

AGRARIAN CHANGE UNDER THE CHILEAN MILITARY GOVERNMENT

Patricio Silva
University of Leiden

DOS DECADAS DE CAMBIOS EN EL AGRO CHILENO. By LUZ ELENA CERECEDA and FERNANDO DAHSE. (Santiago: Universidad Católica de Chile, 1980. Pp. 170.)

INSTITUCIONES Y PROCESOS AGRARIOS EN CHILE. By SERGIO GOMEZ. (Santiago: FLACSO, 1982. Pp. 167.)

EL CAMPESINADO CHILENO DESPUES DE LA REFORMA AGRARIA. By JOSE BENGUA. (Santiago: Ediciones SUR, 1983. Pp. 201.)

TRANSFORMACIONES AGRARIAS Y CAMPESINADO: DE LA PARTICIPACION A LA EXCLUSION. By EMILIANO ORTEGA. (Santiago: CIEPLAN, 1987. Pp. 235.)

LA AGRICULTURA CHILENA: LAS DOS CARAS DE LA MODERNIZACION. By SERGIO GOMEZ and JORGE ECHENIQUE. (Santiago: FLACSO/AGRARIA, 1988. Pp. 304.)

Since the military takeover in September 1973, Chilean society has experienced profound socioeconomic, political, and even cultural transformations. The intensity of the societal changes has led some scholars to call it a “de facto revolution.” Chilean and foreign social scientists studying the period since 1973 have focused generally on the political nature of the new regime and particularly on the overall results of its neoliberal economic policy. Relatively less attention has been paid to the specific transformations occurring during that period in the Chilean countryside, despite the fact that this sector has undergone the most radical changes of all.

In reviewing these books on the Chilean agrarian question under authoritarian rule, one is struck by the marked absence of foreign scholars among the authors. The preponderance of Chilean authors is all the more remarkable when one recalls that prior to 1973, Chilean land reform (1962–1973) was one of the most popular research subjects among Latin Americanists in the United States and Britain, inspiring dozens of books and dissertations.¹ Moreover, the few books published outside Chile since 1973 are mainly based on fieldwork completed before the coup and hence do not cover the authoritarian period.² The paucity of foreign scholarship

on the current situation in the Chilean agrarian sector has resulted partly from the great disillusionment felt by many scholars over the traumatic 1973 coup and the violent end of land reform in Chile. Also, fieldwork in the Chilean countryside has been extremely difficult and even hazardous for foreign researchers since 1973. Landowners and security forces have adopted a bellicose attitude toward foreigners, viewing them as potential political agitators and subversives and blaming them for politically activating and radicalizing peasants during the land reform process.

As a result, most investigations have been carried out by Chilean scholars associated with one of the many Santiago-based private research centers that have been established since 1973.³ Until 1980, however, the results were usually published as working papers, reproduced in small numbers and generally available only at the sponsoring institution.

In this sense, the five books listed above represent a real breakthrough in disseminating research on Chilean agrarian reality. In contrast with earlier research, these books are not limited to a few specific sub-aspects of the agrarian policy of the authoritarian regime. Despite differences in focus and method, all the volumes under review attempt to provide a general account of the main transformations occurring in the countryside under military rule.

Dos décadas de cambios en el agro chileno by María Elena Cereceda and Fernando Dahse represents one of the first attempts to explain what has been going on in the countryside since the military takeover. Ironically, it was published not by one of the private research centers mentioned above (as might be expected) but by the Universidad Católica of Santiago, a major bastion of neoliberal thought in Chile.

Although Cereceda and Dahse certainly are not sympathetic with neoliberalism, they demonstrate extreme caution in discussing controversial matters like the privatization of land after 1973, and they display a notable reluctance to locate their analysis within any specific theoretical framework. As a result, they were unable to reach any general conclusions. Yet Cereceda and Dahse chose this approach deliberately. As stated in the introduction, their main goal was "to provide a descriptive overall synthesis that will make the transformation process in the agrarian sector comprehensible. . . . Given the nature of our work, which attempts not to verify theories but to describe facts and tendencies, it seemed appropriate to dispense with the conventional chapter of conclusions. In this regard, the reader will have the last word" (pp. 7, 9).

