

REVIEW ARTICLE

MEXICAN COMMUNITY STUDIES

HOWARD CLINE

Recent appearance of two works neatly closes a cycle of writings initiated in 1930.¹ That year Robert Redfield published a pioneer volume that launched a new *genre* of social investigations. His *Tepoztlán, a Mexican village: a study of folk life*² extended to the Mexican scene a type of community study that has since drawn many emulators. The new approach to investigation had received marked stimulus from the epoch-making description of Middletown, U. S. A. (Muncie, Indiana) by the Lynds and soon found parallels in other studies of communities in the United States, in Ireland, and (following Redfield's footsteps) in Mexico; now scarcely a part of the globe lacks a community study or two.³ Over the quarter of a century since Redfield undertook field work in Tepoztlán, the techniques and methods associated with this class of writings have matured and sophisticated.

Their development and degree of growth are well exemplified by Oscar Lewis' *Tepoztlán Restudied* and by the summaries, syntheses, and range of discussion in *Heritage of Conquest*. The former is a full-scale reassessment and extension of Redfield's original study by an independent observer; the latter reports and sums up the results of a seminar on community studies, the chief query of which was "What have we learned?" Together, these books show that the pioneering days of Mexican community studies have passed; though the frontiers are by no means filled in, their outlines have been sketched. Fortunately,

¹ *Life in a Mexican Village: Tepoztlán Restudied*. By OSCAR LEWIS. With drawings by ALBERT BELTRÁN (Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1951. Pp. 512. Bibliography, index. \$5.00.)

Heritage of Conquest: The Ethnology of Middle America. By SOL TAX and others of the Viking Fund Seminar on Middle-American Ethnology and Social Anthropology (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1952. Pp. 312. Bibliography, index, maps. \$5.00).

² University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1930. For full citation of this and community studies hereinafter mentioned, see Bibliography. Gamio's classic 1922 study is there discussed, Item 25.

³ Betty J. Meggers, "Recent Trends in American Ethnology," *American Anthropologist*, n.s. XLVII (April-June, 1946), 176-214, especially "Community Studies," pp. 190-194. Reviewers were quick to note parallels between *Middletown* and *Tepoztlán*, but Redfield's own inspiration seems to have come from English anthropologists, especially Fay Cooper Cole and A. R. Radcliffe-Brown on whose "The Methods of Ethnology and Social Anthropology" (*South African Journal of Science* XX [Oct. 1923], 124-147) he placed considerable stress.

perhaps, the Viking Fund Seminar included much material from Guatemala, as well as extracting ideas and data primarily concerned with Mexico. Lewis' volume deals in great detail with a single Mexican community about forty miles from Mexico City.

Jointly they point to the crumbling of an old shibboleth: the assumption that a newcomer should not check or criticize another anthropologist's work, because such handling somehow seemed to impugn the veracity of the first work and somehow stigmatize the whole guild. In Lewis' case an even stronger taboo was broken, that of entering a territorial preserve staked out earlier; Redfield, however, not only permitted, but actively encouraged this particular heresy. Refreshingly, the winds of argument, defense, and counter-argument form a major motif in *Heritage of Conquest*, while one of the major contributions of Lewis' monograph and treatment is the airing of a closely argued critique of the methods and assumptions followed by Redfield not only in Teopoztlán but in the much more extensive Yucatan Project. In neither volume does controversy lapse into name-calling and the clash of views is productive of light rather than of heat.⁴

Each volume represents a landmark of a quite different sort. Lewis' is the first major follow-up by an independent worker of an area earlier reported, and, beyond that, adds a whole new dimension to community studies by a successful application of psychological techniques; new findings open up wide methodological vistas and at the same time provide more than adequate grounds for reconsideration and reevaluation of work already done. The Seminar volume, on the other hand, provides technicians with a sort of a synthesis and a series of new working hypotheses into which further information can be fitted; it highlights the strength and weakness of current knowledge about Mexican communities and begins to disclose patterns of what is peculiar to particular communities, what to various parts of Mexico or Guatemala, and what to Middle America as part of Latin America. As such it is a point of departure for the next cycle of studies, of which Lewis' book may perhaps be considered the first. Almost independently he has drawn parallel conclusions.

Involved in these two works is a large, unwieldy, and to some degree, unfamiliar mass of materials—factual and critical. To simplify, it is possible to say that *Heritage of Conquest* is primarily a specialist's item,

⁴ See Note 9. For the jacket of Lewis' book Redfield wrote "Because Dr. Lewis has written an account of a Mexican people that is rich in fact and provocative in ideas . . . because he has made full use of the sketch of this same people I wrote many years ago, correcting and greatly deepening that sketch; and because in putting before other students my errors and his own in a context of intelligent discussion . . . for these reasons I praise and recommend this book." Lewis dedicated the volume to Redfield.

while *Tepoztlán Restudied* (for the moment at least) has greater relevance for historians. *Heritage* . . . assumes a wide, deep, and continuing acquaintance with technical literature possessed by only a few Latin-American historians; it airs issues of importance, but chiefly to practitioners in anthropological work. For the historian and for scholars in other allied fields, its Part I, "General Information" will probably be found most useful, as will discussions in Chapters XII and XIII, where comparative approaches have been employed. One of the objects pursued is an inventory of *lacunae* and of areas of agreement as a guide to future research. Almost to a man, the otherwise contentious members of the seminar agreed that perhaps the largest gap was in suitable historical studies; it is evident, too, from the discussions that by and large none of the technicians seemed fully qualified to fill that particular need adequately.

In his restudy of Tepoztlán, Oscar Lewis provides for one community much information that the Seminar agreed is now necessary. He was not a member of the Seminar, and apparently arrived independently at about the same point it reached. His job itself was something of an historical accident, a happy one, but not foreseen either by himself or others who encouraged and subsidized the study. He did what the collective body of community-studiers now agree ought to be done, but evolution of the investigation was slow. It grew out of a program originally set up in the United States by the Department of Indian Affairs and the University of Chicago's Committee on Human Development to improve Indian education. Into each of twelve American tribal groups a pair of investigators was sent, an anthropologist and a psychologist, who purposely were teamed to make what are known as "culture and personality" studies. In 1942, under wartime collaboration with Mexico, the scheme was broadened to include Mexico. Lewis, trained in anthropology and psychology, was expected to head the Mexican project. For various reasons, Tepoztlán was picked as the site of study, and for the "culture" part of the study, all hands believed it would be a rather easy matter to bring Redfield's 1926 findings up-to-date as a screen against which psychological testing could go on. Matters did not prove to be as simple as that.⁵

Growth in complexity and scope of the research, which led to a complete rethinking and redoing of much that Redfield had covered, is detailed in Lewis' Introduction. Eventually, he applied the whole

⁵ A complete list of the papers and their authors will be found in the bibliography, Item 37. Chapter 13, "The Sixteenth Century and the Twentieth: a Comparison of Culture Types and Culture Areas," tends to summarize gaps and disagreements, as well as to provide a synthesis of knowledge, mapped, with a rough index of retention of pre-Columbian traits by known peoples.

modern battery of anthropological techniques and psychological field methods to Tepoztlán. To account for changes and to formulate a coherent view of continuing change, Lewis was forced to ransack historical materials in print and even to make pilgrimages to the archives. Because it was expedient, and also because of higher motives, he and his team of investigators obtained Mexican government aid and guided welfare and other programs to ameliorate local difficulties so that he had a ringside seat for watching outside influences play on the community and the personalities of Tepoztlán. His *Life in a Mexican Village* embodies an account of all this. It combines a technical report with a general book; it is of high value not only to anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists, but for a wider general public as well.

In professional jargon, Lewis writes that "The methodological orientation of this study combines the historical, the functional, and the configurational points of view." Translated, this says that he has tried to place observed changes within broader historical settings, running back to pre-Conquest days; that he has sketched a contemporary portrait and has described current institutions and inter-relationships; and that he has tried to imbed local developments in wider regional and national trends. This is a new departure, as most studies since Redfield's have been "functional."

II

To the historical public a prime interest of Lewis' work is his self-conscious attempt to link two main streams of writings about Mexico. One of these deals with Mexico topically and as a whole in such volumes as Gruening's *Mexico and Its Heritage*, McBride's *Land Systems*, Tanenbaum's several books, Simpson's *Ejido*, Whetten's *Rural Mexico*, and the like. All the examples cited by Lewis (p. xx), for instance, have been extensively discussed in these pages. The other is less known to the historical guild; these are community studies more or less on the basic pattern of Redfield's *Tepoztlán*.⁶ Carried out almost exclusively

⁶ Undated memorandum, "Project for research on Indian Personality in Mexico" (1942); "Research on Indian Education: Guide for Field Workers" (revised), June 1942; "Research on Indian Education, Co-Ordinator's Report of the Chicago Conference, Mar. 3-13, 1943"; "Research on the Development of Indian Personality: Field Guide to the Study of the Development of Inter-personal Relations (for staff and consultants) (1943); Oscar Lewis to H. F. Cline, Oct. 25, 1943, personal communication; Oscar Lewis, *The Tepoztlán Project: a report on administrative problems*, National Indian Institute (Washington 1945.) Specifically the Mexican program aimed to "determine the degree to which the personality of the Indian child is able to develop fully, and the factors of physical and social environment, including the influence of government programs, which affect this development. Second, since a similar program is being carried out in twelve Indian communities in the United States, it would be desirable to have the record of personality

by American anthropologists and sociologists, these investigations have centered their attention on the varied aspects of one Mexican place observed and probed by a now almost standard repertory of field techniques.

