

From Vegetable Plots to Volleyball Courts:

Landscape, Class & The Politics of Time in Highland Ecuador

Abstract

This paper explores the interplay between landscape, time and class relations. Situated in the Southern Ecuadorian Andes, I examine the ways in which members of the migrant/peasant class use remittances to demolish agricultural buildings, create leisure gardens, and build opulent villas. This transformation of the landscape, I contend, can be interpreted as an attempt by the migrant/peasantry to eradicate the public vestiges of their labouring agricultural past and articulate their 'progress' and 'modern' present; a process which does not go uncontested by the professional and governing classes, who respond by reproducing a folkloric discourse in which romanticised representations of the peasantry, embedded in a synchronic pastoral scene, are mobilised in order to chart the moral 'decline' of the current migrant/peasant class and legitimise increased regulation of their private land and domestic properties. I argue this contestation, while ostensibly concerned with cultural heritage, is ultimately a struggle to maintain the social order and I reflect on how multiple representations of time, as rendered visible through material landscapes, compete for dominance in a rapidly changing social landscape.

Key words

Social Mobility; Class Struggle; Time Politics; Land(scape); Remittances; Rural Heritage.

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to examine how members of the migrant/peasant class, situated in the Southern Ecuadorian Andes, create social distance from their agricultural past through their relations with the landscape, and to explore the response of the governing professional classes to this process. Specifically, I ask how households, who have historically been engaged in smallholder farming as their primary economic activity, but are now reliant on remittances received

from migrant kin, are using this new source of income to change their landscape relations in a way that articulates their social and temporal 'progress'. I further draw attention not only to that which is being materially, and simultaneously culturally, constructed, but also that which is being demolished and eradicated. Situating these processes in a hegemonic discourse concerned with the conservation and reinvigoration of smallholder traditions and cultural heritage, I highlight the paradox that it is the governing classes, rather than the peasantry, who celebrate 'peasantness', and tease out the time politics invoked to elucidate the ways in which the established social order is being contested, negotiated and reasserted through transformations in the landscape.

Landscapes entangle "history, spiritual being, aesthetic meaning, social relations and concepts of nature" (Strang 2000:93). They are also in a continual state of flux and change (Bender 1993, 2001: 3), as individuals encounter, and transform, the material world around them, a practice Hirsch defines as a process of engagement between the foreground of everyday life and the background of our potentiality (1995: 22-23). This model of 'landscape as process' emphasises action and labour and, in shifting from the notion that landscape expresses a particular, often Western-elitist, way of viewing and fixing, Hirsch shows us that the timelessness and fixity of the landscape can only be fleetingly, and transcendently, achieved (ibid: 22). It is, however, as I demonstrate below, this very timelessness that the professional classes strive to attain, and I explore the tensions that arise as migrant/peasant households look to transform the landscape in a way that expresses forward direction and change, while their governing classes look to assert continuity, heritage and tradition. Thus, whilst recognising that landscapes can be culturally constructed, subjective and ideological (Hirsch & O'Hanlon 1995, Ingold 2000, Tilley 1994), I also premise this paper on the tenet that land is a practical resource that is used, appropriated, and regulated (Abramson & Theodossopoulos 2000, Verdery 1998).

The ways in which landscapes, both practically and ideologically, are contested and tensioned has been the subject of some consideration by the social sciences

(cf Abramson & Theodossopoulos *ibid*, Bender 1993, Bender & Winer 2001), and ethnography has detailed the broader political dynamics between those who live off, and within, the land(scape) and those who seek to enact a heritage and conservation agenda (cf Bender 1998, Burnham 2000, Macleod 2001, Theodossopoulos 2000). Likewise, accounts of defined heritage sites have demonstrated that certain voices may be silenced by, and excluded from, the production of historical meta-narratives (cf Benavides 2004, Berg 2005, Handler & Gable 1997, Herzfeld 1991). Taken together, these two bodies of scholarship mutually raise questions of power and governance, a point further expounded by Cosgrove (1984) who argues that, in denying the processes of everyday life, power relations are intrinsically embedded in representations of 'ideal' landscapes. Idyllic representations of the rural are, as Williams (1973) argues, products of urban imaginations, and I look to elucidate this process, through the lens of class, by exploring how political dynamics shape differing constructions, and aesthetic judgements, of the landscape, and the way, in turn, land is mobilised to articulate class subjectivities. Yet I also demonstrate that, while class-based tensions are prevalent, this relation cannot be distilled to a simple insider-outsider dichotomy, nor is it a case of open dispute. Rather, I argue that both the migrant/peasant and the professional classes embrace selected changes to the landscape. As these areas of convergence indicate a potential contradiction in the conservation discourse of the latter group, they indicate that it is not only the nature of change *per se* that is a concern, but also the social actors who direct and enact these changes.

In raising the issue of 'who' transforms the land in socially acceptable (and non-acceptable) ways, in addition to the 'what', 'how' and 'why', I ask which social actors perform, or are expected to perform, to hegemonic constructions of the landscape, and explore how they respond to this burden of expectation. I aim to show that rather than being excluded from the land, as has been noted in the case of national parks and heritage sites (Berg 2005, Macleod 2001), the migrant/peasantry are embedded within, and form part of, the synchronic representation of the agricultural landscape perpetuated by the professional classes. Thus, I highlight the 'burden of timelessness' carried by the

migrant/peasantry, and indicate how the transformative acts of demolition and construction can be understood as a rejection of this burden. Building on scholarship that expounds the politics of time (Fabian 1983, Greenhouse 1996, Lutz 1992), I consequently reflect on how time and land are manipulated in relations between the classes, and provide the foundation for everyday acts of resistance and resilience.

Land Relations & Remittances in El Austro

The ethnographic setting for this paper is the village of Jima (population c. 400), located in the el Austro region of the Ecuadorian Highlands (2,600m). The region, with the city of Cuenca at its heart, is defined as a distinct cultural area by local, national, and external agencies, and is recognised for its historical Cañari foundations, Inca ruins, colonial architecture and mountainous rural aesthetic. Granted UNESCO World Heritage status in 1999 and known colloquially as the 'Athens of Ecuador' – a label which emphasises its agricultural traditions, environmental riches and natural beauty of the landscape, in addition to its artistic and intellectual merits – the 'unique' identity of the greater Cuenca area is highly celebrated by the professional classes, who seek to uphold and protect its cultural heritage (Klaufus 2006, Miles 2004). Embedded within this imagery is the figure of the *Chola Cuencana*, a female, mixed-race, peasant artisan and producer. Represented in civic statues, tourist souvenirs, and visual representations that point to their real-life counterparts engaged in small-scale rural production and selling their wares in the city's markets, the *Chola Cuencana*, swathed in the brightly gathered skirts of the *pollera*, hair plaited and wearing a Panama hat, has become emblematic of the region (Weismantel 2003). Yet, as I discuss below, this valorisation is premised, and conditional, on the *Chola Cuencana* knowing her 'place'; once she breaks out of the rubric of agricultural tradition and participates in 'other' activities that transform the landscape and create a different rural aesthetic, she is regarded as a potentially polluting and morally ambivalent character, and measures are taken to regulate her actions.

