were made in the case of the *imposto do selo* on the basis of the value of duty stamps sold, and in the case of the *imposto addicional* and of the *imposto complementar* on the basis of their legal proportions to the other taxes.)

5. *Total Income*

Data for the gross domestic product and population of Trás-os-Montes circa 1940 and 1980 was taken from Ana Bela Nunes, "População activa e actividade económica em Portugal dos finais do século XIX à actualidade—uma contribuição para o estudo do crescimento económico português" (Ph.D diss., Institute of Economics of the Technical University of Lisbon, 1989).

Estimates of gross domestic product of Trás-os-Montes circa 1790 and 1890 were computed from fiscal payments assuming a ratio of fiscal payments to gross domestic product similar to the Portuguese national ratio in 1890.

The price index was taken from "Portuguese Economic Growth 1835–1985" by Nunes, Mata, and Valério (1989).

6. *A Note on Portuguese Monetary Units*

In the last decade of the eighteenth century, the Portuguese monetary regime was bimetalism, and the monetary unit was the *real* (plural *réis*) defined as 2.054 mg of gold and as 28.046 mg of silver. The *conto* was an accounting unit equal to one million *réis*. The par was £1 = 3,565 *réis*.

In the last decade of the nineteenth century, the Portuguese monetary regime was monometalism (the classical gold standard), and the monetary unit was still the *real* defined as 1.626 mg of gold, The par was £1 = 4,500 *réis*.

In 1911, the *real* was replaced by the *escudo* equal to one thousand *réis*. The gold definition was, of course, dropped later, but the units *escudo* and *conto* (with 1 *conto* = 1,000 *escudos*) are still used today.

REFERENCE

Nunes, Ana Bela; Mata, Eugénia & Valério, Nuno (1989). "Portuguese Economic Growth 1833–1985," *The Journal of European Economic History*, XVIII, 2, Fall, 291–330.

Processes of Peripheralization in a Core Region

The Campine Area of Antwerp in the "Long" Nineteenth Century*

Eric Vanhaute

Peasant life is committed to survival. . . . In so far as it produced the necessary surplus, it was integrated into the historical economic-cultural system. In so far as it supported itself, it was on the frontier of that system.
—John Berger in *Pig Earth* (Part 1 of *Into Their Labours*)

1. PROCESSES OF PERIPHERALIZATION: THE REGIONAL ANGLE

In world-systems analysis the space dimension has always played a prominent part. According to Braudel, the layering of the world-economy in concentric zones "gives capitalism life" (Braudel, 1977: 92), and Wallerstein regards this spatial subdivision into core, periphery, and an intermediate zone not only as the basis for world inequality, but also as the most important motor for incorporation into the world-system (see, e.g., Hopkins & Wallerstein, 1987: 774). In this context processes of peripheralization turn "the use of local resources—in land, in subsoil resources, and in labor—toward the production of items that maximize the process of overall capital accumulation in the world-economy" (Wallerstein & Martin, 1979: 194). This redistribution of the benefits of participation in the world division of labor in favor of core regions is a permanent process based on the continuous mobility of capital, goods, and labor (Arrighi & Drangel, 1986: 27).

* This paper is based on lectures delivered at the Fernand Braudel Center, State University of New York at Binghamton, May 2, 1991, and the Center for Studies of Social Change, New School for Social Research, New York, May 21, 1991. I am especially thankful for the remarks of Professors Giovanni Arrighi and Louise Tilly.

For the study of trends of peripheralization in a regional context, the research of Arrighi and Piselli on southern Italian Calabria is pioneering, not only because it displaces the state as the unit of analysis, but also, above all, because it relates social and economic transformations on a regional scale with shifts in the spatial relations in the world-economy (Arrighi & Piselli, 1987: 649–751). Three Calabrian regions—large commodity (capitalist) production, small commodity (farmer) production, and subsistence (peasant) production—offer three very different "road[s] to peripheralization," that is, "alternative forms of social life and social change within an evolving world-economy" (Arrighi & Piselli, 1987: 736). By putting the focus on "social conflict," or "internal" resistance against "external" (direct or indirect) flows of goods, labor, and capital, this research illuminates in the first place the interaction between regional economies and the world-system. The analysis of the internal structure of income and survival is, then, indispensable to the understanding of the dynamics and resilience, versus the dismantling, of regional societies and, consequently, of processes of peripheralization and deperipheralization.

In this paper we hope to demonstrate that income organization—its composition, internal coherence, and crumbling—is a basic explanatory variable in the study of the expansion of, as opposed to the incorporation into, the capitalist world-system.[1] The fieldwork on which this paper is based focused on the socioeconomic processes of transformation in the nineteenth-century Antwerp Campine region. This area was situated in the center of the core countries of Belgium and the Netherlands, yet, until the beginning of the twentieth century, was undeniably characterized by peripheralization. Two questions accordingly guide us. First of all, how do we describe the socioeconomic organization and, particularly, the substructures of income and survival in this rural society between 1750 and 1910? Can we distinguish processes of dynamics and/or dismantling? Secondly, in which way can these processes be integrated in an interpretative model that starts from the reallocation of, and incorporation into, a capitalistic division of labor?

[1] The basic material for this research is brought together in E. Vanhaute, "De dynamiek en de ontmanteling van de rurale inkomens- en overlevingsstruktuur. De Antwerpse Kempen tussen 1750 en 1910" (unpubl. Ph.D. diss., State University of Gent, 1990). A revised and shortened version is published (Vanhaute, 1992).

2. RURAL SOCIETY IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY FLANDERS: PROCESSES OF DYNAMICS AND OF DISMANTLING

Obviously, the previous questions point to the global, internal socioeconomic organization of rural society. In this way we have tried to formulate an alternative to the two dominant scientific angles in the social and economic history of rural society, namely, studies grounded in macroeconomic research and studies with a sociocultural bent.

