1 Divided Selves

Domestic Production and Wage Labor in Puerto Rico and Anthropology

THE FIELD BOSS speaks to the crew in the broken Spanish he picked up from the Mexican crews before they left for the Blue Ridge Mountains to shape Christmas trees. It is the tail end of a long Indian summer. Back home in Puerto Rico, where Ángel and Miguel have not set foot since June, the threat of hurricanes is passing for another year. Standing in the half circle around the field boss, listening to him explain the tasks of harvest as though teaching dogs how to dig for gophers, Ángel and Miguel do not let on that they speak fairly good English. Not only is it fun to watch him form his words so slowly and carefully; it is also possible to make your job easier by pretending not to understand. *"Ponen los repollos aqui,"* says the field boss, pointing to the big wooden crates in the shade of the packing shed. Ángel tries to look confused, fearing that he looks amused instead. If he were to catch the eye of Miguel or any one of the other crew members, he would not be able to keep from laughing.

At least this crew boss makes an attempt to speak Spanish. Ángel has known field bosses who believed that anyone anyhere could understand English, as long as it was spoken slowly enough. Ángel and the others especially like to watch the field boss demonstrate how and where the heads of cabbage go. They want to see the field boss walk the crew through all the harvest motions. They want to see him do it himself. Only by performing the work himself can the boss appreciate the hardships of working in the U.S. *fincas*. Only by doing it himself can he feel the pains shooting sideways across his lower back after stooping and standing, stooping and standing, for ten hours a day; or the sun burning his neck; or the pesticide

residues stinging his eyes and nose, the toxic dust itching his skin. Ángel believes the field bosses should know: The more a *jefe* experiences the work of those he directs, the closer he comes to passing along the work's tradition, its reason, its necessities of skill and of craft, just as Ángel's father, a fisher, passed his knowledge of fishing to his son. Ángel's father's lessons were deep and comprehensive, nothing like those that have ever come from the field boss, as interwoven with the life of his childhood home as his father's beach seine. He remembers his mother scaling and cleaning the catch for market, the fishers of the community organizing against the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) for the right to cut away mangroves to make a place to launch their fishing crafts into the sea, and his brother painting the hull of their fourteen-foot *yola.* These were as much the lessons of fishing as the way his father took him through the stages of making and setting fish traps, bending and soldering the rods, wiring on the chicken wire and weaving cut bamboo through it to maintain the integrity of the shape of the trap. While they worked, his father's game cocks crowed from their cages along the walls of the workshop. In order to outwit thieves, they had to set the traps in secret, without buoys, within sight of landmarks to mark their location. Remembering, he thinks of the names of fish and other marine animals they caught in the traps: *cabrilla, colirrubia, sama, pargo, chillo, mero,* and *langosta,* the reef and bottom fish that bring high prices in the seafood restaurants between Mayagüez and Puerto Real; or *chapín,* the little box-shaped fishes whose meats fill the *empanadillas* (seafood pastries) of La Parguera; or *pulpo,* the octopus that the women of Las Croabas boil, let cool, season with onions, oil, vinegar, and green olives, and sell in little plastic cups along the main roads to Fajardo on weekends. These are bottom-feeding species, the life of the reef. With other gear (*corrida, silga, cordeles, anzuelos*), they catch the fish that cruise near the surface during the winter months (*sierra, dorado, atún*), the fish that strike and fight with their long, sleek bodies, only to be sliced into steaks that the vendors and shopkeepers fry with sweet onions and garlic to sell in the streets of town.

It is not only watching the field boss take the crew through the motions of harvest that makes Ángel think of his father's lessons. The memory also comes from the distinctive smell of the ocean, perceptible even over the cabbage fields twelve miles inland from Cape May. It is a therapeutic smell, one that calls to mind the quiet, open stillness of the sea, free of the crack, aspirin, beer, and cheap overproof wine that are always central to life in the isolated farm labor camps. The smell calls to mind a fishing excursion achieved only after minute and detailed preparations, the close attention to every piece of gear so absorbing that the whole world seems to hold still to let you finish the meticulous tasks of rigging lines, tying feathers onto hooks in an overlapping, spiral arrangement, and straightening the wire mesh of the fish traps. Here the sea is doubly therapeutic, taking Ángel back to his work and homeland at the same time that it offers the steady breeze that keeps the air above the fields relatively free of pesticide fumes.

