
TOPICAL REVIEW

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TENANT LABOR IN PARTS OF EUROPE, AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA 1700–1900: A PRELIMINARY REPORT OF A RESEARCH PROJECT IN SOCIAL HISTORY

*Magnus Mörner, Institute of Ibero-American Studies
Stockholm, Sweden*

IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE WORLD, LANDOWNERS HAVE SOMETIMES FOUND fit to compensate labor, wholly or partially, by letting laborers have the usufruct of a small plot of land. The border between this category of labor and that of tenants is blurred, as is suggested by the English term, tenant labor (or labor tenants).¹ Without pretending to be exhaustive, we could give the following examples:

1. *Statartorpare* (Sweden). The term means “crofter receiving allowance.” Whereas the *jordtorpare* was a crofter performing day-work, the *statartorpare* was really a farm worker whose parcel was so tiny that an allowance was indispensable. The system of farm workers receiving allowance (of which the *statartorpare* was one variant) was not abolished in Sweden until 1945.² It also spread to Finland.³ An example from 1772 shows that a *statartorpare* had to perform 245 day-work for the landowner, to which some 30 day-work performed by his wife were added. He received two cows and some sheep but no horse. His allowance comprised small quantities of grain, green peas, herring, and hay. The conditions of the *statartorpare* varied greatly from region to region and from time to time.

2. *Husmennene* (Norway). A rather heterogeneous category of tenant

labor that also included certain farm workers who did not dispose of any parcels, and certain cultivators of land without an obligation to perform day-work. Primarily, however, a husmann was a cultivator of a plot of land (*husmannsplass*) who had to do work for the farmer-landowner. In eastern Norway the husmenn usually had the obligation of performing day-work whenever needed. Their low wages, as a rule in kind, were fixed either by contract or local custom. The wives were also obliged to do day work.⁴

3. *Husmaendene* (Denmark). In contrast to Sweden and Norway, the rise of independent peasant proprietors was quite late in Denmark. Obligatory labor-services by the tenant farmers were not discontinued until the middle of the 19th century. When this occurred the husmaend supplied part of the work that landowners needed. To a great extent the husmaend were tenants or even small landowners at the same time. Their burden of day-work was limited as a rule to a couple of days a week.⁵

4. *Instleute* (Northeastern Germany). Married farm workers to whom the landowner granted the use of a house and a parcel. As a rule they were hired by contract. Both they, their wives, and a helper were obliged to do a large volume of day-work. Their wages were paid in kind. The institution existed for some decades in the interval between the abolition of serfdom and the introduction of payment in cash.⁶

5. *Heuerlinge* (Northwestern Germany). These farmers were characterized by the two separate agreements that regulated their position. In the first place, they rented their dwellings and land (1–5 hectares) from the landowner. In the second, they promised him about 100–200 day-work a year against a fixed wage. Day-work by women was also included.⁷

6. *The Tamalia System* (Egypt). This group of the fellahin are compensated by the landowner with the usufruct of a parcel of about $\frac{1}{2}$ hectare. They are lodged with their families in a village belonging to the estate (the *ezbab*).⁸

7. *Labor Tenants* (South Africa). In parts of the Union, these natives form a large percentage of total farm labor. The parcels at their disposal comprise about $\frac{1}{2}$ hectare. They also receive pasture for the animals, some corn meal and a very low wage. The landowner generally also takes care of the ploughing of their parcel. The burden of day-work which they and the members of their family have to perform is usually very heavy. They are said to derive from squatters.⁹ In tropical Africa, plantation workers are sometimes compensated in part with the usufruct of small plots.¹⁰

8. *Huasipungueros* (the Eucadorean Sierra). Until recently, these peasants had to perform 5–6 day-work a week in return for the use of a small parcel (*huasipungo*) and, possibly, a low wage in cash. From 1 to 3 months a year

they were to work as the landowner's personal servants (*huasicama*), with no wage at all or a very low one. Also wives and children were subject to day-work. Variations include the *terraje* of southern *Colombia*, and the *colonato* of Bolivia (prior to the MNR Revolution) and the Peruvian Sierra.¹¹

