

Delays in land reform and economic growth difficulties in Latin America: an evolutionary development economics perspective

Wang Xiaoyun

Abstract: Evolutionary development economics believes that high-quality production activities with increasing returns are the core of economic development. Compared with agriculture, industry is a high-quality production activity with increasing returns. For agricultural societies, the development process starts from As agricultural society enters the process of industrial society, industrialization is undoubtedly the right choice for the development strategy of Latin American countries. However, why did the industrialization of Latin American countries ultimately fail? This article starts from the logic of industrial development and gives a system based on the market perspective. Explanation. This article points out that one of the key elements of industrialization is to provide large-scale market support for industrial production activities with increasing returns. Reformist land reform practices have allowed the polarized income distribution structure to be maintained in Latin America for a long time, severely limiting The expansion of the domestic market in Latin America makes it difficult to provide effective scale market support for the development of industrialization, which in turn makes it difficult to establish a self-motivating positive feedback mechanism for industrialization in Latin America. Learning from the lessons of the failure of industrialization in Latin American countries, we should take effective measures to take into account efficiency, and equity, use the Belt and Road strategy to promote the development of the central and western inland areas, increase farmers' income, narrow regional gaps and urban-rural gaps, break down institutional barriers and institutional barriers that restrict the unification of the domestic market, and raise the integration of the domestic market to the level of a national strategy. Promote implementation and promote the transformation of China's industrialization from being driven by the international market to being driven by both domestic and international markets, so as to effectively safeguard China's economic security and promote the realization of the "Two Centenary" strategic goals.

Keywords: Evolutionary development economics, increasing returns, industrialization, land reform.

About the author: Wang Xiaoyun, Ph.D. in economics, postdoctoral fellow at the Institute of Russian, Eastern European and Central

Asian Studies, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. CLC

number: K15 Document identification code: A Article number: 1002 - 6649 (2022) 01 - 0137 - 17

In the 20th century, industrialization has become a symbol of developed countries. Before the 1980s, imitating the economic structure of developed countries at that time and establishing and developing their own industries was considered to be the only way for developing countries to achieve economic catch-up. Latin America and Both East Asia were hailed as the "Latin American Miracle" and the "East Asian Miracle" because of their remarkable achievements in industrialization. However, after the 1970s, the development gap between the two widened significantly, and Latin America fell into economic stagnation and shock. , fell into the so-called "middle-income trap", while East Asia continued to develop rapidly, and eventually entered the ranks of developed economies. Before the implementation of the industrialization strategy, both Latin America and East Asia focused on the production and export of primary products, and the path to industrialization was Starting from the initial import substitution industrialization, basic consumer goods such as textiles, clothing, shoes and food were converted from imports to local manufacturing. After the initial import substitution industrialization was implemented in the 1950s, East Asia immediately shifted to export-oriented industrialization, and its production Basic consumer goods not only supplied the local market, but also vigorously exported to foreign markets. In the 1960s, East Asia entered the second stage of import substitution industrialization, which shifted capital- and technology-intensive products such as durable consumer goods, intermediate products, and capital goods from imports to local products . manufacturing, and turned to the second stage of export-oriented industrialization in the early 1970s to promote the export of such products. Latin America continued its import substitution industrialization model into the second stage until the outbreak of the 1980s. The debt crisis forced the import substitution industrialization process to be suspended.

When comparing the industrialization paths of Latin America and East Asia, many scholars believe that Latin America has experienced a historic delay in industrialization transformation and did not change the import-substituting industrialization model to the export-oriented industrialization model in a timely manner like East Asia. This is the ultimate failure of Latin America's industrialization path. The key. However, if we use evolutionary development economics to understand the core mechanism of economic growth, we will have different conclusions. We will find that there has indeed been a historic delay in Latin America's industrialization path, but this historic delay has It appeared at the beginning of industrialization, that is, the delay of land reform. This article will first establish an analytical framework of evolutionary development economics to reveal the development logic of industrialization. Based on the perspective of international comparison, it will review the land reform process and its effectiveness in Latin America. Next, starting from the internal logic of industrialization, we analyze the impact of the delay in land reform in Latin America on its industrialization and economic growth.

An analytical framework of evolutionary development economics

Evolutionary development economics is a branch of evolutionary economics and an emerging theory of development economics.

East Asia here mainly refers to South Korea and Taiwan Province

of China. The time when South Korea implemented the initial import substitution industrialization was about 1953-1960, and the time when Taiwan Province of China was about

1950-1959. The time when South Korea implemented the second stage of import substitution industrialization was about 1961- In 1972, Taiwan Province of China probably

existed from 1960 to 1972. The Latin American industrialization process analyzed in this article refers to the import substitution industrialization process from the 1930s to the 1980s.

The main representatives include Norwegian economist Eric Reinert, Korean economist Zhang Hajun and Professor Jia Genliang of Renmin University of China. Evolutionary development economics is based on the development of developed countries in the past 500 years. The history of economic policy is an empirical basis and aims to provide developing countries with a development theory and policy analysis framework that replaces the "Washington Consensus". Evolutionary development economics is based on a thorough reflection on the neoclassical economics ideological system and the search for alternatives. Based on theoretical concepts, the basic shortcoming of modern mainstream economic theory is that it does not have a theory that can truly explain development. Evolutionary development economics believes that the increasing returns mechanism is the core mechanism of economic growth, and in human society for thousands of years of farming. In civilization, the progress of productivity is very slow, and human beings are trapped in the "Malthusian Trap". The growth of a country's wealth is mainly obtained by appropriating the resources of other countries. It was not until entering industrial society that productivity developed rapidly, and human beings began to benefit from the land. Freed from the constraints, the acquisition of wealth is no longer a zero-sum game. The increase in population and the increase in wealth can proceed simultaneously. The key to this is that agriculture based on natural resources has the characteristics of diminishing returns. When development reaches a certain level, after that, the more inputs, the less the output, and industry has a mechanism of increasing returns. The greater the industrial output, the more profitable it is. Therefore, evolutionary development economics believes that production activities are highly heterogeneous, and economic growth is the result of production activities. Specifically, only those production activities with increasing returns (before the international division of labor in the production process in the 1990s, mainly manufacturing) can bring growth, while those focusing on natural resource-based activities such as agriculture with decreasing returns can bring about growth. Production activities are equivalent to persisting in poverty. For traditional agricultural societies, the process of development is the process of moving from agricultural society to industrial society.

So, how to start and promote industrialization in traditional agricultural society? Starting from the logic of industrial development, the first factor to start industrialization in traditional agricultural society is to establish an orderly large-scale market for industrial production with increasing returns. Only market The scale is large enough and the market operation efficiency is high enough.