The present occasion seems suitable to bring them to the attention of historians and to discuss some of the trends in these investigations. The following tabulation gives a rather complete listing of those which have appeared. The bibliography, which gives further details, includes also a selected list of shorter articles and other books of related general interest. Technical studies of exclusive concern to anthropological specialists are purposely omitted. Those interested in the status of knowledge about Mexican groups not studied by the community approach will find a helpful summary and bibliography prepared for their fellow workers by Ralph Beals, Robert Redfield, and Sol Tax; it covers the ground through 1942.⁷

The intellectual and academic genealogy of modern Mexican community studies is as complicated and as interesting as any such family tree, but it cannot be traced in detail here. Broadly speaking, these writings fall into three very general categories and two historical periods. The first category includes studies or reports on individual communities by more or less "free lance" investigators with widely varying motives and objectives, often of an experimental nature.⁸ A second large block or category is directly or indirectly associated with the Carnegie Institution's earlier Yucatan Project.⁹ A third cluster group around the still vital Tarascan Projects, outgrowth of several smaller research programs jointly carried on by Mexican agencies and American universities, nota-

development in communities having a wholly distinct historical experience. . . . Underlying this study is the important objective, urgent and vital, of applying social sciences to serve democracy."

⁷ Ralph Beals, Robert Redfield, and Sol Tax, "Anthropological Research Problems with Reference to the Contemporary Peoples of Mexico and Guatemala," *American Anthropologist*, n.s., XLV (Jan.-Mar., 1943), 1-21; *Heritage of Conquest*, Bibliography (pp. 299-303). The present appended bibliography is supplementary to these, omits many items therein listed, but adds numerous new ones, especially in "Selected Related Works."

⁸ These are labelled "I" in the tabulation; each is briefly discussed in the Bibliography.

⁹ In the tabulation, studies labelled "II" represent the Redfield-directed phase of Yucatan studies. For an outline of the total plan see A. V. Kidder, "A Program for Maya Research," *THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, XVII (May, 1937), 160-169 and Robert Redfield, "The Second Epilogue to Maya History," *ibid.*, 170-181; main publications of the Yucatan project are noted in review, *op. cit.*, XXX (Nov. 1950), 521-525. See also, Robert Redfield, "Culture Changes in Yucatan," *American Anthropologist*, n.s., XXXVI (1934), 57-59, and his "Race and Class in Yucatan," *Coöperation in Research*, Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication 501 (Washington, 1938), pp. 511-532.

MODERN MEXICAN COMMUNITY STUDIES, 1930-1951

Item	Investigators	Major Community	State	Popula- tion	Indian back- ground	Language	Field work		Publication	
							Mos.	Date	Date	Category
1....	Redfield	Tepoztlán	Morelos	4,000	Aztec	Nahuatl	8	1926-27	1930	I
2....	Taylor	Jarandas	Jalisco	7,574	remote	Spanish	4	1931-32	1933	I
3....	Redfield & Villarojas	Chan Kom	Yucatan	251	Maya	Maya	4+	1933	1934	II
4....	Steininger & Van de Velde	Cuatro Venados	Oaxaca	700	Valley Zapotec	bilingual Zapotec	?	?	1935	I
5....	Parsons	Mitla	Oaxaca	2,000	Valley Zapotec	bilingual Zapotec	?	1929-33	1936	I
6....	Redfield <i>et. al.</i>	Mérida Dzitas Chan Kom X-Cacal	Yucatan	96,000 1,200 251 206	Maya	Spanish bilingual Maya		1931-36	1941	II
7....	Foster	Soteapam	Veracruz	900	Sierra Popoluca	Popoluca	4+	1941	1942	I
8....	Villarojas	X-Cacal & ranchos	Quintana Roo	720	Rebel Maya	Maya	9+	1935-36	1945	II
9....	Beals	Ayutla	Oaxaca	300	Western Mije	Mije	3+	1933	1945	I
10....	Covarrubias	Tehuantepec Juchitán	Oaxaca	20,000 20,000	Isthmus Zapotec	Spanish bilingual	?	?	1946	I
11....	Beals	Cheran	Michoacán	5,000	Tarascan	Tarascan	?	1940-41	1946	III
12....	Cámara Barbachano	Tenejapa	Chiapas		Tzeltal	Tzeltal		1943-44	1946*	IIA
13....	Cámara Barbachano	Mitontik	Chiapas		Tzotzil	Tzotzil		1944	1946*	IIA
14....	Villarojas	Oxchuk	Chiapas		Tzeltal	Tzeltal		1942-44	1946*	IIA
15....	Guiteras Holmes	Cancuc	Chiapas		Tzeltal	Tzeltal		1944	1946*	IIA
16....	Guiteras Holmes	Chenalho	Chiapas		Tzotzil	Tzotzil		1944	1946*	IIA
17....	Corona Núñez	Cuitzeo	Michoacán	3,265				1931?	1946	I
18....	Pozas Arciniega	Chamula	Chiapas		Tzotzil	Tzotzil		1944	1947*	IIA
19....	Cámara Barbachano	Zinacantán	Chiapas		Tzotzil	Tzotzil		1942-43	1947*	IIA
20....	Foster	Tzintzunzán	Michoacán	1,231	Tarascan	Spanish	14	1945-46	1948	III
21....	de la Fuente	Yalalag	Oaxaca	4,000	Sierra Zapotec	Zapotec bilingual	11	1937-41	1949	I
22....	Redfield	Chan Kom	Yucatan	445	Maya	Maya	1½	1948	1950	I
23....	Brand	Quiroga	Michoacán	4,159	Tarascan	Spanish	9+	1944-45	1951	II
24....	Lewis	Tepoztlán	Morelos	4,000	Aztec	Nahuatl bilingual	13	1943-44 1947-48	1951	I

MARGINAL COMMUNITY STUDIES, 1922-1940

25....	Gamio <i>et al.</i>	Teotihuacán	Mexico			Aztec			1922	I
26....	Taylor	Nueces County	U. S. A. Texas			English Spanish bilingual			1934	I
27....	Spicer	Pascua	U. S. A. Arizona	429	Yaqui	English Spanish Yaqui trilingual	12	1936-37	1940	I

*Microfilm publication. Full bibliographical citation is found at the end of this article.

bly the Universities of California, New Mexico, and now Texas, materially aided by the Smithsonian Institution's Institute of Social Anthropology.¹⁰ This sponsorship and its changes have tended to break one phase of studies off from the other, with the dividing line coming somewhere about 1945.

In the earlier period, individual studies, carried on by the lone worker (with his wife) are numerous, but the era passed under domination of the Yucatan Project.¹¹ On the basis of his findings in Tepoztlán and the scheme used there, Redfield developed a research plan whereby four types of communities in Yucatan were investigated by individuals; only two full-scale monographs resulted, but the appearance of Redfield's *Folk Culture of Yucatan* (1941) closed further fieldwork there. Emphasis shifted to mainland Maya areas in southern Mexico and Guatemala, in which Sol Tax aided, then replaced, Redfield as supervisor.¹² Their methods were also reflected in individual studies which their protégés made of Canadian,¹³ United States border,¹⁴ and Zapotec communities.¹⁵ Publication of Villarojas' *Quintana Roo* and de la Fuente's *Yalalag*, each summarizing field work done much earlier, tends to close

¹⁰ Denoted by "III" in the tabulation. D. F. Rubín de la Borbolla and Ralph Beals, "The Tarascan Project: a Coöperative Enterprise of the National Polytechnic Institute, Mexican Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the University of California," *American Anthropologist*, n.s., XLII (1940), 708-712; Ralph L. Beals, Pedro Carrasco, and Thomas McCorkle, *Houses and House Use of the Sierra Tarascans*, Smithsonian Institution, Institute of Social Anthropology, Publication I (Washington, 1944), Introduction; George M. Foster, "The Institute of Social Anthropology," *Boletín Bibliográfico de Antropología Americana*, IX, 1946 (Mexico, 1947), 22-24; XI, 1948 (Mexico, 1949), 104-107; XIII, 1950 (2 vols., Mexico 1951), I, 74-76; Gordon Willey, *ibid.*, XII, 1949 (2 vols., Mexico 1950), I, 122-124.

¹¹ See Note 9 and Items 3, 6, 8 in bibliography.

¹² Marked as "II A" in the tabulation. No finished monographs or books have emerged from the Mexican studies, as most of the material remains as roughly ordered field notes of a joint expedition of the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (Mexico), State of Chiapas, the University of Chicago (on grants supplied by The Viking Fund) and with the coöperation of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. These data are available in microfilm form through The University of Chicago, *Microfilm Collection of Manuscripts on Middle American Cultural Anthropology* (Four series, 1946—), described in *Boletín Bibliográfico de Antropología Americana*, X, 1947 (Mexico, 1948), pp. 54-57, XII, 1949 (2 vols., Mexico 1950), I, 124-125. To September 1, 1949, 26 of the projected "40 or 50" items had been reproduced (Hectograph announcement, University Library, Department of Photographic Reproduction). Sol Tax, "Middle America: Ethnology and Indian Linguistics," *Handbook of Latin-American Studies*, XIV, 1948 (Gainesville, Fla. 1951), p. 23, notes that "The Carnegie Institution of Washington had by 1948 brought to an end its investigations of contemporary cultures and languages."

