

Rosa Congost and Pablo F. Luna (Eds.)

Agrarian Change and Imperfect Property: Emphyteusis in Europe (16th to 19th Centuries)

Turnhout, Brepols (Rural History in Europe, 15), 2018, 311 pp.

It is fitting to begin this review on a celebratory note: this is the fifteenth book in what is already a remarkable series, Brepols's Rural History in Europe, now in its tenth year. Along with the European Rural History Association, this book series is a major outcome of COST Action *Progressore*, headed by Gérard Béaur, who still directs the series at the head of an editorial board, issued of the Action co-ordination team. Be it by design or by accident, *Agrarian Change and Imperfect Property* even follows the lead of the first book in the series (though not actually the first one to be published) (Béaur *et al.*, 2013). Besides being a well-deserved tribute to Gérard Béaur's decades-long commitment to the collective endeavour of rural history, this fifteenth book in the series is also a token of the productivity of European networking programmes such as COST, often outlasting their short-term "deliverables".

The book consists of fourteen chapters. The first, "Emphyteusis: A practical question?" (p. 11-38), by Gérard Béaur, Rosa Congost and Pablo F. Luna, stands in-between an introduction and a concluding synthesis. The remaining thirteen chapters, which for expediency's sake I shall henceforth call "empirical", are as many historical studies or review essays on regions in what are nowadays five European countries, predominantly, although not exclusively, in southern Europe. The contents are arranged geographically. Two chapters concern northern and central Italy: "Some points on emphyteusis in Central-Northern Italy between the end of the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Age" (pp. 39-51), by Giorgio Chitollini, and *What the dominia could do: Enfiteusi and other forms of divided property rights in Lombardy from the fourteenth to the twentieth centuries* (pp. 53-73), by Michela Barbot. Three are about

France, dealing with northern regions and a national overview: “The many faces of emphyteusis in France: An overview, with a case study from the Meaux region (1600-1800)” (pp. 75-96), by Gérard Béaur; “*Erblehn* and *Hoflehn* in Germanic lands: Disguised forms of ownership? The Alsatian countryside in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries” (pp. 97-112), by Jean-Michel Boehler, and “Emphyteusis in practice in eighteenth-century Normandy: Why choose the *fief*?” (pp. 113-31), by Fabrice Boudjaaba. Five are about different regions in Spain, two of which on Catalonia: “More than just access to land: Emphyteusis and the redefinition of property rights in North-East Catalonia (eighteenth and nineteenth centuries)” (pp. 133-54), by Rosa Congost, Pere Gifre and Enric Sagner; “The origins and evolution of the *rabassa morta* contract in Catalonia: Was it an emphyteusis?” (pp. 155-81), by Llorenç Ferrer-Alòs and Belén Moreno; “From ‘feudal’ to ‘common’ emphyteusis in rural Mallorca, eighteenth to twentieth centuries” (pp. 183-206), by Antònia Morey and Gabriel Jover; “*Foros*: Land tenure as a source of income and conflict in early-modern Galicia” (pp. 206-35), by Pegerto Saavedra, and “From *foro* to renting (and back?): Emphyteutic tenure at the Asturian monastery of San Pelayo during the Old Regime” (pp. 237-62), by Pablo Luna. One is about the Portuguese insular region of Madeira: “The *colonia* contract: Ambiguity between sharecropping, fixed rent, and emphyteusis” (pp. 263-85), by Benedita Câmara. And two are about islands in different Greek archipelagos: “*Emphyteotic* practices and rela-

tions of power: An approach of social conflicts in the Greek Archipelago” (pp. 287-96), by Eleftheria Zei, and “Agrarian practices and their social and ideological ramifications in the Ionian Islands during the Venetian domination” (pp. 297-311), by Efi Argyrou and Sevasti Lazari. Almost all empirical chapters look at the early modern period, often glancing back at the late Middle Ages; only the one by Câmara is mainly focused on the nineteenth century. Several of them follow developments up to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and the one by Morey and Jover up to our days. On a formal note, even though the occasional glitch does no serious harm, several chapters could have done with more attentive linguistic and typographical proofreading.

It is impossible in this review to do full justice to the richness in this book’s content, and to discuss the different contributions in any degree of detail. As is often the case in books grown out of conference papers, the empirical chapters differ in their aims and scope. That being said, the first chapter offers a quite effective keynote, providing an underlying thread that does help readers look at the diverse cases as pieces of a common historical puzzle. Béaur, Congost and Luna set out in this initial chapter to elaborate a working definition of emphyteusis, to outline the questions to be asked, and to organize the main lessons they have learned from the empirical chapters.

The authors clearly state their rationale for exploring the intriguing subject of “imperfect property”: *The present book focuses on emphyteusis in the early modern period.*

[...] To focus on *emphyteusis* is to draw attention to one of the possible contractual forms by which agrarian structures and systems of cultivation were transformed. Although historians have devoted considerable attention to short-term contracts [...] much less has been said about the uses, advantages and disadvantages of long-term contracts, as if *emphyteusis* were a survivor or an eccentricity left over from an earlier period. This interpretation can no longer be maintained (p.11).

Their primary aim is, therefore, to challenge a shortcoming in recent literature on the early modern and modern periods, concerning this specific kind of ownership and contract and the property relations around it. *Emphyteutic* contracts, the authors sustain, continued to perform during the modernization of European rural societies, even up to this day, and not necessarily as a hindering factor. This also echoes the claim that Rosa Congost, in particular, has long upheld for concrete historical analysis of practice in both the institutionalization and the appropriation of property rights, against the abstract and normative narrative of the triumph of “perfect property” as the hallmark of agrarian modernization.

