

Peasant Prospects in the Neoliberal Age

PHILIP MCMICHAEL

Peasant prospects today are matters of significant contention, not least regarding the question of the recomposition of the peasantry. The question of the peasantry's future links to another longstanding debate about the trajectory of capitalism. This continues the Marxist/populist debate over peasant prospects anchored in Lenin's claim that what Russian Narodniks viewed as peasant 'differentiation' was indeed peasant 'disintegration' in the context of a developing home market for capital.¹ Variants of this debate echo in the extensive literature concerning the persistence of small farmers in the capitalist era. While the latter centres on the reproduction of small farming within the circuits of capitalist agriculture, a broader agrarian question concerns the reproduction of small farming by capitalism globally and across sectors.

This broader 'agrarian question' focuses attention on the relentless assault on small farming by a new balance of forces, including financial relations incorporating agriculture into global industrial-retailing circuits, intellectual property rights protocols displacing peasant knowledges through seed monopolies, and globally-managed circuits of food displacing small farmers. In reviewing these questions, this essay argues that the current agrarian question and its resolution depend on the peasantry itself, in a politicised movement on a world scale to confront the international power, and socio-ecological impact, of capital.

In this respect, the *Vía Campesina* transnational peasant movement favouring 'food sovereignty' makes the critical observation that the 'massive movement of food around the world is forcing the increased movement of people'.² The juxtaposition of labour and new circuits of food represents a historic moment in the reproduction of capitalism through the mechanisms of the 'corporate food regime'.³ These mechanisms are captured in David Harvey's concept of 'accumulation by dispossession', which involves the direct expropriation of peasantries through global market forces (destabilising effects of food imports, contract farming relations, and so on), and the more indirect dispossessions through privatising public supports of small-scale agriculture, in turn enabling the consolidation of corporate agriculture.⁴ In this respect, the dismantling of farm sectors everywhere not only undermines local stewardship of the land and relegates 'food security' to a global market relation, but it also nourishes global capitalism with an endless supply of 'surplus' labour that depresses wages worldwide.

Philip McMichael, Department of Development Sociology, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA.

As an institution of the global market, the corporate food regime combines capitalism's logical processes and world-historical forces. The latter can be specified with reference to Karl Polanyi's concept of the double movement.⁵ Polanyi viewed the institution of the self-regulating market in the mid 19th century as a movement to commodify land, labour and money, and the protectionist movement as a counter-movement to regulate each of these social substances. The counter-movement across the turn of the twentieth century involved a cumulative politics of nation-state formation, whereby labour legislation, agrarian protectionism and central banking attempted to re-embed the market in society, culminating in the modern welfare state. The resulting 'social contract' informed state building in the subsequent mid twentieth century 'development project',⁶ which, in the Cold War context, included US-sponsored programmes of land reform, followed by the Green Revolution.⁷ In the twenty-first century, the Polyanian trinity of land, labour and money and its protectionist impulse work differently. The regulation of money is no longer vested in the state *per se*, but in institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which restructure states to reproduce money by using up labour and land across the world with decreasing regard for their sustainability. Not only is the question of a home market for capital rendered inappropriate, but also the politics of the counter-movement have shifted dramatically as national social contracts have steadily eroded.⁸

My argument here is that, like the terms of the classic agrarian question, Polanyi's terms of political reference were state-centric and discounted the significance of imperialist relations during the 'great transformation'. In fact, metropolitan welfare states were constructed with imperial foundations. In other words, to the extent that class politics in the 'great transformation' era centred on the state, rather than the state *system*, organised labour remained vulnerable to late twentieth century forms of capital devolution (outsourcing/sub-contracting) and disassembling (financialisation). These forms stem from the rise of a global market of stateless money that privileges capital mobility and flexibility in the neoliberal age.

It is this neoliberal trajectory of global capital accumulation that over-determines the latter's contradictory social and ecological relations, and hence its resistances. The corporate food regime, which deepens the use, misuse and abandonment of natural and social resources, unfolds within a general imperative of 'disembedding'. Arguably, 'peasant movements' (including land rights, 'food sovereignty,' biodiversity and seed-saving movements) are the most direct expression of the crisis created by dispossession and ecological commodification, especially insofar as these movements manifest themselves in a diversity of responses to 're-spatialise' the social and economic relations in the corporate food regime. They represent the possibility of a peasant modernism, dedicated to an 'agrarian citizenship',⁹ via a politics of ecology and food sovereignty anchored in an episteme of politically reconstituted place.

