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Foreword

It was perhaps inevitable, given the quixotic history of cannabis in the twentieth century, that the issues surrounding its alleged hazards would become a matter of sustained controversy. With the dramatic increase in marihuana use in North America during the 1960s, this controversy erupted into crisis proportions. In 1969, the Canadian government installed a commission of inquiry into the nonmedical use of drugs. A year later the United States followed with its own national commission on marihuana and drug abuse. By the early 1970s, cannabis research had expanded and was receiving greatly augmented financial support, the bulk of which went for biomedical and other closely related study of specific categories of people in the United States. Even maverick projects, out of the ordinary and nontraditional in orientation, occasionally found approval and funding. Three overseas, multidisciplinary studies of the long-term effects of cannabis use, for example, were commissioned by the Center for Studies of Narcotic and Drug Abuse at the National Institute of Mental Health, which was to form the nucleus of the National Institute on Drug Abuse.

The first of these three projects, and probably the best known, was carried out in Jamaica, the second in Athens, and the third in San José, Costa Rica. With multidimensional research designs and integrated teams of social scientists and medical specialists, the projects provided opportunities for systematic comparisons of cannabis use and effects between working-class, long-term users from nonindustrial countries and a newer wave of predominantly middle-class users in North America and Western Europe. Not only were the subjects of these three studies, both drug users and controls, examined in clinics and laboratories, but they were studied by anthropologists over time, as they lived and functioned in their natural surroundings. All three projects, but particularly the Jamaican study, were innovative and ground-breaking at a critical time in the development of the drug research field.

Not surprisingly, the primary interest of drug researchers and the public at large in these overseas projects was not focused on innovative
design but on the clinical findings. Quite surprisingly to many, each project had reached the same general conclusion regarding the effects of cannabis use on long-term users—that thorough testing revealed no pathology or significant damage attributable to the substance. Given the social, cultural, economic, and racial differences between the three using populations, this finding was, and remains, exceptionally significant. Paradoxically, the Jamaican, Greek, and Costa Rican medical data, remarkable in their uniformity, served as much to exacerbate as to resolve the cannabis issue—a fate shared, it might be added, and on a considerably grander scale, by the relatively benign reports and recommendations of the American national commission and its Canadian counterpart. It could be argued in explanation that the linked controversy over the effects of cannabis and appropriate sociolegal responses is so encrusted with the economic, political, and ideological debris of decades that objective evidence, in and by itself, has been less than influential in the formation of policy and law. In any case, cannabis is now a thoroughly politicized issue with damaging results to both science and society. It is an issue artificially but effectively polarized. Researchers are pressured into warring camps, and the scientific enterprise itself is in danger of being debased and perverted. Politicization has led to, and buttresses, a needlessly convoluted problem, one that has affected the lives of millions. In this regard, I need only mention that the myriad and often contradictory laws that constrain cannabis use and prescribe its users have all been justified on the basis of “scientific” evidence and in the name of “science.”

By the very nature of their disciplines, social scientists involved in drug research are acutely aware of these problems and their complexity. And it is these social scientists who should be most instrumental in understanding of the dynamics of cannabis use was being developed, as well as the behaviors linked to its use, are culturally conditioned and controlled. In the words of Governor Raymond Shafer, chairman of the American national commission, their work effectively demonstrated the critical fact that “the relationship between man and marihuana is not simply pharmacological.”

It was during the early period of the project, when a more holistic understanding of the dynamics of cannabis use was being developed, that the seed for Working Men and Ganja was planted. This major contribution to the field of drug studies is one which I take great pleasure in introducing.

Dr. Melanie Dreher was a key member of the Jamaica team, responsible for the anthropological field research in the eastern section of the island. She completed three full community studies in eighteen months, an anthropological tour de force when one considers that the subjects of her research were individuals involved in illegal and sanctioned activity. Her early field work, reported in Ganja in Jamaica, the major publication of the project, provided the basis for describing the “ganja complex,” or social institution of marihuana in Jamaica. On a more theoretical level, it was her exceptional field data and insights that led eventually to the culture argument so central to that report. By any estimate, Dr. Dreher is a superlative researcher, a field worker with few peers in this most demanding activity of anthropological study. A capability of this kind, to paraphrase Professor Meyer Fortes, can never be taught, but only encouraged in the classroom. The particular blend of intelligence, disciplined effort, and extraordinary field skills that has characterized all of Dr. Dreher’s work made her invaluable to the Jamaica project.

Working Men and Ganja goes beyond the necessarily static model of the ganja complex presented in Ganja in Jamaica. In this book Dr. Dreher systematically explores variations in marihuana use and marihuana-linked behavior at the community level. Its primary theme is the integration of individual ganja behavior to the local sociocultural system in which it is embedded, a theme detailed by unusually rich qualitative and quantitative data drawn from three communities. While these sites were in relatively close geographical proximity, they differed from each other in economic base and internal organization. They were selected not for any special characteristics related to ganja, but because they represented three distinctive Jamaican community settings.

In the opening chapters of Working Men and Ganja, Dr. Dreher gives a full description of these communities and of the major elements that make up the ganja complex. This provides the necessary backdrop for the development of her central point that ganja use at the community level is dependent on local socioeconomic factors. Case materials and survey data are deftly marshaled to examine the relation of the level of ganja use and nonuse to position in the local stratification systems, a method that accounts for both intracommunal and intercommunal differences in ganja use. I know of no other study in the drug field that treats pattern and variation with such preciseness and clarity.

A substantial portion of the book is devoted to the multifaceted question of marihuana and work. This thorny issue is dealt with by considering first the relation of ganja to the organization of agricultural
labor in the three communities and then proceeding to the relation of ganja to the actual performance of work. In the first instance, Dr. Dreher provides vivid examples of interpersonal patterns of ganja use set in qualitatively different work situations as evidence that differences in such patterns are functions of different productive arrangements. In essence, interpersonal patterns of ganja use are adaptations to the conditions and requirements of work. Put metaphorically, ganja is often the lubricant of social relations essential for carrying out agricultural work in particular ways. In the second instance, ganja and work performance, Dr. Dreher carefully dissects the insistent claim of Jamaican workers that ganja enhances their ability to work, a claim echoed by cannabis users in other parts of the traditional world. This perception, found wherever cannabis is put to multipurpose use, runs completely counter to that held by a number of clinical researchers in the United States. This group posits the existence of an "amotivational syndrome," a damaging condition supposedly caused by the use of marihuana and characterized by a loss of desire to work and to participate. In her study, Dr. Dreher had a rare opportunity to test these two contrasting claims by comparing the work performance over time of ganja-using and nonusing sugar cane cutters in the context of estate organization, policy, and practice. The ensuing analysis provides a most illuminating, objective view of an important issue as well as a much-needed methodological corrective to purveyors of unsubstantiated generalizations.

Although I have deliberately touched on just a few aspects of this book—a foreword should introduce and not review—two attributes of Working Men and Ganja need to be mentioned. This is among a very few studies in the drug field that treats substance users as human beings involved in the full round of life and not as exotic, dissected objects. If only for this, Dr. Dreher deserves our thanks. But it is also a study that has much to offer in a practical sense to the people and government of Jamaica. The need for objective reporting and assessment of the burgeoning ganja phenomenon and its attendant social and economic problems is acute. Dr. Dreher offers no ready solutions, no prescriptions for their solution. Nevertheless, her eminently rational book, which captures the reality of the rural Jamaican, serves that country well.

Quite apart from its value to drug research, Working Men and Ganja is an exciting addition to the comparative sociology of the Caribbean region. It offers a fresh anthropological perspective on the dynamics of rural labor in contemporary Jamaica and brings together materials and analyses of very considerable value to regional specialists in microeconomics, rural development, and labor relations. Of more theoretical importance to Caribbean studies, and in order to reach the objectives of a social anthropological study that focused on illegal activity, Dr. Dreher dealt empirically with aspects of social structure and organization, to borrow Sir Raymond Firth's felicitous conceptualization. This was facilitated by systematic examination of illegal activity per se, an activity that serves, for the astute analyst, as a dye marker that reveals the contours of the social system of which it is a part. Thus Working Men and Ganja, a methodologically sophisticated study, tells us as much about rural Jamaican structure and organization as it does about ganja and consequently adds substantially to our basic understanding of Jamaican and Caribbean society.

I have known Melanie Dreher since her first days in the Joint Program in Applied Anthropology at Teachers College, Columbia University. Over what seems to have been just a very short period of time, she developed professionally from a promising student and novice researcher into a seasoned investigator, dedicated teacher, and respected colleague. With the publication of this excellent first book, she completes a most important academic cycle and fully establishes her credentials as scholar, anthropologist, and Caribbeanist.

LAMBROS COMITAS
Professor of Anthropology
Director, Division of Philosophy,
Social Sciences and Education
Teachers College, Columbia University
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Introduction

Most available evidence indicates that cannabis—commonly known to
Jamaicans as ganja—is not native to Jamaica but was introduced to the
island by Indian indentured laborers around the middle of the nine­
teenth century. Since that time, it has steadily diffused to the Afro-Ja­
maican segments of the population and now enjoys regular and frequent
use throughout the laboring class (Davison 1973; Lindesmith 1971: 228;
M. G. Smith et al. 1960). Despite its widespread acceptance, ganja has
been subject to various penal restrictions in Jamaica since 1913 (Rubin
and Comitas 1975: 20–35). In July 1970, when the fieldwork for this
study began, possession of ganja carried a mandatory eighteen-month
sentence. Legislation passed shortly after the national elections in
March 1972 eliminated this penalty; but, despite this politically moti­
vated concession to ganja consumers, ganja use and commerce remain
criminal offenses carrying penalties which vary with the discretion of
individual magistrates.

Changes in law have not eliminated the controversy over ganja use
in Jamaican society. The debate is organized along socioeconomic divi­sions. The middle and upper sectors almost uniformly condemn ganja
use among the laboring class, claiming that it makes “them” lazy, irre­
sponsible, psychotic, and potentially violent. Ganja users, on the other
hand, who are drawn primarily from the laboring class, maintain that
ganja makes them work harder, has a calming influence, and, far from
being mentally disorganizing, induces great wisdom. Furthermore,
ganja has become increasingly associated with the Ras Tafarians, a polit­
ico-religious cult originating within Jamaica’s lowest rungs of society.
Fearful and suspicious of this group, which is often believed to harbor
the “criminal element,” the middle classes have become even more
vehement in their condemnation.

The major concern of the Jamaican government at the time of field­
work was not so much with the domestic use of ganja—though govern­
ment legislation in this regard certainly reflects the sentiments of the
controlling classes—but more specifically with the illegal importation of
firearms resulting from the smuggling of ganja from Jamaica to the United States and Canada. This illegal ganja-gun trade, together with the rise in usage and the association with Rastafarians, contributed to making ganja a polarizing issue in Jamaican society. Thus, what was once regarded as a mildly troublesome practice among the lower classes has now become a catch-all explanation for any kind of deviant or criminal behavior. During the fieldwork for this study seldom a day went by in which the Daily Gleaner, Jamaica's most widely circulated newspaper, did not carry a story of some ganja-related event: the arrest of Americans on ganja charges, a raid in Kingston, or some new report on the alleged effects of the drug. This study does not attempt to take a position in regard to the current debate concerning the use of cannabis in Jamaica or, for that matter, in the United States. My interest is not policy formation but rather a better insight into a poorly understood sociocultural phenomenon.

The findings presented here are drawn from eighteen months of fieldwork that commenced with a two-month pilot study in July and August 1970 and terminated in January 1973. This study represents a small part of a multidisciplinary research effort undertaken by the Research Institute for the Study of Man and the University of West Indies on the effects of chronic smoking of cannabis in Jamaica. Thus, the medical, psychological, and jural-legal aspects of cannabis use in Jamaica, considered at length in the full report, are dealt with only incidentally in this examination, which focuses on the sociocultural dimensions of ganja use among the rural working class.

The research design that guides this study is based on the attempt to apply a descriptive, holistic, comparative approach to determining the function and role of cannabis in Jamaican society. Before outlining the method of procedure, however, I must include a word about human rights and confidentiality. The fact that ganja use carries both legal penalties and stringent social sanctions required not only the coding and safeguarding of notes while in the field but the assurance to all informants that their communications would be held in strictest confidence. The fact that ganja use carries both legal penalties and stringent social sanctions required not only the coding and safeguarding of notes while in the field but the assurance to all informants that their communications would be held in strictest confidence. Since the nature of this study entails the exposure of illegal practices, all names of persons and places used here are fictitious and bear no relation to any persons or places holding such names in Jamaica today. This is also the reason why no maps have been included in this volume and why the photos depicting rural working life throughout the island are not specific to any community presented here.

The research for this study began with a two-month survey of cannabis use in Leyburn, a rural highland community typical of Jamaican interior settlements. Since I was familiar with this community from previous fieldwork, it became a logical place to conduct a pilot study where entry to ganja activity could be gained with relative speed. The goal of this early exploration was a comprehensive description of the behavior and values associated with cannabis, noting the extent, nature, and variations of use within the specific framework of Leyburn's social organization and dynamics. The absence of more defined research goals and hypotheses at this stage was purposive and based on the anticipation that the early data would help generate relevant research questions.

This first systematic look at cannabis use in Jamaica exposed a highly patterned set of activities with a code of rules, material apparatus, well-established values and sets of relationships, and definitive, though often fluctuating, forms and cycles of groupings. Viewed within this framework, ganja use assumed significance as a social institution. Furthermore, a comparison of these findings with those of other members of the research team working in different settings revealed that many of the values, activities, and groupings comprising this institution varied from community to community. This provided a sound indication of the integration of cannabis behavior within the socioeconomic parameters of local life.

While there were many additional findings of major significance, those most consequential in formulating my subsequent research efforts are as follows. First, while cannabis is consumed in many forms, only inhalation or smoking is socially extensive, and this usage is informally, though effectively, restricted to adult men. Second, cannabis use, particularly smoking, receives its heartiest endorsement from members of the lower socioeconomic levels of the community, while middle and upper levels tend to eschew ganja and deny association with both the drug and its users. Finally, in addition to the anticipated leisure settings, male-dominated work settings are primary sites for the consumption of ganja, with smokers consistently reporting that ganja enhances their ability and performance in work-related activity.

From these early findings, major questions evolved which guided my research the following year. What patterns of activity, groupings, and values comprise the ganja institution? How is ganja integrated with other working-class institutions, specifically those pertaining to the organization and accomplishment of men's work? Of what significance is the sectional or class-level disparity in ganja use to intersectional movement and how is it expressed in the behavior of individuals in communities? Finally, what are the effects of local socioeconomic circumstances evolving from the organization of production on all the aforementioned concerns?

On returning to the field in July of 1971, I selected two other communities. I "discovered" Buckland, a coastal community located on estate backland, while seeking an appropriate sugar estate setting. It
proved a serendipitous find. Conversations with local residents indicated that Buckland householders combine cultivation of their own lands with wage labor for small and medium-sized properties as well as for large estates. It also provides a glimpse of the role of ganja in banana and coconut production—two important products in the Jamaican economy and an ecological setting as yet unresearched by other field workers on the Ganja Project. I established residence in this community from July 1971 to early December 1971.

Deerfield, the third setting, consists of several interconnected rural neighborhoods surrounding a sugar estate where wage laborers are employed in the large-scale production of sugar for export. Because Deerfield is located less than five miles by car from Buckland, selection of this estate allowed me to remain informed of events and activities in the backland community while residing in the sugar belt. I lived in Deerfield from December 1971 to January 1973, except for a two-month return to the United States during July and August of 1972 and a three-month return to Leyburn for additional fieldwork.

None of the communities was selected on the basis of a particular incidence or prevalence—either suspected or confirmed—of ganja activity. The extent and nature of ganja use in each of the three communities was an unknown to be determined through field research. Rather, the communities were selected because they typify common forms of rural settlements and social structure in Jamaica (M. G. Smith 1965a) and throughout the Caribbean (Steward et al. 1956; Padilla 1960; Horowitz 1960; Frucht 1967). According to Smith (1965a: 162), roughly one-fourth of the population of Jamaica resides in the sugar-producing areas, one-half in the mountainous interior or in small communities along the coast, and the remaining quarter in the urban centers.

In addition to being representative of the Jamaican population in this regard, Leyburn, Buckland, and Deerfield are all characterized by a principal type of agricultural organization and production corresponding to the three major kinds of Jamaican farms as delineated by M. G. Smith (1956: 9):

(1) Large estates which operate as industrial or quasi-industrial concerns under an impersonal employed management, are controlled mainly by syndicates, and on which the labour is unionized directly;
(2) Middle or large sized properties lacking this overtly industrial character, lacking direct union representation for their labour, administered under individual or family ownership and personal, often paternalistic, control; (3) Small farms proper which are purely individual in their administration, focused on production for household subsistence as well as exchange in local and overseas markets, and on which no element of trade unionism has yet appeared.

Finally, each of these settings is concerned with the production of crops that are cultivated widely and are of major significance to the island's economy for both export and domestic consumption.

The importance of a broad ethnographic foundation from which to view a specific problem is basic to anthropological method. Traditionally, this foundation represents the spectrum of sociocultural institutions and organizations including the broad categories of habitat and ecology, economy, social organization (including domestic structure, status groups, and political organization), religion and magic, endemic values, and the life cycle. Ethnographic data for this study were gathered in two ways: by participant observation in the daily round of community activities and by a household census. Participant observation typically included conversing with local residents—visiting homes, shops, schools, and markets—and attending meetings of political clubs, agricultural societies, and church activities, as well as special events such as baptisms, weddings, funerals, and dances. In each setting, I developed relationships with several key informants who assisted greatly in substantiating observations and reports, providing introductions when needed, and helping to interpret the field research to other residents.

A household census was conducted in each community in order to determine the major demographic characteristics of the community, including settlement patterns, the number of households, distribution of the population by age, sex, and socioeconomic status, occupations, source of principal income, migration patterns, educational levels, religious dispositions, marriage patterns, and household composition. In most instances, I obtained this information directly from household members. When that was not possible, the information was supplied and checked by key informants. At least minimal data were obtained on nearly every household in Leyburn and Buckland. In Deerfield, household data were obtained through a census of estate employees residing on the compound and a cross-section of households located in one of the neighborhoods on the fringes of the estate land. They were not randomly selected but were chosen to represent the various socioeconomic levels and occupational categories of the local population.

While the intent of each census was to be as comprehensive and inclusive as possible, the quality of information varied: about fifty to seventy-five households in each community were covered in detail, while only the most basic demographic data were gathered for the remaining. However, enough data were obtained to interpret the adult male population in the three settings in terms of age, ethnicity, church membership, domestic patterns, status, and occupation. This survey, carried out early in the fieldwork process, became a useful quantitative backdrop on which to place the qualitative ethnographic details obtained later.
In order to explore the role of ganja in inter-level relations and socioeconomic mobility, I ranked the households according to socioeconomic status within the community. While the differences that exist within Leyburn, Buckland, or Deerfield do not always accurately reflect the sectional or class differences that exist on the national level, they are nevertheless consequential on the local level and are well recognized by community members. Indeed, since friendships and social activities tend to follow class lines in rural Jamaica, the tasks of delineating socioeconomic levels and then making more subtle distinctions of sublevels were much less difficult than I originally anticipated. My rankings were corroborated and re-checked by several competent informants who proved particularly helpful in dealing with those individuals who were difficult to classify.

Once I had established a broad ethnographic base, I concentrated on ganja-related activity. In each setting I spent a substantial proportion of time in men's work situations, observing the organization and production of work, the choice of partners, the relationships between coworkers, and the role of ganja in these processes. In Leyburn, this involved going “bush” with the farmers; in Buckland, it meant daily treks into the banana and coconut groves and periods of observation at the copra factory and work yards of the larger properties. On the basis of these observations and using interviews to trace the network of relationships associated with men's work, I was able to determine the organization of work on a community-wide basis.

In Deerfield the concentration of large gangs of men in sugar production necessitated a greater amount of time spent actually monitoring the work setting. I spent approximately two weeks on each of the seven farms of Deerfield Estate, observing and interviewing workers. One to three days were spent with each farm manager recording his relationship with workers and style of administration, as well as obtaining information on his personal life and background. Eventually I singled out four farms for more intensive study and continued research. Estate records were used to determine performance and pay levels of cane workers as well as the production and cost differences among the various farms on the estate.

In all three settings some time was spent in male-oriented recreational activities—sitting in rum shops, playing dominoes, attending cricket matches, and so forth. Community attitudes regarding appropriate female conduct, however, limited the amount of time I could spend in rum shops, unescorted, without generating damaging gossip. During this phase, I ranked the adult males included in the census according to their degree of ganja smoking. This procedure was based not on a tabulation of the number and size of ganja cigarettes smoked daily, but rather on a more sociological type of ranking that took into consideration the individual's commitment to ganja and to other ganja users, as well as the frequency of use. Broadly, these designations are heavy, occasional, infrequent, discontinued, and non-smoker. (See Chapter 1, Table 1, for definitions of these terms.) Like socioeconomic status, ganja rankings were community knowledge and were obtainable through direct observation, questioning, and key informants.

Once community relations were firmly established, I conducted a series of broad enquiries and informal interviews into the prevalence and nature of ganja activity in each setting. Persons of both sexes and various ages, nonusers as well as confirmed users, distributors, and cultivators, were all included. For the most part, these interviews were spontaneous, casual, and open-ended, generating data that the informant regarded as significant—his or her particular attitude and position regarding ganja use, its effects, who should use it, how it is cultivated, sold, and prepared, the associated risks, the role of authorities, and so forth. While this kind of interview has the advantage of not forcing the interviewee's responses into researcher-constructed categories, it occasionally limited the comparability of the data. However, the fact that different persons chose to focus on different aspects of the substance was itself a useful finding. Intra-community variations revealed in these conversations were noted and categorized according to the organizing principles of community life determined earlier in the research process.

Once I had gained entry to ganja-smoking sessions, I was able to record observations on the composition of the groups, the time and location of smoking, the material apparatus, the suppliers of ganja, topics of conversation, and the general process of group activity. Collection of data on the ganja complex also included on-site observation of cultivation and distribution as well as interviews with cultivators and vendors.

The data obtained in this manner are both quantitative and qualitative in nature. Throughout this study the quantitative material pertaining to prevalence and degree of ganja use, socioeconomic levels, productivity, and so forth provides the statistical background for the interpretation of the particular events, behavior, life histories, case studies, and interviews comprising the qualitative findings. The actual procedures and rationales used in investigating the identified problems and analyzing the data are beyond the scope of this introduction, but they are fully detailed in later sections.

The study begins with a description of the three communities that form the basis of this research. Because of the problem-oriented nature of the research, these descriptions are directed at those data that are most cogent and necessary for the examination of cannabis in subsequent chapters. Chapter 2 continues laying the descriptive groundwork...
with a presentation of the ganja complex within an institutional framework. For purposes of clarity, this presentation is organized around the cultivation, distribution, and consumption of ganja with constituent groupings, activities, and norms delineated for each phase.

Chapter 3 places this institution in socioeconomic perspective by relating its various components to status and stratification as they exist in the three communities. Since much of the national diversity in behavior and values surrounding ganja is related to socioeconomic factors, this chapter is central to translating the subtleties of individual diversity as well as community differences. The latter part of the chapter depicts the variations that may occur within a sectionally differentiated, institutional framework as a response to individual situations and local conditions.

The remaining two chapters take a considerably narrower focus by concentrating specifically on the relationship of ganja to the organization and accomplishment of agricultural production. Chapter 4 opens with a summary of the relationship between the ganja complex and those institutions associated with work life and then demonstrates the integration of these two sets of phenomena in each of the three communities. Chapter 5 continues the theme of cannabis and work life through an objective examination of the notion, widely held by ganja smokers, that ganja enhances the performance and production of work. The findings of this probe ultimately lead back to the class-level debate for interpretation of the diverging postures on the relationship of ganja to productivity. While the main focus of this study is the ganja complex, its primary theme throughout is the integration of individual behavior with the sociocultural system in which it is manifested. The conclusion traces the Jamaican findings with reference to some of the major social science models traditionally employed to explain the relationship between cannabis and culture and discusses the extent to which this study can help us understand marijuana use in North American or European contexts.

Notes

1. Referred to throughout this paper as the Ganja Project, the results of this research were published in Rubin and Comitas (1975).
2. The findings of this early phase, which appear throughout this study, were first presented in Rubin and Comitas (1975: 36–62).
3. In this study the terms level, class, status, and section are used interchangeably to designate those differences in power and influence that exist among residents in each of the three settings. As already mentioned, those differences do not correlate with the social and cultural differentiation that exists on the national level. Thus, the use of a particular term is not intended to denote one or the other of the conceptual frameworks currently competing for interpretation of that differentiation—namely, the plural society model (M. G. Smith 1960), which regards Jamaican society as divided into cultural sections, versus the social class model (R. T. Smith 1961, 1970), which argues that Jamaica is best viewed as a class-stratified society. For the purposes of the present work, “class,” “section,” and “level” are all employed in the descriptive sense.
The Communities

To the outside observer the communities that form the basis of this study are barely distinguishable. Located in the same geographical region, Leyburn, Buckland, and Deerfield are all rural settlements in which agriculture is the main economic activity. They are also alike in ethnic composition and their major sociocultural institutions. A closer examination, however, reveals the subtle but critical differences that provide the context for this comparative analysis of ganja activity in rural Jamaica.

LEYBURN

Leyburn is a rural settlement located in the Blue Mountain foothills, seven miles up a narrow, winding road after one leaves the main artery to Kingston at Packers Corners. Approximately seven hundred persons, nearly half of them children, comprise the population of this community. Most of the inhabitants are of Afro-Jamaican descent; only six of Leyburn's 182 households claim members of East Indian ancestry. Typical of interior communities, clusters of homes and shops are strung out in ribbon fashion along the main road, which parallels the wide and rapidly flowing Sheldon River. Because "the main" is viewed as the most desirable and prestigious location with easy access to schools, shops, and transportation, many residents have sold large tracts of land across the river and up the mountainside in order to purchase more convenient house plots of only a few squares. Approximately one-fifth of the households, however, are still located on the surrounding mountainsides, far from the populated area, or on the opposite side of the river in the section of Leyburn called Goshen. No bridges span the Sheldon in this particular settlement, but most of the year the river is so shallow that daily fording presents no problem. During the heavy rains of May and November, however, the river rises and residents of Goshen are often left in semi-isolation. Goshen children are unable to attend school during this time, and obtaining supplies from the shop requires climbing several miles up a steep mountain pathway to the nearest bridge.

When banana production was the area's primary economic activity, Leyburn was the market center to which farmers from surrounding districts brought their bananas to be measured and purchased. According to older residents, Leyburn was then a much livelier and more prosperous community. For several years, however, the small farmer has been unable to compete with larger estates, and banana cultivation has given way to other kinds of agriculture. With this change, and the development of daily public transportation, the focus of activity appears to be steadily shifting from Leyburn to the capital, less than twenty miles away. Thus, more and more residents of Leyburn and surrounding districts now look to Kingston for marketing, employment, entertainment, medical services, and so forth. Though Leyburn is situated only ten miles away from Sheldon Bay, one of the fastest-growing towns in Jamaica, relations between these two communities have remained, until very recently, undeveloped. The establishment of a junior secondary school, two new factories, and a larger market in Sheldon Bay may alter this relationship in the future. However, except for one market truck which passes through Leyburn at 4 A.M. on its way to Sheldon Bay, all daily public transportation, which includes one bus, a van, and three market trucks, connects Leyburn with Kingston.

Despite this shift in focus, Leyburn continues to serve residents of surrounding smaller districts through its public agencies and institutions. These include a post office, primary school, health station, police station, Land Authority Office, and community center used for holiday dances and cricket games. Five churches—Anglican, Methodist, two Baptist, and a Pentecostal Revival—serve the religious needs of Leyburn and its satellite districts. Besides the cricket team and election-related political activities, voluntary organizations function primarily in name only, receiving their greatest promotion from the staff of public agencies in the community and a few middle-class Leyburn residents. For example, the Parent and Teachers Organization is coordinated by the headmaster of the primary school and the local chapter of the Jamaican Agricultural Society is organized by the extension officer for the Land Authority Office. Meetings are held sporadically and attendance is generally low and not representative of the majority of Leyburn residents.

Rum shops located at each end of the settlement provide Leyburn residents with mid-week grocery supplies—flour, rice, canned goods, and so forth—while four very small shops, not licensed to sell rum, are scattered in between along the main road. Though recorded music is played at one of the rum shops on Friday nights, few residents convene there to socialize. There is no village center per se, where residents
gather to spend their leisure time; rather they form small groups that meet in a variety of favorite places throughout the village and its environs: in front of a shop, on the river beach, along a bridge rail, or in the yard of a popular householder.

Though most inhabitants reside near or on the main road, cultivation takes them, alone or in small groups, deep into the surrounding bush in a highly dispersed pattern of work activity. Agriculture is still the main economic activity in Leyburn, but the coffee and banana cultivation of the past has been replaced by mixed farming of various tree and ground crops. Mango, avocado, pear, lime, and pimento are the major tree crops; ground crops include primarily corn, carrots, yams, sweet potatoes, congo peas, and a variety of beans. For the last eight years, an international tobacco company has rented land within the district and contracted with twenty-two farmers, ten of them from Leyburn, to grow and harvest tobacco under company supervision and guidance.

Almost all householders in Leyburn own or have access to some cultivable land through inheritance or through the resettlement activities of the Government Land Authority, which makes three- to ten-acre plots available for local farmers to purchase on loan with generous repayment terms. The high rate of land ownership in the area is not, however, an indication of economic stability; the quality of land is generally inferior—steeply sloped, easily eroded, and, in many cases, located far from the homestead, barely accessible by foot or donkey. Even though the Sheldon River brings a bountiful supply of water through Leyburn every day, it remains untapped, and local farmers have no access to a dependable source of water for their crops. Long and severe droughts followed by torrential rainfalls make agriculture a difficult and precarious occupation. Even if a farmer controls land of adequate quality and quantity, he may lack the household labor to manage it profitably, and the cost of employing wage labor for most Leyburn agriculturalists is prohibitive. Only a few households in Leyburn have the right combination of land and labor to make farming a payable concern. Reciprocal arrangements and work partnerships pervade agricultural production in Leyburn and provide institutionalized means of meeting labor requirements.

For the majority of householders, farming is a hand-to-mouth existence, and if the opportunity arises for road work with the Parish Council or for migrant labor abroad, most are willing to leave their own cultivation to do it. Only about one-fourth of the households rely solely on farming their own lands for a living, and these rank among the poorest in Leyburn. The rest have one or several occupational supplements that they practice along with farming, such as masonry, carpentry, or work with one of the local government agencies. In Leyburn the most realistic strategy for obtaining economic security is to have as many sources of income as possible, no matter how small.

In most cases the land can barely support farmers' immediate families, much less the families of their children. Moreover, opportunities for part-time tradesmen or artisans are effectively restricted to the older, longer-established householders. Consequently, there is a genuine lack of economic opportunity in the area, and most young people are encouraged to look to Kingston or abroad for employment. Such employment, however, usually requires a degree of education or training beyond the primary school level. This presents a serious problem for youthful job seekers from Leyburn, most of whom have not even completed elementary school. Although a few relatively affluent parents can afford to send their children to primary and secondary schools in Kingston, the costs of tuition and boarding children in town are utterly beyond most village parents. They must, therefore, rely on government youth camps and training schools, for which there is often a long waiting period and which, without political influence, are difficult to enter. Consequently, when a Leyburn boy completes his education at the local primary school, he may have to wait several years before he is called for trade school. During this period between leaving school and settling into adult life, the young generally live in their parents' yards. The only work available is day labor for one of the better-off farmers or for the tobacco company. The work is usually tedious and the pay is poor—from eighty cents to one dollar per day. While young men often perform poorly and complain about their situation, local employers counter that these "rude boys don't want to work—only walk up and down and smoke ganja." Ironically, while the children of these critical, more affluent farmers are among the few who have ample land to begin farming, they systematically reject farming as a career and, with their parents' blessing, leave Leyburn to pursue more prestigious vocations in the capital. This leaves their parents dependent on the sons of less fortunate farmers to assist them as casual laborers.

The patterns of stratification and segmentation outlined for Jamaican hill communities in general (M. G. Smith 1965c: 185–191) apply very well in the specific case of Leyburn. Those unfamiliar with Jamaican rural life may fail to see social differences between residents of this community. In fact, variations in wealth and status do exist and are acknowledged by the inhabitants. The recognition of these differences is of critical importance in understanding village social structure and variations in village behavior and values. From observational and survey data on 182 households, at least five hierarchically ordered social strata or levels can be distinguished. Since traditional definitions of class are not entirely appropriate to the Jamaican rural scene, the social strata of
Leyburn, for purposes of discussion and identification, are arbitrarily labeled Levels I, IIa, IIb, IIIa, and IIIb.

Level I, the highest-ranked social layer in the local stratification system, comprises only one household, headed by Mr. Attridge, the largest landowner and dominant economic power of Leyburn, who is reputed to be one of the wealthiest persons in the parish. Now retired from active public service, he has had a distinguished career as a national political figure and director of one of the most important and influential national organizations. As owner of Leyburn Woods property and much livestock, as a landlord, a justice of the peace, and an official in the local Cooperative Bank, he continues to wield considerable influence on both the national and community level. Well informed of village affairs, he actively involves himself in Leyburn’s economic life, from deciding on bank loans granted to village farmers to the selective hiring of day labor for his own properties. Many villagers dislike him. They contend that he manipulates the community as if it were his private plantation, that he has suppressed plans for economic improvement and, in so doing, has sustained a steady source of cheap labor. It is generally held that he has made it difficult for locals to progress. In a sense, while Attridge and his family are from the community, they are not of the community. Economically, they dominate the village; socially and culturally, their links are with the capital. In terms of the national system of social stratification, they belong to Jamaica’s rural middle class.

Level II comprises 13 percent of the total number of domestic units in Leyburn. A typical Level II family owns a multi-roomed cement house close to the main road and owns or has access to a van, car, or motorcycle. The parents are legally married, the children attend school in Kingston, if not at the primary, then the secondary level, and the family members are of the socially prestigious Anglican or Methodist churches. Only a few on this level rely on agriculture as the major source of income, though indigenous members of this stratum control the most substantial portions of optimal land in Leyburn. Most derive income, as well as status, from their occupations—as a religious functionary, a head teacher, a government social worker, a postmistress, a public works contractor, or the like. The majority of “migrants” to the community and the formal leaders of local public and service organizations belong to this group. They may well be considered, in national terms, as members of the rural middle class.

Finer distinctions within this level separate those members who have extra-local or substantially greater material and/or educational resources at their disposal, and whose social ties are primarily outside the community (Level IIa), from those whose power and influence, as well as their social life, are essentially confined to the Leyburn area (Level IIb). Typical of Level IIa is the university-educated headmaster of the primary school and his wife, both newcomers to the area. Despite their very intensive participation in local affairs—establishing a Parent and Teachers Organization and coordinating community pageants, parades, and school events—their closest associates and active social life remain in Kingston. The nurse and her husband, an insurance salesman and gentleman farmer, enjoy a similar relationship to and standing within the community, as does the college-educated tobacco company supervisor. The only indigenous household to fall within this category is that of the Davenports, an East Indian farming family who effectively control the best cultivable land in Leyburn. In addition to their successful rum shop which is managed by Mrs. Davenport, Mr. Davenport and one of his sons operate a large cash-crop, mixed vegetable farm. Unlike any other farmers in Leyburn, they own a tractor and several other pieces of modern farming equipment as well as two trucks for transporting their own produce to Kingston. To meet the labor requirements of their farm, they have become one of the major employers of day labor in the community. Like others of their rank, the Davenports enjoy primary social links in Kingston, where their other well-educated and well-married sons and daughters reside.

While the Level IIb householders control both a greater quantity and a better quality of land than the majority of Leyburn farmers, their scale of farming is several degrees below the modern system of agriculture practiced by the Davenports. Substantially less wealthy and less sophisticated than the members of Level IIa, these persons are, nevertheless, considered to constitute the leading families of the community and are accorded respect and status.

Over 86 percent of all households in Leyburn fall into Level III, comprising elements of the lower sociocultural section of Jamaica. Level IIIa consists of fifty-three households, or approximately 35 percent of the total number. Typically, the economic resources of this group are at least minimally adequate to meet daily needs. Their income is largely derived from own-account cultivation or contract farming for the tobacco company and is often supplemented by work in masonry, carpentry, or employment in one of the ministerial agencies in Leyburn. It is not unusual for older members of this level to receive remittances from children working in England or the United States. Aspirations for a higher standard of living are rising among this group, whetted in part by their ability to purchase and receive some of the material benefits of “middle-class” life. Level IIIa contains the slightly better-off members of the rural poor, ideologically mobile or “straining” toward a higher socioeconomic status, but nonetheless culturally and firmly a part of the lower sector of the Jamaican population.
Finally, seventy-nine households, or about 52 percent of the domestic units in Leyburn, fall into the lowest level, IIIb. Characteristically, members of these households lead a hand-to-mouth existence with few, if any, prospects for raising their social and economic position. With insufficient land for subsistence and insufficient education, training, or opportunity for regular employment locally or abroad, this group consists partly of older people, sometimes living alone, who eke out their existence in poverty, and partly of individuals in their young or middle years with large families and meager resources. Like those in Level IIIa, this lowest-ranked group in Leyburn is representative, in social and cultural terms, of the lower-class majority of the island.

With the exception of Levels I and IIa, power, influence, and community standing are highly correlated with age in Leyburn. Because of the extensive out-migration of Level II youths, most of those young men who remain in Leyburn to earn their living as farmers are those who must begin life with minimal wealth and status. As they assume domestic responsibilities and settle into their adult occupations, however, they may, with careful economic and social management and good fortune, gradually acquire the material and behavioral accoutrements of Leyburn’s Level II in their middle years.

Despite the daily connections to Kingston, most Leyburn residents live out their lives in the presence of their neighbors. Without more convenient and accessible transportation at their disposal, they remain comparatively isolated from the towns or larger centers that provide alternatives to local economic and social life. The following incident typifies the constraining influence of a small and confined social life on individual behavior. Clive Perry is a young farmer from Leyburn’s lowest socioeconomic level. Over a period of time Clive had become acquainted with an American family, stationed in Kingston, who visited Leyburn’s river beach each Sunday to swim and picnic. He assisted the family down the steep slopes to the beach, pointed out the best places to swim, safeguarded their small children, and became their all-purpose helper. They rewarded him with beer, food, and small amounts of cash.

One day the man asked Clive if he would like to take one of the four rain barrels, which they had brought to the beach site, to keep in his yard. Clive politely thanked the man and, though he had good use for it, never removed the barrel. Later, Clive explained that if he took the barrel and someone in the village saw him, they would say, “Ras, Clive tek de white man barrel, ah me tek one too . . . an’ all de barrels dem soon gone.” Clive reasoned that when the American man returned and saw that the barrels were missing he would assume that Clive had taken them and would not favor him again, “an’ so me jes lef it.” Thus conservatism, induced by the scrutiny and vigilance of community residents, characterizes public behavior in Leyburn, often to the detriment of individual self-interest.

As in many small, rural communities, relations among residents in Leyburn are multiplex, often comprising several roles at once. While out-migration mounts steadily as young people search for economic opportunity, migration into the community is increasingly rare (except for those, already noted, who occupy ministerial posts). Thus, most inhabitants are not only co-residents but are connected as kin, schoolmates, neighbors of long standing, co-workers, church brethren, or a combination of these. Acceptance and approval in this community, characterized by its limited options and the particularistic nature of community relations, are highly important to most citizens even though such approbation may impede individual progress. In his study of small farming practices in rural Jamaica, Edwards (1961: 91) deals with this same issue in relation to acceptance of innovative farming techniques:

Since one of the farmer’s main ends in life is to be accepted by the rest of the community, he tries not to depart from the norms of the community in case this causes his rejection. If he ceases to be accepted he is no longer a member of the community in any real sense. In adopting many new techniques the farmer is not only doing something different from his neighbors, he is also doing things common to people with a much higher social status—the big property owners who are rich enough to employ these relatively expensive techniques. Departure from the remarkably uniform practice of a farming system would be common knowledge in a very short time because news passes rapidly from mouth to mouth. The potential non-conformist is well aware of this, which thus constitutes part of the constraining force.

Local achievers—particularly if that achievement is regarded as excessive, untimely, undeserved, or in other ways extraordinary—must often disguise or play down their good fortune in order to avoid both the endless requests made by friends and relatives for favors and loans and the social reprisals if such requests are not honored. One Leyburn householder, for instance, severely reprimanded his son for divulging to a school chum that his father had won the national lottery. Alleged magical sanctions, either attributed to or practiced against local achievers, reinforce this behavior and inhibit the expression of pride and pleasure in individual advancement, if not the advancement itself. Mrs. Magee, for example, on learning that her daughter had passed all her examinations and won a place in secondary school, rushed her off to the Pentecostal minister, who is also the local “science man” or practitioner of magic, to obtain “protection” against the jealousy of their neighbors.
Meanwhile, Mrs. Magee herself had to live with accusations of using “science” to prevent other village children from doing well on their examinations. Thus, Leyburn is typical of small, long-settled, relatively isolated communities in which the intensity of community life is expressed in various social and economic sanctions that often limit individual achievement and promote conformity and conservatism in public behavior.

BUCKLAND

Buckland is a post-emancipation settlement nestled in the small range of steep hills and gullies that lead down to the sea and surround the coastal plains. It is surrounded by several large banana- and coconut-producing properties on the west and by sugar-producing Deerfield Estate on the east. Narrow roads and lanes eventually converge in the focal section of the community, called Buckland Center, located approximately a quarter of a mile from the sea. It is here that the four largest shops and the primary school are to be found. Five churches, seven small shops, and all 232 households are situated along roads that ascend the hillsides surrounding this central section of Buckland in a comparatively concentrated settlement pattern. Pathways and shortcuts crisscross through the yards of inhabitants as well as through their cultivation so that, unlike Leyburn, there are very few places, either in yard or field, that are isolated and free from intrusion. Two narrow, slow-moving rivers wind their way through the settlement to the sea, providing a place for children to bathe and for women to do their laundry and to socialize.

The age and ethnic composition of the population of Buckland is similar to that of Leyburn: nearly half of this community’s 850 residents are children and there are only nine East Indian households while the rest are of Afro-Jamaican descent. The inhabitants of Buckland can be divided into two broad categories: one consists of descendants of the early Buckland settlers, who are now the land-holding families in the community; the other is comprised of those landless residents, most of them migrants or descendants of migrants, who came to the area in search of employment on the properties or on Deerfield Estate when the estate owned the flatland that stretches out from Buckland Center to the sea. This dual character of Buckland’s population is significant in understanding the basic parameters of the community’s system of stratification and intra-community relations. The indigenous families are usually higher-status, “respectable” community leaders; the landless families ordinarily comprise the lower socioeconomic strata and have less of a voice in directing community activities. These are very broad categories, however, and individual exceptions to this scheme appear daily. Thus, it is now possible to find adult children of the landless laborers who have gradually acquired capital through their wage employment and subsequently purchased sizeable tracts of land. On the other hand, the diminishing holdings of certain indigenous families as they are divided among children often put these descendants on an equal footing with the descendants of landless laborers. Many youths in this situation are encouraged to attend trade school or take up another vocation to supplement their family cultivation. Furthermore, marriage and mating between these two categories of residents are not uncommon. Propertied women who marry landless migrants, however, are often criticized by their families and neighbors, and it is not unusual for their inheritance to be reduced to a tiny houseplot or perhaps an older family residence with only enough land room for a kitchen garden.

Unlike Leyburn, which is a service village for surrounding districts, Buckland enjoys a satellite relationship to neighboring larger communities and boasts only a postal agency and primary school to serve local residents. Community members look to the densely populated area surrounding the sugar estate for weekly markets, “wholesale” shops, health services, police services, junior secondary and trade schools, certain kinds of entertainment, and so forth; in good weather these are within easy walking distance by a shortcut through the cane fields. Though Buckland is located on estate backlands, transportation to and from the settlement is abundant when compared with Leyburn. Several buses and small vans pass through or near the community several times each day. In addition, residents can usually obtain rides from owners and managers of properties in the area.

In Buckland, cultivated land is generally located at or near the homestead so that farmers do not have to travel long distances to remote areas in order to tend their fields. Several persons leave the residential community daily, however, walking various distances to their jobs on surrounding estates, the fishing beach, or the loading docks at Friendship Wharf, five miles away.

During the week, community residents spend their free time in groups of three or four, at the smaller shops, along the roadside, or in certain yards, assuming a pattern very similar to that of Leyburn. However, on Friday, which is payday for estate and property workers, and on Saturday nights, people leave their yards and gather at the large rum shops in Buckland Center to “sport” themselves—playing the jukebox, shooting billiards, matching dominoes, and drinking rum.

There are five churches in Buckland—Methodist, African Methodist Episcopal (AME), Baptist, and two varieties of “Poco” (Pocomania) or “Wraphead” churches. Leaders of these last two have reputations for
being able to heal the sick and manipulate evil spirits believed to cause illness and misfortune. Several community members belong to denominations not found in Buckland and regularly attend churches that are located in neighboring communities. Unlike Leyburn, voluntary organizations flourish and represent a major focus of both male and female social life. Thus, there are not only church-related organizations, such as the Men’s Fellowship Group and AME Missionary Group, but very active chapters of the Cane Farmers Association, the Banana and Coconut Growers Association, two branch organizations of each political party, three functioning “Benevolent Societies,” which provide insurance and funeral expenses for contributing members, a Parent and Teachers Organization, and the Buckland Community Council. Meetings of all these organizations are held frequently and are well attended. Fund-raising projects, “unveilings,” picnics, dances, and so forth, organized by these various groups, provide Buckland with a social event almost every weekend.

Windsor Farms, the largest property (1,250 acres) and a major employer in the area, has recently shifted former cane land into non-labor-intensive cattle production. Previously a part of Deerfield Estate, Windsor Farms was sold to Canadian investors who planned to build a tourist resort at the shoreline of this property, which boasts one of the most magnificent natural beaches in Jamaica. However, large property and estate owners, comprising a parish autocracy, feared the loss of their already scanty labor supply to tourism, and successfully exercised their political power to thwart those plans. For a few years the new owners continued in sugar production, delivering cane to the Deerfield Estate factory, until labor and transport problems became so untenable that the decision was made to phase out cane altogether and concentrate on beef production, thus vastly reducing labor requirements. In the meantime, negotiations between Windsor Farms and the Land Utilization Department resulted in the expulsion of nearly eighty squatters, mostly Buckland residents, who had established illegal, but formerly tolerated, cultivation on the property. Although the recent history of Windsor Farms has had serious economic consequences for Buckland inhabitants, it continues, nevertheless, to be the largest producer of bananas and coconuts in the Buckland area and thus employs many Buckland men and women both in cultivation of these crops and in the production of cattle—running fences, planting grass, and tending herds.

Though banana production is gradually diminishing in importance for many of the same reasons as in Leyburn, this crop, along with coconuts, remains the mainstay of Buckland’s economy. Cultivation of bananas and coconuts in this area is characterized by two different modes of production operating simultaneously: one is through large properties, and the other is through small, individually operated holdings similar to those of Leyburn. In addition to Windsor Farms, Stonleigh Property (150 acres) and Eaglebrook Property (180 acres) constitute the large-scale production of banana and coconuts that is carried out in the Buckland area. These two smaller enterprises are administered personally by their owners, both of whom are Jamaicans with long family histories in the district. However, only Hugh Bell, the owner of Stonleigh, actually resides in Buckland, where he also operates a copra factory. One of the most serious difficulties in managing banana and coconut cultivation on this scale in Buckland is retaining adequate labor, particularly from January to July, when workers gravitate to the higher-paying sugar industry. To combat this situation, property owners now offer financial incentives to workers who stay with them throughout the year. In addition, the paternalism of owners and managers toward their workers has assisted in promoting the development of a nucleus of regular, faithful employees.

The remaining banana and coconut production is carried out on small and middle-size farms (one to thirty acres), which are usually family operated. While the size of the average holding in Buckland is much smaller than that in Leyburn, soil and rainfall conditions are far superior in this community, allowing greater and more predictable yields. Also, the Buckland coconut producer is working in a more favorable market system. Hugh Bell’s copra factory on the centrally located Stonleigh property not only purchases all the coconuts that local farmers can provide but transports them to the factory as well. Since the labor requirement for cultivation of these crops is lower and more consistent throughout the year than that of the mixed crops in Leyburn, small farmers often complement their cultivation with regular employment on Deerfield Estate or on one of the many properties—some as laborers but many in mid-level jobs such as technicians, clerks, supervisors, or guards. Cane farming under contract with Deerfield Estate provides still another seasonal source of income for many of these Buckland farmers. Thus, cane farming and related enterprises, employment on the estates and properties, and, most recently, fishing provide viable economic supplements to banana and coconut cultivation for Buckland residents. Trade schools in Deerfield and in Bayport, only ten miles away, as well as more favorable political connections in this area, assure many Buckland youths the opportunity to acquire a trade without the long waiting periods typical of Leyburn.

In Buckland, the landless segment of the population can almost pick and choose from among the “common laborer” jobs both within the community and nearby. While older men, who have domestic responsibilities to meet, are essentially committed to regular wage labor on a
particular estate or property, young men who do not qualify for secondary or trade schools resist this kind of work as long as possible, drifting in and out as necessity dictates. Many bide their time hoping for the opportunity to procure a contract for migrant farmwork in the United States or Canada or to become a tractor sideman. Several others have recently turned to fishing as a vocation since it requires little initial investment and allows them a degree of independence from the estates and properties. Opportunities for field labor are always there and, as such, tend to be used as a last resort, particularly those on Deerfield Estate.

As in Leyburn, internal differences in wealth and status, while not readily observable to outsiders, are of major consequence to residents of Buckland. The primary factors distinguishing the various social levels in Buckland are land ownership and the position one enjoys in the employment hierarchy of the surrounding estates and properties. As owner of Stonleigh property and its copra factory, Hugh Bell heads the community in terms of power and influence, occupying a position akin to Leyburn's Mr. Attridge. While he himself appears politically inactive, his brother is a parish councillor; thus, "Mass Hugh" is quietly instrumental in local political decisions and in obtaining political favors for Buckland residents, such as a farm work card or placement in a trade school. He and his wife attend the Anglican church in Deerfield and, though they are known for their generous financial contributions to various community activities and funds, they do not actively participate in the planning and running of such functions. Like Mr. Attridge, Mr. Bell's interests in Buckland are more economic than social even though his family is indigenous to the district. Unlike his Leyburn counterpart, however, he is respected and well liked by most Buckland residents, many of whom are his employees as well as suppliers of coconut for his copra factory.

Below Hugh Bell, the four householders who head the community in terms of power and status (Level IIa) are the leading shopkeeper, fisherman, and cane farmer in Buckland, and the headmaster of the primary school. With the exception of the last, all are regular employers and all have sizeable coconut and banana holdings. They are influential in directing and financing community activity though they remain aloof from local social relations. For example, these individuals and their families actively organized and participated in a Community Council dance to raise money for needy children in the area; yet private parties held in their own homes are consistently restricted to persons of their own social and economic caliber, most of whom come from outside Buckland. Their children attend the "better" schools in Deerfield or the parish capital and, like the Bells, they are members of the Anglican church. With the exception of Mr. Thornley, head of the local branch of the Cane Farmers Association, they are generally well liked. Mr. Thornley is also justice of the peace, AME minister, and political "watchdog" for the incumbent party. Villagers regard his power and success with suspicion and fear, claiming that he has employed "obeah" and "necromancy" to achieve wealth and position for himself and to prevent other people in the community from advancing their status.

Unlike Hugh Bell's impressive home, which is located away from Buckland Center on Stonleigh Property, the homes of these four are not physically separated from the rest of the village. Their houses are, however, the best in Buckland, complete with electricity, indoor plumbing, refrigerators, and stereo sets. All four have at least one automobile at their disposal as well as equipment used for their occupations—tractors, hauling carts, jeeps, trucks, boats, and motors.

The next socioeconomic level in Buckland is comprised of those residents locally referred to as "three-quarter rich black men." They correspond to Level IIb in Leyburn. Generally, the thirty householders in this category earn a livelihood from their own land or business and do not work for wages on the estates or properties, unless in a mid-level position such as bookkeeper or clerk. Members of this level have usually made a substantial capital investment in a shop, van, tractor, or motor boat, and often employ at least part-time or seasonal wage labor. They own well-built, multi-room, cement or frame houses and some own automobiles and motorcycles. Of the twenty-one cohabiting householders, sixteen are legally married. Their children attend Buckland Primary School and, practically without exception, continue their education either in the nearby junior secondary school or a secondary school. Within this stratum are also found the leaders and officers of the many voluntary organizations throughout the community and the most active members of the AME, Methodist, and Baptist churches.