Read in this light, the adjective in the first chapter title may convey a double meaning. On the one hand, the question of *emphyteusis* is a practical one because it raises issues that remain very much alive. On the other hand, it is a practical question *in theory* as well. As most empirical chapters show in their own different ways and instances, interpreting historical processes involving this kind of split *dominia* con-

tracts requires an understanding of how different actors and groups might take advantage, in everyday practice, of their rules and the ambiguities surrounding them, in order to contest or encroach on the other parties’ *dominium* and eventually become the full owners, or to turn *de facto* possession into *dominium de jure*.

Briefly summed up, the main point of the argument, which the empirical chapters amply support on the whole, is that such forms of divided ownership in perpetual or long-term contracts proved “versatile” and “flexible” enough to adjust to different uses and to be appropriated in creative ways, which in turn explains the resilience of *emphyteusis* in the face of economic and social change. Therefore, both the prevalence and the economic and social outcomes of such contracts are contingent on historical contexts and processes. Instead of dismissing *emphyteutic* rules and practice as being, by definition, archaic and adverse to agrarian change and economic growth, detailed historical analyses like the ones included in the book are required for those outcomes to be identified and their variation explained.

A second, broader aim of the book is to look beyond the name and define the ideal-typical characteristics that set this type of ownership and contract apart from others, in order to identify commonalities of institutions and practices around which to organize the empirical variety of changing forms and vocabulary. The two defining characteristics are, firstly [...] *the existence, when the contract was signed, of shared rights in the same land*, including those to

sell and bequeath, and secondly *the long-term nature of the contract* (p. 15). This conceptual operation is then used to assert that emphyteusis is more widespread, geographically as well as chronologically, than often is assumed, and the three chapters on France fully demonstrate the comparative potential in that claim. Contracts sharing those two typical features are unveiled, which had so far remained hidden underneath a variety of names and details, and which were far from irrelevant even where common historiographical wisdom would not expect to find them. Possible motivations are discussed for their choice and use, from the supply and the demand perspectives, and the role such contracts played in the dynamics of property relations is explored – all of this in quite comparable ways to those shown in the chapters on the more commonly acknowledged “cultural area” of emphyteusis.

The questions and the conclusions in the book certainly invite further work in this comparative direction. However, this is the result of a conference built up around one particular research network, and the uneven geographical representation certainly reflects this circumstance. It is unfortunate that the historical cases could not cover a wider area, namely further to the North and the East, but also further south in Italy and France. Furthermore, the two small chapters on the Greek cases, which read like conference paper drafts rather than edited chapters, fall rather short of the book’s overall achievements, which is especially disappointing because what they do tell us is quite promising.

My only general criticism concerns the terminology used in chapter one to elaborate on the second ideal-typical trait of emphyteusis, *divided property rights* (p. 18, my emphasis). This term, which is replicated in chapter one and across several other chapters, risks understating a crucial feature of emphyteutic property – of which, however, the authors are well aware. The specificity of emphyteusis is not simply about a division of property rights. Actually, according to the “property rights paradigm”, all kinds of contracts, such as leases, divide or subdivide the bundle of rights subsumed under “full property”. Even long-term, tacitly or coercively renewable lease contracts did not, however, afford lessees as full and sure a physical and economic command of the assets as did a *dominium utile* – along with, in the case of land, the landowner status that could prove all-important in achieving social mobility. What is at stake in emphyteusis is therefore not just a division of property *rights*, but rather the division of legal or *de facto* ownership of the land and/or related assets. This involves not just the appropriation of much wider property rights than a lease, but also a qualitatively different property “regime” or “system”, the *Dominia*, as Barbot put it (pp. 53-4).

Granted that this is mostly a wording issue, and that most authors in the book seem fully aware of this difference when using “property rights” instead of, and sometimes interchangeably with, “ownership”, it is nonetheless meaningful. It is the real division of ownership, not the contractual division of property rights, that sets emphyteusis apart,

and therein lay the “imperfection” of emphyteutic property as looked upon from the ideological standpoint of one absolute and singular right of property. Emphyteusis came *halfway between sale and renting* (Béaur *et al.*, p. 76). As a sale, it created (at least) two distinct ownerships over the same asset. As a tenancy, it afforded the tenant real, albeit partial, land ownership. It was this duplicity that made emphyteusis so versatile and flexible to interpretation and appropriation, and therefore so prone to dispute and change, as the collected studies widely document. It facilitated land buying when capital and credit were in short supply and allowed to adjust it to the family life-cycle; it bolstered supply in the real estate market by making the *dominium utile* saleable while the *dominium directum* remained in commons, in entail, or in mortmain; it provided an incentive for investing in land

improvement, as well as a means for social mobility and for creating or consolidating new landowning groups, adapting from “feudal” to “common” (Morey and Jover) as societies and economies changed.

All in all, this is a compelling book to read, above all an invitation to further research and discussion on this fascinating historical topic, and a quite worthy volume of the Rural History in Europe book series.

Rui Santos

orcid.org/0000-0002-4524-6384

Universidade Nova de Lisboa

REFERENCES

- BÉAUR, G., SCHOFFIELD, P. R., CHEVET, J.-M., & PÉREZ PICAZO, M. T. (Eds.) (2013). *Property Rights, Land Markets, and Economic Growth in the European Countryside (Thirteenth-Twentieth centuries)*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Herbert S. Klein and Francisco Vidal Luna **Feeding the World: Brazil's Transformation into a Modern Agricultural Economy**

Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2018, 468 pp.