¹³ Horace M. Miner, *St. Denis: A French-Canadian Parish*. University of Chicago, Publications in Anthropology, Ethnological Series (Chicago, 1939).

¹⁴ Edward H. Spicer, *Pascua: A Yaqui village in Arizona* (See Bibliography, Item 27).

¹⁵ Julio de la Fuente, *Yalalag: una villa zapoteca serrana* (See Bibliography, Item 21).

what we can call the "University of Chicago" phase. Redfield's recent revisit to Chan Kom is an individual study.¹⁶

After 1945, areal emphasis, purposes, and leadership in community studies have changed. In general there has been less tendency to document a preconceived sociological scheme, with more stress on rounded accounts of the total community seen in historical perspectives. There is also less concern with Indian communities *per se*, and periods of field work have been longer. Publication has been the end-product of team research, in which a group of Mexicans and Americans joined to cover one place. There appears, too, a greater sensitivity to concrete possibilities of social and economic betterment, and reports suggest the limitations and possibilities of government programs. As far as I know, most of the field work of the original Tarascan programs has drawn to a close, and Brand's announcement (see Bibliography, Item 23) suggests that another characteristic feature of the period—U. S. Government support of publication—is on the wane.

As suggested, the publication of *Heritage of Conquest* and *Tepoztlán Restudied* signalize the closing of one major epoch and the opening of another. In the Viking Fund Seminar the three classes of workers, the independents, the ex-Carnegie investigators, and the Tarascan specialists were purposely brought together to exchange views, in an attempt to "develop and unify their understanding. . . . Scholars hampered by their traditional isolation show here how truth is approached through the conflict and congruence of minds. It thus reports an event in the immense intellectual adventure" (p. 7.) As the following pages suggest, the impact of both books is likely to have important repercussions on community studies for some years to come, since there is little doubt that the trend toward using sample areas and communities has passed a transitional stage and is now firmly established. The problem now is to improve the studies and to link them with broader and meaningful concepts, as well as to refine those which exist.

III

Against this general background we can scan Lewis' particular achievements in *Tepoztlán Restudied*. As indicated, the proposed use of the village for a specific culture-personality project led him to repeat and rethink much of the cultural investigation performed earlier by Redfield. The final outcome is a beautifully made, significant volume that is bound to influence future community studies. Sprinkled liber-

¹⁶ See my review, cited in bibliography, Item 22; Lewis, *Tepoztlán Restudied*, p. 435. *Boletín de Bibliografía Americana*, XIII (1950), I, 90, reports that Redfield "is at work on a book which will clarify his theory of Folk Society and Civilization."

ally with graphs, charts, photographs, and charming vignettes and drawings by Alberto Beltrán, *Life in a Mexican Village* is an extensive and able production.

It has two main parts, corresponding roughly to the "culture-personality" aims. "Village and Institutions" (pp. 3-283) deals broadly with environment and practices on an anthropological-sociological basis, while "The People" (pp. 287-426) stresses interpersonal relationships and individual responses. A summary chapter, appendices, a lengthy bibliography, and a useful index complete the whole, while an introduction opens up the avenues which Lewis subsequently follows.

In addition to explaining his gradual involvement in a total restudy, Lewis' opening remarks briefly outline his methods and set forth some basic theses and summary information aimed at placing "Tepoztlán in the broader Mexican scene in terms of its geography, history, population trends, agrarian problems, and other aspects." Here is indicated in what respects the place is typical of rural Mexico, and in what atypical. Wisely, this survey leads Lewis to the conclusion that "Tepoztlán is not here presented as *the* synthesis of Mexico but rather as *one* synthesis."

In this preliminary view, and again in the summary chapter, Lewis airs his strongly held and proper view, now shared more widely by workers in the field, that "ideological localism" among social investigators of Mexican places is an anachronism.¹⁷ Communities cannot be treated as self-contained cultural units like isolated and remote tribes, but must be considered within their larger areal and temporal contexts. Specifically Lewis warns fellow-workers that "in studying communities in Mexico, it is important that the anthropologist become a student not merely of the single community but of the region and nation as well."¹⁸

This approach underlies Part I, "The Village and Its Institutions," which is essentially a monograph in itself, comparable to the general run of recent community studies. Through eleven chapters Lewis examines institutional evolution and operating patterns on a village-wide basis after providing a thoughtful geographical analysis and historical summary. By his independent research along historical lines, Lewis casts considerable doubt on Redfield's assertions about the *barrio* basis of modern Tepoztlán, and, in passing, pointedly questions Cook and Simpson's hypothesis about colonial population numbers in this district.

¹⁷ A formal statement was made by Julian Steward, "Some Limitations of Anthropological Community Studies," American Anthropological Association Meeting, 1948. Robert Bierstedt, "The limitations of anthropological methods in sociology," *American Sociological Review*, LIV (1948), 22-30. These are samples of critiques, brought into the open by *Heritage of Conquest*.

¹⁸ p. xxi. See especially remarks by Kirchhoff and Jiménez Moreno in *Heritage*.

Appropriately, Lewis devotes much space to agriculture and agrarian matters, which shed important new light on the local meaning of the *ejido* program, as well as on relationships between the two systems of agriculture, tillage and *milpa*. Lewis finds, for instance, that possession of village lands by Tepoztlán rather than a cohesive force is one of the most fecund sources of discord.

One of the most significant chapters in this part deals with the class and social structure, in which wealth differences and levels of living among four thousand Tepoztecan are worked out in detail by use of an ingenious scheme. The very wide ranges of economic status and their relatively independent relations to social prestige and degree of acculturation are highlights; whether rich or poor, for instance, older people in Tepoztlán wear sandals or go barefoot, and whether rich or poor, younger people wear shoes. The rapid decrease of Nahuatl as usual speech under the impact of educational programs and other national movements is noted, and important findings show the villagers' political and economic relations to the state and the nation. Unlike Redfield, Lewis finds that local politics is a serious concern, with real meaning to the people. Chapter X summarizes these political matters and is in large part a political history of the village from Díaz' time to 1946. The final chapter of Part I, on religion and the church, tends to be a catch-all; it seems to fall below the standard of its predecessors, though here and earlier some interesting material on Sinarquism is included.

Apart from the laudable and partially successful attempt to relate these local materials to broader ones, Lewis is treading fairly well-worn conceptual ground in Part I. He synthesizes an enormous body of factual material, well organized and capable of being compared with results from other communities. When placed against Redfield's pioneer monograph on the same village, Lewis' is seen to be far richer in ideas and data, but when aligned with other recent community studies by Beals, Foster, and Brand, it emerges as just a little better than par. That does not detract from Lewis' achievement, as the course is now more difficult and standards higher than in the pioneering days.

It is in Part II, "The People" and in his summary chapter that Lewis makes new and significant contributions, especially for the general reader. He plunges headlong into problems ducked or overlooked by other community-studiers who have tended to avoid much concern with the psychological aspects of the gathered facts they have been collecting for decades, and have similarly been loath or unable to probe the relationships of the individual villagers to the cultural pressures operating on them.

One of the immediate results of Lewis' dive into the tangle of personality-culture problems is to point up the utter neglect of all but a handful of literary figures to try any summation of Mexican national character and characteristic traits to form a psychologically true general portrait within which localized findings from places like Tepoztlán can be set and analyzed. Recently Mexicans themselves have shown some interest in this critical problem; a valuable summary has appeared by José E. Iturriaga,¹⁹ and it has just been announced that under Leopoldo Zea there is being created a "Centro de Estudios sobre Lo Mexicano" as a step toward building a general view on a more substantial foundation than the superficial statements of subjective nationals and emotional foreigners.²⁰ A second general result of Lewis' new departures is to damage quite seriously the *cliché* that village life is emotionally and morally more satisfactory than city life. As this has wide implications, it is touched on again below.

Two techniques are chiefly responsible for these new and impressive "inside views" of villagers who are transferred from the realm of statistical abstractions to human beings with hopes, fears, attitudes, and tendencies of which they are themselves often unaware but which emerge under skillful psychological investigation. One is application of Rorschach psychological tests, which have long ago been validated for cross-cultural use, and the other is intensive analysis of family (rather than individual) case histories. On historically and methodologically sounder ground, Lewis' emphasis on the family unit rather than the *barrio* used by Redfield yields meaningful material. Under Lewis' eye the life cycle from womb to tomb, nearly always touched on by other observers, becomes more than a catalogue of rites and ceremonies. It broadens into descriptions and evaluation of the learning process and maturation. The reader gets some sense of what it means to grow up in Tepoztlán.

The generalized findings and their implications are summed up in a chapter entitled "General observations on the Life Cycle" which also serves as a sounding-board for a number of *ex parte* remarks on the whole "culture-personality problem." Its technical importance is a distinction that Lewis makes between "private personality"—the Walter Mitty as the rebel and hero of a thousand secret adventures—and external or "public personality," the demanded conformity to cultural

¹⁹ José E. Iturriaga, *La Estructura social y cultural de México*, Nacional Financiera, *Estructura Económica y Social de México*, II (Fondo de Cultura Económica, Mexico-Buenos Aires, 1951), especially pp. 225-244, citing considerable relevant literature; *Heritage*, pp. 193-222.

