ARCHIVIO ANTROPOLOGICO MEDITERRANEO

anno XII/XIII (2009-2010), n. 12 (2)

on line

Abstracts

Marlène Albert-Llorca
Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail
LISST-Centre d'Anthropologie Sociale
marlene.albert@wanadoo.fr

Memoria e oblio dei campi di concentramento dei Repubblicani spagnoli nel sud ovest della Francia

Nel 1939, alla fine della Guerra Civile spagnola, migliaia di Repubblicani oppositori del Generale Franco finirono in esilio in Francia. Sin dal loro arrivo, essi furono internati nei campi e costretti a condizioni di vita molto dure. Sino agli anni Settanta del Novecento, questo inglorioso episodio della storia francese è rimasto praticamente nell'oblio. Oggi, almeno nel sud del Paese, non passa giorno in cui qualcuno non evochi la memoria dell'esilio e dell'internamento dei Repubblicani spagnoli in Francia. Questo contributo, basato sul caso del Campo di Le Vernet, mostra il processo che dall'oblio ha condotto alla memoria dei campi e ne analizza le caratteristiche.

Parole chiave: Memoria; Oblio; Campi di concentramento; Repubblicani spagnoli; Ebrei.

Memory and oblivion of the internment camps of the Spanish Republicans in South-West France

In 1939, at the end of the Spanish Civil War, which set Republicans against General Franco partisans, tens of thousands of them flowed into exile in France. Upon their arrival, they were interned in camps where living conditions were very hard. Until the 1970s, this inglorious episode in the history of France had practically fallen into oblivion. Today, in the south at least, never a day passes but somebody evokes the memory of exile and internment of Spanish Republicans in France. This paper - based on the Camp of Le Vernet case - shows the process that leads from oblivion to recovery of the memory of the camps and analyses what characterizes this memory.

Key words: Memory; Oblivion; Internment camps; Spanish Republicans; Jews.

Eugene Cohen
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
College of New Jersey, Ewing, New Jersey
cohen@tcnj.edu

Sensible men and serious women: order, disorder, and morality in an Italian village

For over a decade, anthropologists engaged in a vigorous debate regarding the utility, meaning, and explanation of honor and shame in Mediterranean communities. There are competing interpretations regarding these cultural constructions, but no consensus. Partly, this is a result of examining honor and shame as discrete domains deriving from more fundamental conditions.
In this paper, I examine, in detail, the ethnography of honor and shame in a central (Tuscany) Italian village. I use these data to contend honor and shame are not encapsulated domains, but are part of a wider and fundamental cognitive framework and world view involving the nature of inter-personal relations, understandings regarding the attributes of human nature and an agonistic perception of the human condition.

Keywords: Italy (Tuscany); Honor; Shame; World View; Inter-Personal Relations.

Uomini responsabili e donne serie: ordine, disordine e moralità in una comunità italiana

Per più di un decennio gli antropologi si sono impegnati in un acceso dibattito sulla pertinenza, il significato e il senso dell'onore e della vergogna nell'area del Mediterraneo. Le interpretazioni fornite per queste costruzioni culturali sono state spesso contrastanti e non si è raggiunto un accordo. Ciò è dipeso, in parte, dal fatto che l'analisi ha riguardato l'onore e la vergogna intesi come ambiti separati derivanti da altre condizioni fondamentali.
In questo contributo, propongo, in particolare, un'etnografia dell'onore e della vergogna presso una comunità dell'Italia centrale (in Toscana). L'obiettivo è mostrare come queste due sfere, lungi dall'essere isolate, vadano invece inserite in un più ampio quadro cognitivo e in una visione del mondo che coinvolge le relazioni interpersonali, la comprensione degli aspetti della natura umana e del suo modo di percepire agonisticamente la propria condizione.

Parole-chiave: Italia (Toscana); Onore; Vergogna; Concezione del mondo; Relazioni interpersonali.

Antonino Cusumano
Università di Palermo
Dipartimento di Beni Culturali
Viale delle Scienze - 90100 Palermo
dancus@tiscali.it

Pane al pane e vino al vino

È noto che il pane e il vino rappresentano due pilastri centrali delle basi alimentari dei popoli del Mediterraneo, essendo entrambi i frutti fecondi e millenari di due fondamentali piante di civiltà: il grano e la vite. In quanto segni eccellenti di riproduzione ciclica della terra e per ciò stesso di rifondazione del vivere e dell'esistere, pane e vino sono simboli paradigmatici dell'indissolubile simbiosi tra l'umano e il vegetale, tra l'umano e il sovraumano. Assicurando la transizione dalla natura alla cultura, il loro consumo ha contribuito a determinare status e gerarchie, a plasmare forme e pratiche rituali, a conferire identità e memoria, a dare ordine e significato al mondo. Per alcuni aspetti in opposizione dialettica, ponendosi il pane sul versante del cotto e il vino su quello del fermentato, l'uno e l'altro sono nella prassi e nella lingua popolare siciliana elementi complementari di un'endiadi formale e concettuale, di un binomio semantico irresistibile e inscindibile, significanti indiscutibilmente diversi ma – a livello delle strutture profonde – sostanzialmente riconducibili ad un comune orizzonte di senso.

Parole chiave: Relazioni pane-vino; Fermentazione; Simboli; Proverbi; Riti.

"Pane al pane e vino al vino". *Symbolical meanings of bread and wine in Mediterranean cultures*

It is known that bread and wine are two fundamental pillars of the basic diet of the peoples of the Mediterranean, being both thousand-year old and fruitful products of two key plants of civilization: wheat and vine. As excellent signs of the cyclical reproduction of the earth and thereby of the re-foundation of life and existence, bread and wine are paradigmatic symbols of the indissoluble symbiosis between the human and the vegetable kingdom, between the human and the superhuman. By ensuring the transition from nature to culture, their consumption has contributed to determine status and hierarchy, shape ritual forms and practices, give identity and memory, give order and meaning to the world. Being in some respects in dialectical opposition, as bread is cooked and wine is fermented, they are both, in practice and in the Sicilian vernacular, complementary elements of a formal and conceptual hendiadys, of an irresistible and inseparable semantic pair, significants indisputably different, but – at the level of deep structures – essentially referable to a common horizon of meaning.

