Agrarian land property

P. Maldonado[1] & I. Maldonado[1,2]
[1]*Urban and Rural Sociology, North East National University, Argentina*
[2]*Barcelona University, Spain*

Abstract

The existence of a new trend towards to the sanction of an agrarian property domain right, different from civil property, tends to give a positive answer to the most notorious failures presented in our legislation about the rural life. Finding the right procedure to add a new real estate domain without violating the National Constitution nor the existing legal rights. Adopt the right method to define and enshrine the new domain's characters and its insertion according to law. The new agrarian property that we proposed should rise from this kind of real estate domains, becoming a new type with some common characters and others specific to their own legal functions. This land property is the product of a permanent development of solidarity ideas with the rural unprotected man, but also respectful with the medium and large landowners and the mega companies when they produce benefits for our territory development. The reasons that encouraged it, reaffirm its solidarity, respectful with other sectors and aim to promote the welfare and progress of the country and its people, without hatred and resentment. Today's world raises the people of all the world the challenge of development, without asking and perhaps admitting the negatives to this challenge. But there are few who trust that solidarity can achieve the epic of snatching away the world over selfish individualism. People living on welfare or revive the "good life" term and concept of our native cultures.
Keywords: rural development, land property, agriculture, problem.

1 Introduction

The existence of a new trend to the sanction of an agrarian property domain right, different from civil property, does not constitute a statement unproved of solid foundations. It can be argued the existence of a universal and constant tendency to the institutionalization of a new agrarian domain with new legal institutions that


WIT Transactions on Ecology and The Environment, Vol 193, © 2015 WIT Press
www.witpress.com, ISSN 1743-3541 (on-line)
doi:10.2495/SDP150141

tends to give a positive answer to the most notorious failures presented in our legislation about the rural life.

Apart from the historical background that we can see in many studies of land tenure systems, evolution after the first world war occurred in the majority of European States as a recognition of rights to rural sectors, perhaps partly as a fair remuneration to workers' and agricultural producers' families that had offered their lives on the battlefields.

New legal institutions start to appear in the various legislations that aim to give a positive answer to the most notorious failures presented in our legislation about the rural life. Some of these institutions pointed with realism to the solution of the best-known deficit of law on this subject.

European legislation, since the First World War, shows a marked tendency to sanction special rules for rural properties that hint at a different treatment to civilian property.

Shows the acute symptoms of crisis of the characters of the civil property that governs without difference urban and rural lands, without solving acute problems arising around the rural property. The latifundia, smallholdings, lack of rootedness of the agricultural population on the land that works, the apparent character of goods of the land, with consequent impacts on social and economically, cause strong pressures that make feel new laws that will punish and the new orientation of the doctrine.

2 Antecedents

In Germany, a process of internal colonization began in 1919, aimed at neutralizing the troubles originated by the presence of large estates and the generalization of smallholdings. In various laws, several measures are established to enable the authorization of unexploited zones and to defend the economic unit of exploitation. Among these rules we can distinguish some that enshrine institutions that constitute a net differentiation from the civilian ownership regime.

The "Rentengüter", small economic units created by the State, had the characters of "indivisible" and "inalienable". A right of use was given to the dealers, guaranteed against the payment of a fixed fee or depreciable by annuities. This form of ground occupation is derived from the German colonization law of 1890. The institution of "Anerbenrecht" is also from Germany, which contains special rules for the hereditary transmission of a rural domain, and which prevents the splitting of the property through the partition, retaining the full ownership for an heir, called the "Anerbe" with the duty to compensate the other heirs.

Both the "Rentengüter" and the "Anerbenrecht" are forms of family estates, types of "homestead" and tend to implement a number of protective measures for the economical units as family property. Similar characteristics can be found in the most diverse legislations, as in France, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, etc. All of these aim to modify the inheritance system when it comes to the goods of the family, as well as the transmission system to singular title and the conditions for the maintenance of the property right.

