

IASCP Europe Regional Meeting
**Building the European Commons: from Open Fields to
Open Source**

Brescia - Italy - March 23-25,2006

**Title: COMMONS FOR SUSTAINABILITY. LESSONS IN HISTORICAL
PERSPECTIVE FROM THE SPANISH CASE, XVIIITH – XXTH CENTURY.**

Ortega Santos, Antonio¹
Herrera González de Molina, A.²
Soto Fernández, D.²
González de Molina, M.²

Keywords: Environmental History, Common Property, Dislocation.

González de Molina, Manuel
Herrera González de Molina, Antonio
Ortega Santos, Antonio
Soto Fernández, David

Introduction

In this paper we offer a contribution around the common goods, and the historiographical discussion in Spain about natural resources having in common. In the first steps of environmental history, ecological efficiency of common woodlands, especially belonged to peasant communities, has been basic variable for its development. Debate unreasonably polarized between defender and detractors of common property and its ability for conserving Spanish woodlands. Both them may be qualified like “nominalist”, due to they don’t incorporate that the degree of conservation, which reveals Spanish woodlands, isn’t correlated directly with the kind of property implemented. We propose an alternative theory for understanding the forestry dynamic of common woodlands not based on the form of property or ecological efficiency of the management. That theory rests on the concept “dislocation of common property” that may explain the present-day situation and the dynamic history.

1. The Debate regarding “The Tragedy of the Commons”.

From the well-known article of Gardin about “the tragedy of the commons” and particularly since the growth of environmental consciousness, many social scientists and a majority of ecologists began to ensure the suitable forms of management of natural resources and

¹ Departamento de Historia Contemporánea, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Campus de Cartuja s/n
Universidad de Granada, Granada, 18071, Spain, Email: aortegas@ugr.es, phone number: 34 958 243635,
fax number: 34 958 248979

² Area de Historia Contemporánea, Facultad de Humanidades, Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Sevilla, Crta.
Utrera Km. 1, 41013, email: ahergon@upo.es; dsotfer@upo.es; mgonnav@upo.es, phone number : 34
954349099

environmental services that all societies have had in common. Since then, goods such as water resources, fisheries, air and surface water have been out of economist and ecologist interest, perhaps due to the fact that economic development and productive activities had not been affected. As Naredo (1999) said “these resources hadn’t been considered economic goods”.

What is the most suitable form of efficient property management of such important resources? Hardin’s approach has been the object of large debate still at hand³. Reasons for this are quite comprehensive: the first manifestations of an Ecological Crisis appear, and the deployment of natural resources began to ensure the governments and scientific community. (Ostrom, 1990, Berkes, 1993, 2000). Among these concerns is the debate around institutional implementation, and specifically, rights of property, that may guarantee an appropriate management of common resources, outside ecology and design of political programs to regulate sustainable usage of assets. From this idea, arose the discussion regarding the institutional framework, and more specifically the type of property rights that could guarantee a proper management of the common resources.

For some, these properties did not belong to anyone, and therefore were at risk of being overexploited. The fisheries, forests and many other resources were examples of individual rationality that maximized its options, empowering benefits of the use of common goods and eluding the costs of the damages provoked by overexploitation.² In agreement with Hardin, it the consolidation of defined rights of property was proposed to warrant the incorporation of political rationalist for the use of one of several resources. Private and state property constitutes the two endogenous forms of property for this. Hence, the rights of property consolidated and delimited by government’s policy should be made clear. As we will see further on the proposals support discourses regarding the rights of property, the owner of the assets, and the institutional growth, and they will have acquired relevance for the historical/graphical debate.

For other authors, however, common property constitutes a guarantee for the conservation of resources and for the more or less equitable distribution of its exploitation within determined societies without problems for implementing rationalizing policies of extractive effort³. In the international debate, economists linked to “neoinstitutional” tendencies, ecologist and anthropologists have participated in providing evidence in favour of and against efficiency of common property, given that in many countries these forms of property are still in existence. Since the debate remains open, some questions seem to have been clarified, due to the large amount of articles, books, reports, etc that have been written in the last decade.

In the first place, the usual confusion between defender of the privatisation of common goods and goods lacking effective if any regulation (free access and exploitation) is finally quite clear. Some authors continue to encourage the confusion by reducing the forms of property to a mere problem of doing away with the assignment of the usage of rights, obviating the socio economic implications of the managed systems in each historical moment. This “neoinstitutional” point of view, promotes the privatisation as the only valid way for obtaining an environmental and efficient management of natural resources (Ostrom, 1999, 2000), given that this constitutes an incentive for the protection and the sustainable management of them. Given the peculiar nature of the resources, the rejection of its privatisation on a small scale is obligatory because fluxes and stocks circulate and are managed difficultly for making segments; the most suitable way is a privatised management in extended units that maximize the administrative efficiency of the management (Ostrom, 2000).

³ See articles contained in *Human Ecology* (1998) n. 26.

³ See applied to historical evidence of systems of property and common management in Latin America, Primack, R. (1999).

In any case, common goods are being subjected to very specific regulations that confirm rigid rules for the use of resources protected under this form of property. Common property can't be confused with free access. Now, debate is touching upon institutional aspect that implies some regulation of access and use of common resources. Historical experience and present cases of common properties studied have revealed the importance derived from exclusion criteria and access to uses, but the forms of organization of communities and the production of rules that conform the sustainable forms of management of common resources (Agrawal, 2000, Gibson y Becker, 2000, Becker, 2000). Debate is being conducted by more complex ideas than that of the mere form of property.

Historiographical Debate: From common goods to “goods owned in common”.

Historiographical debate around common property is not new at all in the wide tradition of the European historiography. Studies about common property from Germanic and Slavic origin or the process of enclosure and, in general, privatisation of common property have been the main character of the studies concerned of the liberal revolutions in Europe and the introduction of private property in other continents. But, the contribution to the historiography to the debate about forms of property of common resources and its environmental efficiency has been limited, having a low opinion of the rich experience from the past or incorporating elements of confusion, like in Spanish case.

Opposing this point of view of the common resources exists a current “institutionalised” so that the point of discussion is focused on the application of the government laws or where the exclusion of the use or enjoyment of some places. Exclusion and the privatisation are considered previous requirements for the sustainable management of the ecosystems (Banana et al, 2000; Agrawal, 2000). For that reason the institutional capacity of the application of the exclusion criteria's, are understood by authors as an internal mechanism to reinforce the “collective action” (Gibson y Becker, 2000; Becker, 2000). Another element that has been made quite clear, is that the goods known as common, from the old Slavic, or Germanic tradition, were goods that were submitted under very specific regulations that establish at times very strict rules for the use and exploitation of the resources that were protected under this form of property. This made it impossible to confuse the common property with that of free access.