Macroeconomic research narrows the Braudelian aim of the *longue durée* to the compiling of quantitative time series, with the ultimate goal of framing the social world in terms of purchasing power or, more broadly, of national accounts (the reconstruction of the G.N.P.).[2] On the microlevel, the sociocultural angle confines itself to the internal life in the villages, often resulting in superficial and/or ahistorical descriptions.[3] This artificial historical division of labor between macro "contour sketches" and micro "filling-in exercises" has had a slowing-down effect on the development of models of social interpretation. The macroeconomic angle—insofar as the multiple problems of historical criticism of the sources that cross the process of reconstruction of production and consumption can be solved satisfactorily—has almost *par définition* a limited explanatory force. We say *par définition* because it overlooks in the first place (or, at its best, regards as dependent variables) the social tangents, the division of production, income, and consumption over the social groups, and the resultant struggle between them; and secondly, because of the narrow definition of the economic sector that neglects internal (household-based) networks of income and survival. Sociocultural studies, on the other hand, often keep a distance from the material bases of income organization and refer mechanically to broader processes of transformation. In short, both approaches are based on reduced concepts of reality and consequently cannot present generalizing explanatory schemes for social developments.

An inevitable step towards such an explanatory model is the

[2] Pioneers of the method of national accounts are P. Deane, W. H. Cole, and S. Kuznets. For an overview, see Van der Wee & Delbeke (1983: 11–29).

[3] Two of the best-known synthesizing studies are Weber (1976) and Luxardo (1984).

elaboration of an "integrated" methodology, directed at the lifting of artificial delimitations between economic, social, and cultural activities. We hope to make a modest contribution to this integrated methodology with our microresearch. We call it integrated because it relies in the first place on basic cross-sections, the result of the gathering of quantitative information per household from a multiplicity of socioeconomic and demographic censuses. Secondly, we try to integrate the analytical levels of the socioeconomic organization in the villages in one overall view, relating the internal dynamics of the village with the external dynamics of the world-system. This is our paradigm of analysis; it perceives the resilient internal structures of income and survival (the microlevel) as an answer to, or as a reaction against, the intrusion of capitalist relations of labor and production (the meso- and macrolevel). The unit of analysis is the household, not as an independent variable, but within the context of the regional economy and society. This regional context is the Antwerp Campine ("Kempen"), the sandy rural area east of the harbor town, Antwerp (see map).

The main characteristics of nineteenth-century agricultural exploitation are the small family farm, moderate soil productivity, mixed farming (the combination of crops and livestock in one production cycle), the subsidiary character of market production, and the vast waste lands. Because of the very slow virtual disappearance of subsistence farming in large parts of continental Europe in the nineteenth and even twentieth century, the results of this research exceed in our view the original regional context of the study.

Before we can elucidate the transformations in the Campine villages, we need first of all to define this "structure of income and survival" and to describe the so-called dynamics or resilience of it. The rural structure of income and survival is a set of internal socioeconomic patterns and relations functioning, at least partly, independently or autonomously from market networks that frame the capitalist world-system. Taking into account a certain degree of autonomy (loosely defined) in the social life in the countryside is not the same as stating that this pattern of rural organization falls beyond the perspective of the modern world-system. One can even say the contrary, as I will argue further in this paper.

Five main components build up or support these structures or

Map. Province of Antwerp (Belgium)

strategies, all pointing to a social organization based on self-control.

• First of all, there is the dominance of property holding—the property of real estate, of houses and land, and the property of the means of production—and this as an antipode of the processes of expropriation and proletarianization.

• Secondly, there is the independent status of labor, translated as the independent, self-controlled regulation of labor circumstances, and this contrasts with a dependent, proletarianized labor status. This allows for a free hand over labor intensity, a major tool in regulating the production process.

• The third component is the independent status of income, income defined here as the "total income of the household". As stated before, the household is regarded as the unit of counting, of analysis. In this analysis we do not confine ourselves to an enumeration of all monetary, and even non-monetary, earnings, but define this total income as the addition of all benefits proper to the rural social organization.

In this rural income, four subcomponents can be distinguished. (a) Income may be based on independent labor, as mentioned above. This can be agrarian (in most cases) or nonagrarian (e.g., artisanal) labor. For example, the cultivation of just a few acres of land can already be an important supplement to other earnings supporting the household. (b) If necessary, this "independent" income might be combined with earnings based on dependent labor, either within the household (as is the case of proto-industrial forms of labor) or outside the household. As a rule, this "dependent" income is only a supplement to self-controlled forms of income. (c) Income may emanate from what can be called "informal" circuits of commodities, services, and labor. These include, for example, the exchange of a whole gamut of services that are part of everyday life—the availability of a range of cheap or unpaid chains of commodities, labor and services, and earnings from "non-official" or even illegal activities such as smuggling, poaching, and wood-gathering. (d) Relating to the former subcomponent, we mention here the broad range of public rights, generally called "common usage," on waste and wooded land, on borders and edges, and on arable and pasture land after the harvest. The importance of these, very often unwritten, common rights in a rural society with a yet relatively strong internal organization, can barely be overstressed.

This is plainly illustrated by the usage of free grazing of sheep and cattle; the gathering of fruits, wood, fuel, construction materials, and manure; the availability of free land for the native poor; and much more. In the Campine area of Flanders, and in many parts of rural western Europe where the family farm remains predominant, these common rights, although not today legally backed and even strongly opposed by the central authorities, disappeared, if slowly, in the nineteenth century and first half of the twentieth century. The pace with which they were dismantled was set by the process of the intrusion of external market structures. The English case, however, well known as the enclosure movement, is, as is many of its developments, not characteristic of the European continent.

