

# Food Sovereignty and the Quinoa Boom: Challenges to Sustainable Re-peasantisation in the Southern Altiplano of Bolivia

Tanya M. Kerssen\*

*Institute for Food and Development Policy/Food First, 398 60th St., Oakland, CA 94618, USA*

In the last three decades, quinoa has gone from a globally obscure food to an internationally traded product with rising global consumer demand. This transformation has had complex social and ecological impacts on the indigenous agro-pastoral communities of the southern Altiplano region of Bolivia. This article analyzes the role that global quinoa markets have played in the repopulation and revitalization of this region, previously hollowed out by out-migration. Yet it also points to a number of local tensions and contradictions generated or magnified by this process, as peasants struggle to harness the quinoa boom as a force of 'sustainable re-peasantization' and 'living well.' Finally, the article suggests that the food sovereignty movement should place greater emphasis on examining the culturally and historically specific challenges facing re-peasantization in particular places.

**Keywords:** Bolivia, quinoa, food sovereignty, re-peasantization

## Introduction<sup>†</sup>

The southern Altiplano of Bolivia, once dominated by transhumant pastoral populations, is now experiencing a dramatic expansion of its agricultural frontier. As a result, the region is seeing a number of social, economic, and ecological transformations. This expansion is the result of peasant-led efforts in the 1980s to forge global alliances and build an export market for quinoa at a time when neoliberal policies combined with postcolonial perceptions of indigenous foods made accessing domestic markets all but impossible. Their success generated an important livelihood opportunity in a long-marginalized region marked by poverty and out-migration. Nonetheless, the rapid expansion of quinoa and the entry of new actors have engendered extractivist tendencies that threaten both the ecological sustainability and social integrity of agro-pastoral systems. Quinoa producers—as well as their trading partners, NGO allies, policymakers, and consumers—now find themselves at a crossroads, debating the path to a socially and environmentally sustainable future for the quinoa sector.

---

\* Email: [tkerssen@foodfirst.org](mailto:tkerssen@foodfirst.org)

<sup>†</sup> Cite this article as: Tanya M. Kerssen (2015) Food sovereignty and the quinoa boom: challenges to sustainable re-peasantisation in the southern Altiplano of Bolivia, *Third World Quarterly*, 36:3, 489-507, DOI: 10.1080/01436597.2015.1002992

As global demand grows, cultivation expands to new frontiers, and pressures on productive resources increase; the traditional custodians of the “golden grain of the Andes” face an uncertain future. How are Bolivian producers confronting this uncertainty? Is the development of the quinoa sector likely to contribute to “repeasantization” and local wellbeing in a sustainable way? And what lessons might the food sovereignty movement draw from this case? In order to address these questions, this article employs historical and political economic analysis of quinoa in the southern Altiplano; participant observation in the region; attendance to two international quinoa research conferences in Bolivia and the United States; and seventeen semi-structured interviews with diverse actors in the quinoa sector in Bolivia and the US, conducted between March and July of 2013.<sup>1</sup>

### **Food Sovereignty and Repeasantization**

A concept popularized by the international peasant confederation La Vía Campesina at the 1996 World Food Summit, “food sovereignty” is defined as “the right of nations and peoples to control their own food systems, including their own markets, production modes, food cultures, and environments.”<sup>2</sup> As Desmarais explains, food sovereignty is explicitly rooted in the assertion of a peasant identity in the face of neoliberal capitalism that declares the disappearance of the peasantry an inevitability of progress.<sup>3</sup>

The (re)affirming of peasant cultures and economies—or repeasantization—thus appears as a strategic necessity for the building of food sovereignty, particularly since 54 percent of the global population now lives in cities.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, the call for food sovereignty emerges at a seemingly dismal historical moment for peasants. Araghi, for instance, described massive urbanization from 1945 to 1990 as a process of “global depeasantization,” in which Third World peasantries lost access to their means of subsistence and became rapidly concentrated in urban areas.<sup>5</sup>

A number of more recent analyses, however, have drawn more complex conclusions about the fate of the peasantry. Kay, for instance, has suggested that, today, “the situation is more fluid and varied: not only do peasants move to cities, but urban inhabitants move to rural areas” generating what he calls a “new rurality.”<sup>6</sup> Going even further, some scholars suggest that neoliberal globalization has actually led to a *strengthening* of peasant identity—particularly in Latin America—through the emergence of peasant and indigenous social movements. Radcliffe, for instance, shows how peasant indigenous confederations in Ecuador began reclaiming indigenous dress in the 1990s along with other cultural and political strategies that strengthened “Andean, rural, and agricultural identities.”<sup>7</sup>

For others, however, such as Bernstein, it makes little sense to talk about modern “peasants” as a social category since, he argues, most if not all peasants have essentially “become petty commodity producers, who have to produce their subsistence through integration into wider social divisions of labour and

markets.”<sup>8</sup> The response of agrarian scholars in the pro-peasant or “populist” camp, such as Van der Ploeg, has been to affirm that peasants are incorrectly understood as purely subsistence-oriented and disconnected from the wider (capitalist) world. Rather, “peasants, their livelihoods, and their processes of production are constituted through the structure and dynamics of the wider social formation in which they are embedded.”<sup>9</sup> For Van der Ploeg, one of the defining features of the modern peasantry is its “fight for autonomy and survival in a context of deprivation and dependency,” a struggle he characterizes as “repeasantization.”<sup>10</sup>

Repeasantization, for Van der Ploeg, must not only involve a return to the countryside by non-peasants or former peasants, but also a return to “peasant values” among the world’s farmers. As Van der Ploeg explains, this implies a “double movement”:

It entails a *quantitative* increase in numbers. Through an inflow from outside and/or through a reconversion of, for instance, entrepreneurial farmers into peasants, the ranks of the latter are enlarged. In addition, it entails a *qualitative* shift: autonomy is increased, while the logic that governs the organization and development of productive activities is further distanced from the markets.<sup>11</sup>

In the decidedly peasantist food sovereignty literature, this qualitative shift generally involves—as Van der Ploeg lays out here—a distancing from markets and, ostensibly, a return to more subsistence-oriented production.

And yet, as Burnett and Murphy show, numerous prominent farmers’ organizations associated with La Vía Campesina and the food sovereignty movement are engaged in the production of commodities—including for export markets—such as ROPPA in West Africa and the National Family Farm Coalition in the United States.<sup>12</sup> As these authors argue, while “the food sovereignty movement is identified with a strong preference for local markets,” this tendency risks overlooking how peasants have, in the face of adverse local market conditions, utilized export markets as a strategy to remain on the land (and thus avoid the fate of urban migration).

In a recent critique of food sovereignty, Bernstein argues that food sovereignty advocates frequently use “emblematic instances” of peasant practices (e.g. diversified/agroecological hillside production in Central America) that highlight the “virtues of peasant/small-scale/family farming as *capital’s other*.”<sup>13</sup> Similarly, the term “community” in food sovereignty discourse often “exemplifies a ‘strategic essentialism’ (Mollinga 2010), as in populist discourse more widely, which obscures consideration of contradictions within ‘communities.’”<sup>14</sup> Though I am not as willing as Bernstein to discard the term “peasant,” this paper seeks to apply greater scrutiny to the “peasantry” and “peasant community” in a particular place, highlighting some of the local tensions and contradictions at play in a peasant

population that is far from homogeneous in its farming practices and in its position vis-à-vis capital. In so doing, I also suggest that the food sovereignty movement should place greater emphasis on recognizing—as opposed to obfuscating—these tensions in the interest of advancing its political project.

