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Introduction.

Systematic social study of the British West Indies is a recent development, hence the slenderness of our sociological literature, and its dependent character. This dependent character reflects the fact that hitherto most of the researches in this area have been conducted by visiting social scientists from America or Britain, and have been guided by theories and themes of interest developed in studies of societies and cultures outside the British Caribbean. The resultant diversity of approaches has undoubted value for the systematic study of British West Indian society, as this diversity directs attention to a wide range of problems and aspects of local life. On the other hand, these researches have an ad hoc, exploratory character, and require careful sifting and collation if they are to form the background of a systematic programme of area studies. Yet it is patent that to build soundly and quickly, we must use the old foundations, testing them first, and then assimilating all that proves useful and valid into the newer structure. The present paper is intended as a partial contribution toward that task.

It has not been entirely fortuitous that social studies of the British Caribbean reflect theories and themes of interest developed in the study of societies outside this area. This derivative character of Caribbean sociology partly reflects the comparative character of social science in general, and partly the fact that the British Caribbean has many elements and patterns which have been found and studied in a wider area. It is therefore necessary to consider those studies conducted within this wider area which have special significance for social research in the British Caribbean.

From the outset, Caribbean research is faced with problems of frames of reference. These are implicit in the dual bases of affiliation already mentioned. In the first place we have to face the problem of the appropriate geographical frame of reference for such studies; that is to say, we shall have to delimit the area which forms the natural comparative context of Caribbean social research, and to define its most important characters. In the second place, we have to develop a system of concepts, orienta-
tions, and hypotheses, that is, a theory, which can act as an appropriate frame of reference for research in this area. In building this framework of theory, there is an obvious advantage in reviewing those studies carried out within the appropriate geographical frame of reference which have the most direct relevance for Caribbean research. We must begin therefore by delimiting the geographical frame of special comparative value to Caribbean studies, directing attention to its more significant features from our point of view. We shall then have to consider the various bodies of research and theory developed within this wider area which are of most importance in the present stage of Caribbean studies. On the basis of such a review of the literature, we shall then attempt to indicate the type of theoretical frame which seems appropriate for Caribbean social research.

Context.

General historical processes define the regions from Brazil to the United States as the wider context of direct relevance for Caribbean area studies. This does not mean that all research into social and cultural conditions in this wider area, or even the majority of such work, possesses significance for the understanding of West Indian problems, but only that some studies in this wider area have already had considerable influence on Caribbean research by virtue of their local relevance, quite apart from their more general theoretical or methodological interests. This type of thing can be expected to continue.

The historical conditions which define the area from Brazil to the United States as the broad comparative context of Caribbean studies are well known. They consist in the expansion of Europe to the New World, the common historical patterns of conquest, colonization, peonage or slavery, and the development of multi-racial and multi-cultural societies throughout this area. Regional differences of a contemporary or historical nature are of obvious significance for comparative work within so vast a frame of reference. For present purposes the differences of habitat, economy, population composition, political history and status are the most useful general guides in a preliminary subdivision of this wider area.

The Northern United States forms one region with an overwhelmingly high proportion of Whites to Negroes in its population, a temperate continental habitat, high degrees of urbanisation and industrialization, independent political status, and Anglo-Saxon Protestant affiliation. The Southern United States forms another region, having a higher ratio of Negroes in its population, lower degrees of urbanisation and industrialization, greater reliance on agriculture, a sub-tropical habitat, and a political history and status differentiated from that of the North in certain respects, notably, of course, by defeat in the American civil war of 1865-7.

The Middle American states of Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Panama, Colombia and Venezuela can be treated as a group having certain common characteristics, namely, populations composed principally of Whites and Amerindian elements, with minor representation of Negroes, tropical continental habitats, low degrees of urbanisation and industrialisation, economies based on agriculture and mining, independent political systems of similar types, Spanish and Catholic affilations.

Cuba and Puerto Rico resemble these Middle American republics in certain features, while differing in others. These two islands have been in closer association with the United States than the mainland countries, and occupy a politically dependent position. They are also distinguished from the mainland republics by the absence of significant Amerindian elements from their population, and by the presence of Negroes in some numbers, although clearly as minority groups.

Haiti differs from other provinces in this geographical frame especially in its combination of French Catholic affiliation, political independence achieved long ago through a revolt of slave and free coloured, the absence of Whites or Amerindians from the native population, and its recent political association with the United States. Other Haitian characteristics include low urbanisation, low industrialisation, tropical habitat, and agricultural economy, and the island-wide border with its neighbour, the Dominican Republic, which resembles the Central American republics in certain respects.

Within the vast sub-continent of Brazil, as in the U. S. A., several regional sub-types are distinguishable (1). These regional differences primarily reflect significant variations of climate and habitat, racial population distributions, urbanisation, industrialisation, and agriculture. A general description of that country in terms of our present interest would note the White majority in its population, the variable racial distributions with Indian elements predominating over Negroes in the interior, while Negroes are numerous in such coastal areas as Maranhao, Bahia, and Sao Paulo. The political independence and Portuguese Catholic affiliation of Brazil are also distinctive as a combination of characters within this region.

(1) Lynn Smith, & Marchant, 1951, passim.
This brings us to the Caribbean area proper, a region characterised by political dependency, and consisting mainly of small island territories, within which Amerindians are little represented, White elements form a numerical minority, and the overwhelming majority of the populations are of Negro descent. A general summary of this kind at once calls attention to diversity within this area. We have somewhat arbitrarily separated Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Cuba and Puerto Rico from the rest of the Caribbean, because of their distinguishing characteristics. Even so, our Caribbean area as it stands includes British Honduras, and the Guianas, British, French, and Dutch, all of which are continental territories with significant Amerindian elements in their population. Trinidad and British Guiana are also distinguished from the remaining British territories in the area by the presence of large East Indian populations. Surinam differs from other Caribbean colonies partly in its more varied ethnic composition, partly through the recent constitutional changes which have accorded that country an increased share in the management of its internal affairs.

The past and present associations of Caribbean territories with different metropolitan powers are clearly important for comparative work within the area. Present effects of previous association rules out the treatment of this aspect of Caribbean differentiation purely in terms of the contemporary distribution of territories among British, Americans, French or Dutch. American St. Thomas still reveals the influences of its former masters, the Danes. Within the British Caribbean, islands such as Trinidad, Grenada, Dominica, and St. Lucia differ as a group from certain other territories by their continuing affiliation to Catholic tradition, a pattern laid down in earlier days by French or Spanish masters. The St. Lucia folk probably have more in common linguistically with French colonies such as Martinique or Guadeloupe, or with the former French possession, Haiti, than with islands such as Barbados or Antigua. If we attempt to classify Caribbean colonies in terms of their present association with metropolitan powers, we must therefore keep in mind present cultural variations and continuities within and across these divisions which reflect historical factors of various kinds. Within the British colonies, the major distinctions reflect differences of racial population ratios and composition, Protestant or Catholic affiliation, insularity or its opposite. Together with the Caribbean colonies of other nations, these British territories share a multiracial composition, from which Amerindian elements are largely absent, dependence on agriculture, low levels of industrialization, and low urban ratios.

It is clear that whatever the common patterns which the British West Indies share with other Caribbean territories, or with countries outside this Caribbean region, these British colonies nonetheless form a separate area for social research, on the ground of their present political relations as well as history. Yet the patterns common to these British territories and other countries of the wider area delimited above are often of an order which cannot be ignored in the definition of Caribbean research problems except at one's peril. Perhaps within the geographical frame described above, the Middle American republics, with their Spanish and Amerindian populations, political independence, continental situation, and low population densities, have least in common with the British colonies. Yet it is clear that conditions in these countries provide useful comparisons with those of the British area, the populations of which differ from them in history as well as composition. The comparison of British Caribbean and Middle American conditions illuminates the study of either milieu separately by stimulating a variety of questions, hypotheses, and lines of investigation. Without delaying over this point unduly, we may mention such questions as the following which invite this comparison: what continuities of social structure obtain in multi-racial societies which vary in their individual racial constitution as these do? With what structural variations does this continuity coexist? What differences are associated with the fact that the subordinate race was settled in the area on the one hand, while it was brought into it on the other? Or with the parallel fact that the dominant group settled in the one area, and tended to remain expatriate within the other? Or with the fact that subordination involved slavery in one case, and peonage in the other? Or with the development of plantation economies in one set of societies, and their absence in the other? Or in the different Catholic and Protestant traditions of the two areas? Or their different political histories and conditions? It will be clear that Caribbean studies may gain greatly from adopting initial orientations which include these and parallel problems within a single comparative frame.

Racial and cultural intermixture and blending have gone on in both Indian-White and Negro-White populations alike. Among the peoples of Middle America, this has given rise to a section of the population known as Mestizos (mixed-bloods), or, as in Guatemala, Ladinos. Within the Caribbean islands, it has produced a hybrid group of mixed heritage and colour. The same applies broadly to the United States and Brazil. What then are the similarities and differences of relations between these racially and culturally differentiated groups in the various societies of our comparative frame? What significant implications do these continuities and variations present for social research in the British territories? At what levels are they expressed, in what ways, in terms
of what structures, and with what variable types of function? These are only a few of the problems which arise when Caribbean research is conceived in its natural comparative context.

Linkages between Caribbean studies and researches conducted within the broad geographical frame delimited above will become clear from a brief survey of such work over the past thirty years. We can date the development of current sociological interest in the British West Indies from 1924 when Martha Beckwith's first studies of folk-lore and life in Jamaica were published (2). Two years later, Puckett, from the same American university, published his definitive study of folk beliefs among the Negroes of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana (3). During these years also Nina Rodrigues and Arthur Ramos in Brazil, and Melville and Frances Herskovits in the United States were being led from initial studies of folk-lore and physical characteristics of the Negro populations of their respective societies into the broader problems of Negro contributions to Brazilian and American culture, and their adaptation to these environments (4). Herskovits' interest in this research field was greatly stimulated by an early visit with his wife to Surinam (5). The broad problem of acculturation which Ramos and Herskovits formulated was approached by Redfield working among the Maya of Yucatan from a different point of view, and led to the formulation of his dichotomy between folk and urban societies (6). Within the U. S. A. studies of the assimilation of American Negroes by Franklin Frazier and Lloyd Warner were underway; and these approaches have also influenced research by later workers in other regions of our geographical area (7).

