

**Marxist Legacy in Agriculture: A Comparative Analysis of Land Reforms in Cuba, China, and Vietnam --- By Pasa et al.**

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Authors     | Dr. Rajan Binayek Pasa <sup>1</sup> , Hem Raj Joshi <sup>2</sup> , Dr. Chuda Dhakal <sup>3</sup> and Chiranjibi Dhakal <sup>4</sup>  |
| Affiliation | <sup>1</sup> Lecturer at Central Department of Rural Development Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur, Kathmandu<br><sup>2</sup> Department of Agriculture Extension and Rural Sociology Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, PG<br><sup>3</sup> Department of Statistics, Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science<br><sup>4</sup> Corresponding Author, Lecturer at Gramin Adarsha Multiple Campus Nepal Tar, Tarakeshwor, Kathmandu  |
| Email       | <a href="mailto:rajan.pasa@cdrd.tu.edu.np">rajan.pasa@cdrd.tu.edu.np</a> ; <a href="https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8886-7714">https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8886-7714</a><br><a href="mailto:hem.805122@iaas.tu.edu.np">hem.805122@iaas.tu.edu.np</a> ; <a href="https://orcid.org/0009-0001-0399-3170">https://orcid.org/0009-0001-0399-3170</a><br><a href="mailto:chudadhakal@iaas.tu.edu.np">chudadhakal@iaas.tu.edu.np</a> ; <a href="https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5810-9103">https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5810-9103</a><br><a href="mailto:chiranjibi1988@gmail.com">chiranjibi1988@gmail.com</a> |

**Abstract**

*This paper presents a comparative analysis of land reforms in Cuba, China, and Vietnam through the lens of Marxist agrarian theory. Utilizing a comparative historical methodology, this library based study conducts a qualitative documentary analysis of secondary sources, including government reports and academic literature, triangulated with quantitative data on agricultural output. This approach facilitates a systematic examination of how core Marxist principles—such as the abolition of feudal-capitalist structures, collectivization, and wealth redistribution—were*

*adapted to distinct national contexts to empower rural populations and achieve socio-economic justice. The analysis reveals that while all three cases successfully established a foundation for poverty reduction, food security, and economic sovereignty by dismantling historical inequities, their long-term efficacy was contingent on pragmatic adaptations. China's "Post-collectivization Household Responsibility System" and Vietnam's market-oriented "Doi Moi" reforms catalyzed unprecedented growth, though often at socio-environmental cost. Conversely, Cuba's agroecological focus ensured food security despite constraints. The study concludes that sustainable agrarian transformation requires moving beyond rigid ideological models. Instead, it necessitates a hybrid governance framework that strategically get hitched Marxist concerns for equity with market mechanisms for efficiency. This is best achieved by ensuring secure, transferable land-use rights for smallholders, providing targeted state support, and integrating environmental stewardship and agroecological practices from the outset to ensure both productive and equitable outcomes.*

**Keywords:** Marxism, wealth redistribution, land reforms, collectivization

## **Introduction**

Marxism is a term that refers to a body of ideas or a type of political practice that is based on the works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (Warren, 2011). As a political, economic, and social ideology, it expresses criticism of the disparities that are inherent in a capitalist system and encourages the establishment of a classless society through the use of revolutionary methods. Marxism has consistently emphasized the significance of class conflict and the ways in which the bourgeoisie take advantage of the working class (Thiele et al., 2014). In addition, the concept of historical materialism is a fundamental aspect of Marxist theory (Marx, 1867). The latter concept posits that the economic base of society, which is made up of the means and relations of production, is the primary factor in determining the shape of the superstructure, which is composed of politics, culture, and social relations.

The contemporary agricultural challenges in developing nations are less about the legacy of Marxist land reforms and more about the efficacy of current national strategies, particularly regarding extension services and farmer support (Pasa et al., 2024). However, Marxist analysis asserts that capitalist agriculture has a tendency to concentrate wealth and land in the hands of a small number of capitalists, thereby resulting in monopolies and the exploitation of human and

natural capital (Pearce, 1985). This dynamic was particularly noticeable in the agricultural sector, where large-scale producers and landowners frequently have disproportionate authority over peasants and small-scale farmers (Fatima et al., 2021). Marx was a harsh critic of capitalism, and this Marxist analysis of the agricultural sector illustrates one of the ways in which Marx believed that capitalism was detrimental to society. The communist rule that Marx inspired, which was in direct opposition to these capitalist notions, was the catalyst for agricultural changes like the elimination of individually owned land, collective farming, commune farming, state farms, collectivization, and land redistribution (Graziosi, 1996).

Over the course of time, the application of Marxist theory to the agricultural industry has undergone a process of development and refinement as scholars have addressed the challenges that are inherent in rural social systems and the ever-changing character of agricultural production (Boswell & Hawkins, 1999). Marxist ideology states that land reform is essential if the capitalism and feudal structures that keep wealth and land concentrated in the hands of a small percentage of the population are to be overthrown. Marxism considers land redistribution for the working class and peasantry to be a critical stage in the construction of socialism and, in the long run, communism since it views these groups as the genuine producers of wealth (Marx & Engels, 2002). The land reform projects that were implemented in China, Vietnam, and Cuba are three of the most significant examples of the Marxist legacy in the field of agriculture. After their respective revolutions, the rural landscapes of these countries embraced Marxist ideas. The Marxist concepts of class equality and wealth redistribution were mirrored in the Agrarian Reform Laws, which were passed after the Cuban Revolution of 1959, which was led by Fidel Castro. These laws sought to redistribute land from huge estates to peasants and cooperatives (Perez-Stable, 2011).