Today, Brazil is one of the world's leading exporters of agricultural and livestock products, competing with and surpassing countries with a long tradition such as United States, Canada, Russia and Australia. The ascent of Brazil as a net food exporter in the global market is a recent phenomenon. Although it started in the 1960s, it has gained momentum in the last decades. Brazilian agriculture radically transformed during this period, which

witnessed an extraordinary modernization of the sector as a result of introducing new crops, using more land and the latest agricultural technology, and developing research programs. Klein and Luna explain the causes of this modernization or agricultural “revolution” in a lengthy book that seeks to answer how and why Brazil went from extensive agriculture (based on exports of a few products and directed at few markets) to intensive agriculture (based on exporting

and therein lay the “imperfection” of emphyteutic property as looked upon from the ideological standpoint of one absolute and singular right of property. Emphyteusis came *halfway between sale and renting* (Béaur *et al.*, p. 76). As a sale, it created (at least) two distinct ownerships over the same asset. As a tenancy, it afforded the tenant real, albeit partial, land ownership. It was this duplicity that made emphyteusis so versatile and flexible to interpretation and appropriation, and therefore so prone to dispute and change, as the collected studies widely document. It facilitated land buying when capital and credit were in short supply and allowed to adjust it to the family life-cycle; it bolstered supply in the real estate market by making the *dominium utile* saleable while the *dominium directum* remained in commons, in entail, or in mortmain; it provided an incentive for investing in land

improvement, as well as a means for social mobility and for creating or consolidating new landowning groups, adapting from “feudal” to “common” (Morey and Jover) as societies and economies changed.

All in all, this is a compelling book to read, above all an invitation to further research and discussion on this fascinating historical topic, and a quite worthy volume of the Rural History in Europe book series.

Rui Santos

orcid.org/0000-0002-4524-6384

Universidade Nova de Lisboa

REFERENCES

- BÉAUR, G., SCHOFFIELD, P. R., CHEVET, J.-M., & PÉREZ PICAZO, M. T. (Eds.) (2013). *Property Rights, Land Markets, and Economic Growth in the European Countryside (Thirteenth-Twentieth centuries)*. Turnhout: Brepols.

Herbert S. Klein and Francisco Vidal Luna **Feeding the World: Brazil's Transformation into a Modern Agricultural Economy**

Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2018, 468 pp.

Today, Brazil is one of the world's leading exporters of agricultural and livestock products, competing with and surpassing countries with a long tradition such as United States, Canada, Russia and Australia. The ascent of Brazil as a net food exporter in the global market is a recent phenomenon. Although it started in the 1960s, it has gained momentum in the last decades. Brazilian agriculture radically transformed during this period, which

witnessed an extraordinary modernization of the sector as a result of introducing new crops, using more land and the latest agricultural technology, and developing research programs. Klein and Luna explain the causes of this modernization or agricultural “revolution” in a lengthy book that seeks to answer how and why Brazil went from extensive agriculture (based on exports of a few products and directed at few markets) to intensive agriculture (based on exporting

more than 36 agricultural products and sub-products, and linked to international market dynamics).

The authors reconstruct the historical process of agricultural modernization of the sixth largest country in the world through a multivariable and transareal analysis. They focus on three periods that are key to understanding the Brazilian countryside's transformation: 1) military dictatorships (first phase of modernization), characterized by strong government intervention in agriculture between 1965 and 1984; 2) the economic crisis in the 1980's, which led to radical restructuring of agricultural policies and credit systems; and 3) market liberalization (second phase of modernization), characterized by a series of adjustments that caused commodities chains to rebuild since 1995. In their analysis they consider the critical and favorable conditions of the international and domestic markets, agricultural policies (federal or state-level), the role of public and private institutions in agricultural extension and research programs, the changes of the technological packages and the chemical industry, and the economic impact of agricultural modernization.

Through qualitative/quantitative analysis and through the elaboration of different data series that consider a plethora of variables (economic, political, institutional, social, demographical, technological and market access) the authors explain the transformation in Brazilian agriculture. In short, subsidized credits, guaranteed minimum prices per harvest, protective tariffs, improved infrastructure (bridges, roads,

irrigation channels), agricultural research, technical assistance programs and scientific education were the basis of the first phase of modernization. From a critical point of view, the authors note that there were important regional differences. In this regard, it is worth stressing that credit was mainly given to commercial farmers, since small farms did not benefit as much from having better technology, and until 1970 there were no actions taken against the concentration of property and hence the power of conservative rural elites went unquestioned. Likewise, although prices were stable in this period, thereby reducing uncertainty for producers and consumers, the military government's support policies created distortions as regards to resource distribution.

In Brazil, the farming sector grew during the first phase of modernization, but this growth accelerated during the second phase. A detailed analysis of the production structure which took into account the number of farms, land ownership, cultivated area, types of crops, increases in productivity and output, the value of agricultural and livestock production, job market composition, agricultural technology and materials, and the weight of exports on the international market allowed the authors to conclude that not even the critical circumstances of the 1980's seemed to halt it. They attribute this to the fact that Brazil had already achieved a significant production increase, developed several agroindustries within the context of Import Substitution Industrialization (ISI), and had begun to penetrate the international market with a wide variety of products. The fiscal

crisis, rampant inflation and the advent of neoliberalism, caused profound changes in the previously designed agricultural policies. They marked the end of subsidies and protections, and the beginning of new lines of credit and financing options (banks and commercial firms, supermarkets, co-ops). Rising productivity in Brazilian farming can be largely attributed to technological innovation, as well as a change in public and private policies. In Brazil, the largest growth in the agricultural technological park and in the chemical industry occurred in the context of the Green Revolution. The military governments funded certain producers in order to acquire modern technology, and also launched research and extension programs. The Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation (EMBRAPA), established in 1973, played a fundamental role in the sector's modernization through the generation, adaptation and transfer of technology. Education was also stimulated with the creation of universities, agronomical institutes and technical centers. With liberalization, agricultural research fell into the hands of private companies, which currently control the markets for materials, technologies and seeds. Brazil is currently one of the highest consumers of fertilizers in the world (175 kg per acre), surpassing the United States, France, Spain, Italy, Australia, Canada and Argentina, but behind China, Germany, the United Kingdom, Chile or Colombia, and at roughly the same level as India.