Although Dollard's examination of caste and class in a Southern town of the U. S. A. acknowledges a debt to Warner and his school, it also marked a significant departure from previous research in this field by its thorough application of psychological analysis to the social conditions and relations in the community which he studied (8). This psychological approach was also combined with an interest in cultural forms and development by Powdermaker in her independent study of the same community (9). Psychological studies and interpretations of West Indian societies have since been published by Campbell, Simey, Hadley, Krujilier, Cohen, Rhoda Metraux, and Madeline Kerr (10). Meanwhile those interested in the administrative and political aspects of Caribbean society were attracted by Macmillan's concise account, and were moved by the riots and strikes of 1937-8 to reconsider the colonial situation, and to develop new policies and programmes of social reconstruction (11). Since the end of the Second World War, there has been a sharp increase in the volume of social research in the British Caribbean, which has now come to be recognised as a separate unit for a programme of area research. Clearly the guiding ideas of future studies will reflect the interests and approaches already developed in greater or less degree; and it is to the separate consideration of these relevant orientations severally that we must now turn our attention.

Afro-American Research.

Afro-American Research merits consideration first, not merely because it was the first major development with a direct Caribbean reference but also because it has been largely developed on the basis of materials from Caribbean societies, and therefore has a direct and obvious relevance for us. Afro-American studies owe a very great deal to Professor Herskovits, who has not been content to study African survivals in the New World, but has also sought to fill gaps in the ethnographic knowledge of parent societies on the West Coast of Africa by his own field-work. Sociological literature on the Caribbean has also been enriched greatly by the accounts of Professor Herskovits and his wife of their field-work in Surinam, Trinidad and Haiti; and by other researches of like orientation, falling within this area or its broader context (12).

Briefly, Afro-American researches consist in the study of changes or persistence of African tradition and cultural forms which have marked the historical association between Whites and persons of African origin or descent in the Americas. Culture here connotes the total body of learned and transmitted behaviour which characterises a population, and distinguishes it from others. Thus Afro-American research is focussed on the problem of 'acculturation'; or cultural change in a situation of contacts between carriers of different cultures. In particular, such research studies the processes by which the African immigrants and their descendants have retained, lost, or adapted elements of their initial African cultures within the contact situation provided by association with Whites in the New World. The method employed in pursuit of this enquiry is a combination of history and ethnology; and the general object is to contribute to the study of cultural persistence and change by unravelling some of the factors and processes of acculturation, through detailed studies of Negro-White contacts in the New World.

(2) Beckwith, 1924, 1929. (3) Puckett, 1926.
(6) Redfield, 1940, 1941, 1947, 1953.
Now clearly the determination of results of this culture-contact must precede the investigation of the processes by which these effects developed. Hence, Afro-American research is initially concerned with an examination of contemporary Afro-American cultures to discover survivals, retentions, syncretisms, or reinterpretations of African cultural elements obtaining within them. As the results of such examination accumulate, they also raise problems about the processes of acculturation, especially with regard to the differential survival of African cultural elements of various kinds, and in differing environments. A useful tool developed to facilitate such comparative analysis is the concept of a scale of intensity of Africanisms, which permits a classificatory comparison of New World cultures from Brazil to the U. S. A., distinguishing between Africanisms in economic, social, religious, and aesthetic life (13). Such a scale shows a greater concentration of Africanisms in such fields as folk-lore, music, and religion, than in technology and economic life; but there is a notable absence of political and governmental institutions from this comparison of Africanisms. The differential intensity of Africanisms in these various fields invites some explanation. Analysis of the problems which this differential intensity presents is undertaken with the aid of various hypotheses and concepts, the most important of which distinguish the focal aspects of cultures as those most tenacious in situations of contact, and of greatest interest to the populations concerned; and conceptualise cultural persistence in terms of survivals or retentions on the one hand; syncretism and reinterpretation on the other. Survivals have greatest direct resemblance to original forms. Syncretisms involve a combination of parallel forms from the cultures in contact; while reinterpretations adhere to the substance or content of the original culture, although departing from its initial forms. Finally the concept of cultural imponderables connotes that category of Africanisms which are clearly not included in the cultural focus, but nonetheless have a high level of intensity in New World populations. It appears that values and automatic motor patterns constitute the bulk of these surviving cultural imponderables. Within this frame of research the ethnohistorical method has hitherto been employed principally to determine the cultural provenience from which Africans were recruited for the various New World slave-states, and the types of condition to which they were subjected under the slave regime. In the attack on problems of differential intensities of Africanisms, that is, the variable effects and processes of acculturation, the ethnohistorical method has played a less prominent part than the development of the hypotheses and concepts just mentioned.

We can summarise the relations between the conceptual system and the scale of intensity in the following terms; greatest intensity of cultural survivals occurs in the area of cultural focus, if cultural imponderables are excluded. The cultural focus is the
area of greatest tenacity in cultural retentions, consequently, assuming equal pressures on all fields of cultural activity from outside, it will show the highest degrees of purity in these retentions, and will also contain the last elements to disappear. Purity of retention diminishes as it passes from direct survival to syncretism, and so to reinterpretation. The relative proportions of these particular modes of persistence in different cultural spheres is reflected in the scale of intensity; and this illustrates or defines the focus. So the circle is completed; and the variable persistence of cultural elements of different kinds is simply restated in the form of a system of hypotheses and concepts, ostensibly developed to further the analysis of this variability, only to be canvassed thereafter as its explanation.

Even so the distinction between cultural focus and periphery in terms of tenacity and persistence is not borne out by the scale of intensity on which it is based. Thus, Herskovits' comparison of folk-lore with magic or religion in terms of levels of intensity of African elements of these kinds for the fifteen areas concerning which materials were then available shows that folk-lore elements persist on average to a higher degree than do either magic or religion. Similarly, Africanisms in music have a higher level of intensity than those in any other field, in terms of this scale (Herskovits, 1946, p. 352). Now it is possible to exclude music from the comparison effectively by treating it as a pattern of motor behaviour of the type which is liable to persist in a very marked degree, even though marginal to the culture focus. But this treatment cannot be extended to cover folk-lore. Nor is it useful to define folk-lore, religion, and magic coterminously, although this would remove the problem of peripheral elements showing a higher degree of tenacy and persistence than focal ones. On the other hand, if folk-lore is included among the cultural imponderables on grounds of the value-systems which it often expresses, the question arises whether all other departments of culture are not equally open to similar treatment, notably of course, religion, and kinship. In such a case, the notion of cultural focus as distinct from periphery would cease to be of much use.

There is always grave danger in exaggerating the relative importance of one aspect of culture at the expense of others; and this difficulty is involved in the concept of cultural focus. The type of conclusion which emerges from the most thorough study of any African society yet published is relevant here. "To study Tale kinship institutions apart from the religious and moral ideas and values of the natives would be as one-sided as to leave out the facts of sex and procreation. On the other hand, our analysis has shown that it is equally impossible to understand Tale religious beliefs and moral norms apart from the context of kinship. A very close functional interdependence exists between these two categories of social facts" (Fortes, 1949, p. 346). Similarly Forde finds from a review of African cosmologies, that "belief and ritual tend, in other words, to mirror the scale and degree of social integration" (Forde, 1954, p. xvii). Fortes and Evans-Pritchard reach a parallel conclusion from their review of African political systems. "Myths, dogmas, ritual beliefs and activities make his social system intellectually tangible and coherent to an African and enable him to think and feel about it. Furthermore, these sacred symbols, which reflect the social system, endow it with mystical values which evoke acceptance of the social order." (Fortes & Evans-Pritchard, 1940, p. 17). These observations indicate the very great need for caution in the classification of cultural elements as focal or otherwise, and direct attention to their close interdependence. Clearly, insofar as religion and kinship are essential to the understanding or practice of one another, their separation and ranking in terms of cultural priorities is liable to do violence to these relations.

We can perhaps more usefully and easily distinguish foci in the culture-contact situation itself than in the cultures themselves. Herskovits makes frequent reference to this variability in the pressures of the contact situation, but does not systematise concepts to treat it. In the historical situation of Afro-American culture-contact these foci of contact reflected the interests of the dominant group in its control of the subordinate as slaves. Consequently the social organisation, technological, and economic practices of the subordinate Negroes were subject to pressure of a kind without parallel for intensity, and continuity, in such other fields as religion, music, or folk-lore. Language, the essential mode of communication between the dominant and subordinate groups, occupied an intermediate position in this variable pressure of cultural elements between the two groups. The advantages of conceiving the contact-situation as a field of variable pressure over time as well as at any moment are many and varied. It directs attention consistently to the study of social relations between and within the two culturally differentiated groups as the matrix of these acculturation processes, and thereby invokes employment of historical and sociological research together to relate these processes to the structures and situations through which they matured. It allows relatively simple and precise determination of the focal and peripheral fields of culture-contact on the basis of documentary analysis. It thereby permits the study of persistence of different categories of elements and in differing degrees of intensity or purity to proceed without supplementary postulates about focal and peripheral sectors within the cultures themselves which are hardly verifiable. It directs attention to the fact that purity of
form in survival might simply indicate marginality within the acculturative situation rather than any central significance of the elements retained to the original culture on the one hand; while relative impurity of form in persistence might simply indicate the relative intensity of pressure on the elements concerned, rather than their marginality to the original culture. A good many possible fallacies are ruled out at once by such conceptualisation of the contact continuum, and effort is thereby redirected from the development of broad classificatory conceptions such as retention, reinterpretation, and syncretism, or of imprecise and unverifiable hypotheses such as that of cultural focus, toward the formulation of more limited propositions capable of being tested against historical materials on the contact situation within the particular fields for which they are separately developed.