9. *Yanaconaje* (Peruvian Coast). This institution has been defined as follows: "The yanacona is a worker who performs two contracts at the same time: one in which he undertakes to serve the estate as a regular worker, and another by which he receives a piece of land to cultivate on his own account. . . . The second of these contracts is one of tenancy for cash or share."¹²

10. *Inquilinos* (Chile). These farm workers receive necessities and lodging from the landowner and, in addition, a parcel. At times they also receive right of pasture (*talaje*). There is also the category of *inquilino-mediero* who, in addition to the plot, rent some land from the owner on a share-crop basis.¹³

11. In the sugar area of northeastern Brazil, workers are sometimes remunerated in the form of *condição*. The worker receives a dwelling and a parcel. The day-work required varies from a couple of days a week during the low season to almost daily during planting and harvest. As a rule, he also receives a low wage in cash. After the abolition of slavery in 1888, a similar category of *colonos camaradas* appeared in the coffee districts in the south. In Brazil, land is frequently placed at the disposal of squatters against services of different kinds.¹⁴

It is obvious that a feature common to these groups is that they are closer to a natural economy than to a money economy. They are doomed to disappear with the expansion of money economies. They also depend on the existence of latifundia or large farms that need extra farm hands. It is also clear that the rise and development of the groups is intimately related to demographic evolution.¹⁵

Combinations between these systems of labor and that of sharecropping (*métayage*) are entirely feasible. Nevertheless, the circumstance that tenant labor does not seem to exist in Asia or, apart from the Tamilia system, in the Mediterranean, would seem to have to do with the predominance of different kinds of tenancy and sharecropping in those parts of the world. These systems already permit an extremely harsh exploitation of the majority of the rural population.¹⁶

The various forms of tenant labor mentioned above reached their greatest expansion in Europe during the late 18th and the 19th centuries. Since then they have gradually disappeared. The historical development of the Latin American groups is very little known but they also seem to have appeared in

the course of the 18th century. They have mostly lingered on until the present. In Black Africa the rise of similar groups is a contemporary phenomenon connected with the detribalization of certain groups of workers.

STATE OF RESEARCH

The chief outlines of the history of the Swedish, Norwegian and Danish groups are fairly well known. The basic work on the early Swedish farm workers is that of Gustav Utterström (1957). S. Skappel published a survey of the husmenn of Norway in 1922; F. Skrubbeltvang one on their fellows in Denmark (1952). None of these works can, however, be described as exhaustive. There do not seem to be any monographs giving a real insight into the functioning of the systems in different regions and at different times. The heuerling system has been the subject of a monograph by Hj. Seraphim (1948). As far as the historical part is concerned, this is based on an investigation by A. Wrasmann (1919)¹⁷ No specialized research of this type has been carried out with respect to the East German instleute, even though the literature on the agrarian history of Germany is both abundant and thorough.¹⁸ Labor system similar to instleute also appeared in eastern Europe in the wake of the abolition of serfdom, but it has not been possible to consult the literature on this stage.¹⁹ The system in South Africa is known to us mainly through pamphlets issued by the Institute of Race Relations in Johannesburg. Concerning the Latin American groups, their present conditions were fairly well mapped out by the International Labor Office in its surveys, "Indigenous Peoples" (1951), and "The Landless Farmer in Latin America" (1957). However, the analyses in these works and in many studies by social anthropologists and sociologists tend to suffer from a lack of historical perspective and insight. Assumptions are made about the historical origin and development of the institutions that are poorly documented and at times directly misleading.²⁰ An American sociologist, for example, took it for granted that Latin American *colono* institutions were derived from the Roman *colonato*, which was thought somehow to have survived in medieval Spain and Portugal. There is not the slightest support for his assumption in historical sources.²¹ Until now, the specialized monographs published by the Chilean historian Mario Góngora on the origin of *inquilinos* and changes in the agrarian structure of the Valle del Puangue have been unique in their historical perspective and skilful use of reliable sources.²²

Like most literature in social and agrarian history, the literature bearing on the history of tenant labor has a strictly national framework. The authors only mention the existence of similar systems outside the borders of their country by way of exception.²³ On the other hand, a student of cultural

geography, L. Hempel, has made an interesting comparison between heuerlinge and the crofters of Scotland, with the emphasis on ecological conditions.²⁴

THE AIM AND METHODOLOGY OF PROPOSED RESEARCH

The student's interest and curiosity is raised by the presence of more or less analagous forms of tenant labor in different parts of the world. Which factors have determined their rise, relative extent and evolution? Which factors have retarded or hastened their disappearance? Against the background of contemporary problems of development, it seems particularly urgent to carry out an historical investigation of labor systems that are of the same basic type, and which have come to exist both in countries that are now highly developed and in countries that are now underdeveloped.

