

ACCUMULATION OF CAPITAL, DISPOSSESSION AND DISPUTES OF AGRARIAN SPACES IN BRAZIL AND MÉXICO

ACUMULAÇÃO DE CAPITAL, DESAPROPRIAÇÃO E DISPUTAS
DE ESPAÇOS AGRÁRIOS NO BRASIL E NO MÉXICO

ACUMULACIÓN DE CAPITAL, DESPOJO Y DISPUTAS DE
ESPACIOS AGRARIOS EN BRASIL Y MÉXICO

Agustín Ávila Romero – Universidad Intercultural de Chiapas – San Cristóbal de las Casa – México
agustinavila@yahoo.com

Adriano Rodrigues de Oliveira – Universidade Federal de Goiás – Goiânia – Goiás – Brasil
adriano.ufg@gmail.com

Leon Enrique Ávila Romero – Universidad Intercultural de Chiapas – San Cristóbal de las Casa – México
leonenriqueavila@gmail.com

Abstract

The accumulation of capital in Latin America causes a process of dispossession of lands to peasants and indigenous peoples in different nations. And Mexico and Brazil are immersed in this dynamic despite having for several years other designs of economic and agricultural policy. Through a bibliographic and database research, we find a process of disputes between agrarian spaces between large transnational corporations and rural producers of both nations. Thus, the agrarian space is marked by the impulse of agribusiness, neoextractivism and the commodification of nature. Thus, a geographical reconfiguration of capital is constructed, where these countries are subordinated to global capitalism. It presents a process of real subsumption of the territory to capital that leads to the construction of regimes of expropriation in both nations and the strengthening of coloniality and the concentration and foreignization of land.

Keywords: dispossession, peasants, agribusiness, Brazil, Mexico.

Resumo

O acúmulo de capital na América Latina tem provocado o processo de desapropriação de terras para os camponeses e os povos indígenas em diferentes nações. O México e o Brasil estão submetidos à essa lógica, mesmo com adoção de políticas governamentais distintas, de governos populares que ascenderam ao poder nas últimas décadas, implementando políticas econômicas e agrícolas distintas. Por meio de revisão bibliográfica e análise de dados e informações secundárias, apresentamos um processo de disputas nos espaços agrários entre grandes corporações transnacionais e os produtores rurais das duas nações. Assim, o espaço agrário é marcado pela expansão do agronegócio, do neoextrativismo e da mercantilização da natureza. Assim, uma reconfiguração geográfica do capital é construída, submetendo esses países ao capitalismo global, caracterizada pela subsumção real do território ao capital que leva à construção de regimes de expropriação em ambas as nações e o fortalecimento da colonialidade e da concentração e estrangeirização da terra.

Palavras-chave: espoliação, camponeses, agronegócio, Brasil, México.

Resumen

La acumulación de capital en América Latina ocasiona un proceso de despojo de tierras a campesinos e

indígenas en diferentes naciones. Y México y Brasil se encuentran inmersos en esa dinámica pese a tener por varios años otros diseños de política económica y agropecuaria. A través de una investigación bibliográfica y de base de datos, encontramos un proceso de disputas de los espacios agrarios entre las grandes corporaciones transnacionales y los productores rurales de ambas naciones. Así el espacio agrario se encuentra marcado por el impulso del agronegocio, el neoextractivismo y la mercantilización de la naturaleza. Se construye así una reconfiguración geográfica del capital, donde dichos países se insertan de manera subordinada en el capitalismo global. Se presenta un proceso de subsunción real del territorio al capital que conlleva a la construcción de regímenes de desapropiación en ambas naciones y el fortalecimiento de la colonialidad y la concentración y extranjerización de tierras.

Palabras clave: despojo, campesinos, agronegocio, Brasil, México.

Introduction

The agrarian issue in Latin America revolves around an impressive process of dispossession of the peasants and indigenous people of this continent. What is also accompanied by the closure of any process of access to the lands of new social groups, that is, the closure of agrarian reform by governments related to international capital and a new concentration of landowners in many regions.

In contrast, large areas of rural or natural areas of the territories of our continent have become new spaces for valorization and profit seeking by the capitalists. We are thus witnessing an unusual movement of capital towards the peasant and indigenous spaces in the search for extraordinary profits. This has also generated processes of resistance and re-existence on the part of rural actors with a sense of territoriality. (Porto-Gonçalves, 2001).

Among the lines of exploitation of capitalism in rural areas are: 1) the drive to the productive reconversion of peasant and indigenous production, to contribute to the food subordination of the inhabitants with the loss of the food sovereignty of our nations. To them is added 2) the neoextractivism that through mining, hydrocarbons, tourism, wind farms, gas pipelines, pipelines and construction of dams and infrastructure, seeks a new production of rural space according to the dynamics of global capitalism. And 3) the commodification of nature through the creation of mechanisms of privatization of common goods such as water, biodiversity and various environmental services, to which is added the appropriation of international corporations through patents on the biological wealth of the planet with its consequent valorization.