Hitherto we have been discussing certain aspects of Afro-American research which focus on the processes by which acculturation proceeded among New World Negroes. We must now turn to consider its conceptual system with reference to the classification and study of the forms produced by such processes. Here we are mainly concerned with the precision or generality of the principal concepts, although we must commence with the problem of attribution. Clearly, Afro-American research can only yield tentative ascriptions of provenience to contemporary custom, to the degree that the African centres from which New World Negroes and their ancestors were recruited are unknown, or to the degree that parallel European practices, or the measure of influence exercised by these forms on the development of contemporary Africanisms are not fully determined. Systematic study has shown that the areas from which most of the New World Negro slaves were recruited lie along the densely populated West African Coast. This reduces the problem of the provenience of Africanisms, leaving only the question of their accretions of European or Amerindian elements. Amerindians being largely peripheral to the areas of Negro-White contact, they may be ignored for general discussion.

Herskovits is careful to weigh the influence of European cultural practice on African tradition, particularly where elements of folk-lore are involved; but the issue is greatly obscured by his postulate of common denominators in European and African cultures in the concept of the Old World as a single cultural province (14). A concept of this level of generality is of dubious value. It implies a division of the World into two cultural provinces, the New and the Old. Yet this could easily be criticised, partly on the evidence that points to the movement of Old World populations into the Americas to become its 'aboriginals'; more importantly on the ground that absence of such elements as the wheel or writing from 15th century America on the one hand, or tobacco in the Old World at that date, form an inadequate basis for such a distinction, since cultural differences of a similar order have been overlooked within the cultures of the Old World province itself. Yet if this criticism was granted, it would place some strain on the conceptual framework of Afro-American studies.

It is difficult to reconcile specific studies of Afro-American acculturation with statements such as the following: "It is here we must turn for an explanation of the seemingly baffling fact, so often encountered, that given traits of New World Negro, and especially of American Negro behaviour, are ascribable equally to European and African origin. This may well be viewed as but a reflection of the fact that deep beneath the differences between these varied civilisations of the Old World lie common aspects which, in generalized form, might be expected to emerge in situations of close contact between peoples, such as Europeans and Africans, whose specialized cultural endowments are comprehended within the larger unity" (Herskovits, M. J., 1941, p. 18). Similarly in comparing the wider persistence of Africanisms in magic than in religion, Herskovits notes the advantages of magic in being private and difficult of detection where pressures are brought to prohibit both practices; and concludes that Africanisms in magic "persisted in recognizable form everywhere, particularly since the similarity between African and European magic is so great that the one cultural stream must have operated to reinforce the other" (1946, p. 348). It is doubtful in what sense the predicated similarity of European and African magic can be taken to contribute to the survival of Africanisms in this field, as is clear from a glance at such patterns in West Indian Obeah. As is well known, a good deal of the magical rites of the Obeahman are taken in whole or in part from imported literature such as the Sixth and Seventh Books of Moses, the Black Arts, and the like. These books describe techniques which are significantly different from African practices, especially by use of cabalistic signs, writing, foreign languages, and the like. They present a type of magic which is distinguished locally in terms of its literary and learned pretensions, as 'book magic'. In contrast, pure Africanisms in Obeah rely mainly on the employment of herbal or animal substances, and the casting of spells in dialects or African tongues. These two categories of Obeah, the literary and the strictly African, are at least as much in competition as they are active in reinforcing one another. Thus acceptance of the one form may mean displacement of the other. Something similar has been recently reported from Africa also, by Nadel, who found the native pagan

(14) Herskovits, M. J., 1941.
magic of Nupe being displaced by imported forms enjoying the higher prestige of Islamic civilisation (15). Now, unless a careful analysis of the magical systems of New World Negroes is made to determine exactly what proportion and type of practice has European or African provenience, the attribution of these forms to African culture whether as syncretisms, reinterpretations or restitutions, is really begging the question of their origin. The concept of a ‘generalized form’ which permits this type of attribution is thus confusing rather than helpful to the analysis.

These observations direct attention to the levels of generality on which the search for Africanisms and their attribution proceeds; and these levels vary widely indeed, from meticulous correspondences between Haitian and Dahomean vodun, or Afro-Cuban and Yoruba divinatory practices on the one hand, to such conceptualisations as that which reduces ‘matriarchal’ family patterns and loose mating associations among New World Negroes to the level of ‘reinterpretations’ of African polygynous patterns by the device of successive rather than simultaneous plural matchings on the other (16). Important questions concerning the levels of generality in such conceptualisations of family-types, mating patterns, and reinterpretations remain to be answered before the attributions involved can be discussed profitably. But there is an alternative approach to consideration of such problems as changing family structures present for acculturation studies, through the comparison of parallel situations and developments in other parts of the world.

Let us examine this matter of family forms for a moment, since its handling by Afro-Americanists has promoted some controversy, their opponents attributing the contemporary ‘disorganisation’ of New World Negro family forms to “the historic condition of slavery”, under which, as is well known, stable matchings among the Negro populations were inhibited by a variety of factors (17). Afro-Americanists, as we have seen, derive these ‘deviant, disorganised’ family patterns of New World Negroes from African practice by reinterpretation. Much ink has already been spilled on these conflicting ascriptions, and their antithesis has directly affected the study of family patterns in the British Caribbean.

Since as we have seen the level of generality in the ascription is imprecise, the only check on these competing theories is to compare West Indian conditions with those elsewhere; yet, obvious

---


as this is, it has not yet been attempted. Among the South African Bantu living in Native Locations on the outskirts of European cities, “deviant, disorganised” family patterns strikingly similar to those found among New World Negroes are common. Yet clearly these South African Bantu families cannot be attributed to slavery on the one hand, nor to the persistence of aboriginal Bantu patterns by reinterpretation on the other, since there has been no experience of slavery among the urban populations presenting these problems, and the new family types which are developing among them are as deviant from Bantu norms as from European. (18). A debate whether such family types among the urban Bantu are reducible to persistent Africanisms which have been reinterpreted, or to historical conditions such as slavery, would therefore have little to recommend it; and by extension this applies also to the debate about the derivation of the similar family patterns of New World Negroes. A more realistic analysis than either school of thought seems yet prepared to apply would involve the study of mating and family patterns in terms of particular social and economic contexts.

It is also unsatisfactory to attribute peculiar New World Negro family types to “historic conditions of slavery” without making a far more detailed comparative analysis of these than has yet been attempted. Among the Muhammadan Hausa and Fulani of Northern Nigeria who operated an institution of slavery similar in many respects to the historic New World pattern, religious conversion and marriage of slaves was an important obligation of their owners, and the abolition of slavery in this area has left no aftermath of deviant and disorganised family types (19). What in fact passes under the name of ‘slavery’ in the British West Indies and the New World generally, includes a great many factors which are not essentials of the institution. The Hausa sought to arrange marriages for their slaves: the New World masters on the whole did not. Slavery as an institution does not enjoin any particular mating patterns, for slave or slave-owner. This institution, like others, can only be fully understood by comparative studies of its structure and function in different and similar contexts. It is therefore just as unsatisfactory to reduce ‘deviant’ New World Negro family types to slavery as to the reinterpretation of African polygynous forms.

It is worthwhile to dwell a little longer on this problem of family derivation as handled in Afro-American studies. If our preceding observations are accepted, the problem is basically
one of deviance, rather than a problem of cultural survival or reinterpretation. Similarly, if our observations on the composite character of West Indian Obeah are valid, then Obeah as a deviant pattern of behaviour is more extensive than the specifically Africanist magical practices of West Indian populations. These distinctions between deviance and Africanism are surely of critical importance to Afro-American research. The deviant mating patterns of various Latin American populations, as implied by the statistics of illegitimacy, are obviously in some respects parallel to those of New World Negroes, while in no way being attributable to African culture. (19). The distinction between deviance and Africanism is however somewhat difficult of construction in Afro-American studies, on three main grounds; imprecision in the definition of traits as African or other, which we have already seen to be partly related to the assumption of correspondences between African and European cultures in the Old World; wide variability in the level of generality of the concept of reinterpretation, which together with the imprecise definition of Africanisms allows of extension equally to almost every field of social life; and most importantly, the formulation of problems of Afro-American contact and research mainly in terms of culture and acculturation, without corresponding emphasis on the primarily sociological aspects of these processes. Deviance, for example, is more easy to define in terms of social norms than in terms of cultural form. On the other hand, where the deviant practices are concentrated disproportionately among a particular ethnic group, the culture of which forms a direct object of enquiry, it is easy to conceive the differentiating behaviour primarily or even entirely in cultural terms. This over-simplifies the problem on the one hand, and poses questions of acculturation and culture-change which may be of little direct relevance on the other. Yet because culture is the total transmitted heritage of a population, deviance in any form also invites consideration in terms of a theory of culture-change. Now this is obviously a valid interest, but one liable to fail of attainment, unless it is accompanied by a thorough study of the social structures and situations within which and with regard to which the deviation has developed.

Another characteristic of Afro-American theory which merits attention is the relatively great emphasis which it places on the acculturative situation of slavery and the relatively marginal treatment which is given to historical conditions following on emancipation. For this reason it has been possible to debate the derivation of deviant Negro family types in terms of slavery or African influences. Wittingly or not, in this matter as in certain others, Afro-American studies give the appearance of opposing African cultural conservatism and resilience on the one hand to the culturally destructive practices and organisation of slavery on the other (20). But the acculturative process is liable to serious misconstruction if handled in terms of such a simple dialectic. Many years have elapsed since emancipation in all parts of the Western world, and this period may well have an importance for the study of Negro acculturation equal to or greater than that of the slavery which preceded it. If we compare the distributions of Africanism among the Negroes of the Northern and Southern United States on the one hand, and the Haitians whether urban or peasant on the other, we find the scale of Africanisms increasing in this order: Negroes of the Northern United States, those of the South, the Haitian town dwellers, the Haitian peasantry. Such a pattern of distribution directs attention to the variability of acculturative situations and influences experienced by these four groups in the post-slavery period. Despite the relatively late emancipation of the American Negroes, they practise a culture which contains fewer African elements than that of the Haitians, whose freedom was gained many years earlier. Within either population moreover, the variation of African elements reflects differences of acculturative situation and exposure. Thus, urban Haitians are exposed to foreign cultural influences to a greater degree than the peasants, and the Northern American Negroes enjoy an environment more favourable to their acculturation than do those of the South. For some years after emancipation, Africans continued to arrive in the British West Indies as free indentured labourers; and the same is true in various other parts of the Afro-American area from Brazil to Haiti (21). In Jamaica between 1834 and 1865, 11,380 free African immigrants settled, a number well in excess of the indentured labourers imported from India over this period (22). More so than any other group of immigrants, these free Africans enjoyed cultural conditions which were favourable to the survival of certain of their practices. Quite often the decisive condition for this survival consisted in group cohesiveness, as well as sympathetic attitudes in the Negro section of the host society. We can illustrate this process by a glance at the development and spread of the Shango cult in the island of Grenada.

