

PN-ABB-544
54950

**SMALL RUMINANT
COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH SUPPORT PROGRAM**

**TECHNICAL REPORT SERIES
NUMBER**



PN 4006

Department of Rural Sociology
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri 65211

July, 1986

93/102-10

74

BARTER AND NON-MONETARY EXCHANGES
OF LABOUR IN A HIGHLAND PERUVIAN COMMUNITY

by

Paula Bilinsky

*810 4006
180 S*

SP... PM...

*810
B...*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was carried out as part of the United States Agency for International Development Title XII Small Ruminant Collaborative Research Program under Grant Number AID/DSAN/XII-G-0049 and AID/DAN/1328-G-SS-4093-00 in collaboration with the Instituto Nacional de Investigacion y Promocion Agraria. Additional support was provided by the University of Missouri.

In Peru, my thanks first to the staff of SR-CRSP working in Lima. Benjamin Quijandria's acceptance of my work and willingness to put the needed resources at my disposal was a comfort during difficult times. To Maria Fernandez, I owe a large debt of gratitude for her aid in getting me really started on my field research. No researcher could possibly have asked for more friendly and supportive companeros than the SR-CRSP Community Project team. Nancy Kajjak, Hugo Salvatierra, Marcelino Inga and Luis Coronado helped smooth my way in the community with words of wisdom and patient explanations of what was really going on. To my field assistant, Elsa Huanuco, no amount of thanks could express my gratitude for her friendship and loyalty and the amount of hard work she put in for me. Of course, many thanks go to the people of Aramachay who accepted my presence in the community and answered all my seemingly childish questions.

Many thanks to Anne Swindale for her support. Her positive attitude helped me see the light at the end of the tunnel. To Keith and Kety Jantgaard, on both continents, I wish to express my gratitude for their guidance and hospitality. Many thanks to David Guillet, who advised me while in Peru and in the U.S. Last, I would like to thank my family for their support throughout this long adventure.

RESUMEN

El presente estudio es un trabajo de investigación que se llevó a cabo para evaluar el papel que juega el trueque junto con otras formas de intercambios no-monetarios de mano de obra en el sistema de producción campesina en la Sierra Central del Perú. El objetivo del estudio fue el lograr entender mejor el sistema de subsistencia del campesino a través de un análisis como un sistema total de producción dentro de su contexto socio-económico.

La problemática del trueque e intercambios no-monetarios de mano de obra se enfocó desde un punto de vista teórico de la articulación de los modos de producción. Se interpreta la comunidad campesina como representante de un modo de producción no-capitalista y la economía Peruana de alrededor como el modo de producción capitalista. Estos modos de producción tienen relaciones sociales de producción fundamentalmente diferentes. El aspecto crítico de esta teoría es el punto de articulación o interrelación entre estos dos modos de producción. Se propuso en el estudio que el trueque y el intercambio no-monetario de la mano de obra representan un punto importante de articulación entre estos dos modos de producción.

Los datos para el estudio fueron recogidos durante seis meses en el año de 1,984. La comunidad campesina de Aramachay fue escogida como sede del trabajo, y está ubicada en el Valle del Mantaro (300 kilómetros al este de Lima, Perú). Aramachay es una comunidad campesina representante de esa zona. La comunidad mantiene una fuerte organización comunal, además de la producción familiar. Los comuneros producen una variedad de productos, que incluyen papa, trigo, y cebada, y también crían ovinos, vacunos, y cerdos. Su economía es básicamente de subsistencia, pero algunos productos son destinados para los mercados grandes del valle.

Un amplio rango de prácticas abarca el trueque y el intercambio de mano de obra. Se distinguen las siguientes categorías: productos por productos, productos por mano de obra, y mano de obra por mano de obra. Los productos agrícolas como papas o granos son intercambiados por otros productos agrícolas o artículos fabricados como frazadas u ollas, empleando unidades de volumen (en forma tradicional) o de peso (de acuerdo a los valores del mercado). Como muchas familias no disponen de suficiente mano de obra, es necesario en ciertas épocas del año buscar ayuda de otras familias. Muchas veces esta labor se adquiere a través de relaciones como ullay que involucra un intercambio de cantidades iguales de productos en forma inmediata ó futura (como un porcentaje de la cosecha). Finalmente, un sistema "al partir" es prevalente en la comunidad, en el cual dos familias se acuerdan dividir los factores de producción y cosechas de una parcela. Por ejemplo, una provee la tierra, mientras que la otra provee factores de producción como semillas y fertilizantes. Se divide la mano de obra y se comparte la cosecha. Existen muchas variaciones en este sistema.

Hay varias razones que explican la ocurrencia de estos tipos de intercambio. La mayoría de los comuneros prefieren limitar sus transacciones en efectivo, debido a la alta tasa de inflación en Perú, tendiendo ésto a favorecer intercambios de tipo producto por producto.

Prácticas tradicionales basadas en relaciones sociales de largo plazo-- como los intercambios conducidos por los llameros--son todavía comunes en los Andes peruanos. Dentro de la comunidad misma, el sistema de com-padrazgo facilita la persistencia de estos tipos de intercambio tradicional en vez de cambios basados en el mercado. Finalmente, re-laciones como al partir fueron ventajosas por una carencia de factores específicos de producción, como semilla o tierra.

En el trueque, como una indicación de la articulación de dos modos de producción, se puede observar claramente la intrusión de una men-talidad de mercado, lo de las relaciones tradicionales de producción donde se intercambian productos por trabajo. Actualmente existe vacilación en usar las patrones tradicionales porque es más ventajoso comercializar los productos y utilizar el ingreso para pagar a la mano de obra que indemnizar a la mano de obra con los productos mismas. En tal caso hay ambigüedad en el tipo de relaciones de producción entre estos dos particulares. ¿Es la persona proveyendo la mano de obra un obrero o un integrante en una relación social tradicional? Este es el tipo de pregunta que hay que hacer cuando se quiere comprender un sistema de producción campesina. Hay que investigar el sistema de producción campesino como un total, como también su vinculación a la economía nacional, antes de enfocar a sus diversos componentes, como es la pro-ducción de ovinos.

ABSTRACT

This study examines the role that barter and non-monetary exchanges of labor play in the production system of peasants living in the Central Andes of Peru. It should be possible to better understand the peasant's subsistence system by examining the total production system within its socioeconomic context.

The issue of barter and non-monetary exchanges of labor was approached from the theoretical standpoint of the articulation of modes of production. The peasant community is viewed as representing a non-capitalist mode of production and the larger Peruvian economy as a capitalist mode of production. Each of these has fundamentally different social relations of production. The crucial aspect of this theory is the point of articulation or interrelationship between the two. It was proposed in the study that barter and non-monetary exchanges of labor represent an important point of articulation between the two.

The data for this study were collected over a six month period in 1984. Aramachay, the study community was located in the Mantaro Valley, some 300 kilometers east of Lima, the capital of Peru. Aramachay is a typical comunidad campesina for that area. The community maintains a strong communal organization in addition to each family's own production. Community members produce a variety of crops including potatoes, wheat and barley as well as raising sheep, cattle and pigs. Theirs is basically a subsistence economy; however some products are marketed through large markets in the valley.

There is a wide range of practices which fall under the terms "barter" and "labor exchange." These may be divided into the following categories: product for product, product for labor, and labor for labor. Various agricultural products such as potatoes or grains are traded by volume (traditional measures) or weight (usually according to market values) for other agricultural products or for manufactured goods such as blankets or pots. Because most families cannot provide all necessary labor, they must, at certain times of the year, seek extra household labor. Often this labor is acquired through relationships such as ullay which involve an exchange of equal amounts of products either immediately or in the future (such as a percentage of the harvest.) Lastly, a system of sharecropping called ai partir is prevalent in the community. Most commonly this involves two families agreeing to split the inputs and results of a plot. One party provides the land while the other provides inputs such as seeds and chemicals. Labor is shared and the harvest is shared. There are many variations of this system.

There are a variety of reasons behind these types of exchanges. Most community members prefer to limit their cash exchanges due largely to the high inflation rate in Peru. This makes product for product exchanges more attractive. Traditional trading practices, based on long-term social relationships such as the llamero trade, are still common in the Peruvian Andes. Within the community itself, the system of compadrazago aids in the continuance of these types of traditional exchanges rather than market exchanges. Lastly, relationships such as

al partir were sought out due to a lack of specific production factors such as seed or land.

Barter is an indication of the articulation of two modes of production. This can be seen clearly in the intrusion of a market mentality as opposed to the traditional relations of production when exchanging a traditional amount of products for labor. There is now some reluctance to give a traditional measure because these products may be sold for a greater cash value than would have been paid in cash wages. In this case there is ambiguity in the nature of the relations of production between two parties. Is the person being asked to work as a wage laborer, or is he/she engaging in a traditional social relationship? These types of questions need to be addressed in understanding a peasant production system. The production system as a whole and its relationship to the national economy must be examined before we can begin to speak about what is occurring in any particular aspect of production, such as sheep raising.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
The Problem	1
Barter and Non-Monetary Exchange: Some Theoretical Perspectives.	2
Nature of Barter	2
Barter and Sale in the Andes	3
Theoretical Approaches to Peasant Economy	4
Modernization Theory	4
Dependency Theory	5
Modes of Production	6
Research Setting.	9
Aramachay--A Mantaro Valley Community	9
The Community Structure	10
Subsistence Strategies	12
Agro-pastoral System in Aramachay	13
Methodology	15
Barter Practices.	17
Animal Products	17
Labor Exchanges	17
Conclusions	21
Why Barter?	21
Barter as an Articulation of Modes of Production	23
Implications for Further Research	24
Glossary of Spanish Terms.	26
Bibliography.	27

THE PROBLEM

This study was to examine the role of non-monetary exchanges of goods and services in the subsistence strategy of peasants in the Andes of Central Peru. By examining the peasants' entire production system--taking into account agriculture, animal husbandry and trading, within their socioeconomic context--an increased understanding of the strategies they employ to insure their survival should be possible.

