EXPLORING NEW AVENUES: ANTHROPOLOGICAL HISTORY, POLITICAL ECONOMY AND PEASANTRIES

FRED SKANES

Exploring New Avenues:

Anthropological History, Political Economy and Peasantries

Fred Skanes

Submitted in Partial Fulfilment

of the Requirements for the

Masters of Arts Degree

Department of Anthropology

Memorial University of Newfoundland

St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada

ISBN 0-315-82666-5

ABSTRACT

In the past fifty or sixty years the field of anthropology has gone through many shifts concerning the nature of its endeavor. Shifts within general theoretical orientations reflects shifts of topic specific agendas. Moreover, a recent awareness of the role that history can play in a more vibrant and eclectic anthropology has been advocated. The purpose of this thesis is to analyze the history of anthropological theory as it pertains to the discipline's orientation concerning a specific topic, namely the concept of the peasant. Anthropology is enjoined to reevaluate its orientation and accept the challenge of delineating new avenues of inquiry.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. George Park for his encouragement during the writing of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS iv

INTRODUCTION 1

Limits of Tradition 8

Method of Approach 11

ANTHROPOLOGY AND HISTORY 15

Community Studies and the Peasant Concept 29

Economic Anthropology and the Peasant Concept 33

The Substantivist Challenge 39

Closed Community 47

Open Community 50

MODE OF PRODUCTION AND SITUATIONAL LOGIC 56

Peasant Situational Logic 68

Households 72

Proletarianization and Landlessness 79

MEXICO AND THE DILEMMAS OF CENTRAL AMERICA 85

Mexico 94

Smaller Nations of Central America 104

CENTRAL AMERICAN PEASANTRIES 120

Zinacantan 120

San Cosme 123

Honduras: San Esteban and Orocuina 139

CONCLUSION 146

BIBLIOGRAPHY 150

INTRODUCTION

Over the years the discipline of anthropology has developed an abundance of theoretical models in order to understand various cultural/societal changes. In general, anthropology's scope suggests an attentive awareness of human action and interaction at various levels; the individual, clan, tribe, community, and state to name a few.

It is apparent that today there are a number of topic specific approaches available in anthropology that enable anthropologists to address and resolve a particular problem. In a specific context this thesis addresses this situation. The concern here is attempting to understand the way that anthropological models have been developed for a specific topic, namely understanding peasant populations. Moreover, attention is given to the fact that anthropological theory has not been dormant; new avenues of inquiry are constantly being constructed while challenging those that already exist. Thus, an historical foundation concerning theoretical development and direction is necessary. As Regna Darnell once pointed out,

> Students who learn to think historically about the Anthropological past will simultaneously learn to evaluate the present context of Anthropology and not to accept as gospel truth all that they are told. It is in large part history which illustrates that gospels of all varieties are only partial truths (Darnell 1982:267).

When attempting any form of social inquiry, specific parameters for investigation must be delineated. For the task at hand, a guiding question has been, 'Why is there a need for an analysis of anthropological tools'? The answer in turn is that our theoretical and methodological constructs are not immune to stagnation; in essence, they often are applied in ad hoc fashion or as pointed out above, accepted as 'gospel'. Here the immediate challenge is to address one such tool, the concept peasant. An assessment of this concept requires rating the viability of the several ways in which it is incorporated in the anthropological field today.

In order to approach this subject properly an historical account of the concept's development is the proper avenue for investigation. Succinctly the argument is that by acknowledging and understanding how anthropologists over the years have defined and implemented the peasant concept today's anthropologists will be able to assess the concept's feasibility for understanding current problems. As George Park was inclined to surmise, "Thinking about history doesn't have to be competitive....Each school shouldn't aim to replace but complement others by improving its own partial explanation for the diversity of cultures and the limits of that diversity" (Park 1990:88).

C. Wright Mills once stated, "Every social science or better, every well considered social study requires an historical scope of conception and a full use of historical material" (C. Wright Mills, 1959: 145). In anthropology, history can be equated as tradition since we build upon past endeavors. Tradition, as Jean Pouillon would have it is "a continuation of the past in the present..." (J. Pouillon 1971:77). Thus tradition has been a history of sorts:

> Through his interpretation of a given author the anthropologist expresses what he has done or wanted to do in the field; he formulates in terms of his own culture the lesson he has derived from contact with alien cultures. By choosing precursors, he reveals the way in which he approaches cultures, and vice versa, his work in the field reveals the way in which he reads authors (Pouillon: 79).

Pouillon is stating that over the years, in an historical light, anthropology has developed many diverse traditions. These would include general as well as specific theoretical constructs. It is the anthropologist through disciplinary training who discerns which tradition influences him or her the most. It is with this basic premise that one can outline the eclectic nature of the anthropological profession:

> The proof is that there is not one tradition but several. Their multiplicity shows that their role is not the accumulation of experiences and doctrines into a kind of global mass which would constitute the tradition and which would be the common property of everybody. On the contrary, traditions are discriminatory, and that is their essential and practical function: by affirming that he is affiliated to such and such a tradition, an anthropologist does not simply exercise a retrospective choice, he first of all makes a present choice, he puts himself in opposition to certain colleagues as well as expressing agreement with others. To have recourse to tradition is a way of formulating one's difference (Pouillon: 79-80).

Our focus then is on learning from the past. The concern here is with those theoretical directions, themselves situated in tradition, that have relevance in the development of the concept peasant. It is the tradition(s), the history of anthropological theory, that enjoins us to seek out new avenues of inquiry. A more concrete assertion consists of allocating to the anthropologist a level of historical relativity. As Robert Murphy stated:

> The premise that knowledge is 'relative' to, that it is contingent upon and covariant with, the investigator and his social milieu became hardened into a doctrine of 'historical relativism', which holds that the criterion of the validity of a history is it's relevance to the times in which it was written. It would follow, then, that the writing of history is a continuous process that must be repeated for each era as new insights and canons of relevance are developed (Murphy 1971: 105).

History then is most beneficial when it offers insight into problems of the day. Accordingly this thesis attempts to juxtapose this very large anthropological concern upon a limited problem: the development of the concept peasant and it's relevance for understanding social change in the present Central American context. The following few paragraphs sketch out how this line of inquiry is to be pursued.

In chapter one the focus will be on the development of the concept peasant in the field of anthropology. To begin with we will trace one historical path that led to the development of peasant studies. Attention is paid to such development as it pertains to Central American peasantries as illuminated in English language texts. The basis by which Central American peasantries are examined is that it became clear during the research stage that recent work on the area relies tremendously on a specific tradition in the discipline. In short this thesis will illustrate that historically there has been a strong English foundation that connects British functionalism to Robert Redfield's community studies approach and in turn has led to a focus that connects local peasant communities with the world around them.

Moreover, a specific theoretical model is analyzed in order to illustrate the historical relevance of such a tradition. This model concerns the role of the sub-discipline economic anthropology and in turn an attempt will be made at explicating how a particular internal debate, the Formalist/Substantivist debate issued new life into our understanding of peasant populations. As J. Ian Prattis stated:

> The formalist-substantivist controversy debated the variable subject mix between economics and anthropology, but in terms of arriving at an axiomatic base and set of parameters for the successful analysis of primitive and peasant economies (Prattis 1987:9).

During the 1950s and the 1960s the development of an economic anthropology led to a concerted effort at delineating the role that the economy played in peasant societies. This does not imply that such concerns were not addressed at earlier times by anthropologists but rather that an increased awareness of the complexity of peasant economic activity was being incorporated into the field. This can be seen as the direct result of ever increasing complex levels and types of socio-economic change. In assessing the role that the economy played in peasant life, a few key issues surfaced. Unlike early attempts at understanding peasant populations as culturally isolated communities (Redfield:1967), new directions suggested an historical approach that delineated the peasant's connection with non-peasant populations. Wolf summarized this approach in 1982: "Human populations construct their cultures in interaction with one another, and not in isolation" (Wolf 1982:ix).

The historical parameter that accentuates or gives rise to this postulate is the penetration of non-capitalist societies by a capitalist social formation. In a general sense this implies two related ideas. First, in order to understand such developments anthropologists have begun to look at the history of the people in question. William Roseberry states that:

> When we tire of theoretical debates, anthropologists turn to history because we want to know how the people with whom we live got to be the way they are. We want to know what happened when, what they did, what was done to them, what they did about it, what they thought about it. Often what was done to them has to do with state formation, or proletarianization, or colonialism, and if we are to make any sense at all about the people we study we have to analyze such larger, world-historical processes (Roseberry 1986:75).

Bearing this in mind, such historical awareness in turn meant dealing with specific social processes of change. One attempt at doing that was the question of 'agrarian transition'. As alluded to above, a particular way to assess change was by looking at the effect capital penetration had on certain populations. The theoretical basis of this argument as it will be incorporated in this thesis is outlined in the work of David Goodman and Michael Redclift. In their seminal work, *From Peasant to Proletarian*, (1982) Goodman and Redclift state that capital penetration cannot be Eurocentric in scope and application when considering the avenues it has taken in Latin America:

> The penetration and expansion of capitalism in agriculture also has followed divergent paths in Latin America and the dynamics of this process have aroused much controversy in recent years. [Moreover]...evidence also suggests the partial, incomplete nature of 'agrarian transition': that is, when conceived as the real subsumption of labour by capital and the formation of a rural capitalist class and a rural proletariat of wage labourers completely from the means of production (Goodman and Redclift 1982:24-25).

Goodman and Redclift pay close attention to this type of socio-economic change since this process is an overriding concern for all disciplines focusing on Latin America. A cornerstone of their argument is that since there is no unilateral path for agrarian transition in Latin America, the focus must be on individual social formations. The authors do not really explain what they mean by social formation. One argument they do put forward is that agrarian transition can be blocked by the existence of non-capitalist structures, and "although the social formation is incorporated in the capitalist world economy and governed by capitalist laws of motion, crystallized capitalist class relations have not become generalized in agriculture" (Goodman and Redclift: 68).

Since there are no 'capitalist class relations' the social formation can be seen as those transitory relations that exist when socio-economic change is occurring. Thus a social formation is meant to be a "definite set of relations of production together with the economic, political, legal and cultural forms in which their conditions of existence are served" (Cutler et al 1977:315). This becomes important for the study at hand in that each case study can be seen as being particular.

In chapter two the purpose is to outline the historical development of the concept peasant as it pertains to Central American anthropology. The juncture between chapters one and two is concerned with a more intense line of inquiry, one that focuses on the increasing awareness among rural populations of their economic situations. Through this method the

contention is that we are able to assess the feasibility of 'traditional' peasant definitions for today's anthropology. In doing so limitations to their application are established and new avenues of inquiry are suggested. This chapter situates this endeavor by outlining such limits and in turn reveals the methodology for the study at hand.

Limits of Tradition

For our use here limitations of anthropological tradition are too numerous to mention. For the purpose at hand two points can be established. First, limitations can be overriding as they pertain to the fulcrum of the anthropological endeavor; the consensus being that repetitive and cyclical postulates in the field are not very useful when they offer little insight into understanding the diversity of human populations. A key point here is that these postulates are especially weak when addressing the problems associated with levels and/or types of social change (in essence peasants in transition).

In *The Rebirth of Anthropological Theory*, Stanley Barrett assesses the degree to which 'salvage theory' is legitimized as ongoing practice in the field. In turn Barrett's point illustrates the limiting qualities of specific theoretical and methodological traditions:

> This concerns the manner in which scholars tinker with discredited theories in order to keep the theories alive. Even if a theoretical approach has been subjected to devastating criticism, there is usually no shortage of devotees who will continue to defend it to the hilt (Barrett 1984:84-85).

Detailed analysis of this limited tradition is not necessary at this juncture. Suffice it to say that anthropological theories must be viewed, as the late Bob Scholte stated, as being "culturally mediated, that is they are contextually situated and relative" (Scholte 1972:431).* In a longer passage Scholte clarifies:

> Critical reflection on diverse anthropological traditions, it was said, is necessary and liberating insofar as it is motivated by, bears witness to, and contributes toward the progressive realization of a value free and therefore objective science. Toward this end, we should be concerned with improving and refining the methodological concepts and empirical data of our historical predecessors and near contemporaries (Scholte:432).

Thus, tradition is only useful if it enables anthropologists to deal with modern problems. In dealing with the peasant concept tradition can be illustrated as being inhibiting if it is implemented as salvage theory. An example would be the modernization theory approach to development and under-development. The point here is that modernization theory's central argument was (is) that, in order to gain economic prosperity, to become 'modernized', rural peoples (peasants) would have to let go of their past(s):

> Modernization was considered different from economic development, although it usually included the latter. Modernization was a social process. It focused on factors such as secularization, individualism, achievement rather than ascription, a futuristic orientation, and structural differentiation (Barrett: 85).

* See Barrett (1984) for an account of anthropological traditions, their usefulness and salvage qualities.

Such inhibiting qualities allocated to this position stem from the fact (as Barrett points out) that this approach in a general context has been considered outdated. One of the essential criticisms of this approach has been that its reformulation (salvage) in anthropology and other social sciences has never transcended western ethnocentrism.

In anthropology these views are abundant. Two notable cases are Foster's 'Image of the Limited good', (1965) and Lewis's 'Culture of Poverty' (1951). Concerning Foster's premise, Barrett contends,

> Foster states that what is most necessary to promote development is to somehow replace the peasant's conception of limited good with the image of an open society in which individual initiative will not threaten the stability of the community (Barrett:209).

For Lewis's case his orientation flows along similar lines. As Chambers and Young point out:

> ...community studies in this vein support the hypothesis that the values of rural peoples, especially those at the bottom of the rural stratification system, hinder their ability to respond to opportunities for change (Chambers and Young 1979:51).

These traditions act as hindrance since they offer little understanding of modern social change. On the other hand, anthropological tradition offers new insight when it's reflexive nature suggests learning from the past. We have learned to realize that 'mentalist or cognitive' orientations concerning social change are incomplete and eventually give way to more economic oriented types of analysis.

Such new avenues have often been called 'historico-structural', or 'materialist'. Their common thread is that they view the mentalist approaches as not being causal but "reflections, rather than causes, of the material world" (Rothstein 1982:8-9). The economic sphere begins to manifest new directions for understanding social change amongst rural populations. This is the focus of chapter three; to squarely situate traditional definitions of peasantries within the everyday context of larger economic activity.

METHOD OF APPROACH

As stated the method can be seen as growing out of the past. In short the method is as follows:

1) Understanding of anthropological tradition as pertaining to the development of the concept peasant (Central American context illuminated in English text language) means explicating the viability of such tradition.

2) Through this assessment new parameters are established. They include the dominant role that economic life has in Central American rural populations. This also means revealing and understanding the types of capital penetration involved in the case studies that will be used.

3) Once this has been established attention is paid to specific developments in rural populations that suggest a new understanding of the concept peasant. Such

areas will include the increased levels of internal migration, and the restructuring of rural households in response to economic conditions.

4) An overall concern is to explicate how the above three points illuminate new directions for Latin American anthropology. Key points for discussion are anthropological usage, seen in historical perspective; situational economics as delineated by types of capital penetration; and understanding the change in rural structures—the type of work and the type of household.

Prattis discusses the implications of *situation* in the following passages:

> Situational logic focused on the actor-situation matrix in that an actor's position within any socio-cultural structure was examined in terms of his (her) access to and control over resources. (Prattis 1987:19).

> My argument was that the actor grows up in networks of information, constraints and opportunities which constitute the social reality within which he acts. The actor's view of the situation and its implications for action are given in the cross cutting of life history with location in social structure. If we view life history as a trajectory of the actor through relationship networks, then reality as he (she) experiences it must be socially based. By this I mean that the framework within which the actor interprets experience and acts is given by his (her) changing location in social structure (Prattis 19).

In chapter four the focus shifts from general theoretical and methodological matters to specific case studies. To begin with an attempt is made to situate particular case studies into the general framework of analysis outlined above. Beginning with Frank Cancian's study of Zinacantan (1987) I establish that situational logic reveals the locality of decision making processes with direct relation to the larger society.

With Frances Rothstein's work *Three Different Worlds* (1982) we are offered a more in depth study into the processes of capital penetration and the attendant situational logic that is in place. Moreover, the point here is that while it is important to understand the ways in which a community is integrated into a larger social system (capital penetration) it is necessary to understand the reasoning why certain decisions regarding change are made over others. This can only be accomplished by focusing on those directly involved in such situations. For Rothstein what is important is understanding the process of 'depeasantization and proletarianization' (Rothstein 1982:16). Her focus is on industrialization and migratory work patterns. In general Rothstein states that wage work is becoming the dominant way of life:

> In 1940 San Cosme was a peasant community. By 1980 less than one in every four households continued to rely primarily on what they themselves produced... What is happening in San Cosme is part of the larger process of the expansion of industrial capitalism and the depeasantization and proletarianization of Mexico (53).

My purpose here is to analyze this development and in turn suggest that a common structural feature in Central America is a movement to wage labor. In turn this changes the

way in which anthropologists go about constructing models and concepts for analysis. The situational perspective also incorporated here means that an ever increasing preoccupation of rural populations is with their economic livelihood.

Finally I will look Susan Stonitch's work on Honduran peasantries. Like the other case studies presented so far those of Stonitch are similar in theoretical orientation. Stonitch attempts to explain how Honduran peasants are faced with new economic decisions in light of capital penetration.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND HISTORY

To develop a proper investigation into the development of the concept peasant in anthropology one must locate its origin in the spectrum of anthropological theory. Bernard Cohn stated that like history, anthropology is a type of knowledge, but on a more abstract level, the two disciplines are concerned with knowledge of 'otherness' (Cohn 1980 :198).[1]

Moreover, such 'otherness', its development and usage, was Eurocentric in conception and application (McGrane 1989:129). The quintessential difference between the two disciplines is that history attempts to perceive such 'otherness' in time, while anthropology is concerned with space. It can be stated however, that limited time for the anthropologist equates as space. Fabian (1983) stipulated that early anthropological efforts in dealing with 'otherness' was vis a vis temporal space which allocated 'difference as distance' (Fabian 1983:16).

By this point Cohn stresses the anthropologist's viewpoint:

[1] More clearly, Cohn states that both history and anthropology "aim ... at explicating the meaning of actions of people rooted in one time and place, to persons in another" (Cohn 1980:198).

> The anthropologist posits a place where the natives are authentic, untouched and aboriginal, and strives to deny the central historical fact that the people he or she studies are constituted in the historically significant colonial situation, affirming instead that they are somehow out of time and history (Cohn :199).

To illuminate I quote the following passage from Evans-Pritchard:

> In such a study as, for instance, the place of the Crown in English public life today, or indeed at any particular time, we would (anthropologists) not consider it necessary, as most historians would, to trace the history of the kingship in detail and perhaps over centuries, because we would be more interested in a particular point of time, whether the present present or the past present, rather that in it's development, which for us have only a limited relevance (Evans-Pritchard 1962:60).

In an historical light it has been stated that anthropology's role in the human acquisition of knowledge was mostly due to the development of the European state.* Furthermore, with this development, the theoretical orientation of this nascent anthropology led to the early development of a pseudo-paradigmatic stance: 'others' meant primitive.**

* Retreating a moment to illustrate the point. Eric Wolf has stated that in 800 A.D. nobody thought of Europe as being a highly developed area. It was within the next few centuries through trade, war, commerce and outright competitiveness of developing states to expand that Europe found its legs (1982:208). In this context Peter Bowler (1989) reports that with the Victorian evolutionism of the period, anthropology "increasingly tended to see those technologically primitive races that had survived into the present as illustrations of how contemporary man's ancestors lived back in the stone age" (Bowler 1989:7).

** See Marianna Torgovnick (1990) for a detailed account of the term primitive equating as Other. In a general statement Torgovnick writes "The word primitive first appeared in English in the fifteenth century to signify the 'original or ancestor' of animals, perhaps of man. In its dominant meanings

However, having stated this it can be argued that the concept 'other' was not an anthropological invention. Bernard McGrane contends that the development of the other concept dates back to the 16th century:

> In the cosmography of the sixteenth century, it was Christianity which came between the European and the non-European Other. Anthropology did not exist: there was, rather, demonology, and it was upon this horizon that the Other took on his specific meaning. In the Enlightenment it was ignorance that came between the European and the Other. Anthropology did not exist: there was rather the negativity of a psychology of error and an epistemology of all the forms and causes of untruth; and it was upon this horizon that the Other assumed his significance. In the Nineteenth century, finally, it was time, geological time, evolutionary time, that came between the European and the non-European Other (McGrane 1989:77).

The 'other' concept, developed as a classificatory tool, was assigned a role in anthropology due to the European world view of the time [18th century]. Cohn suggests that one must view anthropology as being formulated at the time when history (that of nation states) was reaching its apex:

> History and anthropology are forms of knowledge, the creation, formalization, and practice of which are deeply embedded in the historical experience of Western Europe from the fifteenth century to the present. Until the eighteenth century anthropology was a part of history (Cohn 1981:227).

through the eighteenth century, it referred to 'the first, earliest age, period, or stage', usually of church history, later of biological tissue" (Torgovnick 1990:19).]

It was the Europeans' belief that the past was causally related to the present. By examining aspects of their present (social practices for example) the Europeans surmised that this endeavor would help them understand the past's effect on the immediate present (Cohn:227). Thus time became an instrument of measure:

> The European native theory of time itself was transformed into chronology with the idea that time could be objectively measured and computed through the regular divisions of time into periods to which events could be assigned by dates" (Cohn:227).

The fundamental method by which this was accomplished was with the establishment of, as McGrane states, a 'Christian chronology':

> The various "histories" of the various ancient kingdoms had to be synchronized into "history", and the primary rhythm around and through which they were to be interwoven in "connections" and synchronized into one overall unitary pattern was Biblical history: a somewhat tyrannical synthesis willed and guided by the ideal of a totalitarian unity (Mcgrane 1989:60).

Such beliefs were constructed by what Evans-Pritchard called 'historiens-sociologues': those concerned with "social institutions, in mass movements and great cultural changes, and who seek regularities, tendencies, types and typical sequences; and always within a restricted historical and cultural context" (Evans-Pritchard 1962:48). Coupled with this view, one saw the development of a rather ethno/Eurocentric point of view concerning the nature of man. The dominant mode of thought, Europe's centricity in the order of things, did not

bode well for those peoples who were just being discovered in Oceania, Asia, Africa, and the Americas. As Cohn states:

> Europeans saw themselves and their nations as the progressive elements in the world. The anthropologists' subject became primitive peoples associated with the natural world, as distinguished from Europe where the people were cultured, civilized and progressive (Cohn:228).