In Russia, starting in 1917 with the triumph of the Bolshevik revolution, the Marxist program begins to be implemented with the consequent abolition of private ownership of the land – as well as other production goods – and, consequently, the great historical experience contrary to the tradition accepted by the western countries expressed in the continuity of the Romanist and liberal domain of the codes of Justinian and Napoleon. After the submission of the small and medium agrarian producers (who had supported the revolution) – the kulaks – in 1928 the abolition of private property was generalized.

Throughout the territory of the Soviet Socialist Republics, the typical ways of communist productive unities raised and spread: the kolkhozes and the sovkhozes. The first came to replace the old "mir" – already known in Russian history – and which are a way of collective ownership of the land, livestock and production machines, all of which belong to the kolkhoz; reserving to each family the personal use of one hectare at most for their family farm (a small herd, a cow, some lambs or pigs); and the second which were large farms operated by the State through official workers.

In Spain, an interesting process of agrarian legalization can be found; which has led to the setting of special rules for rural property, during the brief but deep phase of republican life.

Such dispositions are subject to the so-called "forced labour" Law, in the Republic's National Constitution itself and in the Law of "Bases" for the Agrarian Reform. The first of these, passed in September 1931, modifies the absolute and perpetual characters of the civil property regime, related to unexplored large estates. It incorporates a form of decay of the right of ownership for not exercising, and it enabled certain organisms, public or labour unions (by peasants) to own land in order to work it under the conditions established by the respective regulations.

Meanwhile, the Republican Constitution, contains general principles and special rules relating to the ownership of rural estates. Article 47 says: "The Republic will protect the peasant and, with this aim, will legislate about other subjects, about the non-seizable family patrimony and free from all kinds of taxes, etc."

The Law of Bases, passed also in 1932, lays down the rules for a deep agrarian reformation, and contains dispositions that modify the characters of civil property in the referred to rural real estate. The lots are created by the colonising action, they were indivisible and immutable, to avoid small landholders and concentration. The Spanish republican legislation, referring to agrarian matters, is wide and pithy, but on this occasion some dispositions are only quoted, to circumscribe them to the subject under discussion.

In recent years in this country, various doctrinal works and some legal modifications have been seen to have a tendency to stimulate the associative forms of production, which, although it is not the central topic of this work – the agrarian property – is a manifestation of the associative needs which are evidenced in the contemporary productive activity. As an example are the SAT. and SAL. institutions, especially the one which refers to the Agrarian Societies of Transformation.

Another very interesting case to analyze is the one of Israel, which showed to the whole world the natural possibility of incorporating to a national law various forms of dominance of the most opposite features, without an impact on the juridical or political order.

Founded in the new State of Israel in 1945, its rulers did not hesitate to take a pragmatic approach in consecrating their right to all forms of domination and possession in order to offer better answers to the various peasant producers who submitted to them.

On the other hand: the kibbutz, collectivistic people where land, housing, production and trading do not have an individual character. Then, there are other population of intermediate juridical structure and they participate of both modalities: the Moshav Situff are cooperative people with individual houses and the Moshav Ovdim, mixed people, half cooperative and half capitalist, here work and life are separate, but land is collective and does not belong to the peasant.

What is remarkable and serves as a valuable background, is the demonstration that a country can perfectly and without any legal or constitutional transgression have various types of rights of real estate ownership, without necessarily having any kind of distortion or anarchy because of this. Within the same territory, individual private properties can coexist with collective ones without having to admit the convenience of socialist forms (whatever the denomination) for our western countries, because they are forms rejected by the idiosyncrasy of the people and, one might add, man's nature.

In Argentina, we can start to see the evolutionary process towards agrarian property, as opposed to the civil one, since the apparition of the Home Law No. 10.241, "of shelter and donation to the Argentinean family, in 1917, following the steps of the American "homestead", a protective institution of the agricultural family and its goods". Its origins can be traced back, according to different authors, to the old Norman law; and for some others to the Spanish law (Ordinance of Alcala. Title XVII, Law II) which established the benefit of non-seizable goods for the rural family. It is an institution whose purpose is the protection and consolidation of the rural family.

