

Historical developments of Family farms and post-war dilemma of agriculture in the Netherland in comparison with Japan

原 島 正 衛

Historical developments of Family farms and post-war dilemma of agriculture in the Netherland in comparison with Japan

Masae Harashima

contents

1. Historical developments of family farm in the Netherlands
 - 1.1. Before 1750
 - 1.2. 1750-1850
 - 1.3. 1850-1914
 - 1.4. 1914-1955
2. Small family farms in the Netherlands between 1920's and early 1950's
 - 2.1. Growth of family farming and its consolidation
 - 2.2. The evolution of the structure of family farms
 - 2.3. Prehistory of Structural policy
 - 2.4. Confessional family farms
 - 2.5. Development of small family farms and the small family farms in agricultural policy in Japan
 - 2.6. Conclusion

As many studies have shown, the current structures of agriculture both in the Netherlands and Japan are predominantly based on family farm. The post war agricultural policies in both countries have been directed mainly to family type of farming. The increase in the labour productivity of family farms after the war, for example, has been one of the most important policy targets.

One of the key issues of agriculture, therefore, is how to put the family farms in the development of modern agriculture. What kind of role did the family farm play in the modern history of agriculture in general and more particularly both in the Netherlands and Japan?¹

Other questions also arise; how did this type of farming occupy the dominant position in agriculture? When did this domination take place?

In this chapter, I will focus the previously studied historical contents of the Netherlands and Japan on the developments of family farm though successive years and its consolidation. After WW2, small family farms entered into difficult situation. This situation will be dealt with within the framework of the post war economic development which brought deep rooted dilemma to the family farms.

1. Historical developments of family farm in the Netherlands

1.1. Before 1750

Roughly speaking, European farming from the 16th to the 18th century was carried out in

the same way as the middle age. Just in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, some big changes occurred in agriculture. In England, enclosure of common community lands, cultivation of new crops, newly reclaimed lands and selective breeding of farm animals took place. New technological improvement such as Norfolk four-course system and the use of iron plough became common and increased the quantity of agricultural products. This supplied the growing demands for food in industrial cities. At the same time, the population growth and commercialization of economy underwent. Based on these developments in agriculture, England was able to become the first industrialized country and 'agrarian capitalism' was borne.

The situation in the Netherlands was quite different and unique.

Since the separation from Spanish empire, commercially oriented farming was strongly developed in the coastal provinces. Commercial interests prevailed in farming activities. Hired agricultural labourers were widely used and borrowing of capital often took place to increase productivity. Those with capital could become large tenants or peasant proprietors. Under these circumstances, transformation of peasant economy in Holland and other coast provinces took place. Merchant class in Holland invested in large land reclamation. Large and capital intensive farms were common despite the dense and growing population. Lack of feudalism in the Republic made landownership primarily a commercial venture. Large farmers were devoted to butter and cheese making and cattle breeding. Farmers near cities became extremely labour intensive to provide products such as horticultural crops, tobacco, bulbs and industrial crops (hemp, hops etc.).²

Polarization of social structure dominated first in Holland and Friesland, then Zealand and Utrecht. It reached in the 18th century to Groningen.³

In pasture farming of the coast provinces, in particular in dairy farming, scale merit played an important role as well as in arable farming. In clay soil, farmers had to plough the land with at least 4 to 6 horses with heavy and expensive tools. Only with large size farming could utilize these capital goods in efficient way. Therefore, factor 'capital' played an important role (capital intensive farming). Accordingly, the ground in coastal provinces was more expensive than the one in the rest of the country and it was difficult for agricultural labourers to access to lands. This commercial and market oriented agriculture in the coast provinces supported the economic activities of the Golden Age of 'United Provinces'.

In the inland provinces, on the contrary, 'peasant economy' was predominant. In the sandy soil of the east provinces, the price of the ground was relatively cheap because of less population pressure compared to the coast provinces. 'Proto-industrial work' provided small farmers and labourers with additional income. Everybody was in the position to explore small farming, although they had to compensate their low rentability through 'self-exploitation' of their family members.

Large farmers on the other hand profited from the increasing possibility to sell their products and the rise of market prices (especially after 1750) in relation to wages. They

could use relatively cheap labour and were able to expand their farms by purchase of drained lands. There was a clear sign of polarization of social structure in this region in which large farmers became more market oriented.

In the south (North Brabant), small farm was relatively large in number and labourers (or farmers without horse) were predominant. This is probably caused by large population pressure compared to the east provinces. No clear polarization was seen.

In this type of (peasant) farming, labour (not capital) stood as the crucial and determinant element. Not land productivity, but labour productivity decided advantage and disadvantage of a farmer.

1.2. 1750–1850

After the Golden Age, the Netherlands in the second half of the 18th century was considered to be economically backward country.⁴ ‘Industrial’ sectors such as iron and steel were indeed in relative stagnation. In this sense, the Netherlands in this period was still a country of commerce and agriculture. However, towards the middle of the 19th century, gradual recovery of economy began to take a shape.

As mentioned, agriculture in the Netherlands had been highly developed since the Golden Age. Around 1800, there was a highly specialized, market oriented and productive agriculture in the coast provinces. There were, on one hand, a large group of the landless, either as rural proletariat or specialized craftsmen. On the other hand, market oriented farmers dominated land use.⁵ There was a clear process of proletarianization and polarization.

In the inland part of the country, the less market oriented small farming (family farming) was predominant. All the means of production were provided by the farmer’s household and products were mainly consumed to keep the household survive. Some kind of ‘self sufficient peasant’ farmers existed there.

These ‘peasant’ farmers did not mean to exclusively engage themselves in farming. In the pre-industrial rural society, agricultural by-occupation was widely practiced in the Netherlands (and also in Japan). Family household of a peasant produced food for the household itself and was engaged in various by-occupations to earn cash in very complexed way.

The concept of ‘family economy’ in pre-industrial rural society can be applied to this situation. In ‘family economy’, the most products, goods and services were produced in house by family members for keeping household alive.

This difference between the coast provinces (strongly market oriented agriculture) and the rest (‘peasant’ farming with low level of specialization) is very fundamental for economic structure and income.⁶

The beginning of the first half of the 19th century was still the period of stagnation in agriculture. As the demand for agricultural products per capita declined, the agricultural production stagnated. At the same time, as the urban sectors in the coast provinces stagnated, the agricultural labour force increased rapidly.

However, towards 1850, agricultural production for arable, livestock and horticulture increased quickly. British market was open to Dutch agricultural products. Purchasing power grew and basic infrastructure such as road, canal and railway was improved. Accordingly, land and labour productivities increased.⁷ The gradual industrialization of neighbour countries made the Netherlands once again important transit point (*trafiiek*) and its late industrialization in due course of the 19th century began to change the rural society. The increasing population pressure and commercialization brought polarization of social structure in rural areas.