²⁰ *Tiempo: Semanario de la vida y la verdad* (Mexico), XX, No. 505 (4 de enero, 1952), 56.

norms. Cautiously, Lewis remains clear of attempting to predicate a "basic personality" structure and other devices that have become popular by those attempting to cross-breed psychology and anthropology. What he has done is to demonstrate effectively and without cavil that within range of these techniques are important aspects of hitherto hidden village life, and thus he has added a new dimension to the already many-sided community study. Among community studies, *Tepoztlán Restudied* stands unique for its massing and interweaving of psychological information against a cultural panorama.

IV

The heart of many matters is exposed in Lewis' final "Summary and Conclusions." As it takes the author himself a full chapter to epitomize them, any summary will unduly distort them. The main topic is a comparison between Redfield's earlier monograph and Lewis' work, one that has sufficiently wide implications to merit brief notice here.

By his restudy, Lewis has devastated some fondly cherished views, not only of Redfield, but of many others. One is the tacit assumption among anthropologists that all field reports are born equal, and therefore the problem of assessing relative reliability does not exist. Although some skepticism among co-workers increasingly troubled by anthropology's extension of its techniques to new fields has been expressed, general feeling in the guild remains that by some process of apotheosis all subjectivism disappears when a report sees print. It should be unnecessary perhaps to stress that community studies, like the famous reports of 1579-1580 in answer to Philip II's questionnaires, are fallible historical documents, and should be used with all the critical wariness a professional historian employs for any source. Lewis' discussion blows the whistle on those who would and did (in the case of Stuart Chase²¹) borrow and generalize Redfield's view of Tepoztlán as it was in 1926.

That had a Rousseau-like simplicity that was not true even then. Redfield was forced to terminate his work there because of general flare-ups and little of the seamy side of life appeared in his subsequent monograph. It was unconcerned about violence, economic difficulties, personal problems of villagers but pictured Tepoztlán as essentially a homogeneous, relatively happy little world of peasants who occasionally played at politics but had little of the insecurity of Middletown, U. S. A. As was common in Mexican and American intellectual circles of the time, Redfield's stress fell on the communal aspects of life as a partial explanation of the idyll; this unconscious romanticism echoed the sloganeering of the era about the nature of the Indian, views which are

²¹ Stuart Chase, *Mexico: a Study of Two Americas* (New York, 1931).

still, unfortunately, at the base of much writing about Mexico and, more important, of official policy formation.

On the basis of a great deal more field experience and perhaps ten to fifteen times as much information, Lewis paints a view of Tepoztlán that bears small relation to the Redfield village. Lewis' summary of Tepoztlán "would emphasize the underlying individualism of Tepoztecán institutions and character, the lack of coöperation, the tensions between villages within the *municipio*, the schisms within the village, and the pervading quality of fear, envy, and distrust in interpersonal relations."²² Lest it be thought that Dr. Lewis is a misanthropic young observer, his views can be paralleled by Foster in an analogous community at some distance in space and with a different background from that of Tepoztlán. Writing of Tzintzuntzan in 1948, Foster sums up, "The collectivist aspects of rural and Indian communities have been stressed in many studies of Mexico, and much recent government planning, such as the development of *ejidos*, has been predicated on the assumption that this is a dominating characteristic of rural peoples. In Tzintzuntzan one is struck, not with collectivistic but rather with the strong tradition of individualistic attitudes . . . *egotismo* or 'every man for himself' philosophy. . . . Mistrust, suspicion, and fear are the common reactions . . . it is assumed that the other person is trying to get the better of one; hence one must keep oneself adequately covered, trying if possible to outmaneuver the other. . . . Visible success stimulates rancor and ill-feeling in one's neighbors. . . ."²³

The cumulative effect of these findings by serious investigators who stay with their communities over long periods provides the ground for historians writing about Mexico to reëxamine interpretations of Mexican history favored by Gruening, Parkes, Tannenbaum, and others whose slant is based on a now dubious view of how rural Mexicans actually feel and react. Though far from perfect and complete, these and similar field findings make possible some assessment of the current governmental swing away from policies dominating the "Roaring Thirties." If it does nothing else, Lewis' restudy confirms for other social scientists a fact long familiar to historians, that even the most "scientific" of writings in any period reflect to a larger or smaller degree the general climate of opinion in which they are produced. No one can deny that the United States and Mexico of Coolidge and Calles' time differ considerably from those of the Fair Deal and the Institutionalized Revolution, intellectually as well as physically. Because the issue is basic, it is worth following a little further some of the discrepancies be-

²² p. 429. Cf. *Heritage*, pp. 31-39, 60-62, *et passim*.

²³ Foster, *Empire's Children*, pp. 297-288. (See bibliography, Item 20.)

tween Redfield's account and Lewis' conclusions twenty-five years later.

A partial list of such divergences includes quite a roster of matters on which there is a clash about factual matters, as well as emphasis. Opposed views are found on the role of land, collective labor, cultural florescence under Díaz, effects of the Revolution on class structure and other social institutions, importance of crime, participation in local politics, and above all, division of the village into two socio-cultural groups, the *correctos* and the *tontos*.²⁴ This reported dichotomy had wide repercussions within the field of Mexican community studies and was diffused widely outside it. Briefly, Redfield implied that in Tepoztlán the *correctos*, few in number, were the self-conscious bearers of change, as they were imbued with city-ways and ideas of "progress" that would ultimately destroy the folk-culture, whose protagonists were the *tontos*. Within the village, this silent but dramatic struggle was being carried on between the majority of peasants on the one side and forces of civilization (urbanization) symbolized by the *correctos* on the other. No other field worker has found a similar situation where villagers categorize themselves in these terms.²⁵

Some of the high drama of the exciting struggle in Tepoztlán is deflated by Lewis' careful analysis of what the terms meant and mean to Tepoztecans. Once cleared of semantic ambiguity they are seen to be quite different from what Redfield believed. Lewis states that "The use of the terms *tonto* and *correcto* to designate social groups which did not and do not exist and operate as such makes much of Redfield's analysis of Tepoztecan society oversimplified, schematic, and unreal. . . . While Redfield's concept would tend to make for two cultures (urban and folk) we see Tepoztlán as a single culture, with more or less acculturated individuals in close and frequent contact, each influencing the other, as they have done for the past four hundred years."²⁶

This denial, or at least overt criticism, of Redfield's main thesis has importance beyond a localized difference of opinion between master and pupil. It reaches out to touch a whole way of accounting for Mexican social dynamics, past, present, and future. What Lewis has done is to level critical fire at what is technically known as the "folk culture and folk-urban continuum" as a scheme to guide the selection, emphasis,

²⁴ Redfield, *Tepoztlán*, pp. 68-69, 218-23, *et passim*.

²⁵ In the mountain Chinantec community of San Pedro Yolox I found (1943) the *solteros'* guild subdivided into *inteligentes* and *ignorantes*, and assigned corresponding duties by the municipal authorities. This division, however, is along the lines given by Lewis for the Tepoztlán situation as it really exists: "Within any one family, some of the members may be considered *tonto* and others *correcto*, depending almost entirely upon personality traits and manners" (*op. cit.*, p. 430), *cf. Heritage*, p. 96.

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 431.

and interpretation of materials bearing on Mexican social change. Summarized, this view holds that there is an "urban" type society at one pole and at the other primitive "tribal" society; urban ways, diffusing outward, come in conflict and penetrate "tribal" ways, with a resultant intermediate "folk culture" in which one or the other are found in varying amounts. The central problem thus posed for investigators is to learn how urban ways affect these folk and tribal societies; tacitly assumed is the ability to create a sort of scale, as in the Yucatan Project, to determine how far urbanization has penetrated and what its effects have been.²⁷ This scheme is a complicated sociological statement of the "urban *vs.* rural" forces and interactions that underlie much historical and sociological analysis not only of Mexico but of general history.

On the basis of his work in Tepoztlán, Lewis lists six main points of weakness in this general conceptual scheme, and discusses each in detail. Summarily his arguments run that the "folk-urban continuum" fails as a satisfactory device in accounting for changes because in the first place it focusses attention primarily on the city and outside influences as major sources of change, to the disregard of nearly all others, Folk societies not only influence each other in many ways, but internal urges to alter their ways exist; these are ignored in the Redfield scheme. Further, significant changes do not move communities up and down a scale of more or less rural; introduction of the Spanish plow, oxen, new food plants merely diversified a rural community even though it changed profoundly. As part of the dogma of the "folk-urban continuum" are certain imputed traits of each, among them that interpersonal relations in cities are more impersonal than in rural communities; the bigger the place, the more impersonal are relations. This has not been borne out by field work in Mexico and Guatemala, where villages and hamlets often demand more impersonality than do city areas.²⁸ This means that variables which Redfield assumed to be interdependent are in fact independent; size does not correlate with types of interpersonal relations.

²⁷ See Notes 9, 11, also Redfield, "The Folk Society and Culture," Lewis Wirth, ed., *Eleven Twenty-Six* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1940), and his "The Folk Society," *American Journal of Sociology*, LII (Jan., 1947), 292-308.