The quoted law created the non-seizable family property, unalienable and indivisible, with the exception of expressed conditions. They can be seized with the authorization of the EP (Executive Power) as long as it is given to another agrarian family, and it can only be divided after the coming of age of the owner's children. This institution, which last up to these days, was renovated by the more recent "Family Property" No. 14.394. The latter, although it establishes similar characteristics to family property, tends not only the socials aspects but also the economical ones, and it can be applied to such regime according to the owner's will but it can also be disaffected by spontaneous will with the exception of the interest of a third party.

But where the dispositions that tend to configure the different nature of agrarian domain can be more clearly found, is in the Law No. 13.995 (of fiscal lands) which, although it has been repealed by the Decree Law No. 14.577, 13th August 1956, it is an interesting background to the purpose of this study, because of the characteristics of many of its rules.

The protection and perpetuity of the economical unit are established. For that purpose it is modified in the aspects referring to those lots, the hereditary regime without changing the legitimacy of the heirs, replacing the partition of the farm by money compensation. This institution cannot be mistaken with the "elder" one of Spanish law, given that the Argentinean law had mainly economic reasons as a foundation, although with a certain social content. It can be compared with institutions like the already quoted "Rentengüter" or "Anerbenrecht" in Germany.

The law lays down the revocable nature of these properties, establishing a strong difference with urban properties (also granted by this law) for which maintains the validity of common law. It should be noticed that the revocability is established without deadline, indefinitely, even after being given the domain title.

Law No. 14.394, sanctioned almost simultaneously with No. 14.392, organizes the situation of Family Property with the characteristics of being non-seizable and indivisible, taking rural property specially intro account.

In 1958 two projects of Agrarian Law arrived at the National Congress, one of them developed by the then Secretary of Agriculture and Livestock of the Nation, Dr. Bernardino Horne, precursor of the Argentinean Agrarian Law, and another one signed by Dr. Rodolfo Carrera, professor of Agrarian Law at the University of La Plata, who was at the time Member of the Congress.

In the first project, it was established that property titles given by the Council of Agriculture on colonisation action, must contain special prohibitive clauses of: a) subdivide the economical unit, without the Council's authorization, who may authorize giving well-founded technical reasons; tacitly considering the authorization as agreed if no answer should be given within ninety days of the request; b) To pass on the property before ten years, and even if it were after that period it should be given to a corporation. Article 73 of the project, gives the owner the obligation to keep the land at a "rational level of productivity", the obligation of which passes on to the subsequent acquirers without a recommended time. The project does not establish a penalty in the case of breach.

In the evolutionary process that is being studied, it can be observed how we have been moving forward to the realization of particular agrarian property and differences from the civil one. Nevertheless, there were still many things that needed to be improved.

Years later in June 1973, another project was presented to the Chamber of Deputies that already proposed the approval of a new agrarian real estate property as a type within the genre of estate domains.

In America, in the last sixty years, many laws of Agrarian Reformation have been passed in order to reduce the social tensions and recover balance in the redistribution of wealth. They sought to establish limits and restrictions to large properties and push to achieve higher volumes of production. To do that they were incorporated to institutional judicial law as "indivisible" and "non-seizable", determining the maintenance of the titles of ownership to big landowners.

Most of the time these measures, as they happened throughout history, created social friction and acts of violence that undermined the foundations of the legal order. This endless struggle, which still threatens social peace and keeps large peasant sectors as outcasts, is caused by the mishandling of law resources, the lack

of method and appropriate systems. The antecedents and the foundations exist; we just need to know how to assemble them and that leads to the creation of agrarian real estate property.

3 Discussion of the doctrine

In the last few decades, in different countries around the world, jurist's opinions are read, that accept law's tendency towards the consecration of a new type of rural property, but without specifying procedures, methods or characters to achieve it.

Back in the 1940s, a leading Argentinean jurist, professor and precursor of agrarian law, Bernardino Horne [1] said: "That means that we are dedicated to the fundamental problem that this country needs to resolve: fixing a regulation for public and private land for production".