This change can be seen in particular in Groningen. Through the analysis of the number of horses per household, increase of agricultural workers between 1807 and 1862 was shown (50% in 1807 and 66% in 1862).⁸ Also in Friesland, the number of small farmers increased and average size of farm decreased between 1793 and 1883.⁹ In other part of the coast provinces, the situation of social structure was similar to the one in Friesland. In general term, it was very difficult for labourers to enter into land market to become a farmer. The needed capital for land lease was extremely high (Df. 100 to 200 per ha.). Labourer whose average wage was 1 guilder per day was not able to pay this sum of money. Together with the increase of agricultural population, polarization of social structure in the coast provinces further developed.

Roughly speaking, a clear 'proletarianization' was seen between 1810 and 1850 and then afterwards a process of 'de-proletarianization' began to emerge, which became clearer after 1880.

In the inland provinces (in particular east provinces), there was also 'polarization' and 'proletarianization' of social structure.

Large farmers profited the most from the commercialization of agriculture, in which cattle breeding became more important. Dissolution of 'mark' and distribution of common pasture land also benefited large farmers.

On the contrary, small farmers in sandy soil had to survive under strong pressure of commercialization. They could do it because they did not need large capital goods. And they used 'self exploitation' nature of their family labour. Mutual supports among small farmers also contributed their competition with large farmers. Through a strong population increase and difficulty to access lands, the number of agricultural labourers grew and they were absorbed by employment in large farms.

In the eastern provinces, through various economic and demographic factors (modern infrastructure; railway, roads, some industrial development; textile, transportation, rural population growth, price increases in livestock products etc.) agriculture of this region was transformed from 'peasant economy' into a specialized and market oriented agriculture.

After the mid-19th century, a lot of small farmers gave up farming and emigrated to cities to gain a higher wage income. The 'proletarianization' of farmers and polarization of the society took place. Already around 1860, the real income rose and the number of work

force per farm began to decrease. After 1880, this tendency became much clearer.

Dutch agriculture was clearly divided in two regions ; highly commercialized and specialized farming in the coast provinces, peasant farming with predominantly small size farm in the inland provinces.

1.3. 1850–1914

This is a period in which the market mechanism worked, export of agricultural products was restored and increased and urbanisation took place. Accordingly structural changes in agriculture also took place.

Since the mid-1860s, international competition with Denmark, France for products such as butter resulted in stagnation of agricultural products. Bad harvests of arable products for 1878, 1879 and 1881 also contributed to the stagnation. Farming population began to leave stagnant rural area and migrated to cities for better wage income. After a clear 'proletarianization' between 1810 and 1850, a process of 'de-proletarianization' began to emerge in cost provinces, which became clearer after 1880. Main cause of this 'de-proletarianization' was the increasing scarcity of labour in rural areas.

Small farmers in sandy soil had to survive under strong pressure of commercialization. They could do it because they did not need large capital goods. And they used 'self exploitation' nature of their family labour. Mutual supports among small farmers also contributed their competition with large farmers. Through a strong population increase and difficulty to access lands, the number of agricultural labourers grew and they were absorbed by employment in large farms.

In the eastern provinces, through various economic and demographic factors (modern infrastructure ; railway, roads, some industrial development ; textile, transportation, rural population growth, price increases in livestock products etc.) agriculture of this region was transformed from 'peasant economy' into a specialized and market oriented agriculture.

After the mid-19th century, a lot of small farmers in the inland provinces gave up farming and emigrated to cities to gain a higher wage income. The 'proletarianization' of farmers and polarization of the society took place. Already around 1860, the real income rose and the number of work force per farm began to decrease. After 1880, this tendency became much clearer.

Before 1880, the total number of labourers and per farm increased. Until 1860, land labourers did not profited and farmers increased their return and incomes. The economic growth took place in some areas of the Netherlands and the economic gap between labourers and farmers widened.

After 1860 the situation gradually changed. The real income of labourers began to increase and the number of labourers per farm began to decrease. After 1880 this tendency became clearer. During and after the agricultural depression, minimization of farms and 'de-

proletarianization' of agricultural population took place. This tendency was stronger in sandy soil of the inland provinces than in the coast provinces, where the structure of farms was rigid and difficult to change.

One of the reasons for this change is the migration of wage earners in agriculture to cities where strong increase of employment took place. During the agricultural depression, there was even a spark of redundancy in agriculture in the coast provinces. The other reason is the increase of the number of small farms, through which large number of land labourers became independent farmers, in particular in the inland provinces.

Since the coast provinces kept relatively large farms and the inland provinces increased the number of small farms, a clearer structural characteristic of Dutch agricultural geography emerged. In general view, the increase of small farms between 1880 and 1910 can be seen. At the same time, the large farms were concentrated in the coast provinces and the small farms were predominant in the inland provinces.

Causes of these changes — 'de-proletarianization' and the growth of small farmers⁰ — can be summarized as follows ;¹⁰

- 1) Strong increase of real wages took place in this period. Nominal wage increased at about 50%, the prices of agricultural products declined and also the living costs declined. These favourable developments for labourers were the results of labour shortage. The economic position of labourer strengthened towards farmers. It also resulted in the changes of social structure, in particular in sand area. In the sand areas, labour productivity was still low and the wage increase was the strongest. Large farming began to unprofitable because of the increase of hired labour. Modernization of the large farms also faced difficulty because large farms consisted of many scattered arable and pasture lands. The increase in wages made small farmers competitive towards large farmers. Small farmers could explore their in-house labour through 'self-exploitation'. Tenancy by the small farmers from the large farmers also increased. Small farmers used these tenanted lands more and more for the less labour intensive cattle and horse breeding. The wage increased more than tenancy price and the entrance to 'land market' by labourers became easier. Even in the coast provinces, the land use by labourers increased substantially.
- 2) Technical developments in the period. Use of artificial fertilizer and manufactured dairy products strengthened the position of small farmers. The artificial fertilizer made small farmers stronger in competition with large farmers. By the introduction of factory for dairy products, small farmer with one or two cow could get the same profit margin as large farmer.
- 3) Importance of the cooperatives for modernization of small farmers. Small farmers were dependent on retailers (traders) for buying materials and selling products. Through the cooperatives, these activities of retailers and traders were abandoned. The cooperative also provided the needed capital for small farmers for modernization. For small family farms the cooperatives were of crucial importance.¹¹

Since 1880, these factors contributed to strengthen the position of small farmers. Equal distribution of means of production among agricultural population became clear. Specialization of small farmers took place, in which they could compete large farmers. Tendency towards the domination of small family farms has begun.

1.4. 1914–1955

This period had crucial importance to the fate of small family farmers in the Netherlands. Facing economic 'up' and 'down' in this period, they consolidated their economic and social position. Interests of the small family farmers became a determinant element of Dutch agriculture. This period also experienced dramatic changes of government policy on agriculture. How did the small family farmers cope with the crisis and changes?

As the demand for labour in cities increased, due to the industrial developments, wages in agriculture also increased already from the late 19th century. Large commercial farmers reacted to this development by decreasing the amount of labour through the rise of labour productivity. However, in case of small farmers, the rise of productivity was not easy business. Lack of capital formation made these small farmers less possible to increase productivities. In addition, children of small farmers who had been important element of labour force tended to immigrate to cities for higher wages and attractive social life. Traditional 'self-exploitation' of remaining 'in-house' labour was the only possible solution for this problem.