For eluding this absence of connection with the general debate, the historiographical debate must be thematically clarified and conceptual confusion for making both of them comprehensible. It is essential to distinguish between common reserve of resources or common-pool resources (Ostrom, 1999) as far as the affect to the humankind (Nordhaus, 1984, Hartwick, 1992, Dasgupta, 1997, Buck, 1998), and the common goods. The first refers to a whole of resources in which there is a common nature (oceans, air, subterranean water, etc.) yet, that may be appropriated from judicial perspective in one of four ways: free access, common, state and private property. Common property constitutes one of the forms of appropriation of common resources, with specific characteristics and different with respect to private or state property: inalienability, intergeneration assignation of rights, restricted access of use for the citizens, existence of norms for use and management, etc.

Starting with these considerations, different natures of general and historiographical debate may be distinguished. The first refers to “tragedy of the commons” but the second is focused on the privatisation of common lands occurred from the Liberal Revolution. Both debates have a tendency to overlap each other and can result in confusion, yet it's not the same idea. The historiographical debate makes an evaluation of the efficiency of forms of common property from the historical experience. The results of this historical debate has resulted in many implications for the current

situation; identifying common forms of property with “pre-capitalist societies” just as private property has been identified. Unbalances in economic development have facilitated the consideration of private property as exclusive to underdeveloped societies and private property as most suitable for economic development. This is an implication that has affected the general discussion on dismissing common property with respect to state and private property.

Finally, a time scale distinction where historiographical debate is situated and a general debate is determined by the nature of common resources. Not all historical experiences of common management of common resources are extrapolated to the present-days. Empirical evidences reveal that, common resources may be managed with efficiency in small communities under common forms of property, reduced socio-environmental areas⁴. It doesn't mean that common property has been warranted of sustainable forms of management because sustainability depends on the degree of penetration of commercial forms of management resources more than characteristics of title deed (Sharma, 1992; Repetto y Gillis, 1990). However, problems related to the global context affect the management when resources are managed like global commons (air and water). Self-management, character of norms of use and exploitation and polycentrism of decisions (Ostrom, 1999) is more difficult for being implemented. Simple and obvious example: Who would be the suitable subjects for implementing a more suitable management of oceans? Ethnic communities, Nation-State, International Organizations, etc.? Questions like these establish other forms of property.

We must distinguish between the common properties of the past and, those of the present, given the different amount of quantity and quality and the scale of resources in the discussion as well as, the different contents that the forms of property have today with respect to the past. Our main hypothesis is that forms of common property as a right of older property than state or private property, has changed its content and efficiency, better adapted with respect to the past or the present-day situation in determined in indigenous communities and peasants in the Third World. Conclusions of historical debate may be translated to the current debate with more caution. “Historicity” of common property is an object where institutional factors of local field, articulation of access of rules, exclusion of resources, but, also forms of historical management are inter related.

Given that, it seems absurd that the debate would focus exclusively on rights of property. Perhaps for that reason, the debate ended up turning into a debate around designation, non-historical and quite simplified. Above all if we are aware of cases where common management is or has been a disaster and other cases in which it has been successful. In any case, it appears that common property as such is far from representing a fossil institution, inherited from the past and without any use for the future in front of state property, and especially, private property.

Recently, interesting approaches are improving the debate, general and historiographical, linking forms of property with determined social relations and with determined qualities of institutions that favoured or hindered sustainable management of commons resources. Holling, one of the most relevant ecologist, has proposed the concept of “adaptive management” that means understanding the sustainable management of resources like processing meaning, breaking distinction between researching and management (Holling, 1993; Hanna et al, 1995, Holling et al, 1998; Berkes y Folke, 1998). Sustainable management implemented like iterative manner en the ecosystem, managed assuming the changes in its dynamic, natural and “anthropic” factors. In this meaning, “adaptive” character of traditional management is linked with cultural diversity and biodiversity. New theoretical approaches note interdisciplinary, historical, comparative and experimental methods, keys for designing sustainable forms of management. Holling notes (1993),

⁴ Abundant bibliography noted about local management of resources give like result sustainable systems long-dated for rural communities. See Toledo (1993, 1995, 1999), Carabias, Provincia y Toledo (1995), Gari (1999) and Dean (1995).

sustainability is the direct result of interrelation between renovation cycles, dynamic and local systems of management that affect all elements of the socio-environmental sphere (applied to Mexico, Alcorn y Toledo, 1998). In this sense, forms of management appear as another aspect of the institutional framework of local community. Framework not understood like a mere tool of power, with rules, norms and institutions emerged in the context of communities that reveals a different ability for interacting with the changes of the environment and result of ecological knowledge constructed throughout centuries. (Toledo, 1995; Berkes y Folke, 1998).

In agreement with recent results of the ecological theory, some researchers defend that forms of property may increase or diminish the resilience of an ecosystem. In the same way, social components are linked with environmental elements. Stemming from a neoinstitutional approach of economy, many of these authors think that these forms of common property have resulted more sustainable form than other forms of property, given that they favour the implementation of adaptive management of resources, adapting to changing circumstances of ecosystems. In a recent book, Berkes y Folke (1998), various convincing examples are gathered although we are not going to include here. Our proposal approaches the problem in similar ways, searching the “diachronic” analysis with explicative elements of ecological efficiency or un-efficiency of common forms of property, trying to link changes of the forms of management with forms of property and, especially, forms of organization of relations between nature and society. Definitively, each type of socio-environmental metabolism requires specific appropriation forms, in the manner of its suitability may not be understood isolated, but in the integral context of specific organization form of the metabolism.

2. The tragedy of the Spanish Commons

In spite of the eminent approach, the historiographical debate in Spain is just now situated at a stage in which economic and environmental efficiency is being discussed; free of links between Ecology and Economy with respect, for example, of the management of water and pollution of air, emission of CO₂ and other greenhouse gases. Although, anthropologist and economists are the most implicated in this debate, especially from delegacy of water (Aguilera Klink, 1987, 1990, 1991), it is the historians that have been the most successful. At any rate, the debate has been centred on, the questioning of role of the Liberal Revolution in the process of privatisation and appropriation of existent common spaces and its economic and productive transformation. Efficiency in resource conservation, existence or not tragedy of commons, has been valued in function of actual results of historical processes from mid 18th century.