The remaining 197, or 64 percent, of the households in Buckland, are ranked in Level III. Within this level there are fifty households in Buckland that correspond closely to Level IIIa of Leyburn. For the most part, these domestic units have enough financial resources to meet their family responsibilities and secure a relatively stable existence. They are, to quote one informant, "betwixt and between," containing, as in Leyburn, those members who are straining toward higher status. Those who rank at this level tend to be more active in community affairs than the others of Level III, but usually as members of various organizations rather than as leaders. The 50 percent rate of legal marriage within this sublevel is generally greater than that of Level III as a whole. While many are small cultivators, this level includes a variety of occupational categories: tradesmen, independent fishermen, individuals who have had opportunities to do farmwork
abroad, small cane farmers, and those who enjoy year-round employment with either the estates or the ministry.

The remaining 147 households in Buckland belong to Level IIIb. Ten of these are completely dependent on the Parish Council for "poor relief," which, significantly, is nonexistent in Leyburn, where relatives and neighbors assume responsibility for such persons. The other households, a large proportion of them female-headed, are supported mainly through common labor (cane cutting and loading, coconut reaping and husking; for women, work at the copra factory boiling oil and planting grass on Windsor Farms) or through jobs ranked slightly above common labor such as penners (cattle tenders), sidemen, some fishermen, and domestics. This stratum also includes the households of old people living on small pensions who receive little, if any, support from their children. Most of this group are landless and cannot live independently of the estates or the "three-quarter rich black men" in the area who offer occasional employment. Though a few may attempt to farm on their own, several in this level are among those who were displaced from Windsor Farms and, thus, lack the land room to pursue more than a limited cultivation.

Housing for this level is generally poor—one or two rooms made out of wattle and daub and most frequently rented or leased rather than owned. Legal marriage is not the rule, and many of the youngsters do not complete primary school. The two Poco churches receive their entire support from this section of Buckland’s population, particularly from among the women.

Despite the lower rate of landownership in Buckland, the quality of life in this community is generally better than that of Leyburn, even for its poorest citizens. Superior climate and soil conditions as well as greater educational and economic opportunities provide more advantages and alternatives for Buckland residents, and, as one Level III resident who had recently migrated from a neighboring parish claimed, "it better here, if we cyan [can’t] find wuk we can still find crab and banana and coconut and fe n’yam’ [to eat]."

If the two communities were compared according to the intensity of intra-community relations and conservatism, Buckland would score as less intensive and less conservative than Leyburn. As in Leyburn, the presence of long-standing families, tied to the community through their interest in property or years of employment with a particular estate, interconnected as kin, neighbors, and so forth, contributes to community entanglement and poses a constraining influence on the behavior and relationships of residents. Unlike Leyburn, however, continuing migration, both in and out of Buckland, as well as social and economic relations with surrounding communities, provides residents with considerably more social and economic options. Thus, while gossip and community censure still operate in Buckland, they are, for a large proportion of residents, less consequential. Residents of this community, on the whole, enjoy more personal freedom and are less influenced by the pressures and reservations of local life.

**DEERFIELD**

In Deerfield, the sugar estate has had such a pervasive and unifying effect on adjoining settlements that to examine any one of them separately would present a distorted picture of local life. The unit of analysis, then, consists of the entire tract of company-owned land (nearly nine thousand acres) divided into seven "farms" and seven rural "neighborhoods," which border and intrude on this land. Deerfield Estate occupies the alluvial flood and coastal plains known as the Guava River Valley. The Guava River, which marks the interior boundary of the estate, overflows each year, carrying alluvial deposits far from the river bed and creating one of the most fertile regions in Jamaica. Going toward the sea from Deerfield Estate lies a range of small hills (previously mentioned in the discussion of Buckland) which are planted in banana and coconut. These provide an alternative source of employment for estate workers during the dull season.

A major coastal road transects the estate, linking it with the capitals of two parishes and eventually with Kingston. This road is also used to transport raw sugar to Friendship Wharf, ten miles away, for export. At one time, a railroad system crisscrossed the entire estate, carrying sugar directly to Friendship; but in recent years this has been replaced by sugar trucks, which, during reaping season, commute several times a day between factory and wharf.

Less than half the total acreage of the estate is planted in sugar. Much of the remainder consists of large expanses of swamp and bog, at the end of which lies an isolated and dangerous beach. This swamp is navigable in only a few places with a boat small enough to glide through the tortuous, alligator-ridden passages. There are a few small tracts of cultivable land within the swamp, but the access to these is so difficult that the company has designated them as "waste land" and they remain essentially undeveloped. Other sections of company-owned land unsuitable for cane cultivation are used for grazing dairy cattle and for cultivation of minor crops such as cacao, banana, and coconut. None of these crops has been developed as intensively as sugar, and the dairy cattle are used exclusively to provide the managerial staff with fresh milk.

Finally, remaining sections of hillside land are reserved for the
living quarters of managerial staff members. For the highest levels of management these include not only well-designed, substantial houses but enough land for roomy and productive gardens as well. Workers who reside on company-owned land live in barracks-like housing located along the roads that traverse the cane fields. Six such clusters of workers' housing exist on the estate, most of which were originally erected by United Fruit Company for its workers before World War II. The encroaching cane fields permit no room for residents of these dwellings to cultivate even a kitchen garden.

The population of Deerfield numbers over six thousand, including children. Like Leyburn and Buckland, the majority are of Afro-Jamaican ancestry with a small minority of East Indians and a few Caucasian families from Great Britain who were sent to Jamaica to occupy the top management posts. The greatest proportion of this population resides in densely settled neighborhoods located on the steep hills that surround and divide the level expanse planted in sugar. Each of these rural neighborhoods has its own place, name, and set of crossroad shops, but blend one into another so that only long-time residents of the area can distinguish boundaries of the settlements.

These neighborhoods were originally separate communities formed in the post-emancipation period, when plots of estate land were sold off to small settlers. At one time several small sugar plantations occupied the Guava River region that is now Deerfield Estate. Each had its individual mill powered by animals, water, wind, or steam. Slave labor was used for planting and harvesting the cane. After manumission, the old cane fields were gradually given over to agricultural pursuits that required less labor intensive as the sugar industry. Banana and coconut production and some cattle raising were pursued under the auspices of the United Fruit Company and their competitors, Jamaica Company and Pringle Estates. In the mid-1920s, this large tract of land was purchased by a foreign syndicate for the purpose of cultivating and grinding sugar. The factory was erected and the post-emancipation settlements gradually assumed the configuration of rural neighborhoods surrounding a large agro-industrial complex.

Descendants of the original small settlers living in these communities became wage laborers on the sugar estate for at least part of the year. However, the local population, most of whom were engaged in own-account cultivation, could not provide the amount of labor required by the estate during the reaping season. Consequently, large numbers of single men were encouraged to migrate to Deerfield on a seasonal basis. Many of these seasonal laborers developed ties with community residents and established households with local women. Instead of migrating seasonally, they tended to remain in Deerfield as permanent residents, so that now only 25 percent of the estate workers who reside in Deerfield are native to the area. Meanwhile, indigenous residents subdivided their already small plots, either for rental or sale, to accommodate the migrants. This trend made them more dependent on the estate and less on own-account agriculture as a source of income. Today the population of Deerfield has essentially stabilized; fewer than fifty workers migrate to the area each year and the large seasonal fluctuations in population are essentially past history.

Shops and churches are practically the only facilities that are indigenous at the neighborhood level. Most other agencies and institutions did not evolve locally but were strategically planned and placed through the collective efforts of the estate management, the Sugar Welfare Bureau, and the national government. Supposedly, the intent behind the scattered placement of these facilities was to serve the entire estate community rather than the particular neighborhood in which they happened to be located. In addition, this scheme has, by their own admission, served the interests of politicians by helping to promote a broader distribution of votes. The three primary schools are located in Ipswich, Wilmington, and Dover. Dorchester houses the hospital, the family planning clinic, and the junior secondary school. The police station and post office are located near the market place, gas station, and "wholesale" shops that form a cluster of buildings along the main road passing through Ipswich. Further on in Northfield is the trade school. The credit union and union offices are situated in Wilmington along with the movie theater, a restaurant, and several large and busy rum shops.

Churches of various denominations are located throughout the sugar belt. The Anglican church was located in Ipswich, but a serious fire destroyed the structure, and the church members are now negotiating with the company for another, more central site to rebuild the church. The Methodist church is in Dover; Seventh Day Adventist and Baptist in Dorchester; Church of God in Chelsea; Jehovah's Witness in Wilmington; and Friends in Northfield. Small branches or "missions" of these churches are also located in various locations throughout the several communities.

Convenient to all these communities, across from the commercial section of Wilmington, is the entrance to the Deerfield Estate compound including factory, tractor shed, and office buildings. Sugar production is central to the economy of Deerfield, and, because this production is seasonal, household earnings fluctuate from being relatively high and steady during the reaping seasons to meager and sporadic during the dull season. This affects not only estate employees but shopkeepers, artisans, tradesmen, domestics, drivers, and so forth. From January to July, Deerfield is filled with activity, particularly on Friday,
when the rum shops are lively, the market place is teeming, and higglers (market vendors) have set up their merchandise at the crossroads and the paybill offices. Crop time is that season of the year when courtships flourish, houses are repaired, medical problems are attended to, and new clothing is purchased. Attendance at schools also increases, since parents can then afford uniforms, books, and the small fees.

From August through December dependable weekly income gives way to sporadic day work. Most of the workers in both factory and field are laid off, and the rare opportunity to work during this time depends on how well the worker is liked by management. The advantageous location of Deerfield next to coconut and banana estates provides some employment opportunities during the dull season, though they are low-paying and irregular. The government and estate have also collaborated on a system in which the majority of public road work is done when the crop is off. A few men try fishing during the dull season, but this requires an established affiliation with a boat-owning fisherman. In previous years, cultivation was a major economic activity carried out in the dull season. Tomatoes, cucumbers, pumpkins, melons, and other ground crops were planted in between the rows of cane. However, the burning of cane and the use of chemical herbicides sprayed from airplanes have obviated most of these activities, though many workers continue to plant gardens on estate waste land. In general, while laborers in this area may have more opportunities for dull season work than those in other parts of the island, jobs are still at a premium, usually uncertain, and often require walking long distances daily.

While management complains regularly that there is a serious labor problem in the area, laborers complain that they cannot find work. Actually, both perspectives are accurate. Management would like to attract younger, stronger, more productive men who would remain throughout the entire reaping season and would work on both flat and hillside cane lands. Laborers, on the other hand, prefer to work on the level land, where work is both safer and more lucrative. In the beginning of the season, everyone is eager to work in order to obtain steady cash after the long dull season. By the middle of reaping season, however, when the weather becomes uncomfortably hot, the estate has difficulty retaining workers. The most dependable workers are in the thirty-five to fifty age bracket. Management contends that they miss most of the worker's physically most productive years—eighteen to forty—and that these young men, living with their parents, are interested only in making enough money to provide themselves with ganja and to "sport a daughter" (girlfriend). It is true that the younger workers participate only minimally and sporadically in cane production. Young men ordinarily do not become serious, reliable workers until they near the age of thirty, when they have set up households and assumed responsibilities for a woman and children. Indeed, most young persons in the area, as in Buckland, regard field labor for the estate as a last resort for obtaining money. They are allowed, even encouraged, to live at home, without contributing to the household income, in order to hold out for work that offers more opportunity and prestige, such as a job with a factory or as a tractor sideman. The youngest workers in the cane fields consistently hail from outside the sugar belt where lack of land room for farming on the parental homestead forces them, at least temporarily, into the sugar industry to supplement the family household income.

More than in the other two settlements, social stratification in Deerfield conforms closely to that in Jamaican society at large. Of the three communities, Deerfield has a greater representation in the higher socioeconomic levels and these are more easily distinguished by the casual observer. While color is of little significance in differentiating socioeconomic levels in the other two communities, in Deerfield it is consequential. In general, however, the overriding factor in the structure and stratification of social life in Deerfield is not color, but the organizational hierarchy of the sugar estate.

The very top of the social pyramid (Level Ia) are the highest levels of estate management. Most of this group are white expatriates. Though this group has profound effects on Deerfield, its members seldom if ever participate in local social activities. The men in this stratum are known to the community through contact on the job, but their wives are seen only in passing and remain unknown in Deerfield, except by a few domestics and favored higglers. This group clings together, their closest associates being other expatriates residing in Kingston or in cosmopolitan areas of the north coast. Their children are educated abroad, visiting their parents in Jamaica only on holidays. They drive expensive cars and occupy the largest, most well-built homes on the estate, which are located in a section referred to by local residents as Peacock Hill. This group comprises what M. G. Smith (1965a: 163) describes as the white section of Jamaican society.

In Deerfield, Level Ib is comprised primarily of the Jamaicans who occupy high-level management positions on the estate as well as the professionals and large cane farmers and property owners in the area. Ethnically, this group is Jamaican but many are of fair complexion, commonly referred to as "Jamaican White." Without exception, this group is legally married and have wives who are often university-educated and professionals themselves. Their children attend private boarding schools in Kingston or the north coast rather than locally, most of them going on to university in Jamaica or abroad. They belong to the
Anglican church and attend services regularly. With regard to material indices, they are hardly distinguishable from Level Ia, the major differences lying in nationality and cultural background. Like Mr. Attridge and Mr. Bell, in terms of the national system of stratification, they belong to Jamaica's rural upper middle class.

Level Ia in Deerfield consists primarily of Jamaican senior staff members, most of whom have attained their position through on-the-job promotion rather than through educational qualifications, though many have completed secondary school. This category also includes some teachers and nurses, mid-level ministerial appointments, and certain shopkeepers and business persons. Though whites are absent, this level is the most diversified in color and has a substantial proportion of East Indians and Chinese, again conforming to national patterns. Most wives in this group either stay at home or work at relatively prestigious jobs—nursing, teaching, secretarial or bookkeeping work, or shopkeeping. Legal marriage is the rule, although a few cohabited for several years before entering into a marriage contract. Anglican and Methodist churches are the most frequented among this group. Their children attend the primary school at Wilmington, the most prestigious and best staffed of the three primary schools in Deerfield. Completing high school in the parish capital, many then go on to college or university in Jamaica. It is this level that is most active in the organization of community social activities in Deerfield. They promote cricket matches with other estates, sponsor dances in conjunction with the hospital, arrange holiday parties, and direct the activities of churches, credit unions, so forth. Most in this level have at least one car, several "luxuries" in their comparatively well-furnished houses, such as a television and a stereo set, and can afford to employ routine domestic help.

Equally diversified, Level Iib includes a variety of occupational types including junior staff positions on the sugar estate, technicians, clerks, small cane farmers, shopkeepers, tradesmen, some ministerial positions, transport owners, and larger-scale fishermen and cultivators. Many of these individuals work for the estate but carry on their private trades or businesses as well. Composed mainly of indigenous households, this stratum includes most of the remaining East Indian and Chinese families. Seventh Day Adventists and Jehovah's Witnesses derive their greatest membership from this level, though other denominations are represented as well. While this group, as a whole, is literate, the level of education usually does not exceed primary school. Many have received some special training in a particular trade or craft. The children of this level usually go on to the junior secondary school rather than directly to secondary school and then, perhaps, to a trade school to complete their education.

Level III in Deerfield constitutes the "black section" of Jamaican society as delineated by M. G. Smith (1965a). As in Buckland and Leyburn, Level IIIa contains the slightly better-off members of this lowest socioeconomic section. Included in this group are factory laborers and field timekeepers, generally considered a cut above the "common field laborer." These individuals may actually be paid less than the cane cutter, but their jobs have more prestige and more influence. Some of these are cane workers who have regular alternative employment in the dull season or whose wives perform work—which helps to elevate the status of their households—such as dressmaking, small shopkeeping, higglering, or employment in the hospital or clinics. For the most part, their children attend school regularly, and education is regarded as extremely important among this group. Many of this level are "baptized Christians" and adhere to the various injunctions imposed by their fundamentalist churches. Generally, the material accoutrements of Level II are lacking here. They do not have indoor plumbing, electricity, or access to vehicles. However, the ownership of land and a home, a degree of literacy, active participation in union activities, and legal marriage serve to distinguish this group from the more stagnant members of Level III in Deerfield.

Level IIIb in this community is composed primarily of landless wage laborers who depend almost entirely on seasonal employment at Deerfield Estate for their livelihood. Women in this group may also do seasonal day work on the estate such as planting grass, spreading manure, or carrying water to the field workers. Consensual union is the rule and marriage is the exception. Women attend the revival churches, while men are generally not churchgoers. However, Cumina's activities are popular. Housing in this level is of poor quality and usually rented. Several live in the barracks furnished by the estate, which saves rent money, but the poor conditions, lack of privacy, and relentless mosquitoes force many into rentals off the estate land. Children of this level have the most sporadic school attendance, and it is not unusual for them to drop out before completing primary school. Thus, illiteracy continues to be high within this stratum. Labor unions have been the main organizing factor and source of power for this group, though the effectiveness of the unions is often debated and rumors of "deals" between management and labor abound within the community.

The decentralized location of facilities, agencies, and institutions has promoted a regional, rather than community, focus to local life. Inhabitants of the various neighborhoods perform intermingling at market, in the churches, or at work on the estate; thus, strong ties develop between persons who may not necessarily be neighbors, promoting a supra-neighborhood quality to social relations. Whereas in Leyburn and,
to a lesser degree, in Buckland there are overlapping relationships in which one’s neighbor may be also kin, co-worker, and fellow member of a voluntary organization, in Deerfield relations between residents are more one-dimensional and universalistic.

A high degree of residential mobility within the sugar belt compounds the effects of regionalization of agencies and institutions on social relations. This is largely a result of migrants to the area who rent, rather than own, their dwelling places. In Leyburn and Buckland, where land ownership is more prevalent, families remain on their own homesteads, and neighbor relationships develop over years and sometimes over generations. In Deerfield, on the other hand, households frequently change their place of residence and neighbor relations are less significant than other supra-neighborhood ties, which tend to be developed more along class lines. Thus, the size and diversity of life in Deerfield provide its residents with significantly more options and alternatives than are available in the two other communities. It is less conservative and conformist, and offers greater personal freedom of behavior to its inhabitants.

Notes

1. The descriptions in this chapter are not intended to be an exhaustive, detailed examination of every aspect of life in these communities, but a summary and comparison of those features that are most germane to the analyses of ganja use that appear in subsequent chapters.

2. The description of Leyburn and the findings from this community that appear throughout this study were first presented in Rubin and Comitas (1975: 36–62).

3. All the dollar amounts mentioned throughout the text refer to Jamaican currency. At the time of the research $1.00, Jamaican, was approximately equal to $1.20, U.S.

4. "Ras" is a commonly used Jamaican curse word, a contraction of "your ass."

5. Sidemen are assistants to mechanics or vehicle operators who function as apprentices with the hope of one day becoming drivers.

6. Farm work cards are issued by the Ministry of Labor and allocated locally by officials of the incumbent party usually through a system of political patronage.

7. Obeah is the Jamaican version of black magic, based on the belief that spirits of the dead, called "duppies," can be activated by a practitioner of the black arts, an "obeah man," to bring illness or misfortune to individuals. "Science" practiced by a "science man" is then needed to counteract the obeah.

8. The distinction between universalistic and particularistic behavior and the ranking of communities in this regard is derived from Bailey (1971: 4–8).

9. Cumina is a traditional ceremonial dance in which a group of men sit together and drum rhythmically while other men and women dance in single file around them. The objective of the drummers is to excite the dancers and put them "in spirit." According to informants, the custom is derived from the days of slavery and is held to celebrate important occasions and life cycle events—funerals, weddings, house openings, and so forth.
Ganja in an Institutional Framework

Ganja use is widespread in all three communities. Table 1 shows that in Leyburn, where the degree of ganja usage was determined for 91.5 percent of the male population over fifteen, 62 percent were currently smoking or had smoked ganja in the past; in Buckland, where data pertaining to degree of ganja consumption were obtained for 94 percent of the adult male population, three-quarters (75 percent) are or were ganja smokers; and in Deerfield, where the population is too large to question in entirety, a sample of 282 male estate employees and adult men living on the estate and selected perimeters indicated that 68 percent are current or former smokers. These rates may all be regarded as conservative figures, since those informants identified as non-smokers may have smoked for a short period of time in their youth or possibly experimented with ganja once or twice.

Not only is this practice widespread, but it comprises a highly patterned set of activities with a code of rules, values, and relationships—in short, all the essential elements of a social institution as defined by Nadel (1951). This chapter describes the ganja complex as a functioning social institution in the specific contexts of Leyburn, Buckland, and Deerfield. For this purpose the ganja complex is divided into the three phases of cultivation, distribution, and consumption.

CULTIVATION

The physical conditions for growing ganja in Jamaica are excellent, particularly in the hilly interior, where unattended bush lands are available for cultivation. Essentially, all the potential grower requires is access to land that is relatively isolated and removed from regular traffic. In most regions of the island, two crops a year can be harvested, the growing
cycles generally running from April to August and from June to November. When approximately two inches high, the seedlings are watered gently every day. In two or three weeks, they are transplanted in the field, where watering is continued every other day until the young trees are four weeks old. After that time only occasional budding is required until the crop reaches maturity or becomes kali. Estimates of the average amount of ganja produced by each bush or tree range from one to three pounds, depending on the stage at which it is reaped and the quality of the weed.

In none of the communities in this study does ganja production exist on the scale that is alleged to occur in other parishes, where supposedly acres of ganja are planted and police raids take days to complete. Ganja cultivation in these three communities is carried out neither by large syndicates nor by a criminal element but rather by low-income family men attempting to ameliorate their situation. Although a number of variables, such as family sanctions, religious proclamations, and fear of legal action, inhibit some individuals from growing ganja, the major determining factors for persons entering into this illegal activity appear to be the lack of better economic alternatives coupled with access to holdings appropriate for the cultivation of ganja. Of the three communities, Leyburn provides the best conditions for widespread cultivation of ganja; individual land ownership is high and large mountainside holdings, impractical for most crops, have been left fallow and unattended. Of the 182 households in this community, at least fifty-four (30 percent) are known to include a member who plants some quantity of ganja. Given the secrecy attached to this illegal cultivation, this is probably a conservative figure. Nor does this figure include individuals who were former “planters” but have since discontinued the practice. Of the fifty-four who currently plant ganja, thirty-seven cultivate solely for personal and household consumption while the remaining seventeen cultivate for commercial purposes as well. In Leyburn, the distinctions between these two categories of cultivators are significant and will be cited in subsequent chapters. The present discussion will focus primarily on commercial ganja production.

Despite the prevalence of cultivators and the relatively ideal conditions that exist in this community, Leyburn is not a particularly large producer of ganja. The largest commercial grower cultivates approximately two hundred roots. The next four average around one hundred roots and the smaller producers plant from thirty to fifty. Leyburn residents who plant purely for domestic consumption may “jam a ten root” (sow ten ganja plants) in a remote corner of their bush but, because of infrequent tending, anticipate that only two or three, if any, will reach fruition. The exceptions to this comparatively limited production are those men who have planted one or two large ganja crops in the past, grossed a sizeable cash payment, and then never planted again. Certain village men are known to have done this in order to “get a start,” that is, build a house or provide the cash outlay necessary for investment in some legal enterprise. For example, a Leyburn man who runs a taxi service into Kingston financed the down payment on his vehicle by cultivating a huge ganja crop. Since that time, however, he has planted only a few roots each year for personal consumption.

While there is considerable variation among Leyburn farmers in their commitment to ganja as a commercial venture, none of the seventeen relies exclusively or primarily on herbs as a source of income. Rather, ganja cultivation is incorporated as an occupational sideline that fits well within their life style and economic undertakings. As a convenient adjunct to the cultivation of legal crops, ganja offers several advantages to the small farmers of Leyburn. The problems posed by remote and inaccessible holdings preclude the cultivation of perishable food crops, which must not only be tended regularly but marketed within a limited time range. Ganja, on the other hand, is necessarily grown on such holdings. Moreover, it can be cured, stored, and removed for sale at a time that is optimal for the farmer. Unlike food crops that require constant tending, ganja needs little care after the first few weeks until reaping time. Finally, the price of ganja is comparatively stable, particularly in Leyburn, where a pound of weed brings about twenty dollars from a middleman. Food crops, on the other hand, are often brought to a fluctuating market in which farmers may be forced to sell at a reduced profit or even at a loss.

While there are currently no Leyburn farmers who are willing to risk their entire farming enterprise to ganja, it is planted as a crop that makes use of land that is unfit for legal crops and that can be conveniently combined with legal cultivation. Thus, while this illegal activity entails many social and economic risks, including imprisonment, fines, public embarrassment, and physical danger, there is general agreement among many cultivators in Leyburn that, given the nature of their holdings, a ganja crop is worth attempting. In this group, all claimed that they would not bother with ganja cultivation if they had large enough, level, and easily irrigated holdings.

Leyburn planters who reside and farm on the mountainside, removed from the main village, generally sow ganja among their food crops in a typical pattern of mixed cropping. Ganja planted in this manner not only receives the same attention as legal crops but has the additional advantage of being well disguised among the corn and congo peas. If, however, farmers have control of cultivable land located close to the main road, that land is reserved for legal crops while ganja is
planted alone on an isolated patch of bushland and tended when tree crops are reaped or stock is tethered.

It is not unusual for ganja to be planted by one farmer on land belonging to another. Mr. Tuttle, for example, an elderly farmer who seldom visits his forty acres on Ashfield Mountain, was surprised to discover nearly fifty ganja seedlings carefully sown on his land. Himself a non-user, he suspected that the crop had been planted by the young farmer whom he had hired to tend his cows; consequently, he ignored the presence of the ganja. Since it is the older, middle-class residents who own the largest expanses of fallow bush land, they ironically harbor more cultivation even though they are generally not ganja consumers. Two of Leyburn's strongest commercial cultivators, for instance, plant weed on a portion of the land that they rent from Mr. Attridge, Leyburn's wealthiest citizen, who is adamantly opposed to the use of ganja.

In direct contrast with Leyburn, ganja cultivation is nearly absent in Buckland. Individual land ownership is less prevalent and plots are not isolated and remote but crossed with well-traveled pathways that interconnect yards and neighborhoods. Even more important, there is little wasteland in Buckland, most all of the individually owned holdings being effectively cultivated in coconuts, bananas, and other well-paying legal crops that provide a good living with limited risks.

There are, however, five Ras Tafarian men who are known occasionally to cultivate herbs on the "forest" land of Windsor Farms. On first discovering their presence, Mr. Whitney, the senior manager, directed the bulldozer driver to "mash down" their ganja cultivation. The driver refused, fearing that the "Rastas" would harm him. Mr. Pearson, the overseer of Windsor Farms, felt that the driver's fears were unjustified, but he did not pursue the matter because the Rastas had, in the past, given him several days of free labor for the privilege of using the land. The Ras Tafarian men are not, however, members of the community and the ganja that they cultivate is diverted from the community. Unlike Leyburn, ganja planting is not typically integrated with the Buckland farmer's legal enterprises; similar to Leyburn, however, when ganja cultivation does occur, it is almost always a subsidiary economic activity. For example, two young Buckland men who work as vehicle operators for the nearby sugar estate report that, when unemployed during the dull season, they assist their uncle in cultivating ganja in the mountainous interior of a neighboring parish. Their uncle is a forest ranger who plants ganja on crown land and, according to his nephews, has the advantage of being assigned to guide the pilot of a police helicopter and, thus, easily diverts the attention of the authorities from his ganja fields.

Similarly, in Deerfield a few of the seasonally employed cane workers use the dull period to cultivate a ganja crop if they have interior land at their disposal. As in Buckland, however, individual land ownership in Deerfield is limited and the types of holdings are not suited for extensive ganja cultivation. For personal or household consumption, it is commonplace to camouflage a few ganja plants within kitchen gardens or on "pepper-corn" cultivation (plots situated on patches of estate wasteland). Some householders, who have no space even for a small garden, plant ganja in pans which are discreetly hung in a tree or some other high place, well out of view.

While such small planters may occasionally sell their surplus, the prevalence of commercial ganja cultivation is generally limited by the nature of holdings in Deerfield. Within the great expanse of bogs and marsh that separates the arable estate land from the sea, however, there are small plots of elevated cultivable land. Referred to as Cheapside, this tract is owned in part by Deerfield Estate and in part by their neighbor, C. J. Willis, a large sugar and banana planter. Because of difficult access, both owners have written off the entire area as wasteland, essentially ignoring even the arable sections. The near side of Cheapside is located on the perimeters of Ipswich and Dover farms and can be reached overland. Here several cane workers have each "captured" a few squares of land and established small gardens that they cultivate during the dull season. Though some of these cane-worker cultivators occasionally plant limited quantities of ganja, the proximity of this land to the sugar estate makes it risky for commercial cultivation on a larger scale. The far reaches of Cheapside, on the other hand, are accessible only by sea or by a road, several miles long, that circumcribes the entire area. Furthermore, the alligator-ridden swamps that surround most portions of elevated land deter men from leaving the road on foot. As in Leyburn, the characteristics of remoteness and inaccessibility make these sections of Cheapside opportune for commercial cultivation of ganja; there are currently eight men who are known to plant ganja regularly on this land.

Unlike at Leyburn, where commercial ganja production can be incorporated with legal crops, Deerfield ganja cultivation is not easily combined with other forms of agricultural activity. Daily visits to Cheapside are not feasible except by sea. Consequently, commercial ganja cultivation in the sugar belt is more or less restricted to those who have a boat at their disposal or to those who have few other commitments and are willing to spend days and even weeks in the bush. While not practiced exclusively of other vocations, cultivation of herbs on Cheapside is more a specialist activity and is given more serious and concentrated effort than that in Leyburn. Thus, in Deerfield ganja production is less prevalent but more intense. The largest commercial producer in Deer-
field estimates that he plants about seven squares in total. The other seven known cultivators have approximately two or three squares in ganja cultivation—all surpassing the largest producer in Leyburn. In both communities ganja production is carried out not by a criminal element but by low-income family men.

In Leyburn, most ganja planters ignore the April to August crop because of unpredictable rainfall. In Deerfield, however, both growing seasons are exploited. In fact, one producer reported that in former years he planted continuously from late February through July. This, of course, required that he stay in the field for almost an entire year tending and reaping. In both Leyburn and Deerfield, the earliest stage of the growth cycle is the most rigorous. Seedlings require regular watering and protection from insect pests. In Leyburn, damage from winds and overflooding must be guarded against while Cheapside planters must contend with the destruction of young trees by crabs. Planters from both communities report a variety of magical practices that help to protect the crop in this early phase. For example, among Deerfield planters there is almost universal agreement that some forms of precaution centering around sexual activities are necessary to ensure the success of the crop. A few purists claim that total abstinence from sex until the crop is harvested is the only way to guard against failure, while others say that it is permissible to engage in sexual intercourse provided seven days elapse before returning to the crop. Still others maintain that washing in the river with germicidal soap suffices before handling the crop again. In Leyburn, no such injunctions are mentioned, though avoidance of contact with menstruating women is reported in all three communities for all crops, legal or otherwise.

The process of budding the young plants is carried out by cultivators in both Leyburn and Deerfield. This not only improves the quality of the plant, rendering the foliage thick and sticky, but has the additional advantage of making the trees grow low and wide and thus less noticeable. In Deerfield, planters are adamantly opposed to the use of fertilizer, insisting that “fertilize herbs will sick you.” Though Leyburn men do not use fertilizer, they are essentially neutral, claiming simply that fertilizer is unnecessary to produce quality herbs. In general, the cultivation techniques employed in both Leyburn and Deerfield are traditional. More sophisticated procedures that are commonplace in other areas of the island, such as establishing nurseries for a ready supply of seeds and suckers or separating the male plants to improve the quality, are not practiced here.

In the final phase of curing, a one- to three-week process, the ganja is placed on a piece of corrugated metal or on barbecues built in the field for drying pimento berries or coffee beans. Vigilance is required at the curing stage in both communities to ward off birds and to protect the ganja from winds and rain.

While ganja is most vulnerable to natural hazards at the seedling and curing stages, the most precarious phase, in terms of social risks, occurs just before the crop is ready for reaping. At that time, the very conditions that encourage men in the cultivation of ganja become impediments to success. Since ganja plants are generally grown on remote and not easily guarded land, the planter is at constant risk of pradial larceny. For example, Dudley Wright, a Deerfield cane cutter, recounted an incident that occurred in the hill farming community where he had lived prior to coming to the sugar belt. Having acquired some ganja seeds, he had decided to try, for the first time, planting a small ganja crop in a secluded site on family land. After the first few weeks, he returned to the crop only a few times each month for budding and told no one of his experiment. In the meantime, his wife, Miss Jem, had reserved a few of the seeds and succeeded in growing “one lovely likkle [little] tree” in a pan that she hid so well that even Mass Dudley was unaware of his wife’s endeavor. One evening she surprised her husband with a gift of the ganja, matured and cured, from her tree. Dudley invited a friend to have a smoke and “it so nice” that they took some to a neighbor’s house where they shared it with several men in the community. Two days later, while returning from his cultivation, Mass Dudley detoured to check on his ganja crop, which was nearly ready for reaping. On arrival at the site, he discovered that the entire crop was stolen, “not a leaf, not a stick fe lef [was left].” He reasoned that Miss Jem’s ganja, which he had shared with his neighbors, had precipitated the theft. “Dem believe me have and dem look till dem find.”

Often the discovery of a ganja crop is not purposeful or conspiratorial, as in the case of Dudley Wright, but occurs by happenstance. The effects, however, may be just as drastic. Mr. Brown, a gatekeeper on Deerfield Estate, once planted a fairly large ganja crop on the wasteland perimeters of the Chelsea farm. He had carefully nurtured and guarded the crop through the spring months and was planning to reap in early July. However, in the last week of June, a cane fire broke out on Chelsea. Men on the gang were instructed to leave their work and fight the fire, approaching from behind the farm. This required that they pass directly through Brown’s ganja cultivation. Some of Brown’s friends, who worked on the gang, later described the situation: “Dem go in a t’inn [thin] man an’ cum out a fat man,” their shirts and pants stuffed with young kali. That afternoon, as his friends passed through the gate, they called to Brown, “Your business mash up [ruined], man,” and witnessed “big eye-water run down him face.”

Brown’s enterprise was unusual in Deerfield. Commercial crops of
ganja are generally not planted on the threshold of cultivated estate lands, where they are vulnerable to theft or raids. Brown, like Dudley Wright, was an amateur planter. Though he had sown a few roots of ganja on his "grung" (ground) in the past, this was the first time he had experimented with a ganja crop of commercial proportions. Men who have more experience with cultivating ganja attempt to minimize this risk of theft and raids by planting in the most remote areas and by distributing their plots in several locations. Cheapside planters remain in the bush night and day, guarding their ganja as it approaches fruition. In these swamplands, where more vigilance is possible, growers generally wait to reap in the kali stage, when the weight is greater and the price is higher. In Leyburn, however, where planters are not free to patrol their crops in this fashion, only a few men let their weed reach maturity, with many reaping as early as three months after planting. The constant demands of food crops, if planted in a separate location, impede adequate surveillance of ganja in this community. Thus, in contrast to Deerfield, ganja planted among food crops (provided the cultivation is sufficiently far from main traffic) has the best chance of success, for it is given greater supervision against both natural and social hazards. In the event of a police raid, however, there is a much greater chance of conviction when the ganja is planted among food crops, particularly if it is close to the homestead.

In Leyburn, praedial larceny of legal crops ranks second only to domestic squabbles as the chief source of complaints lodged at the Leyburn police station. A victimized ganja grower, however, even if he knows the identity of the thief, has no recourse to the law and is left to his own resources to protect his illegal enterprise. For example, Mr. Bloomfield, a ganja cultivator, discovered that Mr. Lewis, another ganja cultivator, had been stealing his herbs. Recognizing the futility of a direct confrontation, he went to people closely associated with Lewis and his wife and told them that he knew Lewis was stealing his ganja, that he planned to put poisonous seeds that resembled ganja seeds on a few of his plants, and that this poison would bring instant death to the consumer. Bloomfield imparted all this with an air of great secrecy and with the plea that his plan not be divulged to Lewis. Predictably, Lewis' friends warned him of the "plot" and the depredation of Mr. Bloomfield's ganja ceased.

If this type of approach fails, the ganja cultivator still has recourse to other forms of social control. For example, Pastor Morgan, the leader of the Pentecostal church in Leyburn, is also the local "science man." In this dual capacity, he keeps well informed about local events and has intimate knowledge of relationships among the villagers. With this information and his position, he has amassed sufficient power to manipulate events to the advantage of his clients. Mr. Cherrington, for example, discovered that a large quantity of ganja that he had cut and left for curing was stolen. After making discreet inquiries, he determined the identity of the thief. Unable to go to the police, he turned to Pastor Morgan with his problem. Pastor Morgan, while not guaranteeing the return of the stolen ganja, instructed Mr. Cherrington on the steps he should take to punish the thief. Following these instructions, Mr. Cherrington posted a piece of parchment on a pear tree near the place where the ganja had been stolen. On the parchment, inscribed with dove's blood, was a biblical psalm decorated with magical symbols. A few days after the posting, the wife of the thief came to Mr. Cherrington with the half-cured ganja, begged for forgiveness, and asked him to remove the curse. Mr. Cherrington, gratified with the results, assumed that the thief had seen the parchment and recognized its significance. In reality, the wife of the thief was a member of Pastor Morgan's congregation, and he had called her in, lectured her strongly on the possible consequences of her husband's actions, and told her to return the ganja before serious misfortune befell her and her husband.

An awareness of the meaning of magical symbols is shared by the community at large: eggs laid carefully between the corners of ganja plots, posts with inverted bottles, and parchment posted on nearby trees are all well-known indications that the plot is protected by "science." Ganja planters in both communities report the use of magical symbols and have reputations for the frequent use of "science" to harm poachers. For example, one cultivator was heard describing to friends how he lays out a fine thread on his plot to catch a thief and then employs "science" to "mad" him. By using the broken thread in the formula, he can activate the "science" without having to determine the identity of the thief. Planters, in fact, often encourage such reputations even when falsely accused. For example, Mr. Faircough, the leading planter in Deerfield, was once raided by the police. Shortly after, one of Faircough's competitors was drowned at sea and the rumor quickly spread that Faircough had employed "science" to drown this man, who had allegedly informed on him. In private conversation, however, Faircough confided that it was Mr. Willis of Willis Estates who had discovered his ganja while shooting birds in the marshes with some friends from Kingston. Not wanting to be implicated in ganja cultivation, Mr. Willis immediately reported to the police and a raid followed early the next morning. Nevertheless, when among fellow villagers, Faircough does nothing to protest the rumor relating him to the drowning and prefers to maintain a reputation as a local "bad man."

There is no doubt that the sanctions that ganja cultivators employ to protect their crops have some influence. When men were questioned
what they would do if they accidentally happened across a man’s ganja cultivation, only a few responded that they would take a smoke and only three of these indicated by their answers that they would not be afraid in such circumstances:

Stop and take a smoke. . . . Maybe tek a branch. Me nah fraid a dem.
I would take a branch. . . . It use for all mankind.
Only get as much to smoke and leave the cultivation (if it come to de smokin stage). Me nah fraid.

Others would stop and smoke but indicated their unwillingness to remain in the field for long:

Take up a cigar from drop leaf [from leaves that have fallen off the plant].
Take a little cigar and gone.
If green, pick a branch, but hide.

The vast majority claimed they would not touch the ganja, referring specifically to fear of the planter:

Me nah trouble it fe planter ambush men [either with a gun or with “science”].
I wouldn’t trouble it. You could lose your life. . . . Dem gun you down.¹
Move away quick, the man may see me and hurt me. . . . lick me down.
Turn back—maybe planter will come and take me for a t’ief. Him would harm you. . . . trow stone pon you.
Just pass. . . . Me nah trouble it. Men are tricky [referring to “science”].
I wouldn’t trouble it. I don’t know that type of man. . . . Dem can do you bad t’ings. . . . Work witchcraft.
Nah trouble it. Science will sick you.

An incident frequently recounted in Buckland involves a young man named Kenrick Bundy. One day when he was working at Cheapside as a tractor driver for Deerfield Estate, “him buck up a man’s ganja field.” The man saw him and promised him a sum of money (which ranged from twenty to one hundred dollars, depending on who was telling the story), to be paid when the ganja was reaped, if he promised not to tell the police. Allegedly, the planter also gave Bundy some ganja. Bundy took the ganja and the money but also informed the police, who subsequently raided the fields and destroyed the man’s ganja. A few months later, Bundy began to have intestinal complaints, which appeared with greater frequency and intensity until he died a year and a half later. His illness and death were attributed to obeah or “science” employed by the ganja planter: “De man swell him belly . . . an’ when de sea is calm, him just alright; but when de sea is rough him in de hospital.” Bundy’s role as a police informer was criticized throughout Buckland, with residents observing, “is not that a cruelty?” Public sympathy, in this case, lay mainly with the planter.

Ordinarily, the local constabulary does not trouble ganja cultivation to any appreciable degree unless directed to do so. Police in both communities claim that, given the scale of local ganja cultivation, raids are seldom worth the effort they require. Moreover, it is almost impossible to charge an individual with cultivation of ganja unless he is apprehended in the very act of cultivating. For obvious reasons, finding ganja in a particular field is not sufficient evidence to convict the owner of that field with cultivation of ganja. Consequently, raids are seldom organized unless specific information is received and in such a way that it must be acted upon, such as Mr. Willis’ report of ganja at Cheapside.

Because ganja is planted on company land in Deerfield, the threat of police action resulting from management surveillance is a genuine possibility. In both Leyburn and the sugar belt, however, intra-community conflict, competition, and vindictiveness, expressed through informing to the police, are regarded as more menacing to successful ganja cultivation than are the police themselves. This point of view is underscored by Pastor Morgan in Leyburn, who contends that the police are the least worrisome part of ganja production and sale in Leyburn, that by far the most significant problem is the jealousy and hostility that provoke men to take advantage of one another’s vulnerability. Pastor Morgan himself employs certain safeguards. Even though he believes there is no inherent danger in ganja and privately admits to drinking ganja tea each night, he does not smoke ganja and, in fact, the evils of ganja smoking constitute one of his most regular sermon topics. His own ganja supply is procured from outside the local community, prepared by his own hand and consumed in the privacy of his room.

Intra-communal friction is also noted by the small East Indian minority living in Leyburn. Two East Indian men report that they watch with considerable amusement while “these people” (Leyburn’s Afro-
Jamaicans) fight among themselves, report each other to the police, and steal from each other's ganja fields. In their opinion, the Jamaican black man is "so selfish" that he will use up all his ganja before it matures, before "it comes to kali." As a point in contrast, one of these East Indian farmers described his own family's ganja enterprise in another parish, in which male kin work together, cultivate several acres, rotate guards, and have an elaborate warning system as protection against police raids. His brother-in-law, a leader in the enterprise, was currently serving his third year in prison and had one more to complete. Nevertheless, the wife has carried on the business as usual, so that upon his release, it is claimed, he will find himself a rich man.

A Deerfield example of intra-community conflict centering on ganja cultivation involved Mr. Singh, the head ranger of Deerfield Estate, who was responsible for patrolling the entire property for protection of crops and land. After having secretly encouraged certain cane workers to cultivate small gardens on a section of estate wasteland, he then began to ask for "gifts" of produce from their gardens. This form of extortion continued for several seasons, but the anger and resentment of the cane workers finally reached a pitch when Singh brought in a small truck to load with fruits and vegetables that he planned to market. The men refused to give him anything more and "cursed him off." Singh calmly asserted his power, observing that Mr. Carwell, the senior manager of the estate, would not like to know about the ganja being cultivated on estate land. That evening the men who had planted small quantities of ganja within their gardens removed the trees and sent word for others to do the same. When he could no longer use their ganja cultivation as a means of eliciting free produce from the men, Singh, without the knowledge of the management, told the men that the estate had decided to use the site of their cultivation for grazing cattle and ordered them off the land in two months. Since the estate had carried through on a decision for ganja growers, and many men claim that they would not或will not cultivate unless they have a guaranteed buyer, preferably one who has provided some cash in advance. Men who plant routinely must maintain a clientele of trusted buyers. This reduces the threat of foul play during the transaction, which is a grave concern to all ganja cultivators. There are many accounts of farmers who have brought their entire ganja crop to a transaction in good faith, only to be told at gun point that there would be no payment. Since most of the small-scale cultivators are farmers, unarmed, unsophisticated in dealing with the Kingston criminal element, and unprotected by the law, they are essentially defenseless. Moreover, ganja transactions of this nature ordinarily take place in clandestine circumstances, at night or in early morning, intensifying the vulnerability of cultivators.

The risk of criminal foul play is particularly great for those men who plant for the first time or attempt an occasional crop, for they must often sell to men whom they scarcely know. For example, after a day-long search for two Deerfield fishermen missing at sea, their boat was discovered drifting off the Cheapside coast with the charred remains of the two men inside, having been drenched with kerosene and set on fire. A subsequent police investigation revealed that the men had been killed as a result of foul play during a ganja transaction at sea. According to the
wife of one of the men, this was the first time her husband had attempted to plant and sell ganja.

Because of incidents such as this, ganja growers have been known to burn up crocus bags of weed rather than attempt to sell to an unknown buyer, and men who plant ganja routinely will favor the same buyers year after year even when they are offered more money by another. An extraordinary example of the stability that relationships between cultivator and wholesaler may attain involves a planter named Rupert Graham. One of the largest ganja producers in Leyburn, Graham for many years had sold his entire crop to an East Indian man from Kingston named Scully. When Graham had harvested his ganja, Scully would drive to Leyburn two or three times each week, fill the trunk of his car with ganja, and then drive back to the capital, where it was distributed. On one occasion Graham asked Scully for a ride back to Kingston in order to visit his sister. To their misfortune, a police roadblock had been set up at the junction with the main road to Kingston at Packers Corners. As they approached the roadblock, Scully instructed Graham to admit nothing: "Never mind, Rupert... You go back and plant and my wife will take care of you." He told the police that Graham was simply "begging a ride" to town and had no knowledge of the ganja in the trunk of the car. Scully himself was charged and sentenced to a two-year mandatory prison sentence. During that two-year period Graham continued to plant ganja for Scully's wife, who sent a relative to pick it up, until her husband was released from prison and continued the arrangement as before.

In Leyburn, the cooperation that characterizes the relationship between cultivator and middleman is not present among the cultivators themselves. The risks incurred in planting ganja are sufficient to deter the cooperative work arrangements that typify other kinds of cultivation in this community. Ganja partnerships are few, thereby avoiding the recriminations and blame that might follow if a jointly worked ganja field is raided by the police, plundered by neighbors, or neglected by one of the partners. For a precarious venture such as ganja cultivation, each grower takes on all the responsibility as well as all the profit, and in so doing, he minimizes both the legal and social risks, such as the rupturing of harmonious work relationships in legal cultivation. One exception to this pattern of individualism in ganja production in Leyburn is a planter who occasionally employs adolescent boys to tend and guard his ganja fields, paying them with ganja rather than cash.

In Deerfield, on the other hand, associations for the planting of ganja are quite common and actually necessary for Cheapside cultivation. Since men often stay in the fields for weeks at a time, they require partners to keep each other company, alternate patrols, and take turns getting supplies. These alliances may change from year to year and ordinarily do not extend into other economic or social activities. In most cases, these are not true partnerships but consist rather of a planter and his assistant. Typically, the planter is a fisherman and the assistant is a cane worker who can commit his dull season time to the ganja crop. One fisherman named Hendrix, who has planted ganja every year on Cheapside, complained of the difficulties in finding a man whom he could trust and who was willing to sit in the bush for weeks at a time. During a previous year he and his former helper had been in the field eating breakfast when the police came to raid. When they fired a warning shot, the two men ran through the swamps until they reached the fishing beach. Once safe, his helper informed Hendrix that he would not go back again. Since that time Hendrix has been cultivating alone, as yet unable to find a trustworthy man who would be willing to assume the risks incurred in planting ganja.

There is no debate among Deerfield men that the growing of ganja on Cheapside is an uncomfortable and often dangerous enterprise. As one informant stated, "It tek a brave heart man" to contend with alligators, mosquitoes, police, competitors, criminal middlemen, and weeks of solitude in the bush. Even in Leyburn, where planting a ganja crop is comparatively less dangerous, the attending risks serve as a major deterrent to initiating and continuing ganja cultivation. In neither community are men willing to invest all their time and labor in a ganja crop, although Deerfield planters, because of different circumstances, have the greater commitment to ganja production and are generally more successful in raising a larger crop to fruition. In Leyburn, attempts to minimize the risks of illegal cultivation such as reaping early or planting small amounts also minimize the rewards.

DISTRIBUTION

The nature of ganja distribution in all three of the communities presented here is consistent with the findings of Rubin and Comitas, who report that the distribution of ganja in rural Jamaica "can best be characterized as a small, albeit illegal, individual business activity engaged in by a relatively large number of occasional and part-time vendors" (1975: 45). In Leyburn, there are currently twenty-three men who sell ganja to other members of the community on a retail or limited wholesale basis. Of these twenty-three, seventeen are farmers who grow some proportion of the ganja that they sell. Eleven of the seventeen are primarily producers who reserve a portion of their crop for sale to a limited number of friends and acquaintances. When their stock is depleted,
they themselves become buyers of ganja from other members of the community. The remaining six cultivator-vendors also sell from their own stock but continue as more or less active retailers by replenishing their supply of ganja from middlemen in the capital. Only two of these, however, retail ganja consistently throughout the year.

One is Reuben Henry, an own-account farmer who lives with his common-law wife, Miss Girlie, and eight children. Reuben cultivates ganja along with his legal crops and retails ganja on a regular basis from his home. When he is not there, Miss Girlie assumes responsibility for selling the weed. Only rarely does his supply of ganja run short, in which case Reuben may purchase additional stock from whatever source is most convenient at the time. Ordinarily, however, he procures the bulk of his ganja supply from a distant cousin and ex-resident of Leyburn who now resides in Kingston as an active member of the Ras Tafarian sect.

The other large-scale vendor is Darwin Hamilton, who lives in the Mount Hermon section of Leyburn. Darwin migrated from another parish approximately ten years earlier to work for Mr. Paul, an East Indian absentee landowner. As caretaker and cultivator of the small property, Darwin routinely cultivates ganja along with legal crops. When the ganja is cured and ready for sale, Mr. Paul transports and distributes it in Kingston. In turn, he periodically provides Darwin with most of the weed that he retail locally in Leyburn.

Darwin and Reuben are the only two vendors in Leyburn who may be classified as perennial in the sense that they always can be relied upon to have a supply of weed for sale. Further, unlike the majority of ganja vendors in Leyburn, these two deal with a regular middleman from whom they purchase practically their entire stock of ganja and from whom they may expect special consideration in return.

No other Leyburn vendors have this intensive, persistent commitment to selling ganja, and often several months elapse without any retail ganja activity on their part whatsoever. They have no particular middleman, but procure their ganja from multifarious sources as need or occasion dictates. In fact, the chance acquisition of a quantity of ganja often provides the incentive to sell, rather than the other way around. For this category of vendor, the selling of ganja provides an immediate source of day-to-day income that helps to keep a household financially intact between the annual or semi-annual cash flows when crops or livestock are sold. Thus, while their participation in ganja distribution may appear sporadic and unpredictable, it is at least partially related to the financial modulations of their legal business activities.

The six Leyburn vendors who do not cultivate a portion of their ganja supply all bear in common either part-time or full-time employment in the capital area. There they procure ganja to retail periodically for themselves or wholesale to other occasional vendors in Leyburn. As regular commuters, they are in a particularly advantageous position to procure and transport ganja. In fact, for most of these men, their entry into commercial ganja activity was precipitated by requests from local vendors and residents to procure weed in Kingston. Like their farming neighbors, ganja selling for this group is not the primary source of income but an occupational sideline that is easily and conveniently integrated with their routine excursions to the capital. One of these men is a Kingston fisherman who has only recently come to live in Leyburn as a result of his relationship with a local woman; another works as a delivery boy for a dry-cleaning company, one on construction, one as a factory laborer, one as a butcher, and the last as a jeweler who actually works in Leyburn but must travel routinely to Kingston in order to procure his materials. Though none of these men reach Reuben's or Darwin's scale of vendorship, nineteen-year-old Barrington (Barry) Henry, who works as a delivery boy for a Kingston dry-cleaning company, has the most consistent commitment to ganja distribution as a business endeavor. Barry remains in the capital Monday through Friday, returning on weekends to Leyburn, where he sells ganja to his friends.

For the remaining commuters, ganja selling is a casual and temporary business, related both to need and to opportunity. If they anticipate the need for extra cash, or happen to be in a position to buy weed at a good price, or have been asked to procure ganja for other members of the community, they temporarily enter the distributory net as retailers or low-level middlemen. None of the twenty-three Leyburn vendors is a full-time specialist, though dealing in ganja may provide for some, such as Darwin, Reuben, and Barry, a substantial portion of their incomes and significantly affect their life styles.