But the field boss has finished his demonstration. Stooping, Ángel loses the full effect of the breeze, smelling the chemical pungency that accounts for the headaches and bellyaches that plague the camp all through the harvest. In a smooth, rapid motion, he bends and cuts the cabbage and bends and cuts again and again, bagging the heads, moving with the crew down the row.

Moving Between Domestic Production and Wage Labor

Like Ángel, who performs farmwork in southern New Jersey while he remains very much a part of his father's household and fishing operation, many people from poor households around the world combine wage labor with small-scale productive and reproductive activities that require small investments of capital and energy. A rural shopkeeper in Oaxaca, Mexico, travels to Guadalajara, Mexico, to lay bricks during a construction boom and returns to his shop when the building he helped construct is completed. A Jamaican youth works part time in a jewelry store and spends

his evenings picking pockets and selling ganja (the local marijuana) to British and American tourists and businesspeople staying in New Kingston. A Puerto Rican chambermaid in San Juan's Condado district quits her job during the slow summer months to sell earrings and necklaces that she makes out of tarpon scales, tropical shells, and the spinal cartilage of juvenile sharks. Or a Kikuyu peasant farmer spends twelve years of his life emptying trash in a London bank building to accumulate enough wealth to expand his cattle herd and bargain for a wife in Kenya.

Each of these examples entails a different amount and quality of involvement in wage labor. Each influences social class formation differently. Each stimulates the development of new, creative relationships among businesses, workers and unions, households, governments, and the neighborhoods and communities that supply workers to the formal labor force. For the rural shopkeeper, Guadalajara's booming economy provides a one-time, short-term employment opportunity that involves internal migration, in which the contract between employer and employed appears limited to the simple exchange of the shopkeeper's labor power for the employer's wage. This image of equivalent exchange—common under capitalism—disguises the systems of authority and policy and the need they create that bring buyers and sellers of labor together. The urban youth in Kingston combines wage labor and independent economic activity daily or at least several times a week. He does not migrate; yet his work requires passage from the formal to the informal economy: from the safe, low-paying job in the jewelry store to the shadowy, dangerous, yet potentially high-return frontiers of crime and the night. The artisan/chambermaid moves annually between a seasonal labor market and a cottage industry, much in the same way that Ángel moves between farmwork in South Jersey and small-scale fishing in Puerto Rico. Finally, the Kikuyu peasant, the janitor/farmer, represents a type of adaptation common during the 1950s and 1960s, when Southern Europeans, Asians, Africans, West Indians, and Latin Americans poured into Europe and North America during the postwar economic expansion and then, late in life, retired to their homelands (Basch, Glick-Schiller, and Szanton Blanc 1994; Brandes 1975; Gmelch 1987).

These examples cover but a fraction of the ground. As common methods of mixing wage labor with seemingly independent, autonomous economic activity, they include many of the arrangements that we encounter in the world today. Yet if any lesson emerges from this work, it is that combining wage labor with home production is a dynamic process, formulated, conditioned, and revised by the characters of both capital and domestic time and space. Such multiple livelihoods are not beyond the reach of explanation. Yet they demand that we draw on theoretical work on proletarians along with theoretical work on peasant, artisanal, and small-scale producers, negotiating among explanations even as the categories of proletarian, peasant, artisanal fisher, and others come under attack (Kearney 1996).

In this work, we look closely at the ways that Puerto Rican small-scale fishers combine fishing and wagework. Puerto Rican fishing families, like most families around the world, rarely rely on a single economic pursuit to survive. Instead, they combine fishing and fish vending with jobs in public service, agriculture, and industry and more informal enterprises such as guiding tourists through mangrove forests to bioluminescent bays or making crafts from shark cartilage, tarpon scales, and shells. In this book, we examine these multiple livelihoods up close. We consider what they mean for theories drawn from ecological and economic anthropology and for how we think about households of small producers everywhere. In the process, we discuss several concepts and assess them in light of the behaviors of Puerto Rican fishers. We consider the variety of ways that one key concept, proletarianization, or the process of *becoming* a wage laborer, is expressed in Puerto Rican fishing households and communities. Most commonly, we have found that these households and communities tend to be only *semi*proletarianized partially engaged in wage labor and working-class behaviors and beliefs yet still strongly present in fishing. Semiproletarianization often involves the combination of formal and informal economic activities, with the former consisting of activities that governments and economists consider legitimate and that are taxed, regulated, and largely institutionalized. Working the disassembly line in a poultry plant, though usually unpleasant, is a formal economic activity. Informal economic activities