Capital accumulation on a world scale

In the context of corporate globalisation, 'accumulation by dispossession' works through *general* mechanisms of structural adjustment, as well as through

particular mechanisms that displace peasant agriculture as corporate commodity chains construct a ‘world agriculture’. Local provisioning everywhere is subordinated to the combined pressures of the dumping of Northern food surpluses, an agro-industrial supermarket revolution and the appropriation of land for agro-exporting. The consequence of economic liberalisation is that new food circuits relentlessly displace small farmers into an expanding circuit of casual labour, flexibly employed when employed at all. Karl Marx argued that a surplus-population was ‘a condition of existence of the capitalist mode of production’ and ‘belongs to capital quite as absolutely as if the latter had bred it at its own cost’. Anticipating current discourses of ‘flexibility,’ he noted that: ‘Independently of the limits of the actual increase of population, [the capitalist mode of production] creates, for the changing needs of the self-expansion of capital, a mass of human material always ready for exploitation.’¹⁰

Aside from Marx’s argument that natural demographic trends are overdetermined by the social compulsions and relations of capital, it is important to emphasise that such trends are not determinative. That is, while the logic of capital accumulation requires a supernumerary class of workers, responsibility for its creation lies not only with capital but also with the politics of capital that are specific to historical conjunctures. In other words, capital accumulation is filtered through the competitive relations among (significantly unequal) states, governed by the corporate pursuit of ‘comparative advantage’, institutionalised via World Trade Organization (WTO)-style rules that promote the mobility of capital and intellectual property rights.

The corporate food regime is realised through the deregulation of financial relations embodied in the privatisation of indebted states (sale of public assets, subordination of policy to market principles) and a world-scale process of labour casualisation.¹¹ This food regime is effectively accomplished by the political construction of a *world price* for agricultural commodities, significantly divorced from labour cost. Agricultural commodity prices are artificially depressed in a regime of overproduction and dumping. The world price is universalised through liberalisation (currency devaluation, reduced farm supports and corporatisation of markets), rendering farmers everywhere vulnerable to dispossession.

These new relations of production, converting agriculture to agribusiness, accelerate global circuits of food and agricultural capital via a profound transformation of relations of consumption. Not only are producing regions exporting rather than consuming the products of their lands, but also staple producers themselves are being displaced; thus Mexico’s inexpensive white maize tortillas are replaced by yellow corn tortillas manufactured at triple the price, following the opening of the Mexican economy to US corn exports under the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).¹² This transformation exemplifies the distinctive relations of social reproduction of the neoliberal age where new commercial foods displace local provisioning and rural households supplement an economy of subsistence with cash-cropping for local markets. Additionally, off-farm income is earned on neighbouring farms or plantations, as well as from mushrooming rural industries/*maquilas* and remittances.

Under these conditions peasantries are being conceptualised as ‘semi-proletarianised’,¹³ or as reproducing themselves through the economic form of

‘agricultural petty commodity production.’¹⁴ In the former view, capitalism follows a path-dependent resolution of all social forms into the capital–labour relation. In the latter view, this path remains unresolved, which, in the neoliberal era Henry Bernstein characterises as the ‘agrarian question of labour’.¹⁵ While peasants have always reproduced within broader social relations, Bernstein derives this new agrarian question from a key contradiction of global capitalism, whereby capital systematically fails to reproduce its wage-labour force in an endemic global crisis of employment.¹⁶ Another view is that of Heather Johnson, who answers Bernstein’s observation that imperial capitalism destroys traditional peasantries with the claim that this ‘has resulted not in the disappearance of the peasantry, but in its redefinition’.¹⁷ In context of global capitalism’s tendencies toward ‘involution’ via its spatial concentration and centralisation, matched by an expanding sphere of social exclusion, she adds:

the peasant form of production as operating according to a driving logic of subsistence and retaining at least some control over the means of production is not disappearing. Rather, it persists as rural populations are increasingly marginalized and impoverished by the currents of global capital. The persistence of the peasantry is not a positive process. It stands as a testament to the failures of the development project.¹⁸

I problematise these scenarios by focusing on a new *campesino* politics. This view, developed below, questions the assumption that the contemporary agrarian question’s sole referent should be capital (and the problematic of the development of social labour).