See [Norway] Eric S. Reinert, translated by Yang Htao and others: "Why are rich countries rich? Why are poor countries poor?", Beijing: Renmin University of China Press, 2013. See [English] Zhang Xiazhun, Xiao Lian, Ni Yanshuo, etc.

Translated: «The Rich Countries Trap: Why do developed countries kick away the ladder?» Beijing: Social Science Literature Press, 2009. [English] Author Zhang Xia Zhun, translated by Yan Rong: «The Hypocrisy of the Rich Countries: The Myth of Free Trade and the Secret History of Capitalism » Beijing: Social Science Literature Press, 2009. [English] Written by Zhang Xiazhun, translated by Sun Jianzhong: «The Lie of Economics: Why We Can't Be Superstitious about Free Marketism» Beijing: Xinhua Publishing House, 2015. See Jia Genliang's book: «Synthesis of Evolutionary Economics: The Development of the Third Economic Theoretical System» Beijing: Science Press, 2012. Jia

Genliang: "Introduction to Evolutionary Economics" Beijing: Renmin University of China Press, 2015. Jia Genliang: «Evolutionary Economics—The Origin of the Economic Revolution» Taiyuan: Shanxi People's Publishing House, 2004. Zeng Yunmin: «Reconstructing the "Alternative Canonical Economics" of Economic Development Theory—Comment on «The Wealth of Nations in Poor Countries» » contained in «Economic Society

Comparison of socialist systems» Issue 3, 2007

The "Malthusian Trap" is named after the British political economist Thomas Robert Malthus. Malthus proposed that population growth increases according to a geometric progression, while subsistence means only increase according to an arithmetic progression. A larger population will always increase in some way. The method is eliminated, and the population cannot exceed the corresponding level of agricultural development. This theory is called the "Malthusian Trap."

Only then can the effect of increasing returns in industry become apparent, product costs can be reduced, and product prices can be reduced, consumer welfare can be improved, and manufacturers' profits can increase at the same time, which enables manufacturers to increase R&D investment, achieve innovation, and increase workers' wages. γ National income can be increased, thereby providing a larger market for industrial development. A self-motivating positive feedback mechanism is created between the expansion of market scale, increasing returns, innovation, increase in worker wages, and further expansion of market scale, thereby promoting industrial development. Entering into a cumulative upward causal cycle.

The expansion of market scale requires policy guidance and institutional support. Mature large-scale markets do not exist naturally, but are the result of continuous development. The government plays an irreplaceable and important role in the process of market construction and cultivation. Market mechanism The cultivation and expansion of market scale is a long-term and gradual process, which mutually supports the development of industrialization. From a geographical point of view, the market includes the domestic market and the world market. From a time point of view, the focus of market construction and cultivation is different in different periods. γ The development of a country's industry always starts with the domestic market. After it has achieved a certain degree of competitiveness, it is then promoted to the world market. Therefore, at the beginning of industrialization, the construction of the domestic market is particularly important. With the development of industrialization, the world market The expansion of land has become the focus. Improving the land distribution structure through thorough land reform and increasing the income of farmers will become the first step to start industrialization and the starting point of industrialization to build the domestic market.

The primary issue of setting

Based on historical experience, there are two ways to realize industrialization. One is bottom-up industrialization driven by demand. This kind of industrialization originated in rural areas and further developed with the support of mercantilist governments. This is the case in developed countries in Europe and the United States. As well as the industrialization approach commonly adopted by developed economies in East Asia γ , under this approach, by reforming backward production relations and productivity in rural areas, a more equal income distribution is achieved among farmers, thus increasing farmers' enthusiasm for production, agricultural surplus and farmers' income. With the increase, farmers gradually have the ability to consume industrial products that were previously only consumed by the urban aristocracy and wealthy workers and the rural landlord class. The increase in farmers' demand for industrial products has led to on-site primitive industrialization and long-distance trade in the countryside. Becoming profitable, the development of primitive industrialization injected vitality into rural economic growth, further increasing farmers' income. In this process, rural surplus labor was generated, commerce was developed, rural infrastructure was established, and the market was expanded. Farmer entrepreneurs and businessmen were cultivated. All these factors laid the foundation for a larger scale and higher level of industrialization. The industry gradually upgraded under the support of demand. Industrialization established a self-motivating positive feedback mechanism. Such industrialization deeply Rooted in the domestic market demand, when the industry develops to a certain level,

γ See the first work of Wen: «The Great Chinese Industrial Revolution——Development Political Economics» A Critique of General Principles γ Beijing: Qing Dynasty Hua University Press, 2016

When the domestic market scale potential is not enough to support its further development, these countries promptly expand their markets abroad through free trade or export-oriented strategies, thereby providing support for a larger market for further industrial development and successfully achieving industrial upgrading.

The other is top-down industrialization led by the government. This kind of industrialization lacks a market gestation process of rural original industrialization. Under the administrative guidance of the government, industrialization is carried out around urban areas. The import substitution industrialization of the Soviet Union and Latin American countries took the form of industrialization. This is the approach. In this approach to industrialization, the government uses administrative power to mobilize national resources to invest in industry, and industrialization is rapidly promoted. In this process, due to the lack of understanding of the increasing returns mechanism of industry, the importance of market size is not as important. After receiving enough attention, the administrative power of the government replaced the market supply and demand mechanism and became the core driving force of industrial development. Under the logic of this industrialization, more emphasis was placed on agricultural production efficiency than on the size of the market including rural areas. Industrial development was based on On the basis of sacrificing the interests of agriculture and farmers, that is, agriculture will first feed industry, and rural areas will feed cities. After industrialization has developed to a certain extent, industry will feed agriculture, and cities will feed rural areas. However, such industrialization lacks a market-based basis. The internal support of the mechanism will eventually fail.

Taking Latin America as a case, this article briefly reviews and evaluates the land reform process and its effects in Latin America. Starting from the market logic of industrialization development, this article elaborates on the constraints of the failure of land reform in Latin America on industrialization development, and provides reasons for the failure of import substitution industrialization and the The economic growth dilemma provides an institutional explanation based on the logic of the industrialized market, and thus provides inspiration for the in-depth development of China's industrialization.

2. Land reform practice and effects in Latin America from an international comparative perspective

Latin America was the first developing country to start land reform, but land reform in Latin America has gone The reformist path has never fundamentally touched upon the seriously unfair land distribution structure from beginning to end.