Thus, these four subcomponents—independent labor, the possible combination with earnings based on dependent labor, the informal sector, and common rights—compose, with varying degrees of significance, the "total income of the household." What, then, are the most important characteristics of this rural income? First, the combination of several activities and earnings per household, that is, household-based income pooling, is the rule. Secondly, the subsistence of the household, the balance between the needs and the wants of the household, on the one hand, and labor efforts, on the other hand, is the ultimate aspiration of those who work the land. Thirdly, the internal, rural circuit and supply of commodities, labor, and services are the main sources of income. And fourthly, the flexibility in the composing of the household's total income is the primary element responsible for the resilience of the income structure. Insofar as the reproduction of the household can be secured, many shifts in the composition of income are possible. This, for example, explains the relatively swift implantation and disappearance of proto-industrial activities in the countryside, at least to the extent that the agrarian basis of the income structure is not fundamentally undermined. This was the case in several Campine villages (cf. Vanhaute, 1991).

• After property holding, independent labor input, and independent income formation, the fourth principal components of the rural structure of income and survival are the internal, at least partly independent, movement and determination of wages and prices. Until well into our century, and in some aspects up to the present, the level of wages and prices in the countryside is well

below the general, and *a fortiori*, the urban average. The peculiarity of the rural income formation, as mentioned above, and the quasi-absence, at least until the end of the nineteenth century, of fully proletarianized households, are responsible for the low level of wages, which is not enough to sustain one's family. Internal circuits of commodities and services generate, on the other hand, a partly autonomous price determination. The determining factor in this is not the exchange value but what is called the use value, the value without the reproduction costs of labor.[4]

• And finally, as a fifth component, we have to mention the global subsistence of the regional economy, within its regional context, and this again with regard to the chains of commodities, labor, and services. Because this self-sufficiency on a regional scale did not exclude external exchanges and transfers, it does not point to an autarchic, closed economic organization. In other words, regional subsistence includes a kind of production that covers both the regional needs and the required surpluses for transfer or trade.

These are the five principal components of the globalizing concepts of income and survival, and for each, we need research into the rural society.[5] It needs to be stressed, however, that these components or substructures do not frame a stringent model of some "ideal" autarchic society. On the contrary, used as flexible guiding principles in research, they allow us to describe the processes of internal dynamics and dismantling of what I have called the rural structures of income and survival.

[4] In this I join the narrow definition of Braudel (1977: 17) ("Everything outside the market [economic life] has only 'use value'; anything that passes through the narrow gate into the marketplace acquires 'exchange value'") with Marx (1983: 438) ("Use values become a reality only by use or consumption").

[5] In his analysis of the internal organization of peasant householding, the Russian economist Chayanov stressed familiar characteristics, such as household-based labor, the balance between labor and consumption, the independence of the market, and the flexibility of labor intensity and labor surpluses. The difference with our analysis is that we take into account, in the first place, the global rural organization, and not only the peasant economy; secondly, our approach leaves much more room for flexibility and adaptability in a temporal perspective (cf. Chayanov, 1966). For an integration of Chayanov's theory in an historical study, see Dallas (1982).

3. PROCESSES OF TRANSFORMATION IN THE RURAL ORGANIZATION OF INCOME AND SURVIVAL IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY ANTWERP CAMPINE

As I have already pointed out, the core of this research is based on a microscopic investigation into the socioeconomic life of several Campine villages, which, when taken as a group, represent an important diversity in the economic substructure (agrarian organization, proto-industry, modern industry at the end of the century, external trade, etc.).[6] The fieldwork rests on four basic cross-sections—1750, 1800, 1850, and 1910. For each census year the available statistics on the communal level were put together, so that per household family cards could be compiled, each containing information on the constitution of the household, the professional occupations, the possession of land, houses, and livestock, the agrarian exploitation, the fiscal assessments, and so on. Integrated microresearch is, to be sure, an extremely labor-intensive method. Yet it allows, given that decent quantitative sources are secured, a scientific approach with multiple angles of analysis. Therefore, this method is far superior to one-dimensional approaches based on censuses of professional occupations or on static models of stratification, such as those generated from tax lists. The period from the mid-eighteenth to the beginning of the twentieth century is long enough to interpret basic transformations with regard to two main integrating forces, industrial capitalism and the central state. In further research the *terminus ad quem* has to be moved up to as late as the 1960's, to include what can be considered as the final stage in the process of the disintegration of the Flemish and western European countryside.

In what follows I distinguish between three analytical levels in the socioeconomic organization and, of course, transformation of

[6] In our original research we selected three communities, two in the center of the region and one on the outskirts of it (bordering on a major city). Here we confine ourselves to the two center villages, Rijkevorsel and Dessel. Rijkevorsel is an agrarian village that, from the last quarter of the nineteenth century onwards, passes through a rapid industrialization process (brickworks, chemical industry). Between 1750 and 1850, Dessel is characterized by the implanting and languishing of proto-industrial cloth manufacture (wool). The second half of the nineteenth century means a backsliding in the agrarian sector.

rural society. These are the organization of population, the organization of labor, and the organization of income and survival. The three levels of analysis, it should be added, possess a cumulative explanatory potency. In other words, the previous level of description and explanation is always integrated into the next level. Let me begin my survey with an examination of the organization of population.

A. *The Organization of Population*

The first thing we must know is the demographic organization of the actors in the story—namely, those living in the small Campine villages. Between 1750 and 1910 the total population of the region grew 170%, a moderate annual growth rate of .50 to .75%. This growth is the result of three major demographic characteristics.