In redefining the agrarian question as a question of social reproduction rather than capitalist transition, Bernstein abandons the classical agrarian question of capital on the grounds that globalisation involves centralising capital and fragmenting labour under conditions of ‘massive development of the productive forces in (advanced) capitalist agriculture’. That is, the material (but not social) question of food supply is resolved, even as global labour is impoverished by tenuous employment conditions. The ‘agrarian question of labour’ is now ‘manifested in struggles for land against “actually existing” forms of capitalist landed property’.¹⁹ A question here is why labour would struggle for land rather than employment, or, if the strugglers are indeed peasants of one kind or another, why represent the struggle through a lens that invokes (only) the capital/labour relation? Johnson’s scenario echoes Bernstein in suggesting that capital turns its back on its margins – for her, evidence of an incomplete development project, which suspends the peasantry in a negative logic of subsistence. However, over a decade ago, Susan George and Fabrizio Sabelli remarked:

Some critics make the mistake of proclaiming that development has failed. It hasn’t. Development as historically conceived and officially practiced has been a huge success. It sought to integrate the upper echelons, say ten to forty per cent, of a given third world population into the international, westernized, consuming

classes and the global market economy. This it has accomplished brilliantly.²⁰

In other words, the ideological project of development masked a process of concentrating social wealth within relatively contained circuits of money and commodities.²¹ As Bernstein emphasises, this containment process is exacerbated by globalisation. Marx conceptualised the process thus:

The fact that the means of production, and the productiveness of labour, increase more rapidly than the productive population, expresses itself, therefore, capitalistically in the inverse form that the labouring population always increases more rapidly than the conditions under which capital can employ this increase for its own self-reproduction.²²

That is, where labour does not control the means of employment, its dependency on capital is expressed and experienced in a process of immiseration, countered only by the historic political mobilisation of labour in the rise of the welfare state. However, in the neoliberal era of corporate globalisation, organised labour is progressively de-mobilised, restoring immiseration as the centrepiece of social reproduction, fuelled by the 'pauperisation' of urban fringe dwellers. This effect results from the accelerated marginalisation of rural populations by the corporate food regime and its price war against small farming. The key point here is that the global farming crisis is not simply about capital's involution, but also about the global institution of a politics of dispossession of rural cultures (including logics of subsistence) in the name of a singular market culture. This process informs the political reassertion of the 'peasant way', discussed below.

The peasant question

Bernstein views the economic form of world peasantries, agricultural petty commodity production, as a transition stimulated by colonialism.²³ In his rejoinder to Eric Hobsbawm's obituary for the peasantry, Bernstein's methodological directive for analysing an internally diverse world 'peasantry' notes that they 'become petty commodity producers . . . when they are unable to reproduce themselves outside the relations and processes of capitalist commodity production, when the latter become the conditions of existence of peasant farming and are *internalized* in its organization and activity'.²⁴ Of course, this representation of peasants as 'petty commodity producers' raises boundary questions: whether off-farm labour is a petty commodity, whether and to what extent peasants produce commodities that routinely enter capitalist circuits, and whether and to what extent peasants perceive themselves as utilising, rather than internalising, commodity production to sustain their households and communities. In other words, 'petty commodity producer' may be a necessary, but not sufficient, condition of existence or survival for peasantries. Johnson's 'logic of subsistence' might suggest a complementary, or critical, condition of existence/survival, rooted in an attachment to the land and knowledge of its cultivation.²⁵ Certainly this logic depends on

particular, gender/kin-based relations of reproduction, and specific state-based credit and property regimes. To the extent that these relations are rendered increasingly fragile by the pressures of commodification, in the Polanyian sense there is now a palpable counter-movement to capital that, in redefining what 'peasant' means in this historic conjuncture, reformulates the political terms of resistance.²⁶

Accordingly, to represent the prospects of the peasantry solely through the lens of the capital relation is problematic because it reproduces a *telos* regarding the transience of peasantries,²⁷ and tends to foreclose possibility of *campesino* resistances to capitalism. Here, Rajeev Patel demonstrates that a political economy of representation is critical to an understanding of how the *Vía Campesina* has worked to redefine the 'peasant way' in opposition to the neoliberal agrarian project through a politics that unites diverse and autonomous struggles anchored in a 'practical ethic of peasant movement solidarity'.²⁸