In a similar vein, the communist government of China initiated the Great Leap Forward in the year 1958 in an effort to achieve more collectivization of agriculture. In addition, the government launched land reforms in 1949 in order to put an end to feudal property ownership (Dikotter, 2010). However, China's communist government faced significantly more consequences and obstacles compared to what communist government of Cuba is experience. As part of a wider socialist purpose, the socialist government of Vietnam, which was established after 1975, employed land redistribution and cooperatives in an effort to improve the quality of life in rural areas (Zinoman, 2001). In their efforts to put Marxist land reforms into action, each of these countries encountered

different obstacles and outcomes. These experiences offer important insights into the issues that arise when attempting to bring about agrarian transformation under a socialist policy. This comparative study is going to examine the historical settings, the real-world implementations, and the long-term implications of these changes in order to gain a greater understanding of the effects that they have had on agricultural and rural development in each nation. This research is essential for gaining a more comprehensive knowledge of the effects that Marxist land reforms in Cuba, China, and Vietnam had on the economics of rural areas, on social fairness, and on environmental sustainability.

It underscores the connection that exists between ideology and the practical implementation of policy through an analysis of the historical and social conditions of these transformations. The study assesses the extent to which the redistribution of land is effective in improving agricultural output and reducing inequality, taking into account issues of governance, market integration, and sustainability. Furthermore, it examines the extent to which Marxist principles can be applied to a variety of agrarian contexts, providing valuable information for the land reform initiatives that are currently underway in developing nations. Marxism should be analyzed on the basis of Gandhian thoughts in South Asia (Badal, 2020). The study shows us how to construct agricultural systems that are both fair and sustainable by encouraging inclusive governance, reinforcing tenure security, and maintaining a balance between equality and efficiency through the analysis of these situations. Even in Nepalese context,

### **Key Concepts in Marxist Agrarian Theory**

Collectivization in order to successfully implement socialism, a nation must first embrace industrialization and restructure its agricultural system in accordance with socialist principles. This restructuring should include the incorporation of communal labor and public ownership of the means of production. Following the working class's assumption of power, one of the most crucial tasks will be to restructure agriculture, which, in contrast to industry, is still fragmented under capitalism and is characterized by small-scale peasant farming. As long as private land ownership is allowed to remain, the rural bourgeoisie will continue to take advantage of peasants who are members of the middle and lower classes, and the poverty of these peasants will not be alleviated by small-scale commodity production. The collectivization of agriculture is a necessary step in order to deconstruct capitalist institutions, integrate peasant farms into cooperative organizations,

and replace obsolete private farming with enormous, automated socialism production. As this reform removes class distinctions in rural areas, increases productivity, and guarantees that all workers have equal access to resources, it is in accordance with the fundamental interests of all workers. Collectivization is an essential element of socialist development that encourages both rural and national growth by substituting a cooperative and coordinated framework for inefficient, small-scale agriculture (Economics Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R, 1954).

Conflict between social classes is one of the fundamental concepts of Marxist agrarian theory which is the idea of class struggle.

According to Marxists, the exploitation of the peasantry by capitalist farmers or landed gentry is one of the defining features of capitalist systems. Two examples of this exploitation include the unequal distribution of land ownership and the expropriation of surplus value from the peasants' labor (Cogliano et al., 2016). The number of landowners and peasant capitalists who make use of hired labor has increased as a result of the fact that the middle peasants are becoming extinct. As a result of the integration of imperialist capital, which is being accomplished through the increased participation of corporate giants in agribusiness on both the input and output sides of the agricultural economy, the peasantry is now engaged in a class struggle (Baisya, 2017). The rule of realization of surplus value and surplus accumulation in agricultural production is being enforced by this integration.

Land ownership is a controversial topic. Marx's criticism of the private ownership of land is closely aligned with the theoretical framework of agricultural Marxism, which investigates the ways in which capitalist connections influence rural class dynamics and agricultural institutions. Because the ownership of land controls access to productive resources and economic power, agrarian Marxists contend that land ownership is a fundamental element of class antagonism in rural cultures. Marx saw land ownership as more than just an economic entity; he regarded it as a social connection that perpetuates exploitation, notably through systems like primogeniture, which ensured that land was concentrated within specific groups of people (Munro, 2013). Marx argued that the independence of producers who operate on a small scale was destroyed and that class distinctions were reinforced as a result of this structural limitation, which compelled landowners and peasants to take part in economic exchanges driven by capital accumulation.