This article is divided into three sections in addition to this introduction and the final conclusions. In the first section we present

the theoretical framework about the processes in force in Latin America, highlighting the contemporary strategies of appropriation and use of territories markedly marked by dispossession and expropriation. In the second section, we present how these processes are territorialized in Brazil, with the drive to commoditization/reprimarization of the economy and the foreignization of land. In the third section, we analyze the territorialization of agro-food monopolies, mining and the expropriation of indigenous and peasant communities in Mexican territory.

Original accumulation, accumulation by dispossession and regimes of expropriation in Latin America

One of the mechanisms used in this phase of capitalist development are megaprojects through the incorporation of rural territories around large geostrategic plans such as the Mesoamerica Project that covers Mexico to Colombia, or the Initiative for the Integration of South American Regional Infrastructure (IIRSA), in which 12 nations of South America participate, in the matter of construction of regional energy, transport and telecommunications infrastructure and which fundamentally seeks to facilitate the extraction of natural resources. This is so because

The megaprojects are a necessity according to the magnitude of the development of world capitalism in two senses: one with almost unimaginable productions of merchandise, for excessive consumption of some sectors; and the second as infrastructures, since capital requires these works to maintain the machinery that allows it to close consumption cycles. That is why megaprojects are the spatial manifestation of the development of neoliberal capitalism on a global scale (Ibarra, 2016, p. 26).

Together with the impulse to megaprojects, we are witnessing the formation of a transnational capitalist class and transnational states (Robinson, 2007) that impose the transnational agenda in the field of Latin America, above the food, environmental and socio-cultural needs of their inhabitants. All this accompanied by a territoriality of the corporations that assign the goods to be produced, the technological orientations and rhythms, the control of consumption and ways of life, and the disciplining of social life. (Ceceña, 2016)

Thus, a geographical reconfiguration of capital is created, where our continent is subordinated to global capitalism, through the promotion of extractivism and the expansion of agribusiness, which promote large mining, agro-industrial, bioprospective and infrastructure projects, where the dynamics of dispossession always appears.

Large impacts on peasant and ecological life in Latin America occur where:

The transformation of food and raw materials into objects of speculation (commodities) does not constitute, therefore, an economic process that comes from the mechanical functioning of the system, but responds to a dominance strategy, which is why the food crisis has greatly benefited the Anglo-Saxon agro-food, energy and financial companies (Rubio, 2014, p. 19)

This last phase of geographical and agro-food dominance by transnational corporations has increased the dispossession, exploitation, repression and racism¹ faced by peasants and indigenous people in the south of our planet, for defending their natural resources and ways of life, this has raised the emergence of political ontologies that clearly pose territory and difference as ways of doing politics beyond universalizing visions (Escobar, 2014).

Thus, in the 21st century, the process of subsuming territories to the dynamics of capital continues with greater force (Revelli, 1997). Territories become strategic issues for capital in the 21st century, so what capital seeks is to subordinate those territories to capitalist logic.

The control of the territory becomes a key productive factor as it directly generates conditions to generate value. This is today the scene of the most significant confrontations between the capital and the guardians of the earth, the original peoples (Rodríguez, 2015, p. 50).

As they have well noted in the case of Latin America there are moments of territorial subjugation (Núñez et al., 2015). The first corresponding to the process of original accumulation of capital that Marx studied (1867) where there is a separation of the peasants from their means of production and is where at the territorial level there is land dispossession and territorial reorganization, what they call formal subsumption of the territory to the capital. For its part, the process of real

subsumption of the territory to capital implies the use of technological innovations in the production process with an unprecedented intensification of the aggression of Mother Earth – as many indigenous peoples of the continent call it.

So with the real subsumption of the territory the capital

It begins to produce a space directly at its own measure. That is, a space determined by the sovereign demands of the economic. A space cut to the measure of the productive demands, a space directly `capitalist`, that realizes precisely the real subsumption of the territory to its valorization process (Revelli, 1997, p. 60).

An example of this is what we see now in Latin America with open-pit mining, the construction of waterways in the Amazon basin or the destruction of biodiversity with agroforestry plantations such as African palm or eucalyptus on the continent.

It is important to note that Mesoamerica, the Andean region, the Amazon and the Southern Cone harbor landscapes and natural, cultural and political assets that constitute an invaluable biogeographic heritage threatened with this geographical reconfiguration of capital (Porto-Gonçalves et al., 2016).

This leads us to try to understand the current processes of the agrarian question in Latin America and of dispossession, through the discussion that is generated between the understanding of the original accumulation explained in Chapter 24 of Volume I of Marx's *Capital* (1867), the assertion by David Harvey (2004) that we are experiencing a process of accumulation by dispossession, and the position of Michael Lieven (2013, 2014) of expropriation regimes, all this serves to explain the complexity of the processes of global capitalism in the rural spaces.