To the extent that these social forces contest the policies and effects of neo-liberal capitalism, they complicate history by weaving an alternative, agrarian-centred narrative into a capitalist narrative. Not only do they stall or contest Hobsbawm's scenario of the twilight of the peasantry²⁹ by asserting political identities drawing on ancestral cultural themes (ethnic and/or anti-capitalist), but also their political interventions modernise these themes as potential alternatives to the social and ecological crisis of neoliberal capitalism.³⁰ Their historical intervention is formed and informed by the inability of capitalism to realise its ideologised promise of development and its betrayal of that promise via neoliberal practices governed by ruthless financial, rather than socially productive, criteria.³¹ This intervention also draws on a politics of voice – 'To date, in all the global debates on agrarian policy, the peasant movement has been absent: we have not had a voice. The main reason for the very existence of the *Vía Campesina* is to be that voice and to speak out for the creation of a more just society . . .'³² – and on a politics of stewardship – 'that is what the *Vía Campesina* is. It's a movement of people of the land who share a progressive agenda. Which means we share the view that people – small farmers, peasants, people of the land – have a right to be there . . . That it's our job to look after the earth and our people. We must defend it and we have to defend it in the global context.'³³

The proximate reason for this *campesino* intervention is the evident inability of modern agriculture and urban industry to absorb an increasingly 'superfluous' landless labour force. Within world agriculture, productivity ratios of the highest to the lowest input branches have deepened from 10:1 in 1940 to 2000:1 in the early twenty-first century,³⁴ and this gap has contributed to the impoverishing condition where 43 per cent of the global South's population dwells in slums.³⁵ Here the Brazilian *Movimento Sem Terra* (MST) is the exemplary case of reversing the historic rural to urban circuits, by intervening against 'the massive movement of food around the world' and protecting the right to work the land in the 'peasant way'. While this phenomenon may be referred to as 're-peasantisation', in fact, it represents a twenty-first century *campesino* politics reasserting the right to farm as a social act of stewardship of the land and food redistribution against the destabilising and exclusionary impacts of the neoliberal model.

Accordingly, rather than considering peasant prospects solely through the lens of capital accumulation, a complementary lens would be the political spaces that constitute its oppositions. The issue then is to understand the historically specific

relations of capitalism against which peasants struggle.³⁶ That is, how is the preservation or reclamation of the peasant way entwined with a politics framed by dispossession and its enabling institutional policies?

Resurgence of the peasant way

The agrarian relations of the corporate food regime are multiple – ranging from dispossession, displacement and long-distance labour circuits, through variegated forms of off-farm (often gendered)³⁷ labour strategies and on-farm contract labour, to political mobilisation to reassert and/or sustain a peasant movement politics as a space of opposition to neoliberal capitalism. The latter involves specific reassertions of ‘civil society’ in pursuing a politics of mediated territorial and/or ethnic autonomy – framed at times by a vision of collective rights to the means of agricultural production, replacing the state with a self-governing or non-governmental organisation (NGO)-based political economy, and/or forming coalitions with other classes similarly affected by neoliberal capitalism’s exclusions, in a context of a polarised electoral politics.

Strategies to reconstitute peasant spaces vary within and across states. In Mexico, for example, the domestic fair trade scheme *Comercio Justo*, which aims to stabilise small farm markets for coffee, honey and handicrafts, is complemented by efforts to protect Mexico’s ‘culture of maize’. However limited in scope, off-farm activities subsidise this culture – ranging from monetary remittances to creating new markets for locally grown maize varieties and other peasant products, such as amaranth and beans.³⁸ Beyond such local actions, the *El Barzón* movement of the 1990s reached beyond a million-strong debt-ridden *campesino* constituency to form a national debtors’ insurgency contesting removals of public credit and prices subsidies.³⁹ The *Zapatistas*, by contrast, situated a regional struggle for local autonomy in world-historical context via a politics addressing the decline and renewal of Mexican civil society.

