

This approach, together with effective (but not excessive) repetition and cross-referencing of information, calls the reader's attention to important relationships and contributes to a more complete understanding of what follows.

After a brief historical introduction and enumeration of the Indian population, the author deals immediately with the concept of community and indicates its usefulness for understanding Indian society in Uganda. The reader is then provided with an overview of several of the more important conclusions in the book: the Indian community, as a unified whole, is relatively unimportant in Uganda; the caste system, as it was known and understood in India, was not transplanted in Uganda, but caste exclusiveness was retained and was used as an important organizational factor; and caste and sectarian communities emerged as the most significant and meaningful units of organization for Indians in Uganda. The statement of these conclusions early in the book gives the reader some insight into the author's direction and goals and provides a basis for complete discussion of each.

Morris devotes the next five chapters to an explanation and demonstration of his stated conclusions, showing, systematically and clearly, the importance and effect of external and internal forces. In this way, such important topics as the attitudes and objectives of British administration, the influence of Hinduism and Islam, the dependence of Uganda Indians on India, the presence of Islamic sects and Hindu castes and their relationship to one another, and the influence that the development of a sect into an organized community had upon the development of other castes and sects are introduced and elaborated.

The next three chapters—institutions of kinship, economics, and government—are concerned with "Indians as individuals settled in an alien society rather . . . than as members of a community" (p. x). This arrangement is of some concern to Morris, because he believes it may detract from his discussion of the plural society—the final chapter in the book. While Morris does provide the reader with an understanding of the place of the individual Indian in Uganda, I believe his fears are unfounded. In fact,

much of the information given in these three chapters illuminates preceding discussions and contributes to the reader's knowledge of the individual in the plural society.

The final chapter summarizes existing theory about plural societies and includes some excellent criticism of existing conceptions. One even receives the impression that a new set of hypotheses will be offered, but such is not the case. While he does provide certain suggestions pertinent to the theory of plural societies, Morris does not develop them fully here. This, however, should not be construed as a shortcoming, for the book is not intended as a complete revision of the theory of the plural society, and the ideas that Morris sets forth, as well as their application, are definite contributions to this body of theory.

In accomplishing a rather difficult and complex task, Morris has not found it necessary to resort to jargon or esoteric explanations. The descriptive summaries presented—and, more importantly, his analyses and interpretations—are straightforward, meaningful, and easily understood. No reader should have any difficulty reading this book, nor should anyone have a problem determining the author's meanings and intentions.

This book is a must for anyone interested in overseas Indian communities, Indian society and culture, plural societies, urbanization, and contemporary African society. Since the research upon which this work is based was completed in 1955, I regret that the book was not completed and released sooner. It is an important contribution.

*English Rustics in Black Skin: A Study of Modern Family Forms in a Pre-Industrialized Society.* SIDNEY M. GREENFIELD. New Haven: College and University Press, 1966. 208 pp., 25 tables, notes and references, bibliography, index. \$5.00 (cloth).

Reviewed by JEROME S. HANDLER  
Southern Illinois University

Greenfield's book, a slightly modified version of his Ph.D. dissertation, is concerned with describing and accounting for various forms of the family in the island of Barbados and is largely based on a community study done in 1956–1957 (more recent materials and developments are not consid-

ered). The island was the oldest of Britain's sugar colonies, the plantation system based upon slave labor having been well established by the mid-seventeenth century. Under continuous British control until 1966, Barbados is still overwhelmingly dependent upon sugar production, and its population is deeply thrust into the network of a market economy and cash dependency.

Greenfield's findings and analysis can be summarized as follows: consensual mating relationships are frequent, economic conditions restricting marriage "to the fortunate few" (village statistics, however, indicate otherwise), but marriage, and the family based upon it, is an ideal towards which most villagers strive. Men marry largely to "insure the property rights" of wife and children; women prefer marriage because of the material security it entails. A married man is expected to be the main breadwinner, and it is the clear role definition of the conjugal pair that distinguishes marriage from mating. A family, however, is created when children are born to a couple, married or not. Villagers participate in two major family types: 56 percent in the "complete" or nuclear family, usually based on marriage and formed when an adult male succeeds in the occupational system and fulfills his role expectation as breadwinner; an "unsuccessful [male] tends to depart from the family at a late stage of its development" thus precipitating the "incomplete" or matrifocal family, in which the mother, who is generally unmarried, assumes both adult roles. Family forms vary with class level, primarily determined by occupational position, and are understood in relation to the island's stratification system. Greenfield's "structural-functional" analysis owes much to R. T. Smith's now classic Guyana study, but his "cultural-historical explanation" of family forms is more novel.

He argues that the "Barbadian small nuclear family [and] its matrifocal variant" derive neither from Africa nor from slavery but directly from English patterns introduced in the seventeenth century. Slaves participated minimally in the island's culture, and slavery made it impossible for them to "re-establish African culture [or] to develop new independent patterns." With emancipation in the 1830s, former slaves

"could have had no choice but to accept the culture that already existed in the island," which included the two major family types. They were encouraged to marry and adopt the nuclear family, but "in a sense they were . . . like children . . . who had not been permitted to learn the roles of adults in the society of which they suddenly and without choice were made members." This, combined with factors that kept many males working at low paying and "degrading" jobs, compelled adoption of matrifocality by many lower class persons. Nonetheless, they aspired to marriage and the nuclear family, which were "associated with property and high socioeconomic status." Starting in the 1930s and accelerating in the postwar period, lower class males had increased access to higher status occupations and more opportunities for social mobility, causing an increase in the percentage of nuclear families based on marriage. Greenfield predicts this trend will continue as the islanders' standard of living continues to rise.