The existence of an extended common heritage, or common exploitation up to date, composed of essentially forestry lands, makes the debate focused on the history of these goods possible. In this way, woodlands and history of forests constitute the field of study in order to verify the correction of Hardin’s hypothesis (although Hardin remained absent from arguments).

To the contrary of what happened in the United States for example, few authors defended the efficiency of private property, (at least to the level of knowledge known at that time), in such a way that the discussion was centred above all on, whether the state, forest administration and peasant communities had implemented different kinds of property as well as institutions that extended a more efficient management of forestry resources. Probably, each one of these tendencies possessed a different concept of “efficacy” and “efficiency” of management of resources. Monetary vision of the management was compared to a concept of commons revitalized for its socio-economic importance for rural communities.

For a historiographical tendency, which we will call “*pro-state*”, woodlands constitute an interior territory, in which developed productive activities that generate goods, services and incomes are measurable in aggregate physical units (tons and cubic meters) or in currency. Essentially economic criteria was then applied (economic efficiency, level of benefits, commercial orientation of products, etc) allowing itself to be considered by the general exploitation and environmental services not directly monetary. From this perspective, woodlands are considered as a producer of goods with a market value, independently of the relation with kind of society and agrarian system established along the history. Common goods, as part of forestlands, must be considered as another agrarian subsystem, from the perspective of their contribution to the economic development of the nation-state.

Assuming the role played by the woodlands for the supply of raw material for agrarian artisan and industry activities, valuing the forestry policies implemented by local power in the context of the economic development policy inspired by the Spanish nation-state (exploitation, “ordering” –state management of forestry areas- and afforestation) (Casals Costa, 1988, 1996; Gómez Mendoza, 1992; Gómez Mendoza y Mata Olmo, 1992; Castroviejo et al, 1985; Rico Boquete, 1995, 1998). In this orientation, contributions from the Grupo de Estudios de Historia Rural (GEHR) refers the forestry statistical (1985, 1988, 1990, 1994). Workshops from this tendency attribute the “mercantilisation” of woodlands products to a revitalizing effect of rural economies by the way of commercial exploitation of uses of natural resources, especially uses for wood and cattle.

In accordance with this “productivist” view, state interventionism of property and forms of management is considered positive, interventionism initiated with “Ley de Montes de 1863” (Woodlands Act, 1863) (Jiménez Blanco 1986, 1991a, 1991b, 1994, Manuel Valdés, 1996). In some cases, privatisation of woodlands and rationalist intervention of the Forestry Administration (“ordering” and afforestation) threatened by practices and municipal uses, were considered degrading. In common goods, defined by liberal law like goods of public utility, interventionism of the state would have avoided their total degradation and, at the same time, its conversion in origin of incomes by means of promotion of “new industrial uses”. As a result, the existence of an important part of public forestry natural resources, under form of common property, had been possible thanks to the role of the nation-state (Manuel Valdés, 1996; G.E.H.R., 1999; A.A.V.V. 1999).

Finally, this tendency establishes a positive correlation between forest law and promotion of an intensive-commercial form of management, by which woodlands become an element of an “agro-industry” system as the origin of raw materials. Capitalist Market holds up as an assigned factor and access-regulation mechanism of woodland usage proceeding the traditional forms, of local basis, considered as low efficiency for promoting and safe keeping of a suitable level of income. In this aspect, tendency is tributary of Jesus Sanz’ proposals, who in two pioneering articles about Spanish public woodlands published in *Historia de la Agricultura* (Garrabou y Sanz Fernández, 1985a, Sanz Fernández y Garrabou, 1986) defended the role played by State and Forestry Administration, responsible for conservation of an important amount of Spanish forest lands. Liberals, defender of *Desamortización* (selling of lands in public auctions) and privatisation of public woodlands and subsequent deforestation and ploughing up, were considered the main causes of deployment or disappearing of tree-covered woodland. Along these lines of argument, there should be an unification of the articles written and published by forestry experts or people closely related. (Bauer, 1980; Mangas Navas, 1981, 1984).

For this historiographical tendency, the non-equalitarian access and use of resources under common property was profitable. They suggest undervaluing the social impact of its privatisation,

treating it like an inevitable cost for the conservation of public forestry heritage. This fatalist view of the necessary end of commons by the way of rationalization-“ordering”, emanated from forestry laws of XIXth century, implied an intensive silviculture practice, its anthropic action transformed bio-geographical structures of commons and forms of traditional appropriation in the rural world. All these arguments are going with a positive valuation of forestry experts and a well-rounded rejection to municipal and neighbouring management, according to Hardin’s thesis of the *Tragedy of Commons*.

To the contrary are there are those who consider the triumph of “productivist” criteria in management of woodlands, supported by State and private owners and materialized in the segmentation of uses, exclusion of integrated uses and search of maximum physical and monetary profits, importing fast growing non-native species could not be considered in a positive manner from environmental perspective. This tendency, called “communalist” has considered environmental variables and their not always positive evolution as a counterweight of the optimist interpretations inspired by the other tendency. Evidences such as an increase and amplitude of forest fire when forestry administrations took up control of public woodlands (Balboa, 1995; Casero y González de Molina, 1997; Cruz Artacho et al, 2000; Cruz Artacho et al, 2003), inconvenience of forestry reforestation (Rico Boquete 1995, 1999; Groome 1985, 1988, 1990) o degrading changes in native vegetation for introducing commercial management of woodlands (Ortega Santos, 1999, 2002) have been some of the key elements of research. In other words, facing the view focused on productivity that ignores the existent relation between production and conservation, or not assume contradiction between them, the “comunalista” tendency has considered this like an relevant contradiction. The main conclusion is: peasant communities managed their resources under local rules, in many cases with efficiency, far from the “overexploited savagery” that was attributed to them. In this meaning, State form of management of common woodlands was not always positive.

Some of the more recent approaches have insisted of the interaction among humankind and space, to consider commons as a outcome of century-old action of human groups and result of different “forestry transitions” among different models of management of resources and structure of forestry spaces (A.A.V.V. 1999,; González de Molina y Ortega Santos, 2000). From a mode of use of woodlands integrated in agrarian system (“agrosilvopastoril”) toward a commercial management of national and international range transfers surplus outside of the local sphere in a wider context of State-Nation structure. Consequently, changes in the functionality of woodlands are decisive for understanding their evolution, biological and economic factor.