Employing the Total Factor Productivity (TFP) measurement, the authors conclude that Brazilian agriculture's performance

has been exceptional since 2000 (3.5% annual growth between 1975 and 2011, and 5.6% between 2010 and 2017). Nonetheless, they emphasize that this performance is regionally uneven. Analyzing five regions (North, Northeast, Southeast, South and Center-West) and considering a series of physical, demographic, economic and human capital variables, the authors show how these differences have become more acute. The SE, S and NE regions are the most densely populated. In the N and NE we find the largest concentration of poor rural population. Life expectancy has increased on a national level, but the S and SE regions are where the highest longevity is registered. Fertility rates have fallen in the whole country (they went from 6 children in 1970 to 2.2 children in 2002), but the decrease was gradual in the N, NE and Center-West. In 2010, 91% of the Brazilian population was literate, and the S and SE reported the highest literacy rates, in contrast with the N and NE.

In Brazil there is huge inequality linked to land tenure. Land reform, a subject pointed out by the authors, is still a pending task. In the N and CW regions large estates dominate, while in the NE, SE and S medium and small farms are more common. During the "agricultural revolution", the N and CW regions have experienced the largest growth in cultivated land, while in the NE, SE and S a decline has been reported. Seasonal crops experienced notable growth in all regions and went from representing 77% of cultivated land in 1970 to 93% in 2016. The seasonal crop that presented the highest growth has been soy.

Its sowing started in the S, but spread to the rest of the country rapidly. The CW and SE regions control beef production, the S leads in chicken and pork production, and the SE and S lead in milk and egg production.

Within these regions we also find important differences, or at least this is one of the main conclusions of the authors when they analyze agricultural modernization in Mato Grosso (CW), Sao Paulo (SE) and Rio Grande do Sul (S). In Mato Grosso commercial agriculture took off at the end of the 20th century in the area of El Cerrado (within the Amazonas, and one of the most important biomes in the world): there was a significant internal migration, the predominance of large and technological farms dedicated to cattle and soy, cotton and sunflower cultivation, and a large presence of multinational companies. In Rio Grande do Sul commercial agriculture began in the early 19th century: there was significant external migration, and small and modern property was encouraged through the logic of mixed agriculture (rice, wheat, corn, fruit, soy, tobacco, potatoes, pigs, chickens, milk and eggs), agroindustry was early boosted, and they hold the largest co-operative organization in the country. In Sao Paulo commercial agriculture began during the colonial period: there was significant internal and external migration, permanent crops are predominant (coffee, oranges) although seasonal crops have also been boosted (rice, sugar cane, soy, fruit, legumes, vegetables). It is the largest producer and exporter of sugar cane and orange juice in the world, and holds its position as

the main agricultural, industrial and financial state in Brazil.

In the beginning of the 21st century, Brazil had already established as a leading agricultural producer and exporter, becoming the world's largest exporter of processed meat and chicken, orange juice, sugar cane, coffee and soy; the second largest exporter of corn (after the United States); while other exports are also on the rise. Although farm size has recently decreased and production has concentrated in medium-sized, yet modern, farms, the regional or spatial dimension is still relevant. In this regard, the Brazilian agricultural revolution only reached a portion of the rural world. According to the authors, most of the farms and a high percentage of the rural population live in conditions similar to the first half of the 20th century: low productivity, low value-added production and very low incomes, which are not enough for families to subsist on. Lack of education, and poor credit access and infrastructure, hinder the transition from subsistence farming into modern agriculture.

Having said that, it seems clear that the authors are defenders of the second phase of agricultural modernization, despite the social and environmental impact it has. They point out that agricultural growth stopped being at the cost of forest grounds, and that production increased through the implementation of technological change, old land was rejuvenated through modern technology, credits allowed production increase, latifundia were replaced with large modern farms that use machinery, seeds, fertilizers and pesticides, and agricultural

business owners capable of responding to the sector's modernization emerged. The environmental impact of the agricultural "revolution" is a subject that the authors prefer not to delve into. Rather than debating or discussing this issue, they just point out a few strategies implemented by farmers to mitigate the effects of the agricultural "revolution" on the environment (direct sowing –without the use of a plow–, biological nitrogen fixing and intercropping). The social conflict is a subject that the authors warn you early on that they will not be discussing. Future studies will have to assess the effects of the agricultural "revolution" on several dimensions such as the loss of biodiversity and territorial connectivity, and the growing tensions and conflict over land and in defense of natural resources.

The book reviewed could interest researchers who study commodities chains, agrarian and regional history, agricultural

policies, production structures, technological changes or international trade. Regardless of whether or not you agree with the authors' views on the advantages of agricultural modernization, this is a serious, well-constructed, empirically solid and intriguing investigation. Although it does not contribute much at the theoretical level, it does it at the methodological level through a deeply review of primary and secondary sources, and the elaboration of data bases at a regional and state level. It is a really good written book that catches the attention of the reader since the beginning. It is a work that boasts the virtue of making the reader at times validate it, and at times question criticize it. It is highly successful in sowing the seeds of curiosity and interest in the subject.

Andrea Montero Mora
orcid.org/0000-0002-7718-9206
 Universidad de Costa Rica

Joshua Specht

Red Meat Republic: A Hoof-to-Table History of How Beef Changed America

Princeton / Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2019, 368 pp.

There is perhaps no other food commodity that screams more American than cattle's meat. Beef has played a major part in the construction and reproduction of an American national identity. Yet, *America made modern beef at the same time that beef made America modern* (p. 2); this is historian Joshua Specht's central claim in *Red Meat Republic: A Hoof-to-*

Table History of How Beef Changed America (2019). The author examines the consolidation of the "cattle-beef complex" in the United States stemming from the conquest of the American West throughout the nineteenth century when the region was accommodated for ranching purposes to the rise of the midwestern meat-packing industry in the early twentieth century.

business owners capable of responding to the sector's modernization emerged. The environmental impact of the agricultural "revolution" is a subject that the authors prefer not to delve into. Rather than debating or discussing this issue, they just point out a few strategies implemented by farmers to mitigate the effects of the agricultural "revolution" on the environment (direct sowing –without the use of a plow–, biological nitrogen fixing and intercropping). The social conflict is a subject that the authors warn you early on that they will not be discussing. Future studies will have to assess the effects of the agricultural "revolution" on several dimensions such as the loss of biodiversity and territorial connectivity, and the growing tensions and conflict over land and in defense of natural resources.