Thus one of the most basic assumptions of nineteenth century Europe was the idea that the new labelled 'primitive other' was part of a grand evolutionary scale. As Tylor, a pioneer in the discipline of anthropology, posited:

> The history of the lower races, as of the higher, is not the history of a course of degeneration, or even of equal oscillations to and fro, but of a movement which, in spite of frequent stops and relapses, has on the whole been forward (Tylor 1870 :193).*

Again a point worth mentioning here is that the other concept itself evolved. McGrane states that in its early stage the other concept was understood in demonological terms. Eventually this was surpassed by a more 'enlightened' approach where the concept derived legitimation by being assessed on an evolutionary scale as being 'ignorant'. Finally, in the nineteenth century, the other concept was reflexive; with the establishment of Lyell's geological time

* For a discussion of Tylor's views and their importance see part two of Bowler (1989).

anthropology was given "the space it needed to account for the slow, progressive evolutionary rise of the human condition from savagedom to civilization" (McGrane:90).

Understanding then the importance of evolutionism in the philosophical wanderings of man, attention must be turned to its role in the development of anthropology as a field of knowledge and eventually discern the construction of the peasant concept.

In a recent article entitled "Ethnohistory: the Unfinished Edifice," Bruce Trigger outlines the early European's perception of the primitive other. Dealing with North American populations, Trigger suggests that there are some very obvious and fundamental problems associated with this perception. For example, on his own work dealing with the Huron, Trigger states that he encountered "intellectually indefensible views about native peoples and an accompanying moral insensitivity about European conduct toward them" (Trigger 1986 :254). Moreover Trigger contends that:

> European explorers approached the first native peoples they encountered with expectations derived from classical traditions and medieval superstitions concerning what sorts of peoples lived in the remote corners of the world: monsters, savages, cannibals, or the remnants of a golden age (Trigger:254).

With Latin America similar opinions were quite evident. Todorov points out that upon initial contact Columbus stressed the backwardness, the non-civilized aspects of these primitive others: "Physically naked, the Indians are also to Columbus's eyes, deprived of all cultural property; they are characterized in a sense, by the absence of customs, rites,

religion..." (Todorov 1984: 35). In both Trigger's and Todorov's accounts these early encounters are cosmographical (16th, 17th centuries).

It was therefore, with the eventual onslaught of evolutionism and the overriding concern of the new European states with their histories that it was left to a fledgling anthropology to attempt to understand the primitive other.

It was contrived that these others could not fit into the immediate European scheme of things as temporally situated; although the opinion of Tylor and associates was that all peoples progressed, the primitive others were at a stagnating stage. This position was emphasized when Tylor attempted to classify people through stages. His criteria were:

> The absence or presence, high or low development, of the industrial arts, especially metal-working, manufacturing of implements and vessels, agriculture, oriculture, etc, the extent of scientific knowledge, the definiteness of moral principles, the condition of religious beliefs and ceremony, the degree of social and political organization, and so forth (Tylor 1871: 23-24).

In concluding this section I mention one overriding point. From the outset then, the beginnings of a nascent anthropology were based on the dictation of European society; it being the pinnacle of civilized man. It follows that the common denominator of European thought was the idea that "cultural developments everywhere followed definite laws—unfolding uniformly from the simple to the complex and culminating in the institutions of Western Europe" (Eggan 1968 :122). As Mcgrane revealed, the other concept entailed the fundamental underpinnings of what eventually would be anthropology (McGrane:113). The

new anthropology, weak in method and burdened with loose theoretical parameters, was left the task of interpreting the primitive other's culture and society. Focusing on this concern led the early anthropologists into the area of developing a science of man.

In the 1920s one saw a particular line of investigation concerned with a science of man/society—British Anthropology. A natural science of society (developed under the auspices of Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski) played a very important role in the development of anthropology in general and for our purposes here, the peasant concept. First, before dealing with the specific (peasant concept) a generalized introduction to the construction of anthropological theory is necessary.

The purpose of a natural science of society is to discover laws which govern the social relations in a particular social structure:

> The structure consists of the sum total of all the social relationships of all individuals at a given moment in time. Although it cannot, naturally, be seen in its entirety at any one moment, we can observe it ; all of the phenomenal reality is there (Radcliffe-Brown 1957:55).

Radcliffe-Brown wanted to "formulate generalizations about common features of all human societies. These generalizations would constitute social laws" (Kuper 1973 :72). The purpose was that the establishment of societal laws meant analyzing how certain parts of society functioned in order to maintain society over time. As Kuper points out,

> The stability of the structural form depends upon the integration of its parts, and the performance by these parts of particular tasks which are necessary for the maintenance of the form. These are the functions of the parts of the system (Kuper:72).

The unit of analysis for such an investigation became the primitive other (and eventually the community study approach). Here like in earlier cases, the anthropologist (with a unit of analysis in place) went out to seek the other.

It was at this time that the other was not so far away. With man's (European) innovative ability in the field of transportation the other could be reached in days or weeks. Moreover, the industrializing world needed to contact the other areas of the globe for various reasons; the need for raw materials, labor and markets were paramount here. In an historical light this was part and parcel of the European tradition since the sixteenth century:

That complex historical encounter between the West and the Third World which commenced about the 16th century: When capitalist Europe began to emerge out of feudal Christendom; When the conquistadors who expelled the last of the Arabs from Christian Spain went on to Colonise the New World and also to bring about the direct confrontation of 'civilised' Europe with 'savage' and 'barbaric' peoples ... when the conceptual revolution of modern science and technology helped to consolidate Europe's world hegemony (Asad 1973 :104).*

* Or, as Johannes Fabian, in a long passage was moved to conclude, "Among the historical conditions under which our discipline emerged and which affected its growth and differentiation were the rise of capitalism and its colonialist--imperialist expansion into the very societies which became the

Debating whether or not anthropology was linked to colonial government is not the focus here (See Asad:1973). Suffice it to say that anthropology's subject, the other, was no longer an isolated level of inquiry. Our concentration here is on convergence; relating the history of anthropological theory to a precise development (the peasant concept) and thus evoke a connection to a more historical approach in the discipline. The above statements have suggested a part of this model.

So far attention has been on associating anthropological theory in an historical context, now at this juncture it is appropriate to suggest how the concept of the peasant became a theoretical construct and methodological tool in the anthropological tradition as developed within the framework of the community study approach.

We have considered in anthropological history the development of a science of man. The British functionalist approach elucidated the need for understanding how parts of a society operate to maintain the society [the whole]. As pointed out above an earlier practitioner of this approach was Radcliffe-Brown. In the introduction to John F. Embree's

target of our inquiries. For this to occur, the expansive, aggressive, and oppressive societies which we collectively and inaccurately call the West needed space to occupy. More profoundly and problematically, they required time to accommodate the schemes of a one--way history: progress, development, modernity (and their negative mirror images: stagnation, underdevelopment, tradition). In short, geopolitics has its ideological foundations in chronopolitics" (Fabian 1983:143-144).]

ethnography *Suye Mura: A Japanese Village*, Radcliffe-Brown outlines his aim and the beginnings of the community study approach:

> What is required for social anthropology is a knowledge of how individual men, women, and children live within a given social structure. It is only in the everyday life of individuals and in their behavior in relation to one another that the functioning of social institutions can be directly observed. Hence the kind of research that is most important is the close study for many months of a community which is sufficiently limited in size to permit all the details of its life to be examined (Radcliffe-Brown 1939: xv).

Following in Radcliffe-Brown's footsteps Robert Redfield began such a study in a Latin American context. For Redfield his approach necessitated a particular theoretical and methodological avenue similar to that of Radcliffe-Brown's:

> In the development of science it is usual and necessary to break up the wholes we encounter into parts. It is the way of science to find small elements that can be more precisely described and related to each other than can such complex wholes as are communities and personalities and civilizations (Redfield 1960:10).

The point here is that the community can in itself be considered a 'whole' or a part of a larger, more complex one (civilization). Redfield saw small communities as being the anthropological subject matter by which to understand larger societies and in turn, relate these to an overall 'natural system'.

Unlike Radcliffe-Brown however Redfield did not see peasant culture as being an ancillary aspect of the society. Redfield was concerned with culture since it was a fundamental mechanism by which a given society was maintained (Redfield 1960:41).

The point here is that Redfield was quite aware that unlike the primitive isolates that had been the focus of much of the early anthropological practice, the peasant community was connected to a larger society. Thus the interconnection of what he called the 'little and great traditions' was essential in understanding the perpetuation of not only peasant society but also the larger society of which it was a part (41-42).

Thus Redfield states that the anthropologist who is going to study a peasant community must take "on some part of the responsibility for the study of a composite cultural structure comprised of little and great traditions which have interacted in the past and which are still interacting today" (50). Thus cultural traditions are intrinsic in that they are the ways in which peasant culture reinforces identity and perpetuates such identity via social structure.

As Singer states, it was between 1900 and 1950 that social anthropologists delineated "societies and cultures as natural systems, studied first hand some of the simpler ones intensively, and compared them in a side-by-side timeless equivalence to arrive at generalizations about the nature of society and of culture" (Singer 1976: 188). In turn these developments led to the increased awareness of the historical and structural relationships of the small and large community.

Redfield, Singer contends, had three reasons for such an approach. First, that the methodology and findings of such anthropological work were fundamental as representations of 'simpler' societies which in turn contrast with the larger 'civilized' society. Second, Redfield's work on Tepoztlán and Chan Kom illuminated the way of life (community) that most people lived around the world. The third and final reason for Redfield's approach was that Redfield believed that the civilizations in general had been studied many times over by other scholars; "the study of the little community, and its cultural tradition within the orbit of a civilization or a nation, had been neglected except for a few anthropological studies" (Singer 1976: 208-209).

It was with such views that Redfield began the study of the peasant as pertaining to small communities. In 1956 with the publication of *Peasant Society and Culture*, one of the first, strong, purposeful and analytical attempts to situate the concept of the peasant in the anthropological discourse is initiated by Redfield. Peasant society consisted of the following:

> We are looking at rural people in old civilizations, those rural people who control and cultivate their land for subsistence and as a part of a traditional way of life and who look to and are influenced by gentry or townspeople whose way of life is like theirs but in a more civilized form (Redfield 1956 :131).

Therefore an historical account suggests a movement from 16th century other to community other: from Renaissance other meaning cosmography and demonology (Trigger's 'remnants of a golden age') to an Enlightenment other developed on the basis of ignorance and 'the psychology of error'. It was only with the Enlightenment's construction of the

concept of 'unknown causes' that the myths and religions of the ancient pagans and the contemporary non-Europeans could be seen as ignorance, i.e., as erroneous evaluations of 'unknown causes'. Myths and polytheistic religions were then experienced as errors—for in order to see 'myths', both those of the ancients as well as those of the primitives, as erroneous evaluations of 'unknown causes', the Enlightenment first had to have the established concept of 'unknown causes' (McGrane:74). With the nineteenth century's evolutionary approach the association was with positing such others on an evolutionary time scale of progress. Here chronology came into play. Finally in the twentieth century the other represents progress and development and an emphasis on the culturally different community other (McGrane:113-129). This last stage is where we now turn:

> The community-study approach to settlements that would later be described as 'peasant' was the product of links between Functionalist anthropology and certain trends in sociology. Radcliffe-Brown's influence was particularly marked, for his definition of 'comparative sociology' was an invitation to extend the theoretical framework of his structural functionalism into the study of literate societies (Silverman 1979:50).

Thus, the establishment of a community study orientation heralded a shift in the types of peoples that would be studied. As stated above, with the increase in contact between all parts of the world the anthropological subject matter began to shift from the dominant (isolated other) approach to peoples within the confines of nation states and/or colonial areas. It is within this overall line of inquiry that the peasant concept was developed in the Latin American context.

COMMUNITY STUDIES AND THE PEASANT CONCEPT

In a review of the 1970s concerning Mesoamerican community studies, Chambers and Young (1979) stipulate that the foundational English work on the area is Redfield's *Tepoztlán: A Mexican Village*, (1930). The question to be raised here is what exactly were the criteria by which Redfield developed his community study model? It would seem that the essential theoretical motivation has been understanding how particular societies operate [natural system] and deal with change. For Redfield the avenue by which this could be formalized was by relating social structure and culture.

Silverman points this out:

> In speaking specifically of peasantry, Redfield sets society and culture side by side (1956a). Culture (which here includes great and little traditions, values, and world-views) constitutes the plan and meanings that hold society together. Society (social relations, particularly, in this book, peasant-elite relations) gives culture a vehicle and means of communication, a social organization of tradition (Silverman 1979:55).

In a most general context, Redfield consistently assigned equal importance to all aspects of a given society:

> In the course of their studies of small and self-sufficient primitive societies, anthropologists came to think of each such community as a system of elements in relationship to one another. Each was an analyzable whole. Each could be looked at by itself, without necessary reference to things outside of it, and could be understood as parts working together within a whole (Redfield 1956:35).

However it was Redfield's view that the peasant community was not isolated for example like primitive tribal populations (indeed it was his view that without 'higher traditions' and civilization peasant communities could not exist): "The fact is that anthropologists have come to see their real small communities as parts of larger and compound societal and cultural wholes" (Redfield 1956:14).

Within the confines of the community study approach specific factors then are delineated for outlining exactly what circumscribes the anthropological acceptance and usage of the peasant concept. Such factors, the methodological underpinnings if you will, centered on attempting to observe and interpret all that was represented within the confines of a given community. These would include such typical sociocultural areas as plantation work, kinship, religion, technology, economy and language. At this point it is not necessary to delineate the characteristics of these areas since their importance will be explicated later on when the focus shifts to understanding the community approach to social change. The main point here is that community, culture, and society are intertwined as they are related to external populations.

For the peasant community in a Latin American context, the dominant focus became understanding the socioeconomic structures that related scattered populations. As Eric Wolf asked, "Indeed has there ever been a time when human populations have existed in independence of larger encompassing relationships, unaffected by larger fields of force?" (Wolf 1982:18).

Following in Redfield's footsteps Julian Steward suggested that although the anthropologist is aware of the fact that peasant populations are part of a larger society it is evident that particular segments of these communities carry more weight when attempts are made in trying to define such populations. With Steward the priority centered on productive forces. Silverman, paraphrasing Steward outlines the approach:

> The 'productive processes' land use, land ownership, organization of production, and related phenomena were taken as primary; variations in 'the way of life' were assumed to be corollaries of these processes (Silverman 1979:61).

While Steward was concentrating on productive processes Wolf and Mintz contended that Steward's approach, a reliance on understanding "land use and the productive requirements of different crops" was too narrow an area for investigation. Their focus in turn was "the economic and social situation of those who produced and those who lived off of the crops, and the relationship of the local productive arrangements to the larger processes of colonialism and capitalist development that shaped them" (Silverman 1979:61). Hence the concerted effort by Wolf and Mintz to analyze peasant populations in economic terms but focusing on plantations rather than small communities.

It was at this point that anthropologists began to shift their focus of peasantries from the small communities approach to one that addressed a larger historical context; understanding the various, complex socioeconomic and political structures of 'modern' peasantries.

In a recent article William Roseberry summarizes the theoretical stand of Wolf and Mintz in two general postulates. First, their approach can be considered historical in that Wolf and Mintz understand the development of local communities over time and on a global scale. Secondly, by assessing the historical development of such communities, Wolf and Mintz address the anthropological subject "at the intersection of local interactions and relationships and the larger processes of state and empire making" (Roseberry 1988:163).

This viewpoint is that such populations do not perpetuate their ways of life in isolation. Rather, it is their relationship with outside forces that delineate the shape that they take. The key factor involved here becomes the economic environment in which the peasant community finds itself. It is at this juncture that a shift in emphasis becomes apparent. It is not the internal, isolated characteristics of a peasant community that are paramount when trying to understand peasant populations but rather the socio- economic and political relationship with outside (nation state and world economy) forces.

It is in this context that the role of the sub-discipline economic anthropology became dominant. The following paragraphs will attempt to situate the role economic anthropology played in relationship to this development. In turn new avenues of investigation are opened. These will include understanding the dominant role of capital penetration, situational logic and migration.

Economic Anthropology and the Peasant Concept

As the above overview has suggested the dominant theme when trying to define Latin American peasants was the type of economic activity involved.

When Karl Polanyi's *Trade and Market in the Early Empires* was published in 1957 its inevitable effect was to intensify a debate that had begun roughly 20 years earlier. As George Dalton stated, the debate, in its most fundamental sense, centered on:

> ...which of several alternative sets of analytical concepts are best to interpret real-world processes and institutions, and what kinds of analytical questions should be put to primitive and peasant economies-those asked by economists about our economy, or questions having to do with the connections between economic and social organization? (Dalton 1971:70).

Concerning the Formalist/Substantivist debate, Sahlins in an earlier article explicated what Dalton called the 'alternative sets of analytical concepts'. He contended that the debate centered on using either 'ready-made' models of economic theory (e.g., microeconomics) to analyze and interpret non-western economies or 'developing a new analysis more appropriate to the historical societies in question' (Sahlins 1969:13). In other words, addressing non-Western economies as being 'underdeveloped versions of our own' or economies that are completely different (Sahlins:14). To put it another way, can Western economic theory be employed to interpret economies that are non-Western—economies not based on the market exchange principle?

The intensity of the debate increased when Polanyi constructed a model of formal economic theory. Polanyi contended that formal economics are based on the logic of rational choice-making behavior rather than factual empiricism [a difference between logical, deductive implication and empirical, inductive implication]. Polanyi explicated that formal as stated above is "simply a way of creating assumptions about an actual or potential empirical reality in order to perform certain kinds of analysis" (Halperin 1985:344). However, Polanyi overstepped the boundaries of logical deduction and implied that formal economic theory would be given empirical grounding: meaning that formal analysis was typified by conventional microeconomic theory:

> By saying that the formal definition of the economy consisted of the concepts and categories used in conventional economics, Polanyi gave the concept of the formal specific empirical content and created separate domains for formal and substantive analysis (Halperin:344).

The domain for formal economic theory in Polanyi's model was market exchange systems (capitalist). This is where the debate really begins. Those who adopted Polanyi's model went one step further; they attempted to apply it as a universal construct. At this juncture an outline of the Formalist and Substantivist positions is necessary to situate the relevance of economic anthropology to the peasant concept.

Formalist Economics

The most generalized cornerstone of the Formalist position is that universality predicates all economies. As George Dalton stated ardent Formalists believe in the "universally applicable concepts of economic theory, e.g., scarcity, maximizing (and) surplus that can be used empirically to analyze primitive and peasant economies" (Dalton 1971:70). This in turn is illuminated by assuming the position of Prattis:

> The formalist case in economic anthropology draws on Robbins' definition of economics as the science which studies behaviour as a relationship between ends and scarce means which have alternative uses. This analytic conception focuses on a particular aspect of behaviour - the consequences of scarcity. In fact any kind of behaviour which is influenced by scarcity considerations falls within the scope of economic generalisation (Prattis 1987:14).

Thus the fundamental characteristic that shapes human economic activity is scarcity. In the physical world the resources available for utilization are scarce, meaning limited in relation to the demand for them (Cook 1966:336).

Peasants, like all individuals in a given society, rely on the means available to satisfy their needs and wants. When scarcity is evident, material benefits have to be divided amongst those involved. It is the role of the economic system to regulate this economizing procedure (Cook 1966:336).

To restate the Formalist position, scarcity initiates the process of economizing—people have to make rational choices in a given economic environment. This

means that ideas, or if you like, laws such as scarcity become institutionalized in the economy of a given society. Simply put, "an examination of the place occupied by the economy in society is simply a study of how the econo ic process is instituted" (Prattis 1982:209).

The role that the anthropologist plays in this type of analysis is to discern the cultural variables that would hinder or benefit this formalist analysis: "It was to provide ethnographic description of different value systems and cultures so that the analyst could isolate the culturally perceived alternatives that were appropriate to particular decision situations" (Prattis 1987:15). The following is an example of this type of analysis.

Matthew Edel (1967), in an article entitled "Jamaican Fishermen: Two Approaches in Economic Anthropology," attempts to delineate the roles of two anthropologists who work within the formalist framework. A basic criterion for this study was that these fishermen did not operate within the context of market exchange. Thus, Edel's generalized statement that "economic analysis may be considered the formalized study of the way in which economic means are combined to satisfy the desires of the participants in an economy" (Edel 1967:433). Edel argues that since market exchange is non-existent the premise is that the two anthropologists in question, Davenport and Comitas, are not concerned with the western principle of monetarization but rather with the premise that formalist analysis can be applied when economization is the focus.

Edel states that Davenport and Comitas structure their arguments on the premise that if it is known exactly what are the available resources in a society and the type of technical productive capacity and exchange realities then it becomes clear as to the "maximum degree to which these means permit the satisfaction of the preference function" (Edel: 433-434). Preference function meaning the "set of wants that the participants in the economy desire to fulfil to the maximum degree possible" (Edel: 434). Without a detailed analysis of these studies the point of relevance centers on the preference function as being a cultural factor:

> In either case, the desires, resources, techniques and patterns of property are taken as given. It is in this assumption that the economic analyst differs from the anthropologist. The latter, in his theories of values, culture history, diffusion and invention of techniques, ownership customs and social structure, is concerned explicitly with explaining the nature and origins of the economist's "givens" (Edel:434).

Based on this assumption Edel explicates how Davenport and Comitas combine both economistic as well as cultural factors in their respective models. A brief overview should suffice to explain the basic aspects. Edel stipulates that the economizing nature of the Jamaican fishermen in question can only be understood if the role of innovations (e.g., spear-fishing, co-operatives and seine netting) is portrayed as a result of 'cultural preference'. With seine netting, a capital intensive fishing method, it does not seem plausible for the fishermen to use this method since it goes against the risk minimization factor (e.g., if lost in a storm a complete financial bust is entailed). Furthermore, a cultural constraint that impedes this 'preference' is the quantity procurement involved. If certain fisherman are perceived as

dominating (due to innovation) by the sheer size of their catch of the day the end result will be objection by those not using the same technology (akin to Foster's limited good principle).

In conclusion Edel states that "the general approach, which implicitly follows the methods of economic analysis in explaining economic decisions on the basis of the interaction of preference [cultural] resources and potentially available techniques can be extended to cover all of the cases" (Edel:438). What does this mean for peasant populations?