The introductory task would necessarily involve a careful mapping of all the related institutions, whether they have now ceased to exist or are still present. This study would comprise available source material as well as secondary treatment. Though this mapping may deserve to be presented in some form, its main objective would be to make possible the definitive selection of categories of workers and systems to be subjected to a closer, comparative study. At this early, preliminary stage, it would seem as if some of the Scandinavian, German and Latin American institutions would be of special interest. As far as the system in South Africa is concerned, a sociological investigation of present conditions may be more rewarding than an historical approach. It would then fall outside the present project, although it would retain very considerable interest from the point of view of the project.

Comparative methods make heavy demands on those who are to use them in research on social history. The question concerns the degree of analogy between the objects of study. Is it sufficiently great? If the objects are distant in space, the importance of their nearness in time and structure will increase. The risk of superficiality and false conclusions becomes particularly great if the cultural contexts are of a markedly different nature.²⁵ Despite all these risks and difficulties, the use of comparative methods may prove stimulating and rewarding. The ambitious study by Barrington Moore on the agrarian background of contemporary political systems in England, France, the United States, China, and Japan is a case in point. To quote this author: "Comparisons can serve as a rough negative check on accepted historical explanations," and may even lay the basis for new and better documented generalizations.²⁶ The author of another comparative study, Folke Dovring, claims that the comparative approach is necessary especially because of the need to arrive at clearer definitions of "basic concepts."²⁷

The chronological framework of the investigation, 1700–1900, is sug-

gested by the circumstances we already know. Tenant labor systems had their breakthrough in northern Germany and Scandinavia during the latter part of the 18th century. Their decline set in during the latter part of the 19th century. It would seem as if the parallel systems in Andean Latin America came into being at the same time as in northern Europe. Both regions seem to reflect the acceleration of global population growth towards the middle of the 18th century.²⁸ Even if it is true that the systems have survived long after 1900 in Latin America, the limits may be justified in the case of this project of social history. What cannot be reached with the methods of social anthropology is the period prior to 1900.²⁹

To place the investigation of the different tenant labor groups within a more general context it will be necessary to establish as far as possible the following variables:

1. Demographic development
2. Rural stratification³⁰
3. Land resources, land tenure (including frequency of absentee ownership) and distribution of land
4. Farming techniques and access to capital
5. International and regional price movements
6. Structures of production, distribution and marketing
7. Politico-legal institutions

As already indicated by our short survey of the state of research, this task will prove much more difficult in the case of Latin America than in that of Scandinavia or northern Germany. The demographic development of the latter region is, for instance, fairly well known. Agrarian cycles have been traced by the German, Wilhelm Abel and the Swede, Utterström.³¹ A short article published recently by Marcello Carmagnani suggests, however, that some fairly good source material may be available in Spanish American archives for the part of our period that has remained unexplored.³² A recent Mexican work discusses in a stimulating way the possibility of determining agrarian cycles in a Latin American environment.³³ As Max Weber pointed out, market conditions often exert a highly important influence on labor systems. According to Weber, the dominant type of latifundia with forced or hired manpower east of the Elbe river was largely a result of the absence of local markets. West of the Elbe, the trend towards tenancy was favored by the existence of many towns where small farmers could sell their produce.³⁴ Finally, it ought to be kept in mind that in Latin America certain observations of present conditions, for instance, farming techniques, may be applicable to an historical study. The situation is wholly different in the agrarian environment of northern Europe, which has been radically transformed since 1900.