(1) The process and results of land reform in Latin America. Land

reform in Latin American countries lasted a long time, the process was difficult and tortuous, and the results were limited. As former colonies, land in Latin American countries is highly concentrated in the hands of large planters and large estate owners. To a large extent, these large real estate classes were also the leaders of the War of Independence in Latin America, and they have long dominated politics and economy. In view of the complicated interest relationships, the Latin American countries that became independent in the early 19th century did not reform the highly concentrated land ownership. Instead, they inherited the large estate system of the colonial period intact. Some large estate owners even continued to expand the area of their estates by plundering Indian communal properties and small farmers' land, as well as through the transfer of church land and public land. This has further increased the concentration of land. The highly concentrated land situation in Latin America still did not improve at the beginning of the 20th century.

Agricultural surveys in Latin America in the 1950s showed that among the 33 million agricultural population, 660,000 (accounting for 2%) are large landowners, 3.3 million people (accounting for 10%) are medium landowners and tenants. The remaining 29 million people (88%) are small farmers, farm laborers and agricultural workers. In the total real estate in China, large landowners, accounting for 1% to 15% of the rural population, own more than half of the real estate. On average, each large landowner covering an area of 6,000 hectares, the degree of land concentration in major Latin American countries can be seen from the survey data in Table 1.

A spot

Table 1 Land concentration in major Latin American countries before land reform (̄)

Year of country name		Various types of farmers divided by land area						total farmers	
		100 ~ 200 hectares		200 ~ 500 hectares		500 hectares or more		More than 100 hectares	
		Number of farmers Proportion	land surface Proportion of area	Number of farmers Proportion	land area Proportion of area	farmers Number ratio	land area Proportion of area	Number of farmers Proportion	land area Proportion of area
Argentina	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄
pampas region									
Nationwide								̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄
Brazil	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄
Venezuela 1956								̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄
Guatemala 1950								̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄
Honduras 1952		̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄
Dominica 1950		̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄
Colombia 1954		̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄
Costa Rica 1950		̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄
cuba	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄			̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄
Mexico	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄
Nicaragua 1952		̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄
Uruguay	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄
El Salvador 1950		̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄
Ecuador 1954		̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄	̄̄̄̄̄̄

Data source: Quoted from Feng Xiuwen et al.: "Agricultural Development in Latin America", Beijing: Social Sciences Literature Press, 2002 Year, pages 151-152.

The high concentration of land has brought about many problems. First of all, a large number of farmers have no land or little land.

̄̄̄̄̄̄ Feng Xiuwen et al.: «Agricultural Development in Latin America», Beijing: Social Sciences Literature Press, 2002, pp. 150-151.

Being able to rely on the semi-feudal landlord class to survive, they are deeply exploited by the landlord class and live in poverty. According to statistics,

Plan, landless farmers before land reform in Ecuador, Chile, Venezuela, Colombia,

The proportions in Guatemala, Peru, and Paraguay were as high as 58%, 86%, and 93% respectively. Some of these farmers who had little land and were in dire straits were eventually forced to embark on a path of resistance.

Road. Peasant movements have emerged one after another in Latin American countries, causing long-term social unrest. Secondly, the large-scale real estate system has

The prevailing semi-serf exploitation of peasants by the landlord class not only suppressed the peasants' enthusiasm for production, but also

Moreover, the cheap labor of farmers and farm laborers also hindered the use of machinery and land improvement by the large landowner class, leading to

As a result, the agricultural production methods in Latin America are extensive, labor productivity is low, and a large amount of land is abandoned. Latin America

Low land utilization is very common. According to Danilevich's statistics, the utilization rate of arable land in Latin America is

The utilization rate is only 22% in Brazil and 79% in Costa Rica. 3 2% Paraguay 1 3% Mexico 9 5% Argentina 11 1% Uruguay 12 2%

After independence, with the development of national economies in Latin American countries, the power of the national bourgeoisie gradually grew.

And after the mid-19th century, it entered the political stage as a class. By the 1950s and 1960s, the people

The national bourgeoisie has taken power in most Latin American countries. In the 1930s, Latin American countries

The process of industrialization has begun one after another. The development of industry not only requires rural areas to provide food and industrial raw materials, capital and cheap labor, and also need rural areas to provide a broad market for the sale of industrial products.

The existence of the real estate system undoubtedly severely restricts the supporting function of agriculture to industry. Therefore, the reform of backward areas

The large-scale real estate system is not only a requirement of the majority of farmers, but also an important demand for the development of the bourgeoisie.

The Agrarian Law promulgated by the Calañá government in Mexico in 1915 and the Constitution promulgated in 1917 are considered to have started the

This was the prelude to land reform in Latin America. Afterwards, Guatemala and Bolivia implemented land reforms in 1952 and 1953 respectively.

The land law was promulgated in 2001 and began land reform. However, the real watershed was the Cuban Revolution in 1959. Cuba was divided into

Different from the promulgation of land reform laws in May 1959 and October 1963, the two land reforms not only eliminated

The latifundia system was eliminated and the rich peasants were eliminated. Cuba's state-owned land accounted for 70% and 30% of the country's small farmer land area. Encouraged by the success of Cuba's land reform, people from various countries in Latin America have demanded land reform.

Due to ideological considerations, the United States was pressured to propose a land reform package in 1961.

The "Alliance for Progress Plan" thus pushed land reform in Latin America to a climax. Most Latin American countries have this

Later, land reform began.

[Soviet] Danilevich: «Land ownership and land use systems in Latin American countries», in «Collection of Essays on Latin America Today» (Moscow edition), 1960, pp. 60-110. Quoted from Wu Hongying: «Causes and Impacts of Latin American Land Reform in the 20th Century», ed. "World History" Issue 1, 1993

Quoted from Feng Xiuwen et al.: "Agricultural Development in Latin America", Beijing: Social Sciences Literature Press, 2002, page 154.