At the turn of the present century, the representative African cult of the Grenadian folk was a type of ancestor ritual known locally as the Big Drum, the Nation Dance, or simply *saraka*

(20) Herskovits, M. J., 1941, pp. 110-142.
(22) Hall, D. G. H., 1954.
The ritual dances of this cult normally lasted three days, from Wednesday to Saturday, and contained several elements which have since been assimilated by Grenadian Shango; but Big Drum rites were not associated with spirit-possession, which was not then practised. Shango in Grenada was originally the ritual of certain closed communities of Africans and their descendants at Munich, Concorde, and La Mode. These Africans came from Ijesha in Yorubaland after slavery had been abolished, over 1,000 of them in 1849. On completion of their indentures they settled in the three communities named above. Within these communities, Yoruba was the spoken language, and numerous elements of Yoruba culture were preserved, including kinship elements, and the basic concepts and rites of Yoruba polytheism. Later, when the Africans and their descendants started to move out from these communities, Creole Grenadians showed great receptivity to their cult, and its spread outwards from these three centres was marked by syncretisms of form and content, numerous traits being taken over from the Nation Dance as well as from Catholicism, until Shango is now the representative form of African ritual among the Grenadians.

Here we see clearly the importance of group cohesion for the persistence and survival of a trait or complex of traits. Shango with its priesthood, has displaced the Nation Dance, which lacked formal group organisation, in Grenada island, although Shango was a late arrival competing with a widely held cultural form. But Shango remained quite unknown until 1953 to the population of Carriacou, a Dependency of the Grenada government, and only about 23 miles away. No groups of post-emancipation immigrants from Africa had settled in Carriacou; and the Big Drum cult still flourishes as the representative folk ritual in that island.

To devote insufficient attention to the sociology of acculturative situations or the role of organised and persistent groups in the preservation or transmission of culture is methodologically perilous, since it is clear that the group as a carrier of culture is a natural unit far superior to the individual; and also that the structural relations holding between as well as within each of the culturally differentiated groups involved in the acculturation process might well be of the utmost significance in understanding its development and effects. It seems likely for example that the Dahomean contingent imported to Haiti by Christophe after slavery and maintained by him as a unit with high prestige may have contributed to the present persistence of Dahomean patterns in Haiti in a degree disproportionate with their relative numbers. (24). The point to note here is that if acculturation is to be studied in terms of specific social contexts, then the implied opposition of slavery and African cultural conservatism must be replaced by a continuous study of the contact situation both within and since slavery, and particular attention must be devoted to the historical reconstruction of the social situations within which these developments occurred. This extension of interest could well entail major revisions of the method, theory, and conceptual equipment of Afro-American research.

However, this conceptual equipment in any case needs some overhaulings. Let us briefly consider first, the principle of reinterpretation, and then the concept of Africanisms, for example. "Where it is not possible to set up syncretisms, the force of cultural conservatism seeks expression in the substance, rather than the form, in psychological value rather than in name, if the original culture is to survive at all. Here the importance of resemblance of the old element to the new is again involved. Though to a lesser degree than in the instance of syncretisms, reinterpretation also requires that some characteristic of the new cultural element be correlated with a corresponding part of the original one by those to whom it is presented, before the mechanism can operate effectively" (Herskovits, M. J., 1946, p. 351). Much of this is perilously like reification; and one of the dangers of acculturation studies which are not balanced by continuous examination of and reference to social process consists precisely in this tendency toward the reification of cultures and their component forces or parts. This danger is inherent in acculturation studies which are undertaken without adequate sociological emphasis, since their field of interest is therefore defined purely in terms of two or more cultures, or bodies of tradition, in contact. But cultures do not carry themselves, nor do they of themselves have contacts, although their human carriers do.

The other notable point in this definition of reinterpretation is its inclusiveness, and its functional reference. Retention and syncretisms are the conceptual categories which focus directly on the survivals of cultural form. With reinterpretation however we are concerned with the survival of substance, that is content and function, rather than with cultural form. Thus reinterpretation demarcates a category of persistence which cannot be defined or recognised in formal terms, but involves functional or valuational correspondences. From this point of view, it is somewhat difficult to set any bounds, other than the purely formal one already mentioned, to the ramifications of the interpretative mechanism which


expresses ‘the force of cultural conservatism’ within any process of cultural exchange. Herskovits is well aware of this, but fails to face its implications. “This, of course, raises one of the most difficult problems in the entire field of cultural dynamics—whether any element of culture is ever taken over without some degree of reinterpretation, however free the borrowing.” (ibid, p. 351).

The point is that, as defined, reinterpretation can apply to every cultural item observed among persons initially classified as bearers of any particular culture on grounds of race, descent, nationality, or otherwise. All that is necessary for this ascription is that there should be no formal parallels with practices of the ‘original’ culture and also that there should be a general tendency of human cultures to show some correspondences on the planes of function or value. Categories of such generality are liable to mean everything and nothing at once, and to invite questions as to whether particular reinterpretations may not be as validly attributed to a writer as to the African population itself.

The key concept of Africanism is similarly ambiguous. It applies equally to any particular trait, however minute, such as the word ‘ere’, to the thing or condition with which it is associated and to the system within which the trait is found. It applies equally to relatively pure retentions on the one hand, or reinterpretations which have dubious value on the other, and to minute elements or large behavioural systems, such as family-patterns, throughout all ranges of persistence. It does not seem to permit easy attention to competing Africanisms, such as have been illustrated above from the development of folk ritual in Grenada, nor to compound formations of African tradition which develop through such processes, though here also the concepts of survival, syncretisms, and reinterpretation might apply. Taken together with the postulate of cultural conservatism and the general concept of reinterpretation it allows easy admission to a variety of possible types of deviant behaviours as Africanisms, although they may have no African provenience or parallels at all. In concert with the postulate of common denominators among the Old World cultures, it can also be applied to such institutions as the West Indian ‘wake’ or ‘nin’ night’, which Walter Scott reported among his countrymen. Similarly, although Haitian vodun is clearly African in inspiration and detail, there are elements in it, such as the pantheon of Creole gods headed by Dom Petro, which have different, perhaps Amerindian, provenience. (25). These Creole elements are clearly African in a different sense from the more strictly Dahomean parts of the complex, and cannot adequately be handled in terms of syncretism or reinterpretation separately. The problem of independent developments among the New World Negroes, such as the Calypso music and steel bands of Trinidad, must also be faced. In some sense these new cultural forms are Africanisms, but little is to be gained by classifying them as retentions, syncretisms, or reinterpretations. Pearse’s approach to the study of these and other musical forms in the South Caribbean in terms of their institutional settings, participants, and pattern, offers a useful lead by its precise formulation of research problems and definitions which could also be applied to certain other areas of Afro-American cultural exchange. (26).

Studies of acculturation which are inadequately balanced by studies of the social situation, processes, and structures involved in such change, can hardly be expected to produce agreement, where social structures are the cultural traits involved. Careful reconstructions of past states of the societies with which Afro-American studies are concerned on the basis of indexed documentary materials, undertaken with the object of defining the structures, contexts, and functional characteristics of units and institutions in these past systems, are perhaps the only ways of determining how past social conditions and processes may have guided acculturation and contributed to the development of current social and cultural forms. Comparative studies of Afro-American societies focussed on the detailed analysis of their structural and functional characteristics will also give rewarding leads about the role of social factors in the present as well as the past acculturative processes. Together such studies might serve to clarify the nature of cultural exchange and evolution, the types of context within which particular cultural developments occur, the distribution of Africanisms within delimited populations, and the relation of this distribution to contemporary social and economic factors on the one hand and historical process on the other.

The lack of any systematic study to date of the degrees and types of acculturation associated with different social and economic positions in Negro-White populations of the New World constitutes a serious weakness of Afro-American research. Until these studies of social and cultural differentiation within the populations from which Afro-American materials are drawn have been made, problems posed by the variable distribution of Africanisms within these populations, as well as between them, cannot even be defined, let alone receive attention; nor can the critical relations of social structure and acculturative process be analyzed. Yet variability in the incidence of Africanisms within a popula-


tion is clearly an aspect of the internal differentiation of that unit, and implies the concurrence of acculturative processes between the differentiated sections, as well as of acculturative processes separately within each. Until such studies of internal differentiation are made, the representativeness or significance of the Africanisms reported from such populations remain open to question, and the core of the acculturative process cannot be exposed.

The Folk-Urban Continuum.

Robert Redfield, who has also been interested in the problem of acculturation, has attacked it on a different front—in Central America—and from a different point of view. Redfield worked in Yucatan, studying an important urban centre, Merida, and three rural Maya communities which were situated at different distances from the town. He found that differences in the cultural and social life of these rural communities seemed to form a developmental series which was matched by their relative distance from the common urban centre, or, conversely, by their immunity and isolation from modern influences. Redfield therefore raised the question whether in fact the significant feature of this acculturative process did not consist in the change of societal type; and on this basis he formulated an ideal-type dichotomy of folk and urban societies (27). In terms of this polarity, the most isolated of his rural communities, Tusik, most nearly approximates the definition of the Folk Society, while Merida is representative of Urban Society in Yucatan, and other intermediate communities such as Chan Kom occupy a position on the cultural scale corresponding to their geographical situation between these two poles. This ideal-type antithesis allows Redfield to present a systematic comparative analysis of cultural changes to be found as one moves from Tusik towards Merida in terms of increasing disorganisation, secularization, and individualisation; and then to enquire into the functional relations between these aspects of the acculturative processes to which modern urbanisation submits folk societies.