²⁸ For example, Sol Tax, "Culture and Civilization in Guatemalan Societies," *Scientific Monthly*, XLVIII (May, 1939), 463-467, "the Indians of Guatemala, far from resembling Redfield's typical *folk* culture, actually fit the criteria by which a city-type is judged" (p. 466); Oliver Ricketson, Jr., "Municipal Organization of an Indian Township in Guatemala," *Geographical Review*, XXIX (Oct., 1939), 643-647. For a critique of the Redfield scheme in general and for African data in particular, see M. J. Herskovits, *Man and his works* (N. Y., 1947), pp. 605 ff. Recent literature on this matter is cited by Lewis (*op. cit.*, pp. 431-438). *Heritage* underlines the simple nature of the scheme, and points toward a new historico-social synthesis of concept.

To Lewis' mind (and his belief is now shared by many) the most serious drawback to the use of "folk" *vs.* "urban" concept as the major tool of analysis is twofold: It implicitly denies the one primary induction of anthropology, and it has as its base a subjective but unvoiced value system of debatable nature. The sum of anthropological work by moderns has indicated beyond question that groups and individuals adjust in a wide range of surprisingly numerous ways; the nineteenth century evolutionist's pre-occupation with "stages" breaks down because combinations of usages and degrees of sophistication termed "primitive" turn up all over, and in some instances "primitive societies" have "advanced" or extremely complex institutions. Again what have been thought or assumed to be interdependent traits and variables have been slowly revealed to be independent. Further, the "urban-folk" dichotomy lumps together "cities" as disparate as ancient Babylon, Rome, New York and Buenos Aires, and similarly stresses the few likenesses among "folk" groups to the exclusion of their more important divergences from one another. As a practical matter, adherence to the "folk-urban" division narrows fieldwork to problems concerned with the formal, outward aspects of culture, to the detriment of rounded coverage, especially any ventures into the psychological realms, now within the grasp of tested techniques.

The minute one does venture there, as Lewis did, it becomes immediately apparent that followers of the "urban *vs.* folk" school are on fairly shaky ground, and that their stress tends to reflect a conscious or unconscious bias. In the European tradition, especially voiced by Spengler in one area, and numerous sociologists in others, "city" and "bad" become equated, while "rural" and "good" become inextricably bound. In the setting up of criteria, city-dwellers are almost by definition unintegrated personalities, neurotic, troubled, and frustrated, while the "folk" are endowed with calm, order, faith, confidence, security and other widely sought virtues.

To the historical eye, the "folk" of today seems remarkably like his ancestor, the Noble Savage of yesteryear. The ancient struggle between Las Casas and Sepúlveda is refought in learned journals, with "scientific" jargon clothing the hoary arguments that civilization (carried by urbanites nowadays) is bent on a latter-day destruction. Somehow, lack of plumbing becomes the sign of a superior moral order—until the men with the Rorschach tests come along. As Sherwood Anderson pointed out in the literary sphere for Americans many years ago, petty meanness and cramped souls, the corrosion of envy, fear, and malice are also part and parcel of small-town life. After the job performed by Lewis (Oscar, not Sinclair), *Tepoztlán Restudied* turns out

to be more like Winesburg, Ohio, than the antithesis of Middletown, U. S. A.

As a sort of exercise, Lewis analyzes Tepoztlán in terms of the Redfield scheme, just blasted, but soon he turns to what he apparently believes the proper way to do this job—"in terms of concrete historical occurrences and their patterns." The changes and growth of Tepoztlán are recapitulated in three historical periods from which flow some inductions; they might even be called historical generalizations of some importance. Like many another who has essayed historical analysis, Lewis finds that "it is apparent that there is no single formula which will explain the whole range of phenomena."

Historians of Mexico might smugly agree, were it not for the fact that one of the clearest lessons from Lewis' work is that they as a body have failed in their primary mission. Recent community-studiers, chiefly anthropologists, sociologists, geographers, and few misplaced natural scientists, have had to turn historian through default of the professionals to provide vital and up-to-date information and a tested interpretative synthesis. Recent community studies indicate that their makers have learned that field-work is only part of the chore; to get at major questions (traditionally a main concern of historians)—what occurred? why and how has change taken place? what does it mean?—they now must hie themselves to the library, even archives, to extract data for a base-line.²⁹

The often floundering and amateur efforts of community-studiers to provide themselves with historical lore has produced professionally unacceptable history. But the fact that they must enter the field unequipped by the long training required to handle the complex problems of historiography points up the lamentable fact that the historical guild has been slow to provide the answers a wide range of workers now need. When one moves forward from Bancroft, published in pre-Porfirian days, pickings become rather slim; the works not avowedly polemic or partisan are few and by workmen whose training for the most part lay outside history. Fortunately for all concerned, Harry Bernstein's recently published volume,³⁰ while by no means complete, points the way

²⁹ One of the salient motifs in the Viking Seminar was the need for more and proper historical treatments of places and times; again and again discussions would terminate something like this "Wisdom: 'What is the basis for this artificial division of labor?' Tax: 'Historical reasons? We come to a point where we don't explain.'" (*Heritage*, p. 75), "Beals: '... I think we would have to review the historical data, such as royal instructions on the formation of Indian towns.'"

³⁰ Harry Bernstein, *Modern and Contemporary Latin America* (1952). See bibliographical item 37. See also Item 31. With all its excellencies, the Bernstein work is less than clear on differences between the larger sections of Mexico, regions and sub-

to the kind of historical synthesis anthropologists and sociologists have been trying to write for themselves to meet their immediate and *ad hoc* needs.

As has become stylish in such studies, Lewis summarizes the implications of all his work for "administrators, social scientists, and others concerned with the problem of improving life in communities like Tepoztlán." By extension, this means the "under-developed areas" of the globe embraced by variations of Point IV plans. Lewis affirms that their problems are not industrial ones, but are distinct and numerous: limited agricultural resources, backward technology, low productivity, with consequent poverty and barely minimum material standards. Somewhat darkly, he states "it is difficult to see how the standards of living can be raised in such an environment" and sees emigration to cities as a chief safety-valve for Tepoztecs. Historically, the Tepoztecs have learned to live with and disregard their problems rather than to solve them; as problems increase, the chief result seems to be an increase of individual frustrations rather than any sort of affirmative group response. Lewis notes that in recent years some of the more superficial aspects of modernity have wormed their way into local life—juke-boxes and Coca-Cola, for instance—but he ends his long volume with a rhetorical query: "Can western civilization offer them no more?" A tough-minded Yankee counterquestion might raise blood-pressure throughout the hemisphere by asking "Why should it?"

Reviewers within the ranks of anthropology and sociology have been greatly and favorably impressed by the Lewis' book, justifiably so. It is honest, sincere, and able. It not only provides food for those with an insatiable appetite for facts, but what is more unusual and valuable, fare for thought and debate about fundamental matters. It is perhaps as significant for future community studies as Redfield's original *Tepoztlán* was in 1930.

V

Even casual inspection makes it clear that the extant Mexican community studies, collectively considered, are not a microcosm of the Mexican macrocosm. Further analysis reveals that if they formed the sole basis for generalizations about Mexico, a fairly distorted view might well result. The total population covered by community studies is almost infinitesimal, a few thousands out of 25 millions; selections of

regions within them, and localisms of varying size. In a forthcoming volume I have expounded at some length on a division of Mexico into the Core, South, West, and North, appropriately subdivided; at the moment there is no universally accepted division. See Whetten, *Rural Mexico*, pp. 18-20, for the five "regions" customarily employed for compilation of statistics.

these samples, where not haphazard, have been badly skewed in numerous ways. This is less the result of deliberate efforts to mislead than the incidence of chance in the evolution of community studies.

In areal coverage, for instance, the predilection for certain areas and states has not been guided by the weight they represent in the total Mexican scene, with the result that important imbalances are apparent. The fairly lightly populated Maya areas of Yucatan, Quintana Roo, and Chiapas account for about 40% of the communities limned; a restricted area of Oaxaca represents a quarter, with the Tarascans of Michoacán and the Aztecs of the Mesa getting almost equal coverage, though the latter are ten times as numerous as the former.

The important gaps are immediately evident to the student familiar with Mexico. The heart of the country, the area immediately surrounding Mexico City north to the Bajío, south to Tehuacán and down the Veracruz corridor, is represented by dated studies by Gamio (1922), Redfield (1930) and the work under review. Though marginal areas are overrepresented, some important secondary cultural and economic provinces are almost untouched. The North, stretching from Zacatecas north to the border, half of Mexico, is utterly neglected; the second main area of Mexico, integrated around Guadalajara, has been sampled only by one minor study made by Taylor to round out his main project involving Mexican emigrants in the industrial areas of the United States. Conversely stated, we have studies of a number of marginal communities in marginal areas, but few and skimpy ones (except the Lewis volume) for main theatres of Mexican life, village or otherwise. As part of the same syndrome, it may be noted that emphasis on the Indian and Indian-like places has but little statistical justification. Less than 7.5 per cent of the Mexican population is monolingual in native tongues, and less than 15 per cent retain any use of idioms; samplings of the majority, the 85 per cent who customarily and exclusively speak *only* Spanish, are conspicuous by their absence in community studies to recent date.

This sort of discrepancy between Mexico as a whole and Mexico studied in terms of communities reappears when one examines the size and function of places investigated. There is a semantic murk around the term "community," but (leaving that aside for the moment) it is clear that there is a marked preference for particular ranges of size, rather than samplings in accordance with the actual numbers and weights of population. Taking the completed and full-scale books and monographs that have come out since 1930 and aligning them against the way Mexicans group in communities of various size, we can see the situation.