Traditionally there have been two ways of looking at the peasant in Latin America. The first, known as modernization theory, locates the peasant on the traditional side of a traditional-modern continuum. The peasant economy was seen as backward and stagnant, as opposed to the dynamic modern sector. Any interaction between the two was initiated by the modern sector, and usually to the advantage of the traditional sector.

The second view, generally called dependency theory, asserts that since the 1800's, all of Latin America has been an integral part of the world capitalist system. Thus the peasant living in the countryside was seen as participating in the capitalist system the same as any proletarian worker in a capitalist, industrial nation. The peasant is subject to the same forces of capitalist exploitation; and these completely dominate his subsistence possibilities.

Both theories have different perspectives on the survival of the peasant in Latin America. Modernization theory views peasant subsistence as limited by its internal characteristics. The peasant improves his lot through the influence of the modern sector; and the greater that influence, the quicker the peasant will improve his production level and lifestyle. Dependency theorists, on the other hand, argue that it is precisely the influence of the modern capitalist sector which has caused stagnation in the peasant economy, and that it is in the best interests of the modern sector to keep peasants in a dependent position.

I feel that neither of these perspectives adequately addressed the reality of the Peruvian peasant. The stereotype of the ignorant, unprogressive peasant has long since been disproven and replaced by the picture of the peasant managing, often in inventive ways, a complex set of production and distribution factors. One of the most interesting of these strategies is the use of barter and other non-monetary exchanges of labor and services. These exchanges reflect Peruvian peasants' involvement in traditional agricultural and social systems as well as in the capitalist economy. The question is: what is the impact of this involvement on the peasants' agricultural system? It is my view that barter and non-monetary exchanges are an indication of peasants' participation in a non-capitalist mode of production articulated with the larger Peruvian capitalist mode of production.

This study was undertaken with the goal of viewing the peasants' production system in its entirety rather than examining individual production factors, such as livestock or potatoes, in isolation. Before one can begin to examine or change any one aspect, it is necessary to

understand the entire production system and how it functions. This included an understanding of the social system as it interacted with the economic system.

Mode of production theory has been criticized for its lack of concrete data as it attempts to link specific modes of production with existing peasant societies (Humphrey, 1981). This study, by applying it to a real set of data, addresses this issue by examining a distinct case of an articulation of two modes of production in an Andean community.

BARTER AND NON-MONETARY EXCHANGE: SOME THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

Nature of Barter

Barter is the exchange of a good or service for another good or service, rather than for cash money. Equivalences may vary according to the relationship between exchangers or the types of products being exchanged. Equivalences may remain unchanged for years, or they may change daily. The nature of the exchange itself may be what Western society looks upon as an impersonal commercial exchange; or it may be an exchange affecting many levels of interpersonal relationships. Thus, one must be aware of the great variety of phenomena which are routinely labeled "barter."

Chapman (1980) provides an extensive classification of barter in all its forms in all types of societies--primitive to modern. She defines barter, at its most basic level, as "...a transaction between two living social human beings or groups; it always occurs in a social and psychological situation." (1980:36) Chapman distinguishes between barter and other forms of direct exchange by arguing that barter "...is a purely economic transaction, involving no mutual obligation between the partners." (1980:39) This point is debatable. It is arguable that there are no direct exchanges which are purely economic as the very nature of two human beings' coming together involves social interaction (Mayer, 1974). This perspective guides much of the reasoning that follows.

Humphrey (1985) defines barter as "... the more or less simultaneous exchange of one good for another with the possibility of bargaining ..." (1985:49) Her approach to barter and other forms of direct exchange is closer to my own. Humphrey argues that barter "refers only to a social transaction and not to economic values ..." (1985:50) Humphrey emphasizes the social side of such exchanges while Chapman emphasizes the economic. In my view, barter is both a social and an economic transaction. The social relationship between the two parties directly affects the economic aspect of the exchange. The reverse is also true.

Traditional economic analysis has viewed barter not as an element of economy, but as a precursor to monetary exchange (Humphrey, 1985). Barter is the first, primitive step in the evolution toward an economic system based on money (Chapman, 1980). The distinction (even incompatibility) between money and barter is referred to frequently in both economic and anthropological literature (Humphrey, 1985). However, there

are few who would deny the existence of barter in nations generally considered to be totally monetized.

Barter and Sale in the Andes

Barter and its role in Andean society was the subject of various studies in the early 1970's. A number of these were compiled in Reciprocidad e Intercambio en los Andes peruanos (Alberti and Mayer, 1974). In their opening chapter, Alberti and Mayer discuss the importance of barter in a setting dominated by communal production systems. They contrast the works of Burchard and Custred with the work of Orlove. Burchard and Custred view barter as a means of acquiring needed goods from ecological strata which the peasant no longer controls. They do not see these exchanges as having a profit motive. Orlove, on the other hand, demonstrates that barter is used as a means to accomplish a series of for-profit exchanges beginning with the peasant and leading to the national and international market.

One of the most recent studies of barter in the Andes was Orlove's (1982) study of the distribution and exchange of fish in the Lake Titicaca area. Orlove presented three positions on the relation of barter and cash sales.

- 1) Barter and sale are different. This is based on the belief that the system of barter in the Andes is a unique, distinctive alternative to cash sale. Barter is traditional (thus based on personal ties) while sale is a modern, western exchange.
- 2) Barter and sale are the same. Orlove posits that there is no difference between a barter exchange and a cash sale, neither in form nor content. They are both merely different ways of obtaining goods.
- 3) Barter and sale are related. Barter serves the interest of the native Andean culture whereas cash sale represents the dependency on the capitalist economy which is fostered through such linkages. Cash sale serves the purposes of the capitalist sector.

The first two propositions are eventually rejected by Orlove. He indicates that the third proposition (which he terms Marxist) is closer to explaining the pattern of barter and sale that currently exists in the Lake Titicaca area. Fishing acts as a support for the subsistence economy while providing a low cost staple food for the larger Peruvian society.

A number of studies dealing with barter have recently been published, Ecology and Exchange in the Andes (Lehman, 1982). Two in particular address the effect of barter on highland communities. Harris (1982) identified two different forms of barter. The first involved an exchange of local produce for manufactured goods that can be given monetary value. The second is an exchange of use-values where the objects being exchanged are produced by those doing the exchange. The latter is generally expressed in exchanges by volume rather than weight, e.g. using a poncho to measure the quantity of potatoes to be exchanged

for that poncho. Harris hypothesized that this transaction indicates an avoidance of a monetary exchange. Among the Laymis (the ethnic group Harris studied) barter was a social obligation among members of their own group; but among outsiders it was predicated solely on the need to obtain certain products. Thus barter forms part of a pattern of the circulation of goods (Harris, 1982).

Bradby (1982) defined barter as those exchanges which arise between various ecological levels. She described the typical llama train circuit and the types of exchanges which took place in this context. In addition, she identified marketplace exchanges that took on certain barter characteristics. These exchanges occurred primarily with products from different ecological zones and were generally the result of a personal relationship between the exchangers.

Finally, Smith's article, "Socioeconomic Differentiation and Relations of Production among Rural-Based Petty Producers in Central Peru, 1880-1970" (1979), addressed the issue of barter and non-monetary exchanges of labor. Smith traced the process of differentiation among petty producers by examining the characteristics of specific relations of production. He identified two types of reciprocal arrangements to acquire extra-household labor: ullay, a direct and equal exchange of labor; and minka, the exchange of part of the harvest for labor. Barter or trueque is identified as an activity previously done by all households in the Mantaro Valley of Peru with households in the jungle. Because of increasing commercial agriculture in the valley, this is no longer the case (Smith, 1979).

While all these studies looked at barter among peasants in the Andes, only Smith and Harris dealt with the issue within a specific community. Rather than add to the body of literature defining barter, this study examines the role that barter plays in the economy and social structure of a particular Andean community.

THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO PEASANT ECONOMY

Modernization Theory

Modernization theory, as applied by some social scientists in the 1960's, rested upon the following assumptions: (1) Western, industrialized nations are model states and all nations should strive to become like them. (2) Traditional societies haven't developed because they lack some required cultural traits but they have the possibility of becoming modern. (3) The major barriers to modernization are internal to the society. The peasant class is generally considered to be a barrier to modernization and the elite are seen as the instigators of modernization. (4) The impact of Western nations is considered to be beneficial, if considered at all. (Omvedt, 1971)

The term "modernization" indicates a movement from a traditional society to a modern society (i.e. Western, industrial nation) (Omvedt, 1971). The factors indicating any nation's place along this continuum include monetization, urbanization, industrialization and political participation. Bernstein (1971), identified a number of critical issues

arising from this perspective. These criticisms are as follows. The traditional-modern continuum is conceptually weak because it defines traditional only as the opposite of modern. Any societies that do not fit into the preconceived categories are shunted into residual categories. This brings up the second objection--the accusation that the entire theory is based on an ethnocentric definition of what all societies should be like. This is an especially telling point when one tries to universalize a definition of "modern." Often modernization is taken as synonymous with Westernization. This raises difficulties in categorizing nations which have achieved identified characteristics of modern nations (for example, political participation) but through non-Western means. Bernstein's last criticism centered around another aspect of modernization. There are some modernization theorists who attempt to reduce modernization to the development of certain "universal" character traits that will allow modernization to occur. These character traits centered mainly around an ideal type of dynamic, innovative individual. There is a problem in linking types of individual personalities to social structures and processes (Bernstein, 1971).