Despite this questionable approach, *Dos décadas de cambios* offers a complete overview of the main changes occurring in Chilean agrarian society since the early 1960s. Each of the three parts deals with a different historical period. Cereceda and Dahse begin by describing the main features of the traditional rural order in Chile prior to the land reform of the mid-1960s. They analyze the traditional system of land tenure and the

type of social relations prevailing in the latifundio, stressing the factors that help explain the system's longevity.

Despite the absence of an explicit theoretical framework, Cereceda and Dahse launch into describing a series of hypotheses put forward about the nature of the Chilean traditional rural order. They stress the affinity between the process of industrialization begun in the late 1930s and the persistence of the latifundio system in the countryside. The center-left and center-right coalitions in power between 1938 and 1964 limited the civil and labor rights of peasants in order to impede the growth of political consciousness and the rise of agrarian unionism. Politicization of peasants was perceived as a threat to the traditional latifundio system, which was protected by the ruling political parties for two reasons. On the one hand, maintaining the system gave political parties support for their industrialization efforts from the powerful latifundistas (as part of a tacit compromise). On the other hand, impeding the formation of agrarian unions kept agrarian salaries low (along with the price of agrarian products), thus benefiting the industrialization process, which requires cheap agrarian inputs.

In the second part of *Dos décadas de cambios*, Cereceda and Dahse discuss what they call "the breakdown of the agrarian social traditional order," as produced by the implementation of land reform between 1964 and 1973. Weakening of the right-wing parties in the early 1960s made this implementation politically possible. The Christian Democratic government as well as that of Unidad Popular (UP) considered such reform necessary for heading off the crisis of import-substituting industrialization, which had already begun in the late 1950s. As the authors correctly stress, land reform was successful in eliminating the latifundio system and in unionizing peasants, but in actuality, the traditional dependency ties with the *patrón* were replaced by a possibly stronger dependence on the state and the political parties in power.

In the third part of the book, "Las nuevas transformaciones económicas y sociales en el agro," Cereceda and Dahse deal with the changes that occurred after the military takeover. Their treatment of the post-1973 events is highly "statistical," however, and limited to reproducing official figures. They depict the transformation occurring in the structure of land tenure after the privatization of the so-called *sector reformado* (the ten million hectares expropriated during the land reform).

Of the fifty-eight hundred estates expropriated before the coup, some thirty-eight hundred (representing 28 percent of the land) were restored partially or fully to their former owners. Peasants of the former reformed sector (*asentados*) retained nearly 52 percent of the land, distributed by the military government in *parcelas* (family farms), while the remaining 20 percent of the land was sold by tender to the private sector. It has been estimated that almost half of the applications for *parcelas* made

by former *asentados* were rejected by the military government, mainly for political reasons. Among those rejected were former peasant leaders and individuals who played active roles during the land reform.

Although Cereceda and Dahse do not provide a theoretical framework for their statistical data, they do make a number of interesting observations with far-reaching theoretical implications. For example, they correctly state that applying neoliberal policies in the Chilean countryside has led to a growing homogenization of exchange relations among the agrarian population due to the monetarization of salaries and the development of collective and impersonal labor relations. Theoretically, this trend could imply in the future that the interests of different peasant factions (landless, smallholders, family farmers, sharecroppers, and agricultural workers) will tend to resemble those of industrial workers, leading eventually to strong intersectoral labor unions.

Finally, surveying *Dos décadas de cambios* as a whole forces one to conclude that its three sections are poorly interrelated. Chronological order was employed too narrowly from past to present to provide the historical background needed to explain more recent events. As I have observed elsewhere,⁴ it is almost impossible to understand the nature of the military government's agrarian policy without constantly referring back to discussions between structuralists and monetarists of agrarian performance since the 1950s, especially regarding the land reform process. From 1964 to 1973, the structuralist approach dominated agrarian policies, but after the military takeover, the monetarist (neoliberal) view became totally dominant.