A social hierarchy, in which class, genealogy, and ethnicity interplay under the nation-building ideology of *mestizaje* and *blanquemento* (racial and cultural whitening), is deeply entrenched in the consciousness of el Austro (Brownrigg 1972, Hirschkind 1980, Weismantel 2003), although the categories invoked are subjective, relative and expressed through cultural characteristics and social qualities (cf Bourque 2001, Miles 2004, Weismantal 1988). This structure is further reflected and shaped by land relations and, until The Agrarian Reform Act of 1964, the *encomienda* and *hacienda* systems, introduced by Spanish colonisers, had concentrated land ownership into the hands of the few and bound the majority of the rural population to tied labour. As the Act abolished debt peonage and encouraged greater levels of small-scale private land-holding, the governing landed elite adapted by shifting from polyculture to the monocropping of high-value, export-orientated products, establishing multinational trade relations, and replacing previously embedded relations with the peasantry with flexible waged labour (Colloredo-Mansfield 1999). This process is commonly understood as the defining moment in which the rural highlands became integrated into a broader capitalist economy (Barsky 1988, Zamosc 1994), and the livelihoods of the incumbent peasantry became intrinsically entwined with, and subject to, the trends and fluctuations of global markets. The subsequent national economic crises in the 1980s and late 1990s were thereby keenly felt in the region, and the resulting lack of economic stability and waged labour opportunities, coupled with rising prices and withdrawal of state support, encouraged many members of the el Austro peasantry to look to the United States as a source of employment, income and economic security.

The 1980s and 1990s witnessed unprecedented levels of transnational migration from Ecuador, with the lower, rural classes of el Austro forming “the ‘core’ sending zone” (Jokisch & Pribilsky 2002: 78). Consequently, the region has become the locus for an “inflow of remittances that serve to transform the livelihood of the poor” (Whitten 2003: 10) and in the village of Jima, as with its neighbouring communities (cf Miles 2004, Jokisch & Pribilsky *ibid*, Kyle 2000, Pribilsky 2007), outward, semi-permanent migration remains the primary economic strategy for peasant households. With this has come a gradual decline

in smallholder agriculture, as livelihoods become more diverse, reciprocal labour agreements break down, and land is adapted to other uses. A multiplicity of factors are thereby contributing to the decrease in smallholder yields,¹ although my purpose in this paper is not to survey these in their entirety, but rather cast light upon one specific dimension – the shifting relationship between the peasantry and the land – and the ways this interplays with class and time.

Migrant remittances now provide one of the most significant flows of income into Ecuador (CBO 2005),² and are by far the greatest source of income for the *mestizo* (mixed-race) migrant/peasant households in Jima with whom I conducted my research. Yet the consequences of this remittance flow, at a household, community and national level, remains largely under-analysed. On average, Jimeño households receive between USD200 to USD350 per month³ and, although additional, generally less profitable, sources of income are generated from the rental of rooms, market stalls, and informal trading, any entrepreneurial labour tends to be fortuitous, casual and infrequent. Moreover, while migrant/peasant households maintain smallholdings, these are diminishing in import and rarely, if ever, contribute to household incomes, with the small amount produced being used for personal consumption rather than being sent to market. As in other el Austro communities, remittances are spent as opposed to saved in Jima and, while conspicuous consumption is commonly limited to the reproduction of the household and a hierarchy of expenditure can be discerned, there is little to no agricultural investment and any acquisition of additional landholdings is for residential development (Abbots forthcoming, see also Pribilsky 2007). Migrant/peasant households in el Austro have thus shifted

¹ See Bryceson et al (2000) and Brass (2003) for wide-ranging and detailed discussions of the changing nature of 'the peasantry' in Latin America and beyond, and the multiple factors informing these changes.

² Remittances from migrants amount to over 6% of GDP, and come only behind oil and agricultural products as a source of foreign currency. They also equate to 112% of foreign direct investment, and 663% of official development assistance (CBO 2005).

³ Remittance income is dependent on the number of migrant kin living in the USA, and the highest 'earners' commonly receive income from their husbands and older children. While average remittance income clusters between \$200-350, some households receive closer to \$500, while others receive sporadic payments between \$50-100. Pribilsky (2007: 75) also notes similar clustering between \$200-250, with significant numbers of households receiving between \$250-500.

from being an economic unit of production to one of consumption (Kyle 2000, Pribilsky *ibid*).

The el Austro context thereby echoes the use of remittances elsewhere in Latin America (cf Cohen 2004, Durand & Massey 1992, Fitzgerald 2009), and the recurrent high levels of expenditure on the household in contrast to the low level of investment in entrepreneurial and agricultural activity has fuelled the longstanding debate between those who argue that remittances increase dependency and those who contend they can stimulate rural development and provide economic security.⁴ Notwithstanding, regional governments are looking to harness remittances through a series of policies aimed at stimulating rural economies (Fitzgerald 2009: 64-65, *el Tiempo* 2010) and, in Ecuador, these parallel market-orientated food security programmes including, for example, the FAO's 'Initiative on Soaring Food Prices' (FAO 2011), that endeavour to build the capacity of smallholder farming. These programmes ascribe a particular 'ideal-type' model of the peasantry which resonates with an academic and activist discourse that, in challenging neo-liberal paradigms and industrial agriculture, has, at times, represented the peasantry's relation with the land as one which is essentially harmonious, sustainable and/or community-orientated (cf Rossett 1999, 2006). This discourse also invokes themes that are not dissimilar to those found in the narrative of Jima's governing classes, and appears to be significantly at odds with the shifting landscape relations of the Jimeño peasantry. I thereby contend that that a more nuanced understanding of migrant/peasant households' engagement with their landscape, and the political dynamics that inform both the processes of transformation and the governing classes' celebration of peasantness, can problematise the assumptions on which a number of idealised models of the peasantry, and the associated policies and interventions, are premised.

⁴ See Cohen (2004: 101-105) and Massey et al (1998) for a more detailed discussion on the remittance and development debate.

Eradicating the Peasant Past: The Demolition of Agricultural Buildings

The rumble of the earth-mover could be heard before it was seen, and it was with a certain sense of inevitability that I watched the massive yellow vehicle squeeze down the narrow lane and come to a shuddering halt outside the front gates of the house in which I boarded with Sonia and her sons. Its arrival was met with great excitement, as all members of the household, and immediate neighbours, came out of their houses to greet the driver – who was ostensibly employed to resurface the Pan-American highway nearby – although initial enthusiasm quickly turned to consternation and heated discussion when it became evident that the vehicle's access was blocked by the ten foot high brick wall Sonia had recently erected to enclose her grounds. It was soon determined, however, that while the wall could be rebuilt, the availability of the both the driver and the vehicle – the latter of which had been donated by the Japanese state as part of a state orchestrated development programme – was limited, and the vehicle was driven through the wall. The process of razing Sonia's agricultural buildings and removing the topsoil thus began and, in total, six adobe buildings, previously used for rearing chickens and pigs, were demolished, with the excess soil being dumped outside the main house to form the foundations of a new driveway. Within twenty minutes the earth-mover had completed its work and the only publically visible vestiges of Sonia's agricultural heritage were the wooden remains of the buildings' struts and beams which, over the course of the following weeks, were gradually picked through and removed by Sonia's casual workers and neighbours as her payment against longstanding reciprocal labour agreements.

While the demolition was swift, making a decision about how best to use the patch of newly cleared land, which was the approximate size of a football field lying to the side of the house, was a far lengthier process. The following weeks were filled with household discussions over the space, with Sonia canvassing members of her extended family and friends, including those who had migrated, for their opinions on the best way forward. A volleyball court, car park, swimming pool, and site for wooden cabañas were just some of the muted options, and a tension emerged between those who believed the land should be

utilised for leisure and those who favoured it being put to income-generating purposes. These tensions were not strictly delineated along gender or generational lines, although elder members of the household appeared to favour uses that could provide Sonia with an additional income. As Carlos explained;

She should use this [the cleared land] for a volleyball court. She could lay it out with concrete and put up a net; that wouldn't cost much. Then the chicos (youth) can come and play – it will be good for them, and good for her – they'll pay a few dollars. Maybe she could have a kiosk too – over in that corner – and sell colas and beers. And when they're not playing, Manual can park his bus here – and she could charge for that too.