Dependency Theory

Dependency theory as a means of explaining social change emerged later in the 1960's. It was a reaction to early modernization theory as well as to orthodox Marxism. The theory of dependency (or dependent development) was most clearly outlined by Andre Gunder Frank (1979). His theoretical perspective was based on several theses.

First, Frank rejected the classic Marxist notion that all nations proceed through the same series of stages towards capitalism. In his view, "The now developed countries were never underdeveloped though they may have been undeveloped." (Frank, 1979:104) Underdeveloped nations cannot expect to develop in the same way as Western nations. In fact, by the very nature of the world capitalist system, they will not develop.

Second, underdevelopment cannot be viewed as a result of internal social, political and economic characteristics of a nation. Instead, it results from the relationship between what Frank terms peripheral nations and center or metropolitan nations. Frank considered these relations to be structured by the world capitalist system and to be essential to its workings. This type of imperialistic relationship was also reflected at the national level, thereby creating centers and peripheries within Third World nations.

Last, in addition to rejecting classic Marxist theory, he also rejected the conventional "dualistic" interpretation of underdevelopment. Unlike the dualists who maintain there are two completely separate sectors (capitalist and traditional), Frank argued that every part of the world has been penetrated by capitalism: "...the expansion of the capitalist system over the past centuries effectively and entirely penetrated even the apparently most isolated sectors of the underdeveloped world." (Frank, 1974:104) Capitalist relations of production and forms of exploitation characterize both the metropolis and the satellite nations (Foster-Carter, 1971).

Both Ernesto Laclau (1971) and Colin Henfrey (1981) find a number of theoretical shortcomings in Frank's self-proclaimed Marxist theory. Laclau indicated Frank's main analytical problems lie in his definition of capitalism. According to Laclau, "Frank totally dispenses with relations of production in his definitions of capitalism" (1971:25) by abstracting relations of production to such an extent that an extremely imprecise definition of capitalism is produced. Thus, Laclau argued, Frank is unable to arrive at any concrete analysis of social reality.

Henfrey focused on Frank's lack of conceptual rigor in his class analysis (or again, lack thereof). Frank's theory of class formation is, as Henfrey states, "... an ideal non-history--not one of which classes have formed and how, and the relationships between them, but of those which inevitably failed to do so..." (1981:34) In addition, he points out Frank's tendency to view circulation as the "...exclusive determinant of political economy." (1981:37), thus limiting the ability to analyze variations in social formations through a dependency standpoint. Frank's lack of clarity of the level of analysis also created difficulties Frank's theory has had its greatest applicability at a macrolevel in viewing development and underdevelopment as "partial, interdependent, structures of one global system." (O'Brien, 1975:12)

These criticisms contributed to the interest in a different Marxist approach to underdevelopment articulation of modes of production. Clammer (1975) identifies Dupre, Rey and Meillasoux as instrumental in clarifying the debate. Foster-Carter (1971), also credits Laclau (1971), with drawing out the essential conceptual differences between dependency theory and modes of production.

Modes of Production

Laclau was one of the first to address modes of production directly. His article "Feudalism and Capitalism in Latin America" (1971) analyzes Frank's works in order to address these theoretical issues. Laclau emphasized that one must view "...the system as a whole and to show the indissoluble unity that exists between the maintenance of feudal backwardness at one extreme and the apparent progress of a bourgeois dynamism at the other." (1971:31) A mode of production was defined by Laclau as a complex of social productive forces and relations. The most crucial aspect of this complex, for Laclau, was ownership of the means of production.

A mode of production was defined by Long and Richardson (1978) as the combination of production forces (material resources, labor power, instruments of labor and associated technological arrangements) and the social relations of production (ownership and control of means of production, creation and appropriation of the social product). Articulation, in the general sense of the word, is a combination of these modes of production and their subsequent interrelations at various 'levels' (economic, political and ideological) (Henfrey, 1981). These relationships take the form of one dominant mode that has controlling influence over subordinated modes.

Rey proposes a more specific definition of the term articulation by introducing the element of time. (Foster-Carter, 1978) Articulation

must be looked at not as a static relationship but as a process in time. This articulation must be seen, says Rey, as a series of confrontations and alliances between classes or combat between two or more modes of production (Foster-Carter, 1978). Rey adds more specification to his definition by addressing the two most critical issues for this struggle between the capitalist and peasant mode of production--labor supplies and raw materials.

Another manner of looking at the concept of articulation is in terms of a system as a whole. Schejtman (1984) defines articulation as "...the relationships (or systems of relationships) which link the sectors in question one with another and with the rest of the economy, forming an integral whole (the economic system) whose structure and dynamics are determined by (and in turn determine) the structure and dynamics of the parts." (1984:286)

Schejtman locates this articulation in the exchange of goods and services between the non-capitalist and capitalist modes. These exchanges are asymmetrical and are an indication of a transfer of surplus from the subordinated mode (peasant or non-capitalist) to the dominant mode (capitalist.) The articulation occurs specifically in the exchange of products the peasant produces or needs to purchase for his reproduction, and in the market for agricultural day laborers hired at a rate below that needed for their reproduction. (Schejtman, 1984)

The theory of articulation of modes of production has its roots in the writings of a group of French anthropologists: in particular, Meillasoux, Godelier, Dupre and Rey. These writers were influenced by Althusser's interpretation of Marx. (Clammer, 1975) Clammer refers to this group as neo-Marxist. While accepting the basic tenets of Marx's later writings, they rejected the notion of a single path in the development of capitalism. Instead, they favored a more flexible view allowing for the interaction of two modes rather than the complete destruction of one mode by the next (for example, the proposition that feudalism was completely replaced by capitalism in Europe). These Marxist writers--who have identified 'dominant' and 'subordinate' modes of production--proposed that the subordinated forms are necessary for the reproduction of the dominant mode of production (i.e. capitalism). (Long and Richardson, 1978)

Dupre and Rey's argument rejects the characterization of economic systems on the basis of forms of exchange by comparing it to a Marxist analysis of the complex of relationships between capitalist and 'traditional' modes of production. They deny liberal economic stand that the market economy and traditional economy are completely separate and unrelated. (Clammer, 1975)

Rey identified three 'stages of articulation' of modes of production. First is the primary connection in which capitalism supports the pre-capitalist mode. (Foster-Carter, 1978) In this stage capitalism gains access to raw materials, but the pre-capitalist social formation is not overruled by capitalist relations of production. The pre-capitalist mode of production is reinforced. For example, in West African lineage societies, slave trading reinforced existing modes of production by

maintaining the elder's control over his tribe through the threat of slavery.

Second, capitalism becomes established while using and subordinating the pre-capitalist mode. The preexisting modes of production are now based on capitalism without completely adopting capitalist relations of production. At this stage it is common to see a partial separation of the peasant from his land. In Africa this is generally seasonal. Because the farmer needs cash to pay taxes, he must migrate to the cities for a time, to earn cash; thus he must restrict his farming activities. In Latin America, this is more likely to occur on haciendas. The peasant must give part of his labor and products to the hacienda owner after being moved to less fertile land.

Third is the complete disintegration of the pre-capitalist mode. According to Rey, the Third World has yet to enter this stage. (Foster-Carter, 1978) It has completely occurred only in the United States, where even the agricultural sector operates totally within capitalist relations of production. The stages proposed by Rey reflect his belief that the social formations created by the articulation of two modes of production suggest "...capitalism's increasing (and eventually total) ability to look after itself." (Foster-Carter, 1978:61)

Meillasoux (1981) argued that the peasant mode of production serves the needs of capitalism by providing a seasonal work force. The peasant sector originally had the ability and resources within itself to be self-sustaining; but when the capitalist market is forced upon it, the balance of the peasant sector changed. The capitalist sector draws off labor but cannot completely convert the peasant sector into full wage earners because of the increased burden of reproduction of the work force currently taken care of within the peasant mode of production. Thus pre-capitalist forms are "...being both undermined and perpetuated at the same time." (Meillasoux, 1972)

A number of authors specifically discuss Andean modes of production. However, the articulation between these and the capitalist economy is not always examined. Scott (1976) identified the articulation of the peasant mode of production in the sierra with the capitalist economy as represented by the coastal plantation agriculture in Northern Peru. This articulation operates through the labor market. Bradby (1975) discussed the peasant mode of production, 'resistance' to capitalism. But she does not go into the mechanisms by which the peasant mode is articulated with the capitalist mode in Peru, except to indicate that political means (the Agrarian Reform) may be used by the capitalist formation to restructure agriculture in order to convert the peasant mode of production.

Long (1975) identified various non-capitalist modes of production in Peru and argues that exchanges between modes take place in the form of labor, capital, technology, as well as non-economic means such as political activity and kinship relations. He focused on the social relations of production and their influence on these exchanges.