Marx explains clearly in *Capital* that the history of capitalism is based on the violent dispossession of the means of production of the peasants, and with it, their ways of life and their relations with nature. It is not an economic act alone but also the institution of new legal mechanisms and political power, based on property, the market and surplus value. Marx emphasizes that dispossession and violence are the inseparable pair of the process of the functioning of capitalism as a world system, where capital resorts in a cyclical manner to the same mechanism of original accumulation in new territories and rural spaces.

This is complemented by Rosa Luxemburg (1967, p. 285) when she states that

Capital can not develop without the means of production and the labor force of the entire planet. To deploy, without obstacles, the movement of accumulation, you need the natural treasures and the labor forces of the whole earth. But these are in fact, in their great majority, linked to pre-capitalist forms of production-this is the historical means of capital accumulation-arises here the irresistible impulse of capital to seize those territories and societies.

For what Luxemburg concludes based on Marx that the struggle against the natural economy, – understand other territories – is fundamental for capitalism so the dynamics of dispossession and violence are part of the capitalist operation. And therefore, – we note – the dispossession is the central point that pumps blood to the heart of contemporary capitalism. We are not talking only of dispossession as part of colonial history, but as the engine of the functioning of current capitalism.

For his part, David Harvey (2004) the tendency of the capitalist system to produce crises of over-accumulation of capital creates surplus (expressed as a glut of commodities on the market, which can not be sold without losses, and unused productive capacity or surplus capital-money that lack opportunities for productive and profitable investment) and surplus labor (rising unemployment), which coexist without clear possibilities of combining in a useful way.

To resolve this tendency to overaccumulation, capital uses the process of geographical expansion and spatial reconfiguration allowing other parts of the world-the rural worlds- fully incorporated into the dynamics of valorization of capital and thus of exploitation and dispossession their different economic and social practices.

In this way of production of space Harvey develops, the concept of accumulation by dispossession, which from his point of view includes the original accumulation of Marx, but also a new set of dispossession processes:

[...] the emphasis on intellectual property rights in the WTO negotiations (the so-called TRIPS agreement) marks the ways through which patents and licenses for genetic materials, seed plasma, and any form of other products, can be used against entire populations

whose environmental management practices have played a crucial role in the development of these materials. Biopiracy is galloping, and the plundering of the world stock of genetic resources for the benefit of a few multinational companies is underway. The recent depredation of global environmental goods (land, air, water) and the proliferation of environmental degradation, which prevents anything but capital-intensive modes of agricultural production, have resulted from the total transformation of nature into merchandise. The commodification of cultural forms, histories and intellectual creativity supposes total dispossession - the music industry stands out for the appropriation and exploitation of popular culture and creativity. The corporatization and privatization of previously public assets (such as universities), not to mention the wave of privatization of water and other public services (Harvey, 2004, p. 114).

The examples of accumulation by dispossession according to Harvey include the expropriation of land and natural resources of the peasant populations, the conversion of communal or state property into private property, the extraction of rents for the rights of intellectual property, the privatization of collective social goods, such as health, education, and the pension system, among others, this concept helps to understand the functioning of contemporary capitalism.

As Miguel Teubal and Tomas Palmisano (2013) affirm, it must be noted that this process of accumulation by dispossession is traversed in Latin America by the coloniality of power and the concentration of the land by the financial and agro-industrial capital that seeks above all the differential rent.

That constitutive coloniality is important, to visualize the capitalist dynamics as non-homogeneous between continents or nations. From Latin America we can observe then a structural heterogeneity that allows us to locate the processes of dispossession at different times and places according to diverse political, economic and ideological factors and not only dependent on the functioning of global capitalism.

This brings us to Michael Levien (2014, 2015) who points out that the specific configuration in a certain place can be understood as a particular dispossession regime. For this author, a dispossession regime represents an institutionalized means to dispossess assets to their current owners or users. This requires a State willing to dispossess in the name of

a set of economic purposes linked to class interests and the construction of consensus to make dispossession possible.

For Levien (2015) to understand the way in which societies expropriate land and natural resources, and the way they produce space, in different political-economic configurations is central, since there are fundamental differences in capitalist development between different nations and continents.

In our particular case, various institutional policies are put in place in Latin America that tell us about two large configurations that open up the possibility of speaking about specific dispossession regimes, on the one hand the countries that apply the Washington consensus and the neoliberal norms of orthodox way, where the Mexican case stands out and what was the idea of the neo-developmental countries – until the coup d'état of 2016 in Brazil – (Mitidiero Junior, 2017). We will analyze the Brazilian case first.

The recent stage of capital accumulation in Brazil: foreignization of land and commoditization of the economy

Brazil, due to its territorial dimension that exceeds 8.5 million km², concentrates a large amount of natural resources that can be synthesized in three basic dimensions that make up its territory: water, land and subsoil.

It is well known that these dimensions of the Brazilian territory are separable only from the point of view of the abstract exercise of thought, because they are concretely imbricated in the totality of the relations that exist between society and nature. Thus the process of constitution of the Brazilian territory, has as a special characteristic its submission to the colonial interests of the Portuguese metropolis in the beginning of the 16th century.