In a most general light the above example illuminates the role that anthropologists played in formal economic analysis. The broad conclusion is that the universal logic of such analysis means that *all* economies are subjected to this type of analysis. Moreover the anthropologist helps by situating the cultural context of given economies. With peasant populations formalist analysis meant that the economic activity in a given peasant society could [and should] be subjected to this type of analysis; scarcity, maximizing and individual logic are thus universals. Within the confines of the community studies approach a peasant would be seen as a maximizing individual: all activity becomes economic. The key here that differentiates peasantries from other peoples is the level of market exchange.

Moreover, economies then differ only in degree not in kind (Halperin 1988:11): peasant economies therefore are considered as being 'miniatures' of larger capitalist economies. The relevance of this premise will be explicated when our attention turns to capital penetration in peasant societies.

THE SUBSTANTIVIST CHALLENGE

Substantivists perceive economics as being constructed out of sets of rules that are relevant when trying to understand a specific type of social organization. All people involved in a given system are born into it and eventually they learn the rules of the system (Dalton 1971:71). With all economies Polanyi stipulated that it is the type of 'institutional process' that is important. As Halperin contends, "Process implies movement through time-activities that often occur in complex combinations but are ongoing and changing, as well as continuous, whether cyclical or linear" (Halperin 1988:33).

The rules here are not centered on the market economy and rational, individualistic, choice-making behavior as the only type of institutional arrangement available. As Dalton argued for many societies;

> In Traditional bands, tribes, and some peasantries--small economies without machines, markets, or commercial money--the constraints on individual choice of material goods and economic activities are extreme and are dictated not only by social obligation but also by primitive technology and by physical environment. There is simply no equivalent to the range of choice of goods and activities in industrial capitalism which makes meaningful such economic concepts as "maximizing" and "economizing" (79).

This type of argument drew strength from the fact that concern focuses on the non-market institutional arrangements that exist in non-market economies. With Polanyi the economy was constructed out of both economic as well as non-economic institutions:

> The human economy, then, is embedded in institutions, economic and noneconomic. The inclusion of the noneconomic is vital. For religion or government may be as important for the structure and functioning of the economy as monetary institutions or the availability of tools and machines themselves that lighten the toil of labor (Polanyi 1957:249).

Within this framework Polanyi stressed the role of integration as the key to assessing the relationship between economic activity and structure. Integration explicated how unity and stability worked in order to maintain the particular type of economy. For Polanyi three kinds of integration were dominant, these were the market, reciprocity and redistribution. Thus his conclusion that "the study of the shifting place occupied by the economy in society is therefore no other than the study of the manner in which the economic process is instituted at different times and places" (p.250).

We have seen from the above how the market acts as the instituted process when approaching from the formalist position. Now let's turn to the other two types of institutional arrangements that rely on non—market integration.

With Polanyi, reciprocity meant integration only if the economic process occurred between two [or more] equal structures. With peasants this meant the arrangement between people who are in some kind of symmetrical socio-economic relationship. Moreover such relationships are not purely economic (in the strict sense of the term) but rather include non-economic factors. An example in a Latin American context is the role that kinship (both real and fictive) plays in the economic livelihood of peasants. Redistribution can be seen as a type

of integration if a centralized area is delineated as being the place where goods and services are brought and then distributed.

Halperin states,

> Redistribution as a model of economic integration requires centralization in the sense of an identifiable structure that serves as the allocative center into which goods and services are collected and from which they are then disbursed. The centre must be established and ongoing and it must exist independently of any particular movements of goods and services (Halperin 1984:255).

Thus from the above the key aspect of a substantive approach are the institutional arrangements of given societies. With specific peasant populations we need to assess the type of integration that exists. A general point would be that with all peasantries the above types of integration may in fact occur. The point of the matter is how do we attempt to situate such contexts? One way is by relating and thus understanding all the integrative aspects of given peasant societies. Rhoda Halperin in *Peasant Livelihood* (1977) has suggested that an interesting way to tackle such a problem is by what she refers to as the 'matrix of processes and dimensions'. In assessing this model, a major theme of this thesis will be explored and hopefully validated; that with an institutional process like a dominant market economy (the nascent stage being capital penetration) attempts at defining or situating peasantries based solely on non-market (reciprocity and redistribution) institutional processes are no longer valid in the Latin American context. Moreover, the general premise is that by assessing each

population from a situational logic perspective one is able to develop a more concise understanding of the economic activity of peoples.

Thus in an historical light reciprocity and redistribution give way to the market as instituted process when capitalism becomes the dominant method of structuring the economic livelihood of peasant populations. As Halperin points out Polanyi believed that "under capitalism, the economy, as it is organized by market institutions, usurps all of the other institutions of society" (Halperin:252).

Concerning Halperin's matrix the fundamental assumption is that the three types of processes (production, distribution, and consumption) intersect with the three dimensions (physical, cultural, and social) in various ways. To cite Halperin's example,

> Production ... can be seen in all three dimensions in that it requires physical effort, a system of cultural rules to determine appropriate periods for work activity, and social organization to allocate work tasks individuals (Halperin 1977:270).

The main point is that this substantive matrix's applicability is general and specific. It is general in that Halperin sees it as being able to assess all economic activity. Specifically its relevance is that it entails avenues that allow for analysis on a particular level. Given a specific case the matrix will incorporate all factors of the processes and the dimensions (Halperin:270).

Also worth mentioning here is that within the framework set down by Polanyi, the instituted processes, the market, reciprocity and redistribution are further defined in terms of actual activity: When people are involved in 'material-means provisioning', the end result is that 'these productive efforts must be distributed to points where they can be consumed' (Halperin:2). Thus instituted process entails the above matrix.

The question to be asked at this juncture is exactly what form does the matrix take when being applied to specific Latin American peasantries? Also, how do we define specific Latin American peasantries in light of the divergent paths that capital penetration has taken in the area?

Let's retreat a moment. Earlier it was stated that attempts at understanding peasantries were instigated in an oppositional manner (Roseberry 1989a:213). A base point is the Redfieldian idea of the folk-urban continuum. The community study approach would incorporate Halperin's matrix, the emphasis centered on the processes as illuminated by the dimensions at a local level. For example, the process of production is explicated via its relationship to cultural dimension factors such as kinship and religion.

With Steward's Puerto Rico project a shift was taking place. The processes were being viewed as relational to the social dimension in a larger than community context (i.e.,the nation state). Social here meant the following:

> Since the substantive approach is based on the premise that the economy must be studied as it is embedded in the social structure, the social dimension is the key to the substantive framework. In general terms, the social dimension of the economy involves the institutional organization of the material-means provisioning process—that is, the relationships between people playing roles in institutional contexts (Halperin:279).

With peasantries then if we are concerned with their role in the larger nation state the emphasis should be on the movement away from traditional matrix approaches to ones that delineated capital penetration and thus the emphasis on proletarianization and migration. Moreover, a situational context will illustrate that this will be the dominant mode of economic activity for rural groups/peasants. Before doing so we must outline (in more detail than has already been done) what are considered to be traditional approaches.

First, as a starting point we have already alluded to what is considered the first tradition in Latin American peasant studies—the Redfieldian view of local community, of world-view, of culture. It was due to a sense of inadequacy that such an approach, that relied heavily on isolated studies, was eventually abandoned. An increased awareness of larger societal structures that bear down upon local areas shifted the type of focus.

These local studies as mentioned above dealt with mostly the culture of peasant populations as delineated by a specific world view; a perspective on their surroundings. To put it another way, ethnographies that explicated the cultural features that made a specific group unique and particular; such features would include social organization, religion, language, art, dance, music and kinship to name a few.

Indeed if the economic activity was to be considered a strong area of investigation it was tackled from the level of subsistence activity. In other words, the processes of production, distribution and consumption are viewed institutionally and can be explicated as structural relations seen via the dimensions in a local context.

In a seminal piece of work for the time, "Types of Latin American Peasantry" (1955), Eric Wolf had stated that peasantries could be classified or typologized based on three economic factors. First, they may be seen as groups of people who are only agricultural producers; in other words excluding those who we may consider to be fisherman, miners or livestock keepers. Second, we could focus on those who control the land they work—here control can be construed to mean either outright ownership through legal means or squatters or even customary agency. The third and final factor in Wolf's classification is that peasants aim at subsistence. Such subsistence is part and parcel of the peasant's place in a given cultural setting. Thus Wolf explains the peasant's response;

> His answer, the production of cash crops for a market, is prompted largely by his inability to meet these needs within the sociocultural segment of which he is a part. He sells cash crops to get money, but this money is used in turn to buy goods and services which he requires to subsist and to maintain his social status, rather than to enlarge his scale of operations (Wolf 1955:454).

In this view, peasantries are to be seen in a specific economic light, emphasizing the market as a means to improve one's subsistence lifestyle.

Wolf goes on to illustrate that if we see such groups as being subsistent but only so, then we are to be aware that they are a part society or a segment of a larger whole that affects them daily. Or to put it another way such groups can not be equated with primitives, groups in complete isolation. Here, Wolf already illustrates particular ways in which peasant groups are part of larger social structures. Structure, as outlined by Polanyi, Halperin and others, means people acting, living, in various types of relationships. These may be socio-economic, cultural, or political. Thus, structurally Wolf states that a typology of Latin American peasants

> ...should be set up on the basis of regularities in occurrence of structural relationships rather than on the basis of regularities in the occurrence of similar culture elements. In selecting out certain structural features rather than others to provide a starting point for the formulation of types we may proceed wholly on an empirical basis. The selection of primarily economic criteria would be congruent with the present interest in typologies based on economic and socio-political features alone. The functional implications of these features are more clearly understood at present than those of other features of culture, and their dominant role in the development of the organizational framework has been noted empirically in many studies of particular cultures (Wolf 1955:454).

Based upon this Wolf states that there were a few specific types of peasant that existed in Latin America during the 1940s and the 1950s. Here he concludes that the predominant types were the 'open' and 'closed corporate' communities. It is the closed community that can be seen as being aligned with traditional Redfieldian anthropology while the open community is tied extensively to the larger society. This is the shift in understanding.

CLOSED COMMUNITY

The closed corporate community can be seen as one that is found often in the highlands of Latin America. In a general context intensive cultivation is the economic lifestyle or in other words subsistence activity. Low market activity is used as a concurrent source of provision namely (as mentioned above) to allow members of the community to sell their produce in order to buy products not made within the community. Thus, markets as such are marginal economic ventures.

Wolf states that the distinctive feature of the corporate community is that it is a bounded social system:

> It has structural identity over time. Seen from the outside, the community as a whole carries on a series of activities and upholds certain "collective representations." Seen from within, it defines the rights and duties of its members and prescribes large segments of their behavior (Wolf 1955:456).

Steve Stern stated that the structural identity over time is due to

> ...a resilient complex of institutions and social pressures which, on the one hand, drew members inward, binding them to the life and needs of the collective group, and on the other, erected barriers to penetration by "outsiders" defining sharp limits beyond which such intrusions normally could not advance (Stern 1983:22).

Wolf is inclined to suggest that such communities no longer rely on kinship as the dominant avenue of social organization. This is due to the fact that kinship within corporate communities has been subjected to change, or re-organization from pre-Columbian times to

the Spanish Invasion and Conquest. What Wolf saw as the new social binding mechanism was the development of co-ownership of land. The reasons behind this are numerous but in essence the cornerstone of this development was it enabled the Crown to establish and maintain control.

As Steve Stern has pointed out corporate communities

> ...provided a reservoir of cheap labor to colonizers; bound peasants to lavish community celebrations lining the pockets of priests, merchants, and landowners; and divided the peasantry into rival communities unable to effectively challenge the outer world. The closed corporate community, then, was a colonial institution designed to benefit the oppressors of the indigenous peasantry (Stern 1983:23).

Such communities, then, in order to maintain their structure over time must have structural features that for all intents and purposes will impede processes of change. One such feature is the location of such communities on what Wolf called 'marginal land'. Here, the continuance of such communities is directly linked to the needs of the larger society. Since the costs of reorganizing such communities would be high and there is no need of the land on the part of the larger society, it appears that these communities would stay static. Another key feature is that traditional techno-environmental relations are the norm; meaning these communities rely on (for the most part) nuclear family manual labor that entails a modest level of production (456-457).

This leads Wolf to conclude that

> ...marginal location and traditional technology ... limit the production power of the community, and thus its ability to produce cash crops for the market. This in turn limits the

> number of goods brought in from the outside which the community can afford to consume. The community is *poor* (Wolf 1955:457).

Another distinctive feature is the 'political—religious system'. Wolf contended that this system defined "the boundaries of the community and acts as a rallying point and symbol of collective unity" (458). Moreover, this system is the avenue of communal achievement. In other words, prestige and status are garnered via the attainment of social positions within this system. This is important since conspicuous consumption is geared at the communal level not the individual. Simply put,

> Conspicuous consumption is geared to this communally approved system of power and religion rather than to private individual show. This makes individual conspicuous consumption incidental to communal expenditure. Thus the community at one and the same time levels differences of wealth which might intensify class divisions within the community to the detriment of the corporate structure and symbolically reasserts the strength and integrity of its structure before the eyes of its members (458).

This in turn ironically means that while the system attempts to maintain a sustainable livelihood by tying consumption to community-defined mechanisms of control, the members of the community rely on outside markets for products it cannot supply.

Concerning the economy in general Wolf stated that it has direct links to outside markets due to the fact that small communities are unable to maintain a supply of the goods that are deemed to be needed and/or wanted. A general reason for this is a lack of money. Also, these markets offer communities the goods needed to maintain the traditional consumption patterns.

Open Community

With Wolf's typology of closed corporate and open peasant communities in Latin America a key economic feature is that both make a living off of the land. Subsistence agriculture, whether largely for direct consumption or as a cash crop, is the dominant economic lifestyle. The structural feature that differentiates the communities in question is the level of outside market involvement.

With the open community the level of outside market involvement is quite large when compared to the closed corporate community. Here, Wolf stated that with this type of community economic activity is not centered on subsistence solely but rather production for the larger market. According to Wolf such communities sell roughly 50% to 70% of their produce in such markets. These communities are found in the low-highlands and the tropical lowlands. Their types of crop production have been historically associated with outside markets (Wolf 1955:461).

With such ties to the larger society the open community relies on this society for capital in order to produce the cash crops needed by the market. This Wolf argued is based in the historical development of capitalism in Europe. While this is the basic structural feature it differs from the closed community in several ways. First, and a most general point is that unlike the closed community that has a 'defensive ignorance' towards the larger society, the open community needs the outside community. This is not only so, due to a market need but

also since there is no strong mechanism by which the community is bounded. Another point is that the open community, since it relies on the outside market in order to sell its goods, must also allow for individual wealth accumulation since social ties are reshaped and strengthened this way—they are directly responsive to the demand for the goods produced by the open community.

In a general context then Wolf outlines two communities that have varying degrees of involvement with outside forces. In the case of the open community the main point that differentiates it from the closed corporate community is the structural ways in which it is tied to the outside. Not only are such communities tied economically but also socially and politically and thus culturally. But what does this mean when the levels of outside influence are such that they delineate new types of economic activity that are not a constant fluctuating equilibrium between subsistence production and consumption and a concurrent fluctuating level of market involvement? It is to such structural influence that we now turn.

The above few paragraphs have attempted to illustrate what I consider to be a limiting tradition in anthropology. Wolf's typology of peasant economic activity as applied to particular cases is in essence a type of anthropological tradition that was valuable for its time but no longer. Indeed Wolf argues the case that his typology [and thus the idea of a unilinear movement from subsistence to cash crop production] is not universal it is structurally limiting for our investigations today. Why? Well the most basic reason is that the increased levels of capital penetration have brought greater processes of socioeconomic change. Wolf's

typology is unable to deal with these processes today. How is this so? Let's begin by assessing this situation in light of the substantivist/formalist debate.

Here the debate centered on who more or less had the correct theoretical and methodological orientation when attempting to understand and categorize types of economic activity. If we assess this whole debate, as Prattis does, as missing the point then we are left with trying to formulate new avenues of investigation. Thus Prattis states:

> The substantive argument was rightly concerned with perspectives on adaptation and embeddedness that the formalists could not ignore, but their strategy of polemic was wrong. Instead of arguing for an analysis that was discrete to primitive and peasant economic systems, their corrective to formalism should have been an argument that applied equally to the social processes of a market economy, thereby providing a theoretical base to discuss *all* economic and social formations (Prattis 1987:18).

In Wolf's typology this would seem to be an a priori assumption. Again, if the main point was to delineate a typology of peasant economic activity while centering this on the framework of substantive analysis then Wolf was headed in the right direction. To retreat a moment, if we return to Halperin's matrix and follow her premise that the social dimension is the correct way in the substantive scheme of things to understanding economic livelihood then it follows that the larger structural features are the dominant area of focus. In Wolf's typology there is the direct correlation between economic activity and structure and thus the dynamic that gives Wolf's typology weight is the level of influence and interaction between people (here peasants) and structures (here the market as an institution).

What can be seen as lacking in the Wolf typology is the level of market involvement that situates the peasant in a type of economic lifestyle. While Wolf describes levels of market activity on the part of open and closed corporate communities he does so with limiting factors.

In Wolf's early fieldwork in Puerto Rico the structural features of what he then calls peasantry allocate, if we follow his typology, A) a level of ownership, albeit quite small B) a reliance on agricultural production and C) aiming at subsistence activity. To suggest that this is no longer the case is only problematic since combinations of the three features alone and/or with other factors may suggest otherwise depending on the type of analysis. As a particular and even isolated investigation my argument is that to an increasing degree peasantries in Central America (and Latin America in general) are losing control of land altogether, and concurrently do not rely on agricultural production as the sole economic activity. Furthermore there is a reliance on what I shall call survival rather than subsistence activity.

In the case of Wolf's Puerto Rico study the peasantry is seen as oppositional to other segments of the community of which it is only a part. A key factor in this premise is landownership. Here the peasant is identified as the segment with the least ownership. Wolf stated that a peasantry consisted of

> ...persons owning less than ten cuerdas (small holders) and persons owning between ten and thirty cuerdas (small farmers). Peasants rely upon members of their families to till their

> holdings and employ wage labor only rarely, but often supplement their income by performing wage labor elsewhere. They grow cash crops to satisfy a culturally defined standard of living and are unable to accumulate capital beyond this limit (Wolf 1966:203).

Here one can also see where the other main factors of Wolf's typology come into play. The peasant relies on agricultural activity as such activity is part and parcel of a 'culturally defined standard of living'.

Thus the above has illustrated Wolf's typology as being a limited tradition. Again it can be argued that all such typologies are just that, typologies that attempt to delineate specific avenues of inquiry that are compatible with diverse areas of investigation.

In the case of Wolf's typology I have suggested (in view of Halpern's matrix) that it can be seen as being limiting from two pertinent angles. First, while it is apparent that Wolf is aware of the relationship between peasant populations and the larger society of which they are only a segment his typology suggests a limited connection. While Wolf is concerned with those peasants who are connected to the larger society via involvement in a market system he illustrates such connections as they are constructed on the basis of a subsistence lifestyle. The question to be asked is the following: Are peasant populations still connected to the larger society by way of subsistence activity? In other words can one still see this connection as an integral part of the peasant's culturally prescribed needs or as Wolf stated 'needs which are defined by his culture'?

The second angle centers on the historical context of peasant studies. Here I would suggest that while Wolf's typology was seen as useful at the time this can no longer be the case. It is the basic premise of this thesis that a key factor in trying to understand Central American peasantries is the increased importance of 'types' of interconnections between what on the one hand are called peasants and on the other the larger complex society of which they are only a part. In the next chapter I will attempt to outline these new 'types' of connections.

MODE OF PRODUCTION AND SITUATIONAL LOGIC

As the previous chapter has suggested various theoretical approaches have been used when attempting to define peasantries. Since the focus has been on economic interpretations of peasant populations, the premise has been to explicate the usefulness of economic anthropological traditions in relation to such peoples as they are subjected to diverse currents of social change. While it is apparent that peasantries can no longer be viewed as isolated communities it cannot be assumed that they are simply part cultures or part societies.

Rather in looking at Eric Wolf's work I have attempted to find a starting point for a line of inquiry that suggests new avenues of investigation. In essence by establishing the interconnectedness of populations I wish to go further than illustrate the low level of market involvement and contend that increasingly, peasant populations are being incorporated into a market system whereby contrary to Wolf's assertion, they do so not on a culturally defined subsistence level but rather a situational, economic and survival level. This can be seen by understanding the dominant structural role of capital penetration in Central American societies.

It is through this main factor that we are able to address a few down to earth postulates. These include; that since capital penetration can be seen as a fundamental force that shapes the economic activity of peasant populations we can therefore argue that an end result will be an adjustment in the economic activity of peasant populations; that with such adjustment the peasant's outlook on viable economic alternatives shifts; in turn, such areas of investigation as migration, wage labor and household restructuring become focus points for further study and finally; a way that this can be illuminated is through understanding that the peasant's economic orientation is based on a will to survive. This can be explicated in a proper manner via the use of situational logic.

Earlier I stated that for the task at hand I will concern myself with a definition of capital penetration as outlined by Goodman and Redclift. The central focus is on the variegated avenues that capital penetration takes in specific localities. In order to be clear about specific paths it is necessary to delineate some common features of capital penetration.

First of all what exactly does the term capital penetration mean? What does it mean for the purpose at hand? In a most common manner that is central to this paper capital penetration incorporates types of processes that occur when peasant societies are caught up in larger economic forces. Based on European historical patterns Goodman and Redclift contend that capital penetration as Marx would have it delineates patterns of capital accumulation and the reproduction of such capital. As Goodman and Redclift stated,

> Capitalist penetration of backward economies is historically necessary to raise the forces of production [the material basis of the productive process] and set in train the process which will result in eventual transition to a higher level of development (Goodman and Redclift 1982:27-28).

Indeed, it is the cornerstone of this thesis that such processes are important in that they illustrate how peasant societies are vulnerable to change that is not completely up to them.

With capital penetration our focus shifts from the community as entity to an approach that suggests change for the community. While some economic anthropologists argued amongst themselves whether a formalist or substantivist approach was the proper avenue of investigation others were more concerned with understanding how such societies were becoming increasingly incorporated into larger economic systems. Central features of the various arguments were the areas of structural relations between peasant communities and the other segments that made up the society.