Sergio Gómez's *Instituciones y procesos agrarios en Chile* is based on several research projects that he and other scholars carried out between 1977 and 1980, but it is not a book in the strict sense. Following a deeply rooted tradition among Chilean social scientists, the different "chapters" were neither conceived nor written to form part of a single book but were assembled a posteriori. These papers and reports were actually presented on a variety of occasions, although they all deal with aspects of the changes experienced in the Chilean countryside after 1973. The original material has been re-edited to some extent, but the different chapters do not harmonize with each other because of diverse styles, foci, and methods.

For example, in the initial chapter, Gómez provides an interesting historical review of the struggle among peasants, *latifundistas*, and the state during the land reform process,⁵ ending with a description of state repression of the peasant movement since 1973. In sharp contrast with this global historical-sociological approach is his chapter entitled "Historia de vida de dos dirigentes campesinos," which is based on tape-recorded peasant testimony about the course of their lives since 1973, transcribed in first-person form. The method utilized seems rather questionable, however, because the "two" peasant leaders ("Don Segundo"

and "Efraín") do not actually exist but were created by Gómez as composite figures. He selected information obtained from interviews with twenty-eight peasant leaders to construct the two composites "by adding bits of the histories of various leaders, as actually lived by each one" (p. 74). Despite the useful information provided, the artificially manipulated nature of the testimony represents a step backward when compared with traditional "life histories" that allow real social actors to speak for themselves, with minimal "editing."⁶

In the sixth chapter, Gómez employs yet another method to gather and present information. Here he analyzes rather journalistically the so-called milk conflict of 1977 between certain organizations of agrarian entrepreneurs and government economic policymakers. Using newspaper articles, he provides an almost day-by-day account of this conflict. For the first time since 1973, landowner organizations succeeded in forcing the military government to revoke a major measure, which involved a large reduction in tariffs on milk imports that was adversely affecting their domestic interests. Although this chapter offers no new theoretical insight, it vividly documents the arrogance and political insensitivity of the "Chicago boys" in response to sectoral demands.

In the final chapter, Gómez provides a succinct but powerful synthesis of the main changes occurring in the Chilean countryside after 1973. He demonstrates that the rural policy of the military government has led not to reconstituting the old latifundio system but toward a selective capitalist modernization in agriculture, which has gone hand in hand with extreme social and legal retrogression in the peasants' living conditions.

A more actor-oriented approach is found in José Bengoa's *El campesinado chileno después de la Reforma Agraria*. Despite its being another collection of papers and articles, this book exhibits a strong thematic consistency. Bengoa's rigorous analysis explores the changes since 1973 among the different categories of peasants in Chile. He begins by describing the present condition of the smallholders (*minifundistas*), whose holdings are inadequate to support a family.

Bengoa admits that during the land reform, the attention of policymakers and academicians (often one and the same) focused almost exclusively on the latifundio and possible ways of eliminating it. This perspective lost sight of the smallholders, who then comprised about half of the agrarian population. As a result, no major efforts were made during the Frei and Allende governments to integrate minifundistas into the ongoing process of change in the countryside. The privileged actors were the permanent peasants (*inquilinos*) who lived on the expropriated estates and obtained all kinds of state assistance for running them in the collective form known as *asentamientos*. The marked lack of interest in the minifundistas' situation reflected political considerations. Because of their characteristic individualism and broad geographical dispersion, it

was almost impossible for the political parties in power to organize minifundistas in unions in order to orchestrate their political and electoral support for the government. Bengoa shows that as a result of the steep deterioration of the peasant living standards after 1973, minifundistas have been forced to broaden their traditional peasant economy by selling part of their labor outside their landholdings. This semi-proletarianization of the minifundistas has allowed agrarian entrepreneurs to pay only a part of the reproduction costs of the work force, which is used only on a temporary basis.

Another group of minifundistas have lost their land and become entirely proletarianized. They either live together with other peasant families or have moved into one of the hundreds of rural shantytowns that have sprung up since 1973 (the so-called *villorrios rurales*). Bengoa demonstrates in another chapter that the peasants who obtained family units from the military government (*parceleros*) have not fared much better than the minifundistas. Confronted with a lack of support from the authorities and the difficult conditions of a free-market economy, almost half of the *parceleros* are estimated to have lost their land.