However, the land reform in most Latin American countries is not thorough. They either carried out relatively thorough land reform like Chile, but then the big landowners and big bourgeoisie counterattacked, destroying the land reform results, or like Brazil. Similarly, land reform was more of a show-off and did not touch the core interests of the big real estate class and foreign capital. During this period, although most Latin American countries announced the abolition of the big real estate system either on their own initiative or due to circumstances, but in actual implementation, the interests of large property owners are very favored. For example, in Venezuela, the government not only provides high compensation for the expropriation of large properties, but also stipulates that as long as these properties "fulfill social functions", they will not be touched. The land in many Latin American countries The reform avoided the important and neglected the trivial, taking colonization, immigration and taxation of underutilized large real estate as the main content of land reform. Costa Rica and Colombia both promulgated land reform laws in 1961 (the name of Costa Rica's land reform law is "Land Occupation and Reclamation Law" (i.e. Decree No. 2825), Ecuador promulgated land reform laws in 1959 and 1964 respectively. These land reform laws were supported by the United States. The hope of land reform was based on foreign financial support. The content of land reform was to settle immigrants. and mainly taxing idle land. Such land reform is naturally very incomplete and basically retains the original land ownership structure. The result of the 10-year land reform in Colombia is only to allocate 0.25% of the total cultivated land area to 0.25% of the total cultivated land area. 45% of farmers

Land reform in most Latin American countries has stagnated since the 1970s. In the 1980s and 1990s, Latin American countries that were mired in debt crises began to embark on the path of neoliberal reform. The large real estate system was in the wave of privatization. was consolidated and legalized. The severely unfair land and wealth distribution structure coupled with economic shocks made the lives of ordinary people in Latin America increasingly distressed and intensified social conflicts. This ultimately promoted the rise of left-wing governments in Latin America at the beginning of the 21st century, setting off a new round of land disputes. The wave of reform. This round of land reform was carried out under the good external economic situation of the international commodity super cycle. Although these left-wing governments are determined to achieve "land to the tiller" through land reform, they still have no specific policies.

After Salvador Allende took office as President of Chile in 1970, he began to vigorously promote land reform and set the upper limit of privately owned land to 40 hectares. On the expropriated land, farmers were encouraged to establish cooperative organizations to solve the difficulties of insufficient technology and funds. Allende The land reform under the Allende administration was vigorous and fast. During the entire Allende administration, a total of 8.22 million hectares of land from 4,287 estates were expropriated. The land reform achieved remarkable results. However, due to the damage to the interests of the big real estate and the big bourgeoisie, the land reform In 1973, the Allende government was overthrown by a military coup supported by the big real estate and the big bourgeoisie. Allende died in the line of duty. After the Pinochet military government came to power, it completely changed the direction of Chile's land reform. Farmers' land was returned to the landlords. By the end of 1978, a total of 2.93 million hectares of land had been returned to the original owners, and 3.14 million hectares of land had been distributed to cooperatives and small farmers who supported the government. The remaining expropriated land was all sold to individuals. Large real estate companies also However, the farmers who obtained the land quickly went bankrupt due to insufficient

security. The Vargas government of Brazil promulgated Decree No. 29803 on July 26, 1951, announcing the establishment of the National Agrarian Policy Committee and proposing the principles of land reform. The goal was to limit the size of large estates and gradually concentrate small estates. The Goulart government, which came to power in 1961, retained the land reform principles of Vargas and stipulated that idle land in estates should be expropriated. However, due to the opposition of large landowners, the land reform was The reform decree was not implemented, and land

distribution was mainly based on colonization and immigration. Feng Xiuwen et al.: "Agricultural Development in Latin America", Beijing: Social Science Literature Press, 2002, page 176.

The main focus is on requisitioning idle land, changing business methods and allocating state-owned land. Even if the upper limit of privately owned land is set, the upper limit is very high (for example, Venezuela is 5,000 hectares). After the global financial crisis in 2008, with the international bulk commodity super cycle has receded, and Latin American countries with bulk commodity exports as their main economic driving force have fallen into economic recession and social unrest. The land reform process has been interrupted. Latin American countries have not yet achieved a more reasonable land distribution through thorough land reform. Large real estate The land system is still the core of the land system, and there are still a large number of landless and landless farmers.

Latin America was the first developing country to start land reform. The land reform achieved certain results. Many landless farmers obtained land, and the feudal and semi-feudal exploitation system was basically eliminated. However, the land reform did not fundamentally touch the serious injustice. Land distribution structure Compared with East Asian economies, land reform in Latin America not only takes a long time (it takes about a century from the start of land reform in Mexico in 1915, and more than 60 years from the Cuban revolution in 1959), but also Land reform is extremely incomplete, and the reform process often goes back and forth. First of all, from the perspective of the goals of land reform in Latin America, except for a few Latin American countries such as Cuba, Mexico, Guatemala (Arbenz period), Bolivia, etc., they aim to eliminate the large estate system and change the height of land reform. In addition to the goal of concentrated land ownership, the land reform in most Latin American countries is not to completely change land distribution, but to develop capitalist farms as the main goal. They only impose necessary restrictions on large estates to promote land investment by large estates. Operations, reducing idle land waste. These countries have taken the expropriation of idle land from large estate owners, colonization and immigration, and taxation of idle land as the main content, allowing the large estate system to exist for a long time. Secondly, even in those countries that try to eliminate large estates, the content of land reforms in Latin American countries that have thoroughly reformed their systems and land distribution is much less severe than that of East Asian economies. For example, Mexico's land reform from 1934 to 1940, Guatemala's 1952 land reform law, and Bolivia's 1953 land reform law. The land reform law stipulates that the upper limit of privately owned land ranges from a few hundred hectares to as many as thousands of hectares, which is much higher than the privately owned land limit set by various East Asian economies.

¶ In November 2001, Venezuela promulgated the Land Law, which stipulates that the government has the right to take back privately owned land of more than 5,000 hectares and idle land. In November 2006, Bolivia promulgated a new land reform law, which stipulates that the state has the right to expropriate part of idle land from estate owners. And distributed to the landless poor and indigenous residents according to a certain proportion. In Ecuador's "Citizen's Revolution", the expropriation of idle land was one of the main contents of the economic revolution. Before running for president, Lula, the chairman of the Brazilian Workers' Party, criticized Brazil's big economy. However, after the Labor Party came to power in 2002, no thorough land reform was carried out. On the contrary, land became increasingly concentrated. From 2003 to 2010, the area of large-scale farms in Brazil increased from 214843865 hectares to 318904739 hectares, accounting for 10% of the total area. The proportion increased from 51.3% to 55.8%, with an increase of 48.4% over the same period. At the same time, although the area of small farms increased from 38.9 million hectares to 46.6 million hectares, the area of medium-sized farms also increased from 88.1 million hectares to 113.8 million hectares. However, ¶ The percentage of the total farm area occupied by the two is lower than that of large farms.