Under this situation, farmers, in particular small family oriented farmers, took a strong initiative to organise themselves into farmers unions to protect their interests. Royal Dutch Agricultural Committee (K.N.L.C. : Koninklijk Nederlands Landbouw Comite) was established in 1884, Dutch Catholic Farmers Union (K.N.B.T.B., Katholieke Nederlanse Boeren en Tuindersbond) in 1896 and Dutch Christian Farmers Union (CBTB : Nederlandse Christelijke Boeren-Tuindersbond) in 1918. They initially took a powerful policy to protect the whole farmers, who were facing risks to be left behind the industrial developments in urban areas, and to sustain farming by raising knowledge and technological ingenuity through which they hoped to increase land productivity. Strength and power of these farmers unions had begun useful instrument for the survival of farmers and fate of agriculture in the Netherlands since then. Cooperatives, which were backed by the unions and established in various fields, were useful instrument to achieve these goals.

Once the agricultural depression of the 1890s was over, through favourable economic situation, (commercial) farmers were able to accumulate some capitals which they could use for farm innovations. Around 1910, they enjoyed 'high prices, low production costs'. The First World War further strengthened the position of these farmers. Up until 1917, the Dutch farmers enjoyed favourable price levels mainly thanks to the increase of exports to Germany. A considerable wealth Dutch farmer obtained in this period has been stressed.¹² But after 1918 prices of agricultural products had begun to decline continuously because

of tougher internal competition and international free market for agricultural products. Although large farmers were able to cope with the situation by further rationalisation of their farming, it was not easy for small family farmers to cope with the situation. The only possible solution they could employ was once again further 'self-exploitation' of their 'in-house' labour. Despite of these differences of solutions, the overall situation of Dutch agriculture enjoyed still comparatively favourable period of the 1920s.¹³

After 1928, Dutch agriculture came into a real crisis situation. Three years beginning from 1928 experienced drastic decrease in prices of agricultural products, first for arable products and later for livestock products. Farmers' income began to decline and accordingly employment in agriculture (some 30% reduction). For the survival of farmers (in particular small family farmers), the change of government policy was considered to be the only way out from the crisis. Farmers, centred and organised in farmers unions, rallied for the government intervention for the favour of farmers.

At the beginning, the government policy for the crisis was fragmented and 'sector by sector' approach: Sugar Law (Suikerwet) in 1930, Wheat Law (Tarwewet) in 1931 and Crisis-Dairy Law (Crisis-Zuivelwet) in 1932. The Wheat law was considered a turning point of Dutch economic policy. It set the minimum wheat price at about twice the world market level and obliged the milling industry to use a certain percentage of Dutch wheat which was more expensive than the foreign exports (20 to 35%). It had a positive effect on wheat production. When Great Britain and Scandinavian countries left Gold Standard and the neighbouring countries began to introduce protectionist measures, Dutch cattle breeding industry came into difficulty. Dutch exports began to be hindered.

K.N.B.T.B., the majority of whose members were small family farmers, had argued from the beginning of the crisis for the necessity to change the government trade policy of 'ultra liberalism'.

Policy change which took place in this period can be said to be a historical turning point of Dutch economic policy, which had been an ultra liberal compared to the neighbouring countries. Government intervention, in which various interests groupings took their share, had begun a common practice in Dutch economic policy.

However, even after 1935, small family farmers did not enjoy the benefit of the policy change. On the contrary, the farmers suffered from it. Profitability of these small farmers in fact declined, due to the introduction of the protective measures, by which inland grain production was protected and import of cheap grains (wheat) were limited and therefore the prices went up. Circle of catholic farmers' unions whose members were mainly small family farmers became aware of difficulties that their members were facing. Crisis measures were not effective to these small farmers. Mixed farming, which was common practice among small farmers, suffered from protective measures. They brought higher production costs (high grain costs and import limitation). For K.N.B.T.B., maintaining of small family farmers were important mainly for two reasons: that small family farmers were the best social class for religious and spiritual reasons and intermediary class between working class

and capitalists and that could not be allocated easily and properly to employment in cities. Under the strong pressure of the farmers unions, government introduced more direct measures such as direct income support in 1938. In 1939, the farmers unions even gained the power to execute these crisis measures by themselves. This close relationship between government and farmers organisations in favour for farmers' organisation can be considered the beginning of 'cooperative order' in agriculture ('agricultural welfare state', according to J. de Vries).

After the war, the most acute problem was food supply. Without sufficient food supply, reconstruction of the national economy was not possible. Therefore, the production was first directed to internal consumption. By 1955, all the sectors of agriculture overcame the post war difficulties and restored the pre-war production levels.

Rapid industrialization in the 1950s created profound problems to small farmers. Fast developments in industry and commerce began to require a huge labour supply. The only source of labour could be found among agricultural population. The post war mechanization of farming began to create over population in rural area. First, agricultural labourers and female work force in agriculture began to leave farming for better paid work in industry and commerce. However, among small family farms in which the mixed farming was still common, strong hesitation existed to leave farming, particularly in catholic dominated inland area. Sons of farmers stayed unmarried with his parents hoping one day to find a way to become a farmer. There was indeed strong 'anti- industry' feeling among the farmers that feared the loss of farmer's identity and social disorder.

This negative attitude towards industrialization had to stop because of negative prospect of agriculture. 'Industry' had to be accepted to solve problem of over population in rural area. This means that, through a kind of redundancy of children of farmers from farming, 'healthy' family farmers should be created.¹⁴

It seems that one of the problems the small farmers in this period faced is to find a balance between their independency and identity as farmer and their economic improvement.

2. Small family farms in the Netherlands between 1920's and early 1950's

Fate of small family farms in this period was determined by various activities of farmers' unions. In other words, farmers' unions functioned as instrument to consolidate the social and economic position of family farms in this period.

In this section, general growth of family farms, their structure and around family farms will be discussed.

2.1. Growth of family farming and its consolidation

General growth of family farms can be seen in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1. No. of farms and some important figures 1910-1956

	1910	1920	1930	1947	1956
No. of farms (x 1,000)	100	117	121	144	137
No. of male work force in farming (x 1,000)	100	100	107	109	88
Average no. of male work force per farm	2.97	2.85	2.62	2.55	1.91
Average size of farm (ha)	11.65	10.85	10.99	11.05	11.35

1) Farms : ones less than 1 ha are excluded. In case of horticulture, less than 0.01 ha.

(Source : Willem Deckson et., *Vijfendertig jaar SER-adviezen*, Deel I 1950-1964, p. 200)

Continuous increase of farm number is shown until 1947, the year of highest agricultural population. Before WW2, male number per farm was more or less stable with slow tempo of decline. But after the war, a drastic decrease took place. It can be explained that although slow exodus of male work force from farming (for example land labourers who left for cities for better pay etc.) took place before the war the real exodus of farming population took place after the war. Mechanization of farming made the over-population in rural area useless work force and a rapid economic reconstruction and industrialization required more work force from among farming population.