First, the trend of decreasing mortality rates varied from about 30% or more in the eighteenth century to 20% or less around 1910.

Secondly, the relatively stable level of birth rates, at least up to the last quarter of the nineteenth century, was followed by a strong upswing, from 30–33 to 40% or more, after 1900. This signals a breakthrough in what we can call a "traditional" demographic pattern. The well-known restrictive nuptial behavior, mainly controlled by high average marriage ages and by a significant share of never-married people in the total population, is loosened from the end of the nineteenth century onwards. However, this does not affect the high fertility rates within the marriage; on the contrary, they increase, resulting in more births per marriage and a broadening base of the population pyramid. The portion of the population below 15 years decreases between 1750 and 1850 from 35 to 30% but rises sharply after 1880 to 40–45% in 1910. This process towards a combination of high nuptiality and high fertility rates is illustrated in table 1.

The trend between 1846 and 1910 is clear: more fertile women having a married status, and a higher "productivity" within the marriage. The intrusion of practices of "anticonception" in broad layers of the rural population in Flanders is only a matter of the postwar period, the 1950's and, primarily, the 1960's.

The third important demographic characteristic concerns the patterns of mobility or migration. Although an increasing part of the population becomes mobile, the average loss due to emigration

Table 1. Index of Nuptiality (IN) and Nuptial Fertility (NF)

	Dessel		Rijkevorsel	
	IN	NF	IN	NF
1846	0.456	0.797	0.347	0.881
1910	0.600	1.044	0.600	0.989

Note: Index IN: portion of fertile women (15–49 years) actually living in marriage-bond; values below 0.5 indicate a restrictive nuptial behavior.
Index NF: indicator of the real use of the potential fertility of married women between 15 and 49 years old; values of 0.8 and more reflect a natural pattern.

Table 2. Migration Rates (Per 1,000 Per Year)

	Dessel		net	Rijkevorsel		net
	immig.	emig.	flow	immig.	emig.	flow
1831–35	18.5	23.3	-4.7			
1836–40	19.4	26.8	-7.4			
1841–45	20.8	25.8	-5.0			
1846–50	28.7	36.6	-7.9	45.6	44.9	+0.7
1851–55	32.3	41.5	-9.2	43.5	47.8	-4.3
1856–60	37.0	41.7	-12.7	41.1	52.9	-11.8
1861–65	29.0	38.7	-9.7	45.0	57.5	-12.5
1866–70	27.5	32.9	-5.4	47.0	50.8	-3.8
1871–75	26.7	31.5	-4.8	43.5	39.7	+3.8
1876–80	20.3	26.7	-6.4	62.2	48.2	+14.0
1881–85	25.1	28.0	-2.9	47.4	56.0	-8.6
1886–90	29.5	35.3	-5.8	51.2	50.6	+0.6
1891–95	28.5	38.2	-9.7	51.6	48.4	+3.2
1896–1900	26.0	38.2	-12.2	70.2	56.5	+13.7
1901–05	30.4	32.5	-2.1	64.3	57.4	+6.9
1906–10	24.5	32.2	-7.7	63.7	68.9	-5.2
1911–13	23.7	36.8	-13.1	50.0	57.3	-7.3

Note: Gross figures for immigration and emigration and net flow.

surpluses is limited to 1% on a yearly basis. The annual coefficients for the three villages are compiled in table 2. 50 to 60% of all emigrants stay in the rural neighborhood, within a radius of 20 km. The direct loss to urban centers (emigration to minus immigration from cities) is limited to .5% a year. These figures, in short, do not point to an *exode rural.*

By way of a summary, these three demographic elements—

mortality, fertility, and mobility—are responsible, on the one hand, for the multiplication of the population with a rate of more than 2.5% in 150 years and, on the other hand, for a remarkable stability in the global demographic pattern until the last decennia of the nineteenth century. This stability, a combination of a "traditional" pattern of nuptiality and fertility with low emigration losses, is based on a resilient, dynamic socioeconomic organization, again, at least up to the end of the nineteenth century. In analyzing the organizational structures of labor, income, and survival, we try to elaborate further these processes of dynamics and dismantling.

B. The Organization of Labor

The analysis of the organization of labor is concentrated on the supply of and demand for labor and, of course, on the balance between them. For that purpose we have elaborated a comparison between demand and supply in the economic sectors, and this is expressed in a double way: in the number of active persons, or the active labor force, what we call "the participation of labor"; and in the number of man-years, called "the input of labor". Two methods of calculation have been used. The first one, the participation of labor, expresses the total measured number of the active population, independent of their part- or full-time status. The outcome is given in proportion to the total population or to the population between 15 and 65 years old, the theoretically active population (about 65% of the total population). The second method computes the input of labor, translated in the theoretical measuring instrument, man-years. A man-year is the equivalent of the amount of labor of a full-time adult male worker during one year. The result is given in proportion to the total amount of labor, again theoretically available. Table 3 compares these computations for the agrarian sector, and table 4 includes the division between the agrarian and the nonagrarian sectors.