A brief comparison of Redfield's approach with that of Herskovits may be useful at this point, since both sets of researches fall into the common field of acculturation studies, and these two workers once co-operated in producing an early memorandum on the study of acculturation (28). Both writers employ comparative procedures in their studies of culture change or persistence, but whereas Herskovits devotes little attention to the variability of acculturation levels within a population, and compares societies on the basis of the distribution of African items between them, Redfield's emphasis is rather on the comparison of different levels of acculturation within a single continuum, and on the processes associated with acculturation as such. Unlike Redfield who takes the contemporary situation as his historical base-line, and then proceeds to compare four differently situated communities in terms of certain selected indices and characters, Herskovits regards the initial situation of contact between the carriers of different cultures as the appropriate base-line for his studies of Afro-American acculturation. Herskovits is therefore committed to ethnohistorical research, whereas Redfield's concern is with the incidence and processes of contemporary acculturation. Here it must be pointed out that Redfield's analysis of the cultural continuum of Yucatan is considerably weakened by the insufficient attention which he gives to the effects and processes of suppression of the great Maya rebellion in that area, as well as to the general history of Indian-Spanish relations in Mexican politics and government.

Redfield's approach directs greater attention to the structure of relations within and between groups as well as to impersonal media of communication than apparently does that of Herskovits; and this difference of orientation is reflected in the different conceptual systems of the two writers. Thus Redfield analyses the acculturation continuum from Merida to Tusik in terms of a societal polarity, and consequently employs concepts and categories which focus on the social aspects or concomitants of cultural change, such as disorganisation, individualisation, or secularization. Herskovits, on the other hand, approaches problems of process through the initial study of forms, and therefore utilises categories such as survival, syncretism, or reinterpretation, which reflect degrees of purity and independent persistence of the original cultural forms. Herskovits, in other words, has placed a primary emphasis on the cultural frame of analysis, whereas Redfield has tended to dovetail his studies of acculturation with the analysis of changing social forms.

Behind these differences of Herskovits and Redfield loom the historical differences of the areas with which each worker is concerned. The subordinate Maya of Yucatan were inducted into the wider society of their conquerors as communities, and their original social organisation persisted in this new situation as far as the two were consistent. The African populations of the New World, however, were recruited on a basis which, in large measure, destroyed their original social organisation, and were then subjected to a mode of social reorganisation in slavery which tended to continue that process. Consequently, the study of acculturation among the Maya can hardly be developed without devoting equal attention to social process and changing social
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forms, while the same study of acculturation in Afro-American populations would encounter many obstacles if it was initially conceived in terms of the concurrent study of social change. These important differences of milieu largely account for the hitherto divergent interests and procedures of the two sets of studies; but they do not by any means rule out the combination of their approaches within the framework of a general theory and conception of sociocultural processes which may hold for both fields alike.

Redfield's approach, like that of Herskovits, has stimulated considerable interest and debate, and will probably continue to do so for some time to come. Tax has shown that Redfield's ideal-type dichotomy is not mutually exclusive as suggested, even in nearby Guatemala (29). Julian Steward has pointed out that the concept of levels of organisation within a developmental continuum applies to the materials which Redfield uses, and therefore makes the classification of any community in terms of the folk-urban continuum a purely definitional problem (30). Herskovits has brought West African data to bear on the continuum (31). Bascom, quoting Schwab, notes that some Yoruba cities are 'urban' in terms of form, but 'folk' in terms of process (32), and it has often been pointed out that urban communities frequently contain folk elements, and that folk societies also may exhibit urban elements. The position of certain societies such as the Hausa of Northern Nigeria in this continuum will vary according to the particular differentiate of the polar ideal-types which are under immediate consideration (33).

It seems, however, that the principal criticism of Redfield's ideal-type analysis and approach to the study of cultural contact and change may consist in the incommensurability of the units between which his comparisons were actually made. One term of Redfield's dichotomy is given as the Folk Society, but it is only communities that he actually investigated, and there are crucial differences between communities and societies, particularly where the former are subordinate rural administrative units of a modern state whose governmental and economic life is centred in the urban areas. (34). Steward has recently called attention to this difference and to the problems of comparability which it presents. In terms of Redfield's ideal-types and empirical research, the urban unit, Merida, more closely realises the condition and status of a society therefore, than do any of the rural communities which are under its effective administration. For this reason also, the variation in degrees of urbanisation, dis-

organisation, and the like, which are exhibited by the several rural communities which Redfield studies, are more significantly analysed in terms of the effective subordination and inclusion of these communities within the wider administrative unit, than simply as a function of linear distance from the town.

The root of this difficulty seems to lie in the failure to distinguish sufficiently between social systems and societies. Almost any group structure or activity can be conceived of as a social system of some particular kind or other, and this applies to schools, societies, and communities alike. But the society as a system is distinct from other social systems in many important ways. (35). The society is a system which includes all other types of social system as parts of itself. It is self-recruiting, theoretically self-sufficient, and is self-determining within the context of its relations with external societies. Communities differ from societies particularly with respect to inclusiveness, self-determination, and self-sufficiency. Communities also vary in the degree or level to which they control their own regulative institutions as self-sufficient units, and this variation corresponds directly with their subordination to and dependence on governmental, religious, and economic institutions and processes which regulate local life and integrate local groups within the broader framework of a wider society. It follows, therefore, that corresponding variability obtains between communities with respect to the levels of their integration as local units on the one hand, and their integration within the society on the other. This variability forms an important aspect of the processes of secularization, disorganisation, and individualisation, which Redfield noticed in the Yucatan communities which he studied. But it is clear that of themselves community studies provide an inadequate basis for the construction of a societal typology, since variability in the local control of regulative institutions, and hence of local integration, corresponds to variation of levels and degrees of integration within the societies of which communities are parts.

The significance of Redfield's work for British Caribbean sociology can hardly be overestimated. Beckwith, Edith Clarke, Cohen, Herskovits, Madeline Kerr, Matthews, Taylor, and R. T. Smith have all been concerned with problems of folk culture and its relation to the dominant traditions of various British Caribbean territories in one way or another (36). Hadley and Macmillan have generalised distinctions on this basis, and applied them as exploratory categories in formulating general models of
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British West Indian society (37). The Editors of *Caribbean Quarterly* have also directed attention to this cleavage, and Broom has indicated the necessity for specific studies of urbanisation within the area. (38). On the other hand, analyses of society in Jamaica and Trinidad have been presented in terms of class, caste and colour concepts, without reference to the polarities of 'folk' and 'non-folk' (39); and Henriques has challenged Kerr’s statement that a cultural conflict obtains between folk and elite cultures in Jamaica (40). It seems clear that differences of definition, research problems, and theory may all be involved in this conflict of analytic models, and that some conceptual and theoretical clarifications are requisite at this stage in the development of British Caribbean social research.

It is an indication of the general resemblances between British Caribbean societies and those of the wider area initially delimited that similar ambiguities about the appropriate analytic models for communities in this wider area should also obtain. Thus Haitian society has been analysed in terms of class and caste stratification, as well as cleavages between the urban and folk cultures (41). Brazil and the Southern United States have received similar treatment (42). So has Central American society (43). The point at issue here is not simply the superiority of these competing models—stratification, and folk-elite cultural differences—since each may well be more appropriate for particular problems. Rather we are concerned with their combination to produce a richer and more balanced analysis that can be expected from researches conducted within either of these frames of reference separately. Where, as in Haiti, stratification coincides with marked cultural differences, there is almost no problem of the type we are now considering, and comparability of the research with other studies in the wider area of our concern is assured, whatever analytic model is employed. But to the extent that stratification and cultural differentiation are not patently coincident, then considerable problems of interpretation and conceptualisation invest the analysis, and competition rather than comparability of models and materials may result.

At present, the debate over Redfield’s theory seems to have shifted towards the question of the cultural status of the alternat-
or in terms of folk and elite, and if they are found to exhibit cultural differences of an order sufficient to distinguish one culture from another, we could then apply terms such as class-culture, caste-culture, folk and elite cultures, to distinguish their ways of life. Clearly, where the two are found together, this type of cultural differentiation is of a different type from regional variation, and it invites confusion to treat them as equivalent (47). Such an equivalence does violence to social space, reducing its contemporary dimensions from three to two. Thus problems of substance which are involved in this differentiation of vertical and horizontal cultural variations have been somewhat obscured in Redfield’s formation of the folk-urban continuum; but terminology should aid rather than obscure their investigation.

Psychological studies and interpretations.

Problems of cultural and social differentiation, and of their handling, can be appreciated from a review of the psychologically oriented literature on the Caribbean and adjacent areas. Since a good deal more has been published on the psychological content and aspect of social relations among the Negro-White populations of the United States and the Caribbean, than about the mixed Indian-White communities of Middle America, we shall confine our discussion to psychological studies and interpretations of mixed Negro-White societies. From the outset it is important to stress the distinction between psychological studies on the one hand, and interpretations which employ psychological concepts but do not represent the results of psychological field research on the other. A brief summary of the writings about to be examined will direct attention to this difference.

Since the pioneer studies by Dollard and Powdermaker of a cotton-producing area in Mississippi, formal studies of social psychology have been made in several Caribbean territories, in St. Thomas by Campbell, in Jamaica by Madeline Kerr and Yehudi Cohen, working independently, and apparently by Rhoda Metraux in Haiti. Psychological interpretations lacking bases of formal psychological research have been applied to St. Martin and St. Eustatius by Kruijier, to the British West Indies en bloc by Simey and Hadley, and to the Trinidadian middle-class by Braithwaite (48). Clearly these two sets of work rest on different foundations and require different treatment.