Participation in ganja distribution activity is equally widespread in Deerfield. While the complexity and magnitude of the sugar belt population does not permit a complete tabulation of the various types of ganja retailers, in the Dover district alone there are fourteen perennial vendors—thirteen men and one woman. Only one of these vendors, Mr. Faircough, grows a portion of the ganja that he sells. As in Leyburn, even these perennial ganja vendors in Dover are, for the most part, gainfully employed in legal occupations. Three, including one woman, are small shopkeepers, four are fishermen, and six are laborers for the estate. Jebediah Newhall, who is paralyzed from the waist down, is the only vendor who relies on ganja retailing as the single source of income for his household. Significantly, there are countless others who enter and leave the distributory system at various points and for varying periods of time, as the need or occasion arises. For example, Arnold Pud-
obtain the necessary funds quickly, he visited his old friend, John Sawyer, a ganja cultivator living in the hill community where Arnold was born and raised. In order to allay suspicion, Mrs. Puddington accompanied her husband on the journey. Delighted to see and help his childhood friend, Sawyer gave Arnold a pound of ganja, telling him “not to worry” about paying him for it until he returned from Canada. Arnold thanked his friend but took only a half pound, insisting that it would serve his purpose. He placed the ganja in his satchel and covered it with mint and plantains for the bus ride home. On their return to Dover, Arnold took the weed immediately to his favorite vendor, Mr. Fair-cough, who gave him eight dollars for the half pound.

By transporting only a limited amount of ganja and by selling it all to one dealer, Arnold attempted to minimize the risks even though he was aware that he would also minimize the profit. In fact, Arnold admitted that by the time he reimbursed Sawyer and added the price of the bus fares for himself and his wife, the transaction had actually cost him money. For Arnold, however, the purpose of the venture was not profit but ready cash for what he considered a far better economic opportunity than ganja vending.

Kenroy Magee is employed as a fireman on Deerfield Estate factory. When he was a boy, his mother supported her children by selling ganja. As a teenager, Kenroy assisted his mother but discontinued ganja retailing when he became steadily employed in the factory. A short time later he met a young woman from a neighboring community and took her to live in his mother’s yard. His mother and his girlfriend quarreled constantly, however, so he decided to build his own house on the small plot of land given him by his grandmother. In order to pay for the material, Kenroy sold ganja for several months. Afterward, he did not attempt ganja vending again for almost five years, until he had to undergo abdominal surgery. Because this precluded his working at the factory for two months, he once again sold ganja until he was able to return to his regular employment. The most recent interim in which Kenroy engaged in ganja retailing followed an automobile accident in which he was injured and again could not work for several weeks. On this occasion, however, Kenroy’s vending activity was abruptly terminated by a police raid. The resulting fines and lawyer’s fees set him back even further financially, and since that time Kenroy has heeded the pleas of his family to suspend ganja-vending operations altogether.

Though both Kenroy and Arnold are heavy smokers, the special dangers of ganja selling dissuade them from pursuing this activity on a regular basis. Kenroy, who is knowledgeable about ganja vending from his teenage experience, finds it a convenient, albeit perilous, means of supplementing regular income for special projects as well as for financial crises. Arnold, on the other hand, is considerably more reticent than Kenroy and participated in ganja distribution only because the advantages of going to Canada so greatly outweighed the potential dangers of the venture. Neither Kenroy nor Arnold depends on vending as a primary source of income; thus, they are content to leave it when it is no longer necessary and to accept lower profits than perennial vendors.

Some enter ganja distributory activities through a chance opportunity for quick profits. For example, a Dover cane worker, Nicholas Phelps, happened to meet a Ras Tafarian on the road one evening and asked him if he would like to share some of his food. The Rasta man gratefully accepted and, after they ate and smoked, he gave Nicholas two ounces of weed to sell. A week later the Rasta came with two other men in a car to Nicholas’ yard, bringing him a pound of ganja to sell and a two-ounce package to keep for himself. He told Nicholas that he wanted eighteen dollars for the weed but that he would not ask for the money until it was sold. Nicholas proceeded to sell the ganja for a good profit but, contending that the risks and demands that accompanied the endeavor were too great, decided not to continue as a full-scale vendor. Consequently, when the Rasta returned, Nicholas gave him the eighteen dollars and referred him to a friend who was interested in pursuing ganja vending.

In addition to the perennial and occasional vendors who characterize distributory activity in both Leyburn and Deerfield, there is, in the latter community, a third type of vendor who retails ganja on a seasonal basis. This category consists of laborers who sell ganja to their colleagues at the work site during reaping season. Field vendors are generally not permanent retailers; rather they take advantage of a cane field market when and where ganja smoking is at its peak. One cane worker, recognizing the profitability of this activity, almost doubles the amount of his estate paycheck by selling ganja on the Dover farm even though he himself is a non-smoker. For the most part, this is a limited enterprise; the majority of field vendors purchase their small stock of ganja almost on a daily basis from perennial vendors in the community.

In Buckland there are five men and two women who retail ganja on a more or less regular basis. As for Leyburn and Deerfield vendors, ganja selling for these seven Buckland retailers is a subsidiary economic activity that provides additional income. The largest and best-known dealer, Melvin Cass, lives with his common-law wife and three school-age children, “adopted” from his wife’s niece. As a younger man, Melvin used to have an extensive cultivation on land captured from Windsor...
Farms, but was displaced when the property reformed its land utilization policy. Now in his late fifties, he is content to sell ganja and to cultivate a small mixed vegetable plot on his own half-acre of land.

The other six vendors are variously employed. The two women are both homemakers living with mates and children. In addition to their domestic responsibilities, they work as part-time laborers on Windsor planting grass, and one prepares and sells coconut oil as well. Mr. Neary is a butcher and laborer for Stonleigh; Basil Thompson drives a tractor during reaping season for a small sugar property outside the district. Mr. Johnson works on a Public Works Department truck that travels throughout the entire parish. Through his legal job, Johnson is able to purchase ganja in the interior communities of the parish where it is grown and sell it to vendors along the coast, including those in his own community of Buckland. He also reserves a small amount for sale to a few, favored retail customers. Mr. Winslow, Buckland’s district constable, has a diminishing ganja retail business. With his recent appointment to a superior position in the security department of Deerfield Estate, his interest in selling ganja has waned. Since he still has access to ganja confiscated in police raids, however, he occasionally sells to a few close friends.

While similar in its subsidiary role, the system of ganja vending in Buckland is more stable and consistent than in the other two communities. Persons do not enter and leave the distributory system to the same extent as in Deerfield and Leyburn. Periods of inactivity among practicing vendors in Buckland are related more to fluctuations in their sources of ganja supply than to recessions in their legal economic activities. Thus, the relatively steady pace of employment and cash flow, as well as the comparative abundance of opportunity that characterizes economic life in Buckland, appears to have a stabilizing effect on the number of distributors and the flow of distributional activity.

Despite this greater constancy in the number and identity of practicing vendors in Buckland, only Melvin Cass can be relied upon for a consistently available supply of ganja. The rest, with smaller, more intimate clienteles, occasionally deplete their stock and are without ganja for several days or weeks. Only Melvin Cass and, now and then, Neary aggressively seek ganja when their supply is low. The others generally wait to be contacted by their wholesaler-middleman. Since ganja cultivation is essentially absent in Buckland, vendors must procure their entire inventory from outside the community. Melvin used to purchase from Faircough, the largest Cheapside cultivator and dealer. As his business grew, however, Melvin discovered that he needed a more reliable source of ganja and now "travels out" to his regular wholesaler in a nearby town, carrying one- or two-pound weights of ganja in his satchel.
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The other Buckland retailers, with the exception of Winslow, depend primarily on their fellow dealer, Johnson, or on "Herbie," the ice-cream vendor. Herbie sells small quantities of ganja (one or two ounces) to retailers as he motorcycles to the various districts on his ice-cream route.

In all three communities retail sales are generally of small quantities—a "stick" or "pura" (twenty cents' worth) or "half-stick," "bump," "knuckle," or "head" (ten cents' worth). During crop time in Deerfield, the "quarter" (a quarter ounce costing fifty cents) becomes a more popular unit of purchase, since smokers have more cash and daily consumption is higher. Ordinarily, however, only men who have steady and comparatively well-paying work purchase a quarter- or half-ounce at a time. Such individuals generally buy a greater quantity per purchase but purchase less frequently.

For all these quantities the price is constant to the buyer although vendors fluctuate in that they will pay the wholesaler depending on supply and demand and the available cash for re-stocking their store of ganja. Theoretically, retailers could realize greater profits by purchasing larger quantities of ganja at a time. Vendors in all three communities report that they are contacted regularly by cultivators and middlemen to buy one or more crocus bags at one-third the price per pound that they ordinarily pay. Even if they had the capital outlay required for this size purchase, however, which most do not, vendors are generally unwilling to stock more than a few pounds of weed at a time. Crocus bags are difficult to hide and the possibilities of either theft or of a police raid are too great to risk a loss of that magnitude. Since neither cultivator nor vendor is willing to keep large quantities of ganja on hand, the middleman plays a vital and comparatively hazardous role in ganja distribution.

In Buckland and Deerfield most of the ganja sales take place in the yard of the seller, usually referred to as an "herb yard." In this setting, the men gather to smoke as well as purchase ganja and to enjoy the company of other men who have come for the same purpose. In addition, there are several other yards throughout the three communities in which men ordinarily congregate and smoke weed but which are not the yards of vendors. It is not unusual for retailers to carry with them a small quantity of ganja for sale when joining their colleagues in such gatherings.

Unlike Buckland and Deerfield, herb yards do not typify the distributional system in Leyburn. Gatherings of adult men are generally reserved for secluded sites along the river beach and seldom include more than four participants. The only vendors’ yards in which men occasionally remain to smoke are those of Reuben and Darwin, and even in those settings it must be at the expressed invitation of the vendor. The
majority of Leyburn distributors do not permit patrons to smoke in the vicinity of their yards and, in many cases, will meet the prospective buyer in a neutral, unfrequented place to transact the sale.

Even where herb yards typify the distributional system, the size and cohesiveness of congregations vary from community to community. In Buckland no more than five or six men, usually close friends and neighbors, convene in a particular yard, whereas in Deerfield it is not unusual to find fifteen to twenty men assembled in a particular herb yard, some of whom may be only minimally acquainted with one another.

In none of the three communities do “herb camps” form part of the distribution system. Deerfield smokers reported that, while a few such camps had at one time flourished within the sugar belt, intensive police action had effectively limited that scale of ganja activity in the area. Occasionally, a Deerfield vendor may have access to a particularly large quantity of ganja—one or two crocus bags—and will hold a party on the sea beach selling ganja, beer, and food and provide music for entertainment.

In ganja distribution, patterns of social clustering are clearly discernible, each vendor generally establishing his or her own network of trusted clients. With the exception of Reuben and Darwin, who will service practically any smoker in the community, Leyburn vendors maintain very small clienteles—sometimes as few as three to five individuals. To others in the community, they may even deny that they have ganja to sell. In this pattern, buying is indirect: the ultimate consumer requests a trusted person to procure ganja, who in turn, may ask another. Thus, ganja is often procured through a long succession of non-profit middlemen and the eventual consumer and original vendor may well have no knowledge of each other’s identities. The following episode exemplifies the usual buying pattern in Leyburn. Mr. Mayberry, who is a “Christian,” a devoutly religious man, does not smoke ganja but wanted some weed for tea, which he consumes regularly. He asked James Ellis, his neighbor of many years who grows, smokes, and sells ganja, if he had any. Ellis did not, but agreed to secure some for Mayberry. Mr. Ellis went to his nephew Kevin, a known “ganja man” and a person whom he trusted. Kevin told his uncle to meet him at the macca tree by the river in an hour and then went to see Mr. LaBelle, another known vendor and cultivator. LaBelle sold Kevin the amount requested by Mayberry, and during the transaction they both smoked some ganja provided by LaBelle. Kevin then returned, with the ganja, to his uncle, Mr. Ellis, and was reimbursed. Mr. Ellis then took the ganja to Mr. Mayberry, the ultimate consumer, who reimbursed Ellis and gave him a small amount of ganja as a sign of appreciation.

In this series of transactions, Mr. Mayberry and Mr. Ellis both knew of LaBelle’s reputation as a ganja vendor. Neither would have approached him directly, however—Mayberry primarily because he did not want his interest in ganja to be visible to the community, and Ellis because he was not part of LaBelle’s trusted following and his request would probably have been refused. Thus, while Leyburn vendors sell directly to only a few, they ultimately supply greater numbers in a complex pattern of indirect purchase.

In this community, groupings of patron and vendor strongly reflect the social ties of friendship, kinship, and work partners that exist independent of the ganja transaction. Thus, most smokers patronize a vendor who is also a friend or co-worker. If that vendor has none available for sale, he will then appeal to Darwin or Reuben for alternative sources of ganja. Of all three communities, the followings of Leyburn vendors are the least flexible; changes in clientele almost always follow changes in social relationships external to the ganja transactions. For example, one occasional vendor in Leyburn sold ganja only to his four regular work partners. When one of the partners went abroad and another took his place, the new man was then offered ganja to buy for the first time even though he had been a resident of Leyburn for several years.

In Buckland and Deerfield as well, most smokers have one or two favored vendors whom they patronize regularly. That patronage is direct, however, thus eliminating the long line of non-profit middlemen and expanding the small followings that characterize the Leyburn distributive system. With the exception of Melvin Cass and Mr. Winslow, most Buckland vendors supply from ten to thirty regular customers. These networks are more or less contained, with entry ordinarily based on personal knowledge of the client by the vendor. In comparison with Leyburn, however, these nets are also flexible, occasionally adding potential clients vouched for by other members. Melvin Cass fills a role similar to Reuben and Darwin in providing an alternative to the relative, co-worker, or friend who is the favored vendor.

Of the three communities, perennial vendors in Deerfield maintain the most universalistic style of retailing and have by far the largest followings, sometimes numbering in the hundreds. Entry to these followings is relatively easy and requires only the most minimal introduction by another customer. Even in the context of these large herb yard clienteles, however, there exists a nucleus of trusted regular customers who patronize the vendor regularly and pay their debts and on whom the vendor may occasionally rely to assist him in his vending activities. These alliances also pay off in critical situations. For example, when Mr.
Davidson, a fisherman and perennial vendor in Dover, was arrested in a police raid, his nucleus of faithful clients raised the funds for bail and lawyer’s fees. As Mr. Davidson claimed, “Every soul in sympathy, . . . good people give one dollar, two dollars for help.” In return, vendors in all three communities are expected to acknowledge a consistent, loyal patronage in special considerations such as gratuitous spliffs, green ganja for tea, and extending credit if the patron is without cash.

Among ganja vendors in Leyburn, Buckland, and Deerfield, the extension of credit is acknowledged as playing a central role in the development and maintenance of a successful retail ganja business. However, the manner and degree to which this practice occurs and its effects on the social patterning of ganja vending are definitively related to local conditions. Buckland retailers and estate cane field vendors, for example, generally follow the policy established by merchants and vendors of legal commodities in extending credit on a weekly basis to coincide with pay schedules. If a particular buyer does not settle his account on payday or the day following, vendors are generally reluctant to grant further consideration until the account is brought up to date. Perennial vendors, on the other hand, must contend with the intense seasonal variation in cash flow, and all Dover retailers report extending credit intermittently for the entire six months of the dull season. This practice is commonly regarded as necessary to help ensure a substantial clientele for the reaping season, when men have money to spend and competition among vendors increases.

While there is general agreement among ganja retailers regarding the importance of credit arrangements in developing business and meeting competition, vendors also assert that such arrangements require careful administration. If not properly managed, the extension of credit is detrimental and probably the single most important factor in limiting profits and terminating the enterprise. Individuals who have not succeeded in their attempts to establish a viable ganja retail business charge mismanagement of credit relations as the most significant factor precipitating their failure. As one unsuccessful vendor complained, “Me trus’ [extended credit to] enough man an’ dem nah pay. I mouth dem off [verbally harassed] but some still nah pay.”

Compared with vendors of legal commodities, ganja retailers are at a distinct disadvantage in the collection of outstanding accounts. An incident that illustrates the less tenable position of ganja vendors occurred on the reaping crew of the Ipswich farm on Deerfield Estate. A worker named Desmond Green had accumulated debts with both Miss Inez, a food and beverage vendor, and John Pease, a ganja vendor. Both sellers, who conduct their entire business activity on the Ipswich cane field, reminded Green of his obligations, and on each occasion he promised to settle his account on the next payday. When three such paydays had passed without compensation, however, Miss Inez took her complaint to the Ipswich manager. At the Friday payroll, the bookkeeper removed the amount of money that was owed to Miss Inez from Green’s pay envelope, paying her directly before handing the remainder to Green. John Pease, on the other hand, had no such recourse to higher authority and was forced to suffer the loss. He refused to grant Green further credit, but Green simply patronized other vendors. At the end of the reaping season and dissolution of the gang, Pease still had not been paid.

In Leyburn, where credit arrangements pervade nearly all purchasesale transactions—legal and otherwise—the collection of ganja debts is particularly problematic. In this community, individuals are connected in multiplex relations; refusals to honor a request for credit and reminders of outstanding debts are extremely awkward. As the wife of one cultivator and occasional seller lamented, “The people here, dem terrible. . . . If dem know you have [ganja], you must give dem or dem curse you off or carry your name [gossip about you] throughout the district.”

It is not surprising that Leyburn’s most successful vendor, in terms of duration and profits, is Darwin Hamilton, whose entrance into the community is relatively recent. He has no woman or children in the community who would expand or complicate his role. Though he is acquainted with most men in Leyburn, his relationship to them is primarily one-dimensional, centering around the ganja transaction itself. Darwin tends to limit socializing to smoking sessions with buyers in his own yard and attends no community social events.

In contrast, Reuben Henry maintains the same scale of vendorship but has difficulty showing profits from his enterprise. Both he and Miss Girle were born and raised in Leyburn and have extensive kin and social ties throughout the community. Reuben works in a partner relationship with four other men and is also an active member in the local chapter of the Jamaican Labor Party. Reuben attributes his low profits and general lack of success to his inability to refuse credit and collect payment from his friends, neighbors, or relatives when they purchase his ganja.

Most Leyburn vendors have resolved the problem by restricting sales to a very limited, semi-permanent clientele whom they know will pay their debts. To others, they deny that they have any ganja for sale. Thus, the problem of credit is a major factor in accounting for the indirect and clandestine pattern of ganja distribution in Leyburn.

The collection of debts is just one of the social risks that beset ganja dealers. Unlike ganja cultivation, which requires intense secrecy in
order to be successful, ganja retailing on a large scale requires a guarded kind of publicity. A certain degree of community knowledge of its existence is intrinsic to a thriving year-round herb yard. This semi-notoriety required of a successful ganja dealer renders his or her position in the community extremely fragile. This is exemplified by the case of Leonard Scott, a cane loader who lived with his common-law wife and seven children in a rented house in Dover. One day a neighbor's dog came into Leonard's yard and killed two of his fowl. That evening when he returned from the cane fields, his wife told him of the day's events. His relations with that particular neighbor were already strained and, annoyed by this incident, Leonard decided that he would demand some compensation for the chickens. Before he had finished making his complaint, the woman began to shout that she was not responsible and would not pay. "Fe oonoo [you] a ganja man an' oonoo can sell ganja fe pay fe fowl run loose. Me nah pay, fe oonoo ha' weed money." Leonard was angry but, fearing that she might attract the police, he returned to his house without rebuking the woman. His wife, frightened and upset, urged Leonard to suspend selling ganja until they moved to a new house. Leonard agreed and in the following weeks found a new house to rent in another neighborhood. Though Leonard resumed ganja vending at the new location, the worry and inconvenience incurred by the incident disrupted both his economic and his domestic life.

In fact, the domestic situation of ganja retailers is a major factor in determining the style and degree of their vending. For example, Leyburn's James Ellis, the ganja cultivator and occasional vendor (pp. 56–57), always meets his clients at the river beach rather than at his home. According to Mr. Ellis, these precautions are taken out of respect for his wife, who is a church woman, and his young daughters: "Me nah wan [want] dem [customers] round de yard. . . . Too much gal pickney [female children] deh."

The vulnerability of the vendor also extends to domestic relations. According to police, a large proportion of the information they receive regarding ganja vendors comes directly or indirectly as a result of domestic rifts. An incident that occurred in Deerfield is representative of this problem. A small-scale, part-time ganja dealer named Bradford Huxley was living in consensual union with a woman named Joyce. Eventually, they had a falling out over Huxley's relationship with another woman, and they separated. A week later Huxley returned to pick up some clothing and other personal articles that he had left in Joyce's house. Joyce refused to let him in and a noisy quarrel ensued, which attracted several neighbors and passersby. Soon the police arrived on the scene and, after inquiring into the matter, instructed Joyce to let Bradford have his belongings. As Joyce angrily watched Bradford put his things into the police jeep, she suggested that as long as he was taking his possessions he could also remove the "tin of foo-foo [stupid] sum't'ing" from underneath the veranda and put that in the jeep as well. Bradford gave her a frightened look and several men standing around cautioned Joyce to be quiet: "Daughter, nah send de man a jail." The police did not acknowledge the remark, though they later confirmed that they had indeed heard the comment but had chosen not to act on it. Thus, it is not surprising to find that most successful vendors have either extremely stable unions or, like Darwin Hamilton, no union at all.

Unlike cultivators, who encourage reputations as "bad men," ganja dealers in the main tend to be "nice guys," jocular and inoffensive. Successful vendors assert that it is important to "live peaceful with everyone" (including their wives) and "stay cool." In order to uphold this policy, they generally live quietly within the perimeters of their yards, seldom frequent bars or rum shops, and remain essentially inactive in community affairs. Despite the importance of a friendly demeanor, too much compliance could threaten the integrity of the enterprise. The collection of debts or the request that a disorderly client leave the premises are just two of the more distasteful tasks that accompany herb yard operations and that require the most diplomatic handling and continuous weighing of risks.

The guarded exposure implicit in successful herb yard operations also renders them far more susceptible to police action than weed cultivation operations. In addition, the police themselves assert that vendors are more likely to be raided, as such action requires less effort and time and yields greater rewards (in terms of actual arrests) than the raiding and destruction of ganja fields.

In practically all cases, the police are aware of the existence and reputations of ganja vendors throughout the community and it is only a matter of police strategy as to when and which yard they elect to raid. The relationship between police and residents is paramount in this decision and accounts for differences in the level of raiding in the three communities. In Leyburn, a comparatively isolated and small community, the police have established unions with local women and developed friendships with several men in the community. Since a ganja raid would directly or indirectly affect a large proportion of the population, police are reluctant to rupture community relations by raiding any herb yards. Residents of Leyburn cannot recall when there has ever been a raid of vendor operations in their village.

In the populous belt surrounding the sugar estate, on the other hand, four separate raids of herb yards were conducted during the period of fieldwork in the Dover district alone. In Buckland, serviced by the same police station as Deerfield Estate, raids of two vendors had occurred the year previous to my fieldwork but no arrests were made. Of the twenty-three perennial ganja vendors currently operating in
Buckland and Dover, over 60 percent had been raided at least once. In these communities police are dealing with a larger, more diverse population. While social ties are often developed with persons occupying the middle socioeconomic levels in these communities, relations between police and residents of low income and status are more formalized and less intimate. The pattern of ganja raiding in Deerfield reflects these selective relations. For example, while it is common knowledge that ganja is sold and smoking is intense at the work site, arrests for sale or possession of ganja never occur in the cane field. Local police readily confirm that the repercussions from the highest levels of estate management in response to such action would be significant.

While police have less allegiance to the laboring-class population, police action, even in the recreational context of Deerfield herb yards, is still discretionary. For the most part, police have and receive considerably more information than they ever act on, and several factors influence the decision to raid a particular yard. One such factor is the source of information; complaints from the more influential members of the community generally cannot be ignored. Another factor is whether police have information that the yard may be harboring guns and criminal types. There is an unstated agreement between vendors and local police that, if the sale of ganja transpires in a quiet, non-criminal context, the chances of a police-initiated raid are less likely. In fact, it is not unusual for herb yards to be a useful source of police intelligence with lenience being extended to perennial vendors who occasionally provide information about criminal behavior in the community.

Still another factor is how recently the herb yard has been raided. Generally, raids of the same yard are spaced several years apart unless some intervening factor has come into play. The exception to this general rule is Jeb Newhall, who is raided almost annually. With both legs paralyzed, this vendor is easy prey to police incursions. He fully expects to be raided, and the last time the police lifted him into the jeep he calmly stated to the sympathetic crowd that had gathered, "Never mind, me nah care [I don't care], fi me c'yan bruk stone [can't be sentenced to hard labor]." The local magistrate before whom Jebediah has appeared on numerous occasions dismissed the case, as usual, but severely criticized the arresting police, entreating, "Why do you officers insist on bringing this man to court over and over again?" This nearly annual arrest of Jebediah is actually the most convenient and least provocative of all possible ganja vendor arrests in the community. The local police are credited with vigilance over ganja activities by higher officials (who seldom investigate the circumstances of the arrest) and, since Jebediah is essentially exempt from serving a prison sentence, they minimize the disruptive influence on community relations.

Because of the legal technicality that, in order to constitute a charge of possession, ganja must be found on the person or somewhere in the person's abode that does not permit public access, police commonly falsify evidence in order to justify the arrest. For example, during the raid of Mr. Davidson that took place on a Sunday morning, the vendor spied the police jeep passing slowly by his gate. Since his house is located at the end of a deadend road, he suspected a raid. He quickly picked up the two Ovaltine cans in which he kept sticks of ganja, and ran, throwing them into the gully of his neighbor's yard. Crawford, the arresting officer, meanwhile ran from the jeep and fired two shots in the air. When Davidson turned back the two men met. Crawford held him and asked, "Any shots catch you?" Davidson responded "No," at which point Crawford "carried him way in de bush," where he detected the two cans. At the trial, however, Crawford alleged that when he fired the two shots Davidson stood frozen and, when apprehended, dropped the Ovaltine cans at his feet.

Earlier the same morning another raid had taken place at the yard of Kenroy Magee. This time Crawford and his assistant, Harpur, had pulled up in the jeep and announced to Magee that they had a warrant to search his house. Magee queried, "For what?" and they answered, "For drugs . . . We've been informed you're havin' drugs," and proceeded to search his house. Finding nothing incriminating in the house, they searched the gully behind the yard, where they found a quarter-pound parcel, one can containing twenty sticks, and a plastic bag containing fifteen sticks. When Magee's case came to court, however, Crawford reported that the entire supply of ganja was found inside the house, packed in a carton and tied with a string.

Ganja vendors express comparatively little animosity toward the police. They expect police to make raids and to fabricate the events of those raids in court. Rather, their hostility is directed toward the police when suspected of precipitating the raid—either by direct complaints to the police, or indirectly, by drawing unfavorable attention to the yard through misbehavior, or through circuitously employing "science" to "compel" the police to raid.

Despite the fact that over 50 percent of the currently practicing ganja vendors in Buckland and Deerfield have been charged and convicted for criminal offenses related to ganja, they are quiet and law-abiding in all other respects. They voice the same attitudes and make the same protests against criminality and violence as do the more affluent and respectable members of the community. One vendor expressed his opinion that there would be more crime if people were not able to earn additional needed revenue through the sale of ganja.

Indeed, given the patterns of occupational multiplicity found in...
rural Jamaica (Comitas 1973), ganja selling can be viewed as another supplementary economic enterprise available to the poor. Occasional and part-time entry is particularly widespread where economic life is unstable and cash flow is subject to great fluctuations. Ganja vending requires only minimal, sometimes no, initial investment and can yield relatively high profits in a comparatively short period of time. For the majority of vendors, ganja selling is an effective, though high-risk, means of obtaining immediate cash needed to meet pressing situations and supplement the limited income derived from legal sources. Consequently, persons who enter the ganja market often do so only occasionally or for abbreviated periods of time.

Unfortunately, it is for this category of vendor that the accompanying risks, problems, and pressures are greatest. Such individuals leave the ganja market before outstanding debts are paid and re-enter when they have been forgotten. Relationships with middlemen are only temporary, and these vendors must often pay top dollar for their stock because they are not regular buyers. Likewise, they seldom are in business long enough to develop relationships with the constabulary that would protect them from raids. Finally, pressures from neighbors and family may dissuade a potential vendor from continuing the enterprise before any profits are realized from his investment. As with many business enterprises, the risks are greatest at the beginning, and most vendors never reach beyond this level. It takes a considerable amount of time to build up a protective, loyal, and paying clientele, establish a negotiating alliance with a middleman, and order one's social and domestic relations from such individuals. Thus, while temporary entry to the distributory net is easy and available, it is considerably more difficult to remain there and establish a viable, perennial ganja retail business.

CONSUMPTION

Ganja is consumed by residents of Leyburn, Buckland, and Deerfield in a variety of ways: it is smoked, drunk as medicinal tea or tonic, applied topically as plasters and ointments, and ingested as food. It may be smoked in cigars called spliffs,14 or in the chillum,15 the Jamaican equivalent of the hookah or Middle Eastern water pipe. Primarily an adult male practice, ganja smoking is both a solitary and a group activity that occurs in both work and leisure settings. Such contexts are considered entirely appropriate for the smoking of ganja, whereas routine solitary or group consumption of rum during working hours is commonly regarded as abuse of the substance.

Solo smoking ordinarily takes place during periods of relaxation both at the work site, if the smoker happens to be working alone, and at home, if his domestic situation permits. Depending on the age of the smoker, the presence of either an older or a younger generation often proves a deterrent to smoking ganja at home. Thus, some householders confine domestic ganja smoking to early morning or late at night when children are asleep; and young men still living in their parents' home often abstain from smoking in their yards even though senior males of the household may do so on a regular basis.

Adult male gatherings either at leisure or work are customary settings for smoking ganja. In Deerfield and Buckland established herb yards of vendors and non-vendors provide settings for recreational smoking, and in all three communities central, but secluded, locations in the bush or along the river or sea beach are typical sites. In those communities where group work efforts are the norm, sufficiently protected work areas such as the cane fields in Deerfield and remote farms in Leyburn are usual sites for group smoking. In contrast, on Buckland farms and properties, where men work singly, group smoking in the work setting is less common, although men convene daily in hidden corners of the Windsor or Stonleigh work yards to enjoy a smoke during lunch time. A primary requirement of all of these situations and locations for group smoking is the degree of security they afford through seclusion from, and/or tolerance of, the authorities. Cricket matches, rum shops, and the sugar factory compound are not, for example, ordinarily considered appropriate locations for group-oriented ganja smoking despite their predominantly male and recreational orientation.

Daily individual consumption levels vary from smoker to smoker. Rubin and Comitas report that consumption among rural Jamaican males ranges from one to twenty-four spliffs per day, the average number consumed per day being seven (1975: 83). Individual variations reflect not only user preferences and capabilities but external factors as well, including cash on hand, activities and demands of daily living, availability of ganja for purchase and so forth. Community variations in the prevalence and degree of smoking will be analyzed in subsequent chapters.

In all three communities, spliff smoking is far more popular than smoking the chillum. It is more convenient and more easily concealed; the small quantities of weed necessary for ganja cigarettes can be carried in the user's clothing so as to be readily handy during work breaks in the field or during leisure hours. The chillum, on the other hand, is ordinari-
ly reserved for group recreational activity. Proponents of the chillum come predominantly from the fifteen to twenty-five-year-old smoking population of all three communities. These younger consumers tend to smoke in large groups, and their identification with Ras Tafarian ritual and doctrine, which include the use of the chillum, is indicated by comments such as “de pipe iray” and “it [the chillum] fe I and I [you and me]". According to this minority, the pipe also produces a “purer” and thus healthier smoke:

The pipe better to use, it keep away nicotine.
The pipe more better, . . . everyt'ing filter through.
De pipe is healthier but spliff gives your brain de same t'ing.
Prefer de pipe, . . . de paper [wrapper] give you a cold.
It a pure smoke, . . . no paper.

Despite their stated preference for the pipe, only a small number of these younger informants actually own and use the chillum with any degree of regularity. Most are still living in their parents' homes and do not have sufficient privacy to conceal a pipe. In all three settings only two men over thirty, both of whom are Ras Tafarians, admitted owning and using a chillum. Opponents of the pipe, on the other hand, are found even among the heaviest smokers and among some ganja vendors. This opposition to the chillum centers on alleged physiological effects:

I only smoke spliff, . . . doan like de pipe. Ha fe tek too much breath fe draw it.
I not a lover of pipe. It can break down my structure.
I prefer de spliff, . . . pipe would give you an amount of revolution in your stomach and jerk your structure.

It also centers on the social implications, including the substantially greater precautions required:

No, it not de right way fe smoke, . . . a fe likkle bad boys.
De pipe look brawlin' and ugly.
A fe Indian [East Indians], . . . it too strong.
I doan like it and de government more against it.

Ganja users report a wide and seemingly incongruous range of psychobiological and psychodispositional effects from the consumption of ganja by inhalation. Psychobiological effects are linked to physiological responses involving a "frame of mind" and a resultant behavioral act on the part of the user. Most often included in this category are the enhancement of sleep, appetite, sexual performance, and work. Psychodispositional effects relate to the mood and personality of the user and divide quite naturally into three basic moods or dispositions: reflection, euphoria, and relaxation, which will be discussed in relation to the life cycle of the user later in this chapter.

Descriptions of both psychobiological and psychodispositional effects are typically qualified by mention of necessary prior conditions. Thus, if a user is in the mood to go to bed, ganja will make him sleepy and give him a good night's rest; if he is alone with his girlfriend, ganja will make him "feel sexy" and augment his sexual performance; if he has a problem "to consider," ganja will help him reflect and concentrate on the solution. As one informant claimed, "Anyt'ing your heart desire it [ganja] give to you." In this view ganja operates as a catalyst in achieving whatever activity or attitude is desired by the user. Accordingly, ganja alone does not result in a particular behavior or frame of mind but is qualified by the psychological state of the smoker. This belief, universally held by the smoking population, not only accounts for the apparent incongruities in reports of effects (ganja can make one feel both sleepy and "workish," both euphoric and relaxed) but it also effectively places the ultimate responsibility for behavior during and after smoking on the user rather than on the ganja.

As a persisting social activity, ganja smoking among adult men is guided by a code of customary usage. The spliff is smoked in a manner similar to ordinary cigarettes, each user rolling, lighting, and smoking his own cigar. Among certain groups, however, members occasionally take turns supplying all or most of the ganja needed for a particular smoking session. It would be regarded as extraordinarily ill-mannered, when in a group, to smoke individually without at least offering a draw to others of the group who are without ganja. Thus, it is expected that in male gatherings a limited supply of ganja will be shared throughout the group. Among close friends and associates this expectation is particularly keen, and if it is known that an individual has ganja or access to ganja, but declines to bring it forth to share with friends, he is strongly criticized. In Leyburn, where practically all residents are closely related and privacy is limited, this principle of sharing is a major incentive for purchasing and possessing only small quantities of ganja at a time.

While having the appearance of being free and spontaneous, the apportionment of ganja among friends is subject to rules of reciprocity implicitly recognized by all participants, and individuals who continuously default in this regard are censured and eventually dropped from
the group. A significant qualification to this reciprocal ideal of exchange, however, is that each smoker is expected to contribute in relation to his ability to procure ganja. For example, when Russell Sykes, a tractor operator in Buckland, won in drop hand\textsuperscript{23} one week, he supplied all the ganja that he and his friends smoked that Friday evening. It was fully anticipated that he would do so and had he done otherwise, he would have incurred the disappointment and criticism of his peers. Likewise in Leyburn, when a smoker receives an unusually large cash payment through the sale of a particular crop or some livestock, it is anticipated that he will share some of his new wealth with his comrades by procuring ganja for them to smoke collectively. Rupert Graham, the largest recognized ganja cultivator in Leyburn, “toasts” his colleagues each year at reaping time by providing from his own crop almost all the ganja smoked in his group during that period.

The obligation to partake is just as compelling as the obligation to give. Even on first meeting, it is not unusual for a smoker to offer ganja to another smoker as an overture of friendship. A refusal to accept the offer of a draw with either old or new acquaintances, provided the situation is appropriate, is regarded as a refusal of friendship and social intercourse. Among ganja smokers, smoking with companions symbolizes comradeship, equality, and belonging; it is a sign of friendship and trustworthiness. Confidence can be placed in a man who joins in a smoke. In such a milieu, working-class men who do not smoke ganja, with the exception of the elderly and those complying with religious or medical injunctions, are suspect, at least initially; they may be considered either “mean” (too miserly to spend money for sharing ganja with friends), “technical” (untrustworthy), or possessing “weak brains” (not mentally competent to handle the effects of ganja smoking). The degree to which these suspicions are translated into the actual exclusion of non-smokers from peer-oriented male social activity varies with the community. Leyburn smokers are particularly rigid in this regard, while in Buckland and among certain groups in Deerfield there is more of a qualified tolerance for non-smokers.

Finally, there is a commonly expressed norm that regular smoking should be limited to those who are mentally capable of handling its effects. Not only does this belief attribute any untoward behavior that occurs during or after a smoking episode to a defect in the user and not in the ganja, but it also rationalizes the widely shared opinion that regular and frequent participation in this activity should be limited to adult men. Women, on the other hand, should restrict smoking to occasional use,\textsuperscript{25} preferably in the company of their more experienced mates. And young boys must undergo only a very gradual introduction to the substance because “dem nah haf de brains fe it.”

Such beliefs also impose internal controls on the conduct of smokers. The serious smoker does not want to behave in ways that would convince his friends and companions that he cannot handle the effects of ganja. Not only are such individuals perceived as less manly than more competent smokers, but they are also regarded as a threat to the group. For example, Ralph Dickinson, a young cane worker from Deerfield, is known for his indiscriminate and inappropriate use of ganja, which includes smoking while walking on the road and neglecting to extinguish his spliff before approaching the manager of his work gang. Among other workers, including heavy smokers, his behavior is considered foolish, disrespectful, and potentially dangerous. Consequently, his company is uniformly shunned.

In Leyburn, where peer relations have economic as well as social significance, this kind of avoidance may have harsh consequences for the individual. An illustrative case is that of Ruddy Ward, a small farmer in Leyburn, who had once been hospitalized for mental illness. He and four other users were smoking ganja down by the river when suddenly Ruddy began to shout about salvation and the devil. The other four, frightened that the police might hear, quickly picked up Ruddy and dropped him into the cold river water, holding him under for a few seconds. When they pulled him out he was sober, rational, and quiet. While “getting into spirit” in this manner may be an infrequent occurrence, it remains well within cultural expectations of religious behavior expressed in rural Jamaica by smokers and non-smokers alike. Nevertheless, such behavior contrasts with the “cool,” calm demeanor expected of smoking men. Because of his mental health history, smokers in the community are reluctant to invite Ruddy to join them, claiming that “him brains too weak fe smoke weed.” Not only has this position limited Ruddy’s participation in male social activity, it has also left him devoid of regular work partners. Consequently, despite his diligence and hard work, Ruddy has never been able to stabilize his economic position to equal that of his peers. Finally, these constraints on the behavior of ganja smokers extend to non-ganja activities as well. Men who do not meet their work and domestic responsibilities ordinarily are not respected by their peers and are avoided as regular smoking associates no matter how competent and generous they may be with regard to ganja use.

Of all methods of ganja consumption, the drinking of tea and tonic preparations enjoys the broadest acceptance, crossing socioeconomic, age, and sex lines. While smoking is designated as an adult male activity, women and children commonly share in the consumption of teas and tonics. Users and non-users alike discriminate between the effects of ganja tea drinking and those of ganja smoking. According to the folk
of ganja tea is prescribed as the ideal in all three communities, con-
colds, fevers, or intestinal complaints. Thus, while daily administration
for both therapeutic and prophylactic purposes. The effects of teas and
tonics entering the blood stream are not felt to be contingent on the
psychological state of the consumer and are essentially outside the user's
control.

The health-rendering effects of these preparations are reported for a
wide variety of general and specific disorders including the alleviation of
symptoms specific to arthritis, rheumatism, gonorrhea, hypertension,
asthma, bronchitis, urinary retention, recurrent malaria, impotence, vi-
sion problems, dermatologic eruptions, pneumonia, colds, and various
intestinal complaints. Ganja teas and tonics are particularly recom-
manded for children, who may well consume, in this form, a substantial
portion of the ganja used in rural Jamaica. These preparations are ad-
ministered to children to cure marasmus and infant diarrhea, relieve the
pain of teething, and in general provide an all-purpose medicine for the
young.

Besides these curative powers, ganja is reputedly used in the gen-
eral maintenance and promotion of health for both adults and children.
For example, farmers preparing for the heavy work of planting and
laborers anticipating migration abroad for farmwork often follow a re-

dime of daily tea and/or tonic consumption to "build blood and
strength." These preparations are equally popular for children to "make
dem strong and smart." A Leyburn midwife, for example, gives each
baby that she delivers a teaspoon of very weak ganja tea a few hours
after birth for the prevention of illness. Several mothers report prepar-
ing ganja for their children when they are sitting for examinations.

Though the conviction that ganja teas and tonics are beneficial is
universally held by the using population, there is considerable variation
of opinion pertaining to the time, quantity, and frequency of administra-
tion. These variations appear to reflect individual rather than community-
wide differences. In actual usage, however, only in Leyburn was ganja
tea consumed as regularly as ganja spliffs. For most residents of Buck-
land and Deerfield, neither bushweed nor the sticks (twigs and
branches) of the plant are readily available; consequently, cured, high-
quality ganja must be used. For this reason, tea is considered too expen-
sive to consume prophylactically and is reserved for specific illnesses;
colds, fevers, or intestinal complaints. Thus, while daily administration
of ganja tea is prescribed as the ideal in all three communities, con-
sumption of tea in most households of Buckland and Deerfield realistically
occurs once or twice per month. Likewise, despite almost unani-
mous agreement on the merit of ganja in maintaining the health and
alertness of children, only in Leyburn do children receive ganja tea or
tonic on a daily basis. In the other two communities ganja is adminis-
tered to children only as necessary for a particular illness or during
examination time. Tonics, however, administered by the teaspoon,
make more conservative use of ganja and are thus more prevalent in
Buckland and Deerfield than are tea preparations, particularly in a pre-
ventative, health-maintenance context.

Ganja poultices and compresses are used in all three communities
for the relief of pain, open wounds, and skin eruptions. Compresses are
made by placing green ganja leaves directly over the open wound or
painful area and then wrapping it with a thin cloth saturated with ganja
tonic. One reported treatment for open wounds included washing the
affected area with clear ganja tea and then sprinkling it with additional
ganja that has been parched and allowed to blacken. Not uncommon is
the belief that clear, boiled ganja tea can be effective for the relief of
pain when rubbed on the affected part. Also used for the relief of pain is
a topical preparation derived from seeds that have been ground, boiled,
and clarified and then bottled for an indeterminate amount of time to be
used when necessary. Topical ganja preparations for newborn infants are
also frequently mentioned. One woman reported that, if possible, ganja
leaves should be used to wash the baby on its birth night; another
prescribed the use of ganja tonic as a protection against colds in the
newborn by gently rubbing the tonic on the baby's fontanelles. Topical
medicaments prepared from ganja leaves, which are common in Ley-
burn, are, again, rare in Buckland and Deerfield. In the latter commu-
nities, plasters and rubs are derived primarily from seeds that have been
carefully removed from cured ganja prior to smoking.

The use of ganja as food has been reported, particularly in the hill
community, though this form of ingestion appears to be the most un-
usual form of consumption. One Ras Tafarian user in Leyburn reported
that he often chews green ganja stalks or leaves. A young woman
claimed to make ganja wine by boiling the substance and then leaving it
to ferment. An elderly East Indian informant from Leyburn reported
that in "first time," when his father and uncles planted ganja, they
would walk among the mature trees, letting the resin rub off on their
white clothing. On returning home they would scrape off the accumu-
lated substance and bake it in cookies and other condiments. There is no
indication, however, that this is currently practiced by even the most
ardent ganja devotees.

By far the most popular preparation of ganja in food is the addition
of the substance to soup or to greens and bananas by men who cook for themselves while working in their fields. For Leyburn farmers, this is a fairly regular occurrence, since they routinely spend from one to three nights in the bush each week in the company of other farmers. Buckland and Deerfield workers, however, seldom travel far enough from home to warrant cooking at the work site. This particular use of ganja is significant as the only one, other than smoking, that occurs in a peer-oriented social context. Otherwise teas, tonics, and topical preparations are generally limited, as are most medicinal substances, to a private, household, familial setting. Of the three communities, Leyburn residents appear to be the most inventive about the ways in which they prepare and consume ganja. This may be partly a result of the relatively consistent availability of ganja, particularly green, immature ganja, and partly because of the greater reliance on “bush teas” and other home remedies that hill farming communities have, in general, when compared to other communities.

The behavior and social groupings directly involved with ganja consumption are heavily influenced by age and sex. Social patterning of ganja changes as an individual moves from one period of his life to another. For the average rural user, at least four such periods are discernible, each with qualitatively different behavior, alignments, and values pertaining to ganja use: infancy-childhood (exposure to ganja), adolescence (experimentation with and socialization to smoking), young adulthood maturity (stability in smoking), and old age (decline in smoking).

During the first period, infants and young children of both sexes are exposed to ganja through the ingestion of diluted versions of ganja teas and tonics and other forms of medication. Many parents, even if they themselves are not ganja smokers, agree that its use “brainifies” and keeps the young healthy, and thus they will prepare ganja for these purposes. Even though tea is drunk inside the house in a familial setting, an aura of secretiveness surrounds this ordinary practice. Often words denoting ganja are not used to identify the tea served, and its taste is commonly disguised by milk, sugar, and other flavors, such as mint, so that the drinker may well be unaware of the basic ingredient.23

Verbal socialization of the child by the parent to ganja tea, as to ganja itself, is minimal. Young housewives, who themselves had been given tea regularly as children, report that they first learned the value of ganja tea and how to prepare it not from their mothers but from slightly older girlfriends or, after having established their own households, from their mates. After these young women begin to boil tea regularly, their mothers may then admit the “secret” and may even share their ganja supply with their daughters. For men, intergenerational restrictions continue well into adulthood, and only in a few instances were father and son observed smoking together. Even many heavy users are reluctant to smoke a spliff in the company of their parents.

Significantly, regular intense childhood inhalation of ganja is not advocated by users in any of the communities. A few fathers report that they give young sons an occasional draw to “make dem smart” and a Ras Tafarian claims that he sporadically blows smoke into the face of his newborn son in order to give him “wisdom and health.” Otherwise, tea or tonic consumption is the only method of ganja use, and childhood is the only period in which sexual discrimination of ganja consumption is absent and in which the use of ganja is not peer-related but intergenerational, with adults prescribing and providing ganja for minors in their care. Tea and tonic drinking, then, is the initial exposure to ganja for the young in rural Jamaica. As such, it is a preliminary, but not causal, phase leading to smoking.

During adolescence males become the primary consumers of ganja. While young boys are warned about the dangers of smoking ganja, such occasional admonitions appear to have minimal impact, particularly in households with senior males and regular smokers. While parent examples undoubtedly serve as role models, there is substantial evidence indicating that the initial experience with ganja smoking for both males and females is in the company of friends or kin of similar or slightly older age. In contemporary Jamaica, initial smoking may begin during pubescence, with the more precocious starting as early as seven or eight years of age. Smoking at such an early age, however, has occurred only in recent years. While the age of initial contact with smoking is definitively related to structural factors of local life and consequently varies from community to community, data from all three settings indicate that those users now fifteen to twenty-five years old began at an earlier age than smokers presently between thirty and fifty. The trend over the past decade or so toward earlier experimentation with ganja seems to be significant. And though it continues to elicit critical comments from smokers as well as non-smokers, it is no longer unusual for young boys of nine or ten to be seen smoking ganja in the hidden recesses of their villages.

In Leyburn it is almost impossible to find a boy thirteen years of age who has not experimented with ganja smoking on at least one occasion. In Buckland and Deerfield, on the other hand, a large proportion of the children do not experiment with ganja until comparatively late—from sixteen to nineteen years of age. These differences are related to variations in local social structure, the explication of which is reserved for future chapters. However, it is significant in comparing the three communities that the age at which initial contact with smoking occurs appears to have little influence on adult smoking patterns. Thus, preco-
cious experimenters in Leyburn often abandon smoking early in adult life, while the relatively older initiates of Deerfield and Buckland may continue as confirmed and regular smokers throughout most or all of their adult lives.

During the first years after initiation, smoking is more often a sporadic act rather than a regular activity. While never actually verbalized, this degree of usage is well within the expectations of ganja-smoking parents. Boys of this age who smoke with greater regularity are sharply criticized not only by parents but by the community in general. It is the opinion of seasoned smokers that the most appropriate introduction to ganja is a very gradual one. Not until a boy begins to earn his own living is it economically feasible for him to smoke on a more regular basis. Before that, the young initiate, if he is not supplied ganja without charge by a friend or relative, must pilfer it from the fields or from his father’s supply.

Despite the fact that mothers often encourage their young sons to smoke alone (if they must smoke at all) rather than in a group, solitary smoking remains a fairly infrequent occurrence among adolescents, who typically interact in large amorphous peer groups. And although smoking becomes increasingly regular during adolescence, it is generally limited to social occasions in the company of other adolescents—Friday and Saturday night gatherings along the river or sea beach, secluded locations on the perimeters of dances, or while bathing in the sea or river on Sunday afternoon. Ganja smoking is usually the primary focus of such gatherings in which conversations center on herbs, Ras Tafarianism, and contempt for the government position pertaining to ganja. These groupings are often dominated by the adolescent suppliers of ganja. In Leyburn, for example, boys do not ordinarily purchase ganja from adult vendors in their community for fear of exposure and also because adult vendors are reluctant to sell to them. Therefore, they rely on two young distributors, both of whom have spent a considerable period of time in the capital, one of whom is Barry Henry. On occasion, Barry or his counterpart brings a free supply of ganja and invites the others to share a chillum. After the free ganja is consumed, the boys then purchase bumps or sticks and turn to smoking spliffs. Because he has ganja to distribute and is slightly older and more worldly, Barry assumes leadership in these smoking sessions, opening and directing discussions and passing on new members. In this respect he wields considerable power within his peer group. 26

Young boys in Buckland are equally reticent to purchase ganja from local vendors, who may well have known them since they were infants. However, unlike in Leyburn, which is comparatively isolated, they have relatively easy access to the neighboring Deerfield sugar belt, where they may purchase ganja with comparative anonymity. The size and complexity of Deerfield facilitates the purchase of ganja both for its own adolescents and for those in surrounding communities. Consequently, the single-vendor domination typical of adolescent gatherings in Leyburn is generally not the norm in these communities, where access to ganja by teenage smokers is not as inhibited. However, older, more experienced smokers, who are often the suppliers of ganja to the younger ones, tend to control group activities to a large extent. Participation in these youthful groups varies according to the individual’s ability to buy as well as his commitment to ganja. Some young boys are only curious bystanders; others may smoke an occasional spliff; still others, particularly the oldest, are confirmed and steady smokers. Adolescent females in all three communities may share an occasional spliff with friends and siblings. However, their smoking pattern, unlike that of their male counterparts, remains casual and less organized. In Leyburn, for example, female adolescents are not present (nor is their presence encouraged) at Friday night smoking sessions on the river beach.

In any case, ganja smoking for many adolescent boys grows increasingly important. It is no longer “a joke” or inspired purely by curiosity but rather a continuous demonstration of courage and defiance, a commitment to their peers and most importantly, through their mature handling of ganja, a demonstration of manhood. In subtle ways, the transition from familial tea drinking to peer group smoking may be regarded as an informal rite of passage, an audacious act signifying the transition from boyhood to adulthood. The direct linkage of ganja to adult or responsible status appears to be well understood by users, as indicated by statements such as:

Ganja makes you more conscious. You meditate about life’s problems and don’t talk about silly things.

I think about what I would do if I had a wife and children and didn’t have a job.

Similarly, a man in his twenties who occasionally gives ganja to his ten-year-old brother claimed, “After he smokes, he becomes more conscious, he cannot romp in the streets any more like a little boy.”

In their twenties, young men begin to establish their own households, choose mates, acquire children, and settle into their adult occupational routines. As their life styles change, so do their ganja-related activities, alignments, and values. The alterations in ganja activity include primarily the extension of social smoking to the work setting and the significant increase in solitary smoking in both work and leisure contexts. Peer-oriented social smoking continues, but modifications in
the nature and composition of the groupings are distinguishable. The purchase or procuring of ganja, for instance, is often distinct from the social act of group smoking. In Leyburn, regular ganja users may even begin to cultivate their own supply in order to save money and to decrease their dependence on vendors. With the absence of vendor-leaders and buyer-leaders, adult groups evolve in all three communities that are more egalitarian than the adolescent ones that preceded them.

In this new period, smoking ganja is no longer a central preoccupation of these networks as it is for the younger age groups, but rather an integral part of the daily round, an almost unnoticed routine at work parties, lunch breaks, evening visits, and the like. Topics of conversation that center on crops, politics, union activity, village gossip, and so forth are banal when compared to adolescent dialogue, which focuses on ganja and its symbolic importance.