Marginalization of family farm in the 20s and 30s can be detected from the decrease of size of farm.

Although the general trend of growth of small farms was a result of economic development within and outside of agriculture, farmers' unions played an important roll to consolidate the status of small family farms.

'Family based' Catholic farmers' unions (in particular in the southern regions such as north Brabant) were keen to consolidate the position of family farmers in the inter war period. In the crisis time, the consolidation efforts were fatal importance for their existence. Their consolidation efforts can be followed in four categories : land, labour and capital/innovation.

Consolidation effort on land issue in the inter war period was mainly concerned with price of land rent (tenancy price). Although large landownership was not common, tenancy was wide spread practice in small farmer dominated areas of the south and sand soil. In the first years after the First World War, tenancy and land prices went high due to favourable performance of agriculture in general. Tenancy became more expensive and land acquisition which was done with mortgage before the war became large financial debt. This situation got an important attention of farmers unions, in particular K.N.B.T.B. and its regional unions.

Although tenancy issue had been on political agenda since the end of the 19th century, it was in the 1930s when practical solution of the issue began to be sought. Weak position of tenants (one year contract, contract without fixed term, all levies paid by tenant, lack of continuity right of tenancy, remission right etc.) should be revised. K.N.B.T.B., in particular, N.C.B. had long fought for concrete legal protection of tenancy right. After some failure, they finally succeeded to introduce Tenancy Law (Pachwet) in 1937.¹⁵

One of the results of these efforts is the growth of number of family farming.

2.2. The evolution of the structure of family farms

2.2.1. Self-exploitation issue in small family farms

This is the issue of labour. Facing the crisis, small family farmers took traditional course of 'self exploitation' as a remedy. Women and children were exploited as 'non-cost' or cheap labour. High fertility in rural area was also caused by this need for the in house labour. Since labour was cheap or non-cost, market for crops and dairy products which required labour intensive work were searched. Capital saving method of production was a key for survival of small family farms. In addition, children of small farmers began to emigrate to cities (factories and service sectors). Maintaining small family farms became a big issue. In order to maintain labour supply within agricultural circle, expansion of agricultural employment was of course necessary. But more interestingly, catholic farmers unions took this labour issue as moral argument. Although government and farmers unions had a big responsibility to expand agricultural employment that should make agricultural population stay in agriculture, the core of the issue for catholic farmers was not economic but moral. Agriculture should not be considered as pure production factor but also a way of life. Plain life style in rural area was preferable in social and moral context to city life style which was dominated by economic consideration.¹⁶ This was powerful argument among small family farmers who were heavily influenced by catholic belief. Here again, farmers unions under control of Catholic Church played an important role.

2.2.2 Small family farming and landownership

Among agricultural population, the passion for land was very strong. The ideal small family farms career was a 'step up' from agricultural labourer to small farmer. However, supply of land was limited. Children of small farmers were not able to become independent until late stage of their youth (average age of marriage was 29). Many children had to remain unmarried (low nuptiality).¹⁷ Once succession took place, the land was split according to equal inheritance rule. This resulted in spread of 'peasant landlords' in the Netherlands.

Accordingly, capital formation of small farmers was rather limited. Their market access was limited as well. Isolated small farmers had scale disadvantage.

Therefore, organisation and cooperation among small farmers was the key for survival and development in the crisis time.

2.2.3. Major changes in structure, organization of the small farms

Farmers and agricultural labourer began to organise themselves in the late 1890s and consolidate their organizational structure after the 1920s. One of the interesting points of the formation of these organisations is 'polarisation' of agricultural interests, which means that they are organised horizontally according to their philosophical believes. That is to say, there were three main streams that organised agricultural interests, Catholic, protestant and non confessional.¹⁸

Catholic farmers were grouped into Katholieke Nederlandse Boeren en Tuinderbond (K.N.B.T.B.) (Dutch Catholic Farmers and Growers Union) with 4 regional unions, as well as Catholic labourers into Nederlandse Katholieke Landbouwerbond "St. Deus".¹⁹

Protestant farmers formed Nederlandse Christelijke Boeren en Tuindersbond (C.B.T.B.) (Dutch Christian Farmers and Growers Union) with 10 regional unions, as labourers did Nederlandse Christlijke Landbouwersarbeidersbond (Dutch Christian Landworkers Union).²⁰

Non-confessional farmers established Koninklijk Nederlands Landbouw Comite (K.N.L.C.) (Royal Dutch Agricultural Committee) and the labourers Algemene Nederlandse Agrarische Bedrijfsbond (A.N.A.B.) (Dutch General Agricultural Workers Union).²¹

All three farmers' unions were created in order to represent and consolidate the interests of farmers in various fields. However, if we look at the structure of the unions, there are clear differences among them. One most important difference is the composition of member farmers. Table 2.2 shows this difference. Although all the unions have various sizes of farmers, small farmers were the most represented in KNBTB. KNBTB that included various sizes of farmers, share of small farmers, the interests of small farmers were represented by KNBTB.

Table 2.2 Composition of member of farmers' union per size (%) in 1955

	KNLC	CBTB	KNBTB
1-5ha	21	24	31
5-10ha	25	26	35
10-15ha	17	17	18
15-30ha	24	24	14
30ha-	12	9	3
Total	100	100	100

(Source : Rolf van der Woude, *Op geode gronden*, p.323)

From this difference, it could be said that although CBTB and KNLC were more middle and large farmers oriented and less small farmers oriented. On the contrary, KNBTB is consisted of small farmers and the share of large farmers was less important. Therefore, KNBTB was more sensitive to the situation and difficulties of the small farmers. Another important difference should be also taken into account. Membership ration in KNBTB area was very high among small farmers. CBTB, on the contrary, did not organise small farmers

well.²² Generally speaking, organisational ratio of farmers was higher among large farmers than among small farmers. The ration of small farmers of less than 5 ha is about 49 % and of large farmers of more than 30 ha 93 %. However, in catholic part of the country (North Brabant and Limburg), the ratio for large and small farmers were much higher (72 % and 80 %, respectively).²³ From these figures, it could be understood and concluded that the problems and difficulties the small farmers faced could be followed mainly through the activities and policies of KNBTB.

As I mentioned before, it was of crucial importance for KNBTB to protect the small farmers since the end of 19th century. The importance of the small family farms continued to exist up to the end of the period covered in this section. Catholic farmers' unions, centred in KNBTB, consolidated its power basis among the small family farms during the 1920s and 1930s along with the strong tendency toward 'polarization'. 'Small farmers' problems' was the issue that made the catholic farmers' unions strong and they stood clearly on the side of the marginal family farms.

However, surplus of work force in agriculture began serious problem after WW2. KNBTB tried first to solve this problem through the increase of agricultural land and to move other industries. In spite of the strong initial resistance among farmers, they had to accept the exodus from farming to other sectors of economy which speeded up after the second half of the 1950s. It means a big change in social sense. Being a farmer did not mean only as a production factor but also more importantly as a way of life.²⁴

Even after the war, a strong voice to keep the mixed farm as the best suitable farming in sand area. KNBTB, in particular NCB, tried to keep the small family farms. They asked strong government policy to support small family farms in exchange of enough food supply. This strategy to keep the small mixed family farms continued to exist in KNBTB until the rapid process of industrialization took place after 1955.