Land privatization, which restricts the capacity of both large and small farmers to allocate capital in an efficient manner, constitutes the primary impediment to agricultural transformation,

according to an agricultural Marxist perspective. Marx held the belief that land prices are inflated by private ownership, which makes it more difficult for small farmers to earn a living and also gives landlords the power to extract surplus value from tenants. Due to the fact that ownership guarantees that the landlords, and not the farmers, would receive the profits, tenant farmers are unable to make effective use of capital in vast capitalist estates. The Agrarian Marxist ideology is in accordance with Marx's suggestion to nationalize land in a capitalist society. This is because it is aimed at eliminating structural obstacles that would otherwise permit more adaptable capital investment in agriculture while at the same time exacerbating class struggle. This point of view brings to light the essential assertion of Marxism, which is that the abolition of private land ownership is a necessary step in order for capitalist production to expand and for a socialist agrarian system to finally be implemented (Marx, 1992).

### **Objective and Methodology**

The objective of this paper is to analyze land reforms in Cuba, China, and Vietnam from Marxist agrarian theoretical viewpoint. It used comparative analysis method, which is based on a thorough evaluation of secondary data. The study utilizes a comparative historical analysis, an approach adept at investigating the evolution and transformation of policies across various socio-political situations (Mahoney & Thelen, 2015). This methodology facilitates a thorough examination of the mechanisms by which overarching Marxist agricultural doctrines were modified and executed in the specific national contexts of Cuba, China, and Vietnam. The methodology largely employs qualitative documentary analysis, utilizing a diverse range of secondary sources. According to Bowen (2009), this strategy entails "sourcing, evaluating, and synthesizing data within documents" to derive meaning, enhance understanding, and cultivate empirical knowledge. Government papers, historical documents, and scholarly publications were meticulously assessed and cross-referenced—a triangulation process—to augment the legitimacy and dependability of the findings. The study employs a mixed-methods framework to guarantee a thorough evaluation. Quantitative statistics regarding agricultural output and land allocation are combined with qualitative perspectives on socio-political factors. This methodology, advocated by Creswell & Plano Clark (2017), offers a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon being examined, facilitating the assessment of both quantifiable results (economic performance) and their intricate social and political settings (equity, sustainability).

## **Historical Context of Land Reform**

Cuba had a period of land reform as a result of the nation's history of colonialism. During this time, a tiny group of hacendados, or landowners, controlled the majority of the land, while the mass of the population, including indigenous and peasant populations, had little access to land resources. The rise of the sugar business, which resulted in a concentration of land ownership among a small group of rich individuals, further worsened this disparity (Assies, 2007). The Cuban Revolution, which took place in 1959 and was led by Fidel Castro, was a watershed moment in the struggle to address this legacy. It involved the redistribution of land to state farms and peasants, as well as the eviction of major estates in order to encourage agricultural sustainability and food self-sufficiency (Gliessman & Rosemeyer, 2009).

The Cuban land reform has advanced through a number of stages. The First Agrarian Reform Law, which was enacted in 1959, nationalized one-third of the country's land and redistributed it to over 100,000 peasants. The Second Agrarian Reform Law, which was enacted in 1963, increased state control to sixty-six percent of the total land area. By the end of the 1960s, state ownership had increased to eighty-two percent of the land as a result of voluntary land transfers. In response to the agrarian crisis that occurred in the 1990s, the Third Agrarian Reform of 1993 redistributed land to farming cooperatives and peasants, which resulted in a reduction in state ownership to forty percent. The Fourth Agrarian Reform of 2008 redistributed idle lands under usufruct conditions, which resulted in a further reduction in state control to approximately twenty-five percent. This action was taken in an effort to further reduce the state's control of land (Paz, 2011). The Cuban land reforms have developed over time from a system of widespread nationalization to a system that is more equitable in terms of distribution. Under this new system, cooperatives, peasant farmers, and private individuals have been granted new ownership rights, although the state has retained authority over the agricultural sector.

The Communist Party of China sought to replace the feudal systems that existed in the country with a socialist system of agricultural production, and this aim was the driving force behind land reform in China. Prior to the establishment of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), land ownership was exceedingly unequal, with approximately 10 percent of landlords holding 70 percent of the fertile land and the majority of peasants either being landless or paying expensive rents (Meisner, 1999). The Chinese Communist Party (CCP) started to advocate for the redistribution of land in the late 1920s, but it was not until 1949, when Mao Zedong formed the

People's Republic of China (PRC), that significant reforms were made. The 1950 Land Reform Law was designed to bring an end to feudal landlordism and to redistribute land to peasants who were impoverished. The law proposed doing this by identifying landowners as enemies of the people, forcing them to endure public struggle sessions, and sending them to labor camps or even to their deaths (Hinton, 1966). In 1952, the Chinese Communist Party officially put an end to feudal landownership and instituted a land system in which the land was owned by peasants. This decision was made after 300 million peasants were each granted 47 million hectares of land (Shapiro, 2001). This reform led to a rise in agricultural output, an improvement in rural productivity, and the establishment of a basis for China's industrial development (Jin, 2001). In 1958, Mao launched the Great Leap Forward, which included abolishing private ownership, collectivizing farmland into "people's communes," and implementing centralized planning in order to boost production (Dikotter, 2010). In 1953, the cooperative movement began, and this technique was established in conjunction with it in order to transfer ownership from individual farmers to collective administration (Li et al., 2023).