Smoking groups in Leyburn diminish in size and stabilize in membership as the choice of smoking companions is deliberately limited to certain work mates and trusted neighbors. In Buckland and Deerfield, on the other hand, the range of potential smoking associations increases, and groups are more fluid and diverse in membership. In any case, the choice of smoking associations in all three communities reflects work, neighbor, friendship, and kinship ties within each setting.

For the adult woman as well, patterns of ganja use are functionally linked and balanced with the ordinary requirements of rural life. As her peer group associations steadily decrease and her activities and goals take a more familial focus, her ganja activity is then comprised of preparing tea and other ganja medicines for her family and possibly smoking before engaging in sex. The woman who ignores these sex-linked injunctions on peer group smoking is sanctioned through censure and gossip by smokers and non-smokers alike. Moreover, she may be severely rebuked by her mate even though he smokes regularly with his peers and may actually encourage her to smoke with him alone.

This norm is exemplified by twenty-two-year-old Norma Bartholomew, who lives in Buckland with her two children and their father, Clifford Caldwell. Clifford is employed regularly as a laborer in Guantanamo Bay and is gone for several months at a time. During these periods Norma frequented her parent's home nearby, where she would enjoy the company of her younger brothers and sisters and their friends with whom she would occasionally smoke ganja. On his last visit home, however, Clifford was informed that "Norma gwan [is going on] like bad pickney [child]." He was extremely angry and reproved her in public. A few individuals were sympathetic to the loneliness of Norma's situation, but most of the community supported Clifford, and she was widely criticized for not behaving in a manner befitting a woman of her age and responsibility.

Many women not only give up smoking themselves but encourage their mates, often quite successfully, to discontinue the practice as well. Most women, however, ordinarily resist exerting such pressure until they are within the protected confines of a legal marriage. The limiting effects of marriage on social ganja smoking are related to the elevated status of legally married persons and are more obvious in Leyburn than the other two communities, which have higher percentages of married smokers.

Though a few smokers claimed that they would not trust a woman who does not smoke herself, their view of the ideal woman is one who is non-smoking but tolerant of her mate's ganja activities and supportive of his enterprises in production and distribution. A case in which the wife did not approach this ideal involves Mr. and Mrs. Clark, now in their sixties, who are largely inactive landowners in Leyburn. In the early days of his marriage, Mr. Clark allegedly grew a bumper ganja crop in order to construct a large house for his family "on the main." Throughout the entire process of cultivation and curing he told no one of his venture, including his wife. On the night that he was preparing to take the ganja to Kingston by mule, however, he asked Mrs. Clark to help him load the cart. When she saw the entire field storage shed filled with cured ganja, she angrily shouted at him, calling him a "ras dirty ganja man." Shocked and infuriated by his wife's reaction, Mr. Clark loaded the cart himself, marketed the ganja in Kingston, and returned with more than enough money to finish the house. Supposedly the success of his trip changed his wife's opinion. When he threw the bag of money on the table, Mrs. Clark excitedly asked her husband when he would plant the next crop. Mr. Clark became even more angered and shouted that he would not again risk going to jail for a "greedy, craven woman." The house was built as scheduled, but the couple's relationship steadily deteriorated, and Mr. Clark established a union outside the marriage that has persisted to the present. Mrs. Clark, in retaliation, refused to do more than minimal housekeeping. Consequently, while the house is structurally one of the finest in the community, it suffers in appearance from lack of care. Though the Clarks' relationship was probably unstable to begin with, this marital history is well known and often recounted among Leyburn ganja smokers and their mates as an example of the destructive force of an unsupportive woman.

Compared to younger age groups, there is a smaller percentage of regular ganja smokers over the age of sixty. Explanations for this vary. Some informants claim that the brains of elderly persons become weak and "dem cyan [can't] tek ganja again", some of the elderly themselves say that as they become older and death approaches they become more Christian, feel guilty about ganja smoking, and give it up. Other factors
may also be operative. For one, since the incidence of ganja use was considerably less when these men were in their formative and young-adult years, there should be proportionately fewer confirmed smokers among the older men. Secondly, older male smokers tend to lose their customary settings and incentives for smoking as they retire from work and lose their smoking companions through illness or death. Third, many old men have ceased to work and thus can no longer afford to buy ganja. And finally, as their status increases with age, men may relinquish this working-class activity. Although this pattern is present in all three communities, the reduction in prevalence of smoking among elderly men is greatest in Leyburn, where age and status are strongly correlated.

Significantly, perceived reactions to ganja that affect the mood and personality of the user are also roughly correlated with life cycle stages of ganja use. According to informants, these effects result primarily from smoking rather than from other forms of consumption. Since smoking is the primary form of social consumption, its effects on the individual in such observable settings are likely to be seen in terms of psychological disposition. As previously mentioned, these effects can be divided into three basic moods or psychic states: reflection, euphoria, and relaxation.

With few exceptions, reports on the reflective effects of ganja use come primarily from young men in late adolescence and the early twenties. As previously mentioned, ganja smoking enables them to reflect on their past and future and provides them with insights into the problems of life. The following comments are typical:

- This is a time for discussing God, creation, the ruling of man, and signs of the time such as war and depression.
- It helps you to think about the future.
- You plan your life.
- If you have something to consider, you smoke ganja to help you.
- I smoke when I have to consider.
- Smoking helps me see plenty t'ings.
- We talk about girls, the future, and how to get out [improve one's condition].

These statements strongly reinforce the proposition that ganja smoking is, in fact, an informal rite of passage for young males, symbolizing the transition from adolescence to manhood and leading to serious consideration of adult life.

Young adult smokers of both sexes report the sensation of euphoria, often described by them as the lifting of depression:

- It makes you feel lively and nice. Like you're in the world again.
- She smoked some kali during the dance and when she came back she danced better than before.
- I feel more merry, not lonesome.
- Just nice and happy.
- It makes you sing better and your brains quick.
- It give I a brave spirit.
- It give I a bold speech.
- I get through schoolwork very fast.
- It let you feel brave.
- If somet'ing trouble you, it cut off de t'ing from your brains.

A third type of mood believed to be induced by ganja is reported primarily by informants over thirty years of age. These users, of both sexes, claim that ganja makes them feel "cool," "conservative," "relaxed," and "calm." In fact, one informant insisted that smoking so calmed and relaxed him that his wife complained he was uncommunicative and silent, and eventually he gave up the practice of smoking. For most of the middle-aged and older smokers, however, a state of relaxation, of calm, of "coolness," is thought of as being desirable for their status and condition in life. In general, it might be argued that reactions to ganja pertaining to mood and temper are heavily influenced by the age and status of the user to achieve the dispositional states appropriate to and functional for particular age groups in particular socioeconomic contexts.

Even this cursory overview of ganja activity as it exists in three rural Jamaican communities reveals that it is organized on an institutional level, complete with social groupings, patterns of activities, a regulatory code, and a charter of values. It is evident that, for the majority of users, the consumption of ganja is not indiscriminate and sporadic, motivated only by a desire for the drug experience itself, but conforms to standards that qualify participants by age and sex, regulate the physical and social circumstances in which ganja may be consumed, and delineate appropriate behavior associated with ganja use. Acceptance in smoking groups and approval of the community in general imply adherence to these institutional constraints on behavior, and those
who do not conform are exposed to the negative sanctions of their fellow residents.

While ganja-related behavior indeed constitutes a rural Jamaican social institution, its local conditions vary. The present introductory comparison has touched upon differences in the prevalence of smoking, the prevalence of tea drinking, the age of first contact with smoking, and the social groupings that attach to production, distribution, and consumption, all of which demonstrate the influence of local socioeconomic conditions on the patterning of ganja activity, and the intense integration of ganja behavior with other institutions. While this chapter has provided a summary overview and some intercommunity comparison of the ganja complex as it exists in rural Jamaica, intracommunity variation in production, distribution, and consumption of ganja, firmly entrenched in local status differences, has been given only passing recognition. The next chapter will analyze these socioeconomic variations in the deployment of the ganja complex as they appear among the three communities.

Notes

1. The following are the most common terms used by the folk for various grades of cannabis sativa:
   
   Kali: According to users and cultivators, the fully matured plant, which "grows tall as a man and stands wide as a room," is generally recognized by the presence of seeds and by its strong smell. Kali is considered the most potent form of ganja and is the most expensive to purchase.

   Bush, bushweed: The immature ganja plant, pale green in color, is distinguished from kali by the absence of seeds. It is considered less potent than kali and not as smooth for smoking.

   Cured ganja: Cannabis that has been systematically set to dry by sunlight for two to twelve weeks. It can be either kali or bushweed, although a full three-month curing process is generally not adhered to for bushweed. Curing is reputed to increase ganja potency so that cured kali is generally regarded as much stronger than green kali.

   Green ganja: The cannabis plant when first cut and before curing. It can be either of the kali or bushweed variety and enjoys greatest use in medicinal potions or teas.

   2. "Weed" and "herb" or "herbs" are common synonyms for ganja.

   3. Ten squares equal one acre.

   4. Where seedlings are not planted among other crops, the quantity of ganja planted is measured in the amount of land used rather than the number of roots planted. It is estimated, however, that between two and three hundred roots are planted per square (one-tenth of an acre), but that one can expect only fifty to eighty full grown trees per square.

5. It is likely that the differences between the two communities in the sexual injunctions related to ganja cultivation reflect community differences in the stability of working-class conjugal relations. In Deerfield, where unions are comparatively brittle and change frequently, notions about the inherent danger of women abound. In Leyburn, on the other hand, where such unions are reinforced by a variety of social and economic considerations, suspicion is directed categorically less at women and more at neighbors.

6. Four of the eight Cheapside cultivators are reputed to possess and carry hand guns.

7. These are large burlap sacks that can hold approximately sixty pounds of ganja.

8. Barry's clientele is composed mostly of adolescents who are generally Friday and Saturday night social smokers.

9. Though the selling of cards is illegal, the practice is widespread.

10. District constables are local men appointed to carry out police activities in the absence of officers of the regular constabulary and to act as their liaison with the community. They are permitted to carry fire arms and to enter and search without a warrant.

11. The distinction between an herb camp, where men and even some families reside in a pattern of domestic organization centered around the sale and use of ganja, and an herb yard, where only the sale of ganja is transacted, was originally made by Claudia Rogers, fellow member of the Research Institute for the Study of Man anthropological team (Rogers 1975).

12. Ganja vending has much the same rate of success as other merchandizing ventures in Leyburn. During the two-year period in which I was in contact with the community, no fewer than seven shops were opened and closed again because people refused to pay outstanding bills. The only two shops in Leyburn that have succeeded are owned and managed by families who are not native to the area: the Davenport's, who are large landowners in the area but maintain their social life in Kingston, and Mrs. Morris, a childless widow who came to Leyburn as a result of her marriage and has no compunction about denying credit or collecting debts from customers.

13. This essential difference became obvious early in the fieldwork when I was trying to identify and enumerate cultivators and vendors in the three communities. Whereas the number of cultivators was difficult to ascertain due to the degree of secrecy attached to this illegal practice, it was a comparatively simple task to locate and talk to vendors—particularly in Buckland and Deerfield. This was less true in Leyburn, where herb yards are not the distribution mode and vendorship is more clandestine. Even there, however, it was much easier to identify vendors, though they may have claimed they were currently not selling, than to identify growers.

14. Spliff, often pronounced skliff, is the Jamaican equivalent of the American reefer or joint. Spliffs are rolled by hand by the user, who...
may utilize any kind of paper wrapping, although white bakery bag paper is the wrapping of choice. A spliff may contain varying amounts of ganja mixed with about a half-inch of cigarette tobacco to which small amounts of rosemary or anise may be added on occasion, mainly to disguise the smell. It is conical in shape, about four inches in length, and twisted at the thicker end. The pointed end is held in the mouth, and the spliff is generally positioned vertically while smoking to prevent the ganja-tobacco blend from falling out. Each inhalation is called a draw, although this term is sometimes used to refer to the smoking of the entire spliff.

15. Chillum, from the Hindi term chilam, is the part of the pipe that contains a burning ganja-tobacco blend. However, the term is often used to refer to the whole pipe. It is constructed of glass bottles, wood, coconut shell, or horn, or a combination of these materials, and fitted with one or more pieces of wood or rubber tubing, through which ganja is inhaled. A quarter- to a half-ounce of ganja, usually mixed with tobacco, can be used at one time. Smoking the chillum is ordinarily a shared activity.

16. "Iray" is a Ras Tafarian term meaning fine, uncontaminated, possessing a natural excellence.

17. "I and I" is a Ras Tafarian expression.

18. Physiological responses such as increased urination, increased heart rate, perspiration, dryness of the mouth, and so forth were also reported. However, since they did not result only from the consumption of ganja by inhalation and since they are not directly related to the sociological thrust of this study, they are not included here. See Rubin and Comitas (1975: 80–110).

19. While a few users reported achieving these effects through tea and tonic consumption, the majority indicated that psychological consequences of this nature are derived primarily from smoking.

20. The relationship of ganja to the performance and organization of work is a major theme of this study and will be examined in detail in Chapters 6 and 7.

21. The relationship of these individually perceived effects to cultural set and setting in Jamaica are reviewed in Rubin and Comitas (1975: 157–161).

22. An illegal gambling game similar to the "numbers" racket.

23. Individual exceptions to this general rule exist in each of the three communities.

24. This study does not include a detailed description and analysis of forms of consumption other than smoking. However, reports from Leyburn residents of tea and tonic preparations and their effects are recorded in the original report of the Jamaican Ganja Project submitted to the Center for Studies of Narcotic and Drug Abuse, National Institute of Mental Health, Contract No. HSM-42-70-97, entitled Effects of Chronic Smoking of Cannabis in Jamaica.
Ganja in Socioeconomic Perspective

The ganja complex, while widespread, does not enjoy universal acceptance within Jamaican society. References to ganja in the sociological literature consistently identify extensive use and endorsement of the drug as a lower-class phenomenon (M. G. Smith 1965a: 170), associated primarily with laborers (Davison 1973: 152) and Ras Taffarians (Smith et al. 1960; Henriques 1968: 88; Nettleford 1970). The sectional exclusivity of the ganja complex is identifiable in public sentiment as well. During 1972, over 150 arrests for illegal possession of ganja were reported in the Daily Gleaner, Jamaica's national newspaper. For the most part, those arrests were of men from the lowest socioeconomic level and were summarily dismissed in a few small paragraphs designating names, location, and the amount of ganja confiscated. When a middle-class university student was arrested for possession of a comparatively small amount of ganja, however, the event was given a full-page write-up; every facet was covered in great detail with equally copious coverage given to the lengthy trial that ensued. In spite of the fact that it is illegal and that it meets with considerable social disapproval, ganja smoking appears to be well within Jamaican societal expectations for the lower classes. It is, however, deemed inappropriate, even sensational, for members of the upper levels of Jamaican society.

As we shall see, this association between socioeconomic level and ganja use is central to understanding the behavior, attitudes, life cycle patterns, and social groupings that comprise this highly significant institution. The intent of this chapter is to describe the apparent relationship between socioeconomic status and the ganja complex with reference to working men in Leyburn, Buckland, and Deerfield, and to establish whether and to what extent ganja behavior at the community level conforms to the norms expressed at the societal level. Often raised in debates pertaining to ganja is the specific issue of whether or not ganja smoking induces antisocial behavior. In all three settings the sectional polarity of this issue is readily observable in the reactions to and opinions regarding certain local events and phenomena—particularly those that concern aggressive acts, criminal behavior, and mental illness. For example, in Leyburn there are two men, Malechi Graham and Sam McKoy, both of whom are heavy ganja smokers and both of whom suffer from occasional psychotic episodes.

Malechi Graham is ordinarily no threat to the villagers, who regard his autistic wanderings with sympathetic indifference. However, during his "spells," in which he shouts, curses, and wildly wavers his machete, he is terrifying, and middle-class residents are then quick to insist that Malechi's condition is a direct result of heavy ganja smoking; lower-level residents, on the other hand, claim that while Malechi, indeed, smokes a "whole heap a weed," he became "mad" from studying books on "science."

Sam McKoy's behavior during his periods of irrationality is far less menacing than Malechi's, and he is the object of considerable teasing as well as concern from fellow residents. His brother, Clayton, however, a well-established Level II resident of Leyburn, is the object of criticism as well as envy from lower-level villagers. These people insist that Sam was once a respected citizen with land and a good trade but that his brother Clayton was jealous and used obeah to "mad" him and to usurp Sam's legacy from their father. The use of ganja is not seen by these residents as contributing to Sam's mental condition. On the other hand, Clayton McKoy and his friends, who find Sam's bizarre behavior a social embarrassment, insist that it is Sam's extensive use of ganja that precipitated his mental condition.

In Buckland, one of Justice Thornley's adult sons, Desmond, spends most of every day walking up and down the road, mumbling incoherently and smoking ganja, despite his reputation for being one of the most intelligent, well-educated men in the area. According to the Justice and his friends in Buckland's middle sector, Desmond's mental problems began when he was introduced to ganja while living with his mother in London and attending school there. The ganja made him ignore his schoolwork and eventually affected his mind and personality. Lower-sector residents of Buckland, however, who uniformly regard Justice Thornley as "wicked" and who express great fear of his "scientific" (obeah-founded) power, claim that the Justice is so evil that "him tun [turn] him own son fool-fool." They insist that Desmond's openly critical stance regarding his father's opportunistic, even ruthless, treatment of fellow Buckland residents led to his downfall through obeah employed by his father.

Thus, while middle levels of both communities uniformly attribute the mental illness of these individuals to their use of ganja, the lower
strata tend to seek explanations elsewhere. As indicated by these examples, obeah and ganja often provide alternative explanations for a particular phenomenon. The selection of one of these alternatives by a villager depends to a considerable extent on his socioeconomic position and his relationship to the participants in the event. Ruddy Ward, the forty-two-year-old ganja man from Leyburn who was confined to a psychiatric hospital for several months when in his twenties, is typical. Mr. Attridge, his employer, claims that Ward’s hospitalization was a result of smoking ganja; his peers, on the other hand, claim that “his brains were too weak” to consume the amount of ganja that most men can smoke; and Ward himself contends that it came about because a “duppy” (spirit of a dead person) was “set” on him through obeah. Whatever the explanation, Ward maintains that in the hospital his recovery was actually hastened by his procuring and smoking the “best kali me ever have.” Since that time, he has had no recurrence of the “illness” even though he has continued smoking regularly.

Of even greater concern to middle and upper sectors of Jamaican society is the relationship of ganja to criminally aggressive acts. The two major newspapers abound with articles implicating ganja in the perpetration of disorderly and criminal behavior. In Buckland, debate on the relationship of ganja to this type of antisocial behavior was provoked by the murder of thirty-three-year-old Percy Thomas by sixteen-year-old Owen Williams. Owen had been working intermittently on the small truck that Percy drove to Kingston several times each week delivering empty beverage containers to a bottling plant. The employment arrangements between the two were loose, the boy generally substituting when one of the two regular assistants were not available to work. Owen lived alone with his grandmother, who had raised him from infancy in one of the poorest households in Buckland. Having left school at fourteen, essentially illiterate and with no skills, he picked up jobs here and there for extra cash but continued to rely primarily on his grandmother for support. Owen’s use of ganja, like that of most boys in his age and socioeconomic category, was generally restricted to social occasions in the company of his peers. The opportunity to work with Percy was highly valued by Owen and he anticipated eventually becoming one of his regular assistants. Those who were in a position to observe the relationship at close hand claimed that the boy worshiped Percy and recounted to his friends greatly exaggerated stories about the places that Percy would take him and the things they would do while in town.

In the meantime, Percy’s nephew had asked him for some temporary extra work and, without informing Owen, Percy agreed to have his nephew ride the truck for a few weeks. After several days had passed without being called to work, Owen dejectedly went to the rum shop where Percy ordinarily rested and socialized with friends on his return from town. The boy asked when he would work again. Percy, who had been drinking heavily, ignored the question and continued conversing with his colleagues. Finally, as Percy rose to go home for dinner, Owen approached him again. With a gesture of annoyance, Percy loudly told the boy to “go home and bathe fe me cyan [can’t] stan’ how you stink.” The others in the shop had barely started to laugh when Owen pulled a rachette from his pocket and gave Percy one fatal stab.

Since both Percy and his wife were native to Buckland and very popular, his death touched nearly everyone in the community and stirred profuse speculation on the cause of the incident. The role played by ganja was at the core of the controversy. The police report stated that ganja had been found in Owen’s possession and that the boy’s grandmother had said that he had been home smoking all day before the incident. Members of the middle sectors, including Percy’s parents, insisted that this was a clear indication that ganja led to aggression and crime, particularly since Percy had been “so good” to the boy, giving him work and taking him places. Owen’s peers, however, claimed that the grandmother was simply excusing Owen’s actions by attributing his behavior to consumption of ganja. According to this group, Owen had no money for the purchase of ganja because he had not worked in several days. He had, they admitted, procured a stick from a friend and rolled two spliffs a short time before the incident. He smoked one spliff at that time, their argument ran, for the sole purpose of acquiring the self-assurance to approach Percy about his employment. The prevailing opinion among those from the lower sectors of the community was that Owen was an extremely unstable and agitated boy to begin with and, their friendship for Percy notwithstanding, that the youth may have been seriously mistreated and provoked.

In a neighboring district to Leyburn, a teenage boy murdered his mother, mutilated her body with a machete, and then attempted to bury her along the river bank under a pile of leaves. The body was soon discovered and the boy arrested for the crime. According to the police, ganja was found in his possession, and he admitted to have been smoking for several days before the murder. Individuals from the higher sectors of the community, recounting the grisly event, categorically claimed that ganja “mad” the boy and led him to kill his mother. On the other hand, smokers and those closely associated with them from the lower strata claimed that the “boy’s brains were no good” and that “he was funny to begin with.”

Though neither side totally eliminated ganja as a factor, the non-smoking middle and upper sectors of these rural communities uniformly blamed ganja, admitting to no other possible reason for these criminally
psychotic acts. Discussion among lower-strata members, in contrast, usually stressed the boy's mental state prior to smoking:

If you have somet'ing against somebody you shouldn't smoke right then because smoking will make you carry it through.

Smoking can make you do somet'ing that you've kept in your heart.

Age and maturity were also frequently mentioned by the lower strata as critical factors in both cases: "It can make boys susceptible to bad thoughts and to do bad things." A Leyburn man, himself a heavy smoker, observed that a teenage acquaintance was "too young fe smoke. Him 'black up' [becomes intoxicated] and want to kill him father." Still others of this sector in Leyburn hinted that the boy who killed his mother made use of ganja as a culturally convenient excuse to commit the crime, in the same way that Owen's friends claimed that his grandmother used ganja smoking as a rationale for the boy's actions.

In Deerfield as well, the managerial sectors of estate society commonly attribute aggressive behavior on the part of workers to their use of herbs. For example, when questioned about the effects of ganja smoking on cane workers, Jonas Brown, a reaping headman, claimed, "Dem ready fe kill you dat time," and described an altercation between the assistant headman and several irate cutters at the Friday paybill. "Dem went fe kill Mr. Paul and me haf fe stan in front and just humors dem." When he reported the incident to the manager, expecting that the men would be reprimanded, the manager instead told Brown to "just mek [let] dem stay.... You know what dem in already.... Dem into dem t'ings [they're intoxicated with ganja]." It was then, Brown later asserted, that he knew the manager was afraid of the influence of ganja on the workers.

Members of the managerial levels also contend that ganja is a primary cause of disability and illness among workers. Three weeks into the reaping season, sixty-three-year-old Mr. Cornwall, a heavy ganja user, became ill and remained absent from work for one week. On the first day of his return to work he "dropped down" and was taken to the infirmary by the farm manager. The doctor advised him to rest at home and not return to work until he felt better. Three days later he died. As with cases of aggressive behavior, conflicting postures surrounding ganja use crystallized around Mr. Cornwall's illness and death. Management uniformly attributed Cornwall's death to his extensive use of ganja, which they claimed is deleterious to the health of all workers. Workers, on the other hand, varied in their assessment of the situation. Some claimed it was not the ganja itself that caused Cornwall's death but that, under the influence of weed, men are likely to work beyond their physi-

cal capacity because they do not recognize the symptoms of fatigue; others insisted that when one uses ganja to work, it requires that you "eat plenty food to build your strength," and, accordingly, Cornwall's death resulted from his not eating enough food to restore the energy that he expended doing the hard work of cutting cane. Still others felt that Cornwall's death was completely unrelated to his use of ganja—that he was simply too old and unwell for the heavy work of cane cutting—and used their own consumption of ganja as evidence that it is not detrimental to health and physical maintenance.

It became quickly evident from the various reactions to all these incidents that, if a man uses ganja on a regular basis, he can anticipate that any untoward dimension of his health, character, or behavior will be charged to his consumption of ganja, especially by his socioeconomic superiors. Much like obeah or magic, ganja serves as a transcendent explanation for certain categories of behavior and events. Once an individual is known to be a ganja smoker, untoward behavior on his part is almost automatically attributed to the herb.

Even those who view smoking as possibly, rather than necessarily, generating antisocial behavior—"smoking can mad you" or "smoking can be dangerous"—do not attribute such behavior to properties of ganja itself. A commonly cited folk explanation that prevails among the middle sectors is that when you smoke "a tiny lady dances before your eyes and everything she tells you to do you must do." The directions given to the smoker by this tiny lady can be either for good or for bad, but the smoker has essentially lost control. This loss of control, whether or not it is associated with "little ladies," becomes an important rationale for members of the higher or aspiring levels to abstain from smoking ganja.

A senior staff member of Deerfield Estate described an incident concerning Mr. Miller, one of his colleagues, who is responsible for keeping the records of tonnage and sucrose content of the cane brought to the factory by cane farmers. On this particular occasion, Miller was working the night shift. Before going to work, a friend visited him from Kingston, bringing some ganja to smoke. Since this was Miller's first experience with smoking ganja, he was curious to know its effects. He had, however, no apparent reaction to the drug and went to his job feeling perfectly normal. He sat down at his desk, opened the record book, and proceeded to draw a giant X across the page. After looking at what he had done, Miller burst into uncontrollable laughter, closed up the book, and went home to sleep. Since that time, he has never again attempted to smoke ganja and warns others not to smoke. The using population, on the other hand, drawn from the lower socioeconomic strata of these communities, maintains that the knowledgeable smoker controls ganja and not the reverse: "Dem say it make people commit
rape and murder and rob people but people do all dem t'ings wit' or wit'out ganja.” Some members of these strata, including smokers, do not deny a possible loose linkage of ganja smoking and violent behavior, but they adamantly claim that such behavior is the result of a misuse of ganja. Thus, comments such as “him smoke too much herbs” or “him smoke on an empty stomach” express concepts of overindulgence and improper consumption. Ganja users also feel that attempts to link ganja to antisocial behavior are merely another example of government propaganda against poor people. One belief commonly held by members of this section of society is that the government has made ganja illegal not because it leads to criminality but because it takes money away from medical doctors, since people who use ganja do not get sick.

From their perspective, ganja is considerably less of a threat in causing aggression and violence than are rum and other hard spirits, which enjoy legal sanctions and the patronage of middle-class men, including the police. In this regard, the death of Buckland’s Percy Thomas precipitated new discussion on the continuous sectional debate concerning the relative merits of rum and ganja. Several individuals in Buckland claimed that it was really white rum that indirectly resulted in the murder; Percy would not have responded in such an abusive manner if he had not been drunk. On the surface, the lower-stratum assertion that rum is more socially dangerous than ganja appears to be plausible.

In rural Jamaica hard drinking by the relatively affluent is not uncommon, particularly on weekends. Boisterousness and aggressive outbursts are not infrequent, and hostility, truculence, and even physically abusive behavior while drinking are culturally understood and are tolerated within limits. Ironically, Percy, himself, had stabbed and seriously wounded his best friend in a rum shop quarrel two years earlier while under the influence of white rum. In contrast, ganja users enjoy their spliffs in relative isolation, away from central points of congregation. Unusual behavior by one theoretically endangers all in the group; consequently, care is taken to quiet the offending individual and not draw public attention. Thus, while the real incidence of ganja-induced aggressiveness may well be smaller than that from rum, the social controversy surrounding its use clouds attempts to compare their effects objectively.

Table 2, which concerns the relationship between socioeconomic status and expressed opinions concerning ganja use, indicates that 92 percent of the adult male sample drawn from the middle and upper sectors (I and II) of these communities expressed their opposition to the smoking of ganja, while only 51 percent of the opinions expressed by the lower-strata sample (III) could be classified as unfavorable toward ganja smoking. Table 3 leaves little doubt as to the close association between the prevalence of ganja smoking and the socioeconomic status of adult men in the three settings of the study. Institutionalized smoking, represented by the number of heavy and occasional users, is rare (7.4 percent) among members of Level II and absent among those in Level I. Clearly the majority of men in the upper strata of the communities are not routine ganja smokers. Conversely, ganja smoking appears to be almost symptomatic of the lowest status level (IIIb), which, as a group, contains the highest percentage of regular (48.4 percent) and occasional (14.9 percent) smokers and the lowest proportion of non-smokers (24.2 percent). In fact, members of this stratum who do not partake in this activity and are not elderly or “Christians” are often regarded by their peers as slightly suspect:

Him a technical man, y’see. . . Him tek his money and buy someting else while you spend your money on herbs.

Me na trust de man. Him will give we away [inform to those in authority] fe him wicked.

No, me never see him smoke weed but him always seeking seed fe plant. I never gi’ him because me fearful him will tell police. Dem talk about men who use it and me na trust him.

Dem too coward fe tek a chance to enjoy a spliff.

Among the rural middle class, however, ganja smoking is not an integrated part of work and recreation. In the entire course of fieldwork, I never observed ganja smoking as an ingredient of the social events, dances, dating, or parties of this section—even those that were male oriented such as cricket games and fish feeds. Likewise it is absent on work breaks and lunch hours, a favorite smoking time among laborers in both factory and field. Thus, both in reaction to local events and in the behavior and opinions of the adult male sample, the three field sites conform to the expected relationship between ganja-linked values and socioeconomic position revealed in public sentiment on the national level: the higher the socioeconomic ranking, the more critical the stance in regard to ganja; the lower the socioeconomic ranking, the more defensive the stance in regard to ganja.

No matter what the position taken, the ganja issue is almost always argued in the context of smoking. Tea and tonic drinking are not considered to affect social behavior. As indicated in Table 2, 62 percent of the sample of Levels I and II who disapproved of smoking nevertheless endorsed ganja tea drinking. This figure becomes significant when compared with the 24 percent of Levels I and II who currently smoke ganja to even the most limited extent, with only 7 percent classified as “heavy” or “occasional” users (Table 3). Apparently it is not the ganja
Table 2  Opinions Regarding Ganja Use Expressed by Adult Males* in Leyburn, Buckland, and Deerfield by Socioeconomic Level†

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic level</th>
<th>Defends use of ganja</th>
<th>Endorses tea but not smoking</th>
<th>Opposes use of ganja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Col. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Ia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Ib</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIIa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIIb</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Males over fifteen years old.
† Socioeconomic levels are defined in Chapter 2.

Table 3  Prevalence of Ganja Smoking Among Adult Males* in Leyburn, Buckland, and Deerfield by Socioeconomic Level and Degree of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic level</th>
<th>Heavy</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Infrequent</th>
<th>Discontinued</th>
<th>Non-smoker</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Col. %</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Col. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Ia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Ib</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIIa</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIIb</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Males over fifteen years old.
itself but the method of consumption and the social context in which it is consumed that are the critical factors determining acceptance by the Jamaican rural middle class. Teas and tonics are considered medicinal preparations with no adverse side effects, consumed in the confines of the household, and, as such, they are quietly but widely accepted throughout these communities. Their use ordinarily brings neither police reprisal nor social censure. Therefore, they are socially "safe" methods of consuming ganja.

Ganja smoking, on the other hand, is a social act generally carried out in the company of peers. This is not to say that individuals never smoke alone in the privacy of their homes; they do, of course. However, to be considered a "ganja man" in the sociological sense requires not only that the individual smoke heavily but that he be reputed, within his community, to be a routine smoker of ganja and one who openly associates with other ganja smokers. For this reason smokers are more vulnerable to arrest for their illegal activity than tea drinkers. If caught and convicted, their economic future may be jeopardized.

But even more significant than the deliberate and open defiance of national jural-legal standards, the strong correlation between ganja smoking and socioeconomic status is self-reinforcing: ganja smokers are quickly "coded" or identified with the lowest socioeconomic level. Public display of such behavior by a well-established citizen or an aspiring individual leaves him vulnerable to social censure as well as to the jural-legal penalties already mentioned, and affects his chances for maintaining or achieving high status and the material benefits derived from such a position. For these individuals, the local community represents the arena in which evaluations are made and in which their respectability and authority are established. Residents function not only as neighbors and friends but also in relationships that are intrinsically asymmetrical—employer-employee, deacon-congregation, headman-applicant, and so forth—with some residents exerting power and influence over other residents in various spheres of activity. Because their authority is, to a large extent, derived on the local level, it is important that they separate and distinguish themselves from their socioeconomic inferiors both behaviorally and in their endorsement of values. As the supervisor of Leyburn's tobacco company stated, "There are three things I don't do that will help me get ahead in life: I don't drink rum; I don't gamble; and I don't smoke ganja."

Moreover, smoking ganja together presumes a degree of intimacy and mutual knowledge among the participants that would make an individual from Level I or II uncomfortable in the company of his socioeconomic subordinates. For males on the lowest rung of society, ganja symbolizes both trustworthiness and friendship. Confidence can be placed in a man who joins in a smoke, and those who will not are regarded as "technical" or unpredictable. When smokers were questioned individually as to which men were hypothetically closer friends—men who smoke ganja together or men who drink rum together—they unfailingly selected the smokers. While certainly joint participation in an illegal activity assists in creating this atmosphere of trust and solidarity, the very absence of "bosses," "massa," and "three-quarter rich black men" further encourages a feeling of common experience through conversations centering on drought, low market prices, long work hours, poor wages, low crop subsidies, and so forth. The result is a peer-oriented activity that reinforces the feelings of brotherhood within the working class.

For those of higher status, participation in an activity that is not only illegal but temporarily suspends the distinctions in wealth and prestige among men produces a socially leveling effect too drastic in its consequences. One cannot smoke in a spirit of brotherhood one day and exercise authority over the same men on the next. Mr. Logan, for example, is one of only two men on the entire senior staff of Deerfield Estate who were born and raised in the sugar belt. Many of the boys with whom he grew up and with whom he cut cane in his youth are still field laborers. Reflecting on his situation and status, Logan often comments for never having smoked ganja in his younger days, claiming that, when he has to supervise his former friends in their labor, no one can say "Well, come on, we smoked weed together, . . . You can't tell me what to do."

Ganja smoking differs from other recreational activities, such as rum drinking, in this regard. Few, if any, prohibitions or disabilities prevent an employer from occasionally drinking with his employees and social inferiors, usually at the employer's expense. The ganja complex, however, is guided by values that make it incongruous for men whose relationship is asymmetrical to smoke together. Consequently, the middle levels of rural communities will endorse ganja consumption only when it does not endanger their respectability or entangle them in the web of lower-level community relations.

Nevertheless, despite the prevailing practice of non-smoking and negative sanction indicated in the Level I and Level II samples, infrequent and discontinued smokers comprise over one-fourth (26 percent) of these levels. This reveals that a substantial proportion of the rural middle class has either limited current experience or past experience with ganja smoking. Unlike the lower section pattern, however, in which ganja smoking is institutionalized and inextricably meshed with other functions of daily living, smoking among this group is a special event, taking place in special circumstances. The following incident,
reported by a Buckland informant in an atmosphere of intense confidentiality, occurred when he was working as a helper at the small restaurant on the fishing beach:

Mass Hugh [Bell] and Sidney Armstrong [owner of Eaglebrook property] and three men from town was down at Miss Lottie's. Dem a drink rum and eat fish and mek plenty joke when Mass Hugh call me. "Thomas, cum y'nah. You know where to get some weed?" An me heart a jump fe me frighten. . . . but me tek courage. Me seh "sure boss." Him seh "Well, come bring we some now." So me carry bring some and dem go far along de sea beach and deep into de cane piece fe smoke weed.

These elaborate preparations have as their major purpose the exclusion of the local community from the knowledge that one is indeed a smoker of ganja. Their purpose is to avoid social censure and subsequent loss of authority or prestige. The daughters of the postmistress in Leyburn, for example, admitted experimenting with ganja while boarding in Kingston to attend school. However, they quickly added that they would never consider smoking ganja in Leyburn or smoking with any of the local youths for "people would talk," causing embarrassment to themselves and to their mother.

For members of the rural middle section, the procuring of ganja for teas, tonics, or a rare spliff is as problematic as smoking. For example, a Deerfield middle-class smoker who was a senior staff member apologized to his house guests that he had no ganja to offer them. He had not been able to get into Kingston to purchase a supply, despite the fact that within a mile radius of his dwelling there were at least six active ganja vendors. Even if he knew the location of these local retailers, however, which he did not, he would not have patronized them for fear of being identified by other members of the community in the act of procuring ganja.

In Leyburn, where local conditions permit cultivation of ganja, middle-section users frequently plant their own so that they will not be in the position of having to expose themselves by purchasing it publicly or asking others to purchase it for them. In fact, of the thirty-seven men who plant ganja solely for domestic consumption, seventeen, or nearly half, belong to Level II households. Other residents of the middle strata—particularly in Buckland and Leyburn—procure ganja indirectly by asking a trusted individual to handle the transaction for them. In Deerfield, middle-class purchasers will buy ganja directly from a vendor, but they tend to purchase larger quantities (a quarter- or half-ounce) less frequently and seldom remain in herb yards to socialize with the other men as lower-stratum (IIIb) buyers would do. For a number of middle-class households in all three communities, relatives or close friends who are in the police force provide a major source of ganja for consumption.

Finally, as with most other dimensions of the ganja complex, the question of who is participating in and profiting from commercial ganja activities is also subject to considerable sectional debate. Members of the middle sector insist that the reason the "lazy" and "rude" boys of the lower strata will not work for an "honest" living is that they make more money when they "stay home and sell ganja" instead. Lower-section persons, on the other hand, contend that members of the upper strata are making the most money and assuming the least risks in commercial ganja activities. For example, according to a rumor circulating in Leyburn, the owner of a large property in a neighboring community formerly planted acres of ganja on his land for export, thereby acquiring great wealth and prestige while "never a leaf [of ganja] touch him hand." However, the small-scale commercial cultivation and local retailing described in the previous chapter are typically Level III enterprises. All the commercial cultivators in Deerfield and twelve of the seventeen in Leyburn are from the lowest socioeconomic level (IIIb), and their ganja use and ganja cultivation are commonly acknowledged throughout the community. The remaining five, however, in all critical sociocultural dimensions, belong to Level IIIa and Level II. This minority operates differently from the lowest-stratum ganja producers in the area by consistently selling their entire ganja harvest outside of the community and by systematically restricting their social activities and relationships in the community. In so doing they effectively conceal their commercial ganja activity. Unlike most commercial cultivators, they do not reserve a portion of their crop to share with friends or to sell—even to a limited clientele. In fact, only one of these men engages in social smoking; the other four do not smoke at all in public and are generally regarded throughout the community as non-smokers. Three have restricted any close relationships with friends and neighbors that might call for ganja smoking and are criticized as being "cross," "proud," or "dark." A fourth is Mr. Butler, Leyburn's district constable, who is not expected, by nature of his position, to smoke and fraternize with known "ganja men." The fifth man, and only smoker, within this category, Lucas Noyes, actually achieved high status through his wife, a clever, industrious, and popular woman, who insists that he sell ganja in Kingston rather than in Leyburn in order to protect their children from his bad reputation. As a dressmaker, higgler, and active participant in school and community affairs, she is the major reason that the Noyes household is classified as Level IIIa. Consequently, although her husband smokes ganja frequently with other users, his behavior is not as detrimental for his
household as it might be if he had another, less well-liked, less respected wife. Community residents generally regard Mrs. Noyes sympathetically and tend not to impose the usual sanctions that would inhibit commercial ganja cultivation. Constable Butler’s advantage lies in his relationship to the local constabulary; he is well informed of impending raids, is authorized to carry a gun, and is the only rank of police who can enter and search without a warrant. The three other middle-class growers are so aloof from community life that most villagers do not know their schedules and hardly know the location of their fields. Furthermore, since rapid upward mobility is often associated by villagers with the use of “science” or obeah, fear of magical sanction reinforces the protected positions of these men. Finally, with the exception of Lucas Noyes, all these men are temporary commercial cultivators and anticipate discontinuing ganja cultivation as soon as their financial situation stabilizes.

Middle-level persons are particularly active in certain phases of ganja distribution. They have the means and authority to negotiate with police, organize transportation, store sizeable quantities of ganja, and generally coordinate and control the distribution network. While such persons are in contact with both local producers and retailers in all three settings, they are usually not residents but operate instead from the larger urban centers on the north coast and from Kingston.

The degree of publicity and contact required for community-level ganja retailing is generally viewed as undesirable by middle-level occupants and aspirants. Thus, the number of the better-off residents in vending activity is predictably lower than in cultivation, which can be carried out in secrecy. Other than Mr. Winslow, Buckland’s district constable, there are no individuals above Level III in any of the three settings who are currently retailing ganja locally. Winslow, encouraged by his consistent access to ganja confiscated in police raids, maintains a limited and steadily declining ganja retail business, selling to a few friends and relatives. Like the middle-level cultivators in Leyburn, Winslow is in a transitional, phasing-out stage of operations.

There are undoubtedly several individuals who have acquired middle-class accoutrements and prestige at least partly through commercial ganja activities. In Leyburn no fewer than ten of the twenty landholding male householders currently classified in Level II are known to have planted ganja for commercial purposes at some time, though they are now identified as non-smokers and their ganja activity is limited to planting a few roots for medicinal consumption. In Buckland, it is common knowledge that Justice Thornley, one of the community’s leading citizens, now regarded as a non-smoker, once operated a thriving “back door business” as a ganja vendor. This provided him not only with funds but with information that he opportunistically used to earn the position of political watchdog in his area and, eventually, his appointment as justice of the peace. As with the Level II ganja producers of Leyburn, Thornley’s social and political power as well as the fear of magical sanction have mitigated any legal or social pressures that might have been imposed by members of the community.

Thus, in spite of their protestations, there is both quantitative and qualitative evidence that a substantial number of individuals in Levels I and II consume ganja as a tea or tonic, produce and sell ganja, are not adverse to smoking ganja once in a while in certain circumstances, and may have done any or all of these on a routine basis when they were younger. For such persons, it is not the ganja itself that is detrimental but the social liabilities connected with consumption by inhalation that causes them to limit or mask their ganja behavior.

Just as there is no completely uniform pattern of abstinence among Levels I and II, neither is there a completely uniform pattern of heavy use within Level III. While 99 percent of heavy smokers and 95 percent of occasional smokers in the sample are drawn from Level III, only 41 percent and 14 percent of the sampled adult male population of this level may be classified as regular and occasional smokers, respectively (Table 3).

The observation from Table 3 that is of perhaps greatest value for understanding the variation within Level III is the difference in prevalence and degree of ganja smoking between strata IIIa and IIIb. Level IIIa, earlier defined as containing the socially aspiring segment of the lower class, shows only 22.1 percent of its sampled male members smoking ganja with regularity, while Level IIIb, the lowest-ranked stratum, shows 48.4 percent. More importantly, the degrees of use between these two strata are markedly different. Level IIIb includes almost all the heavy and occasional smokers but only 4.7 percent of the infrequent users. However, the proportion of infrequent users increases to 14.8 percent in Level IIIa. Since IIIa and IIIb have integral sociocultural links and since most from Level IIIa originated in IIIb, it appears that the rejection, avoidance, or discontinuance of ganja smoking is a significant feature of the slightly higher-ranked, more mobile members of this group. The following life history is illustrative:

Case 1: Renford Pryce

Renford Pryce, a thirty-six-year-old resident of Leyburn, has been smoking ganja regularly since the age of eighteen. For most of his adult life he was poor, without steady employment, and with little land—a member
of the lowest-ranked stratum of the community (IIb). During this period, he set up a household with a common-law wife and fathered four children. At the age of twenty-eight, his situation began to change for the better with the help of his stepfather, who was himself becoming increasingly prosperous. Renford managed, illegally, to procure a permit for migrant farm work abroad and worked for several seasons as a farm laborer in Canada. In the meantime, his common-law wife attended domestic school, was certified as a seamstress, and began to contribute financially to the household income by sewing for other women in the village. Utilizing his savings, Renford purchased additional land in Leyburn, a cow, and some other farm animals. At about this time he discontinued smoking ganja on a regular basis. His alleged reason for this was his wife's increasing objections concerning the social and financial risks of smoking ganja.

At the age of thirty-five, Renford was granted a long-awaited contract to plant company tobacco—a prized and sought-after economic opportunity in the district. Shortly thereafter, he and his common-law wife became legally married and began enlarging their house. After their marriage, Mrs. Pryce became a "baptized Christian" in the Pentecostal church, and while this sect currently enjoys the lowest status of all five churches in Leyburn, it is rapidly gaining in prestige along with its most active members. Encouraged by its pastor, Mrs. Pryce holds literacy classes in the church every week.

For all intents and purposes, Renford has given up ganja smoking although he continues to use the plant in the form of tea. In order to avoid purchasing ganja for this purpose within the village, he has begun to grow his own supply—about five or six plants. Nevertheless, he admits that he occasionally finds himself in situations where old friends offer him a draw, which he always accepts so that he will not be considered "in any way funny" or "extra."

As mentioned earlier, socioeconomic prestige and authority for residents in the three settings of this study rest, to a large extent, on how closely their deportment approximates local middle-class standards of behavior. This includes not only legal marriage, active participation in community organization, literacy, regular attendance in a denominational church, and the construction of a substantial, multi-room dwelling, but abstinence from social ganja activity as well. The Pryce family is almost a prototype of this model of upward mobility. While still ranked within the lowest section of Jamaican society, Renford Pryce has made definitive progress toward advancing his standing and status within the community and in the process has relinquished his once regular practice of smoking ganja.

As for many lower-status farmers and laborers, smoking relations were central for Renford Pryce in the organization of his time, materials, and energy. However, because the institution ordinarily requires reci-
regular users who decided to forsake smoking as a signal of their rising status, they must find ways of refusing to smoke without offending old friends and former peers. In these situations, former smokers weigh the anticipated rewards to be derived from the new status against the possible losses that might be incurred during the process of breaking past associations. In essence, these men must maintain their reputations on two fronts, each with opposing criteria for acceptable behavior regarding ganja use.

Depending on the contingencies of each situation, this dilemma may extend into Level II and perhaps never be entirely resolved. Eleven of the sixteen men above Level III who are designated as "infrequent" smokers in Table 3 participate in social ganja activity under the pressure of specific circumstances. The following incident is typical of this category of middle-level smokers:

Mr. Collins, a middle-class farmer from Leyburn, took his cows down to the river for watering. This was normally his wife's responsibility, but she was in Kingston attending the birth of their daughter's first child. As he arrived at the river beach, he discovered his wife's brother and some other village men enjoying a bath and smoking ganja. The cows had already started to drink so Mr. Collins sat down to join the small gathering. He was offered a draw, which he accepted. Remaining until the cows had finished, Mr. Collins took a few more draws and left. For the remaining days that his wife was away, Mr. Collins herded the cows to a different beach along the river for watering, purposely avoiding the smokers.

For Mr. Collins, smoking ganja is not a routine part of his daily activities, although it had been in the past. He is typical of men who have come up through the ranks, modifying their patterns of ganja use in the process. While not particularly eager to become enmeshed in the activities of lower-ranked community members, such men are equally unwilling to snub their relatives or former friends. As with men in Level IIIa, the occasional draw is an act of compromise in those unavoidable, awkward situations.

Significantly, all eleven of those typified by Mr. Collins belong to the lower-ranked stratum of Level II. Since Level IIb includes the most recent arrivals to middle class and Level IIIa includes those who are signaling their departure from the lower class, it is not surprising that men from these two strata comprise 71 percent of the "infrequent" smokers in the Table 3 sample, even though they comprise only 34 percent of the total sample. The pattern of "infrequent" smoking in the communities is a conciliatory reaction to the conflicting class postures regarding ganja smoking that impinge on individuals who are in various stages of the transition between them. For the individual in Level II, infrequent ganja smoking is a reasonably accepted deviation from the prevailing class norm of abstinence; for the individual in Level III, the same smoking pattern is a reasonably accepted deviation from the prevailing class norm of institutionalized use.

Individuals in the early stages of this transition are at a particular disadvantage, for they may not yet be sufficiently independent to forego the mutual aid derived from their ganja smoking associates. When Renford Pryce first began migrating annually, he advanced his socioeconomic status with comparatively substantial earnings for investment in land and stock. The same two-month absence, however, coupled with his newly increased holdings, necessitated greater reliance on his peers for assistance while he was gone. In those early years, Renford could not afford to pay for labor on even a casual basis, and both he and his wife were adamantly opposed to keeping their children home from school to provide family labor. Consequently, Renford was obliged, on his return, to offer his own services and time to the friends and neighbors who had helped his family during his absence. This, of course, kept him in regular contact with ganja-related activities in both work and leisure.

During this period in Pryce's life, his wife complained frequently about his ganja smoking—"spending a whole heap a money on a fool-fool something"—and it was her displeasure and quarreling that he eventually proclaimed as the reason for suspending ganja smoking. Significantly, Mrs. Pryce endorses the use of ganja teas or tonics for medicinal purposes and often described in detail how ganja tea had saved the life of her youngest son, whom doctors had been unable to cure. For Mrs. Pryce it is not the ganja itself she finds objectionable, but the circumstances surrounding her husband's usage. She fears the serious social and legal consequences that could endanger their chances for upward mobility.

The domestic rift between Pryce and his wife over his use of ganja symbolizes the dilemma inherent in socioeconomic mobility in Leyburn: the advance to Level II requires at the same time a withdrawal from, as well as the acceptance by, Level III; the attainment of eventual independence requires temporarily greater interdependence. Thus, a sustained period of infrequent smoking is typical of men constrained by divided loyalties and dual interests. While Renford Pryce's ganja-smoking encounters have decreased in frequency, they have increased in embarrassment. In time, if his new status solidifies and the nature of his relationships with old friends is altered, the economic and social pressures to smoke and to identify with the lower classes should dissipate. Despite his wife's urgings, however, the retreat of Renford Pryce from social ganja activity is necessarily a gradual one.

Ganja men are on guard for exhibitions of middle-class behavior by
their colleagues, and news travels quickly among them when self-interest and aspirations for higher status precipitate an offense or betrayal. For example, Neil Phillips, a Leyburn farmer and heavy ganja user, hailed his friend Chester Smith one morning to tell him of a conversation that had taken place earlier that day at Mrs. Morris' shop, in which a friend and fellow ganja smoker had been maligned. Nathan Geary was overheard by Mrs. Morris telling Constable Blake that "the music [the sound system dance] held Friday and Saturday nights at Mrs. Morris' shop] would never be any good because it operate by pure ganja man dem." According to Neil and Chester, Nathan himself had smoked ganja regularly until the past year, when he had built and moved into his new house and given up farming to work full time as a mason. Though unsurprised by Nathan's behavior, Chester was angered that he would jeopardize his former friends, the sound system operators, by informing to the police: "Ras Neil, me nah tell you him wan' fe get on de force [police force], ... ah nah him up at de station every night telling about de testing.7... Him nah fe trust. ... But never mind. me tek care a him."

Within a few hours, ganja men throughout the district had heard of the incident and weighed its significance. The consensus among them was that Nathan was trying to enhance his own reputation and credibility with the police at the expense of his friends, and thus did not deserve the trust and friendship of his peers. After a period of being snubbed at the shop, not invited to play dominoes, and so forth, Nathan was confronted with the issue. He angrily denied the accusation, claiming that, contrary to what Mrs. Morris said, Constable Blake had told him that "ganja men ruined the music at the shop." He further insisted that Mrs. Morris was re-telling the incident in her own way as a means of discouraging the sound system owner and operator from smoking ganja in the bushes behind the shop.

Whether or not Nathan actually informed the police was never determined. However, it is significant that his recent mobility and aloofness from his former smoking circle created an atmosphere of mistrust; his peers were alert for and willing to believe any possible violations of friendship on Nathan's part.

Actually, the sudden claims to prestige of individuals who attempt to establish their superiority too abruptly may incur the disdain and suspicion of both social levels. Those held as traitors by Level III are criticized as upstarts by Level II. Fears of magical sanctions imposed from either social level may further restrain mobile individuals and delay disengagement from ganja smoking relations, even when they are no longer socially or economically essential. The role of ganja smoking in maintaining an arena of trust and mitigating jealousy is evident in the case of Headley Stewart, a Buckland fisherman.

Case 2: Headley Stewart

At thirty-eight years old, Headley Stewart is the second most successful fisherman in Buckland. He also controls eight acres of bananas and coconuts. Legally married, he and his wife, Lottie, and their two preschool-age daughters have recently settled into their new home, one of the best in the community.