This paper uses the term “peasant” not as a fixed analytical category per se, but rather as a deliberately messy term that embodies, following Van der Ploeg, a continuum or “grey zone” where processes of repeasantization and depeasantization are contested. I also analyze the complex role that global markets have played in facilitating repeasantization in the southern Altiplano of Bolivia on one hand, and threatening its long-term viability on the other. While seeking to understand how global markets have affected Bolivian peasants, I also aim to analyze how *peasants* have affected *markets*. As Van der Ploeg observes, “just as capital impacts upon the peasantries, the peasantries impact upon capital.”<sup>15</sup>

Lastly, this case highlights the importance of historically grounded, place-based analyses of peasantries “under construction” and the challenges they face. While our theorizations need not be “prisoners of place,” in the words of Bebbington and Batterbury, analyses that theorize outward from cases can “enrich and nuance our understandings of the intersections between globalization and contemporary rural life.”<sup>16</sup> Thus, I begin by reviewing the social and historical context of food systems in the southern Altiplano. Next, I discuss the transformation of quinoa from a globally obscure food disdained in national markets to a globally traded product with rising global (and to some extent domestic) consumer demand. In the third section, I discuss the challenges that may impede a sustainable repeasantization. Finally, I address some of the ways in which Bolivian peasants are struggling to harness the quinoa boom as a force of repeasantization and “living well” in the region.

### **Ayllus, Autonomy, and Depeasantization in the Southern Altiplano**

Drastic climatic variations over short distances characterize the Bolivian landscape: from the semi-arid to arid cordillera and Altiplano in the West to the humid eastern mountain slopes and tropical rainforests to the East. For millennia, politically independent pastoral societies traversed the North-South corridor of the Altiplano with large pack trains of llamas exchanging both ideas and products—such as salt, meat and fiber for potatoes, vegetables, coca and fish—with farming and fishing villages. The relationships developed by pastoralists with their sedentary trading partners became a form of kinship known as the *ayllu* that persists to this day—though greatly transformed.

Over time this movement of people, goods, and genetic material among different ecological zones generated an extraordinary number of domesticated food crops and animals produced in non-contiguous territories, exploiting numerous ecological niches<sup>17</sup>—a system famously described by anthropologist John V. Murra as a “vertical archipelago.”<sup>18</sup> Of these crops, quinoa was particularly well suited to

areas with high climatic risk such as the southern Altiplano—being able to withstand conditions of drought, salinity, wind, hail and frost in which other crops would perish.<sup>19</sup>

Risk management and dietary diversity in Andean food systems went hand in hand with the *ayllu* system, based on reciprocity relations; seasonal migration to various productive zones; communal resource management; and long-distance trade to exchange products from different regions and elevations.<sup>20</sup> Under this system, “indigenous pastoral production was able for centuries to maintain a balance between demographic constraints and resource scarcity.”<sup>21</sup>

The Spanish conquest of the 16th century, however, radically disrupted this system. Confused by the *ayllu*'s discontinuous landholdings, Spanish administrators resettled Andean inhabitants into centrally located villages within bounded, contiguous territories.<sup>22</sup> While Spanish haciendas took over the best land, semi-autonomous Andean *ayllus*—now mostly severed from their extra-territorial linkages—were allowed to persist on the most remote lands, seen as unfit for agricultural development. Thus, with low rainfall (110-250 mm annually) more than 200 frost days per year, and poor soils, the southern Altiplano remained largely beyond the reach of the Spanish hacienda system. As Healy notes, “the *ayllu*'s territorial control became limited to mostly remote herding communities whose pastoral economies had little appeal for the landed oligarchy.”<sup>23</sup>

In 1952, a social revolution succeeded in abolishing the hacienda system and redistributing land to thousands of highland peasants. However, agrarian reform did little to transform the southern Altiplano—where there had been few haciendas. By the 1970s, the military dictatorships turned their focus toward reconstituting the agrarian elite in the eastern lowlands. As the country increased its production of lowland commodities like sugarcane and soy, US food imports also increased, transforming patterns of domestic consumption and creating a preference for wheat products such as the now ubiquitous “*fideos*” (pasta) and white bread.<sup>24</sup>

The liberalization of the economy in the 1980s further marginalized peasant food production as the terms of trade for highland, peasant-produced crops like potatoes, onions, and barley rapidly eroded. Regional trade agreements such as the Tariff Union of the Andean Community of Nations (CAN) and agreements with Chile and Mercosur left peasants without protection from imports, bringing down the price of their products.<sup>25</sup> Farm incomes lost an estimated 50 percent of their purchasing power between 1985 and 1998.<sup>26</sup>

As throughout the Global South, neoliberal restructuring spurred a dramatic wave of rural out-migration in Bolivia, mainly to the cities and to foreign countries like Chile or as far as Europe. The severe El Niño-induced drought that hit Bolivia between 1982 and 1984 also contributed to depopulating the countryside, triggering a “migration explosion” out of the southern Altiplano.<sup>27</sup> Then, just as

people were returning to their communities after the drought, the government introduced structural adjustment policies that not only removed protections for peasant agriculture, but also dismantled the state-owned mining sector—two primary rural livelihood strategies—leading to further rural depression and depopulation of the region.<sup>28</sup>

Though post-colonial marginalization led to the impoverishment and depopulation of the southern Altiplano, it also remained a remarkable space where autonomous cultural, political, and productive forms were able to persist. Long-distance trade and articulation with distant markets are not a novel occurrence in this region. Indeed, they are part of a livelihood strategy that predated the Spanish conquest and a repertoire of indigenous peasant resistance and adaptation.

### **“Quinoa Repeasantization” through Alternative Global Food Networks**

Food sovereignty and repeasantization generally assume a dynamic of “localization,” retreat from (global) markets, and “local production for local consumption.”<sup>29</sup> Contrary to these assumptions, this section argues that peasant-led efforts in the southern Altiplano in the 1980s led to *greater* market integration and helped to unleash a process of repeasantization linked to alternative global food networks. As Goodman et al. note, the “new politics of food provisioning” opened up by fair trade in the 1980s and ‘90s, “build on imaginaries and material practices infused with different values and rationalities that challenge instrumental capitalist logics and mainstream worldviews.”<sup>30</sup> Still, these “alternative” global trade networks are not immune to destructive market forces—challenges that will be addressed in the following section.

Quinoa’s original expansion was made possible by the introduction of tractors to the southern Altiplano in the 1960s and ‘70s, which brought the subsistence crop down from hillside terraces to the flat scrublands, previously reserved for grazing. While the state focused primarily on industrializing agriculture in the tropical lowlands during this period, some agricultural modernization credits were extended to highland peasants to purchase tractors and disk plows.<sup>31</sup> NGOs and religious groups also promoted mechanization in the Altiplano. Belgian missionaries, for instance, established a tractor-rental service in the province of Nor Lipez.<sup>32</sup>

When the Belgians left in 1975, they turned over the assets and management responsibilities of the project to local communities organized as a new cooperative entity called CECAOT (*Central de Cooperativas Operación Tierra*). The National Association of Quinoa Producers (ANAPQUI) was later created in 1983, and the two organizations became the country’s leading producers’ associations growing and marketing *quinua real* (“royal quinoa”)—a large-grained quinoa ecotype grown along the shores of the Uyuni and Coipasa salt flats (in what’s known as the inter-salt flat or *intersalar* region)—which has since become the most prized

quinoa on the global market for its large, white grain (> 2.2 mm) and high nutritional value.<sup>33</sup>

During the economic crisis of the 1980s—and particularly after the privatization of state mines in 1986, which led to the lay off of thousands of workers—miners relocated to the cities or to the tropics to plant coca. Others returned to their native communities in the southern Altiplano to grow quinoa.<sup>34</sup> These dynamics coincided with the growth in demand from the Global North for specialty fruits and vegetables, organic products and health foods, which unleashed the non-traditional agricultural export (NTAE) boom in the Global South.<sup>35</sup> In this context, the demand for Andean quinoa products has grown precipitously, reaching 36 quinoa-importing countries in 2012.