The largest communities receive the least attention. One very skimpy study of Mérida, plus scattered notes through Redfield's *Folk-Culture* are about all we have. Covarrubias' sketches of Tehuantepec and Juchitán, in the 20,000 population class, are highly subjective and capricious; if these are eliminated from consideration and attention concentrated on the professionals' selections available in printed form it is seen that so far we have a view of 0.00017% of Mexico, disproportionately narrowed to towns and villages.

RELATION OF COMMUNITIES STUDIED TO POPULATION DISTRIBUTION

Approximate category		Size		Communities			Population* Mexico	
		Min.	Max.	Mexico	Percent	Studies		
CITIES	Large.....	50,000 or more		13	0.0	0	2,674.8	13.6%
	Medium....	25,000	50,000	18	0.0	0	624.9	3.2
	Small.....	10,000	25,000	66	0.0	0	1,008.5	5.1
TOWNS	Large.....	5,000	10,000	165	0.1%	2—13.3%	1,101.8	5.6
	Small.....	2,500	5,000	438	0.4	5—33.4	1,486.6	7.6
VILLAGES	Large.....	1,000	2,500	1,988	1.9	2—13.3	2,976.0	15.1
	Small.....	100	1,000	26,821	25.5	6—40.0	7,777.0	39.6
HAMLETS	Large.....	50	100	13,623	13.0	0	972.8	5.0
	Small.....	10	50	35,156	32.5	0	865.0	4.4
ISOLATED.....		less than 10		26,897	25.6	0	166.0	0.8
TOTALS.....				105,185	99.0%	15—100%	19,653.4	100%

*Thousands of people living in this size community. Based on 1940 Census data. Arbitrary limits have been set for "Approximate category."

If one could hazard some predictions from unsystematic but interested observation of Mexico, it could be prophesied that samples taken from the Bajío, northern Mexico, and the Pacific and Atlantic coastal strips would show significant divergences from the regions already tested. Real illumination and valid bases for generalizing about historical and cultural changes and their tendencies would accrue from the addition of regional to community studies. To be concrete, if soundings were taken within the cultural and economic bailiwicks of the local metropoli like Monterrey, Torreón, Guadalajara, Puebla, and Veracruz, subjecting them to investigation too, the dynamics of modern Mexico would be more clearly visible. Sub-regions where modern community studies exist (Morelia in Michoacán, for instance) need examination and the whole array of materials needs to be woven into some sort

of geographical-historical framework adumbrated by West, Stanislawski, and Brand, and by the Viking Seminar group.

Due to the efforts of the collective body of community-studiers, the present and future historian of Mexico has at hand a new range of sources of considerable merit. Though they argue among themselves about which information is important, the investigators of communities are skilled and professional observers who tell us a great deal about how local governments actually operate, what the *ejido* means to people who have one or want one, how the official "government party" performs at the grass-roots level, what the real appeals and drawbacks of Sinarquism and Protestantism are, why the *compadre* relationship cements economic and political institutions, what the position of the priest and church really is, and a long catalogue of other matters on which reliable testimony is often unavailable. As suggested, these blocks of data make excellent brakes for unchecked generalizations based on official documents or sheer intuition.³¹

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF MODERN MEXICAN COMMUNITY STUDIES, 1922-1952

(Arranged chronologically)

1. Robert Redfield, *Tepoztlán, A Mexican Village: a Study of Folk Life*. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1930.)

A pioneering sketch of a Nahuatl-speaking community in Morelos, and prototype of subsequent investigations.

2. Paul S. Taylor, *A Spanish-Mexican Peasant Community: Arandas in Jalisco, Mexico*. [Ibero-Americana: 4.] (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1933.)

An historical-contemporary sketch of a section of Mexico where peasant proprietorship and emigration to the United States are characteristic; Arandas was selected "as generally representative of the larger region. . . ."

3. Robert Redfield and Alfonso Villa R., *Chan Kom, a Maya village*. [Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication 448.] (Washington, 1934.)

First of four projected monographs on Yucatecan communities sponsored under the more general Yucatan Project and the only detailed study of a single community to emerge; Chan Kom is purportedly representative of peasant or "folk" villages, as distinct from tribal, town, and city communities. See also item 22.

³¹ It seems easier for the non-professional to know what is "Indian" than for the anthropologist; one of the main points of discussion in the Seminar was the criteria which mark Indians off from *ladinos*, mestizos, *criollos*, rural nationals, villagers in former Indian areas and the like. A considerable and inconclusive debate about the "ethos" of the Indian revealed that the bases for any major generalizations simply do not yet exist.

4. G. Russell Steininger and Paul van de Velde, *Three Dollars a Year, being the story of San Pablo Cuatro Venados, a typical Zapotecan Indian village, that hangs on a slope of the Sierras in southwestern Mexico*. (New York, Delphic Studios, 1935.)

A semi-popular treatment of a Valley Zapotec community near Oaxaca City which stresses daily life in the community and which contains useful documentary appendices. The authors were respectively an enlightened amateur anthropologist interested in Oaxaca and a journalistically inclined landscape architect who was especially concerned with folklore, herbs, and witchcraft. Lively and significant, this little volume has been grossly neglected.

5. Elsie Clews Parsons, *Milla, Town of the Souls, and other Zapotecan-Speaking pueblos of Oaxaca, Mexico*. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, August, 1936.)

A bulky, somewhat disorganized but classic ethnological sketch by a professional with long field experience in the American Southwest. She tries to throw light on "how the substitution of Spanish for Indian was made, if made at all. Such substitution is an outstanding problem throughout Latin America; to the historian of the post-Conquest period perhaps the paramount problem."

6. Robert Redfield, *The Folk Culture of Yucatan*. [University of Chicago Publications in Anthropology, Social Anthropology Series, I.] (Chicago, 1941.)

The summary volume resulting from the community studies carried on under auspices of the Carnegie Institution of Washington in Yucatan. Using findings of his own, as well as those of Asael Hansen and Alfonso Villa, Redfield has "attempted to do two things at once: to summarize a great many particular facts about a particular people at a certain time and also to declare or suggest some general notions about the nature of society and culture . . . the volume tries to be both a report and a book." (p. ix.)

7. George M. Foster, *A Primitive Mexican Economy*. [American Ethnological Society, *Monographs*, V, Centennial Anniversary Publication.] (New York, J. J. Augustin, 1942.)

Doctoral dissertation at the University of California (1941) which attempts "to bring together the discipline of economics and ethnology" by "an analysis of the economy of one group of people, that of the Popoluca Indians of southern Veracruz, in Mexico." The major part of the field work was carried on in Soteapan, one of three branches of Popolucas, whose dialects are almost mutually unintelligible. Concludes that "A sojourn in a Popoluca village leaves one with the impression that these people have made a satisfactory and essentially logical adjustment to the environment in which they live. . . . Deeper insight makes it clear that the basic economic processes and the underlying motivations are not so very different from those of the modern machine age."

8. Alfonso Villa R., *The Maya of East Central Quintana Roo*. [Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication 559.] (Washington, 1945.)

Belated appearance of a monograph describing the "tribal unit" of the Yucatan Project, involving Maya who revolted in the Caste War (1847). Though closed to Yucatecan influences, these peoples have long been in contact with British Honduras, which vitiates some of the basic thesis of the project. The volume also contains texts and documents, and a long article by H. F. Cline, "Remarks on a selected bibliography of the Caste War and allied topics," a guide to the historical sources of nineteenth-century Yucatan.

9. Ralph L. Beals, *Ethnology of the Western Mixe*. [University of California, Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, XLII, No. 1.] (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1945.)

Belated publication of a study which circumstances circumscribed to Ayutla. An important view of the operation and power of a local *cacique*. Notes that "the cohesion of Mixe society is extremely tenuous and rests almost wholly on the prestige of the political and ceremonial office holding system and on the ceremonial life itself." Has a critique of Schmieder's paper (Item 47 below), *The settlements of the Tzapotec and Mije Indians* (1930).

10. Miguel Covarrubias, *Mexico South: The Isthmus of Tehuantepec*. (New York, Knopf, 1946.)

A large, beautiful book which combines travel notes, archeological musings, and history by an artist. Sketches of the Veracruz communities draw heavily on Foster's work, but Part II, "The Pacific Plains" center on Tehuantepec and Juchitán. Assertions about prehistory and archeology are suspect, but an attempt has been made to set the contemporary peoples in their historic and areal contexts. Important drawings and photographs.

11. Ralph L. Beals, *Cherán: a Sierra Tarascan Village*. [Smithsonian Institution, Institute of Social Anthropology, Publication II.] (Washington, G. P. O., 1946.)

First of the full-scale community studies of the Tarascan area fostered by the Institute of Social Anthropology as extension of earlier Mexican-American collaborative investigations. A geographical-social study of an "Indian" place, "primarily a cross section of the culture of the community at the time of study without any effort to interpret its historical development."

12. Fernando Cámara Barbachano, "Monografía sobre los Tzeltales de Tenejapa." University of Chicago, Microfilm collection of Manuscripts on Middle-American Cultural Anthropology, First Series (June, 1946), No. 5.

Original field notes, roughly ordered by their author.

13. Fernando Cámara Barbachano, "Monografía de los Tzotziles de San Miguel Mitonix." University of Chicago, Microfilm collection of Manuscripts on Middle-American Cultural Anthropology, First Series (June, 1946), No. 6.