As the previous chapter has attempted to illustrate Eric Wolf can be considered a forerunner of this approach. Concurrently however, I have tried to explicate limitations to earlier traditions within this specific area. While many anthropologists have debated the applicability of either the formalist or substantivist positions, one particular line of rebuttal centered on the dismissal of the entire debate. Concerning capital penetration some anthropologists were turning to analysis of this problem as it became a dominant area within Latin America and Africa. As John Clammer pointed out there were some very pressing problems that had to be addressed. First, and most general, was the problem of defining

exactly what did economic analysis entail? Second, there didn't seem to be a clear set of guiding characteristics about the societies in question and third there had to be a realization that not all of the diverse assumptions from other disciplines could be applied—there were limits (Clammer 1975:213). The main assumption was that a reliance on the progressive idea of movement from a backward economy to a modern capitalist one. Economic analysis then suggested understanding economic activity as types of exchange with capitalist exchange patterns prevailing as the ultimate level of such activity.

In a more concise manner Maurice Godelier argued that the formalist approach's inherent mistake was not to develop microeconomic models but rather "in believing that the model constitutes a general theory that asserts universal validity for the axioms of liberal political economy" (Prattis 1982:217). Moreover, concerning the substantivist position, Dupré and Rey argued that the central problem postulated that it was deemed acceptable to simple set up a model based on opposition; Dupré and Rey asserted that the substantivist position should have challenged the universality of the market system and thereby 'set up a general problematic' (217).

Others have challenged the traditional approaches and set up theoretical postulates that suggest an attentive awareness to structural change. In their minds what needs to be addressed is the

> ...historical problem that in many instances economic change (or development) exerts its influence over traditional economies by impelling them from being market-less economies,

> through the stage of being economies with peripheral markets to their economic climax, economies in which the market principle is dominant (Clammer:214).

While Wolf can be seen as someone who was concerned with the patterns of change that were occurring he did so with limited analysis. His focus was on the incorporation of the peasant in the market system as seen from the structural point of 'subsistence' as this pertained to small levels of wage labor. Also, the market was the avenue by which peasants obtained those goods they themselves could not produce but deemed necessary. In turn they sold goods at the market in order to perpetuate the cultural system of which they were a part.

Our position here then accepts that peasants are incorporated into a market system in specific cases. Moreover, that they are increasingly being pushed into the ranks of landless peoples is part and parcel of the process of capital penetration and in turn they no longer rely on agriculture as the main method of survival (subsistence?).

What is at issue is the level or type of structural incorporation into a market system—namely capitalism. With the rejection of the formalist and substantivist models new studies focus on the incorporation of peasant populations within the capitalist market system. One of the new avenues was the production—exchange debate and thus the mode of production approach.

Here structural relations dominated but how they were to be seen in relation to the active role of peasants was another matter. The main points are as follows. To begin with, the

contention was that production forces and relations should be central to any type of anthropological investigation. Exchange relations on the other hand are considered secondary since they focus on relations of production (Prattis 1987:23). "The position developed is a view of the economy as being composed of production, distribution, exchange and consumption moments with the moment of production as the determinant level in any structure" (23).

I do not wish to pursue implications of this position which would only deter my analysis. The key component of the argument that is relevant here is the question of understanding what Prattis calls a 'macro/micro' intersection framework of analysis. He calls for the incorporation of both positions as they pertain to the 'reproduction of a system'. Here the focus is on the dialectical relationship between forces and relations of production, emphasising new avenues that will supersede polemics on exchange versus production. The main avenue that Prattis suggests is understanding how systems are incorporated into other systems. Here the focus is on capitalism and its articulation with those systems deemed to be non-capitalist (Prattis 23-27). The strongest alternative that deals with this type of analysis is the mode of production approach.

William Roseberry (1989b) has recently suggested that the mode of production approach in itself has become the focal point in anthropology when trying to construct models of peasant societies. I would argue that the mode of production approach has taken on 'debate' form in that it can be seen as the fundamental avenue of inquiry since the

Formalist/Substantivist debate. The gist of Roseberry's argument centers on the infighting over what exactly is meant by mode of production.

A major source of this problem has been the development of theoretical approaches concerning peasantries (and their interaction with levels of capital penetration) outside of anthropology. The most notable has been the gamut of models relating to dependency, development and underdevelopment. At the forefront of this debate have been the writings of Andre Gunder Frank (1976) and F.H.Cardoso (1979).

Roseberry points out that the fundamental agreement amongst those who adhere to one form or another of the dependency approach is that while a few countries developed economically (and concurrently socio-politically) it was at the expense of many others:

> There was general agreement about an emphasis on a systematic connection between the developments of some countries and the underdevelopment of the majority, on the historical creation of a situation of dependency which served as a limiting condition in the development of under-development countries, and on the extraction of surplus from the underdeveloped by the developed formations (Roseberry 1989b:12).

Within this general framework of acknowledgement there did exist however two specific divergent interpretations. Frank's approach centers on what Roseberry calls 'the persistence of dependence'. Meaning that while capitalism can be roughly seen as penetrating Latin America since the 16th century, the conditions by which it has developed have been structurally cohesive over that time span. This Frank would have us believe means that any

changes that have occurred have been of the 'epiphenomenal' kind, or that dependence continues.'

The other view, as seen in the work of F.H.Cardoso, counters by postulating that dependence is not a static situation but rather a dynamic one of movement and change. Thus Roseberry writes;

> Although Latin America has long existed within a capitalist system, that system has experienced (and continues to experience) multiple transformations that change both the form and content of relations between developed and underdeveloped societies. Rather than viewing changes in the nature of dependence as epiphenomenal, then, this set of approaches would view them as central, affecting the nature of class relations within countries as well as relations between developed and underdeveloped countries (Roseberry 1989b:13).

Concerning Frank's position the focal point is the systemic relations between core and periphery. A major problem is that in neglecting to deal with movement within this system such an approach leaves no room for an understanding of change that does occur within the system. Thus Roseberry writes;

> The purely systemic understanding, with all that is dynamic coming from the core, or from the maintenance requirements of the system, leads to a disparagement of dynamics from below and results in an impoverished understanding of the contradictions, possibilities, and potential instability of the system itself (Roseberry 1989b:13).

' Recently Frank (1990) has extended the general theory of a world system back 5000 years with Latin America being a late addition.

In this world system there is little room for understanding differentiation. This may mean differentiation between nations, regions or even classes within a totality. Roseberry argues that this view lacks the ability to connect anthropological problems and subject matter to the larger processes of economic and socio-political change. In his view what is a central alignment between the theory of Cardoso and anthropology in general is the concurrent trains of local and world histories as they are developed in accordance with the mode of production concern of differentiation within a system (14-15). Roseberry concludes that

> The mode of production concept, in conjunction with other concepts such as social formation, offers the possibility of an analysis of differentiation within a capitalist totality that will take sufficient account of anthropological subjects and avoid the reduction of that differentiation to its spatial expression (Roseberry 1989b:14).

As this stands this is a general idea of the relationship between anthropology and other disciplines. In turn a key factor that overrides disciplinary boundaries, the mode of production approach, is illuminated as being a viable tool for use in understanding peasant populations. At this juncture we need to look more closely at the mode of production.

In essence for the purpose at hand I do not want to attempt to unscramble the various positions. Rather, since this thesis wishes to go beyond such a debate and outline a new line of inquiry concerning peasantries I shall consider a working definition of the mode of production. This will in turn enhance my own position concerning the concept peasant and capital penetration.

Mode of production here centers on the Marxian idea of focusing on production as the prime unit of investigation when trying to understand all forms of human action and interaction. Here belongs also the idea that such focus is historically specific. This is so based on Marx's idea of laws of motion. Each historical period has particular laws of motion. These laws are often interpreted as being scientific but I will argue that they do not operate outside of human action (Roseberry 1989a:169). Rather it can be stated that laws of motion are developed by the inherent contradictions that exist in given modes of productions (e.g., class struggle).

Roseberry states that these laws are subject to types of analysis since they rely on two important sets of relations A) the forces of production and B) the relations of production. Forces of production are seen as the ways in which men and women extract and transform nature in order to survive and the relations are the ways in which labor is transformed (Roseberry 1989b:17). Thus "the concept (mode of production) therefore articulates and treats as a unity human/nature relations and human/human relations" (17).

This line of thought suggests that the type of relationships that are pertinent to particular societies are those built up from man's interaction with nature, ultimately establishing the human relations that we know as class structure.

Since the focus here is to establish a limited working definition of the mode of production approach I think it is only appropriate to stipulate that I use mode of production

in accordance with its companion construct the social formation. Here, mode of production assumes a role within a social formation. How do I come to such a conclusion? In light of the subject matter, Latin American peasantries, it has been argued that social formation implies understanding peasantries as a part of a social whole—here this may mean the nation state or even a regional context (Roseberry: 21-22). Mode of production assumes that the forces and relations of production of a peasant population are non-capitalist and are found in conjunction with a capitalist mode of production in a social formation dominated by capitalism (Roseberry: 22). The basis for this is that peasantries are considered to be people who are not separated from the means of production. We need to address a fundamental point.

Earlier I stated that a social formation as defined by Cutler et al. meant relations seen in Latin American society whether perpetuated or transitory, since it has been established that agrarian transition is not unilinear nor complete as has often been argued (Stonitch 1991). Relations may be seen as transitory in that they are evolving—particular peasant populations are becoming separated from their means of production due to capital penetration.

Therefore a mode of production in the context laid out above can be seen as being

> ...an articulated combination of relations and forces of production structured by the dominance of the relations of production . The relations of production define a specific mode of appropriation of surplus-labour and the specific form of social distribution of the means of production corresponding to that mode of appropriation of surplus-labour (Hindess and Hirst 1975:11).

Thus a peasant population that begins to be pressed by the requirements of capitalism (namely free labor that is separated from the means of labor) can no longer be seen as being completely non-capitalist existing in a social formation that is dominated by a capitalist mode of production.[1]

Inherent in this scheme of things is the perception of capital as being a social relation, implying that in order for the capitalist mode to exist it must evoke the subsumption of labor to capital. Laclau stated that a mode of production must have the following characteristics 1) a specific type of ownership of the means of production 2) a determinant form of appropriation of the economic surplus 3) some kind of division of labor and 4) a certain level of development of the productive forces (Laclau 1971:33). If we follow Laclau's model then Latin American peasantries can be categorized in specific instances by the above qualifications and ranged on a scale of intensities. Peasants are continuously immersed in some kind of exploitative relations where a capitalist mode of production within a given social formation is dominant.

[1] Goodman and Redclift state that free labor occurs when there is a "determinate mode of production with specific relations of production under which surplus labour is appropriated in the form of surplus value. This is all specifically capitalist from the appropriation since it presupposes a mode of extraction of surplus labour from the direct producer determined by conditions specific to the capitalist mode of production: the complete separation of the direct producer [peasant] from all the property in the means of production and the existence of a free labour market in which labour power is sold as a commodity" (Goodman and Redclift 1982:37).

This is a key point to the main arguments of this thesis. While it is not a point of contention whether or not there actually exist peasantries that are non-capitalist it can be argued from specific criteria that within a social formation dominated by capitalism peasantries are indeed being separated from the means of production and thus are to be reconsidered situation by situation in light of economic factors. The question to be asked at this stage is what has been the peasant's response ?

Peasant Situational Logic

It has been argued that a main problem with the gamut of models that are subsumed under the rubric of the mode of production approach is that they often neglect to explicate how individuals react and thus interact to structural economic conditions that are in a state of change (Love 1989:149). Suffice it to say there has been a plentitude of group level studies that illuminate the diverse social movements that have been in existence and are ongoing and are formulating in Latin America today. From armed struggles (Wolf 1968) to everyday forms of resistance (Scott 1976, 1985) peasant populations as large groups have been documented as reacting to the variegated paths of capital penetration.

To reiterate Prattis's point, we need to assess the usefulness of the mode of production approach as a theoretical and practical construct that enables one to evaluate the intersection of macro and micro positions—the individual and social structure. Or as Roseberry would have it the direct relationship of "the action of human subjects in the

constitution of structure" (Roseberry 1983:10). The avenue by which I believe this can be attempted is by understanding the situational logic of individual people. In turn, the process of proletarianization and thus companion factors such as migration and household change are seen as complimentary.

Situational logic was a direct assault on the incapabilities of economic anthropology's polemic (the formalist/substantivist debate) in dealing with peasantries involved in diverse processes of change. In its most fundamental use situational logic refers to "the actor's position within any given power or wealth structure in terms of his [her] access to and control over resources" (Prattis 1973:46). In turn, Prattis moves beyond the rationality debate (formalism and substantivism) and argues for a position that views humans as strategizers (40). In other words, the best way to understand situational logic is by understanding decision-making processes. With peasants control over resources is increasingly out of their hands. New strategies for economic livelihood have to be developed. Thus as De Janvry has recently pointed out " the peasantry has been unable to protect its access to land and average farm size has been declining forcing peasant households to seek sources of income outside the farm, most particularly on the agricultural labor market " (De Janvry 1989:396).

Decisions then are seen as the result of people making choices. These choices are influenced by the resources available. Resources include goods, services, land, information, people and even past experiences (Prattis 1982:213). Overriding this Prattis contends is one

very pertinent point; "the power that manipulation of these factors affords" (214). In a longer passage Prattis states the point more succinctly:

> Differential location in social structure implies that there are different relationship networks and attendant resources actors may have access to. The question of power is important when we consider the different interests consequent upon differential location of actors in a social structure. That actors have different situational logics gives rise to different interpretations and interests in given social situations. The resolution and management of these differences involves the relative amounts of power which actors have to further their own interests vis-a vis the interests of those with whom they interact. In these terms power can be viewed as a scarce resource unequally distributed in social systems (214).

It is in this context that we need to assess the relationship between situational logic and the mode of production approach.

As a basic point, class is the determinant aspect of a social structure that centers our concern here. To retreat a moment, earlier we looked at the role of the social dimension (structure) in the processes and dimensions matrix of Rhoda Halperin. Social structure became the dominant way to view social change. Simply put, social classes as defined by a capitalist mode of production reveal the "social constitution of structure and that the class structures characteristic of a period are themselves the products of prior and present human activity" (Roseberry 1983:11). This idea is directly related to situational logic in that any decision based on such logic is concurrently reliant on the space occupied in a social structure by anyone making a decision.

Prattis stated that in order to understand how people use the resources of their environment we need to relate individuals' situations to their past, their life histories and thus the social structure:

> The actor's view of the situation and its implications for action are given in the cross-cutting of life history with location in structure. If we view life history as a trajectory of the actor through relationship networks, then reality as he [she] experiences it must be socially based (Prattis 1982:214).

If we state that with the increase in types of capital penetration in Central America, peasantries as defined economically can now (via the mode of production and situational logic) be seen as individuals making new economic decisions, then it follows that the problem of intersection of local and global economic processes has been addressed.

Based on this assumption I will state that economically peasants are increasingly becoming non-peasants in the anthropological typologies outlined above. Rather, increasingly they are becoming involved in the processes of proletarianization. Their situational logic suggests real decisions based on real lives with real needs. No longer can we view the majority of Central Americans as being involved in non-capitalist modes of production. In fact many peasants often have to make a negative choice if they decide not to move to wage labor.

It is appropriate now to assess a particular aspect of peasant populations that can be seen as a powerful definitional tool for understanding the context of socio-economic change. I refer to the household.

HOUSEHOLDS

When attempting to understand Central American peasant households and all peasant households in general a few points need to be clarified. First and foremost in the field of anthropology the term household has often been meant to include, or be exchanged for the term family. The reason behind this has been one prevalent not only in anthropology but in the social sciences in general. In essence this problem has been the result of an ethnocentric application of the western nuclear family onto non-western societies. To put it another way, the nuclear family has been the yardstick by which all other culturally different kinds of families are measured. Also within this context families and households are measured by two dominant features, common residence and kinship (Yanagisako 1979).

With anthropological traditions the two social units (family and household) have been classified from divergent angles. The definitional weight of the family stems from a reliance on kin-based organization while the household is viewed predominantly from the common residence angle. Because of this focus other kinds of small social units tend to get lost within the loose boundaries of this typologizing (165).

This type of analysis means that we must see the household through a new lens. Another way to understand the household is by focusing on the activities that such social units have in common. Particular with this thesis we wish to see the household in light of the

economic processes of production and social reproduction.[1] As Henrietta Moore has recently stated,

> In much of the anthropological literature, 'household' is the term used to refer to the basic unit of society involved in production, reproduction, consumption and socialization. The exact nature and function of the household clearly varies from culture to culture and from period to period, but the anthropological definition usually rests on what the people themselves regard as the significant unit of their society (Moore 1989:54-55).

Thus in this context we need to identify the main ways by which Central American peasant households are defined within the discipline in light of the above. Once this is established we will be able to move on and challenge such definitional parameters in view of capital penetration.

As has often been the case in anthropology four main areas are delineated as being the pertinent avenues of investigation for either the family or the household: 1) general patterns of personnel and household formation 2) the division of labor and production 3) consumption and exchange activities and 4) areas of power and authority within and outside the household (Bartlett 1989:4).

[1] See Sylvia Yanagisako (1979), for a detailed account of the general debate in anthropology and other fields on the typologizing of the family and household.

It is the first three that have been dealt with the most. The fourth area, power and authority, is seen as being given directedness via the feminist critique of anthropological traditions (4). For the purpose at hand our focus deals with all four areas as they are interconnected to processes of capital penetration. Fundamentally the household is seen as a social unit involved in two kinds of reproduction 1) the general reproduction of human life and 2) the reproduction of a social formation as it stands or in transformation (Evers 1984: 24). Congruent with this postulate the field of anthropology has dealt with these areas in two particular ways.

First, the early tradition stipulated that peasant households existed outside of external control or influence. This view, in line with the early community studies work, dealt with the reproduction of life and the type of communal life from an insular perspective. The cultural or world-view perception of the peasant household postulated seeing such households and their inhabitants in the context of symbiotic or disruptive relationships within the community. In this light the four criteria mentioned above were seen in this way (Lewis 1968).

Eventually, this view gave way to one that incorporated the peasant household into the larger society of which it was a part (the nation). The work of Steward, Wolf, Mintz and others helped to identify the peasant household as a structural social unit within local communities that were connected to much larger socio-economic structures:

> Peasant reproduction does not take place in isolated units independent of each other but in households tied together through kinship, cooperative and reciprocal arrangements, and

> sometimes tenancy or wage-labor relations; and the conditions of reproduction are to a large extent determined by the "outside world" through the market and political structures. Any analysis of peasant reproduction that neglects these factors must remain inadequate (Evers 1984: 30).

As a starting point let's return to Eric Wolf. Wolf does not distinguish in any concrete fashion between the family and the household. Rather they are used as interchangeable social units of analysis. Wolf offers a general outline of the family that is categorized by dominant structural features.

His emphasis is on relating the diversity of the family/household social unit to the larger society. Thus, Wolf states that the peasant household can be seen as being nuclear, extended, or combinations therein (Wolf 1966:65). In this context then the peasant household is seen as being shaped by various forces. In Wolf's earlier article, "Types of Latin American Peasantry" (1955), the forces that shaped the peasant society and thus the household/family are of two main types. First when addressing the closed corporate peasant community Wolf stipulates that the fundamental force that shapes the peasant community is the various ways in which members of that society perpetuate the society:

> Adherence to the culture validates membership in an existing society and acts as a passport to participation in the life of the community. The particular traits held help the individual remain within the equilibrium of relationships which maintain the community (Wolf 1955:460-461).

Households in the corporate peasant community the are units of organization based on the aspects of the community that dictate its design. Hence the reproduction aspects of the household are stipulated in this context. Patterns of kinship and residence then are regulated by the society as a whole; these 'collective representations' must be upheld in order for the community to maintain its existence.

With the open community Wolf states that the existence of kinds of nuclear, or extended household units is based primarily on the interaction of the open community with the outside society. The maintenance for example of the nuclear family in this community relies heavily on the capacity of the community to adapt to the economic pressures that are brought on from the larger society (Wolf 1966:72-73).

As Wolf stated, the form by which a peasant community exists and reproduces is in the Latin American situation subjected to forces outside of the peasant community (Wolf 1955: 458-463). With the closed corporate community Wolf argued that patterns of consumption for instance are regulated in light of economic circumstance:

> While striving to guarantee its members some basic livelihood within the confines of the community, the lack of resources and the very need to sustain the system of religion and power economically force the community to enter the outside market. Any imposition of taxes, any increase in expenditures relative to the productive capacity of the community, or the internal growth of the population on a limited amount of land, must result in compensatory economic reactions in the field of production (Wolf 1955: 458).

Moreover, Wolf contends that if this is the case then it is up to the 'nuclear family' to regulate patterns of consumption and increases in production (459).

Therefore with the open community, which participates in a market system more freely, the objective of the household unit would be to make the transition to new patterns of reproduction more easy (465).

Arguably those areas of the peasant household that dealt with reproduction (sustainability) became the dominant features. In this vein the peasant household is seen as either 1) belonging to a social formation dominated by a capitalist mode of production while being non-capitalist in nature or 2) increasingly becoming incorporated into the capitalist mode of production in specific and various ways (kinds of proletarianization). Thus as Marianne Schmink concludes,

> Household studies have the potential to bridge the analytical gap separating microeconomic theories that concentrate on the atomistic behavior of individuals (sometimes aggregated within household units) from the historical-structural approach that focuses on the political economy of socioeconomic and political development (Schmink 1984: 87).

These considerations establish the importance of the household when trying to understand peasant societies. The main point to emphasize is the diversity of peasant households based on their individual ability to reproduce. Crucial variables are the access and control of those factors that are fundamental in such reproduction.

While households are seen as being diverse and particularistic in the Central American context it would seem that their ability to change is responsive to the kinds of pressures put on them. Thus, from this point of view we can state that the increase in kinds of capital penetration in the region individual households are constantly adapting and changing. One of the main avenues is the general process of proletarianization. In this context the peasant household as portrayed in anthropological tradition is no longer valid. There have been a constant increases in landlessness and migration.

Norma Chinchilla has recently stated that with capital penetration and the concurrent change in agricultural activity a real situational option for peasant populations is migration. No longer can rural peoples in general sustain or reproduce a livelihood, off of the land (Chinchilla and Hamilton 1991). At alarming rates the amount of land available to peasant populations is dwindling (de Janvry et al 1989). As mentioned above the tradition in anthropology has been to typologize, in economic terms, peasantries on the basis of reproduction off of the land. This is no longer feasible. For anthropology, situational logic allows for one to assess specific households based on their particular relationship to capital penetration. In fact, an anthropologist should be able to use situational logic to reveal the factors that may keep a given household from moving to wage labor.*

* Richard Wilk points to such analysis in an example from his work with the Kekchi Maya: "Some households were taking advantage of new economic opportunities, growing new crops using agrochemicals, expanding their cash crop production, setting up small retail shops, trading in hogs, and buying trucks for hauling freight. Other households with the same family composition and the same

In the following section this situation will be outlined.