consist of those that people use, even in the face of laws that prohibit them, to make ends meet. Taking fish out of season or selling octopus salad along the roadside without a license, though both may be pleasant activities, occur beyond the reach of the state and most economic analysis.

Because semiproletarianization almost inevitably involves households, neighborhoods, fishing associations, and coastal communities—areas where fishers and workers are reproduced and acquire a sense of humanity—we also consider relations between production and reproduction and the roles of these collectives in such relations. Particularly important are households, whose compositions and life cycles influence, quite strongly, the ways in which fishers combine fishing with jobs and other economic pursuits. Yet the collectives that we identify as households among Puerto Rican fishers differ from many common representations of households in the sociological and anthropological literature. We are indebted to several previous works on independent-producer households (see, for example, Chayanov 1966; Deere and de Janvry 1979; Durrenberger 1995; Gudeman and Rivera 1993; Roseberry 1976, 1989). But we have also drawn on literature on households that come from long traditions of emigration and return migration (see, for example, Basch, Glick-Schiller, and Szanton Blanc 1994; Duany 2000; Portes and Bach 1985).

METHODOLOGICAL AND SAMPLING CONSIDERATIONS

The bulk of our work in this volume focuses on 102 fishing households in 21 coastal municipalities on the main island of Puerto Rico and the island municipalities of Culebra and Vieques. We sampled disproportionately more households from seven municipalities for the following reasons:

1. *Coho Rojo,* on the Southwest Coast, includes Puerto Real, the port of Puerto Rico's largest fishery and the subject of Manuel Valdés Pizzini's doctoral dissertation (1985). This is also the site of the grouper/snapper fishery and the conch fishery, and it is increasingly a target for tourism and leisure capital development.

Map of Puerto Rico: Municipalities and Key Sites

2. *Aguadilla,* on the Northwest Coast, includes one of the island's most politically active fishing associations.
3. *Fajardo,* on the East Coast, is one of the most highly developed tourist areas on the island, home to several marinas, large resorts, small hotels, coastal reserves and a favorite beach, watersports, and general recreational location. As such, it is a site of potential conflict between commercial and recreational coastal industries.
4. *Guánica* is an area of incipient tourist development on the South Coast with little urban development and one of the more impoverished coastal populations.
5. *Vieques* is a twenty-mile-long island municipality off the East Coast of the main island, whose domination by the U.S. Navy, which owns all but the island's central corridor, has been a source of contention since the 1940s.
6. *Guayarna* is a sugarcane-producing area on the South Coast, east of Ponce, similar to Mintz's (1956) Caiiemelar. Though impoverished, it has been attracting new businesses, such as the petrochemical, plastics, and pharmaceutical industries.
7. *San Juan,* the seat of the island's government, is the most highly urbanized *municipio* and hence home to families of urban fishers.

In addition to interviewing fishers in these municipalities, we interviewed fishers in the fifteen randomly selected municipalities distributed over the island as shown in Table 1.1.

We set out to visit between fifteen and twenty fishing households in the seven targeted municipalities and between two and three in the randomly selected municipalities. In the latter, we

TABLE 1.1. Additional Municipalities Included in the Study Sample

North Coast	East Coast	South Coast	West Coast
Isabela	Ceiba	Arroyo	Aguada
Camuy	Naguabo	Juana Díaz	Rinctin
Barceloneta	Humacao	Laias	
Vega Baja	Maunabo		
Vega Alta			
Catatio			