In 1978, China adopted the Household Responsibility System (HRS) in an effort to address the stagnation, poverty, and starvation that had been caused by the People's Communes. Families were able to lease land from the collective and manage production on their own thanks to this structure, which resulted in a considerable increase in agricultural productivity (Guo & Liu, 2021). Nevertheless, the fragmentation of land, which necessitated further modifications, hindered the development of widespread agriculture. In 2014, the State Council extended land contracts by thirty additional years and established the "Three Rights Separation" policy in an effort to guarantee the long-term stability of farmers and to provide them with incentives for production. The "Three Rights Separation" policy provided definitions for land ownership, contracting rights, and management rights (Li et al., 2023).

Prior to the colonial era in Vietnam, the three systems of land ownership were the village system, the private ownership system, and the government ownership system. These three systems were all interconnected and in conflict with one another. The majority of the land in the village was collectively owned, legally non-transferable, and frequently divided up between the men who resided there. When the state offered support for the restoration of the land in the South, peasants were given permission to claim and hold onto as much land as they were able to produce, but this was not always the case. As a consequence of this transformation, the amount of land that was



owned by private individuals increased, while the amount of land that was considered common property gradually declined (Ho, 2023). After it had successfully conquered the territory, the French colonial authority enacted policies that provided wealthy landowners with the most benefits. These policies included the distribution of huge property parcels to French colonists and Vietnamese loyalists. This led to a distribution of property that was extremely unequal, with major landowners owning approximately 80% of the land, which marginalized small-scale farmers and exacerbated economic inequalities in rural regions (Callison, 1983).

The Viet Minh implemented minor land reforms in the year 1948, during the anti-colonial fight, which resulted in a reduction in rents while also maintaining the support of influential landlords who were in favor of the revolution. They seized land from people who were not living on the land, individuals who had collaborated with the enemy, and citizens of France, and they then distributed it to peasants who did not have any land of their own, while still maintaining governmental control over the ownership of land (Tran, 2024). After the French departed Vietnam in 1954, the country was split into two regions: North Vietnam and South Vietnam. North Vietnam undertook a decisive land reform program from 1953 to 1957, during which time land was redistributed to agricultural households, prior to taking the next step toward collectivization (Prosterman & Riedinger, 1987). Concurrently, the Prime Minister of South Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem, passed Ordinance No. 57 (1956), which established a limit of 100 hectares for land holdings and attempted to seize huge estates. The 650,000 hectares of land that were supposed to be transferred actually benefited a small number of tenant farmers. By 1967, only 275,000 hectares had been handed to 130,000 recipients (Truong, 1987).

Following the conclusion of the conflict in Vietnam, the Communist Party of Vietnam (VCP) implemented land reform in the southern region of the country in order to eliminate the final traces of colonialism and feudalism. Resolutions 247/NQ-TW (1975) and 254/NQ-TW (1976) were passed by the government, and as a result of these resolutions, the government seized land from affluent landlords, foreign businesspeople, and political adversaries in order to strengthen the Communist Party's hold on power (Dang, 2022; Womack, 1987). The changes known as "doi moi," which translates to "renewal" in English, were implemented in 1986 in order to liberalize the economy. The implementation of these reforms was a direct result of the disastrous economic consequences of collectivization. In 1988, "Resolution 10" was passed, and in 1993, the property Law was established. These two laws conferred upon farmers the ability to use their property as

they saw fit and delegated the management of agricultural output to family businesses (Marsh & MacAulay, 2006). The Property Law of 2003 allowed for the reallocation of property for the purposes of investment and infrastructure development, which enhanced state engagement through "fiscal socialism." This increased state involvement resulted in economic growth but also increased concerns about land security (Tran, 2024).

### **Impact of Land Reform**

Following Cuba's revolution in 1959, Marxist land reforms were enacted, which brought about a significant transformation in the agricultural landscape of the country. These reforms also resulted in a redefinition of the social, cultural, and economic framework of the nation. The reforms were designed to increase both equity and self-sufficiency by transferring land from vast private estates to cooperative and public ownership through the redistribution of land. This change not only resulted in breakthroughs in agricultural technology, but it also led to changes in production relations (Guardado-Stuart & Fondeen-Veloz, 2023). The First Agrarian Reform created peasant producers, each of whom had an average land area of twenty-four hectares. A number of different cooperative models were developed, one of which was the Agricultural Production Cooperative (CPA). These cooperatives were significant during the 1970s and 1980s, but their popularity fell in later years. Another type of cooperative, the Credit and Services Cooperative (CCS), experienced a period of growth and prosperity in the 1990s. The Basic Units of Cooperative Production (UBPC) were established during the privatization process that occurred in the 1990s. The UBPC was designed to integrate state agricultural workers into a hybrid cooperative framework (Rodríguez & Esteban, 2020). During the 1970s and 1980s, Cuba's agricultural policy made great progress as a result of the country's efforts to establish a balance between the expansion of exports and the demand for agricultural products within the country.