Within the “comunalista” tendency, the effects of the loss of control over management of common woodlands derived from liberal legislation, although in many cases forms of common property were not altered, are being analyzed. Even in many villages, with abundant common properties, local power assumed management and benefits of their uses, to the detriment of poor neighbours. In many cases, Oligarchies controlled local power and were the main addresses of the benefits resulted from the public auctions of uses. In other cases, commons or neighbouring uses, conveniently privatised by the way of auctions, constituted a source of incomes, necessary for sponsoring the local finances, lightening tax burden or warranting local indebt ness (Cobo, Cruz y González de Molina, 1992; Núñez Delgado y González de Molina, 1998; Iriarte Goñi, 1997). In this context, common goods were an essential tool for successful constitution of liberal municipal government, and conforming local oligarchies, insofar as a source of income and patronage system.

Recent researchers have contributed to shape the first hypothesis suggested by the “comunalista” tendency about social consequences for applying forestry contemporary legislation. Researches offer a critical view of reforestation process during Franquism (Age of Franco’s government), political regimen guided by a interventionist-nationalist logic for the management of

public woodland property (Rico Boquete, 1999). Focused productivity view of forestry planning, and emphasis on intensive forestry practices oriented to satisfying commercial and industrial needs were origin of an increased neighbouring opposition to the reforestation projects, in order to reduce subsistence opportunities (cattle uses, picking of wood). Some researching projects have analysed the impact or privatisations of use and management of common property woodlands in the last two centuries (Ortega Santos, 1999, 2002).

In spite of the ecological impacts of forestry policies implemented by State-Nation or impacts in forms of management of resources by peasant communities have been approached only superficially. Studies on social consequences have received more attention than environmental (Cobo, Cruz y González de Molina, 1992; Sabio Alcutén, 1995; 1997, Sala, 1995, 1997; Moreno Fernández, 1998; Balboa, 1990). Forestry delinquency and structural changes provoked by lower stratum of peasantry constitute a representative evidence of interest for “comunalista” tendency. On that same note, the valuation of forestry policy and legislation and included role played by State-Nation under the direction of forestry expert, have been very critical and in general negative from the social perspective. Assessment extended to environmental context, not as the accumulation of empirical evidences as negative consideration received by the majority of reforestations and public forestry “ordering” during the second half of the XXth century.

Debate between both tendencies have ended up polarized between defender of considering the existence of common like result of “tragedy of the commons” and those who consider the process of privatisation like “tragedy of the enclosures” (Martínez Alier, 1992). However, the discussion has channelled into on a “dialogue of the deaf” between defender of the peasant management and defender of state management, making them both responsible for the success and mistakes of the management.

In these conditions, historiographical contribution of the debate around management of common goods has been reduced to a nominalist confrontation between two forms of property. Follower of peasant management and, therefore common property, are dismissed for vindicating an institution derived from the past as useful for the future. Follower of private management and property are dismissed by the failure of forestry policy. Historical accumulated experiences are not useful for examining the suitability of several forms of property.

However, historical researching may contribute to the general debate if theoretical fundamentals are being discussed. Especially, we pretend to propose an alternative interpretation for understanding correctly the evolution of forms of use and management of resources under common property. First of all, prior assumptions may be explained, usually hidden in the historiographical debate. Within this, opposing ideas regarding common goods as institutions and resources are not being discussed. Despite what implicit assumptions in many articles and books (efficiency of market, valuation preferably currency, dismiss or ignorance of forestry ecology, superiority of rationality of profit, under valuation of peasant logic for management of ecosystems, etc) defend a special approach to the mountains. Members of ecologist movements, belonging to urban areas, project present-day knowledge to the past, as non-temporary ideas: mountains, preferably, tree-covered as possible, mono-species, dense of climatic vegetation. This offers service and environmental functions (related to needs of economic more sustainable activities, for example, fixation of carbon dioxide) and an increase of quantity of wooded resources as well as non-wooded, making compatible production and conservation. From this perspective, the state of common woodlands use to be considered “disastrous” state of being of a common woodland, for not being tree-covered, with a strong cattle carrying capacity with croplands inside them, justifying the “ordering” and reforestation action by Forestry Administration (Sanz Fernández, 1985, 1986).

3. The concept of “Dislocation” of Common Property

It's suited to formulate the question to the past, not reduced to the efficiency of common property for the conservation and management of resources owned in common. Taking in account the different historical trajectories of common goods from the perspective of conservation (optimal state to degrading, ploughing up and change of use⁵, mono-cause explanation may be refused, tiding to kind of property. Analyzing a determined style of management of resources, form of judicial appropriation is only part of institutional and environmental factors (economic and social dimensions) that influence the sustainability. In other terms, degrees of sustainability of the use of resources doesn't depend on, not only, forms of property (Clayton y Redclife, 1996; Goodland, 1996; Masera et al. 1999). Here is the concept of “dislocation” of common property may define the terms of discussion and giving useful experiences for general debate.

Before that, common property may be situated in historical context. Common property was functional to the forms of production based on solar energy-systems o organic energy-systems (Wrigley, 1991; Sieferle, 2001), without possibilities to introduce measurable quantities of external energy and materials. If source of basic energy came from biological converters, so biomass collected on the ground, its stability depended of the changing balance between endosomatic and exosomatic needs, between production of foods, herbage and fuel. Factors of production and consumption –land, water, cattle traction, manure and labour force- were determined by the quantity and existence of lands in each community (González de Molina, 2001).

But the photosynthesis process requires concrete amounts of grounds en which crops may grow up. Noted that all the kinds of biomass satisfied food needs of population but it's was necessary devoted a determined amount of territory for its domestication and breeding, part of cropland. Grazing lands were devoted to fodder and, finally, woodlands devoted to production of fuel, raw materials, wood and firewood. Agrarian surface available was divided according to their uses, agricultural, cattle and forest, which degree of incompatibility depended on the capacity of each territory for producing biomass and forms of management that were implemented. In our case, harshness of semiarid climate, like Mediterranean case, impeded the compatibility of uses in the same plot. Although, solar energy made responsible for mechanic energy, wind power and hydraulic power by the way of atmospheric circulation, the energetic supply came from the management of plants in the available territory.