Finally, Orlove (1986) approached the question of the articulation of two modes of production specifically by examining the continued existence of barter among fisherman on Lake Titicaca. He characterized

fishing activity as a petty commodity mode of production and viewed barter as a means for a peasant to withdraw from the capitalist economy in the event of a crisis in that sector.

When looking at the peasant communities of the Peruvian Andes, it becomes clear their agricultural system is not based solely on capitalist means of production. Such agricultural producers have been termed small commodity producers. However commodity production (i.e. capitalist producers) depends upon free markets in land, labor and credit. (Freidmann, 1980) Taking each of these factors separately it can be seen that the Peruvian peasantry has a different means of reproducing itself.

As indicated in a recent survey of communities between 3,100 and 4,000 m. in the Mantaro Valley of Peru, there is no free market for land (Swindale, 1985). The survey showed that no land was sold in 1984 in any of the communities (Swindale, 1985). The labor market is also restricted. Although some labor is expressed in capitalist terms of a wage earner, this is by far the least used relation of production. Most labor comes from the family unit and from reciprocal labor exchanges (Swindale, 1985). In addition, the extension of credit in these communities is extremely limited (Swindale, 1985) and there is very little division or specialization of labor. Most peasants grow a variety of crops and there are few specialized workers. Thus, it can be said their "...household reproduction is based on reciprocal ties, both horizontal and vertical, for renewal of means of production and subsistence..." rather than the reproduction of small commodity producers whose "...circuits of reproduction... intersect with those of commodity, landowning and banking capital, and with markets of labor power, in abstractly determined relations." (Freidman, 1980:162)

There is no doubt that capitalism is fully operational in the larger Peruvian economy and the Andean peasant operates in both these sectors. The critical question is, how does one analyze elements of the peasants' society and economy in order to understand his rationale for economic and social behavior? In order to answer this, it would seem that one must look at both modes of production in which the peasants are engaged as well as what results from the articulation of the two. Barter and non-monetary exchange form a critical juncture between these two spheres.

RESEARCH SETTING

Aramachay--A Mantaro Valley Community

The Mantaro Valley is located about 300 kilometers directly east of Lima, the capital city of Peru. It is an interandean valley which stretches some 70 kilometers between the department capitals of Jauja and Huancayo (see map 1). Altitudes range from 3,100 to 4,000 meters above sea level (masl) if one includes the valley floor and the lower reaches of the mountains rising on either side. Mayer (1979) divides the valley ecosystem into three zones. It is in the intermediate zone (3,500 to 4,000 m.l) that 55 percent of peasant communities in the Mantaro Valley are located. (Swindale, 1985) This intermediate zone may be further divided into two subzones on the basis of maize production in the lower

and the relative importance of livestock over agriculture in the higher. (Swindale, 1985) Aramachay, the site for this study, is located in the upper subzone; however, it is at the very lowest end, thus putting it at an altitude in between the two subzones.

Within communities of the higher subzone, Aramachay is close to average in terms of territory, number of families and percentage of family heads who are comuneros. (Swindale, 1985:13 and 25) Aramachay enjoys a fairly high level of services compared to most communities in both subzones. However, it lacks electricity. As part of the higher subzone, Aramachay has a somewhat higher educational level than communities in the lower subzone, both in education of the family head as well as of women.

In line with both subzones, the principal activity is crop production with livestock as a secondary activity. The relatively low average number of sheep per family in Aramachay (23 versus an average of 47 for the entire higher subzone) reflects its position between the two subzones. (Swindale, 1985) This is also reflected in cultivated family land. Families in communities in the lower subzone have an average of one and a half hectares. The higher subzone averages a little over one hectare per family. Aramachay averages one and three-fifths hectares per family, which would be high even for the lower subzone. (Swindale, 1985)

Aramachay was originally an estancia belonging to five herders. The community received its name (which means cave of stone in Quechua) from the rocky hillsides that surround the present village. To reach the community one must follow a nine-mile dirt track which climbs up from the valley town of Sincos. This road passes through other small communities that were once, like Aramachay, political annexes of Sincos. One passes small agricultural plots that belong to community members. Coming over a rise, the village proper is spread out around the plaza with its municipal building and church bell tower. Beyond the village, to the right, is a large open field where bulls sometimes graze. Behind this field is another path leading into higher grazing land and other communities. To the left of the village a road lined with eucalyptus leads to another open area used for threshing in July and August. On the hillsides all around are small, plainly delineated plots, some no larger than one-eighth hectare.

The Community Structure

Aramachay is more than just a collection of houses and land. It was officially recognized as a Comunidad Indigena in 1937. At this time it became independent of Sincos and was given some 4000 hectares of land. On June 24, 1969 its legal status was changed to a Comunidad Campesina under the new Agrarian Reform.

The status of Comunidad Campesina means a number of things to the people of Aramachay. All heads of households (including widows and single mothers) have the right to decide if they want to become a legal member (comunero) of the community. This entails responsibilities as well as benefits. This choice is given to a person when he turns 18 or moves into the community. If he chooses to become a comunero he must pay an initial fee and agree to attend all assemblies and work parties and to

obey the rules for the use of communal resources. In return each family is entitled to use communal resources such as communal grazing lands, water for irrigation, the right to rent irrigated land and to a share in the profits from the sale of agricultural products grown on community land or from the sale of products from the communal sheep flock.

The community totals 1689 hectares of territory from 3,680 to 4,200 (masl) (Swindale, 1985). The six hectares of communal agricultural land were planted in 1984 with the following crops: 1 hectare in potatoes, 1 hectare in wheat, 1/4 hectare in tarwi, 1 hectare in barley, leaving 2.75 hectares or 45 percent of the communal land in fallow. These crops, or the profit from their sale, are divided among the comuneros. The communal sheep herd consists of 150 animals usually grazed on 431 hectares of community grazing lands. The community hires a fulltime herder. Major management decisions are made by a committee of six community members.

The remaining land is considered to be privately owned. Most people have legal title to their lands; however, occasionally there arises a case of a plot without legal papers. The average amount of land controlled by a single household is one and three-fifths hectares. (Swindale, 1985) This land is likely to be spread out among as many as 30 parcels. According to community leaders there were no sales or purchases of land in the community in 1984. (Swindale, 1985)

Comuneros of Aramachay are required to attend any communal work parties (faenas) that are voted upon by the general assembly. The type of work done in faenas varies according to the time of year and the agricultural cycle. The following is a partial list of tasks accomplished at faenas during 1984: building a schoolroom, planting potatoes and other agricultural tasks, cleaning out drainage ditches and streams, weighing and docking the communal sheep and fixing the road bed. Generally on the day of the faena, the assembly bell is rung at 10:00 and people begin gathering by 11:00. Discussion of the work to be done or community issues may last anywhere from a half hour to three or four hours. On some occasions the actual work is postponed because the discussion stretches on too long.

Attendance is mandatory for comuneros. If they cannot or choose not to attend, they have three alternatives. First they may send someone from their household to replace them as long as that person is capable of doing that particular task. The second alternative is to pay a fine. The fine is determined by the general assembly of the community according to the task. The last alternative is to hire someone to do the job. However this is difficult because most grown men have to fulfill their own obligations. It is not uncommon for more wealthy community members to pay the fine rather than attend the faena. This is frowned upon by other community members as shirking.

The community has both a primary and a secondary school built in 1934 and 1979, respectively. Both were built with community labor and are maintained by the State. Both employ seven teachers. In 1984 the high school graduated 20 students. The other service available to community members is a full-time nurse stationed in a medical post in the community. The post has a supply of basic medicines and is supported by

the Peruvian Ministry of Health. The closest hospitals are in the cities of Jauja or Huancayo (approximately an hour away by car). There are also several members of the community who are trained to give injections, and one woman who is a trained midwife.

Under agrarian reform law, the community is governed by a council of administration which consists of a president, vice president, secretary, treasurer and three spokesmen. In addition, there is a vigilance council which oversees fines and punishments. Beyond these two councils is the general assembly of all registered comuneros. Auxiliary authorities are the delegates from each barrio who oversee barrio attendance at communal work parties, and inspectors who verify damage done to crops or animals by other community members.

Community authorities are elected by the General Assembly and serve two years. State authority is represented by a Lieutenant Governor (political authority) and Municipal Agent (administrative authority). These officials are elected by the General Assembly for two-year terms.

There are four barrios in the community. These were created to control communal work. Membership in a barrio has nothing to do with residence. Each barrio has a spokesperson who takes attendance at communal work parties. One joins a barrio at the time that one becomes a comunero. Usually an 18 year old would enter the barrio to which his family belongs; however, it is possible to change barrios by petitioning the authorities. It is also possible to be rejected from a barrio by the consensus of the other barrio members. Most authorities in Aramachay belong to barrio #3.

Subsistence Strategies

Each household controls different resources which they exploit to support themselves. The main aim of community families is subsistence rather than profit. Most families share the same lifestyle. All live in similar housing; none have electricity or sanitary facilities. While there are some families with greater resources, such as a truck or grain mill, there are no great class differences. There are no landless community members, and all members derive their sustenance mainly from agriculture.

The best way to assure subsistence is to spread the risk out among activities, and this is reflected both in production and marketing choices. Production in the central Andes is highly diversified, both in subsistence strategies and staple production (Guillet, 1981; Swindale, 1985). By maintaining both agriculture, animal husbandry and trade skills, the loss of income or production from one sector will not be devastating. Planting a number of different crops assures that the family will have some food to eat throughout the year. If all crops are successful a fairly balanced diet can be achieved (Brush and Guillet, 1985; Hutchinson, 1973). In addition, one finds a diversification of production choices in horizontal space (Guillet, 1981). Most peasants in the community have a detailed knowledge of the microclimate of each of their fields and plant accordingly.