Index; rough field notes.

14. Alfonso Villa Rojas, "Notas sobre la etnografía de los Indios Tzeltales de Oxchuc." University of Chicago, Microfilm collection of Manuscripts on Middle-American Cultural Anthropology, First Series (June, 1946), No. 7.

Original field notes, roughly ordered by the author, with index.

15. Calixta Guiteras Holmes, "Informe de Cancuc." University of Chicago, Microfilm collection of Manuscripts on Middle-American Cultural Anthropology, First Series (June, 1946), No. 8.

Original field notes, organized and retyped by their author; indexed.

16. Calixta Guiteras Holmes, "Informe de San Pedro Chenalhó." University of Chicago, Microfilm collection of Manuscripts on Middle-American Cultural Anthropology, Second Series (November 1946), No. 14.

Retyped and indexed field notes.

17. José Corona Núñez, *Estudio antropogeográfico del municipio de Cuiztzo del Porvenir, Michoacán, México*. Acta Antropológica, II, No. 1. [Publicada por la Sociedad de Alumnos de la Escuela Nacional de Antropología e Historia]. (Mexico City, 1946.)

A survey of the *cabecera*, its six attached towns and hamlets, and twenty-five ranchos, with useful historical materials. A fairly superficial summary.

18. Ricardo Pozas Arciniega, "Monografía de Chamula." University of Chicago, Microfilm collection of Manuscripts on Middle-American Social Anthropology, Third Series (December 1947), No. 15.

Organized and retyped original field notes, with index.

19. Fernando Cámara Barbachano, ed., "Notas sobre Zinacantán, Chiapas." University of Chicago, Microfilm collection of Manuscripts on Middle-American Social Anthropology, Third Series (December 1947), No. 20.

Various rough field notes of members of a joint expedition, entitled "Primera Parte: Capítulos sobre la organización religiosa-política."

20. George M. Foster, assisted by Gabriel Ospina, *Empire's Children: The People of Tzintzuntzán*. [Smithsonian Institution, Institute of Social Anthropology, Publication IV.] (Mexico, Nuevo Mundo, S. A., 1948.)

"One of a series of monographs describing the results of the joint field studies of the Institute of Social Anthropology and the Escuela Nacional de Antropología of Mexico in the Tarascan area of Michoacán, 1945-46." A full-scale treatment of this ancient place and its connected communities in which the author has tried "to describe life in Tzintzuntzán as a functional whole, the end product of a period of more than four hundred centuries of change, starting from a base which we know fairly completely." A combination technical report and book, of great utility for the general reader as well as the specialist.

21. Julio de la Fuente, *Yalalag: una villa zapoteca serrana*. [Museo Nacional de Antropología, Serie Científica, I.] (Mexico City, 1949.)

Belated but welcome publication of materials collected earlier by a Redfield-Tax protégé who also worked with Bronislaw Malinowski on an unpublished study of market systems in Oaxaca. This is the first full-blown community study by a Mexican investigator trained in modern techniques that has appeared in book form; it marks an important milestone in the development of social science research development in Mexico, as the volume meets high critical standards. Chiefly functional rather than developmental in emphasis and point of view.

22. Robert Redfield, *A Village that Chose Progress: Chan Kom Revisited*. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1950.)

See review in THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XXX (Nov. 1950), 521-25 (H. F. Cline.) A notable shift of theoretical views and approach occurs in this follow-up.

23. Donald Brand, assisted by José Corona Núñez, *Quiroga: a Mexican Municipio*. [Smithsonian Institution, Institute of Social Anthropology, Publication XI.] (Washington, G. P. O., 1951.)

See review in THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XXXI (Nov. 1951), 665-67 (Marvin D. Bernstein). Only published section of a completed three-volume study started in 1939 and merged with the Institute of Social Anthropology's Tarascan Programs. Parts I and II will deal with the physical setting and historical development, which presumably will include the promised bibliographic essays, history of research, and maps. This published section (III) deals with "Modern Quiroga." The goal of the whole investigation was "to amass sufficient information to describe a Mexican town and municipality . . . so that people in other Mexican towns and in foreign lands might know how this community made a living, what the people were like . . . and the dozens of other items that make up the life and actuality of a community or people. A part of the goal was the determination and description of how a pagan Tarascan village had become converted into a Christian Spanish-speaking mestizo town. . . . We have endeavored to stress those elements most commonly neglected or slighted by geographers, anthropologists, and sociologists." Brand notes that "Owing to limitation of appropriations, it is probable that the other two parts of the English edition of this work will be published through a non-governmental medium."

24. Oscar Lewis, *Life in a Mexican Village: Tepoztlán Restudied*. (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1951.)

See foregoing review.

MARGINAL COMMUNITY STUDIES

25. Manuel Gamio, ed., *La población del Valle de Teotihuacán: El medio que se ha desarrollado, su evolución étnica y social*. (2 vols. in 3, Mexico City, Secretaría de Agricultura y Fomento, Dirección de Antropología, 1922.)

A series of related monographs which stands as a monumental but isolated Mexican effort to combine regional and community studies from various disciplinary points of view. Unfortunately to date it has found few emulators.

26. Paul S. Taylor, *An American-Mexican Frontier: A Study of Nueces County, Texas*. (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1934.)

A parallel study to Arandas (No. 2 above), but properly belonging to the enormous literature on Mexicans in the United States.

27. Edward H. Spicer, *Pascua: A Yaqui Village in Arizona*. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1940.)

A Redfield-directed study involving three cultures. For a long time this was about the only monograph which described adequately the *compadre* system, of even greater concern in Mexico proper.

SELECTED RELATED WORKS, 1923-1952

General

28. George M. McBride, *The Land Systems of Mexico*. [American Geographical Society, Research Series, XII.] (New York, 1923.)
Translated by Hernán Laborde and Teodoro Ortiz in *Problemas agrícolas e industriales de México*, III, No. 3 (jul.-sept., 1951), 11-114.
29. Herbert I. Priestley, *The Mexican Nation*. (New York, 1923.)
A now out-dated text on Mexican history. Most recent ed. 1938.
30. Eyler N. Simpson, *The Ejido: Mexico's Way Out*. (Chapel Hill, 1937.)
A classic summary of land and community developments to about 1935.
31. Henry B. Parkes, *A History of Mexico*. (Rev. ed., Boston, 1950).
See THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XXXI (Aug. 1951), 476-77, which notes "there is scant evidence of any revaluation of Mexican history in the light of the developments of the thirteen years since the earlier edition appeared." Cf. *ibid.*, XIX (Aug. 1939), 334-337, review by H. I. Priestley.
32. Carlos Basauri, *La población indígena de México*. [Secretaría de Educación Pública.] (3 vols., México City, 1940.)
Summary of monographic materials to date, plus some original studies of places and tribes. Useful bibliographies. Arranged regionally.
33. Preston James, *Latin America*. (New York, 1942. Rev. ed., 1950.)
A general geographic survey and text, in which chap. xx provides detail and bibliography on Mexico.
34. Robert S. Platt, *Latin America: Countrysides and United Regions*. (New York, 1943.)
A series of unit area studies.
35. Nathan L. Whetten, *Rural Mexico*. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1948.)
An encyclopedic work that summarizes data and much bibliography to about 1946.
36. Sol Tax and others, *Heritage of Conquest: The Ethnology of Middle America*. (Glencoe, Illinois, Free Press, January, 1952.)
See foregoing review. This reports the Viking Fund Seminar on Middle-American Ethnology and Social Anthropology. The formal papers are reproduced, as well as discussion from the floor of controversial points raised in each. A list of materials in this seminal and invaluable book follows:

Part I, General Information

Paul Kirchhoff, "Meso-America"

Robert Redfield and Sol Tax, "General characteristics of present-day Mesoamerican Indian society"

Part II, Aspects of Culture

Sol Tax, "Economy and Technology"

Julio de la Fuente, "Ethnic and communal relations"

Calixta Guiteras Holmes, "Social organization"

Charles Wisdom, "The supernatural world and curing"

Fernando Camara, "Religious and political organization"

Benjamin D. Paul and Lois Paul, "The Life Cycle"

John Gillin, "Ethos and cultural aspects of personality"

Part III, Conclusions: the Old and the New

Ralph Beals, "Notes on acculturation"

Gertrude P. Kurath, "Dance acculturation"

"Four hundred years after" (group discussion).

"The Sixteenth century and the twentieth: a comparison of culture types and culture areas" (group discussion and synthesis).

"Summary for the Twenty-Ninth International Congress of Americanists (New York City, September 5, 1949).

37. Harry Bernstein, *Modern and Contemporary Latin America*. (Chicago, J. B. Lippincott, March 1952.)

As one of the few modern syntheses of Mexican history (pp. 3-158) by a professionally trained historian using cross-disciplinary methods, this summary fills a long-felt need and takes on added importance from its use of regional concepts and analysis. Here clothed with meaningful detail and abundant new materials is the view sketched by Bernstein in his provocative "Regionalism in the National History of Mexico," *Acta Americana*, II (1944), 305-314.