With little external support, CECAOT formed its own committee for industrializing quinoa processing, sending representatives to Peru to seek out new technologies and eventually building its own quinoa de-husker based on a barley-hulling machine.<sup>36</sup> Similarly, ANAPQUI members worked tirelessly to improve processing methods, even traveling to Brazil carrying sacks of quinoa with them to test out rice and soy processing machines.<sup>37</sup>

CECAOT started exporting *quinua real* on a small-scale to the US-based Quinoa Corporation in 1984—a company that pioneered the opening of the quinoa market in the US. One of the company's goals was to revalue quinoa as a neglected food crop, not only in the US, but also in its place of origin:

For the founders of the Quinoa Corporation, this was a necessary step that would eventually contribute to the food security of poor Bolivians, subjected as they were to a nutritionally inferior dietary regime based on highly-subsidized wheat products through US food aid. They hoped to increase internal demand and sales of *quinua real*, while at the same time contribute to improving the incomes and quality of life for indigenous producers of the southern Altiplano.<sup>38</sup>

Currently, 23.7 percent of Bolivia's quinoa production is sold in the domestic market, compared to 51.9 percent exported through legal channels and almost a quarter (24.4 percent) leaving the country as contraband.<sup>39</sup> While domestic consumption is said to have tripled between 2009 and 2013—from 0.35 to 1.11 kg per capita<sup>40</sup>—this is a small portion of domestic cereals consumption, which remains heavily dominated by wheat. According to the FAO, in 2009 Bolivians consumed 125.14 kg of cereals per capita, of which 45 percent consisted of wheat.<sup>41</sup> Further, 68 percent of the domestic wheat supply was imported—the legacy of an acute structural dependence on US food aid.

The emergence of quinoa as a globally traded crop in the 1980s and '90s was arguably paramount to ensuring peasants' reproduction on the land in the southern Altiplano. This occurred at the height of neoliberalism, which was

eroding livelihood options, especially in the countryside. There is also evidence that quinoa producers have fared better under subsequent crises because of their link to alternative global food markets. Pérez et al., for instance, indicate that quinoa farmers were better able to manage rising prices during the 2008 food crisis than producers of other crops such as potatoes.<sup>42</sup>

The point here is not to argue that neoliberalism *benefitted* the southern Altiplano, but rather, to recognize the tremendous—unlikely even—achievement that is the contemporary quinoa sector. In the context of hostile neoliberalism, peasants of the southern Altiplano—with few economic resources and marginalized by the state—were able to mobilize their local, well-organized communities to generate opportunity. As Burnett and Murphy indicate, “while imperfect, fair trade does embody elements of a Polanyian Double Movement, that is, a social movement that emerges in confrontation of existing economic structures...with an effort to re-embed markets in society” and “also provide important opportunities for farmers, most of whom have too few alternatives and are evidence that not all small-scale producers are pursuing the same model of governance.”<sup>43</sup>

With little hope of accessing domestic markets for their products, quinoa producers forged long-distance trade relationships—a pre-colonial strategy that not only ensured their survival, but spawned a socio-economic revival. Nonetheless, new and profound challenges to sustainable “quinoa repeasantization” have also emerged.

## **Challenges to Sustainable Repeasantization in the Southern Altiplano**

### ***Transformation of Land and Resource Use***

The southern Altiplano is the fastest expanding region of quinoa cultivation in Bolivia. Already high producer prices for quinoa relative to other smallholder crops skyrocketed in 2008, more than tripling between 2008 and 2010. Recent reports claim that prices doubled in 2013 alone, which has been largely attributed to publicity from the UN’s International Year of Quinoa.<sup>44</sup> This spike has promoted the expansion of the agricultural frontier, more than doubling the area planted in the Altiplano in four years—from 51,000 hectares in 2009 to an estimated 104,000 hectares in 2013.<sup>45</sup> This expansion poses a potential threat to the fragile, sandy and volcanic soils of the region, which are characterized by high salinity, a scarcity of organic matter, and low moisture retention capacity.<sup>46</sup>

While the hillsides contain higher amounts of clay, organic matter, and nutrients than the flatlands, many hillside plots are now abandoned, as farmers now prefer to cultivate the pampas with tractors. By loosening the subsoil, the use of disk plows and sowing machinery has created a more favorable environment for pests.<sup>47</sup> Additionally, fallow periods of six to eight years have given way, in some areas, to near continuous production.<sup>48</sup>



Until the introduction of tractors for agricultural production in the 1970s, pastoralism had been the primary economic activity of the southern Altiplano, providing critical fertility for subsistence quinoa plots. Indeed, the relationship between quinoa, llamas, and humans represents an ancient and pervasive form of symbiosis.<sup>49</sup> Higher prices in the 1980s, however, motivated families with larger herds to sell their llamas or sheep in order to invest in machinery and expand quinoa production on communal grazing lands.<sup>50</sup> A shortage of labor due to out-migration also stimulated the shift away from animal husbandry, which requires daily care and is ultimately less remunerative.<sup>51</sup>

The reduced area and labor time devoted to pastoralism has begun to generate a rupture in the “quinoa-camelid complex” which has been acutely felt, for example, in the high cost of animal manure. Quinoa producer and ANAPQUI member Daniel comments:

Before, my grandparents always had manure, from sheep and llamas. Not many people had pick-up trucks back then—just a few people. When they came, my grandmother would give it away for free. But today, a truckload can cost you 2,000 to 3,000 bolivianos [\$385 - \$430].<sup>52</sup>

The value of animal manure, meat, and fiber, however, has thus far not made pastoralism profitable enough—considering its high labor costs—to help it compete with quinoa and recover the ecological balance between crops and animals.

While a broad-based extension program to support sustainable quinoa production throughout the sector is lacking, a number of localized—mostly peasant-led—initiatives do exist. ANAPQUI, for instance, provides assistance for sustainable production through its technical arm PROQUINAT (Program for the Production of Natural Quinoa/*Programa de Producción de Quinoa Natural*). In 2010, ANAPQUI also formed its own financial entity, the Agro-livestock Financial Association of the Southern Altiplano (*Financiera Asociación Agropecuaria del Altiplano Sur*, FAAAS), which provides credit for llama production as part of an effort to promote soil fertility through llama-quinoa integration.<sup>53</sup>

### ***Returning Migrants and Conflicting Rationalities***

The quinoa sector is often hailed for its contributions to the repopulation of a region previously hollowed out by out-migration, infusing new life into the countryside.<sup>54</sup> Many comment that previous waves of out-migration had left the region inhabited primarily by elderly people, and lacking the resources and labor to invest in the communities. Yet returning migration has also amplified local tensions, as described below.

According to the most recent national census (2012), the country’s eight biggest quinoa-producing provinces registered an average annual population growth rate of 19.25 percent since the last census was taken in 2001.<sup>55</sup> Within these provinces,

the quinuero municipalities of Nor LÍpez, Sur LÍpez and Salinas de Garci Mendoza registered growth rates as high as 34.4, 39.3 and 25.5 percent, respectively. These astronomical rural population growth rates compare to an almost stagnant national average rural population growth rate of 0.5 percent and a national urban population growth rate of 2.4 percent.<sup>56</sup>

For returning migrants, the experience can be quite emotionally charged, as Gustavo describes. Gustavo has lived his entire life in the capital La Paz, but five years ago began traveling to the southern Altiplano to tend his quinoa field in his father's native village. However, he was not welcomed with open arms when he first arrived. Not knowing exactly where his family's land was located, he found it difficult to get answers from community members. Despite the initially icy reception, Gustavo was profoundly touched by the reconnection to his rural roots:

I'm returning now to my ancestors' land. My father had left the village in the fifties. He always stayed in touch with his roots though, even though he didn't produce much, just enough for the family. Now, with quinoa I'm going back. When I got there, it was like finding myself. This is my land. This is where I come from.<sup>57</sup>

Gustavo and his father are characteristic of a common Andean phenomenon of double or even triple residency. Those who have left their native communities—but who have not abandoned their lands—are paradoxically known as “residents” (*residentes*). This generally refers to the fact that they have become *urban* residents who no longer live in the countryside.<sup>58</sup> Double residency represents a kind of risk-aversion that allows for the possibility of returning to subsistence farming if needed. Abandoning or selling one's land is an act of great finality that is not done without a secure economic alternative or access to land elsewhere.<sup>59</sup>