Headley is one of five children of a landholding family in Buckland. Upon the death of his father, the property was divided equally among the three sons and two daughters. While the original piece of land was sufficient to provide a good living for one family, it could not support five separate households. Consequently, Headley and his younger brother, Curtis, had started fishing in order to supplement their incomes. When Basil, the oldest of the three brothers, went to England, he left his son, Albert, in Headley's supervision. In exchange Headley was given the privilege of farming Basil's portion of the inherited land. Though Albert resided with his grandmother, he looked to Headley as his surrogate father, and when he had finished primary school, he joined his two uncles in their fishing enterprise.

Headley's progress as a fisherman has been accelerated largely through his wife's tireless industry and ambition. Her small but profitable restaurant on the fishing beach provided Headley with the capital to purchase a good boat and then a motor. During the day Lottie sells soup and beverages to the fishermen, while in the evening she cooks for special "fish feeds" held by the "big men" in the area—estate staff, policemen, politicians, and property owners. Though she is the pet of this more exclusive circle, Lottie is generally unpopular with the other fishermen on the beach, who complain that she is not only merciless in collecting debts but treats them with prevailing discourtesy and disrespect. Occasionally they boycott her restaurant for a few weeks in an act of protest over some insult or another.

This period of rapidly increasing wealth has not been without stress for the Stewarts. One of their daughters became very ill for several months and doctors seemed unable to cure her. At the same time, the sugar estate, which owns the fishing beach, requested the removal of all structures on the beach, including Lottie's restaurant. Lottie took this problem to her more influential patrons and in the end was allowed to remain. However, the other fishermen—even those of the same scale—were forced to remove the small shacks that they had erected to hold equipment and supplies. This resulted in even more resentment toward Lottie. Stewart himself contracted pneumonia during this time as a result of exposure when his motor failed during a sudden storm at sea. He suspected that this series of misfortunes was a result of obeah directed at him and his family by other fishermen on the beach. A visit to a science man in the parish capital confirmed his suspicions that he was the object of intense jealousy related to his rapid success and Lottie's victory in negotiations with the sugar estate. The science man stated that the vehicle of "evil" was Curtis, Head-
ley's younger brother, but implied that the source of evil came from someone in Curtis' house. Headley surmised that his brother's wife was responsible for their afflictions; not only had she demonstrated her jealousy of Headley and Lottie's new house by gossiping to neighbors that it was built from Curtis' share of the catch, but her own brothers and father were among those who were forced off the beach during the altercation with the estate. Headley paid the science man nearly one hundred dollars (Ja) for protection against the evil forces directed toward him and for the advice that he must "take care" not to offend "those who are close to him."

Having used ganja since the age of twenty, Headley continues to smoke on a daily basis with his nephew and brother when at sea. However, he no longer gathers with the other men along the beach to play dominoes and smoke ganja in the afternoon when the catch is sold and equipment put away. Other fishermen claim that this is because he is afraid of his wife, who "is terrible against it." Indeed, Headley's continued regular use of ganja with his brother and nephew is a source of considerable antagonism for Lottie, who regards the practice as "too common" and "mix-up" [mixing with those of inferior social status].

Headley, like Renford in Leyburn, is caught between the conflicting demands on his behavior made by his wife, on the one hand, and his co-workers, on the other. His relationship with Lottie symbolizes ambition, increased material wealth, and self-interest, while his relationship with Curtis and Albert represents crew cooperation and affective kin ties. Unlike Renford, however, who has all but given up ganja smoking as he approaches middle-class status, Headley, who is already stabilized in Level II, continues to smoke on a daily basis. This unusual smoking pattern is a compromise to the contending expectations of his wife and his brothers. By continuing to smoke on a daily basis with his brother and nephew, he reasserts the cooperative aspect and de-emphasizes the authoritative and socially dangerous dimension of the relationship; yet by restricting his smoking to the work setting and only with these two men, he reduces public exposure and avoids encumbering ties with other men less solvent than himself.

Stewart's ganja smoking pattern assumes even greater significance when compared with the other three large-scale fishermen in Buckland, who do not smoke ganja at all and, in fact, maintain considerable social distance between themselves and their crews. For example, when one of these fishermen held a large party at his home, his crew attended, not as guests, but to slaughter and cook the goat. This kind of relationship would be impossible for Headley to maintain with his own crew, who are related to him, not only as his original fishing partners, but through kin ties as well. Smoking ganja with Curtis and Albert has a long history that cannot be easily altered without serious social and economic consequences for Headley. It bolsters and replenishes a potentially unstable relationship, signaling an equality, which, in reality, does not exist. It is a display of good will in one area that covers up a transgression in another. Moreover, through his crew, Stewart attempts to be recognized among other fishermen on the beach as one who can be trusted and is not deserving of their jealousy. Although his ganja smoking is the source of continuous domestic friction, this is far less troublesome for Headley than the possibility of envy and reprisal in the form of magical sanctions. Thus, while Stewart and Pryce bear in common the transitional nature of their status, Stewart's situation holds greater constraints and has thus far delayed his withdrawal from ganja activities.

Stewart attempts further to palliate the impact of his increased material wealth by limiting his participation within the community. He attends the social functions of neither level, insisting that his work is too demanding and leaves him too little time to take part in such activities. While seemingly the safe road, Stewart pays a heavy toll in opting for his low community profile; by avoiding criticism and trying to reconcile diverse expectations, Stewart puts himself in a position of being held in generally low esteem by both levels. Other fishermen contend that Stewart is a nice enough fellow, but he is "coward before Lottie." They cannot understand how or why he tolerates her henpecking. On the other hand, members of Buckland's middle class claim that the Stewarts are "too dark" and do not know how to move with other middle-class families. Lottie herself complains that, as a newcomer to Buckland, it is she who always takes the brunt of criticism emanating from the community toward her household.

Headley Stewart is one of six men in the sample (Table 3) who are anomalies in a generalized middle-class pattern of negative sanction and infrequent or non-use. As Level II men who engage in heavy or occasional ganja smoking, these six are of as much sociological interest as the statistical regularities that they contradict, for they illustrate what happens when the general pattern that governs the use of ganja is disrupted. The brief histories of the remaining five, which follow, summarize observations and information derived from numerous informants including the individuals themselves.

Case 3: Barrington Henry

In Leyburn, the only heavy ganja smoker in Level II is Barrington Henry, the nineteen-year-old son of a substantial middle-class household. His father is a landowner, shopkeeper, and chauffeur to Mr. Attridge. Although local teachers consider Barry to have artistic talent, his lack of
academic qualifications prevented him from entering secondary school. Once Barry had completed the primary level, he applied to a government vocational training school but was put on a long waiting list. In the meantime, Mr. Henry, eager for his son to leave Leyburn for a "better opportunity" and "better company," found a job for Barry in Kingston as a delivery boy for a dry-cleaning firm. Though the work is low-paying and uninteresting, Barry was promised that he would eventually be trained as an operator of the truck. Through this new job, Barry became acquainted with ganja smokers and vendors in the capital and frequently carried ganja to his friends when visiting his home on weekends. He soon recognized the opportunity for profit by purchasing large quantities of ganja at a low cost in Kingston and re-selling at a higher price in Leyburn. Eventually he became the main supplier of ganja to teenagers in the district. At the same time, Barry began to espouse Rastafarian doctrine, using Rasta vocabulary in his speech and incorporating the ritual in smoking sessions. Among Leyburn teenagers, Barry is known as the "King of Kali" and the youthful authority on Ras Tafarianism. As the convener of smoking circles among his age group, Barry exerts his influence by controlling and directing the activities and conversations of these sessions.

This sphere of influence, however, is limited to one age group. Barry is the object of intense disapproval throughout the rest of the community. Tobacco company supervisors refused to honor Mr. Henry's request that they employ Barry in order to curtail his weekly commutes to Kingston. Even Leyburn's ganja men insist that Barry and his following "look too brawlin' and disrespectful" and have never patronized Barry as a vendor. He has been a constant source of embarrassment to his parents, who are the objects of sympathy from their friends and criticism from their adversaries. Quarreling with Barry, Mrs. Henry has told him that she will even provide him with all the ganja he needs if he will only smoke alone at home rather than keep "bad company" in the district. The use of ganja is not foreign to Mrs. Henry, who prepares tea regularly for her family. Even though Barry is his only child, Mr. Henry admits that he would prefer that he remain in Kingston permanently rather than commute weekly to Leyburn, where people "carry complaints every day" about his son.

Case 4: Derrick Hill

Derrick Hill is the twenty-year-old son of a prominent middle-class family in Deerfield. After completing junior secondary school and receiving an electrician's certificate, he became employed in the factory of Deerfield Estate. Through his father's influence as a union leader and political figure, Derrick obtained a relatively high-paying, year-round job in the machine shop, well above the usual caliber of work that most young men finishing trade school would have been offered. Confronted with older technicians who took several years to achieve their current position through on-the-job training, Derrick was the object of almost immediate resentment. Feeling out of place and uncomfortable, Derrick sought his own age group from among the factory employees. For the most part these young men had less prestigious jobs than Derrick's and came from families of a lower socioeconomic status. Originating in work breaks and lunch hours, Derrick's associations with these youths soon extended into leisure hours and included daily ganja smoking.

Though Derrick had experimented with ganja while in trade school, it now became a well-integrated part of his work and leisure life. Because he draws the highest pay of all his cohorts and because he is the only one of this group whose salary continues through the dull season, Derrick has become the financial stabilizer of the group; he contributes the most ganja, buys the most beer, and frequently pays for the other boys to get into dances or the cinema. While this means a continual financial drain for Derrick, it also provides him with the popularity and prestige among his companions that he lacks at work.

His new life style, however, has caused his parents great consternation and his father has threatened to "throw him out" if he does not give up his "worthless friends" and smoking ganja "like any common criminal." During these outbursts, his mother usually counters that if Derrick is away from the house the problem will be compounded and insists that his father let him remain. When she is alone with her son, however, Mrs. Hill quietly beseeches him to give up smoking "while the government is so hard against it."

Case 5: Overton Lloyd

Mr. Lloyd, forty-five years old, is one of Deerfield's district constables. Though he owns two acres of inherited land, which he farms in his spare time, his primary occupation is a steady but low-level job on the malarial control team under the Ministry of Health. Mr. Lloyd was born in Deerfield to parents who were once farmers and landholders but who gradually sold off all but a few acres. As a youngster, Lloyd obtained a minimum of education and has remained only barely literate throughout his adult life. He and his wife met and married after each had grown children, and they now have one of Mr. Lloyd's small granddaughters residing with them while her parents are in Canada.

In Deerfield, the Lloyds are consistently ranked as members of Level II. They are legally married and own a comfortable home with electricity and running water. Mr. Lloyd's power and influence are derived primarily through his lifelong relationship with the member of parliament representing Deerfield's constituency. In his role as political watchdog, Mr. Lloyd keeps party leaders informed of local events and intrigues. In return, he assumes a pivotal position in the organization and distribution of farm work cards, government-subsidized housing, public works jobs, incentive payments, and other politically oriented dividends in the area.
In spite of his middle-class status, Mr. Lloyd has remained a heavy ganja smoker in both work and recreational settings. Working in remote and isolated areas permits the malarial control team to smoke ganja while on the job. Unlike most men of his social ranking, Lloyd does not work in a supervisory capacity but shares an equal status with his co-workers. Smoking ganja with his fellow workers, who are also his closest friends, is an activity that Lloyd claims genuinely to enjoy and refuses to limit or discontinue for the sake of conforming to Level II norms. Mrs. Lloyd does not complain about her husband’s ganja smoking and, in fact, occasionally joins him for a smoke.

Despite their inconspicuous life style, the Lloyds are occasionally the object of community censure, primarily by members of the opposition and particularly from Mr. Lloyd’s supervisor and his wife, who live directly across the street. "Imagine! Our district constable and he smokes ganja like all the little rude boys in Deerfield!” The middle-class members of even his own party view Lloyd as somewhat of an embarrassment in certain aspects of his deportment—primarily his limited literacy and his regular use of ganja. Though sensitive to this criticism, both Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd ordinarily brush it off, insisting, "Dem nah feed we, neither give we shelter, so mek [let] dem talk."

Case 6: Randall Cross

The youngest member of Deerfield Estate’s senior staff is twenty-six-year-old Randall Cross. He was born and raised in a middle-class household in Kingston. A superior student, Randy received a scholarship from Deerfield Estate on the completion of secondary schooling to attend engineering college in England, with the condition that he would work for the estate on his return to Jamaica.

Though he had never smoked ganja as a young man in Kingston, he became well acquainted with the drug in London student circles. By the time Randy was ready to return to Jamaica, he was smoking socially three or four times each week. Though he had looked forward to the high-quality ganja that could be procured more easily and cheaply than in London, he soon discovered that he had no one with whom to enjoy smoking. In this regard, as well as in many others, Randy found the provinciality of estate life lonely and constricting. He missed the sophisticated social life of London or even Kingston. His Deerfield peers, for the most part, were non-smokers and highly critical of members of their own class who used ganja. The only two friends who occasionally joined him for a smoke were his cousin, Trevor McCallum, who is the bookkeeper for one of the estate farms, and Stanley Ferguson, the manager from the same farm. Both these men, however, admit that they prefer to limit their smoking to an occasional weekend in Kingston and feel extremely uncomfortable using ganja in the estate vicinity; the only occasions on which they did smoke ganja locally were at Randy’s urging.

Case 7: Keith Harvey

Keith Harvey, twenty-nine years old, was transferred to Deerfield through his position with the Cane Farmers Association. His job was to
work as a liaison between the estate and the cane farmers as well as to advise and organize cane farmers in the area. Originally from Montego Bay, Keith attended agricultural college and, for a short time, took university courses in Kingston to qualify him for his position.

Among Deerfield's middle class, Keith was reputed to be a "radical" from Kingston. He reinforced this opinion by openly flouting the norms and behavior of this level. He wore his Rasta hat at executive meetings, socialized with the workers on a regular basis, drove too fast, engaged in fist fights in Deerfield rum shops, was not legally married, and made no attempt to conceal his commitment to Ras Tafarian doctrine or his preference for ganja. Purposefully excluding him from their parties and other social activities, Level II residents freely expressed their disapproval of Keith, claiming that he was a troublemaker.

His attempts to achieve middle-class commodities without behaving in accordance with middle-class standards were consistently thwarted by the other members of his class in the district. For example, when Keith first moved to Deerfield and was looking for a house to rent for his family, he contacted the assistant chemist, Winston Cavendish, who owned a house that would be vacant within a few months. Cavendish promised the house to Keith, who made arrangements for his common-law wife, Collette, and their baby daughter to stay in Kingston until the house could be occupied. During this period Keith's reputation spread quickly through the district, however, and Cavendish's associates convinced him that he had made a mistake by promising the house to him. Therefore, when Cavendish learned that a new agent for the Ministry of Health needed a place to live, he quickly moved him into the house as soon as it was vacant without notifying Keith. When Keith eventually found out, he angrily confronted Cavendish about the matter. Cavendish told Keith that the ministry agent was the husband of his cousin and he felt that family obligations had to take precedence. Keith, of course, knew he was lying, but had little support from members of this level and could do nothing.

The one sympathetic person who agreed with Keith that he had been treated unfairly was Randall Cross. Keith and Randy had occasionally commiserated on the difficulty of estate life and had smoked ganja together once at Randy's house. While at a dance, shortly after Keith had found out that he would not be getting Cavendish's house, he asked Randy if he would intervene on his behalf since Randy and Cavendish appeared to be on good terms. When Randy refused, Keith became angry and declared that he was "just like the rest." Taking Keith's arm, Randy started to suggest that they go outside in order to discuss the issue in some privacy, but Keith, in his anger, misinterpreted the gesture as the beginning of a fight and knocked off Randy's glasses, which smashed on the floor. A fight almost ensued, but Randy's colleagues quickly broke it up and took him home. Thus, Keith lost his one ally and confirmed the general opinion that he was a troublemaker and should be avoided as much as possible. This lack of cooperation from his peers in the social realm eventually spread to

An examination of the special circumstances of the five men presented here discloses that, like Headley Stewart, each feels drawn to more than one social group. As members of the rural middle class by birthright, both Barry and Derrick are expected to behave in accordance with the traditional norms of their parents' level. However, the majority of their current friends and following originate from much lower sectors. Both the Henrys and the Hills hold high aspirations for their sons and were instrumental in what they had surmised to be the deliverance of their sons from the snares of local life. Ironically, their efforts served to entangle them to an even greater degree. While Barry's flirtation with city life and brief acquaintance with Ras Tafarian doctrine would appear to be of little significance to an urbanite, it offers him a definite advantage over other Leyburn youths; they look to him as a sophisticated leader from whom they can procure ganja and who will instruct them in Ras Tafarian doctrine. Likewise, Derrick's relatively prestigious job provided him, first, with the motivation for cultivating friendships with his socioeconomic inferiors and, second, with the money to sustain his leadership role among them.

For Mr. Lloyd, as well, the ganja smoking aspect of his work-based friendships clashes with the norms of his socioeconomic level. Like Headley Stewart, he relates to his co-workers on a level that is atypical for his class. Unlike Stewart, however, Lloyd does not attempt to limit or disguise his smoking when away from the work setting, despite his role in public life. Stewart, Lloyd, Barry, and Derrick all straddle class lines and are, therefore, subject to divergent class expectations.

For Keith and Randy, on the other hand, the source of conflict is not organized as much around local class lines as along urban-rural distinctions. The comparatively liberal, metropolitan backgrounds of these two young men accustomed them to a degree of personal freedom that is incompatible with the standards of their more provincial Deerfield counterparts. While the conditions of their employment require that they live in one social environment, their categories and values have been formed largely in another.

The social disapprobation incurred by each of these men varies from mild reproof, as in the cases of Headley and Lloyd, to ultimate expulsion, as with Keith and Randy. While the potential for censure is present in all the situations presented, the extent and nature of that censure are related to each individual's position within that structure. As
shopkeepers in a rural community, the Henrys are already the object of generalized village criticism. Complaints abound that they will not extend credit, their prices are too high, they do not treat customers with the proper respect, they send back the wrong change, and so forth. These antagonists to the Henry family use Barry's smoking to embarrass shopkeepers in a rural community, the Henrys are already the object of and manipulate his parents. For example, when Mr. Henry discovered two young boys stealing from his shop, he took his complaint to their parents, demanding that they pay for the stolen items or he would report the boys to the police. The parents and their friends, however, countered that it was ganja, sold to them by Barry, that gave the boys a "criminal spirit" and caused them to "tief," so if he were going to the police station, he could take Barry along as well, "a fe him [Barry] de cause of it." Thus, Mr. Henry's social vulnerability led him to intensify his disapproval and censure of Barry.

On the other hand, Mr. Hill's political interests are a major factor in limiting the extent to which he can express his condemnation of his son Derrick. If he carries through his threats of eviction, Mr. Hill risks a reputation for being antagonistic to ganja smokers or for thinking his son is too good to associate with the sons of his electorate. In this community, where a politician is dependent on a large working-class vote, he is restrained by his own political aspirations from attacking the values and behavior of that class, even though they may be contrary to his own and what he would wish for his children.

Equally influenced by political factors is the community judgment surrounding Mr. Lloyd's ganja smoking. Most of the time, the Lloyds live in a quiet, unassuming manner, largely unscathed by the anticipated undercurrent of criticism from neighbors in the opposition party. However, during the weeks preceding the national elections, Mr. Lloyd's deportment and qualifications became an issue around which a contention of his jobs did not provide enough of a constraining influence to company they desired, were in Kingston or abroad. Even the economic motivation of their jobs did not provide enough of a constraining influence to control their behavior, though Randall, who genuinely enjoyed his work, was more sensitive to this aspect of his life than Keith and generally adhered to the minimum standards of social behavior set for estate senior staff. The opportunities and increased options provided by their more cosmopolitan experience and education permitted a sense of freedom and self-confidence that was not shared by their Deerfield-born counterparts, who were vulnerable to the vagaries of local gossip and opinion. Keith's and Randy's access to economic and social resources was based on their qualifications and experience rather than on their deportment and relationships within the Deerfield setting. The corollary of the freedom from local constraints, however, is the absence of local support; while their education helped them obtain their positions, keeping those positions depended, at least partly, on being accepted by their peers in Deerfield. Thus, while their individual abilities rendered Keith and Randy more secure in the larger society, their positions as outsiders rendered them less secure in this particular community.
In the cases reviewed here, the usual connections between abstinence from ganja smoking and the attainment of local power and influence do not hold up. Like Headley Stewart, these men view affinities with other men who happen to be ganja smokers as more important than adhering to local middle-class standards. For Barry and Derrick, the economic and social advantages of smoking ganja outweigh the disadvantages of parental censure. Their power and influence among their own age group permit them to control more resources more quickly than if they attempted to establish their reputations slowly along the traditional lines desired by their parents. In fact, the ongoing conflict with their parents actually serves to enhance the positions Derrick and Barry hold among their peers, who admire them for their acts of filial rebellion.

Likewise, Mr. Lloyd’s role as party watchdog is facilitated by his friendships with ganja smokers. He is on intimate terms with individuals who can provide vital information on political and related activity within Level III. While this information is essential to political planning and strategy in the area, most prominent party members are unwilling to develop the degree of intimacy and trust with their socioeconomic inferiors necessary to gather this information. Mr. Lloyd’s source of material wealth and power is derived from his political function and not from his reputation among other Level II residents in Deerfield.

While the refusal to comply with local Level II standards of behavior did not offer special benefits to Randy and Keith as it did to Stewart, Barry, Derrick, and Mr. Lloyd, the rewards of that compliance were insufficient to constitute a restraining force on the behavior of the two young men. If an individual is in a position to do without middle-class approval, as were Randy and Keith, or if his position is actually improved by violating Level II standards, as it was with Stewart, Barry, Derrick, and Lloyd, then their behavior and relationships cannot be expected to go in the traditional direction of their class.

Although it may be altered or delayed by individual circumstance, the relationship between mobility and ganja smoking is evident from the quantitative evidence presented thus far. However, a comparison of Tables 4, 5, and 6 permits the influence of community structure on this relationship to become increasingly clear. Though the connection between socioeconomic rank and the prevalence and degree of smoking follows the same trend in all three communities, there appear significant differences among them in the strength and nature of those trends, particularly as they exist within the lower socioeconomic strata. Thus, while both Buckland and Leyburn show a dramatic decrease in the rate of heavy smoking going up the socioeconomic scale from Level IIIb to IIIa, Deerfield, although it follows the same trend, shows a comparatively less significant decrease. Moreover, Leyburn and Buckland both exhibit a greater range in the degree of ganja use throughout their lower socioeconomic strata, while Deerfield Level III men tend to be classified as either heavy smokers or non-smokers.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, a primary means of assessing status in Deerfield is by the position one occupies in the estate hierarchy. This criterion is so influential that it ordinarily overrides the other traditional measures of socioeconomic rank in rural Jamaica. Consequently, a man in his fifties who cuts cane for a living is generally ranked beneath a youth who occupies a clerical position with the estate, even though the cane cutter may be literate, legally married, active in union and church activities, and own a substantial home. While he might be readily placed in the upper stratum of Level III, none of these attributes is sufficient to bring a cane loader or cutter into Level II; for of all occupational categories in Deerfield, field labor is lowest in social prestige.

Thus, intra-level mobility in Deerfield is theoretically achievable on the basis of the usual criteria; inter-level mobility, however, is more difficult and more uncommon, for it often requires upward movement through the worker-management hierarchy. This more rigid corporation-linked system of social mobility contrasts with the age-correlated system of mobility that exists in Leyburn, where most of the farmers currently ranked in Level II began their adult life in Level III. While only a small number of Leyburn men actually acquire middle-class status, they nevertheless provide a model of achievement for younger men in the community, who are starting out in similar circumstances, and reinforce the significance of respectable behavior for attaining a higher rank. Thus in Leyburn, Level IIIa status is regarded as a prelude to Level II, a transitional state in which one signals his readiness for acceptance by those who formerly his superiors and his separation from those who were formerly his equals.

In Deerfield, on the other hand, most persons in this category stabilize as the prominent members of Level III. These "first families of Plainfield," as one farm manager refers to them, are key and important people, especially for politicians and union officials, for they have earned reputations as leaders and spokesmen for a large proportion of the low-status, illiterate workers. With few exceptions, however, they are not contenders for Level II. This more rigid system of social stratification in Deerfield provides little incentive for the avoidance or discontinuance of ganja smoking as a signal for upward movement from Level IIIb to IIIa. Unlike legal marriage, literacy, union activity, church participation, and the like, which continue to be significant factors for demonstrating superiority within Level III, abstinence from ganja has little meaning for the attainment of power and influence within this level. In fact, in some
### Table 4  Prevalence of Ganja Smoking Among Adult Males* in Leyburn by Socioeconomic Level and Degree of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic level</th>
<th>Heavy</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Infrequent</th>
<th>Discontinued</th>
<th>Non-smoker</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Row % Col.%</td>
<td>No. Row % Col.%</td>
<td>No. Row % Col.%</td>
<td>No. Row % Col.%</td>
<td>No. Row % Col.%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Ib</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>1 100.0 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>7 100.0 10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9 2.4</td>
<td>3 17.6 15.0</td>
<td>5 29.4 20.0</td>
<td>8 47.1 11.8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIIa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.8 19.0</td>
<td>13 22.4 65.0</td>
<td>8 13.5 32.0</td>
<td>24 21.4 35.3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIIb</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56.3 78.6</td>
<td>4 4.4 20.0</td>
<td>12 13.2 48.0</td>
<td>28 30.3 41.2</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Males over fifteen years old.

### Table 5  Prevalence of Ganja Smoking Among Adult Males* in Buckland by Socioeconomic Level and Degree of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic level</th>
<th>Heavy</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Infrequent</th>
<th>Discontinued</th>
<th>Non-smoker</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Row % Col.%</td>
<td>No. Row % Col.%</td>
<td>No. Row % Col.%</td>
<td>No. Row % Col.%</td>
<td>No. Row % Col.%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Ib</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>2 50.0 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIb</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>17 60.7 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIIa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2 12.5</td>
<td>4 23.2 29.6</td>
<td>4 26.4 22.6</td>
<td>5 28.6 27.6</td>
<td>23 41.8 39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIIb</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51.9 57.5</td>
<td>25 18.5 73.4</td>
<td>4 3.0 19.0</td>
<td>19 14.1 65.5</td>
<td>17 12.6 28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Males over fifteen years old.

### Table 6  Prevalence of Ganja Smoking Among Adult Males* in Deerfield by Socioeconomic Level and Degree of Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic level</th>
<th>Heavy</th>
<th>Occasional</th>
<th>Infrequent</th>
<th>Discontinued</th>
<th>Non-smoker</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Row % Col.%</td>
<td>No. Row % Col.%</td>
<td>No. Row % Col.%</td>
<td>No. Row % Col.%</td>
<td>No. Row % Col.%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Ia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>4 100.0 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Ib</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>2 50.0 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>9 69.2 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3 1.1</td>
<td>1 8.3 4.5</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>10 83.3 12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIIa</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.6 16.9</td>
<td>4 11.1 18.1</td>
<td>3 8.3 42.9</td>
<td>1 2.8 16.7</td>
<td>13 36.1 16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IIIb</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52.9 82.0</td>
<td>15 10.9 68.1</td>
<td>2 1.4 28.6</td>
<td>5 3.6 83.3</td>
<td>43 31.2 53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Males over fifteen years old.
cases a position of prominence within Level III may even call for the continued regular social use of ganja. Consequently, while inter-level variation in the prevalence and degree of ganja use in Deerfield conforms to the same pattern as in the other communities, intra-level variation in this regard is minimized.

For this reason, certain symbols of status such as age and legal marriage do not correlate as strongly with the prevalence and degree of ganja smoking in Level III of Deerfield as in the other two settings. For example, in both Leyburn and Buckland legal marriage is highly correlated with the abandonment of ganja smoking, as exemplified by Renford Pryce and Headley Steward; for Level III residents of these communities legal marriage often signals incipient Level II status. In Deerfield, on the other hand, legal marriage is not uncommon among the lowest socioeconomic level (IIIb) and, though the frequency of legal marriage steadily increases with higher rank, it does not carry as much social significance as in the other settings.

Buckland is composed of essentially two kinds of residents, having different chances for economic mobility and, thus, different degrees of commitment to local standards of respectability. The indigenous residents and landholders of Buckland function in a social system similar to that of Leyburn; they are concerned about respectability and public appearances in achieving or maintaining a high socioeconomic rank. The landless, laboring, and more transient segment of Buckland, on the other hand, comprising the majority of Level IIIb, are structurally akin to the laboring class of Deerfield. The high proportion of confirmed smokers among Level IIIb (Table 5) in Buckland, as in Deerfield, reflects the presence of this segment, which has less stake in community expectations as an avenue to social mobility. On the other hand, the significant decrease in confirmed heavy smokers from Level IIIb to IIIa reflects the presence of a social segment, however small, that has a vested interest in local resources and that is committed to upholding local symbols of status.

Closely related to their systems of stratification, another factor that distinguishes the three communities with regard to working-class patterns of ganja use is the level of complexity. Small and relatively isolated, Leyburn is distinguished by its uniformity and tightly controlled social life; there are relatively few options in the selection of associates or in the means of earning a livelihood. Consequently, the cautious and conservative management of one's reputation throughout the community is an essential component of upward mobility. It is a man's reputation with the Land Authority officer that earns him a crop subsidy, his relationship with the teacher that provides his children with extra attention in school, his standing with the social worker or justice of the peace that furnishes a needed letter of reference. It was in Leyburn that Barry's role among local youths as the "King of Kali" created community-wide concern. Even the village's heaviest ganja smokers condemned Barry as a disgrace to his parents and objected particularly to his selling ganja to "little youths."

The size and diversity of the Deerfield sugar belt, on the other hand, permit a greater degree of personal freedom and less intense social censure, at least for individuals of Level III. This reduces the symbolic importance of ganja smoking and, even for mobiles, reduces the need to guard one's reputation scrupulously. This does not mean that respectability is unimportant and scandals do not occur in Deerfield; rather it means reputations are not territorially based to the extent that occurs in Leyburn and, to some degree, in Buckland. For example, in the case of ganja dealer Leonard Scott, presented in Chapter 2, the censure of his neighbor cost him compensation for his lost fowl and precipitated the transfer of his household to a new location in the sugar belt. Though inconvenient and annoying, the move did not represent a major transition for Leonard and his family. He easily found another house to rent and continued loading cane for the estate while his wife carried on her usual occupation of higglering. Since both had acquaintances in all the various neighborhood-communities of the estate area, they were quickly able to re-establish themselves both socially and economically in their new residence.

In Leyburn and Buckland, on the other hand, where home ownership prevails and economic and social interests are invested in the territorial community, residents do not ordinarily pack up their belongings and move to another community in quest of more tolerant neighbors. Even if a move to another location within the community were possible (intra-community transience is limited by the number of rentable dwellings, especially in Leyburn), it would serve little purpose, since one must still interact with the same village personnel. The following life history of a Deerfield man indicates how the role of ganja for mobiles differs between Leyburn and Deerfield.

Case 8: Peter Mitchell

Peter Mitchell, thirty-two years old, was born and raised in Deerfield, the son of a cane cutter. He began working for the estate at the age of eleven as a water boy. Since his parents insisted that he attend school regularly, this work was confined to weekends and holidays. Peter completed the primary levels, but was not a particularly promising student and, hence, was not encouraged to go further in his schooling. Being unprepared for a specific vocation, he spent his late adolescent and young adult
years living in his parents' home, taking occasional odd jobs and making just enough money to "sport himself" at dances and to buy ganja to smoke with his friends.

At the age of twenty-three, however, Peter procured a low-level job as a mechanic's assistant for the sugar estate, primarily through his mother's strong political affiliations. Peter liked the job and made special efforts to please his superiors: doing extra work, being punctual, and demonstrating an interest in learning as much as possible. Peter readily admits the purposiveness of his behavior, claiming that his one goal during this period was to "please de boss." When the opportunity arose to attend a driver training course sponsored by the estate, Peter asked his supervisor if he could be one of the four men selected for enrollment. His efforts rewarded, Peter joined the class and, on completion, was given the job of driving the sugar truck from factory to wharf. By this time Peter was a confirmed ganja user, smoking daily on lunch hours, work breaks, and in evening recreational contexts.

Soon after acquiring his driver's license and the new job, Peter started visiting Miss Eva, who lived in a neighboring community. When she became pregnant he brought her to live in his parent's home with their approval. After the birth of their first son, Miss Eva went to the youth training center in Deerfield, became certified as a domestic, and went to work for the "white people" (foreign members of the estate staff) in Deerfield.

In the meantime, Peter purchased a second-hand motorcycle and, through making his own repairs, developed a steady and lucrative occupational sideline as a self-taught motorcycle repairman. This now supplements his seasonal income from the estate, which has increased through the addition of overtime pay. During the dull season he also drove a van that carried passengers back and forth between Deerfield and the parish capital. The extra income from this additional work allowed him to build and then enlarge his own home. Peter's plans for the future include buying first a car and then a larger van to run a taxi service, with the ultimate goal of resigning from the sugar estate entirely. He and Miss Eva now have another son and have "adopted" Peter's "outside" daughter. They are also making plans for a wedding when they are financially more solvent.

Despite his advancement, Peter continues to smoke on a daily basis in both work and recreational contexts. However, the pattern of his smoking has significantly altered. Peter no longer smokes in Deerfield herb yards or on the perimeters of dances. This activity is now limited to a small group of close associates and takes place in his own yard or in theirs. His visits to herb yards are for the sole purpose of procuring ganja, which he purchases in comparatively large quantities, two or three times each month, as opposed to purchasing smaller quantities on an almost daily basis as before.

Peter Mitchell, like Renford Pryce, has made significant progress in acquiring material wealth and advancing his standing in the community from Level IIIb to IIIa. Unlike Pryce, however, Peter has continued smoking ganja with the same degree and frequency as he did before his rise. This continued daily use of ganja does not appear to have affected Peter's employment status or his chances for advancement within the working class. The relationship between employer and employee in Deerfield is relatively impersonal and a distinction is normally drawn between the worker's public and personal life. Peter's opportunities to collect overtime pay and to attend the driver training class were awarded on the basis of his work performance alone, and not on his relationships and reputation within the larger community. Unlike the management levels of the Leyburn tobacco company, those of Deerfield Estate, with a few exceptions, are not extraordinarily concerned with whether a worker smokes ganja, is legally married, or goes to church, provided he is reliable and industrious. As Derrick Hill's supervisor confirmed, after endorsing Derrick as an excellent and reliable employee, "You can hardly find a young man in Deerfield who doesn't smoke weed." In direct contrast is the tobacco company supervisor's assessment of Barrington Henry as "worthless" and his refusal to employ him or to assist him in any way, as he would normally have done for the son of a middle-class household.

Not only is ganja smoking less meaningful in Deerfield for assessing the competency of Level III workers, but ganja smoking relations in this estate setting are less encumbering and constraining. In Leyburn, where Level III farmers cannot afford to employ labor, men are bound together in a system of mutual cooperation and assistance that is symbolized and activated in ganja smoking. Level III men in Deerfield, on the other hand, relate as individuals directly to the estate, rather than with each other, for economic survival. Peter's ganja smoking relations have less economic significance than Renford's and, consequently, are more easily abandoned. Though ganja smoking still requires a greater degree of commitment than other recreational activities, that commitment is less binding because the community provides more options for both friendships and employment. Moreover, the process of breaking past associations is not as strained in Deerfield as in Leyburn. Peter's new job brought him into contact with different men with whom he had more in common and with whom he developed new social relations at the expense of his old ones. While Deerfield's size and diversity did not eliminate the possibility of jealousy and offended feelings on the part of Peter's former peers, the withdrawal from relationships was not as embarrassing or as complicated as for Renford Pryce, whose former associates were also close neighbors, kin, and co-workers. In Leyburn, the aspiring individual must shift his position in relation to the same set of people, while in Deerfield the mobile replaces one set of associates with another with considerably less fear of economic liability or social sanction.
The differences between the two communities for the mobile ganja user become explicit in a comparison of patron-vendor relationships. Though Deerfield herb yards are a focal point of male leisure life, individuals can easily purchase ganja and smoke it elsewhere. The most recent relationship between Peter and his vendor, for instance, is single-interest in nature, the content of which is the purchase-sale transaction. For Renford, on the other hand, the acquisition of ganja entangles him in a web of social relations. He must either ask someone to procure it for him or approach a vendor himself. If he opts for the latter, he will most likely be invited by his vendor-friend to join in social intercourse. In either case, he draws attention to himself as a user and enhances his identification with the lowest socioeconomic stratum in the community. For this reason, most middle-level users in Leyburn prefer to grow their own supply.

It is evident that even for mobiles there are more options with regard to ganja use and ganja smoking associates in the estate-dominated setting. Compared with Leyburn, the pressures of competing class norms are considerably less burdensome for members of Level IIIa. Thus, an extended transitional period in which one's behavior must satisfy the norms of both levels appears to be less necessary. It is likely that if Peter does eventually attain middle-class status he will accede to middle-class values and relinquish smoking. However, unlike for Renford Pryce, that process need not be a gradual one. Table 6 shows that the conciliatory patterns of "infrequent" or "discontinued" smoking that signal current or past ambivalence with regard to ganja smoking are relatively insignificant in the estate setting when compared to the other communities—particularly Leyburn. Deerfield men tend to be either smokers or non-smokers.

Ironically, the size and diversity of Deerfield's lowest class make it easier to abstain from smoking ganja. In this community it is possible for a man who prefers not to smoke to find others of the same persuasion; thus, he need not run the risk of total exclusion from male social life. While ganja smokers in Deerfield are as critical of non-smokers as are Leyburn smokers, their criticism has fewer consequences, both socially and economically.

In comparison with the sugar estate community, social relations between property owners and workers in Buckland are more personalized and accompanied by a mutual loyalty and dependence. When compared with Leyburn workers, however, Buckland workers experience fewer restraints on their social deportment. For the landless workers who comprise the largest proportion of Level IIIb, Buckland provides neither the constraining influence of community morals to limit ganja use nor the size and diversity that would provide potential non-smokers with options for leisure-time friendships. These two factors combine to produce the highest rate of institutionalized (heavy and occasional) smoking and the lowest rate of non-smoking among the three communities.

This variation among Leyburn, Buckland, and Deerfield in degree of intensity of community life is particularly helpful in accounting for local differences in adolescent smoking patterns. From Chapter 2 we know that it is fairly common to find boys in Deerfield and Buckland who at age sixteen or seventeen have not yet begun the social use of ganja. The size and diversity of the sugar belt permit adolescents from Deerfield and Buckland to select friends with similar interests and life situations. Thus, boys who continue to junior secondary or secondary school, most of whom come from Level II and IIIa households, are likely to choose their friends from among their classmates rather than from among their neighbors. As a group, their contact with ganja is ordinarily delayed until their late teens, while boys who enter the labor market at an earlier age usually begin smoking in their early teens. Even among the latter group, however, Deerfield provides social options for the non- or delayed users.

Leyburn, on the other hand, provides little choice in the selection of friends and it is highly unusual to find a boy of any social level who has not at least experimented with ganja by the age of thirteen or fourteen. In this comparatively small and isolated community, a non-smoker risks being excluded from all adolescent social activity in the village. For parents from Level II or IIIa this is a source of grave concern. Children from the higher levels are discouraged from associating with "rude" children of Level III, and if parents can afford to send their children to Kingston for secondary schooling, they do so; if they are not yet in this economic position, parents with high aspirations for their offspring are extremely severe in their disapproval of ganja smoking. These strictures, however, are essentially fruitless in Leyburn, where higher-level children smoke in order to gain or maintain the acceptance and respect of friends and to avoid being labeled a coward.

For some parents, one way of safeguarding against ganja smoking and "bad" associations is to encourage their children to join a church and to be baptized as "Christians." In this regard, being a "Christian" means the strict observance of injunctions against drinking alcohol, dancing, fornication, the smoking of tobacco or ganja, and so forth. During my period of fieldwork in Leyburn, four adolescent boys and one girl, all twelve to fourteen years of age, were baptized in the Baptist and Pentecostal churches of Leyburn. None smoked ganja before or after baptism. More importantly, after the event their peers neither invited nor appeared to pressure them to share a spliff or to join a ganja smoking clique. In all three communities active church membership provides a
culturally acceptable means of avoiding ganja smoking without losing friends or being considered a coward.

These cross-community differences in the nature, prevalence, and degree of ganja smoking within Level III reveal the structural regularities in the relationship between ganja smoking and community type, in the sense that each setting offers a different set of chances and strategies for upward mobility. In comparison with this variation in lower-class smoking patterns, the quantitative profile of middle- and upper-class behavior related to ganja is much more consistent from setting to setting (Tables 4, 5, and 6). For these groups, behavior linked to ganja appears to be less dependent on local conditions and more responsive to national middle-class standards of behavior. The lower rate of infrequent smokers and correspondingly higher rate of non-smokers in Deerfield’s upper levels again reflect a system of mobility and stratification in which individuals may rise within one segment but ordinarily do not cross level boundaries. Consequently, ganja smoking is not reduced or abandoned to the extent that occurs in Leyburn and Buckland, where the majority of residents start on a low level and, as they accumulate capital, status, and age, compromise their smoking patterns in the process. In Deerfield, persons who are currently ranked in Levels I or II were more than likely born into those levels and, consequently, have never had to modify their ganja activity.

These comparatively minor differences notwithstanding, the quantitative data indicate that the behavior of members of Level I and Level II with regard to ganja is remarkably uniform among the three settings. However, subtle differences in their expressed attitudes, revealed in the qualitative data, suggest that even among members of the higher socio-economic levels, views on ganja smoking reflect the particulars of the local scene. As head of the only Level I household in Leyburn, Mr. Attridge is not only a non-smoker but is vehement in his denunciation of ganja, insisting that it makes young men “rude” and “lazy.” His major concern is not with the drug’s alleged connection to criminality and insanity, expressed by many members of his class, but rather with its role as an economic enterprise that interferes with his source of labor: “Why should they want to do honest work when they can walk up and down and sell ganja for a living?”

Though Mr. Attridge has retired from large-scale farming, he continues to employ men intermittently for various tasks, such as reaping his remaining tree crops or cleaning chicken coops. Local men, however, resist working in his employ. Besides their well-founded grouse that the pay is too low, they also complain that Mr. Attridge accuses his workers of “cheating” him by stealing crops and produce and denies them even one of his mangoes to eat while working. In general, the treatment and pay are “too mean” for Mr. Attridge to attract reliable and efficient men year after year. Consequently, he must rely on adolescent boys or men who begrudgingly work for him only as a last resort. Since economic opportunities are severely limited in Leyburn, Mr. Attridge has been able to draw sufficient labor from these sources. However, the quality of both work and workers suffers from the lack of fair treatment, good pay, and the reciprocity that characterizes relationships between other employing farmers and their laborers in Leyburn. Mr. Attridge perceives ganja cultivation and vending as competition for this available and cheap, albeit second-rate, supply of labor; furthermore, he attributes the poor performance of his workers not to the imperfect working conditions but to their use of ganja. Police in Leyburn confirm that Mr. Attridge frequently acts on his convictions by writing complaints to constabulary headquarters in Kingston, criticizing the Leyburn police for failing to control ganja activity effectively in the district.

Mr. Bell, as head of the only Level I household in Buckland, occupies the same position as Mr. Attridge in Leyburn. The nature of his relationship with fellow residents is distinctly different, however, and this difference is reflected in his comparatively liberal opinion regarding the use of ganja. Mr. Bell, or “Mass Hugh,” as he is called by his workers, claims that most of his men are heavy ganja users and that this does not detract from their reliability and efficiency as workers. He himself is known to have taken a drawer of ganja on occasion “with men of his own bracket,” and his workers ordinarilv do not hesitate to smoke in his presence while working in the factory yard or in the bush. In fact, the only negative opinion voiced by Mr. Bell with regard to ganja was that smoking should be restricted to “hard men,” that “young boys don’t seem to have the brains for it” and “they will bring trouble.” Unlike Mr. Attridge, Hugh Bell is an active farmer and must compete with the surrounding estates and properties for labor. Furthermore, since many of his workers are farmers, he also competes for their coconut produce for his copra factory. Consequently, he is compelled to treat his workers with courtesy, not only by providing financial bonuses and other incentives but by “showing good face” as well. Thus, the relationship he enjoys with his workers goes beyond strictly economic interests; he attends their weddings, helps defray the cost of funerals, is godfather to countless children, and seldom fails to buy his men a rum or a beer if he happens to meet them in the shop. Workers speak with pride of how “Mass Hugh tol’ him own cousin, Miss Daisy,” that he would no longer send a truck to collect her coconuts and bring them to the factory because she was “too facetey and miserable” to his men. Hugh Bell’s reputation for understanding and fair treatment of employees has resulted in a staff of loyal, productive workers who do not leave him during cane reaping season to work for the sugar estate.
In Deerfield, no one in Level I smokes. While essentially negative, the position of this primarily white, expatriate group toward ganja is best described as detached and existential. Though ganja smoking is outside the personal experience of British-born and educated Mr. Carwell, as senior manager of Deerfield Estate, he is painfully aware of the popularity of ganja smoking among estate workers and the significance of this for sugar production. His discussions of worker manageability and productivity in relation to ganja smoking are, however, denuded of the moral overtones that typify opinions offered by Mr. Attridge and Mr. Bell. In comparison with these two, who enjoy a certain degree of integration with community life through kinship, neighbor ties, and participation in organizations and churches, Mr. Carwell has no intense direct involvement in the lives of estate laborers external to the work situation. He approaches the use of ganja among workers as he would deal with a problem in a piece of equipment. In contrast to Mr. Attridge, Mr. Carwell has actually negotiated with police to refrain from harassing workers so that field laborers may smoke unmolested within the work setting. His moral detachment from his workers permits him to encourage their use of ganja for the sake of production even though he essentially disapproves of the practice.

This brief qualitative comparison of the highest-ranked men in Lembern, Buckland, and Deerfield suggests that local circumstances and community structure color and mold the postures toward ganja use assumed by even the most powerful and influential residents of each setting. Since their dominance in community affairs is great, even though they are numerically small, the attitudes of these individuals, in turn, help to shape the character of local ganja activity. Consequently, while these differences among them appear trivial at first glance, they are nonetheless significant for understanding the variation among the communities in their profiles of ganja use.

The smoking of ganja is one of the institutions that distinguish the various segments of Jamaican society. Of course, social classes can also be distinguished by their domestic conventions, or education, or economic practices. But unlike consensual union or family-transmitted knowledge of cultivation techniques, which have no particular prestige within the lower strata (where legal marriage and higher education still remain the ideal), ganja smoking is a subject of ideological opposition between the classes; it meets with social censure as well as jural-legal penalties from the controlling section, but has become the symbol of brotherhood, solidarity, and mutual suffering for members of the working class. As we have seen, however, while expressed values are easily correlated with socioeconomic level, the configuration of actual behavior associated with ganja exposes a highly complex interplay between the

sections or classes. Thus, class-linked values are continuously altered, shifted, manipulated, and differentially applied to meet the demands of particular situations or to further individual interests. Through the presentation of specific events and life histories, viewed against a statistically normative pattern, the conflicts faced by individuals in their ganja-related behavior have become visible. This has permitted us to examine the circumstances that accompany the violation of those norms.

In intersectional contexts, for example, ganja has assumed significance as a highly effective mechanism for soliciting the support of members of the working class. Thus, politicians like Derrick Hill's father are known to endorse ganja use in order to draw the support of the large working-class vote. For example, during the presentation of a new lamp at the Buckland chapter of the Jamaican Labor Party, an elected official made a speech of appreciation in which he stated that he would do his best to secure farm work cards for as many men in the community as possible; in return, he expected that they would not embarrass him or their country by smuggling ganja into the United States or Canada. In his words, “We all know that every man must enjoy his little cigar but we must not wash our dirty linen in public.” This implicit, but qualified, tolerance of ganja use was well received by the Buckland audience and met the standards of both smokers and non-smokers.

The 1972 national elections underscored the usefulness of ganja in political strategy on both island-wide and community levels. In a plea for working-class support, members of the opposition issued several statements, reported in the Daily Gleaner, regarding the unfairness of existing laws pertaining to ganja use, and stressed the association of their party leader with Ethiopian Emperor Haile Selassie, the Ras Tafarian divinity. In Buckland and Deerfield, these same themes were stressed in speeches by Frank Willoughby, the opposition candidate for the parliament seat. Willoughby himself had acquired notoriety among local ganja men through his law practice in which he became the major defender of ganja violators in the constituency. Himself a non-smoker, Willoughby’s sympathetic position with regard to ganja and ganja users earned him a reputation as being a “man of the people” even though it was commonly known—and frequently pointed out by his adversaries—that his high rate of success in ganja cases resulted from his longstanding illicit love affair with the district magistrate. On election eve, Willoughby and Mr. Darrity, the manager of the Wilmington farm on Deerfield Estates and a staunch party man (and also adamantly opposed to the use of ganja by his workers), reportedly delivered five-pound packages of cured ganja to key vendors throughout the sugar belt to distribute among party supporters. According to the recipients of this ganja, it was not intended as a political bribe but rather to give the men a
"brave heart" and "courage" in order to "guard" the polls effectively the next day and watch for any misdoings.

These examples demonstrate that while the upper elements of society vociferously register their objections and disapproval of ganja smoking, they indirectly support and encourage its use by employing it as a reward for services rendered by members of the ganja-using population. Furthermore, the observations throughout this study reveal that many of those who are currently among the most vocal opponents of ganja smoking were once smokers, growers, and even dealers of ganja in their more youthful, less reputable days. Indeed, several of these individuals continue to consume ganja on a regular basis in the form of teas and tonics. If they themselves are not, and never were, ganja consumers, they still have a host of ganja-using neighbors and relatives whom they can readily observe are law-abiding, industrious, mentally and socially competent community members. Smokers, likewise, are consistently exposed to non-smoking neighbors and co-workers who are just as hard working, just as congenial, and suffer the same social inequities as they. Moreover, while bitter complaints are registered by ganja users against the police and government legislation, such users are equally cognizant that misbehavior, dissension, and jealousy within their own ganja-smoking ranks are most often the factors that precipitate police and court action. Thus, despite the host of opportunities for a more realistic evaluation of ganja use in both upper and lower elements of Jamaican society through intersectional relations, community contact, or even personal experience, ganja continues to be a polarizing issue. This controversy surrounding its use generally is not based on any objective assessment of ganja-related behavior from either side of the debate—nor would it be significantly altered by such an assessment—for it is the expression of a sharply stratified society in which ideological opposition serves to distinguish the sections and identify one’s position therein. In the words of M. G. Smith (1965a: 174–175):

... the coexistence of these divergent value-systems within a single society involves continuous ideological conflict. The need to express these differences of value and morality governs and reflects intersectional relations, and this insistence on the incompatibility of the sectional moralities is incessantly activated by the differing sectional reactions to common events, especially of course those which involve intersectional relations.

It is not merely the same event has different meanings or value for the different sections; these differing interpretations compete continuously, and their competition is inherent in their coexistence, and in the corresponding cultural and social plurality which they express and represent. It follows that interpretations of events by reference to one or another of these competing moral systems is the principal mode of thought that characterizes Jamaican society, and also that such sectional moralizations normally seek to define a negative, extra-sectional and disvalued pole in contrast to a positive, intrasectional and esteemed one. Thus Jamaicans moralize incessantly about one another’s actions in order to assert their cultural and social identity by expressing the appropriate sectional morality.

An understanding of the conflicting class postures and the management of status and mobility in the various community contexts is prerequisite to the analysis of the subtleties of ganja behavior in the work context described in the chapters that follow.

Notes

1. In the years since the fieldwork for this study was carried out, there has been steady increase in ganja smoking among university students, artist groups, and certain upper-class urban populations in Jamaica. Nevertheless, the level of usage within these groups does not begin to approach the institutionalization of this practice that exists among Jamaica’s working classes.

2. The few examples presented here suggest some of the difficulties of objectively assessing the effects of ganja through retrospective accounts, especially since ganja is used by some to explain entire categories of socially aberrant behavior. On the other hand, smokers make efforts to control, to conceal, or to rationalize away any aggressive behavior that occurs while smoking, no matter what the precipitating cause.

3. In addition to the correlation between ganja usage and composite socioeconomic rank presented in Table 3, cross-tabulations of the level of ganja smoking with each of seven selected variables that are commonly employed as indicators of social and economic status in Jamaica (age, marriage, religious affiliation, church participation, literacy, occupational level, and housing conditions) revealed, in each instance, a strong monotonic correlation. These results provide further substantiation that ganja smoking and socioeconomic status are highly correlated in Leyburn, Buckland, and Deerfield (Dreher 1977: 210–212).