The book reviewed could interest researchers who study commodities chains, agrarian and regional history, agricultural

policies, production structures, technological changes or international trade. Regardless of whether or not you agree with the authors' views on the advantages of agricultural modernization, this is a serious, well-constructed, empirically solid and intriguing investigation. Although it does not contribute much at the theoretical level, it does it at the methodological level through a deeply review of primary and secondary sources, and the elaboration of data bases at a regional and state level. It is a really good written book that catches the attention of the reader since the beginning. It is a work that boasts the virtue of making the reader at times validate it, and at times question criticize it. It is highly successful in sowing the seeds of curiosity and interest in the subject.

Andrea Montero Mora
orcid.org/0000-0002-7718-9206
 Universidad de Costa Rica

Joshua Specht

Red Meat Republic: A Hoof-to-Table History of How Beef Changed America

Princeton / Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2019, 368 pp.

There is perhaps no other food commodity that screams more American than cattle's meat. Beef has played a major part in the construction and reproduction of an American national identity. Yet, *America made modern beef at the same time that beef made America modern* (p. 2); this is historian Joshua Specht's central claim in *Red Meat Republic: A Hoof-to-*

Table History of How Beef Changed America (2019). The author examines the consolidation of the "cattle-beef complex" in the United States stemming from the conquest of the American West throughout the nineteenth century when the region was accommodated for ranching purposes to the rise of the midwestern meat-packing industry in the early twentieth century.

In *Red Meat Republic*, the author draws a direct connection between America's rise as a world power and the rapid expansion of the "cattle-beef complex" in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Joshua Specht uses the term "cattle-beef complex" in reference to the set of institutions and practices that allowed a constant supply of beef meat at both national and international levels. Specht argues that the "cattle-beef complex" was a project of the Modern American State aiming to ensure the establishment of a federal policy for agriculture modernization and control the corporate power. According to Specht, the government of the United States and the cattle-beef industry shaped each other in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As the author persistently argues throughout the book, the emergence of a "cattle-beef complex" was a matter of land, business, labor, and even taste.

The first two chapters explore how the expansion of cattle ranching in the Great Plains rested on the violent expropriation of Indian land and disturbance of rangeland ecosystems. The expansion of the production of meat cattle in the American West was a spontaneous process of the expansion of the capitalist market forces throughout the nineteenth century. In many respects, extensive cattle agriculture was the sick man of the American economy. But it was far less spontaneous how the government of the United States favored the industrialized cattle husbandry. The author explains that the open-range cattle industry of the Great Plains was a partner within the prevailing institutional apparatus of the Ame-

rican state. Cattle ranching became then a characteristic American institution, one of the main forms of frontier colonization west of the 100th meridian. In Specht's own words: "The land and its inhabitants had to be pacified, the canvas cleared, for the coming of the Cattle Kingdom" (p. 66).

In chapters 3 and 4, Specht demonstrates how the cattle industry's wealth and economic power were wielded within Chicago by a handful of emerging meat-packing companies. By the late 1880s, western cattle ranchers began to be dwarfed by a large Beef Trust that would ultimately control the American beef market and dictate prices. The railroad opened new markets or at least set the stage for market access for livestock raised on far away rangelands. Around 1900 the meat-packing industry had achieved a great degree of centralization largely as a result of the development of new forms of mechanical refrigeration. In the early twentieth century, the chief meat-packing firms of the Midwest, including Armour & Co., Swift & Co. and Morris & Co., emerged possessing total control of the cattle industry and beef market.

The American capitalism remains at the heart of Specht's analysis. The author explains how large meatpacking firms were protected by the Government over labor, the environment and sustainability. The two of them were part of an intricately related system (the "cattle-beef complex") that left cowboys, ranchers and packing-house workers immiserated. And at the same time, it left American consumers mostly unaware of the suffering that went

into making their steaks. Situated between cattle ranchers and consumers, meatpackers acquired a position to control meat prices, quality, and supply. As Specht explains, higher cattle production and a slower global economy had the potential to reduce prices, which in turn increased the beef consumption in the country. The author describes the fed-cattle industry as a “paradigmatic industry” in the modern industrial agriculture. He writes: *...modern agriculture is a compromise between the unpredictability of nature and the rationality of capital. This was a lurching, violent process central to the “cattle-beef complex” as meatpackers displaced the risks of blizzards, drought, disease, and overproduction onto cattle ranchers* (p. 9).

The book is particularly engaging where it focuses on labor issues. The author explains the importance of some contemporary voices –including Charles Edward Russell with his *The Greatest Trust in the World* (1905) and Upton Sinclair with his *The Jungle* (1906)– in exposing the horrid living and working conditions of slaughterhouse workers in the large meatpacking plants of Chicago. Meatpacking workers were vulnerable to exploitation due to the fracture in the workforce. De-skilling made labor more vulnerable to replacement. Furthermore, according to Specht, unions unsuccessful efforts to organize those workers generated a prejudice nationally against these organizations that meatpackers could take advantage of, and kept driving their profits and growth at the expense of the workers. The author contends: *The modern slaughterhouse was a triumph*

of human ingenuity as well as a site of brutal labor exploitation (p. 3).

Also, the author gives sustained emphasis to the standardization of methods and spaces of procuring beef all over the country. This standardization process was a direct product of the meat-packing companies’ centralized power and concentration of capital in the control of production and distribution of meat. Cattle towns emerged on the outskirts of larger mid-western metropolises. In Specht’s own words: *Because a multiplicity of towns were doing the same thing, this promoted a process of town standardization that would become a core aspect of the emerging national cattle market* (p. 153). Thus, both cattle ranchers and cowboys were embedded in a national market designed and controlled by meat-packing companies. Furthermore, the author explains how encourage efforts to promote standardization within the meat-packing industry shaped at the same time the development of American agriculture. Meatpackers rented railroad refrigerator cars to other growers to transport other crops and thus, the meat-packing industry profoundly affected agricultural and economic structure of the whole country.