Key words: Bread-wine connection; Fermentation; Symbols; Proverbs; Rituals.

Nicola Cusumano
Università di Palermo
Dipartimento di Beni Culturali
Viale delle Scienze - 90100 Palermo
remocl@libero.it

Turisti a Sparta: il passato che non torna e l'invenzione della tradizione

Quando è nato il "turismo culturale"? Di solito il punto di partenza generalmente indicato e privilegiato è l'Europa del Settecento. Tuttavia è possibile esplorare altre culture, più distanti nel tempo, ma pur sempre strettamente collegati alla nostra, almeno nell'autorappresentazione dell'*identità* di cui si alimenta il nostro Occidente.

Si focalizzerà l'attenzione sul mondo greco, con alcune osservazioni generali sul viaggio culturale che è alla radice stessa della storiografia: destinato a divenire in seguito un *topos* obbligato nelle dichiarazioni proemiali degli storici, il viaggio, anzi i viaggi, del *pater historiae* Erodoto introducono ad un'esplorazione sottile e ambigua dell'identità greca. Tuttavia, è il "turismo" culturale a Sparta, divenuto rapidamente tappa obbligata della classe dirigente greco-romana, a fornire il caso più interessante.

Parole chiave: Turismo culturale; Memoria; Passato; Origini; Sparta.

Tourists in Sparta: the past that does not come back and the invention of tradition

When the "cultural Tourism" is born? The point of departure is generally identified in the European culture of XVIII century. Nevertheless it's possible to examine other cultures, which are historically more remote, but at the same time strictly connected with our, in accordance with the status of "identity" that characterizes Occidental world. The attention will be focalised on the ancient Greece. This paper will reserve some reflections to the cultural travel and his relevance among the Greeks. A meaningful example is the travel of the historians: since Herodotus, it has been considered an element necessary and topical, as we can observe in the proemial declarations. The travels of Herodotus, the pater historiae*, enable a penetrating and ambiguous exploration of the Greek identity. In the second part of the paper the focus of attention will be on Sparta, a celebrate destination of the cultural travels of the Greek and Roman elite. This town, for many reasons, provides the most attractive case-study.*

Key words: Cultural Tourism; Memory; Past; Origins; Sparta.

David D. Gilmore
Dept. of Anthropology
Stony Brook University
Stony Brook NY
dgilmore@notes.cc.sunysb.edu

Peasant and Others in Rural Spain. The Relevance of Models

Since the days of Eric Wolf, most social scientists have routinely depicted peasants as oppressed and exploited, as the bottom rung of society. But are peasants always downtrodden and despised? Can peasants enjoy a high status, be respected, even admired in their society? This paper offers a modest corrective to the prevalent Marxist view from Andalusia (southern Spain). There, peasants – even the poorest – so long as they had a piece of land, represented a solid middle class in local terms, enjoying a relatively prized status. I try to explain the structural context of this glaring exception to the generic paradigm of peasant subjugation by describing the status of peasants relative to other agrarian social classes.

Key words: Peasants; Stratification; Social class; Spain; Andalusia.

I contadini e gli Altri nella Spagna rurale. L'importanza dei modelli

Dai tempi di Eric Wolf, la maggior parte degli studiosi di scienze sociali ha rappresentato i contadini come oppressi, sfruttati e collocati al rango più basso della società. Ma i contadini sono davvero così disprezzati e oppressi? Possono invece apprezzare la loro condizione, essere rispettati e diventare persino oggetto di ammirazione? Questo articolo offre un modesto correttivo alla prevalente visione marxista dell'Andalusia (Sud della Spagna). In questa regione i contadini – anche i più poveri – in quanto proprietari di un terreno, rappresentavano un solido ceto medio locale, tenuto in una certa considerazione. Cerco di illustrare il contesto strutturale di questo caso di studio, che costituisce un'eccezione al generico paradigma del contadino assoggettato, descrivendo la sua condizione in rapporto alle altre classi sociali del mondo agrario.

Parole chiave: Contadini; Stratificazione; Classe sociale; Spagna; Andalusia.

Elisabetta Grande
Università del Piemonte Orientale Amedeo Avogadro, sede di Alessandria
Dipartimento di Studi giuridici ed economici
Via Mondovì 8, 15100 Alessandria
elisabetta.grande@jp.unipmn.it

Diritti Umani egemoni: il caso della circoncisione femminile. Un appello a considerare seriamente il multiculturalismo

L'articolo si interroga sulle differenze che intercorrono fra la circoncisione femminile e le altre pratiche modificatrici degli organi sessuali, in particolare la circoncisione maschile e la mastoplastica additiva, e spezza una lancia a favore dell'applicazione di uno standard unico di valutazione delle diverse pratiche modificatrici. Solo un approccio inclusivo, che tratti "noi" al pari degli "altri", può infatti restituire credibilità all'idea di diritti umani "universali", che altrimenti rischiano di diventare meri strumenti di egemonia culturale. Per prendere sul serio il multiculturalismo occorre, insomma, secondo l'autrice, utilizzare un approccio integrativo, che metta davvero tutte le pratiche culturali sullo stesso piano.

Parole chiave: Multiculturalismo, Egemonia culturale; Diritti Umani; Circoncisione maschile e femminile; Mastoplastica additiva.

Hegemonic Human Rights: the Case of Female Circumcision. A call for taking multiculturalism seriously

In addressing the issue of female circumcision, the paper suggests that only a comprehensive approach towards all modifications of sexual organs, using a single, not a double, standard will make the human rights discourse on sexual organs' modifications less imperialistic, more effective and less assimilating. A more inclusive notion of human rights, a notion that includes "us" – the Westerners – as well as "them" – the "Others" – serves, it is argued, to give credibility to the "human rights spirit". What makes female circumcision a human rights' violation while male circumcision and breast augmentation are considered acceptable and even respectable cultural practices? Trying to find out the reason for singling-out female circumcision, the author will briefly address a number of issues, including health concerns, patient's consent (choice), sexual fulfillment limitation, and beauty requirements in different cultures. Taking multiculturalism seriously, it is argued, calls for an integrative approach towards the plurality of cultures and practices.

Key words: Multiculturalism; Cultural Hegemony; Human Rights; Female/Male Circumcision; Breast Augmentation.