Proletarianization and Landlessness

In a recent article Alain de Janvry et al. have illustrated that in general, Latin American peasantries are caught up in a 'double (under)development squeeze'(de Janvry et al, 1989:396). The authors state that on the one hand peasantries have been unable to maintain access to land and thus the traditional reproduction patterns are no longer evident.

In turn this has led to what I call a situational logic pragmatism: peasant households must seek out alternative survival avenues and strategies. The most general avenue by which peasants attempt to survive is the agricultural labor market--selling their labor for wages. While this is the dominant avenue it will be revealed in the next chapter that increasingly peasants also move into wage labor in other economic sectors (e.g.,industrial and informal areas). On the other hand the authors state that when the agricultural labor market is no longer seen as a viable economic alternative peasants often rely on seasonal migratory work and concurrently must compete with urban based workers. The end result is that peasants are becoming marginalized in increasing numbers due to the inability of the state economies

access to labor and basic resources, spent most of their cash income on consumer goods and foods. Each household made different decisions about mixing subsistence production and participation in the cash economy, but some were actively accumulating capital while others did not" (Wilk 1989:34).

to supply employment (404). For the purpose at hand we need to assess de Janvry's argument in light of the postulates laid out thus far in this thesis.

Earlier I stated that within the confines of disciplinary typologizing, the precepts by which peasantries are constructed are often reliant on forms of economic activity. A fundamental point of de Janvry's argument is that due to the double underdevelopment squeeze peasants are increasing in numbers. We need to assess the economic factors by which de Janvry comes to such conclusions.

Concerning the peasant farm (household) de Janvry sees peasantries as using land to produce goods for a ...arket more than for simple subsistence. By gaining income this way, or relying on, income, de Janvry is suggesting that reproduction orientation of the peasant household is no longer focused on subsistence production (396). Coupled with this is the fact that due to a decrease in farm size (but an overall increase in farms) the productive capacity is also in decline and therefore a general movement to other income sources begins (406).

In the 18 countries that were used as the basis for the thesis put forward there was an increase in the number of small farms (over 30 years) in 15 countries. Only in Argentina, Panama, and Venezuela does one see a decrease. Also when looking at farm size de Janvry cites 16 countries and sees a decrease in 10, while 4 had increases and 2 remained the same. Thus de Janvry's conclusion:

> This observation confirms the interpretation of the peasantry as a covered sector of population, increasingly dependent on non-farm sources of income but unable to find sufficient employment opportunities to either migrate and abandon the agricultural sectors or to fully depend on wage earnings for its subsistence. Thus, while the peasantry grows quantitatively, it undergoes significant qualitative changes away from being pure farm producers and toward increasing integration in the labor market (406).

A factual parameter that was mentioned earlier also comes into play here. Earlier I explicated by way of Eric Wolf that the average peasant farm (household) often subsisted off of a plot of land that was minimal in size. De Janvry depicts a trend where the small farm/household unit can only generate roughly a third of the income that wage earners make. This he argues is due to the inability of such small plots in allowing for all household members to work the land. Usually therefore there is a labor surplus (408).

Having this in mind then it is easy to see that a movement to wage labor via various avenues is imminent. In light of situational logic I would argue that in real survival terms, the reliance (not supplementation) on wage labor is the avenue by which peasants sustain livelihoods.

In this context I argue that they are not in economic terms peasants but rather rural peoples caught up in social formations defined by transitory relations of production. Inherent then is the fact that forms or types of proletarianization, based on situational logic, dominate

everyday survival and parallel with the kinds of capital penetration occurring. One avenue by which this is illuminated is migration.

Migration has been a subject long studied and in the case of Latin America is applicable as above shown in trying to understand socioeconomic change. In early colonial days migration was seen as a common feature of colonial life as indigenous and immigrant peoples interacted in order to survive. As David Robinson has stated migration in colonial times can be illustrative of today's more complex patterns:

> The diffusion of Spanish immigrants throughout the continent, spreading among other things their gospel, diseases, and world view, triggered a migrational response on the part of the aboriginal Indians, only parts of which are we now able to outline in sketchy fashion. Invasion, and immigration for whites often meant retreat, and emigration for Indians. For the newcomers their "opening" of the continent resulted in a necessary "closing" of aboriginal worlds, the initiation of cultural assimilation or rejection, racial mixing, the onset of market economies and new trade patterns –in short a new phase in the development of social and spatial structures and processes throughout the continent (Robinson 1990:1).

With migration it is evident that one must be aware of a rather large factor of distinction. Since the discussion has centered on the consolidation of Latin America under European rule we must be aware of patterns of migration as they are directly related to colonial control. As Brian du Toit puts it we need to understand the conditions under which people migrate on their own free will or those "who have no choice in the decision" (duToit 1990:305).

If we assume that in the context of capital penetration in Latin America that peasants are forced to move, then we need to assess why this is so. Above we have delineated some of the economic characteristics of peasant populations. In light of these the charge can be made that the lack of control over resources has forced a large percentage of peasants into new economic environments with new real life strategies. Thus I would argue in light of situational logic, for the most part the majority of Latin American (and specifically those in Central America) peasants migrate due to external control. The decisions made to migrate are therefore based largely on the penetration of traditional societies by the processes of capitalism.

As deJanvry has shown the degree to which peasants are able to sustain a livelihood off of the land has decreased in dramatic fashion. It would be erroneous to think that the net rural-urban migration between 1950 and 1960 of 14.6 million people can be seen as the result of unprompted individual decision makers (Grigg 1980).

Michael Kearney has illustrated that as a study area in anthropology, migration coincided with the shift from community studies—the intersection of local and global economy. Here the central focus (as alluded to earlier) is on the dominant role that external forces (states and economies) have over local areas (Kearney 1986:332). Earlier I mentioned that for Goodman and Redclift capital accumulation meant the extraction of the surplus from the countryside. In light of migration's dominant role in real life economic situations, the surplus is often seen in the form of 'free' labor.

Thus in keeping with the theme of this thesis I view migration as a result of capital penetration. A few points need to be addressed here. In keeping with the mode of production approach I see migration as part and parcel of various types of capital penetration: not a single path. Also since I have focused on production rather than circulation we take migration as being the economic avenue available for the most part as a result of separation from the factors of production. Furthermore I do not dispute the point that there are peasants who are non-capitalist and who articulate with a capitalist mode. But increasingly (via migration to forms of wage labor other that agricultural) such populations are becoming capitalist (Kearney:342-345).

It is now pertinent to follow up these conclusions by seeking and understanding real socioeconomic processes of change. In the next chapter this will be the focus.

MEXICO AND THE DILEMMAS OF CENTRAL AMERICA

From the standpoint of western social science the history of Latin America and more precisely Central America began in 1492. When Columbus landed on Guanahani in the Bahamas the 'New World' came into existence. It is from this date that we begin an historical account of the area (Milanich and Milbrath 1989:7).

This new world, invented and interpreted by Europe was eventually subdued and thus controlled by the European conquerors. In a larger context this was related to the dominant conqueror, Spain's, cleaning house. On the one hand Spain had finally ousted the Moors from their land. As Todorov is moved to state, 'the country repudiates its interior Other' (Todorov 1984:50).*

On the other hand the discovery of the New World was in itself part of Spain's attempt to shrug off the status as an inferior European power (Stein and Stein 1970: Chapter

* Verena Stolcke (1991) states that while the conquest of America was underway, in Spain there was a similar domestic conquest ongoing. Directly targeted for expulsion were the Muslims and Jews, who at one point had gained corrective status by way of religious conversion(Catholicism), but now were the subject of "a racist doctrine of original sin of the most repulsive kind (Stolcke 1991:24).

One). Thus the discovery of Spain's 'exterior Other', this 'America which will become Latin' (Todorov:50).

There is a new consciousness that the history of Latin America (as it was named in France in 1861) from the beginning has been part and parcel of European thought and identity. In this context Taylor writes, "The notion of a history made from without has often revealed more about European beliefs and ambitions, and about the ideology of the interpreters than about the historical imprint" (Taylor 1985:116). An example would be a passage from Bruce Trigger's work 'Ethnohistory: The Unfinished Edifice' where Trigger explicates the discoverers intellectual background:

> As a consequence of even more ambitious European projects to seize possession of American lands, native people were represented increasingly as savages, irredeemably bellicose, and the inveterate enemies of civilization. The Spanish conquests of Mexico and Peru were portrayed in contemporary accounts as crusades to rescue native people from ignorance and sin: the conquerors argued that servitude in this world was a reasonable price for the natives to pay for the salvation of their souls (Trigger 1986:255).

Thus the scope of European ambition, in a nascent stage, evokes an image of a Europe attempting to add a new chapter to its history. The question that wants an answer is that of historical imprint. We need to reveal exactly what the Conquest of Latin America has meant for the peoples that live there today. What has been the outcome of their history as a result of 500 years of contact?

At the forefront of the European 'discovery' were Spain and Portugal. In Columbus's day Spain and Portugal were considered dependent nations in Europe. The new world allowed these countries to gain a foothold into the European circle of influence by way of an increase in power via wealth (Stein and Stein 1970: chapter one). This became the impetus for their overseas endeavors.

From the outset the Spanish crown was in need of financial stability. The colonies therefore:

> ...existed to increase the economic well-being and political strength of their mother countries. Their production and markets were intended to benefit solely their metropolises which regulated trade and imposed taxes to transfer colonial wealth to themselves" (Burkholder and Johnson 1990:125).

Based on the dominant opinions and structural realities of Europe at the time, the method by which European nations were to garner such 'well-being' and 'political strength' was to rely on a mercantilist mentality. Hence, the need for gold and silver bullion and thus the beginning of Spain's monopolistic activities in the new world (Skidmore and Smith 1984:21).

With Cortes having conquered parts of Central America and the Spanish crown setting up the viceroyalty of New Spain (Costa Rica, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Belize, and Chiapas, a part of Mexico) the early discovery of gold sharpened the edge of the mercantilist mentality. While gold was not lucrative on a large scale, silver helped

to bolster Spain's wealth and status in Europe (Burkholder and Johnson:125). In 1530 silver strikes in two areas outside of Mexico City herald the dominance of silver (126-127). In 1550 large deposits were found. With this colonization increased dramatically.

In 1557 the patio process was established and this increased the profitability of silver exploration and extraction. The process was a way to extract silver from ore by amalgamating it with mercury. By 1609 63% of new Spain's exports were silver (Cockcroft 1983:39-40).

In light of this early economy New Spain became an important part of the overseas mercantilist trading system. Beginning with the silver and gold mining the Spanish crown eventually moved into other exporting areas. One other key area was sugar production in Brazil in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries (Burkholder and Johnson 1990:131).

But for all the constant economic activity tying the new with the old world, eventually Spain and Portugal would lose their positions of dominance. In 1588 when the British defeated the Spanish armada, the end of Spain's colonial rule was inevitable (Skidmore and Smith 1984:23).

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the northern economies of Europe were becoming dominant. While trade and various taxation avenues transferred the wealth of

the colonies to the old world, the eventual outcome for Spain was repeated bankruptcies. Also other European nations began to challenge Spain and Portugal in the colonies (23).

Coupled with these old world economic problems were those found in the colonies. To begin with the colonies were having a rough time dealing with the problems associated with being in an inferior position in the mercantilist system. For instance when it seemed at one point that the colony was dominating in a trade area the result would be that Spain would ban the production of those products that were hindering the priority of the Spanish export (Burkholder and Johnson:159). Also there was the problem with a complex bureaucracy.

The colonial administration often redirected capital destined for production areas into consumption areas. As Burkholder and Johnson point out, "Import and export taxes, the tithe on rural production, and mining taxes all steered wealth away from mines, plantations, and farms to urban administrative centers, defensive installations, and naval forces protecting Atlantic shipping" (159). There were also problems with the geographical location of resource centers, a chronic trade deficit, shortage of credit, and conservative investment by those with funds—the merchants and the clergy who would invest in land and property since these could be used as collateral and offered no chance of speculative lost (159).

Other problems centered on the composition of colonial society. Colonial society was changing. Due to natural increases and immigration the creole (colonial born whites) population grew rapidly. The eventual outcome of this demographic increase was that the

creole population would become increasingly involved in the economies of the colonies. Concurrently they would gain political strength, rising from the local electoral posts (audiencias) to the upper echelons of colonial society (Skidmore and Smith:24). From the beginning;

> Colonialism subordinated the indigenous and later creole cultures to European cultural hegemony. Undergirded by Catholicism cultural colonialism proved to be more durable and resistant to American efforts to establish an independent cultural identity than did the more visible political and economic structures it helped sustain" (Burkholder and Johnson:221).

From the above we get a picture of the problems associated with early colonization. Eventually the colonies would break free from their European controllers but this would not occur for some time.

With the Bourbons assuming the monarchy in Spain, a new era of colonial rule unfolded. The priority of the monarchy was to shore up Spain's declining position in the new world and in Europe. The first act by this new monarchy was to incorporate two new viceroyalties into the colonial fold---these being New Granada (1717) and Buenos Aires (1776). Next Charles the 3rd adopted a new system of colonial administration; the intendant system would replace the old troublesome 'corrigedores'. These intendants were to be directly responsible to the monarchy not to the viceroys. It was hoped that by adopting this policy it would ensure the loyal support of the intendants since the majority were peninsulares (from Spain). The end result of this system was that it challenged the creoles' status (Skidmore and Smith:29-30). Thus Skidmore and Smith conclude:

> It was the challenge to creole status, more than the influence of Enlightenment thought or the example of British colonies in North America, that ultimately prompted the Spanish American dominions to opt for independence (30).

By the year 1808 Spain's hold on it's colonial territories began to waver. After fifteen years of ongoing conflict, the loss of an expensive naval fleet at Cape St. Vincent and Trafalgar, and the incurring debt, Spain's position weakened markedly (Burkholder and Johnson:290-291). Coupled with Napoleon's capture of Madrid and installing his brother Joseph as the king the end result it would seem was rebellion in the colonies.

Upon independence the new nations of Latin America were in dire economic straits. Capital was scarce and the labor force decimated due to the various struggles for independence. Since the economies had been export oriented (mining and agriculture) the individual states continued this pattern. Between the 1830s and the 1850s the export--import economy dominated the region (Skidmore and Smith:43).

After 1850 the Latin American economies became integrated into the world economic system in a more permanent manner. The impetus for this action was twofold. On the one hand you had new nations wanting to maintain the idea of a liberal economy. This rationale was pursued by the elites of the various countries who would benefit economically.

On the other hand you saw industrialization occurring in Europe (with Britain at the forefront) and North America. In Europe especially, the need for raw materials and foodstuffs intensified. Trade relations deepened and by 1880 further economic expansion was occurring but in a limited way (Skidmore and Smith:43-45).

One of the major problems that confronted the economies of Latin America was that domestic industries were not developing. The need for light industrial technology was being met by Europe and America. The reasons are numerous but essentially the main problem centered on the fact that the political economy of Latin America as a whole could not afford the luxury of economic independence.

Since the imported products were of higher quality than anything that the domestic industries could produce they were meeting the demand of the consumers. Thus the government and local businesses could not afford the time and capital to develop competitive domestic industries. A general reason for this was that in order to compete against the imports, local industry would have to be protected by either higher tariffs on imports or their outright banning from local markets (Skidmore and Smith:44).

This did not happened since most governments buoyed themselves up by way of revenue generated from tariffs. Protectionism would undoubtedly have had a detrimental affect on their positions. Furthermore, the elites of the various Latin American countries were strongly in favor of the free trade or liberal economy. Coupled with this was the fact that since

most Latin American economies relied on exports (mining and agriculture) the cost of labor was low and therefore the level of domestic consumer activity needed for growth was for the most part missing. As Skidmore and Smith contend, "Latin America was being pulled farther into the international economy in a way that would sharply limit its economic development" (44-45).

Following through with the idea of a liberal economy a second stage of economic development began in 1900 and ran through till the 1930s. Here the key point was that the Latin American economies were now concretely immersed into the world economy. The major source of wealth for all nations centered on their ability to sell exports and thereby increase their beneficial standing in terms of balance of trade (51-55).*

For instance, in Mexico henequen and sugar plantations expanded and mining continued along with the nascent oil industry (51) Up to this point this is a general view of Latin America as a whole. At this juncture we need to outline the situation in Central America during this period since it will be the area of focus later on.

* Early on economic growth was seen as being solely based on the export market. Charles Brockett concluded that "bias toward commercial export agriculture was justified in the nineteenth century by the spread of liberal ideology, which was in part a manifestation and defence of the expanding international capitalist economic system" (Brockett 1988:36).

In line with the above statements concerning the idea of a liberal economy in general the concept was an intricate part of the Central American economies, including Mexico. In the early stages of colonialism Central America was nothing more than an area of little economic value. The relevance of the region to Spain's economic motivation was minimal. Outside of Mexico, where gold and silver were mined, the only activity of the sort was in Honduras. Here cacao was shipped to Europe via Mexico (Weeks 1985:12).*

With the introduction of coffee by settlers in the 1790s the integration of Central America into the world economy had begun. After independence (1808-1821) by the year 1840 large exports of coffee were being shipped from El Salvador and by 1880 all states except Honduras exported coffee (13). Eventually the Central American economies would diversify with the growth of bananas as a major export crop. Finally it is with the production of cotton that one sees Central America more or less fully integrated into the world economy (16).

Mexico

In Mexico the mercantilist attitude dominated as well. The rule of the colonizer meant wealth for Spain. As Eric Wolf has stated rather poignantly;

* Cacao trade was in reality little more than outright looting. While a way of life was partially sustained by the indigenous population, for the Spaniards, cacao was there for the taking.

> Under the new order, Middle America was no longer allowed to follow out the logic of its past development. Now part of an empire upon which the sun never set, it was subject to the dictates of an imperial reason of state which transcended local decisions carried out for local reasons. New Spain, like other parts of the Spanish Empire, was to be a valuable source of raw materials for the h[illegible]eland, not a primary producer in its own right" (Wolf 1959:187).

With mining fully under way new avenues for revenue began to develop. Mining generated the need for foodstuffs due to the influx of people. Here one saw the beginnings of commercial agriculture. As Cockcroft states, this commercialism included "breeding mules and horses to transfer the wealth; cultivation of sugar and maize to feed the labor force that produced it; and establishment of immense wheat fields, grinding mills...on haciendas" (Cockcroft:29).[1]

With this level of economic activity there were attendant costs. Early on there were problems with the lack of labor, a reliance on credit and mercury supplies (for mining), a complex bureaucracy and attendant problems with infrastructure; machinery, markets and transportation links. Also in agricultural production the common thorn was the up and down cycle of the export market. Coupled with this was the fact that agriculture was becoming variegated throughout the regions (Cockcroft: 29,41).

[1] For sugar see Sidney Mintz's recent study (1985) where he traces the early beginnings of sugar crop production.

These practices while enlarging the economy of Mexico at the time where of course not without problems. The agricultural production went through various ups and downs (along with the mining sector) and became variegated depending on the region (31). Eventually these models of economic development would dominate the Mexican landscape and the need for an internal market would grow (31).

By the time of independence the Mexican economy was dominated by the export industry as this was a direct link to the mercantilist attitudes of the time. As Cockcroft points out,

> New Spain's rich merchants not only financed the mines but also exerted influence in agriculture, manufacturing, and a medley of speculative activities. And, as was typical during the mercantilist-capitalist era, they accumulated great wealth in high finance and trade (41).

Thus up until independence Mexico was characterized by a dual market economy—one focus on the domestic situation and this in turn was controlled by the export market, which entrenched Mexico firmly into the world market system (43).

During the late colonial period the form of accumulation in Mexico shifted. With the British and French becoming involved in the area the Spanish crown enacted what are called 'The Bourbon Reforms' (1759-1788 under Charles the 3rd). The basis of these reforms

was to reduce the amount of contraband activity (by opening up channels of free trade) and concurrently increase taxation (Andrews 1985:110-111).*

Eventually this would expand the Mexican economy. By the late 1700s manufacturing was valued at 72 million pesos a year. From 1779 to 1803 mining more or less doubled and agricultural production increased dramatically. The total of exports jumped over 50% during this period (Cockcroft:46-47).

Like elsewhere in Central America the economic vitality of colonial Mexico led the Spanish crown to cede certain economic and political powers to the ever increasing elites. Here unlike the Central American colonies the elite was not a strong creole class but rather a complex interweaving of various sectors of Mexican society (Cockcroft:48-51). Once the elite population became threatened by the crown's activities, the response would be one that reverberated throughout colonial Latin America.

With the "Act of Consolidation of Royal Revenues" in 1804 (due to Spain's war with England) many creoles saw this as a direct challenge to their status (51). Coupled with

* Andrews states that the Reforms were set up to 'increase production and tax revenue'. Such reforms in general hurt those who made up the majority of colonial society--the workers and the Indians. The head tax and the Alcabala taxes were harsh. Coupled with taxes was the idea that labor productivity would increase due to the fact that the owners of production facilities would increase output by labor since the technological means to increase were unavailable and often ladened with high taxes (Andrews 1985:115).

this was the Hidalgo-Morelos rebellion of 1810-1815. Here those who had been downtrodden for the most part by Spanish rule, began to rebel. The elites at the time saw this as a way to secure control of the colony. As Andrews states "When independence finally came to Mexico, it was precisely because the Spanish suppression of all but a remnant of the revolutionary forces freed the Mexican elites to declare independence untroubled by threats of insurrection from below" (Andrews:124).

Coupled with the ongoing political instability were problems with the economy. From 1808-1810 the rate of agricultural production was in decline (Cockcroft:54). Historically, colonial agriculture was constantly going through cycles of prosperity and downturn since 1720. The problems associated with such crises included the growth of unemployment, famine, lack of trade and a weak financial structure. As Cockcroft summarizes in a long but insightful passage:

> Mexico's Wars of Independence were profoundly anti-colonial and interclass struggles that succeeded in establishing national sovereignty but failed to achieve a social revolution. No single class or class fraction was able to assert or maintain hegemony over the tide of mass rebellion that swept the land from 1810 to 1821. Politically, the foremost precondition for the movement of independence was the steady erosion of Spain's traditional system of control over the American colonies, which climaxed in 1808 when Napoleon's army occupied Spain (Cockcroft:57-58).