Despite the discussions and arguments – a decision had still not been reached by the time I left the field four months later – all members of the extended family were united on one point; that the cleared land should not be used for farming purposes, and any suggestion that it should was derided and mocked.

The mutual clarity of Sonia's family and friends indicates that it is not only what replaces agricultural lands that is significant in this context, but also the act of demolition itself. The demise of Sonia's agricultural buildings was not due to their gradual erosion through neglect or lack of use, nor was it a planned decline or programmed shift to another purpose. Rather, it was a violent and swift action, facilitated by heavy machinery laboriously appropriated, and at significant cost, for the task: a process of rendering the agricultural past publically invisible that is echoed in other everyday actions of migrant/peasant actors, albeit in a less dramatic fashion.

Susana and I were sat in her newly extended kitchen with her cousin Felicia, browsing through their collection of family photographs. Amidst the images of children and family gatherings, and the recently received shots of young men posing outside McDonalds, Walmart and other iconic images of their successful journey to the USA, was a photograph of a small adobe building. On seeing this, Susana snatched up the image and proceeded to tear it up: *"that was a horrible house; I don't want to see it, it was horrible – a poor house"*. Felicia interjected, and

taking the photograph away, explained, “*yes, but you shouldn’t do that – we need to remember antes (before) – our family lived there*”. A heated debate ensued, with Felicia acquiescing to her cousin who was adamant that the photograph should be destroyed. Susana forcefully stated that she did not want to have the reminder of “*that ugly house*” and the photograph was subsequently, along with a number of similar images pulled from the collection, torn up and thrown into the waste.

Not all vestiges of agricultural life are, however, destroyed and demolished, and, as I alluded to above, migrant/peasant households do maintain a smallholding and raise a limited number of livestock. Yet, these are commonly hidden to the back of houses and are increasingly encroached upon by both residential home extensions and by the type of demolition practices exemplified by Sonia. Moreover, guinea pigs, a local delicacy, have been moved from their traditional home of the kitchen (Weismantel 1988) and are now raised in small sheds in the back garden, and most sheep, pigs and cows are tethered and grazed on common land away from domestic property,⁵ and those that remain are squeezed into increasingly smaller enclosures.

The everyday actions of tearing up photographs and hiding livestock and crops are seemingly mundane in contrast to Sonia’s razing of her agricultural buildings, but I suggest they have a common thread of rendering smallholding life and labour invisible. Whether it is through demolition, destruction or concealment material expressions of a peasant livelihood are rapidly disappearing from public landscape. This does not mean that migrant/peasant households are shifting away from smallholding agricultural completely, although the general trajectory of their economic strategies and practices appears to indicate this may be the case, nor am I suggesting that individuals of the migrant/peasant class are engaged in collective and individual processes of forgetting. Rather, my intention is to draw attention to the revised public narrative of their past, present, and future, these social actors are constructing through their transformation of the

⁵ In what appears to be a case of ‘out of sight, out of mind’, my enquiries regarding where their livestock was currently located would sometimes appear to remind my research participants that they had livestock, and on more than one occasion I witnessed the death of livestock due to neglect.

land: what is significant in this context is firstly, that migrant/peasant actors are attempting to revise their rural, agricultural past and secondly, the form this is taking.

The act of demolition and destruction has received considerably less anthropological attention than their counterparts of building and construction, although comparisons to Jima can be drawn with work that examines how alternative public narratives of the past are constructed through land, monuments, and material culture. Monuments may be 'heterotopias' in which public historical narratives and personal recollections engage in dialogue to produce collective memories (Foucault 1984 Low 1996, Wanner 1998), but they also play a significant role in the attempts of a specific social group to revise their, or another's, past. Wanner (*ibid*) discusses this process in post-Soviet Ukraine, and describes how the state articulated a revisionist history by changing street names, destroying Soviet-era statues, and erecting new monuments in their place. She situates this practice in the context of nation building, but her elucidation of the ways in which a historical narrative can be constructed through the built and natural environment is enlightening to the Jimeño context, as it indicates a potential political motivation and purpose behind the demolition practices of migrant/peasant households.

These practices, to an extent, can also be seen as acts of violence and they have, at their heart, a visibility that is performed to an audience of witnesses, a symbolic purpose, and a practical desire to change the social environment (cf Riches 1986).⁶ As Schröder and Schmidt argue, acts of violence are never idiosyncratic, isolated or meaningless, but always express a relationship with another party that is a product of historical processes (2001: 3). This relatedness is central to Riches' (*ibid*) definition of violence, in which he highlights the political relations between performer and witness. It is this dynamic which provides a useful lens for viewing the practices of the Jimeño migrant/peasantry, as it points to the potential class tensions that inform their

⁶ The range of social acts defined as violent has been subject to considerable debate, and I do not intend to broaden that discussion here. For a detailed discussion of the application of the term 'violence', see Riches (1986).

demolition practices, in addition to showing that these practices are centred around public, visible statements and representations. As suggested by the notion of heterotopias, the ways these 'statements' are interpreted are subjective and, following Riches, these acts may be deemed legitimate by some, but not by others. I pick up this thread below when I consider alternatives to the narratives of the migrant/peasant class – and how they too are embedded in the landscape – but first I turn to examine how migrant/peasant households are actively constructing a new narrative of modernity and progress to replace the one of tradition they are engaged in dismantling.

Constructing a Socially Mobile Present: Leisure Gardens & Modern Houses

Although members of Sonia's household could not agree on the purpose of her newly cleared plot of land, the common thread that it should be used to express the upward social mobility of the household can be discerned. Social mobility, under the rubric of *mestizaje*, is commonly articulated by members of the Andean peasantry as a shift away from agricultural labour towards both professional, entrepreneurial work and increased leisure time (Colleredo-Mansfield 1999). The options muted for Sonia's land clearly reflect this orientation, and indicate that, for the Jimeño peasantry, the rural domain has become as site of leisure rather than labour (op cit: 207). This is not to state that the land cannot be used for productive means, as Carlos' comment regarding the income generating potential of a volleyball court illustrates, but rather I wish to highlight the distance that members of the migrant/peasantry look to create, through their land use, between their current position, their social aspirations and their agricultural past. Hence, I suggest, a simple dichotomy between productive and non-productive uses does not adequately reflect migrant/peasant attitudes to land, rather it the form of labour required to transform the land into income that is of import in this context.

Nevertheless, adapting previously agricultural land to leisure use is a recurrent theme, and this is demonstrated by the Jimeño adoption of ornamental gardens. A significant proportion of migrant/peasant households in the village are, like Sonia, clearing their land of agricultural buildings and crops, and are planting

ornamental plants and laying lawns in their place. These gardens are commonly located to the front and sides of residences, and are thereby highly visible to the general public, despite being enclosed within ornamental wrought iron railings and gates. Lawned areas, shrubs and flowering plants, and paved walkways leading up to balustraded sun terraces, are favoured in most designs and, while gardens are frequently planted with apple and cherry trees, and cape gooseberry plants, the fruits are rarely harvested, and are left to rot into the ground. Moreover, orchids, which are sourced from the neighbouring cloud forests and Amazon lowlands often take pride of place, with merchants from lowland villages making frequent trips to Jima to sell an assortment of tropical plants.