Although each household controls an average of less than two hectares of land, these plots are dispersed across various altitudes, microclimates and soil types. Land is generally cropped in a traditional system of crop rotation that in the past included a long fallow period; however recent evidence shows that for families in Aramachay, only 13 percent is left uncultivated. (Swindale, 1985)

All families have both agricultural fields and animals. If asked, most heads of households will designate agriculture as their major occupation. The second most common occupation listed was herder. Besides agriculture and animal husbandry, many people have other skills such as carpentry, tile making and house building.

Agro-pastoral System in Aramachay

Community members support themselves by a complex mix of resources and skills. It is basically a subsistence system where the goal is to maintain a minimal existence. Agriculture takes the majority of time and effort; however, pasturing and animal management are constant activities. There are several peak periods of labor demand during the agricultural cycle (harvesting, planting and weeding), whereas there is only one peak period for animal management (shearing and marking).

A major part of people's time is spent trying to provide for the reproduction of the family--which includes disposing of their surplus. In this, too, the community members exploit different methods to assure family subsistence. People have several options for obtaining the goods they need. They may consume their own produce; this is by far the most common. Products may be bought or bartered from other community members and/or from traders coming to the community. There are seven small stores in the community which stock a limited selection of manufactured goods such as noodles, sugar, candles, liquor and soap.

Another possibility is to travel to larger towns or cities to sell surplus products and to buy manufactured goods and vegetables. Nine miles away is the town of Sincos. South beyond Sincos lies the department capital of Huancayo, which has one of the largest Sunday markets in the country. At the northern end of the valley is Jauja, a provincial capital. Jauja has a major market on Wednesdays and Sundays. This market is preferred by community members because there is less thievery. It is not uncommon for a crop of potatoes to be sold directly from the field to a middleman from Lima. At potato harvest, these middlemen travel around the highlands buying by the truckload. The last option is taking goods all the way to Lima--not a feasible strategy for most households. Only those families which regularly conduct business and have family in Lima would be able to sell their products there.

Agricultural products grown in the community include a mixture of grains and tubers. A few families have small vegetable gardens. The major crop is potatoes and it is the one crop on which chemical fertilizers and pesticides are routinely used. Other crops, in order of importance, are barley, wheat, ollucos, broad beans and corn. Crops are also fertilized with animal manure from household corrals. Family herds generally consist of several different species. Sheep are the most

numerous followed by cattle and pigs. Household animals such as chickens, guinea pigs and rabbits are also kept.

The most time consuming animal husbandry task is herding. Most animals are grazed between five and seven hours a day. Herds may consist of all animal species (sheep, cattle, pigs and burros) or they may be separated into groups. At least one adult (over 15 years old) will usually accompany any herd over five animals. Often, younger children herd two or three individual animals (especially pigs). At times herding is done early in the morning by older school children and then again in the afternoon following school. However, when grazing land close to the community is limited or depleted this is impractical and someone must take the herd to pastures located up to two hours away for the entire day. These pasturing arrangements vary according to agricultural tasks. For example, during the harvest in April, one family keeps their cows at home to be pastured by the children and hires a herder to look after their sheep. Another option is to bring the animals along to the fields being harvested.

One major husbandry practice is marking new animals in the family and communal herd. This is a common practice throughout the Andes and takes place during the month of Carnival (February) over three days: Sunday, Monday and Tuesday. The first day is dedicated to marking the community's herd; the whole population of the community participates. The second and third days the family herd is marked.

The ceremony involves ritual coca chewing the night before the marking. New animals are marked the next day with colored ribbons and distinctive notches in the ears. In addition, lambs are usually docked. The entire ceremony takes place in a festive atmosphere. Although it takes approximately only two minutes to mark each animal, the ceremony lasts all day. At the end, a sheep shaped stone is buried in the corral along with coca leaves to assure good production in the coming year.

The marking of the communal herd is similar. In this case community members give the herder presents of rice, sugar, potatoes and sometimes money. In 1984 the herder marked 62 lambs with the assistance of 140 adults. This ceremony is practiced annually but has apparently decreased in quality over the years. According to some informants, past feasts were more elaborate and a cow was killed to provide meat for the party. This is no longer done. There are some families in the community who mark their animals without such a festival. These are generally Evangelicals who no longer believe such actions will bring better production.

The community of Aramachay has an animal dip usually used once a year. The dip provides income for the community, since a charge is made for each animal. Some community members also drench for internal parasites.

The following table is an indication of the yearly cycle of animal husbandry practices.

TABLE 1: CALENDAR OF ANIMAL HUSBANDRY

	JAN	FEB	MARCH	APR	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
HERDING	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
BREEDING	X	X	X	X								X
MARKING		X	X									
SHEARING				X	X							
DIP				X	X							
DRENCHING	X	X							X	X		

Source: SR-CRSP Community Characterization (unpublished)

METHODOLOGY

Data for this study were collected as part of the Small Ruminant Collaborative Research Support Program (SR-CRSP) in Peru. The SR-CRSP is a collaborative effort of: the U.S. Agency for International Development; several American universities and institutions; and in Peru, INIPA (Institute of Investigation and Promotion of Agriculture and Animal Husbandry). My research was carried out as part of a multidisciplinary SR-CRSP team working in a highland community. The goal of the community project was to validate, in a community setting, the technological packages designed by the various components of the SR-CRSP to improve sheep production.

The principal methods of data collection were participant observation, informal interviews and a dynamic interview schedule. A sample of ten families within the community was selected, and extensive interviews were conducted over seven months. These interviews were done while participating in the everyday work and home environment of the community. Interviews were unstructured and covered most topics concerning production and disposition of crops, live animals and animal products such as meat, milk and wool. Questions concerning family labor and extra-household labor were also asked. The most useful interviews were accomplished while working along with community members. Not only was I able to recheck the validity of some data gathered in other ways, but also trust between myself and community members was strengthened. I kept a daily record of my activities as well as my observations of the community members' activities and comments.

Because of the size of the community, it was not possible to know every person. However, many people in addition to the ten selected households were interviewed. Interviews were also done with comerciantes (traders) coming into the community to determine where they were from, what they were trading with or for and why they came to Aramachay. Some census data were provided by the medical post in the community.

Aside from interviews I attended community meetings and communal work parties. During these activities, attitudes toward the general condition of life in the community were often expressed. The political and public values of the community were revealed in issues that came up for discussion and action in the public forum. Long term planning for the community was also discussed in these forums. The community project team, including myself, was often asked to participate in community

fiestas. This permitted an excellent opportunity to observe the religious and social reality of not only individuals but also the community as a whole.

Supporting data were provided by a dynamic interview schedule covering most aspects of crop and animal production. This form was constructed and utilized by members of the community project. The interview schedule was applied to the same ten families in the community that were interviewed by me. The interview schedule was updated approximately every week with the latest information about the family's agricultural cycle and animal husbandry activities. The unit of analysis used in the case of participant observation and the dynamic interview schedule was the household. I chose to focus on the household rather than the individual because all production decisions are made at that level. Productive resources such as land and animals were seen mainly as belonging to the family. Interaction on the community level was done by representatives of the household. A household generally consisted of a nuclear family (the average family size is 6) and usually one or two members of the extended family. (Swindale, 1985)

As a methodology, participant observation gives the sociologist the ability to understand, in a more holistic fashion, the society and economy of the peasant. Drawing from a long and respected anthropological tradition, active participation in the everyday life of the people being studied allows a better perspective into their rationale. Although demanding, such participation is essential for one to be accepted in the eyes of community members. Truth and trust can be gained only by responding in kind. The difficulties in such an approach relate to the researcher's proximity to the subjects. It becomes hard to separate the "data" from the reality of the people with whom you are living.

Communities in the Mantaro Valley are particularly interesting for a study examining the interaction of two modes of production because at this moment in history those living in the communities exist with "one foot" clearly in each. Western contact in the valley dates back to the opening of mines in La Oroya in the early 1900's. The rail line linking the valley with the capital began operating in 1895. Yet communities at higher altitude levels (above 3200 meters) have a relatively traditional manner of production. Although they have access to major markets they still engage in barter. For this reason the community in which the SR-CRSP was working was a good place to undertake my research. Because there were team members already living in the community, I was able to benefit from the rapport they had already established with community members. After being in the community several weeks, I began to choose the families for my cases. With the aid of other team members, I selected ten families from among several generally perceived economic and social status levels (Schejtman, 1984). Two of these families were dropped due to an unwillingness to cooperate and inavailability for interviews. Other families were then added over the next month or so. Among these families there were certain individuals who were more cooperative than others and became key informants for general information about the community.

BARTER PRACTICES

Animal Products

Most sales of live animals took place in the market of Chupaca, near Huancayo. This market was established in 1924. The majority of sellers and buyers there from the Mantaro Valley. Activity is greatest in the months of harvest, March through June. There are five different plazas in which products are sold. Manufactured products were sold in Independence Plaza grains and vegetables in the Plaza of Provisions; pigs and sheep in the Plaza of Pigs; cows, horses and burros in the Plaza of Bulls; and lastly poultry and food products in the Plaza of Grains and Poultry. In addition to individual buyers there were many wholesalers present.