¶ For example, in Central America in 1978, small farmers, who accounted for 79% of the total farmers, only owned 10% of the farmland, while large farmers, who accounted for 6% of the total farmers, owned 74% of the farmland. Data from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) show that, 7 % of large landowners (land area of more than 100 hectares) own 77% of the land, while 60% of small farmers own only 4% of the land. In contrast, in East Asia, large landowners own only 16% of the land. And 96% of farmers own land with an area of less than 10 hectares (land ownership accounts for 68% of the total area). See Jiang Shixue: "Why is the income distribution in Latin American countries so unfair?" in "Latin American Studies", Issue 2015 Issue 5

(For example, the Korean government stipulates that the upper limit of land owned by farmers is 3 towns, which is approximately 3 hectares). Moreover, East Asian economies have made relatively comprehensive and long-term efforts to establish small-scale peasant economies to support their own farmers and prevent land from being concentrated in the hands of a few people again. However, the land reforms in Latin American countries lack attention to consolidating the reform results, which is reflected in the lack of attention to support and assistance to small farmers who obtain land (except for the Arbenz land reform in Guatemala). As a result, small farmers lack production means or necessary Without sufficient capital and technology, they were unable to effectively manage the land, and were eventually forced to sell the land due to poor management, thus re-concentrating the land into the hands of a few people.

(2) East Asia's experience from an international comparative

perspective Zhang Peigang, a leading development economist, once pointed out, "World historical experience shows that most countries that have transitioned from a traditional economy to a modern economy through the 'industrial revolution', or in other words, most agricultural countries or economically backward countries In order for countries and regions to achieve industrialization or economic take-off and economic development, they must first implement changes in the land system. Generally speaking, except for city-states and regions like Singapore and Hong Kong, China, where there are no land issues, in all other countries, Anyone who succeeds in land reform will inevitably develop their economy more rapidly and significantly. This is true for capitalist countries, and it is also true for socialist countries." Looking back at the industrialization path in East Asia, we can find that, in addition to Singapore and Hong Kong, China, Japan At the beginning of industrialization, both China and the "Four Little Dragons" in Asia passed thorough land system reforms, weakening or even eliminating the power of the landlord class, establishing a relatively equalized land ownership system, realizing land to the tiller, and thus greatly releasing rural productivity. Laid the foundation for industrialization

1 Japan's experience

The development of Japanese capitalism began during the Meiji Restoration period, and land reform also began during this period. During the Tokugawa shogunate period, Japan implemented a feudal lord land ownership system. Land was concentrated in the hands of feudal lords. The majority of farmers accounted for 80% of the total population of Japan. None of them had land and relied on renting small pieces of land from feudal lords to make a living. After the Meiji Dynasty came to power in 1868, it gradually confiscated the territories of feudal lords (shogunate and feudal lords)2, and in 1871 "abolition of feudal lords and establishment of prefectures" abolished the feudal lords' control over each other . The ownership rights of land and farmers were established, and a unified centralized state was established. In 1872, the Meiji government issued a decree to abolish the land ownership of the old feudal lords, confirm the land ownership of the actual land owners, and nationalize the unowned land. Meiji government

2 Zhang Peigang: «Land Reform and Economic Development», published in «Economic Review», Issue 2, 1991. In February 1868, the

Meiji government issued a recovery order against Tokugawa Keiki, and distributed it to shogunate jurisdictions across the country (Tenryo) and the land of the flags belonged to the imperial court. In January 1869, an edict was issued to punish the Samaku clan. In July 1869, the policy of returning the editions was implemented, and the land of the Samaku clan was confiscated to the imperial court. In February 1870, the Meiji government ordered The temple community handed over other territories other than the land occupied by the temple itself to the imperial court. After these reforms, before the "abolition of the feudal domain and the establishment of prefectures" in 1871, the imperial court's territory was approximately 10 million koku. In contrast, according to the feudal status at the time of the return of the edition, According to the governor's table, the total stone height of all feudal lords was 1904.6 million stone. The imperial territory accounted for roughly 1 / 3 of the total stone height. See Chen Xintian: "A preliminary study on the land system reform during the Meiji Restoration period in Japan", published in "Journal of Chifeng University" (Chinese Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition), Issue 1, 2005

The reform of the feudal land ownership system destroyed the feudal land ownership system. At the end of the shogunate period, the land ownership of some new landlords, rich peasants and yeoman farmers was confirmed. However, the reform was not thorough. More than 50% of the cultivated land was firmly controlled by a few landlords, and most farmers did not own their own land. And need to pay high land rent.

From 1946 to 1950, Japan carried out its first post-war land reform. This land reform was the core of the Allied occupation policy and was modeled on the "Memorandum on Rural Land Reform" submitted to the Japanese government by the Allied forces stationed in Japan in 1945. The reform effectively dealt a blow to the landlord class. A large amount of land from the landlord class was confiscated and distributed to the vast number of landless tenant farmers. As a result, the number of self-cultivated farmers increased by nearly 2 million. From 1945 to 1950, the proportion of self-cultivated land increased from 54% to 90%. To prevent land from being concentrated again in the hands of a few people, the government promulgated the "Land Law" in 1950, which set limits for land owned by farmers and for land leased to outsiders. The excess land must be resold to other farmers at a low price by the government, and it is stipulated that only self-owned land can be owned by farmers. Only farmers with land of less than 3 hectares have the right to purchase land. Subsequent land reforms centered on farmers' land ownership and land transfer systems. In 1952, the government promulgated the "Agricultural Land Law", which permanently established farmers' rights from a legal perspective. land ownership

In the 1960s, the Japanese government relaxed restrictions on the transfer of agricultural land by amending the "Agricultural Land Law". In the 1990s, the "Agricultural Management Foundation Strengthening Promotion Law" and the "Food, Agriculture, and Rural Basic Law" were successively promulgated, gradually establishing It established the agricultural land transfer system, encouraged farmers to rent and sell private agricultural land, and laid the foundation for the development of agricultural scale and industrialization.

2 South Korea's experience

Similar to Japan, South Korea's land reform after World War II was also promoted by the United States. According to a survey by the Bank of Korea, 77% of the South Korean population was engaged in agriculture at the end of 1945, and 63.4% of the agricultural land was leased land, and only self-cultivated land was Accounting for 37% of the 2.06 million rural households, 49% are tenant farmers, and 35% are owner farmers and tenant farmers. Owner farmers (including landlords) account for less than 14% of all farmers. Farmers are required to hand over 50 to 70% of their crop harvest to the landlords, and are subject to Severe exploitation by landlords, there was an urgent need to get rid of the shackles of the old production relations. After the liberation of Korea in 1945, the US military occupied South Korea, and promulgated the "Land Trinity Ordinance" at the end of 1945, setting the upper limit of land rent to the harvest of agricultural land. However, because the grassroots organizations in South Korea were mainly controlled by big landowners, the decree was not effectively implemented. In 1945, North Korea implemented a thorough land reform, which had an impact on South Korea. The Communist Party of South Korea led South Korea Workers' strikes and peasant riots occurred in various places. Under this pressure, the US military put agricultural land reform on the agenda. Driven by the US military, South Korea's land reform was implemented in two steps: the first step was to convert the land occupied by Japan back into the country according to the The paid principle \bar{y} will be distributed to farmers whose land area is less than 2 hectares (1 hectare is approximately 1 hectare) to support their own development.