The Jimeño migrant/peasantry generally perceive the greater Amazon region as an exotic wilderness, and individuals commonly extolled the region's natural virtues, urging me to visit so I too could enjoy the "*beautiful flowers, orchids and trees*". During my guided tours of domestic gardens, it was these plants from the lowlands that frequently drew the greatest attention and professed pride, and I was frequently asked to pause and admire them. In contrast, I was hurried through areas where crops were being grown and indigenous plants, for example, apple trees were bypassed and ignored. This pride in the 'exotic' and 'exogenous' extended to non-productive animals and pets, with an ostrich that Carmen had laboriously acquired being perhaps the most striking example of the incongruent elements that are becoming increasingly visible in the Jimeño landscape. As I discuss below, these additions are problematic for the professional and governing classes in Jima but, for members of the migrant/peasantry, introducing these 'other' elements into the tamed and manicured environment of their homes are regarded as an improvement to the overall aesthetic, whereas the vestiges of agriculture are perceived as a detraction; a point asserted by Susana, who consistently referred to adobe buildings as "*feo*" (ugly), and the flowering trees and plants in her garden, and the Amazon lowlands, as "*lindisimo*" (very beautiful).

The introduction of the exogenous into the local vernacular continues in the manner in which migrant/peasant households construct, and extend, their

houses. While being the place of sociality and kinship, domestic architecture can also be “a public medium through which individuals broadcast claims about themselves” (Holston 1991: 457, see also Lawrence & Low 1990), and the houses of migrant/peasant families in Jima broadcast the characteristic opulent ‘migrant’ aesthetic widely recognised across the nation (Colloredo-Mansfield 1994, Klaufus 2006, Kyle 2000, Walmsley 2001). This form, while not explicitly defined as a consistent style, is recognisable in the manner it differs so dramatically from the previously dominating models (Klaufus *ibid*: 78), particularly in relation to their ‘oversized’ proportions.

On entering Rosa’s house one is met with a cavernous atrium and sweeping staircase. To the right is the lower salon, and the warren of bedrooms in the eastern wing, while the west wing houses the open dining area before leading into fully-fitted kitchen, storage and utility rooms, and a private dining room. Together, the open plan space of the dining area and lower salon could comfortably contain Sonia’s potential volleyball court, and these dimensions continue on the second floor, which houses the upper salon, a further seven bedrooms and bathrooms, and a study. Yet ‘migrant style’ refers not only to the scale of domestic architecture, but also the materials used. In Jima these are commonly, tinted and coloured glass, concrete breezeblocks and cement, coloured roof tiles, wrought iron, and other metals. These materials, in contrast to the inexpensive mud bricks that are manually produced in the village and the widely available timber, are often associated with industrial, urban buildings (Gough 1996: 43), and it is the introduction of these elements, together with the layout and scale, that has led some to argue that the influence of North America can be discerned in the houses of migrants (Fletcher 1997, Klaufus 2006).

It is the introduction of these ‘exogenous’ influences that heighten the governing classes anxiety over the construction of migrant homes (Klaufus *ibid*), yet members of Jimeño migrant/peasant households rarely classify their architectural preferences in these terms. Rather, they describe their houses as “*modern*”, “*comfortable*”, “*beautiful*” and “*good*”, and while these terms are ambivalent and subjective, and may well incorporate external influences, it

suggests that do not frame their construction activities, and their transactions with the land more generally, with the same explicit 'insider-outsider' paradigm utilised by commentators and the professional classes alike. For the migrant/peasantry, an aesthetically pleasing landscape, I suggest, will contain 'exogenous' elements, both in the form of tamed plants from the Amazon and urban industrial materials, but these are not necessarily regarded as incongruous. The introduction of these elements are, however, symbolic of their modernity and progress, and coupled with the demolition and relocation of agricultural buildings, crops, and animals, it appears that the migrant/peasantry are attempting to construct a new narrative that emphasises their distance, both socially and temporally, from their agricultural past.

The social motivation to publically express this mobility can, at least in part, be explained with reference to the dominant ideology of *mestizaje* and historical class relations. While, as I discuss below, smallholding and peasantness is now valorised by the governing classes, the Ecuadorian peasantry have historically been relegated to the margins of society, and smallholding agriculture, under the nation-building rubric of *mestizaje*, was firmly associated with servile relations and a lack of sophistication and 'culture' (Stutzman 1981, Whitten 1981). As it was envisaged the peasantry would desirably, and inevitably, be drawn from their rural periphery into the urban centre of the nation, and moral judgements were made against those who, despite the best efforts of the state, 'refused' to modernise, the peasantry were simultaneously constructed as an impediment, but also central, to the demonstrative success of 'the modernisation project' and economic development.

The Jimeño practice of obliterating and hiding vestiges of their smallholding past, and building 'modern' homes and leisure gardens, appears to resonate with, and potentially uphold, this ideology, and this is supported by the way they explain their practices and articulate their social, and temporal, position. I was told consistently that "*we are modern now*" and migrant/peasant actors confidently asserted that the traditions associated with small-scale agriculture were disappearing with each generation. As Rosa explained, "*before, there were lots of*

mingas [collective work groups], in the fields, sowing seeds and harvesting. But now, not so much; we are losing the traditions". When asked why this was the case, I was told that there was no need for *mingas* as there were less fields to work, people had more money, and that "*we live a modern way of life*". As Felicia surmised, "*things change, people leave, and the young people – they're not interested any more.... but that's progress*".

Yet these comments were rarely tinged with nostalgia, but were rather expressed in a more pragmatic manner. The demise of traditions and changes to the landscape, while occasionally being lamentable, are also regarded as indicative of good fortune and progress, a view articulated by Carlos who, in recounting his life history, highlighted the journey from poverty and labour to economic security, variety and leisure.

Before, we only had what we grew and raised here; maize, pork maybe, beef, some vegetables, and trout from the lake. Then a campesino [peasant] would earn one sucre a day and he would walk six kilometres to the hacienda and back – all the time barefoot – for his day's wage. But the workers without shoes, we had children who go to the United States and look, now we have these big houses and light [electricity] and cable television; I can spend all day watching television now! We are more economically stable now; life is much easier now.

Upholding Agricultural Heritage: The Response of the Professional Classes

Come learn about and participate in the agricultural activities of Jima. Jima is traditionally an agricultural community. The main crops are corn, potatoes and apples. In addition, the people of Jima produce many dairy products such as cheese and yogurt. The people of Jima also raise milk cows, chickens, pigs, sheep, goats and guinea pigs.

Come and enjoy an authentic traditional fiesta in Jima. There is the election of the Cholita of Jima [and], you can browse the market, enjoy traditional dances and tour the agricultural fair.

(Jima Tourist Foundation Website 2010,
text written by a Peace Corps worker)

While migrant/peasant households appear to be upholding the ideology of *mestizaje* and modernisation, an alternative discourse, in which 'unique' regional identities through cultural heritage are emphasised, has equal, if not greater, salience among the professional classes. This argument is well established in the regional literature (cf Klaufus 2006, Miles 2004, Weismantel 2003), although the time politics and peasant contestation to this discourse have not been fully expounded. Pribilsky explains,

Pollera skirts, humble adobe homes tucked away in the foliage of *maíz* fields, elderly campesinos.....and fields being plowed by draft animals form part of the imagery of local residents that have led to the characterization of them as *nuestro folklórico* (our folklore) by middle- and upper-class urban Ecuadorians (2007: 41).

This analysis resonates the description of the village written by the Jima Tourist Foundation above, and when placed alongside the current landscape practices of the migrant/peasantry, a disjuncture between the classes, and their models of an aesthetically pleasing landscape, starts to emerge.