This factor introduces certain “rigidity” in the territorial organization, because each society –according with soils characteristics and their amount of resources- needed to devote a plot of lands to food population, supplying fuel, raw materials and fodder. Many of the non-cultivated lands played essential functions and a change of use may provoke provision crisis and unbalances for the agrarian systems. In this meaning, the case of territories of Castilla Crown reveals that organic energy-basis societies tried to preserve the equilibrium in stationary societies by means of common appropriation of basic resources for reproducibility of agricultural and cattle production. And it was difficult and costly to replace by means of importations – exchange and/or market-, the nutrients and energy necessary for keeping and agrarian system without balance, for example, for the benefit of agricultural production. It was indispensable keeping these lands from individual appropriation. Attitude of *free riders* would drives, en case of becoming general, to the unbalance and

⁵ Conclusion derived from specific research about public woodlands and, especially, municipal woodlands (“Propios y Comunales”) is clear enough: nature of property doesn't warranties *per se* the sustainability of use and exploitation of resources; or in other words, existence of woodlands under forms of common property hasn't warranted its use and sustainable management.

disintegration of peasant societies. With the result that commons, far as constituting territories of free access, became spaces strongly regulated who everybody couldn't accede.

At the beginning of XIXth century, Liberal Reforms mean the enthronization of market economy and private property and, as result, the promotion of agricultural use of lands (*agricolization*) over the other possible uses (cattle and forestry). In this new context, new mode of use was shaped, supported by Forestry State Administration and municipal governments in many cases, opting for commercial exploitation, preferable forestry and cattle options of the woodlands for obtaining incomes for local finances and reducing, much more as possible, tax burden that wealthy people "resisted".

Characteristics of this commercial or industrial mode of use are well-know for being fully valid. Nevertheless, we want to reveal that proposal of forestry policy, from the end XIXth century, was extracting the highest profit, without harming the opportune conservation by the means of Dasonomy and Silviculture. Penetration of this mode of use in common woodlands was not made by the means of conservation of commons in private or state property. Followed different ways, in a complex process, that we have called "dislocation" of common property in Spain. Concept that means loss of lands for peasants and neighbouring, in general, by the means of "desamortizacion" of forestry patrimony or its alienation for the own municipal governments along XIXth century and beginning XXth century. Too, means the privatization of uses of products of the woodlands in the context of interventionism of Forestry State Administration by different ways: indicating and making products to quotas under municipal exploitation, delimiting plots of lands without quotas, "ordering" and reforestation of mountains, disappearing or appearing "new products" of the woodlands, "oligarchizing" uses by means of public auctions that implied privatization of part of them. But "dislocation" of common lands other process that didn't imply necessarily extinction of common property. We refer to increased deployment that common lands experimented under neighbouring control as result of disorganized traditional agrarian system of organic basis-energy and the progressive rupture of "agrosilvopastoril" integration that was based on. Woodlands loosed their traditional agricultural and cattle functions, orientated progressively towards commercial "silviculture" and promotion of commercial forms of management that look for maximum profit of yield best orientated to the market. This process was accompanied by a municipalization of management, still permitting the neighbouring uses, concentrated increased control over yields for public sell, devoted for supplying finance needs of local governments.

"Dislocation" of common goods –included those yet now survive as mere form of judicial appropriation, but without relation with traditional uses and forms of property- culminated in two parallel process, one gradual and other included in the State: one side, la extinction of many of traditional functions of woodlands (energy, fertilization, cattle, harvesting, etc) faced with push of fossil combustibles and new forms of industrial agriculture. At the other side, definitive promotion of intensive "silviculture" by means of reforestation that began at XXth century, and developed during Franquism. Dramatic consequences for peasant communities related with massive migration that ended industrializing the rural production (Rico Boquete, 1995). Next Table resume the noted process of "dislocation of common property".

Table 1. Ways of “Dislocation of Common Property”, Spanish Woodlands, XVIIIth-XXth century.			
<i>Type</i>	<i>Factors of Dislocation</i>	<i>Policy/Economic Consequencies</i>	<i>Socioenviromental Consequencies</i>
Judicial Way	-“Desamortización” - Fixing limits of Villages - Fixing Limits of rights of way -Appropriation of Lands	-Privatization Commons -“Territorial Building up of Villages”	-“Agricolization and Extended Cattle Use of Commons
Productive Way	- Forest Laws: Annual Public Auctions “Arbitrado” System of Use (quota/head of cattle)	-Privatization of Use -Mercantilization -“Wage Basis” of Rural Economies -Oligarchization, Municipalization and “Statalization” of Common Property	-Promoting Commercial Management: loss of biodiversity -Degrading Bioclimacic Stages -Increased of Bushy Domain in Woodlands
Socio-Environmental Way	-Environmental Conflicts -Modes of Peasant Use versus Commercial Use	-Hegemony of Exchange Logic in front of Use Logic -Monetarization Environmental Incomes	-Loss of peasant knowledge. -Rupture Methabolism Relation Neighbouring-Woodlands
Source: Own Elaboration			

As noted above, privatization of use, mercantilization, oligarchized access and socially segmented access to uses were part of the same sphere of “dislocation” of common property. Process with different consequences according with ecosystems implied. In some areas, as in southeast of Iberian Peninsula, native and endemic species of Mediterranean ecosystem replied better to the “productivity oriented” model supported by Forestry Administration means a vegetable regression to bushy species (Ortega Santos, 2002). In more areas, wooded-“silviculture” management gave priority to the introduction of tree-covered non-native species, with currency profitability. So, woodlands, although being “legally common”, gave complying with own functions of organic economy for performing other different, in the context of economy highly depended on fossil combustible.

Historical experience is useful for checking the not-suitable form of property, considered isolated of environmental factors for analyzing sustainable forms of management of resources. Too, historical experience reveals that narrow link between woodlands and reproduction of traditional agrarian systems of organic basis-energy, consecrated by means of common forms of property, supported conservation of Spanish woodlands until the end of XVIIIth century. And participation of citizens, from economic and symbolic perspective, was a key element for conservation, management and exploitation of resources. With other words, historical experience shows that participation in management and binding of citizens with woodlands constitute two essential conditions to ensure the sustainable management of Spanish woodlands at present-days. Both conditions are more feasible in the context of common forms of property that private or state forms, in which private owner or forestry administration decided apart from neighbouring interests.

In effect, common property –that converts common resources in inalienable that regulates use, exploitation promoting participation of common users in its management- may be the most efficiency form of management, and leaving them to the next generation in optimal conditions. Similarly, in organic basis energy economies, resources of vital importance for reproduction of local economies were protected by means of common property, resources and global environmental functions, essential for warranting sustainability of productive activities and conditions of habitability in the planet Earth for humankind, would may be protected through common property.