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI PALERMO
Dipartimento di Beni Culturali
Storico-Archeologici, Socio-Antropologici e Geografici
Sezione Antropologica

fondazione **ignazio buttitta**

ARCHIVIO ANTROPOLOGICO MEDITERRANEO on line

ANNO XII/XIII (2009-2010), N. 12 (2)

SEMESTRALE DI SCIENZE UMANE

ISSN 2038-3215

Università degli Studi di Palermo
Dipartimento di Beni Culturali, Storico-Archeologici, Socio-Antropologici e Geografici
Sezione Antropologica

Indice

Ragionare

Ricercare

Documentare

Leggere - Vedere - Ascoltare

Abstracts

In copertina foto di Antonio Cusimano

David D. Gilmore

Peasant and Others in Rural Spain. The Relevance of Models

In the social sciences and especially in anthropology, peasant peoples are often depicted as the "bottom rung of society", the "low man on the totem pole" or "the underdog", or by some similar metaphors indicating not only low status, but indeed the very lowest (see Murray 2005). Further, the classic peasant model developed by Eric Wolf and his followers in the 1960s and 1970 relies on consistent reference to marginality, illiteracy, powerlessness, political oppression, subordination and despised status as virtually defining features of peasantries everywhere (see Dalton 1974, 1976; Kearney 2001; Bernstein 2010). There has been general acceptance of view of the downtrodden peasant, but is it always accurate? Are peasants always exploited, despised and oppressed? Are there social rungs down below the peasantry in agrarian civilizations? Can peasants enjoy a high status, be looked up to, be admired?

In this paper I will like to offer a modest corrective to the prevalent view of peasant subjugation from southern Spain – mainly from the 1970s and 1980s[1]. Historically peasants in Andalusia (the sun-splashed southern region of Spain), even the poorest among them, so long as they had a piece of land (no matter how tiny) represented a solid middle class in local terms, enjoying a relatively prized status. I would like to explain the structural and cultural context of this apparent exception to the generic paradigm. First let us backtrack and review the classic model as developed by anthropologists Redfield and Wolf, and others who followed in their stead.

The first work among peasant was that of Robert Redfield in Mesoamerica: these are exquisitely crafted ethnographies of Indian villages in the Maya areas of Yucatan. With their colorful half-indigenous cultures, Maya farmers were conceived by Redfield as constituting a unique category which was neither "modern" nor "primitive" but something intermediate: a *sui generis* category which Redfield called "folk". In the years following, "folk" metamorphosed into "peasant" and took on a life of its own; today of course we regard "peasant studies" as a distinctive sub-field in the social sciences and one that has passed its prime because traditional peasantries are disappearing, universal victims of globalization (so I speak here in the past tense about Andalusia – peasants there are rapidly vanishing[2]).

Building on a passing reference by Kroeber in 1948, Redfield elaborated the nascent peasant concept in a number of works, most importantly *Peasant Society and Culture* (1956) and *The Little Community* (1960). Aside from opening up a virgin territory for anthropological research almost single-handedly, Redfield did the discipline a signal service by providing a workable definition or model. Later Eric Wolf (1966) and others such as Foster (1965); Potter and Diaz (1976) and Kearney (2000); refined and corroborated the Redfieldian model and operationalized it for work on subjects like modernization, rural revolutionism, and agrarian politics (being rather apolitical, Redfield had little interest in these issues). Today the focus has shifted to globalization (Edelman 1999; Borras *et al.* 2008). But especially noteworthy in the work of Wolf and his followers is the emphasis on "exploitation and "domination" as criteria for peasantries everywhere, indeed a defining characteristic.

My goal here is to show the ambiguities in the peasant concept by exploring the unusual degree of structural diversity in some nominally peasant societies using the classic models as reference points. This question of typological

fuzziness was brought up briefly by Redfield and Wolf and many others (see Murray 2005), but largely left in a suspended animation in the 1970s largely because the issue seems open-ended. I am particularly interested here in how the "not-quite" peasant categories developed by Redfield, Wolf, Kearney and others, can provide methodological means for sorting out social-cultural and status distinctions within the context of paleotechnic peasantry. Remaining of interest to anthropologists today is the subtlety of the early theorists' identification of peasant-like groups which are "not quite" peasants, that is, who are rural cultivators who live in a nation-state but lack true "peasantness". In Spain I found a natural laboratory for the testing of a nuanced typologizing with major consequences for an understanding of agrarian hierarchization.

Peasantries in Anthropology: Models, Definitions, Debates

An enduring definition of "peasant" was developed both by Redfield and Wolf. In Redfield's view peasants are people who farm "as a way of life". Living in a wider social context, they are the rural segment of dual world, rural and urban. Second, peasants are subsistence farmers, not profit-driven capitalists, who depend upon family labor, eschewing employment of non-kin. The third point for Redfield is that true peasants have some access to, and control over a plot of land: this connection is organic, meaning that peasants a long-term, often ancestral, association with a particular place and they have some rights of usufruct. And last, peasants live in the domain of a nation-state; they are the food-producing segment of civilization which includes non-food-producing elites and other non-agrarian classes such as merchants, proletarians, artisans, and, most importantly, the carriers of a Great Tradition, that is, a literate, intellectual and religious/philosophical system of world-import. According to Redfield, major Great Traditions are those of Roman Catholicism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, Judaism, and Confucianism/Taoism. Since they are part-society with a part-culture, peasants are subject to the laws of the state as well as to the power of overlords to whom they pay rents or tithes or tribute.

We may regard the four criteria above as significant not only in providing a framework of definition but also for excluding and contrasting certain marginal farming groups which Redfield, as well as Wolf are careful to consider and contrast to pure peasants. The first kind of farmers that are excluded from the peasant model are large-scale, industrialized agro-businessmen. They are, unlike peasants, not subsistence farmers, but capitalist entrepreneurs. They farm for profit and they operate using neotechnic methods in a commodities market. An example is the large-scale corn growers of the the American Midwest, Australian wheat agro-businessmen, Mexican hacendistas, or Spanish latifundistas. The second category contrasted to "peasants" consists of what Wolf calls "rural proletarians" and Redfield "landless peasants". These are migrant fieldworks or landless laborers who work for big growers, as for example the Mexican grape pickers in California. Although rural proletarians farm for a living, they have no land of their own and thus no decision-making autonomy in agriculture. They are simply hired hands who work for a casual wage and have no historical connectedness to a plot of land as peasant do. To summarize thus far: we can observe three distinct social categories of rural cultivators who live in the domain of a nation-state: first are subsistence peasants; second are profit-oriented capitalist farmers; and third are landless rural proletarians.