The Jima Tourist Foundation was established as part of a Peace Corps initiative to generate revenues from tourism for the benefit of the whole community, although their remit is significantly broader than their title suggests and they are responsible for the political administration of all community and cultural events. The Foundation board are thus self- and NGO- appointed guardians of Jima's cultural heritage. The individuals responsible for representing the village and maintaining its traditions, in this officially sanctioned capacity, are primarily drawn from the professional rather than the peasant classes, and reside in the city of Cuenca as opposed to the village. Juan, a school head-teacher, together with lawyers, architects and those from well-named and established landholding families comprise the majority of the Foundation's decision-making board and, while some members of the peasantry were involved in supplying services including food and accommodation, those who are no longer using their land for smallholder agriculture, have built 'modern' houses and are publically rejecting their peasant past are excluded.

Sonia had been embroiled in an ongoing dispute with the Tourist Foundation, in which she wanted to participate, as a board member, for some time, and had written a number of letters outlining the reasons as to why she was best placed to offer services to tourists, as well as canvassing support from her extended family and neighbours. The crux of her argument was that she had “*the biggest house in the village*” which, with its spacious ensuite bedrooms, running hot water and a luxury fitted kitchen, was also one of the “*most modern*”. Heightening these tensions was the Foundation’s appointment of Zoila, a *mestiza* woman who lives with her children in a modest adobe house, and earns her living subsistence farming a small plot of land and selling meals in the makeshift restaurant that occupies the ground floor of her home and. Quietly-spoken, and commonly dressed in a *pollera* and panama hat, with long braids, Zoila does not, and cannot with her income, participate in the land transformation practices of her wealthier neighbours. She can thus be seen to embody the folkloric image of the *Chola Cuencana* celebrated by the professional classes. Moreover, in being appointed to serve *comida típica* (traditional meals), house visiting language students, and participate in an agricultural *minga*, as opposed to being included in the management of the Foundation and its relations with NGOs, Zoila appears to enact, and conform to, their narrative of the peasantry’s primary role in Jimeño society.

Pribilsky contends that the romanticised narrative of the peasantry landscape reproduced by the professional and governing classes evokes a past in which, “above all, rural peoples knew their place in the social order: as industrious workers on the land, producers of artisanry, and humble servants” (2007: 41), and Zoila’s appointment appears to reassert the historical class relations upon which this discourse is founded. It also reiterates historical gender relations. The *Chola Cuencana* is a strictly female character, and while male *cholos* exist they are not the equivalent of the romanticised *chola*, but are rather more socially undesirable and present characters who are not reified as symbols of the region’s cultural heritage. As a result of the processes of social change instigated by migration and remittances, including the transformation of the landscape, there is a constant threat that the “the folkloric *chola*’s son turns into the

grasping *cholo* boy” (Miles 2004: 28), and hence a discourse centred on migrant/peasant women’s reproductive capacity can be discerned. It is through this discourse, I argue, that the professional classes project an idealised view of the past onto peasant women, holding them responsible for the reproduction of cultural heritage and the preservation of agricultural traditions, and in doing so, they invoke a specific model of femininity and construct an ideal-type of rural woman who is embedded in a synchronic pastoral landscape. The female peasantry thereby carry the greatest burden of timelessness and, as Sonia’s exclusion from the Foundation demonstrates, rejecting that burden has significant political and economic consequences.

The relations between Sonia, Zoila and the Tourist Foundation indicate the actions members of the governing classes, supported by external agencies, take to uphold Jima’s agricultural heritage and their narrative is further perpetuated through a number of mechanisms, including the ‘official’ account of village’s name, and the articulation of this history at cultural fairs and events.⁷ However, with the exception of Zoila, who has more restrictive economic circumstances, the migrant/peasant households with whom I worked, like Sonia, are engaged in transforming the landscape and are refusing to stay in their social and temporal place. As a result, political leaders are responding by looking to regulate the building activities of migrant/peasant households, a perspective demonstrated by Arquitecto Sacaquiri’s (2005) article published in Jima’s community magazine, *Huinara*.

Huinara magazine, named after the tallest topographical peak that overlooks the Jimeño valley, and distributed to all the households in the village and surrounding communities, is edited by the same individuals who comprise the Jima Tourist Foundation and, as such, is a vehicle through which members of the professional classes articulate their political views. Articles criticising the

⁷ The ‘official’ history of the village, as recounted in cultural events and taken from the local historian Aguilar Vázquez (1944), reasserts its agricultural heritage by stating that it takes its name from *zhima*, a type of white corn, and supporting this with poetic descriptions of the past, including how, during battles over the territory, the Incas were impressed with the agricultural industriousness of the village’s inhabitants. Alternative suggestions, including that village was once lowland Shuar territory, and takes its name from a Shuar word (Aguiles Pérez 1978) does not get recounted.

strategies and practices of the migrant/peasant class are the mainstay of the magazine, and associations between migration, family breakdown, drug use, teenage pregnancies and general moral decline are not uncommon. Entangled within this is the view that the landscape must to be preserved and traditions upheld, with Arquitecto Sacaquiri writing to oppose the “modern” builds of migrant/peasant families, with their concrete walls, coloured roofs, extensive glass and elaborate decoration. He forcefully argues that this form of construction is leading to the destruction of the environment – and, synonymously, the cultural heritage of the region – and expounds his idea of the perfect ‘peasant’ house; small, made of clay walls and other local materials, and situated alongside vegetable plots and grazing lands for life-stock. This form of architecture is not only suited to a modest, agricultural way of life, he explains, but is also embedded within, and sits harmoniously with, the rural landscape. Thus, Sacaquiri concludes that Jimeños should be following the example of their grandparents and building properties which reflect “continuity, harmony, proportion and most of all CONSCIOUSNESS and community spirit”, as opposed to the “monumental buildings which try to speak mistakenly of progress” (2005: 26, original emphasis).

Seen through the eyes of Sacaquiri, Sonia’s argument of having the biggest and most modern house in the village was probably not the best tactic for inclusion into the Tourist Foundation, and his perspective parallels a discourse noted elsewhere in the el Austro region. Miles’ account of the neighbouring town of Cumbe, highlights the circulation of narratives that mock the landscape and consumption practices of the migrant/peasant class, and she concludes the upper classes regard the them as “ignorant peasants who have been blinded by the lure of earning dollars and do not really know what they are doing to themselves, their families, and, most distressingly, the cultural patrimony of Cuenca” (2004: 28). Thus, the migrant/peasant households who reject the burden of timelessness and the *Chola Cuencana* narrative are discursively constructed as polluting actors who are unaware of the broader repercussions of their actions. Moreover, it is not only the political classes that (re)produce this narrative thread. As can be seen by the Peace Corps’ involvement in the Jima

Tourist Foundation, external agencies can invoke similar values in reference to the aesthetics of the rural and cultural environment, as can academics working in the region, with Jokisch & Pribilsky, for example, stating that the landscape is now “*littered* with the large homes” of migrant families (2002: 81, my emphasis).

A range of actors thereby discursively construct the transformative actions of the migrant/peasant class on the landscape as a problem that needs to be addressed, and Arquitecto Sacaquiri suggests the solution is increased governance of rural building activity. He outlines a proposal that emphasises the need for planning and building regulations, an inventory and protection of ‘heritage’ buildings, including those used for agricultural purposes, defined urban limits and distinct sectors that are in agreement with topographical features and the landscape. His concern appears to be that of conservation, and the ‘need’ to maintain cultural continuities and harmony between the built and natural environment, yet his answer is a regulatory framework administered by the state and implemented by local authorities and the professional classes.