The geographical spread of these studies is almost matched by their differences of psychological orientation. Dollard and Powdermaker gave detailed treatment to the psychological content of race and caste relations without attempting to formulate overall personality configurations for the population studied. Lloyd Warner in an early study of Chicago Negroes developed a specialised concept of ‘social personality types’ from the consideration of the individual life-changes of American Negroes, and found thirty-two such types among his sample (49). Braithwaite applied the concept of the Authoritarian Personality to one social class in Trinidad. Campbell, Kerr, and Kruijier on the other hand, have attempted to define ‘basic personalities’ in the populations which they studied, using methods and concepts formulated by Kardiner. Simey and Hadley have both written about British West Indian ‘basic personality’ types, while employing the frustration-aggression theories of Dollard and others in their formulation. Campbell has also supplemented Kardiner’s methodology by constructs derived from Lewin. Cohen’s analysis of interpersonal relations within a Jamaica community represents yet another approach.

Problems of social and cultural differentiation and their handling are of central importance in the consideration of these psychologically oriented studies, and have received the clearest formulation in Warner’s work. Since the determination of social structures, groups, and classes must precede their psychological investigation, it is thus necessary to consider the treatment of social differentiation first, before proceeding to discuss the psychological interpretations proposed for such patterns. In this respect, the first point to note is that the studies listed above were made in several different types of society. Chicago, we are told, operates a system of informal caste. In Mississippi caste is traditional, highly formalised, and ubiquitous. In St. Thomas, the Americans have recently introduced their caste pattern to a society formerly organised otherwise in terms of wealth, colour, and culture. In Haiti, however much writers may dispute the nature of stratification in terms of caste or class, all agree that cultural and social differentiation coincide. In discussing stratification in Trinidad, Braithwaite describes it in terms of caste, semi-caste, and class, while also assigning a prominent place to colour differences. Kerr, whose psychological studies were mainly of the Jamaican folk, distinguishes three classes in Jamaican society, and points out that these are correlated with cultural and colour differences, such that the conflicting cultural requirements which obtain are productive of personality disorientations and disorganisations under certain conditions. As mentioned above, this coexistence of diverse cultural traditions in Jamaica is questioned by Henriques, who submits no evidence to the contrary

however, and in his conceptualisation of Jamaican culture in terms of 'syncretism' would seem to indicate that Kerr's observations may reflect concrete conditions (50).

Within the small community of 270 souls studied by Cohen, three classes were distinguished, primarily in economic terms. Cohen also adds that even the upper class of this community would “occupy a lower class status in the urban areas” (51). Simey conceived of West Indian social stratification in terms of three classes, but described one “basic West Indian personality type”, and has been criticised for this by Hadley on the basis of data from St. Vincent which indicate the existence of three major strata with marked cultural differences, and personality types postulated to correspond (52). It would seem therefore that outside the United States with its formal or informal caste systems, there is little unanimity about the nature and significance of differentiation within the societies examined.

A brief consideration of the two finest studies now under consideration, those by Dollard and Powdermaker, will serve to bring this issue into sharper focus. Both these workers conducted independent field researches in the same community of Mississippi, and attempted psychological analyses of the social milieu. Both recognised the importance of social differentiation within the community, and the necessity for determining its form and extent as a preliminary to the psychological study of social and race relations. The 'caste' system was clearly indisputable, but within either caste both writers report differently the existence and extent of class divisions. Dollard regards the white population of the community as being mainly middle-class, with no local representatives of the Southern upper class, and only Poor Whites or 'red-necks', who live outside the township studied, in the white lower class. Powdermaker finds representatives of the white upper class present also. Among the Negroes Dollard finds two major divisions, a middle class, and a lower class, while Powdermaker reports the existence of a Negro upper class also, and implicitly subdivides the Negro middle and lower classes. It seems that whereas Dollard gives his classification a primary regional reference, Powdermaker's was primarily local; but there are other differences in the two concepts of class with which these writers worked. Dollard's classes seem to have the same reference or connotations on both sides of the caste line, whereas it appears that the class subdivisions which Powdermaker employs have different meanings or referents on either side of the caste line.

These alternative schemes naturally have significant implications for the psychological analyses which these writers present. Thus Dollard defines the race problem as presented primarily by the patterned relations among and between middle-class Whites and lower-class Negroes, although he also discusses the situation of middle-class Negroes. Powdermaker on the other hand finds a more diffuse, variable, and less dramatically articulated set of patterns, corresponding to her initial view of the greater degrees of internal differentiation of both groups.

This comparison is made here simply to highlight the critical importance of differentiation and stratification for social-psychological studies of communities, and to indicate that even after careful investigations by able workers carried out in an area of highly formalised social differentiation disagreements concerning the nature and type of social differentiation remain which have significant influences on the psychological analyses themselves. Even admitting that different emphases or objectives may predispose workers to favour different systems of classification for the same population, we are simply left with the question of the expository, heuristic, or substantive nature of the categories involved, and their relations (53).

Another aspect of these researches of Powdermaker and Dollard which is worthy of mention reflects the nature of the social system in which they worked. This system, that of the Southern United States, presents a rigidly organised set of race relations, and equally rigid definitions of racial membership. In an important sense therefore, Dollard and Powdermaker were carrying out studies of 'race relations' under conditions of their precise and elaborate articulation which are not usually found in other populations of the wider area which forms the natural frame of reference for Caribbean social research. On this ground alone it would seem quite likely that the conclusions reached by Dollard and Powdermaker in Mississippi would be unlikely to hold generally elsewhere in this area, and that their application to societies with less rigid systems of racial differentiation would be somewhat incautious. In fact, however, Simey has relied heavily and uncritically on Dollard's formulation of Southern Negro frustration-aggression reactions to their racial situation, and has applied this in a generalised form to the British Caribbean at large, with little attention to variations between or within colonies. This is simply one instance of the growing number of loose applications of concepts and theories developed by careful psychological studies of quite distinct field conditions to the description of West Indian social life. Social and psychological research will both suffer if this vogue should continue unchecked.
The fact that the frustration-aggression hypothesis lends itself to such facile application as that made by Simey is of itself sufficient to raise questions concerning the degree of precision in the definition of key terms, or in the delimitation of processes and effects, covered by that theory. Simey, for instance, argues that submissive behaviour is a form of aggression (54). Powdermaker also writes of a young Negro girl who is "aggressive in her determination to hold her head high and break away from the lowly position to which the whites would condemn her" (55). Thus both self-respect and its opposite, self-abnegation, are instances of aggressive behaviour in similar contexts; and one is left to wonder what isn't. Key terms which are used helter-skelter in such a fashion are clearly of dubious analytic value.

Divergencies in the psychological interpretations of West Indian social patterns as well as in the procedures of their investigation are probably as great as any community of method or findings among the psychologically oriented writers on this area. It seems to be generally assumed, probably on the basis of the two Mississippi studies just discussed, that aggressiveness characterises a great many areas of social relations in the Caribbean, though relatively little attention is usually paid to the frustrations required by theory as correlates of this. Hadley and Campbell however point out that aggressiveness varies in its expression, incidence and intensity according to the status of the individuals concerned. Kerr makes little use of this concept in her study of the Jamaican basic personality, by which she perhaps means the 'peasant' personality type, and which she finds to be extra-punitive (56). In his study of a small Jamaican community Cohen presents a picture of a group of persons markedly hostile, insecure, dependent, and fearful. Braithwaite, discussing authoritarian characteristics of the Trinidad middle-class in a quasi-psychological manner, also stresses anxiety and insecurity, together with drives for power and submission. Rhoda Metraux traces Haitian individualism in political and social life back to certain traumatic adjustment situations of infancy and childhood. Campbell employs Lewin's concept of aspiration and achievement levels to subdivide the population of St. Thomas into three groups, those with high aspiration and achievement, those with low aspiration and achievement, and those with high aspiration and low achievement, the last being a situation productive of both frustration and aggression. This attempt to extend the analysis beyond the circular frustration-aggression reaction by delimiting the types of situation under which frustration develops is highly commendable as an aim, though unsatisfactory in performance. It is not easy to demonstrate that persons enjoying favourable conditions are any whit less aggressive than those who do not, although their frustrations may be less immediately obvious. Nor is Campbell's omission of the fourth category of Lewin's conceptual system, those with low aspiration but high achievement, entirely satisfactory. Social systems being what they are, such a category is not likely to be altogether devoid of empirical reference, and indeed, if aspiration is relative to the individual's situation, and if achievement is measurable in terms of social recognition, (how else?) then on Campbell's data, both the immigrant American and Creole groups of St. Thomas contain elements classifiable in those terms. On the whole, however, it would appear that such highly general categories could be applied a priori to any human or animal population whatsoever, yielding similar results, and thus saving a good deal of research.

As a group these psychological studies and interpretations are therefore subject to two main criticisms, the generality and vagueness of their various theoretical and conceptual systems, and the ambiguities in their classifications of the populations studied. It is also of interest to note how variously these students stress different aspects or stages of social life. Dollard and Powdermaker, for example, give the psychologically primordial infancy situation scant attention. Cohen deals with the early period most methodically and effectively, but largely ignores the school, which Miss Kerr finds to be a fairly efficient agency for personality disorganisation in Jamaica. Hadley regards the past and present situations of the British Caribbean populations as of such moment for understanding contemporary personality patterns that he devotes half of his paper to these topics, the remainder being a brief summary of the three main personality types as revealed by this survey. Simey indeed seems to have made little direct or systematic study of the West Indian situation with which his book deals, but was content to apply concepts drawn from studies in America to the Caribbean area in a manner not strikingly different from the application of stereotypes. In somewhat similar fashion, Kruijier has simply adopted Campbell's work on St. Thomas Negroes as a convenient frame for the discussion of St. Martin and St. Eustatius, while Braithwaite has done the same for Trinidad's middle-class with the concept of the Authoritarian Personality. The apparent ease with which these psychological concepts lend themselves to wholesale projections in alien areas without prior research strongly suggests that their formulations may be defective in rigour, or else are not fully understood by those applying them; and it also suggests that such concepts and interpretations may possess more significance as an expository device in the hands of certain writers, than as substantive statements about the populations referred to. Bearing this in mind,
it is interesting to note the agreement obtaining among these students who lay such different stresses on different phases of the psychogenetic process, or on different situations expressive of personality traits, in the definition of West Indian personality patterns.