"The future depends on this, because without a new legal regulation, adapted to the environment, which defends agriculture thoroughly, it is not possible to correct the imbalance between city and countryside. It is not, consequently, logical nor serious, that while that does not happen we keep on talking about populating the countryside, much less about bringing immigrants. Any action program must start by setting a proper regulation for the land".

Later in the same work he says: "We have to humanize the property law so that land does not continue to be a commodity, because it produces our livelihood. Today one can freely speculate with the land of an owner in this country, abandon it, denature it, and give it whichever destination one pleases, even if it harms third parties. We live under the regime of "despotism of the property" as Spencer said". Professor Horne also alludes to his own manifestations made in the Congress: "that it was not possible to pass a modern agrarian law, wide and organic without modifying the concept of property of the old Civil Code".

Meanwhile Dr. Domingo Buonocuore [2], professor of the Faculty of Law and Social Sciences of the National University of the Litoral, said: "We have not yet properly instituted a legal regulation of the land in a country where the richness of agriculture is, and will remain for a very long time, the source of all its economy and the regulator of its social and political evolution".

"The right to land in favour of those who work it makes it necessary, in order for it not to be illusory in its legal effects, the creation of peasant property as a new institution and different from urban property. There are substantial differences between the two of them of technical, economic and social character, and recognize a diverse foundation. It is logical from all points of view, then, that they are subjected to a different legal treatment in the matter of its acquisition and loss, limitations and restrictions, expropriation, transfer, being non-seizable, a regime of contract rescission, rent, etc., taking into account above all that land is a good of work and not simply merchandise. A repeated experience tells us that it not enough to subdivide the land and give it to the settler, in order for the colonisation plans to be fulfilled".

Gelsi Bidart [3] said: "The agrarian development has to be everywhere – but this is dramatically urgent in Latin America – a socio-economic development and not only economical: two strongly tied elements". Agreeing with the criteria that

this work holds up, that law must be aimed to the behaviour of the medium producer – as the author expresses "The elaboration of legal resources suited for agrarian exploitation, but not without relying on those who work the land. A right that is not limited to the creation of possible settings, but that it establishes paths to follow in a needed and effective way, provided that fundamental rights are at stake, which in agriculture, are always linked to the real and proper possession of the land".

The professor of the Polytechnic University of Madrid, Sanz Jarque, [4] agrees in similar claims: "It is known that the practise and normal development of land property law, in all its extensions and consequences or effects, overflow breaking the legal methods that channel and regulate it. It even happens sometimes that these same legal methods are not enough to attend the present social needs and even prevent the normal exercise and normal development of the property".

And it ends adding a "special legal status to the land property": "that is why the legislator, in order to correct the deficiencies of fact that present the land ownership in Spain and to satisfy when possible the new necessities, has been successively promulgating, since several decades, although with a special and extraordinary character, that it is the eloquent proof of some things: one, of the downgrade and lack of normative of the ordinary regulation of land ownership in our positive law mainly regulated by the Civil Code of 1889 and the Mortgage Law of 1945; and, another, of the necessity of promulgating, in addition to the special rules that correct the current problems of fact, a special legal statue of land ownership, so that it regulates it according to the principle of functionality, derived from its nature with the demands of time according to the state of fact of it in each place and time."

Another Spanish jurist, De Los Mozos [5, 6], agrees to this by holding up: "In order to achieve the acceptable goals we must go on orderly, a methodological rule that receives an unavoidable importance in the legislative technique, because forgetting it always causes the failure of even the noblest attempts. What, in part, has happened between us in rural regulation, a regulation that most surely has anticipated in this legislative process. That is why, we must start with property, though with a different direction than the already overcome "agrarian reform".

De los Mozos does not stop admitting the huge difficulty that will always exist, in order to modify the legal structure of the traditional property, which leads to finally pointing out the necessity for a suitable regulation of the rustic property; though without giving more details: "For that we must take into account private property, in a system of legal freedom and of the parallel economical freedom, property will always be, regardless of the limitations that may surround it, i.e., will retain at all times the character of absolute law of elastic content, kept by the private enterprise and by the owner's disposition power.