When the military government announced its intention to privatize the *asentamientos* and parcel them out in small individual plots, the *asentados* initially responded with enthusiasm. How can this response be explained? To answer this question, Bengoa reviews land-tenure policy during the land reform. Offering a significant critique, he describes the great dissonances between the communitarian goals pursued by technocrats and politicians and the traditional aspirations of peasants to possess their own piece of land (this discussion is self-criticism in a certain sense, given the important role Bengoa played during the land reform). Moreover, the poor functioning of most *asentamientos* did nothing to reinforce collective peasant attitudes but instead created tensions among the *asentados*. As Bengoa points out, "One of the problems most severely affecting peasant consciousness was the tension between collective labor and individual effort and retribution" (p. 101). The fact that the "free-riders" obtained the same benefits as the rest greatly disappointed many peasants, who had hoped to be able at last to exploit the land for themselves. In other words, the absence of economic incentives for intense hard work and personal dedication almost paralyzed communal labor during the land reform. In fact, during the UP government, many *asentamientos* existed only on paper, while *asentados* actually farmed the land as separate plots.

The military government found itself in an ideal position to fully exploit this situation by demonstrating its willingness to bestow individual property titles among the peasants. In doing so, the regime sought to restrict peasant activities to the narrow confines of their family units and thus depoliticize them.

Bengoa dedicates an entire chapter of *El campesinado chileno* to analyzing the dramatic situation of one category of the Chilean peasantry that is often forgotten—the Mapuche Indians.⁷ According to Bengoa, the military government's policy toward the Mapuches has been oriented from the outset toward destroying their culture, which is based on collective ownership and use of land. Since the late nineteenth century, the Mapuches have been constantly threatened by Chilean landowners and European immigrants who, supported by the law, have expropriated most tribal land. In 1972, however, the UP government introduced a new Indian law that protected Mapuche land by prohibiting persons outside the tribe from obtaining community land. It also empowered Mapuche communities to recover a significant part of their usurped land.

This law was abrogated, however, by another Indian law established by the military government in 1979 as part of its campaign to create a free market for land. Against the will of most Mapuches, the government eliminated the communities and divided the land into individual plots (*hijuelas*), justifying this action by two kinds of arguments. The neoliberal technocrats argued that in a society organized around the "impersonal and impartial" rule of the market, there was no place for a protective measure that provided advantages for particular economic actors. Second, the military argued that this approach was the best way to integrate the Mapuches into national life, while simultaneously helping to fortify and ensure Chilean territorial unity and national security.

Bengoa's account makes it clear that the disintegration of the Mapuche communities has led to growing cultural alienation among its former members. Indeed, the Mapuche were abruptly integrated into an aggressive market economy operating according to norms almost totally antagonistic to those of their former community.

After analyzing the fate of several categories of peasants now existing in the Chilean countryside, *El campesinado chileno* comes to a very different conclusion than that of Cereceda and Dahse. Bengoa finds that heterogeneity, not homogeneity, is a major feature of today's rural population. He views this heterogeneity along with repression and unemployment as the main factors explaining why the peasant movement has failed to rebuild its organizations according to the old formulas. The present situation demands a profound transformation in peasant organizations because peasant demands have become more heterogeneous than before. In contrast with the era of land reform, current peasant demands are not limited to better wages and possession of land. Bengoa concludes that the stress today is on securing stable jobs, improved labor conditions for temporary workers, financial and technical support from the state for small tenants and parceleros, and basic health and education services.

Emiliano Ortega's *Transformaciones agrarias y campesinado: de la participación a la exclusión* provides an excellent analysis based on rigorous

arguments that were carefully formulated and ordered. This book breaks with another custom in Chilean academic circles, one especially evident among scholars dealing with the agrarian question. In most such studies, bibliographical references are scarce, and when books are cited, they are mentioned mostly as a courtesy, to offer tribute, or to borrow a specific statistical table or figure. In contrast with the American and European academic tradition in which each author is expected to place his or her book's arguments in an ongoing debate, this Latin American practice encourages almost no explicit references to the ideas, arguments, and explanations of other scholars on the subject being addressed.