Without taking exception to any of the above, Eric Wolf however insists upon an additional criterion for a definition of peasants. He agrees with Redfield that peasants are rural cultivators who live within a nation-state and are subject to the laws of a state; but he places most of his emphasis on the disposition of the peasant surplus. Wolf's model is based on the critical assertion that peasant surplus is expropriated unjustly by powerful elites. Additionally, for Wolf, peasants are always "exploited" and "dominated" by these elites. Consequently, peasants constitute a downtrodden subjugated class wherever they are found: they are inevitably abused, suppressed and maltreated by elites, who need and extract their surplus production and give little of value in return. Peasants are vassals, peons and serfs – used and abused. By regarding the issue in class-conflict terms, Wolf introduces a frankly Marxist point of view which was largely lacking in previous studies. For Wolf the defin-

ing feature of peasantry is an "asymmetrical" relationship to overlords who "siphon off" peasant surplus "by force" or the threat of force. All this occurs within the context of a predatory legal framework by which elites impose "domain" upon peasant production (that is, assert a lien).

According to Wolf, domain over peasant produce can occurs in numerous guises, all of which are legal fictions masking the use, or the threat, of force. The first form of domain is *patrimonial*, which is almost synonymous with feudalism: peasants swear fealty to a lord and pay a portion of their yields in return for "protection". The second domain is *prebendal*, which is also associated with feudal arrangements: a prebend is a kind of tax farming by which, satisfying debts or promoting favorites, nobles gave authority to third parties to impose excises upon peasant produce or peasant possessions, such as draft animals, candles, the number of windows in their hovels, and so on, often in a most arbitrary fashion. The third form of lien is called *mercantile* domain, which is basically equivalent to private property. This occurs mainly under modern capitalism. Under mercantile dominion, landlords extract a rent in cash or in kind from peasants who occupy their land (this can also take the form of sharecropping or corvée labor as in the haciendas of colonial Latin America). The fourth form of domain is *administrative*, or state ownership, as in the agrarian collectives or cooperatives under Communist rule. Under Communism, peasants are turned into wage laborers on what are essentially state-owned farms. In any of these legal systems, the taxes, tithes, payments or the corvée labor that peasants owe to their overlords are referred to collectively by Wolf as the "peasant fund of rent". For Wolf, it is this fund of rent, that is, the duty levied on peasant surplus – which for him is little more than extortion – that underscores the Marxist model of peasantry. As Dalton (1974) and others have pointed out, Wolf predictably has little to say about "peasant exploitation" under administrative domain, possibly due to political sensitivity, or perhaps bias.

In the ensuing years, Wolf's insistence that "exploitation" was integral to the peasant model gave rise to a virtual industry of rebuttal and counterattack (see Dalton 1974; Dunn 1976; Roseberry 1976, 1985; Derman, Levin 1977; Newcomer 1977). Conservative critics battled it out back and forth with the Marxists for decades with no clear outcome, and the issue is still in limbo. For his part, Redfield did not live long enough to become ensnared in this academic vitriol. Nevertheless, implicit in his writings is the notion that the give-and-take between peasants and overlords is not one simply of domination but one of reciprocity, even mutualism, by which peasant rents are rewarded by the endowment of a Great Tradition – basically the civilizational process. Evading any moral evaluations, Redfield implies simply that peasants' spiritual needs are met in the "synchronization" of Great (literate) and Little (local) Traditions. Through this exchange peasants are ennobled and enriched by being provided membership in a high civilization, so the exchange between non-food-producing elites and peasants is mutually beneficial. Still, some anthropologists see in Redfield's encomiums about the benefits of the Great Tradition a distasteful political conservatism or at best a Pollyanna blindness (Lewis 1960). Of course, one may form one's own opinion about this debate, but I think "apolitical" or "culturalogical" might be a better description for Redfield's work rather than an ideological epithet like reactionary.

Whatever may be their respective intellectual merits, Wolf and Redfield certainly agree that peasants stand apart from other types to whom they can be profitably contrasted for heuristic purposes. Thus the "peasant model" gets its defining shape not only by the criteria of inclusion above, but also by criteria of exclusion like any scientifically-valid category. So there are "peasants" and there are rural people who farm but who are "not-peasants". And it is here in the gray areas of the model, where my work in Andalusia comes in. When I conducted fieldwork in the mid 1970s, I was lucky enough to find all three social groups in one setting – a rarity in agrarian studies in anthropology. Living together in one Andalusian pueblo there were "classical" peasants, rural proletarians and capitalist farmers, side-by-side and cheek-to-jowl. What separated these people and what made them distinctive in the local consciousness? How did they interrelate? On what terms did they live together, imagine each other? What kind of status did each enjoy in the eyes of the others. Here I address these questions.

The Field Site: An Andalusian Agro-town

Located in Seville Province, just off the main road connecting Seville and Cordoba, lies the symbolically-named pueblo of Fuentes de Andalucía. Hoping not to appear too symbol-minded, I use this term because Fuentes exemplifies the agro-town prototype as is a "fount" or "source" of knowledge for the social scientist. Agro-towns are bog conglomerations, are farming folk living in nucleated settlements: common in southern Spain, Italy and Portugal – a Mediterranean phenomenon. Nestled in a typical latifundio region on a vast fertile plain, Fuentes in the 1970s and 80s displayed all the famous (and infamous) characteristics of traditional Andalusian rural society, such as poverty, class hatred and political strife (see Gilmore 1987). I did fieldwork in Fuentes intermittently between 1971 and 1986. It was home in that period to about 7,500 (there were 12,000 in 1950, the rapid decline due to labor out-migration). Today (2009) the population has recovered somewhat due to the return of many migrants. Typical for the *comarca* and throughout its history back to the Reconquest, large landowners (*latifundistas*) owned most of the arable land in the municipal territory. Fuentes was typical also in boasting a large and vibrant society of small "minifundistas" living cheek-and-jowl with the latifundists, farming scattered plots of sunflower, wheat, olive, and other Mediterranean staples. There were a few hectares in irrigation (*huertas*), producing table vegetables, tomatoes, lettuce, peppers, and so on. A few people engaged in animal husbandry, mainly sedentary sheep and goat herding, although a few cattlemen made a relatively good living, supplying milk. Many families kept a few pigs and chickens if they had space in their backyards.