However, the limitations of the law of property, as frequent as the ones of modern law, though they partially affect its content (for example, the obligation to improve, or forced work, the obligation to rent, exchange, alienate, etc.), do not manage to modify it in a radical way, especially because of the right of property owns flexible content. So, it turns out, like Savatier has said, "that the property that leaves through the door returns through the window. That is why,

the modifications that are operating in this way, in which it is interesting to highlight the necessity for a regulation, action is taken more on the objective of law than on its content, hence the necessity of a proper regulation for the so-called rustic property".

The teaching that, in my opinion, must be extracted from the state of things that has been described, is that there is an urgent need to detail that "recognisability" of the property law when it falls on properties with agrarian destiny, in the same way, it seems urgent to rethink the State's role in property transmissions, both *inter vivos* as *mortis causa*, in order not to interfere in such processes [7].

The codifications and legal reforms of the XIX century try to free property from the old obstacles, but this liberation of the land and the soil was carried out through "mobilizing" the property, that is, turning it into value so that it can serve as a base of territorial credit and to this end it helps the organization of a system of advertising registry. Mobilized in this way the property richness, it is natural that its economic value and the free belonging of that value to its owner would become the most important thing, protected by the configuration of the right of property with a limited and absolute character, according to the meaning given to its content, which we have mentioned before, with, as a result, the object to which the law falls will be blurred, relegated to a second term. This process of subjectivation of the legal relationship, which some people qualify as the marketing of Civil Law, will soon trigger the opposite reaction, although it is not yet possible to speak of, in the opposite direction, a process of objectification in legal relationships and, specially, in everything related to property, which has barely started to be talked about, even though jurists are aware of the importance of this transformation.

Some known Italian authors support this position: like Pugliatti [8] "the agrarian property is an aspect of property that can only be autonomous" and when supporting it, he aims to strengthen his opinion with the assertion not of a simple autonomous aspect of a known institute, but that of a true and proper autonomous institute." Carrozza *et al*. [9] also affirms the necessity of a new form of agrarian property; conviction that in the world's agrarian scene it will have to be secured in the following years; though these quoted authors do not proceed in defining the methods nor the procedures, in order to incorporate the new species of domain, nor limits or differences with traditional property".

The idea of an agrarian property or a rustic property is noticed to have grown in the agrarian world ambit, but on the other hand a blockage of the idea can be seen. What some precursors like Bernardino Horne have pointed out as the necessity of a new agrarian property in the 1940s and since, and the quoted authors that are rightfully recognizing the tendency towards a different form of property are still far from establishing solutions. They offer us the instrumentation and the methods to manage to trace outlines of agrarian property, the characters, and the procedure for its insertion in the Positive Law. This is what modern agrarian jurists do not manage to handle yet.

They have not moved forward beyond the statement of the necessity to create the agrarian property, without defining how it will be done, with which characters and to which extent. A proof of this is that it is frequently mistaken how and where the different species of real state ownership must be delimited.

What happens in legal doctrine and in legislation is that the right method is not used: by separating urban property from rural property and legislating this in a different way without distinguishing agrarian property from rural property, we arrive at an unsolvable puzzle because between the big landowners and the little ones there are opposite economic interests that are very hard to overcome in this topic.

That is not the appropriate method, another path has to be taken, given that what has to be separated is the "civil domain" from the "agrarian domain" with this, the new agrarian property would appear and that would include urban and rural property, both legislated in the Civil Code; and then we would be on the right path.

The proposed method is the following: 1. To accept the criteria of the diversity of real estate domain types (for example: civil property and agrarian property). 2. Not to separate urban property or rural property, but rural property (civil) and agrarian property. 3. To find the proper procedure to incorporate a new real estate domain without violating the National Constitution or the pre-existing legitimate rights. 4. To adopt the suitable method to define and embody the characters of the new domain and procedures of insertion into the law. We now have the instrumental elements to elaborate the new agrarian property [10, 11].