Coinciding with NAFTA’s implementation, the *Zapatista* rebellion opposed implementation of neoliberal reforms by the Mexican state, asserting a politics of self-determination transcending individual or property rights with human and community rights. Its world-historical sensibility brings a cultural politics to the question of civil rights, grounded in place-based mobilisation and ‘historical memory, cultural practices and political norms as much as on legal norms’.⁴⁰ Its strategy of regional autonomy challenges local class inequalities (and military occupation) as forms of state despotism and ethnic oppression, and resonates directly with other regions and indigenous communities elsewhere. As a movement against empire, the *Zapatistas* particularise a universal notion of rights into a politicisation of ethnic, gender and class relations at the regional scale in the service of an open-ended or networked process. In asserting the currency of the peasant way, women in the movement challenge indigenous policies that dichotomise modernity and tradition, insisting on ‘the right to hold to distinct cultural traditions while at the same time changing aspects of those traditions that oppress or exclude them’.⁴¹

In challenging *capitalist* modernity, indigenous/peasant movements of Latin America, such as the *Zapatistas*, the Ecuadorian CONAIE, Peruvian Indians, the Aymara and Quechua peoples in Bolivia and Guatemalan Mayans, affirm citizen-

ship as a basic national and human right, but view it as the vehicle for respecting the substantive rights of minorities, creating pluri-national states with differential sovereignties⁴² – essential to the sustainability of peasant ways in the shadow of the crisis of neoliberal development.

While ethnic autonomy is not unproblematic,⁴³ the enabling principle here is the reassertion of local forms of social reproduction, often dependent on relations of reciprocity, in the context of the chronic failures and instability of broader mechanisms of social reproduction as constituted by global circuits of capital. Thus struggles over ‘traditional resource rights’ to protect genetic materials from corporate biopiracy are simultaneously proactive and protective. Such reassertion blends Patel’s ‘practical ethic of political movement solidarity’ and an ethic of self-reliance, including the cooperative relations embedded in local knowledges of biodiversity, cultivation and seed-saving, often interwoven with kin relations.⁴⁴ Wendy Wolford, in noting spatially distinct subjectivities in the South and North-east of Brazil, noted that for ‘southern Brazil, small farmers who decided to join the MST were tied into a spatially expansive form of production that they valued as a part of a broader community. Family and community ties that were forged and re-forged through everyday practices working on the land helped to lower the threshold for participation in MST.’⁴⁵ In seeking to reconstitute the ‘rural’ as a civic base through which to critique the Brazilian development narrative, the MST develops cooperative forms of rural labour, reproduces staple foods for the working poor and offers livelihood security to the urban unemployed. This new *campesino* politics self-consciously connects not simply with other agrarian and indigenous movements, but also with those united by the exclusions of the neoliberal model. Thus, ‘the sem-terra, the “without-land” movement, has given rise to an urban version, called the sem-toto (“without-roof”) movement of homeless people’.⁴⁶

In these ways, the MST also practices ‘food sovereignty’, a robust counterpoint to the corporate relations of production and consumption of food, projected into global discourse by the *Via Campesina* in 1996. While food sovereignty has multiple meanings depending on context, the transnational political movement for the ‘peasant way’ is building an alternative, decentralised understanding of food security in which material want-satisfaction is not subordinated to the market but embedded in ecological principles of cooperative production relations and forms of agro-ecology.⁴⁷ Food sovereignty, in the *Via Campesina* vision, would subordinate trade relations to a re-politicisation of access to credit, land and viable prices, to be set via rules of fair trade negotiated in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and not the WTO, with the active participation of farmers’ movements. This principle of self-organisation informs a distinctive vision of strategic (rural) diversity, sanctioned through a democratic multilateralism. Resistance to corporate globalisation ultimately concerns not only reintegrating social, agricultural and ecological relations into alternative conceptions of the ‘peasant way’, but also, in so doing, transforming *political* cultures of modernity premised on the industrialisation of rural economy, the redundancy of peasantries and the subjection of cultures of food production and its distribution to the market.

Conclusion

The contradictions of neoliberal capitalism express themselves through agrarian relations in various forms of ‘accumulation through dispossession’, concentrating and centralising agribusiness capital, privatising states, redistributing social resources away from labouring classes and peasantries, and degrading environments. But they are also expressed in the politicisation of the ‘margins’, where capitalist circuits of social reproduction are tenuous and unstable, and infuse class with gender, racial and ethnic oppressions.