Once the above-mentioned variables have been determined, a series of questions must be asked of the source material concerning each of the tenant labor systems, such as: In which way has the rise of the system been related to the access to land, capital and manpower? Which alternative forms of labor have been present? Was the main objective of the landowners when introducing the system to lower the costs of production during a downward trend? Or did it, on the contrary, manifest a desire to ensure a stable supply of labor during an upward economic trend? Is the labor group in question mainly a product of upward or downward social mobility? What has been the quantitative evolution of the group in relation to the other groups of farm labor? What is the evolution of the mutual obligations of landowner and worker in social legislation and, far more important, in social reality? What has been the evolution of the group's standards of living? In comparison with previous conditions of farm labor in the area, has the institution under study increased or decreased spatial mobility? Have the members of the group identified themselves mainly with peasants or with workers? What has been their social reputation?³⁵ What have been the political consequences of the system? Has the link with the land served to diminish the discontent and aggression of farm hands? Has the system to a greater or lesser degree owed its growth to the political domination of landowners?³⁶ Have the conditions of the group been reflected in social debate and the literature of social protest and if so, accurately or not?

Considering the enormous geographical extent of the regions where tenant labor has existed and the vast range of sources, the coverage of the research project must unavoidably be strictly limited. To begin with, only two or three groups in Europe and Latin America should be subjected to closer scrutiny. By way of example but in no way anticipating the final selection, the investigation might be limited to the husmenn of eastern Norway, the statartorpere of the Lake Maelar district and the instleute of the Elbe, the huasipungueros of Ecuador and the inquilinos of Chile.

To obtain tangible evidence and to test hypotheses of a general nature, it will also be necessary to carry out a number of intensive investigations concerning units the size of a parish or municipality.³⁷ The choice of these areas cannot be made until a rather advanced state of research. These intensive investigations should emphasize the gathering of quantitative data, to be processed in the most appropriate way.³⁸

The general aim of the investigation has been stated in the introduction to this section of this report. It should also be borne in mind that research of this unreserved character would highlight the purpose and applicability of many current concepts and terms such as "feudalism," "serfdom," "peasant freedom," and "colonialism."

In *Asian Drama* (1968), Gunnar Myrdal states: ". . . the big landlord

in South Asia often managed to enjoy the prerogatives of a capitalist landlord without giving up the privileges of a feudal chief. At the same time he avoided nearly all the obligations of both."³⁹

Would it be fair to say something similar about the landlords concerned in this investigation? There is hardly any doubt that the type of landlord-farm labor relations we are concerned with here helps to determine the approach of agrarian reform in comparison with the countries where farm hands were paid in cash.⁴⁰ In a European context the investigation is likely to elucidate the real importance from the point of view of the labor system of the different historical traditions, that is, "peasant freedom" as opposed to "serfdom."⁴¹

Finally, a comparison between north European and Latin American labor systems might contribute to the understanding of a highly topical problem. I refer to the question whether "colonialism," "neo-colonialism," and racial issues have been decisive or only modifying factors as far as the various forms of exploitation of manpower are concerned.

Commentary of Sources. We limit ourselves to some remarks on sources in Latin America and Sweden. It is, of course, difficult to generalize about Latin America, since the preservation and availability of sources varies from country to country. The writer of this report, who has personal experience of research in all the main archives of the Andean countries, has noticed some rather surprising contrasts in this respect. On the whole, records pertaining to the late colonial period are better catalogued and more easily available than those belonging to the period after 1810. Land titles and suits related to land have often been gathered in archival series called *Tierras*. Mario Góngora found many references to his humble inquilinos in judicial acts. They appeared as witnesses in boundary disputes between landowners, and so on. Like his Peruvian colleague, Pablo Macera, and the Colombian, Germán Colmenares, Góngora has found another category of sources especially rewarding, the accounts and administrative records of religious orders.⁴² For a long time they were the greatest latifundistas of Latin America. A particularly rich documentation has been preserved with respect to the properties of the Jesuit Order, confiscated in Spanish America in 1767, to be administered by the authorities as *Temporalidades*. Jesuit accounts of wages and the provision of meals, etc., constitute invaluable sources for the history of the rural proletariat and Negro slavery.⁴³ There is less reason to hope for material of this kind as far as private owners of haciendas are concerned. It is not only a question of survival and accessibility of the records. We do not know to what extent such systematic material was ever produced during the period in question, though examples are not lacking from the 19th century.⁴⁴ The notarial archives in Spanish America are extremely rich, though historians have been slow in exploiting or even