Referencias.

- A.A.V.V. (1999): *PreActas del IX Congreso de Historia Agraria*, S.E.H.A.-Universidad del País Vasco, pp. 780.
- AGUILERA KLINK,F. (1990), “El Fin de la Tragedia de los Comunales” en *Ecología Política n° 3*, C.I.P./ICARIA, Madrid, pp. 137- 147.
- AGUILERA KLINK,F. (1991), ¿La Tragedia de la Propiedad Común o la Tragedia de la Malinterpretación en Economía? En *Agricultura y Sociedad n° 61*, Madrid, Ministerio de Agricultura, pp. 157-181.
- BALBOA,X. (1990) , *O monte en Galicia* Vigo, Ed. Xerais.
- BALBOA,X. (1995), “Resistencia y protesta: una visión a largo plazo de la conflictividad rural en la Galicia Contemporánea” en *Actas del VII Congreso de Hª Agraria*, Baeza.
- BAUER MANDERSCHIED,E. (1980), *Los Montes de España en la Historia*. Madrid. Servicio de Publicaciones del Ministerio de Agricultura.
- BERKES,F y FOLKE,C. (1998), “Linking Social and Ecological Systems for Resilience and Sustainability” en Berkes,F. (ed.) :*Linking Social and Ecological Systems*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-25
- BUCK, J.J. (1998), *The Global Commons. An Introduction*. Washington, Island Press.
- CARABIAS,J., PROVENCIO,E y TOLEDO,C. (1995), *Manejo de Recursos Naturales y Pobreza Rural*. Fondo de Cultura Económica-Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- CASALS COSTA, V. (1988), “Defensa y Ordenación del Bosque en España: Ciencia, Naturaleza y Sociedad en la obra de los Ingenieros de Montes durante el siglo XIX” en *Geocrítica n° 73* Universidad de Barcelona.
- CASALS COSTA,V. (1996), *Los Ingenieros de Montes en la España contemporánea, 1848-1936*. Barcelona, Ed. Del Serbal.
- CASERO,F y GONZALEZ DE MOLINA,M. (1997), “Mitos y realidades de los Incendios Forestales en Andalucía” en González Alcantud,J.A. y González de Molina (ed.), *El fuego: mitos, ritos y realidades*. Ed. Anthropos/Diputación Provincial de Granada, pp. 377-411.
- CASTROVIEJO,S et al. (1985), “Política Forestal en España. ¿Producción o Conservación ? *Arbor n° 477*, C.S.I.C. Madrid, pp. 13-40.
- CLAYTON, M.H y RADCLIFFE, N.J. (1996): *Sustainability, A system Approach*. Westview Press.
- COBO ROMERO,F et al. (1992), “Privatización del Monte y Protesta Social. Una primera aproximación a los delitos forestales (1836-1920)” en *Agricultura y Sociedad n° 65*, Ministerio de Agricultura, pp. 253-302.
- CRUZ ARTACHO,S et al (2000), “Social and environmental determining factors of forest fire history: the case of eastern andalucía, 1840-1890” en Agnoletti,M. y Anderson,S. (ed.), *International Studies on Socio-economic and Forest Ecosystem Change*, C.A.B.I. Publishing, Londres, pp. 211-223.
- CRUZ ARTACHO, S. (2000): De campesino a ladrón y delincuente en Andalucía (XIX-XX). Otra mirada a la esfera de los comportamientos sociales del campesinado” en GONZALEZ DE MOLINA,M. (ed.): *La Historia de Andalucía. A debate. I. Campesinos y Jornaleros*. Barcelona. Ed. Anthropos/Diputación Provincial de Granada, pp. 159-179.

- CRUZ ARTACHO, S.; GONZALEZ DE MOLINA, M.; NUÑEZ DELGADO, M.; ORTEGA SANTOS, A.; HERRERA GONZALEZ DE MOLINA, A. (2003): ¿Porqué se quemó el monte mediterráneo?. Una relectura socioambiental de los incendios forestales en Andalucía, 1840-90” en ORTEGA SANTOS, A. y VIGNET ZUNZ, J. (eds.): *Las Montañas del Mediterráneo*. Working Papers nº 4, Diputación Provincial de Granada-Centro de Investigaciones Etnológicas “Ángel Ganivet”, pp. 85-105.
- DASGUPTA,P et al. (1997), *The Economics on Transnational Commons*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- DEAN,W. (1995), *With Broadax and Firebrand. The destruction of the Brazilian Atlantic Forest*. University of California Press, EEUU.
- EARLE, C. (1988), “The Myth of Southern Soil Miner: Macrohistory, Agricultural Innovations and Environmental Change” en D. WOSTER (ed.), *The End of the Earth. Perspectives on Modern Environmental History*, Cambridge, CUP, pp. 175-210.
- FEENY,D et al. (1990), “The Tragedy of the Commons. Twenty-two years later” en *Human Ecology*, vol. 18, nº 1, Plenum Press, New York, pp. 1-19.
- GARCIA LA TORRE, J; GARCIA LA TORRE, Jesus (1996), “Los Bosques ignorados de la Almería Arida. Una interpretación histórica y ecológica” en SANCHEZ PICON, A. (ed.), *Historia y Medio Ambiente en el territorio almeriense*, Almería, Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Almería, pp. 99-126.
- GARI,J.A. (1999), “*Cultivating Amazonia: The Political Ecology of Biodiversity among the Indigenous People of Pastanza*”, Draft Paper. 101 pp.
- GARRIDO PEÑA, F. y GONZALEZ DE MOLINA, M.: “La cuestión nacional desde la Ecología Política. Algunos elementos de análisis” en *Ecología Política nº 13*, Madrid, C.I.P/ICARIA, (1997), 125-155.
- G.E.A. (1999), “Modos de Uso y Protesta Social en los montes andaluces, 1750-1930. Algunos estudios de caso” en *Preactas IX Congreso de Historia Agraria, S.E.H.A.-Universidad del País Vasco*, pp. 641-655.
- G.E.H.R. (1985), “Contribución al análisis histórico de la ganadería española, 1865-1929” en Garrabou,R. y Sanz Fdez,J.: *Historia Agraria de la España Contemporánea. Tomo 2*. Ed. Crítica/Grijalbo, pp. 229-279.
- G.E.H.R. (1988), “Crisis y Cambio en el Sector Agrario: Andalucía y Extremadura, 1875-1935” en Garrabou, R. (ed.): *La crisis agraria de fines de siglo XIX*. Ed. Crítica/Grijalbo, pp. 161-181.
- G.E.H.R.(1990), *Estadísticas Históricas de la producción agraria española, 1859-1935*. Madrid.
- G.E.H.R.(1994), “Más allá de la “propiedad perfecta”. El proceso de privatización de los Montes Públicos Españoles (1859-1920)” en *Noticario de Historia Agraria nº 8*, Universidad de Murcia, pp. 99-155.
- G.E.H.R. (1996), “Política Forestal y Producción de los Montes Públicos Españoles. Una visión de conjunto, 1861-1933” en Pujol, J et al. (ed): *Cambio Institucional e Historia Económica. VIII Simposio de Historia Económica*. Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona.
- G.E.H.R.(1999), “Producción y gestión de los montes españoles, 1946-1979” en *Preactas IX Congreso de Historia Agraria, S.E.H.A.-Universidad del País Vasco*, pp. 809-825.
- GIBSON, C.C. et al (eds., 2000): *People and Forests. Communities, Institutions and Governance*. M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- GOMEZ MENDOZA,J. (1992), *Ciencia y Política de los Montes Españoles (1848-1936)*. Madrid, ICONA.
- GOMEZ MENDOZA,J. y MATA OLMO (1992), “Actuaciones Forestales Públicas desde 1940” en *Agricultura y Sociedad nº 65*, Ministerio de Agricultura, pp. 15-64.
- GONZALEZ DE MOLINA, M.: “El modelo de crecimiento agrario del siglo XIX y sus límites ambientales. Un estudio de caso” en González de Molina, M. y Martínez Alier, J.(eds.): *Naturaleza Transformada*. Col. Antrazyt, Ed. Icaria, pp. 87-125.