Arguably, politicisation is over-determined by the historical conjuncture of the evident gap between the neoliberal project of ‘global prosperity’ and its exclusionary bio-political dynamic. In this context, peasant movements, in reformulating what it means to renew and secure a politics of social justice on the land, are compelled to ally with other excluded strata nationally and internationally, and situate their struggle in world-historical terms. As MST coordinator, João Stedile, remarks, ‘if capital has become international and uses international methods, peasant movements must also internationalize their forms of struggle and develop new and creative ways to confront a common enemy’.⁴⁸ This involves blending an anti-capitalist, or class, politics with a *campesino* politics that revalues substantive forms of economy (in the Polanyian sense) via a distinctive modern politics rooted in a global moral economy.⁴⁹ Given the intimate connection between hyper-urbanisation and peasant dispossession, *campesino* politics is indelibly linked to questions of ecology, by reversing the centralisation of economic resources and its catastrophic human and environmental consequences. In other words, the contemporary global agrarian question is pivotal to all other social arrangements.⁵⁰

When James Scott argues that ‘if the obstacles even to national working-class solidarity have proved so daunting, why should we be optimistic about peasant solidarity, let alone a “Peasant Internationale” that could hold its own against the WTO and world agribusiness?’,⁵¹ he reproduces a state-centric and sectoral understanding of a radical politics. A politics opposing capitalist modernity includes a critique of the state system and the necessity to scale up and *transform* – a double movement. It is only when national sovereignty (under neoliberalism) is universally called into question that the artificial separation of politics from economics, defining capitalist modernity, is fully revealed.⁵² At that point, *because* capital holds sway, alternative conceptions of political-economic sovereignty and subjectivity emerge, offering social pathways to a future governed by sustaining principles such as ecology, labour cooperation, diversity, political subsidiarity, sustainability, fair trade and political alliances built on the principle of ‘cooperative advantage’ (as in the Bolivarian Alliance for the Americas).

Contemporary *campesino* politics nurtures such principles, but by no means resolves all questions, including and especially that of gender relations.⁵³ Food sovereignty is an enduring principle, but it is also a strategy of reversing the social, cultural and environmental damage of a privatised food security system. Some of its movements, such as the MST, engage tactically with urban forces, but are strategically preoccupied with consolidating the ‘struggle on the land’ as a social project. Longer-term questions of raising agricultural productivity to provision cities are yet to be resolved, but securing the legitimacy of ‘peasant spaces’

is vital to surviving the crisis of industrial and transgenic agricultures. In sum, the transnational peasant movement represents a strategic intervention in the agrarian question to broaden future possibilities. Rather than conceding to an agro-industrial future, or viewing land redistribution as a solution to labour surpluses, the food sovereignty movement envisions as agrarian trajectory that would reintegrate food production and nature as an alternative culture of modernity.

Notes

My thanks are due to Rajeev Patel for critical suggestions on an earlier version of this essay.

1. Philip McMichael, 'The Concept of Primitive Accumulation; Lenin's Contribution', *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (1977), pp. 497–512.
2. Bangalore Declaration of the Via Campesina, 6 October 2000, http://viacampesina.org/main_en/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=53&Itemid=28
3. Philip McMichael, 'Global Development and the Corporate Food Regime', in Frederick H. Buttel & Philip McMichael (eds), *New Directions in the Sociology of Global Development* (Elsevier, 2005), pp. 265–300.
4. David Harvey, *The New Imperialism* (Oxford University Press, 2003).
5. Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time* (Beacon Press, 1957).
6. Philip McMichael, *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective*, 3rd edn (Pine Forge Press, 2004).
7. Farshad Araghi, 'Global De-Peasantization, 1945–1990', *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (1995), pp. 601–32.
8. Philip McMichael, 'Globalization', in Thomas Janoski, Robert Alford, Alexander Hicks & Mildred Schwartz (eds), *The Handbook of Political Sociology* (Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 587–606.
9. Hannah Wittman, *The Social Ecology of Agrarian Reform: The Landless Rural Workers' Movement and Agrarian Citizenship in Mato Grosso, Brazil*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 2005.
10. Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1 (Progress Publishers, 1967), p. 632.
11. Philip McMichael, 'The Global Crisis of Wage Labour', *Studies in Political Economy*, No. 58 (1999), pp. 11–40.
12. K. Bensinger, 'Mexican corn comes a cropper', *The Washington Times*, 9 September 2003; Oxfam, 'Dumping without borders: how U.S. agricultural policies are destroying the livelihoods of Mexican corn farmers', *Oxfam Briefing Paper* No. 50 (2003), p. 19.
13. Cristobal Kay, 'Latin America's Agrarian Transformation: Peasantization and Proletarianization', in Deborah Bryceson, Cristóbal Kay & Jos Mooij (eds), *Disappearing Peasantries? Rural Labour in Africa, Asia and Latin America* (Intermediate Technology Publications, 2000), pp. 123–38; and Sam Moyo & Paris Yeros, 'The Resurgence of Rural Movements under Neoliberalism', in Sam Moyo & Paris Yeros (eds), *Reclaiming the Land: The Resurgence of Rural Movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America* (Zed Books, 2005), pp. 8–64.
14. Henry Bernstein, "'The Peasantry" in Global Capitalism: Who, Where, and Why?', in Leo Panitch & Colin Leys (eds), *Socialist Register 2001: Working Classes Global Realities* (Merlin Press, 2000), p. 40.
15. Henry Bernstein, "'Changing Before Our Very Eyes": Agrarian Questions and the Politics of Land in Capitalism Today', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol. 4, Nos 1–2 (2004), pp. 190–225.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 205.
17. Heather Johnson, 'Subsistence and Control: The Persistence of the Peasantry in the Developing World', *Undercurrent*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (2004), p. 54.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
19. Bernstein, "'Changing Before Our Very Eyes"', p. 202.
20. Susan George & Fabrizio Sabelli, *Faith and Credit: The World Bank's Secular Empire* (Westview, 1994), p. 147.
21. Sandra Halperin, 'Trans-Local and Trans-Regional Socio-Economic Structures in Global Development: A "Horizontal" Perspective', in Buttel & McMichael, *New Directions*, pp. 19–56.
22. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 645.
23. Thus: 'The analysis of "peasants" [concentrates] on peasant production as an *economic form*, agricultural petty commodity production, constituted by the class relations (and contradictions) of capital and labour