\bar{y} Yang Bingxun: "Agricultural land transfer system in the United States and Japan", published in "World Agriculture", Issue 5, 2015. The allocated land price is

\bar{y} three times the annual production. Farmers can pay it off in one lump sum or in installments. The period is 15 years

20% repayment per year , But it must be paid in kind.

This move has allowed more than 500,000 landless or landless farmers to be allocated land. The second step is to distribute the land to farmers in the country.

The land occupied by the landlord class was confiscated and distributed with compensation. In June 1949, the Syngman Rhee government issued the

The "Agricultural Land Reform Law" was promulgated, which stipulated that the upper limit of farmland owned by farmers was 3 hectares. The government would purchase farmland at low prices.

Farmland with more than 3 bu of farmland to households is sold to farmers with less than 3 bu of cultivated land at a lower price.

As of 1951, more than 1.54 million rural households had been allocated land. By the early 1960s, 0.5% of cultivated land was owned.

The proportions of farmers with less than 1 hectare, 0.5 to 1 hectare, and more than 1 hectare were respectively 41.8% and 26.7%. The goal of "land to the tiller" has been basically achieved.

Beginning in 1962, through the Park Chung-hee administration's three five-year economic development plans, South Korea shifted from an agricultural country to a country that is gradually transforming into an industrial country, the disadvantages of small-scale decentralized management of rural land are becoming more and more prominent. In view of this, South Korea has made a series of changes to the laws on agricultural land occupation and transfer, relaxing restrictions on land transfer and occupation, and encourage large-scale agricultural operations.

3 The experience of Taiwan Province of China

When the Kuomintang regime fled to Taiwan in 1949, 56% of the cultivated land in Taiwan Province of China was occupied by landlords.

According to statistics, only 36% of the total farmers are owner-cultivators. Semi-owner farmers account for 25%. Tenant farmers account for 39%. Every year the tenant farmers have to pay 60% to 70% of their income to the landlords, regardless of drought or flood, or whether the annual income is good or bad.

Land rent of no less than 60% of the total harvest in a good year, known as "iron rent", was deeply exploited by landlords. 1949-1953

During the year, with the economic and technical support of the United States, the Kuomintang authorities implemented "land reform" in three steps.

The first step is the "37-5 rent reduction", which limits the maximum land rent to the annual crop output in 1948.

375% of the total, and stipulates that all farmland leases must be signed in writing, and the lease term must not be less than 6 years.

Additional burdens such as rent deposits and rent payments in advance were removed. The second step was to "release public land", which was introduced in June 1951.

«Implementation Measures of Taiwan Province for Release of Publicly Owned Cultivated Land to Support Homeowner Farmers» The ownership of publicly owned cultivated land will be gradually transferred to peasants, in order to support self-cultivation farmers, the objects of transfer are sequentially farmers, farm laborers, tenant farmers, etc. on public land. Transfer

The land price is 25 times the total annual harvest of the main products of the cultivated land, and will be repaid in kind within 10 years.

The farmers who are allocated the land have ownership of the land, but they have no right to buy, sell or transfer the land before the land price is repaid.

The repayment amount shall be 125% of the annual production volume and shall be repaid in kind over 5 years. After the repayment is completed, the government shall issue a "repayment certificate".

To the landowners whose land was confiscated, the government issued "land price securities". According to the output of the confiscated land, the government provided subsidies in the form of cash.

In this process, the government played the role of an intermediary. See Wang Jianhong: "Re-evaluation of South Korea's Agricultural Land Reform", in "Jiangnan Studies"

Technology Issue 4, 2015

Zhu Xinfang, Jia Kaifang: «Comments and reflections on the reform of agricultural land systems in Japan, South Korea and Russia», published in «Research on the World

World» Issue 1, 2005

As early as April 1948, the Kuomintang promulgated the "Key Points for the Implementation of Taiwan Province's Release of Public Land to Support Homeowner Farmers" and took over the land.

The land owned by the Taiwan Development Society (that is, the land prepared by Japan for its immigrants) and the farms of the Taiwan Sugar Company and the Taiwan Tea Company were designated as zero

Star Land is an experiment in releasing public lands.

No interest is borne. The third step is "land to the tiller". In 1953, the Taiwanese authorities promulgated the "Regulations on the Implementation of Land to the Tiller", which stipulated that landowners could retain a certain amount of land, and the excess land would be purchased by the authorities and resold to farmers. The land price was the same as the public land release, that is, 25 times the total crop production in 1948. The land price paid by the authorities to the landowners was 70% in physical land bonds and 30% in public utility stocks. This was intended to guide the landowners to use the land they received. Part of the land price was transferred to industry. Landowners were encouraged to reserve land to encourage self-cultivation. If rented, the Taiwan authorities supported tenant farmers to purchase it with loans, and the landlords were not allowed to refuse the sale. After the above reforms, a large number of tenant farmers in Taiwan Province obtained land and became self-cultivation farmers. By 1960, Taiwan Province The proportion of owner-cultivators among the total rural households reached 64%, and the proportion of tenant farmers dropped to 36%, effectively dismantling the local feudal land ownership system and promoting rural productivity. Since then, with the second development of 15% industrialization, the shortcomings of the small-scale peasant economy have also begun to appear. Taiwan Province of China The land reform began in the 1980s to encourage specialized and large-scale agricultural operations.

Through the above-mentioned cases, we can get the following enlightenment. First of all, the land ownership reforms focusing on establishing owner-peasants all occurred at the beginning of the economic development of these countries and regions. The land system reform stimulated agricultural productivity, thus accumulating funds for the development of industry and market. Secondly, industrialization is promoted through land equalization reform, and the development of industry in turn promotes intensive land management. This is a common phenomenon in the industrial and agricultural development process of these developed economies. Several economies in East Asia have less land and more people. In order to limit the concentration of land, the government has set an upper limit on the land owned by farmers, thus making these areas present a typical form of decentralized small-scale peasant economy. With the passage of time and the development of industrialization, the effects of land ownership reform in these areas have been exhausted. On the contrary, because decentralized management is not conducive to mechanized farming and restricts the further development of productivity, these countries and regions have subsequently launched reforms in land management and transfer systems aimed at large-scale agricultural operations.