An important trend is the relapse, as it were, of the proportion of the input and, especially, of the participation of labor to the amount of labor that is theoretically available in the villages. Or, in other words, we detect an increasing surplus and, consequently, an increasing tension, in the rural labor market from the second half of the nineteenth century onwards. It is true that, due to an un-

Table 3. Input and Participation of Labor in the Agrarian Sector

	input: man-years % potential supply man-years	participation: active population (% total population)			
		self-supp. farmers	casual labor	servants	total agrarian population
Dessel					
1755	37	27	2	6	35
1796	46	33	2	5	40
1846	34	34	4	5	43
1910	32	26	3	1	30
Rijkevorsel					
1755	46	39	3	7	49
1796	50	44	4	7	55
1846	48	36	8	10	54
1910	33	27	1	2	30

Note: Input of labor: expressed in man-years (% of total supply of labor in man-years); participation of labor: expressed in the number of active workers (% of total population; active population is ± 65% of total population).

equal distribution of tasks, a (more-or-less temporary) surplus of labor is inherent in an agrarian economy (which accounts for the ease with which proto-industrial activity absorbs this surplus); but the greater supply of workers from the end of the nineteenth century onwards is only partly compensated by a process of intensification in agriculture and by new possibilities in the secondary and tertiary sectors. The consequence of this is twofold. First, there is a growing surplus of labor "hiding" in the primary sector (resulting in a further division of activities without increasing the total input, expressed in man-years, and, consequently, in a pressure on the productivity of labor) and in a variety of related, underlying, informal circuits. There is also, secondly, a shrinking of the (agrarian and nonagrarian) independent status of exploitation or labor (in 1910, only 40 to 60% of the active population has a nondependent labor status, dropping back from 80% and more in the eighteenth-century agrarian villages).

Table 4. The Demand for Labor: Proportion of Supply of Labor and Division Between Agrarian and Nonagrarian Sectors

	participation of labor			input of labor		
	% population 15–64 y.	% agr. sector	% nonagr. sector	% potential supply man-years	% agr. sector	% nonagr. sector
Dessel						
1755	82	56	44	74	50	50
1796	92	53	47	99	46	54
1846	89	66	34	62	55	45
1910	70	50	50	67	48	52
Rijkevorsel						
1755	95	77	23	66	70	30
1796	103	73	27	75	67	33
1846	105	72	28	74	65	35
1910	73	47	53	72	46	54

Note: Input of labor: man-years; participation of labor: active population (% of "active" population between 15 and 65 years old).

C. The Organization of Income and Survival

After having detected an increasing disequilibrium in the internal labor market, we move to the third and most comprehensive level of research, the organization of the income structure. Within this structure we stress four processes undermining the rural income strategies, as defined above, especially from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards.

First of all, there is the undeniable process of expropriation and proletarianization, of the loss of real estate. This can be illustrated most clearly by concentrating on the organization of property holding. Some summarizing figures can be found in table 5.

Between 1750 and 1910, a double evolution in the property patterns of real estate took place: first, a growing portion of Campine land owned by nonresidents (7 to 15% in 1750 to 40% of the land in 1910); and secondly, an increase in the number of households without land or dwelling (5 to 10% in 1750, 25 to even 60–70% in 1910). There is, therefore, no doubt that we can speak of a process of expropriation. The number of families owning more than 2

Table 5. Residential Landholding (Private Autochthonous Proprietors)

	% total surface	% families without property	distribution families with property (% all fam. with property)				
			-0.5	0.5–2	2–4	4–10	10+ hectare
Dessel							
1755	45	5	11	26	20	31	12
1796	45	10					
1846	50	22	21	27	17	24	11
1910	40	22	42	30	8	15	6
Rijkevorsel							
1755	29	10					
1796	27	23	19	10	3	25	44
1846	59	33	19	12	11	12	46
1910	56	61	33	21	11	8	26

hectares (the absolute minimum for a subsistence farm) diminished from 60 to 65% in 1750 to about 20% at the beginning of the twentieth century. Moreover, a greater pressure on the leasing market of real estate was cause for an escalation in the price of land, which, in real terms (i.e., relative to the price of rye and to daily wages), tripled or even quadrupled during the period under consideration.

As a second process in the income structure we point to the growing importance of what we have called "the dependent labor position," and this translated as the disruption of concord between the possession and input of labor, on the one hand, and the possession and input of the means of production, on the other hand. Two parameters illustrate this evolution. Between 1750 and 1910, the number of households that were able to manage exclusively on the family farm was cut down by half (from 60 to 30%), whereas the number of families dependent on non-self-controlled labor grew larger and larger (from 15–25% to 60–70% in 1910). Consequently, income pooling based on an increasing share of uncertain income strategies (e.g., irregular wage-labor) became more and more important. Or, in other words, the loss of the local population's control over its own income position was accelerated. Besides, the available wage-labor was mostly a non-full-time occupation (we find, for example, a lot of seasonal unemployment in the local brick-

works, set up in the Campine region from the last quarter of the nineteenth century onwards), and the earnings remained, as discussed above, extremely low until a few years before the First World War. It was only after 1900 that the "real" level of the middle of the eighteenth century was reached again and exceeded.

As a third process, we must take into consideration the greater burden of direct surplus extraction on the rural income (the combination of the tax burden and the burden of renting or leasing). The increasing extraregional flow of capital has its roots, primarily, in the multiplication of real rents and of the portion of farmers dependent on rented land. The direct taxation by the local and central governments withdraws less than one-tenth of the total physical product (the combined product of the primary and of the secondary sectors) of the region. Hence this evolution of increasing direct surplus transfer, at least until the interbellum period, almost exclusively benefits private investments, mostly in land.

And finally, as a fourth process, we note once more population growth, which was accelerated by changes in demographic behavior and resulted in both an absolute increase of the potential active population and a growth in absolute and in relative terms of the share of households without an independent labor and income status. The coincidence of this evolution with a less-restrictive nuptial pattern is not an accident. It is a variation on the well-known theme of the relation between independent versus dependent labor and family formation.

Bringing these four evolutions together, it becomes clear how a fast-growing group of the Campine population became dependent on precarious and uncertain strategies of income pooling (strategies without a firm basis of self-controlled labor and income) towards the end of the nineteenth century. But the (apparently contradictory) fact that, as we know, a rural exodus failed to occur can only be explained by the flexibility of the rural organization of survival.