- and located in the shifting places of agriculture in the imperialist periphery within international divisions of labour.' Henry Bernstein, "'The Peasantry" in Global Capitalism', p. 40.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 29.
 25. Cf. Frédérique Apffel-Marglin, 'Counter-Development in the Andes', *The Ecologist*, No. 27 (1997), pp. 221–4.
 26. Philip McMichael, 'Globalization'; and Rajeev Patel, 'International Agrarian Restructuring and the Practical Ethics of Peasant Movement Solidarity', *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, Vol. 41, Nos 1–2 (2006), pp. 71–93.
 27. Farshad Araghi, 'Global De-Peasantization, 1945–1990', *The Sociological Quarterly*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (1995), p. 604.
 28. Patel, 'International Agrarian Restructuring'.
 29. Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century 1914–1991* (Abacus, 1994), p. 289.
 30. James Petras, 'Latin America: the Resurgence of the Left', *New Left Review*, No. 223 (1997), pp. 17–47; Gerardo Otero, *Farewell to the Peasantry? Political Class Formation in Rural Mexico* (Westview, 1999), p. 154; Marc Edelman, 'Bringing the Moral Economy Back In . . . to the Study of 21st Century Transnational Peasant Movements', *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 107, No. 3 (2005), pp. 331–45.
 31. Saturnino M. Borrás, Jr., 'Questioning Market-Led Agrarian Reform: Experiences from Brazil, Colombia and South Africa', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (2003), pp. 367–94.
 32. Paul Nicholson (Basque Country) at the Second International Conference of the *Vía Campesina*, quoted in Annette-Aurélien Desmarais, 'The *Vía Campesina*: Consolidating an International Peasant and Farm Movement', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (2002), p. 96.
 33. Nettie Wiebe, former President of the Canadian NFU and member of the *Vía Campesina*'s International Coordinating Committee, quoted in Desmarais, 'The *Vía Campesina*', p. 98.
 34. Samir Amin, 'World Poverty, Pauperization and Capital Accumulation', *Monthly Review*, Vol. 55, No. 5 (2003), p. 2.
 35. John Vidal, 'Beyond the city limits', *Guardian Weekly*, 17–23 September 2003, pp. 17–8; Mike Davis, 'Planet of Slums', *New Left Review*, No. 26 (2004), pp. 5–34.
 36. Philip McMichael, 'Rethinking Globalization: The Agrarian Question Revisited', *Review of International Political Economy*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (1997), pp. 630–62.
 37. Catherine S. Dolan, 'On Farm and Packhouse: Employment at the Bottom of a Global Value Chain', *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 69, No. 1 (2004), pp. 99–126.
 38. Daniel Jaffee, Jack Kloppenburg, Jr. & Mario Monroy, 'Bringing the "Moral Charge" Home: Fair Trade within the North and within the South', *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 69, No. 2 (2004), pp. 169–96; David Barkin, 'The Reconstruction of a Modern Mexican Peasantry', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (2002), pp. 73–90.
 39. Heather L. Williams, *Social Movements and Economic Transition: Markets and Distributive Conflict in Mexico* (Cambridge University Press, 2001).
 40. Neil Harvey, *The Chiapas Rebellion: The Struggle for Land and Democracy* (Duke University Press, 1999), p. 28.
 41. Christine E. Eber, 'Seeking Our Own Food. Indigenous Women's Power and Autonomy in San Pedro Chenalhó, Chiapas (1980–1998)', *Latin American Perspectives*, Vol. 26, No. 3 (1999), p. 16.
 42. James Petras & Henry Veltmeyer, *System in Crisis: The Dynamics of Free Market Capitalism* (Zed, 2003), p. 195.
 43. Judith Adler Hellman, 'Real and Virtual Chiapas: Magic Realism and the Left', in Leo Panitch & Colin Leys (eds), *Socialist Register 2000: Necessary and Unnecessary Utopias* (Merlin Press, 2000), pp. 161–86; and see the critique of peasant essentialism in Tom Brass, *Peasants, Populism, and Postmodernism: The Return of the Agrarian Myth* (Frank Cass, 2000).
 44. Rachel Bezner-Kerr, 'Informal Labour and Social Relations in Northern Malawi: The Theoretical Challenges and Implications of *Ganyu* Labour for Food Security', *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 70, No. 2 (2005), pp. 167–87.
 45. Wendy Wolford, 'Families, Fields, and Fighting for Land: The Spatial Dynamics of Contention in Rural Brazil', *Mobilization: An International Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (2003), p. 202.
 46. Angus Wright & Wendy Wolford, *To Inherit the Earth: The Landless Movement and the Struggle for a New Brazil* (FoodFirst Books, 2003), p. 329.
 47. Annette Desmarais, *The Via Campesina: Peasants Resisting Globalization*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Calgary, 2003.