The amount of land used for agriculture has more than doubled since the 1950s, and 62 percent of the country's total land area is now used for agricultural purposes. Food stability was ensured through diversification into crops that did not contain sugar, such as rice, citrus fruits, and tubers, while sugar production increased to the point where it reached seven to eight million tons by the latter part of the 1980s. The industrialization of livestock made it easier to achieve protein self-sufficiency because the production of meat, milk, and eggs met the essential nutritional needs of the population. In 1989, the average daily consumption for each person was made up of 76.5 grams of protein, 46.5 grams of fat, and 2,845 kilocalories. Tobacco, sugar, and citrus exports have been

steadily increasing, which is an indication that the agricultural sector is thriving (Paz, 2011). However, the crisis that occurred in the 1990s led to soil deterioration, labor shortages, and decapitalization, which ultimately resulted in a limited recovery in agricultural domestic product (AGDP) by the end of the decade. In the 2000s, urban agriculture and diversification had a significant increase, although sugar production consistently fell short of expectations, failing to achieve the goals that had been set. The production of milk and meat from cattle herds dropped to just 25 percent of what it had been before, and herds themselves experienced a significant reduction in size. However, poultry, swine, and small ruminants have demonstrated a more resilient comeback. Forest covering increased from 13.4 percent in 1959 to 25.3 percent in 2007 as a result of conservation efforts in the environment. This increase in forest coverage made it easier to achieve sustainable development (Rodríguez & Esteban, 2020).

According to the most recent data, the state continues to possess 76 percent of the agricultural land inside its borders. Fourteen percent of small farms are owned by individuals, while seven percent are owned by organizations or cooperatives. The majority of landholders, accounting for 68.2 percent of the total, are usufructuaries. Following owners, who account for 24.1 percent of the total, are scattered holders, who account for 7.4 percent, and renters, who account for 0.3 percent. When it comes to discussing agricultural production, sugarcane accounted for 71.8 percent of all farming production in the year 2020. After that, at 4.1 percent, vegetables were the next most popular item, followed by maize at 3.4 percent and bananas at 3.1 percent (Zuniga, 2023). These were the improvements that were noticed; these changes contributed to the strengthening of rural communities, the reduction of inequality, and the improvement of social connections by encouraging cultural activities and education. Even if these accomplishments were achieved, the changes were subjected to criticism on the grounds that they were unsuccessful and did not correspond with the larger economic tactics that were being used at the time. Cuba's experience illustrates that in order for agrarian reforms to be successful in the long run, it is essential to find a compromise between principles and real measures.

During the past forty years, substantial changes have occurred in China with regard to land ownership and agricultural policies. These changes have resulted in increased security of land tenure and increased agricultural production. The Household Responsibility System (HRS) and the "Three Rights Separation" policy were two of the reforms that were implemented. These changes altered agriculture from a collectively owned and operated system to one that was based

on individual households. As a result, the earnings of those living in rural areas increased, and economic growth occurred (Zhou et al., 2020). In order to provide stability, the period of land contracts has been continually prolonged, despite the fact that new institutional frameworks, such as township land rights transfer platforms, promote land consolidation (Huang & Ding, 2016).

China was able to supply 95 percent of its food requirements between the years 1978 and 2018 despite the fact that its natural resources were limited. This was made possible by the fact that agricultural GDP grew at an average annual rate of 4.5 percent throughout that period (Huang et al., 2010).

There was an increase in agricultural production, which occurred at an annual rate of 5.4 percent. This increase was accompanied by a shift in focus toward the cultivation of animals and crops that are of high value. The rate of growth for cotton, sugarcane, edible oils, and fruit reached as high as 11.5 percent per year, while the production of grain climbed at a pace of 2.1 percent per year. Dairy products saw the largest yearly growth rate, at 9 percent, although meat and fish output climbed at corresponding rates of 5.9 percent and 7.3 percent (Huang et al., 2020). Rural poverty decreased significantly as a result of the aforementioned achievements in conjunction with the increase in employment opportunities outside of the agricultural sector. The number of people living in poverty in rural areas decreased from 250 million in 1978 to 15 million in 2007, and then to 30 million (3.1%) in 2017, despite the fact that the poverty threshold was higher. In 2023, the amount of land that could be used for cultivation in China totaled 171.62 million hectares, and 98 percent of the people who worked in agriculture were smallholders who managed 70 percent of the farmland (C, 2024).

That being said, challenges continue to exist, including the uncertainty of land tenure and the discretionary authority of local governments in the redistribution of property, which may discourage long-term investment and reduce productivity (Wang et al., 2011). In addition, the danger to food security that is posed by urbanization and the conversion of agricultural land makes it necessary to adopt a balanced approach to the management of land (Deng, 2015). It is possible to establish a connection with someone who has different political views than you. In order to maintain agricultural productivity and guarantee the economic stability of rural areas, it is essential to develop policies that are progressing and sustainable.

The land reforms that were enacted in Vietnam, particularly those that were put into effect following the Doi Moi in 1986, resulted in a substantial improvement in agricultural production

and economic growth. These reforms accomplished this by shifting the Vietnamese economy away from a collectivized agricultural system and toward a market-oriented system of economics. The Land Law of 1993 consolidated property rights, simplified the process of land transactions, and increased the economic agency of people in rural areas, particularly women, by raising household spending and economic involvement (Menon et al., 2017). According to the data from 2020, there were 7,471 agricultural businesses, 7,918 cooperatives, and 9.1 million farming households that were active in farming in Vietnam (Li et al., 2023). According to Szalontai (2005), the initial redistributions of land had an impact on more than 4 million people living in rural areas, while the rent reduction program had an impact on nearly 8 million people. The improvement of fairness was not the only benefit of these measures; they also encouraged investments in the long term, which lessened worries about land confiscation and promoted modernization in agriculture.