In offering this ‘solution’ to the migrant/peasant ‘problem’, Sacaquiri echoes the voices of other members of the professional and governing classes. Discussing the Cuencano elite’s response to what they perceive as the ‘overwhelming’ and ‘rapid spread’ of nonconformist and imported domestic architectural styles (2006: 70), Klaufus highlights that this cohesive social group are preoccupied with protecting authenticity and safeguarding the rural landscape, which they understand as being under threat and “spoiled by the bad taste of the nouveau riches and the imported aesthetics from ‘outside’” (ibid: 71). She thereby argues that ‘migrant architecture’ is not a neutral, but a politically loaded, term through which judgements are made about the changing livelihoods and lifestyles of the migrant/peasant class, and contends that there is much more at stake than aesthetic preferences as members of the privileged elite start to feel threatened by the economic power and non-emulative practices of the migrant class. Klaufus thus interprets the attempts of Cuenca’s elite architects and state-employed planners to re-establish their control over the landscape and built environment as an attempt to reassert their political hegemony over the lower, rural classes.

Debates surrounding migrant architecture and the manner in which migrant/peasant households are transforming the landscape are thereby subject to, and indicative of, broader political concerns regarding social change and the potential challenge this brings to the established social order, an argument that is further supported by the acknowledgement that the professional classes' opposition to changes in the landscape is rather selective.

The construction of the Jima-Oriente road has been a long process, and its reaching the province border was marked with a handover ceremony, attended by provincial officials, community leaders and local residents from both provinces.⁸ My first visit occurred a few days before this official event, when a number of migrant/peasant households arranged a trip to see the site of the handover. As we travelled along the mountainous, unpaved car-width track, which comprises the road on the Jima side, felled trees and landslides could be observed, and these changes upon the landscape become even more apparent at the handover site. Three heavy-duty earthmovers, trenches of clay-like mud, and swathes of decimated cloud forest could be seen stretching over the horizon. Nevertheless, my co-travellers were undeterred, and they set up camp to explore the site, had a picnic and toasted the road and its builders. Carlos, in particular, made a point of showing me the bulldozers, proudly telling that they were the best technology available, and had been loaned by the Japanese state, and when I mentioned that it was a shame about the damage to the cloud forest, he dismissed my concerns, telling me that *"it's progress, the road is good"*.

Carlos' perspective was echoed not only by other members of the migrant/peasant class, but also the professional classes. During the handover ceremony, and in interviews, an unquestionably positive attitude to the road was expressed by individuals of all social groups, with many speaking of the *"dying villages"* along the route that would be revitalised by being directly connected to

⁸ The handover ceremony occurred as the Jimeño side of the road had reached the province boundary and its construction would subsequently be managed by officials in the Amazonian Morona-Santiago province, as opposed to those in Azuay, the highland province in which Jima is located. Upon completion, the road will link Jima to the lowlands.

Jima. One of these interviews was conducted with Jenny, a young employee of an environmental group, who had been introduced into the community by its political leaders in order to teach environmental awareness to schoolchildren, and whose engagement with migrant/peasant households primarily involved giving talks about the dangers of littering, fly-tipping, and burning household rubbish. She explained,

Well, it's not so bad, the trees will grow back in time. It's worth it; more small communities will be connected to Jima now, and Cuenca too. People from them can come and trade, and sell their goods – that's the most important thing.

Challenging the Social Order: Time, Landscape & Class

Attitudes to the road suggest that relations that the migrant/peasant, and professional, classes have with the landscape can, on occasion, converge, and demonstrates that the latter are not entirely opposed to change and transformation being wrought upon the land. Yet, while both social groups understand the road as a symbol of progress, and do not appear to be concerned with any environmental damage caused by its construction, members of the professional classes primarily stressed the economic benefits it would bring. The road is therefore viewed, from this social position, as a productive activity, and positioned in contrast to the “*misguided*” and “*unproductive*” extended houses, leisure gardens, and volleyball courts of the migrant/peasant class. Moreover, the road is also a state-led project managed by local political leaders.⁹ Thus, it becomes apparent that rather than two competing landscape discourses – one opposed to transformation, the other enacting change – multiple representations and valorisations circulate and not only do these, at times, overlap, compete and contradict each other, but they are also informed by a variety of factors, including the type of construction/destruction activity, its perceived purpose and utility, and the overarching cost-benefit of the activity. But perhaps the most important of these factors is the social group who are enacting change upon the land, and the consequences, to the established social order, of that change.

⁹ These observations also help explain why the professional classes are not opposed to the introduction of new seeds and fertilisers that also affect a change on the landscape.

Class position, and aspirations, therefore comes back into focus. In some respects, the migrant/peasant class are doing what the state has been advocating; they are modernising. However, they are not performing this modernisation in the 'productive' way they are expected to, but are rather rejecting agricultural livelihoods and directing their economic activities towards consumption. This rejection is expressed most forcibly through the destruction of their agricultural buildings, an act, suggested by theories of violence (cf Riches 1986, Schröder & Schmidt 2001), that is not only distinctly relational, but is also a visible attempt to symbolically express discontent with, and practically change, the social environment. As Riches (ibid) further highlights, these acts are perceived as legitimate by its performers, but can be deigned illegitimate by its observers, and it this perceived illegitimacy that can be seen in the governing classes' attempts to regulate, and ultimately stop, the transformations the migrant/peasant class are enacting upon the landscape. Through this lens, I suggest, any attempt to stop these transformations can be viewed as an attempt to minimise visible opposition to the established social order.

The demolition and construction activities of migrant/peasant households can thereby be conceived not only as a potential threat to the landscape, but also as a threat to the social hierarchy. The migrant/peasant class no longer know their social and temporal place labouring in a synchronic rural landscape, but are attempting to express their modernity and progress by transforming the landscape into a site of urban leisure, and looking to exogenous sources of social prestige. From the perspective of the governing classes, this is not only a potentially dangerous and polluting practice, but can also be regarded as tantamount to a challenge to their hegemony over the physical and social landscape. This argument is further made by Klaufus (2006) who shows that while Cuencano architecture has historically been a mix of imported styles, these styles reflected the dominant values of the privileged elite and were emulated by the lower classes. However, out-migration, together with the economic capital it has brought to the peasantry, has changed this relation and challenged the

existing social hierarchy. Thus, the debate over landscape, cultural heritage and architectural style “hides a more sensitive class-based struggle” (ibid: 71).

The response of the governing classes to this struggle is a shift in orientation away from the forward-looking modernisation agenda to the reassertion of cultural heritage and a celebration of the past. This reassertion, as epitomised by the romanticised figure of the *Chola Cuencana*, constructs a narrative that renders the peasantry timeless and traditional by embedding them in an unchanging pastoral scene, while simultaneously situating the governing classes outside of this representation in the urban centre (cf Williams 1973). Social distance is thereby created through the use of time and space, a process elucidated by Fabian (1983) who argues that the “denial of coevalness” (ibid: 31) places the self in the here and now, and the other in the there and then (ibid: 27). Thus otherness is established through time as “all living societies were irrevocably placed on a temporal slope, a stream of Time – some upstream, some downstream” (ibid: 17).

Through this paradigm, time can be interpreted as “an object of power relations” and its control can be seen as essential for the exercising of power (Lutz 1992:1). Time is inherently plural and contested (Greenhouse 1996: 7, Lutz ibid), and conflict arises when one social group attempts to dominate the time of another (Lutz ibid: 1). Time is thus intentional, interested and “belongs to the political economy of relations between individuals, classes and nations” (Fabian, ibid: x). Yet, just as time can be the source of political legitimisation through the suppression of rival temporalities, its plurality also presents the opportunity for resistance. This process is discussed at length by Greenhouse who argues that time is the cultural formulation of agency, and its basis is therefore not in nature, but in social contest (ibid: 4). Time is thus open to improvisation and manipulation, and can be utilised by actors to challenge the political order and the legitimacy of institutions by contesting the elite’s representation of time on which their political legitimacy rests. A counter discourse of time thereby becomes a site of political resistance. As Lutz concludes, the study of time is a study of the ways power relations are effected in social life (ibid: 2).