The eventual outcome would be independence, but this independence did not mean economic freedom.

After independence the Mexican economy was slow to rejuvenate despite pockets of growth. Besides political instability there were other associated problems as well. First, there was the lack of a labor force—most of the existing one had been eliminated during the wars. One estimate puts the loss at roughly half a million (Cockcroft:64). Coupled with this loss of life was the fact that in reality the physical decimation of the economic infrastructure was overwhelming. Between the armed forces, the rebels and the bandits the mining industry was destroyed, the productivity of the agricultural sector was no where to be seen and finally the wars meant capital flight from the colony (Hansen 1971:11-12).

Furthermore, there was a lack of transportation infrastructure, loss of over half its territories in 1848 to the United States, and a weak bureaucratic system with poor fiscal policies. All in all Mexico was faced with a chaotic economic infrastructure and no real economic surplus (Cockcroft:64).

Based on this situation of political and economic turmoil the new Mexican nation would not prosper for 65 years until Porforio Diaz became president in 1876. During the following 35 years (until the Revolution in 1910), the Mexican economy grew at a slow rate. Like all of Latin America, the dominant area of economic activity was agriculture, but unlike elsewhere the manufacturing sector was viable.

Hansen points to three fundamental reasons for growth. First, there was political stability. Second, foreign investment was deemed logical and necessary. A pertinent role of

such investment was directed towards the construction of the railway system. The third factor was that with foreign investment in the railways, the Mexican economy was not only integrated for the export market (namely the U.S.) but also with the domestic market (13-14).

Like all of Latin America, Mexico was becoming integrated into the world market. Hansen concludes,

> Foreign investment also integrated the Mexican economy into the world market. The extent of the tie is revealed in both the diversification of Mexican exports and their overall rate of growth. Between 1877 and 1910 the value of Mexican exports rose by more than 600 percent in real terms (14).

The reliance on the export mentality also issued in the development of the domestic market by higher levels of consumer demand.*

Thus Reynolds states that Mexico was following the typical export economy pattern:

> Mexico, was following the pattern of a typical export economy, which depends upon increasing exploitation of natural resources with cheap labor and foreign capital and technology to expand production for overseas markets. As in many other Latin American countries of the

* See Hansen (1971) for an account of the growth of the domestic market. Hansen points out that clearly, state policies and incentives were a major factor in the growth of the domestic market. These included high protectionist tariffs, new domestic tax structures, and cheap transportation (Hansen 1971:18-19).

time, this type of export-led growth brought prosperity to some portions of society but almost entirely excluded much of the population from the development process (Reynolds 1970:23).

However, by the turn of the century, Mexican exports (like those in other Latin American countries that relied on external markets) began to waver. Demand was slowing down. Hansen points out that export revenue between 1890 and 1900 had climbed by 144% while from 1900 to 1910 it was at 75% (21).

Thus the economy was slowing down generally since it was fuelled by exports (agriculture and mining mostly). The effects on the population were twofold—unemployment and hunger. While the government offered incentives for industrial growth and export diversification, they were unable to deal with the problems confronting the majority of the population. The essential characteristics of Mexican society during this period was that like other Latin American countries, an elite, historically based, was the sole benefit of the wealth that was being generated (Hansen:20-23).

Basically for the most part Mexican society was a rural one dominated by the hacienda economy. Attendant to this kind of economy was the fact that few people owned the land and its capabilities in supplying the population with foodstuffs was not being acted on. Thus while the production of raw materials for the domestic market increased, and the export market grew as well, the degree by which domestic consumption goods were being produced was negligible (27). Thus Mexican society consisted of;

> ...a limited number of large landowners [who] responded to the opportunities for commercial production created during the Porfirian peace. Their estates produced for export and for internal industrial needs.... Even those who availed themselves of the new transport systems to produce some export crops still held large sections of their arable lands fallow, often refusing to rent them to idle and hungry campesinos. At the same time, they chained those peasants to the hacienda so that they could be seasonally employed (Hansen:28).

The eventual outcome of economic and political turmoil would be revolution. The Porfirian (1877—1911) type of economic development would lose its hold on the economy. During the revolution and after, the Mexican economy would be in shambles (except those enclave areas that had their own military). The infrastructure that had been built to facilitate export development and diversification was in disarray.

The export economy (mining and agriculture) was in decline. With mining, production was down 40%. In the manufacturing sector the decline was noticeable at 9%. By the mid-1920s, the productive capacity of the economy was only holding its head above levels achieved during the last years of the Porfirian regime (Hansen:30).

Besides the general chaos surrounding the Revolution the next factor that would not bode well for the economy was the Depression. By 1932 the gross national product (GNP) had fallen to a level below that in 1910 (Reynolds:1970:35). Also there was the added problem of capital leaving the country. This was a direct result of the policies of the Cardenas administration (1934-40). Here the government often sided with workers in disputes with the foreign companies and their management (Hansen:30-31).

Coupled with this was the foreign exchange situation. Between 1925 and 1940, the rate of exchange declined by 4% annually (31). Also the high level of agrarian reform (which was a reversal of the previous fifty years) meant constant battling over control of the land. This situation ultimately ushered in a period of low agricultural production (32-33).*

By the 1940s new economic policies were initiated. Hansen states that the Mexican economy had grown by 6% in the three decades since 1940 (41). Unlike the rest of Central America, Mexico had been able to diversify it's economy from early on. From the early colonial period, agriculture and mining exports led the way to economic development. With agriculture Mexico led all Latin American nations in growth except Costa Rica (69). While the export market did slow down by the end of the 1950s there was still annual growth (216). The key to this was that unlike other Latin American economies that relied heavily on one or two main exports, Mexico was able to diversify early on. As Hansen points out the dominant export, cotton, during the 1960s and the 1970s, only made up one fifth of export earnings, while other crops and manufactured goods comprised the other four fifths (216).

Manufacturing, for instance, by 1940, was able to compete (albeit on a limited scale) with imports, thus illustrating the effectiveness of import-substituting industrialization (ISI) (56-57). Coupled with this general economic trend was the fact that during the post-

* Hansen offers an account of the kind of agrarian reform during this period.

independence and post-revolution periods the key factor in the development of the Mexican economy was the availability and proximity of a very large market for Mexican exports—The United States. From 1940 75% of Mexican exports went to the U.S. In turn Mexico benefitted from the availability of technology from the U.S. as well (65). Also it would be misleading if it was not mentioned that during these periods (with fluctuations) the U.S. was very much a player in Foreign investment in Mexico (15-18).

Another important factor is the impact of government policies on economic growth. For instance between 1940 and 1960 the level of public investment in domestic industries was in the 35—50% range (67).

While there are problems today with the Mexican economy the historical record should illustrate that over all the economy has been growing. It is with the levels of industrialization that one sees the attendant problem of landlessness and increased proletarianization occurring. These problems will be dealt with shortly but first we need to focus on the other Central American economies.

Smaller Nations of Central America

In Central America with the development of the coffee industry there was also the concurrent development of the banking and transportation systems as well. The first commercial bank, Banco Anglo-Costarricense, opened its doors in Costa Rica in 1864, while the transportation system based on railways rather than roads began in the 1870s (Bulmer-

Thomas 1987:2-4). With these infrastructural systems in place Central America was becoming further integrated into the world economy.

By the 1920s then Central America based on the export economy model was fully a part of the world economic system. As Bulmer-Thomas points out the major factor involved here was that agriculture contributed the dominant part of the gross domestic product and concurrently agriculture for export for the most part was more important than domestic use agriculture (9). Also it has been illustrated that while exports dominated the economies of the Central American states the development of other economic sectors was minimal. Foreign investment in other areas besides agriculture was seen lightly in mining and railroads (10). Thus like Latin America in general Central America was becoming integrated into the world economy along similar lines.

As has been noted a fundamental factor that illustrates economic integration is that the dependence on exports meant that any strong change in the international economy would have caused concurrent socio-economic and political change for the various Latin American republics.

With the Great Depression the 1930s issued in a downturn in all Latin American economies. With the fall of the world economy there was no where for Latin American exports to go. By this time the main exports, coffee, sugar, metals, and meats, were experiencing a downturn. As Skidmore and Smith point out the value of exports from 1930

to 1934 was 48% lower than it had been during the 1925-1929 period (Skidmore and Smith:56).

In general Latin America economies could resolve this problem in two ways. The first strategy centered on the export-import system. Here the emphasis was on individual countries trying to guarantee new terms of trade that would continue the growth of the export industries. Argentina for example took this route with beef exports by signing the Roca-Runciman Pact in 1938 with Britain. The bottom line was that both countries agreed to new arrangements that would benefit domestic exports (57).

The other strategy was to increase industrialization. A fundamental goal of such policy was to increase autonomy for the Latin American economies. The Great Depression had illustrated just how vulnerable they were to the demands of the world economic system. Since the Latin American economies were dependent on imports of manufactured goods and the exporting of raw materials the general thrust of the strategy seemed plausible. As Skidmore and Smith point out:

> By producing industrial as well as agricultural and mineral goods, the Latin American economies would become more integrated and more self sufficient. And, as a result, they would be less vulnerable to the kinds of shocks brought on by the worldwide depression (Skidmore and Smith:58).

Coupled with economic autonomy was the idea that there was the need to supply employment for the burgeoning working class that had been developing since the turn of the

century. In general the Latin American economies for the most part followed the economic development path focusing on industrialization. The general policies constructed centered on import-substituting-industrialization (ISI) (58).

With Central America, the depression meant that the leaders of the individual republics were thrown from power in light of the economic devastation. They were replaced by what Bulmer-Thomas calls 'authoritarian caudillismo' (Bulmer-Thomas:68). With this change the new regimes of Central America saw no alternative strategy to the export economy. Thus as Brockett concludes the reliance on exports was fuelled by the coercive measures of the Central American elites:

> Central to most of the transformations of the past has been the expropriation of land and labor from the peasantry in order that elites might pursue their objectives. While the implementation of the agro-export development model in Central America has brought great wealth to some, for much of the peasantry it has represented the loss of land, food supply, and autonomy (Brockett 1988:14).

While the export led economies of Central America did not rejuvenate to a large degree during the 1930s, the various political leaders stuck to exporting policies in any case (Bulmer-Thomas:74).

The eventual outcome of these policies would be that import substitution would take place in the agricultural sector not in the manufacturing sector as in other areas of Latin America (69). During the 1930s the Central American economies were more or less

stabilized. While the initial shock of the depression was felt everywhere the end result was that when the gold standard collapsed the Central American economies readjusted debt payments. The result was twofold. First, debt defaultment could be viewed as an avenue by which the Central (and all Latin) American economies could redress the problem of the value of export commodities (their decline). Also it was seen as a way to increase the competitiveness of domestic products that would normally compete with imports at a disadvantage. Furthermore, it released foreign exchange and therefore allowed for the procurement of 'much-needed imports'. In general however, the growth here was minimal and essentially the Central American economies focused on import-substituting industrialization (ISI) (Bulmer-Thomas:68).

With import substitution there were two main avenues. First there was import-substituting industrialization(ISI) and second, import-substituting agriculture(ISA). This two-pronged approach was the result of the region relying heavily on imports (foodstuffs) and the fact that even with the external debt default foreign exchange was still a problem (79).

With ISI the effect was minimal during the 1930s. One reason for this was that the percentage of imported goods (outside of foodstuffs) was essentially the same as ten years ago; there was little decrease. Reasons for this vary but a couple dominate. First, the infrastructure needed to provide energy for industrialization was not fully developed. Also there was little in the way of financial credit. Finally domestic demand in the local markets was meager thus nullifying consumer incentive for growth (79-81).

With import-substituting agriculture there was more success albeit in a limited manner. Here the emphasis was not on capital as the fundamental growth strategy. Rather what was needed was land and labor of which both were available (81). Essentially ISA was helpful in economic recovery. However, in light of the strength of the export-import strategy ISA did not overtake the economy. In general during the 1930s Bulmer-Thomas stresses the following factors for its demise: first and most importantly as mentioned above, the general economic orientation was towards the export sector. While during this period it was facing a downswing the expectation was that when the external conditions improved exporting would once again direct the economy. Second, with the import substitution of foodstuffs there were limits and concurrently if the supply was too great it would have an detrimental affect on prices (82).

With the onset of the Second World War the Central American economies were forced to seek out new markets for their exports. The United States became the dominant market. With the signing of the Inter-American Coffee Agreement in 1940, the Central American economies were guaranteed access to a large market (91-92). During the war years the Central American economies moved away from ISA. From 1939 priority was once more given to the export sectors of the individual economies. Also with ISI there was minimal activity but nothing that would threaten or weaken the position of agricultural exports (95).

After the war the following decade was one that would illustrate the lack of diversity of the Central American economies. As Bulmer-Thomas states, the Central American economies showed all the 'classic signs of under-development':

> Exports continued to be dominated by earnings from coffee and bananas, both of which were non-essential as far as the Allied war effort was concerned, and output had suffered accordingly. Although foreign exchange reserves had expanded during the war, there had been no possibility of translating this into imports of machinery to start new industrial activities because of wartime shortages of such goods. Production of goods for the home market, whether agricultural or industrial, was held back by inadequate infrastructure, a weak financial system and low effective demand, and the state's ability to correct these deficiencies was retarded by a regressive fiscal system, which remained over-dependent on import duties, and a political system which was in some cases overtly hostile to capital modernisation (105).

Essentially the economies still were fundamentally orientated to the export-import model of growth. The value of agricultural exports was astounding at this time but the economies could not use this growth along with large tracts of land to stimulate export diversification. Since labor was in short supply the orientation was to diversify with crops that would lead to mechanization and also to labor saving processes on existing crop land. The result was that rather than diversifying and modernizing the agricultural industry, the Central American pattern was to limit growth since the profits would be essentially held by a few (106). Once more industrial development was put on the back burner. As Brockett put the case, "Strategies based on export agriculture not only avoided these constraints [in ISI] but in addition were congruent with existing socioeconomic structures and their attendant ideologies" (42).

After 1944 the agricultural export sector for the region had generated a great surplus but the sector could not absorb this based on investment and consumption. What was needed was development outside this sector. As stated above there were various reasons why this was not possible—the poor infrastructure and the lack of domestic markets are the most

fundamental. The avenue by which diversification could take place was with private capital direction.

This direction seemed good on paper but in reality it didn't bode well for the region. There were numerous problems facing such diversification. First, there was a problem in using raw materials for industrial products. Since domestic consumption was hindered by the low level of agricultural diversification the materials needed had to be imported. Second, the existing tariff structure was not designed to enhance the growth of local industry and third there was the all too common problem of required energy sources (117). Essentially the only growth during this period was in the export sector with the development of cotton as a primary exportable crop (106).

Eventually sugar, cotton, and beef would be introduced as new exports. The result would be that these exports alongside coffee and bananas would now be the 'traditional exports' (Bulmer-Thomas:150). The outcome of this export dependency was that an ever increasing percentage of the population was reliant on the export economy (Brockett:58). As Bulmer-Thomas stated, "The development of these products, facilitated by strong state support, created new, powerful pressure groups who combined with coffee growers to safeguard the interests of agricultural-export-led growth" (150).

However by the 1950s the demand on the international market for the Central American exports lessened. There was a fall in foreign exchange rates, a problem with balance

of payments and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) began to intervene on a more regular basis (Bulmer-Thomas:150).*

As a result the Central American Common Market was formed in 1960. The CACM was seen as a way to integrate the various Central American economies in light of the balance of trade problem. Bulmer-Thomas points out that between 1954 and 1960 the balance declined by 33.6% (363). The policy of the CACM was to increase industrialization from two angles: first intraregion free trade was to be encouraged and second, there was the need for across board tariff policies that would protect and benefit nascent industries (Skidmore and Smith:297).

In the beginning the CACM increased the financial stability of the region. Commerce increased in the export sector from 7.5% in 1960 to 26.9% in 1970. Also manufacturing increased as well. However, a problem still existed with the agricultural sector due to strong protectionist policies and a very rural population. Other problems included the lack of strong policy formation and implementation--there was no guarantee that the incurred benefits would be distributed evenly. Thus, the full development of the industrial sector was at a disadvantage from the start (Bulmer-Thomas:175).

* At this time one saw the establishment of various treaties that would help foster economic growth for the region. These treaties were the forerunners to the development of the Central American Common Market(CACM) (Bulmer-Thomas 1987:171-174).

Another problem centered on the failure to install common fiscal policies relating to industrialization. The member countries negated the possibility of increased tax revenues that would be garnered from new foreign investment. Finally, there was the problem of inadequate response to the decline in import duties (175).

The direction taken by the CACM was therefore reliant once more on the export agricultural model. By 'grafting' industrial development onto the export model of growth the CACM wished to use the export sector to help build a new industrial base, while not challenging the hegemonic status of the landowning oligarchy (Bulmer-Thomas:185).

This policy was to increase Central America's role in the international market by way of autonomy not dependence. The result was that with intraregion development, trade, and small industrialization there was also an increase in interregional trade (Rosenthal 1985:147-148).

However, even with this growth the reliance on the export model meant an eventual decline in the strategy. The two main reasons for this were first, the CACM was unable to guarantee 'balanced industrial growth' and second there was not a steady increase in 'extra-regional exports' (Bulmer-Thomas:195). Bulmer-Thomas contends that balanced industrial growth was needed in order to insure that the weaker member nations were on par. As far as exports went, these started off well (especially cotton) but by 1965 they curtailed.

The reasons were the fall in coffee prices and internal production problems namely with cotton (196).

By the 1970s the CACM was in decline. One reason was the Soccer War between El Salvador and Honduras with Honduras leaving the common market. As for the individual economies, for the most part they were entering a period of decline. With a rise in the cost of industrial inputs (externally influenced) and the oil crisis of 1973-74, the Central American economies were subjected to high inflation. This in turn brought on a fiscal crisis (200).

Also at this time the completion of the 'easy' stage of ISI was near. The extra-regional imports had moved from light manufacturing to capital and intermediate goods—the region could not supply these. During the 1970s the individual economies began developing non-traditional exports for outside of the region and continued with regional industrial exports. Coupled with this was the historically based reliance on export agriculture. The main problems associated with this orientation had to do with a downturn in the world economy that effected exports and also there was also a decline in extra-regional exports as well.

Since the 1970s a return to the export model has been prevalent. Concurrently the development of non-traditional exports has begun. As Skidmore and Smith conclude, "the historical de-emphasis on manufacturing meant that the agricultural sector would never be challenged by an industrial sector. To be sure, CACM helped give shape and strength to a

fledgling business group, but it did not lead to an outright assault upon the social order (Skidmore and Smith:298).

In both Mexico and Central America the historical record suggests that for the most part both areas are still subjected to (and now more so) the economic conditions of a world capitalist system. This has been the case for all of Latin America.

In light of the historical imprint Latin America has been plagued with consistent upheaval and instability. Within this context the historical imprint has been dominated by:

> ...three centuries of Iberian colonization, enclave economies, and, long after the nominal political independence of most Latin American nations in the early nineteenth century, a common marginality to an emerging world economic system. But these are not homogeneous or timeless traits. Iberian institutions and demands did not spread uniformly or penetrate everywhere at once (Taylor:117).

From the above our central focus has been on outlining the general pattern of Latin American economic development. While focusing on Mexico and Central America we need now to ask what of the peasant populations during this historical time frame?

In anthropology with attention to Central America, the usage of the term peasant (as outlined above) roughly began during the 1940s. This is the time frame for our understanding of peasantries.

Historically peasant populations have been caught up in broad economic processes that have, for the most part, yielded them little or no direct benefit. Therefore, it is safe to say that the political economy of Central America has been designed and perpetuated to benefit a small fraction of the region's peoples.* Fundamentally the reliance on the agro-export model of growth has not always been economically sound and yet in stagnation policy makers have for the most part stayed with this model despite the increase in inequalities throughout the region. This reliance can be attributed to the internal inequality the social structures imposed. As Brockett states,

> Across the centuries, the results of the agro-export development model have been much less that its promise.... As often as they have invested their profits in development enterprises, elites have used them for the purchase of luxury goods imported from industrial countries (Brockett 198:4).

For those in the countryside the benefits have not been forthcoming. With the increased diversification of agriculture, and the increased needs and wants of the elites, peasants have struggled to maintain a hold on the land.

In light of this we can illuminate certain factors of economic change. First, the levels of commercial agriculture have lessened the security that peasants have with the land;

* A thorough account on this subject is Richard Newbold Adams *Crucifixion By Power* (1970). Although Adams looks at a specific country (Guatemala) the essential arguments can be applied to the region in general.

as outlined above, increasingly landholdings are being held by the few (de Janvry). Concurrently, the subsistence activity of peasant populations has shifted. No longer reliant on owning land to subsist peasants are now faced with 'incentives for mobilization'. Survival becomes the dominant way of life. Finally, while the transformation of rural society often has meant that small peasant landholders move to wage labor in agriculture, it also means a movement to proletarianization in other economic sectors (Brockett:6).

During the 1960s and the 1970s capital penetration into rural Latin America increased dramatically. There was the increase in what are called green revolution innovations, levels of heavy investment in mechanization, increased orientation to the export market and concurrent incorporation of multinationals in such production and the great increase in the use of wage labor as the main type of labor relations (Grindle 1986:2).

With Mexico and Honduras in particular the processes of agricultural diversification have led many peasants into the socioeconomic processes of proletarianization. As Stonitch and DeWalt have pointed out, the increase in commercial agriculture has meant a reduction in labor costs. This has meant an increase in 'land-extensive and capital-intensive rather than labor-intensive commodities' and the commodities produced are based on the demand. In other words they are produced for those who can afford them (Stonitch and DeWalt 1989:223).

By addressing land use patterns in both countries Stonitch and DeWalt have illustrated how peasant situational logic is used to find new avenues of economic survival. One pertinent feature of their model is that while land use patterns and changes can be delineated on many levels, it becomes evident that the decision making processes of individual peasant households are directly linked to the larger social processes in rural areas and therefore can be seen as a useful way to understand the movement to proletarianization (205).

This is evident in Mexico in 1982 where the government could no longer service a burgeoning foreign debt (62 billion). The result of this was that the rural population found themselves in dire straits. As Grindle points out, "the poor on the margins of subsistence to begin with found mere survival increasingly difficult to ensure" (Grindle 1989:192).

