

ogy of reputational approach, a conception of the power structure at the community level as a power arena in which actors as single units struggle and exhibit power. Such conceptualization, probably highly pertinent for the context of Miller's first study (Seattle in the 1950s), clearly presented problems in the continuation and expansion of the research to the other world cities. Although Miller indicates that all the four cities have a power structure tending toward the 'cone' or 'trunked pyramid' type, the conceptualization of community has to be extended in order to work in a context where there is a higher degree of class stratification or where local and national 'communities' overlap as in Lima. Moreover, when dealing with situations expressive of the pluralistic model, decision making does have a community wide network; whereas in more stratified contexts it is closely linked to one segment of the social structure. Such a situation is of particular importance when the analysis of power is focused on decision making around community issues. In a highly stratified context these may deflate the studies of power structure to the ephemeral, since these can be used, intentionally or otherwise, for distracting purposes; e.g., the alleged recent focus on pollution to distract attention from more fundamental issues such as war, the existing political process, or the urban ghettos. Finally, the 'atomic' view of the power structure, leading to individualization of power (and thus the reason for the reputational method used), proved to be the most problematic in cross cultural research since it did not tap power segments such as the military and the church that usually express group instead of personalized power.

A final critical issue deals with the process of interpretation in such cross cultural research. Miller was most clear in his indication that in such research the process of explanation could not be confined to the parameters of his research design, but had to appeal to cultural, socio-economic, and historical analysis. It is unfortunate that such and similar central issues, were not discussed more at length.

To conclude, in spite of such criticisms, Miller's contribution is one that must and will certainly be taken into consideration in research on power structures.

Notre Dame University

FABIO DA SILVA

*Tradition and Growth: A Study of Four Mexican Villages.* By MANUEL AVILA. Chicago, 1969. University of Chicago Press. Tables. Appendix. Index. Pp. xv, 219. \$10.75.

This study is interestingly conceived. The author, an economist,

wants to confront *the* question about traditional societies: are they hopeless backwaters populated by indolent peasants who do not respond to economic incentives, i.e., are they doomed to fall ever further behind the modern sectors of developing countries? For data that speak to his questions, he restudied four widely separated Mexican villages that had been studied by anthropologists more than twenty years before. Thus, directly relevant data on actual change or lack of change in four traditional societies were gathered.

The first chapter sets the problem. In the second, Avila uses the earlier studies to build a picture of the villages in his base period. The studies used (and the time of field research) are: Robert Redfield on Tepoztlán (1926-1927), Elsie C. Parsons on Mitla (1929-1933), Redfield and Alfonso Villa on Chan Kom (1931) and George M. Foster on Soteapan (1941). Chapters 3, 4 and 5 are devoted to the changes that occurred between the original studies and Avila's visits in 1964. Chapter 3, "Three Decades of Rural Progress," reviews population trends, communications, education, health, municipal services, occupational diversity and the role of local government in the communities. A short Chapter 4 concentrates on agriculture and a long Chapter 5 describes the results of a survey of households in the four villages (36 households in all).

The final chapter, "The Traditional Sector and National Growth," begins: "The three decades of village history just reviewed attest to a record of genuine growth," thus answering the question about backwardness in the negative. Given this, Avila raises more general questions about the optimal contribution of growth in traditional and modern sectors to overall national growth.

The major weaknesses in the study stem largely from the attempts to use limited quantitative data to make arguments normally reserved for simple assertion or systematically drawn extensive samples. Though Avila explicitly recognizes the limits of his data, at one point he can be found comparing data he and Foster gathered on a single family in Soteapan with Mexican national aggregate figures and claiming partial proof for the proposition that "the relative growth of the per capita income of the villages is converging toward the national average." In another place he presents data from his own household surveys in great detail and then correctly explains away their incorrect implications by pointing out the "nonrandom character of the sample."

In sum, while Avila's effort to go directly to traditional societies to answer questions about their potential for economic transformation is to be admired, the results are disappointing.

Stanford University

FRANK CANCIAN