



---

Ethnographic Aspects of the World Capitalist System

Author(s): June Nash

Source: *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 10 (1981), pp. 393-423

Published by: Annual Reviews

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2155722>

Accessed: 04/02/2009 16:51

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=annrevs>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*Annual Reviews* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Annual Review of Anthropology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## ETHNOGRAPHIC ASPECTS OF THE WORLD CAPITALIST SYSTEM

◆9683

*June Nash*

Department of Anthropology, City College of the City University of New York,  
New York, NY 10031

Ever since its origin, anthropology has had a worldwide scope. Indeed, the very stimulus to the field were the advancing frontiers of European trade and colonies (77, 193). What distinguishes the present interest in the world scope of anthropology is the paradigm of integration of all people and cultures within a world capitalist *system*. This approach, fostered by Wallerstein (177–182), has roots in the political economy of dependent development and unequal exchange (2–5, 45) and in anthropological studies of the Third World (4, 7, 19, 176). This paradigm poses a challenge to established ways of describing as well as analyzing our field material. I shall attempt to review recent studies which assess the conceptual categories for placing ethnographic studies in the world system as well as the ongoing self-criticism and refinement of our traditional approaches in the intensive case studies, cross-cultural analyses, and ethnohistorical studies of colonialism and imperialism. I shall also attempt, and this is a much more difficult task, to assess the contributions anthropologists who have not addressed themselves to the specific paradigm of a world system have made as they developed a language for talking about worldwide customs and institutions. Eric Wolf prophesied this role for anthropology (188, p. 97): “. . . in the process of creating that science of man that will underwrite the new world culture and its new possibilities, anthropology will also change itself, and change itself beyond recognition. Some of the changes are already under way. To make them possible, in a world of necessity, is our obligation.”

According to Fred Eggan (44, p. 140), during World War II “the worldwide scope of the war made heavy demands on anthropological knowledge and anthropologists emerged with a new position in social science as well as with new ideas and sometimes new careers.” With grants available, students turned from North American Indian studies to studies of Africa,

Asia, India, and Latin America. British anthropologists had already spelled out the methodological implications of this shift in focus. In his presidential address to the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland in 1940, A. R. Radcliffe-Brown (138) stated:

Let us suppose that we wish to study and understand what is happening in a British or French colony or dependency in Africa, at the present time. Formerly the region was inhabited by Africans having their own social structure. Now a new and more complex social structure has been brought into existence. The population now includes a certain number of Europeans—government officials, traders, missionaries and, in some instances, settlers. The new political structure is one in which the Europeans have a large measure of control, and they generally play an important part in the new economic structure. The outstanding characteristic of this kind of social structure is that Europeans and Africans constitute different classes, with different languages, different customs and modes of life, and different sets of values and ideas. It is an extreme example of a society compounded of heterogeneous elements. As such it has a certain instability, due to the lack of adjustment of divergent interests. In order to understand the social changes that are taking place in a society of this kind, it seems to me essential to study the whole set of relations amongst the persons involved.

In the intervening decades, anthropologists made considerable advances in contextualizing their field observations in the colonial encounter (48, 71, 77, 117, 132, 161, 187) and postwar independence movements (7, 35, 47, 50, 51, 69, 70, 111, 189) and the impact of industrialization (46, 80, 90, 101, 119, 128, 137, 140). Anthropologists have recorded the transformations as stone axes gave way to steel in New Guinea (148) sleds to skiddoos in the Arctic (135), long bows to rifles in the South American jungles (89), and camels to pickup trucks in Saudi Arabia (31). They have recorded the varied responses of people who have shifted from subsistence crops to cash crops (145) and from intensive subsistence plot cultivation to “green revolution” farming (78, 116). Worsley (194, p. 232) summarized the formation of a Third World Coalition in terms that anticipate Wallerstein’s model: “The new societies,” he said, “have become what they are under the quite specific conditions of an emergent world-system and this external impact shaped their internal development.” The emergent world perspective of the 1960s became a central problem in the 1970s. Syntheses of aboriginal societies such as that of Eleanor Burke Leacock and Nancy Oestrich Lurie (102a) on North American Indian societies show their evolution in an historical framework that includes all of the political and economic trends affecting their populations. Two of the past presidents of the American Anthropological Association in the 1970s pointed to the new paradigm in their presidential addresses. As a result of world integration, Colson warned (33, pp. 261–62): “Not only is our basic subject matter suspect, but often enough we are told that we are now superfluous given that the ‘primitive’ cultures, which some assume we study, are disappearing and everyone is now, or is

soon to be, a member of a world society dominated by giant industrial bureaucracies and contending imperialism." While she forecasts as a central problem of the 1980s the "implications of the large-scale organizations within which so many of us now spend our lives" (33, p. 264), Bohannon (14, p. 513) asserts that the most important topic might be the "world problematique" concerning population, pollution, and conservation of resources." Some anthropologists have anticipated these programs for the 80s by studying the implications of transnational corporations (53, 81, 127, 146, 190, 191). Given this accumulating reservoir of case studies contextualized in global changes, and the growing awareness of the dialectical responses to the global forces that shaped the formation of "tribes" and "primitive" cultures, it is unfair to conclude, as Rollwag (142, p. 370) does, that the field "has been skewed in the direction of conceptualizing cultural systems *in vacuo*," and that "The significance of much of this research is destroyed because the isolationist tradition in cultural anthropology places more emphasis on the search for ethnographic case studies than upon a search for cause or process in the larger system . . ."

In this attempt to assess ethnographic contributions to a world systems understanding, I shall first present the Wallerstein paradigm and some of the criticisms of it that may help direct anthropological studies. I shall then turn to the related approaches in development and dependency studies. Following this, I shall indicate some of the ethnographic concepts and methods developed in their search for universally valid cross-cultural categories. This will include a reassessment of emic and etic distinctions and the cross-cultural studies. After a brief resume of recent studies in colonization and development, I shall conclude with a summary of those projects and publications dealing with the growing concern over the loss of cultural diversity and programs to reverse the trend.

## THE WORLD SYSTEMS PARADIGM

"A world system," as Wallerstein (181, pp. 347-48) defines it, "is a social system, one that has boundaries, structures, member groups, rules of legitimization and coherence. Its life is made up of the conflicting forces which hold it together by tension, and tear it apart as each group seeks eternally to remold it to its advantage." The basis of this world system is an international division of labor mediated through trade exchanges without the need for a unified political structure. This was, in fact, the strength of the system since it permitted flexibility for the various zones, which he calls core, periphery and semiperiphery depending upon their changing role in the overall economy. These zones contain different class structures, used differ-

ent modes of labor control, and profited unequally from workings of the system (181, p. 162).

Wallerstein was not the first to perceive the operations of a world system in the sixteenth century. Historians such as Parry (134) and Williams (186a) sketched the outline of the system as European powers competed for and consolidated economic advantages in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Dodgshon (40) gives credit to at least six precursors, the most important of whom to social scientists is Andrew Gundar Frank, whose work (63–65) is discussed below. Worsley (194, p. 14) stated the dimensions of the system a decade before the publication of Wallerstein's first volume:

Europe had accomplished a transformation which created the world as a social system. It was a world-order founded on conquest and maintained by force. The New 'World' was no egalitarian 'family of nations'; it was essentially asymmetrical. At the one pole stood industrialized Europe, at the other the disinherited. Paradoxically, the world had been divided in the process of its unification, divided into spheres of influence, and divided into rich and poor.

What made the publication of Wallerstein's book an event was possibly the growing dissatisfaction with the development model and the failure of the world to conform to its proscriptions, as well as the breakthroughs these precursors had made in preparing the ground for the new paradigm.

Wallerstein has succeeded in making history available to social scientists interested in contemporary problems of the world system, just as he has linked historical investigation to the current concerns. Braudel (17), the original inspiration for the world paradigm according to Wallerstein, could trace the strength of the system in the flexibility that permitted the growth of innovative firms incorporated in the overarching structure at the same time that he foresaw its demise as growing centralization threatened the basis for change. Wallerstein's view is equally encompassing. The first volume (181) has been followed by one projected for the period 1640–1815 (183), a third will cover material from 1815 to 1917, and finally 1917 on. It is quite possible that anthropologists will have more difficulty with subsequent volumes that tie more directly into their own analyses. I shall present some of those problems as critics have responded to his first volume.

### *The Problem of Unitary vs Multiple Modes of Production*

In contrast to the Marxist view that class opposition occurs at the site of production, Wallerstein's thesis maintains, in Lane's (102) words, that "classes are to be understood by their relation to the world system in which they exist," since they "arise from production oriented toward meeting demands expressed in the system of exchanges embodied in that world system and contribute to the concentration in the core." This challenge to the Marxist view of distinct modes of production defined by the internal

division of labor and ordered in lineal succession has caused the most controversy. Wallerstein flatly states that there is only one mode of production and that is the capitalist world system (178, p. 390).

Trimberger (171) contrasts the unitary view of the capitalist mode of production contained in the Wallerstein model with the uneven development thesis put forth by Mandel (113) and Amin (4, 5). Mandel considers the world capitalist system to be made up of a variety of modes of production found in diverse social formations united by capitalist modes of exchange. Thus: "The historical specificity of imperialism lies in the fact that, although it unites the world economy into a single market, it does not unify world society into a homogeneous capitalist milieu" [quoted in Trimberger (171, p. 129)]. This view is supported by Amin (4, p. 147), who shows the persistence of several modes of production with strong resistance to absorption in the capitalist sector. This viewpoint is consistent with that of English social historians, Trimberger notes (171, p. 131), citing the work of John Foster, (61) and E. P. Thompson (170), who found the most militant anticapitalist consciousness among those artisans who were not absorbed in capitalist production. Gutman (85) cites the frequent incidence of worker resistance to debasement of craft skills in New England's nascent industrial cities and the introduction of immigrant labor to break the solidarity of these craft workers in the mill towns of New England. Resistance to the penetration of the world capitalist system may pivot around women's resistance to the loss of their economic production and the values surrounding it. This can be seen in the contributions to the anthology on *Women in Colonization* (48), particularly those dealing with the Seneca, the Bari of Colombia, the Montaignais, the Luo, the Trobriand Islanders, and the Ivory Coast. The Ibo women's war (94a) was a fight against a taxation system that threatened the subsistence agriculture managed by women, and it was interpreted by them as a threat on life itself.

The acceptance or rejection of the thesis concerning a single dominant mode of production may depend upon the timing and place of ethnographic inquiry. Sidney Mintz (118) and Jane and Peter Schneider (151) find it compatible with the analysis of class formation in peripheral countries—the Caribbean islands and Sicily—particularly up to the nineteenth century. Mintz (118) shows how interdependent forms of labor with local initiative and local response made it possible for forced labor to exist in the periphery along with free labor in western European manufactories up to the nineteenth century. This paradigm, Mintz states (118, p. 253), "... calls into question attempts to analyze local economic subsystems in terms of their component modes of production, to the extent that such analyses ignore or circumvent the significance of the overarching world system within which such subsystems must function." In contrast, "To examine the capitalist

system globally when looking at any one of its sectors means taking into account the accumulation of capital through wage-labor at the core, while seeing other sectors as satisfying the systemic requirements of that core" (118, p. 259). Thus the coexistence of different modes of labor control, slave and free labor, within the capitalist mode of production, is not a paradox but a stimulus to the operation of the world exchange system. Similarly, this global perspective enables Jane and Peter Schneider (151) to view the Mafia of Sicily as businessmen acting in defense of their interests as pastoralists and wheat growers in the developing world market rather than as politicians frustrated with the weakness of central political authority.

I shall not try to resolve the differences between those who stress the unity of the world system against those who emphasize the variety of coexisting modes of production since I am convinced that the concept of mode of production and its application to particular historical formations can only be clarified by further discussion in relation to field data, some of which I assess later on. As others (91, 118) have noted, the advantage of the Wallerstein model, and that of dependency theorists (23, 24, 41, 64, 65), is that one avoids the false opposition of "feudal" vs "capitalist" in attending to the overarching framework. We can see how, for example, the interests of nascent capitalizing interests join with those of foreign capitalists when a Brazilian coffee producer employing labor in various forms of contract and sharecropping labor invests in a branch of a multinational corporation operating in Sao Paulo. If his activities were consigned to separate modes of production, we would miss the special dynamic of Brazilian politics.

### *The Problem of the Passive Periphery*

Anthropologists will probably have greater difficulty with the treatment of the periphery [or dependent country in Frank's (64) model] as a passive recipient of the dynamic penetration of the modernizing capitalist system. Root (143) rejects this assumption in Chirot's *Social Change in a Peripheral Society: The Creation of a Balkan Colony* (27) on the basis that the state's priorities were not strong enough to undermine social relations based on land tenure until the late seventeenth century. Hence internal class relations could not be defined adequately by a worldwide division of labor organized under the Ottoman empire since social relations based on land tenure were still in effect. Hechter's (86) analysis of Celtic resistance to British domination is a case in point.

Similarly, Sella (154) criticizes the tendency of the Wallerstein model to "exaggerate the influence of the newly emerging pattern of relationships on the internal life of the areas involved." He argues that one cannot explain all forms of labor control in core and periphery in terms of the capitalist imperative since sixteenth century capitalism made use of preexisting forms

of labor review. Skocpol (156) criticizes the overemphasis on market processes to the neglect of technological invention. Since everything is treated as though it reinforced the system, the stability of the system is overstated. This treatment ignores other than economic variables such as historically preexisting institutional patterns that result in the threat of rebellion or other geopolitical pressures which ultimately determine what class will be in the best position to take advantage of available trade opportunities.

These arguments countering the priority Wallerstein gives to the global system are most concisely stated in Sella's (154) statement:

To go back to Wallerstein's contention that the combination of free and coerced labor was the "essence of capitalism," it would seem preferable and more accurate to say that, insofar as the new world-system involved the clash and the blend of widely different cultures, its vitality if not its essence resulted from its ability to adapt to its own ends whatever forms of labor control came its way in different parts of the world, not because they were the most economical, but simply because they happened to be available. The failure of the Spanish monarchy to transform the American Indians into wage earners after the European model illustrates this point.

Historians of Spanish America might well question whether it was the policy of the Spanish monarchy to transform American Indians into wage earners, since the crown often countered the measures of colonists to mobilize labor by any means. However, the thesis concerning the importance of local modes of labor control feeding into the productive relations established after colonization is worth emphasizing.

Jane Schneider (150) also criticizes a world's systems approach that ignores the dynamic of precapitalist empires of Asia. Because Wallerstein views trade in preciosities as nonsystemic, Schneider (150, p. 20) maintains, he cannot explain the expansion of countries such as Portugal which was only minimally interested in basic commodities. A similar criticism might be made of Smith's (158) emphasis on the structure imposed by the world system.

The implicit treatment of periphery as a "passive victim" universally giving way to the capitalist invasion is a corollary of the unitary perspective on mode of production in Wallerstein, according to Trimberger (171). This reinforces her favoring uneven development approaches which recognize "specific combinations of pre-capitalist, semi-capitalist and capitalist relations of production." She argues that

... this model opens the way for understanding between distinct social formations in the world system and a dynamic which is not unidirectional. Precapitalist relations of production are subordinated and distorted by the impact of capitalism, but they too have their own dynamic which has an impact on capitalist development and may serve as the material base of the genesis of resistance to capitalism.

An example of such a dynamic is the variation in economic position among peasantry, often assumed to be a homogeneous, subordinated group. The historic significance of such variation can best be envisioned by the microanalytic anthropological perspective (144).

### *Time and Space in the Emergence of the World Capitalist System*

Another problem brought up in connection with the first volume of Wallerstein's projected series is the spatial boundary and chronology for the world system. Dodgshon (40) draws upon Polanyi (136) and Dalton (37) in questioning the emergence of an integrated system in the sixteenth century. Citing Dalton's (37) statement that "only when the market is self-regulating can we talk of a capitalist system," he accuses Wallerstein of confusing a world-based economy with the world system which took its place. This transformation occurs when there is a move from penetration through distribution to penetration through production, a change that Polanyi believes did not exist until 1750. Since there are no political institutions marking the transition (120), it is more difficult to set the time. Other problems on the timing of the emergence of the world system rise when one considers the significance of luxury trade (150) and long-distance trade (169) prior to European developments.

One can also expect disagreement with the allocation of countries according to core, semiperiphery, and periphery as specific regions are taken into account. The growing integration of production processes on a world scale may break down all geographical boundaries. With the present trend toward accumulation by a few transnational corporations which are not subject to redistribution by any political entity, there may be no core population benefiting from the system. But before that level of integration is reached, the system will indeed be in demise (178, 186).

## DEVELOPMENT, DEPENDENCY, AND UNEQUAL EXCHANGE

The difficulty for anthropologists concerned with problems of development and underdevelopment is in the shift from general statements about the world system to microfieldwork (62). Proponents of the world systems model are specific about what is forbidden; the "ethnographic present" is negated, as is the reification of structures in polarities contrasting subsistence cropping and cash cropping or folk-urban (91). However, Hopkins (91) is less definite on what should be done. What will be done may well depend on the current polemic concerning: 1. the focus on exchange relations or productive relations as the central dynamic; 2. the question of the

articulation of the mode(s) of production; and 3. explanations for the growing inequality between sectors of the international economy. I shall restrict my summary of these controversies to anthropological commentaries.

### *Exchange vs Productive Relations*

In Wallerstein's projection of the world system into discussion of contemporary relationships, the central dynamic of the world system remains that of maximizing the accumulation of surplus in the core countries on the basis of inequalities in exchange relations with the rest of the world (177, 178, 181, 182). Fluctuations in the supply of goods lead to a shift in the terms of trade, resulting in a strengthened worldwide effective demand, and then expansion of the capitalist world economy. The relative bargaining power of each producer depends on relative scarcity or glut of the products it exchanges on the world market. Semiperipheral countries in the modern world are those characterized by 1. a larger external and weaker internal property-owning bourgeoisie; 2. a better-paid professional sector and more poorly paid sector of proletarianized workers; and 3. a larger sector of semiproletarianized workers in comparison with core countries (182, p. 468). These would include countries of Latin America such as Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Venezuela, Chile, and Cuba; and the outer rim of Europe, such as Portugal, Spain, Italy, Norway, Finland; and the Arab States. Although different states may occupy different positions relative to the core, divergences will continue. All states cannot develop simultaneously since the system functions by virtue of having unequal core and peripheral regions (180, p. 23).

Wallerstein attributes much of the inspiration for his thesis about underdevelopment to Frank. His thesis, familiar to most anthropologists, is worth stating briefly in order to relate it to the criticisms that followed:

It is generally held that economic development occurs in a succession of capitalist stages and that today's underdeveloped countries are still in a stage, sometimes depicted as an original stage of history, through which the now-developed countries passed long ago. Yet even a modest acquaintance with history shows that underdevelopment is not original or traditional and that neither the past nor the present of the underdeveloped countries resemble in any important respect the past of the now-developed countries. The now-developed countries were never *underdeveloped*, though they may have been *un* developed. It is also widely believed that the contemporary underdevelopment of a country can be understood as the product of reflection solely of its own economic, political, social, and cultural characteristics or structure. Yet historical research demonstrates that contemporary underdevelopment is in large part the historical product of past and continuing economic and other relations between the satellite underdeveloped and the now-developed metropolitan countries. Furthermore, these relations are an essential part of the structure and development of the capitalist system on a world scale as a whole. A related and also largely erroneous view is that the development of these underdeveloped countries and, within them of their most underdeveloped domestic

areas, must and will be generated or stimulated by diffusing capital, institutions, values, etc. to them from the international and national capitalist metropolises. Historical perspective based on the underdeveloped countries' past experience suggests that, on the contrary, in the underdeveloped countries economic development can now occur only independently of most of these relations of diffusion (64, p. 5).

Frank's historical studies (63–65) stress the trading relationships and the resulting failure to develop industry. Dependency theory as developed by Latin American scholars (23–25, 41, 165) stressed the “dynamic aspects of industrialization in underdeveloped countries” (131, p. 22). In this perspective on dependency, productive relationships were central to the analysis, as dos Santos' (41, p. 76) statement of the problem shows:

... dependence is a *conditioning situation* in which the economies of one group of countries are conditioned by the development and expansion of others. A relationship of interdependence between two or more economies or between such economies and the world trading system becomes a dependent relationship when some countries expand through self-emulsion while others, being in a dependent position, can only expand as a reflection of the expansion of the dominant countries, which may have positive or negative effects on their immediate development. . . . Dependence, then, is based upon an international division of labour which allows industrial development to take place in some countries while restricting it in others, whose growth is conditioned by and subjected to the power centers of the world.

This “new dependency” rescues the model from overemphasizing the exchange relations while focusing on productive relations based on the international division of labor. Critics of the Frank and Wallerstein model of the world system, including Bradby (16), Chilcote (26), Laclau (99, 100) Dupré & Rey (42), and Foster-Carter (62), reject the centrality of exchange relationships in explaining international imbalances. They prefer to revitalize the Marxist thesis of feudalism as a “coexistent although differentiated mode of production” (62). The novelty in this thesis, in comparison with earlier treatments that dealt with unilineal successive stages, is their view of these “precapitalist” (though coexistent) forms of social relationships acting to reinforce capitalism by producing the subsistence needs of a labor force at lower cost. Rey (139) reinvents a new set of Marxist stages to account for the entry of capitalism in the periphery, starting with (a) an initial link in the sphere of exchange, (b) capitalism taking root, and (c) precapitalist modes disappearing. Wolpe (192) and Bartra (9, 10) show the dialectical nature of the interaction between precapitalist and capitalist forms as they mutually reinforce each other in the transformation of productive relationships.

This discussion on the relationship between different modes of production will be picked up below in the section on articulation of the mode(s) of production. What I wish to point out here is that the critics of Wallerstein

and Frank may be identifying the nexus in which the productive relations involved in the international division of labor take place, i.e. international trade, with exchange itself thus losing the sense of how productive relationships become realized in international trade. It is easier to appreciate the embeddedness of productive relations in exchange in the case of export diversification since the components produced in low wage areas are useful as commodities only when they have been exchanged and assembled in the core capitalist countries for sale to consumers. But this integration of production at an international level is only the final step in the internationalizing of production begun during colonial days with exchange of raw materials or foodstuffs for manufactured goods.

Wallerstein's (180) distinction of cyclical trends, which concern exchange relations, from secular trends, which concern relations of production, may clarify this point. Cycles of expansion occur when world production is less than world effective demand based on the existing social distribution of world purchasing power, and contraction occurs when the total world production exceeds the world effective demand. Secular trends involve the physical expansion and politico-structural consolidation of the capitalist world economy and the counter movement of consolidation. This now involves the capitalization of world agriculture and the present elimination of small-scale subsistence production. Independent farmers reduced to being proletariats are more dependent on central capitalized sources of productivity and are more exploitable. At the same time, technological innovations reinforce the costs of production and as a result the centralization of control over the means of production. Both cyclical and secular trends respond to pressures emanating from the unitary capitalist system according to Wallerstein's model.

### *Articulation of the Mode(s) of Production*

Frank (64), like Wallerstein, rejects the dual model of the economic system, with underdevelopment of the "feudal" sector explained as a lack of articulation with the metropolitan centers. He conceives of "... a whole chain of metropolises down to the hacienda or rural merchant who are satellites of the local commercial metropolitan centers but who in their turn have peasants as their satellites (64, pp. 146-47). In his model, increasing polarization between the dominant and subordinate groups results in growing local, regional, and international inequality.

Long (107) summarizes some of the ways in which Peruvian analysts have attacked the problem of disjunctures between different kinds of markets and different units of production. He criticizes the contributors to *Dominación y Cambios en Peru* (36, 115), for the emphasis on the fragmentation of rural society and dependence on outsiders for mobilizing resistance to capitalist institutions. Cotler's contribution to this volume (36)

has been widely cited as a model for thinking about the impact of populist and reform agencies on the peasants. In his diagram of the "closed" and "open-based" triangle he shows the stimulus to communication among peasants as national agencies intervene between them and the former power-holders.

Long (107, p. 277) commends the anthropological studies of brokers as being of "central importance for the analysis of underdevelopment since they identify the groups and individuals holding strategic positions in the system of linkages between local rural economies and the wider regional and national structures" (8, 30, 68, 75, 84, 108, 155, 164). Zenner & Jarvenpa (195) focus their study of Scottish brokers in the Hudson Bay Company—one of the early multinational corporations—directly on the linkage between such ethnically distinct enterprises with the world market. These studies of broker relationships supplement the analyses of modes of production by showing how types of horizontal relations that occur at the local level function to maintain certain types of vertical relationships (107, p. 273). Linkages between differentially developed sectors of the economy result, according to Long & Roberts (109, p. 300), in "the chain of exploitation that links the metropolitan centers to their provincial satellites [referred to by Frank (64)]. These exploitative relationships can be visualized, for example, as manifest in the way in which large city traders are linked to traders in smaller towns or to large land-owners. The basic point is that even the most remote village and poorest agricultural laborer have been fully integrated into a hierarchical system whereby, at successive points, the metropolitan centers siphoned off economic surplus."

Clammer (28, p. 222) calls for clarification of Frank's metaphor of a "chain of metropolitan-satellite relationships stretching from the world centres of capitalism to the most isolated peasant," by referring to the "French school's approach." This reference is to Terray's (168) model of two or more modes of production which he would apply to "the nature of exchanges between sectors" in a "metropolis-satellite model." Terray's analysis is based on Meillassoux's study of the Guro, where he finds a new mode of production each time the Guro expand their cooperative work group. Godelier (74) criticizes Meillassoux's own treatment of the Guro economy for confusing a mode of division of labor with a mode of production. This trivializes the concept of mode of production to the point that one cannot deal with it analytically. Even in cases of the most rudimentary division of labor, there are different modes of organizing the work force. These variations can be encompassed within the same mode of production. If we deal with several coexistent modes of production narrowly defined in terms of ownership of the means of production or organization of the task force, we constantly encounter the kind of anomaly Long (107, p. 271) points to where any one family may end up as classified in different modes

of production. Illustrating this with the example of a family linked to a mining center by one waged worker, sharecropping land owned by a neighboring family, owning a small plot of land, and supplying labor of some of its members to a nearby hacienda, he concludes that "the reproduction of the social relations of production for one mode is dependent on the continuity of other social relations of production found in other modes." But if we used this concept of mode of production consistently, we would have to put every family in which a woman works as a paid or unpaid (married) domestic within the house in two separate modes of production. As O'Laughlin suggests (130), since the real problem is to locate traditional communities and marginal groups within the structure of the overall system, the relationship of "dominance" and "accessory" should be kept in the forefront. This, I take it, would mean rejecting the multiplication of modes of production.

If we turn from the problem of relating multiple modes of production in coexistence at one point in time and turn to the problem of historic processes, we encounter other problems. In his critique of the unitary mode of production in dependency theory, Laclau (99, 100) proposes retention of the "feudal" mode to highlight the contrasts between modernizing sectors of the capitalist economy and enclaves with traditional relations in production. However, as Grondin (80, p. 123) shows in Muquiyayuyo, Peru, the very same system can fluctuate between mercantile and industrial strategies, with communal organizations bringing in capital investments that provide the infrastructure for modernization. Conceptualizing this fluid, historical process as a dual mode of production would be a retreat into the "traditional modern" dichotomy under new labels, causing us to lose sight of that dialectical process that the dialogue about the world systems approach has initiated. The absence of capitalist institutions *within* a given social formation does not necessarily imply the autonomy of that group, as Seddon (153) points out in the transformation of Moroccan society. The articulation of capitalist and precapitalist modes of production under the domination of the former implies, on the contrary, the transformation of the social formation in question, whether or not capitalist production is acutally established in it.

The crucial point is the degree of autonomy of each sociopolitical formation within the world system. The chronology has to be worked out for each enclave, taking into account the many points of resistance to the intrusive mode of production. No formula will be adequate, and each case should be determined on the basis of careful studies of the articulation between subordinate and dominant groups, such as those of Scott (152) and Cook (34).

The anthropological perspective can help considerably in analyzing the internal hierarchy of dependencies that support the imposed dependency of satellite and metropolitan centers. These include not only the cultural bro-

kers discussed above, but also the fundamental dependency of workers on the job in industry or commercial crop farming. Even counter structures such as trade unions depend upon legitimization within the same framework of legal and political institutions that the capitalists maintain in power (126). At an even more fundamental level, the dependency of a family, however constituted, on a single wage earner provides a setting in which the roles of subordination and superordination are socialized and reinforced (126). Robert's (140, p. 131) study of a cooperative factory in Huancayo shows that "dependency is not only a process imposed from the center—but is also one that is contributed to, and often sustained by the activities of local people." The very reforms made by governments to strengthen the position of workers and peasants such as land reform (38, 141, 159) can foster a new dependency.

The family, as the basis for the reproduction of the work force and of society itself, both reinforces and resists the demands and pressures exerted from above. The way in which family institutions responded to colonization is discussed in several of the contributions in the Etienne and Leacock anthology (48) and in Block (13). Stavenhagen (162) opened the analysis of rural social structure by examining class formation almost two decades ago. Roseberry (144) explores the dynamic of socioeconomic differentiation in peasant society. Contemporary studies on the relationship between household structure, class formation, and the capitalist world system accept variation within peasant communities as a conditioning variable rather than an anomaly. Case studies (18, 32, 103, 122) presented at the American Anthropological Association annual meetings, December 7, 1980, showing the varied responses to the penetration of capitalist institutions of work, consumption, and leisure reveal a variety of strategies not predictable from the imposed system.

From a social and cultural perspective, one of the most important factors in the articulation of satellite and metropolis is the migration of workers. Amin (4, 5) and Emmanuel (45) discuss the perpetuation and aggravation of the unequal exchange with this loss of the most economically active and productive sector of the work force. Jane and Peter Schneider (151) show how the export of labor ties Sicily into the world market even after the loss of its role as wheat supplier of Europe. When workers migrate to another nation, problems of illegal status may exacerbate the cultural or class bases for discrimination (20, 129). Employers in core countries, particularly in highly competitive industries relying on labor-intensive processes such as garment work and electronics, often rely on such a segmented labor force (53, 79, 98, 129, 146, 160). Even within national boundaries, migration of rural to urban (30, 68) and peasant village to commercial agricultural plantations (87) creates new arenas for examining the major propositions of the world system from ethnographic approaches.

The final basis for dependency is technological innovation. Hopkins (90, p. 620) attacks the problem from a world systems perspective, showing how technological innovation permits increased control of the periphery by the center which dominates access to machinery. Dependency on loans to purchase technology and replacement parts perpetuates the ties of metropolitan and satellite, resulting, as Hopkins points out, in political centralization and stability within the satellite. Hopkins illustrates this process as he observes the change from locally produced technology to imported capital-intensive technology in Testour. Revolutionary governments, such as Cuba and Chile, became painfully aware of the dependency on foreign technology when replacement parts for machinery, transportation, and communications equipment were cut off by the United States. Even without a drastic rupture in relations with the international market, the choice to invest in capital-intensive machinery has implications for social policy, irrespective of the ideology officially proclaimed by the state (12, 104).

### *The Problem of the Widening Gap*

The widening gap between core and peripheral regions, and between rich and poor classes, was becoming increasingly apparent in the decade of the 1960s (1). A decade of development focusing on import substitution industrialization (43) and green revolution agriculture (78) not only had failed to improve the position of Third World populations but had contributed to trade imbalances, increasing debt and impoverishment revealed in indices of infant mortality and life expectancy. Schneider (149) and C. T. Smith (157) summarize some of the case studies by anthropologists (11, 22, 54-56, 82, 147) showing how a small number of entrepreneurs benefited from development programs. Smith (157, p. 815) concludes that, "Economic development, left unconstrained with mechanisms to assure equitable distribution at all levels, produces benefits most effectively for the upper levels in the hierarchy." While he would search for equality "rooted in planning," the world systems proponents would discount that possibility since they see inequality as endemic to the system. Amin (3) argues that the value of the work force is maintained at a level of subsistence in the dependent countries while wages may multiply 20 or 30 times that in "imperialist centers." It is precisely from this abyss that unequal exchange arises. In a later article, Amin (4) spells out the consequences of monopolistic competition: 1. the growth of selling costs through advertising to create special needs reduces the profitability of producing goods; 2. the state bears an increasing share of infrastructural costs for roads and communication; and 3. the difference between the rewards to labor in the periphery is greater than the difference in productivity between the two because of the higher rate of profit for investments in the periphery. The survival and reproduction of the labor force depends upon the extreme exploitation of the rural economy, and

particularly of women who produce subsistence crops (124, 184). Burawoy (21) and Gudeman (83) review the literature showing the impact of uneven development on labor throughout the world. The uneven character of development by monopoly capital is viewed by *dependistas* as intrinsic to the system. Sunkel (165, p. 519) concludes that:

The concept of "dependency" links the postwar evolution of capitalism internationally to the discriminatory nature of the local process of development, as we know it. Access to the means and benefits of development is selective; rather than spreading them, the process tends to ensure a self-reinforcing accumulation of privilege for special groups as well as the continued existence of a marginal class.

## CULTURAL DIVERSITY IN WORLD PERSPECTIVE

The pitfall of a world systems approach is twofold: 1. the outcome seems predictable in the model, and 2. the mobilization of counterforces is doomed to failure (171). It is precisely for that reason that the anthropological quest for cultural diversity should be pursued. Foster (60, p. 321) points out that ethnographic materials provide "valuable information on the full range of possibilities for human social and cultural behavior . . . [which] have implications for developers interested in assessing the desirability of certain transformations." He urges that the field not lose attention to the local dimension, but see it enhanced in theory derived from a world perspective.

If we take a world perspective, what are the special contributions we can make as ethnographers? What descriptive techniques and methods can we draw upon as we carry out our "methodological speciality"—in Foster's words, that of "reconcil[ing] general formulations with observations from diverse cultural settings" (60, p. 321). I shall consider three such approaches here: the intensive case studies, the emic and etic distinctions as a tool for arriving at universally valid terms of description, and cross-cultural correlations or comparisons.

### *Intensive Case Studies*

The advances made in our understanding of how countryside is linked to the city, urban centers and industries related to the nation, and sometimes directly to the world market, have come about as a result of decades of intensive case studies. We should not lose sight of these nor underestimate their value in the enthusiasm for a world systems approach. Fortes (59) set forth the objectives of the intensive case study approach in his presidential address in 1954. His own work (57, 58) and that of his contemporaries (49, 54–56) inspired by Malinowski (112) demonstrated the interconnectedness of the internal operations of the society. Those who followed them to the field in the later 1950s and 1960s looked beyond the "tribal" boundaries that

were constructed in the colonial encounter itself to the interaction of indigenous and capitalist systems (30, 46, 88, 119). But their central interest, and that of the many American anthropologists working in field research outside of the United States after World War II, retained that sense of the value of intensive analysis of the local, particular case, ignored, for the most part, by analysts of other disciplines. If at times, in reacting to the disdain of scholars in other disciplines to the local particularism of their approach, anthropologists developed a defensive blindness to the macrostructures that shaped the societies they studied, this has to be evaluated in terms of those times. One of the hazards in ethnographic work is that the field experience cultivates the emic view of one's informants that treats the overarching dominant structure as irrelevant. The tendency for informants to explain all cause and effect relationships as resulting from conditions contained within the boundaries of their community is contagious and often influences the ethnographic conclusions.

The danger of a world systems approach, to add to what Sella (154) pointed to, is that we might lose sight of these internal "logico-integrative" (69) schema that provide the motivation and apprehension of what is happening in the world. In our reappraisal of case studies, we should try to show the advances they made, as Frankenberg (66) does in his discussion of Gluckman's studies of the Barotse.

### *The Emic and Etic Distinctions*

Even—or especially—when ethnologists begin a study of their own society, they cannot take any terms for granted, since the particular segment of the society may contain variations from the subcultural variant they know. The process of discovery, as Goodenough points out, relies on discerning contrasts (76, p. 37):

We start armed with the concepts our own culture has given us. We discover that other people make conceptual distinctions that we don't make and that we make distinctions that they don't make. To describe theirs and compare them with ours we have to find a set of concepts capable of describing their distinctions as well as our own. To do this, we have to analyze the phenomena more finely than we had to before, discovering and sorting out variables of which we were previously unaware.

This process is analogous to that of linguists when they try to describe the speech sounds of other languages. Etics provide the basic data for comparison, and here, in Goodenough's words (76, p. 129), is the importance of our etic concepts for understanding the world system:

As a kind of typology, a systematic set of etic concepts is a tool for describing and comparing cultural forms. Its adequacy is judged by its ability satisfactorily to describe all the emic distinctions people actually make in all the world's cultures in relation to

the subject matter (whether functionally or otherwise defined) for which the etic concepts were designed . . . Such etic concepts satisfy the criteria for a comparative study of cultural forms free of ethnographic or specific cultural bias . . . If they succeed in embracing all of the distinctive features needed to describe the elementary emic units of any culture, they constitute the minimum number of concepts needed to determine the universal attributes of culture and by inference from them, the universal attributes of men as creators and users of culture—the nature of the human species which is the principal scientific aim of anthropology.

If we take this approach, which has been most developed in kinship analysis, and apply it to problems in the organization of work, distribution, and economic values, we would advance the old substantivist/formalist debate. Clammer (28, p. 213) warns us that, “Anthropologists, while correctly recognizing that much can be learned from other disciplines, have undoubtedly leaned far too heavily on the concepts that those subjects have developed for themselves. Economic anthropology perhaps more than most other specialized subbranches of the activity, must develop its own concepts appropriate to its own peculiar needs.” Weeks (185, p. 27) picks up this warning and applies it to neoclassical models:

. . . in fastening a fiction that they abstract from institutional forms and therefore allegedly encompass a wide variety of institutional possibilities, do more than implicitly and explicitly justify development through capitalist exchange relationships. Implicitly they view poverty as arising from *internal* causes—the relationship of underdeveloped countries to the industrialised capitalist countries is ignored, or viewed as potentially beneficial if correct policies are pursued.

The concepts of economists, derived from neoclassical precepts, are, in Weeks' terms, a *prescription* for social relations for capitalist underdevelopment. These reevaluations of theory and method in economic anthropology are further explored in Clammer's (29) anthology. Godelier's (73) criticism of the concept of rationality as the key concept in the ideological justification for capitalist exchange is a fine example of what can be gained from such an analysis.

As we extend our understanding about economic systems, questioning the applicability of neoclassical terms to capitalist institutions as well as to nonmarket societies, we might overcome some of the ethnocentric projections as to what is universal in economic behavior. The “capitalist”, “precapitalist” contrast inspired by the French Marxist school obscures emic contrasts existing within advanced capitalist economies just as it has obscured the interface between different modes of labor and exchange.

Just as the analysis of the many varieties of family structure enabled anthropologists to overcome the assumptions based on a Western model (121), so might we overcome the spell of economic rationality, technological determination, or profitability as the measure of progress. Appleby (6) has

traced the process by which “The capacity to objectify human relations, to demythologize them and turn them into natural phenomenon [enabled] men . . . [to] manipulate their social and material environment.” This is an ongoing process, since the terms the neoclassical economists developed to objectify production and exchange relations have become an ideology justifying the status quo. The debate between “formalists” and “substantivists” might shift from the question whether neoclassical terms can be extended from “market” economies to “primitive” exchange systems, to the question whether these terms apply to capitalist economies given the monopolistic practices.

*Cross-Cultural Comparisons: The Current Status of Studies*

The ghost of Sir Francis Galton, who raised the question of the independence of cultural units when Tylor (172) first tried out cross-cultural analysis, still haunts those who make comparative studies. The questions as to whether the traits being correlated were inherited from a protoculture or whether they were acquired through borrowing are even more devastating when viewed from a world systems approach. Zucher (196) tried to resolve the problem in these terms:

All solutions to Galton's problem which attempt to recreate a pristine, diffusion-free world are inherently dubious. Instead, a solution to Galton's problem should concern itself with what has happened in our world. The differential-diffusibility methods are the only methods which accept the occurrence of diffusion and use the process to determine whether a correlation is based on function, rather than attempt to carve up the world into supposedly independent cases suitable for use in a correlation unbiased by diffusion.

Zucher concludes that, “if you can't lick 'em [diffusion] join 'em.”

If “by joining 'em” Zucher means undertaking intensive case studies over time, taking into consideration the power structures involved, we do not resolve the question, but raise it to a higher level. Let us take, for example, the case of a U.S. multinational corporation setting up branches for the assembly of electronic components in duty-free locations. A cluster of traits is 100 percent predictable: (a) assembly line production, (b) wage payment of workers based on hourly performance, (c) young female workers. These traits are found in the electronics industry in Hong Kong, Singapore, Malaya, Mexico, the Philippines, and North Korea (53, 79, 81, 98, 105, 129, 146, 160). To conclude that these traits are “functionally related” in any biologically or ecologically determined way because of the universal co-occurrence would be to ignore the power structure that 1. segments the labor force in ideologically reinforced categories arbitrarily assigning fitness to speciality (e.g. women have smaller fingers and are temperamentally suited to performing boring work); 2. determines the differential ability of labor in the countries selected to gain minimal wages and standards of

working conditions either because of the lack of alternative employment or the repression of trade unions; and finally 3. defines the relations of dominance between nations enabling core industrial states to establish branches under favorable conditions. One cannot solve the problems of functional relations, nor even discover that they exist, as Narroll (123, p. 312) points out, but simply prove that the correlation exists and then go on to question why.

In addition to the problems that cross-cultural analysts have been concerned with in quality control of data (97, 123), definition of the social unit (15, 173), and delimiting diffusion (163, 195), we have the additional problem of defending the very concept of cultural variability in distinct societies. Without attempting to close debate on this topic, which should arise as a world systems framework is taken, I would argue for the perpetuation and even intensification of cultural variability with the spread of industrialization and modernization. While larger clusters of shared traits tend to be atomized, variation in the frequency of associated traits increases. In the preliminary fieldwork I am doing in an industrialized city of western Massachusetts, I am constantly encountering variation in emic categories held by individuals in the same community. Although I am a native of the culture, I find that differences in time—the generational gap between me and informants older and younger than myself—and space—the 140 miles distance from the town in which I was brought up and the one I am now struggling to understand—have brought about variations that we have not even begun to chart.

Variability persists, but within a narrowing range. Instead of trying to find some identity in the exotic, we are trying to find something exotic in the apparently familiar. The integration of people in the world capitalist system heightens the dependency and hence vulnerability to contraction in the central economies. In a worldwide evaluation of subsistence systems, Lomax & Arensberg (106, p. 679) express the concern about the loss of variability that most anthropologists share:

It is agonizing to look over the roster of the species and to reflect that it is in good part a roll call of dead or dying peoples and that this taxonomy is an artificial game, played with grave markers. Many of the cultures in these lists have vanished with all hands in the tidal wave of industrial civilization and now occupy fictitious positions on the ethnographic map. Many others exist only in the memories of powerless oldsters whose descendants walk, without gods or ancestors, into the alienating environment of urban sprawl.

The danger is, as the authors point out, that the reduction of cultural variability limits the plasticity and adaptability that was the principle advantage in evolution.

## COLONIALISM, IMPERIALISM, AND TRANSNATIONAL CORPORATIONS

The anthropological view of the world system has been concerned with the impact of global institutions in peripheral or semiperipheral zones more than with the system itself. In the process of "reinventing" anthropology, some anthropologists have tried to study the global institutions themselves. Hymes (94, p. 35) asks us "to employ our ethnographic tradition of work, and such ethnological insight as informs it, in the study of the emergence of cultural form in concrete settings and in relation to a world society." In the first flush of interest in development studies, social scientists in other disciplines came to anthropologists in search of concepts and understandings of exotic cultures; now we are required either to adopt some of the findings and methods of the other social sciences or to accept a division of labor in which we share in the study of emergent forms. But, as Hymes suggests, we should not forget the unique sensibilities that ethnographers have developed in field situations that clearly presented distinct phenomenal categories.

### *Transnational Corporations*

As anthropologists, we are best trained to study the impact of transnational corporations throughout the world and, as a result, less likely to view the organization of production and distribution on a worldwide scale directly. By opening our minds to the manifold possibilities of reinterpretation by the societies undergoing the transition into industrialization, we have shown some unique features in the sociocultural integration that develops (or fails to develop) in the wake of global transfers of technology, management, and labor (127, 191).

A far more difficult task is the study of multinational corporations. A pioneer in this study is Alvin Wolfe (190), who as early as 1963 discussed the implications of integration of industry on a supranational level. While the study of multinationals—industries based in an industrial center with branches established in one or more foreign countries—and transnationals—industries whose international operations take priority over the claim of any home base—is dominated by economists, political scientists, and sociologists; anthropologists can make a contribution by maintaining an holistic approach and evolutionary perspective.

Wolfe (191) emphasizes the integrative evolution as firms established overseas branches and then proceeded to integrate the manufacturing process itself. This has already happened in electronics, garment manufacturing, and to a lesser extent, automobile production (160). However, the

integration of corporate management through transnational organizations has resulted in the disintegration of national states (166) and of labor organizations (67, 72, 93, 95, 96). We can mark three stages in the integrative evolution. The initial thrust overseas was an attempt to get behind tariff barriers, particularly after World War I in Canada and Latin America. The greatest surge of overseas expansion came after World War II and the establishment of the European Economic Community when U.S. firms tried to maintain a share in that market by establishing a branch firm. Starting about 1964, when changes in the tariff laws permitted reshipment of components with tariffs only on the value added, or labor of assembling parts that were then incorporated in final products at the home base and sold in a domestic market, a new phase of integration took place. This evolving international division of labor (72) is bringing about an integration of manufacturing processes that is beginning to erase the boundaries of "core," "periphery," and "semiperiphery" as transnational firms move production sites to whatever areas contain reserves of cheap, available labor and where they will expect the least resistance from government or labor unions. The integration of the productive system is occurring simultaneously with a breakdown in social organization. The resulting crisis (186) is exploding before us in our field research, often inhibiting the entry and participant observations essential to good fieldwork.

Changes brought about by these dramatic shifts in the locus and volume of production are only beginning to be analyzed. Change in the employment rates of women and men is affecting the household and gender relations in ways that are now being assessed (53, 81, 98, 105, 110, 146). The variations in employment practices of multinational corporations in branches at home and abroad are another significant problem area anthropologists could follow up on analyses by economists (95, 129, 133). The effect on class consciousness created by the changing structure of employment in transnational organizations has hardly been touched. This is an area in which traditional ethnographic methods, including oral histories and symbolic analyses, can get us beyond the ideological facade which masks sentiment and behavior (174, 175).

Anthropologists can play a distinctive role in analyzing the changes brought about in the international organization of production by investigating the "logico-meaningful integration" which Geertz (69) defines as the unity of style, meaning, and value, distinct from the "causal-functional integration" where each part is an element that keeps the system going (127). We might also pursue comparative studies of the work process within branches of the same plant in different countries in order to test assumptions about the limits of variability posed by a shared technology and management. Just as our studies of household organization of production where

there is a merging of economic base and political and ideological superstructure contributed to the understanding of mode of production, so might our study of transnational organizations, where economic base seems divorced from logico-integrative structures, go beyond the questions raised by economists or other social scientists. Our holistic approach will enable us to investigate the impact of development and change on populations and environment, as Davis (39) does in his study of Amazonian forest people, within a structural historical framework. It can also encompass the logico-meaningful integration in the encounter with capitalist institutions, as Tausig (167) attempts.

### *Colonialism and Imperialism*

In the 1970s, critical reviews of anthropology in the colonial period resulted in calls for decolonizing the profession (35, 92, 94, 114, 125). What I wish to put into perspective here is the progress made in the action-oriented research that grew out of this critique. The importance of "investigating reality in order to transform it" (52) is more a part of the tradition of Third World scholars than of the United States. Nonetheless, several research institutes have made the colonial and imperial encounter the focus of investigation. These include the International Work Group on Indigenous Affairs, Cultural Survival, the Anthropology Resource Center, and Survival International. The work of these groups not only provides the richest documentation of the advance of the capitalist world system, but represents a commitment to resist that advance.

The International Work Group on Indigenous Affairs developed out of the 38th International Congress of Americanists in Stuttgart in 1968. Concerned with the genocide, terrorism, and relocation of indigenous populations, the group includes 1200 members. In addition to contributing documents regarding threatened populations, the members offer their technical competence to intervene in critical situations as legal specialists. They have published about two dozen pamphlets on the indigenous people of Latin America, in particular, and with reports on India and Canadian Indians.

Cultural Survival was organized in 1972 by David Maybury-Lewis, Evon Z. Vogt, and Orlando Patterson of Harvard University. The organization grew out of concern with self-determination for indigenous people and the desire to help those populations threatened with ethnocide to achieve the economic means to maintain their way of life. Although the interest of the group is worldwide, the organizers are now concentrating on Latin America where 18 projects are being carried out. The group publishes a newsletter and occasional papers. Among these are reports on the situation of the Native Americans in Brazil and Paraguay, the first a collection of work from

Portuguese ethnologists and the second authored by James Howe. Plans in the near future include publishing a study of deforestation of the Amazonian jungle and its ecological consequences as a result of the actions of Japanese and U.S. companies in Ecuador, and the impact of the Cerro Colorado mines in Panama. The group has recently accepted a proposal by the Nicaraguan government to search land claims of the Indians before carrying out the agrarian reform program.

Anthropology Resource Center was organized in 1975 under the directorship of Shelton Davis. Interested in bringing social anthropological analyses on contemporary public issues to a wider public audience, Shelton Davis and a group of graduate students in the Boston and Cambridge area started a newsletter. Among the first issues aired in their publication was the rights of Native Americans both in North and South America. They have brought their research to the attention of international agencies and tribunals in an attempt to bring action to safeguard the human rights of threatened populations. They have published special issues on mining and petroleum companies in Brazil and Australia, as well as studies assessing the impact of the U.S. Agency for International Development and international banks on remote areas of the world. Recent articles discuss the impact of the energy programs on Native Americans, especially the Crow, Navajo, and Northern Cheyenne. This research, summarized and edited by Joseph Jorgenson, resulted from a collaboration between Native Americans and anthropology students.

The importance of these groups in bringing an anthropological perspective to international issues cannot be underestimated by anthropologists in academic or applied fields. Their holistic approach to the problems that affect the destiny of the human species is central to the "process of creating that science of man that will underwrite the new world culture and its new possibilities" that Wolf envisioned.

## SUMMARY

Wallerstein's paradigm of a world capitalist system challenges social scientists to view all societies and cultures of the world as integrated in a worldwide division of labor. Drawing on analyses of dependency and uneven exchange, the paradigm promotes systemic analyses of the interrelationships between "core" industrial states, "semiperipheral" regions, and "periphery." Anthropology, as a discipline oriented toward worldwide descriptions and comparisons of society, has developed ethnographic methods and a vocabulary for talking about particular features in relation to universal characteristics of the human condition. The respect for internal variation and resistance to ethnocentric judgments imposed on other cultures which

has been cultivated by ethnologists can overcome some of the difficulties critics have raised with the world systems approach. The tendency to take the emergence and dominance of the capitalist system as a foregone conclusion, to assume passive acceptance by peripheral and semiperipheral regions to the imposed will of core nations can be corrected by methods and findings of ethnographers past and present.

I have considered some of the ethnographic concepts and methods developed in the search for universally valid cross-cultural categories. This includes a reassessment of intensive case study approaches, emic and etic distinctions in ethnographic description, and cross-cultural comparisons. Noting the loss of cultural variability in subsistence systems as the world's population becomes dependent on employment and income generated in capitalist enterprises, I have summarized some of the dangers inherent in the vulnerability to contraction in the world system. Finally, anthropological responses to the crisis of vanishing cultures in the present expansion of the capitalist system in the Anthropology Resource Center, Cultural Survival, and the International Work Group on Indigenous Affairs are recorded and the importance of their contributions suggested.

#### Literature Cited

1. Adelman, I., Morris, C. T. 1973. *Economic Growth and Social Equity in Developing Countries*. Stanford Univ. Press. 257 pp.
2. Amin, S. 1972. Underdevelopment and dependence in black Africa: Historical origin. *J. Peace Res.* 2:105-19
3. Amin, S. 1972. Underdevelopment and dependence in black Africa: Origins and contemporary forms. *J. Mod. Afr. Stud.* 4:503-24
4. Amin, S. 1976. *Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Formations of Peripheral Capitalism*. New York: Monthly Rev. Press. 440 pp.
5. Amin, S. 1977. *Imperialism and Unequal Development, Essays by Samir Amin*. New York: Monthly Rev. Press. 267 pp.
6. Appleby, J. 1978. Modernization theory and the formation of modern social theories in England and America. *Contemp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* 20:254-85
7. Asad, T., ed. 1973. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. New York: Humanities. 281 pp.
8. Barth, F. 1963. *The Role of Entrepreneurship in Social Change in Northern Norway*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. 83 pp.
9. Bartra, R. 1974. *Estructura Agraria y Clases Sociales en México*. Mexico City: Era. 182 pp.
10. Bartra, R. 1975. Sobre la articulación de modss de producción en América Latina: Algunos problemas teoricas, *Hist. Soc.* 5:5-19
11. Belshaw, C. 1965. *Traditional Exchange and Modern Markets*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. 149 pp.
12. Bienefeld, M. A. 1972-73. Planning people. *Dev. Change* 4:51-77
13. Block, M. 1975. Property and the end of affinity. In *Marxist Analyses and Social Anthropology*, pp. 203-28. London: Malaby
14. Bohannon, P. 1979. *You can't do nothing*. Presidential Address presented at Ann. Meet. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., 78th. *Am. Anthropol.* 82:508-24
15. Bourguignon, E., Greenbaum, L. S. 1973. *Diversity and Homogeneity in World Societies*. New Haven: Hum. Relat. Area File. 190 pp.
16. Bradby, B. 1975. The destruction of natural economy. *Econ. Soc.* 4:127-61
17. Braudel, F. 1980. Will capitalism survive? *Wilson Q.* Spring 4:102-17
18. Brock, L. L. 1980. *Marriage exchange and class formation; strategies of production and reproduction in a Tuareg community 1860-1976*. Presented at

- Ann. Meet. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., 79th, Washington DC
19. Bronfenbrenner, M. 1978. Review article: A world class economist from underdeveloped Africa. *Economic Development and Culture Change* 27:195-201
  20. Buechler, H., Buechler, J. M. Hess. 1976. Something funny happened on the way to the Agora. A comparison of Bolivian and Spanish Galician female migrants. *Anthropol. Q.* 49(1):62-68
  21. Burawoy, M. 1979. The anthropology of industrial work. *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 8:231-66
  22. Cancian, F. 1965. *Economics and Prestige in a Maya Community; the Religious Cargo System*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press. 238 pp.
  23. Cardoso, F. H. 1972. Dependency and development in Latin America. *New Left Rev.* 74:83-95
  24. Cardoso, F. H. 1972-73. Industrialization, dependency and power in Latin America. *Berkeley J. Sociol.* 17:79-95
  25. Cardoso, F. H., Faletto, E. 1979. *Dependency and Development in Latin America*. Transl. M. M. Urquidí. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press. 227 pp.
  26. Chilcote, R. H. 1974. A critical synthesis of the dependency literature. *Lat. Am. Perspect.* 1:1-15
  27. Chirot, D. 1976. *Social Change in a Peripheral Society: The Creation of a Balkan Colony*. New York: Academic. 179 pp.
  28. Clammer, J. 1975. Economic anthropology and the sociology of development; 'liberal' anthropology and its French critics. See Ref. 131, pp. 208-28
  29. Clammer, J. 1978. *The New Economic Anthropology*. New York: St. Martin's. 260 pp.
  30. Cohen, A. 1969. *Custom and Politics in Urban Africa; A Study of Hausa Migrants in Yoruba Towns*. London: Routledge & Keegan Paul; Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press. 252 pp.
  31. Cole, D. P. 1977. Bedouins of the oilfields. In *Arab Society in Transition, A Reader*, ed. S. E. Ibrahim, N. S. Hopkins, pp. 632-38. Cairo: Am. Univ. Press
  32. Coleman, R. G. 1980. *Household structure and capitalist incorporation on the periphery in North Sumatra*. Presented at Ann. Meet. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., 79th, Washington DC
  33. Colson, E. 1976. *Culture and Progress*. Distinguished Lecture presented at Ann. Meet. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., 74th. *Am. Anthropol.* 78:261-71
  34. Cook, S. 1976. Value, price and simple commodity production: Zapotec stoneworkers. *J. Peasant Stud.* 3:395-427
  35. Copans, J. 1975. *Anthropologie et impérialisme*. Paris: Maspero. 460 pp.
  36. Cotler, J. 1969. Actuales pautas de cambio en la sociedad rural del Perú. In *Dominación y cambios en el Perú rural: la microorganización del Valle de Cancai*, ed. J. Matos Mar et al, pp. 60-79. Lima: Inst. Estudios Peruanos
  37. Dalton, G. 1974. *Economic Systems and Society. Capitalism, Communism and the Third World*. Baltimore: Penguin. 250 pp.
  38. Dandler, J. 1976. *Campesinado y reforma agraria en Cochabamba: dinamica de un movimiento campesino en Bolivia*. La Paz: Cent. Invest. promoc. campesino. 40 pp.
  39. Davis, S. 1977. *Victims of the Miracle; Development and the Indians of Brazil*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 205 pp.
  40. Dodgshon, R. A. 1977. A spatial perspective. *Peasant Stud.* 6:8-19
  41. dos Santos, T. 1973. The crisis of development theory and the problem of dependency in Latin America. In *Underdevelopment and Development*, ed. H. Bernstein, pp. 76-77. Hammonds-worth: Penguin
  42. Dupré, G., Rey, P. P. 1973. Reflections on the pertinence of a theory of the history of exchange. *Econ. Soc.* 2:131-63.
  43. Economic Commission on Latin America, United Nations. 1970, 1972. *Economic Survey of Latin America*. New York: United Nations. 351 pp.
  44. Eggan, F. 1968. One hundred years of ethnology and social anthropology. In *One Hundred Years of Anthropology*, ed. J. O. Brew, pp. 119-52. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press
  45. Emmanuel, A. 1972. *Unequal Exchange: A Study of the Imperialism of Trade*. New York/London: Monthly Rev. 453 pp.
  46. Epstein, A. L. 1958. *Politics in an Urban African Community*. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press. 254 pp.
  47. Epstein, T. S. 1973. *South India: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow; Mysore Village Revisited*. New York: Macmillan
  48. Etienne, M., Leacock, E. 1980. *Women in Colonization*. Brooklyn: Bergin. 339 pp.
  49. Evans-Pritchard, E. E. 1940. *The Nuer*. Oxford: Clarendon. 277 pp.
  50. Fallers, T. 1959. *Bantu Bureaucracy: A Century of Political Evolution Among*

- the Basoga of Uganda*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 283 pp.
51. Fallers, T. 1963. Equality, modernity, and democracy in the new state. In *Old Societies and New States. The Quest for Modernity in Asia and Africa*, ed. C. Geertz, pp. 158–219. New York: Free Press
  52. Fals Borda, O. 1979. Investigating reality in order to transform it: The Colombian experience. *Dialect. Anthropol.* 4: 33–56
  53. Fernandez, M. P. 1980. *Mexican border industries; Female labor force participation and migration*. PhD thesis. Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick, NJ. 350 pp.
  54. Firth, R. 1929. *Primitive Economics of the New Zealand Maori*. Wellington, NZ: Owen. 519 pp.
  55. Firth, R. 1936. *We the Tikopia*. London: Unwin. 605 pp.
  56. Firth, R. 1966. *Malay Fishermen*. Hamden, Conn: Archon. 398 pp.
  57. Fortes, M. 1945. *The Dynamics of Clanship among the Talensi*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press. 270 pp.
  58. Fortes, M. 1949. *The Web of Kinship among the Talensi*. London: Oxford Univ. Press. 358 pp.
  59. Fortes, M. 1953. "Analyses and description in social anthropology." Presidential Address, Sect. H., Br. Assoc. Advan. Sci. 38th publication 1970. In *Time and Social Structure and Other Essays* pp. 127–146. London: Athlone
  60. Foster, B. L. 1978. Development, modernization and comparative parochialism; A review article. *Comp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* 20:319–28
  61. Foster, J. 1974. *Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution; Early Industrial Radicalism in Three English Towns*, with foreword by E. J. Hobsbawm. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson. 346 pp.
  62. Foster-Carter, A. 1978. The modes of production controversy. *New Left Rev.* 107:47–78
  63. Frank, A. G. 1964. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Historical Studies of Chile and Brazil*. New York: Monthly Rev. 298 pp.
  64. Frank, A. G. 1967. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*. New York: Monthly Rev. 344 pp.
  65. Frank, A. G. 1975. *On Capitalist Underdevelopment*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press. 113 pp.
  66. Frankenberger, R. 1978. Economic anthropology or political economy? The Barotse social formation; a case study. See Ref. 29, pp. 32–57
  67. Fröbel, F., Heinrichs, J., Krëye, O. 1978. The new international division of labour. *Soc. Sci. Inf.* 17:123–42
  68. Geertz, C. 1960. The changing role of the cultural broker: the Javanese Kijaji. *Comp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* 2:28–49
  69. Geertz, C. 1973. Ritual and social change: A Javanese example. In *The Interpretation of Cultures; Selected Essays of Clifford Geertz*, pp. 142–69. New York: Basic Books
  70. Geertz, C. 1963. *Peddlers and Princes; Social Change and Economic Modernization in Two Indonesian Towns*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 162 pp.
  71. Geertz, C. 1963. The Dutch colonial period in Indonesia: Agrarian Involution. In *Agricultural Involution*, pp. 38–123
  72. Giersch, H., ed. 1974. *The International Division of Labor; Problems and Perspectives*. Tubingen: Möhr. 556 pp.
  73. Godelier, M. 1973. *Rationality and Irrationality in Economics*. Transl. B. Pearce. New York: Monthly Rev. 326 pp.
  74. Godelier, M. 1978. Infrastructures, society and history. *New Left Rev.* 112: 84–96
  75. Gonzalez, N. L. 1969. Patron-client relationships at the international level. See Ref. 164, pp. 178–209
  76. Goodenough, W. H. 1970. *Description and Comparison in Cultural Anthropology*. Chicago: Aldine. 173 pp.
  77. Gough, K. 1969. World revolution and the science of man. In *The Dissenting Academy*, ed. T. Roszak, pp. 135–58. New York: Pantheon
  78. Gough, K. 1978. Changing agrarian relations in South Eastern India. *Curr. Anthropol.* 19:399
  79. Green, S. 1980. Silicon Valley's women workers; A theoretical analysis of sex-segregation in the electronics industry labor market. *Occasional Papers of the East West Center*, Honolulu. 39 pp.
  80. Grondin, M. 1978. Peasant cooperation and dependency: The case of the electricity enterprise of Muquiayauyo. See Ref. 108, pp. 99–127
  81. Grossman, R. 1978. Women's place in the integrated circuits. *South East Asia Chronicle*, Pac. Res. RSC Issue 9:5–6.
  82. Gudeman, S. F. 1978. *The Demise of a Rural Economy; from Subsistence to Capitalism in a Latin American Village*. London: Paramis. 176 pp.
  83. Gudeman, S. F. 1978. Anthropological economics: The question of distribution. In *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 7:347–77
  84. Gulliver, P. H. 1973. Negotiations as a model of dispute settlement; Towards a

- general model. *Law Soc. Rev.* 7:667-69
85. Gutman, H. 1976. *Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America: Essays in American Working-Class and Social History*. New York: Knopf. 343 pp.
  86. Hechter, M. 1975. *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development 1536-1966*. Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Press. 361 pp.
  87. Hill, P. 1963. *The Migrant Cocoa Farmers of Southern Ghana. A Study in Rural Capitalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 265 pp.
  88. Hill, P. 1977. *Population, Prosperity, and Poverty*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Stud. Rural Capitalism in West Africa. 172 pp.
  89. Holmberg, A. R. 1950. *Nomads of the Long Bow; The Siriono of Eastern Bolivia*. Washington: GPO. 104 pp.
  90. Hopkins, N. S. 1977. The impact of technological change on political centralization: The case of Tunisia. In *Arab Society in Transition*, ed. S. E. Ibrahim, N. S. Hopkins, pp. 620-31. Cairo: American Univ.
  91. Hopkins, T. 1978. World systems analysis: Methodological issues. In *The Capitalist World Economy*, ed. B. H. Kaplan, pp. 100-217. Beverly Hills: Sage
  92. Huizer, G., Mannheim, B., eds. 1979. *The Politics of Anthropology: from Colonialism and Sexism Toward a View from Below*. The Hague: Mouton. 520 pp.
  93. Hymer, S. 1973. The internationalization of capital. In *International Business*, ed. D. S. Henley, pp. 278-98. East Lansing: Mich. State Univ. Press
  94. Hymes, D., ed. 1972. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Pantheon. 476 pp.
  - 94a. Ifeka-Moller, C. 1975. Female militancy and colonial revolt: the women's war of 1929, Eastern Nigeria. In *Perceiving Women*, ed. S. Ardner, pp. 127-58. New York: Wiley
  95. International Labor Office. 1977. *Social and Labour Practices of Some U.S. Based Multinationals in the Metal Trades*. Geneva: United Nations. 172 pp.
  96. Jagor, E. R. 1975. U.S. labor and multinationals. In *International Labor and the National Enterprises: Studies in International Economics and Development*, ed. D. Kujawa, pp. 22-46. New York: Prager
  97. Jorgensen, J. G. 1979. Cross-cultural comparisons. *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 8: 309-31
  98. Katz, N. 1980. *Women electronic workers in the Silicon Valley*. Presented at Ann. Meet. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., 79th, Washington DC
  99. Laclau, E. 1979. Modos de producción, sistemas económicos y población excedente: aproximación histórica a los casos argentino y chileno. *Rev. Latinoam. Sociol.* 5:344-83
  100. Laclau, E. 1971. Feudalism and capitalism in Latin America. *New Left Rev.* 67:19-38
  101. Laite, J. 1978. Processes of industrial and social change in highland Peru. See Ref. 109, pp. 73-97
  102. Lane, F. C. 1976. Economic growth in Wallerstein's social systems. A review article. *Comp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* 18: 517-32
  - 102a. Leacock, E. B., Lurie, N. O. 1971. *North American Indians in Historical Perspective*. New York: Random House. 498 pp.
  103. Lennihan, L. 1980. *As the world turns: Capital, class, and the household in Northern Nigeria*. Presented at Ann. Meet. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., 79th, Washington DC
  104. Leviatan, U. 1976. The process of industrialization in the Israel Kibbutzim. In *Popular Participation in Social Change*, ed. J. Nash, J. Dandler, N. Hopkins, pp. 549-58. The Hague: Mouton
  105. Lim, L. Y. C. 1978. Women workers in multinational corporations: The case of the electronics industry in Malaysia and Singapore. *Mich. Occas. Pap.* 9. 67 pp.
  106. Lomax, A., Arensberg, C. M. 1977. A worldwide evolutionary classification of culture by subsistence systems. *Curr. Anthropol.* 18:659-79
  107. Long, N. 1975. Structural dependency modes of production, and economic brokerage in rural Peru. See Ref. 131, pp. 253-82
  108. Long, N., Richardson, P. 1978. Informal sector, petty commodity production and the social relations of small-scale enterprise. See Ref. 29, pp. 176-209
  109. Long, N., Roberts, B. R., eds. 1978. *Peasant Cooperation and Capitalist Expansion in Central Peru*. Austin: Univ. Texas Press. 349 pp.
  110. Long, N., Roberts, B. R. 1978. Peasant cooperation and underdevelopment in central Peru. See Ref. 109, pp. 297-328
  111. Magubane, B. 1979. *The Political Economy of Race and Class in South Africa*. New York: Monthly Rev. 364 pp.