- GONZALEZ DE MOLINA, M. y ORTEGA SANTOS, A. (2000) “Bienes Comunes y Conflictos por los recursos en las Sociedades Rurales, siglo XIX y XX” en *Historia Social* 38, Fundación de Historia Social, pp. 95-116.
- GOODLAND, R. (1995), “The Concept of Environmental Sustainability” en *Annual Review of Ecological System*, 26, pp. 1-24.
- GROOME,H. (1985), “El desarrollo de la política forestal en el Estado Español. Desde el siglo XIX hasta la Guerra Civil” en *Arbor*, n° 474, C.S.I.C. Madrid, pp. 59-89.
- GROOME,H. (1988), “El desarrollo de la política forestal en el Estado Español: desde la guerra civil hasta la actualidad” en *Arbor*, n° 509. C.S.I.C. Madrid, pp. 65-110.
- GROOME,H. (1990), *Historia de la Política Forestal del Estado Español*. Agencia del Medio Ambiente de la Comunidad de Madrid.
- GUHA,R. y GADGIL,M. (1993), “Los Hábitats en la Historia de la Humanidad” en *Ayer* n° 11, Ed. Marcial Pons, pp. 49-111.
- HANNA,S.S. et al. (1995): *Rights to Nature. Ecological, Economics, Cultural and Political Principles of Institutions for the Environment*, Washington, Island Press. Ed.
- HARTWICK,J.M. (1994), *The Tragedy of the Commons revisited*. Kingston Institute.
- HOLLING,C.S et al. (1998), “Science, Sustainability and resource management” en Berkes, F et al. (ed): *Linking Social and Ecological System*. Cambridge Univesity Press, pp. 342-362.
- HOLLING,C.S. (1993), “Investing in Research for sustainability” en *Ecological Application*, vol. 3, n° 4, Ecological Society of America. pp. 552-553
- IRIARTE GOÑI,I. (1997), *Bienes Comunales y Capitalismo Agrario en Navarra*. Serie Estudios, M.A.P.A. Madrid.
- JIMENEZ BLANCO,J.I. (1986), *La producción agraria de Andalucía oriental, 1874-1914*. Madrid, Universidad Complutense.
- JIMENEZ BLANCO,J.I.(1991a), “Los Montes de Propiedad Pública (1833-1936) en Comin,F y Aceña,P. (ed.): *Historia de la Empresa Pública en España*. Espasa Calpe,ed.
- JIMENEZ BLANCO,J.I. (1991b), “Los Montes Públicos en la España Contemporánea: la cara oculta de la propiedad” en *Noticario de Historia Agraria* n° 2, Universidad de Murcia, pp. 27-35.
- JIMENEZ BLANCO,J.I.(1994), “Presente y Pasado del Monte Mediterráneo en España” en Sánchez Picón, A. (ed.): *Agriculturas Mediterráneas y Mundo Campesino. Cambios históricos y retos actuales*. Instituto de Estudios Almerienses. Pp. 111-134.
- JIMENEZ BLANCO,J.I. (1996), *Privatización y Apropiación de Tierras Municipales en la Baja Andalucía, Jerez de la Frontera, 1750-1995*. E.M.E.M.S.A./Ayto. de Jerez.
- LELE, S. Y NORGAARD,R.B. (1996), “Sustainability and he Scientit´s Burden en *Conservation Biology Papers*, vol 10, n° 2, pp. 354-367.
- MANGAS NAVAS,J.M. (1981), *El régimen comunal agrario en los Concejos de Castilla*. Madrid, Serie Estudios, M.A.P.A.
- MANGAS NAVAS,J.M. (1984), *La propiedad de la tierra en España: los patrimonios públicos* Madrid, I.E.A.P.A.
- MANUEL VALDES,C. (1996), *Tierras y Montes Públicos en la Sierra de Madrid*. Serie Estudios, M.A.P.A.
- MARTINEZ ALIER,J. (1992), “Pobreza y Medio Ambiente. A propósito del Informe Brundtland” en González de Molina,M. y González Alcantud, J.A. (1992): *La Tierra: Mitos, Ritos y Realidades*. Anthropos/Diputación Provincial de Granada, Granada, pp. 295-332.
- MARTINEZ ALIER, J.: “Political Ecology, Distributional Conflicts and Economic Incomensurability” en *New Left Review* 211 (1995), PP. 70-88
- MASERA, O et al. (1999), *Sustentabilidad y Manejo de Recursos Naturales. El marco de evaluación MESMIS*. Ed. Mundiprensa.
- MORENO FERNANDEZ,J.M (1994), *El Monte público en la Rioja durante los siglo XVIII y XIX: aproximación a la desarticulación del régimen comunal*. Diputación Provincial de Logroño.