Brazil – as well as the other Latin American nations – is marked by the phases before and after the European invasion in its economic-social formation. From a period in which intersubjective relations were given by subject-subject conformation, through the balance between indigenous societies and nature, for a period composed of successive stages that were shaping a new relationship between subject-object, dictated by the rhythm of accumulation driven by the Industrial Revolution (NÚÑEZ et al., 2015).

Thus, the rupture of the harmonious relations between nature and society occurred, passing on to the dominion of the first by the second. Such an irruption ultimately means the acceleration of the process of degradation of environmental conditions.

The recent stage of capital accumulation in Brazil has been strongly influenced by the potential offered by the natural resources that make up its territory. Harvey (2004) supported in Luxembourg (1968) develops the concept of accumulation by dispossession to explain the two processes that would be “organically linked”: 1) obtaining surplus value by the alignment of the peasants and workers of the means of production and 2) the relations between the capitalists and the non-capitalist modes of production, which begin to emerge on the international stage. All this for the expanded reproduction of capital in the international scale, the strategies used can win multiple characteristics that go through fraud, oppression, pillage, etc.

On the one hand, the successive crises of international capital, notably the last one that broke out in 2008, on the other hand, the food and energy crises that have unleashed a “runaway run” by territories, where there is abundance for land for the cultivation of food and alternative forms of energy. It is observed that the territorialization of capital in the agrarian space has constituted an important strategy to allow the maintenance of the extended reproduction, and therefore, the economic recovery of the international corporations, that by the diversification of their capitals, have extended their tentacles in the development of agribusiness in countries of Latin America, the Caribbean and sub-Saharan Africa (Clements; Fernandes, 2013).

In Brazil, the reserve of productive lands has triggered a series of land management strategies by both the State and the agribusiness corporations. The delimitation of the productive region of MATOPIBA (acronym formed by the initials of the states of Maranhão, Tocantins, Piauí e Bahia) through the Agricultural Development Plan (PDA), established by Presidential Decree No. 8.447 in 2015, makes that portion of the territory of the Brazilian biome “Cerrado” in a great attraction for the national and international financial capital. The region totals 73 million hectares and includes the territories of diverse traditional populations (Quilombolas and Indigenous) and peasants. (Brasil de Fato, 2017)

Such action makes clear the pact established with private capital, once with the regulation of that geoeconomic region, the company RADAR Propiedades Agrícolas S.A.² step to act in the region with a view to speculate with the ownership of the land (Pitta; Mendonça, 2015). The performance of RADAR in the biome of the *Cerrado*, demonstrates the hybrid character that the agribusiness corporations have assumed, once COSAN S.A. – responsible for the negotiations – is originally from the sugarcane agribusiness. That same company, created a joint venture to act in the production of ethanol and sugar with the oil company Royal Dutch Shell: a Raizen – which happened to be responsible for the annual production of 2.2 billion liters of ethanol and 4 million tons of sugar. (Xavier; Pitta; Mendonça, 2011).

The territorialization of the sugarcane agribusiness anchored in the binomial represented by the production of sugar and ethanol as an agrofuel – a sector historically subsidized by the Brazilian State, notably from Proálcool in 1975 – had a new impetus for the advance of its agricultural frontier through of the National Agroenergy Plan (2006-2011) which, based on an agroecological zoning of the territory carried out by the EMBRAPA (Brazilian Agricultural Research Company), established the areas suitable for the internalization of sugarcane cultivation in the *Cerrado* biomes and of the Brazilian Pantanal, resulting in the growth of sugarcane production in states such as Goiás (908 thousand hectares), Minas Gerais (811 thousand hectares) and Mato Grosso do Sul (677 thousand hectares) that came to be listed respectively as second, third and fourth largest producer of sugarcane in the country, which had the state of Sao Paulo (4,678 million hectares) as the main producer in 2015, out of a total of 8,995 million hectares cultivated with sugarcane in the country (CONAB, 2015).

It is observed that the agribusiness corporations have found fertile ground in Brazil for the production of food (soy, corn and sugar) and for the production of agrofuels (soy for biodiesel and sugarcane for ethanol), having the State as the main agent of ordering the territory, offering credit, creating infrastructures related to logistics (Ferrovia Norte-Sur, the production of electricity (Belo Monte Hydroelectric Plant), among other things.

The territorialization of the agribusiness is anchored in the appropriation of the land, but also of the superficial waters (rivers and

lakes) and underground (mainly extracted from the Guarani Aquifer) used for a long time in the irrigation of the agricultural lands and in the agroindustrial processing of the materials bonuses like sugar cane and soybeans. In addition to the centrality that water has for international corporations, Mendonça e Mesquita (2007) developed the concept of “*agrohídronegócio*” (*agrohydrobusiness*) to demonstrate the modus operandi orchestrated by national and international corporations for the expanded reproduction of capital through the production of commodities and the export of water and soil incorporated in the raw materials exported by the country.