Monocrop commercial agriculture occupied about three-quarters of the economically-active population of the pueblo. People engaged in farming were divided up by local standards into a four-fold hierarchy based largely on land ownership and work habits. The rest of the people were involved in non-food-producing pursuits: tradesmen, brokers, merchants, agrarian agents, bankers, bureaucrats, professionals, baristas, construction workers, and so on. A growing and powerful minority was made up by white-collar workers – teachers, utilities workers, office workers, mechanics. Positioned at the apex of the social pyramid was a single man, the Duke of the Infantado, who was at that time one of the richest men in Spain, titled or untitled, and among the largest landowners in Andalusia. He was naturally absentee, living principally in Madrid, but maintaining a castle/residence in the municipality known as La Moncloa, constructed out of the ruins of a charming Moorish watchtower and complete with servants-quarters, swimming pool, private chapel, garages and stables. This aristocrat does not figure in this discussion since he played no visible part in village life, only participating indirectly as collector of rents.

A Spanish Squirearchy

The next highest social group was made up of untitled gentry known locally by the famous Andalusian colloquialism "los señoritos", although people in town also called them "capitalistas" or "terratenientes" and simply "los ricos". Referring to this elite, many of my sophisticated friends used the term "la alta burgesía", attesting to tradition of social consciousness and political awareness. Sometimes out of a common antagonism, the workers referred to the big landowners as "señoritingos", a disrespectful double-diminutive. There were of course other, unprintable, epithets used. Making up about two percent of the population, these latitfundistas each owned about 200 fanegas or more, sometimes as much as 500 hectares. Therefore they needed hired hands to work the harvests, so they constituted the employer class upon whom so many others depended for work. Rich by any standards, Spanish or otherwise, with apartment houses in Seville and taking weekend vacations in Paris, these local potentates correlate to the category "capitalist farmers".

The word "señorito" of course is only the diminutive of *señor*, and supposedly was used in olden days by house servants to address the young master, so it was a term commonly heard only in the context of a rich man's household. Since this label derives directly from the master-servant relationship, the word *señorito* was often used interchangeably in Andalusia for "employer" or "boss" in any context, not only agriculture. Used broadly, it also can connote "playboy" or rich lay-about, that is, a scion who does not work – or less flatteringly, a wastrel or

parasite. In truth the *señoritos* of Fuentes had a group horror of manual labor and consequently were surrounded by servants. Labor was cheap and unemployment rampant. One of their servants was the *chacha*, a nursemaid or nanny, immortalized in the pueblo as a human symbol of *señorito* luxury. Another was the *casero*, a kind of butler-handyman who did odd-jobs around the house, and another was the *portero*, a concierge who would look after the master's farmhouse (*cortijo*) which no self-respecting *señorito* was without).

In addition to this vast staff, a rich man needed a *vaquero* to look after his livestock, an *aperador* (machinist/mechanic) to fix the farm implements, any number of *tractoristas* to drive the combines and to cultivate, a *capataz* (steward or bailiff) to manage the estate, and of course a *manijero* (manager) to hire day laborers. When he went hunting, the *señorito* would be accompanied by a *secretario* a hired hand who reloaded his shotgun, prepared the blind and brought along and served lunch and poured the ubiquitous sherry (*fino*). Honorifics were vitally important. The lower order always addressed a *señorito* with the title "don", paid respect with hat-in-hand deference and rose to greet their superiors. This kind of kowtowing is of course gone forever in the new, democratic egalitarian-minded Spain.

Jealous of their exalted status, the *señoritos* affirmed their exclusivity by avoiding contact with the lower classes on a daily basis. They did this by establishing exclusive clubs, bars and casinos, private hunt clubs, *casetas* (pavilions) for the summer fair, maintaining apartments in the provincial capitals and spending as much time as they could away. So people said of them that were "in the pueblo" but not "of the pueblo"; that is, they were not "*hijos del pueblo*" (sons of the village). Indeed the gentry agreed with this. Their identity was fraught with symbols of "otherness" and distinctiveness, as they emulated urban sophisticates in Spain and abroad. They referred to themselves, when asked, as "we, the gentlemen of this pueblo", or "we the *labradores",* the latter term meaning "gentleman farmer" or, as in Victorian Britain "the squirearchy". Naturally, the Communist underground press was always fulminating against this class and its dissipated life style known as "señoritismo". The rich-man stereotype and the associated folklore and class hatreds go back to the early days of the last century (see Gilmore 1998).

The homes of the rich in Andalusian pueblos stand unmistakably apart. They are three stories high whereas others have two at the most. The rich man's mansion features a pair of entrance pillars, gorgeous plaster molding, elegant window bars and other such fripperies of decoration. The clerestory towers over other houses. The *señorito's* home always boasts a large balcony. Here the family gathers to take the summer air. Naturally it was bruited about in Fuentes that the *señoritos* "literally look down upon the common people". Aside from an imposing palace in town, members of the elite always had a *cortijo* complete with stables, warehouses, libraries, a wood-burning fireplace (unusual in Andalusia), agricultural outbuildings and of course a staff of housekeepers. These visible manifestations of inequality remain today in brick and plaster, even as all other status distinctions disappear. In its village architecture, the past is present in Andalusia (see Gilmore 1980).

Peasants: Solidly In the Middle

Squarely in the middle of the agricultural hierarchy was a stalwart group of farmers, "peasants" by any definition. They had a special moniker in Fuentes and in the region: "mayetes". Other people in the town regarded the *mayetes* in very different ways, all relative to their own class status. When the landless workers (discussed below) spoke of a *mayete* they did so in reverential tones. The poor looked up to the *mayete* as affluent: self-employed, economically independent, relatively conformable – a person to be admired and respected. Most important is that "mayete" indicates freedom from wage labor, although it does not mean freedom from manual labor – very different matters. To work hard for yourself was good; to work for others was bad. The *mayetess* themselves emphasized this, so that when asked about their profession they liked to call themselves *autónomos*, "yeoman" in English. But it was just as common for a *mayete* to call himself a *proprietario* (proprietor, owner). The latter is definitely a middle-class label in Andalusia; it has the ring of the complacent bourgeois. A *proprietario* is what Marx called a "petty commodity producer". The *mayetes* constituted about 23 percent of the economically-active people in Fuentes.