attempted to sample randomly from the names that were supplied to us from the recently completed census of La Corporación para el Desarrollo y Administracion de los Recursos Marinos, Lacustres y Fluviales de Puerto Rico (Corporation for the Development and Administration of the Lake, River, and Marine Resources of Puerto Rico), CODREMAR. Because of the vagaries of fieldwork and developments in fishing communities and associations that we considered of interest, combined with fishers' own fascinating life methods of moving among jobs and regions, our set of interviews and observations ended up more uneven than we had planned. In addition, although the bulk of the fieldwork was concentrated in the period from January 1988 to the summer of 1991, our work benefited from Valdés Pizzini's 1985 study of Puerto Real, two related studies of recreational fishing and coastal fishing infrastructure conducted from 1986 to 1987 (Griffith et al. 1988; Valdés Pizzini et al. 1988), and studies that focused on net fishers and the conch fishery conducted during the mid-1990s (Valdés Pizzini 1995; Valdés Pizzini et al. 1996).

Although we were primarily interested in fishers who moved between fishing and wagework, our discussion also includes information about Puerto Rican fishers who did not sell their labor. This information is important because full-time fishers' interactions with the marine environment, use of seafood markets, membership in fishers' associations and cooperatives, and conceptions of the sea and its gifts help establish the social and cultural parameters of those Puerto Ricans who move between fishing and wage labor. At the other extreme are individuals whose primary economic existence has been defined by wagework, who fish to supplement household subsistence needs, to earn additional cash, or to escape from the tedious routines and rigors of jobs in economic sectors such as manufacturing, agriculture, construction, and tourism. This variation raises the problem, similar to the difficulty in peasant studies, of trying to categorize fishers to reflect the full range of their behaviors (Kearney 1996). By examining the life histories of Puerto Rican fishers who are located at various points along this continuum—from full-time fisher to nearly full-time wageworker—we attempt to reveal how wagework and domestic production complement or frustrate one

another, create or resolve tensions within fishing households, fragment communities, or help unite fishers in common causes and associations.

At the same time, we attempt to enrich Puerto Rican ethnohistory and ethnography by using the life histories of fishers as shadows, reflections, and critiques of historical processes and intellectual traditions that have influenced our thinking about Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans. As workers, even workers who spend part of their lives at sea, Puerto Rican fishers are members of social classes and victims of labor market segmentation based on ethnicity, legal status, linguistic ability, gender, and other sociologically important criteria. Puerto Ricans—having been drawn by force into the orbit of North American influence at the end of the nineteenth century and granted U.S. citizenship in 1917 after prolonged racist debate in the U.S. Congress that ultimately allowed their conscription for military service during World War I—share with African Americans the reality of being minorities against their will. In this context, we pose questions about their political behaviors, whether subtle or overt, and their complacency about, acceptance of, subversion and manipulation of, and resistance against their positions in power structures and economic institutions. How self-conscious are they of their status? Do they agree with many of the ideologies that justify their use in servile, low-paying, high-injury jobs? Do they perceive clearly how their work in fisheries, like work among peasants, maintains and reproduces a reserve army of labor that helps keep wages low?

Yet as these workers move back to Puerto Rico, take up their nets and traps, oil their motors, and freshen the coats of paint on their boats, they move into a different theoretical light, becoming, as fishers, people whose cultural orientations are influenced by their time at sea. They interact with the natural environment in the political context of fishing associations and common property resources. Residues remain from their work on land. They remain workers, but now workers at sea, withdrawing from and thereby resisting the terms of capitalist production. Or, as many of us have argued at one time or another, they fall back on their own means of subsistence and thereby subsidize those for whom they work. Yet leaving wagework to fish, they run the risk of

accommodating and having to resist alternative forms of domination, particularly those organized by merchant capital and the state. Resisting wagework, we illustrate in this book, can create divisions between family and community members similar to those that divide social classes from one another, even, paradoxically, while demanding coordination within households.

Thus, this movement between *la zafra* (the sugarcane harvest) and the sea, between factories and the sea, or between other hourly wage or piece-rate jobs and the sea is at once complementary and contradictory, generating ambivalent feelings and allegiances among those who undertake such treks and those who, as we do, structure intellectually, categories and theories about them. Social and cultural analysis is as likely to become entangled in the paradoxes of divided lives and selves as fishers who divide their lives between fishing and earning wages. Over the last years of the millennium, during the long, staccato process of writing this book, cultural anthropologists experimented with new paths toward knowledge as they maintained their central interest in local culture, local history, and social relationships within local, regional, and national processes. That we continue to be interested in local settings and processes—regardless of methods of observation, data collection, or presentation—lends some credence to the idea that local settings and processes define us in ways that the global corporation or the nation cannot, even in the face of cyberspace, transnational diasporas, or deterritorialized nation-states. Place is a social construction, and the social constructions of locality that we encounter among Puerto Rican fishers invoke the ways that they conceive of and represent coastal landscapes and offshore seascapes. Detailed attention to local settings among those who inhabit them leads to ethnic consciousness, questions of self and identity, and critical reflection on the various ways in which peoples from various cultural backgrounds and linguistic practices have been depicted by the media, politicians, and anthropologists.

It was from this enduring interest among anthropologists in local settings and local processes that during the last decade and a half of the twentieth century we entered the space of fishers and

their family members and elicited information about their lifestyles. During these visits, we asked fishers and their families about specific features of their lives, especially events surrounding changes in their fishing operations and the deepening or diminishing nature of their experiences in their jobs. We also asked how they coped with crisis, how they enlisted the aid of family and friends or established ties with others in their communities. We were interested in their political views and behaviors, the ways they assembled their fishing crews and the dispositions of their catches. Throughout these interviews, we encouraged them to emphasize whatever they considered important, even if this meant straying from the structure imposed by our questions. Although we were interested in information on Puerto Rican fishers for its own intrinsic value, this work also attempts to weave Puerto Rican life histories into the biography of cultural anthropology.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The histories we present in this book invoke two fields of human experience that have formed much of recent world history: (1) domestic production, which consists of the practices of hunters, peasants, pastoralists, and others who hunt, fish, farm, raise livestock, or produce goods and services using family and household labor and (2) the incomplete incorporation of groups of domestic producers into capitalist systems of power, time, discipline, control, identity, and meaning. This incorporation has been uneven and highly variable. Puerto Rican individuals, households, networks, and communities have been differentially drawn into capitalist spheres of influence. They are not influenced merely as workers. Puerto Rican fishers, like domestic producers everywhere, also participate in capitalist economic systems as merchants, brokers, commodity producers, and entrepreneurs. Consequently, learning more about them forces us to revise common designations used in anthropology to talk about domestic producers, particularly the designation of "peasants" living in closed corporate communities (Wolf 1966), binary or hyphenated categories such as semiproletarian (Kearney 19961, or disguised wage

laborers (Roseberry 1976). Puerto Rican fishers buy and sell fish, add value to their catch by processing their products, use credit systems, seek and obtain government licenses, and participate in political protests. They cannot be considered isolated to any degree or even fully independent in their production, since they neither inhabit villages in remote areas nor produce everything they need to live themselves. They inhabit, influence, and are influenced by the wider, complex societies of Puerto Rico, New York, Chicago, and the other locations, mostly scattered throughout the eastern United States, that have attracted Puerto Rican migrants and serve as anchors for the Puerto Rican diaspora.

Encountering groups that have been pushed and pulled by many influences has become common in anthropology and cannot help but become more common. By the end of World War II, many of the cultures studied by anthropologists could no longer be accurately represented without considering the ways the local histories of peoples and communities had become interwoven with world and regional history, a process that William Roseberry aptly calls "the internalization of the external" (1989:89). Especially important global processes included colonialism, independence and nationalist movements, European and communist bloc expansion, and the rise in the scope and influence of multinational corporations. More recently, anthropologists have turned their attention to ethnic conflicts, alternative histories, the growth of transnational communities, and other international currents of power and resistance (Anderson 1983; Basch, Glick-Schiller, and Szanton Blanc 1994; Roseberry 1989; Wolf 1982).

Yet, adept at and predisposed to studying small, local groups, few anthropologists have been willing to sacrifice attentive and detailed techniques of observation—the daily fare of fieldwork—for the broad, sweeping international analyses that too often rely on poorly collected statistical data. What would become of kinship, mating, ritual, foodways—of culture itself—under the influence of big projects? If at first our enterprise became one of balancing micro- and macroprocesses, or internal against external, later we became more concerned that we neither reduce local histories to the eddies and flows of international politics and economics nor venerate customs to such an extent that they are free

of the influences of global change (Comaroff and Comaroff 1992, 1999; Mintz 1977). Working toward this balance has neither produced nor is likely to produce a standard method of data collection or analysis but has instead followed the path of any history: plodding, cluttered, dense with fashions and fads yet carried forward with occasional voices of insight, comparative work, and criticism.

We, the authors of this volume, came out of Marxist traditions yet entered a rapidly changing world of anthropology when we assumed university positions and began carrying on conversations in print. Through the first ten years of our careers, the issues of the 1970s elaborated by Immanuel Wallerstein and tempered by Sidney Mintz, Eric Wolf, Raymond Williams, William Roseberry, and others slowly withdrew into the shadows as the cultural studies and interpretive positions of postmodernism, having played themselves out in literary criticism, assumed importance in anthropology. However much we have experimented with these approaches, they have not satisfied our desire to illuminate the ways in which Puerto Rican fishers have been involved in a century of North American domination or our desire to describe and analyze (as clearly as possible and without either undue interpretive baggage or static measures of central tendency and dispersion) the local history, circumstances, and intrigues of fishing.

Prior to World War 11, anthropological publications had noted that domestic producers sometimes exported labor to capitalist labor markets, but they rarely raised questions about how this might stimulate cultural change or alter local power or wealth relations. Thomas Gum, writing about the Maya, stated:

> The Indians of British Honduras who live near settlements do light work for the rancheros and woodcutters; they have the reputation of being improvident and lazy, and of leaving their work as soon as they have acquired sufficient money for their immediate needs, and this is to some extent true, as the Indian always wants to invest his cash in something which will give an immediate return in pleasure and amusement. (1918:17)

Gunn's observations imply that, left to their own devices, indigenous peoples will never be reliable as wageworkers. What "ranchero" or "woodcutter," reading Gunn's account, would not

think that the image of the "Indian" he profiles—the lazy savage, unwilling to work once he has had his bourbon and beans—calls for taking steps to make indigenous peoples more productive, more willing to work, or finding another labor force entirely? Gunn's assessment was by no means uncommon. In his classic "The Original Affluent Society," in *Stone Age Economics*, Marshall Sahlins points out that several observers of the leisurely habits of hunting and gathering groups have interpreted this as a natural propensity for laziness and indolence (1972:27-28). He quotes Martín Gusindc as follows:

> The Yamana are not capable of continuous, daily hard labor, much to the chagrin of European farmers and employers for whom they often work. Their work is more a matter of fits and starts, and in these occasional efforts they can develop considerable energy for a certain time. After that, however, they show a desire for an incalculably long rest period during which they lie about doing nothing, without showing great fatigue.... It is obvious that repeated irregularities of this kind make the European employer despair, but the Indian cannot help it. It is his natural disposition. (Sahlins 1972:28)

Observations such as these suggest that labor forces need to be constructed. They do not emerge as natural responses to job opportunities. Domestic production operations need to be either destabilized to the point of forcing some individuals into labor markets completely or eliminated, because as long as they exist, they deter people from putting in a full day of wagework. E. P. Thompson's (1974) work on the rise of the English working class, following Karl Marx, shows how the enclosure of common lands forced English peasants to seek work in manufacturing. Among fisheries, "managing the commons" of the open seas results in restricting access to natural resources in such a way that fishing families need to supplement fishing incomes with wage labor (McCay and Acheson 1987). Ann Stoler elaborates this point in her historical work on Sumatra. There Dutch planters debated the merits of different forms of labor control as though comparing blends of coffee, experimenting with several models and several ethnic groups before settling on East Indian coolies. Similar observations have been made by Philipe Bourgois (1989) and Mark Moberg (1992) in Central America, by Claude Meillasoux (1972)

in Africa, by William Roseberry (1983) in Venezuela, and by David Griffith (1993) in the United States.

Various tensions exist between local groups-groups bound by descent, marriage, residence, production relations, common consumption habits, and other cultural factors—and the larger organizations of capital and the state. Often these tensions emerge because of the demands of domestic production: the home-based productive and reproductive tasks that help poor households around the world meet their subsistence needs. Because these tasks draw on family labor and, usually, investments of cash and hope, they can cause scheduling conflicts and divided loyalties. Employees may leave outside work undone to attend to home production needs, or home producers may neglect kitchen gardens or allow fishing nets to fall into disrepair because of the demands of their jobs.