As elaborated in the first part of this paper, this rural network of survival brings together formal and informal circuits of labor, income, and services. The connotation "survival" is more comprehensive than "income," because it also integrates the nonquantified and mostly unquantifiable circuits or networks of labor, services, and income. Consequently, on the one hand, this concept of structure of survival approximates in the most real way the socioeconomic organization of the countryside but, on the other hand, remains and, I think, is doomed to remain in a certain way an amorphous concept, not to be cached in an exclusively quantitative framework. But instead of neglecting aspects that cannot be framed in existing interpretative schemes and, consequently, working with reduced and thus amputated models of reality, I think we must keep trying to broaden, or better, "multidimensionalize" our interpretative models. But turning back to this structure of survival, paramount in this is, as I have already pointed out, the combined and global domestic income, based on a combination of agriculture, the two other "formal" economic sectors, cheap and informal exchange networks of commodities, labor and services, common usage, activities in the nonofficial and semilegal domain, and so on. As long as the stabilizing bases are not significantly affected, the rural structure of income and survival is characterized by a great elasticity, resilience, dynamics. One of the dominant factors in this is without a doubt the agrarian activity. First of all, it guarantees the regional self-sufficiency, the output per capita of the basic agricultural products—namely, grain, potatoes, milk, and meat. Due to important quantitative (reclamations) and qualitative (productivity)[7] improvements in the second and the third quarters of the nineteenth century, these per capita ratios show a rising trend. Secondly, the larger part of Campine households continues to rely for their income on at least a few acres of land (+90% of the families) and, to a lesser degree, on one or more heads of livestock (70–75% of the families; see table 6); these figures point to a remarkable stability until the beginning of the twentieth century.

This network of income and survival, specific for rural societies with a self-sufficient regional supply and with semi-autonomous circuits of commodities, labor, and services, is the primary stabilizing element in the social organization of countryside communities. Only when, in an accelerating pace from the second half of the

[7] Nineteenth-century Campine agriculture is characterized by a doubling of the soil productivity, promoted by internal improvements, above all crop rotation and manuring, all directed towards the consolidation of the traditional mixed exploitation. Commercial fertilizers and mechanization only exercise an influence from the last decennium of the previous century onwards. Quantitative data on labor productivity are scarcely available, but scattered information shows a rising trend, notwithstanding the slowing down effect of the growing labor surplus in the agrarian sector.

Table 6. Families with Livestock (% of Total Families)

	families with horses	cattle	pigs	sheep	goats	total with livestock
Dessel						
1755	31%	72%		9%		72–75%
1796	15%	67%		8%		67%
1816–30	9–14%	61–69%		8%		61–69%
1856	13%	77%	49%	5%		77%
1866	15%	82%	22%	4%	33%	82%
1901–09	30%	74%	75%			75–80%
Rijkevorsel						
1755	69%					70–75%
1765–95	60–66%					65–70%
1796	43%	64%	26%	8%		64%
1816	40%	70%		6%		70%
1820	43%	70%				70%
1826–30	46%	65%	45%	1%		65–70%
1880	26%	49%	53%		62%	72%
1910						(70%)

nineteenth century onwards, various bases in the Antwerp Campine are more and more undermined—I have mentioned property holding, self-controlled labor, independent agrarian activity and income, common rights and usage, possibilities for labor and income pooling allowing for a flexible labor organization, internal and cheap exchange networks of goods, labor, and services—only then can we speak about an irreversible turn in the development, or better, the dismantling, of western European rural society. As mentioned earlier, this turn is reflected in changes in demographic patterns in the villages.

Finally, and this is the last research question, in what way is the "social configuration," the network of social relations, in our villages affected by the processes mentioned. In other words, do they generate a process of social subsidence?

The integrated microresearch (based on integrated cross-sections) enables us to determine the quantitative extent and the qualitative characteristics of what we call the social substratum. This term refers to that section of the population that is either fully proletarianized (without ownership of real estate, with a minimum

of agrarian capital, i.e., no livestock, and without an independent labor status) or, owing to various uncertain strategies of income pooling, balances on the verge of the rural mechanism of survival: in short, the households having no stable income bases. This substratum doubles in the period under consideration, from 20–25% in the eighteenth century to 40–50% by the beginning of the twentieth century. Table 7 compiles the most important social and socio-economic parameters of the income structure for two cross-sections, 1846 and 1910. The evolution of the social substratum between 1750 and 1910 can be deduced from table 8.

Table 7. Parameters Concerning the Income Structure between 1846/56 and 1910

	Dessel		Rijkevorsel	
	1846	1910	1846	1910
participation of labor (% population 14–65 y.)	89%	70%	105%	73%
families with landholding	78%	78%	67%	39%
– with livestock	77%	75–80%	70%	70%
– with self-supp. farm	45%	30%	50%	30%
– dependent on wage labor	37%	58%	19%	75%
real wages (unskilled laborers) (liters of rye per day)	7	14	7	12
burden of surplus-extraction (proportion of hectares of rye)	0.14	0.32	0.15	0.24
extent of social substratum (% tot. population) –minimum	15%	15%	15–20%	30–35%
–maximum	30–35%	40–45%	30–35%	45–50%

These tables confirm that we are dealing with a process of proletarianization and social polarization (knowing that the superstratum does not shrink). However, we have to be more cautious with the term "pauperization." When it is associated with a crisis of subsistence or with hunger in general, the concept is simply not appropriate. And so, in search of a substitute, we find that the increasing instability of income structures in particular and the destabilizing effect of the process of dismantling in general allow us to use the concept of "social subsidence."