From whence does this lexical curiosity, "mayete", derive? Unfortunately, despite years of importuning, I never found out, as local people have no idea what the meaning of the term might be. Some say it derives from the month of May (*mayo*), because that was the time of year when peasants were galvanized into work on the wheat harvest. A cognate, *mayeto*, is found in the provinces of Málaga and Cádiz. A synonym for *mayete* is *pisguarero* or as they say "pihua'ero". This derives from the archaic *pegujalero,* meaning subsistence cultivator. Many townspeople say that the "real mayete" ("mayete-mayete") is a man who "works on his own account" and that is what distinguishes him from all others. Asked to place the *mayete* in the broader scheme of rural social life, some more educated people described the mayete as constituting the local *campesinado*, "peasantry".

Thus "mayete" carried a rich and resounding rhetorical load in this part of Andalusia. So layered are the nuances of the word that it inspires starkly contrasting images in the minds of those above and below in the hierarchy. To the rich, the term conjures up the true peasant with all the pejorative connotations this entails in standard Spanish (or English): a man who is "stuck to the land" who "works like an ox" and is just as stubborn, dense, ignorant and backward. One upper-class man spoke of his *mayete* neighbors as men of the soil whose fingernails were always dirty, a man with earth stains on his pants – a "regular mule".

By definition the *mayete* had at least 20 *fanagas* (approximately 25% of a hectare) of land. But the *mayetes* were not a monolithic group. They were internally stratified. Highest up was the "strong mayete" (*mayete fuerte*). He owned enough land to reap a profit and sometimes he even needed to hire laborers. Then came the middle *mayete* (*mayete mediano*). He has just enough land to support a family without working for wages. Last there is the small *mayete* (*mayete chico*), who has less that the requisite 20 or so fanegas needed for subsistence, and who may in hard times have to accept wage work – a disgrace to be avoided when possible. The "mayete chico" was therefore a borderline peasant, but nevertheless firmly among the propertied class.

All this implies that what marks the mayete off is not only his middling position in the hierarchy, but also his *independence from wage work*, his economic *independence*. In the Andalusian context, the peasant is *defined* as a small-scale cultivator who has the good fortune to be liberated from the cash nexus linking upper and lower classes. It is this special status, this functional autonomy, that provides the *mayete* stereotype with its moral salience in the psychology of the region and provides an aura of solidity.

The Workers

At the lowest rung of the social ladder are the farm workers: men and women who owned no land or only enough to supply a tiny supplement to supplement day labor on the estates of the gentry. In 1973 they constituted about 50% of the town's population. Though the most numerous, they controlled only about two percent of the arable land in the municipal territory, distributed unevenly, with most workers owning none at all. These impoverished folk went by the famous title *jornalero*, a redolent epithet devolving from the *jornal* or day wage. This of course testifies to an ancient history of day labor – a very precarious and miserable existence in a land where jobs were scarce, employers tightfisted and much land given over to unproductive pursuits such as private parks, hunting preserves and ranches for raising fighting bulls.

Being landless, the *jornaleros* were not peasants by the Redfield/Wolf model. Better-off people referred to them pityingly as "those who have nothing, nothing at all". There were other terms for a *jornalero*. People called him (or her) an *obrero eventual* (casual worker), a *bracero* or a *peón* (both meaning landless worker). The *mayetes* might say *taleguero*, a localism meaning someone who carries his midday meal to the field in a bag (*talega*). To the *mayetes*, who usually return home from for an ample lunch and a *siesta*, this implies poverty and deprivation. For the landed people of Fuentes, the term evokes all the dreaded connotations of being "locked into" the day-labor market – a fate from which there was little hope of escape except by emigration. Some of the more sophisticated people would sometimes call a landless man an "obrero agrícola" cognate to "rural proletarian". In casual conversation, a worker would be referred to as a "tio del campo", a nobody, a poor toiler in the fields.

Besides "having nothing at all", the most commonly noted criterion of the *jornalero* was a

migratory life. Even in the 1980s, most workers still meandered about the region looking for field labor in the olive, grape and wheat harvests, or else emigrated to northern Europe or to the Costa del Sol. Every few months, almost the entire jornalero population of Fuentes would confront a difficult series of decisions about where next to find work, whether to emigrate abroad or go to the coast, or to hunker down in the town and live off the tiny welfare doled out by the Franco Government (*la caraca*, or the crutch, as they called the demeaning handouts).

Each jornalero-class family operated on its own behalf, and so patterns of working-class existences varied widely from year to year and from family to family. This is another way in which the workers differed from and the peasants, since latter did pretty much the same thing with little variation except for crop choices. The most important factor in the worker's decision about employment was the labor pool of his family, ages of family members and health of the children. To be employable, a child – boy or girl – needed only to be about six years old. I often saw youngsters of that age at work often in the fields around Fuentes. The necessity to put their children to work worsened the lowly status of the worker and further impeded social mobility within the class. Of course this has all changed since, but in those days, the endless cycle of working and missing school was a great source of frustration.

In the early 1960s, farmers in the Lora del Rio area introduced canal irrigation for their labor-intensive cotton crops. This opened opportunities for many workers from Fuentes and surrounding pueblos mainly because the canals provided piecework wages in the off-months – early fall. Most the workers in Fuentes migrated with their entire families because children can be put to work easily gathering cotton. Once in the canals, they lived in cramped unheated one-room shacks and worked from dawn until sunset for piecework wages. Although a safety-valve, the cotton canals were regarded in a negative light because of the awful living conditions, the backbreaking work and the inescapable cold and damp. Naturally the necessity of working in the canals lowered the already bad reputation of the worker who decided not to emigrate abroad.