Community members who regularly barter and buy animals in communities located at higher altitudes, usually dispose of these animals at the market in Chupaca. A typical series of transactions would be as follows: 1) buy or make clothing, 2) barter this for animals or agricultural products in other communities, 3) sell these in Chupaca for cash. In addition, community members who wish to dispose of an animal--such as one man who wished to buy a younger, more tractable bull--go to Chupaca to sell the animal at what is perceived as a good price.

Some eight years ago there was a weekly market for livestock in Aramachay. Sellers and buyers came from the surrounding communities. This market was discontinued because of the high fees charged by the community for selling spaces. Animals were still marketed in the community on fiesta days such as Corpus (June 3-5) and Santiago (August 3). Animals were staked out on the community football field. Sales were usually quite brisk due to the many people in the community on those days. It was quite common to sell plow bulls after a year or two of maturity; several informants indicated that they would take advantage of these special markets to sell some of their livestock.

Animal manure was also sold and bartered within and outside the community. Among households manure was a medium of exchange mainly for labor. A common exchange was one bag of manure for one day of labor of gathering and carrying manure to fields. This was a common transaction between someone with few animals and a community member who has a large herd. The community also sold the manure produced by the communal herd. Last year all the manure from the herd was sold to another community in the Mantaro Valley.

Cow manure was also used as a source of cooking fuel. Women collected the manure while out pasturing and around the house. It was quite common for members of nearby communities such as Usibamba to come to the community with dried manure (bosta) to trade for potatoes or grain. Bartering for dried manure lessens the need to search for firewood--a time consuming task.

Labor Exchanges

In line with other communities in the central Andes, in Aramachay labor was recruited in several ways (Guillet, 1979). The first was

through the family. If no one can be located among the immediate family, other family members were approached. The next most common course was to ask among friends and ritual kin (compadres), and then among known workers (Guillet, 1981a).

The search for extra-household labor was often time consuming. During peak labor times, it was best to arrange for laborers several days in advance. It was, however, not uncommon to see individuals hurrying from house to house in the evening attempting to secure help for the next day. During the very busiest times, part or all of the salary may be paid in advance in order to assure that workers will show up.

Labor was usually paid in one of three ways or some combination thereof. The first was a straight wage. This wage varied according to the sex; women always received less than men. There was little disparity in wage levels among community members. The same wage was paid for all agricultural tasks despite their nature. Regardless of the manner of final payment, workers received some combination of the following things while they are working: coca, aguardiente, food and chicha. This is true throughout the Peruvian Andes (Guillet, 1981; Mayer, 1974; Orlove, 1985).

The second way to acquire extra-household labor was by offering products (generally the product that the labor was for). This may be a percentage of the harvest or sunay. Sunay was generally the result of labor during planting time; the percentage was in the form of a certain number of rows of the crop. These rows were left to be harvested by the worker. Because of the highly differential yields, these rows were generally spread out over the entire plot. Sunay may be seen as a manner of assuring food stocks for the next season at current prices.

Alternatively, the laborer may receive an agreed upon quantity of the product on completion of the task. This type of exchange was more common during harvest. Generally, the marketplace value of agricultural products given exceeds the cash. Traditionally the amount of products was calculated in arrobas (approximately 11 ½ kilograms). There was some indication this practice was declining in the community because the products given were being sold rather than used as food stocks, as originally intended.

The last manner of paying for labor was by exchanging labor--the ullay. This type of reciprocal labor is very common in the Andes and throughout South America. (Erasmus, 1965) Ullay is called by other names in other parts of Peru such as ayni, waje-waje and minka. (Erasmus, 1965 and Mayer, Guillet, 1981a) Ullay was most common during peak labor times when the only way to obtain labor was to agree to help other community members with equal labor. Most informants stated that they prefer to practice ullay with either family members or close friends. This way they were assured an equitable and timely exchange of labor. These types of exchanges were generally between people of equal social and economic status, and helped foster further ties and dependency among community members (Alberti and Mayer, 1974). The following table indicates the peak uses of ullay labor in Aramachay and other communities in that subzone.

TABLE 2: AGRICULTURAL TASKS FOR WHICH ULLAY IS USED

Land preparation	1.0%
Planting	83.3%
Cultivation	2.1%
Harvest	81.3%

SOURCE: Swindale, 1985

The assurance of labor at a later date was crucial to the comunero. At any one time, a limited number of persons in the community were willing to work as peons. By building ullay relationships the comunero can be relatively sure of extra labor at peak times. It obligated his own time but there were many tasks, in particular harvesting, that were more effectively done by several people in a short period of time, rather than by one person over a long period. Sometimes during one agricultural task, you might see several different labor arrangements at work. For example, in one field during the planting of potatoes the immediate family might be working, along with one person working for sunay and several men working to cancel a cash debt to the owner of the field.

Another form of labor exchange, also sometimes called ullay, was certain group work. It was not uncommon for several young men to collectively agree to work each other's fields (as a group). This was usually done for agricultural tasks which require large amounts of labor such as weeding and cultivating. In this manner particularly difficult tasks were performed rapidly and in the company of friends.

Labor for herding and other animal husbandry tasks was normally provided by the family household. Pasturing was the most time consuming task, and was generally assigned to women and children. Animals might be separated by species, or they might all be herded together. Marking and shearing was done by both men and women. When labor demand for agricultural tasks was great, herders might be hired to take care of the animals for a short time.

Ullay could also be done for animal husbandry tasks. Most commonly, a woman would ask a family member or neighbor to pasture her animals in exchange for the same service at a later date. For example, Sra. Amalia and Sra. Manuela are sisters-in-law who herd each other's animals when the other is overburdened with other tasks. If herds were fairly large, ullay might also be requested; however, the exchange might not be exactly equivalent in this case.

A more festive form of labor exchange involved the yearly marking of sheep. There was not necessarily a direct exchange of equivalent labor or a fixed wage, but it is understood that in the future a similar favor could be legitimately asked. A certain level and quality of food and drink was expected during the marking festivities. This work party was considered by community members to be the most enjoyable of the year.

A form of exchange falling between balanced reciprocity and exchange of products was al partir. Al partir refers to a form of sharecropping in which two farmers combined their resources to produce a crop on a

single field. These choices varied according to the crop planted as well as the relationship between the two parties. Al partir could also refer to an arrangement for caring for an animal. Al partir (for cropping) involves any of the following ways of dividing costs and benefits. Individual plots may be divided between an al partir arrangement and an owner-operator arrangement.

TABLE 3: VARIOUS AL PARTIR RELATIONSHIPS

	LAND	SEED	FERTILIZER	INSECTICIDES	LABOR	HARVEST
FARMER A	X	X			harvest	1/2
FARMER B			X	X	weeding/ planting	1/2
FARMER A	X	X	X		plant/weed	1/2
FARMER B		X		X	plant/weed	1/2
FARMER A	X		-	-	equal	1/2
FARMER B		X	-	-	equal	1/2
FARMER A	X					1/3
FARMER B		X	X	X	all	2/3

Al partir for animals varied according to the relationship of the two people. With cows, the person caring for the animal kept the first offspring, and the owner the second. The person caring for the animal was responsible for feeding and veterinary care. Generally the arrangement was terminated after the second offspring, and the animal was often sold. With pigs, the process was basically the same, with the first litter going to the owner. In both species, if the two partners were family members the process was reversed, with the first offspring going to the owner.

The complex combination of work arrangements that each family chooses can best be illustrated by looking at a short period of time during the planting season to see how one family accomplished its tasks with limited resources. The Espinoza family had approximately 29 plots located in various sites around the community. Five plots were planted in al partir arrangements. They provided only the land in one instance, whereas several of the others were a case of dividing all inputs and labor in half. In addition, because they had several cows from which they got milk to make cheese (which is a major source of cash for them), they rented nine parcels of forage. The rent for one plot was paid in cash, one in a combination of cheeses and manure, one with the labor of their plow, and the rest with a combination of milk and cheese. To plant the potatoes in their own plots they relied mainly on their own household except for the plowing--for which they gave one row of potatoes at harvest (sunay). All the family was busy planting so a neighbor agreed to look after their animals for three days for 1/4 arroba of wheat and 1/2 arroba of chuno (freeze-dried potatoes). Shortly before harvest time, the family ran out of potatoes so they were forced to begin trading cheeses with another person in the community to acquire potatoes. When

their potatoes were ready to harvest they indicated that they would prefer to do ullay with family members.

CONCLUSIONS

One encounters various problems in using the vocabulary of economics to express relationships that are not purely economic, but also social in nature. The aim of this study is not to equate non-monetary exchanges with a non-capitalist mode of production or monetary exchanges with a capitalist mode, but rather to show that non-monetary exchanges may be either part of a non-capitalist mode of production or part of a capitalist mode of production.

Why Barter?

Community members sometimes engaged in non-monetary exchanges because they lacked cash. (Erasmus, 1965 and Guillet, 1981b) This deficiency forced them to make exchanges outside the regular marketplace, bypassing, for a time, the cash component of an exchange within the capitalist mode. A typical exchange would be to take goods to a major market (Sincos, Juaja, Huancayo), sell them to a middleman for cash and then immediately buy goods with the cash. By selling only the amount of produce they need for that immediate cash need, community members limit their interaction with cash markets.