discovering them. Registers of mortgages (*censos*), contracts of sale, and lease of property will be found there, but surely much less of interest directly concerning the modest transactions in which members of the tenant labor group were involved. Their contracts must as a rule have been fixed orally. As far as the demographic material is concerned, the censuses of the late 18th century and, with long intervals, during the 19th century, provide a point of departure if critically analyzed.⁴⁵ There are, at the diocesan level, registers of confessions and confirmations that will complement the censuses in a valuable way.⁴⁶ With respect to the indigenous population, the registers of adult men liable to pay head tax (*tributarios*), form an all important source of material. It should be noticed that the tribute continued in several countries during the early national period, only slightly disguised.⁴⁷ All these demographic sources of a "static" nature must be checked against the "dynamic" information provided by the parish registers. Books of baptism, marriage and burial were required in Spanish America from 1606 onwards. As a rule, the socio-racial status of individuals was included.⁴⁸ Rural parish registers, in contrast to those of the major towns, have hitherto remained practically unexplored by historians.⁴⁹ From personal observations I know that in some parishes, series for extremely long periods of time, and often surprisingly complete, have somehow managed to survive. Such material would be invaluable for the intensive investigations mentioned above. Finally, the records of the visits made by bishops have often produced source material of extraordinary interest from the point of view of social history.⁵⁰

An historian familiar with the difficulties of the source material in the case of Latin American social history will find, for instance, that Swedish sources are relatively easy to cope with. The Swedish population statistics will, for example, provide a general demographic framework for the whole period with which we are here concerned. It is true that the so-called "mantals-längder" (a special kind of register of persons liable to taxation), are incomplete prior to 1810.⁵¹ But they might be complemented with ecclesiastical records (e.g., "husförhörslängder"). The accounts of a great many estates have been preserved and are easily available. To ascertain the wage trend in terms of the value of allowance items, the so-called "markegångstaxor" are indispensable and most useful even though, as Utterström points out, they require a more critical evaluation.⁵² Furthermore, the archives of the authorities have been preserved for the whole period of interest here. The five-year reports of the provincial governors and the records of some governmental committees would be especially useful as a general background. As a consequence of the greater efficiency of administration in Sweden at the time, as compared to Latin America, the inference is that official Swedish material has a greater source value.

Finally, local working conditions receive detailed treatment, for example, in the travel notices of A. G. Barchaeus from the late 18th century, preserved in the Uppsala University Library (MSS Section), and in the parish descriptions made by the land surveyors, kept at the archives of "Lantmäteristyrrelsen" in Stockholm.