Table 8. Extent of the Social Substratum (% of the Total Population)

	Dessel	Rijkevorsel
1750	20–25%	20–25%
1800	25–30%	25–30%
1850	30–35%	30–35%
1910	40–45%	45–50%

Note: For maximum definition of social substratum cf. text and table 7.

4. THE VILLAGE AND THE WORLD-SYSTEM: AN INTERPRETATIVE SCHEME FOR THE PROCESSES OF DYNAMICS AND DISMANTLING

In composing an explanatory model which integrates the determined transformation processes, two major questions deserve attention. The first one points to the historical and spatial situating of the Campine region, an area only one day's journey from one of the centers of sixteenth-century capitalism, Antwerp. In this, what we call the external interpretation, two fundamentally contradictory positions can be taken up. The first position considers the Antwerp Campine as a nonintegrated, more or less autarchic region, and this either with a negative connotation, the region as a latecomer in the process of development, as a "dead weight," an irrational aberration in a rationalizing world; or from a positive, nostalgic point of view, the Campine as a "reservoir" of traditional values in a desecrating urban and industrial world. Both circumscriptions, often considered opposites, put the emphasis on the nonintegrated, precapitalistic social structures. Although this scientific approach, which starts from a notion of deficient modernization, leaves scope for autonomous decision-making processes, it quickly runs up against its own limits. Because it implicitly assumes the "old" rural society as homogeneous and static, integration and resistance are not regarded as dialectical processes. On the contrary, incorporation often turns up as a *deus ex machina*; at a given moment in time (toward the end of the nineteenth century) the premodern countryside, the passive recipient, is absorbed by modern social structures,

the active agent. A less one-dimensional and linear analysis can be worked out by evaluating the transformation processes not outside but within a capitalist division of labor. This does not imply that internal and semi-independent social substructures are excluded—on the contrary. In this context processes of destabilization do not result from a supposed backwardness or a delayed modernization, but from the position of the region within the development of historical capitalism as the regulating social and economic organization. Processes of reallocation of the centers of accumulation and of the networks of exchange are translated into the spatial restructuring of centers and peripheries. In this interpretative scheme, the nineteenth-century Antwerp Campine is not a latecomer in history, but a typical area, to use one of the standardized expressions in the world-systems perspective, "on the road to peripheralization."

Two evolutions, analyzed above, support this process. On the one hand, there is the increasing interference of different forms of surplus transfer—direct transfer through taxes and, more important, rents (the process of expropriation), indirect transfer through the selling of cheap labor (local industries; permanent and temporary migration) and commodities (agrarian surpluses, protoindustrial goods)—that link the regional economy with national and transnational exchange networks. On the other hand, there is the waning importance of internal, noncommodified circuits of goods, labor, and services and of a regional self-supply, and an increasing dependency of extraregional supplies.[8] These two developments, which, as we know, generate a process of dismantling and social subsidence, reach their turning points in the beginning of the twentieth century, when an accelerating process of integration or incorporation in core activities pushes aside—slowly—the negative effects of peripheralization. This enclosing of the Flemish countryside in the core—which is due to the implantation of modern industries and services in the countryside, the commuting of labor to industrial and administrative centers, and the transformation to and survival of market-oriented family farms[9]—is a twentieth-century process

[8] A raising of productivity and output in the agrarian sector by no means contradicts processes of polarization and proletarianization. On the contrary, an expansion of market-oriented production often accelerates processes of peripheralization.

[9] Although we also underline the remaining predominance, at least until the 1960's,

with its roots in the late nineteenth-century depression, and only reaches its final point in the 1960's. This process is part of a reorganization of the extraregional division of labor and income, with the marginalizing of income pooling and the pivoting of wage-labor. We call it the last phase of Flemish rural society, the phase of enclosing, of deperipheralization.[10] Again, we must keep in mind the "long run" of this process, for example, wages in rural Flanders remain until the 1960's significantly lower than in the more industrialized southern part of Belgium. What is important here is that only in this integrated interpretative model can basic characteristics of, and developments in, nineteenth-century rural society, and, even more important, their interrelation, be described and explained satisfactorily. We note again the dynamics of the internal organization, flows of surplus extraction, and the process of social subsidence. These elements are mostly omitted or even denied in developmentalist explanatory schemes.

The second question brings up, after an external framing, the internal aspect. In other words, how can we relate the internal "resistance" to the external "integration"? In addressing this question the study by Arrighi and Piselli on nineteenth- and twentieth-century southern Italian Calabria is most inspiring, especially concerning the definition of autonomous social action within the margins, the limits of the evolving world-system. A key variable for them is the social struggle, the "resistance against all kinds of exploitative tendencies" (Arrighi & Piselli, 1987: 736). It touches one of the fundamental paradigms in historical research, individual (or local) autonomy versus social (or central) determination, a

of family exploitation in Flemish and western European agriculture, the role of this production unit cannot be evaluated properly without recognizing the fundamental changes in its structure and goals in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Because of this lacuna the contribution of Jonsson and Petterson (1989) passes by questions concerned with the income structure of the family farm.