Those who remain in the community, by contrast, are known as *estantes*. With regards to quinoa production, there is an apparent clash of rationalities between “those who stayed” and “those who left” (and have recently returned); in other words, those who *live* in the community (*estantes*) as opposed to those who only *farm* in the community (*residentes*). First, there is a perceived divide related to the *residente's* generally higher level of formal education and link to urban-based power structures (political parties, government posts). According to *estante* Efraín, “the new generation are professors and professionals who don't respect the elders who can hardly read and write; because of this, it's been difficult to make them fulfill their duties.”<sup>60</sup>

Second, “returning” migrants are often seen as having neglected their responsibilities—such as road maintenance or taking on rotating leadership posts—while they were away. Third, many *residentes* manage their production remotely, neglecting long-standing community norms about land and resource use—e.g. norms regulating fallow periods and crop rotations—in order to produce

more quinoa, leading to intra-community and even intra-familial resource conflicts.<sup>61</sup>

When asked how higher quinoa prices have changed community life, Pedro, a quinoa producer and *estante*, gives a complex answer that points to the tension between *estantes* and *residentes*:

Quinoa has improved our quality of life. Before, when the price was low, people left, migrated to the cities, they became *residentes* and we barely saw them anymore. But with the increase in prices, those people have returned—but as strangers.

*[Has this been positive for the communities?]*

No, it's been negative, because they just came back for the price. They come to plant, and then they come to harvest, but the rest of the year they're nowhere to be found. Some even come to harvest too late, when the quinoa is already drying out in the fields and going bad. People here have their beliefs, you know? Sometimes people say, "They're making the quinoa suffer! Because of this, it won't rain this year. Things are going to go poorly for us because of the *residentes*."<sup>62</sup>

These dynamics demonstrate that sustainability is not merely a technical question. It is tightly linked—as it has been for millennia—to culturally embedded organizational forms that mediate resource use and land tenure. Having survived for centuries on the margins of colonial and post-colonial development, the *ayllu* now faces profound challenges.

### ***Territory and Land Control***

Recent literature on the new "land grabs" has pointed out that a focus on foreign land acquisitions and "mega-deals" tends to miss or underplay the role of local government in facilitating land grabbing; deals led by domestic capital; and smaller-scale land acquisitions.<sup>63</sup> Hall's comparative work on crop booms in Southeast Asia further complicates the narrative of large scale, foreign-led land grabs indicating that under "boom" conditions, not just "domestic capital," but also smallholders, themselves, may become agents of land grabbing.

While the issue in the southern Altiplano has not been outsider "land grabs," changing mechanisms of land control have allowed individuals with membership ties to indigenous communities to expand private, individualized production on communal lands. The National Coordinator of Agronomists and Veterinarians Without Borders (AVSF) in Bolivia, explains:

Prior to mechanization, the criteria for determining a family's access to land corresponded to a family's size and capacity—in other words, the number of bodies it had [available to work] and mouths it had to feed. So the

community would allocate a parcel, the size of which varied in direct proportion to the number of family members and their subsistence needs. Now, the big shift is that it's the amount of capital the family has that determines how much land it can control, because capital means the ability to invest in mechanization. So with a tractor you can cover quite a bit of land, maybe 40 or 50 hectares or even more. So there's a bit of a spiral that makes the community controls break down, especially the ancestral norms that once regulated access to land.<sup>64</sup>

In much of the region, land is not owned as private property, but rather held as communal indigenous territories under a communal title known as a “communal territory of origin” or TCO (*Tierra Comunitaria de Origen*). TCOs are a form of communal title hard-won by indigenous social movements in the 1980s and '90s and institutionalized by the 1994 land reform law (*Ley INRA*). In theory, TCOs should protect indigenous lands from outside profiteers and market forces. To some extent they have, by placing indigenous territories outside the land market. But the assumption that all members of a TCO necessarily operate in a way conducive to the conservation of natural resources and local culture is difficult to maintain.

Richard, an *estante* and quinoa farmer, points to the complex overlap of community governance (*ayllus*), collective land titles (TCOs), and the aspirations of individuals (*estantes* and *residentes*) in his community:

It's prohibited to buy and sell land because these are communal lands, a TCO. So nobody is the owner. The community decides how it should be managed, how much of it should be under production. It's prohibited to cede your land to anyone from outside the community.

[Are there people from *within* the community who have expanded their production on communal lands?]

Yes. Many people became interested in quinoa before we [the *estantes*] did. I was living here permanently, but I didn't get interested in quinoa right away. Other people saw the opportunity and came back here to begin growing it. We were more concerned with stability. We weren't very ambitious. But other members of the community had this vision of growing rapidly, of having lots of cars [laughs]... The rest of us thought it was more important to take care of the earth, to leave a legacy to our children, so that they will be able to enjoy this land.<sup>65</sup>

Richard's observations point to changing patterns of land control—even within the restrictions of the *ayllu* and TCO—as community members (both *residentes* and *estantes*) are able to appropriate communal lands for personal gain. While Richard now grows quinoa for sale to a private company, his comments also point to an

ongoing rift between *estantes* and *residentes* as to the conflicting goals of “stability” and sustainability over time on one hand versus accumulation on the other.

Despite increased opportunities to live from agriculture in the southern Altiplano thanks to quinoa markets, multiple tensions exist, one of which is between the community-based logic of *estantes* and the seemingly more extractivist logic of *residentes*.<sup>66</sup> There is also an increasingly individualized notion of land use, provoked in part by mechanization, which is no longer as responsive to communal norms governing sustainable practices. This serves to undermine indigenous resource management, suggesting that “quinoa repeasantization” as it now stands may not be a sustainable phenomenon.

### **Contested Repeasantization and “Living Well”**

Many producers, communities, and organizations in the southern Altiplano are keenly aware of the transformations afoot in the quinoa sector and of the potential threats to sustainability and social cohesion that the “boom” represents. This section looks at some of the ways in which peasants struggle to harness the quinoa boom as a force of *sustainable* repeasantization grounded in ancestral norms, sustainable practices, and local definitions of “living well.”

For Ormachea and Ramírez, “the return of *residentes* to grow quinoa in no way suggests the recreation of a ‘peasant’ society in these communities nor a process of ‘repeasantization.’”<sup>67</sup> For these authors, what is occurring in the southern Altiplano is a classic example of the advance of agrarian capitalism and Leninist differentiation. Bebbington, however, cautions against such linear and fatalistic predictions, suggesting instead that Andean peasants have time and again demonstrated the ability to “expand their control over livelihood and landscape change and so negotiate globalization processes.”<sup>68</sup>

Walsh-Diley, for example, argues that peasants in San Juan, Potosí, are so firmly rooted in a “moral economy” that they are able to engage with the quinoa market “as an opportunity rather than a compulsion.”<sup>69</sup> She argues that reciprocity relations in this community have actually been strengthened, not weakened, as peasants increasingly make use of non-market and cooperative mechanisms to access scarce labor resources and expand quinoa production for global markets.<sup>70</sup>

Clearly, there is great diversity both among and within communities of the region as to the degree and character of the quinoa boom. Factors that might affect its impact include topography; distance from markets including labor markets; distance from and quality of roads; and the presence or absence of committed, forward-thinking community leaders. Nonetheless, Walsh-Diley’s community ethnography indicates that we would do well to heed Bebbington’s advice to:

[employ] caution before uncritical acceptance either of the empirical assertions or of the normative tone of crisis narratives on the demise of

rural livelihoods, the destruction of rural environments and the disempowerment of rural communities in the face of global integration. These may well be frequent outcomes, but not inevitable ones.<sup>71</sup>

A number of communities, for instance, have initiated community meetings or workshops that bring together both *residentes* and *estantes* to discuss quinoa cultivation (among other matters) and to attempt to devise ecologically and culturally appropriate solutions. Part of this work has involved collectively remembering, recovering, and redefining ancestral norms and land use practices such as the traditional system of sectoral fallowing known as *mantos*.