Ortega, however, devotes special attention to the main interpretive contributions made since the 1950s. His synthesis is therefore obligatory reading for those wishing to ascertain the essence of the debate over agrarian reform in Chile. Ortega organizes his analysis around three major areas of Chilean agrarian reality that have experienced important changes in recent decades: the economic and productive transformations resulting from continuing technological development, structural changes produced by the land reform, and transformation of the rural cultural order resulting from what he calls "the urbanization of the rural environment." Ortega goes on to analyze the role played by peasants as direct agricultural producers in the peasant economy, the ways in which peasants as a work force interact with various organizational forms of production, and labor relations in agriculture.

In analyzing the process of technological development in the Chilean countryside, Ortega correctly emphasizes the central role played by the state and its specialized agencies in modernizing agriculture before 1973. From 1950 on, landowners benefited from several kinds of fiscal and financial stimuli to modernize their methods of production. During the land reform, the state made huge investments in order to improve agrarian infrastructure and to stimulate (especially under the Frei administration) the creation of modern agribusiness.

The military government, in contrast, opted for a radical and coercive method of "modernizing" Chilean agriculture according to international standards of technological development and efficiency: the liberalization of markets for agricultural products, capital, and technological inputs. At the same time, the state retreated from its traditional activities in rural areas (the so-called state subsidies), passing along all its assets to the private sector. The slogan "Tierra o muerte" from the era of land reform period was suddenly replaced by "Modernización o muerte."

As Ortega shows, sudden elimination of the services traditionally provided by the state, combined with a lack of protection for the agricultural economy from international competition, generated a process of differentiation within the agricultural sector. Only a few producers who could orient their production toward the dynamic international markets

have been relatively successful in integrating into the new economic model. But the overwhelming majority of the peasants and agrarian entrepreneurs have found it impossible to produce exportable crops due to lack of capital and climatic factors and have been confined to producing for the internal market. The latter in turn has been depressed during most of the authoritarian period.

Ironically, liberalization of markets led to an invasion of the Chilean market when products from the United States and the European Economic Community were dumped in Chile. The outcome was especially harmful for one of the social sectors that applauded the military takeover the most—the large grain-producing and cattle-raising interests in the southern region.

In discussing the structural changes implemented during the land reform, Ortega explores the reform's overall compatibility with the political and economic goals that were subsequently pursued by the military government. His analysis reveals that the military government eliminated only those aspects that were barriers for the development of capitalism in the countryside while it preserved some essential transformations like changes in land tenure and elimination of the latifundio. Among the main "obstacles" that the new policymakers encountered were the asentamientos, the strong presence of the state, peasant unionizing, and legislation that impeded the functioning of a free market for land.

Paradoxically, the earlier land reform made possible the later application of the neoliberal model in the Chilean countryside. As a result, the military did not revive the old latifundio system but instead used the modernization process set in motion by the land reform.

The real "counterreform" took place in the sociopolitical sphere. Within the agrarian policy of the military government, there was no room for peasant participation, as announced by the subtitle of Ortega's book, *De la participación a la exclusión*. Peasants were totally excluded from formulating and implementing the new measures. This exclusion as well as police repression, widespread unemployment, and a lack of legal protection for peasants' rights have damaged Chilean rural society extensively. The damage will be extremely difficult to repair, even after an eventual return to democracy.

Finally, the radical cultural changes experienced by the peasants from the 1960s on constitute a major aspect of the Chilean agrarian question, one that had not received the attention it deserved until the appearance of *Transformaciones agrarias y campesinado*. Ortega stresses that these changes have been conditioned by and subordinated to the political and economic needs of the sectors controlling the state apparatus.

Thus the hacienda system's elimination via land reform signified not only the end of a system of production but also the disintegration of the social and cultural domination of the rural population by the landed

oligarchy. The traditional rural environment was replaced by new forms of organization and the sudden incorporation of the rural population into ideological struggles that were previously taking place only in urban areas. Ortega talks of an actual "cultural invasion" carried out by thousands of urban professionals and technicians who arrived in rural areas to implement the land reform. The rapid politicization of peasants, together with the productive modernization of agriculture, led to an increasing "cultural urbanization" of the rural world.