48. Quoted in Saturnino M. Borras, Jr, 'La *Vía Campesina*: An Evolving Transnational Social Movement', Transnational Institute, Amsterdam, October 2004, p. 10, www.tni.org/reports/newpol/campesina/pdf
49. Cf. Mimi Sheller, *Consuming the Caribbean* (Routledge, 2003); Annette Desmarais, 'The *Vía Campesina*: Consolidating an International Peasant and Farm Movement', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (2002), pp. 91–124; and Edelman, 'Bringing the Moral Economy Back In'.
50. Echoing the early twentieth-century argument by Peter Kropotkin that the pre-eminent social question is the 'question of bread', Amory Starr proposes that the global anti-capitalist movement for 'diversity' is best summarised as 'agricultural': 'encompassing first world farmers seeking market protection, farmers resisting genetic engineering, indigenous sovereignty movements seeking to control land and practices, sustainable development, localist economic visions, and third world peasant movements reacting to the failures of urbanization and neoliberalism by insisting on rights to land and subsistence. These movements have a variety of relationships to political economy, formal democracy and existing nations. But none imagines that growth, modernization or technology provide answers to their problems; indeed they see corporate technology as economically and ecologically dangerous.' Amory Starr, *Naming the Enemy: Anti-Corporate Movements Confront Globalization* (Zed Books, 2001), p. 224; see also Farshad Araghi, 'The Great Global Enclosure of Our Times: Peasants and the Agrarian Question at the End of the Twentieth Century', in Fred Magdoff, John Bellamy Foster & Frederick H. Buttel (eds), *Hungry for Profit: The Agribusiness Threat to Farmers, Food and the Environment* (Monthly Review Press, 1999), pp. 145–60.
51. James Scott, 'Afterword to "Moral Economies, State Spaces, and Categorical Violence"', *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 107, No. 3 (2005), p. 397.
52. McMichael, 'Globalization', p. 598.
53. Cf. Rajeev Patel, 'Transgressing Rights: Via Campesina's call for Food Sovereignty', *Feminist Economics* (forthcoming); note this is particularly the case for agricultural workers, more than half of whom are women and who comprise a third of the 1.3 billion people actively engaged in agricultural production (half of the world's labour force), concentrated in the global South, and as high as 80 per cent of the workforce in some countries, International Union of Food, *The WTO and the World Food System: a Trade Union Approach* (International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations, 2002), p. 3.

Copyright of New Political Economy is the property of Routledge and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.