Vietnam has become a major exporter in the international market as a result of the huge growth in agricultural output. By the early 2000s, Vietnam had become the world's second-largest exporter of rice, as a result of the country's successful rice crop production. In 1980, the country produced 11 million tons of rice, but by 2020, that number had increased to 43 million tons (Thang et al., 2023). Vietnam has established itself as the second-largest exporter of coffee in the world, with the country's production of coffee increasing from 92,000 tons in 1986 to 1.8 million tons in 2020 (Kemper et al., 2015). Between the years 1988 and 2021, the agricultural output increased at an annual rate of 3.7 percent. Rice yields increased by a factor of 2.2, while the total production increased by a factor of 2.8. The cultivation of cash crops saw a tremendous increase, with coffee expanding by twenty times, rubber by twenty-two times, and pepper by thirty-two times. There has been significant expansion in both the fisheries and livestock industries. Poultry production has increased by a factor of 4.9, cattle production has increased by a factor of 2.1, and fisheries production has increased by a factor of 10 (Phat, 2023). The total value of the agricultural, fishery, and forestry products that Vietnam exported in 2022 was fifty-three billion US dollars.

These changes brought in a significant reduction in poverty, as agricultural incomes climbed by a factor of sixteen, and the poverty rate plummeted from 60 percent in 1990 to 4.4 percent in 2021 (Phat, 2023). Millions of people have been pulled out of poverty as a result of increased market access and land ownership, especially in rural areas, where ninety percent of the people living in poverty reside. In 1990, the average life expectancy was 64.8 years, but due to improvements in food security that led to improvements in nutrition, the average life expectancy increased to 73.6

years in 2021. Nevertheless, there are still some hurdles that have yet to be overcome, especially with the unequal distribution of property. Only 36 percent of central highlands households who were eligible acquired land through Program 132 (Benjamin et al., 2018). The overreliance on products for export resulted in an increase in the usage of pesticides, as well as soil erosion and a decline in biodiversity. The informal privatization that ensued from urban land reforms made the environmental concerns and uncontrolled redevelopment that were already present in places such as Hanoi even worse (Le et al., 2022). The reforms that were made to the land in Vietnam contributed to the improvement of society and the economy of the country. However, in order to resolve inequities and maintain sustainability over the long term, it is required to implement policies in an equitable manner and to develop institutional frameworks.

### **Comparative Analysis**

An analysis of land reforms that have been implemented in China, Cuba, and Vietnam demonstrates that the techniques that have been taken by each of these countries have been different, and that these approaches have been influenced by various political, economic, and historical variables. Cuba's agricultural reforms sought to address inequalities that had persisted for a long time and placed a focus on social fairness through the redistribution of land to smallholders and cooperatives. Nevertheless, the inefficiencies of state-controlled agriculture and the overdependence on sugar monoculture were factors that restricted the potential for long-term economic viability.

China's transition from collectivization during the Great Leap Forward to the Household Responsibility System in 1978, on the other hand, signified a major increase in rural living standards and a shift away from a collectivized economy toward a market-oriented productivity system. The Doi Moi reforms that were implemented in Vietnam were comparable to the market-oriented transformation that occurred in China. These reforms boosted agricultural output and reduced poverty in Vietnam, but they also resulted in economic disparity as smallholders had to compete with larger agribusinesses. These stories demonstrate the difficulties that are involved in finding a compromise between governmental involvement and market efficiency in order to accomplish a sustainable agricultural transformation.

Social fairness, in addition to economic impacts, had a significant impact on the outcomes of land reform. The first policies of Cuba that were designed to redistribute wealth enhanced access to

land for excluded communities, even though innovation was hampered by bureaucratic inefficiency and a lack of incentives. The Land Reform Law of 1950, which was implemented in China, granted millions of peasants greater authority; however, collectivization during the Great Leap Forward eliminated the benefits that had been gained until the Household Responsibility System was established, which gave peasants back their autonomy. The reforms that Vietnam implemented were successful in granting land-use rights to households in rural areas, thereby lowering the number of people who were landless. However, regional inequalities continued, which meant that farmers who had a lot of money had greater access to markets than those who did not. These results demonstrate that although redistributive policies have the power to remedy past injustices, their effectiveness is contingent upon the existence of governance systems that foster economic mobility, resource availability, and inclusivity.

To this day, environmental sustainability continues to be a significant issue in all three of these nations. Cuba has demonstrated a dedication to farming in a sustainable manner, specifically with regard to urban agriculture, however issues such as soil degradation and minimal automation continue to persist, despite the country's efforts in the field of agro ecology. Serious environmental harm has resulted from the rapid rise of agriculture in China, which has led to the enactment of new legislation that promote conservation-focused approaches. The country of Vietnam has placed a strong emphasis on agricultural production with the goal of exporting the produce, which has resulted in ecological strain, notably in the Mekong Delta, where climate change has made vulnerabilities even more pronounced. These examples serve to illustrate the significance of incorporating sustainability into agricultural strategies in order to strike a balance between economic development and the preservation of ecological integrity. It is essential for other developing nations to learn from the experiences of China, Cuba, and Vietnam. This highlights the importance of governance that is adaptable and that achieves a balance between environmental stewardship, production, and justice.