The period 1920–1955 was the period to consolidate the power of small farmers and after the war to try to keep it as much as possible.

2.3. Prehistory of Structural policy

Although it was after WW2 that the structural policy in agriculture was well developed, there was already some kind of structural instruments the interbellum (pre- structural policy).²⁵

Development of Dutch structural policy in agriculture since the interbellum has made a remarkable achievement and become one of the most organised among western European countries. In this section, the pre-history of the structural policy will be followed and analysed in order to understand the nature and origin of the policy.

For that purpose, I will employ a study carried by OECD²⁶ as a guide, which defined four fields as structural measures ; 1) land consolidation, 2) retirement and discontinuation schemes, 3) retaining schemes and 4) land transfer and enlargement.

During the inter war period, some small start of structural policy can be seen. Besides improvement of tenancy rights through introduction of Tenancy Law ('Pachtwet' of 1938), land reclamation and land consolidation (van den Brink, pp. 73-75.) took place. In case of North Brabant, already at the beginning of the 19th century, some land reclamations in order to keep and expand small farms were witnessed.²⁷ These reclamation movements grew after the WW1 and began to ask government supports. Government began to provide some financial support (rent free loan) to encourage the reclamation (1920 to 1932). Farmers unions such as NCB actively participated the movements. For them, among others, land reclamation had important social implication in the 20s. They advocated more land and more farmers in order to offer enough foods and work places and to keep population in rural areas.²⁸

Although some land reclamation projects faced financial difficulties because of the Crisis in 1930, shortage of lands was considered to be social problem in the second half of the 1930s. Providing enough lands to young farmers felt acute necessity.²⁹

Land consolidation played a certain role or structural improvement. In case of north Brabant, the first land consolidation took place in 1929. In the second half of the 1930s, nearly all land consolidations took place together with land reclamation and water drainage work.

Land reclamation, land consolidation and water drainage work put their efforts together to change (improve) structure in agriculture to provide more lands and to offer children of farmers, land labourers possibility to remain in agriculture and get its dwellers back to rural areas. In addition, after the Crisis of 1929, these works to improve infrastructure in agriculture were thought to provide the unemployed with alternative working places. Therefore, structural policy in this period had important social function.

After the war, when structural measures were introduced, the situation surrounding agriculture was quite different. Because of the over production of agricultural products, measures to decrease of cultivated lands and farmers were aimed at. The improvement of structure went together hand in hand with a policy to decrease in the number of farmers. In these structural measures, farming population was indeed under great tension. Mechanisation, specialisation and various technological innovations were carried out in order to survive. However, they did not try to reverse the outflow of farm population from agriculture. Practical mind prevailed among farmers unions. This is to say that they concentrated themselves to find some ways to rescue the remaining farm population and encourage its members to run farming as business, not as family heritage. In this framework, exodus of 'hidden unemployed' in family farms were encouraged and head of family farms and his successor was given various opportunities to grow as business farmers. Rapid industrialisation in rural areas such as Eindhoven and Tilburg could provide alternative work places to the exodus of farm population.³⁰

2.4. Confessional family farms

2.4.1. Confessional unions and anti-modern fundamentalism

Family value was determinant factor in rural society for the Netherlands (and also for Japan). In the southern Netherlands, family value was fully and directly dictated by Catholic belief, under which prevailing nuclear family was the core of society. There existed also patriarchal relations between father and his children. But once children created their own household, they acquired equal legal and social status to their father under strict control of 'God' (church). They were free from patriarchal order of family household. Land was considered property of individual person.

Catholicism linked between family and society in the southern Netherlands. Active involvement of Catholic clerics had a great impact on various part of rural society. Since the end of the 19th century, Catholic Church had begun active in social questions. Activities of prominent clerics such as van den Elsen can be seen in this framework to protect 'social poor and disadvantaged' (social Catholicism).³¹ With a big success, Catholic Church gained the power to control rural society and be able to mobilise rural population (farmers).

In politics, family farmer's interests were also solidly represented by Catholic party. Rural voters were the basis of political power of the party. This strong tie continued to exist up until the 1960s. Within trilateral relations among Farmers Unions, political parties and government, voices of family farmers were well heard.

Dutch family farmers were socially and politically well protected. Family value of Christianity made family defender against the devil of free market system. Family farmers' interests were well linked through strong farmers unions into policy making process. Yet, after WW2, Dutch family farmers faced incredible challenge for modernisation. Old Catholic dogma to protect family farmers became insufficient under the circumstance of rapid process of industrialisation and the lesser agricultural population and ration agriculture in national economy. Question of entrepreneurship of family farmers became important task of farmers unions.

2.4.2. Anti-modern fundamentalism and the idea of modern entrepreneurship

During the inter war period, as we have seen, the consolidation of small family farmers took place. Farmers unions and their cooperatives played an important role for the developments and survival of the farmers. Together with government, farmers unions began to control the fate of small family farmers. Powerful agricultural groupings were created.

It was in fact not only in the Netherlands that faced severe agricultural problems. It was rather general problems among countries during industrialisation process. As industrial development took place, agriculture became a matter of controversy. How to put agriculture in industrialised economy and society became a serious policy issue. Under this circumstance, powerful argument of 'agrarian fundamentalism' grew up. In Germany, for example, agrarian fundamentalist such as Georg Hansen³² became active from the late 19th century into the inter war period. In Japan, agrarian fundamentalism was also active. As a late

comer of industrialisation and deep rooted agrarian nature of state organisation of the Meiji regime, Japanese agrarian fundamentalism has been condemned that it played a crucial role to bring the country into the Second World War.

As the name indicates, it is a social thought that value agriculture as the basic born of a nation. More precisely, a common definition can be given that agrarian fundamentalism is a social thought that idealises rural community relationship based on agriculture of small family farmers. From this definition, agricultural fundamentalism has been often considered feudal reminiscent of declining agricultural class and therefore a hindrance (reactionary) to the creation of modern society. Although in some countries such as Japan agrarian fundamentalism went together with reactionary (totalitarian) movement, which resulted in the miserable defeat of the war, it should be also considered to have had important (positive) impacts on farmers and development of agriculture. In case of the Netherlands, agrarian fundamentalism seems to have had enormous success during the inter war period and it stamped a clear foot on future of Dutch agriculture.

As Dutch agrarian fundamentalist, Godefridus (Gerlus) van den Elsen can not be missed. Borne as son of a farmer in Gemert, Brabant, and became canon of abbey of Berne in 1869, he was one of the founders of N.C.B. Since then until 1921, he was the spiritual advisor of N.C.B and in 1902 he became secretary of N.B.B. (Nederlandsche Boerenbond), forerunner of K.N.B.T.B. As the spiritual advisor of N.C.B., he was active in organising regional farmers unions and farmers saving banks (boerenleenbank) in the territory of North Brabant. He was not just religious spiritual leader of the union, but more strategist and thinker of the union. He represents a typical fundamentalist ideology which existed predominantly in the Netherlands (at least catholic part of the country).