4. This aspect of social ganja activity is reviewed in the section pertaining to ganja and work life (Chapters 4 and 5).

5. A notable exception to this is on the sugar estate and some large properties, where men—particularly the younger men—do not hesitate to smoke ganja in the presence of the manager and will even amuse the others by boldly offering him a draw. The very fact that this occurrence is amusing is an indication that it is not appropriate.

6. Sound system dances are a popular recreation in Jamaica. The owner, for a fee, provides the equipment (turntable, speakers, etc.) and
records, which the "operator" (who may also be the owner) plays in disc jockey fashion—interjecting his own voice with the music. There is keen competition among operators with regard to originality, timing, and style of the sounds, words, and phrases that they use to blend with the recorded music. In fact, the sound system dance has now developed into a distinct genre of reggae music in which the voice of the operator is now recorded in the music itself.

7. Referring to the medical and psychological testing for the Jamaican Ganja Project.

8. Recent letters from Buckland indicate that Stewart's situation has been largely resolved since he has given up fishing and turned the boat over to his brother and nephew. For the use of the boat and motor he now receives a share of their catch which he sells in his own retail fish shop in Deerfield. Significantly, he has relinquished ganja smoking as well.

9. Plainfield is the oldest section of workers' housing composed entirely of barracks-like structures and inhabited entirely by field workers and their families.

10. According to several Leyburn mothers, parents anticipate that baptism will limit the sexual activity of adolescent girls in the same manner that it limits the ganja activity of adolescent boys. This appears to be a fairly effective tactic, as local boys openly admit their unwillingness to approach a "Christian" girl for sexual favors.

11. This dimension of work life is very important in Leyburn and will be considered in detail in ensuing chapters.

12. In August following the elections, the new minister of justice issued a statement that 253 ganja offenders would be set free and the eighteen-month mandatory sentence for possession of ganja would be removed. Despite this apparent concession to ganja-using party supporters, ganja remained criminalized. Thus, while the announcement was regarded by many as a victory for ganja users and was met with great rejoicing, there were others who recognized that sentences would be passed on members of the lower section at the discretion of magistrates representing the upper levels of Jamaican society; they shuddered at the implications.

13. The few lawyers who practice in the country often derive a sizeable proportion of their income from defending ganja violators though the defense, in most cases, comprises little more than a plea for leniency from the magistrate. The average charge for this service ranges from two hundred to three hundred dollars—an astounding figure in light of the average earnings of the rural working class—and the case is always postponed until the amount is paid in full. These amounts seem even more exorbitant when compared with the magistrate's fines, which ordinarily run from twenty to seventy dollars.
The pipe, or "chillum," is constructed from various materials—glass bottles, wood, coconut shell, horn—and is fitted with rubber tubing through which the ganja is inhaled.

A remote cultivation area.

A transaction between cultivator and middleman. Because of the dangers of foul play, the cultivator favors the same buyer year after year.
In hand-loading sugar cane, three members of the “spell” heave armfuls of the cane to a fourth man on the cart.

In mechanical loading, the “grabber” picks up cane and loads it into carts drawn by an infield tractor.

Ganja and the Organization of Work

Though its intoxicant properties have dominated the American perception of cannabis, reports from other cultures indicate that the substance is often used for ceremonial, medicinal, and other generally non-intoxicant purposes (Grinspoon 1971: 173–175). The use of cannabis for relieving fatigue and promoting work has been reported among manual workers in India (Chopra and Chopra 1957: 13), Africa (Bourhill 1913), and Mexico and North America (Walton 1938: 117). The literature from Jamaica, as well, refers to the use of ganja among cane workers for similar purposes (Davison 1973: 153):

One estate manager gave it as his opinion that 75% of the labor force on that estate smoke ganja regularly with noticeable effects on the performance of workers in such occupations as tractor driving. On another estate the manager explained that he would never discuss a grievance on Friday or Saturday (pay day and ganja day) because only under the influence of “the weed” was a man likely to become violent. Few managers appeared to be unduly worried by ganja smoking. Indeed some of them pointed out that workers claim that it increases their productivity. On premium pay days on some estates the author was told that the workers are “steeped in ganja” to increase their output. Whether or not this is a problem for the estates, it is clearly a social problem.

Agricultural laborers and farmers in rural Jamaica indicate that there is a distinct and consequential relationship between ganja and work activities. (The use of rum and other intoxicants at the work site, however, is frowned on.) Most smokers claim that they began using weed heavily—that is, in more than just a social context—when they settled into their adult occupation routines. Not only is it then economically feasible to indulge habitually, but ganja smoking assumes a differ-
ent significance. As one Deerfield cane cutter explained, "Is not just the money; it keep encouragin' on work."

Furthermore, a comparison of the three settings reveals subtle, yet significant, local variations in ganja use among agricultural workers, indicating a relationship between the contour of ganja behavior and local production arrangements. This chapter will compare and analyze the role of ganja in the organization and accomplishment of agricultural work in Leyburn, Buckland, and Deerfield.

Whereas previous chapters focused on the whole community as the unit of observation and analysis, this chapter is concerned specifically with smokers of ganja who participate directly in agricultural production. Thus, non-smokers and non-agriculturalists in their respective communities are of only tangential interest in this argument, which centers on variation within the smoking population.

**LEYBURN**

Most agricultural production in Leyburn is carried out on own-account farms of fewer than five acres. According to Edwards' study of small-scale agriculture in Jamaica (1961), the system of mixed vegetable and permanent crop farming, which prevails in Leyburn, is among the highest in ongoing labor requirements, seldom dropping below 350 work hours per month and averaging about 450 per month per farm. In addition, these labor requirements vary greatly with the season, the heaviest concentration of labor occurring in November, when reaping of short-term crops takes place, and in July, when the reaping of mangoes and pimentos combines with heavy tending of ground or "catch" crops. Since cash flow is restricted to the two major reaping seasons of early December and August, most of the small farmers must work off their farms to meet their daily household expenses during slack periods.

Leyburn holdings vary in size and quality; few farmers have sufficient resources to depend only on their farms for a livelihood. Of the eighty-seven active adult male farmers in Leyburn, thirty-eight, or less than half, rely entirely on own-account farming. Of these thirty-eight, only eight are able to make a substantial living. The remaining are elderly or single householders who manage to get by on their farming incomes because they have few domestic responsibilities. The other forty-five men must combine farming with outside employment in order to meet the ordinary expenses of running a household. However, viable off-farm opportunities are seriously limited in Leyburn, particularly for the younger farmers. Equally out of reach is the capital necessary for commercial ventures such as shopkeeping or transportation services. Nineteen Leyburn men commute to jobs in Kingston or along the main road, but these are generally landless migrants who reside in Leyburn because they have established unions with local women. Recently, the new factories at Packers Corners have attracted Leyburn men in the sixteen- to twenty-two-year-old age group who have not yet acquired land room for farming. For the older men, however, the intensive and seasonal work requirements of serious farming obviate daily off-farm employment in these factories or in Kingston. The Land Authority Office and tobacco company have provided a few additional jobs as tractor driver, dairy keeper, and headman; but, again, such jobs usually require a daily commitment not possible for active farmers. Given the restrictions imposed by the general lack of opportunities and a labor-intensive and highly seasonal system of farming, the only source of outside employment for the small man in Leyburn is occasional wage labor for the Public Works Department or for the "stronger" farmers in the area.

The arrangements between "strong farmers" and "small men" are central to the organization of economic and social life in this community. Strong or big farmers are defined locally as the village's most productive agriculturalists. Such men are frequently in a position to employ labor on at least a casual basis. They themselves may do off-farm work, but generally as tradesmen rather than as laborers. Small men, on the other hand, are those for whom farming is also the primary economic activity but who often lack the resources (land and/or labor) to develop their farms as extensively as the better-off farmers; consequently, they are less productive. Small men generally supplement their farm income with off-farm casual labor for stronger farmers. These categories of farmers are not two distinct types but rather opposite ends in a continuum of small farm productivity, and in many cases represent stages in the male life cycle. Theoretically, Leyburn's strong farmers were once small men, who accumulated resources through inheritance, industry, prudence, and increased household labor resources.

The actual terms of the arrangements between strong farmers and small men are complex and highly individual, including, for example, tenancy, labor, domestic services, pasture privileges, and marketing services as well as actual monetary considerations. Notwithstanding the particular terms of such arrangements, there exists a generalized pattern of interdependency between small and big men adaptive to the specific conditions of Leyburn. Generally, the better-off farmer develops an intensive long-term relationship with one or two of the smaller farmers, on whom he depends to work for him when necessary. If he has a task that he cannot do alone, or if he is occupied in more lucrative tradesman work, he may employ the smaller farmer. Compensation for the task
could include pasture rights or a piece of unused land for cultivation as well as cash payment. Such negotiations are generally not singular but part of an ongoing arrangement comprised of mutual obligations and commitments. The small man’s responsibility in this broad arrangement is not only to do a job well and efficiently but also to be available to the bigger farmer, particularly during the labor-intensive months of July and November. The strong farmer, in turn, is obligated to supply the smaller man with opportunities for cash during the slack months. Such arrangements may be further encumbered by social ties such as kin or neighbor relations, godparent commitments, and common membership in agricultural or political organizations.

It is through his small man, in particular, that the better-off farmer deals with the issue of labor in general. In order to complete a piece of work more efficiently, the smaller man often contacts his peers who also need to do wage labor to supplement their incomes. Together they form a loose partnership or work gang to complete the task. This system has advantages for everyone concerned. Working on the premise that five men laboring one day can do a job better and faster than one man laboring five days, the farmer-laborer then has more time to devote to his own agricultural activities. At the same time he provides his friends with work and wages and, therefore, can expect the same from them in the future. This also entitles him to their services in lend-day arrangements on his own farm. For the employer the work is accomplished more quickly; more important, he needs to bargain with and supervise only one man with whom he has strong bonds and mutual commitments. The internal controls of the work gang, comprised of men who rely on each other regularly for services and for wage-labor opportunities, usually ensure the quality of the work.

The following episode, reconstructed from field notes on the activities of small farmer and ganja smoker James Ellis, illustrates the significance of the informal work arrangements typical of Leyburn.

Mr. Lake decided to clear a remote section of his land on which to plant grass for his cows. Since he was now sixty-seven years old and had recently undergone surgery, he knew that he could not do the work himself. Therefore, he sent a message to James Ellis’ yard asking “Mass James” to call on him that evening. Over the past ten years Mr. Lake has grown increasingly dependent on James to help him with his farm, particularly since his wife’s death four years before. His own four sons live in Kingston and abroad and have no interest in farming.

James Ellis, thirty-seven, is the nephew of Mr. Lake’s half-brother and has been known to Mr. Lake since a boy. He has six young children and was legally married four years ago so that his wife could be baptized into the Pentecostal church. Though he is from the poorest class in Leyburn, he is well liked by his peers and respected throughout the community for his abilities in farming. He owns two parcels of land: a half-acre piece purchased in the resettlement scheme, which is convenient to the main road for planting perishable vegetables; and a four-acre, inherited, piece on which he reaps tree crops and permits his goats to browse.

Though James is foremost a farmer, he must supplement his farming income with wage labor for two of the bigger men in the village—Mr. Lake, who is elderly and can no longer put in the heavy physical labor required, and Mr. Andrews, whose work as a carpenter frequently cuts into the time he can devote to his own farm. James is also learning masonry and occasionally has the opportunity to assist in this capacity for the Public Works Department or for one of the senior tradesmen in the village. Finally, he is well known for his skill in grafting fruit trees and earns some additional income performing this service for the Land Authority and various farmers in the area.

After Mr. Lake’s surgery, Mrs. Ellis had come to cook and keep house for him each day, leaving two of her children to stay there for company at night. In the meantime, James had tended Mr. Lake’s cows, making sure they were properly pastured and watered. For this service, Mr. Lake had paid James a small amount of cash and had given him the use of a piece of land to cultivate (conveniently close to where his cows were pastured).

When James returned home that evening, his wife informed him of Mr. Lake’s message. Both James and Mrs. Ellis often complain that Mr. Lake is “too mean” with his money, claiming that he will probably die alone in the house because “a next wife” would not tolerate his stinginess. Nevertheless, James continues to work for him even though the pay is small. Mr. Lake gives him many privileges and makes up in volume and regularity of work what is lacking in payment. Consequently, after his bath and dinner, James went to Mr. Lake’s yard, where they discussed the task to be done and arranged to go to the site the next day.

In the morning, the two men met at the riverside and took the long path up the mountain. Ordinarily, James would take the faster route, but the steep climb would have been too strenuous for Mr. Lake. On arrival in Mr. Lake’s fields, James opened two water coconuts, which they drank while resting briefly. After a few minutes they began to walk and measure the parcel to be cleared, Mr. Lake pointing out what he wanted done and James making suggestions about how the work would be best accomplished.

On the journey back to the house, the men discussed the fee, James asserting that ten pounds would be a fair price. Mr. Lake countered, “Oh no, James; dat too much. I can pay you twelve dollars.” James mentally converted dollars to pounds and then protested, “But uncle, only six pounds? ... Dat too likkle bit. Dem other boys will laf after me.” Eventually, they agreed on a price of eighteen dollars (nine pounds) but with the condition that James clear an additional section that had not been considered in the original plan.
The rest of the journey was spent discussing politics and rejoicing in their party's victory in the recent elections. When they arrived back in the village, Mr. Lake purchased beers, bread, and a tin of corned beef, which he carried to his home for their lunch. Before leaving Mr. Lake's yard, James asked if he could have a one dollar advance on the job, which he would begin on Monday. In a resigned manner Mr. Lake pulled out one of the two dollars in his wallet, saying, "Alright James, me gi' you." James then went to the yard of his friend, Rupert, to bud one of his mango trees—a favor he had promised to do a few months earlier.

As he worked, James weighed the advantages and disadvantages of inviting his colleagues to share the work of clearing Mr. Lake's field. Foremost in his consideration was his unwillingness to remain on the mountain by himself at night; this meant that the job would demand a trek up the steep slope and down again each day. Moreover, James estimated that, working alone, the field would require at least five full days to clear, leaving little time to tend his own farm. Consequently he decided to ask Rupert if he would assist him.

Rupert Graham, a commercial ganja planter of many years, lives with his mother, girlfriend, and thirteen-year-old son from a previous union. His few domestic responsibilities and control over more land puts him in a slightly better economic position than James. He is probably the most successful of James' peers. However, he is still within Leyburn's lowest socioeconomic level. With the exception of his mother's "house spot" and the few squares surrounding it, all of Rupert's land (about eight acres) is located far up the mountainside, where he cultivates corn, peas, and ganja.

It is well known that when Rupert's ganja crop is near reaping stage, he leaves his family and remains for several weeks in his fields guarding against praeclal larceny. Among working-class men in Leyburn, Rupert is highly respected for his strength, his generosity, and his ability to "take a chance" by planting ganja. Rupert supplements his farming income with labor for the Public Works Department and assisting Mr. Pratt, a Kingston lawyer whose avocation is fruit tree farming in Leyburn.

While grafting the mango tree, James asked his friend if he would join him on Monday to do a piece of work for Mr. Lake. Rupert readily agreed, saying that since his fields were near to Mr. Lake's, he could check on his own work at the same time. James said that he would help Rupert and would not plan to come back down the mountain until the next day. As James left he mentioned that he had some "cash fi bu weel" and asked Rupert to meet him at Mass Reuben's yard that night. Rupert laughed and said he would be there.

On the way back to his home, James stopped to see another friend, Lucas Noyes, also a commercial ganja planter (see Chapter 3). Lucas, forty years old, lives with his common-law wife and six children in an unfinished cement house, which he is building himself little by little. Coming to Leyburn as a young man, he worked as a house painter, mason, and carpenter. After setting up housekeeping with Miss Nettie, a local woman, he purchased a half-acre parcel of land on which he eventually built his house. Though Lucas is primarily a tradesman, most building jobs in the community were given to local men so he began supplementing his trade income with light farming on a rented piece of land. As his responsibilities grew, he farmed more extensively and now supplements his farming income, which includes commercial ganja cultivation, with occasional tradesman work. Mainly because of Miss Nettie's dressmaking and activity in community affairs, the Noyes household is classified as Level IIIa.

Before James entered Lucas' yard, he mentioned his annoyance regarding an incident that had occurred a few weeks earlier: One of the vendors in Leyburn had asked James if he could sell him some weed, since he would not be able to get into Kingston for a few days and needed some for business. James did not happen to have any of his own but told the vendor he knew where to get some for $1.50 an ounce. The vendor gave him three dollars to bring back two ounces. Knowing that Lucas had recently harvested some ganja and would be glad to have the cash, James brought the three dollars to his friend. Lucas told James to come back that night because he would have to go to bush to get the ganja (his wife insisted that he not keep it around the house because of the children). James agreed but was unable to return until the following morning, when Lucas had already left for work. Miss Nettie handed him a brown paper bag containing the ganja and James carried it directly to the vendor. Waiting while the vendor opened the bag, James had anticipated that he would receive a stick or at least a smoke for his services. However, when the ganja was poured out on a newspaper, it was obvious that it was far from two full ounces and much closer to an ounce and a half. James was embarrassed, thinking that the vendor would suspect him of keeping some of the ganja himself—"Me ras, dat not even two ounces cousin!" (not even close to two ounces)—and began to assure the vendor that he would make it right. The vendor told him, "Never mind, it alright man," but James left the yard immediately without smoking.

When next he saw Lucas, James confronted him about the matter, but Lucas denied that the amount was short. His temper cooled, James did not pursue the issue because Lucas had promised earlier to get him a good piece of work as a mason helping to build a lady's house in Packers Corners, and he did not want to upset those plans. However, James wanted to use the present opportunity to remind Lucas of his promise by asking him to join the work party. As it turned out, Lucas was not at home, so James left a message with Miss Nettie for Lucas to meet with him and Rupert at Mass Reuben's yard that night.

That night, Rupert crossed the river to James' yard first and Mrs. Ellis gave him some roasted yam that was left from supper. Then James took some ganja from a tin container under the house and each man rolled a spliff and smoked and talked while relaxing in the yard. When finished, they walked back across the river to Reuben's yard, calling first because of the dogs.
Reuben Henry, one of Leyburn’s perennial ganja vendors, is forty-one years old and lives with his common-law wife, Miss Girlie, and eight school-age children in what is probably the poorest household in Leyburn. Having only half an acre in cultivation, he is the least productive farmer within this group of men and has a reputation, even among his closest peers, as being lazy. Reuben supplements his farming income with selling ganja and with more or less regular labor for Mr. Brady, a middle-aged farmer and the local representative of the incumbent party. The latter has put him in good stead with the other men of the group because Mr. Brady has access to farm work opportunities abroad and to public works jobs. When Reuben recently procured a farm card to go abroad, Rupert Graham and James assisted Miss Girlie with her “little work” and also took Reuben’s place with Mr. Brady.

When the men reached Reuben’s yard, James explained the work they would be doing on Monday and asked Reuben if he would join them. James anticipated that Reuben would agree because he had recently helped Reuben with some work and thus Reuben owed him a favor. He also knew that Reuben was out of cash and needed more in order to procure ganja to sell.) Reuben agreed and asked who else would be working with them. When James mentioned that he had left a message with Lucas, Reuben told him that Lucas’ little girl had come earlier to say that her father would not be able to come because he was starting a job in Packers Corners soon and had to finish up his own work in the first part of next week. Reuben then suggested that they ask Miss Jerry, since he would be free next week. Rupert acted on Reuben’s suggestion, sending one of Reuben’s sons to fetch Jerry. Meanwhile, James gave Reuben fifty cents; the ganja appeared and James assisted in rolling spliffs for the four men.

Jeremiah Miller, thirty-six years old, is originally from a neighboring district. He moved to Leyburn, where he set up a household with Agatha, a local woman whom he had met at a dance. She already had two children from a previous union and together they had eight more. Soon after their union had been established, however, she began to suffer from a degenerative nervous disorder that also affected her personality. Her family, who lived in the same yard, continuously blamed Jeremiah and his family for her condition, saying that they had worked oceach on her. When he could not stand the accusations any longer, he moved back across the river to live by himself in a small one-room rented house on the main road. He continues to support Agatha and the children but has been quietly visiting one of the married women in the community and it is rumored that she is pregnant by him. Jerry, like James, purchased a half-acre piece in the resettle­ment scheme and rents two other small parcels on which to farm. He and his teenage sons also continue to reap the trees on Agatha’s inherited land, returning the money to her. Jerry supplements his farming income with off-farm labor for Mr. Anderson, a strong farmer in Leyburn, and for one of the tobacco contractor farmers.

Jerry is the latest member to join this group of friendly co-workers, though he had lived as James’ closest neighbor for several years. On his arrival in Reuben’s yard Jerry was handed a partially smoked spliff by Reuben, who then began to make up another. James explained the work to be done and Jerry agreed to join them. The men spent the remainder of the evening smoking the quarter-ounce of ganja and discussing the price of pimento, the theft of Mr. Davenport’s pigs, the new schoolteacher, and, of course, the recent elections. The last to leave, James purchased another twenty-cent stick of ganja from Reuben to carry with him.

Early Monday morning, Rupert called for Reuben on his way to James’ yard. Miss Girlie shouted down, “Hi already gwan le get Mass Jerry. Him seh dem will catch up with oonoo at James’ yard quick o’clock.” Rupert then went to James’ yard, where, after waiting a few minutes, the two men left word with Mrs. Ellis for Reuben and Jerry that they had gone ahead and would “buck up” at the work site. As they began the steep climb up the mountainside, Jerry and Reuben appeared ahead tethering Jerry’s goats. James told them exactly where to come and he and Rupert went ahead.

Before reaching the field, the two men stopped at Rupert’s field shelter to pick up a pot and some vegetables for soup. When they arrived at the work site, Jerry and Reuben were already there and passing a spliff between the two of them. Reuben then rolled one more, handing it to James. After smoking, the men began to work, chopping with their machetes and throwing the brush into piles. They stopped only once at mid-morning to rest, drink water coconuts, and eat some biscuits Jerry had carried from home. During this break they lighted two more spliffs and passed them around. They discussed the merits of ganja’s assisting them to work faster and harder, claiming that no “rum man” could have accomplished the work they had done that morning. James even proposed an experiment that the “university doctors” should perform in which they would select any four “rum men” and give them an unlimited supply of rum and select any four “ganja men” and give them an unlimited supply of ganja. Then give the two sets of men the same piece of work to do and see who completes the job. He predicted that the university doctors would come back to find the four rum men sound asleep with the “sun high in the sky” while the four ganja men had not looked up since they first put their shoulders to the ground.

At lunchtime the men boiled soup from Rupert’s vegetables and some of his green ganja. Afterward, they rested for awhile and then Reuben and Jerry went back down to the village, picking up Jerry’s goats along the way. Rupert and James went back to the shelter and spent the remainder of the afternoon weeding and thinning Rupert’s cultivation and bussing the young ganja plants. That evening they went into Heath, the tiny mountain settlement above Leyburn, to buy flour for dumplings, some condensed milk, and stout. There they met a friend called “Joker,” who came back to the shelter where they cooked, played dominoes, drank stout, smoked ganja, and conversed.
The next morning Rupert and James were the first to arrive at the site and began working. Within an hour Jerry and Reuben joined them and the men stopped to smoke weed. Again, they worked steadily until midmorning, when they took a break for half an hour. The men ate and drank some biscuits and flavored milk that Mrs. Ellis had sent with Reuben and Jerry and then smoked two more spliffs between them.

Continuing to work, they finished the job shortly after twelve noon and then stopped to eat a lunch of boiled bananas and Irish potatoes cooked in chicken soup mix. After smoking one more time, the men packed up their tools to leave. Jerry and Reuben started back down the mountain carrying some of the grass that they had cut for Jerry’s goats. Rupert and James returned to the shelter where they cleaned the pots and gathered a few vegetables to take home. When he arrived home, James’ wife told him that Lucas had come by the night before to tell him that the job in Packers Corners would start the day after next.

Although James’ actual cash payment for the job was less than one-fourth what it would have been had he done the job alone, his time was freed for work on his own farm and for the more financially promising job with Lucas. Furthermore, James can expect future work from Mr. Lake on the basis of yet another job well done, and he also can expect to be included in the wage-labor opportunities of his colleagues. Finally, what was potentially an onerous and boring task was transformed into a social event that included cooking together, good conversation, ganja to smoke, and a general sharing of male companionship.

Clearing Mr. Lake’s land was not a singular event for James and his friends; these five form an ongoing, loosely organized work group based on reciprocity. Each member combines work on his own farm with off-farm wage-labor opportunities and both these activities are regularly shared among the group. Bound also by strong ties of friendship, these men render mutual favors and assistance of a non-economic nature. For example, when Reuben’s last son was born, James brought him a young mango tree, “to grow strong same as the boy”; when Lucas and Nettie were having domestic troubles, it was Rupert who intervened to “let Miss Nettie’s mind rest easy.” In addition, they are all of the same political affiliation and spend long evening hours discussing the merits of their party.

For men in Leyburn who must combine work on their own farms with sporadic outside wage labor for a living, lateral cooperation in the form of loosely organized, friendly work partnerships is essential. Conditions require that an individual farmer have the option of refusing a particular job at one time when the demands of his own farm are great and yet still be considered for wage-labor opportunities as they occur at a later time. A loose work gang composed of men with strong bonds of friendship ensures this flexibility. Lucas, for example, was confident that even though he was unable to join his peers on this occasion, he would be asked again in the future. Thus, each farmer-laborer participates in a set of relationships in which the exchange of labor and services is a necessary component.

The implications of occupational multiplicity on social organization in rural Jamaica have been reviewed by Comitas (1973: 171):

In many cases more than one role is performed by a single individual. This requires decisions as to work priorities and work schedules and ties individuals to a convoluted set of social obligations. Such structural links or patterned relationships, established for economic gain, are essentially lateral ones connecting members of the same stratum into horizontal socioeconomic segments.

The structural consequences of occupational multiplicity have clear implications for the patterning of local ganja activity. Table 7 summarizes the relationship between the prevalence of ganja smoking and occupational multiplicity in Leyburn. Eighty-nine percent of the sixty-two men who participate in agricultural production solely as cultivators are non-smokers; only 11 percent are smokers. These figures are consonant with the normative pattern of this group, which is generally derived from the higher age and social strata of the community. It is significant, however, that eight of the nine men who are exclusively wage laborers—and who, without exception, are drawn from the lowest socioeconomic level in Leyburn—are also non-smokers. Finally, among the twenty-five men who combine these two agricultural activities, the reverse pattern is evident; twenty-two (88 percent) are smokers while only three (12 percent) are non-smokers. Thus, while there is a generally low rate of ganja smoking among farmers and among agricultural laborers, there is a significantly high rate of ganja smoking among men who combine these two pursuits.

It would appear that the prevalence of ganja use in Leyburn is related to a pattern of occupational multiplicity—specifically, the combination of own-account cultivation with agricultural wage employment. The episode previously described reveals some aspects of the role of ganja use among farmer-laborers. It is a common practice for men in Leyburn to demonstrate their gratitude and good will by “toasting” their friends with a supply of ganja. In the example just cited, James provided ganja for his co-workers, first in Reuben’s yard when the work party was organized, and again during the actual work sessions. Smoking weed is a regular part of their work efforts as well as their leisure time activities, and each contends that a task is accomplished faster and better when the participants smoke together.
Table 7  Adult Males* in Leyburn Classified by Type of Employment and Ganja Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of employment</th>
<th>Smokers</th>
<th>Non-Smokers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time cultivators†</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time laborers†</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivator-laborers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time cultivator-laborers†</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agriculturals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Leyburn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Leyburn</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Males over fifteen years old.
† The part-time category refers to men who combine employment not directly related to agricultural activities, such as tradesman or worker for the ministry, with a direct agricultural pursuit—cultivator, laborer, or both.

It is not merely by chance that all five men in James’ group are heavy ganja users. The exchange of ganja among these co-workers intensifies friendships and solidifies the reciprocal nature of work life, transforming one-dimensional relationships to multiplex ones. Though the exchange is not immediate, exact, or in kind, these men extend themselves for each other further than they would for less intimate, non-smoking associates. Refusal to partake is translated as a refusal of friendship and social intercourse. It represents an unwillingness to participate in the exchange of services for which ganja smoking is the symbolic transfer.

Observational data on the composition of recreational smoking groups in Leyburn indicate that agriculturists who work together regularly also smoke together in leisure settings, and do so to the general exclusion of other village men. At the time of the study, five informal smoking circles were discernible among Leyburn agriculturists, ranging from three to five members each. James, Rupert, Lucas, Reuben, and, most recently, Jerry constitute one such grouping in the sense that each named the others as those with whom he has the most frequent and regular smoking sessions. This does not mean that all five are present at every smoking session nor that any given member of the group may not smoke with a person outside the group, but simply that at this point in time, if James, Rupert, Reuben, Lucas, or Jerry has ganja to share, he is more likely to share it with one or more of the remaining four than with other men.

All five men in James’ circle combine farming and agricultural labor in only slightly varying ways. Thus, they have similar interests and common challenges and problems. This occupational uniformity of membership helps to ensure parity in the transfer of services among members so that the danger of one individual becoming a drain on the resources of the group, and, thus, a disruptive influence, is considerably diminished. Men of similar status in the community who are not in the position of having to combine own-account cultivation with agricultural wage labor are informally but effectively excluded from the smoking circles typified by James and his friends. Such men do not have the same commitment to exchange and interdependence that is essential for farmer-laborers and thus would necessarily detract from group cohesion. Such men ordinarily have strong vertical ties with their employers in which the terms of employment are precise and the work steady. Without the competing demands of their own farms they have little incentive for developing or maintaining the lateral ties enhanced in exclusive ganja-smoking circles. Thus, leisure smoking groups among farmer-laborers in Leyburn are circumscribed by the field of friendly co-activity in which lateral cooperation for the production of work is enhanced and reinforced. Smoking together recreationally serves to differentiate these extremely important community relations and make them operational.

Because of their intrinsic economic significance, it is essential to the stability of these groupings that they be limited to those who can participate in the exchange on an equal basis. Consequently, it is not surprising to discover the comparatively homogeneous composition of smoking circles in Leyburn. All were composed of men from Leyburn’s lowest socioeconomic level and the age span within any one group never exceeded seven years, helping to ensure similar energy levels as well as similar interests among the members of each group.

Because of the egalitarian emphasis of these circles, as the status of any individual changes, so does his relationship to the group. Consequently, membership tends to have a fluid, rather than static, quality and may actually change from season to season. Jerry, for instance, who was a long-time friend and next-door neighbor of James, has only recently enjoyed the status of co-worker and, thus, become a regular smoking associate with the other four. Previous to that time, he participated in another smoking circle of similar composition. The ease with which these changes occur depends on the specific situation. The recent history of James’ group includes, for example, the gradual withdrawal of its oldest member, Simeon Johnson; Simeon has been able to relinquish wage employment and cultivate a larger acreage of his own land with the assistance of his adult sons. He continues to be much admired by the other men, who visit his yard occasionally and bring ganja to share with him. The more abrupt withdrawal of Malechi Smith, however, drew criticism from his peers. Malechi obtained a job as tractor driver for the
fewer hours with less responsibility, lends support to the popular beliefs connecting ganja use to productivity, strength, and masculinity in generational use of ganja in cooperative work efforts and for the exclusion of work and intensive coworker relations at one stage in the male life by virtue of his reputation among his peers.

In summary, ganja smoking among Leyburn agricultural workers tends to be organized around co-worker relations and often supersedes neighbor, kin, or friendship connections. Accordingly, it is structured in small groups that are homogeneous in terms of age, socioeconomic status, and type of employment. These ganja smoking groups are most active during labor-intensive seasons but function at a lower level throughout the year. The high prevalence of ganja activity among agricultural pluralists—men who combine work on their own farms with wage employment for better-off farmers—is indicative of the role of ganja in enhancing short-term cooperative work efforts as well as the vital, long-term co-worker relationship which extends beyond the specific task. In this regard, it is important to recognize that it is not the type of work but the arrangements under which work is accomplished that appear to determine the degree and prevalence of ganja use. Thus, men who participate in agricultural work solely as cultivators or solely as laborers may perform the same tasks as farmer-laborers, but are not committed to the same intensive lateral relationships that are often expressed and replenished in ganja smoking groups.

The values, groupings, and activities linked to ganja use in Leyburn, themselves interconnected and mutually reinforcing, are related to a mode of production and land tenure that requires extremely hard work and intensive co-worker relations at one stage in the male life cycle. For men in this stage, ganja use is generally heavy but not indiscriminate. The groupings in which social consumption of the drug occurs are exclusive; membership carries a positive status within this socioeconomic level and requires that an individual earn the privilege of joining by virtue of his reputation among his peers.

The strength of the association of ganja with work and workers in Leyburn, combined with its general absence among men who work fewer hours with less responsibility, lends support to the popular beliefs connecting ganja use to productivity, strength, and masculinity in general. These values, in turn, provide an ideological basis for the continued use of ganja in cooperative work efforts and for the exclusion of wage laborers from smoking circles. In Leyburn, where a high value is placed on a man's abilities as a farmer, landholders who have opted to "work out for other men," rather than cultivate their own land, are regarded as doing "boy's work" and, hence, not entitled to enjoy the comradeship and social activities of men their own age and status. In some ways they are outcasts of Leyburn male society, and it is not surprising that eight of these nine agricultural wage laborers are men who have never enjoyed extensive participation in ganja smoking activity. This contrasts with Leyburn's other non-smoking group—own-account farmers—many of whom were serious ganja smokers when they were younger and poorer and who relinquished ganja only after growing older and acquiring superior status.

BUCKLAND

The two major agricultural enterprises in Buckland—banana and coconut production and cane farming—represent two different systems of farming, each with its own implications for the arrangement and form of ganja-linked behavior in the community.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, three properties account for the major proportion of banana and coconut production: Stoneleigh, Eaglebrook, and Windsor Farms. The remainder of the production of these two commercial crops in Buckland is taken up on approximately eighty small farms ranging from one to forty acres. Lethal Yellowing Disease, which has devastated native coconut groves on the rest of the island, has only just reached the Buckland area, giving farmers enough time to plant the highly resistant dwarf coconuts before their native coconuts were afflicted. The market value of coconuts is not high in comparison with many other crops, particularly sugar. However, the low labor input, the convenience of having a ready market at the Stoneleigh copra factory, and the reliable transport have great appeal for Buckland landholders, who then use their remaining time in more lucrative work for the surrounding estates.

Excluding leased land designated for cane, only eight farmers in Buckland have holdings measuring over fifteen acres, and only five are able to make a substantial living by relying exclusively on banana and coconut production. As in Leyburn, many own-account agriculturalists supplement the income derived from their farms with off-farm work. In Buckland, the options for making a living and supplementing banana and coconut cultivation include cane farming, fishing, employment in various capacities for the surrounding properties and estates, and the usual range of tradesman activities. Unlike Leyburn, however, the tech-
nician and tradesman jobs are not restricted to the senior men of the community. Placement of young masons, carpenters, electricians, and mechanics on various estates is aided by the nearby government trade school, which many Buckland youths attend. In addition, the presence of large-scale agriculture in the area provides opportunities for young men to learn to operate field vehicles and trucks.

Despite the comparative abundance of these more prestigious jobs in Buckland, there remain, as in Leyburn, unskilled small farmers who combine agricultural wage labor for larger farmers with work on their own farms. However, there are consequential differences in the nature of this combination. First, the Buckland system of banana and coconut farming requires significantly fewer work hours than farms of comparable cultivated acreage in Leyburn. According to Edwards (1961: 62), small banana and coconut farms of ten acres or less can be easily managed by the holder and his family. Second, in terms of seasonal labor requirements, banana and coconut production is the least variable of any of the systems of small farming throughout the island (Edwards 1961: 60). Rainfall is adequate for fairly even crop growth and labor requirements are consistent throughout the year. The recent de-emphasis on bananas has resulted in even more labor regularity in farming because young banana plants require attention.

In terms of hours and energy, the input for this system of farming is not only low but remarkably consistent. Thus, for the Buckland farmer-laborer, the cultivation of his holdings is almost a sideline to his wage labor employment with one of the estates or properties in the area. In terms of time and energy, these men are primarily laborers and secondarily farmers, whereas the men who combine own-account cultivation with wage labor in Leyburn are primarily farmers and secondarily laborers. The commitment of Buckland men to their employers is generally not sporadic and seasonal as in Leyburn, but consistent and daily. The close work setting brings them into daily contact with men who rely entirely on wage labor for a living. Relationships develop among these men in the work setting that are then extended into social activities. In addition, land ownership is not universal, as in Leyburn, and non-farming wage laborers account for 34 percent of Buckland’s agriculturalists in comparison with only 9 percent of Leyburn’s (Table 7). These individuals are not landowners who chose not to cultivate but men who never had nor expect to have land for their own use. Consequently, they are not regarded as lazy or unmasculine by their peers. Thus, even though Buckland laborers are accorded low status in terms of power and influence, they may still enjoy a good reputation and full acceptance among other working-class men. Table 8 indicates that 89 percent of the laborers in Buckland are ganja smokers while only 11 percent are non-smokers, which is exactly opposite to the pattern in Leyburn.

Table 8 Adult Males* in Buckland Classified by Type of Employment and Ganja Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of employment</th>
<th>Smokers</th>
<th>Non-smokers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultivators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time cane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banana and coconut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time banana and coconut</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time laborers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivator-laborers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banana and coconut</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time banana and coconut†</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman-laborers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time fisherman†</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agriculturalists</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician-tradesman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional-commercial-managerial</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Males over fifteen years old.
† The part-time category refers to men who combine agricultural activities with working for the ministry or as tradesmen.

ers as their co-workers; rather, their work on the estates or properties brings them into daily contact with men who rely entirely on wage labor for a living. Relationships develop among these men in the work setting that are then extended into social activities. In addition, land ownership is not universal, as in Leyburn, and non-farming wage laborers account for 34 percent of Buckland’s agriculturalists in comparison with only 9 percent of Leyburn’s (Table 7). These individuals are not landowners who chose not to cultivate but men who never had nor expect to have land for their own use. Consequently, they are not regarded as lazy or unmasculine by their peers. Thus, even though Buckland laborers are accorded low status in terms of power and influence, they may still enjoy a good reputation and full acceptance among other working-class men. Table 8 indicates that 89 percent of the laborers in Buckland are ganja smokers while only 11 percent are non-smokers, which is exactly opposite to the pattern in Leyburn.

Cane farming, on the other hand, does not follow this pattern of regularity in work life. In Buckland, cane farms range from two to...
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twenty-five acres, and all are planted under lease arrangements with Deerfield Estate. Produced under contract to the estate, farming of this commercial crop is similar to the farming of tobacco in Leyburn, except that there is considerably less supervision and guidance from the estate and there is greater variation in the amount of land controlled by each farmer. The appeal of cane farming for the small farmer is not only the comparatively lucrative returns but the advantage of having additional land for planting other crops and keeping stock. Unlike the estates and larger independent cane farmers, small cane farmers neither burn their cane nor use chemical herbicides. Therefore, they are able to plant and harvest melons and pumpkins between the rows of young cane.

The method of remunerating farmers for the cane delivered to the factory is by sampling and computing the sucrose content, not by weighing the tonnage. However, the farmers are protected to a degree by a government guarantee of a minimum of eight dollars per ton for cane delivered, regardless of sucrose content. The cane farmers in Buckland agree that the eight-dollar minimum payment has provided a healthy incentive. However, the lack of reliable transport during reaping season has served as the major deterrent to expanding production. As one farmer commented, "Eight dollars per ton for cane delivered to the factory doesn't help us when we can't get transport to take it there."

Cane farming is labor-intensive from February through April when the cane must be cut, loaded into carts, and sent to the factory. The cutting of cane is seldom a problem for the majority of farmers. Generally, this stage of reaping is successfully accomplished through family labor or short-term partners among cane farmers. For those few farmers who lack adequate family labor, however, or for those who are too old to participate effectively in partner arrangements, employment of men to cut cane is costly and seriously diminishes profits. For example, while Deerfield Estate was currently paying cutters fifty-four to sixty-six cents per ton, cane farmers had to pay them eighty cents to over a dollar per ton. Since the farmers do not burn their cane prior to cutting, the work is slower and more laborious and consequently workers demand more money. Furthermore, small cane farmers do not provide the incentives and bonuses which attract workers to the bigger employers.

While the cutting of cane is a problem for a few farmers in Buckland, the critical issue reported by almost all Buckland cane farmers is the loading and transporting of cut cane. Only two farmers in Buckland possess the necessary equipment—carts and tractors—while the rest are forced to rely on contractors to load and deliver the cut cane to the factory before the sucrose content noticeably depreciates. The longer the cut cane remains on the ground, the greater the loss of sucrose and the less the farmers profit from their labors. Loading contractors own tractors and carts and employ a gang consisting of a driver, sideman, and loaders. For this service, farmers pay from $1.25 to over $2.00 per ton of cane delivered to the factory.

Cane farmers complain constantly of contractors who do not show up on the day specified, or, when they finally do arrive, refuse to load the cane unless the farmer agrees to increase the fee. The cane farmers are particularly vulnerable because time is so critical, and in desperation they often consent to pay a higher price. Often they find themselves competing against each other for labor. Many report going to practically any extreme to get their cane loaded. One jocular farm wife recounted how she stood on top of the car being loaded, arranging bundles of cane and shouting to the men working below, "A fe dem heave sugar get fe peep"! (the more often the men heaved up the cane, the more opportunity they would have to look under her skirts as she bent over in the cart).

The larger farmers who recruit labor periodically throughout the year can usually expect their laborers to give them fair treatment in loading and transport operations during the reaping season. For example, when Mr. Langford, a mason who also cultivates seven acres of cane, needed a man to brush down his overgrown and mosquito-infested yard, he went all the way to Chelsea, in the sugar belt, to contact the man who had loaded cane for him in the last season—in spite of the number of men or young boys from his own community whom he could have asked to do the job. By asking the Chelsea man instead, Langford was attempting to establish a relationship that he expects will serve him well during crop time. This type of relationship is not unlike that which occurs between strong farmers and small men in Leyburn.

Farmers also rely on traditional expressions of good will toward transport and labor teams in order to get their cane loaded quickly and cheaply. Since loading gangs are known for their heavy use of ganja, it is not uncommon for cane farmers to "encourage" the gang by providing them with ganja to smoke at the work site. Mr. Black, for example, claims "those boys love to come to my fields and load cane for me because they know they will get plenty weed fe smoke," even though he himself is a professsed non-smoker.

Other farmers nurture friendly relations with loading crews throughout the year to ensure their availability during reaping season. Friendships between cane farmers and transporters may be established in a variety of settings and through numerous links, and smoking ganja together is not least among them. The significance of ganja in this regard is demonstrated by the case of Mr. Pinnock, who ordinarily does not use ganja but never refuses an opportunity to smoke with his friend, Carlton Beatty, a tractor driver and contractor. In addition, he provides Carlton...
and his crew with ganja when they arrive to do the actual work. Pinnock freely admits that he depends on his "friends" to give him "fair treatment" during crop time.

Thus, social relationships enhanced by ganja figure more significantly in the organization of work for cane farmers than for banana and coconut producers. It is not surprising that among those who are primarily cultivators, cane farmers have a higher rate of ganja smokers (28%) than banana and coconut producers (18%), even though both are drawn primarily from Buckland’s middle class.

While cane farmers find ganja more instrumental in the organization and production of work than banana and coconut growers, the economic relationships facilitated by the exchange of ganja are not the same as those of Leyburn. The offer of ganja by cane farmers to transporters or loaders is a symbol of good will, a gift—or perhaps an enticement—for the favor of fair treatment. It is not a symbol of egalitarian in-group solidarity typical of exclusive co-worker groupings in Leyburn. Cane farmers and transporters do not have the same interests in common. Farmers are at a considerable disadvantage and have little in return to offer loaders except the ganja itself. Therefore, the exchange is unequal and less binding; there is no need for the exclusivity of Leyburn smoking, nor could it be exclusive.

These differences between Leyburn and Buckland with regard to the role of ganja in the organization and accomplishment of work accompany differences in the structure of ganja activities. Buckland smoking groups are not discrete units as in Leyburn and, thus, are more difficult to delineate. However, the following description of a network of regular smoking associates is illustrative. Though we begin with Frank Davies, he (like James Ellis) should not be construed as a leader, but simply as a point of entry into the network.

Frank Davies is a thirty-nine-year-old man who lives with his common-law wife, Miss Andrea. Both were born and grew up in Buckland. Together they had one son who was killed in a motorcycle accident a few years earlier, and Andrea has a son of her own (born previous to her union with Frank) who was raised by her mother. Frank combines several occupations to make a living: he owns five squares of banana and coconut-producing land which he cultivates himself; he leases three acres of land from Deerfield Estate on which he plants cane; he is a carpenter by trade; and finally, he has a job cleaning the furnaces at the sugar factory once a week when the crop is on. With the exception of reaping cane, Frank works individually in most of his jobs and in the evening he enjoys getting together with friends for a smoke. Because Miss Andrea is a religious woman and it might offend her to have several men around the house smoking ganja, Frank usually seeks other places in which to enjoy a spliff in male company, though he does not hesitate to smoke in his home if he is smoking alone.

The men with whom he most frequently smokes ganja are his immediate neighbors—Fitzy Smith, Basil Thompson and, "Duke" Johnson. Fitzy, twenty-four years old, is originally from a neighboring community though he has now lived in Buckland for three years. While working as a tractor driver on Windsor Farms, he met Basil, twenty-two years old, who was then a tractor sideman for that estate. The two became close friends, and began to "sport" together after working hours. To avoid the long journey to work the next morning, Fitzy would frequently stay with Basil, who lives with his mother and younger siblings. Though Fitzy was well known as a "womanizer" and claims to have fathered several children by the age of twenty, he was particularly impressed with Basil’s attractive sister, Icilda. When Icilda became pregnant, she and Fitzy set up housekeeping and now live next door to Basil and his mother. They have two children of their own as well as two that Icilda bore before she met Fitzy.

Basil still lives with his mother and younger siblings and has taken major responsibility for her support. In the meantime, however, he has become a tractor driver for an independent transport contractor and consequently the two young men no longer work together. However, they have continued to nurture their close friendship in the leisure setting. Basil is very shy—particularly with women—and relies on Fitzy in social situations. Basil and Fitzy both smoke ganja regularly in work and leisure settings, and occasionally acquire an extra amount to sell. Frank, their closest neighbor, often comes over to buy a small quantity from Basil and then join them for a smoke.

"Duke" Johnson, thirty-eight years old, works on a truck for the Parish Council. He also cultivates his father’s cane piece and occasionally does some butchering as well. Duke resides with his common-law wife, Monica, and their six small children. Though he has no land of his own, he has largely taken over his father’s work since his father has been employed as a headman on a neighboring property. Duke smokes ganja regularly and, as a sideline, sells ganja to local vendors. He is essentially a middleman and does not sell directly to smokers. During the time of field work in Buckland, Duke was just recovering from a serious motorcycle accident for which he had been hospitalized several weeks. In the meanwhile, Monica had taken over the reaping of Duke’s cane piece. Frank, who had been Duke’s reaping partner for several years, assisted Monica with this task. Basil, Fitzy, and two of Basil’s friends joined them in loading the cane and then Basil transported it to the factory. Thus the cane was successfully reaped and delivered while Duke was immobilized in the hospital. Since that time, Duke has continued to demonstrate his gratitude by supplying Basil and Fitzy with an occasional ounce of weed which they divide and sell for extra cash.

Wallace Edwards, thirty-four years old, is another smoking associate
of Frank's. Wallace works for the Ministry of Health, spraying lowlands for malarial control. A newcomer to Buckland, he met his girlfriend when he came to Deerfield Estate to look for work. Princess, a native to the area, had three children already and then another with Wallace. They settled into the house left to her by her father, which is located close to Frank's yard, and Wallace and Frank have become good friends. Though he no longer cuts cane for Deerfield, Wallace often makes himself available to do wage labor for some of the local cane farmers, including Frank and Duke.

Another neighbor, Joe Watson, worked at a cement factory in the parish capital during the week and returned to his house in Buckland on weekends. Joe, at fifty-five, was an excellent cumina4 drummer and on Friday and Saturday nights men gathered in his yard to play the drums and smoke ganja. Despite the fact that he lived alone—or perhaps because of it—it is rumored that Joe's abilities as a cumina drummer gave him special powers to compel women to stay with him. Frank, however, defends his friend against these accusations, claiming that "people are jealous." During the course of field work Joe died of ackee poisoning, and of all the villagers, Frank probably grieved most over the loss.

Desmond Thornley, the "mad" son of Justice Thornley, is a life-long friend and schoolmate of Frank's. Though people claim that he had great potential as a young man, at age forty Desmond does little more than herd his father's goats and perform common labor for small farmers. Still, most residents insist that his father used obeah to "set dummy pon him brain." He lives alone in a tiny house that he built on a few squares of land given to him by his father. He has no wife or girlfriend and the only social activity he enjoys is getting together with his friends in the evening to smoke ganja.

George Taylor, fifty years old, cultivates one and a half acres of rented land. Occasionally he works for the Public Works Department. George once worked for Windsor Farms as a field laborer, but since the change in ownership he has not done any serious work in cane. Always very much a bachelor, he has only recently established a union with Miss Rebecca, who boils coconut oil and does some higglering on a limited scale. Though an outsider to Buckland and quite poor, Mass George is respected and well liked by the other men. He is very intelligent and was an articulate spokesman for the other laborers when he was cutting cane. George seldom leaves his yard in the evening; his keen sense of humor and "good argument," however, draw friends and neighbors who come each night to enjoy his company and smoke a spliff or two.

The last of Frank's regular smoking associates is "Pablo" Bernard, forty-four, who was born in Cuba to Jamaican parents. As a young boy, he returned to his parents' home in Buckland, and when he came of age he set up a household with a local woman. They now have seven children ranging from early adult to preschool age. Driving a van and cane farming are Pablo's two major occupations. He is also a member of the reaping partnership which includes Duke, Frank, and two other neighboring cane farmers. Pablo, like George, is a favorite among the other men for his clowning sense of humor. His opinions, however, are not regarded as highly as George's and men do not ordinarily seek him out for advice. Pablo is also a heavy rum drinker, though he enjoys weed and is as likely to be found in a rum shop as in a ganja yard.

Frank named these men as his most regular smoking associates, but there are several others with whom he smokes on a less frequent basis. Moreover, the men who smoke regularly with Frank do not necessarily smoke regularly with each other. For example, Basil and Fitzy seldom smoke with Desmond Thornley or Watson but smoke frequently with their friends, Keith and Wilbur Rooms, who seldom smoke with Frank. Leisure smoking relationships in Buckland are not circumscribed and limited to co-workers as they are in Leyburn; they are inclusive and open-ended. Thus, while the size of the actual groupings in which Frank smokes ganja is comparable to that of Leyburn groupings (three to six men), the range of associates from which Buckland groups are drawn is larger; hence their daily composition is subject to greater variation.

Moreover, in contrast to Leyburn, smoking groups in Buckland often include non-smoking men who join their friends for conversation and company. For example, one of Frank's closest friends and neighbors, Thomas Campbell, is admittedly afraid to smoke ganja, but is nevertheless well liked by other men who are entertained by his jokes and praise his skill at relating Anansi lore. Although Thomas is subjected to considerable teasing about his resistance to smoking ganja, he is always included in their social activities. Thomas' situation is not unusual in Buckland; however, non-smoking men ordinarily have to assume the burden of proving their friendship and trustworthiness over a period of time before being accepted in working-class social activities which include ganja smoking. Most non-smoking men in the community who are not restrained from smoking by their religious beliefs are excluded from ganja smoking groups because of reputations as "pugilists" (troublemakers) or men who "will give we away" (are untrustworthy). This kind of segregation, based on personal character, differs from the exclusion of men from Leyburn smoking circles, which is based on economic factors.

In contrast to Leyburn, Buckland smoking groups are not restricted to co-workers. Frank smokes routinely where he works, but of all the men with whom Frank smokes recreationally, only Duke and Pablo are his co-workers and only in the sense that they comprise part of a seasonal cane-reaping group. It is significant that the two other members of that group are baptized Christians who conform to the church injunctions on the smoking of ganja. Thus, unlike Leyburn, recreational smok-
ing groups and work site smoking groups exist independently of each other.

Since recreational ganja smoking is not intrinsic to agricultural work arrangements in Buckland, it is not surprising to find a broader range of ages and occupational categories in any given smoking group. The viabil­ity of a group is not dependent on an even exchange predicated on the equality of its members. Moreover, since ganja use in Buckland is not correlated with a particular combination of occupations that is, in turn, correlated with a particular age level, ganja smoking groups in Buckland do not undergo a developmental sequence that corresponds to the male life cycle as in Leyburn.

