desarrollo en la Argentina contemporánea*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones UNGS.
- Chazarreta, Adriana
2010 "La propuesta analítica de Rodolfo Stavenhagen." *Prácticas de Oficio: Investigación y Reflexión en Ciencias Sociales* 6 (August). ides.org.ar/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/artic123.pdf (accessed April 25, 2016).
- Chazarreta, Adriana and Germán Rosati
2016 "Los cambios en la estructura social agraria argentina (1988–2012)," in Gabriel Kessler (ed.), *La sociedad argentina hoy*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.
- Dobb, Maurice
1999 *Estudios sobre el desarrollo del capitalismo*. Mexico City: Siglo XXI.
- Frank, Andre Gunder
1973 *América Latina: Subdesarrollo y revolución*. Mexico City: Era.
- García Rabelo, Margarita
n.d. "La perspectiva crítica sobre desarrollo y subdesarrollo: un proyecto de investigación." https://www.nodo50.org/cubasigloXXI/taller/grabelo_060404.pdf (accessed April 25, 2016).
- Gras, Carla and Valeria Hernández
2009 "Reconfiguraciones sociales frente a las transformaciones de los 90: desplazados, chacareos y empresarios en el nuevo pasaje rural argentino," pp. 89–116 in Carla Gras and Valeria Hernández (eds.), *La Argentina rural: De la agricultura familiar a los agronegocios*. Buenos Aires: Biblos.
- Guardia, Laura and Leopoldo Tornarolli
2010 "Boom agrícola y persistencia de la pobreza rural en Argentina." *Centro de Estudios Distributivos, Laborales y Sociales Documento de Trabajo* 98. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i0798s.pdf> (accessed April 25, 2016).
- INDEC (Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censos)
2013 "Comercio exterior." http://www.indec.gov.ar/nivel3_default.asp?id_tema_1=3&id_tema_2=2 (accessed April 21, 2016).
2015 "Censo de población, hogares y vivienda 2010." <http://200.51.91.245/argbin/RpWebEngine.exe/PortalAction?&MODE=MAIN&BASE=CPV2010B&MAIN=WebServerMAIN.inl> (accessed April 21, 2016).
- Kautsky, Karl
1974 *La cuestión agraria*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.
- Lódolla, Agustín and Román Fosatti
2004 "Servicios agropecuarios y contratistas en la provincia de Buenos Aires: régimen de tenencia de la tierra, productividad y demanda de servicios agropecuarios." *Documento de Trabajo* 115. Buenos Aires: Universidad de Belgrano.
- Marx, Karl
2006 *El capital*. Vol. 3. Mexico City: Siglo XXI.
- Pucciarelli, Alfredo
1991 "Evolución del proceso de desconcentración de la propiedad rural en la pampa bonaerense, 1920–1980." *Ruralia* 2: 53–93.
- Quijano, Anibal
2000 "Colonialidad del poder, eurocentrismo y América Latina," in Edgardo Lander (ed.), *La colonialidad del saber: Eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.
- Rosati, Germán
2013 "Patrones espaciales de expansión de la frontera agrícola: la soja en la Argentina (1987–1988/2009–2010)," pp. 97–122 in Carla Gras and Valeria Hernández (eds.), *El agro como negocio: Producción, sociedad y territorios en la globalización*. Buenos Aires: Biblos.

Rutledge, Ian

1987 *El desarrollo del capitalismo en Jujuy: 1550–1960*. Tucumán: ECIRA/CICSO.

Stavenhagen, Rodolfo

1967 (1965) "Seven erroneous theses about Latin America." *New University Thought* 4 (4): 25–37.

1968 (1965) "Seven fallacies about Latin America," pp. 13–31 in James Petras and Maurice Zeitlin (eds.), *Latin America Reform or Revolution? A Reader*. New York: Fawcett World Library.

1975 (1969) *Social Classes in Agrarian Societies*. Translated by Judy Adler Hellman. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

1997 "Treinta años después." *Análisis Político* 31 (May–August): 16–22. <http://biblioteca.clacso.edu.ar/ar/libros/colombia/assets/own/analisis31.pdf> (accessed April 21, 2016).

Svampa, Maristella and Mirta Antonelli

2010 *Minería transnacional, narrativas del desarrollo y resistencias sociales*. Buenos Aires: Biblos.

Zapata, Francisco

1995 "Las siete tesis: treinta años después." *Estudios Sociológicos* 13 (37): 181–188.

2012 "A propósito de las 'Siete tesis equivocadas sobre América Latina' de Rodolfo Stavenhagen," pp. 327–342 in Carlos Illades and Rodolfo Suárez (eds.), *México como problema: Esbozo de una historia intelectual*. Mexico City: Siglo XXI/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana.