

ETHNOLOGICAL METHODS, RESULTS, AND THE QUESTION OF ADVOCACY IN ANDEAN RESEARCH

- SICAYA: CAMBIOS CULTURALES EN UNA COMUNIDAD MESTIZA ANDINA.* By GABRIEL ESCOBAR. (Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, 1973. Pp. 190.)
- TO DEFEND OURSELVES: ECOLOGY AND RITUAL IN AN ANDEAN VILLAGE.* By BILLIE JEAN ISBELL. (Austin: Institute of Latin American Studies, The University of Texas, 1978. Pp. 289. \$17.95; \$6.95.)
- MOUNTAIN, FIELD AND FAMILY: THE ECONOMY AND HUMAN ECOLOGY OF AN ANDEAN VALLEY.* By STEPHEN B. BRUSH. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977. Pp. 199.)
- PEASANTS IN TRANSITION. THE CHANGING ECONOMY OF THE PERUVIAN AYMARA: A GENERAL SYSTEMS APPROACH.* By TED LEWELLEN. (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1978. Pp. 195. \$18.00.)
- SACHA RUNA: ETHNICITY AND ADAPTATION OF ECUADORIAN JUNGLE QUICHUA.* By NORMAN E. WHITTEN, JR. (Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1976. Pp. 348. \$12.50.)

In a recent LARR article on peasants,¹ Ernest Feder implies that some anthropologists: "live in the proverbial university ivory tower from which they go only occasionally on organized, foundation-sponsored safaris to observe the wildlife of the peasantry from well-protected, imaginary landrovers" (pp. 199–200). In Feder's view the proper task of social scientists is not to quibble over scholarly definitions of the term "peasant," nor to analyze them in abstract academic terms, but rather to publicize and protest "the peasants' tragic fate in a modernizing agriculture under capitalist expansion" (p. 201). Feder goes on to say that if social scientists fail to commit themselves to such research they commit the sin of becoming "*fellow conspirators in a scheme . . . bound to drive poverty, hunger, and misery to unprecedented and unmanageable heights*" (pp. 202–3, emphasis added).

I share Feder's concern for the poor and oppressed, but cannot accept the hyperbolic condemnation of his colleagues as good science.² His statement is good polemic and may stimulate some researchers to increase the applied dimensions of their work, but I doubt that all social scientists are going to unite in a crusade to defend the world's peasantries from the hoary clutches of capitalism. The economic plight of many of the world's peasants is real, but so is the diversity and complexity of social science and its practitioners. In the real world there are anthropologists, sociologists, economists, and political scientists of every stripe, color, and persuasion and this is likely to continue unless human nature undergoes some profound transformation or is subjected to authoritarian political control. Such diversity is healthy in a scientific sense for it allows the formulation of a great variety of ideas whose adequacy and utility can be evalu-

ated systematically. In the social sciences, political and applied interests are widely accepted as having validity, and Feder has rightly exercised his option to address the issues that concern him and many other social scientists. Feder may accuse those who do not share his particular concerns, but the very existence of social scientists who do not meet his criteria for grace is highly functional to his polemic. How can one be a visionary if everyone shares the same vision?

This brings us to the consideration of five new volumes in the anthropology of South America. First, I should point out that none of the studies in question is concerned with a static definition of "peasant" per se, although all of the books deal partially or entirely with people that some would classify as peasants. The common thread that unites the five works is that they are all concerned with the analysis of social and cultural change. The titles also reveal that four are concerned with the related concepts of "ecology," "economy," or "adaptation." Four of the works deal with highland Peruvian communities, and the fifth with a lowland group of eastern Ecuador. Three of the communities are classified by the authors as indigenous, and two mestizo. All of the works may be considered ethnographic, but each derives from somewhat different techniques of research and styles of analysis. They all shed light on the problems and adaptive responses of real people who are relatively disadvantaged by virtue of their low status within the national economic and power structures. Yet none of these works has a purely polemical intent; rather, the authors have attempted to present scientific analyses of the inner workings of social processes based upon field investigations into these processes. They have, with varying degrees of intensity and success, written of the social, political, and economic forces that confront rural and village peoples and which so concern Ernest Feder. But the essential goal of the authors is to present explanations of socio-cultural behavior derived from empirical research, and it is these aspects of method and results that will receive evaluation here.

Gabriel Escobar's *Sicaya* not only presents the history of a community, but also embodies the history of the development of Peruvian *indigenismo* in the 1920s and the subsequent development of anthropology from the late 1930s through the 1960s. As a young man, Escobar was a field assistant in the Proyecto Antropológico de la Sierra Central del Perú whose collaborators included Dr. Harry Tschopik of the Instituto de Antropología Social (an affiliate of the Smithsonian Institution) and Drs. Jorge C. Mulle and J. M. B. Farfan of the Museo Nacional de la Cultura Peruana. One of the tasks of this group was to survey a variety of highland communities to assess their sociocultural characteristics. Escobar was assigned the task of studying the mestizo town of Sicaya in the Province of Huancayo (Junín Department), which was believed to be representative of the "progressive" communities of the Mantaro Valley. The bulk of the fieldwork upon which this study is based was carried out during 1945 and 1946, and Allan Holmberg later encouraged Escobar to use the material for his dissertation at Cornell University (completed in 1968).

In an unusually open statement, Escobar cautions his readers: "Everything written is new in the sense that my new theoretical concerns . . . have improved the description. Nevertheless, the reader should remember that the

ethnographic present is still 1945. I believe that it is significant to remember this . . . because there are many deficiencies in the fulfillment of my purpose, in part due to the limitations of my fieldnotes and other sources of information, but above all because I was not adequately trained when I did the original fieldwork" (p. 15; reviewer's translation from the original Spanish). Here Escobar raises the question of anthropological training and research methods, and frankly states that he felt inadequately prepared during his initial period of fieldwork as a research assistant. I call attention to these points not to criticize Escobar, but rather to point out that he has raised very important issues. To what extent does formal training assist the anthropologist in his or her field research? And to what extent has there been progress in data collection, presentation, and analysis in recent years? These are questions to which I shall return at several points.

Without a doubt, Escobar's *Sicaya* represents a very traditional community study approach. Indeed, the chapter titles read like a guide to standard anthropological concepts, with items like "Stratification and Social Mobility," "The Economic Structure," and "The Family, Marriage, and the Life Cycle." The work is essentially descriptive and neither poses nor tests any discernable hypotheses. What the book does do is present a readable description of the region and town, a meticulous, if somewhat mechanical, account of the life and ceremonial cycles, and some useful historical information on the ways Sicaya has articulated with Peruvian society. The discussion of migration patterns reveals that the Sicaya-Lima nexus is very old and profoundly significant to the smaller community. Research by Mangin and Doughty³ has focused attention on Lima's regionally based migrant's clubs as an adaptive mechanism that facilitates adjustment to urban life and promotes the interests of the home community in the national capital. But Escobar shows that these organizations have been around for a long time, and had similar functions even before the most explosive phases of Lima's growth began in the post-World War II period. The Centro Sicaya Lima was founded in 1919; it gave Sicaya representation in Lima and provided a flow of ideas, government services, and ideal models for the small town. Although Sicaya continued to have modest resources and most people remained poor, the identification with successful migrants who became the town's benefactors was strong. Nevertheless, Escobar believes that if the migrant Sicainos had found social acceptance in Lima they would have cut their ties to the parent community and merged with the urban population. Instead they found social barriers that obstructed their entrance into Limeño society. Since they could not shed their Sicaino identity they banded together and became the eventual idealized figures of the home town.

The analytical climax of *Sicaya* results in an effort that can be termed "labeling," in which a perceived process is given a term that is supposed to represent a meaningful analytical entity. Science is full of such labels or concepts that have achieved general recognition, and few social scientists go through their careers without at least an attempt to coin a few new terms. In this tradition, Escobar has given us "auto-validation" and "auto-justification" to refer to the observed tendency of Sicainos to emphasize their personal status vis-à-vis other individuals and, by extension, one's family and community vis-à-vis other

families and communities. Escobar sees this tendency toward verbal self-aggrandizement as an integral part of an ideological orientation that stresses progress, altruism, and nationalism. One sacrifices, educates one's children, and makes economic investments for the ideal of "progress." Success adds to the prestige and glory of family and community. Successful individuals become models of behavior for others and are incorporated into the "myth of the community." Escobar attributes the "progressivism" of the Mantaro Valley as a whole to its proximity to Lima, which facilitated the extension of administrative and educational services to the area; to the historical process of *mestizaje*, which reduced the number of closed-corporate Indian communities in the region; and to the rhetoric of the *indigenistas* of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which provided a means of communication concerning the collective situation of the mestizo population of the sierra.

In reading various anthropological studies I frequently find myself asking, "Where are the people?" It is an irony that many works of "the science of man" fail to convey a sense of the texture of everyday life, or what the personalities of real individuals are like. Margaret Mead had a knack for such description in her classic works, such as *Coming of Age in Samoa* and *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*, but she is now criticized for having imputed desires and traits in an overly subjective and cavalier fashion.⁴ Today many anthropologists use a style of analysis and exposition in which people are often described as faceless cogs in some social machine. The scientific goal is to make probabilistic statements about categories of people who belong to one or another kinship, sex, or political status. This is related to what Marvin Harris calls the "nomothetic revival" in anthropology,⁵ which is an attempt to improve the methodological rigor of research and to develop general theoretical principles of culture.

The attempt to upgrade the research and analytical methods of anthropology has considerable merit, but these efforts sometimes result in a jargonistic muddle instead of succinct exposition, and it is often possible to read an entire ethnography and never have a feeling for the everyday events of life in the society in question. Of the five books discussed here, only Billy Jean Isbell's *To Defend Ourselves* conveys a powerful sense of everyday living and coping in a small community. Isbell accomplishes this by including anecdotal passages in which she describes the actions and reactions of individuals in a variety of specific situations. For example, Isbell recounts in vivid detail her less than spectacular entrance into the Peruvian Indian community of Chuschi (Department of Ayacucho) and the isolation and rejection she experienced until she crashed a wake in an attempt to be included in some social event, and a drunken mourner mistakenly served her a glass of kerosene instead of cane alcohol! The resulting confusion and hilarity enabled her to break the barriers of distrust which had impeded her entry into the community.

Taken as a whole, Isbell's work on Chuschi can be classified with Escobar's *Sicaya* as a study of a specific Peruvian community. To say that both works are community studies, however, should not be taken to mean that the two are stylistically or analytically similar. As usual, real differences in the places studied and the specific interests of each ethnographer result in unique products. Isbell

is frank in admitting that her initial intent was to conduct a problem-oriented research design, but that she changed her focus after reaching the field, and shifted her analytical focus again after the completion of the fieldwork. This may seem strange to those who favor the classic scientific model in which one designs a research project, conducts it, and then reports one's findings according to the criteria specified in the initial design. In fact, the type of "sliding focus" that Isbell describes is quite common in anthropology because the planning for a project often begins in a setting far removed from the research site and unanticipated obstacles or opportunities in the field lead researchers to modify their analytical foci. It should also be pointed out that this phenomenon occurs in all of the sciences and is often extremely fruitful.⁶

It seems to me, however, that Isbell never entirely sheds one analytical approach for another, but attempts to use several in presenting a melange of Chuschi society. The title of the book suggests that an ecological study is forthcoming, but the author's statement of purpose promises a more structural and ideological approach: "The major concern of this book is to explore the structural defenses the indigenous population has constructed against the increasing domination of the outside world. The major conflict is between the communal member's ideology of self-sufficiency and the increasing pressures toward cultural and economic incorporation into the nation" (p. 11). Unlike *mestizo* Sicaya, Chuschi is a closed indigenous community in which the ideology is "autonomy" rather than "progress." Despite this, even Chuschinos have begun to participate in the flood of migration to Lima. The first person to visit the capital was a monolingual Quechua speaker who was drafted into the army in the late 1930s. Census data indicate that the population of Chuschi dropped from 1310 in 1940 to 1099 in 1961. Isbell estimates that there were 320 migrants living in Lima by 1970. In discussing findings which are similar to Escobar's, Isbell writes:

. . . the migrants who crowd into urban centers from isolated communities like Chuschi are . . . on the bottom of the urban class structure but dominate the direction of social change in their communities. They are responsible for the increase in education and, in some cases, better health care; for the expansion of the market system; and for the magnitude of the peasant mobilization during the 1960s. However they find themselves in conflict with their communities . . . their goals at times conflict with those of the peasant majority . . . who are attempting to defend their land and resources. (Pp. 21–22)

In her elucidation of the parameters of Chuschi ideology, Isbell presents an excellent analysis of native symbolism and world view, and the divisions characteristic of the regional society. However, the analysis is so structural in emphasis that the second half of the book's title should be "Structure and Ritual in an Andean Village," rather than "Ecology and Ritual." "Ecology" is used in a variety of ways, and some might argue that Isbell's structural analysis focuses on the "social ecology" of Chuschi. I would object to this interpretation because the field of cultural or human ecology is a fast-developing specialization within anthropology and researchers who are doing "ecological" research are empha-

sizing increasingly sophisticated techniques for the quantitative and qualitative analysis of human ecological systems. Such techniques include the careful evaluation of climate, biotic and abiotic resources, patterns of utilization of such resources, productive technology and efficiency, and demographic and biomedical factors.⁷ Isbell does give a general description of the agricultural system and local habitat types, but many of her comments on Andean ecology are from published sources, and her study did not include a quantitative investigation of environmental factors or the productive system.

Having discussed the ecological approach in anthropology, it is appropriate to consider Stephen B. Brush's *Mountain, Field, and Family*. The setting is the highland mestizo community of Uchucmarca in the Peruvian Department of Cajamarca. Brush's book, however, is not a community study in the traditional style, for it is a work that is consistently ecological in its conceptualization and execution. That is to say, this is a book about Andean ecology and adaptation in which Uchucmarca merely happens to be the site selected for intensive investigation. The first chapter discusses Andean geography, micro-climates, John Murra's concept of "verticality" (the utilization of ecological zones at differing altitudes), patterns of resource exploitation, and field methods. This chapter is a good introduction to Andean ecology for the general reader, but the discussion of field methods is disappointingly sketchy. Fortunately, the careful reader will be able to glean additional information on the techniques of data collection from a chapter on agricultural technology and an appendix on food yields. The type of quantitative input-output analysis that Brush uses has been around for some time,⁸ but he is one of the first to use it systematically in the Andes.

One unusual aspect of Brush's study is that he concerns himself with both "economic" and "ecological" anthropology, whereas most investigators are content to deal with one or the other. "Economic anthropology" is a clone from economics, and its advocates are given to debates on whether or not formal economic theory is applicable to nonindustrialized societies. The problem with this is that a great deal of energy is spent trying to prove or disprove that western economic concepts such as "economic man," and the "maximization of profits" and the "minimization of losses" fit behavior in traditional societies.⁹ Within the context of economic anthropology, Brush tries to prove that the concept of "underemployment" does not, in fact, apply to the Andean peasants he studied. I am inclined to agree with him, but I am not sure that his destruction of this straw man adds that much to the ecological analysis.

Like the previously discussed studies, Ted Lewellen's *Peasants in Transition* focuses on the economy and social change of an Andean community; in this case the people studied are the Aymara of the Lake Titicaca region of southeastern Peru. According to Lewellen: "The theoretical basis for this study is general systems theory. Unlike functionalism or structuralism . . . systems theory is designed to deal with change—even to the extent of postulating the absolute necessity for change if any system is to survive. Also, unlike anthropological theories, such as evolutionism, which deal with vast changes over long periods of time, systems theory is applicable to small groups and is amenable to extensive quantification" (pp. 4–5). Despite the useful perspective af-

forded by a systems theory approach, Lewellen's book has some serious shortcomings. His account of the conquest and colonial periods is extremely general and offers little information on the communities that are the focus of the study. The questionnaire that Lewellen used to collect comparative data on three settlements is a flawed instrument because many of the forced-choice questions are not exhaustive (i.e., they do not allow for a full range of responses), and many items are poorly conceptualized and operationalized, such as the one in which the interviewer is asked to rate the respondents' attitudes as "good," "normal," or "bad."

In my view, the major contribution of the book is found in chapter 7, "The Adventist Elite," in which religious change among the Aymara is described in its historical context. This is one of the best descriptions of religious change in the modern literature on Latin America. It is no secret that many anthropologists view "native culture" as sacrosanct, and become upset when they encounter "ethnocentric" missionaries attempting to modify indigenous values and world view. Lewellen rejects the a priori assumption that native religion is "good" and that foreign religion is "bad." He describes how the Adventist mission of Frederick Stahl in the early 1900s was accepted by a handful of Aymara because it was the sole source of educational opportunity presented to them. (Government schools were not provided to many Aymara communities until the 1940s and 50s.) Despite violent harassment, Adventism survived among a small nucleus of individuals who subsequently emerged as a local "elite" because of their literacy and bilingualism. In Lewellen's terms, they constituted a "pool of variability" in the local population and were those best able to adapt to the changing social and economic conditions.

Lewellen's main argument is that religious conversion among the Aymara he studied is based less on religious fervor than on a rational decision to seek educational opportunities. He states: ". . . according to conventional theory and the prevailing belief that Protestants must be marginals in Catholic-dominated countries, these people *had* to be suffering from anomie and disillusionment, they *had* to be on their way out. Actually, precisely the opposite is the case, but to understand why requires a theoretical orientation . . . that views deviance as adaptive, not necessarily dysfunctional" (p. 6). Lewellen is correct to call attention to the need to approach the topic of religious change with scientific objectivity, and to consider the motivations of the "deviants" who opt for new religious patterns. Such change has the potential for both positive and negative consequences.

Unlike the preceding works, Norman E. Whitten's *Sacha Runa* does not focus on a highland Peruvian community. Rather, it is a study of the lowland Quichua¹⁰ of eastern Ecuador. It is appropriate to consider this study along with the others for a number of reasons. Primary among these are the facts that Whitten focuses on cultural adaptation and change as do the other authors, and the jungle Quichua share linguistic affinities and economic links with highland Andean peoples. The book is also significant because it represents the first major ethnography on the jungle Quichua in the English language.¹¹ Although the lowland Quichua number in the thousands, they have remained relatively

obscure to scholars. Without a doubt, part of the reason for this has been the erroneous, but common, assumption that the Quichua have surrendered their native traditions and are currently the impoverished bearers of a hispanicized peasant way of life. This work reveals that Amazonian ethnicity is much more than facepaint and feathers. In their rush to "discover" the most remote and exotic Amazonian Indian groups, ethnologists have often overlooked the very complex adaptive processes characteristic of surviving lowland societies which have had more intensive contact with outside influences. Much attention has been focused on the small, elusive groups that are so prone to extinction following their first outside contact; but it is also important to realize that there are groups such as the Quichua, the various Jivaroan peoples,¹² and the Campa¹³ which have survived in large numbers and have, with some success, defended themselves against white exploitation and encroachment.

Although Whitten gives attention to the Quichua history and aboriginal culture, the thrust of his work is to describe and analyze the situation of the modern jungle Quichua. In opting for this approach, Whitten has abjured the often utilized anthropological fiction of the "ethnographic present." The ethnographic present is a literary device in which the writer describes native culture as he or she believes it to have existed prior to European contact. This is appealing to many ethnographers for it is the only way one can describe the "pure" culture of a group that has experienced acculturative influences. But the pitfalls of this approach are many, not the least of which are the tendencies to idealize the traditional culture and make it appear as a tidy and perfectly coherent system. These are easy traps to fall into when one does not have the problem of facing the ambiguities inherent in the observation of ongoing events. Whitten has eschewed the "museum" approach, and has plunged headlong into the analysis of the complex socioeconomic and political realities faced by the jungle Quichua.

Whitten describes in meticulous detail the historical process of interethnic contact from the seventeenth century to the current efforts of the members of the Quichua community of San Jacinto del Pindo to defend their territory from settlers, ranchers, and inconsistent bureaucratic policies. While other authors express vague hopes that their research will have policy implications, Whitten does not hesitate. He identifies specific injustices, racial biases, and policy errors, and suggests alternative approaches for dealing with these problems. Of all the studies currently discussed, Whitten's is the only one that has a real chance of influencing the official policies of the nation in question and of providing native people with intellectual support for their attempt to organize in the defense of their rights. The reason for this is that Whitten developed a research program that included a staff of Quichua, Ecuadorian, and American research assistants, which from its inception maintained important links with Ecuadorian scholarly and governmental institutions. It is worth noting that Whitten has worked to become a recognized figure in Ecuadorian official and intellectual circles, and this effort enhances the probability that people will listen to what he has to say. Despite differences of programmatic content, the involvement of Whitten and Joseph B. Casagrande at the University of Illinois to build interna-

tional institutional links is reminiscent of the efforts of Allan Holmberg and his colleagues in the famous Cornell Peru Project.¹⁴ Some may prefer to agitate for the overthrow of entire political orders, but Whitten's work is a model for those who would influence existing and evolving systems.

In conclusion, Ernest Feder's a priori assumption that the only significant problem of peasants is the expansion of the agroindustrial complex is not fully supported by the data from Sicaya, Chuschi, Uchucmarca, or the Peruvian Aymara, although this model is applicable to the situation of the lowland Quichua. I do not mean to imply that these communities are completely unaffected by industrialization and agribusiness expansion; certainly, there are very few, if any, places left in the world that are so isolated as to be immune from the effects of the world economy and modernization. But one cannot account for the social dynamics of all peasant or native communities solely by referring to exploitation and disenfranchisement. What is going on in Sicaya, Chuschi, Uchucmarca, and among the Aymara cannot be explained simply on the basis of an external threat. The impact the industrialized world is having on them is often through the wider economic and political spheres and is mediated by local resources, traditions, demographic conditions, and access to transportation routes and administrative centers. The works reviewed here demonstrate that the ethnological community study remains a viable approach to the investigation of these variables and the process of sociocultural evolution.

Feder may wish that all social researchers should have aims similar to his own. Rather than make accusations, I would propose that all of the authors discussed here are reasonable men and women who are concerned about the well being of the people they studied. But this is to be expected and is not the ultimate criterion for the evaluation of their work. Social scientists are a fairly heterogeneous lot, and the ways in which they pursue their "science" are often as varied as the people involved. The books reviewed here reveal the highly individualistic nature of anthropological research and analysis, despite apparent similarities of geographical location and investigative foci. One should not see these differences of approach and style as being based on an inability to perceive and comment upon social inequality. In applied social science the criterion for evaluation should be whether knowledge can be incorporated into effective programs of action that will involve and better the life conditions of significant numbers of people. Many social scientists are involved in efforts of this nature and more are needed. But in general scientific terms, the overriding question should concern whether researchers have contributed to the development of knowledge, methods, and theory. Feder would like for us to perceive the world in general, and social science in particular, in terms of good and evil. This is an approach that contributes little to the understanding of how the world or science actually work.

WILLIAM T. VICKERS

Florida International University

NOTES

1. Ernest Feder, "The Peasant," *LARR* 13, no. 3 (1978): 193–204.
2. Some may take my critique of Feder's position as an indication that I am unconcerned about the well being of peasant and tribal peoples in the face of modernization. For this reason alone I refer readers to the following items: "Development Without Them in Brazil's Northeast and Amazon," *Caribbean Review* 8, no. 2 (1979): 50–53; "Letter to the Editor, Indians on the Amazon," *Time* (Foreign Editions), 13 February 1978, p. 1; "Environment, Production and Subsistence: Economic Patterns in a Rural Otomi Community," in Michael Kenny and H. Russell Bernard, eds., *Ethnological Training in the Mezquital Valley, Mexico* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1973) pp. 143–62; "Indians, Oil, and Colonists: Contrasting Systems of Man-Land Relations in the Aguarico River Valley of Eastern Ecuador," *Latinamericanist* 8, no. 2 (1972): 1–3; "Ideation as Adaptation: Traditional Belief and Modern Intervention in Siona-Secoya Religion," in Norman E. Whitten, Jr., ed., *Cultural Transformations and Ethnicity in Modern Ecuador: Ethnological Perspectives* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, in press); "The Jesuits and the SIL: External Policies for Ecuador's Tucanoans through Three Centuries," in Søren Hvalkof and Peter Aaby, eds., *Is God an American: An Anthropological Perspective on the Missionary Work of the Summer Institute of Linguistics in Latin America* (Bornheim-Merton, W. Germany: Lamuv Verlag GmbH, in press).
3. William Mangin, "Urbanization Case History in Peru," pp. 47–54 and Paul L. Doughty, "Behind the Back of the City," pp. 30–46 in William Mangin, ed., *Peasants in Cities* (Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1970).
4. See Victor Barnouw, *Culture and Personality* (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1973), pp. 129–47 for a discussion of various critiques of Mead's early work.
5. Marvin Harris, *The Rise of Anthropological Theory* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968), pp. 605–33.
6. See, for example, Earl R. Babbie, *The Practice of Social Research*, 2d ed. (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1979), pp. 13–25 for a discussion of the traditional model of science and the realities of scientific practice.
7. Good introductions to the state of the art in ecological anthropology may be found in Andrew P. Vayda and Roy A. Rappaport, "Ecology: Cultural and Non-Cultural," in James A. Clifton, ed., *Introduction to Cultural Anthropology: Essays in the Scope and Methods of the Science of Man* (Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968), pp. 477–97; Donald L. Hardesty, *Ecological Anthropology* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1977); and Emilio F. Moran, *Human Adaptability: An Introduction to Ecological Anthropology* (North Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury Press, 1979).
8. Examples of the use of input-output analysis in the study of nonindustrialized subsistence systems may be found in Roy A. Rappaport, *Pigs for the Ancestors: Ritual in the Ecology of a New Guinea People* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1968) and Bernard Nietschmann, *Between Land and Water: The Subsistence Ecology of the Miskito Indians, Eastern Nicaragua* (New York: Seminar Press, 1973).
9. For an introduction to the debate between the "formalist" and "substantivist" schools of thought in economic anthropology see the collection of papers in Edward E. LeClair, Jr. and Harold K. Schneider, *Economic Anthropology: Readings in Theory and Analysis* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968).
10. The correct spelling in Ecuador is "Quichua," and not "Quechua" as in Peru and Bolivia. This is a sore point for researchers who have worked in Ecuador and who are repeatedly "corrected" by colleagues whose experience is in other Andean countries.
11. Udo Oberem's, *Los Quijos: historia de la transculturación de un grupo indígena en el Oriente Ecuatoriano (1538–1956)*, 2 vols. (Madrid: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras de la Universidad de Madrid, Memórias del Departamento de Antropología y Etnología de América, 1971) is the major modern source on the Quijos Quichua in Spanish.
12. See Michael Harner, *The Jivaro: People of the Sacred Waterfalls* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday/Natural History Press, 1972) and Henning Siverts, *Tribal Survival in the*

Alto Marañon: The Aguaruna Case (Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs Document No. 10, 1972).

13. The situation of the Campa is described in John H. Bodley, *Tribal Survival in the Amazon: The Campa Case* (Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs Document No. 5), and Gerald Weiss, *The Cosmology of the Campa Indians of Eastern Peru* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1969).
14. An overview of the Cornell Peru Project is presented in Henry F. Dobyns, Paul L. Doughty, and Harold D. Lasswell, *Peasants, Power, and Applied Social Change: Vicos as a Model* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1971).