[10] It is clear that in peripheralization and deperipheralization defined as consequences of processes of reallocation and polarization, elements of difference earn as much attention as elements of resemblance. Regional peculiarities include differences in time (the period in the development of historical capitalism), space (the region as part of bigger spatial units with a core, semiperipheral, or peripheral character), and historical-social context (the strength of subsistence-oriented income structures). This exhorts us to be cautious when comparing regions as diverse as nineteenth-century Campine, twentieth-century Calabria, and contemporary Third World areas.

paradigm in the center of numerous pioneering studies, from Marx's *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* to Braudel's *Material Civilization and Capitalism*.[11] In my interpretative scheme I am inclined to put a strong emphasis on internal forms of organization and resistance, not only evolving as a reaction upon external pressures, but also as the organizing principle in the survival strategies. The central role of the internal and at least semi-independent organization of population (the restrictive demographic pattern, the low rates of external mobility), of labor (the predominance of non-wage labor), of income (the central function of independent income strategies), and of survival (based on self-controlled exchange networks of goods, labor, and services, and on regional self-supply), cannot be evaluated properly by pointing out exclusively external pressures and the resulting internal reactions. We have to recognize the importance of internal dynamics with their own rationality, structuring everyday social life in the villages. Only when this has a firm, self-controlled base, can there be something called a "social struggle." It is the confrontation between these two dynamics, the external of historical capitalism and the internal of village life, that feeds the social conflict, a central shaping and reshaping factor in the capitalist world-system. This social conflict has an active and violent character only in a minority of instances. Much more common is the story of everyday resilience and resistance against the commodification of land, labor, and goods. As pointed out by Arrighi and Piselli, in societies with a strong peasant orientation, this resistance has a defensive nature, directed at the internal cohesion of the communities (Arrighi & Piselli, 1987: 656–61). Resistance can be analyzed at three levels of the social organization: the organization of population (the control of the patterns of fertility and mobility), the organization of labor (the absorbing of the labor surplus and adaptation of the labor intensity), and the organization of income and survival (the supporting role of the

[11] This weighing of determinacy in historical perspective is a stepmotherly-treated aspect in world-systems analysis. If we want to "tackle the question of polarization within the capitalist world-economy," for Wallerstein one of the main issues in the "second phase" of world-systems analysis is that more attention has to be spent on questions which address the problems of internal dynamics and dismantling (Wallerstein, 1990: 290). See also the comments by Goldfrank (1990: 252–53).

agrarian sector, the flexibility in income pooling). Each is a strategy to resist the dismantling of self-controlled structures of labor and income. Integrating this rationality into their behavior, its presumed "conservative" or "unteachable" character takes on a completely different connotation.[12]

In this contribution we hope to have reset some benchmarks for a further integration of the micro- and the macrolevel, of the level of the household, the village and the neighborhood, and the level of the world-system. To keep this project going, there is a need for new and original basic research. To be rewarding, this research has to meet three requirements: first, the analysis and integration of the three social substructures—population, labor, and income and survival; secondly the use of an explanatory paradigm that encloses both the dynamics of the micro- and macrolevel; and, last but not least, severe selection and criticism of the historical sources. Without good sources there can be no significant generalizations.

REFERENCES

Arrighi, Giovanni & Drangel, Jessica (1986). "The Stratification of the World-Economy: An Explanation of the Semiperipheral Zone," *Review*, X, 1, Sum., 9–74.

Arrighi, Giovanni & Piselli, Fortunata (1987). "Capitalist Development in Hostile Environments: Feuds, Class Struggles and Migrations in a Peripheral Region of Southern Italy," *Review*, X, 4, Spr., 649–751.

Braudel, Fernand (1977). *Afterthoughts on Material Civilization and Capitalism*. Baltimore & London: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.

Chayanov, Aleksandr (1966). *The Theory of Peasant Economy*, D. Thorner, et al., eds., Homewood, Ill: Irwin, for the American Economic Association.

Dallas, Gregor (1982). *The Imperfect Peasant Economy: The Loire Country, 1800–1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Goldfrank, Walter (1990). "Current Issues in World-Systems Theory," *Review*, XIII, 2, Spr., 251–54.

Hopkins, Terence K. & Wallerstein, Immanuel (1987). "Capitalism and the Incorporation of New Zones into the World-Economy," *Review*, X, 5/6, Sum.-Fall, 763–80.

Jonsson, Ulf & Petterson, Ronny (1989). "Friends or Foes? Peasants, Capitalists, and Markets in West-European Agriculture, 1850–1939," *Review*, XII, 4, Fall, 535–71.

[12] In the conclusion of his analysis of three cases of active agrarian resistance in the late nineteenth century, Kimmel stresses the importance of the communal foundation of social movements: "Instead, I believe we must specify the content of those communal foundations, the meanings associated with market participation, and the fusion of political community and economic autonomy, of rational choice and passionate belief that characterized these movements" (1988: 132).

Kimmel, Michael S. (1988). " 'Disheveled Improvisation': Agrarian Resistance to Industrialization in the Late Nineteenth Century," in F. O. Ramirez, ed., *Rethinking the Nineteenth Century: Contradictions and Movements*. New York: Greenwood, 119–38.

Luxardo, Herve (1984). *Rase campagne. La fin des communautés paysannes*. Paris: Aubier-Montaigne.

Marx, Karl (1983). *The Portable Marx*, E. Kamenka, ed. New York: Viking Press.

Van der Wee, Herman & Delbeke, Jos (1983). "Quantitative Research in Economic History After 1945," in R. Fremdling & P. K. O'Brien, eds., *Productivity in the Economies of Europe*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 11–29.

Vanhaute, Eric (1991). "Wolverwerking op het Turnhoutse platteland (1750–1850). Enkele bedenkingen bij het verstomd proto-industrieel debat," *Tijdschrift voor Sociale Geschiedenis*, XVII, 1, 28–49.

Vanhaute, Eric (1992). *Heiboeren. Arbeid, Inkomen en Overleven in de 19de eeuwse Kempen*. Brussels: V.U.B.-Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel (1990). "World-Systems Analysis: The Second Phase," *Review*, XIII, 2, Spr., 287–93.

Wallerstein, Immanuel & Martin, William G. (1979). "Peripheralization of Southern Africa, II: Changes in Household Structure and Labor-Force Formation," *Review*, IV, 2, Fall 193–207.

Weber, Eugen (1976). *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France, 1870–1914*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.