This process is ethnographically explored in Herzfeld's (1991) account of the politics of heritage and history in Rethemnos, in which he establishes a dichotomy between monumental time, the time of the conservationists and bureaucrats, and social time, the everyday time of the town's inhabitants. Stating "the battle over time is a battle over the possession of identity" (ibid: 4), he argues that the state's attempts to monumentalise people's homes objectifies the living inhabitants as vestiges of the past themselves, and heightens their sense of alienation from the sources of power. However, he demonstrates that Rethemniots contest these bureaucratic efforts to represent and uphold a particular historical narrative by describing how they make alterations to their homes without the necessary permits, occasionally threaten use violence, and standing their ground when confronted with the possibility of fines and imprisonment. These practices, he argues, are attempts by Rethemniots to resist the state's control of history and, by extension, "reclaim their lives from a detemporalized past" (ibid: 9). Yet, this resistance is also tactical and pragmatic, and Rethemniots are shown to appropriate elements of the heritage discourse, and turn it back onto the state, to further their own economic aims. A similar argument is made in the Ecuadorian context by Benavides (2004), who discusses how the land claims of indigenous groups have recourse to alternative historical narratives that challenge the state's representation of the past. Yet, while he shows that these practices have been met with some political success, Benavides demonstrates that the alternative narratives utilised still make claims to cultural authenticity. They thereby remain rooted in the past and in continuities, and consequently uphold the hegemonic paradigm of the nation-state.

In continuing to use land to their own, as opposed to the governing classes', design, the migrant/peasant class of Jima appear to echo, to some extent, the resistance efforts of Rethemniots, yet they differ significantly in the manner that, unlike the Ecuadorian indigenous rights movement, their opposition is not situated in the past, but is rather orientated towards the future. Consequently, rather than appropriating and adapting the hegemonic model of time, their actions can be understood as breaking out from its confines. This revised

migrant/peasant representation of their own time as present, future and change as opposed to the celebration of the past and continuity perpetuated by the governing classes can, through the lens of Greenhouse (1996), be interpreted as a counterformulation of time through which members of the class challenge the governing classes' official, hegemonic representation of time. In doing so, they can also be seen to be contesting the governing classes' political power.

This battle over time, to borrow from Herzfeld (1991), is not solely an ideological contest, but also has real political and economic consequences. As Sonia's exclusion from the Jima Tourist Foundation shows, these consequences are practically experienced in the everyday lives of migrant/peasant households yet, despite this, individuals from this class continue to shake off the 'burden of timelessness' and refuse to perform to the romanticised model of the synchronic peasant. This suggests that, similar to Rethemniots, the Jimeño migrant/peasantry are making tactical decisions regarding their social and economic capital, and finding that they are receiving greater reward for forging their own alternative path than following the established, emulative and culturally cohesive routes of social prestige created by the governing classes. As Herzfeld concludes in reference to an individual who continued to defy conservation building controls, "the social capital of modernity was worth more to him than a few cash fines" (ibid: 230). This perspective appears to parallel the migrant/peasant perspective that outward expressions of modernity are worth the local social cost, an observation that also indicates that the anxieties of the governing classes, as described by Klaufus (2006), are being realised, and that their historically privileged position in the social hierarchy is being gradually eroded.

Sonia's exclusion from the Tourist Foundation serves also to remind us that the timeless peasant/*Chola Cuencana* narrative is not the only representation of the peasantry being produced by the governing classes. Complementing this folkloric representation is a discourse that looks to vilify those members of the migrant/peasant class who refuse to uphold the 'traditional peasant' image as morally irresponsible and polluting. This narrative stresses 'unsuitable' land

relations in the present and paints a picture of a damaged future in which the cultural heritage and landscape of the region will be lost, unless action is taken in the present to regulate these 'damaging' practices. Yet, this discourse is also, I suggest, enabled by, and rooted in, the past, and it is through the idyllic representation of this past that the present, and future-projected, narrative of decline can be produced. It is only through the elevation of the *Chola Cuencana* in the past that her perceived 'fall' in the present can be expressed.

Thus, in the struggle between the classes, time is mobilised and manipulated, as actors from all classes strive to position themselves, and others, on the 'stream of time' (Fabian 1983) and make their representation of time socially dominant. As I have sought to ethnographically demonstrate, these time relations are made manifest through actors' multiple engagements with the landscape. Landscape thereby not only provides the tangible and visible material for multiple narratives of regulation and conservation, but also becomes one of the primary mechanisms through which class position is articulated and social order is challenged.

Conclusion

To be written.

I may use the conclusion to do two things; one, reflect back to the remittance / migration debate (considering the challenge is funded through remittances) and/or two, reflect back on food security debates/ broader discourses of the peasantry (as indicated in the introduction, but not followed up in the paper); I'm not sure how far I can, or want/need to, develop this thread.

I may also reflect back on gender, which I'm conscious I've glossed over.

DRAFT

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramson, Allen and Dimitrios Theodossopoulos (eds) (2000) *Land, Law and Environment: Mythical Land, Legal Boundaries*. London: Pluto Press
- Aguilar Vázquez, Carlos (1944) *Obras Completas: Prosa, Vol 5, Xima*. Cuenca: Ministerio de Educación Pública.
- Aquiles Pérez, R. (1978) *Los Cañaris*. Quito: Casa de la Cultura Ecuatoriana.
- Barsky, Osvaldo (1988) *La Reforma Agraria Ecuatoriana*. 2d ed. Quito: Corporacion Editora Nacional.
- Benavides, Hugo O. (2004) *Making Ecuadorian Histories: Four Centuries of Defining Power*. Texas: University of Texas Press
- Bender, Barbara (ed) (1993) *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*. Oxford: Berg
- Bender, Barbara (1998) *Stonehenge: Making Space*. Oxford: Berg
- Bender, Barbara (2001) 'Introduction' in *Contested Landscapes: Movement, Exile and Place*. B. Bender and M. Winer (eds) pp 1-20, Oxford: Berg
- Bender, Barbara and Margot Winer (eds) (2001) *Contested Landscapes: Movement, Exile and Place*. Oxford: Berg
- Berg, Mette Louise (2005) 'Localising Cubanness: Social Exclusion and Narratives of Belonging in Old Havana' in *Caribbean Narratives of Belonging: Fields of Relations, Sites of Identity*. J. Besson and K. F. Olwig (eds) pp 133-148. Oxford: MacMillan Caribbean
- Bourque, Nicole (2001) 'Eating Your Words: Communicating with Food in the Ecuadorian Andes' in *An Anthropology of Indirect Communication*. J. Hendry and C.W. Watson (eds) pp. 85-100 London: Routledge.
- Brass, Tom (ed) (1994) *Latin American Peasants*. London and Portland: Frank Cass
- Brownrigg, Leslie Ann (1972) *The Nobles of Cuenca: The Agrarian Elite of Southern Ecuador*. Ph.D. Dissertation. New York: Columbia University
- Bryceson, D, C. Kay and J. Mooji (eds) (2000) *Disappearing Peasantries? Rural Labour in Africa, Asia and Latin America*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Burnham, Philip (2000) 'Whose Forest? Whose Myth? Conceptualisations of Community Forests in Cameroon' in *Land, Law and Environment: Mythical Land, Legal Boundaries*. A. Abramson, Allen and D. Theodossopoulos (eds) pp. 31-58. London: Pluto Press
- CBO: Congressional Budget Office (2005) *Remittances: International Payments by Migrants* Washington D.C.: Congress of the United States, Congressional Budget Office.
- Cohen, Jeffrey H. (2004) *The Culture of Migration in Southern Mexico*. Austin: University of Texas Press

Colloredo-Mansfield, Rudi (1994) 'Architectural Conspicuous Consumption and Economic Change in the Andes' in *American Anthropologist* 96(4): 845-865.