NOTES

1. In International Labor Office, "Indigenous Peoples," p. 342, it is pointed out that the Latin American forms of tenant labor are of two different types: those by which the worker receives the usufruct of a parcel or right of pasture as part of his wages, and those by which his day-work form the rent, wholly or in part, for the land he cultivates as a tenant or sharecropper. "There are various intermediate forms or stages but their differences are often nebulous."
2. G. Utterström, "Jordbrukets arbetare. Levnadsvilkor och arbetsliv på landsbygden från frihetstiden till mitten av 1800-talet," (Stockholm, 1957), pp. 791–794. See also L. Furu-land, "Statarna i litteraturen" (Stockholm, 1952), pp. 28–30. The main work for the history of the "jordtorpare" is V. Elgeskog "Svensk torpbebyggelse från 1500-talet till laga skiftet" (Stockholm, 1945). See p. 361. Another monograph is by Elfrid Kumm, "Jordhunger och dagsverkstorp," (Stockholm, 1949). He does not clearly distinguish jordtorpare from statartorpare. In the documentation of the time, the two terms are often confused.
3. E. Jutikkala, "Finnish Agricultural Labour in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries," *The Scandinavian Economic History Review*, X (1962), p. 214. The Finnish term was "muonatorppari."
4. S. Skappel, "Om husmandsvæsenet i Norge. Dets oprindelse og udvikling" (Kristiania, 1922).
5. F. Skrubbeltrang, *Den danske husmand* (Copenhagen, 1952). See also Skappel, *op. cit.*, pp. 179–180.
6. F. Wunderlich, *Farm Labour in Germany, 1810–1945* (Princeton, 1961), pp. 17–18; Max Weber, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Social und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Tübingen, 1924), p. 473 and *passim*. See also Skappel, *op. cit.* pp. 181–182. A specialized research institution in East Germany has informed the writer of the present report that no recent studies have been carried out concerning instleute. Rather similar groups of crofters were *Häuslern*, *Kätbnern* and, on a somewhat more favored level, *Kossätbern* or *Gärtmern*. Wunderlich, *op. cit.* p. 7.
7. H. J. Seraphim, *Das Heuerlingwesen* (Münster, 1948). See also Skappel, *op. cit.*, p. 182. Earlier studies by Heuschert, 1929 and Wrasmann, 1919.
8. International Labor Office, "Labour Survey of North Africa" (Geneva, 1960), p. 63.
9. See, for instance, *Farm Labour in the Oranje Free State* (Johannesburg, 1939), and Margaret Roberts, *Labour in the Farm Economy* (Johannesburg, 1959), an investigation of 76 farms in the Cape Colony. Both are pamphlets published by the Institute of Race Relations. See also R. H. Robertson's essay in I. Schapera, ed., *Western Civilisation and the Natives of South Africa: Studies in Culture Contact* (London, 1967; orig. ed., 1934), and C. W. De Kiewit, *A History of South Africa, Social and Economic* (Oxford, 1941), pp. 202–205. According to De Kiewit, the system was replaced in some parts by payment in cash after World War I. The study by M. Roberts (1959) shows, however, how tenaciously it has

- been preserved in the Cape Colony. Printed sources are presented in I. Schapera, ed., *Select Bibliography of South African Native Life and Problems* (London, 1941), pp. 160–161.
10. Karlernst Ringer, "Agrarverfassungen im tropischen Afrika zur Lehre von der Agrarverfassung" Veränderungen zur Hebung der Agrartechnik" (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1963), p. 187. According to the author, "Arbeitspachtverträge" have come to exist in Senegal, Dahomey and on the Ivory Coast areas in which "Marktkulturen im Vordringen sind."
 11. "Indigenous Peoples," pp. 343–352, 376–385 on the huasinpungueros, e.g. Aníbal Buitrón, B. Salisbury Buitrón, "Condiciones de vida y trabajo del campesino de la provincia de Pichincha" (Quito, 1947). On Bolivian colonos, Rafael A. Reyeros, "Historia social del indio boliviano," 2nd ed., (La Paz, 1963). A particularly disfavored category are the "cuidaderos" mentioned by Orlando Fals Borda, *El hombre y la tierra en Boyacá: Bases socio-históricas para una reforma agraria* (Bogotá, 1957), pp. 116–117.
 12. "Indigenous Peoples," p. 352. On regional variations, see José Matos Mar in *Les problèmes agraires des Amériques Latines: Paris, 11–16 Octobre 1965* (Paris, 1967), pp. 340–341.
 13. International Labor Office, "Landless Farmers in Latin America" (Geneva, 1957), pp. 8–9. Inquilinos and their families even today constitute about 300,000 people in central Chile, that is, a quarter of the rural population. CIDA, *Chile. Tenencia de la tierra y desarrollo socio-económico del sector agrícola* (Santiago, 1966), p. 50. Interesting glimpses of inquilinos' conditions in the "Memoria sobre la Hacienda 'Los Condes' en 1895," published by G. Izquierdo in *Boletín de la Academia de la Historia*, XXXV, no. 79 (1968), pp. 121–205.
 14. J. C. de Oliveira Torres, *Estratificação social no Brasil* (São Paulo, 1965), pp. 26–27; M. Diégues Júnior, *Establecimientos rurales en América Latina* (Buenos Aires, 1967), pp. 154–155; S. J. Stein, *Vassouras. A Brazilian Coffee County, 1850–1900* (Cambridge, Mass., 1957), pp. 268–269. A recent case study on this category of labor in Sapé, Paraíba, summarized in "Posse e uso de terra e desenvolvimento sócio-econômico do setor agrícola; Brasil" (Washington, D.C.: CIDA, 1966), p. 249ff.
 15. In *Les problèmes agraires* (pp. 356–358), the geographer Dollfus discusses in an interesting way how the colonos system is being undermined by the rapid population growth and the desire of the landowners to rationalize production, particularly cattle breeding.
 16. Myrdal, *Asian Drama*, (New York, 1968), II, 1055, mentions the existence of peasants (tenants or owners) who at the same time are day-laborers. But this does not suggest a system of the type we are concerned with. I have been unable to consult J. Surenda Patel, "Agricultural Labourers in Modern India and Pakistan" (Bombay, 1952).
 17. A. Wrasmann, "Das Heuerlingwesen im Fürstentum Osnabrück," *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte und Landeskunde von Osnabrück*, XLII (1919), pp. 72–81.
 18. See for instance the bibliography in F. Lütge, "Geschichte der deutschen Agrarverfassung vom frühen Mittelalter bis zum 19. Jahrhundert" (Stuttgart, 1963).
 19. The Hungarian "Inquilinus" receives short mention (under the name of *bäusler*) in E. Lukács, "Die wirtschaftliche und soziale Lage des Feltarbeiterstandes in Ungarn" (Heidelberg, 1909), p. 36. We also know of some studies in Hungarian. There seems to be a rather extensive literature, almost entirely in Russian, on the Russian "Otrabototshnaia" system. In his famous *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana* (new ed., Santiago de Chile, 1953), p. 68, J. C. Mariátegui stressed the similarities between this Russian institution and the Peruvian *Colonato*.