Stratification and Differentiation.

Commencing with a review of studies which focus on cultural contact and change, we have moved gradually to the other plane of analysis offered by sociology and have now to deal directly with the problems of internal social differentiation. As a glance at the literature will show, these are among the most complex phases of social reality, and a great many conflicting views are held about their nature, interpretation, and appropriate methods of investigation (57). However, we have found that without some adequate conceptualisation of this phase of sociocultural reality, systematic comparative studies within the Caribbean or its geographical context are hardly possible on the one hand, while even the intensive studies of small districts and communities have unclear general implications and references on the other. Cultural variability and psychological problems gain in significance and precision from their definitions in terms of particular situations, structures, and groups. Thus, although alternative interpretations of social life might be offered by cultural, sociological, and psychological studies, the competition of these analytic planes, and of the models constructed within their separate frames, is ultimately more apparent than real; and in the last resort, we shall only approach an adequate and refined analysis of human problems or relations by a combination of these and other approaches. The need for this combined approach is well known of course; what differences of opinion exist on this subject mainly reflect divergences about the form or method of such interdisciplinary work.

We have seen that studies of cultural process and change lose a great deal when conducted without equally intense examination of the social milieu within which these developments occur, and to which they give form; also that societal differentiation cannot be handled apart from equally intensive studies of the forms and processes of cultural differentiation which it implies; and finally that psychological analyses of social systems depend for their utility in large measure upon adequate prior analyses of the structure of such systems, if they are to avoid errors of


reference as well as interpretation. On these grounds it would seem that the order of objectives in a combined interdisciplinary study of society would give high priority to the determination and analysis of the social structure, defining its major units and their interrelations in a systematic fashion which would facilitate the integration of cultural and psychological studies. Clearly enough, the alternative to this procedure is the method of hit or miss, which has already enjoyed an unhappy monopoly for too long. But there is little agreement about the nature, field, and content of social stratification and differentiation. Since these dimensions are basic to the formulation of structural models of complex societies of the type with which we are concerned, lack of agreement here has been largely responsible for delay in the development of an integrated interdisciplinary approach to these problems.

Social stratification is nowadays conceived of as a continuous hierarchic ranking of social positions and roles (58). It is sometimes also regarded as an inherent attribute of all societies; but this view is not empirically tenable. Such a postulate is only essential to general theories which seek to 'explain' stratification as inherent and implicit in the concept of societies as systems of a particular type. If we look behind such theories to the problems which led to their formulation we shall arrive at a better understanding of both.

The recent history of thought about social stratification can be said to commence with the work of Karl Marx. He defined classes in terms of their relations to the means of production, that is, as economic categories within the society. Marx also postulated a continuous conflict between these economic classes, which thereby implied their existence as solitary and self-conscious social units in greater or less degree. That is to say, Marx commenced with an abstract operational classification of persons on the basis of economic criteria, and concluded that these categories were substantive social units. Marx's procedure illustrates one of the critical problems in this field of study, the problem of distinguishing between operationally defined 'classes', and actual social classes; or of ascertaining their correspondence.

In the past forty years, many alternative formulations of the class concept have been offered, some of which are given in the book by Bendix and Lipset referred to above. At the same time, other dimensions than those selected by Marx of importance to the development and study of class systems have attracted notice; and the problems of the interrelation of these dimensions have occupied a central place in theory and research alike. Termino-
logical shifts have accompanied this refinement of the field of study; and nowadays one speaks of economic or social or political classes, of elites, estates, and status, of prestige classes and participation classes, of reference groups, and the like. Each of these terms and concepts reflects certain criteria relevant to the existence or study of classes, and these criteria are often closely related, so that the attribution of any single order of weighting and priority among them raises many problems.

This summary suggests the type of problems which lie behind certain current approaches to the study of stratification. There are problems inherent in the notion of classification itself, as an analytic process. Are social classes simply analytic postulates of various writers? Do they have any substantive existence, and, if so, how? There are further problems concerning the constitution of class-concepts themselves, which centre upon the relation of the various criteria recognised as somehow associated with class organisation. There are problems of the boundaries of social classes, of their functions as well as bases, and of their definition by objective indices of various kinds on the one hand, or by subjective identifications on the other. Above all, there is the question of their existence, which is implicit in disagreements about their definition and nature. One does not question the objective existence of lineage relations in an African tribe, however one disputes their interpretation, simply because these lineage relations recur constantly and in regular patterns during studies by different investigators. One does doubt the reality of the numerous human 'instincts' postulated by various psychologists simply because their lists show so little agreement. Similar difficulties arise in the study of class, and the layman can rightly ask the sociologists, "How are you all so certain of the existence of class, when unable to agree among yourselves in what it consists?"

The type of theory which Parsons advances seeks to meet these problems among others, by differentiating between value-systems in a way which is consistent with, and to some extent reflected in, the conflicting interpretations or models of class organisation that currently obtain. Thus Parsons' four primary value-standards or systems allow of coexistent conflicting interpretations of the system of stratification within any society, to the degree that these value-standards are themselves tightly or loosely integrated. Different rank-orders may therefore obtain according to which of these standards are under consideration. But Parsons also holds that these standards themselves are always ranked in some order of priority, and that the distribution of power accords with this ranking between them, and with the prestige of persons or groups which also reflects this ranking. In other words, such a theory seeks to accept and explain differences of opinion about class boundaries and bases by postulating a system of multiple valuations, which is nonetheless itself hierarchical in structure. And this rank-order of the primary value-standards is conceived on an analytic ground as inherent in the notion of social systems as such. "The principal criterion of priority of evaluation of functions, hence differentiated sub-systems, is strategic significance for system-process." (Parsons, op. cit., 1953, p. 110, his italics). This simply means that insofar as societies are systems they must each have a continuous rank-ordering of roles and positions.

As already observed, however, this generalisation is not always borne out, so that either some societies are not systems, or they are systems of a different type from Parsons' models. In certain tribal societies for example, half the population, women, are often excluded from ranking which obtains among males; and this ranking, frequently, as among the Hausa, or in certain lineage systems, accords equal value to positions discharging different roles, as well as the contrary. Empirical materials of this type may be insufficient objection to Parsons' theory on either of two grounds firstly, that such societies are not systems of the type or in the sense of his discussion; secondly, that, although they are, their analysis has failed to define their four primary value-standards, as well as the content of each, or their interrelation. To these possible rejoinders, there are two replies. Firstly, by what criteria other than field study itself can one establish whether any society is a system, or a system of the particular type under discussion? Secondly, by what criteria, other than the system of stratification itself can one establish the rank-ordering of the various value-standards, or indeed their separateness and content? For clearly, if the theory which purports to 'explain' certain phenomena assumes but cannot predict them, then it simply consists in their description from one particular point of view.

This is not the place for a detailed discussion of Parsons' theory of social stratification. It has been quoted merely to illustrate current thinking about these problems, and the complexity which they present. But before proceeding to discuss empirical researches, three observations are necessary. Firstly, Parsons discusses stratification in terms of roles of performances, which accords with the action frame of reference he adopts, but may not always be appropriate to or consistent with ranking as it goes on in empirical societies, some of which at least accord priority in rankings to positions, rather than roles, defining these consistently or otherwise in terms of one or more criteria. Because Parsons defines stratification problems in terms of roles, and ranks roles in terms of their "strategic significance for system-process", he implicitly assumes that stratification, besides
being continuous with the society, unidimensional and integrative, also has positive functions essential to the system. None of these imputations is easily demonstrable by empirical materials, although each of them may be controverted by such data.

Secondly, Parsons' model of stratification develops from an abstract consideration of social systems as equilibrium systems with particular levels and types of integration. It seems however that levels and types of integration are properly a matter for empirical research, and that they cannot be postulated in any precise sense for societies at large, or for any single society at different points of time. Such postulation would lead to the treatment of a system in rapid and violent change, for example, during a period of revolution and counter-revolution, as exhibiting conditions of equilibrium and integration at all instants equally, and would also permit the entire process to be conceptualised in these terms. Now clearly, predicates of this level of generality and imprecision are of dubious value as guides to empirical studies or their analysis. And the same charge of generality and imprecision may be levelled at each of the value-standards in turn, not as formal categories, but with regard to their content and substance in any empirical society. Traits and functions classifiable in terms of each of these four standards in one context may be classifiable differently in another, and within the same society, as well as between societies. Such a condition simply reflects the multifunctional nature of institutional activities, the multiplicity of their goals, and the manifold of their inter-relations. To conceptualise these diverse aspects in terms of phases reflecting basic differences of value-orientations involves abstractions of an order which are both so highly general as to be of doubtful value, and at the same time so constructed as to mutilate the organic structure and character of institutional activities.

Finally, the point must be made that the existence as well as the nature of a single continuous system of stratification must be established by field research in any particular society, rather than predicted as an implication of theory. Until such a single series is demonstrated, it is wiser to conceive the field of relations which involve ranking and distinctions in terms of social differentiation, which does not imply any particular form for the structures under study, admits the possibility of a single hierarchy, reduces the theoretical problems and overtones which invade such studies, and also keeps empirical research alert to the many factors and aspects which are or may be involved.

Empirical studies of social stratification in America have been conducted on the basis of one or more indices of an objective kind, such as occupation, income, house-type, residential area, or association and group membership, as well as by the use of subjective evaluations and identifications of their own class position, or those of others, as given by informants. These approaches are sometimes combined, as in the work of Warner and his associates (59). The criteria selected in these studies indicate the two primary orientations of the class concept, objectively towards an economic and social base, and subjectively, through identification and other references, as an expression of social psychology. Hence the frequent definition of such classes in terms of prestige, and the phenomenon of their ranking, as more or less prestigious. Naturally, as one would expect, even the most subjective classifications have a certain consistency in their objective referents; but this is by no means a uniformity, and cannot be reduced to invariant relations between any of the various dimensions, such as wealth, occupation, social participation, style of life, family history, power, or the like, which are involved in the general constructs.