In the early 1970s, a concerned schoolteacher in Fuentes conducted an informal study of the impact of the itinerant work life upon the poor. In 1971, he found that over 16% of school-age minors left the local school system to work in the cotton canals from September to December. This represents about one-third of all children of jornalero parents. In addition to these boys and girls who worked in the canals, another 109 left school to engage in other forms of labor within the municipal territory, mainly in the olive and sunflower harvests. Consequently, 26% of all minors in the pueblo were removed from school – many just as the school term was beginning in the fall. Unhappily, many of these children would grow up illiterate and were unable to improve their lives as others did when Spain's economy boomed in the 1980s. Thus the lower class suffers even today from inherited disadvantages – a lingering legacy that will only disappear in the next generation.

In American rural sociology the category "rural proletarian" has a specific meaning not fully applicable to the Spanish case. In US usage, the phrase often refers to nomadic farm laborers, often foreign immigrants, for example Mexican *braceros* in California. This is no doubt the image that influenced Wolf and others writing in the 1960s and 1970s. In this view, "rural proletarian" has the connotation of a people always on the move, desultory and often illegal migrants. But in Spain and in other parts of the Mediterranean rim, the landless farm worker (that is, in the 1970s) was an ancient and indigenous category going back to the middle ages and probably even to the Roman period. There are indeed accounts of day laborers in southern Spain awaiting daily contracts in the village square in the works Cervantes and in earlier eye-witness accounts (see Malefakis 1970). The *jornaleros* of Spain found their counterparts in the *braccianti* of Italy's *mezzogiorno* and in the *jornaleiros* of the Algarve in Portugal. The *jornaleros* seem linked inexorably to Mediterranean latifundism and its New World offspring: the encomienda and hacienda. Today of course, the natives have been replaced by immigrant Africans – but that is another matter.

Status, Class, Life Style

As we have seen what defined the traditional social system in Fuentes was the striking difference among the three classes in terms of basic economy. The landowning gentry were locked into a mar-

riage of convenience with the workers, without whom the *señoritos* could not harvest their crops, especially of olives, which remain labor-intensive to this day. In parallel fashion, the workers were forced to depend upon the gentry, only finding relief by emigrating. Familiarity breeds contempt, as they say, and this unbreakable, hostile bond formed the basis of employer/employee relations in Fuentes in the 1970s as it had for centuries before. This perilous cash nexus caused mutual distrust and antagonism and colored the politics of the two extremes of the class pyramid. The workers were fiercely anti-clerical and held revolutionary doctrines (with exceptions), and the *señoritos*, as is well known, were piously Catholic and avid Franco supporters (of course with exceptions). The mayete peasants were split down the middle, many being religious and right-wing, others aligning with the landless and joining the Communist party. Much depended upon personality, personal history and familial ties as well as upon finances and, personal experiences during the Civil War. However, many *mayetes* were apathetic politically.

Naturally the three classes lived apart, avoiding each other socially, and were basically endogamous. The elite occupied the center of town (*el centro*) near the municipal town hall and parish church. The peasants lived mostly in what was called the periphery (*la periferia,)* an outlying ring of settlement, where they built two-story row houses, each lovingly whitewashed, often boasting tiny balconies to project solid bourgeois status. Inhibited by poverty, the workers lived in dilapidated homes outside the periphery, on the squalid outskirts of town, in the "barrios". The most notorious of these was "Barrio la Rana" (Frog Barrio), so called because of the poor drainage that in local lore caused the *jornaleros* to hop around puddles like frogs. Once again, here not in a metaphorical sense, but literally on-the-ground, peasants occupy a structurally intermediate position between the extremes of the social ladder.

Recapitulation. The Relevance of Models in Andalusia

Returning to our original goal of relating Fuentes to peasant studies, we make the following points. First, the case of Fuentes corroborates the work of Redfield on the peasantry: the *mayetes* represent a stable, traditional group of hard-working, autonomous, proud cultivators, who differ drastically in life style, mentality, and self-image from capitalist farmers above them and from landless workers below. The Fuentes case also seems to provide a counter-example to Wolf's insistence that "peasantry": is synonymous with exploitation and domination. Here it is the *jornaleros* who are "exploited", not the peasants. So we see from this that "peasant" in and of itself implies a wide spectrum of possibilities when it comes to relations with others in the society and degrees of exploitation and status. The critical factor is the degree of structural diversity in any given setting. Where one finds a large class of landless rural proletarians living alongside peasants, as in Fuentes, the peasants' position is strongly middle class. Without such a co-existing stratum, the peasant will by default occupy the bottom rung of the social ladder. In effect, Wolf and Redfield both got it right, but for the wrong reasons. When it comes to "exploitation and domination", *peasant* is a chameleon-like concept, context is all.

Second, we can see that the two marginal farming categories can and do coexist with a traditional peasantry and that this co-existence then defines the status of the peasants. What is true of Fuentes was also true of its region and by extension much of lower Andalusia (see Bernal 2009). The mountain pueblos in the south were of course always different, populated mainly by smallholders with fewer landless workers (Pitt-Rivers 1971). When a cleavage among the farming population exists as in Fuentes, one can expect to find two functionally interdependent classes: landlords and laborers with a peasantry standing between them. This three-fold structural complexity has, indeed, colored the entire history of southern Spain. Elsewhere in the world and in history, there were of course "middle-range" peasants who stood above their struggling brethren, like the *kulaks* of Russia or the "rich peasants" in China as Mao labeled them after the Revolution. But the point is that in Fuentes *all* the peasants were considered inherently "middle class", a solid, even enviable, bourgeois status.

Finally there is the question of the permeability of class lines and question of social mobility among the three social classes. In the case of the *mayetes chicos*, one finds much instability. The poorest seemed to have blended by imperceptible

degrees into the jornalero class, some having just enough land to avoid the canals, but often taking jobs in the olive harvest in the winter to supplement a minuscule farming income. Likewise, some returned migrant workers were able to achieve higher status by buying a few *fanegas* or starting some non-agrarian enterprise. So in the period between the Civil War (1936-39) and the 1980's, the line separating the lower and middle classes was very permeable. Downward mobility was most common, with decline into working-class status a constant nightmare for "small" *mayetes*. Upward mobility was possible, but only through luck (e. g. an hypergamous marriage, winning the lottery or inheriting land) or by emigrating, making a bundle and then returning and buying land and/or a big house.