3. Delays in land reform, failure of industrialization and economic growth difficulties in Latin America

Land reform is an important starting point for the transformation of traditional agricultural society into industrial society and modernization. Land reform

self- By 1952, the public land released accounted for about 1/4 of the total public land occupied by the Kuomintang. About 100,000 households received farmland and became cultivators. For the land reserved by the landlord, the Taiwan authorities in principle encourage self-cultivation. If it is to be rented out, the rent must not be paid. Exceeding the annual output farmers 1948, and it is stipulated that if the landlord retains the land for rent instead of farming it, the authorities support the tenant farmers to purchase it on their own with loans. As long as the tenant have cultivated 375% of the land for more than 8 years, they can apply for the authority to do so. The landlord may not refuse to sell at the price. Since the "375 rent reduction" is based on 1948, it has been 6 years from 1948 to 1953. In addition to the tenancy period before the rent reduction, many farmers are tenants. After cultivating for eight years, you can apply to the authorities at any time to "purchase it at a price on your behalf." Under pressure, the landowners gradually sold the reserved land on their own, leaving only the part for self-cultivation and self-operation. By 1977, the landowners sold the land directly to farmers. There are about 730,000 hectares of reserved land, and there are still about 490,000 hectares of land owned by landlords, accounting for 53% of the total cultivated land in Taiwan. See Wang Kan: "A brief discussion of Taiwan's land reform from 1949 to 1953", in "The Communist Party of China" Journal of the Party School of Zhejiang Provincial Committee, Issue 3, 2005

The incomplete reform has left many hidden dangers for the industrialization and economic development of Latin American countries.

First of all, by reforming the highly concentrated land distribution structure of traditional agricultural society, achieving a more equal distribution of land in the hands of farmers is a prerequisite for easing social conflicts and creating a stable political and social environment for economic and social development. American political scientist Huntington pointed out "In a country that is in the process of modernization, land reform is an extremely prominent political issue." "No social group is more conservative than farmers who own land, and no social group is more conservative than land-owning farmers, and no social group is more conservative than land-owning farmers. Farmers with high land rents are more revolutionary. Therefore, in a sense, the political stability of a country in the process of modernization depends on its ability to implement reforms in the countryside." ̣ The incomplete land reform has made the highly concentrated land distribution structure in Latin America The region has been preserved, which has become the structural source of poverty, serious unfair income distribution and constant social conflicts in Latin America. Latin America is the first developing region to enter the middle-income level. However, it is not coordinated with its economic development level and urbanization process. What is obvious is the significant poverty and income polarization in Latin America. During the period of import substitution industrialization, when the economy developed the fastest, Latin America sacrificed the interests of agriculture and farmers to develop industry. Not only did farmers not benefit from economic growth and get rid of poverty, it was also related to On the contrary, the income gap among urban residents has further widened. Data cited by American economist Birdsall and others show that the Gini coefficient of Latin America was 0.51, 0.52 and 0.50 respectively in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. In East Asia, they are 0.38, 0.40 and 0.39 respectively. The income gap between urban and rural residents is an important factor in the income gap in Latin America. The neoliberal reforms in the 1990s provided legal reasons for adhering to the backward land system. Mexico and other Latin American countries Announce the formal abolition of land reform, and promote liberalization, privatization, marketization and institutionalization under this seriously unbalanced land structure and social structure, which will inevitably lead to the poor getting poorer and the rich getting richer. The wealth gap and poverty in Latin America The problem of culturalization has further intensified.

Severe poverty and polarization have brought a series of unstable factors to Latin American countries. A large number of landless farmers and farmers with little land have poured into cities. However, whether it is an export-oriented development model relying on comparative advantages or a capital-intensive industrialization Roads and roads cannot provide sufficient employment opportunities for these laborers. They either flow into the informal sector or become newly unemployed. They find it difficult to obtain a stable source of income and living security, and eventually become urban poor. This has caused Latin America has a unique phenomenon of urban slums, an urbanization process that is inconsistent with its level of economic development, and an industrial structure that is incompatible with its development stage. Landless and landless farmers who remain in the countryside are constantly falling into conflicts with the government and the government in order to fight for land. In the struggles and armed conflicts of large landowners, such as the peasant armed riots in Chiapas, Mexico, the landless peasant movement in Brazil, etc. According to statistics, in Brazil, only in the three years from 1985 to 1987,

̣ [US] Written by Samuel P. Huntington, translated by Wang Guanhua and others: "Political Order in a Changing Society", Shanghai: Shanghai Century Publishing Group, 2008, page 311.

̣ Jiang Shixue: "Why is the income distribution in Latin American countries so unfair?" published in "Latin American Studies", Issue 5, 2015.

There were as many as 2,264 conflicts between large landowners and landless or landless peasants. The number of people involved in the conflicts was 2.74 million, and 433 people were killed. Latin America is also the region with the most violent conflicts in the world. The murder rate in this region is higher than The world average is five times higher. Continuous social conflicts have become an important factor restricting economic development in Latin America. For example, at the beginning of the 21st century, the left-wing government represented by Venezuela proposed the development concept of "21st century socialism", which aimed to reduce poverty. and social reforms that reduce the gap between rich and poor have been placed in a prominent position. However, unfortunately, the reforms have not touched the most fundamental land system structure of Latin American countries, including Venezuela. Instead, they have focused on the redistribution of real economic benefits, without addressing the The source of economic benefits, that is, land, etc., will be fundamentally redistributed. The reform was carried out under the export-oriented economic development model based on comparative advantage during the neoliberal period. The reform funds relied on the export revenue of bulk commodities. In the first decade of the 21st century, Under the commodity super cycle, the income of Latin American countries whose economies are based on commodity exports has increased significantly. Latin American left-wing governments can use this to significantly increase the level of social spending, so that export income can benefit more poor people and achieve significant poverty reduction results. However, after 2010, due to the continued impact of the international financial crisis, the commodity super cycle receded. Latin American countries, which rely on commodity exports as the main economic pillar, saw a sharp decline in their export income. It was difficult to maintain the previous level of social expenditure. A large number of people had been lifted out of poverty. People fell back into poverty, and the results of poverty reduction were ruined, and the society fell into more serious turmoil. According to data from the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America, the number of poor people living in poverty in Latin America reached 18.4 billion in 2017, which is equivalent to 10% of the regional residents. 30 2% of which 62 million people (10 2% of residents) are in a state of extreme poverty. Secondly, reform the

highly concentrated land distribution structure of traditional agricultural society and realize land to the tiller, thereby improving the income of poor farmers and tenant farmers who account for the vast majority of the population. The income of the peasant class is an important basis for carrying out industrialization and expanding the market. Compared with agriculture, industry has typical characteristics of economies of scale. The more capital-intensive industries (that is, the roundaboutization of production mentioned by Arin Yange) The deeper the degree of industry), the more significant the economies of scale effect. At the beginning of Latin America's industrialization, that is, the initial import substitution industrialization period, because the products produced were mainly light industrial daily necessities, the degree of mechanization and roundaboutness of production was not very high, and the market size was not very important. The restrictive effect of industrialization in Latin America is not very prominent yet. When Latin America entered the second stage of import substitution industrialization, the restrictive effect of the small market size has become very prominent. In order to break this restriction, Latin American countries began to explore regional economic integration since the 1950s. By the 1970s, a total of four regional integration organizations had been established in Latin America, namely the Central American Common Market, the Latin American Free Trade Association, the Andean Group and the Caribbean Community. Among these four integration organizations, only the Central American Common Market had achieved