Chapter 5 focuses on how Americans evolved to prefer beef over other meats in the early twentieth century. As Specht explains, the abundance of beef meat came to be seen as a symbol of economic progress. Its availability and affordable price resulted in what the author calls the “democratization of beef” (p. 219); which refers to the constancy of the propensity to consume beef of different social groups at the turn of

the century. However, the author writes, *Democratization... was not the same thing as equality. Beef was widely available, but distinctions of race, class, and gender remained as important as ever* (p. 249). Meat prices became increasingly subjected to consumer tastes, preferences and purchasing power. Consumers became less concerned about meatpacking workers' conditions and meatpackers' abusive contracting practices, and more about red meat price and safety. In the early twentieth century, price-lowering and meat freshness emerged as the predominant concern of consumers. The author assures: *What is important about the role of consumers in this story is that they drove not how beef products would be regulated but that they would be regulated toward two goals –purity and low prices* (p. 250).

In his conclusion, Joshua Specht puts in a discussion some of the contradictory aspects of America's meat production practices and policy originated in the late nineteenth century by rethinking the tensions, anxieties and contradictions fundamental to human experience. Overall, Specht does an outstanding job of highlighting the problems in the beef production system by bringing to the forefront the historical agency of ranchers, meatpackers, slaughterhouse workers and consumers in the making of a meat-eating culture that continues to influence American society. The author brings up that *cattle-beef complex's broad strokes*, with some changes, persisted with the same formula through the twentieth century until today: a handful of large firms still dominate both meat pro-

duction and distribution, ranching remains subordinated to meat-packing industry, and slaughterhouse workers still tend to be invisible. Specht firmly concludes: *As it does today, beef held special importance for Americans and this importance justified a system that left consumers largely satisfied with those factors they found most salient – taste and sanitation– even if it did not address other factors of periodic concern, such as labor conditions or environmental degradation* (p. 260).

This engaging and well-researched book offers an important contribution to the growing body of scholarship of commodities and food business history. In sum, this is a meticulously researched and analyzed study of ranchers, Native-Americans, Government, slaughtering workers, meatpackers, and consumers that reflects how heterogeneous and interacting economic agents could determine one country's eating habits. Furthermore, *Red Meat Republic* tells us where we are in terms of meat production and consumption not only in the United States, but in the international arena. Reconstructing its historical roots is illuminating in Specht analysis.

Iker Saitua

orcid.org/0000-0002-8367-7070

University of California, Riverside–University of the Basque Country (UPV-EHU)

Eva Fraňková, Willi Haas, Simron J. Singh (Eds.)

Socio-Metabolic Perspectives on the Sustainability of Local Food Systems. Insights for Science, Policy and Practice

Cham, Springer, 2017, 364 pp.

El objetivo del libro es examinar la sustentabilidad de los sistemas agroalimentarios locales a través del enfoque del metabolismo social. Así, examina los conocimientos científicos y políticos relevantes que se pueden extraer de siete casos de estudio para sugerir buenas prácticas. Además, este libro también es una reflexión conceptual y metodológica sobre las potencialidades y limitaciones del metabolismo social para estudiar la sostenibilidad de los sistemas agroalimentarios. Supone una contribución relevante para la ciencia de la sostenibilidad, pues se necesitan enfoques interdisciplinarios para desarrollar métricas que capturen impactos ambientales y *outputs* más allá de los productivos (Garnett, 2014).

Los tres editores provienen del ámbito de la economía ecológica y el metabolismo social, y entre sus intereses de investigación y docencia está el estudio de la sostenibilidad de los sistemas agroalimentarios. El libro que editan está escrito por diferentes autores, y se estructura en tres capítulos conceptuales y metodológicos, siete capítulos que recogen siete casos de estudio en los que se aplica el metabolismo social como marco de análisis, y un capítulo de observaciones finales que recoge las principales ideas del libro. En esta reseña intentaré resumirlo y acercar al lector de *Historia Agraria* a los principales conceptos y argumentaciones que desarrolla.

Bajo la óptica del metabolismo social, la producción es un proceso de transformación de recursos en productos útiles y de desecho, es decir, la transformación de unos materiales en otros (elementos flujo) mediante unos agentes (elementos fondo). Estas dos categorías, flujo y fondo, pueden representar cualquier sistema metabólico dentro de una escala temporal determinada, de modo que, durante ésta, los flujos se transforman y los fondos perduran. Los reservorios (por ejemplo un yacimiento de petróleo), que pueden ser agotados o acumulados, son otra categoría distinta, los *stocks*. Este marco general de análisis puede aplicarse en distintas escalas a procesos que ocurren tanto en agroecosistemas como en sistemas sociales.

Un sistema agroalimentario sostenible es aquel que puede satisfacer de manera igualitaria las necesidades de los seres humanos y al mismo tiempo mantener la salud de los agroecosistemas. En términos metabólicos esto quiere decir extraer flujos suficientes de biomasa para constituir dietas sanas y equilibradas y a la vez redirigir flujos de biomasa para mantener los bienes fondo de los agroecosistemas. Así, lo que contabilizan los casos de estudio del libro que se reseña aquí son: flujos de materiales y energía, usos del suelo y usos del tiempo (porque las personas también forman parte del agroecosistema).

Dicho esto, la complicación reside en acordar escalas e indicadores para medir la

sostenibilidad, porque la relevancia de un indicador u otro cambia según la escala de análisis. Así, como se refleja en los casos de estudio, el contexto de cada sistema y cada escala tiene su *set* de indicadores relevantes e incommensurables. Ello convierte al metabolismo social en un enfoque de diagnóstico muy versátil (por ejemplo para aumentar la eficiencia de los indicadores de cada sistema en particular), pero dificulta –o más bien imposibilita– la comparación entre distintos sistemas que responden a diferentes motivos que no son intercambiables.