Finally, unlike Leyburn, where smoking circles largely ignore neighbor relations, unless they are coincidental with co-worker relations, smoking groups in Buckland evolve as neighborhood-based clusters along a network of friendly relationships which extend throughout the community and into adjacent communities. Buckland men enter the labor market independently, frequently taking jobs located outside the residential community. On returning to Buckland in the evening, neighbor ties and friendships are reaffirmed in male social gatherings and smoking groups. These ties are also activated in times of crisis—death, illness, injury, or any occasion calling for assistance. The case of Duke Johnson is typical. During his hospitalization and recovery he depended on his friends and neighbors in Buckland, not his regular co-workers, many of whom live far away. The enhancement of neighborhood solidarity, rather than co-worker solidarity, is important in Buckland because of the comparatively high mobility of its residents—particularly on the lowest socioeconomic level. Many of its residents are simply not related by the kinship or long-standing neighbor ties ordinarily tapped in stressful situations.

Finally, though this chapter focuses primarily on men engaged in agriculture, the pattern of smoking among Buckland fishermen represents a sociologically important departure from the more generalized smoking pattern among men in this settlement. For this reason it merits a brief description before leaving Buckland. Currently there are seventeen full-time fishermen: six boat owners and eleven crew members. In addition, there are six young spear fishermen who occasionally substitute for regular crew members. Until very recently, fishing in Buckland was, for most, a hand-to-mouth subsidiary economic activity. However, when Windsor Farms reclaimed the land which Buckland squatters had been cultivating, the displaced agriculturalists refused to labor for the estate and turned instead to full-time fishing. Requiring a minimal initial investment, fishing has now become one of the most attractive occupations for unskilled young men seeking an alternative to estate labor. The six Buckland youths currently spear fishing on a regular basis anticipate becoming full-time crew members and aspire eventually to own boats and motors. In addition, several adolescents in the community are spear fishing on weekends and express the desire to become full-time fishermen. Presently, however, fishing as an economic activity in Buckland is still in its infancy. Only four men own motors for their boats. Two others have purchased boats but have not yet accumulated the funds for motors. Five of the boat owners take two-man crews while the sixth ordinarily fishes only with his cousin. The remaining six young men swim out to the rocky shoals where they dive for fish, unless they are fortunate enough to be invited to substitute for an absent crew member. To advance their position when not fishing, these six spend the majority of their time at the beach fraternizing with crew men and boat owners. Most have become regular substitutes for one or two crew members. In addition, they exchange crew opportunities among themselves; for example, when Winston White was offered two crew jobs at once, he offered the second job to one of his comrades with the expectation that the favor will eventually be returned in kind.

The competition for limited crew positions has given a guild-like quality to Buckland fishermen. This, in turn, is reflected in a pattern of ganja smoking remarkably similar to the farmer-laborers of Leyburn. Of the twenty-three fishermen, eighteen, or 79 percent, are regular ganja smokers (Table 8). These men smoke together not only while fishing but in a leisure setting as well. After returning from sea, fishermen ordinarily remain at the beach throughout the afternoon to smoke ganja, play dominoes, and drink beer, only returning to their homes in the village for dinner and early bed. Non-fishermen are generally absent from these daily social activities at the beach, as are fishermen from the smoking sessions held throughout the wider community. It would appear that the intensive and exclusive nature of social relations among Buckland fishermen (like those among Leyburn farmer-laborers) serves to reinforce their economic alliances and minimize divisive influences.

With the exception of fishermen, the configuration of ganja-linked behavior in Buckland varies significantly from that of Leyburn. The nature and structure of the social relations that evolve from the differing modes of production are consequential in the structuring of ganja activities on the community level. Whereas cooperative work efforts and task payment exemplify production in Leyburn, men work independently and are paid by the day in Buckland. The strong association between ganja and work life in Leyburn in augmenting co-worker relations and productivity is greatly minimized among Buckland agriculturalists. Consequently, in contrast with Leyburn, Buckland smoking groups are expansive, heterogeneous, and based on friendly neighbor relations. Fur-
thermore, a comparison of the two settings reveals that it is not the particular category or combination of occupations that influences the prevalence of ganja smoking, but rather the role of occupations in community life and the manner in which they are combined. Thus, laborers in Leyburn suffer poor reputations and tend to be excluded from ganja activity while laborers in Buckland, well integrated in community life, are highly represented among smokers. Moreover, even though men who combine agricultural wage labor and farming show high rates of smoking in both communities, the qualitative differences in the pattern of smoking between Leyburn and Buckland reflect the differences in the structure of that combination.

DEERFIELD

It is perhaps in Deerfield that the influence of production arrangements on the local patterning of ganja behavior is most identifiable. While large-scale production of sugar is the ultimate purpose of the entire estate, the organization of work varies among the seven farms, each of which has its own managerial staff, labor force, and method of operation. The following comparison of ganja activity on two of the seven farms—one on which cane is loaded by hand and one on which cane is loaded mechanically—demonstrates that while the crop remains constant, variation in social arrangements (stemming from differences in reaping operations) effects variations in ganja use.

Chelsea consists of 450 acres of hilly land that is too steep for the use of mechanical loaders. For many reasons Chelsea is one of the least desirable farms on which to work, and generally attracts men living on its perimeters whose age or other occupational commitments prevent them from traveling long distances to cut cane. For example, one Chelsea cutter, Mr. Bernard, has a part-time job at the factory cleaning sugar boilers late at night. Chelsea is not only near his home but is one of the few farms on the estate where he can come late to work and still find cane to be cut. Other local men who raise livestock or do small farming find it convenient to work at Chelsea because it offers them quick access to their homes and fields for necessary chores. For others, Chelsea is the only farm on which they can find employment; these include newcomers to the area and young men who are casually initiating adult vocations as cane workers. Because placement on the more desirable farms is difficult to acquire, men often begin employment with the estate on Chelsea. There they establish their reputations as workers and eventually try for more lucrative placement on the other farms.

Ipswich, on the other hand, is Deerfield’s most desirable location for cane workers. The largest farm on the estate, Ipswich measures 1300 acres of flat land planted in cane, that are easily managed by a mechanical loader. This farm has no trouble attracting workers, and each year several applicants are turned away at the beginning of reaping season. Whereas the Chelsea gang is composed of men who live nearby or actually on the farm in government-sponsored housing, only one-fourth of the men on the Ipswich gang reside in the estate housing provided for workers. The remaining three-fourths hail from seven different communities within the sugar belt as well as from neighboring parishes. With the exception of one East Indian on Ipswich, the workers on both farms are Afro-Jamaicans, all from the lowest socioeconomic sectors of Jamaican society.

The three main tasks performed by reaping gangs on all farms are the cutting, loading, and transporting of cane. The supervisory staff of Chelsea consists of a farm manager or “busher,” who has the ultimate responsibility for the administration of the farm to the estate, a “headman” who records the amount of cane cut, loaded, and sent to the factory, and an assistant headman, who assigns the tasks to the workers. The laboring staff of this gang consists of twenty-four cutters who have the option of working singly or in pairs, and sixteen loaders divided into four teams or “spells” of their own choosing. The transport team consists of an infield tractor driver and his sidemen who draw the cane from the field to the road and an outfield tractor driver and two sidemen who draw the loaded carts from the field to the factory.

In early morning the Chelsea cutters arrive at the field, which has been burned the night before, mark off a section of cane, and begin to cut. They are checked by the assistant headman on his arrival at 6 A.M., and any rearrangements in the location and amount of cane each cutter has designated are made at that time. On Chelsea, where there is usually more cane than cutters, such rearrangements seldom occur and disputes over who will be assigned a particular piece of work are rare. As each worker cuts his cane, he throws it into a pile central to his section. On completion he identifies the cut cane with his special mark, which is known to loaders and headmen. The infield tractor then “spots” one of the carts by drawing it as close as possible to the pike of cut cane. The loaders then pack the cane tightly onto the cart; three members of the spell lift armfuls of cane from the pile and heave them up to the fourth man on top of the cart, who packs the cane down. When the cart is full—a cart holds from five to eight tons of cane—the infield tractor draws it to the road where it is then hitched to the outfield tractor and transported to the factory.

Chelsea cutters work at their own pace, since breaks for breakfast, lunch, and relaxation are largely a matter of individual preference and
cane in a furrow between them. They do not bother to mark the cane since the assignment of rows is recorded in the headman's daily log. The mechanical loader then goes uniformly up and down the rows, picking up cane and loading it into carts drawn by the infield tractor. In this system work is potentially continuous, the grabber operator stopping only for a lunch break or when a slow-down at the factory delays carts from returning to the field for loading. Cutters break from work at their own preference as in Chelsea.

It is obvious that the men on the Chelsea gang work at a considerable disadvantage when compared with Ipswich workers. Cutting cane on flat land is much easier and safer than wielding a machete on steep hills, where footing and balance are insecure. Men who cut hillside cane also exert more effort because they must cut each stalk of cane two or three times to make it a size suitable for hand loading, and then must heave each piece of cane several yards away to the pile. Ipswich cutters, on the other hand, make only one cut and practically drop the cane as they go along. Compounding these physical difficulties is the fact that estate management foresees the eventual phasing out of hillside cane, which has become increasingly costly to produce. Consequently, little money or labor is channelled into replanting, weeding, supplying, mulching, or other cultivation procedures that ensure a more efficient, productive reaping period. Chelsea cutters complain constantly about cane that doesn't "bear" (does not have full weight) because of excessive ratooning (cane that is not replanted but simply grown from cut stumps) or cane that is full of "whist" (vines) and "cow itch" (a weed causing intense irritation to the skin on contact) and therefore difficult to cut.

The greatest injustice, however, is that grabber gang cutters are paid sixty-six cents per ton of cane delivered to the factory while hand loading cutters are paid only fifty-four cents per ton, even though their work is more difficult and dangerous. This difference in pay has its origins in the history of labor negotiations with the estate.

Finally, the interdependency among workers that is intrinsic to hand-loading operations imposes yet another encumbrance on Chelsea workers. For loaders the accumulated weekly tonnage of each spell is divided equally into four parts for payroll purposes. Thus, each loader is dependent not only upon his own ability but on how well his entire spell functions as a team. Each loader is also dependent on his spell's good relationship with the infield tractor driver and his sideman—the placing of the carts for loading is critical. Chelsea cutters work at an even further disadvantage; their earning capacity depends not only on the efficiency of their own work but also on the loaders and, ultimately, on the transport team. Hand-loaded cane is subject to faster spoilage because it has more cut surface, which facilitates fermentation and weight loss. Therefore, it is
particularly important to cutters on Chelsea to get their cane loaded quickly (to avoid spoilage) and neatly (to avoid droppage).

Though it may appear that loaders and cutters are mutually dependent, that is not entirely the case. If a cutter decides not to work, the loader—though he may have no cane to load—has not yet invested time or labor and can use the opportunity to tend his garden, look after his stock, repair his house, or find work on another estate. Cutters, on the other hand, have already expended time and energy and understandably view their cane rotting on the ground as money lost. Moreover, typically loaders differ from cutters in age and life style. In general, loading spells are composed of men who are younger, have fewer responsibilities, and are content earning enough money to buy a little rum, some ganja, and to "sport a daughter" on Friday night. Often loaders have to be coerced to work not only by management but by their cutter co-workers as well. In contrast, cutters are older, have more responsibilities, and depend on cane cutting to support their households.

As a result of this interdependency, a system of informal personal alliances has developed to facilitate cooperation among categories of workers. While most evident within loading spells, these alliances thrive in a more subtle form between individual cutters and particular spells. As one Chelsea loader explained when his spell stayed beyond their usual quitting time to load a favored cutter's cane, "Every man ha' him friends," and these friendships are based on mutual expectation of fair and sympathetic treatment.

In contrast, Ipswich workers are dependent only on the grabber operator who proceeds uniformly up and down the rows of cut cane. It is virtually impossible for cutters to expedite the loading process through friendly relations; nor have they need to. Barring strikes or inclement weather, it is a certainty that their cane will be loaded quickly and sent to the factory. Thus, despite their common goals and despite the similarity of their workers, Chelsea and Ipswich differ in the technological, social, and economic arrangements of production. These differences are reflected in the composition and function of the groupings which activate ganja use on the two farms.

If this analysis were founded on observations of individual smokers, the profiles of ganja use on Chelsea and Ipswich would appear remarkably similar. First, examination of the distribution of ganja smoking according to occupational category reveals that on both farms the preponderance of men who smoke at the work site are field laborers—cutters and loaders. None of the supervisory staff in either gang is a ganja smoker and, though most of the tractor drivers and sidemen admit to being ganja users, only rarely were they observed to smoke in the work context.

Furthermore, those men who do smoke conform to a generalized pattern of daily consumption that is almost identical on the two farms. This pattern includes smoking a spliff on arrival in the fields before commencing to work and again on rest or meal intervals throughout the day. On neither farm do men light a spliff while actually performing a task, though occasionally they begin to work while still finishing the spliff that was lighted during a relaxation break. Both Chelsea and Ipswich workers remain in the cane piece at the work site to rest and smoke, except for extreme weather conditions in which they may smoke while taking shelter under the headman's tent. Reports of the average number of spliffs consumed daily at the work site varied with the individual, not with the farm, and ranged from one to eight. Observations, however, revealed that when ganja was available, smokers on both farms consumed an average of three to four spliffs daily. The common practice of snuffing an unfinished cigar and saving the remainder for the next work break gives the appearance of smoking more than they actually do.

In general, workers prefer to carry ganja from home rather than purchase it at the work site where it is generally more costly and more public. However, vendors on both Chelsea and Ipswich continue to do an extensive business selling to men who are unable to procure any ganja before coming to work or to those who did not bring a sufficient supply for the day.

The similarities between the two farms with regard to the daily routine of individual ganja consumption extend into the weekly cycle of ganja use as well. On both Chelsea and Ipswich, the heaviest use occurs on Saturday and Sunday, and gradually tapers off toward the middle of the week. This pattern was confirmed by vendors from each farm who explained that because Friday is payday, the men have more money for purchasing ganja on the weekend. Furthermore, Saturdays and Sundays are "premium days" on which the men are paid "time and a half." For every ton of cane delivered to the factory all day Sunday and until 10 A.M. on Monday morning, Chelsea cutters are paid eighty-one cents instead of fifty-four and Ipswich cutters are paid ninety-nine instead of sixty-six cents. Thus smokers on both farms consume more ganja on these days in order to enhance their production.

These likenesses between the two farms tend to mask some of the subtle differences which appear when the reaping gang as a whole becomes the unit of observation and analysis. First among these variations is the prevalence of ganja smokers on each gang. On the Ipswich gang only thirty-one of the fifty-eight cutters (53 percent) smoke, while on Chelsea the rate of smokers rises to 83 percent or thirty-three out of forty workers. These differences become particularly meaningful considering that the two groups of men derive from the same socioeconomic
level and generally represent the same age range (the average age of Chelsea workers is 45.6 years compared with 46 years for Ipswich workers). If, for purposes of comparison, we exclude loaders from these calculations (they represent a different category of laborer known for its high rate of ganja use and lower age level), the rate of smokers among Chelsea workers drops only to seventy-one percent—still significantly higher than Ipswich. Furthermore, while the average age of smokers among Chelsea cutters is 45.9 years compared with 44.4 years among Ipswich smokers, the average age of Chelsea non-smokers is 70.7 years, compared with 48 years on Ipswich. This is an indication that most workers on Chelsea continue smoking ganja well into their late years and that non-smoking is generally a function of very old age rather than personal choice, as on Ipswich.

Related to these quantitative variations are qualitative differences. Ganja smoking on Chelsea occurs in relatively exclusive groupings which are highly correlated with work relations. For example, the worksite smoking relations of Paul Cameron, a loader, primarily include the three other loaders in his spell, with whom he smokes several times each day, and five cutters, each of whom joins Paul’s group for a smoke now and then throughout the week. Paul is thirty-two years old and has lived in Chelsea his entire life. Though he has loaded cane off and on since he was sixteen years old, this is the first year that Paul has taken responsibility for organizing his own loading spell.7 Included in this spell are Neil Harvey, his twenty-two-year-old cousin and fishing partner; Rob Bennett, thirty-four, who left his former parish because of “some police trouble” and has lived in Dover for the last five years; and Dennis Griffin, forty, who is a native of Deerfield but has travelled throughout the island cutting cane on various estates. Though all of these men have loaded cane on Chelsea in previous years, this is the first time that they have worked together as a single spell.

All four are heavy ganja smokers and use weed daily in work and leisure contexts. During reaping season, Neil makes extra money as a field vendor, selling bumps and sticks to men on the gang. Typically, these four smoke together when they arrive at the cane piece each morning, throughout the day on intervals between carts, and at meal times. The relative permanency and interdependency of spell membership permit an ongoing exchange of ganja among Chelsea workers based on reciprocity, very similar to that which exists among co-working farmer-laborers in Leyburn. Though no precise tabulation of exchange is kept, each man is expected to contribute an equal share over a period of time, and it is soon recognized when someone defaults in this expectation. If Paul has a supply of ganja, for example, he rolls two spliffs when he arrives at work in the morning which he shares with his spell. If only one spliff is avail-
able, Chelsea protocol demands that the four men share it equally; if no one in the spell has carried ganja to work (this happens most frequently from Wednesday through Friday morning), the men simply don’t smoke. No member of a loading spell would smoke alone or with a member of another spell while at the work site.

Thus, Paul’s spell forms a smoking group which excludes loaders from other spells. This is remarkable considering that most of the men who work on the Chelsea gang reside in the same community, have active friendships, and may even smoke together in the leisure setting. For example, Fenton Gyles, the head spell of another loading crew, and Paul have been friends since early childhood. They are both on the Chelsea cricket team and spend many evenings playing dominoes together at the rum shop. Yet on no occasion did Fenton and Paul ever smoke together at the work site, even when Fenton came to purchase ganja from Neil.

The sense of commitment to and identification with one’s work group is evident among loaders throughout the Chelsea gang. Men from each spell claim that theirs is the most efficient, expounding on how quickly and neatly they load cane and comparing themselves favorably to other spells. This in-group pride flourishes in spite of the fact that during previous years many have worked with, and commended in the same manner, the very men they now disparage. This sense of mutual commitment and obligation among workers is essential in situations where men work interdependently. Accordingly, when a loader does not show up to work he is not merely losing a day’s pay for himself, but is placing an additional burden on the remaining men as well as letting down those cutters who more indirectly depend on his performance; when these others are not just co-workers, but intimate friends, his commitment to them—as well as theirs to him—is intensified.

Not only is group solidarity important for advancing production, it also stabilizes the position of individual members when they cannot meet their obligations. For example, Rob Bennett had to miss work on three consecutive Wednesdays in order to appear in court on his wife’s behalf. Nevertheless, he was credited with one-fourth of the tonnage loaded on those days and received the same pay as the other three. Thus, the intense internal pressures on the performance of spell members are tempered, when necessary, by “friendships” which permit individuals to sustain illness or other untoward circumstances without fear of economic consequences. By restricting the exchange of ganja to members of the same spell, ganja smoking is an identifiable group activity which reinforces the bonds among them.

While ganja smoking does not in itself guarantee good working relations, they can hardly be maintained without it. The refusal to
smoke without an appropriate medical or religious injunction, for example, may be interpreted as a refusal of friendship. Thus, it is only in its violation that the effects of this particular institution are clearly demonstrated. For example, Lester Drummond, a productive, non-smoking worker who neither contributed to nor drew from his co-workers' weed, left early one day due to illness and did not come to work the next. After some discussion the remaining three men in his spell decided to exclude Drummond from the calculated tonnage. In this discussion, Shaw, the youngest of the spell, angrily claimed that he would not come back to work if Drummond received pay that he didn't work for, even though other members of the spell had been granted this privilege on previous occasions. Drummond, however, was not liked by the other men, who claimed that he was "wicked" and "selfish," preferring to keep money for himself rather than buy weed to sport his friends. Moreover, they insisted that Drummond "held them back" by not smoking. Observations of this spell, however, did not reveal that Drummond's performance differed from theirs, nor did the work performance of the total spell differ significantly from that of the other three spells on the gang.

Unlike the loaders, Chelsea cutters do not form specific groups for ganja smoking. In the early part of the day they smoke alone or gather with one or two other cutters on a work break. Upon finishing their day's work, however, or on lunch breaks, Chelsea cutters often rest, chat, and smoke a spliff in the company of loaders from a favored spell. In contrast to the reciprocity evident within spells, exchange of ganja between these two types of laborers almost invariably flows in one direction—from cutters to loaders. Only once during a two-week period of observation was a cutter observed on the receiving end of a ganja exchange, and the loader in that transaction, Neil Harvey, later explained that the cutter, Rob Woodruff, had been purchasing ganja regularly from him. In recognition of this patronage, Neil invited Rob to smoke and rolled him a large spliff. In general, however, what would ordinarily be a breach of the rules of reciprocity is clearly not a source of tension between cutter and loader. This one-way flow of ganja from cutter to loader reflects the cutter's dependent position in the productive scheme. In some ways, they are similar to the cane farmers of Buckland who also found ganja instrumental for establishing good will among loaders.

Altogether there are six cutters who join Paul and his men at lunch breaks or after work to socialize. Five of them are ganja smokers. Spaulding and Hennessey, both in their fifties, are friends and neighbors of many years. Their partnership is extremely stable and functions in their activities as cultivators as well as in cane work. Baily Saunders, thirty-eight, whom the men call "Phantom," and Rob Woodruff, forty-

two, a notorious ganja man referred to as the "King of Kalibra," are also long-time partners, friends, and neighbors. These two men are extremely popular and well known throughout the estate for their sense of humor and their ability to stand up to management (much of Phantom's reputation is based on a confrontation in which he told the estate manager that "him ha fe mek plenty money fe buy him wife panties fe him [his wife] ha de biggest backside in the parish"). Virgil Langford, fifty-four, originally from another part of the parish, moved to Chelsea three years ago when the sugar estate in his own area closed down. He ordinarily works without a partner but is one of the most productive cutters on the gang. Finally, there is Poppy Gibson, one of the favorite men throughout the gang. Poppy is fifty-eight and lives alone. He used to be a heavy ganja smoker, but when his wife left him four years ago he became very religious, was baptized, and gave up smoking. He has a reputation for being kind to the other workers, always sharing his water and food with them. During the season he permitted two young Chelsea cutters to stay at his home when they complained that they couldn't get along with their stepfather and were planning to leave the area.

These are the cutters Paul and the other men in his spell identify as "friends," and they feel committed to provide "good treatment" for them. For example, on one Saturday afternoon the spell had a choice of loading Spaulding and Hennessey's cane or that of another cutter who was not one of the favored six. The decision was made to load the other man's cane, leaving Spaulding and Hennessey's for loading on Sunday, a premium day. Similarly, when an impending strike drew near, Paul and his men stayed after quitting hours to "get Phantom cane off de groun." While Poppy Gibson is testimony that ganja is not the only means of creating good will, for smoking men it is convenient and popular and has the distinct advantage, unlike rum and other traditional inducements, of being bolstered by the commonly held belief that ganja enhances the ability to work. Since favors to cutters are performed by the entire spell and not by individuals, the ganja exchange serves to identify each spell as a transactional unit; cutters may direct gifts of ganja without having such overtures lose their effectiveness by being diluted throughout the entire loading team.

Generally, this type of ganja exchange among co-workers does not occur among Ipswich workers. The intense cooperative arrangements that are exercised daily on Chelsea within spells, and between spells and cutters, are not necessary for the production of work on Ipswich. With the possible exception of cutter partnerships, Ipswich laborers participate in the reaping process independently, and ganja consumption is more individualized.

Smoking affiliations on Ipswich are often an extension of friendships
formed in the cutters' residential communities. However, an individual laborer is not limited to smoking with any particular group and is apt to gather and smoke with any of the men who are working conveniently nearby, some of whom he may be meeting for the first time. Thus, ganja smoking on Ipswich occurs in continuously shifting groups that are part of a larger network that potentially encompasses the entire laboring staff of the reaping gang. Clayton Adams and Douglas Symes, both in their late forties and co-workers of many years, are typical. They loaded cane in the same spell as young men and have now formed a stable partnership for cutting cane. These two are also neighbors in the community of Northfield, where they reside in company housing. Though they have slowed down in the last few years, Clayton and Douglas have reputations for being one of Deerfield's most productive cutting teams and are admired by both management and fellow workers. They are both heavy ganja users, claiming that it helps them to work faster and more powerfully. Generally, Clayton and Douglas have their first spliff when they arrive in the field early in the morning before they begin to work. At breakfast and lunch times they join or are joined by their nearby colleagues to talk and smoke before resuming work.

Table 9, a one-week schedule of observed smoking groups extracted from field notes, indicates that during a seven-day period Clayton and Douglas smoked in groups that ranged from three to seven men and that included at various times thirteen men other than themselves. On no two days was the composition ever exactly the same, though there were some men, namely, Bethune and Brown, with whom they smoked as many as four of the seven days. Bethune, Brown, Smith, and Burke also reside in Northfield and frequently join Adams and Symes for the journey to work. Arriving in the field at the same time, these six men often find themselves working in adjacent rows of cane, taking their rest and meal breaks together. Burke, a non-smoker, has tried ganja on occasion but says it made him feel sick and unable to work; although he declines to smoke, he is still always included in the groups which form during periods of relaxation.

Because cutters works at different rates, it is not unusual to see an Ipswich man stop, rest, and smoke alone—even while his partner continues working. For this reason smoking sessions other than breakfast and lunch consist of smaller groups or perhaps just the two partners. However, a nearby co-worker may temporarily lay down his machete, join the smoking men for a few draws, and then return immediately to work. For example, neither Smith on Tuesday nor Handy on Sunday (Table 9) joined Adams and Symes for a full smoke, but merely took a draw before beginning to work.

Bushers confirm that the shift from hand to mechanical loading has altered the traditional function of ganja on the estate setting. It is likely, however, that the open, shifting groups, typical of ganja smoking on Ipswich, are probably an effective means of extending one's associations throughout the reaping gang—whose members often do not know each other well—for the possible formation of temporary or permanent partnerships in the future. Moreover, there is some indication that one's ideological position and behavior with regard to ganja is related to the selection and maintenance of stable partner relations on Ipswich. Of twenty-nine original partnerships on Ipswich for which data are available, twenty-one were composed of men similar in their attitude toward ganja use and seven were composed of men whose attitudes were distinctly different. Of the twenty-one matched pairs, fifteen, or seventy-one percent, were still together at the end of the reaping season; two separations were due to illness, one to death, and in two cases one of the partners left to do farm work abroad. In only one instance did the partnership end because the two men did not get along. If these five, disrupted due to circumstances which had nothing to do with the partnership, were eliminated from these calculations, the rate of stable partnerships among matched pairs would increase to ninety-four percent. On the other hand, only one (or 12.5 percent) of the partnerships that were diverse in smoking habits survived the entire crop. Among the fourteen men who belonged to the seven partnerships that dissolved,
eight eventually formed stable partnerships with men who had smoking habits similar to their own.

If workers are approximately equal in ability and similar in life style, their differences with regard to ganja seldom come into play. However, if the partners are not well matched in terms of production and responsibility, the differences in ganja use often precipitate a conflict that becomes a convenient excuse for terminating the partnership. A fast-working non-smoker explained his change of partner by attributing his former partner’s slack pace to ganja: “It’s a wicked t’ing; it give you power then tired.” On the other hand, a smoker claimed that he always chooses to work with other smoking men because “dem who doan (don’t) use weed c’yan (can’t) keep up to a ganja man.”

It appears that similarity in ganja behavior promotes an environment in which partners have a better chance of settling disagreements, provided they are sufficiently minor. On the other hand, disparities in ganja use ordinarily represent other differences which preclude the formation of a friendly and stable economic relationship. As one ganja smoker claimed, “There’s more cooperation with herbs men. Men who don’t smoke will not hail you. They will just pass you and gone and seh, ‘a ganja man a dirty man.’ He will be partners but not call to you.”

It is evident that the use and exchange of ganja within these groups are of great functional importance in the organization and accomplishment of work—and not simply through increasing individual productivity, as ganja users maintain—but through the establishment of effective linkages among workers that are operational in the extremely competitive work environments typical of rural Jamaica. When some workers are in a position to bestow favors for which others must compete, those who fail to participate in ganja activity or who do not observe the rules of reciprocity risk being dropped from competition. Bushers who have observed the transition from hand loading to mechanical loading report a generalized decrease in ganja activity at the work site. And while ganja smoking may stabilize the position of an individual laborer, it does little to address the generalized potential for conflict inherent in the structure of work on Chelsea when compared with Ipswich. Thus, management uniformly attests to the relative calm that exists among workers on the grabber gangs, compared with hand-loading operations, where cursing, quarrelling, and even stabbings were the usual fare, accompanied by heavy ganja smoking. Because of this association, ganja is often singled out as the cause, rather than the corollary, of disruptive behavior. An assistant headman reported that in hand-loading days on Ipswich, “me fraid fe talk to dem. . . . Dem smoke till dem dark and will cut you with machetes.” Now, however, Ipswich gangs, along with other machine-loading gangs, are uniformly viewed as the “most polite”—often attrib-

uted to the relatively low rate of ganja use among workers. Ipswich and the other flat-land farms are, of course, those farms on which men can make the most money with the least confrontation; the quarrelling and discontent which once prevailed in hand-loading operations have been gradually eliminated. Furthermore, Ipswich men are well aware of the competition for places on their gang and will not engage in behavior that may jeopardize their position. Finally, most of the men on grabber gangs are older, have domestic responsibilities, and therefore are more cautious about their behavior than the younger workers whose disorderly conduct is not as consequential.

On Chelsea, for example, Mr. Fitzsimmons was often annoyed by Fenton Gyles’ spell of loaders, which he called the “rudey” spell. According to Mr. Fitzsimmons, the men in this spell “cursed bad words,” complained to the busher “all the while,” came to work late, left early, quarrelled constantly among themselves, and upset the other men on the gang. It is true that of the four spells of loaders, Gyles’ was probably the least manageable and the most unreliable. Observations revealed, however, that these men smoked no more, and quite possibly less, frequently than other spells. All four loaders in this spell were between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five and had the most minimal commitment to regular labor of any members of the gang. All were living with their parents and had essentially no responsibilities other than their own clothing and entertainment. While quarrelling among themselves was frequent, it was often because of a breach of the ganja code rather than physiological or psychological effects of ganja on their behavior. In contrast, the more encumbered, older men on the gang did not have the luxury of freely expressing their discontent. While they often complained among their peers, they also ingratiated themselves with management, carrying the headman’s lunch, bringing garden vegetables to the busher, sending a young son or daughter to do errands for the busher’s wife, or even paying the headman for special favors. Thus, what management often identifies as a source of aggressive and disruptive behavior is actually a strategy for dealing with the structural limitations of employment that are the real source of the conflict.

Notes

1. It is common for vendors in all three communities to keep several dogs to inhibit police and thieves and to alert their masters.

2. The inclusion of non-agricultural activities in one’s occupational repertoire appears to make little difference in this pattern. Thus, the twenty-five men who combine own-account cultivation with non-
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agricultural activities—usually a trade or work with the ministry—have a rate of smokers (8 percent) similar to that of the thirty-eight men who are solely cultivators (13 percent). Likewise, though the presence of a non-agricultural vocation is rarer among farmer-laborers, the four men who do fall into this category follow the direction established among farmer-laborers in general.

3. Firth's concept of "douceur" accurately describes the presentation of ganja by Buckland farmers to transporters (1967: 16): "We know that what is sometimes called bribery may be part gift-convention, not necessarily intended to secure undue personal advantage for the donor: at its best, an expression of goodwill and esteem, or gratitude for past services rendered; at its worst, a blatant attempt to secure favours at the expense of other people, such a 'softening gift' may be capable of various middle interpretations."

4. Cumina is a traditional ceremonial dance in which a group of men sit together and drum rhythmically while other men and women dance in single file around them. The objective of the drummers is to excite the dancers and put them "in spirit." According to informants, the custom is derived from the days of slavery and is held to celebrate important occasions and life cycle events—funerals, weddings, house openings, and so forth.

5. Anansi tales are humorous Jamaican folk stories dealing with the adventures of a trickster spider.

6. When the sugar estate first converted to mechanical loading the union argued that, since the estate would profit by not having to employ loaders, they must compensate the cutters who work on grabber (mechanical loader) gangs with an increase in pay. The estate readily agreed to this because at the time it was trying to avoid a dispute with the unions over severance pay for the phased-out loaders. Management contended that if it could offer work which was defined as "equal" by unions and estate alike, it should not be saddled with the responsibility of providing severance pay for all the loaders who became "redundant." Since the loaders protested that they could make more money loading than cutting (and therefore the two were not equal), the estate agreed to pay cutters on mechanical gangs more money, making the tasks equal and avoiding severance payments.

7. Paul's position of "head spell," the organizer of the group, does not imply additional monetary compensation or additional responsibility for decision-making once the group is established, but is merely a convenient way for management to identify the group.

8. Those partnerships formed by the third week of crop when all men had reported to work.

Ganja and Worker Performance

Routine smokers of ganja in all three communities believe that ganja enhances their ability to work. According to popular belief, ganja affects the ability to work in two ways. First, smoking reportedly produces an immediate surge of energy. An informant in Leyburn claims, for example, that when he has a large piece of work to do, such as weeding or clearing a field, he first sits down, smokes a spliff, and within fifteen minutes is ready to begin the task. Other typical comments include:

When crop is on I "eat" the weed. It mek I (lets me) feel workish.
(Deerfield)

It mek I be powerful to work; it give I courage. (Buckland)

During crop me ha fe for breakfast, lunch and, dinner. (Deerfield)

It give me a different change of personality; it mek I feel stronger, work calmly, give a longer breath. (Leyburn)

For the man that have the workin' spirit, it let him work more. (Buckland)

The second way in which ganja enhances the ability to work is through the regular consumption of ganja teas or tonics. A majority of informants, including both smokers and non-smokers, endorse ganja teas and tonics as being efficacious in promoting strength and physical stamina. As one Leyburn farmer claimed, "Come November [a labor-intensive month in Leyburn], me drink de tonic before bed and me can work on just a few hours sleep."

Likewise, men scheduled for farm work abroad, anticipating continuous manual labor in a comparatively cold climate, may begin a regimen of ganja tea or tonic a few months prior to departure.

The strength of this belief is reflected by the seasonal variations in
the amount of ganja smoking, particularly in Deerfield. Because workers increase their consumption of ganja with the objective of augmenting their productivity, smokers and vendors uniformly report burgeoning ganja activity when the "crop is on." To a somewhat lesser extent, the same is true of Leyburn farmers whose heaviest smoking periods take place in July and August and again in November and December. In both these communities the periods of increased ganja activity coincide with labor intensive months in which there is increased cash available for routine ganja purchases. These seasonal fluctuations in ganja use, typical of Leyburn and Deerfield, are for the most part absent in Buckland. A notable exception to the more consistent pattern of ganja consumption in this community are those men, including loading crews and some cane farmers, who are directly or indirectly related to the cane industry. For example, Frank Davies, from Buckland, farms a small cane piece, has a part-time job during crop time cleaning the boilers in the sugar factory, and increases his volume of trade as a carpenter during reaping season; he uses ganja more frequently during this active time, claiming, "When me need strength, it help de body more." However, for the majority of workers in Buckland, temporal variation in ganja activity is on a weekly rather than seasonal basis with a spurt of ganja purchasing on Friday, which is pay day. This weekly cycle is also evident in Deerfield, though during reaping season heightened ganja activity extends from pay day through Saturday and Sunday; the overtime differential in pay on the weekend stimulates increased worker performance.

These community-level differences in the relationship between ganja and work also apply to the apportionment of daily ganja consumption between work and leisure. Thus, Leyburn smokers report and were observed consuming more ganja during work hours than in leisure time. In Buckland, however, where the reverse pattern is evident, men tend to reserve their supply of ganja for recreational purposes after working hours. As one Buckland laborer explained, "The work not dat strivin' again like first time" (when Windsor Farms was planted in cane). Except for a few casual laborers who gather and husk coconuts for small farmers, most laborers on the properties in Buckland are paid on a daily rather than task basis. Thus, workers no longer feel the intense pressure to step up productivity. Buckland's major ganja vendor confirmed the difference in ganja activities; claiming that though the volume of his business has not decreased, it is organizationally different. He no longer goes into the fields to sell weed to laborers as he did to cane cutters; nor do workers call at his yard early in the morning to purchase ganja on their way to work. Now his heaviest business transpires in the afternoon and evening when men are on their way home from work.

Predictably, ganja activity in Deerfield shifts contexts with the season. When the crop is on, cane workers, paid by the task, smoke more ganja in the work context than in the recreational. During dull season, however, these same men emphasize leisure smoking. It is significant that their dull season jobs generally consist of "day work" for the sugar estate or the surrounding banana and coconut estates, following a system of payment similar to that of Buckland.

Because Buckland men place less emphasis on the use of ganja for stimulating production, they are considerably more lenient in their assessment of non-smokers. Though regular users insist that ganja enhances their own work performance, comments to the effect that non-smokers are less efficient workers than smokers are rare. In Leyburn, on the other hand, smokers regularly distinguish themselves from non-smokers in terms of their capacity for work. Non-smoking men are frequently regarded as less hard-working or men who "c'yan keep up" to the difficult tasks of farming. Since the men in Leyburn who earn a living solely through wage labor for other farmers also tend to be non-smokers, this commonly held belief receives empirical support. When names of productive, non-smoking farmers were mentioned to challenge this belief, regular users were quick to claim that when those farmers were doing their hardest work—five or ten years earlier—they consumed ganja regularly. Accordingly, now that they have grown sons to assist them and don't have to supplement their farm income with off-farm labor, the work is less taxing; therefore, they were able to succumb to social pressure and relinquish ganja smoking. To further substantiate this position, it is often pointed out that most of these more senior farmers have continued to consume ganja in the form of tea or tonic.

Similar beliefs are common among cane workers in Deerfield, and it is not unusual to hear claims such as "Herb users work harder" and "Dem (non-smokers) c'yan keep up to the work me do when me smoke it." In both Leyburn and Deerfield, contingent beliefs and values rationalize the performance of those men who are obviously poor workers and who also happen to be regular smokers. Explanations included theories that poor workers did not eat enough food ("Weed is a t'ing dat require too weak," that they smoke in the hot sun, or on an empty stomach; sometimes the fault lay in some characteristic of the user himself—his brains are "too weak," or he is too young, inhibiting the "conscious" use of ganja.

In most rural Jamaican communities, where agricultural tasks vary daily and are performed in multifarious settings, the difficulties of establishing quantifiable units of productivity, or even ascertaining base line data pertaining to work performance, are almost insurmountable. Consequently, the claims of ganja users that smoking enhances their ability to work are as difficult to challenge as to sustain. The general progress of
any own-account farmer is influenced by so many factors outside his control—weather conditions, market fluctuations, availability of land and so forth—that his success, or lack of it, is not a fair or sufficient means of evaluating his productivity. The acute effects of ganja smoking on productivity have been objectively examined by Schaeffer (Rubin and Comitas 1975: 63–79). In a rural Jamaican community not unlike Leyburn, Schaeffer analyzed the immediate effects of smoking in terms of energy expended and work accomplished. However, even that carefully executed study carried a note of caution that the results did not provide a basis for projection of productivity over a season, or a year, or in a different context.

In Deerfield, however, where the tons of cane cut and the number of days worked by each man are carefully recorded for payroll tabulation, at least it is possible to measure output in tons and dollars, and compare smokers with non-smokers in this regard. Unlike Schaeffer’s analysis, which concentrated on the immediate effects of smoking on productivity, the figures pertaining to tonnage and earnings reported here are not indicative of the amount of cane a worker can cut within a given period of time. The difficulties of measuring work performance in this sense, even on a sugar estate where production is carefully calculated, have been reviewed by Davison (1973: 132–133) in his report on the labor force of the Jamaican sugar industry:

In the first place it became clear on every estate that it is virtually impossible, given the present organization of the industry, to keep any kind of accurate check on the number of hours spent by a cutter in the field. The work may be half finished by the time the overseer arrives, a system of time clocks would be quite impractical and serve no useful purpose anyway. The fact is that hours are not homogeneous—the amount that a man can cut between 4:30 and 6:00 a.m. is quite different from his potentiality between 11:00 a.m. and 12:00 noon when the sun is blazing into the cane field. A measure of hours spent without reference to the period of the day would be of little use, even if the information could be obtained, which it cannot at present.

Thus, the tabulation of tonnage and earnings for Deerfield cane laborers reveals how a particular worker compares with other workers doing the same task in terms of tons cut and dollars earned over a given season. While it may not be feasible to talk about physical productivity per se, it is possible to compare workers with regard to their continued performance as earner-producers and relate that performance to their dispositions toward ganja.

The three reaping gangs selected for comparison are from Wilmington, Ipswich, and Dover. All three are mechanical-loading gangs and all represent premium employment opportunities for estate laborers. The Wilmington farm, with over eight hundred acres planted in cane, was the first farm on the estate to institute mechanical loading. Prior to this change, Wilmington required a large reaping crew and experienced severe problems in attracting and keeping laborers for the duration of the reaping season. So successful was the transition from hand to mechanical loading in alleviating the critical labor shortages suffered each year, that within two years Ipswich, with thirteen hundred acres planted in cane, was also converted to mechanical loading.

Before the elimination of hand loading, these farms had to depend on men from outside the area who migrated annually or permanently to provide a sufficient quantity of cutters. According to bushers, local men worked irregularly, and when they did work, preferred to load rather than cut cane. Most of the men who were indigenous to Deerfield had additional occupational responsibilities, such as cultivation, fishing, and various small commercial and trade ventures which encroached on their performance as cane workers. Laboring for the estate was viewed as the most accessible but least desirable source of income and was readily relinquished for more promising opportunities when they appeared. As occupational pluralists, the needs of local men were more effectively met by loading than cutting. Complex and reciprocal arrangements established within spells permitted individual members to continue other vocational pursuits during crop time without losing a day’s pay or bonus time. After completing the twenty weeks necessary to qualify for the crop bonus many of these men went back to their other work and were not seen again by the busher until the beginning of the next crop.

In contrast, men from outside the district had few, if any, sources of revenue other than cane work. For the most part they resided in company housing strategically located adjacent to the cane fields, and thus were always available to management. Many of these men, having little incentive to return to the parishes from which they came, remained in Deerfield through the dull season. Without access to land on which to cultivate, they relied solely on estate day work to tide them over to the next crop, and hence were in a position to develop an intensive year-round association with the busher. Consequently, when hand loading was phased out, the remaining positions on the gang were awarded to those men whom the bushers felt had demonstrated their faithfulness by returning each year to do the least desirable tasks. At the time of the selection, local men complained bitterly of favoritism but had no recourse other than to seek work on one of the less desirable farms. Currently, only twenty-one percent of workers on Wilmington and eight percent on Ipswich are indigenous to the area, though many have established domestic unions with local women, moved out of worker housing, and become well integrated with community life.
Since the conversion to mechanical loading, which took place five years earlier on Wilmington and three years before on Ipswich, the process of attrition, accompanied by a policy of minimal replacement, has produced two reliable and comparatively small reaping gangs. Dover farm is the most recent flat-land farm to implement mechanical loading, the conversion taking place during the period of field work. Though this farm has roughly the same acreage planted in cane as Wilmington (eight hundred acres), only about three-fourths of this acreage are suitable for mechanical loading. The remainder continues to be loaded by a hand-loading gang on the same farm. Though the manager of Dover refused to take any new men, his gang is currently large in proportion to the size of the farm. However, he expects that attrition will eventually produce a small stable gang similar to those on Ipswich and Wilmington. The Dover gang has the highest proportion of indigenous men (30 percent), many of whom had worked previously on Ipswich or Wilmington before hand loading was eliminated. There are no barracks on the Dover farm, though several men and their families live in government subsidized housing, built approximately twenty years earlier and situated on the hills that surround the Dover cane piece. As mechanical loading gangs, Wilmington, Ipswich, and Dover represent the three best employment opportunities for estate field laborers in Deerfield. While other gangs must reap hillside cane under hand-loading procedures, or work on low lands which restrict production to the first six weeks of reaping season, Ipswich, Dover, and Wilmington are almost entirely flat-land farms with an elevation that leaves production comparatively unaffected by rains.

Both smokers and non-smokers are found on all three gangs, but in varying proportions. As indicated in Table 10, Ipswich men are fairly evenly distributed between the two categories with 53 percent smokers and 47 percent non-smokers. The Dover gang, on the other hand, has almost twice as many smokers as non-smokers (65.5 percent and 34.1 percent), while Wilmington has just the opposite (34.6 percent are smokers and 65.4 percent are non-smokers). These differences in the prevalence of ganja smokers from farm to farm are often invoked by management to account for differences in productivity and manageability. Dover, with its high proportion of ganja smokers, is consistently cited as a managerial trouble spot where performance is low, disputes about pay checks are rampant, and where cutters often refuse to work, quarrel with the tractor drivers, and complain to the headmen. Wilmington and Ipswich, on the other hand, with the lowest rates of ganja use for the entire estate, are regarded as the most "polite" and "hard working" gangs.5

In order to evaluate the performance of workers, data were collected from the payroll stubs of 151 cutters on Dover, Ipswich, and Wilmington. Since payroll tabulations were made available for research purposes only after the reaping season had been completed, when the information was no longer of any use to the estate, some of the payroll information had been lost or destroyed. Therefore, a worker was included in the study only if data could be obtained for at least three of the five designated variables. Using this criterion, the sample presented here comprises at least 80 percent of the men on each of the three gangs though the N's are different for each variable, reflecting the missing data.

The averages compiled in Table 10 summarize the quantitative comparison of smokers and non-smokers for all farms and for individual farms by age, earnings, and production. Independent t-tests were performed on each variable to compute the levels of significance for differences between smokers and non-smokers. Because managers and headmen frequently report that younger men are faster workers and have a greater capacity for productivity than older men, the mean ages for smokers and non-smokers were computed for all farms and for individual farms. Independent t-tests revealed that while there was a significant difference in the mean age of smokers compared with non-smokers for all farms, the difference in mean ages between smokers and non-smokers on individual farms was not found to be significant.

The dependent variable, worker performance, comprises two major categories: the first is earnings represented by "backpay," "wages," and "bonus," the second is production represented by tons of cane cut during two selected three-week intervals ("first period" and "second period"). The relationship between the amount of cane a worker cuts and the amount of pay he receives is complex and varies from farm to farm. While cutters were compensated at a rate of sixty-six cents for each ton of cane, their pay also reflects compensation for cane cut during premium time, for "bad cane," or for additional reaping tasks such as building the fire guard, setting up field tents, burning cane, and so forth. Thus a man's tonnage alone is not an adequate indicator of his performance as a worker for he may have been pulled from cutting to do less well-paying work or he may have run into bad cane. On the other hand, an excess of premium cane may serve to inflate the wages of a cutter who may actually be a low producer. Therefore, to obtain a more comprehensive picture of worker performance, both earning (dollar) data and production (tonnage) data were extracted from payroll tabulations.

Earning Performance

Three separate indicators—"backpay," "wages," and "bonus"—were selected to measure different aspects of estate earnings. "Backpay" per-
### Table 10: Summary of Worker Performance

#### Summary Findings for All Farms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Age (N=151)</th>
<th>Mean Backpay (N=128)</th>
<th>Mean Wages (N=119)</th>
<th>Mean Bonus (N=117)</th>
<th>Mean Cane Production: First Period (N=128)</th>
<th>Mean Cane Production: Second Period (N=125)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All persons</td>
<td>45.5 years</td>
<td>$16.16</td>
<td>$13.79</td>
<td>$37.38</td>
<td>59.8 tons</td>
<td>60.0 tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokers</td>
<td>42.9 years (N=76)</td>
<td>$15.92 (N=64)</td>
<td>$13.53 (N=53)</td>
<td>$36.07 (N=56)</td>
<td>67.0 tons (N=65)</td>
<td>60.2 tons (N=63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-smokers</td>
<td>48.1 years (N=75)</td>
<td>$16.41 (N=64)</td>
<td>$14.00 (N=66)</td>
<td>$38.59 (N=61)</td>
<td>57.6 tons (N=63)</td>
<td>59.7 tons (N=62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-values</td>
<td>(p &lt; .01)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .52)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .44)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .34)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .26)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Age (N=55)</th>
<th>Mean Backpay (N=49)</th>
<th>Mean Wages (N=44)</th>
<th>Mean Bonus (N=39)</th>
<th>Mean Cane Production: First Period (N=49)</th>
<th>Mean Cane Production: Second Period (N=47)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All persons</td>
<td>46.4 years</td>
<td>$18.96</td>
<td>$15.27</td>
<td>$50.28</td>
<td>76.2 tons</td>
<td>67.4 tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokers</td>
<td>45.6 years (N=29)</td>
<td>$18.54 (N=26)</td>
<td>$14.70 (N=20)</td>
<td>$50.11 (N=18)</td>
<td>76.7 tons (N=27)</td>
<td>79.6 tons (N=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-smokers</td>
<td>47.3 years (N=26)</td>
<td>$19.43 (N=23)</td>
<td>$15.75 (N=24)</td>
<td>$50.43 (N=21)</td>
<td>75.7 tons (N=22)</td>
<td>65.0 tons (N=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-values</td>
<td>(p &gt; .63)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .47)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .34)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .94)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .89)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary Findings for Ipswich Farm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Age (N=55)</th>
<th>Mean Backpay (N=49)</th>
<th>Mean Wages (N=44)</th>
<th>Mean Bonus (N=39)</th>
<th>Mean Cane Production: First Period (N=49)</th>
<th>Mean Cane Production: Second Period (N=47)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All persons</td>
<td>46.4 years</td>
<td>$18.96</td>
<td>$15.27</td>
<td>$50.28</td>
<td>76.2 tons</td>
<td>67.4 tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokers</td>
<td>45.6 years (N=29)</td>
<td>$18.54 (N=26)</td>
<td>$14.70 (N=20)</td>
<td>$50.11 (N=18)</td>
<td>76.7 tons (N=27)</td>
<td>79.6 tons (N=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-smokers</td>
<td>47.3 years (N=26)</td>
<td>$19.43 (N=23)</td>
<td>$15.75 (N=24)</td>
<td>$50.43 (N=21)</td>
<td>75.7 tons (N=22)</td>
<td>65.0 tons (N=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-values</td>
<td>(p &gt; .63)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .47)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .34)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .94)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .89)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .41)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary Findings for Dover Farm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Age (N=44)</th>
<th>Mean Backpay (N=38)</th>
<th>Mean Wages (N=34)</th>
<th>Mean Bonus (N=37)</th>
<th>Mean Cane Production: First Period (N=39)</th>
<th>Mean Cane Production: Second Period (N=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All persons</td>
<td>41.5 years</td>
<td>$13.21</td>
<td>$12.97</td>
<td>$26.65</td>
<td>49.4 tons</td>
<td>48.7 tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokers</td>
<td>39.9 years (N=29)</td>
<td>$13.34 (N=26)</td>
<td>$12.71 (N=21)</td>
<td>$26.21 (N=24)</td>
<td>51.0 tons (N=26)</td>
<td>49.6 tons (N=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-smokers</td>
<td>44.7 years (N=15)</td>
<td>$12.92 (N=12)</td>
<td>$13.38 (N=13)</td>
<td>$27.46 (N=13)</td>
<td>46.2 tons (N=13)</td>
<td>46.7 tons (N=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-values</td>
<td>(p &gt; .12)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .69)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .53)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .69)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .27)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Summary Findings for Wilmington Farm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Age (N=52)</th>
<th>Mean Backpay (N=41)</th>
<th>Mean Wages (N=41)</th>
<th>Mean Bonus (N=41)</th>
<th>Mean Cane Production: First Period (N=40)</th>
<th>Mean Cane Production: Second Period (N=41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All persons</td>
<td>47.9 years</td>
<td>$15.56</td>
<td>$12.88</td>
<td>$34.80</td>
<td>49.9 tons</td>
<td>61.6 tons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smokers</td>
<td>43.7 years (N=18)</td>
<td>$15.83 (N=12)</td>
<td>$13.00 (N=12)</td>
<td>$34.92 (N=14)</td>
<td>52.6 tons (N=12)</td>
<td>62.4 tons (N=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-smokers</td>
<td>50.1 years (N=34)</td>
<td>$15.45 (N=29)</td>
<td>$12.83 (N=29)</td>
<td>$34.74 (N=27)</td>
<td>48.7 tons (N=28)</td>
<td>61.2 tons (N=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-values</td>
<td>(p &gt; .06)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .72)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .85)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .94)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .28)</td>
<td>(p &gt; .73)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tains to the additional wages received by each worker in settlement of a strike held mid-crop in which estate workers were awarded an increase for specific reaping tasks, most notably a four cent increment for cutting cane. As such, backpay is the earning indicator which is most strongly correlated with production as measured by tons of cane cut. Since the workers were paid retroactively from the beginning of the crop, the “backpay” figure represents the worker’s earning performance on reaping tasks in the first twelve weeks of the season. “Wages” constitutes the average weekly paycheck for cutters during the first three months of the reaping season. It was calculated for each cutter by dividing his total gross wages paid for that period of time by the number of weeks he worked. This dollar figure reflects not only the cutter’s regular and premium time tonnage but also a “soap money” allotment and additional compensation for any other work performed for the estate. The third earning indicator, “bonus,” is the sum paid to those laborers who worked a minimum of twenty weeks of the reaping season. The amount of the bonus varies annually, and for the season in question it amounted to 12.5 percent of the gross earning for all work done on the estate throughout the reaping season. Thus while “backpay” and “wages” measure worker earning performance for the first half of the season when production peaks, “bonus” money measures earning performance throughout the entire season.