- MORENO FERNANDEZ, J.M. (1998), "El régimen comunal y la reproducción de la comunidad campesina en las sierras de la Rioja, siglos XVIII-XX" en *Historia Agraria n° 15*, Universidad de Murcia, pp. 75-113.
- NORDHAUS, D. (1994), *Managing the Global Commons. The economic of climate change*. M.I.T. Press.
- NUÑEZ DELGADO, M. y GONZALEZ DE MOLINA, M. (1998): "La Epoca Contemporánea. Auge y Decadencia de una Economía Agrícola, 1870-1936" en Peinado Santaella, R. (ed.): *De Ilurco a Pinos Puente. Doblamiento, Economía y Sociedad de un Pueblo de la Vega de Granada*, Diputación Provincial de Granada, pp. 167-354.
- ORTEGA SANTOS, A. (1999), *Formas de Propiedad y Gestión de los Montes Públicos: la desarticulación de la propiedad comunal en la Comarca de Baza, siglo XVIII-XX*. Tesis Doctoral, Universidad de Granada.
- ORTEGA SANTOS, A. (2000), "Common Woodlands in mediterranean societies: commercial management versus forms of peasant resistance in andalucia, (Spain)1750-1930" en Agnoletti, M. y Anderson, S. (ed.): *International Studies on Socio-economic and Forest Ecosystem Change*, C.A.B.I. Publishing, Londres, pp. 223-237.
- ORTEGA SANTOS, A. (2002): *La Tragedia de los Cerramientos. Desarticulación de la comunalidad en la Provincia de Granada*, Biblioteca de Historia Social 12, Fundación Historia Social/ U.N.E.D.
- OSTROM, E. (1990), *Governing the Commons. The evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. Cambridge University Press.
- OSTROM, E. (1999), "Revisiting the Commons. Local Lessons, Global Challenges" en *Science*, Vol. 284, American Association for the Advancement of Science, pp. 278-282.
- OSTROM, E. (1999), "Coping with the Tragedies of the Commons" en *Annual Review of Political Science* vol. 2, Annual Reviews, pp. 493-535.
- OSTROM, E. (2000), "Reformulating the Commons" en BURGER, J et al. (ed.): *The Commons Revisited. An American Perspective*, Washington, Island Press.
- PFISTER, C. (1990), "The early loss of ecological stability in an agrarian region" en Briblcombe, P. y Pfister, C. (ed.): *The Silent Countdown*, Berlin, Springer, pp. 39-55.
- REDCLIFT, R. y WOODGATE, G. (1988, ed), *The International Handbook of Environmental Sociology*. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.
- REILLY, J.M. y ANDERSON, M. (1992), *Economic Issues in Global Climate Change. Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resources*. Westview Press.
- RICO BOQUETE, E. (1995), *Política Forestal en Repoboscaciones en Galicia (1941-1971)* Monografías de la Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, n° 187, Santiago de Compostela.
- RICO BOQUETE, E. (1999), "El papel del Estado en la creación e industrialización de las masas forestales. Los eucaliptales del Suroeste y la Empresa Nacional de Celulosas de Huelva, 1940-75" en *Prelectas IX Congreso de Historia Agraria, S.E.H.A.-Universidad del País Vasco*, pp. 791-809.
- SABIO ALCUTEN, A. (1997), *Los Montes Públicos en Huesca (1859-1930): El Bosque no se improvisa*. Colección Estudios Altoaragoneses n° 43, Diputación de Huesca.
- SALA, P. (1996), "Tragedia dels comunals i tragedia dels tancaments, dilema del prisioner i cooperació no altruista. Un estat de la qüestió sobre la propietat comunal" en *Reçerques* n° 33, Curial ed., Barcelona, pp. 137-147.
- SANZ FERNANDEZ, A. (1985), "La Historia Contemporánea de los Montes Públicos Españoles, 1812-1930" en Garrabou, R. y Sanz Fernández, A. (ed.): *Historia Agraria de la España Contemporánea, Vol. 2: Expansión y Crisis (1850-1900)*, Ed. Crítica/Grijalbo, Barcelona, pp. 193-229.
- SANZ FERNANDEZ, A. (1986), "La Historia Contemporánea de los Montes Públicos Españoles, 1812-1930. Notas y Reflexiones II" en Garrabou, R. y Sanz Fernández, A. (ed.): *Historia Agraria de la España Contemporánea, Vol 3: El fin de la Agricultura Tradicional (1900-1960)*. Ed. Crítica/Grijalbo, pp. 142-171.

- SCOONES, I. (1999), "New Ecology and the Social Sciences: What Prospects for a Fruitful Engagement?", *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 28, pp. 479-507.
- SCOTT, J.: *Seeing like a State. How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1998.
- SIEFERLE, R.P. (1990), "The Energy System. A Basic Concept of Environmental History", BRIMBLECOMBE, P. y PFISTER, C. (ed.), *The Silent Countdown. Essays in European Environmental History*. Berlin, Springer-Verlag.
- SINGH, K. (1994), *Managing Common-Pool-Resources. Principles and Case Studies*. Oxford University Press.
- SMILL, V. (1993), *Global Ecology. Environmental Change and Social Flexibility*. Routledge Press, EEUU.
- SWANSON, T. (1996), *The Economy of Environmental Degradation: Tragedy of Commons*. Brookfield-Edward Elgar.
- TOLEDO, V. (1995), "Campesinidad, Agroindustrialidad y Sostenibilidad. Fundamentos Ecológicos e Históricos del Desarrollo" en *Cuadernos de Trabajo n° 3*
- TOLEDO, V. (1993), "La Racionalidad Ecológica de la Producción Campesina" en Sevilla Guzmán, E. y González de Molina, M. (ed): *Ecología, Campesinado e Historia*. Colección Genealogía del Poder, Ed. La Piqueta, pp- 197-219.
- TOLEDO, V. (1999), "Las consecuencias ecológicas de la Ley Agraria de 1992" en RANDALL, L. (ed.): *Reformando la Reforma Agraria*. El Atajo ed./U.N.A.M. pp. 325-343.
- WRIGLEY, E. (1987), *People, Cities and Wealth. The Transformation of Traditional Society*. Oxford and New York, Oxford University Press.
- WRIGLEY, E. (1993), *Cambio, Continuidad y Azar. Carácter de la Revolución Industrial Inglesa*, Ed. Crítica /Grijalbo. Barcelona.