

tinguished, and that the individual household is not the appropriate unit for the study of family relations.

Theoretically, Smith's conclusion that there is a serial order in the three mating alternatives in Latante and Rural Jamaica should not be based on an "einmalig" survey: one would need life histories. Also, the repeated statement that all the populations have a formal commitment to monogamy, probable as this may be, cannot, so facilely, be derived from purely statistical-demographical data. Where the author, comparing the history of marriage in the West Indies and Europe, states that the Europeans, since Tacitus and before, have had unions of the life-long, exclusive type "and knew no other" (263), his vision of the history of mating organization of the different European social strata proves to be too simplified. The ease with which the West Indian white ruling group came to a fusion of marriage and extra-residential mating, very similar to that which Smith describes for the Carriacou Negroid lower class, is at least partially explainable as the continuation and/or imitation of a European feudal pattern of life, just as, maybe, Smith's Carriacou population knew itself backed in its mating organization by the example of its social elite.

The singular in the title of Smith's work suggests a general Caribbean character, both social and geographic, that actually is not present. How fertile would a comparison be with the Spanish Caribbean, where the Carriacou pattern is, or was, practically universal. In spite of these critical remarks—and mainly because of the care with which the terminology was coined—and the hypotheses tested on the basis of extensive quantitative material, I consider the book under review the most important one that in recent years has been written on British West Indian family structures.

H. HOETINK

Institute of Caribbean Studies,  
University of Puerto Rico

*The Chamizal Settlement, A View from El Paso.* By GLADYS GREGORY. El

Paso, 1963. Texas Western College Press. Southwestern Studies. Vol. I. No. 2. Notes. Pp. 52. Paper.

Mexico and the United States have finally settled the disputed boundary between El Paso, Texas, and Ciudad Juárez, Mexico; or have they? Although the senates of both countries have approved the 1963 treaty, Dr. Gregory's short, legal, and historical study indicates that anything can happen, or has in the past.

Instability of the Rio Grande River, which periodically flooded and changed courses, is at the root of the Chamizal controversy. This monograph traces boundary surveys, litigation, and diplomacy from 1848 to mid-1963. A high point was reached in 1911 when the parties agreed on arbitration. An international commission headed by a Canadian divided the territory between the litigants, but the United States refused to accept the decision.

Future books on Mexican-American relations will list this as the best work on the Chamizal dispute. With the assistance of an excellent map, good organization, and documentary footnotes, the reader is conducted through the legalistic and geographic Chamizal jungle without getting lost in the "avulsion of alluvial valleys." However, it does seem strange that a book printed in Texas and written by a Texan should state that "Texas was voted into the Union on March 1, 1945. . .," when most of us recognize a much earlier date.

ROBERT R. MILLER

New Mexico State University

*Sam Houston American Giant.* By M. K. WISEHART. Washington, 1962. Robert B. Luce, Inc. Illustrations. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Pp. xiv, 712. \$10.00.

M. K. Wisheart, an accomplished journalist with all the higher gifts of writing as well as the historical perspective necessary to make a valuable contribution to history, has produced a fascinating addition to the private life, character, and public career of a re-