His thought can be seen in his short book, 'Beknopte Sociologie der Boeren' (Brief Sociology of Farmers).³³

Van den Elsen's thought contains 5 important elements: valuable labour of farmers, social value of farmers, anti liberal free market system, anti city value and modernisation of farmers (farming).

First 'valuable labour farmers' means unique character of farmers' labour. Satisfaction, frugality, patience, industriousness self control and devotion are the result of hard labour of farmers and within which happiness of human being exists and also hope of land possession as well.

Second 'social value of farmers' concerns position of farmers in society. Farmers' social value is clearly identified as an intermediary and stable class among other social groups such as landless, urban labourers and unemployed. Farmers are indispensable social group because they provide food, raw materials and immigrants to cities.

Third concept is 'anti-liberal free market'. Van den Elsen considered liberalism under which free trade and free competition takes place, poisonous for farmers.³⁴ Farmers have right to gain substantial wage and to make profit to be able to survive, because of their social function explained before. Therefore, he demands government to oversee the market.

From this anti-free market attitude, he advocates intensive cooperation among farmers, through which he hopes unfavourable market force should be minimised. Social value of farmers exceeds economic value of market in his mind.

The fourth is 'anti-city value'. City is occupied by materialism and socialism and pestilent atmosphere prevails. Wrong spirit of freedom also prevails in cities. From this view, children of farmers should stay in rural area. For keeping them in agriculture, strong policy to maintain family farms should be delivered.

The last concept is 'modernisation of farmers (farming)'. Although autonomy and isolation of farmers from city are concerned ideal, he acknowledges that it is impossible. Therefore, modernisation in their way is the only way to cope with market force and city influence. For this purpose, new organisations of farmers unions play an important role and fulfil social task. Neither liberal freedom nor socialist freedom should prevail among farmers. Only harmony and unity can hold some results. Therefore, farmers union must be determined to employ powerful agricultural policy together with government and parliament to ensure reasonable prices of agricultural products in order to make farmers' life sustainable and to get back people from cities and factories.

As have been seen, historical change over of the government policy and its implementation were very important for the consolidation of small family farmers. For this consolidation of small farmers' interests, a social thought parlayed an important role, which is 'agrarian fundamentalism'.

Dutch agrarian fundamentalism, represented by van den Elsen, contains indeed ultra conservative and anti-modern elements together in its context. However, functionality of this ideology was remarkably successful. As social framework, it had governed at least Catholic part of Dutch rural area and had kept strong influence on Dutch agriculture down to the 1960s. well defined and practical agricultural organisations were established according to an ideology which was advocated by van den Elsen.

For the development of agriculture and in narrower sense for the development of small farmers, agrarian fundamentalism played crucial and indispensable role. Without this ideology, agricultural landscape in the Netherlands would have been quite different.

2.4.3 Growing ideas about modern entrepreneurship and reform

Concepts of family farm differ according to which elements of farming should be taken into consideration. Size can be considered as determinant element and so as income levels. Land ownership and labour structure within farms are for some scholars important.

Professor Kriellaars, trying to formalise the concept, showed what family farm is not. State agricultural corporations, collective companies and capitalistic companies that try to gain profits from capital investment are not family farm.

For him modern family farms are business of independent farmers with entrepreneurship and authority. They take business risks by themselves and lead the business and organise works. And more importantly family must be main deliverer of necessary labour.³⁵

He emphasises two elements of business of family farm ; one is 'family as labour supplier' and the other 'family as risk taking business unit'. This is the same line as definition of David G. Francis, who defined family agriculture as 'principally operated by family members who are generally free to make decisions concerning production, consumption, storage, commercialisation, investments and others of this nature.'³⁶

This modern concept of family farm is indeed very interesting if compared with the one of van den Elsen.

For van den Elsen, weakness of farmers should be covered by farmers unions through solidarity and organisation based on catholic belief. In his mind, individuality (or individual initiative) of each farmers was not important. In order to protect family farmers from 'devil' of market force, individual farmers were too weak. Cooperatives would cover the weakness of individuals. Modernisation of farming could be achieved through unity, not individual initiatives. In short, family farmers' fate was in the hands of farmers unions and God.

Kriellaars, also based on Catholic belief, takes more individual approach. In his case, in order to cope with market force, farmers should be modern entrepreneur. Although organisation such as farmers union and cooperatives are important, individual farmer's quality is the key for him. Transformation from peasant to modern entrepreneur is the key for survival and success. We could see in this transformation from van den Elsen to Kriellaars an important change of the task of farmers' union and also a need of transformation of farmers themselves after World War 2.

Kriellaars represents a growing idea about modern entrepreneurship and reform among catholic farmers and therefore among small family farmers. The period to protect 'marginal' family farms came to an end with him.

2.5. Development of small family farms and the small family farms in agricultural policy in Japan

One of the major issues in Japanese historiography on agricultural history was nature of landownership. Recent study of Japanese economic and social history has shown the importance of small family farms in the 19th and 20th centuries.

Attention to small family farmers has grown in Japan. Traditional view of theory of 'parasitic landownership', as explained in the previous chapter, has begun to face challenges. This view emphasised the importance of landlords between the Meiji Restoration and the end of the Second World War, in particular the importance of absentee landlords and the problems of tenancy. Recent studies, on the contrary, have begun to show the importance of small farmers who were either landowners or tenant farmers (or farming owners of tenanted lands to work independently in order to obtain their means of life with their family members)³⁷ and diversified categories of landlords (landownership) and tenancy.³⁸

One of the arguments is the number of farmers who cultivate exclusively their own land and farmers who cultivate their own land and at the same time tenanted land. About 72% of cultivated lands were owned by them. In addition, 'landlord' was not unified category of

landowners. Various types of landlords were identified. Owners of tenanted lands were 1) absentee landlords (18% of total tenanted lands, 2) village landlords (24%) and cultivating landlords (farming owners of tenanted lands) or 'peasant landlords' (58%).³⁹ More than one fifth of the total number of farmers also owned some tenanted land and 80% of these cultivating owners of tenanted land leased less than 1 cho⁴⁰ (ha) to tenants. Many were both landlords and tenants. Therefore, many of these farming owners of tenanted land could hardly be called 'landlords', but 'peasant-landlords'.⁴¹ In this condition of landownership, capital agriculture, based on 'landlords', was not thinkable. Peasant economy was a dominant force of agriculture in Japan as well. In village society in Japan, therefore, no sharp division was seen between tenants and landlords. Instead, there was a slow gradation of income and level of consumption from the tenant-cultivators of a small amount of land who supplemented his income by day-labouring, through the tenant-cultivator of an economically viable holding and a wide range of part-owner-part-tenants to the cultivating owner of a few plots of additional leased land and large landlord who derived most of his income from rents.⁴²

Small landowners and tenants were settled into closely inter-related human relationship. Family farmers were strong control of neighbourhood. Quasi feudal relationship still dominated village life. Patriarchal relation dominated family life.