4 Legal structure of the domain right

Through the objective analysis of the evolution of the trade of land ownership, it can be clearly noticed that the rules of the Civil Code are the ones that drive small and medium sized properties to their destruction, with the following despair for the farm whose grandparents may have lived in a medium, prosperous and productive unit which might have later suffered two successive hereditary partitions and now the grandson has only ten hectares, who will then leave one to each of his children after the succession has been made.

Another real and dangerous threat is the vulnerability of the farm against creditors that may start the executions of his land due to unpaid debts in hard situations for his agrarian enterprise. To this we must add the free availability of the farm, which can be transferred or divided in whichever way its owner decides to and with any type of speculation for any kind of end.

Also other aspects that, although they are not completely of a legal nature, must find their solution in the legal context. They are inherent to the personality of the potential owner of the agrarian property.

The nature of the agricultural producer is usually hard-working and skilled, but in many cases results in a lack of willingness to work, careless handling of the land, laziness or guesswork, or in the simplest case: that in spite of their goodwill they do not have enough business knowledge. All of these situations could cause the failure of this important state policy; that is why law, or more specifically the judicial laws of agrarian property, must be avoided for the success of the transforming plan [11].

It has been clearly pointed out that one of the problems with the highest rate of incidence is of a legal nature and that the structure of its legal statute must be

modified. That does not mean that we are proposing to supplant the current regulation of private property.

On the contrary, what is worrying about the existing situation are two unwanted ends: 1. That the contemporary legislation does not show up with the necessary efficiency. 2. That a stable solution is not given to the uprooted or landless farmers. 3. That the medium and large landowners are hounded with legal constraints and constitutional guarantees are skipped.

It should be understood that this work does not aim to judge, nor does it propose that any action should be taken against any agrarian sector. Private property is asserted and defended, what is proposed is the stimulation of all producers towards a higher and more rational obtainment of natural resources.

In order to develop the creative task of the new property we must adopt an ideal method to produce the goals that shape this state policy. A method that allows the selection of legal norms and the different institutes with their functional structures that serve to establish the behaviour of people and the relationships between the interested parties, and this can be called the autonomous technical–legal method of agricultural real property.

5 The real estate

The efficiency of the Argentinean law system states the right of domain and private property are strongly guaranteed in the National Constitution but the regulations of its forms of specific domain are found in its Civil and Mining Codes.

It would not be unusual to find similar legal rules in many countries so an approximate and imprecise common scheme can be traced, which in theory would shorten the smaller differences of the domain laws legislated by each country.

In such general context, the real estate domain right can be defined as the real right that is exercised "erga omnes" over a property, a small or big portion of land or territory of a country, city or particular field. This property may be public (belonging to a national, provincial, or city State, or an autonomous entity, public or private, or a private person of visible or ideal existence).

The new agrarian property that Clemente Maldonado was developing must appear from this genre of property domains, becoming a species with characters common to that one, and others specific of its own legal function.

Agricultural real estate property can be defined in the following way, as a right of real estate nature, subjected to the will and action of its holder, who may use, enjoy and arrange it, obeying the specific legal rules established for its operation.

These types of property have two types of modalities, depending on the technical–cultural ability of the producer, so we can differentiate:

I. Individual: In charge of the titular producer with technical manager training, appropriate to carry out the agrarian enterprise.
II. Associative: It aims to overcome the lack of technical and business capacity that farmers suffer.
III. Cooperative: For beneficiaries of medium capacity development in this sort of work, though not with enough in order to become an independent businessman.

IV. Consortium: For beneficiaries with little technical ability in rural and business work, led by a professional agrarian technician, where they would benefit from the knowledge in order to improve.

This new form of domain must have the following characters: exclusive and perpetual (which are common with to civil or traditional property). It must also be non-seizable and unenforceable, unalterable, revocable (as specific characters) and when it is about associative agrarian properties, they will be subjected perpetually to a cooperative or consortium functioning.