Despite conflicts between domestic production and capitalist labor markets, well-organized economic and political regimes, historically, have encouraged domestic production in several ways. For example, to colonize new territory, governments may, through road construction and the provision of security systems, provide access to frontiers where domestic producers can establish small farms, fish, trap, hunt, or engage in other operations without fear of being victimized by criminals or populations perceived as hostile (Collins 1988; Stoler 1985). Merchants may encourage the growth of markets, using subtle and overt coercion, such as accepting codfish as currency or for payment of debts, to ensure the production of certain kinds of commodities (Roseberry 1983; Sider 1986). Or military regimes may expand their power to the point that domestic producers resist, fleeing into contemporary frontiers of night and illegal activities, such as smuggling, drug dealing, and cock fighting.

When domestic production practices conflict too sharply with capitalist labor needs, however, well-organized economic and political regimes have stepped in to restrict or curtail them. Methods of destabilizing domestic production are as diverse as those that encourage it, ranging from restricting access to the means of production to outlawing domestic production altogether. Small-scale producers are usually restricted from the means of produc-

tion through privatization of resources and the slow or rapid concentration of ownership, facilitated by credit relations and various mechanisms of power. Fishers may be discouraged from fishing by laws that restrict the use of certain gear or access to the sea itself, through the creation of marine sanctuaries, privatization of the shoreline, or the tightening of licensing requirements (Griffith 1999; Valdés Pizzini 1990b). Domestic production may be outlawed entirely by declaring some of its aspects a hazard to public health, as occurred after the U.S. occupation of Puerto Rico, when home milk production, cigar manufacturing, and liquor distilling were outlawed (Picó 1986).

That domestic producers' practices have been discouraged in some places and times and encouraged in others has made it difficult for anthropologists to gauge their importance in terms of trajectories of capital accumulation, class formation, ethnogenesis, and other world historical processes. Under what conditions have domestic production practices, for example, stalled or sidetracked revolutions or frustrated class formation? Do they emerge differently during times of economic crisis, focusing wageworkers' attentions on consumption issues, than during times of economic growth? When can they be interpreted as forms of resistance? How do they reconfigure households and communities or influence conceptions of local history? How have national and international policies that regulate trade, labor, environment, foreign relations, food, and other factors influenced domestic producers' lives?

As if the difficulties that these questions pose were not enough, anthropologists studying in Puerto Rico face an additional challenge. The work directed by Julian Steward in Puerto Rico in the years after world War II occupies a central position within anthropological theory, method, and lore, similar to the Harvard project in Chiapas, Mexico; the Cornell project in Vicos, Peru; and the extensive series of bulletins produced by the Bureau of American Ethnology. In contrast to Vicos, Chiapas, or the bulletins, Steward's study broke from descriptive ethnographies of prewar, Boasian anthropology to establish an enduring tradition of drawing upon and revising theoretical propositions about processes of community formation and culture change.

The People of Puerto Rico (1956), a work coauthored by Steward, is to economic anthropology and cultural ecology what the Western Electric studies are to industrial sociology. This is in large part due to the influence of Steward himself. His early (1938) work among the Shoshone, Ute, and Paiute of the Great Plains traced relationships between technology and social organization, laying the foundation for an extended inquiry into the influence of ecological factors over demographic processes, especially group formation. The pioneering attempts of Steward and his associates to apply cultural ecology to the analysis of various community types in Puerto Rico demonstrated both the potential for an anthropological contribution to understanding complex societies and the weaknesses of a discipline nourished on studies of local groups (Steward 1955:chap. 12; Steward et al. 1956; compare Roseberry 1978). This work constituted early attempts by Steward and others to understand local change in terms of hemispheric domination that brought Puerto Rico into the United States in 1898 and the broader political economic developments that swept the globe after World War 11. Steward's influential statement on cultural change ends by asserting that Puerto Rican "cultural nationalism" is "the spontaneous and inevitable reaction of all segments of the population to profound changes brought about by a set of institutions which has been imposed upon them from the outside" (1955:222; see also Duany 2000).