The other dimension of the territory explored by the international corporations is the extraction of minerals, this has triggered a restructuring of the regulatory framework regarding the exploration of the Brazilian subsoil. Since 2013 this debate in the National Congress, the New Mining Code, which in the regulation seeks the privilege of the interests of private capital, without effective dialogue with the traditional and peasant populations that will be affected, as the social movements that have established the (Re) existence (for example, the Movement of those Affected by Mining -MAM)

In addition to the New Code, draft law 1610/96, whose centrality is to authorize mining on indigenous lands, is being debated, which, if carried out, will raise even more the conflicts with those historically deprived peoples. Such a situation gains more drastic contours when the formation of a Parliamentary Front of Mining is verified, which according to the study of the Pastoral Commission of the Land counts 224 deputies which is equivalent to 43.66% of the 513 federal deputies. (CPT, 2015).

Therefore, mining is considered as a component of the totality formed by the territory, and therefore, at the heart of the agrarian question in Latin America. The private appropriation of the subsoil (institutionally constituted as a good in the Union, Art. 20 of the Federal Constitution), by national and foreign corporations, composes the centrality in the agrarian and class conflicts in the current Brazil.

The accumulation of capital in Mexico, the dispute over agrarian spaces and the neo-liberal agro-export domain

Mexico has a geographical area of close to 2 million square kilometers. With a climatic, geological, landscaping and cultural diversity, it stands out worldwide as the center of origin of diverse crops, among which corn stands out.

With a unique relationship with nature, the ancient Mexicans not only took advantage of the space on which they developed great technological inventions but built great cities such as Teotihuacán, Tenochtitlan Mexico, Chichen Itzá, among others, which have architectural monuments that are the heritage of humanity.

Upon the arrival of the Spanish in the sixteenth century, various empires and city-states developed a way of life linked to agriculture with great agricultural, architectural, astronomical, numerical knowledge, etc. With the conquest military, religious, economic and political, the impressive descent of the Mesoamerican population – which will recover until the 18th century – and the history of dispossession and exploitation of the original inhabitants began.

But it was especially in the second half of the nineteenth century - and with an independent Mexico – where European liberal thought came to power and began the process of expropriation of indigenous lands to build large estates linked to the exploitation of cotton, sugar cane, henequen, among various agricultural products. It was of such size the looting and the social discomfort engendered, that led to the first decade of the twentieth century in the most important peasant and indigenous uprising in Latin America, that was what is known today as the Mexican Revolution.

Thanks to that armed movement, Mexico is one of the few countries in Latin America that could build a partial agrarian reform that placed more than half of the land in the hands of indigenous and peasants. As a result of this, the post-revolutionary pact that gives rise to the Mexican Bonapartist State is built, where these peasant and indigenous masses replaced their political rights in exchange for their reproduction, based on agrarian property and the subsidy of the city by the rural worlds.

All this built in Mexico large spaces dominated by peasant and indigenous life that produced mainly the food that families and the

country required. But above all, a peasant class is formed that reproduces socially and is recognized by society in different cultural and political dimensions.

Armando Bartra (2011, p. 19) puts it this way:

The word peasant designates a way of producing sociability, a culture but above all it designates a player of major leagues, a vague social subject who has earned his place in history. Being a peasant is many things but above all it is belonging to a class: occupying a specific place in the economic order, confronting similar predators, sharing a tragic and glorious past, participating in a common project. Especially the latter: participate in a dream; share a myth and a utopia.

And these peasants participated – with few exceptions – in the stability that Mexico had until the 80s of the 20th century, when the neoliberal reforms of privatization of public goods began, commercial opening and reduction of social spending. All this process transformed the food self-sufficiency that Mexico had achieved in the seventies, to make way for the cereal surpluses of the United States and agro-food imports.

And despite the existence since 1994 of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) between Mexico, the United States and Canada, millions of peasants have resisted the process of expropriation of land for agricultural, mining, tourism, environmental or oil companies. As Luciano Concheiro (2010) has studied, the collective property of the land has increased and the number of peasants also, despite all the catastrophic visions of NAFTA.

According to the Agrarian Registry of Mexico (RAN, 2013), 100 million 235 thousand hectares are under the domain of social ownership of the land, with more than 4 million land owners and more than 25 million Mexicans classified as rural population.

But also according to (Ávila, 2016) NAFTA has caused major territorial reconfigurations where we observe income and usufruct processes of the best irrigated land for the production of fruit or vegetables, achieving peasant subordination to agro-industry. Peasants move decision-making about what to grow, what to harvest, and what technological package to employ several agro-industrial corporations.

Thus, a basic dispute over agrarian spaces is built between agro-industrial companies linked to the export of agricultural goods and

peasant production aimed at the production of food for the domestic market.

Another element of dispute arises between the growing dominance of financial capital over the productive sphere, which brings with it the appearance of different processes of real estate, tourism, energy, etc., speculation around peasant and indigenous lands.