If a community member lacks money for the bus ticket to go to market, or the time to go, he would look for other ways of acquiring the goods he needed. Agricultural products can be acquired in several ways without leaving the community--for example from traders from surrounding communities. Traders came with products that may or may not have been produced in Aramachay. They were often flexible in the type of payment they desired. However, a trader may insist on payment in one type of product only (most commonly potatoes). The majority of traders came from Aco, Vixo or Usibamba. Those from Aco generally bring processed food or manufactured products to exchange for potatoes and grains. From Vixo they brought onions, carrots, seed corn and alfalfa to get barley, potatoes and broad beans. Persons from Usibamba brought dried animal manure (bosta), straw, fresh cheese and onions for potatoes and grains.

The best documentation of this type of trade was the traditional seasonal trading between llameros (llama pack trains) from higher altitudes and valley community members. (Custred, 1972, Orlove, 1977 and Mayer, 1974) The llameros customarily came down to communities such as Aramachay in the months of June, July and August. They brought with them animal products such as wool ropes, wool bags, dried meat and fresh meat. They traded mainly for potatoes and grains (barley, wheat and corn) and rarely, if ever, accepted cash for their products. The ties which linked these traders with community members were often long-term and fairly specific with regard to obligations. These relationships were often made more explicit through compadrazago. These traders brought some products that were not usually available through regular market channels and were not produced in the community. In exchange, community members provided basic food stuffs at a lower price than the larger markets.

There were some community members who engaged in relatively large-scale trading by bulking agricultural products to be traded or sold in central markets. These people traveled to neighboring communities with manufactured goods such as hats, aprons and pots to trade for agricultural products--particularly grains and small animals. They generally did not venture far from their home community unless they heard that a community or area had a surplus of some product. Usually these traders spent two or three days a week gathering their products, and then one day at a large market (Jauja, Huancayo or Chupaca) selling their goods and buying new trading stock. This entire system was based on personal relationships among traders or buyers and sellers. An established relationship sometimes allowed credit on either side or more generous trades. This system permitted agricultural or animal products to be disposed of or acquired without entering the market. Only after the products were taken out of the community did they become part of the capitalist system of circulation.

Products could also be acquired by exchanging one's labor. This was more fully discussed above. However, the point was that it was not necessary to enter the capitalist market as a worker. There existed within the peasant community, mechanisms to secure sufficient labor and adequate food stocks without participating in capitalist relations of production (i.e. selling labor power or commodities). This was true for agricultural products as well as animal products such as wool.

Some products were bartered simply because they were not available to be bought. One example was alfalfa hay. Toward the end of the dry season pasture became very scarce and most people did not have the land to grow fodder. Few had any stored feed for their animals to tide them over this period. There were, however, a few community members who grew alfalfa to use as fodder, but they did not produce much of a surplus. It was only worthwhile for them to trade this surplus if they were very short on cash. But it is also advantageous to trade the hay for the promise of labor at a future date. During planting season labor was difficult to acquire because everyone was planting at the same time. Trading was one way of assuring labor for that time.

There were two main reasons why community members participate in al partir: lack of land or lack of labor. Community members sought counterparts to provide these inputs. Poorer community members were generally those with less land and labor resources, so they were the ones most commonly participating in al partir. In the case of Sra. Antonia, a widowed mother of two children, al partir was her main recourse in accomplishing her agricultural tasks. She had some land (although not a lot) but little household labor to draw on. Her access to cash was limited and she had little extra food to give to peons. In years of poor harvests, lack of seed also entered into such decision making. To buy seed was very difficult and expensive in bad years; so the only way to acquire it was to offer land or labor power in exchange.

Al partir is not based on exchanging labor power for sustenance. Rather, it is a traditional relationship based on an exchange of inputs so both sides can accomplish a common goal--production of a crop. While poorer households most often participate in al partir exchanges, this was not an indication of an exploitative relationship. There was no clear

division of labor (both parties generally contributed labor); and while one party does own the land (as opposed to communal land) this land was not part of the capitalist system of rent.

Labor exchanges and goods exchanges were aided by ties of ritual parenthood or compadrazago. Compadrezago linked households together in a number of ways. Each type of compadrazago entailed different responsibilities on the part of both parties. For example, becoming a godparent to a child at baptism was a serious responsibility. It entailed looking after the child's well-being for the rest of his life. On the other hand, becoming a godparent for a life event such as a boy's first haircut was not nearly so large a responsibility, but was more a form of an initial savings account for the child.

When looking for trading partners or labor, most community members first turn to their immediate blood relatives. The next group from which they chose a partner was their compadres or ahijados. This greatly enlarged the pool of partners with whom one can trade on an intimate basis. When trading with family (natural or "acquired") the exchange was based less on the market value of the product than on the perceived needs of the two trading partners. Such exchanges were seldom just a one-time occurrence. Rather, they were part of an ongoing series of exchanges within the community.

Barter as an Articulation of Modes of Production

Barter of agricultural and animal products and non-monetary exchanges of labor are points of articulation between the non-capitalist mode of production operating in the community and the capitalist mode of production operating in the larger Peruvian society. The barter of goods and labor was based on a traditional system of exchanges, yet elements of the capitalist relations of production intruded into these relationships.

This occurred for labor exchanges in a number of ways. The intrusion of a "market mentality" as opposed to the traditional relations of production is seen in the unwillingness of some to give the traditional amount of products for labor. As mentioned earlier, there was the feeling that these products will be sold in the market rather than used as sustenance for the family. One of the results of this link between the traditional system of exchange and the market was the practice of giving laborers some cash and some products. Labor, depending on the time in the agricultural cycle and the economic status of the household, was looked upon by community members as either a traditional reciprocal exchange or as a commodity to be purchased. In the final analysis, labor in the community must be seen as representative of a non-capitalist relation of production. Household labor was normally the first recourse, followed in most cases by uillay and then, last, by wage labor. However, when people left the community to work, they entered completely into capitalist relations of production.

The exchange of agricultural and animal products also reflected the encroachment of capitalist relations of production. The series of exchanges undertaken by large-scale traders in Aramachay exemplified the articulation of the two modes of production. These traders exchanged

products (sometimes produced themselves and sometimes bought) for agricultural or animal products through traditional methods of barter. These products were then sold in the commercial market and thus entered the national economy. Market value was also beginning to creep into the produce exchanges within the community itself. Many comuneros placed monetary value on agricultural products even when they were being exchanged in traditional settings.

The barter of products and exchanges of labor were influenced by the network of compadrazago in the community. These relationships even biased the terms of cash sales. This was, partly due to their long-term nature as opposed to the short-term nature of commercial exchanges. Community members are cognizant in their relations with each other of the long-term impact of each exchange.

The last specific manifestation of the articulation of the two modes of production was the range of relationships which fall under the term al partir. As mentioned before, these arrangements varied from an equal sharing of inputs such as labor, seed and fertilizer, to rent paid in kind. At one end of the range, the relations of production were non-capitalist with neither party appearing as the exploiter. On the other end, the party who owned the land clearly appropriated the surplus product resulting from the other party's labor.

What does this mean for the peasant in the Central Andes? As long as the peasant remains articulated with the capitalist economy, what little surplus he produces will be siphoned away from his own production system. Some peasants have come to the conclusion that production for the market, at least in the case of some products, is not to their advantage. They have changed their production system in order to reduce their dependence on agricultural inputs and increase their production of products for home consumption. Unfortunately, there has also been a trend toward increasing dependence on manufactured products such as metal cookware, factory clothing and processed food that necessitates a cash income. This is reflected in the increasing demand for a cash wage even in traditional relationships. These two trends are now pulling in opposite directions, resulting in a degree of status quo.

Implications for Further Research

This study indicates the complexity of attempting to categorize peasant communities as either primitive non-dynamic producers or as petty commodity producers (i.e. participating fully in the capitalist economy). It has indicated the necessity of examining the peasant production system in its entirety, rather than piecemeal, before drawing any conclusions as to the fundamental nature of that system.

The nature of the cycle of labor requirements and methods of completing all labor has yet to be fully developed in a comprehensive manner. Included in this is an obligatory examination of the role and contribution of both sexes as well as marginal workers such as children.

A quantification of the amount of goods produced for home consumption, amount bartered in non-capitalist relations and the amount sold within capitalist relations of production would be a natural complement

to this study. It can be seen that products are going these different paths but the question still remains as to how much. Some products reach the metropolitan areas of Peru through informal networks of individuals traveling back and forth. It would be extremely interesting and instructive to determine what percentage of production in the countryside finds its way to the city, thus contributing to the reproduction of workers in the cities.