The Core Region (Southeastern Mesa-Veracruz Corridor)

38. A. Foster, "Orizaba: a Community in the Sierra Madre Oriental," *Economic Geography*, I (1925), 356-372.

39. Robert S. Platt, "Magdalena Atlipac: a Study of Terrene Occupancy in Mexico," Geographic Society of Chicago, *Bulletin*, IX (1933), 47-75.

A Valley of Mexico unit; reprinted in his *Latin America* (Item 34 above.)

40. S. N. Dicken, "The Basin Settlements of the Middle Sierra Madre Oriental, Mexico," Association of American Geographers, *Annals*, XXVI (1936), 157-78.

41. H. C. Lanks, "Otomí Indians of Mezquital Valley, Hidalgo," *Economic Geography*, XIV (1938), 184-94.

42. Norman S. Hayner, "Mexico City: Its Growth and Configuration," *American Journal of Sociology*, L (Jan., 1945), 295-304.

A sociological survey of the changing pattern.

43. Norman S. Hayner, "Criminogenic Zones in Mexico City," *American Sociological Review*, XI (August, 1946), 428-38.

Further detail on Item 42.

44. Joyce Jenkins, "San Gregorio: an Otomí Village of the Highlands of Hidalgo," *América Indígena*, VI (1946), 345-49.
 45. Julio de la Fuente, "Cambios socio-culturales en México," *Alumnos de la Escuela Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Acta Antropológica*, III, No. 4 (dic., 1948), 382-463.
- Part II, "Relaciones sociales en una ciudad de provincia" deals with Orizaba and Córdoba; Part III, "La civilización 'pocha' de México" concerns North-American cultural and social influences. Notes and bibliography.
46. Cándido Cruz López *et. al.*, "Estudio agrológico regional del estado de Tlaxcala," *Ministro de Recursos Hidráulicos, Ingeniería Hidráulica de México*, III (1949), 57-97, (No. 1) 44-96, (No. 3).
- A very detailed modern survey of physical and human elements.

The South (Oaxaca, Chiapas, Yucatan Peninsula)

47. Oscar Schmieder, *The settlements of the Tzapotec and Mije Indians, State of Oaxaca, Mexico*. [University of California, Publications in Geography, IV.] (Berkeley, 1930.)
- Valley of Oaxaca and the Mijeria. See critique in Beals, *Mize* (Item 9 above), pp. 129-131.
48. George C. Shattuck, ed., *The Peninsula of Yucatan: Medical, Biological, Meteorological, and Sociological Studies*. [Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication 431.] (Washington, 1933.)
 49. Asael T. Hansen, "The Ecology of a Latin-American city," E. B. Rueter, ed., *Race and Culture Contacts* (New York, 1934), pp. 124-142.
- A survey of Mérida, Yucatan. This is the only publication on the "city" unit of the Yucatan Project.
50. Alfonso Fabila, *Exploración económico-social del estado de Yucatán*. (Mexico City, Fondo de Cultura Económica, n.d., [1942].)
 51. Oswaldo Baqueiro Anduze, *La ciudad heroica: historia de Valladolid*. (Mérida, 1943.)
- Details on the "metropolis" of eastern Yucatan.
52. Morris Steggerda, "A description of Thirty Towns in Yucatan, Mexico," [Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, *Anthropological Papers*, 30, B. A. E. Bulletin 136] (Washington, G. P. O., 1943), pp. 227-248.
- Uneven travel, historical, anthropological data.
53. Norman S. Hayner, "Oaxaca: City of Old Mexico," *Sociology and Social Research*, XXIX (Nov.-Dec., 1944), 87-95.

Rather superficial sociological notes.

54. Kenneth Weathers, "La agricultura de los Tzotzil de Nabenchau, Chiapas," *América Indígena*, VI (1946), 315-319.
55. Julio de la Fuente, "Cambios socio-culturales en México" (See Item 45).
- Part I "Cambios raciales y culturales en un grupo indígena" deals with Villa Alta, Oaxaca.
56. Lucio Mendieta y Núñez *et al.*, *Los Zapotecos: una monografía histórica, etnográfica y económica*. [Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, U.N.A.M.] (Mexico City, 1950.)
57. Jorge Rivera Aceves, "Estudio geográfico económico del municipio de Oxtutzcab," *Los recursos naturales de Yucatán*, Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística, *Boletín*, LXIX, Núm. 3 (Mayo-junio, 1950), 355-377.
58. Jose Attolini, *Economía de la cuenca del Papaloapán*. [Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas.] (2 vols. to date, Mexico City, 1949, 1950.)

Survey of the large area of Veracruz, Oaxaca, Puebla, and Tlaxcala involved in the Papaloapán drainage and irrigation project. Vol. I deals with agriculture; Vol. II includes forests, fauna, fishing, pastoral activities, and industrial development and potential.

The West (Southwest Mesa, Jalisco, Colima, Nayarit.)

59. Fernando Foglio Miramontes, *Geografía económica agrícola del estado de Michoacán*. (3 vols. and atlas, Mexico City, 1936.)
60. Lucio Mendieta y Núñez, *et. al.*, *Los Tarascos*. [Universidad Nacional, Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales.] (Mexico City, 1940.)
- Essays and studies by various hands.
61. Ignacio Dávila Garibi, *Los estudios históricos regionales como base de la historia general del país. Documentos y datos referentes a la villa jalisciense de la Unión de Tula*. (Mexico City, 1943.)
- An outstanding Jaliscan regional historian's discussion, with concrete illustration of his point.
62. Donald D. Brand, "An Historical Sketch of Geography and Anthropology in the Tarascan Region: Part I." *New Mexico Anthropologist*, VI-VII (1944), 37-108.
63. Alfonso Fabila and Filiberto Vargas Tentory, *Chinicuila (exploración socioeconómica)*. (Mexico City, Ed. Prisma, n.d., [1944].)
- Summary data by the local educational brigade on a Michoacan community.
64. Ignacio Dávila Garibi, *Bosquejo histórico de Teocaltiche*. (Mexico City, 1945.)

An Jaliscan community, bordering Zacatecas

65. Ignacio Dávila Garibi, *Ocotlán: ciudad antigua, hospitalaria y creyente*. (Mexico City, 1948.)

Historical approach to a Jalisco town.

66. Norman D. Humphrey, "The Cultural Background of the Mexican Immigrant," *Rural Sociology*, XIII (1948), 239-255.

Data on Tecolotlán, Jalisco.

67. Robert C. West, *Cultural Geography of the Modern Tarascan Area*. [Smithsonian Institution, Institute of Social Anthropology, Publication VII.] (Washington. G. P. O., 1948.)

A basic recent survey.

68. Dan Stanislawski, "Tarascan Political Geography," *American Anthropologist*, n.s., XLIX (1947), 46-55.

69. Gabriel Agraz García de Alba, *Esbozos históricos de Tecolotlán*. (Guadalajara, Ed. "El Estudiante," 1950.)

See Item 66, and review by Ignacio Dávila Garibi, *Historia Mexicana* I (oct.-dic. 1951), 320-322.

70. Dan Stanislawski, *The Anatomy of Eleven Towns in Michoacán*. [University of Texas, Institute of Latin-American Studies, *Latin-American Studies*, X.] (Austin, 1950.)

See review by Henry Sterling, *THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, XXXI, (Nov. 1951), 675-680. A functional analysis that confuses "anatomy" with "physiology."

71. Miguel de la Mora and Moisés González Navarro, "Jalisco: la historia y sus instrumentos," *Historia Mexicana*, I (jul.-sept., 1951), 143-163.

A summary of archival materials available, periodicals, and recent publications, with some discussion of regional vs. national history.

The North (Excluding Border)

72. Basil M. Bensin, "Agroecological Exploration in the Soto La Marina Region, Mexico," *Geographical Review*, XXV (Apr. 1935), 285-297.

A systematic survey, antecedent to possible colonization by Slavs.

73. S. N. Dicken, "Galeana: a Mexican Highland Community," *Journal of Geography*, XXXIV (1935), 140-147

A small community in northwestern Chihuahua.

74. L. Hewes, "Huepac: an Agricultural Village of Sonora, Mexico," *Economic Geography*, XI (1935), 284-292.

75. Timoteo L. Hernández, *Reseña histórica sobre el origen de las cabeceras municipales del Estado de Nuevo León*. (Monterrey, 1942.)

76. Protasio P. Cadena, *Agualeguas: reseña histórica, geográfica, política y social* (Monterrey, 1942.)

A community in Nuevo León.

77. Alberto Sánchez, *Monografía del municipio de Marín*. (Monterrey, 1943.)

78. Carlos Pérez Maldonado, *La ciudad metropolitana de Nuestra Señora de Monterrey*. (Monterrey, 1946.)

Summary history and influence by a leading regional historian of the North.

79. Miguel Guadiana Ibarra, *Monografía histórica sobre el municipio de Sabinas Hidalgo*. (Monterrey, 1947.)

A Nuevo León area.

80. *Basic Industries in Texas and Northern Mexico*. [University of Texas, Institute of Latin-American Studies, *Latin-American Studies*, IX.] (Austin, 1950.)

Essays by several hands at a conference, June 9-11, 1949. See review by Sanford A. Mosk, *THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, XXXI (May, 1951), 323-324.

81. Ismael Cavazos Garza, "Nuevo León: la historia y sus instrumentos," *Historia Mexicana*, I (ene.-mar., 1952), 494-515.

A summary survey of resources for social investigations, including libraries, collections, periodicals, bibliographies, and a list of recent regional publications.