And finally, in Mexico the agro-energy domain of the territory is expressed in the big disputes that have with various corporations that seek to exploit oil wells, install wind or solar parks, use mining resources or promote monocultures linked to agrofuels such as African Palm, Pinon or Sorghum. In addition, as in Brazil, large agro-hydro-energy megaprojects, airports, railways, highways and Special Economic Zones are promoted, which have the function of creating logistic nodes that facilitate the reduction of the circulation time of capital and thus the realization of the surplus value (Ávila, 2017).

And it is that in the logic of increasing their profits capitalists resort to extraordinary profit through income, where according to Moraes and Da Costa (2009, p. 98):

The differential rent rests on the specific qualities of the place, whether natural (such as soil fertility, water in abundance) or added by human work (advantageous location in urban distribution or have infrastructure and services, or close to the markets potential), which is reflected in a difference between the individual price of production of producers who have better conditions (natural or aggregate) and the average price of production.

For example, according to information from the National Agrarian Registry (2013) in 11, 459 agrarian nuclei of Mexico (social landowners) are carried out agricultural, mining, tourism, ecological or industrial projects, covering an area of about 45 million hectares, so it is observed that about half of social property is under siege of capital and the pursuit of profit through exploitation and dispossession.

Jaime Martínez (2018) makes an analysis about the indigenous conflicts that occur in Mexico and are notable for the number of them, in the states of Chiapas, Oaxaca, Guerrero, Puebla and Hidalgo. It clearly indicates that the main dispute at the national level is due to the development of mining and agricultural projects that violate the right to territory and the enjoyment of natural resources possessed by indigenous peoples.

According to Carlos Rodríguez (2015) there are 1160 mining projects -the majority in the hands of foreign companies- that were developed in Mexico in 2014, where the main feature is the spatial shift towards the south of these extractive corporations since previously only they were located in the north of the country. The interest of companies to invest in Mexico is because it is a privileged geographic space since it is the first world producer of silver, bismuth the second, lead and molybdenum in the fourth, of zinc the sixth and of gold the eighth.

Mexico had granted by the end of 2014 a total of 44 thousand 623 mining concessions covering an area of 36 million hectares, 20% of the national territory, of which 50% are on areas of social ownership of land by peasants and indigenous people. Among the mining companies include Goldcorp, Agnico Eagle, Alamos Gold, Minera Frisco.

For its part, the agricultural issue faces the construction of an agro-food export model, making Mexico the 12th. world agri-food exporter, dedicating more than 24 million hectares to agricultural production and more than 109 million hectares to livestock production. The main export products include avocado, tomato and berries to the markets of the United States, Japan and Canada, mainly. The agri-food export is fundamental for the Mexican economy, since it is the main source of foreign currency over remittances, tourism and oil. From 1980 to 2016 the crops that increased their production area the most were pastures, forage maize, agave, lemon and oats (Sagarpa, 2016).

Conclusions

The two configurations that have developed in Latin America between neo-development and the continuity of the neoliberal economic model show that the capitalist system has been able to adapt to changes in the productive matrixes. In the case of neo-development, the State has taken a different role in the development of the productive forces, generating another type of extractivism, designated by Gudynas (2011) as “progressive neo-extractivism” whose main characteristic is the protagonism of the States that with the tutelage of the governments that made viable the exploitation of natural resources for export despite the strong social and/or environmental impacts. In this sense and exemplified by the foregoing, it is not minor, nor

peripheral, that these particularities of the current context are supported by three spheres; the State and politics, science and technology and communication for its greater acceptance. Subjected to the interests of the agribusiness that is presented as the modern phase of the latifundium of modern-colonial monocultures, we witness the metamorphosis of agricultural production in the production of fuels based on biomass. This is one of the global characteristics of capitalism and the development of the productive forces that capital imposes on the world, as Porto-Gonçalves (2008) has also explained.

And it is that the disputes of the agrarian spaces both in Brazil and in Mexico are not only relevant because they are the two main economies of Latin America, but also because the peasant and indigenous resistance that are built, also show the possibilities to build a new world beyond capitalist relations, which only seek profit through the destruction of nature and the exploitation of human beings and the earth. That will be the crucial dispute in the 21st century.

Notes

1 The Zapatistas write about the four wheels of capitalism: exploitation, dispossession, repression and racism (Sub Marcos, 2013).

2 The company Radar was started in 2008 and has as main shareholders Cosan S/A, with 19%, and Mansilla Participações S/A, subsidiary of TIAA-CREF, with 81%, which makes it the majority company. The index capital of RADAR S.A. It was approximately 400 million dollars (Pitta; Mendonça, 2015).

References

ÁVILA, A. R.; CARÁMBULA M.; OLIVEIRA, A. R. de; ÁVILA L. Reestructuración capitalista, dominio agro-energético y disputas territoriales en México, Uruguay y Brasil. *Revista Argumentos*, Ciudad de México, n. 83, p. 17-42, ene/abr. 2017.

ÁVILA, A. Capitalismo y luchas socio-territoriales en Chiapas, México. *Revista Geonordeste*, São Cristóvão, n. 2, p.77-93, Feb. 2017.