Entonces, si el metabolismo social es un enfoque de diagnóstico, ¿por qué lo aplican en casos de estudio históricos? La respuesta es para poner en perspectiva que la era del petróleo barato es un paréntesis histórico y poner en valor conocimientos y estructuras de organización social compatibles con el mantenimiento de la salud de los agroecosistemas, que han sido relegados al desprecio cultural con el despliegue hegemónico del sistema agroalimentario industrial.

El enfoque del metabolismo social contribuye a dos debates de relevancia mundial. En primer lugar, la relocalización de los sistemas agroalimentarios. Desde la perspectiva del metabolismo social la escala sostenible del sistema agroalimentario debería ser aquella que permite que se cierren los ciclos de nutrientes. Dicho de otra manera, un sistema agroalimentario en el que los flujos de materiales no retornan a los lugares de producción, no es sostenible. Así, el sistema agroalimentario insertado en una lógica global reduce el reciclaje de nu-

trientes y aumenta las emisiones al medio (Billen *et al.*, 2019).

Hay, por lo tanto, una necesidad de relocalizar las cadenas agroalimentarias. Los potenciales beneficios, en contraste con los actuales sistemas agroalimentarios industriales basados en energías fósiles, serían: cerrar los ciclos de nutrientes, mantener los mosaicos territoriales bien integrados con la biodiversidad, mejorar la eficiencia energética de la agricultura, recuperar el conocimiento agroecológico tradicional y unas relaciones urbano-rurales más justas y democráticas.

Sin embargo, y pese a que el libro está posicionado a favor de los sistemas agroalimentarios locales, los autores matizan la crítica sobre el papel del comercio internacional. En primer lugar, una cosa es el comercio global dominado por macrocorporaciones y mercados financieros, algo muy reciente en términos históricos, y otra muy distinta el comercio que ha coexistido con la producción alimentaria durante siglos. En segundo lugar, como en la actualidad las poblaciones humanas no se distribuyen en función de la capacidad regional para alimentarlas, el comercio de alimentos de largas distancias es inevitable para poder mantener dietas equilibradas. En tercer lugar, los impactos del sistema agroalimentario no son proporcionales a la distancia, sino que dependen de muchos otros factores (por ejemplo, 10 km por carretera consumen tanto o más que 100 km recorridos en transporte marítimo). Finalmente, el mismo concepto de *local* es un concepto difuso, y aun sin influencia humana (por ejemplo, por el mecanismo de deposición

atmosférica del nitrógeno), es imposible encontrar sistemas agroalimentarios enteramente locales.

Los autores concluyen que la autarquía alimentaria es una condición necesaria pero no suficiente para la sostenibilidad alimentaria. Proponen que, en vez de tratar de acabar con el hambre mundial aumentando la producción alimentaria global, habría que poner la preservación de los agroecosistemas en el centro y desde ahí diseñar estructuras de mercado *bottom-up* para garantizar la suficiencia alimentaria.

Otro de los grandes debates es el de *land sparing-land sharing* en relación a la biodiversidad. *Land sparing* se refiere a reservar tierra para producción agraria por un lado y tierra para la conservación de la naturaleza por otro. Este posicionamiento ha sido criticado por ser compatible con el sistema agrario industrial y por debilitar la seguridad alimentaria de los pequeños agricultores y las economías rurales. En cambio, *land sharing* parte del principio de integrar la producción agraria con la conservación de la naturaleza. La mayor crítica a este planteamiento es que favorece especies generalistas por encima de las especialistas o endémicas, que generalmente están asociadas a áreas de menor perturbación (Fraanje, 2018).

Más que identificar cuál de las dos estrategias es mejor, lo importante es definir estrategias de usos del suelo que sostengan a todas las especies de una región determinada (Phalan, 2018). Esta especificidad de contexto es lo que no podemos saber para agroecosistemas pasados, pues no existen datos que midan la biodiversidad, aunque

sí sabemos que hay pérdidas de especies vinculadas al abandono de prácticas agro-silvo-pastoriles tradicionales (Otero *et al.*, 2015). Así, el libro se posiciona a favor de la estrategia de *land sharing* con la hipótesis de la perturbación intermedia descrita en el Capítulo 4. Pero más allá de esto, lo verdaderamente relevante para la historia agraria y ambiental es que argumenta y desarrolla un *proxy* para la biodiversidad basado en mapas de usos de suelo y producción primaria neta, que es una información que sí es posible conseguir o reconstruir para algunos casos.

Como muy bien resume la Figura 1.1 (p. 15), los casos de estudio tienen escalas geográficas distintas (granja, comunidad, ciudad, región o municipio) y se centran en distintos puntos de la cadena agroalimentaria, sea producción, distribución, consumo y deshecho o reutilización.

Los resultados de los estudios sociometabólicos son siempre dependientes del contexto e implican profundizar en el sistema considerado. De esta manera, no se aísla el estudio de la producción, sino que se articula con otras esferas del sistema, como la composición de las dietas, o se combina la contabilidad de flujos metabólicos con el análisis del paisaje o con el análisis de la desigualdad social en el acceso a los recursos. Todo ello hace que los casos de estudio sean muy interesantes y aporten información muy relevante para el contexto que analizan.

También destacan buenas prácticas para hacer más sostenibles los sistemas agroalimentarios. La cercanía entre productor y consumidor impulsa la transición a dietas

saludables e igualitarias, ya que los sistemas agroalimentarios implican reajustarse a las limitaciones biofísicas del agroecosistema, por ejemplo con un menor consumo de carne. También es importante hacer una gestión integral de los flujos de nutrientes y materia orgánica para solucionar los desequilibrios de exceso o falta de nutrientes en el suelo. Hay que buscar el enfoque multifuncional de la ganadería y la agricultura, e integrarlos con la base física del territorio. Los ciclos de nutrientes se tienen que cerrar de manera local o regional, y ser menos dependientes de *inputs* basados en energías fósiles.