Jiang Shixue: «Research on Latin American Development Model», Beijing: Economic Management Press, 2007, page 241.

ly/ Western News: Latin America becomes the most unequal and violent region in the world», October 18, 2019

For its outstanding achievements, it has achieved market expansion and thus provided support for the industrial development of member countries. The other three have not made substantial progress, and the Central American Common Market also suffered from conflicts between member states in the late 1960s and early 1970s. into trouble due to border conflicts.

The industrialization of capital goods and durable consumer goods in Latin American countries has never gained the strength of large-scale markets. Therefore, it was difficult to obtain sufficient profitability and market competitiveness to support the development of the industry itself. It had to adopt a long-term model of relying on foreign debt to support industrial development. It eventually fell into crisis when the international financial environment suddenly changed in the 1980s. Industrialization The achievements were also destroyed. In the early days of modernization, East Asia implemented relatively thorough land reforms to realize land to the tiller. This not only effectively alleviated social conflicts and laid a stable social foundation for economic development, but also universally It has increased the income of the peasant class and laid a market foundation for the development of industry. Like Latin America, the industrialization of East Asia also started from the import substitution of simple industrial products. But the difference is that East Asia not only maximized the land reform from the beginning, Expanding the domestic market, and after fully tapping the domestic market potential, it promptly expanded the market of light industrial products to overseas through export incentives such as export subsidies, thus providing the basis for the subsequent capital- and technology-intensive development of durable consumer goods and capital goods. The industrialization of large-scale products has laid the foundation for a large-scale market, giving the heavy industrialization in East Asia an inherent market driving force and successfully achieving industrial upgrading. It is not as heavily dependent on foreign debt as Latin American countries.

Four Conclusions and Enlightenments

The land system problem has become the structural root constraining economic development in Latin America. People tend to believe that the historical delay in industrialization transformation, that is, the failure to switch from import-substituting industrialization to export-oriented industrialization in time like in East Asia, is the reason why Latin America began its economic decline in the 1980s. But from the perspective of the internal logic of industrialization, the biggest delay in Latin American countries may not be the delay in industrial transformation, but the delay in land reform. It is the delay in land reform that has led to the imbalance of the Latin American social structure, constant social conflicts, and difficulty in solving problems. Economic development provides a stable social environment. It is the delay in land reform that prevents Latin American countries from fully expanding their domestic markets and providing sufficient market demand support for industries based on increasing returns. At present, "deindustrialization" is considered to be a key factor in the economic structure of Latin America. The core issues of imbalance, high unemployment, and increased dependence on external markets. Latin American countries are also trying to restart the reindustrialization process. One of the keys to developing industry is to create the largest possible market for industry based on the increasing returns mechanism. Latin American countries want to restart Industrialization, the land system issues left over from its history cannot be ignored.

The importance of the market to industrial development cannot be overemphasized. The failure of industrialization in Latin American countries is largely due to the failure to pay enough attention to the market. The government's efforts to develop and cultivate the internal market

Insufficient, the external market is even more difficult to grasp. The smooth start of China's industrialization was due to the fair distribution of land through thorough land reform in the early days of the founding of the People's Republic of China, which laid a good institutional foundation for industrialization. On the basis of fair distribution of land, The reform of the household contract responsibility system in 1978 greatly released agricultural productivity, and farmers' income increased significantly. It not only provided the necessary surplus labor for the industrialization of primary products, but also provided extensive market support for the demand for industrial products. In the 1980s, In the late 1990s and early 1990s, China further opened up its coastal areas, integrated into the Asian production network by vigorously developing labor-intensive, export-led processing businesses, and implemented an international economic cycle strategy with both resources and markets out. With its huge labor force, Made in China Products have gained a foothold in international competition at low prices. The implementation of the international economic cycle strategy has enabled China to reap huge dividends from economic globalization. China's economy has grown at an average annual rate of 10% for more than 30 years. China has also grown from A poor, low-income country has entered the ranks of middle- and high-income countries. However, this international economic cycle strategy with both ends outside has also brought many hidden dangers to the healthy and sustainable development of China's economy. On the one hand, over-reliance on the external market has made China's economy has been less able to withstand external risks. After the outbreak of the international financial crisis in 2008, the shrinking external market has clearly constrained China's economic development. To this end, China has proposed a development strategy to expand domestic demand, but this has not fundamentally changed. On the other hand, with the deepening of opening up to the outside world, the imbalance of regional development in China has intensified. The gap between the rich and the poor between the eastern coastal areas and the central and western inland areas, and between cities and rural areas has expanded sharply. At present, China's regional economic imbalance and

the widening urban-rural income gap have become structural problems that restrict the release of China's large-scale domestic market potential. The above analysis in this article shows that the key to the failure of industrialization in Latin American countries is that it violates the market logic of industrialization development. At the beginning of industrialization, it failed to mobilize the production enthusiasm of the largest population within the country through effective institutional reforms, and effectively promoted the most fundamental interests of this population in order to provide the largest market support for the development of industrialization. It did not take root within the country. The industrialization of the largest population is like water without a source, and it will eventually be unsustainable. Under the current severe situation of deteriorating international market environment, the importance of the domestic market has become highlighted. We should learn from the lessons of the failure of industrialization in Latin American countries and take effective measures to Measures should take into account both efficiency and fairness, and use the "One Belt and One Road" strategy to promote the development of the central and western inland areas, increase farmers' income, narrow regional gaps and urban-rural gaps, break down institutional barriers that restrict domestic market unification, and elevate domestic market integration to the level of national strategy. It will be implemented at a high level to promote the transformation of China's industrialization from being driven by the international market to being driven by both domestic and international markets, so as to effectively safeguard China's economic security and promote the realization of the "Two Centenary" strategic goals.

(Editor Gao Han)