### **Conclusion and Policy Implication**

A comparative analysis of Cuba, China, and Vietnam concludes that Marxist-inspired land reforms radically rebuilt agricultural societies by destroying feudal and capitalist landholding arrangements, promoting equality, and empowering rural communities who had previously been disadvantaged. These reforms were successful in establishing a framework for poverty reduction,

food security, and national economic sovereignty; nevertheless, their long-term usefulness was dependent on adjusting inflexible ideological precepts to pragmatic local situations. The experiences illustrate that a unique approach is not effective; rather, a delicate balance between governmental involvement for social justice and market mechanisms for efficiency and production is required for sustainable agrarian change. In the end, the most successful results were achieved through policies that incorporated environmental stewardship, adaptive governance, and secure, transferable land-use rights. These policies bring attention to the long-lasting but ever-changing impact of Marxist ideology when it comes to the establishment of agricultural systems that are both productive and equitable.

The findings suggests that sustainable land reform requires a governance framework that carefully combines Marxist equity and market-oriented efficiency. This involves granting smallholders secure, transferable land-use rights to empower them and reduce historical inequalities and implementing targeted support systems like credit, sustainable agricultural technologies, and market infrastructure to prevent new socio-economic disparities. From the start, agrarian policy must incorporate environmental stewardship using agro ecological practices and climate-resilient planning to reduce degradation and resource depletion caused by intensive production, ensuring the long-term sustainability of livelihoods and landscapes.

## References

- Assies, W. (2007). Land tenure and tenure regimes in Mexico: An overview. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 8(1), 33–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0366.2007.00162.x>
- Badal, B. P. (2020). Gandhian Model of Community Development. *Research Nepal Journal of Development Studies*, 3(2), 1–23.
- Baisya, A. (2017). Struggle and class struggle. *Frontier*, 50(11), 17–23.
- Benjamin, D., Brandt, L., McCaig, B., & Hoa, N. L. (2018). Program participation in a targeted land distribution program and household outcomes: Evidence from Vietnam. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 16(1), 41–74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11150-017-9390-0>
- Birchall, I. H. (1977). Marxism and literature. *The Sociological Review*, 25(1), 92–100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.1977.tb03233.x>
- Boswell, T., & Hawkins, H. (1999). Marxist theories of ideologies: An update. *Sage Journal*, 25(2-



- 3), 352–357. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08969205990250022201>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Callison, C. S. (1983). *Land-to-the-tiller in the Mekong Delta: Economic, social, and political effects of land reform in four villages of South Vietnam*. Center for South and Southeast Asia Studies, University of California; University Press of America.
- Cogliano, J. F., Veneziani, R., & Yoshihara, N. (2016). The dynamics of exploitation and class in accumulation economies. *Metroeconomica*, 64(2), 242–290. <https://doi.org/10.1111/meca.12114>
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- Dang, T. (2022). Vietnamese Communist Party leaders' reasons and objectives for post-1975 agrarian reform. In T. Dang, *Vietnam's post-1975 agrarian reforms* (pp. 21–43). ANU Press.
- Deng, X. (2015). *Urbanization and impacts on agricultural land in China*. Taylor and Francis Group.
- Dikotter, F. (2010). *Mao's great famine: The history of China's most devastating catastrophe, 1958–62*. Walker & Company.
- Economics Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R. (1954). The socialist mode of production. In *Political economy* (pp. 345–351). Lawrence & Wishart.
- Fatima, K., Ahmed, A., & Shafi, S. (2021). Marxism in Zakia Mashhadi's *Death of an Insect*. *Global Social Science Review*, 6(3), 28–31. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2021\(VI-III\).04](https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2021(VI-III).04)
- Foster, J. B. (1999). Marx's theory of metabolic rift: Classical foundations for environmental sociology. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 105(2), 366–405.
- Gliessman, S. R., & Rosemeyer, M. (2009). *The conversion to sustainable agriculture: Principles, processes, and practices*. CRC Press.
- Graziosi, A. (1996). *The great Soviet peasant war: Bolsheviks and peasants, 1917–1933*. Harvard Press.
- Guardado-Stuart, Y., & Fondeen-Veloz, D. (2023). Ciencia y tecnología en los procesos agrarios en Cuba durante la década de 1960. *Revista Mexicana*, 2(1), 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.62697/rmiie.v2i1.34>