Latin American Research Review

20. This also applies to such good studies as the chapters on "Peasants" and "Rural Labor" In John J. Johnson (ed.), *Continuity and Change in Latin America* (Stanford, Calif., 1967).
21. "This complex of latifundia-coloni . . . kept alive in Spain and Portugal, was effectively transported to the New World," S. Schulman, "The Colono System in Latin America," *Rural Sociology*, XX (1955), p. 35.
22. M. Góngora, *Origen de los inquilinos de Chile Central* (Santiago, 1960); J. Borde and M. Góngora, *Evolución de la propiedad rural en el Valle del Puangue* (Santiago, 1956).
23. Skappel, *op. cit.*, pp. 177–182; Góngora, "Origen," pp. 105–112. Utterström, *op. cit.*, p. 796, points out, probably correctly, that the system of statartorpare was based on national conditions and that foreign models played an insignificant role. "When similar systems appeared also in other countries, they are explained by the similarity of prevailing conditions." It should be noted that an article in the periodical *Hushållnings-Journal* in 1777, when discussing the institution, explicitly referred to various similar labor arrangements in the Netherlands, England, Germany, and the Baltic Provinces.
24. Ludwig Hempel, "Heuerlingwesen und Crofter-system. Ein agrar- und sozialgeographischer Vergleich von Siedlerschichten in Deutschland und Schottland," *Zeitschrift für Agrargeschichte und Agrarsoziologi*, V (1957), pp. 169–180.
25. M. Duverger, *An Introduction to the Social Sciences* (New York, 1964), pp. 261–267.
26. B. Moore, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy. Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World* (Boston, Mass., 1967), pp. xii–xiv.
27. Folke Dovring, *Land and Labor in Europe in the Twentieth Century*, 3rd ed. (The Hague, 1965), p. 7.
28. See Carlo M. Cipolla, *The Economic History of World Population* (Baltimore, 1965), pp. 99–100.
29. Charles Gibson, *Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale*, II, 1955, pp. 602–603, has pointed out that the period 1810–1890 constitutes the greatest void in Latin American social history, "the former date marking the approximate point at which colonial documentation ceases; the latter, the point at which the memory of living Indians begins."
30. Different criteria of rural stratification presented and discussed in B. H. Slicher van Bath, *The Agrarian History of Western Europe* (London, 1963), pp. 310–314.
31. W. Abel, "Agrarkrisen und Agrarkonjunktur in Mitteleuropa vom 13. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert" (1925). See also the works published by the group of historians connected with E. Labrousse.
32. M. Carmagnani, "Colonial Latin American Demography: Growth of Chilean Population, 1700–1830," *Journal of Social History*, I (Berkeley, Calif. 1967), pp. 179–191.
33. E. Florescano, *Precios del maíz y crisis agrícolas en México (1708–1810)* (México, 1969).
34. He illustrates his thesis by reference to instleute. Weber, *General Economic History* (New York, 1961), pp. 79–81.
35. We are well advised to remember the words of Labrousse that "La mentalité d'un milieu change plus lentement que ce milieu lui-même." *L'histoire sociale: sources et méthodes* (Paris, 1967), p. 5.
36. According to R. Adams in Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 60, "the colono system . . . is a product of