The implementation of neoliberal policies after 1973 exacerbated individualism and consumerism among the peasants and confronted them for the second time in a decade with a new political and cultural system that was being imposed on them by outside forces. Ortega is nevertheless optimistic (perhaps overly so) about the future effects of these cultural changes among peasants. He concludes that these transformations have led to "greater independence in rural social life in relation to the entrepreneurial structures in the countryside. Peasants will be able to direct their demands to the local and regional centers of power, thus speeding up rural progress and improvements in their quality of life" (p. 225).

La agricultura chilena: las dos caras de la modernización, by Sergio Gómez and Jorge Echeñique, offers another broad synthesis in what may be the most complete book written thus far on the agrarian changes occurring under the military government. Gómez and Echeñique focus on the current process of modernization, placing special emphasis on the political attitudes adopted by agrarian entrepreneurs. At first, large landowners almost unconditionally supported the actions of the military regime. They viewed the overthrow of the UP government as itself a major reason for cooperating with the new authorities. Moreover, they perceived the authoritarian nature of the new regime as a guarantee that no repetition of the land reform would be attempted. Also, neoliberal economic policies promised, at least in theory, egalitarian state treatment of all economic forces in the country.

When the economic model began to affect most landowners negatively, however, the initial euphoria dissipated and they began to question agrarian policy seriously. What began in 1975 as timid dissidence regarding the official policy on the part of the agrarian entrepreneurs changed after the economic crisis of 1981 into a resolute opposition to the neoliberal technocracy. Even the sectors closest to the government began to argue against ending state subsidies, asking the authorities to take a more active role in agriculture in order to head off the agricultural crisis, which reached its most dramatic levels in 1982 and 1983.

Thereafter, the government replaced the orthodox neoliberal policies in force since 1974 with measures providing more support for agrarian producers. New protective tariffs were introduced and old debts were

renegotiated. But did the military government really succeed in dealing with the agrarian crisis? Gómez and Echeñique's study concludes that they did. Since 1983 Chilean agriculture has experienced a major revival that has led to a global improvement in almost all agricultural products. High increases have been reported in total area planted, productivity, food-crop production, and export of fruit, agricultural, and forest products. Moreover, agricultural trade in the three-year period between 1984 and 1986 shows a positive balance of one and a half billion dollars.

Gómez and Echeñique demonstrate, however, that this "success story" has been achieved partly at the cost of increasing deterioration in living conditions for most Chileans. For example, between 1981 and 1986, the food consumption per capita has decreased 5 percent in calories and 20 percent in protein. Nor has reactivation of the economy produced visible change in the regressive patterns of income distribution prevailing in Chile since 1973. Furthermore, the new jobs created since 1983 are mostly in the informal sector or are temporary in nature, masking high levels of underemployment. In short, the fruits of the economic recovery of recent years have not benefited most of the rural population, only the big *grupos económicos* who control the commercialization and export of agricultural products.

What tasks lie ahead in the eventual return to democratic rule? In their final chapter entitled "Proyecciones de la agricultura chilena," Gómez and Echeñique evaluate the positive and negative aspects of the military regime's agrarian policy and enumerate the most urgent measures to be adopted. The state should guarantee the nutritional well-being of Chileans by protecting the internal production of the most essential food crops. With respect to the "dynamic sector" (fruit, forest products, and similar products), the state should continue the work begun by the military regime by stimulating increases in exports, although not at any price.

These recommendations do not imply going back to the situation existing before the military takeover, however. In contrast with past policies, Chilean agrarian policy must be guided by national social and economic goals and by technical and rational criteria, not by irresponsible ideological slogans that deny the rights and interests of any social sector that is part of the rural population.

Gómez and Echeñique's concluding analysis makes it clear that the state will have to play a key role in healing the wounds suffered in rural society during the authoritarian period. Any future democratic government will have to try to regain, at least partly, the trust of the rural masses and their organizations through a systematic attack on the causes of their backward position in Chilean society. The future government should also formulate a sharply defined agrarian program as soon as possible, one that pays special attention to the role of agrarian entrepreneurs. As

Gómez and Echeñique observe: "Chilean agriculture today reveals weaknesses and deficiencies but also accomplishments and potentials. . . . To solve the existing problems and obtain the support of agrarian entrepreneurs for the goal of increasing production and exports, a broad political pact is needed in which all parties will have to make concessions. Not resolving these apparent contradictions by democratic negotiation would lead either to a process of violent transformations or to an equally violent return to authoritarianism" (pp. 267, 274).