At the other end of the social spectrum however, mobility was almost unheard of. Even when they struck it rich, the *mayetes* were never fully accepted into elite circles and would be turned away from the gentry's clubs and casinos with alacrity. Upper-class position status required a long pedigree, a history and a "name" (*apellido*), people insisted; and so in its agricultural heyday Fuentes was no different from any other agrarian hierarchy. Conversely, to fall from elite to mayete status, though rare, was a calamity which did occur (I was once told of such a case). But such a *declassé* status almost always meant emigration: for the shame and the contumely were unbearable to the elite, so they usually fled the environs to seek anonymity elsewhere.

A Final Word: Middle-Class Peasants

In conclusion we may say that the traditional social system of Fuentes fails to fit the classic peasant model in terms of the peasant's structural position *vis-à-vis* the rest of society. But this is not true because its peasants (*mayetes*) do not fit the classic definition developed by Redfield and Wolf. The anomaly exists mainly because of the co-existence of parallel categories (or classes) of farming folk who occupy positions both above and below peasants. Remember also that over 50% of the town's population are "beneath" the peasants in status and wealth and only 2% above, so the vast majority of local people did indeed: look up to the peasantry. But the three-fold hierarchy of Fuentes (discounting the absentee Duke) also corroborates the same old peasant models, because these two other "not-quite peasant" groups, the capitalists above and the rural proletarians below, gave shape to the intermediating peasant concept. Remember that local people described the *mayetes* specifically *in contrast* to the other two groups, one above, one below. So it follows that we must define peasants not only by who they are, but by who they are not.

The status implications of all this are clear: peasants, no matter how poor, do not always stand at the bottom of the social hierarchy; sometimes indeed they form a solid and respected middle class. Take note also that the *jornaleros* of Fuentes are not migratory farm workers like the *braceros* of California: being permanent residents of the town they have a long and well-attested history going back hundreds of years. Finally, we should also point out that the example of Andalusia is not anomalous by any means. For, throughout the rural European Mediterranean area, one encounters crowds of landless rural day laborers, from the *braccianti* of Sicily to the *jornaleiros* of southern Portugal – all people who look up to peasant status as a goal and dream. In this way, meridional Europe stands out as an exception to the rule and shows that classic models of a subaltern peasantry needs the refinement that comes only from the lessons of comparative and empirical ethnographic research.

Notes

[1] The research in Spain benefited from support at different times by the following agencies: the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Science Foundation, the Program for Cultural Cooperation between Spain's Ministry of Culture and United States Universities, the H. F. Guggenheim Foundation, the Wenner-Gren Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the American Philosophical Society. I want to thank Prof. Salvador Rodríguez Becerra of the University of Seville and Prof. Carmelo Lisón Tolosana of the Compultense University of Madrid for their insightful advice and wise guidance, and in Fuentes itself I thank Bobi and Sebastián Martín Caro, Antonio Milla Villarino, Manoli Fernández, Antonio Fernández, and all other the good people who were so consistently helpful and generous.

[2] For recent commentaries on the issues of peasant exploitation, disappearing peasantries and 21st century

peasant politics, see: Moyo and Yeros (2005), Holt-Gimenez (2006); Handy (2009). For the end of peasantry, specifically in Andalusia, see Rodríguez Becerra 2009.

References

Bernstein H.
2010 *Class Dynamics of Agrarian Change*, Fernwood, New York.

Bernal A. M.
2009 *Panorama histórico del campesinado andaluz en la segunda mitad del siglo XX*, in S. Rodríguez Becerra (ed.), *El Fin del Campesinado*, Consejera, Sivilla, de la Presidencia: 19-32.

Borras S., Edelman M., Kay C. (eds)
2008 *Transnational Agrarian Movements Confronting Globalization*, Wiley, Blackwell, Oxford.

Dalton G.
1974 *How exactly are peasants 'exploited'?*, in «American Anthropologist», LXXI: 553-561.
1975 *Exploitation of peasants: a reply to Dunn*, in «American Anthropologist», LXXVIII: 643-645.

Derman W., Levin M.
1977 *Peasants and propaganda, economics, and exploitation: a response to Dalton,* in «American Anthropologist», LXXIX: 119-125.

Dunn S. P.
1976 *On the exploitation of peasants: a reply to Dalton*, in «American Anthropologist», LXXVIII: 639-643.

Edelman M.
1999 *Peasants against Globalization,* Stanford University Press, Palo Alto.

Foster G.
1965 *Peasant society and the image of the limited good*, in «American Anthropologist», LXVII: 293-315.

Gilmore D.
1980 *The People of the Plain*, Columbia University Press, New York.
1987 *Aggression and Community*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
1998 *Carnival and Culture*, Yale University Press, New Haven.

Handy J.
2009 *Almost idiotic wretchedness: a long history of blaming peasants*, in «Journal of Peasant Studies», XXXVI: 325-344.

Holt-Gimenez E.
2006 *Campesino a Campesino,* Food First Books, Oakland.

Kearney M.
2001 *Reconceptualizing the Peasantry*, Westview Press, Boulder CO.

Lewis O.
1960 *Some of my best friends are peasants,* in «Human Organization», XIX: 179-180.

Malefakis E.
1970 *Agrarian Reform and Peasant Revolution in Spain*, Yale University Press, New Haven.

Moyo S., Yeros P. (eds)
2005 *Reclaiming the land: the Resurgence of Rural Movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America*, Zed Books, New York.

Murray S.
2005 *American anthropologists discover peasants*, in «Histories of Anthropology Annual», I: 61-98.

Newcomer P.
1977 *Toward a scientific treatment of "exploitations" – Critique of Dalton*, in «American Anthropologist», LXXIX: 115-119.

Pitt-Rivers J.
1971 *The People of the Sierra*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Potter J., Diaz M., Foster G. M. (eds)
1976 *Peasant Society: A Reader*, Little Brown, Boston.

Redfield R.
1956 *Peasant Society and Culture*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Rodríguez Becerra S. (ed.)
2009 *El Fin del Campesinado*, Consejera de la Presidencia, Sivilla.
1960 *The Little Community*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Roseberry W.
1976 *Rent, differentiation, and the development of capitalism among peasants,* in «American Anthropologist», LXXVIII: 45-58.
1985 *Something about peasants*, in «Critique of Anthropology», XI: 69-73.

Wolf E.
1966 *Peasants*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.