- the cultural isolation of the colono on the one hand, and the political dominace of the land-owners on the other."
37. It is also worthwhile to consider the alternatives to such samples discussed by J. Dupaquier in *L'histoire Sociale* . . . , pp. 183–190.
 38. See "Computers and Historical Research," *Soviet Studies in History*, III (White Plains, N.Y., 1964), pp. 3–20 and Dupaquier, *op. cit.*, pp. 148–156.
 39. Myrdal, *op. cit.*, II, p. 1039.
 40. Arturo Urquidí in *Les problèmes agraires*, p. 777.
 41. Revisionist viewpoints expressed by F. Dovring in *Agrarhistorien* (Stockholm, 1953), pp. 99–102, and by F. Lütge, "Freiheit und Unfreiheit in der Agrarverfassung," *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 74 (1955), pp. 642–652.
 42. Góngora, *op. cit.*, pp. 19–24; the very solid introduction by P. Macera to the edition of *Instrucciones para el manejo de las haciendas jesuítas del Perú (XVII-XVIII)*, (Lima 1966); G. Colmenares, "El trabajo en las haciendas jesuítas en el siglo XVIII," *UN. Revista de la Dirección de Divulgación Cultural, Universidad Nacional de Colombia*, no. 1 (Bogotá, 1968), pp. 175–190, or his book, *Haciendas de los jesuítas en el Nuevo Reino de Granada. Siglo XVIII* (Bogotá, 1969), pp. 81–96. See also H. Aranguiz Donoso, "Notas para el estudio de la hacienda de La Calera de Tango," *Historia*, VI (Santiago de Chile, 1967), pp. 221–262.
 43. See, e.g. my article "Los jesuítas y la esclavitud de los negros. Algunas sugerencias para la investigación histórica," *Revista Chilena de Geografía e Historia*, no. 135 (Santiago, 1967), pp. 92–109.
 44. See for instance, Charles H. Harris, *The Sánchez-Navarros: A Socio-Economic Study of a Coahuilan Latifundio, 1846–1853* (Chicago, 1964).
 45. A short survey in my article "The History of Race Relations in Latin America: Some Comments on the State of Research," *Latin American Research Review*, I:3 (Austin, Texas, 1963). A detailed and careful analysis of the Peruvian census of 1792 by Günter Vollmer, is, *Bevölkerungspolitik und Bevölkerungsstruktur im Vize-Königreich Peru zur Ende der Kolonialzeit, 1741–1821* (Bad Homburg v.d.H., 1967).
 46. See above, note 32.
 47. This material has been used most skillfully by George Kubler, *The Indian Caste of Peru, 1795–1940. A Study based upon Tax Records and Census Reports* (Washington, D. C., 1952).
 48. Vollmer, *op. cit.*, pp. 117–118.
 49. The study mentioned by Carmagnani provides an exception: cf. pp. 189–190.
 50. Vollmer, *op. cit.*, pp. 52–56. Cortés y Larraz is an excellent example of this. His work "Descripción geográfico-moral de la diócesis de Goathemala (1769–1770), I-II (Guatemala, 1958) provides an extraordinary detailed description of the conditions of every parish of the diocesis, and he proves a most intelligent observer.
 51. As Utterström points out, *op. cit.*, II, p. 370.
 52. Utterström, *op. cit.*, II, p. 380.