5.1 Characters of agrarian real property

I. *Exclusive*: Because the real right over the property lies on a particular good.
II. *Perpetual*: Because there is not an established term to stop being an owner. The characters of exclusive and perpetual of the real agrarian property are the ones that identify those types of domains as private properties, an extension of the human being, which gives it security, which makes its patrimony, and gives it roots and what we can almost truly say finishes to integrate its personality [9].
III. *Non-Seizable* and *Unenforceable*: It is excluded from the execution and it cannot be seized. This is based on the need to institutionalize a greater protection of exceptions to the productive units registered as agrarian real estate, taking into account the double risk that agrarian producers must constantly bear before the ravages of nature and the ups and downs of both the internal and external market, which are more bearable for big landowners. This does not mean that agrarian property is outside the market, nor that the owner is examined of his responsibility, because a port of his production can be fixed to act as pledge to creditors.
IV. *Unalterable*: It consists in the legal prohibition to modify the dimensions of the agrarian property for the productive function over time. Assuming that it is an optimum or appropriate productive unit, thus the interest in preserving it; and in the case that physical, economic or technological change would result in the necessity of modifying its dimensions; the State, with the support of technical agencies, may authorize the modification.
V. *Revocable*: It is about the loss of the ownership of the land supported by its holder due to neglecting the essential obligations imposed by the legal system for the normal functioning of the agrarian property.

6 Conclusions

Today's world presents to people all over the world the challenge of development, without asking and maybe without admitting the refusal to the challenge. It would seem like the cold and tremendous globalization leaves no choices: only development or development at any cost.

Many of its tremendous derivations or consequences are already known in the weakest social classes, and yet in spite of the dramatic visions, we are not few the ones who trust in solidarity to take the world, over selfish individualism, a

population that lives in welfare or that recovers the concept of "good life" of our native cultures, frugal, austere, but looking with trust toward the future that we all have to know how to take care of.

This essay on agricultural real property, based on the vision Dr. Clemente Maldonado expressed in his work, shows the permanence of this problem in the productive sector, and it ratifies the permanent commitment with the development of great solidarity with the most afflicted farmers, but it is also respectful of the medium and large landowners and with mega companies when they produce for the benefit of development in our territory.

The only thing left to do is planning a future agenda, which prioritises the dynamic of collective action of the parties with the instruments, collective missions and common goals, aimed to a shared vision for the problematic of land as being variable for the agricultural development.

References

[1] Horne, B., Política Agraria y Regulación Económica, Buenos Aires, p. 90, 1945.
[2] Buonocuore, D., Conferencia sobre Colonización e Inmigración, C.E.D., Santa Fe. 1939.
[3] Gelsi Bidart, A., Principios de derecho agrario, Ed. Universidad, Uruguay, 1983.
[4] Sanz Jarque, J. J., Propiedad rústica y explotación agrícola, Ordenación Territorial Información IRYDA, Madrid, 1974.
[5] De Los Mozos, J., Estudios de Derecho Agrario, Ed. Tecnos, Madrid, 1972.
[6] De Los Mozos, J., El derecho de propiedad: crisis y retomo a la tradición jurídica, Edersa, Madrid, p. 153. 1993.
[7] De la Cuesta Sáenz, J.M., El estatuto jurídico del suelo con destino agrario, Universidad de Burgos, España. Online: http://www.estig.ipbeja.pt/~ac_direito/DPC_003_131.pdf 1994.
[8] Pugliatti, S., La Propietá e Le Propieté, Italia, 1983.
[9] Carrozza, A.; Comporti, M. Y Panuccio, V., La didattica del diritto agrario: i testi deU'ultima generazione, Ac. Ec. agraria dei Georgofili, vol. XXXV, Florencia, 1989.
[10] Maldonado, C., Hacia una reforma agraria con sentido nacional, Ed. Federación Agraria Argentina. Rosario, Santa Fe. 1963.
[11] Maldonado, C., Propiedad Inmueble Agraria, Moglia Ediciones. Corrientes, Argentina, p. 334. 2000.