Conclusion

The books reviewed here were all written by Chilean academicians who played active roles in the land reform process in either the Frei or Unidad Popular governments (or in both of them). In the past, their dual roles as state officials engaged in agrarian policy and academicians frequently colored their scientific analyses according to the ideological battles raging during that period.

After the traumatic experience of the military coup, most of these policymakers could not objectively evaluate the achievements and failures of the land reform, particularly the achievements of the "other" government and the failures of their own. It has been even more difficult to develop an objective analysis of the agrarian policy of the military government. The works reviewed here show, however, that during the last decade their authors have achieved the necessary distance from their own past to elaborate genuinely objective studies on the subject. Their unorthodox retrospective analyses of the land reform process and fair treatment of the agrarian situation during the authoritarian period are extremely promising signs—all the more so when we consider that it will certainly be these scholars who will play key roles in formulating and implementing agrarian policy under a future democratic government.

NOTES

1. Among the most influential studies are M. J. Sternberg, *Chilean Land Tenure and Land Reform* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962); William Thiesenhusen, *Chile's Experiments in Agrarian Reform* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1965); H. Landsberger and F. Canitrot, *Iglesia, intelectuales y campesinos* (Santiago: Editorial del Pacífico, 1967); Solon Barraclough et al., *Reforma agraria chilena: seis ensayos de interpretación* (Santiago: Instituto de Capitalización e Investigación en Reforma Agraria, 1970); P. Crosson, *Agricultural Development and Productivity: Lessons from the Chilean Experience* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1970); David Lehmann, "La agricultura chilena y el período de transición," *Sociedad y Desarrollo* 3 (July–Sept. 1972): 101–44; Brian Loveman, *El mito de la marginalidad: participación y represión del campesinado chileno* (Santiago: ICIRA, 1971); Robert Kaufman, *The Politics of Land Reform in Chile, 1950–1970: Public Policy, Political Institutions, and Social Change* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972).
2. See Arnold J. Bauer, *Chilean Rural Society: From Spanish Conquest to 1930* (Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 1975); Brian Loveman, *Struggle in the Countryside: Politics and Rural Labor in Chile, 1919–1973* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976); J. Carrière, *Landowners and Politics in Chile: A Study of the "Sociedad Nacional de Agricultura," 1932–1970* (Amsterdam: CEDLA, 1981); and T. C. Wright, *Landowners and Reform in Chile: The Sociedad Nacional de Agricultura, 1919–1940* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982). One of the few exceptions is L. Jarvis, *Chilean Agriculture under Military Rule: From Reform to Reaction, 1973–1980* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985).

3. Valuable work has been done by research groups such as Grupo de Investigaciones Agrarias (GIA), the Grupo de Estudios Agro-Regionales (GEA) and the Centro para el Desarrollo Campesino y Alimentario (AGRARIA). Also deserving of special mention are the influential articles of Cristóbal Kay (University of Glasgow), which have been published in various international journals, and the work of José Franco Mesa (a pseudonym of Emiliano Ortega) published in the review *Mensaje*.
4. See Patricio Silva, *Estado, neoliberalismo y política agraria en Chile, 1973–1981* (Amsterdam: CEDLA, 1987).
5. Gómez's analysis of the period before the coup is mainly based on his own early works. See Sergio Gómez et al., *Movimiento campesino chileno* (Santiago: ICIRA, 1970); and Gómez, *Los empresarios agrícolas* (Santiago: ICIRA, 1972). These two excellent books have already become classics on the Chilean agrarian question.
6. A good example of successful application of this method in studying the current conditions of Chilean peasants is María Elena Cruz and Rigoberto Rivera, *Y los campos eran nuestros* (Santiago: Editora Araucaria, 1984).
7. Bengoa is one of the most prominent scholars studying the Mapuche people. See his superb *Historia del pueblo mapuche, siglo XIX y XX* (Santiago: Ediciones SUR, 1985).