'Ie' system also played an important role to define family farm in Japan. Old 'Meiji' Civil Code was based on patriarchal 'ie' system, which gave 'koshu' (head of family) absolute power within 'ie' and the only eldest son would succeed family properties. This 'ie' system hindered to create a core unit of family (a married couple). Under 'ie' system, family duty and obligation continued to exist permanently in one's life time. They transcended from generation to generation. 'Ie' functioned as social norm and had power of social control in rural area. Under this circumstance, land was considered property of family household, not of individuals.

It had also a vertical relationship with emperor's authority. In place of 'God', emperor's authority was used to fulfilled the task to control society. Emperor was considered not only 'living God', but also 'father of nation'. Relation between Emperor and citizens was the same as patriarchal 'father and children' relation in 'ie' system. Although the status of emperor as God was completely denied after WW2, bureaucratic control of society survived and clear differentiation between family and society has been still weak. Some scholars considered the situation lack of 'civil society'.

Although the small family farms dominated Japanese agriculture before WW2, their political power was quite weak. Land interests were represented by large landlords who had a exclusive right to vote before WW2. Small farmers were excluded in policy making process and paternalistic relation among farmers prevailed.

The land reform after the WW2 changed this situation. Predominant small family farmers were organised into farmers unions (Nokyo) and after a short period of struggles for hegemony among conservatives, socialists and communists the unions became powerful politi-

cal bases of conservative party (LDP) which in practice has ruled the post war Japan's political scenery.

Farm structure in Japan has also changed completely after WW2. Although power of landlords was already decreasing during the war, the final blow took place after the defeat and the following process of land reform.

The Occupied Army's primary concern was 'how to prevent Japan from becoming a menace to the peace of the world'. For this concern, feudal condition of the Japanese rural society and economy brought about Japan's aggressive policies in Asia.⁴³ Reform of countryside became a primary policy target of the Occupied Army.

Under strong pressure and guidance of the Occupied Army, the necessary legislations⁴⁴ were introduced in 1946. The land reform measure consisted of four major elements: 1) all the land of absentee landowners to be purchased by government and to be sold to tenants who cultivates the land, 2) all tenanted land in excess of 4 cho (4ha) in Hokkaido and average of 1 cho (1ha) in the rest of Japan to be purchase. In addition, such additional land to be purchased as to bring the total holding of leased and cultivated land to a total of not more than 12 cho (12ha) in Hokkaido and an average of 3 cho (3ha) in the rest of Japan, 3) the reorganisation of Land Committees to administer the scheme in the villages, giving equal representation to landlord and non-landlord interests, and 4) the abolition of produce rent and their replacement by a money equivalent calculated on the standard landlord's price for government purchase of deliveries.⁴⁵ Drastic result of this measure was the maximum limit of landownership of 3 ha (in Hokkaido, 12 ha). Post war Japanese family farm has begun their cultivation on land in this limited framework.

Another important element which changed family farms in Japan was introduction of new Civil Code.

New Civil Code was published in 1947 which was based on new constitution. Equal rights between man and woman and the dignity of personality became a guiding principle. Abolishment of 'koshu', strengthened right of spouse, equal distribution of inherited property became norm. Although farm land should be distributed equally among legal successor, which would make unit of farm land smaller, various factors worked to keep the land in one successor's hand.

After the Land Reform, a characteristic of landownership in farming (smallness) was further strengthened.

2.6. Conclusion

Historical development of Dutch agriculture is quite unique. Highly commercialized large 'capital' farming was created in the coast areas during the Golden Age. On the contrary, the inland areas were predominantly occupied by small (marginal) family farms (peasant economy). This contrast became one of the most important characteristics of Dutch agriculture.

Strategy of these small family farms for survival was 'self-exploitation'. Utilization of the

in-house labour was the only means they could manipulate. In this situation, 'land productivity' was the up most importance and 'labour productivity' was out of their scope. In-house labour was not a cost.

These small farms increased in number during the interbellum because of serious economic condition. It was the catholic farmers' unions that consolidated the power of small family farmers against their weakening position. For K.N.B.T.B, family farms were also important for social reasons. Family farmers were the basis of the social stability and mediators between socialism and liberalism. A Dutch version of agricultural fundamentalism grew up. Thoughts of G. van der Elsen show clearly this ideology.

After WW2 and more particularly after 1955, this ideology began to face economic reality of industrialisation. Policy to keep small mixed family farms alive was not possible. New policy to encourage family farms to become 'entrepreneur' was in the end beginning to emerge. Prof. Kriellaars represents this new strategy.

However, the period up to 1955 was kind of continuation of the policy which was set up in the inter war period. Real big wave of changes came after 1955.

(This is part of the larger study that plans to be completed under the title of *Agricultural Success and family farming in the Netherlands and Japan 1930-1970* in 2013)

¹ Before answering this fundamental question, we need to make some conceptual definitions.

Concerning Dutch agriculture, regional or geographical difference must be clearly noticed. Historically the coastal provinces such as Holland have had extremely commercialized (capitalized) agriculture. Agriculture was not run by family farm, but by commercial farm. On the contrary, inland provinces such as North Brabant have had family run agriculture. Within Dutch territory, this difference has always appeared when important policy issue on agriculture comes up at national politics.

Difference between family farm and commercial farm in economic term should also be noticed. It can be assumed that 'purpose' of family is to keep family economy going. Commercial farm, although it needs to keep the farm going, has more market economy oriented nature. Profit making in market mechanism is the priority of its existence. This difference is equally applicable both to the Netherlands and Japan.

² Jan de Vries, *The Dutch rural economy in the Golden Age, 1500-1700*, New Heaven-London, 1974, Jan de Vries, *The Economy of Europe in an Age of Crisis 1600-1750*, Cambridge University Press, 1976, pp.69-73.

³ Van Zandem, *De Economische Ontwikkeling van de Nederlandse Landbouw in de negentiende eeuw, 1800 - 1914*, (Doctoral thesis, Landbouwhoogschool, Wageningen, 1985) p.316.

⁴ See, Richard T. Griffiths. *Industrial retardation in the Netherlands, 1830-1850 / Den Haag : M. Nijhoff, 1979*

⁵ van Zandem, op.cit., p.316

⁶ van Zandem, op.cit., p.43.

⁷ Knibbe, Merijn, *Agriculture in the Netherlands 1851-1950*, NEHA Amsterdam, 1993,

⁸ van Zandem, op.cit., pp. 323-325.

⁹ Van Zandem, op.cit., p.326, table 11.5.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp.335-337.