Greenfield's treatment of Barbadian sociocultural history (especially preemancipation) is based largely on a handful of secondary sources and is limited by these as well as by his tendency to argue, both specifically and generally, from insufficient evidence. Categorical assertions, to cite a few examples, that slaves participated in "a series of . . . uprisings" in the early nineteenth century, were "legally prevented" from marrying, and "could not run away" are not documentable. There was but one slave revolt (occurring in 1816, not 1815 as stated), slave marriage was a more complex issue than legal prohibitions against it (there were none, but seventeenth-century laws regulated marriage of European indentured servants), and runaways were a bothersome problem to planters throughout most of the preemancipation period.

Greenfield's account gives the impression that under slavery the mass of Africans and their descendants pursued their daily plantation tasks and not much of anything else; upon being emancipated they developed a culture. But Africans did not arrive on the shores of the New World with blank minds onto which were impressed seventeenth-century English culture patterns in the 1830s. Although the social system of the slave soci-

ety was harsh and highly restrictive, slaves developed a complex of behavioral patterns that by any anthropological characterization was cultural. One crucial problem in Barbadian history is establishing as fully as possible what that culture was, how it developed, and what influence it had upon the island's culture in general. Despite the prominent position of English-derived national institutions and elements in the island's society and culture, Barbadians are not Englishmen (even "rustic" ones at that—the book's title is of questionable taste), and the island's popular sobriquet, "Little England," as Greenfield seems to use it, is a dubious analytic principle. Barbadian culture is a New World one, created by unique experiences and the interactions of a heterogeneous white and black population in a matrix within which colonialism, the plantation system, and slavery were prominent contributing elements. Dismissing "contemporary differences between colony and mother country [as] the result of three centuries of cultural differentiation" hardly does analytic justice to the nature of this culture and the complex of historical processes by which it was created. Thus, Greenfield's "cultural-historical" analysis of the development of Barbadian kinship and mating patterns, in particular, is unconvincingly argued (for example, to assert that nonlegal unions originated in the medieval English trothplight and premarital cohabitation patterns brought to the island in the seventeenth century seems to me to be a rudimentary cultural determinism and strain on the use of historical analogy); exploration of this issue requires a more extensive investigation into British, Barbadian, and, perhaps, even African social history than is evidenced in this book.

*Community in Transition: Nayón-Ecuador.*

RALPH L. BEALS. Latin American Studies, 2. Los Angeles: Latin American Center, University of California, 1966. 213 pp., 25 illustrations, 3 foldout maps, 21 tables (2 foldout), 2 appendices, orthographic note, bibliography. \$5.00 (paper).

Reviewed by NORMAN E. WHITTEN, JR.  
Washington University, St. Louis

In 1952 Dr. Ralph Beals published a short, provocative article, which argued that the Quechua-speaking Indians of Nayón, a

highland Ecuadorian community of 1500 people living only 10 km. from the national capital, Quito, were "almost completely bypassing the mestizo culture." He went on to conclude, "If this is true of the acculturation of other Indian groups in Ecuador it may be that some of the fundamental assumptions made in that country about the absorption of the Indians need to be re-examined" ("Acculturation, economics and social change in an Ecuadorean Village," in *Acculturation in the Americas*, Sol Tax, ed. Proceeding of the XXIXth Congress of Americanists, Chicago, 1952). The appearance of this monograph sixteen years after the initial article is welcome.

The people of Nayón may be the descendants of Inca immigrants from Peru or Bolivia. Today their community is one of a ring of Quechua-speaking villages to the north and northeast of Quito, the ecology of which is increasingly marginal due to expanding population and a decreasing land base. Beals notes that the people within this geographic and cultural ring are "unique in the extent to which they have retained individually owned lands and relative independence of the hacienda system as well as in the persistence of Quechua speech" (p. 25). He elaborates such claims of uniqueness by arguing that

Despite substantial changes, Nayón in no sense is adopting rural mestizo or *cholo* patterns. Indeed, it remains almost aggressively Indian. Neither does Nayón today resemble the usual concept of a peasant society. In the past fifty years the pattern of economic life has changed drastically in Nayón and ways of life have altered at the same time. . . . It is neither Indian, nor rural *cholo*, not urban but for the present at least something unique [p. 16].

Although serfdom in Ecuador is far more common than independent Indian communities, this argument for uniqueness is overstated. Nevertheless, the ideas behind the analysis of Nayón are important, particularly since they seem also to be representative of some other Ecuadorian Indian communities.

In documenting his thesis, Beals discusses geography, history, and involvements in national institutions. The questions he raises should stimulate more ethnohistoric research in archives in Quito and Lima. Chapter 2,