GLOSSARY OF SPANISH TERMS

<u>Ahijado:</u>	a godchild
<u>Arroba:</u>	a unit of measurement equalling approximately 11 1/2 kilograms
<u>Chuno:</u>	freeze-dried potatoes, prepared by community members
<u>Compadre:</u>	the parent of a person's godchild, or co-godparent
<u>Compadrazago:</u>	the institution of ritual kinship
<u>Comunero:</u>	a legal member of a <u>Comunidad Campesina</u> , also usually the head of the household
<u>Estancia:</u>	small herding village, originally used seasonally
<u>Faena:</u>	a communal work project voted upon by the communal assembly of the community. All legal <u>comuneros</u> are required to attend
<u>Olluca:</u>	an andean tuber
<u>Sunay:</u>	a form of labor payment in which the laborer receives a share of the harvest, usually in the form of several rows
<u>Ullay:</u>	a form of reciprocal labor in which one's labor is traded for an equal amount of labor

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Richard N.
1959 A Community in the Andes: Problems and Progress in Muqiyaujo. Seattle: U. of Washington Press.
- Alberti, Giorgio and Enrique Mayer (eds.)
1974 Reciprocidad e Intercambio en los Andes Peruanos. Lima, Peru: Instituto Estudios Peruanos.
- Bates, Daniel and Susan Lees
1977 "The Role of Exchange in Productive Specialization." American Anthropologist 79:824-841.
- Belshaw, Cyril
1965 Traditional Exchange and Modern Markets. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Bernstein, Henry
1971 "Modernization Theory and the Sociological Study of Development." Journal of Development Studies 7:141-60.
- Bloch, Maurice (ed.)
1975 Marxist Analyses and Social Anthropology. New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc.
- Bradby, Barbara
1975 "Destruction of Natural Economy." Economy and Society 4 (2):127-161.
1982 "Resistance to Capitalism in the Peruvian Andes" Pp.97-122 in David Lehmann (ed.) Ecology and Exchange in the Andes.
- Brush Steven B. and David Guillet
1985 "Small Scale Agro-Pastoral Production in the Central Andes." Forthcoming in Mountain Research and Development.
- Chapman, Anne
1980 "Barter as a Universal Mode of Exchange." Man 20 (3):33-83.
- Clammer, John
1975 "Economic Anthropology and the Sociology of Development: 'Liberal' Anthropology and its French Critics" in Oxall, Ivar, Tony Barnett and David Booth (eds.) Beyond the Sociology of Development. London: Routledge, and Kegan Paul Ltd.
1978 The New Economic Anthropology. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Dalton, George
1967 Tribal and Peasant Economies: Readings in Economic Anthropology. Garden City, N.J.: Natural History Press.
- Donham, Donald
1981 "Beyond the Domestic Mode of Production" Man 16:515-541.

- Dupre, Georges and Pierre-Philippe Rey
 1973 "Reflections on the Pertinence of a Theory of the History of Exchange. "Economy and Society 2 (2):131-163.
- Durrenberger, E. Paul (ed.)
 1984 Chayanov, Peasants and Economic Anthropology. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press.
- Erasmus, Charles J.
 1956 "The Occurrence and Disappearance of Reciprocal Farm Labor in Latin America." Pp.173-199 in Dwight B. Heath and Richard Adams (eds.) Contemporary Cultures and Societies of Latin America. New York: Random house, 1965.
- Figueroa, Adolfo
 1982 "Production and Market Exchange in Peasant Economies: The Case of the Southern Highlands of Peru" Pp.123-156 in David Lehmann, Ecology and Exchange in the Andes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fioravanti-Molinie, Antoinette
 1982 "Multileveled Andean Society and Market Exchange: The Case of Yucay (Peru)" Pp.211-230 in David Lehmann, Ecology and Exchange in the Andes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Firth, Raymond
 1968 "The Social Framework of Economic Organization" Pp.65-87 in Edward E. LeClair Economic Anthropology: Readings in Theory and Analysis. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston Inc.
- Frank, Andre Gunder
 1979 "The Development of Underdevelopment" Pp.103-113 in Charles K. Wilber (ed.), The Political Economy of Development and Underdevelopment. New York: Random House.
- Foster-Carter, Aidan
 1978 "The Modes of Production Controversy" New Left Review 107:47-77.
- Gouldner, Alvin
 1960 "The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement." American Sociological Review 25:161-178.
- Golte, Jurgen
 1980 La Racionalidad de la Organizacion Andina. Lima, Peru: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Goodman, David and Michael Redclift
 1982 From Peasant to Proletarian. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Guillet, David
 1981a "Reciprocal Labor and Peripheral Capitalism in the Central Andes" Ethnology 19 (2):151-167.

- 1981b "Surplus Extraction, Risk Management and Economic Change among Peruvian Peasants" *Journal of Development Studies* 18 (1):1-24.
- Halperin, Rhoda and James Dow (eds.)
1977 *Studies in Peasant Livelihood*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Harris, Olivia
1982 "Labor and Produce in an Ethnic Economy, Northern Potosi, Bolivia" Pp.70-96 in David Lehmann, *Ecology and Exchange in the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Henfrey, Colin
1981 "Dependency, Modes of Production and the Class Analysis of Latin America" *Latin American Perspectives* 8 (3 and 4): 17-54.
- Hopkins, Diane E.
1985 "The Peruvian Agrarian Reform: Dissent from Below" *Human Organization* 44 (1):18-32.
- Humphrey, Caroline
1985 "Barter and Economic Disintegration" *Man* 20:48-72.
- Hutchinson, William B.
1973 "Socio-Cultural Change in the Mantaro Valley Region of Peru: Acolla, A Case Study" PhD Dissertation, Indiana University.
- Laclau, Ernesto
1971 "Feudalism and Capitalism in Latin America" *New Left Review* 67:19-38.
- Lehman, David
1982 *Ecology and Exchange in the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Long, Norman (ed.)
1975 "Structural Dependency, Modes of Production and Economic Brokerage in Rural Peru" Pp.253-282 in Ivar Oxall, Tony Barnett and David Booth (eds.), *Beyond the Sociology of Development*. London: Routledge, and Kegan Paul, Ltd.

1984 "Introduction" Pp.1-29 in Norman Long, *Family and Work in Rural Societies*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Long, Norman and Paul Richardson
1978 "Informal Sector, Petty Commodity Production and the Social Relations of Small Scale Enterprise" Pp. in John Clammer (ed.), *The New Economic Anthropology*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Long, Norman and Bryan R. Roberts (eds.)
1978 *Peasant Cooperation and Capitalist Expansion in Central Peru*. Austin, Texas: U. of Texas Press.

- Mallon, Florencia
 1983 The Defense of Community in Peru's Central Highlands: Peasant Struggle and Capitalist Transition, 1860-1940. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton U. Press.
- Mayer, Enrique
 1974 "Reciprocity, Self-Sufficiency and Market Relations in a Contemporary Community in the Central Andes of Peru" PhD Dissertation, Series No.72, Cornell University.
- 1979 Land Use in the Andes: Ecology and Agriculture in the Mantaro Valley of Peru with Special Reference to Potatoes. Lima, Peru: International Potato Center.
- Meillasoux, Claude
 1972 "From Reproduction to Production: A Marxist Approach to Economic Anthropology" *Economy and Society* 1 (1):93-105.
- 1981 *Maidens, Meal and Money: Capitalism and the Domestic Community*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Nash, Manning
 1966 *Primitive and Peasant Economic Systems*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co.
- 1968 "The Social Context of Economic Choice in a Small Community" Pp.311-322 in Edward E. LeClair Jr. and Harold Schneider (eds.), *Economic Anthropology: Readings in Theory and Analysis*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- Omvedt, Gail
 1971 "'Modernization' Theories: The Ideology of Empire?" Pp.119-137 in A. R. Desai (ed.), *Essays on Modernization of Underdeveloped Societies*. Bombay, India: Thacker and Co. Ltd.
- O'Brien, Philip
 1975 "A Critique of Latin American Theories of Dependency" Pp.7-27 in Ivar Oxall, Tony Barnett and David Booth (eds.), *Beyond the Sociology of Development*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Orlove, Benjamin
 1965 "Inequality among Peasants: The Forms and Uses of Reciprocal Exchange in Andean Peru" in M. Banton (ed.), *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- 1977 *Alpacas, Sheep and Men*. New York: Academic Press.
- 1982 "Sale, Barter and Subsistence: The Distribution and Exchange of Fish in the Lake Titicaca Area" Paper presented at the Symposium on Indian Participation in Markets: The Central Andes in the Colonial and Republican periods, 44th International Congress of Americanists, Manchester, England.

- 1986 "Barter and Cash Sale on Lake Titicaca: A Test of Competing Approaches" *Current Anthropology* 27 (2).
- Roxborough, Ian
1979 *Theories of Underdevelopment*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Sahlins, Marshall
1965 "On the Sociology of Primitive Exchange" in M. Banton (ed.) *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*. London: Tavistock Publications.
1972 *Stone Age Economics*. New York: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Sanchez, Rodrigo
1982 "The Andean Economic System and Capitalism" Pp.157-190 in David Lehmann, *Ecology and Exchange in the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schejtman, Alexander
1984 "The Peasant Economy: Internal Logic, Articulation and Persistence" Pp.274-298 in Charles Wilbur, *The Political Economy of Development and Underdevelopment*. New York: Random House.
- Scott, C. D.
1976 "Peasants, Proletarianization and the Articulation of Modes of Production: The Case of Sugar Cane Cutters in Northern Peru, 1940-1969" *Journal of Peasant Studies* 3 (3):321-342
- Smith, Gavin A.
1979 "Socio-Economic Differentiation and Relations of Production among Rural-Based Petty Producers in Central Peru, 1880-1970" *Journal of Peasant Studies* 6 (3):286-310.
- Stomaker, J.
1979 "Sunday Fair at Huancayo: A Market's Contribution to the Regional Economy" *Journal of Anthropological Research* 35:459-476.
- Swindale, Anne
1985 "Characterization of Highland Andean Peasant Communities, Mantaro Valley, Peru" Final report for the Dairy Module Report, Inter-American Foundation and IVITA, Lima, Peru (mimeo).
- Warman, Arturo
1980 "We Come to Object" *The Peasants of Morelos and the National State*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Waters, William F. and Frederick H. Buttel
1985 "Isolation, Dissolution, or Evolution? Access to Land and the Highland Ecuadorian Peasantry in the Twentieth Century" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Blacksburg, Virginia.

Weldon, Peter and Mary Morse
1970 "Market Structure in a Highland Peruvian Community" Human
Organization 29 (1):43-48.