Colloredo-Mansfield, Rudi (1999) *The Native Leisure Class: Consumption and Cultural Creativity in the Andes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cosgrove, Denis E. (1984) *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*. New Jersey: Barnes and Noble

Durand, Jorge and Douglas S. Massey (1992) 'Mexican Migration to the United States: A Critical Review' in *Latin American Research Review* 27(2): 3-42

El Tiempo 2010

Fabian, Johannes (1983) *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object*, New York: Columbia University Press

FAO (2011) <http://www.fao.org/isfp/isfp-home/es/> accessed 1/9/2011.

Fitzgerald, David (2009) *A Nation of Migrants: How Mexico Manages its Migration*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Fletcher, Peri L. (1997) 'Building From Migration: Imported Design and Everyday Use of Migrant Houses in Mexico' in *The Allure of the Foreign: Imported Goods in Postcolonial Latin America*. B. Orlove (ed) pp. 185-201. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Foucault, Michel (1984) 'Space, Knowledge and Power' in *The Foucault Reader* P Rabinow (ed) pp. 239-256 New York: Pantheon.

Gough, K. (1996) 'Linking Production, Distribution and Consumption: Self-help Builders and the Building Materials Industry in Urban Colombia' in *Third World Planning Review* 18: 397-414.

Greenhouse, Carol (1996) *A Moment's Notice: Time Politics across Cultures*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Handler, Richard & Eric Gable (1997) *The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at Colonial Williamsburg*. London and Durham: Duke University Press

Herzfeld, Michael. (1991) *A Place in History: Social and Monumental Time in a Cretan Town*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Hirsch, Eric (1995) 'Landscape – Between Space and Place' in *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space*. E. Hirsch and M. O'Hanlon (eds) pp 1-30 Oxford: Clarendon Press

Hirsch, Eric and Michael O'Hanlon (eds) (1995) *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Hirschkind, Lynn (1980) *On Conforming in Cuenca*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

- Holston, James (1991) 'Autoconstruction in Working-Class Brazil' in *Cultural Anthropology* 6(4): 447-465.
- Ingold, Tim (2000) *The Perception of the Environment: Essays in Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London: Routledge
- Jima Tourist Foundation (2010) website available at: www.projectsforpeace.org/jima accessed 5 April 2010.
- Jokisch, Brad and Jason Pribilsky (2002) 'The Panic to Leave: Economic Crisis and the "New Emigration" from Ecuador' in *International Migration* 40 (4): 75-101.
- Klaufus, Christien (2006) 'Globalization in Residential Architecture in Cuenca, Ecuador: Social and Cultural Diversification of Architects and their Clients' in *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 24: 69-89.
- Kyle, David (2000) *Transnational Peasants: Migrations, Networks and Ethnicity in Andean Ecuador*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Lawrence, Denise L. and Low, Setha M (1990) 'The Built Environment and Spatial Form' in *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19, 453-505
- Low, Setha (1996) 'Spatializing Culture: The Social Production and Social Construction of Public Space' in *American Ethnologist* 23 (4): 861-879
- Lutz, Henry J. (1992) 'Introduction: The Idea of the Politics of Time' in *The Politics of Time*. H.J. Rutz (ed) pp 1-17. Arlington, VA: America Ethnological Society
- Macleod, D. V. L. (2001) 'Parks or People? National Parks and the Case of Del Este, Dominican Republic, *Progress in Development Studies* 10(2): 99-114
- Massey, Douglas S., Joaquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kouaouci, Adela Pellegrino, and J. Edward Taylor (1998) *Worlds in Motion: Understanding International Migration at the End of the Millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Miles, Ann (2004) *From Cuenca to Queens: An Anthropological Story of Transnational Migration* Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Pribilsky, Jason (2007) *La Chulla Vida: Gender, Migration and the Family in Andean Ecuador & New York City*. Syracuse N.Y: Syracuse University Press.
- Riches, David (1986) 'The Phenomenon of Violence' in *The Anthropology of Violence*. D. Riches (ed) pp 1-27. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Rossett, Peter M. (1999) *The Multiple Functions and Benefits of Small Farm Agriculture in the Context of Global Trade Negotiations – Policy Brief No. 4*. Oakland, California: Food First/The Institute for Food Development and Policy.
- Rossett, Peter M. (2006) *Food is Different: Why We Must Get the WTO Out of Agriculture*. London: Zed Books.

Schröder, Ingo W. and Schmidt, Bettina (2001) 'Introduction: Violent Imaginaries and Violent Practices' in *Anthropology of Violence and Conflict*. B. Schmidt and I. W. Schröder (eds) pp 1-24. London: Routledge

Strang, Veronica (2000) 'Not So Black and White: The Effects of Aboriginal Law on Australian Legislation' in *Land, Law and Environment: Mythical Land, Legal Boundaries* A. Abramson, Allen and D. Theodossopoulos (eds) pp. 93-115. London: Pluto Press

Stutzman, Ronald (1981) 'El Mestizaje: An All-Inclusive Ideology of Exclusion' in *Cultural Transformations and Ethnicity in Modern Ecuador*. N. E. Whitten (ed) 45-94 Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Theodossopoulos, Dimitrios (2000) 'The Land People Work and the Land the Ecologists Want: Indigenous Land Valorisation in a Greek Island Community Threatened by Conservation Law' in *Land, Law and Environment: Mythical Land, Legal Boundaries* A. Abramson, Allen and D. Theodossopoulos (eds) pp. 59-77. London: Pluto Press

Tilley, Christopher (1994) *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments* Oxford: Berg

Verdery, Katherine (1998) 'Property and Power in Transylvania's Decollectivization' in *Property Relations: Renewing the Anthropological Tradition*. C. M. Hann (ed) pp. 160-180

Walmsley, Emily (2001) 'Transformando Los Pueblos: La Migración Internacional y el Impacto Social al Nivel Comunitario' in *Ecuador Debate* 54. Available at; <http://www.dlh.lahora.com.ec/paginas/debate/> accessed 17/04/08.

Wanner, Catherine (1998) *Burden of Dreams: History and Identity in Post-Soviet Ukraine* University Park, PA: Penn State Press

Weismantel, Mary J. (2003) 'Mothers of the Patria: La Chola Cuencana and La Mama Negra' in *Millennial Ecuador: Critical Essays on Cultural Transformations and Social Dynamics*. N. E. Whitten (ed) pp 325-354 Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Weismantel, Mary J. (1988) *Food, Gender and Poverty in the Ecuadorian Andes* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Whitten Jnr, Norman E. (1981) 'Introduction' in *Cultural Transformations and Ethnicity in Modern Ecuador*. N. E. Whitten (ed) pp1-44. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Whitten, Norman E. (2003) 'Introduction' in *Millennial Ecuador: Critical Essays on Cultural Transformations and Social Dynamics*. N. E. Whitten (ed). pp 1-45. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Williams, Raymond (1973) *The Country and the City*. New York: Oxford University Press

Zamosc, Leon (1994) 'Agrarian Protest and the Indian Movement in the Ecuadorian Highlands' in *Latin American Research Review* 29(3): 37-68.