ÁVILA, A.; AVILA, L. Las nuevas zonas económicas especiales en México: despojo agrario y resistencia campesina. *Revista NERA*, Presidente Prudente, São Paulo, v. 20, n. 40, p. 138-162, dez. 2017b.

BARTRA, A. *Campesindios: aproximaciones a los campesinos de un continente colonizado*. Ecuador: Ediciones La Tierra, 2011.

BORQUEZ, L. C.; BERLANGA, H. R. Tierra, territorio y poder a cien años de la reforma agraria en México: lucha y resistencia campesindia frente al capital. In: ALMEYRA, G. et al. (Coord.), *Capitalismo: tierra y poder en América Latina (1982-2012)*. México: UAM/Clacso/Ediciones Continente, 2014. p. 181-224. (v. III).

BRASIL DE FATO. *Terras na região do Cerrado viram alvo de especuladores*. Belém, 06 fev. 2017. Disponível em: <<https://www.brasildefato.com.br/2017/02/06/terras-na-regiao-do-matopiba-viram-alvo-de-especuladores/>>. Acesso em: 08 fev. 2017.

CECEÑA, A. La territorialidad de las corporaciones. In: CECEÑA, A.; ORNELAS, R. (Org.) *Las corporaciones y la economía-mundo*. 1. ed. México: UNAM-SIGLO XXI editores, 2016.

CONAB. Companhia Nacional de Abastecimento. *Acompanhamento Safra Brasileira*. Cana, v. 2 - Safra 2015/16, n. 3 - terceiro levantamento, Brasília, p. 1-65, dez./2015. Disponível em: <<https://www.cptnacional.org.br/index.php/component/jdownloads/send/41-conflitos-no-campo-brasil-publicacao/14019-conflitos-no-campo-brasil-2015>>. Acesso em: 26 jul. 2018.

CPT. Comissão Pastoral da Terra. *Cadernos de Conflitos no Campo*. Coordenação: Antônio Canuto, Cássia Regina da Silva Luz, Thiago Valentim Pinto Andrade – Goiânia. CPT Nacional Goiânia – Brasil, 2015. 240 p.

CLEMENTS, E. A.; FERNANDES, B. M. Estrangeirização, agronegócio e campesinato no Brasil e Moçambique. In: *Observador Rural*, n. 6, maio 2013. Disponível em: <http://www.omrmz.org/imagens/publicacoes/Observador_6.pdf>. Acesso em: 16 mar. 2017.

ESCOBAR, A. *Senti pensar con la tierra: nuevas lecturas sobre desarrollo, territorio y diferencia*. 1. ed. Medellín: Ediciones UNAULA, 2014.

GUDYNAS, E. Más allá del nuevo extractivismo: transiciones sostenibles y alternativas al desarrollo. In: WANDERLEY, F. (Org.) *El desarrollo en cuestión: reflexiones desde América Latina*. La Paz, Bolivia: Oxfam y CIDES UMSA, 2011. p. 379-410.

HARVEY, D. El 'nuevo' imperialismo: acumulación por desposesión. *Socialist Register*, v. 10, n. 1, p. 99-129, 2004.

IBARRA, V. Los megaproyectos desde una geografía crítica. In: IBARRA, V.; TALLEDOS, E. (Org.) *Megaproyectos en México una lectura crítica*. 1. ed. Ciudad de México: UNAM, 2016.

LEVIEN, M. The land question: special economic zones and the political economy of dispossession in India. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, v. 39, n. 3-4, p. 933-969, Jul/Oct. 2012.

LEVIEN, M. Regimes of dispossession: from steel towns to special economic zones. *Development and Change*. v. 44, n. 2, p. 381-407, dec. 2013.

LEVIEN, M. Da acumulação primitiva aos regimes de desapropriação. *Sociologia & Antropologia*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 4, n.1, p. 21-53, jun. 2014.