Community norms often go beyond land and resource use, requiring producers to become active in the communities, to attend community meetings, to help solve communal problems, and to invest their profits in the community's wellbeing. Walter Mamani, a quinoa producer and faculty member at the Technical University of Oruro (UTO), explains:

In some communal norms, they outlined that the producer who wishes to grow quinoa has to build a house in the community... Some communal norms have outlined that families have to invest in improving their kitchens. Before, when there wasn't much money, people would cook with dirty water, or kids would get sick because they didn't have warm coats. These things can be addressed through the communal norms, because now there's economic growth.<sup>72</sup>

At the heart of these efforts is the desire, not to recreate some idyllic version of the past, but to reassert collective decision-making over individual accumulation so that quinoa cultivation may contribute to common wellbeing or "living well"—known as *suma qamaña* in the Aymara language; *sumak kawsay* in quechua; and *buen vivir* or *vivir bien* in Spanish—for generations to come.

In recent years, the notion of living well has been embraced by various indigenous movements throughout Latin America; incorporated into the new constitutions of both Ecuador and Bolivia; and adopted by the global movement for climate justice.<sup>73</sup> It expresses, on one hand, "critical reactions to classical Western development theory [and] on the other hand, it refers to alternatives to development emerging from indigenous traditions, and in this sense the concept explores possibilities beyond the modern Eurocentric tradition."<sup>74</sup>

In a survey conducted by UTO, families in 18 communities of the municipality of Salinas, in the heart of quinoa country, were asked to define "living well." Above all other definitions, the families of Salinas defined living well as "living in harmony"—i.e. without social conflicts within or among families and communities. For Mamani, "In an area where the quinoa boom has created this issue of land conflicts, it's significant that living well for them means living in harmony."<sup>75</sup> Other aspects of living well that were mentioned were: a dignified home; a healthy diet;

access to education; maintaining cultural identity; and conserving natural resources so that they may benefit future generations.<sup>76</sup>

According to the Bolivian scholar and agronomist Mario Torrez, “*suma qamaña* operates in a special social, environmental, and territorial context, represented by the Andean *ayllu*... It is a space of well-being with people, animals, and crops [in which] there is no duality that separates society from Nature since one contains the other and they are inseparable complementarities.”<sup>77</sup> Of course, “living well” is subject to numerous contradictions, appropriations, and distortions, especially when deployed by the state.

Yet perhaps at its best—defined and defended by local populations—living well’s “various expressions, whether old or new, original or the product of different hybridizations, open the door to another path.”<sup>78</sup> This “other path” is as yet unclear in the quinoa sector; it is being fashioned and debated by individuals, communities, and organizations. At stake is a contested process of re-peasantization whose character and sustainability have yet to be seen.

## Conclusion

The southern Altiplano, I argue, occupies what Van der Ploeg calls a “grey zone” at the interface between “peasantness” and entrepreneurial farming. In this grey zone, some non-peasants are returning to the countryside to farm; some peasants are constituting themselves as entrepreneurs; and other peasants are working to reshape their social and productive system so as to protect and enhance local culture, autonomy, and natural resources. As Van der Ploeg notes,

In these grey zones one encounters *degrees of peasantness* that are far from being theoretically irrelevant. Indeed they characterize arenas in which, over time, important fluctuations occur with respect to de-peasantization and re-peasantization.... Both processes will pass through many in-between situations, thus enlarging the many shades of grey that together characterize this intersection.<sup>79</sup>

As Desmarais points out in her study of La Vía Campesina, “communities should be seen as sites of diversity, differences, conflicts, and divisions often expressed along gender, class, and ethnic lines and characterized by competing claims and interests.”<sup>80</sup>

Despite the highly fraught transformations occurring in the southern Altiplano, there are promising grassroots organizing efforts, both at the level of producers’ associations and at the level of indigenous *ayllus*, *markas* (a grouping of *ayllus*), and confederations. CONAMAQ has been calling for the government to prioritize domestic consumption of quinoa as a means of strengthening cultural identity and tackling malnutrition.<sup>81</sup> ANAPQUI is working with members through its technical arm PROQUNAT to promote agroecology and a culturally appropriate

development model. The renewed invocation of ancestral land use norms; the creation of new local rules to regulate how wealth is invested in community; and reflections on what it means to “live well” are all examples of a process of repeasantization that is both contested and under construction.

If the *state* has been conspicuously absent from my analysis, it is because, as outlined in the historical section of this article, the modern state—from the colonial era to the present day—has itself been conspicuously absent from the southern Altiplano region. While the current government has discursively attempted to take some credit for the quinoa boom—for instance, through successful lobbying at the UN level for an “International Year of Quinoa” (2013)—state interventions in the sector have been negligible. As ANAPQUI Marketing Director Juan Carlos observes, “a lot of people think that the government created the quinoa boom, but that’s not the case; it’s the producers, along with our clients and the consumers, who [made it happen].”<sup>82</sup> With apparently little political will to enact state extension programs or regulate supply—at least for the time being—peasant, grassroots efforts are leading the charge in trying to secure their own, sustainable livelihoods in the southern Altiplano.

This article has argued that the recent “quinoa boom” in Bolivia has its roots in a decades-long process of repeasantization in which indigenous peasants have struggled—collectively and individually—to defend, rediscover, and redefine their “degree of peasantness” while navigating neoliberalism and global market forces. Repeasantization in this case did not occur through a retreat from the market or return to the local, but rather by leveraging collective indigenous organization in order to forge global relationships and access export markets. Through the grassroots efforts of peasant organizations and other civil society actors, a market for this maligned indigenous crop was generated against sharp odds, at the height of neoliberalism.

While there is little doubt that the quinoa export sector has benefitted communities in the region, it has also created steep new challenges, not least of which is the influx of returning migrants with distinct, and even conflicting, rationalities. The strong history of resistance and autonomy in the southern Altiplano, however, may bode well for the region’s ability to assert an alternative model of production that sustains communities—but this remains to be seen.

For the food sovereignty movement, this case shines light on the need to examine the culturally and historically specific challenges facing repeasantization in particular places. It should not be assumed, for instance, that processes of repeasantization only or necessarily occur via a retreat from (global) markets and a return to subsistence. In the case of quinoa, engagement with alternative global food networks allowed peasant associations of the southern Altiplano to build a successful economy in a region marked by poverty and out-migration. This complex process of repeasantization, however, has generated both opportunities and challenges. It is equally important for advocates of food sovereignty not to



simply celebrate repeasantization while neglecting how fraught such processes can often be.

If repeasantization is to be seen as an essential process for building food sovereignty, then the many challenges to reconstructing peasantries must be acknowledged and explored. Admittedly, the biggest challenges to the world's diverse peasantries may stem from the expansion and restructuring of the capitalist food system, including the financialization of agriculture and corporate land grabs. But they also include numerous *internal* tensions, conflicts, and contradictions occurring within those "peasantries under [re-]construction." How these tensions are reconciled will likely determine their—and our—ability to resist the corporate onslaught and to build food sovereignty, "living well," and other ecologically and culturally appropriate alternatives.

### Bibliography

- Araghi, Farshad. "Global Depeasantization, 1945–1990." *The Sociological Quarterly* 36, no. 2 (1995): 337–68.
- Associated Press. "Quinoa Duplica Precio En Año Internacional," 21 March 2014. Accessed 5 June 2014. <http://noticias.latino.msn.com/latinoamerica/bolivia/quinoa-duplica-precio-en-a%C3%B1o-internacional-1>.
- AVSF. *Quinoa Y Territorio*. Agronomes & Vétérinaires Sans Frontiere. La Paz, Bolivia: Plural editores, 2009.
- . *Quinoa Y Territorio Nuevos Desafíos: Gobernanza Local Y Producción Sostenible de La Quinoa Real En Bolivia*. La Paz, Bolivia: Agronomes et Vétérinaires Sans Frontieres, February 2014.
- Bebbington, A.J., and S.P.J. Batterbury. "Transnational Livelihoods and Landscapes: Political Ecologies of Globalization." *Cultural Geographies* 8, no. 369 (2001).
- Bebbington, Anthony. "Globalized Andes? Livelihoods, Landscapes and Development." *Cultural Geographies* 8, no. 414 (2001).
- Bernstein, Henry. "Food Sovereignty Via the 'Peasant Way': A Sceptical View." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 41:6 (2014): 1031-1063.
- . *Class Dynamics of Agrarian Change*. Halifax and Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing, 2010.
- Borras, Saturnino M., Jennifer Franco, Sergio Gómez, Cristóbal Kay, and Max Spoor. "Land Grabbing in Latin America and the Caribbean." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 39, no. 3–4 (July-October): 845–72.
- Brett, John A. "The Political-Economics of Developing Markets versus Satisfying Food Needs." *Food and Foodways* 18, no. 1–2 (2010): 28–42. doi:10.1080/07409711003708249.
- Burnett, Kim and Sophia Murphy. "What Place for International Trade in Food Sovereignty?" *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 2014. DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2013.876995. p. 8
- Cáceres, Zina, Aurélie Carimentrand, and John Wilkinson. "Fair Trade and Quinoa from the Southern Altiplano." In *Fair Trade: The Challenges of Transforming*

- Globalization*, edited by Laura T. Raynolds, Douglas L. Murray, and John Wilkinson, 180–99. Oxon, UK: Routledge, 2007.
- Carimentrand, Aurélie, and Jérôme Ballet. “When Fair Trade Increases Unfairness: The Case of Quinoa from Bolivia.” *Cahier*, no. 5 (2010). Accessed 2 April 2014. <http://ethique.perso.sfr.fr/Working%20paper%20FREE-Cahier%20FREE%20n%20B05-2010.pdf>.
- Cazorla, Iván, Nico Tassi, Ana Rubena Miranda, Lucia Aramayo Canedo, and Carlos Balderrama Mariscal. *Rural Migration in Bolivia: The Impact of Climate Change, Economic Crisis and State Policy*. IIED, 2011.
- D’Altroy, Terence N. “Andean Land Use at the Cusp of History.” In *Imperfect Balance: Landscape Transformations in the Pre-Columbian Americas*, 357–90. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Desmarais, Annette Aurelie. *La Vía Campesina: Globalization and the Power of Peasants*. Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press, 2007.
- Desmarais, Annette, Nettie Wiebe, and Hannah Wittman, eds. *Food Sovereignty: Reconnecting Food, Nature and Community*. Fernwood Publishing and Food First Books, 2010.
- Dong, Shikui, Lu Wen, Shilang Liu, Xiangfeng Zhang, James P. Lassoie, Shaoliang Yi, Xiaoyang Li, Jinpeng Li, and Yuanyuan Li. “Vulnerability of Worldwide Pastoralism to Global Changes and Interdisciplinary Strategies for Sustainable Pastoralism.” *Ecology and Society* 16, no. 2 (2011).
- El Potosí. “Según El CONAMAQ, El Gobierno Debe Priorizar Consumo Interno de Quinoa,” 18 March 2013. Accessed 6 August 2014. <http://www.elpotosi.net/2013/03/18/19.php>.
- Fundación Milenio. “Quinoa En Bolivia: Fortalezas Y Debilidades.” Informe Nacional de Coyuntura No. 190, 19 April 2013.
- Goodman, David, Melanie E. DuPuis, and Michael K. Goodman. *Alternative Food Networks: Knowledge, Practice and Politics*. London and New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Gudynas, Eduardo. “Buen Vivir: Today’s Tomorrow.” *Development* 54, no. 4 (2011): 441–47.
- . “Good Life: Germinating Alternatives to Development.” *América Latina En Movimiento*, July 14, 2011. <http://alainet.org/active/48054>.
- Hall, Derek. “Land Grabs, Land Control, and Southeast Asian Crop Booms.” *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38, no. 4 (October 2011): 837–57.
- Healy, Kevin. *Llamas, Weavings, and Organic Chocolate: Multicultural Grassroots Development in the Andes and Amazon of Bolivia*. University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- . “Towards an Andean Rural Development Paradigm?” *NACLA Report on the Americas* 38 (2004): 28–33.
- Hellin, Jon, and Sophie Higman. “Crop Diversity and Livelihood Security in the Andes.” *Development in Practice* 15, no. 2 (2005): 165–74. doi:10.1080/09614520500041344.
- INE. “67% de La Población Del País Habita En Áreas Urbanas Y 32.7% En Áreas Rurales.” *Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas*. January 6, 2014. Accessed 8 June 2014.

- [http://www.censosbolivia.bo/sites/default/files/archivos\\_adjuntos/N%204%20Area%20urbanas%20y%20rurales\\_1.pdf](http://www.censosbolivia.bo/sites/default/files/archivos_adjuntos/N%204%20Area%20urbanas%20y%20rurales_1.pdf).
- Jacobsen, S.-E. "The Situation for Quinoa and Its Production in Southern Bolivia: From Economic Success to Environmental Disaster." *Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science* 197, no. 5 (2011): 390–99. doi:10.1111/j.1439-037X.2011.00475.x.
- Kay, Cristóbal. "Reflections on Latin American Rural Studies in the Neoliberal Globalization Period: A New Rurality?" *Development and Change* 39, no. 6 (2008): 915–43.
- Kolata, Alan L. *Ancient Inca*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- . "Quinoa: Production, Consumption and Social Value in Historical Context." University of Chicago Department of Anthropology, 2009. Accessed 6 August 2013. <http://lasa.international.pitt.edu/members/congress-papers/lasa2009/files/KolataAlanL.pdf>.
- Laguna, Pablo. *Competitividad, Externalidades E Internalidades: Un Reto Para Las Organizaciones Económicas Campesinas*. Debate Agrario. Lima, Perú: CEPES, 2002. Accessed 3 April 2013. <http://www.cepes.org.pe/debate/debate34/04-articulo-da34.pdf>.
- Laguna, Pablo. "El Impacto Del Desarrollo Del Mercado de La Quinoa En Los Sistemas Productivos Y Modos de Vida Del Altiplano Sur Boliviano." In *XVI Simposio de La Asociación Internacional de Sistemas de Producción*. Santiago, Chile, 2000. Accessed 6 April 2013. [http://www.academia.edu/2190139/El\\_impacto\\_del\\_desarrollo\\_del\\_mercado\\_de\\_la\\_quinoa\\_en\\_los\\_sistemas\\_productivos\\_y\\_modos\\_de\\_vida\\_del\\_Altiplano\\_Sur\\_boliviano](http://www.academia.edu/2190139/El_impacto_del_desarrollo_del_mercado_de_la_quinoa_en_los_sistemas_productivos_y_modos_de_vida_del_Altiplano_Sur_boliviano).
- . *Feasibility Study of Quinoa Fair Trade Labeling in Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia*, 2013. Accessed 13 May 2013. [http://www.academia.edu/603563/Feasibility\\_Study\\_of\\_Quinoa\\_Fair\\_Trade\\_Labeling\\_in\\_Ecuador\\_Peru\\_and\\_Bolivia](http://www.academia.edu/603563/Feasibility_Study_of_Quinoa_Fair_Trade_Labeling_in_Ecuador_Peru_and_Bolivia).
- . "Mallas Y Flujos: Acción Colectiva, Cambio Social, Quinoa Y Desarrollo Regional Indígena En Los Andes de Bolivia." Wageningen University, 2011.
- Laguna, Pablo, Aurélie Carmentrand, and Zina Cáceres. "Del Altiplano Sur Boliviano Hasta El Mercado Global: Coordinación Y Estructuras de Gobernanca de La Cadena de Valor de La Quinoa Orgánica Y Del Comercio Justo." *Agroalimentaria* 11, no. 22 (June 2006).
- La Razón. "El Consumo de Quinoa En El País Se Triplicó En Los Últimos 4 Años," 17 February 2013. Accessed 9 August 2013. [http://www.la-razon.com/economia/consumo-quinua-triplico-ultimos-anos\\_0\\_1780622010.html](http://www.la-razon.com/economia/consumo-quinua-triplico-ultimos-anos_0_1780622010.html).
- Medinaceli G., Ximena. *Sariri: Los Llameros Y La Construcción de La Sociedad Colonial*. La Paz, Bolivia: Plural editores, 2010.
- Murra, John V. "The Economic Organization of the Inca State." University of Chicago, 1956.
- Ormachea S., Enrique, and Nilton Ramírez F. *Propiedad Colectiva de La Tierra Y Producción Capitalista: El Caso de La Quinoa En El Altiplano Sur de Bolivia*. La Paz, Bolivia: CEDLA, 2013.