The words "from the outside" must have struck an ominous chord in the hearts of anthropologists who were used to thinking about fishing villages, peasant communities, bands of hunters and gatherers, and pastoralists as though they were isolated from the flows of world history. In ethnography, there had been a bias toward freezing people in time, discussing their cultures as though they had had no history, as though their traditions had remained unchanged for generations (Wolf 1982). We possessed the ethnocentric notion that Western, capitalist societies changed rapidly, whereas people who practiced production techniques that looked primitive to us had been stuck in some Stone Age. We embraced, all too uncritically, the notion that technological advances were the hallmarks of cultural change and that tradition lived in backward regions of wooden plows and animal-skin headgear (see Mintz 1985:24).

Steward's well-known attention to patterns of work organization and resource exploitation—the "culture core"—(Steward et al. 1956:6-7) reflected this bias, leading to a typology of Puerto Rican communities based on economic and ecological characteristics. His conception of the Puerto Rican countryside was one of farm towns where ways of life revolved around the rhythms of producing tropical crops. He deployed research associates in four agricultural communities on the island and in the upper-class circles of San Juan, encouraging Robert Manners's study of a tobacco and mixed-cropping community, Eric Wolf's study of a coffee-producing community, Elena Padilla's and Sidney Mintz's studies of sugar-growing communities, and Raymond Scheele's study of Puerto Rico's elite. The names of these research associates, as well as those of some of the field assistants on the project, are well known to several generations of anthropologists; they are associated with such enduring works as *Europe and the People Without History* (Wolf 1982), *Worker in the Cane* (Mintz 1960), and *Sweetness and Power* (Mintz 1985).

Steward's own contribution to the book was primarily typological, and in those chapters written by Steward and "The Staff," the authors disagreed over the utility of cultural ecology to explain the persistent poverty of large segments of each of the farm communities described at the heart of the volume (Roseberry 1978). Steward's analysis may have illustrated connections between family structure and the production of commodities, for example, but Steward was conceptually unprepared to examine the ways that production regimes subordinated families to their operations, encouraging some household structures while discouraging others. Instead, his notion of "levels of sociocultural integration" (Steward et al. 1956: 14-15) distinguished between larger, smaller, and qualitatively different social arenas: family, band, tribe, and state. Yet this concept said little about the ways that those different social arenas influenced one another. Because his interests lay in formulating a general theory of cultural change, Steward's levels implied a developmental sequence, from primitive societies organized around families to complex states organized around institutions such as governments and corporations. Within this developmental sequence, if progress involved

participating in ever more complex systems of organization, then those who failed to participate in wider social arenas must have been, in some way, backward, having fallen short of attaining the heights of complex societies that were capable, Vine Deloria reminds us, of setting their rivers on fire.

Steward was a fine anthropologist, and no good anthropologist would suggest that Puerto Ricans lacked the ability to achieve levels of integration on par with supposedly advanced nations of the world. Yet his model, similar to the traditional-modern and folk-urban models developed by an earlier generation of anthropologists and sociologists, implied as much. These models also implied that the most likely cause of technological inferiority was isolation—simply, peoples producing with primitive production technologies had not had enough exposure to outside influences to recognize the benefits of, say, outboard motors, freezers, the production regimes of the modern factory, or DDT.

Images of backwardness and isolation satisfied two demands in the social sciences of the postwar era. First, they legitimized the studies of anthropologists who continued to treat fishing communities, peasant villages, tribal groups, and others as though they were isolated, eventually spawning studies of the internal ecological and economic rationality of these groups. Second, they encouraged studies of modernization, spearheaded by sociologists and economists interested in diffusion of innovation. Studies of modernization inaccurately viewed increased wage labor among small-scale producers as symptoms of a general transition from preindustrial to industrial society, viewing social change as primarily a process in which domestic producers came to understand the benefits of advanced capitalism. These assumptions made it difficult for the researchers to examine ways that capitalist expansion could foster the reconstruction, maintenance, and reproduction of so-called traditional social, cultural, and technological adaptations (Roseberry 1989).

Anthropological analyses influenced by modernization theory (see, for example, Dalton 1971) focused on the internal logic of "traditional" or "folk" systems, paying little or no attention to the relationships that existed between local groups and national and international economic processes. These traditions guided