Backpay: Data on backpay were collected for 128 workers. The amounts ranged from seven dollars to twenty-seven dollars with the mean backpay for all workers being $16.16. The difference in backpay between the sixty-four smokers ($15.92) and the sixty-four non-smokers ($16.41) was not significant (p > .5). Ipswich workers (N = 49) received an average backpay of $18.96 in a range of $10.00 to $27.00. Ganja smokers on Ipswich (N = 26) averaged $18.54 which was not significantly different (p > .4) than the average backpay of the non-smokers on Ipswich (N = 23) which was $19.43. On Dover, the average backpay for workers (N = 26) ranged from $8.00 to $19.00 with a mean of $13.21. Ganja smokers on Dover (N = 26) received an average backpay of $13.34 compared to $12.92 for the non-smokers (N = 12). As on Ipswich, this difference was not significant (p > .6). Backpay amounts for Wilmington workers (N = 41) ranged from $7.00 to $21.00 with a mean of $15.56. Smokers on this farm (N = 12) received an average back-pay of $15.83 compared to $15.45 for non-smokers (N = 29). Once again this difference was not significant (p > .7).

Wages: Data on average weekly wages were collected on 119 workers among the three farms. The wages ranged from $6.00 to $24.00 with the mean for all workers being $13.79. The difference in mean wages between the fifty-three smokers ($13.53) and the sixty-six non-smokers ($14.00) was not significant (p > .4). Salaries for Ipswich workers ranged from $6.00 to $23.00 with a mean of $15.27. The average weekly salary of ganja smokers on Ipswich (N = 20) was $14.70 compared to $15.75 for the twenty-four non-smokers. The difference between them was not significant (p > .3). Nor was there a significant difference (p > .5) in average weekly wages on Dover between the twenty-one smokers ($12.71) and the thirteen non-smokers ($13.38). The range on Dover was $8.00 to $24.00 with a mean for all workers of $12.97. For Wilmington men (N = 41) the range in average weekly salary was $7.00 to $17.00 with a mean of $12.58. The average weekly salary for the twelve ganja smokers was $13.00, while for non-smokers (N = 29) it was $12.83. As with Ipswich and Dover, the difference between smokers and non-smokers on Wilmington was not significant (p > .8).

Bonus: Data on the third earning performance indicator, “bonus,” were collected for 117 workers. Bonuses varied a great deal, ranging from $13.00 to $75.00 with the average bonus for all workers being $37.38. The average bonus of the ganja smokers (N = 56) was $36.07, while for non-smokers (N = 61) it was $38.59. The difference in bonus between smokers and non-smokers was not significant (p > .3). Bonuses for Ipswich workers (N = 39) ranged from $25.00 to $75.00 with a mean of $50.28. Ipswich smokers (N = 18) averaged a $50.11 bonus which was not significantly different (p > .9) than the average bonus for Ipswich non-smokers (N = 21) which was $50.43. On Dover, bonuses for all workers (N = 37) ranged from $13.00 to $45.00 with a mean of $26.65. Ganja smokers (N = 24) averaged $26.21 compared with $27.46 for non-smokers (N = 13). This difference was not significant (p > .6). Finally, on Wilmington (N = 41) bonuses ranged from $15.00 to $68.00 with a mean of $53.80. The average bonus for Wilmington smokers (N = 14) was $34.92 compared to $34.74 for the non-smokers (N = 27). Once again, this difference was not significant (p > .9).

Production Performance

Because of the many and various factors which influence production, the amount of cane cut in any one week is not an adequate indicator of ongoing productivity. Therefore, two three-week periods were specified to constitute the production performance variable. They comprise the fourth, fifth, and sixth weeks and the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth weeks of the reaping season. During these periods there were no inclement weather conditions or labor disputes to prevent the workers from being out in full force. Thus, “cane production/first period” and “second period” refer to the average per man tonnage over two three-week periods.
of time. They are the only performance measures which do not include any other work performed for the estate.

The comparison of smokers and non-smokers in production performance is consistent with earning performance. Data on the quantity of cane cut were collected for 128 workers in the first period and 125 workers in the second period. The average amount of cane cut per man was 59.8 tons and 60.0 tons respectively. In the first period ganja smokers (N = 65) averaged 67.0 tons, while the mean for non-smokers (N = 63) was 57.6. In the second period, smokers (N = 63) produced on the average 60.2 tons of cane compared with non-smokers (N = 62) who cut an average of 59.7 tons. In both periods the slightly better performance of smokers over non-smokers was not statistically significant in the first period (p > .2) or in the second period (p > .8).

Turning to the individual farms, Ipswich workers averaged 76.2 tons in the first period (N = 49) and 67.4 tons in the second period (N = 47). Smokers (N = 27), with a mean of 76.7 tons, were only one ton higher than non-smokers (N = 22) who averaged 75.7 tons during the first period. In the second period Ipswich smokers (N = 25) averaged 79.6 tons compared with a mean of 65 tons produced by non-smokers (N = 22). These differences were not significant in either the first period (p > .8) or the second period (p > .4).

On Dover, 39 workers averaged 49.4 tons in the first period and 37 workers averaged 48.7 tons in the second period. The mean for ganja smokers (N = 26) in the first period was 51 tons compared with 46.2 tons for non-smokers (N = 13), while in the second period the twenty-five smokers averaged 49.6 tons compared with 46.7 tons for the twelve non-smokers. The differences between smokers and non-smokers were not significant in either instance (p > .2 and p > .5).

The figures from Wilmington continue the same pattern established on Ipswich and Dover. The mean cane production for forty Wilmington workers was 49.9 tons in the first period with smokers (N = 12) averaging 52.6 tons and non-smokers (N = 28) averaging 48.7 tons. In the second period the average cane production for all workers (N = 41) was 61.6 tons with smokers (N = 13) producing 62.4 tons and non-smokers (N = 28) producing 61.2 tons. Once again these differences were not statistically significant (p > .2 in period one and p > .7 in period two).

Summarizing the results of both earning and production variables, independent t-tests performed on the data from each farm indicate that there are no significant differences between smokers and non-smokers on Ipswich, Dover, or Wilmington in age, backpay, average weekly wages, bonus payments, or tons of cane cut during two-three week periods. Shifting, however, from intra-farm comparisons of smokers and non-smokers to an inter-farm comparison, a one way analysis of variance revealed that there are significant differences among and between Ipswich, Dover, and Wilmington in each of the five variables measuring worker performance. A priori contrasts show that Ipswich workers are significantly higher than Dover and Wilmington workers in backpay (p < .001 for both), wages (p < .001 for both), bonus (p < .001 for both), and cane production/first period (p < .001 both). In cane production/second period the difference between Ipswich and Dover continues to be significant at p < .001, while the difference between Ipswich and Wilmington was just not significant (p > .07). A priori contrasts further reveal that Wilmington workers are significantly higher than Dover workers in backpay (p < .01), bonus (p < .05), and cane production/second period (p < .001). Differences in salary and cane production/second period follow the same trend but are not significantly different.

For estate administration, these inter-farm differences overshadow the more subtle distinctions between smokers and non-smokers within each farm and lend confirmation to the opinion that the low ganja use—Ipswich and Wilmington—are generally harder working than the high ganja use Dover farm. A comparison of reaping operations on the three farms, however, suggests an alternative explanation for the differences in worker performance and exposes the context in which ganja and productivity are often linked. As mechanical loading gangs, reaping flat-land farms, Ipswich, Dover, and Wilmington are technologically similar. Nevertheless, each gang functions within a distinct managerial framework in which administrative policies and strategies are determined to a great extent by the individual busher. The influence of management on worker performance is clearly addressed in Davison's report on the sugar industry in Jamaica (1973: 132) in which he cautions that variations in worker output from estate to estate may be the responsibility of managerial decision-making as well as worker capabilities. On Deerfield Estate, where farm administration is highly decentralized and individualistic, Davison's note of caution regarding comparisons among estates is equally applicable to comparisons among the various farms.

**IPSWICH AND MR. PIEDMONT**

One of the primary influences on the amount of cane a worker can cut is the policy held by each busher regulating the ratio of laborers to the work to be done. Despite having the largest amount of acreage to reap, Mr. Piedmont, the manager of Ipswich, prefers to employ a small reaping gang of sixty men. On the first day of the season, he announced to his gang, "Na carry, na bring come," indicating that the cutters must select their partners from within the existing gang. When one of the younger
workers protested that he would not work with "old men," Mr. Piedmont replied that every year "the company" pressures him to employ seventy-five men for the Ipswich gang but that he is holding to sixty for the benefit of the workers. According to this busher, small gangs are more easily managed because the men earn more money and worker satisfaction is high: "They will say, 'Piedmont the most baddest man,' but the Ipswich gang made more money last crop than any other gang."

While it is acknowledged among workers throughout the estate that "Mr. Piedmont gang a money gang," it is also recognized that one must work much harder for money earned on Ipswich because of Mr. Piedmont's policy of not reaping bad cane. Contending that the additional cost in time and money required to cut a small section of cane that is thick with vines is out of proportion to its value, Mr. Piedmont instructs the men to leave it standing and work around it. If laborers worked continuously and had unlimited cane to cut, this policy would be to their advantage. However, because individual assignments are restricted to certain rows each day, workers usually find that, by leaving out bad cane, their rows are shortened and their daily tonnage rates affected. On the other hand, if they proceed to reap the cane, as many do, they can expect to work much harder without the additional compensation that would be awarded on other gangs. Hence workers on Ipswich frequently complain that Mr. Piedmont "prefer cane styan up in de field ... Him na wan fe see we mek money." Mr. Piedmont also holds over-time production in check through minimal burning of fields on Friday and Saturday evenings. According to an Ipswich headman, "Busher na give anyting. Him save de estate money an get bonus.\textsuperscript{9} Him look pleasin' and nice, but no' him ... Him bring starvation to the people."

Finally, to accomplish the additional tasks that accompany reaping operations such as burning cane or building the fire guard, Mr. Piedmont routinely selects men from a pool of six favored cutters. Because these men are often required to interrupt their cutting in order to perform this other work, they are awarded the privilege of marking off their rows on the next piece of cane before they have completed the one in which they are working, in advance of the other men. Since they are thus almost always assured of good rows, these favored workers can secure their regular tonnage as well as increase their earnings through the performance of additional tasks.

**DOVER AND MR. FURGUSON**

At the other extreme, Mr. Furguson, the manager of Dover, employs fifty-eight men to cut cane on approximately six hundred acres—a ratio of ten acres per man on Dover compared with twenty acres per man on Ipswich. Unwilling to interfere with existing partner relations or show partiality in his selection of men from the former hand-loading gang, Mr. Furguson has tried to accommodate as many of the workers as possible in Dover's recent conversion to mechanical loading. Hence the amount of work each laborer can be assigned is necessarily limited in comparison with Ipswich. Unlike Mr. Piedmont, Mr. Furguson does not cut back on weekend production and many of his cutters weigh in nearly as much cane on Sunday and Monday morning as they do for the entire week. Furthermore, he directs the men to reap bad cane and then pays additional compensation. The more lenient position of this busher in regard to premium time and bad cane imposes additional costs on the estate which he justifies as compensation for the limited work assignments that accompany a large gang in transition.

Mr. Furguson is the most popular busher with the workers. Though the men often complain that they don't make much money on Dover, they praise Mr. Furguson regularly for his fairness and impartiality. As one worker commented, "Busher Furguson de best busher. To him every man is just a man." In contrast to Mr. Piedmont, Mr. Furguson tries to avoid situations in which he might be accused of favoritism, contending that it kindles resentment among the men and encumbers management. For example, he does not request specific workers to leave their cutting in order to perform other reaping tasks. Rather, he employs three men as year-round workers who do all the special procedures that Piedmont distributes among six favored cutters for extra income. Ironically, however, in his attempts to be fair, Mr. Furguson has increased the potential for conflict on his gang. By distributing the quantity of work among as many workers as possible, all are slightly dissatisfied with their pay. By authorizing the reaping of bad cane—a more equitable policy from the worker's viewpoint—Furguson endorses an activity that is very difficult to administer. Differences in opinion between the cutters and the headman in estimating the proportion of bad cane in a cutter's work, errors made in the field both in recording and reporting, or in the accounting department or computer are a constant source of complaints from workers, voiced at the Friday paybill. Thus, despite the overwhelming popularity of Busher Furguson, the Dover gang is the most irascible and difficult to manage.

**WILMINGTON AND MR. DARRITY**

The manager of Wilmington, Mr. Darrity, uses a strategy that is unique from the other two bushers. Currently employing sixty-six men to cut
approximately eight hundred acres, Mr. Darrity's ratio of men to land (one to twelve) is only slightly better than that of Dover. However, in contrast to Furguson who is temporarily trying to accommodate as many workers as possible, Mr. Darrity is highly selective. His first consideration is not productivity, but manageability. According to this busher, "Young boys only want to make enough money to buy weed and sport themselves on Friday night. They complain all the while and if you try to talk to them, them black up with ganja and curse you off." In his efforts to eliminate "rude boys" from Wilmington, there are only nine of his fifty-five cutters who have not passed their fortieth birthday. Darrity prefers to have a gang of "manageable" men over age forty than thirty young, high producers who create "botheration" for him. Because older men do not demand large work assignments, Darrity maintains a proportionately large gang without encountering the problems with worker satisfaction typical of Dover. Similar to Piedmont, Darrity delegates additional reaping tasks to certain cutters. He does not, however, permit them to select their next rows in advance. Thus on Wilmington these tasks are not regarded as extra income opportunities but rather as unwelcome assignments reserved for those with the least seniority. Darrity also holds premium production in check; thus, while tonnage rates are slightly greater than those on Dover, per man earnings on the two farms are similar. Wilmington men are well aware of their busher's position on age and manageability and occasionally complain that he takes unfair advantage of them. During a minor dispute over poorly burned cane, one cutter objected, "Oonoo [you] must treat we good because young men won't do this work and we dead soon and then oonoo must plant all ganja instead of cane."

It is evident from this brief comparison that the three farms provide vastly different opportunities for workers to earn and produce. Policies governing the ratio of laborers to land, premium time production, and assignment of additional reaping tasks all influence the performance of workers. Obviously, the fact that Mr. Piedmont employs the same number of men to cut over twice as much acreage almost guarantees that Ipswich workers will be stronger performers over the season. Cutters on Ipswich are seldom turned away because not enough cane has been burned to accommodate all the men who report to work, while on Wilmington and Dover this is a routine occurrence. The disparity in earning potential among the three farms is manifested in the differences in bonus payments which measure earnings over an entire season: the average bonus on the Ipswich gang was $50.28, while for Dover and Wilmington it was only $26.25 and $34.80.

Managerial policies are also linked to labor relations, manageability, and the extent to which workers express their dissatisfaction. Both Piedmont and Furguson are agreed that an earning gang is a manageable gang. However, their operational strategies to meet this objective differ. Piedmont puts the onus of responsibility on the worker to cut more cane, while Furguson shifts responsibility to the estate to pay more money. Thus, while their total earnings are less, Dover men are actually compensated at a higher rate than Ipswich men for work accomplished. Yet on Dover, with its high proportion of young workers, its absence of selection criteria, and its policies for additional reimbursement that invite resentment and dissatisfaction, labor skirmishes are routine. Piedmont minimizes labor disputes through a managerial logic—by eliminating potential sources of conflict (for example, compensation for bad cane) or by turning liabilities for workers into advantages as in the assignment of additional reaping tasks. In contrast to Piedmont and Furguson, Darrity reasons that an old gang is a manageable gang and selects men who are less likely to object to small work assignments and limited premium cane. However, while it is true that the older men on Wilmington and, to some extent, Ipswich tend to be less vocal in expressing their dissatisfaction, they are also sensitive to the competition for places on their gangs, regarded as the two best employment opportunities for unskilled labor on the estate. Thus, while they are quick to criticize their bushers' frugal policies among themselves, even the young men on Ipswich and Wilmington are hesitant to jeopardize their jobs in a confrontation with either Darrity or Piedmont.

This review of administrative strategies employed on the three farms further suggests the extent to which managers themselves are responsible for the inter-farm variations in worker performance which they commonly attribute to the use of ganja. Although none of the farm managers approve the use of ganja by workers, they vary considerably in their tolerance of ganja smoking at the work site. Mr. Piedmont neither supports nor contests the smokers' position regarding the effects of ganja on productivity. He is, however, fully aware of the significance of ganja smoking among working class men and regards it as one of the routine problems which accompany labor administration. During a discussion with the manager of Chelsea farm, Piedmont facetiously remarked that the only way to get hillside cane reaped was to "plant one entire hill in ganja and let them [the laborers] in there when the cane done." Though Ipswich workers do not hide their ganja when Piedmont enters the cane piece, they generally "show respect" by "outing" a lighted "sciff" before approaching him directly.

Despite Mr. Piedmont's existential view of ganja smoking, all but one of the men whom he has selected for extra income tasks are non-smokers. Though undeniably members of the laboring class, these
workers approach middle class standards of respectability, being legally married, church-going, and literate, as well as abstaining from ganja smoking. Though they are not particularly fast workers compared with other men on the gang, the additional tasks and secure tonnage raise their earnings until they are commensurate with or even surpass the leading cutters on the gang. For example, we can see from Table 10 that while the differences are not significant, non-smokers are consistently lower in tonnage than smokers. Yet they are higher than smokers in dollars for each earning category. Of the seven Ipswich men who represented the upper range in average weekly wages (over $20.00 per week), five are non-smokers and all five are in Piedmont's exclusive group. Furthermore, of the six men who received the highest backpay settlement, four were favored cutters whose payment was based on the performance of tasks in addition to cutting, while the backpay of the two non-smokers was based completely on cutting performance.

In contrast to Ipswich men, Dover workers were observed not only to address Mr. Furguson with ganja in hand but jokingly to ask if he wanted a draw or if he would bring them some weed to smoke. When asked about Mr. Furguson's position on ganja, one of the men commented typically, "Him just jocular. ... Busher sit down next to we ... him seh, 'well boys, we ain't got any rum but we got a little tot.' ... Busher tek two schiff from him shirt pocket and give to we." Though he does not believe ganja to be harmful, Furguson is also not convinced that it really steps up productivity. He attributes the extensive use of ganja among his workers to an over-rated faith in the efficacy of the drug. "Since they believe it will make them work, it does." As with Ipswich, the highest ranges in tonnage are consistently occupied by smokers, but unlike Ipswich there is apparently little discrimination against smokers in the day to day operations on Dover; therefore, the relationship between tonnage and earnings is fairly uniform across the two categories of workers. The somewhat higher average weekly earnings and bonus payments for non-smokers, despite their lower tonnage, reflect the wages of one cutter who worked in the factory at night; thus, his earnings were much greater than the other men on the gang while his cutting production was understandably less. If the average weekly earnings and bonus payment of this cutter were eliminated from the calculations, the means for average weekly wages and for bonus payment would drop to 12.5 and 26.1 respectively, thus conforming to the pattern of the other figures for Dover.

Despite his casual, accepting, even encouraging approach to the use of ganja among workers, five of the six men whom Furguson promoted to assist the loader operator as "scrappers" were non-smokers. According to this busher, these men were promoted to this highly desired employment opportunity because they were the most "reliable," "conscientious," and "polite" workers on the gang, though their behavior did not differ noticeably from other workers.

Of all three managers, Mr. Darrity is the most rigid and negative with regard to the workers' use of ganja. He maintains that during the labor shortages of hand loading days he was forced to employ ganja-smoking boys on his gang and contend with their disruptive behavior. Now that he can be selective, however, he prefers older, non-smoking workers. Wilmington is the only farm where smoking men ordinarily hide their ganja from the busher when he enters the field. One such smoker commented, "Busher na like fe see a man enjoy him likkle weed . . . a fe no outlaw on de Wilmington gang." While the difference between smokers and non-smokers on Wilmington, as on the other farms, is not statistically significant, the consistently superior performance of smokers is of interest in an employment context where youth and ganja are negatively sanctioned in the selection of workers. To be retained as cutters on Wilmington, given Mr. Darrity's antagonism toward youthful, ganja-smoking employees, they must clearly demonstrate their proficiency as workers.

While there is little evidence to indicate that differences in worker productivity—measured in dollars and tons—can be successfully related to ganja use, there is strong indication that the attitudes of managerial staff toward ganja use do affect worker performance. If non-smokers are consistently selected on the basis of alleged greater reliability or manageability over smokers for the most lucrative and secure jobs, it would be surprising if they failed to produce and earn more. Mr. Piedmont's selection of his non-smoking political associates for additional work, Mr. Furguson's preference for "well mannered" men for scraper jobs, and even Darrity's general exclusion of young, ganja-smoking men from his gang are just a few examples of the ways in which bushers reinforce their own values through their actions. Thus while management will often argue that the two gangs which are highest in per-man production, Ipswich and Wilmington, are lowest in ganja use, they are also the two farms on which optimal conditions exist both for worker productivity and worker satisfaction.

In spite of management's essentially skeptical view of the effects of ganja on productivity, it generally acknowledges the role of ganja in providing the necessary motivation for laborers to face the arduous task of reaping cane. As such, ganja has been accepted as a necessary evil. For example, the primary issue of a parish-wide management meeting was a new sergeant of police who was conducting a series of small ganja raids, searching and arresting workers on their way to the cane fields. Discussion centered on the best way to approach the parish constabulary in order to limit police molestation of workers.

Not only do bushers passively acknowledge and permit the use of
ganja, they are known to distribute it in order to attract and encourage workers. Early in the crop bushers generally have no trouble obtaining labor; having accumulated debts during the dull season, men are usually anxious to work. Later in the season, however, when debts are paid, the weather is hot, and the twenty weeks necessary to qualify for a bonus have been completed, workers become scarce. Loaders in particular often leave the estate after their bonus commitment has been fulfilled and work for one of the private transport contractors, who pay considerably higher. Moreover, because loaders are generally younger and have fewer domestic responsibilities, they are less interested in working as long as possible. This situation has been relieved to a large extent through the introduction of mechanical loading and the gradual phasing out of hand loaders. However, it is not unusual to find hillside cane left standing in the field at the end of the season because there were not enough workers to reap it. Bushers were reported to drive through the district in the evening during labor shortages, seeking out workers and buying them rum in the shop or distributing ganja to some of the more influential laborers as an inducement to work. Likewise, if production appeared to be lagging, as it often does during the middle of the week, bushers were reported to procure ganja for the men to motivate them to work faster and harder.

An illustrative incident involving Mr. Furguson and the Dover loaders occurred in the season previous to the field work used in this study. Less than two months into the season, one of the loaders, ironically called "Peace-and-Love," "cursed off" the busher at Friday payroll during a dispute over extra pay for "heading" cane. In order not to appear manipulated by Peace-and-Love, Furguson told him not to report to work for three days, which meant missing the premium days for the next work week. The three other men in his spell stated that they would not return to work either, and would take the matter to the union. On Saturday, the entire loading staff of the Dover gang stayed home. Mr. Bellamy, the union official residing in Dover, reviewed the issue but indicated that in this situation the union could not support the workers. He advised them to go back to work so that their bonus pay would not be affected.

Sunday morning the loaders arrived in the cane piece between 7:00 and 7:30—a full two hours later than their ordinary arrival, particularly for a Sunday. By this time, according to Dover workers, there were "all fifteen hundred ton of cane on de groun." The loaders sat around their carts or loaded very slowly, frequently stopping to rest when a cart was only half finished. As Furguson went from spell to spell, the men made remarks like "Laud busher, de spirit na tek me fe wuk today," or "Me nah feel fe wuk so, busher." Meanwhile the cutters and transport team, though sympathetic to the loaders' situation, were pressuring the busher to get their cane to the weigh station during premium time.

Finally, Furguson called to Will Kennedy, a Dover cutter who was also a small time ganja dealer and asked if he had "weed fe sell." Kennedy, however, had sold most of his supply on Saturday and had only a small amount left. The only two men in Dover who had a sufficient supply were Faircough, a fisherman and vendor, and Peace-and-Love, the very man Furguson had suspended.

Kennedy went to Faircough's yard, as requested by Mr. Furguson, but Mrs. Faircough told him that her husband had not yet returned from the fishing beach. On his way to the beach, Kennedy stopped to see Peace-and-Love, who had returned late the night before from another parish with a crocus bag of kali. Peace-and-Love carefully pack-aged a pound-weight of weed, putting it in his lunch case with his thermos. When the two men returned to Dover, "busher nah know fe laf or vex." However, every man got a "good cigar fe smoke and nah raise up till done," and "all three hundred fifty ton of cane loaded by noon and three hundred more by three o'clock."

Whatever the real or perceived effects on individual productivity, the lateral cooperation in work efforts, enhanced by ganja smoking, is itself a boon to production. Ganja provides the impetus to accomplish work on both the individual and group level. It has traditionally been advantageous for cane workers to smoke ganja, and remains so for hand-loading gangs; farmer-laborers in Leyburn and fishing crews in Buckland also derive distinct economic benefits through the social use of ganja. Generally speaking, the relationships established in ganja-smoking circles are beneficial in helping individuals of all three communities deal with the limitations of the socioeconomic milieu in which they work and live. In some situations, such as the loading spells of Chelsea and co-working groups in Leyburn, a fairly rigid system of mutual obligations revolves around ganja use. Workers are compelled to give ganja, accept ganja, and repay ganja, and failure to do so may result in withdrawal of co-operation and support from co-workers. Despite the class-linked stigmas attached to heavy ganja use, users tend to associate initiation to smoking with the entrance to a responsible life. Caleb Lucas, for instance, a typical young farmer-laborer and heavy ganja user in Leyburn, claimed that when he began to smoke regularly in his early twenties, ganja "mek I check out my life and see the life I was living until then wasn't good. It mek I take better care of money, for me have business to look about, . . . and me decide fe rest woman awhile." It was during this introspective period of his life that Caleb established the union with his present mate and began farming on a piece of leased land. He now has two children and, while still renting the rooms in which he lives, has
applied for a government subsidy to build his own home on a plot of land which he recently purchased. Caleb combines farming with wage labor for the tobacco company and two of the larger farmers in the district. To accomplish all this, he works in a partner relationship with two of his peers. All three men are heavy ganja users and smoke regularly together in work and leisure contexts.

Until Caleb started smoking routinely with co-workers, he had been regarded as one of the local “rude boys”—working irregularly, wasting what little money he earned in the rum shop, and “sporting women.”[12] Though he had had the coveted opportunity to go to Canada for farm work, Caleb behaved so poorly on the first trip that he was never invited back. For Caleb, ganja symbolizes the transition from a careless to a conscientious life.

In contrast, George Cunningham, a slightly older farmer from the same community, recently gave up smoking because it “makes men lose their ambition… their plans in life. The police know every man in the district who smokes weed, so you must take a chance each day.” (It is of interest that George made this comment in the same week that he planted twenty-five ganja roots for domestic use.) While George has successfully combined farming with off-farm labor for several years, he recently inherited more land room and found himself in a position to do full-time farming with the assistance of his two teenage sons. Work partnerships, established when still relying on wage-labor opportunities, were suddenly less useful and George began to minimize his participation in them, including the smoking of ganja. In addition, George had become legally married within the year, and his wife complained often about his consuming ganja and setting a poor example for the children.

Though these men hold opposing views on the motivational value of ganja, each is correct, for their positions reflect different life stages with different options and different goals. For Caleb, heavy ganja use is an integral part of the cooperative work efforts that accompany the early years of his role as an accountable farmer, husband, and father. For George, who has already accumulated resources and is in the process of beginning partnerships, established when still relying on wage-labor opportunities, the ganja relationships and obligations that once had been necessary now have become liabilities that hinder his social and economic advancement.

Notes

1. Reports from farm managers and headmen indicate that the stronger producers are generally the faster workers. The reverse, however, is not always the case.
2. The actual size of the Wilmington property is 1,863 acres, but a large proportion is waste land or tide land which is unusable for planting cane.
3. The total acreage for Ipswich, the estate’s largest farm, is 2,078.
4. The annual bonus payment is one of the major incentives in estate work. It represents a form of enforced savings. A few workers claim they would prefer to have higher pay and forget the bonus, but more typical comments include “Me love it to god…. Me can buy a pig or shegoat.” The bonus payment is also timed to occur in late November, immediately prior to holiday season, which enhances its attractiveness among workers.
5. This attitude was clearly illustrated when, after I received approval to conduct field work on the estate, upper management scheduled Wilmington and Ipswich as the first farms to be studied because their gangs were “better mannered” and “more cooperative.”
6. “Bad cane” refers to any special condition of the cane which makes it more difficult or time consuming to reap, such as the presence of vines or cow itch or its location in steep gullies. According to an agreement between management and the unions, cutters working in any of these conditions are supposed to be awarded additional compensation in the range of ten to twenty cents per ton.
7. Theoretically, all seven gangs on the estate are interchangeable and are supposed to work whenever they are needed. Thus acreage would be distributed evenly among all workers on the estate. However, cutters become extremely upset when they have to travel long distances to work, or work under a busher whom they are unused to. They become equally annoyed when another gang is brought in to work their home farm. For example, approximately mid-crop the Ipswich gang was brought in to help cut a piece of Northfield wet-land cane in order to hasten reaping before the rains. Because the work was allocated on a first come, first served basis, some of the Ipswich men were assigned rows of cane while Northfield men were sent away. That evening an “accidental” cane fire burned several acres of cane on Ipswich, forcing management to recall Ipswich workers to their home farm for several days. While the bushers of both farms were certain that the fire had been started by Northfield men, they didn’t bother to pursue the matter; they also disrelish the problems which accompany the transfer of gangs from one farm to another.
8. According to workers and union organizers, bonus payments are awarded to farm managers who reduce costs or maintain them at the same level.
9. According to management, forty is the age at which workers begin to decline in productivity. Unfortunately, however, men below the age of thirty or thirty-five are generally regarded as notoriously difficult workers. Though they are fast and powerful, they are said to be unreliable, inconsistent in their performance, and difficult to supervise. Thus, by the time a laborer has settled down to what is regarded as a good, responsible worker, he is almost past his most productive years.
10. Occasionally, the labor situation is so bad that the contractor is hired by the estate to finish the reaping season.

11. If the cart cannot be spotted within a certain range of the pile of cut cane, the loaders are supposed to receive additional monetary compensation for cane carried on their heads to the cart.

12. During this time he also contracted gonorrhea, which he claims to have cured by using a preparation of ganja tonic.

Conclusion:
Cannabis and Culture

The preceding chapters have attempted to articulate the manner in which ganja is woven into the fabric of working-class life in rural Jamaica, bending and twisting with the contours of local conditions. Often as important as political, kinship, or neighborhood ties, ganja affiliations influence and are influenced by situations of cooperation and competition: the organization and accomplishment of work, the choice and maintenance of partner relations and, ultimately, the stabilization of each worker's position in a basically unstable economic scheme. The interrelatedness of work life and ganja use described in this volume reinforces the earlier reports on Jamaica (Rubin and Comitas 1975) which challenge the universality of an "amotivational syndrome." This syndrome was described by D. E. Smith (1968: 43) as "the loss of the desire to work, to compete, to face challenges. Interests and major concerns of the individual become centered around marihuana and drug use becomes compulsive." Whether or not ganja enhances individual productivity as users claim, it is clear that it often provides the impetus for both individuals and groups to accomplish work; ganja functions both ideologically and operationally to permit the user to face tasks in competitive work environments. Thus, the claims of Smith and others (Marcovitz and Myers 1944, Wilson 1968, Maugh 1974, Jones 1976, Hart 1976) that the consequences of routine smoking of cannabis include impairment of the ability to work, apathy, lethargy, unsound judgment, and detachment from reality simply are not supported by the evidence from rural Jamaica; in fact, the evidence indicates that ganja functions in just the opposite manner.

The amotivational syndrome is admittedly a difficult concept to evaluate in the context of North America, where the argument is confounded by multi-drug use. Nonetheless, the significance of using the experience of other cultures to re-evaluate our assumptions has been accepted as a major contribution of anthropology to cannabis research.
drug use by nature of the sociocultural and psychological characteristics of their members.

The deviant sub-culture model, on the other hand, stresses the influence of drug-using associations rather than predisposing characteristics of the individual. In this model, culture refers to the group of cannabis-using associates, who, through sharing an activity considered deviant by the larger society, form a kind of common identity, thereby establishing a cannabis sub-culture to which new members are continuously being socialized. Again, however, interpretation of this sub-culture is usually approached through questionnaires or interviews of individual sub-culture members rather than through field studies of the broader social context. Consequently, despite claims that “the unit of analysis for the sociologist, then, is the culture, the society, the milieu in which the individual finds himself” (Goode 1969:16), that social milieu usually narrowed to include only those relationships and behaviors that directly involve cannabis use.

In fact, neither of the two models accounts for the overall context in which cannabis use occurs, doesn’t occur, or occurs sometimes and not others. Instead, the formal interview and survey techniques employed in the bulk of sociocultural research on cannabis tend to separate, analytically, the individual from his socioeconomic environment and examine him according to previously designated, researcher-formulated variables. While these traditional techniques may be methodologically rigorous (with suppositions that can be stated exactly and correlations that can be expressed quantitatively) such techniques often ignore significant social and cultural data that would readily be included in a community-based, institutional analysis.

In the predisposing background model, this arbitrary separation of cannabis use from the other aspects of an individual's total behavior often leads to monocausal, or at least inadequate, explanations of the relationship of cannabis to society. Cannabis activities, like culture, are reduced to a listing of individual traits—the amount of use, frequency of use, age first smoked, etc.—which researchers then correlate with other individual traits. This methodology invites them to overlook the context of cannabis use and the way in which it is linked to other social, cultural, and economic behavior. Thus researchers attempt to explain a sociocultural phenomenon in terms of individual characteristics and values.

The shortcomings of this method are clear when viewed against the evidence from rural Jamaica. If this study were based entirely on a survey of randomly selected individual smokers, we would find that 99 percent of heavy smokers hail from the lowest socioeconomic sectors, 80 percent do not attend church, 62 percent do not belong to a church, 98 percent are functionally illiterate or non-literate, and 68 percent live in

(Rubin and Comitas 1975, Rubin 1975, Carter et al. 1976, Comitas 1980, Hamid 1980). Societal comparisons, for instance, reveal that theories about cannabis use such as deviance, rebellion, relief of boredom, and the stepping-stone hypothesis also fail to hold up cross-culturally. Nor can these ethnocentric theories account for the ritual and medicinal consumption of marihuana which occurs in societies such as Jamaica's, but which are generally absent in North American culture. Thus, in the process of testing some commonly held notions about marihuana, the overseas studies have raised serious questions about the way in which culture influences the nature and extent of cannabis consumption.

Theoretically, a systematic comparison with other cannabis-using societies should help us interpret the relationship between cannabis and culture in our own. However, the ethnocentrism which underlies much of the sociocultural research on cannabis in Europe and North America invades the research process itself and often limits the usefulness of findings for cross-cultural comparison. Perhaps most damaging is the conventional perception of marihuana smoking as an individual's psychological experience rather than as a social institution; this attitude has colored the choice of methods, the units of analysis, and the models selected for interpretation. Consequently, despite long-standing affirmations that cannabis usage cannot be properly understood without reference to the sociocultural context in which it occurs (Weil 1968, Blum 1969, Goode 1969, Grinspoon 1971), the majority of sociocultural research focuses on the individual user and the marihuana experience rather than on the society and the marihuana complex.

Two models have dominated this body of research, each with its own interpretation of the role of culture. They may be described as the predisposing background model and the deviant sub-culture model. In the predisposing background model, certain common characteristics of marihuana users are considered to influence both their initiation to cannabis and the later patterns that use will take. That is, given the availability of marihuana, some people are predisposed to use and continue using the drug by virtue of psychological, social, and cultural characteristics expressed in their individual behavior. Although "cultural milieu" is regarded as significant for providing a situation in which smoking marihuana is permitted, cultural factors are determined mainly through the background characteristics of individuals, largely ignoring the social context and the position of those individuals within it. Various populations are thus surveyed and explanations derived from statistical correlations between patterns of use and individual life styles. Through these correlations, researchers attempt to explain phenomena such as motivation, patterns of use, and differences between types of users. According to this conceptual model, sub-populations maintain differing patterns of
substandard housing. Most would be Afro-Jamaicans with the heaviest usage concentrated within the twenty-five to forty-five age range and all would smoke in both work and leisure contexts (Dreher 1977: 211–223). Each variable would perform exactly as anticipated, permitting us to validate statistically the type of person we already know is most likely to begin using and continue using ganja.

Thus, while the construction of a model cannabis user is a useful first step in this sociological inquiry, the actual mechanisms which connect predisposing characteristics with cannabis use remain mystifying without further analysis. Furthermore, misleading assumptions based on simple correlations are likely to develop. For example, the strong association of heavy ganja use with low socioeconomic status in Jamaica appears to support popular assumptions connecting cannabis use with psychological escapism from the dreary realities of oppression and poverty. Yet a closer investigation of the rural Jamaican example demonstrates that ganja smoking actually peaks when cash is in greatest circulation and employment opportunities are most abundant. Moreover, of the three communities, the highest prevalence and degree of use are found in Buckland, whose laboring class is most stable both economically and socially. Likewise, a qualitative analysis of the apparent quantitative correlation between ganja-smoking and anti-social, or even violent, behavior on Deerfield Estate reveals that, far from creating discord and hostility, the smoking and exchange of ganja are actually attempts to deal with a highly charged, competitive work environment. When the estate shifted from hand to machine loading, thereby reducing the potential for conflict, ganja activity was also reduced. These findings must prompt the rethinking of theories such as “poor impulse control” (Abel 1977) connecting cannabis with anti-social behavior. Furthermore, this study has demonstrated the almost insurmountable difficulty of sorting out the relationship between marihuana and anti-social behavior in societies where cannabis is often used as a convenient whipping boy for various kinds of untoward behavior.

Misleading assumptions are equally possible in the deviant subculture model, where excessive concentration on the individual user tends to exaggerate the importance of cannabis in the user’s life. While the importance of cannabis may indeed be great, the application of such models is disquieting because so little is known about aspects of the user that are not related to marihuana. It may not be accurate, for instance, to define a group in terms of its drug-using aspects alone. If persons convene primarily to smoke marihuana, why are such groupings often structured along age, class, occupational, or ethnic dimensions? How does this model account for the fact that these sub-cultures flourish in some segments of the society and not in others? The argument that a cannabis sub-culture exists, therefore, is neither very convincing nor particularly useful. Even if a sub-culture does indeed exist, it cannot be understood in isolation from the mainstream culture that to a large extent defines and structures it. To describe smoking men from Leyburn, Deerfield, or Buckland as a sub-culture whose ideological stance is at odds with the wider society would completely misinterpret the function and role of such groupings. Far from expressing deviant goals and objectives, ganja smoking often serves as an initial strategy for attaining goals held by the wider society.

In rural Jamaica ganja smoking is not an activity for which persons convene specifically. On the contrary it is an activity that is intertwined with social and economic life from ritual to work parties to social gatherings. This integration obviates the notion of a sub-culture organized specifically around the use of cannabis for the purpose of reinforcing and sharing values relating to cannabis. For none of the groups described in these chapters could ganja smoking be described as the major function or purpose. Although ganja is a significant factor in promoting group relations and in establishing a group identity, the groups would continue to function if ganja did not exist at all. In fact, while ganja smoking is a regular activity of adult male groupings, it is incidental to the major purpose of the gathering. The men do remark occasionally on the quality of the ganja being smoked or lament its legal constraints. However, conversation among smoking men generally centers around issues relevant to daily life in their respective communities—farming, politics, religion, and local gossip.

Indeed, ganja smoking is so well integrated with work and leisure activities that in settings such as Leyburn, where community relations are intense and multiplex, it is nearly impossible to avoid offending a whole community when one avoids smoking ganja. Rather than being alienated members of society, participants of smoking groups enjoy the full complement of male social life; it is often the non-smoker who is socially separated. As one informant commented, “Those who don’t smoke are set apart; they are most despairing. When men smoke together they are united; they stand for socialism [sociability].” Institutions such as cannabis use may also be (and usually are) greatly developed in one segment of a population, but entirely absent in another. It is the responsibility of the social scientist to explain these variations along structural lines. Misapplication of the sub-culture concept confuses that explanation and does not assist in delineating the role of smoking in society. That role can be understood only by observing the relationship of cannabis smoking to other sociocultural institutions.

It is obvious that men in rural Jamaica are continuously making choices concerning whether, with whom, and the circumstances in
which they will smoke ganja. The arrangements of ganja smoking are not random or related only to a desire for sharing the drug experience but reflect the socioeconomic options and limitations of the local environment. In these communities, continued access to ganja-smoking friends is not sufficient to account for an individual's actual usage. In fact, it is safe to say that nearly all the men in Leyburn, Buckland, and Deerfield—whether smokers or non-smokers—have friends who use ganja. While the sub-culture model emphasizes socialization by current sub-culture members to account for the recruitment of new members, the question why one selects marijuana-using friends in preference to others remains unanswered. Nor does the model account for differential participation in various groups; that is, it does not explain the behavior of an individual who smokes regularly in one set of relationships and infrequently, or never, in another.

Proponents of both models suggest that an individual's values largely determine whether he will smoke cannabis, and therefore that these same values ultimately account for the presence or absence of cannabis in a particular society or group. Explanations of this nature generally rest on assumptions of cultural uniformity—that is, that members of a particular culture or sub-culture share the same values, use cannabis for the same reasons, and achieve the same desired effects. Relying (again) on correlational evidence, whatever the researcher defines as the most notable value orientation of the population in question then serves as both the motivation for and the effects of cannabis use. Thus, in low-income laboring groups cannabis is used for relief of tedium and monotony; among students, it is to relieve tensions and symbolize alienation and rebellion; within intellectual and artistic communities it is used to expand awareness and heighten experience; among ascetic, spiritual Brahmin, it produces passive spirituality, and so forth. These theories do not, however, explain why the cause-effect complex varies from group to group nor how or why marijuana came to be the vehicle for achieving these various objectives.

Even more important, motivation-effect studies do not account for situational and developmental variations in the expression of cannabis-linked values within a particular culture. The present study has described several instances in which values were selectively expressed to meet the contingencies of specific circumstances and conditions. Cane farmers, for example, fraught with labor problems, have occasionally set aside their middle-class values; thus, while they forbid their own children to smoke ganja, they procure and dispense weed to other people’s sons without compunction. Likewise, estate managers recognize the value of ganja in expediting production, despite their claims that weed makes workers difficult to manage, and they do not hesitate to promote its use both directly, as an inducement to work, or indirectly, through dampening the zeal of the local police. Members of the constabulary, as well, admit taking the ganja they confiscate in raids to their mothers and wives for domestic consumption. In all these situations the values attached to ganja are in competition with other values and thus require choices and compromises. In fact, the strength of values notwithstanding, it is not difficult to find persons in rural Jamaica who altered their ganja values when they shifted communities or changed jobs.

In addition, this study cites many individuals who have altered their ganja-linked values developmentally as well as situationally. Community leaders who are now most vocal in denouncing ganja smoking were once among those who not only smoked, but sold and cultivated large quantities of ganja. Their current sanctimonious behavior is understandable in a context where social and economic mobility may be initiated by placing a high value on ganja activity but maintained by holding the very same activities in low esteem. Conversion to a fundamentalist religion which enjoins the smoking of ganja has provided many of these individuals with a convenient means of rationalizing this dramatic shift in values and behavior in the eyes of the local community—especially those of former friends and associates.

Thus, while individually held values may be significant in the decision to smoke ganja, the experience of working-class rural Jamaicans demonstrates that the relationship between ganja values and ganja behavior is exceedingly more complex than the simplistic notion that individuals make decisions and take action in accordance with their basic values. Both models have difficulty accounting for variation over time in a given individual’s behavior, and a similar difficulty accounting for variation within the group which is supposed to share the same values or characteristics. Thus, while the sociological interest in values is legitimate, explanations which center on values as a mechanism for explaining the existence of cannabis in society have serious shortcomings.

In general, the attempts to explain the origins of a group tradition by observing individual decision-making are not very fruitful. Values linked to cannabis are not derived in a vacuum but shaped in a particular social environment which may either repudiate or endorse the substance. In the Jamaican working class the ganja complex is already a well-established institution complete with norms, personnel, and a set cycle of activities. Consequently, any interpretation of ganja must include social phenomena such as the structure and organization of the community or neighborhood, work group cohesion, partner relations, the necessity for reinforcing and maintaining a group identity, and the manner in which all of these articulate with the ganja complex. For example, values in Jamaica are attached to the mode of consumption as
well as to the substance itself. Thus, it is common to find Jamaican housewives who eschew smoking but prepare ganja infusions regularly or men who smoke ten to fifteen spliffs a day but berate chillum smokers. Although at first blush the contradictions may appear illogical or even hypocritical, they are not; the mode of consumption has symbolic social significance that engenders either acceptance or disapproval. This is another indication that ganja-linked behavior is related at least as much to the social characteristics of the substance as to its physical properties. Once marihuana has assumed this kind of symbolic significance, individual drives and perceptions centered on reputed properties or effects of the substance become less useful for explaining the nature and degree of cannabis use in a society. There is no evidence that ganja consumption in Jamaica moved outside institutionally defined limitations and became a mechanism for personal relief.

The emphasis on values has a long history in sociocultural research on cannabis and ties in with the interest in determining causality. The question which guides these research efforts is "Why do individuals initiate and continue using marihuana?" and the attempts to answer it have focused almost exclusively on the ideology of marihuana use—that is, on individual preferences and reported perceptions of the substance. Although the "why" question is an intriguing one, social scientists have often ignored important process questions which may indirectly provide a more useful interpretation of the relationship between cannabis and society. The causes, consequences, and processes of cannabis behavior are firmly interwoven and difficult to separate even for analysis. Rather than try to account for the existence of this sociocultural phenomenon by hypothesizing about individual motivation and individually perceived effects, the present study has endeavored simply to describe the character of cannabis use in relation to a specific milieu that includes the total round of human activities, and then account for the variations in use within that context.

Certainly the Jamaican example suggests that even when individuals are able to articulate their personal reasons for smoking ganja, those reasons ordinarily do not answer questions about the sociology of cannabis use. Thus, the comments, "It let I feel calm" or "It mek I feel workish," which are fairly consistent answers across communities, do not address community distinctions in the nature and size of smoking groups, the differences in prevalence from community to community, intra-community selectivity in smoking associates, the nuances of situational deployment of smoking, or the life-cycle variations in patterns of usage. These are sociological themes which cannot be addressed by hypothesizing about individual motivation and individually perceived effects. The data required for this more sociological type of analysis must be obtained through observations of cannabis use in its naturally occurring context—a context in which the motivation of the non-user not to smoke is as worthy of sociological inquiry as the motivation of the user.

Perhaps part of the reason that sociocultural research has fallen short in bringing a closer understanding of the relationship between cannabis and society lies in the desire of social scientists to justify a point of view for the formulation of social policy. Depending on which side of the cannabis debate the researcher stands, the effects of cannabis are euphoria, a better appetite, more energy, increased sociability, and expanded awareness—or nausea, dizziness, loss of memory, an amotivational syndrome, and psychotic episodes. For some, cannabis users are enlightened, sensitive, politically aware free spirits, while for others they are debauched, hedonistic, anti-social, and potential hard drug users. The importance of having social policy well-grounded in rigorously obtained research findings cannot be overemphasized. The ethnocentric focus on public issues as research topics, however, tends to narrow rather than broaden our range of understanding. Researchers caught up with supporting or negating popular notions about cannabis may overlook other, less sensational, aspects of behavior which ultimately could be more germane to a sociological understanding of cannabis and more useful for the formulation of policy.

While the explosive increase in the use of cannabis in this country and the subsequent concern with regard to social policy have augmented the volume of social science research within the last fifteen years, many of these studies have served only to intensify the medical, social, and legal debates related to cannabis use. They have done so, at least in part, because they regard policy formulation almost exclusively as the object rather than the subject of research. The Jamaican example clearly illustrates that public policy is a configuration of the relationship between cannabis and culture—a prism through which we can view the complexities of ganja in relation to national power structure, class-linked values and behavior, strategies for mobility, and so forth (Rubin and Comitas 1975: Chapter 3).

Even the most cursory look at marihuana policy in the United States shows that it is shaped by multifarious forces and, in turn, is probably more influential in determining the nature and extent of cannabis research than is cannabis research in shaping policy. A case in point is the recent shift on the part of government agencies from a comparatively liberal to a strongly conservative posture on the issue of marihuana. This dramatic reversal appears to have been effected in spite of, rather than because of, any new evidence and probably reflects a score of social, political, and economic factors unrelated to any intrinsic features of the substance itself.

My goal in this study was explicitly not policy formulation, but rather a better understanding of a poorly understood social phenomenon
which happens to be of national and international concern. Unencumbered by the burden of proving or disproving narrowly defined questions for which there are probably no single answers anyway, this examination has permitted the emergence of unanticipated variables which challenge some of the commonly held notions about marijuana. Thus, while the goal of my research is not formulation of social policy, it is, nevertheless, relevant to policy.

As I stated in the Introduction, this research was not intended as a defense of cannabis use. Nor do I believe that the conclusions reached here can be applied indiscriminately to other cultures and settings, although the findings should provide useful material for such comparisons. What this study does defend, however, is a method of research that permits individual cannabis behavior to be viewed within the total fabric of daily life. Using the community and the work place rather than the individual as the units of analysis, I have attempted to present cannabis use as a sociocultural phenomenon, as a set of activities and social relationships in a field of action and process. Certainly the role of ganja in both expressing and reinforcing community social organization makes it difficult to sustain theories that explain cannabis use in terms of deviant subcultures or the psychological and cultural characteristics of individuals.

Whether these findings are culture-specific, however, is another issue. There are many who would argue that the picture of cannabis use which emerges from this and other traditionally using populations is indicative of the powerful influence of cultural factors on cannabis activity. Consequently, the results are not translatable in any sense to the North American context. According to this argument, the evidence that cannabis usage in Jamaica is a participatory, pro-social, self-advancing activity in no way challenges the claim that in the United States cannabis smoking "is a self-absorbing, self-limiting, anti-social experience" (National Institute of Drug Abuse 1979: 49). These differences are simply attributed to cultural differences and allowed to rest there.

Jamaicans themselves turn to culture as an explanation for what the upper ranks consider a deviant or, at best, pointless activity of certain segments of society. Popular interpretations for the widespread acceptance of cannabis within the lower sectors view ganja use as a working-class cultural trait that individuals acquire from their associations with ganja-using members of the lower sociocultural section. Typical of such interpretations is the comment offered by a junior staff employee in Deerfield to account for the extensive use of ganja among cane workers: "Is how dem stay [it is simply the way members of the laboring class behave]. Olden ones give it to the younger ones and dem begin to like it and want it and history repeat." However, to say that individuals try cannabis and continue using it because of their sociocultural background is tantamount to saying they use cannabis because they use cannabis. When the existence of a social characteristic becomes an explanation of itself, intra-cultural variation—wherein the real explanation lies—is largely ignored.

Since ganja consumption is widespread in Jamaica it is often assumed that it is a generally accepted practice, congruent with the basic value system of the rural working class, and that this accounts for the integration of the ganja complex with other sociocultural institutions. However, as we have seen in this study, the same broad range of behavior and attitudes is equally present in Jamaican society where users also function in an atmosphere of social disapproval and jural-legal penalties.

Furthermore, even within the working class segment, a comparison of communities which are culturally alike (in fact, located only miles apart) but ecologically different, reveals the profound influence of local structural arrangements on patterns of ganja use. All these findings challenge the notion of cultural uniformity on which simple culture-cannabis correlations rest.

The relationship between cannabis and culture is extraordinarily complex, and while culture may establish some of the broad parameters of cannabis activity, it is not sufficient to simply dismiss ganja as a cultural trait. The argument raised here is whether many of the differences between the United States and Jamaica in cannabis activity are attributable not to culture but to methodological considerations—considerations that include the techniques used, the populations studied, and the questions asked. The characterization of North American usage as deviant, hedonistic, episodic, and recreational and of Jamaican usage as integrated, functional, and strongly associated with work life may well reflect a research bias rather than a cultural difference. It is quite likely that employing a community-based institutional analysis would transcend the first-level correlational analysis and permit cannabis researchers to find the same integration of cannabis with other social institutions, the same situational expression of values, the same contradictions and rationalizations and scapegoating of marihuana as found in Jamaica.

In the ten years since the Jamaican Ganja Project was initiated, there has been little change in the research strategies of domestic studies. Yet until a community-based examination of marihuana use is conducted in several North American contexts—selected because they are representative of society in general and not because they are notorious for heavy cannabis use—it will continue to be difficult to establish the relationship between culture and cannabis in our own society.

Note

1. A notable exception is Sharff's work in New York City (1980).
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