- Perez, Carlos A., Claire Nicklin, and Sarela Paz. "Food Crisis, Small-Scale Farmers, and Markets in the Andes." *Development in Practice* 21, no. 4–5 (2011): 566–77. doi:10.1080/09614524.2011.562486.
- Pérez, Mamerto, Sergio Schlesinger, and Timothy A. Wise. "The Promise and the Perils of Agricultural Trade Liberalization: Lessons from Latin America." Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA), June 2008. Accessed 5 September 2010.  
<http://ase.tufts.edu/gdae/Pubs/rp/AgricWGReportJuly08.pdf>.
- Radcliffe, Sarah A. "The Geographies of Indigenous Self-Representation in Ecuador: Hybridity and Resistance." *Revista Europea de Estudios Latinoamericanos Y Del Caribe* 63 (December 1997): 9–27.
- Rojas, Wilfredo, José Luis Soto, and Enrique Carrasco. *Study on the Social, Environmental and Economic Impacts of Quinoa Promotion in Bolivia*. La Paz, Bolivia: Fundación PROINPA, 2004. Accessed 14 April 2013.  
<http://www.cropsforthefuture.org/publication/strategic-document/Study%20on%20the%20social,%20environmental%20and%20economic%20impacts%20of%20quinoa%20promotian%20in%20Bolivia.pdf>.
- Rojas, Wilfredo, José Luis Soto, Milton Pinto, Matthias Jager, and Stefano Padulosi. *Granos Andinos: Avances, Logros Y Experiencias Desarrolladas En Quinoa, Cañahua Y Amaranto En Bolivia*. Biodiversity International, 2010. Accessed 14 April 2013.  
<http://www.proinpa.org/tic/pdf/Quinoa/Varios%20quinua/pdf35.pdf>.
- Tapia, Mario E. *Cultivos Andinos Subexplotados Y Su Aporte a La Alimentación*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 1990.
- Thrupp, Lori Ann. *Bittersweet Harvests for Global Supermarkets: Challenges in Latin America's Agricultural Export Boom*. World Resources Institute, 1995.
- Urioste F. de C., Miguel. *Los Nietos de La Reforma Agraria: Acceso, Tenencia Y Uso de La Tierra En El Altiplano de Bolivia*. La Paz, Bolivia: Fundación Tierra, 2005.
- Vallejos Mamani, Pedro Román, Zaima Navarro Fuentes, and Dante Ayaviri Nina. *Medio Ambiente Y Producción de Quinoa: Estrategias de Adaptación Al Cambio Climático*. La Paz, Bolivia: Programa de Investigación Estratégica en Bolivia (Fundación PIEB), 2011.
- Van der Ploeg, Jan Douwe. "Peasant-driven Agricultural Growth and Food Sovereignty" *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 41:6 (2014): 999-1030.
- . "The Peasantries of the Twenty-First Century: The commoditisation debate revisited." *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37: 1 (2010): 1-30.
- . *The New Peasantries: Struggles for Autonomy and Sustainability in an Era of Empire and Globalization*. London: Earthscan, 2009.
- Walsh-Dilley, Marygold. "Negotiating Hybridity in Highland Bolivia: Indigenous Moral Economy and the Expanding Market for Quinoa." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 40, no. 4 (2013): 659–82.
- Zimmerer, Karl S. "Environmental Governance Through 'Speaking Like an Indigenous State' and Respatializing Resources: Ethical Livelihood Concepts in Bolivia as Versatility or Verisimilitude?." *Geoforum*, 2013. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.07.004>.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Interviews fell into three subject groups—quinoa producers, private sector actors, and “experts” (academics and NGO workers)—and were designed to ascertain subjects’ understanding and interpretation of the opportunities and challenges presented by the recent “boom” in northern consumer demand for quinoa. The names of all interview subjects have been changed, and identifying information removed, to protect their confidentiality.
- <sup>2</sup> Desmarais, Wiebe, and Wittman, *Food Sovereignty: Reconnecting Food, Nature and Community*. p. 2
- <sup>3</sup> Desmarais, *La Vía Campesina: Globalization and the Power of Peasants*. p. 37
- <sup>4</sup> World Health Organization. “Urban Population Growth”
- <sup>5</sup> Araghi, “Global Depeasantization, 1945–1990.” p. 338
- <sup>6</sup> Kay, “Reflections on Latin American Rural Studies in the Neoliberal Globalization Period: A New Rurality?” p. 926
- <sup>7</sup> Radcliffe, “The Geographies of Indigenous Self-Representation in Ecuador: Hybridity and Resistance.” p. 16
- <sup>8</sup> Bernstein, Henry. *Class Dynamics of Agrarian Change*.
- <sup>9</sup> Van der Ploeg “The Peasantries of the Twenty-First Century” p. 21
- <sup>10</sup> Van der Ploeg, *The New Peasantries: Struggles for Autonomy and Sustainability in an Era of Empire and Globalization*. p. 7
- <sup>11</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>12</sup> Burnett and Murphy, “What Place for International Trade in Food Sovereignty?” p. 4
- <sup>13</sup> Bernstein, “Food sovereignty via the ‘peasant way’: a sceptical view.” p. 1032, emphasis added.
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid. p. 1046
- <sup>15</sup> Van der Ploeg, “Peasant-driven Agricultural Growth and Food Sovereignty” p. 1022
- <sup>16</sup> Bebbington, A.J., and S.P.J. Batterbury. “Transnational Livelihoods and Landscapes: Political Ecologies of Globalization.” p. 370
- <sup>17</sup> Tapia, *Cultivos Andinos Subexplotados Y Su Aporte a La Alimentación*.
- <sup>18</sup> Murra, “The Economic Organization of the Inca State.”
- <sup>19</sup> Hellin and Higman, “Crop Diversity and Livelihood Security in the Andes.”
- <sup>20</sup> D’Altroy, “Andean Land Use at the Cusp of History”; Kolata, *Ancient Inca*.
- <sup>21</sup> Dong et al., “Vulnerability of Worldwide Pastoralism to Global Changes and Interdisciplinary Strategies for Sustainable Pastoralism.” p. 9
- <sup>22</sup> Kolata, *Ancient Inca*.
- <sup>23</sup> Healy, “Towards an Andean Rural Development Paradigm?” p. 28
- <sup>24</sup> Healy, *Llamas, Weavings, and Organic Chocolate*; Brett, “The Political-Economics of Developing Markets versus Satisfying Food Needs.”
- <sup>25</sup> Pérez, Schlesinger, and Wise, “The Promise and the Perils of Agricultural Trade Liberalization: Lessons from Latin America.”
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>27</sup> Cazorla et al., *Rural Migration in Bolivia*.
- <sup>28</sup> Ibid.; Pérez, Schlesinger, and Wise, “The Promise and the Perils of Agricultural Trade Liberalization: Lessons from Latin America.”
- <sup>29</sup> Desmarais, Wiebe, and Wittman, *Food Sovereignty: Reconnecting Food, Nature and Community*.
- <sup>30</sup> Goodman, DuPuis, and Goodman, *Alternative Food Networks: Knowledge, Practice and Politics*.