Thus at the household level new avenues of economic survival had to be found. It is evident that one such avenue was migration to non-agricultural forms of wage labor. Grindle concludes:

> Undeniably, the crisis has taken a significant toll in the living standards of the vast majority of Mexicans and has required the poor to struggle even harder to ensure basic household subsistence. In rural areas the crisis forced many to increase their efforts to diversify sources of income and to become significantly more dependent on remittances from labor migration (Grindle 1989:194).

In this context it becomes apparent that the situational logic of peasant populations is of immediate concern and influence here. While the backgrounds of peasants from Central

America may differ in concrete personal terms their identification with structural features that have been most detrimental is rather apparent. Coupled with this fact is the notion that the peasant's position in relation to wealth and power is negligible (Prattis 1973:46). Therefore control over resources such as land has been a battle that they are losing.

For each peasant household that is caught up in the processes of capital penetration the situational logic that is used in determining economic survival will be specific to that household. Inherent here is the idea that a given peasant household will use to its best advantage any and all access to power where available. When land is seen as power and it is no longer owned by the majority then the level of power that a given household has is lowered. Thus it is feasible to view the level of power held by Central American peasants as being very low. In light of this fact it seems safe to say that situational logic for many peasants will imply in real terms a movement to wage labor. The following case studies will illustrate these points.

CENTRAL AMERICAN PEASANTRIES

ZINACANTAN

In Frank Cancian's studies of Zinacantan, beginning in the 1960s, the main objective is to illustrate how and why the Zinacantecos have moved away from a reliance on corn farming for subsistence. Like many peasant communities at the time this was the main avenue of economic livelihood. Cancian points out how the community for the most part moved away from such activity.

Zinacantan is a small municipio found in the highlands of Chiapas in southern Mexico where the people are of Mayan descent. The approximate 15,000 residents speak Tzotzil. The majority of the population have relied on corn farming for a living. Any wage activity was usually confined to other agricultural areas (Cancian 1987:132).

Cancian in revealing the movement away from subsistence agriculture illustrates the direct relationship between the small community and larger external forces. The main point is that in a complex way various Zinacantecos found themselves in situations of socioeconomic change that were not their own doing. A fundamental factor (and one that rings true throughout this thesis) that shaped the movement away from subsistence agriculture was the direct displacement from rented land. This was brought on by the building of a milk

processing plant. Many landowners switched to milk production and thereby displaced those who did not own but rented land (133). Also, others were displaced by the increased level of beef production in the area. Another factor of displacement was that when a dam was built at Angostura, large tracks of land in the Grijalva valley were flooded thus reducing arable land (133).

In looking at the hamlet Nachig Cancian points out that in 1967, 96% of Nachig men planted corn and concurrently 93% of the men relied on working land they did not own (132). Again, the point should be made that here in 1967 in this Mexican community, landownership, a key feature in the anthropological definition of peasantry, is low, if in fact almost non-existent.

Cancian reveals that by 1983 the community had changed dramatically. In Nachig 40% of the men no longer relied on growing corn for subsistence. Along with the loss of land, the Zinacantecos have been introduced to new forms of wage labor that act as substitutes for subsistence agriculture. These have been fruits of the industrialization process occurring in the region as a whole.

The region has been constantly open to agro-export and industrial production inputs. From the development of infrastructure (roads and dams) to ongoing export industry expansion the population has been offered new wage opportunities that it cannot pass up. Thus Cancian concludes:

> In sum, wages for construction labor increased, making such work a more attractive alternative to farming; and land became more difficult to find. At the same time, those who continued in farming faced a decline in the real price of corn and an increase in the wages they had to pay in order to recruit workers whose alternative employment was in construction. Thus, Zinacantecos were pushed and pulled out of corn farming (133).

The main point of this brief example is that even though Cancian goes on to state that in 1982 some of the Zincantecos returned to work small plots of land due to a general national economic downturn, they did so based on the alternatives available to them. This reasoning I conclude is the result of situational logic.

Returning to Prattis, a key factor of situational logic is that peasants must be seen as strategizers in social structures with variant access to resources. Resources are varied and can include 'goods, land, services, information, and other people' (Prattis 1982:213). Historically then, land can be seen as a very important resource. If it is no longer a viable route for subsistence activity then an alternative must be found.

An observer's attention must focus on the peasant's location in the social structure, the motivation and prior life experiences that all contribute to the decision that will be made concerning obtaining subsistence. This is the pertinent point since as mentioned above survival becomes the dominant focus in times of hardship. As Prattis states the peasant's ability to make choices depends not only on being a person able to act but also on the means available

to satisfy identified ends. In this case the ends are economic survival avenues. Thus the means available in Zincantan is a move to wage labor.

In light of this premise it is possible to reveal that situationally, many Zincantecos have migrated to wage labor and in so doing moved the household unit away from subsistence production off of the land.

SAN COSME

A more in depth study is that of Frances Rothstein. In Three Different Worlds (1982), Rothstein wishes to address an area of socioeconomic development that for the most part has been overlooked by anthropologists. Her focus is on industrialization which stands outside of the dominant area of agrarian change or reform studies. Rothstein points out that this area has often been neglected due to the community study tradition within the discipline. Coupled with this has been the focus on those underdeveloped areas that have been essentially exporters of raw materials (Rothstein 1982:5).

The thrust of Rothstein's argument is that in the small community of San Cosme Mazatecochco the processes of household change are directly related to the form or pattern of capital penetration in the area. This process of 'depeasantization and proletarianization' goes beyond the move to agro-export wage labor (16). Instead what occurs here is a move to wage labor in the industrial sector.

San Cosme Mazatecochco is a small community of roughly 4200 people (1970). Rothstein points out that San Cosme was similar to other communities delineated in the field of anthropology (see Wolf 1955). The reason is that for the most part, subsistence activity on marginal land, until quite recently, was the dominant mode of living (Rothstein:19).

Rothstein goes on to state that as in many such communities the people have relied on a small level of wage labor to supplement subsistence activity. However by the 1940s it became evident that many in the community became reliant on wage labor in the factories.

Like the Mexican economy in general during the 1940s, San Cosme followed the pattern of industrial growth. Rothstein states that by the 1950s, 12% of the active economic population were in the industrial sector and by 1970 the figure was 27%. Such a move to wage labor however was not within the community. Rather, the obreros (factory workers) migrated to other areas (Puebla and Mexico City) to work in the factories (22).

Rothstein's main argument then centers on the ways in which capital penetration changed the economic conditions of the community. While stipulating that this change of lifestyle was a result of industrialization and a lack of 'dynamism' in agriculture, Rothstein focuses her attention on the ways in which rural people are incorporated into this new economic system. As a main point of referential difference I would argue that a key to understanding this movement is not only the larger political economy but also the individuals

involved. If we focus on the situational logic of peasants in such economic times of change ..ien we are able to offer clarity to the larger field of political economy. Rather than narrowing our focus to the outcome we need to assess the individual reasons why one choice of economic activity is chosen over another.

Returning to Prattis, it becomes clear from the previous statements on situational logic that the combination of a person's life history and their location in a given social structure give rise to a particular type of social action. A key component of Prattis's argument is that if the productive base is altered then the power to control resources is changed as well. Therefore,

> The 'access to resources' component of discrete situational logics alters with respect to a new mode of production, there then occurs a new differential access to control over the means of production and therefore to the exercise of power (Prattis 1987:26).

Viewed in this light, the community of San Cosme while still holding onto land cannot compete with the larger agricultural enterprises and the modernizing industrial sector.

In 1970 as already mentioned the population of San Cosme was around 4200. The density for the area was 1000 people per square mile. The increasing growth rate became a problem since the rate was inextricably tied to the carrying capacity of the land. As Rothstein states:

> Even with their relatively slow population growth and before the rapid increase in the late 1960s and early 1970s, for an agricultural community with limited land resources, little

> improvement in production techniques since Colonial times, and increasing competition from large capitalist farming and industry, the population growth posed a severe problem (26-27).

Within the community there were 2360 acres of cultivated land. Rothstein, citing Nutini and Murphy (1970) points out that if the average family of five needed 3000 pounds of corn for subsistence yearly, and that each acre yielded 1000 pounds annually then each family would need three acres of land to subsist. In 1970 the average landholding per family was 2.9 acres. Thus the end result was that coupled with competition by the early 1980s 59% of the economically active were to be found in factories. (27).

A pertinent fact that should be stressed here is that San Cosme can be seen as a typical Mexican rural community for the time. Increasingly, rural Mexican communities are unable to live off of the land. As Grindle points out recent data suggests that in general for Mexico 1.9 hectares of land is the average that is available to those economically active. Also there are problems with such land and the ability to subsist off of it. In many cases the land is useless since over the years erosion (due to pressure to cultivate) has taken its toll (Grindle 1989:196). Situationally then, in light of such factors it would seem feasible to suggest that many peasants now find themselves faced with only options for survival (199).

In view of the general points mentioned above we now proceed to understanding the changes in the San Cosme household as they are directly linked to the matrix of situational logic and capital penetration.

Earlier I stated that the household can be distinguished by the patterns of social activities that are responsible for production and reproduction. Rothstein points out that within San Cosme and excluding those who have migrated to wage labor, peasants are still reliant on what they produce for consumption (33).

In the context of the household, San Cosme has been centralized around the nuclear family but quite intertwined with extended family relations. With economic activity, all members of the household unit are involved in subsistence activities. As Rothstein puts it,

> Although there is a division of labor by age and sex, in the peasant family men's work, women's work, and children's work are all part of a single process or continuum. Food is produced at one end of this continuum and consumed at the other (43).

Differing from Laslett (1972), Rothstein believes that the nuclear household unit is not the central structure after or during industrialization. Rothstein stipulates that the peasant household changes with capital penetration. While peasant households constantly reinforce existing social relations in subsistence activity, those who are moving towards wage labor in factories are becoming involved in new social relations (42-43).

In subsistence activity this is seen in the low percentage of produce consumed by wage laborers. These laborers may in fact produce a little yield off of small plots but it is only supplementary to that which they buy. This is part and parcel of the changes occurring in San Cosme households. Rothstein states that this is

> part of a more general pattern in which proletarian social relations, including family relations beyond the nuclear family, are becoming more single--stranded. The work, educational, and political activities of proletarians are bringing them into contrast with a more diverse group of people with less overlapping of ties (42).

Rothstein's main conclusion is that for those San Cosmeros who are still considered peasants, the ability to subsist off of the land is becoming tenuous at best:

> Increasingly, however, the subsistence cultivation practiced by peasant families is becoming less viable and more San Cosmeros are being forced to sell their labor on a full-time basis. As wage work increases, production, reproduction, and consumption become separated both physically and socially. The roles of men, women, and children become more distinct and their three different worlds become arranged in a hierarchical order (52).

In general we can view these changes from the context of situational logic in three ways. First, what can be considered the relevant factors of situational logic that influenced the decision of these peasants to move to wage labor? Second, what factors will influence others to migrate to proletarianization? Third, what has this meant for the peasant household?

With the first question it must be recognized outright that when we speak of factory workers, for the most part we are talking about San Cosme men. In San Cosme, Rothstein points out that 48% of those men over the age of 12 rely primarily on factory employment. These jobs are for the most part found in the coneros (textile factories) in Puebla and Mexico City.

The migratory pattern is either on a daily or weekly basis. While working long hours in harsh conditions there is little chance for vertical mobility and this avenue tends to be the one by which most men believe they can survive (82-84).

To reiterate a point, at the forefront of situational logic there lies the question of peasant livelihood: the ability to sustain a given form of livelihood from the land. When this is negated choices must be made in finding and selecting new economic avenues.

With San Cosme peasants, in line with the general patterns of subsistence for the region, the dominant resource was land. This is no longer the case. It has been illustrated that land reform was at the heart of the Mexican Revolution, but in reality today very few peasants are able to own enough land that would enabled them to live on (Grindle 1988, deJanvry 1989).

Rothstein points out a few problems that affected land reform. First, technological innovations and adaptation have in reality only benefited a few; those with large landholdings. The reason behind this was that with the introduction of new seeds, fertilizers and machinery a new package of social arrangements had to follow. For instance, with high yield seeds the attendant fertilization and irrigation conditions needed were not available to small peasant

farmers. In fact Rothstein states that this program even decreased production levels while increasing costs (59).[1]

Another problem centered on the Plan Puebla. This program was instituted to benefit those peasants who relied on the traditional methods of production. The emphasis was on encouraging peasants to reorientate their crop cycle. In general such programs have not worked. Rothstein cites a few main reasons. One, as a government initiative the resources have not been enough so that all peasants are able to benefit from the technological information. Second, being unable to secure a line of credit has meant that many are unable to even try such new methods. Most credit that has been available has gone to commercial operations. Third, there was a lack of government representatives in the field and this meant a lack of communication between peasants and government. The fourth and final factor is that peasants are at a disadvantage in the market. Since the production levels are low in peasant agriculture and there are concurrent problems (erosion, transportation costs, lack of technology) production can cost more than in larger enterprises (59-60).

Coupled with land as a resource, wealth is a fundamental aspect of San Cosme life. Wealth here entails what is available to continue the patterns of production and reproduction. Once more, if land is the source of wealth and it is no longer available then a new source must be found.

[1] See Cynthia Hewitt de Alcantara (1973-74) on the development of agrarian reform in Mexico.

Another factor that will influence the decision to change economic lifestyles is people (Prattis 1982:213). To reiterate, Prattis stated that incumbent upon the existence of resources is the fact that one must have "the power that manipulation of these factors affords" (214).

In San Cosme people are the one factor that makes the situational decision to migrate to wage labor feasible without detriment. The patron-client relationship, a strong aspect of Latin American life is a method by which people attempt to improve their lot. This relationship is dyadic and represents the "exchanges of resources between actors of unequal status" (Grindle 1977:53).

With San Cosme, Rothstein shows that the relationships are developed via three groups. Everyday San Cosmeros seek links with local leaders, and local leaders with regional/national leaders (90). In this context San Cosmeros have often turned to union leaders. In this way such leaders can offer employment in exchange for support for themselves or for their own patrons (91).

Finally we can ask what about the outcome of making the decision to migrate to wage labor? We can see from the above why many men wanted to make a new start this way but can we assume that they knew in advance of the benefits and hardships they would encounter?

From Rothstein's work the key is that San Cosmeros have been involved in such migration for 40 years. During this time undoubtedly many have seen the benefits of such labor migration. These benefits are not only economic but they are for the most part reliant on economic stability. There is the area of better educational opportunities for the children. This tends to be a key area for many of those who have moved to wage labor.

In light of these factors we now ask the second question: what will influence others to migrate? Will it be for the same reasons? Will it be due to the same economic factors? Merilee Grindle suggests that unlike those who have migrated by choice, increasingly the decision to do so will be due to survival:

> Most studies of rural areas and their development take as axiomatic that rural households have access to land and that they generate a major portion of their income from the land. Increasingly, this is a distorted view of what occurs in vast numbers of rural communities. In Mexico, landlessness and declining employment opportunities in agriculture are particularly marked (Grindle 1989:205).

From this new migrants will 1) be motivated by the historical pattern of subsistence activity and the present day infeasibility of such production. 2) The benefits of migratory wage labor practices alleviates day to day hardships from a comparative point with subsistence production. Finally, if the above two questions address general avenues of situational logic they also encompass more concrete aspects of change for the household structure.

The key difference between peasant and proletarian households is what centers around the production/reproduction cycle. With the move to wage labor the existing patterns of such a cycle are changing. As mentioned above, in San Cosme proletarianization has meant a separation of the production, distribution, consumption, and reproduction activities. No longer is the household seen as a 'continuous and compatible structure' (51-52).

In order to understand this we need to assess the roles of San Cosme men and women before and after migratory labor becomes established. Before wage labor, all members of peasant households were involved in one or another aspect of subsistence production. Before the transition, men were responsible, for the most part, for agricultural production. However, both women and children did play instrumental roles (43-44).

By way of example Rothstein illustrates how often the roles are mixed. With the production of corn, Rothstein points out that all San Cosmeros take part, "Young and old, male and female, all participate in the planting and harvesting of corn" and "Women sometimes do the men's tasks and men sometimes plant and perform other women's tasks" (43).

In the domestic sphere, women take charge but they do not work alone. Children are often available to help out. One reason for this is that the house itself is central to

subsistence activity and therefore what is often the case is you get the overlapping of domestic and subsistence activities (47).

In this context Rothstein concludes that due to the nature of the household unit, the mixture of production and domestic control, there is no strong chain of authority. Decisions that relate to all subsistence activity are mutually worked out (48). Thus Rothstein states:

> Within the nuclear family, men, women, and children all participate in both productive and domestic activities. Productive, reproductive (childbearing and child rearing), and consumptive activities are continuous and compatible. Not surprisingly, given their interdependence, relations between the sexes are relatively egalitarian (51).

Charles Wood states that changes occur within the household unit when the patterns of subsistence can no longer be maintained.

> The level of living of the rural population is thus determined by the effectiveness of the household strategies that are formulated within the limitations imposed by the socioeconomic and physical environment (Wood 1981:340).

If existing household strategies are unable to cope with the larger external forces at play (e.g.,capital penetration), then new ones are formulated and implemented.

With San Cosmeros, many have decided that situationally they are limited to options of survival and therefore find the move to wage labor the viable alternative. This in turn means new roles for the members of each household that makes the move.

Therefore, if the main avenue for such reproduction is changed, then the unit itself undergoes change. In general the focus of the proletarian household as far as who is involved in the economic reproduction of the unit centers on the man's wage labor.

As stated above, the peasant men of San Cosme attempt to establish relations with the industrial sector by way of patron-client relations. When peasant men need something they turn to factory workers or someone who at one time or another had ties to the industrial sector. Thus it is the men who are attempting to get work in the factories (93).

The key point here is that men are now seen as the main focus of economic activity. The women are no longer involved in the production process. It would seem from the outset that the community of San Cosme perceived factory work to be the domain of men or that past experience established this perception. Which ever is the case the point is that now the wage working man has the political ties outside the community.

Coupled with the establishment of political ties there is a general change in the standard and style of living. While it is clear that proletarians do not make a lot of money, they make enough to alter the household structure in various ways. The household now buys

what many San Cosmeros would call luxury items. These would include cement houses, appliances and assorted foodstuffs. By way of example Rothstein reveals that the average proletarian family eats meat three or four times a week while the peasant family hardly eat meat at all (96).

In general the men establish new social and economic relations that enable them to expand their economic opportunities. In fact they often are able to establish sidelines. These may include buying taxis or trucks or even setting up small stores. Also men become dominant in the decision making processes in the household. This is a direct result of the fact that women have now been separated from the production aspects of the household (100). This will be discussed further in the next section.

With San Cosme women, before they became members of a proletarian household, they often worked at the processing end of the production continuum. After the move they find themselves separated from production and focus more time and energy on domestic activities. Rothstein states that in general they are dependent on men's wage labor:

> Even the designation proletarian women derives, for most women, not from their own economic activity but from the factory work of their husbands or fathers, because proletarianization has meant withdrawal of women from production (67).

Rothstein bases this argument on three points. First, in general with wage labor workers do not own the means of production. Instead they sell their labor. Second, since production is no longer part of a production/reproduction cycle directly, it is apparent that the

other aspects of the cycle are not connected to it. Third, labor power is the key factor in industrial capital. Those needing the labor may (and will) dictate who may be employed and where. In this context the reproductive role of women becomes a detrimental factor (68).

Thus, if women are not involved in the direct productive arrangements of the household, what do they now do? Rothstein reveals that proletarian women do a little subsistence work but as mentioned above this is only of little value and supplementary. They find themselves for the most part assigned to domestic activities (washing, childcare, shopping, and sewing to name a few).

Through her observations Rothstein found that in general women were responsible for 80% of all domestic tasks. With a peasant mother less than 50% of the tasks were her responsibility while for the proletarian mother the figure was over 60% (72-73). While the figures are not very far apart they do reflect a trend. Since proletarian women become separated from the production process they become more responsible for domestic tasks.

In general proletarian women spend more time on consumptive than productive activities. They also begin to lose the equality they had as far as authority went (79).

While the changes that have occurred are beneficial in some ways, they have also entailed setbacks. For the proletarian men, they will now have to deal with the problems associated with capital penetration, accumulation and transformation. Most notable will be the

fluctuations in the capitalist sector as it expands and consolidates. As Rothstein states, "As monopolistic capital-intensive firms (many of them foreign owned), come to dominate the economy, unemployment rises and the large labor reserve keeps wages down" (101). Coupled with this is the fact that many wage laborers will also be faced with deskilling; the division of labor where by direct control over production is negated (102).

Proletarian women are now forced into domestic activities away from the area of production. They rely almost completely on the man's wages and as mentioned above they lose authority within the household.

In conclusion, this example has attempted to illustrate how peasants decide to move to wage labor. Fundamentally I have argued that while the forces of the Mexican political economy have been directly related to such change it is at the level of economic survival that we are able to situate the actual movement. While the focus has been on Mexico here the general problems and reasons can be found elsewhere in Central America. At this point we turn to an example from Honduras that will help to reinforce the points mentioned so far and offer another view of the movement to wage labor albeit in a somewhat different fashion.

HONDURAS: SAN ESTEBAN AND OROCUINA

Susan Stonitch has argued that like Mexico and all of Latin America Honduran peasants have been tied to the capitalist world system for some time now and the end result has been that "few rural households persist independent of wage labor, while the majority combine income from resource-poor landholdings with wage earnings" (Stonitch 1991:131). While the case studies presented here have common similarities to the Mexican examples outlined above, they differ in certain respects.

First, while the focus is similar, the movement to wage labor, the patterns of where and who are different. Here our focus will illustrate that for the men of San Esteban and Orocuina, the migration to wage labor is mostly in the commercial agriculture sector but also to non-agricultural areas. With the women migration is usually to urban centers (151).

Second, unlike the Mexican cases migration here is seen as simply one avenue open for economic improvement. In the Rothstein study migration was seen as the only real alternative open to those who decide to migrate. As Stonitch states, "When the ability to meet subsistence needs through agriculture is limited by forces beyond their control, families welcome direct participation in the cash economy as a way to make ends meet" (159).

Finally as the third point, the movement to wage labor here is not the only strategy for the household but rather one of many. Unlike the case of San Cosme where those who migrate to wage labor do so based on the real life notion of no other alternatives, the people

in San Esteban and Orocuina perceive and act on various strategies (142-143). Thus, the movement to proletarianization is not as far along as the process in San Cosme or even Zinacantan.