- ¹¹ Klep, Paul. M.M., 'Marktconflict : een geschiedenis zonder einde *Over marktwerking in de landbouw en de elektriciteitsvoorziening in Nederland in de twintigste eeuw*', in de Jong, Eekle (ed.), *Markt en waarden*, Valkhof Pers, Nijmegen, 2002, pp.52-53.
- ¹² Knibbe, op.cit., p.170 and 181. He drew this conclusion from the increase of savings at deposits of cooperative agricultural banks.
- ¹³ There was already a sign of difficulty. Agricultural prices declined and the costs increased continuously in the 20s. As the protective measures (such as export ban for wheat, potato, sugar beat and dairy products and obliged conversion of grassland to arable land) which Dutch government introduced during the First World War were abandoned, prices of agricultural products began to decrease. The production costs on the other hand did not decrease as the prices. The gap between the prices and costs began widened. Increasing imports of arable products from North America began to bring sharp price decline for arable products and cheap butter from Australia and new Zealand and better quality of margarine began harm dairy sector. In the end the profitability of agriculture declined (M. Smits, Boeren met Beleid, p.96)
- ¹⁴ M. Smet, Boeren met beleid, pp.140-158
- ¹⁵ M. Smits, *ibid.*, pp.92-93.
- ¹⁶ T. Deffhues, Voor een betere toekomst, pp.105-106.
- ¹⁷ M. Smet, op.cit., p.156
- ¹⁸ Polarisation of society put important character of Dutch society until the end of the 1960s. Re. Catholic pillar of polarisation, see J.M.G. Thuring, *De wankel zuil* Van Longhum Slaterus, Deventer, 1978.
- ¹⁹ K.N.B.T.B. was established in 1896 and St. Deus in 1904. 4 regional organisations of K.N.B.T.B. were N.C.B. (Noordbrabantse Christelijke Boerenbond), L.L.T.B. (Limburgse Land- en Tuinbouwbond), L.T.B. (R.K. Diocesane Land- en Tuindersbond) and A.B.T.B. (Aartsdiocesane R.K. Boeren- en Tuinbouwbond). K.N.B.T.B. was the strongest power basis of Catholic political party, which was Rooms-katholieke Staatspartij (R.K.S.P, Roman Catholic State party) before the WW2 and Katholieke Volkspartij (K.V.P., Catholic peoples' party).
- ²⁰ C.B.T.B. was established in 1916.
- ²¹ K.N.L.C. was established in 1884.
- ²² Rolf van der Woude, *Op goede gronden, Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse christelijke Boeren- en Tuindersbond 1918-1995*, Verloren, Hilversum, 2001, p.323
- ²³ Ernst Abma, 'Boer en standorganisatie : een regional-quantitative analyse', in *Bulletin / Afdeling Sociologie en Sociografie van de Landbouwhoogschool Wageningen*, No.2, Wageningen, 1955
- ²⁴ T. Duffhues, op.cit., p.105
- ²⁵ The post war agriculture was initially heavily dependent on instruments of government policies including price subsidies and quantitative restrictions (production, imports and exports). However, structural policy became crucial after it became clear that problems of surplus of agricultural products could not be solved just through price/market policy and when income disparity between agriculture and other sectors continued to widen.
- ²⁶ OECD, *structural reform measures in agriculture*, Paris, 1972,
- ²⁷ T. Duffhues, op.cit., pp.121-123.
- ²⁸ T. Duffhues, *ibid.*, p.125.
- ²⁹ T. Duffhues, *ibid.*, p.126.
- ³⁰ As in the Netherlands, structural policy of Japanese agriculture went hand in hand with the decrease in the number of farmers. But big difference is that farmers became part time farmers and did not retreat from farming completely. Industrialisation in Japan in fact benefited from this part time farming because industrial labourers with part time farming activities could afford

their life with fewer earnings from industrial occupation.

- ³¹ Pope Leo 13th advocated this policy. It had had a great influence to social activities of Catholic Church up to the 1960s.
- ³² Georg Hansen, *Die drei Bevoelkingsstufen. Eine Versuch, die Ursachen fuer das Bluehen und Altern der Voelker nachzuchweisen*. 1889.
- ³³ See Paul Klep, 'Marktconflicten : eengeschiedenis zonder einde. Overmarktwerking in de landbouw en de electriciteitsvoorziening in Nederland in de twintigste eeuw' (in Eelke de Jong ed. *Markt en waarden*, Valkhof Pers, Nijmegen, 2002 for detailed analysis
- ³⁴ Klep, *ibid*.
- ³⁵ Kriellaars, F.W.J., *Het agrarish gezinsbedrijf in verandering*, Tilburg University Press, 1987, pp.6-7.
- ³⁶ Francuis, David G., *Family Agriculture; Tradition and Transformation*, Earthscan Publications, London, 1994, p.5
- ³⁷ F. Kurihara, 1984
- ³⁸ R. P. Dore, *Land Reform in Japan* (The Athlone Press, London, 1959)
- ³⁹ R. P. Dore, *ibid*. p. 23. These figures were the ones from the mid-1947.
- ⁴⁰ 'Cho' is Japanese unit of size of land. Approximately 1 'cho' is 1 ha.
- ⁴¹ Dore, *ibid*. pp.26-29.
- ⁴² Dore, *ibid*. p. 79.
- ⁴³ Dore, *op.cit.*, p.115.
- ⁴⁴ an amendment Law of 1938 and Owner Farmer Establishment Special Measures Law.
- ⁴⁵ Dore, *ibid*, pp.132-137. Grasslands, forest etc. were excluded from the reform measure. Only arable land was covered under this measure.

Reference

- De Economische Ontwikkeling van de Nederlandse Landbouw in de negentiende eeuw, 1800-1914*, (Doctoral thesis, Landbouwhoogschool, Wageningen, 1985)
- Jan de Vries, *The Dutch rural economy in the Golden Age, 1500-1700*, New Heaven-London, 1974.
- Jan de Vries, *The Economy of Europe in an Age of Crisis 1600-1750*, Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Richard T. Griffiths. *Industrial retardation in the Netherlands, 1830-1850* / Den Haag : M. Nijhoff, 1979.
- Knibbe, Merijn, *Agriculture in the Netherlands 1851-1950*, NEHA Amsterdam, 1993.
- Klep, Paul. M.M., 'Marktconflict : een geschiedenis zonder einde *Over marktwerking in de landbouw en de elektriciteitsvoorziening in Nederland in de twintigste eeuw*', in de Jong, Eelke (ed.), *Markt en waarden*, Valkhof Pers, Nijmegen, 2002.
- M. Smits, Boern met Beleid
- T. Deffhues, Voor een betere toekomst
- J.M.G. Thuring, *De wankel zuil Van Longhumb Slaterus*, Deventer, 1978.
- Georg Hansen, *Die drei Bevoelkingsstufen. Eine Versuch, die Ursachen fuer das Bluehen und Altern der Voelker nachzuchweisen*. 1889
- Kriellaars, F.W.J., *Het agrarish gezinsbedrijf in verandering*, Tilburg University Press, 1987.
- Francuis, David G., *Family Agriculture; Tradition and Transformation*, Earthscan Publications, London, 1994.
- R. P. Dore, *Land Reform in Japan* (The Athlone Press, London, 1959)

[Abstract]

Historical Developments of Family Farms and Post-war Dilemma of Agriculture in the Netherland in Comparison with Japan

Masae HARASHIMA

Mainly family farmers have managed the Dutch agriculture. The paper explains the historical developments and the dilemma family farming has faced after the war.

The survival of family farmers is one of the key issues agriculture is facing worldwide. This article tries to explain the Dutch survival strategy and its success.