112. Malinowski, B. 1932. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. London: Routledge. 527 pp.
113. Mandel, E. 1970. The laws of uneven development. *New Left Rev.* 59:19-38
114. Maquet, J. 1964. Objectivity in anthropology. *Curr. Anthropol.* 5:47-55
115. Matos Mar, J. et al, eds. 1969. *Domina-cion y Cambios en el Peru Rural*. Lima: Inst. Estud. Peru. 377 pp.
116. Mencher, J. 1970. Change agents and villagers, their relationship and role of class values. *Econ. Polit. Wkly.* 5:1-9
117. Mintz, S. 1974. *Caribbean Transforma-tion*. Chicago: Aldine
118. Mintz, S. 1977. The so-called world system: Local initiative and local response. *Dialect. Anthropol.* 2:253-70
119. Mitchell, J. C. 1956. *The Kalela Dance; Aspects of Social Relationships among Urban Africans in North Rhodesia*. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press. 52 pp.
120. Modelski, G. 1978. The long cycle of global politics and the nation state. *Contemp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* 20:214-35
121. Murdock, G. P. 1937. Correlations of matrilineal and patrilineal institutions. In *Studies in the Science of Society presented to Albert Galloway Keller*, ed. G. P. Murdock, pp. 445-70. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press
122. Mwaria, C. B. 1980. *Household structure in a changing economy: The case of Akimba*. Presented at Ann. Meet. Am. Anthropol. Assoc., 78th, Washington DC
123. Naroll, R. 1973. Holocultural theory tests. In *Main Currents in Cultural Anthropology*, ed. R. Naroll, F. Naroll, pp. 309-84. Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 410 pp.
124. Nash, J. 1977. Women in development: dependency and exploitation. *Dev. Change* 8:161-82
125. Nash, J. 1975. Nationalism and field-work. *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 4:225-45
126. Nash, J. 1975. Dependency and the failure of feedback. *Proc. 40th Int. Congr. Americanists*, Rome, 1972, pp. 507-27. Rome: Tilgher
127. Nash, J. 1979. Anthropology of the multinational corporations. In *New Directions in Political Anthropology*, ed. M. B. Leons, F. Rothstein, pp. 173-200. Westport, Conn: Greenfield
128. Nash, J. 1979. *We Eat the Mines and the Mines Eat Us: Dependency and Exploitation in Bolivian Tin Mines*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press. 362 pp.
129. Nash, J. 1979. *Women, men, and the international division of labor*. Pre-sented at Ann. Meet. Latin Am. Stud. Assoc., Pittsburgh
130. O'Laughlin, B. 1975. Marxist approaches in anthropology. *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 4:341-70
131. Oxaal, I., Barnet, T., Booth, D., eds. 1975. *Beyond the Sociology of Development: Economy and Society in Latin America and Africa*. London/Boston: Routledge & Keegan Paul. 295 pp.
132. Padgug, R. A. 1976. Problems in the theory of slavery and slave society. *Sci. Soc.* 40:3-27
133. Palloux, C. 1973. *Les Firms Multinationales et le proces d'Internationalisation*. Paris: Maspero. 189 pp.
134. Parry, J. H. 1963. *The Age of Reconnaissance*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson. 364 pp.
135. Pelto, P. J. 1963. *The Snowmobile Revolution; Technology and Social Change in the Arctic*. Menlo Park, Calif: Cummings. 225 pp.
136. Polanyi, K., Arensberg, C., Pearson, N., eds. 1957. *Trade and Markets in the Early Empires: Economics in History and Theory*. New York: Praeger. 382 pp.
137. Powdermaker, H. 1962. *Coppertown: Changing Africa; The Human Situation on the Rhodesian Copperbelt*. New York: Harper & Row. 391 pp.
138. Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. 1940. On social structure. *J. R. Anthropol. Inst. GB Irel.* 7:1-12
139. Rey, P. P. 1975. The lineage mode of production. *Crit. Anthropol.* 3:27-70
140. Roberts, B. R. 1978. The bases of industrial cooperation in Huancayo. See Ref. 109, pp. 129-62
141. Roberts, B. R., Samaniego, C. 1978. The evolution of pastoral villages and the significance of agrarian reform in the highlands of Central Peru. See Ref. 109, pp. 241-63
142. Rollwagon, J. 1980. New directions in urban anthropology: Building an ethnography and an ethnology of the world system. *Urban Life*, pp. 370-82
143. Root, H. 1978. The debate on the origins of the 'Modern World System': The Ottoman example. A review article. *Contemp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* 20:626-29
144. Roseberry, W. 1976. Rent, differentiation and the development of capitalism among peasants. *Am. Anthropol.* 78: 45-58
145. Rubbo, A. 1975. La extension del capitalismo rural: sus efectos sobre las mujeres negras en la valle de Cauca, Colombia occidental. *Estud. Andinas* 5:119-38

146. Safa, H. I. 1979. *Multinationals and the employment of women in developing areas*. Presented at Ann. Meet. Lat. Am. Stud. Assoc., Pittsburgh
147. Sahlins, M. D. 1958. *Social Stratification in Polynesia*. Seattle: Univ. Wash. Press. 301 pp.
148. Salisbury, R. F. 1962. *From Stone to Steel; Economic Consequences of a Technological Change in New Guinea*. Victoria: Melbourne Univ. Press. 237 pp.
149. Schneider, H. K. 1975. Economic development and anthropology. *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 3:271-92
150. Schneider, J. 1977. Was there a pre-capitalist world-system? *J. Peasant Stud.* 6:20-28
151. Schneider, J., Schneider, P. 1975. *Culture and Political Economy in Western Sicily*. New York: Academic. 256 pp.
152. Scott, C. 1976. Peasants, proletarianization and the articulation of modes of production; The case of sugar cane cutters in northern Peru 1948-69. *J. Peasant Stud.* 3:321-47
153. Seddon, D. 1978. Economic anthropology or political economy? Two approaches to the analysis of pre-capitalist formation in the Maghred. See Ref. 29, pp. 61-109
154. Sella, D. 1977. The world system and its dangers. *J. Peasant Stud.* 6:29-32
155. Silverman, S. 1965. Patronage and community-nation relationships in central Italy. *Ethnology* 4:172-89
156. Skocpol, T. 1977. Wallerstein's world capitalist system: A theoretical and historical critique. *Am. J. Sociol.* 82: 1075-90
157. Smith, C. T. 1980. Community wealth concentration: Comparisons in general evolution and development. *Econ. Dev. Cult. Change* 28:801-17
158. Smith, D. 1978. Domination and containment; an approach to modernization. *Contemp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* 20: 177-213
159. Smith, G. A., Cano, P. 1978. Some factors contributing to peasant and land occupations in Peru: The example of Huasicancha 1963-68. See Ref. 109, pp. 163-90
160. Snow, R. T. 1980. The new international division of labor and the U.S. workers: The case of the electronics industry. *Occas. Pap. East-West Cent. Honolulu.* 52 pp.
161. Stavenhagen, R. 1965. Clases, colonialismo y acculturación; Ensayo sobre un sistema de relaciones interétnicas en Mesoamérica. *América Latina* 6 (4):63-104
162. Stavenhagen, R. 1966. Social aspects of agrarian structure in Mexico. *Soc. Res.* 33 (3-Autumn): 463-85
163. Strauss, D., Orans, M. 1976. Residence and descent, hyperdiffusional? *Curr. Anthropol.*, p. 754
164. Strickon, A., Greenfield, S. M., eds. 1972. *Structure and Process in Latin America*. Albuquerque: Univ. N. Mex. Press. 256 pp.
165. Sunkel, O. 1972. Big Business and 'dependencia'. *Foreign Aff.* 50:517-31
166. Sunkel, O. 1973. Transnational capitalism and national disintegration. *Soc. Econ. Stud.* 22:132-76
167. Taussig, M. T. 1980. *The Devil and Commodity Fetishism in South America*. Chapel Hill: Univ. North Carolina Press. 264 pp.
168. Terray, E. 1972. Historical materialism and segmentary lineage-based societies. In *Marxism and "Primitive" Societies. Two Studies*, pp. 93-186. Transl. M. Klopffer. New York: Monthly Rev.
169. Terray, E. 1974. Long distance trade and the formation of the state: The case of the Abron kingdom of Gyaman. *Econ. Soc.* 3:314-45
170. Thompson, E. P. 1963. *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Vintage. 848 pp.
171. Trimberger, K. E. 1979. World systems analysis: The problem of unequal development. *Theory Soc.* 8:101-6
172. Tylor, E. B. 1889. On a method of investigating the development of institution: applied to laws of marriage and descent. *J. R. Anthropol. Inst. GB Irel.* 18: 245-72
173. Udy, S. H. Jr. 1973. Cross-cultural analysis: methods and scope. *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 2:253-70
174. Wachtel, H. M. 1975. Class consciousness and stratification in the labor process. In *Labor Market Segmentation*, ed. R. C. Edwards et al, pp. 95-122. Lexington: Heath
175. Walker, P. 1979. *Between Labor and Capital*. Boston: South End. 334 pp.
176. Wallerstein, I. 1966. *Social Change: The Colonial Situation*. New York: Wiley, 674 pp.
177. Wallerstein, I. 1974. Dependence in an interdependent world: The limited possibilities of transformation within the capitalist world economy. *Afr. Stud. Rev.* 17:1-26
178. Wallerstein, I. 1974. The rise and future demise of the world capitalist system:

- Concepts for comparative analysis. *Comp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* 16:387-415
179. Deleted in proof
  180. Wallerstein, I. 1975. The present state of the debate on world inequality. In *World Inequality: Origins and Perspectives on the World System*, ed. I. Wallerstein, pp. 9-29. Montreal/Quebec: Black Rose Books
  181. Wallerstein, I. 1975. *The Modern World System. Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic. 416 pp.
  182. Wallerstein, I. 1976. Semi-peripheral countries and the contemporary world crisis. *Theory Soc.* 3:461-83
  183. Wallerstein, I. 1980. *The Modern World System II: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World Economy*. New York: Academic. 370 pp.
  184. Watson, W. 1958. *Tribal Cohesion in a Money Economy*. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press. 246 pp.
  185. Weeks, J. 1978. Fundamental economic concepts. See Ref. 29, pp. 21-30
  186. Weisskopf, T. 1979. Marxist perspectives on cyclical crisis. In *U.S. Capitalism in Crisis*. New York: Union for Radical Polit. Econ.
  - 186a. Williams, E. 1944. *Capitalism and Slavery*. Chapel Hill: Univ. North Carolina Press. 285 pp.
  187. Wolf, E. 1959. *Sons of the Shaking Earth*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 302 pp.
  188. Wolf, E. 1964. *Anthropology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 113 pp.
  189. Wolf, E. 1969. *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century*. New York: Harper & Row. 328 pp.
  190. Wolfe, A. W. 1963. The African mineral industry. Evolution of a supranational level of integration. *Soc. Probl.* 10:153-64
  191. Wolfe, A. W. 1977. The supranational organization of production: An evolutionary perspective. *Curr. Anthropol.* 18:615-36
  192. Wolpe, H. 1972. Capitalism and cheap labour power in South Africa: from segregation to apartheid. *Econ. Soc.* 1: 425-56
  193. Wolpe, H. 1975. The theory of internal colonialism: The South African case. See Ref. 131, pp. 229-52
  194. Worseley, P. 1964. *The Third World*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 317 pp.
  195. Zenner, W. P., Jarvenpa, R. 1980. Scots in the northern fur trade: a middleman minority perspective. In *Ethnic Groups*, 2:189-310. New York/London: Breach
  196. Zucher, H. G. 1977. More solutions to Galton's problem. *Curr. Anthropol.* 18:117-91