- LUXEMBURGO, R. [1913] *La acumulación de capital*. Ciudad de México: Ed. Grijalbo, 1967.
- MARTÍNEZ, J. V. Conflictos indígenas en México: una aproximación. *Revista El Cotidiano*, Ciudad de México, p. 21-29, ene./feb. 2018.
- MARX, K. [1867] *El Capital*. México, DF: Ed. Siglo XXI, 2004. Tomo I.
- MENDONÇA, M. R.; MESQUITA, H. A. O Agro-hidro-negócios no Cerrado Goiano: a construção das (re)sistências. In: ENCONTRO BRASILEIRO DE CIÊNCIAS SOCIAIS E DE BARRAGENS, 2., 2017, Salvador, Bahia. Anais... Salvador, Bahia, 2017.
- MITIDIERO JUNIOR, M. A. Violência no campo brasileiro em tempos de golpe. *Boletim DATALUTA*, n. 114, jun. 2017.
- NÚÑEZ, V., CONCHEIRO, L.; COUTURIER, P. Tecnologías mineras que violentan a la madre tierra: subsunción formal y real de los territorios en el capital. *Revista Geonordeste*, São Cristóvão, Año XXVI, n. 1, p. 197-214, ene./jul. 2015.
- PITTA, F. T.; MENDONÇA, M. L. *A empresa Radar S/A e a especulação de terras no Brasil*. São Paulo: Rede Social de Justiça e Direitos Humanos, 2015.
- PORTO-GONÇALVES, C. W. P. *Amazônia, Amazônia*. 3. ed. São Paulo: Contexto, 2001.
- PORTO-GONÇALVES, C. W. P.; HOCSMAN, L. D. (Org.). *Despojos y resistencias en América Latina/Abya Yala*. 1. ed. Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires: Estudios Sociológicos Editora, 2016.
- PORTO-GONÇALVES, C. W. P. Otra verdad inconveniente: la nueva geografía política de la energía en una perspectiva subalterna. *Polis - Revista de la Universidad Bolivariana de Chile*, v. 7, n. 21, p. 105-143, 2008.
- REVELLI, M. Crisis del Estado-nación, territorio, nuevas formas de conflicto y de sociabilidad. *Viento del Sur*, Ciudad de México, n. 11, 1997.
- ROBINSON, W. *Una teoría sobre el capitalismo global: producción, clases y estado en un mundo transnacional*. 1. ed. Bogota, Colombia: Ediciones desde abajo, 2007.
- RODRIGUEZ, C. *Geopolítica del desarrollo local: campesinos, empresas y gobiernos en la disputa por territorios y bienes naturales en el México rural*. Xochimilco-ITACA: Ed. UAM, 2015. 255 p. (Colección Teoría y Análisis).
- RODRIGUEZ, S. *Apuntes sobre el pensamiento crítico vs las mutaciones de la hidra en el pensamiento crítico frente a la hidra capitalista*. 1. ed. México: EZLM, 2015. Tomo II.
- RUBIO, B. *El dominio del hambre: crisis de hegemonía y alimentos*. 1. ed. México: Chapingo-CP/Juan Pablos Editores, 2014.
- SAGARPA. Servicio de Información Agroalimentaria y Pesquera. *Atlas Agroalimentario*. México, 2016.

TEUBAL, M.; TOMAS, P. Procesos rentísticos y el extractivismo en América Latina. In: GIARRACA, N.; TEUBAL M. (Org.) *Actividades extractivas en expansión. ¿Reprimerización de la economía argentina*. 1. ed. Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires: Antropofagia, 2013.

XAVIER, C. V.; PITTA, F.T.; MENDONÇA, M. L. *Monopólio da produção de etanol no Brasil: a fusão Cosan-Shell*. In: Rede Social de Justiça e Direitos Humanos (Org.). *Direitos Humanos no Brasil 2011 - Relatório da Rede Social de Justiça e Direitos: Expressão Popular*, 2011.

Agustin Avila Romero – Doctor and masters degree in Rural Development by the UAM-Xochimilco, medal to the academic merit of the UAM, Bachelor in Economics, Faculty of Economics of the UNAM. Visiting Professor at the Institute of Socio-Environmental Studies UFG-Brasil, full-time professor at Intercultural University of Chiapas (UNICH), Mexico. He participates in the Laboratory of Studies and Investigations on Territorial Dynamics (Laboter) and the Group of Studies and Research Work, Territory and Public Policies (Trappu) of Brazil. He is a member of the Academic Body Heritage, Territory and Development on the southern border of Mexico. Member of the National System of Researchers Level 1 Conacyt. Accompanist of social movements, student of the agrarian question, promoter of solidarity economy and agroecology processes and public policy analyst related to rural and territorial development. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4205-0789>

Adriano Rodrigues de Oliveira – Graduated with masters and doctorate in geography from the São Paulo State University (UNESP-Presidente Prudente). Coordinating member of the Work, Territory and Public Policies Study and Research Group (Trappu), linked to the Laboratory of Studies and Investigations of Territorial Dynamics (Laboter); researcher of the Group of Studies and Investigations on the Regional and Agricultural Dynamics (GEDRA) of the Faculty of Sciences and Technology of the UNESP-Presidente Prudente. He made an academic stay at the University of Toulouse, Le Mirail (France). He is currently an adjunct professor at the Federal University of Goiás (UFG) linked to the Institute of Socio-environmental Studies (IESA), in the undergraduate and postgraduate courses in Geography, at the Samambaia-Goiânia campus. He has experience in the area of human geography with emphasis on agrarian geography; his research topics: associativism, peasant family agriculture (settlers and traditional farmers), agroecology, public policies and rural development. <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6477-5364>

Leon Enrique Avila Romero – Doctor in Agrarian Sciences, masters degree in Rural Development and engineer in Agroecology. Member of the National System of Researchers CONACYT Level 1, leader of the Academic Body Heritage, Territory and Development in the Southern Border of Mexico, research line Biocultural Heritage, Territory and Agroecology. He has written more than 21 book chapters and 20 scientific articles. Full-time Professor at the Intercultural University of Chiapas (UNICH).

Received for publication on April 23, 2018.

Accepted for publication on June 2, 2018.