<sup>31</sup> Laguna, “El Impacto Del Desarrollo Del Mercado de La Quinoa En Los Sistemas Productivos Y Modos de Vida Del Altiplano Sur Boliviano.”

<sup>32</sup> Healy, *Llamas, Weavings, and Organic Chocolate*.

<sup>33</sup> Rojas et al., *Granos Andinos: Avances, Logros Y Experiencias Desarrolladas En Quinoa, Cañahua Y Amaranto En Bolivia*. Rojas et al. identify five quinoa “ecotypes” associated with different Andean regions: sea level (primarily coastal Chile); yungas (1,500-2,000 m); valleys (2,500-3,500 m); northern and central Altiplano (Peru and Bolivia; where the highest diversity is found); and salt flat quinoa or “royal quinoa” (*quinoa real*) of the southern Altiplano of Bolivia.

<sup>34</sup> Laguna, “El Impacto Del Desarrollo Del Mercado de La Quinoa En Los Sistemas Productivos Y Modos de Vida Del Altiplano Sur Boliviano.”

<sup>35</sup> Thrupp, *Bittersweet Harvests for Global Supermarkets: Challenges in Latin America’s Agricultural Export Boom*.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Interview with Juan Carlos, Marketing Director at ANAPQUI. La Paz, Bolivia. 22 July 2013, author’s translation.

<sup>38</sup> Laguna, Carmentrand, and Cáceres, “Del Altiplano Sur Boliviano Hasta El Mercado Global: Coordinación Y Estructuras de Gobernanza de La Cadena de Valor de La Quinoa Orgánica Y Del Comercio Justo.” p. 68, author’s translation.

<sup>39</sup> AVSF, *Quinoa Y Territorio Nuevos Desafíos: Gobernanza Local Y Producción Sostenible de La Quinoa Real En Bolivia*.

<sup>40</sup> *La Razón*, “El Consumo de Quinoa En El País Se Triplicó En Los Últimos 4 Años.”

<sup>41</sup> FAOstat, Food Balance Sheet: Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Accessed 28 March 2014. <http://faostat3.fao.org/faostat-gateway/go/to/download/FB/FB/E>.

<sup>42</sup> Perez, Nicklin, and Paz, “Food Crisis, Small-Scale Farmers, and Markets in the Andes.”

<sup>43</sup> Burnett and Murphy, “What Place for International Trade in Food Sovereignty?” p. 8

<sup>44</sup> *Associated Press*, “Quinoa Duplica Precio En Año Internacional.” March 21, 2014.

<sup>45</sup> Fundación Milenio, “Quinoa En Bolivia: Fortalezas Y Debilidades.”

<sup>46</sup> Vallejos Mamani et al., *Medio Ambiente Y Producción de Quinoa: Estrategias de Adaptación Al Cambio Climático*.

<sup>47</sup> Jacobsen, “The Situation for Quinoa and Its Production in Southern Bolivia.”

<sup>48</sup> Rojas, Soto, and Carrasco, *Study on the Social, Environmental and Economic Impacts of Quinoa Promotion in Bolivia*.

<sup>49</sup> Kolata, “Quinoa: Production, Consumption and Social Value in Historical Context”; Kolata, *Ancient Inca*.

<sup>50</sup> Laguna, “El Impacto Del Desarrollo Del Mercado de La Quinoa En Los Sistemas Productivos”

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> Interview with Daniel, quinoa producer and ANAPQUI member. Salinas de Garci Mendoza, Bolivia. 18 July 2013, author’s translation.

<sup>53</sup> AVSF, *Quinoa Y Territorio Nuevos Desafíos: Gobernanza Local Y Producción Sostenible de La Quinoa Real En Bolivia*.

<sup>54</sup> El Potosí. “‘Boom’ de La Quinoa Provoca Regreso de Migrantes.”

<sup>55</sup> INE, “67% de La Población Del País Habita En Áreas Urbanas Y 32.7% En Áreas Rurales.”

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.

<sup>57</sup> Interview with Gustavo, independent quinoa producer. La Paz, Bolivia. 10 June 2013, author’s translation.

<sup>58</sup> Urioste F. de C., *Los Nietos de La Reforma Agraria: Acceso, Tenencia Y Uso de La Tierra En El Altiplano de Bolivia*. Note: Those who have moved to another rural region—generally migrating from the highlands to more tropical elevations—are not referred to as *residentes*, but rather as *colonizadores* or settlers.

<sup>59</sup> Ibid.

- 
- <sup>60</sup> Quoted in: AVSF, *Quinoa Y Territorio*. p. 49, author's translation.
- <sup>61</sup> Ibid. AVSF, *Quinoa Y Territorio Nuevos Desafíos: Gobernanza Local Y Producción Sostenible de La Quinoa Real En Bolivia*. Ormachea S. and Ramírez F., *Propiedad Colectiva de La Tierra Y Producción Capitalista: El Caso de La Quinoa En El Altiplano Sur de Bolivia*.
- <sup>62</sup> Interview with Pedro, quinoa producer and COPROQUIR member (regional chapter of ANAPQUI). Irpani, Bolivia. 19 July 2013, author's translation.
- <sup>63</sup> Borrás et al., "Land Grabbing in Latin America and the Caribbean"
- <sup>64</sup> Interview with the National Coordinator of Agronomists and Veterinarians Without Borders. La Paz, Bolivia. 27 May 2013, author's translation.
- <sup>65</sup> Interview with Richard, independent quinoa producer. La Paz, Bolivia. 10 June 2013, author's translation.
- <sup>66</sup> It should be noted that this dichotomy does not always hold. There are most certainly some extractivist *estantes* as well as ecologically and culturally sensitive *residentes*.
- <sup>67</sup> Ormachea S. and Ramírez F., *Propiedad Colectiva de La Tierra Y Producción Capitalista: El Caso de La Quinoa En El Altiplano Sur de Bolivia*.
- <sup>68</sup> Bebbington, "Globalized Andes? Livelihoods, Landscapes and Development." p. 371
- <sup>69</sup> Walsh-Dillely, "Negotiating Hybridity in Highland Bolivia: Indigenous Moral Economy and the Expanding Market for Quinoa." p. 19
- <sup>70</sup> Her study nonetheless identifies producers—apparently in the minority—who see reciprocal labor as a waste of time, preferring instead to employ machinery and paid workers.
- <sup>71</sup> Bebbington, "Globalized Andes? Livelihoods, Landscapes and Development." p. 431
- <sup>72</sup> Interview with Walter Mamani, quinoa producer and faculty at the Technical University of Oruro (UTO). Oruro, Bolivia. 17 July 2013, author's translation.
- <sup>73</sup> Zimmerer, "Environmental Governance through 'Speaking Like an Indigenous State' and Respatializing Resources."
- <sup>74</sup> Gudynas, "Buen Vivir: Today's Tomorrow." p. 441
- <sup>75</sup> Interview with Walter Mamani, quinoa producer and faculty at the Technical University of Oruro (UTO). Oruro, Bolivia. 17 July 2013, author's translation.
- <sup>76</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>77</sup> quoted in Gudynas, "Good Life: Germinating Alternatives to Development." (Electronic source; no page number)
- <sup>78</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>79</sup> Van der Ploeg, *The New Peasantries: Struggles for Autonomy and Sustainability in an Era of Empire and Globalization*. p. 37-38, emphasis added.
- <sup>80</sup> Desmarais, *La Vía Campesina: Globalization and the Power of Peasants*. p. 37
- <sup>81</sup> *El Potosí*, "Según El CONAMAQ, El Gobierno Debe Priorizar Consumo Interno de Quinoa."
- <sup>82</sup> Interview with Juan Carlos, Marketing Director at ANAPQUI. La Paz, Bolivia. 22 July 2013, author's translation.