También se destacan algunas limitaciones del enfoque del metabolismo social. Pese a que se logran hacer unas recomendaciones generales, el funcionamiento y la respuesta depende del contexto local, así que bajo el enfoque del metabolismo social no se pueden proporcionar soluciones a gran escala. Esto es poco reconfortante. Por otra parte, la articulación y la organización de sistemas agroalimentarios locales requiere unos sistemas de gobernanza capaces de gestionar la incertidumbre y cambiar algunas limitaciones estructurales. Aunque en los capítulos conceptuales se argumenta que el análisis biofísico se tiene que hacer en paralelo con el análisis de las dimensiones socioeconómicas de las sociedades, esto no se acaba de llevar a cabo en los casos de estudio. Por ejemplo, en un trabajo posterior, para un caso de estudio en la misma zona y época, Padró et al. demuestran que sólo el 10% de las unidades familiares agrarias disponían de suficiente tierra como para cerrar los ciclos de nu-

trientes (Padró et al., 2019). Por lo tanto, el cierre de los flujos locales de nutrientes también es producto de las relaciones sociales que configuran los regímenes y las estructuras de propiedad de la tierra.

Como valoración final, el libro cumple los objetivos que se marca, los casos de estudio son muy interesantes y muy distintos entre ellos, y los capítulos conceptuales, sobre todo los de González de Molina, Tello y Gomiero, presentan sus contenidos de manera crítica, admitiendo las contradicciones de algunos de los posicionamientos y reduciendo así el riesgo de un resultado *naïve*. Por último, hay que decir que no es un libro de lectura fácil, tanto por la interdisciplinariedad como por su estructura, que está poco integrada, sobretodo el capítulo metodológico sobre métricas de paisaje de Marull y Font, cuyos contenidos están mucho mejor explicados en los artículos que ya se habían publicado anteriormente (Marull et al., 2015, 2016).

Elena Galán del Castillo

orcid.org/0000-0001-6809-737X

Basque Centre for Climate Change (BC3)

REFERENCIAS

- BILLEN, G., LASSALETTA, L., GARNIER, J., LE NOË, J., AGUILERA, E. & SANZ-COBEÑA, A. (2019). Opening to Distant Markets or Local Reconnection of Agro-Food Systems? Environmental Consequences at Regional and Global Scales. En G. Lemaire, P. C. D. F. Carvalho, S. Kronberg & S. Recous (Eds.), *Agroecosystem Diversity* (pp. 391-413). London: Elsevier.
- FRAANJE, W. (2018). *What is the land sparing-sharing continuum? (Foodsource: building blocks)*.

- (recuperado de <https://www.foodsource.org.uk/building-blocks/what-land-sparing-sharing-continuum>)
- GARNETT, T. (2014). Three Perspectives on Sustainable Food Security: Efficiency, Demand Restraint, Food System Transformation. What Role for Life Cycle Assessment? *Journal of Cleaner Production*, (73), 10-18.
- MARULL, J., FONT, C., PADRÓ, R., TELLO, E. & PANAZZOLO, A. (2016). Energy-Landscape Integrated Analysis: A Proposal for Measuring Complexity in Internal Agroecosystem Process (Barcelona Metropolitan Region, 1860–2000). *Ecological Indicators*, (66), 30-46.
- MARULL, J., TELLO, E., FULLANA, N., MURRAY, I., JOVER, G., FONT, C., COLL, F., DOMÈNE, E. & DECOLLI, T. (2015). Long-term Bio-cultural Heritage: Exploring the Intermediate Disturbance Hypothesis in Agro-ecological Landscapes (Mallorca, c. 1850–2012). *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 24 (13), 3217-3251.
- OTERO, I., MARULL, J., TELLO, E., DIANA, G. L., PONS, M., COLL, F. & BOADA, M. (2015). Land Abandonment, Landscape, and Biodiversity: Questioning the Restorative Character of the Forest Transition in the Mediterranean. *Ecology and Society*, 20 (2).
- PADRÓ, R., MARCO, I., FONT, C. & TELLO, E. (2019). Beyond Chayanov: A Sustainable Agroecological Farm Reproductive Analysis of Peasant Domestic Units and Rural Communities (Sentmenat; Catalonia, 1860). *Ecological Economics*, 160, 227-239.
- PHALAN, B. (2018). What Have We Learned from the Land Sparing-sharing Model? *Sustainability*, 10 (6), 1760.

Jane Whittle (Ed.)

Servants in Rural Europe, 1400-1900

Woodbridge, Boydell and Brewer, 2017, 271 pp.

La publicación del libro coordinado por Jane Whittle se añade a otras publicaciones recientes sobre los *servants*, el servicio doméstico rural (por ejemplo, los artículos recogidos en los números monográficos de las revistas *Historia Agraria*, n.º 35, 2005, y *Mundo Agrario*, n.º 39, 2017). Tal como los caracterizó Ann Kussmaul (1981), los *servants* eran muchachas y muchachos que entre aproximadamente los 12 y 25 años se contrataban como mano de obra permanente en las granjas, lo que postergaba la edad de su primer matrimonio y retrasaba la formación de nuevos hogares. Esta figura tiene un pa-

pel destacado en los debates sobre la formación de los mercados de trabajo y en la explicación de las divergencias en el desigual crecimiento económico europeo anterior a 1850. Así pues, la lectura del libro no será baladí, ni para aquellos interesados en el debate sobre las «pequeñas» y «grandes» divergencias en el crecimiento económico preindustrial, ni tampoco para los interesados en cómo se formaron los mercados de trabajo agrícolas capitalistas.

El libro está integrado por una introducción y 12 capítulos. Nueve de ellos cubren la Europa atlántica: Inglaterra (3), Flandes (2), Holanda (1), Noruega (1) y