- Hinton, W. (1966). *Fanshen: A documentary of revolution in a Chinese village*. Monthly Review Press.
- Ho, H.-A. (2023). Land rights in historical Vietnam: Theory and evidence. *Explorations in Economic History*, 90, 101551. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eeh.2023.101551>
- Huang, J., & Ding, J. (2016). Institutional innovation and policy support to facilitate small-scale farming transformation in China. *Agricultural Economics*, 47(1), 227–237. <https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12309>
- Huang, J., Liu, Y., Martin, W., & Rozelle, S. (2010). Agricultural trade reform and rural prosperity: Lessons from China. In *China's growing role in world trade* (pp. 397–423). National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Huang, J., Rozelle, S., Zhu, X., Zhao, S., & Sheng, Y. (2020). Agricultural and rural development in China during the past four decades: An introduction. *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, 64(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8489.12352>
- Jin, L. (2001). China's rural land system: History and current situation, problems and ways out. *Econ Syst Reform*, 2, 65–68.
- Kemper, N., Ha, L. V., & Klump, R. (2015). Property rights and consumption volatility: Evidence from a land reform in Vietnam. *World Development*, 71, 107–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.WORLDDEV.2013.11.004>
- Le, M. K., Zhu, J., & Nguyen, H. L. (2022). However, uncertain property rights and informal privatization resulted in unregulated redevelopment, exacerbating environmental degradation in cities like as Hanoi. Reforms in urban environments sparked a shift from considering land as a production tool t. *Land Use Policy*, 120, 106–290. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2022.106290>
- Li, i., Tran, T. B., La, H. A., & Nguyen, M. T. (2023). Land allocation policy and income inequality: Evidence from Vietnam. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 70(2), 440–465. <https://doi.org/10.1111/roiw.12640>
- Li, X., Li, X., Liao, Y., Mi, Q., & Yu, G. (2023). China's land reform and rural innovation: A case study. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review*, 27(2), 345–358. <https://doi.org/10.22434/ifamr2020.0021>
- Mahoney, J., & Thelen, K. (2015). Advances in Comparative-Historical Analysis. In J. Mahoney

- & K. Thelen (Eds.), *Advances in Comparative-Historical Analysis*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316273104>
- Marsh, S. P., & MacAulay, T. G. (2006). *Land reform and the development of commercial agriculture in Vietnam: Policy and issues*. Department of Agricultural Economics, The University of Sydney.
- Marx, K. (1867). *Capital: A critique of political economy. Volume I*. Progress Publisher.
- Marx, K. (1992). *Capital: Volume III*. Penguin Books.
- Meisner, M. (1999). *Mao's China and after: A history of the People's Republic*. The Free Press.
- Menon, N., Rodgers, Y. v., & Kennedy, A. R. (2017). Land reform and welfare in Vietnam: Why gender of the land-rights holder matters. *Journal of International Development*, 29(4), 454–472. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JID.3203>
- Munro, D. (2013). Land and capital. *Journal of Australian Political Economy*, 70, 214–232.
- Pasa, R. B., Joshi, H. R., Acharya, M., & Adhikari, J. (2024). Appraising agriculture development strategy of Nepal from agricultural extension perspective. *Journey for Sustainable Development and Peace Journal*, 2(2), 146–160.
- Paz, J. V. (2011). The Cuban agrarian revolution: Achievements and challenges. *Estudos Avançados*, 25(72), 73–87. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-40142011000200007>
- Pearce, R. (1985). The agrarian question. In Z. G. Barański & J. R. Short (Eds.), *Developing contemporary Marxism* (pp. 55–85). Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-17761-5\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-17761-5_4)
- Perez-Stable, M. (2011). *The Cuban revolution: Origins, course, and legacy*. Oxford University Press.
- Phat, C. Đ. (2023). Four decades of Doi Moi in Viet Nam agriculture. *Review of Agrarian Studies*, 13(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.25003/RAS.13.01.0002>
- Prosterman, R. L., & Riedinger, J. M. (1987). *Land reform and democratic development*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rodríguez, E. B., & Esteban, A. L. (2020). Past and present land reform in Cuba (1959-2018): From peasant collectivisation to repeasantisation and beyond. *Rural History*, 32(2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0956793321000108>
- Shapiro, J. (2001). *Mao's war against nature: Politics and the environment in revolutionary China*. Cambridge University Press.

- Szalontai, B. (2005). Political and economic crisis in North Vietnam, 1955–56. *Cold War History*, 5(4), 395–426.
- T., C. (2024). *Acreage of sown or harvested land of farm crops in China from 1980 to 2023*. Statistica.
- Thang, T. C., Trung, N. C., & Hoa, N. I. (2023, November 9). *Land tenure reform perspectives from agricultural sector in Vietnam since 1945*.
- Thiele, M., Pan, Y.-y. D., & Molina, D. (2014). *Alienating students: Marxist theory in action*. Pacific Sociological Association.
- Tran, P. H. (2024). *Vietnam's Land Law evolution*.
- Truong, Q. (1987). *Agricultural collectivization and rural development in Vietnam: A North-South study (1955 - 1985)*. Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam.
- Wang, H., Tong, J., Su, F., Wei, G., & Tao, R. (2011). To reallocate or not: Reconsidering the dilemma in China's agricultural land tenure policy. *Land Use Policy*, 28(4), 805–814. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2011.01.006>
- Warren, P. (2011). *Encyclopedia of global justice*. In *Encyclopedia of global justice*. Springer, Dordrecht. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9160-5\\_323](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9160-5_323)
- Womack, B. (1987). The party and the people: Revolutionary and postrevolutionary politics in China and Vietnam. *World Politics*, 39, 479–507.
- Zhou, Y., Li, X., & Liu, Y. (2020). Rural land system reforms in China: History, issues, measures and prospects. *Land Use Policy*, 90, 104330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.104330>
- Zinoman, P. (2001). *The colonial bastille: A history of imprisonment in Vietnam, 1862–1940*. University of California Press.
- Zuniga, N. (2023). *Cuba - Context and land governance*. Centre for the Study of the Cuban Economy.