Since 1950 in southern Honduras proletarianization has been occurring. The main reasons for such socioeconomic change Stonitch argues has been the changing demographic patterns and an increase in capital penetration into agriculture (132).

Beginning with the expansion of capitalist agriculture after the Depression and the Second World War, Honduras like all other Central American Nations, began to feel the pull of an economic order that would draw it into the world capitalist system. Between the 1950s and the 1970s southern Honduras was developing a domestic agricultural sector while at the same time feeling the encroachment of large foreign investments in agriculture (138). This pattern of change, typical for the region, by 1965 meant that 26% of the total Honduran population were landless (Ruhl 1984:39).

After World War two, the state policy was to encourage the agro-export path of economic growth and development. The government spent heavily on improving the infrastructure (communications and transportation) needed for such expansion. The direct result was that with the growth of major export crops (coffee, beef and cotton) one saw the direct growth of a 'rural export elite'. Eventually this elite would expand landholdings. As Ruhl reports with cotton, the number of hectares planted went from 1,205 in 1950 to 18,199

in 1965. This created great pressure on the land since the cotton was grown in the densely populated region of southern Honduras (40). This leads to the second part of Stonitch's argument, demography pressure.

From the 1950s to the early 1970s the Honduran population rose by 94% and from 1974 to 1988 the figure was 65%. In the south the figures are lower due to migration and a higher mortality rate but still between 1950 and 1974 the figure was 65% and between 1974 and 1988 it was 45% (Stonitch:139).

Stonitch states that in the southern highlands population pressure and the increased landholdings of cattle ranchers decreased the amount of land available for the peasant population. She states that between 1952 and 1974 farms that consisted of less than one hectare climbed from 12% to 21% and that farms up to five hectares increased from 60% to 68%. Coupled with this was the fact that arable land for the region as a whole stayed at 10%. Thus Stonitch concludes that by 1974 30-34% of the peasant population were landless (140). The pattern here then has been like that of Central America in general. We now turn to understanding the patterns of migration and how they are related to the restructuring of the household.

To begin with, Stonitch reiterates a line of thinking that is central to this thesis: "The development of capitalist agriculture provided the means for the socioeconomic

differentiation of households which required many households to engage in a variety of off-farm activities in order to survive" (142).

From this, we can discern that the patterns, or choices of differentiation will be regulated by certain main factors. Of the three that Stonitch mentions (wage labor, land access and avenues for investing capital) only wage labor will afford most households the opportunity for survival (142).

While land has been the traditional venture for the maintenance of the peasant household it is clearly no longer the dominant venue:

> The expansion of commercial agricultural production had far-reaching effects on the economic options available to most people in the region as well as on the regional ecology. Most fundamentally, it affected the allocation and the distribution of land, and in the context of regional population growth, decreased the availability of land for most people (Stonitch and Dewalt: 1989:211).

Thus the move to wage labor seems inevitable.

In San Esteban and Orocuina, the two communities that Stonitch studied this was the case for the most part. Both communities are highland communities and are similar in size (442 and 427 residents respectively). Also they have a similar number of households: 81 in San Esteban and 83 in Oricuina. As far as land goes the communities have dry land that is used for the most part for swidden growth and availability is minimal. In Orocuina land

ownership is held mostly by 27% of the households, while in San Esteban the figure is 67% (145).

Essentially both communities follow patterns of migration wage labor that have been established for some time. In the context of situational logic, those who migrate have relied on the previous knowledge and patterns of community members. The resource open to migrants is the past experiences of people.

With migration there are two basic avenues for the men and one for the women. First, for the men there is seasonal migration to commercial agriculture and this lasts from a few weeks to a few months. This was usually to el Paraíso. The second avenue was periodic to urban centers and to the north coast for commercial agriculture. This kind was of a longer nature but also intermittent as an option (147). For the women migration often meant domestic work in urban centers (145).

From this we see a difference when compared to San Cosme in Mexico. In San Cosme the migrants were almost entirely men, while here they are both men and women. The main reason for this is that migration is not used to move the household away from the community but rather to strengthen ties to the community. Thus, both men and women use remittances from such work for this. In San Cosme there were no opportunities for the women to migrate daily or weekly.

The migration of men to wage labor in San Cosme and Zinacantan was decided as offering enough income so that the household unit of each migrant was able to stay with the community albeit with modifications.

In this light then situational logic would tell us that the decision to migrate for a short period of time is the result of looking at the available resources outside of wage labor that would enable the family household to stay put. When they are seen as being minimal, then it becomes necessary to increase the potential of the available sources, here by increasing the number of household members migrating.

Another factor that influences the people who migrate is that in both San Esteban and Orocuina is that there exists a number of female headed households. This may be reflective of the pattern of past migration (149-150).

As Grindle reports:

> Evidence from a wide variety of studies at the community level and regional level strongly suggests that, for rural households, the decision to allocate some individual or individuals to the migratory labor pool is made largely as a result of an assessment of locally available income-generating activities (Grindle 1988:30).

From this example, as well as the Mexican cases, it becomes apparent that labor migration is a typical economic avenue for survival of both Mexican and Honduran peasant populations. Grindle states that for Mexico "the search for work outside the local community has become

a critical component of complex strategies for ensuring survival, for coping with unexpected economic demands, and for investing in a more secure future" (23). While peasant households do not change completely they are economically different. Thus from this viewpoint many peasant households are beginning to become proletarian.

In light of situational logic, with Stonitch's case studies, the ability to control resources for economic subsistence is no longer the standard route. Like San Cosme and Zinacantan, the communities of San Esteban and Oricuina are faced with a changing lifestyle. In general, in all the cases reviewed here, situational logic has afforded the opportunity to bridge the gap between local peoples and given social structures. In this context capital penetration and situational decisions to migrate reveal an interconnection of economic factors with the everyday lives of those involved.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has dealt with both broad and specific anthropological concerns. In a broad sense, the focus has been on the history of anthropology as it enjoins anthropologists to pay close attention to past traditions. Specifically, the history of anthropology has been illustrative in delineating a certain theoretical and methodological direction that requires assessment. Here the concern centres on the anthropological development of Central American peasant studies.

Historically, anthropology explored peasant communities as small isolated populations. For the most part anthropologists would undertake studies that emphasized the functionality of peasant communities. Eventually such micro-specific approaches would give way to those that incorporated both micro and macro studies. The main reason for this was that peasant communities were being perceived as parts of larger communities.

In basing my arguments on the economic livelihood (on everyday realities), I have consistently stated that for Central American peasantries, new areas of economic activity are being constantly constructed. Increasingly peasant populations are becoming connected to

larger society. It is through the processes of capital penetration that existing socioeconomic and political realities are being changed.

For the discipline of anthropology, and peasant studies in particular, we need to discern whether or not research practice has followed suit. In offering a new line of inquiry (relating history, anthropology and situational logic to peasant lives) I have argued that the field has met the challenge and is working towards new and exciting projects for the future.

Anthropology has been able to initiate new theoretical and methodological avenues and practices by paying close attention to history. In this context history is relevant in two ways. First, as mentioned above, the historical context of anthropological theory and practice opens the door for new approaches if we are able to discern particular traditions as being applicable to problems in the field today. In this context the anthropological tradition of peasant studies fits the bill.

Secondly, history enjoins anthropology to look at the recorded past of the peoples in question. Such looking is situated in the context of anthropological practice. Anthropology can use the historical record of a given peasant population when attempting to understand the realities of everyday living.

The discipline steps outside the traditional boundaries assigned to it and uses methods and practices from other disciplines. With this thesis the other disciplines that have

been most useful are history and political economy. Like the above statements on history we see a vital role for political economy in the area of anthropological peasant studies. Political economy has been important in that it helps to situate the everyday lifestyles of peasant populations in relation to the larger society. We are aware then of the complex forces that are changing and shaping the economic practices of peoples who for the most part relied on subsistence activity.

While anthropology has worked with other disciplines in attempting to understand such complex processes of peasant change we cannot ignore that fundamentally anthropology still relies on certain traditional methods. Direct observation (as illustrated in this thesis) is still a key feature of anthropological practice.

In this thesis the direct method of observation explicates that in order to understand new economic realities and decisions we need to reveal those aspects of everyday economic livelihood that make up day to day peasant economy. In using situational logic I have attempted to illustrate the connection of local economy to the larger global processes that are part of the peasant economy.

Situational logic reveals how internal local decisions are often based on complex external forces (e.g., capital penetration) that intertwine with internal forces (household needs). The way to understand such complex interactions is by assessing the everyday practices of

households. This can only be accomplished by direct observation. The studies used in this thesis bear this out.

In closing I believe that this thesis contributes to the discipline of anthropology because essentially it offers an avenue of inquiry that pays close attention to the everyday realities of change in given peasant communities. Thus like peasant populations that are changing, anthropology must follow suit. An overriding concern is that while this thesis is not ethnographical it has illustrated the need for everyday empirical practice. Moreover, while it may be argued that ethnography is the key to anthropology's future I feel we need to continue the debate, critique, and reflexive thought that this thesis embodies.

James Clifford stated that " Anthropological fieldwork has been represented as both a scientific "laboratory" and a personal "rite of passage" (Clifford 1986:109). This I do not wish to argue with. Simply I beg to differ. Within the institutional parameters of anthropology, it can be charged that many constraints inhibit graduate study (time and funding seem paramount). It would seem that to the graduate student who is unable to tackle the rigor of fieldwork, a well research library thesis cannot be solely rejected on such a claim.

While we still assume that the objective laboratory and the subjective rite of passage are the crux of the profession can we not suggest a degree of critique that does steps outside these traditional boundaries? I hope that this is the case.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Richard N.

1970 *Crucifixion By Power. Essays on Guatemalan National Social Structure, 1944-1966*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Andrews, G.R.

1985 Spanish American Independence: A Structural Analysis. *Latin American Perspectives* 12:1:105-132.

Asad, T. ed.

1973 *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. New York: Humanities Press.

Barrett, Stanley

1984 *The Rebirth of Anthropological Theory*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Bartlett, Peggy F.

1989 Introduction: Dimensions and Dilemmas of Householding. In R.R. Wilk,(ed.), *The Household Economy*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Bowler, Peter, J.

1989 *The Invention of Progress. The Victorians and the Past*. London: Basil Blackwell.

Brockett, Charles D.

1988 *Land, Power, and Poverty. Agrarian Transformation and Political Conflict in Central America*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Bulmer-Thomas, V.

1987 *The Political Economy of Central America since 1920.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burkholder, M.A. and Lymon Johnson

1989 *Colonial Latin America*. New York: University Press.

Cancian, Frank.

1989 Proletarianization in Zinacantan from 1960--1983. In M.D. Maclachlan (ed.), *Household Economies and Their Transformation*. Monographs in Economic Anthropology no.3. Lanham.

Cardoso, Fernando, E. and Enzo Faletto

1979 *Dependency and Development in Latin America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Chambers, E.J. and P.D. Young

1979 Mesoamerican Community Studies: The Past Decade. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. Vol. 8:45-69.

Chinchilla-Stoltz, Norma and Nora Hamilton

1991 Central American Migration: A Framework for Analysis. *Latin American Research Review* 26.1:75-110.

Clammer, John.

1978 Concepts and Object in Economic Anthropology. In John Clammer, (ed.), *The New Economic Anthropology*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Clammer, John.

1987 Introduction. In John Clammer, (ed.), *Beyond the New Economic Anthropology*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Clammer, John.

1975 Economic Anthropology and the Sociology of Development: 'Liberal' Anthropology and its French Critics. In I. Oxaal, T. Barnett, and D. Booth (eds.), *Beyond the Sociology of Development*. London: Routledge and Paul.

Clifford, James.

1986 On Ethnographic Allegory. In Clifford, J. and G. E. Marcus (eds.), *Writing Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cockcroft, James.

1983 *Mexico: Class Formations, Capital Accumulation, and the State*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Cohn, Bernard.

1980 History and Anthropology: The State of Play. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22:1:198-221.

Cohn, Bernard.

1981 Anthropology and History in the 1980s: Towards a Rapproachment. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 12:2:227-252.

Cook, Scott.

1966 The Obsolete 'Anti-Market' Mentality: A Critique of the Substantive Approach to Economic Anthropology. *American Anthropologist* 68:323-345.

Cutler, Anthony et al.

1977 *Marx's 'Capital' and Capitalism Today*. Vol. 2. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Dalton, George.

1971 *Economic Anthropology and Development. Essays on Tribal and Peasant Economies*. New York: Basic Books Inc.

Darnell, Regna

1982 The Role of History of Anthropology in the Anthropology Cirriculum. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 18:3:265-271.

deJanvry, Alain et al.

1989 Land and Labor in Latin America from the 1950s to the 1980s. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 16:3:396-424.

duToit, Brian

1990 People on the Move. Rural-Urban Migration with Special Reference to the Third World: Theoretical and Empirical Perspective. *Human Organization* 49:4:305-319.

Edel, Matthew.

1967 Jamaican Fishermen: Two Approaches in Economic Anthropology. *Social and Economic Studies* 16:4:432-439.

Eggan, Fred.

1968 One Hundred Years of Ethnology and Social Anthropology. In J. O. Brew, (ed.), *One Hundred Years of Anthropology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Evans-Pritchard, E.E.

1962 *Essays in Social Anthropology*. London: Faber.

Evers, Hans, D. et al.

1984 *Households and the World Economy*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Fabian, Johannes.

1983 *Time and the Other: How Anthropology makes its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Foster, George.

1965 Peasant Society and the Image of Limited Good. *American Anthropologist* 67:293-315.

Goodman, D. and M. Redclift

1982 *From Peasant to Proletarian*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Grigg, D. B.

1980 Migration and Overpopulation. In P. White and R. Woods, (eds.), *The Geographical Impact of Migration*. London: Longmans.

Grindle, Merilee.

1977 Patrons and Clients in the Bureaucracy: Career Networks in Mexico. *Latin American Research Review* 12:1:37-66.

Grindle, Merilee.

1986 *State and Countryside. Development Policy and Agrarian Politics in Latin America*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Grindle, Merilee.

1988 *Searching for Rural Development: Labor Migration and Employment in Mexico*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Grindle, Merilee.

1989 The Response to Austerity: Political and Economic Strategies of Mexico's Rural Poor. In William L. Canak ed. *Lost Promises: Debt, Austerity and Development in Latin America*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Gunder Frank, Andre

1976 *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Gunder Frank, Andre

1990 A Theoretical Introduction to 5000 Years of World System History. *Review* 13:2:155:248.

Halperin, Rhoda

1984 Polanyi, Marx, and the Institutional Paradigm in Economic Anthropology. In Barry L. Issac (ed.), *Research in Economic Anthropology*. Vol. 6:245-272. Greenwich, CT. JAI Press.

Halperin, Rhoda

1985 The Concept of the Formal in Economic Anthropology. In Barry L. Issac (ed.), *Research in Economic Anthropology*. Vol. 7:339-367. Greenwich, CT. JAI Press.

Halperin, Rhoda

1988 *Economies Across Cultures*. London: Macmillan Press.

Halperin, Rhoda and J. Dow eds.,

1977 *Peasant Livelihood: Studies in Economic Anthropology and Cultural Ecology*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Hansen, Roger, D.

1971 *The Politics of Mexican Development*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

Hewitt de Alcantara, C.

1973 The 'Green Revolution' as History: the Mexican Experience. *Development and Change* 5: 25-44.

Hindess, Barry and Paul Hirst.

1975 *Pre-Capitalist Modes of Production*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Kearney, Michael.

1986 From Invisible Hand to Visible Feet: Anthropological Studies of Migration and Development. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15:331-361.

Kuper, Adam.

1973 *Anthropologists and Anthropology: the British School, 1922-1972*. New York: Pica Press.

Laclau, Ernesto.

1971 Feudalism and Capitalism in Latin America. *New Left Review*. Vol. 67.

Laslett, P.

1972 Introduction: the History of the Family. In P. Laslett and R. Wall (eds.), *Household and Family in Past Time*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, Oscar.

1951 *Life in a Mexican Village*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Lewis, Oscar

1968 *La Vida: a Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty*. New York: Random House.

Love, Thomas. F.

1989 Limits to the Articulation of Modes of Production Approach: the Southern Peru Region. In B.S. Love, M.W. Foley, and T.F. Love (eds.), *State, Capital, and Rural Society*. Boulder: Westview Press.

McGrane, B.

1989 *Beyond Anthropology: Society and the Other*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Milanich, J. T. and Susan Milibrath

1989 *First Encounters*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press.

Mills, C.W.

1959 *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mintz, Sidney.

1985 *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. New York: Viking.

Moore, H.

1988 *Feminism and Anthropology*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Murphy, Robert.

1971 *The Dialectics of Social Life: Alarms and Excursions in Anthropological Theory*. New York: Basic Books.

Nutini, Hugo and T. Murphy.

1970 Labor Migration in the Tlaxcala-Puebla Area, Mexico. In W. Goldschmidt and H. Hoijer, (eds)., *The Social Anthropology of Latin America*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Park, George.

1990 *The Flying Armchair: Anthropology to Think With*. Memorial University of Newfoundland: Department of Anthropology.

Polanyi, Karl et al.

1957 The Economy as Instituted Process. In *Trade and Market in the Early Empires*. Glencoe, IL.: Free Press.

Poullion, Jean.

1971 Traditions in French Anthropology. *Social Research* 38:1:73-92.

Prattis, J.I.

1973 Strategizing Man. *Man* 8:46-58.

Prattis, J.I.

1982 Synthesis, or a New Problematic in Economic Anthropology. *Theory and Society* 11:2:205-228.

Prattis, J.I.

1987 Alternative Views of Economy in Economic Anthropology. In John Clammer ed., *Beyond the New Economic Anthropology*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Radcliffe-Brown A.R.

1939 Introduction. In John F. Embree, *Suye Mura, a Japanese Village*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Radcliffe-Brown A.R.

1957 *A Natural Science of Society*. Glencoe, IL.: Free Press.

Redfield, Robert

1930 *Tepoztlan, a Mexican Village: A Study of Folk Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Redfield, Robert.

1960 *The Little Community and Peasant Society and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Reynolds, C.W.

1970 *The Mexican Economy: Twentieth-Century Structure and Growth*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Robinson, David. ed.,

1990 *Migration in Colonial Spanish America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roseberry, William.

1989-a Anthropologies, History, and Modes of Production. In B. S. Orlove, M. W. Foley and T. F. Love.(eds.), *State, Capital, and Rural Society*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Roseberry, William.

1989-b *Anthropologies and Histories: Essays in Culture, History, and Political Economy*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Roseberry, William.

1988 Political Economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 17:161-185.

Roseberry, William.

1986 The Ideology of Domestic Production. *Labour, Capital, and Society*. Vol. 19, 70-93.

Roseberry, William

1983 *Coffee and Capitalism in the Venezuelan Andes*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Rosenthal, Gert.

1985 The Lessons of Economic Integration in Latin America: the case of Central America. In A. Gauhar ed., *Regional Integration: the Latin American Experience*. London: Third World Foundation.

Rothstein, F.

1982 *Three Different Worlds: Women, Men, and Children in an Industrializing Community*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Ruhl, Mark, J.

1984 Agrarian Structure and Political Stability in Honduras. *Journal of Interamerican Studies* 26:1:33-68.

Sahlins, Marshall

1969 Economic Anthropology and Anthropological Economics. *Social Science Information* 8:5:13-33.

Schmink, Marianne

1984 Household Economic Strategies: Review and Research Agenda. *Latin American Research Review* 19:3:87-101.

Scholte, Bob.

1972 Toward a Reflexive and Critical Anthropology. In Dell Hymes ed., *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Random House.

Scott, James.

1976 *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Scott, James.

1985 *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Protest*. London: Yale University Press.

Silverman, Sydel.

1979 The Peasant Concept in Anthroplogy. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 7:1:49-69.

Singer, Milton.

1976 Robert Redfield's Development of a Social Anthropology of Civilizations. In John V. Murra ed., *American Anthropology: The Early Years*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Skidmore, Thomas, E. and Peter H. Smith

1984 *Modern Latin America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stein, Stanley, J. and Barbara, H. Stein

1970 *The Colonial Heritage of Latin America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stern, Steve, J.

1983 The Struggle for Solidarity: Class, Culture, and Community in Highland Indian America. *Radical History Review* 27:21-45.

Stolcke, Verena

1991 Conquered Women. *Report on the Americas* 25:5:22:27.

Stonitch, Susan, C.

1991 Rural Families and Income from Migration: Honduran Households in the World Economy. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 23:1.

Stonitch, Susan, C. and Billie R. DeWalt

1989 The Political Economy of Agricultural Growth and Rural Transformation in Honduras and Mexico. In Sheldon Smith and Ed Reeves (eds.), *Human Systems Ecology*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Taylor, W.B.

1985 Between Global Process and Local Knowledge: an Inquiry into Early Latin American Social History, 1500--1900. In Olivier Zunz ed., *Reliving the Past. The Worlds of Social History*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Todorov, T.

1984 *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*. New York: Harper and Row.

Torgovnick, Marianna

1990 *Gone Primitive: Savage Intellects, Modern Lives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Trigger, Bruce.

1986 Ethnohistory: the Unfinished Edifice. *Ethnohistory* Vol. 33:3:253-267.

Tylor, Edward B.

1891 *Primitive Culture*. 2 Vols. 3rd ed. London: John Murray.

Weeks, John.

1985 *The Economies of Central America*. New York: Holmes & Meier.

Wilk, Richard

1989 Decision Making and Resource Flows Within the Household: Beyond the Black Box. In Richard Wilk ed., *The Household Economy*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Wolf, Eric.

1955 Types of Latin American Peasantries: A Preliminary Discussion. *American Anthropologist* 57:452-471.

Wolf, Eric.

1959 *Sons of the Shaking Earth*. Chicago: University of Chicage Press.

Wolf, Eric.

1966 *Peasants*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Wolf, Eric.

1966 San Jose: Subcultures of a Traditional Coffee Municiplality. In Julian Steward ed., *The People of Puerto Rico*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Wolf, Eric.

1968 *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century*. New York: Harper and Row.

Wolf, Eric.

1982 *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wood, Charles. H.

1981 Strutural Changes and Household Strategies. A Conceptual Framework for the Study of Rural Migration. *Human Organization* 40:4:338-344.

Yanagisako, Sylvia.

1979 Family and Household: the Analysis of Domestic Groups. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 8:161-205.