As regards the relation of class-difference to culture, there has so far been little discussion. And this itself is one of the most revealing aspects of stratification studies. Class in other words assumes adherence of the groups which it differentiates to common institutions, and thereby, in the last resort to a common system of values. Classes are thus differentiated culturally in respect of non-institutionalized behaviours, such as etiquette, standards of living, associational habits and value-systems which may coexist as alternatives on the basis of the common values basic to the class-continuum. Classes differentiated in this manner reflect, besides their hereditary aspects, educational, economic, and other differences also. But they are not definable in terms of adherence to different systems of social institutions, since that would imply their equation with societies, as distinct cultural groups.

Now in the U. S. A., the criteria used in studies of stratification among Whites have also been applied to Negros. The sharp racial lines and frequently deviant patterns of American Negros notwithstanding, there appears to be sufficiently general consensus about the validity of such studies, to indicate that in America we have two parallel social segments, one white, the other black, linked together in various ways, among them by formal adherence to common institutions. The nature of this racial division itself calls for some consideration. It varies between regions and between states, but includes legal prohibition on inter-marriage, occupational differentiation to a fair degree, bans on commensality in much of the area, provision of separate public facilities for the two racial groups, and the definition of a Negro as any person with one drop of Negro blood, or more. In terms of this defini-

tion Negroes are a residual social category, and as could be expected, under such conditions, pure Negroes form a minority within the American Negro group (60). Warner and his fellow-workers have labelled this type of race-differentiation, 'colour-caste', a term which directs attention simultaneously to its parallels with caste systems as for instance obtaining in India, and its differences. Caste implies uniformity in the ranking of units, and thus uniformity in ranking members of such groups, which does not always obtain in America. Thus across the American colour-caste line, the poor White occupies an inferior social-class position to the middle or upper-class Negro in many, though not in all, respects. Under a caste system moreover, occupational inheritance obtains which is also lacking in America. Individual social mobility is ruled out by caste, theoretically even where migrancy occurs, and the system of caste stratification enjoys the sanction of religion. Caste is conceived of, in other words, as a sacred structure, and the disobedience to caste norms and inter-relations is not merely unlawful, but also sinful. These latter features of the true caste-system are lacking from the American scene, and consequently Warner's terminology seeks to reflect this.

Within the American Negro group, as many researches demonstrate, differences of colour and shade are widespread and of great significance in personal relations. This means that the number of criteria adequate for a study of class-structure among American whites must be increased to include the colour factor in parallel studies of American Negroes; and the correlation between colour-ranking and other forms of status-determinant also requires investigation. Replications of this sort clearly reflect the ideological patterns associated with American race relations on the one hand, and the continuities of economic, cultural, and other factors which obtain between American Whites and Negroes on the other.

It is clear that such conditions are distinctive of America within our area. It follows therefore that conceptualisation of social differentiation in other racially-mixed societies of this wider field in terms of American patterns may obscure factors of greater significance in the societies under study. Pierson's pioneer study of Bahia, Brazil, which was oriented towards the problem of race relations between the white, coloured, and black groups of that city, illustrates the point very well (61). Pierson's particular interest lay in the contrast between Brazilian and American race relations. This led him to treat social differentiation in terms of race, with little attention to the problems of cultural differentiation which are prominent in Bahia, although race differentiation or its absence are themselves cultural facts reflecting other cultural facts.

(60) Klunberg, (Ed.) 1944: Myrdal, G., 1944.
(61) Pierson, D., 1942.

Pierson's application of American concepts of stratification and differentiation to Latin American conditions is not unique, as Beals' review article makes clear. Beals concludes that "the use of strictly economic or economic and political criteria for class analysis of Latin America is the least useful approach" (62). He directs attention to the differences in stratification and differentiation between North and Latin America, and especially to the cultural differences between the Indian and Mestizo or Ladino groups within these Latin American societies. Redfield also has only touched on these problems of social differentiation within a community indirectly, so we shall have to look elsewhere for their direct analysis.

The Guatemalan village of San Luis, studied by Gillin and Tumin, is a suitable example (63). Both workers were in the field together, but carried out independent researches, which, although overlapping a good deal, were focussed on different aspects of local life. In San Luis, two-thirds of the population are Indians, and the remainder, of mixed Spanish-Indian descent, are known as Ladinos. Within San Luis, Indians are subordinated to Ladinos, individually and as a group. Beals, in the article just cited, observes that "In Guatemala, an anomalous situation exists, for horizontal movement is often possible for the Indian when he leaves his community; within his community, however, movement into the mestizo (here called Ladino) group is regarded as vertical movement, and is virtually impossible" (op. cit., p. 338). Gillin and Tumin describe this system of stratification in terms of 'caste', and both writers indicate that its posited racial basis is largely without objective foundation. Although Ladinos and Indians may not intermarry or eat together within the village, they sometimes do so beyond its perimeter. There are few other features at San Luis of the type usually associated with 'caste' in comparative sociology, except the uniformity of the dominance-subordination relations. On the other hand it is abundantly clear from both accounts that very marked differences of social status and culture obtain between Ladinos and Indians, and that the type and degree of their social differentiation is itself a cultural fact which is linked with and reflects these other cultural differences.

In America for example, colour-caste obtains between Whites and Negroes independently of cultural or class similarities or differences (64). In San Luis, caste difference seems to consist in the social expression of cultural dissimilarity, and seeks to perpetuate this. The Haitian situation is structurally similar to that of San Luis. Although disagreements occur among students of

(64) Warner, et al., 1941.
Haiti concerning the definition of Haitian stratification in terms of caste or class, there is marked consensus on the existence of two different cultures in that country, and also on the definition of Haitian social stratification in terms of this cultural cleavage. In effect this means that cultural cleavage is a particular order, if associated with a rigid and traditional pattern of subordination, may give the appearance of caste, when really of a different nature. It also means that in populations characterised by wide cultural variability, the analysis of social differentiation must proceed together with the study of the cultural differentiation, in the same way that the study of acculturation must proceed also by the study of the social structures involved. Unless this co-ordination of cultural and sociological study obtains, then acculturation study is deprived of its social reference on the one hand, and stratification is inadequately conceived in terms of race, caste or class on the other.

Few explicit studies of social differentiation have yet been made for British Caribbean societies. On the other hand there are several accounts of these populations which interpret them in terms of social and cultural divisions. Thus Martha Beckwith's study of Jamaican folk-culture implicitly recognises an important cultural cleavage within that society by its exclusion of a considerable section of the local population from its reference. Miss Kerr's study reveals similar assumptions, and she explicitly states that this cultural cleavage, expressed as conflict, inhibits the development of healthy personality types among many Jamaicans. For Dutch Guiana and Trinidad, the researches of Herskovits into folk-life have similar implications, many of which are explicitly formulated in terms of acculturative processes. Clearly any acculturative situation presupposes the contact and coexistence of two or more cultural traditions. Observations by other students of Caribbean societies, such as Campbell, Reuter, Gordon, Hadley, Pearse, Kruijier, Cohen, Clarke and Matthews, indicate that this condition is general among Caribbean societies (65). In Central America comparable levels of cultural differentiation are reported by Redfield, Tumin, Wagley, Gillin, and others, although interpretations vary from the folk-urban continuum of Redfield to the caste constructs of Tumin (66).

Writers with primary political or administrative orientations also face this problem of interpreting Caribbean social structures and culture. Blanshard, Proudfoot, Simey, and MacMillan direct attention to the complexity of their internal differentiation in both these fields, though differing about the significance of this condition (67). Olivier writing about Jamaica gave less attention to these aspects of local society, than to the community of social and cultural patterns laid down in its history. But publication of this work was followed by major social upheavals in the island, which contrast sharply with the implications of Olivier's study (68). On the other hand, MacMillan's alternative interpretation of Jamaican society, which directed attention to the instability and internal tensions implicit in its differentiation, was borne out to a high degree by events of the year which followed its publication.

Explicit studies of social differentiation in British Caribbean societies have recently commenced with the work of Braithwaite, Henriques, and Broom (69). All three writers are concerned primarily with the Creole populations, Braithwaite discussing Trinidad, the others Jamaica. Henriques and Braithwaite conceive the field in terms of stratification, but Broom prefers the more inclusive concept of differentiation. All three writers direct attention to ethnicity and colour as criteria of importance in the social structure, but give little explicit attention to cultural differences within the population, or the relation of these factors to the patterns of stratification or differentiation. These three studies are therefore similar in their attack on a common problem to the extent that they omit direct treatment of the cultural aspects of this problem.

Beyond this, they frequently differ, despite concentration on similar problems, and the use of common criteria such as colour, occupation and wealth. Henriques defines Jamaican stratification in terms of three 'colour-classes', while Braithwaite speaks of a similar number of strata in Trinidad as castes, semi-castes, and classes. Henriques divides Jamaican society among these classes as follows: lower class, 85%; middle-class, 10%; upper class 5%; and concludes with the candid observation that, 'The use of the class divisions, upper, middle, lower, is a necessary methodological device, and does not indicate the actual divisions in the society' (70). In other words his analysis may well have no objective reference. Braithwaite's position is very similar; and he simply dismisses the problem of objective reference in a 'note on numbers', consisting of license totals of various kinds, and income tax assessments, which cannot themselves be equated directly with the type of variable, colour, on which his analysis is principally based (71). In other words for both these writers the empirical boundaries of social classes, and thus their constitution, presents little problem for stratification analysis.

Both writers agree that the system under discussion is one of

(68) Olivier, Lord, 1936.
continuous stratification, though one within which individual movement across the principal class or caste boundaries is extremely difficult. Both urge that this system is continuous for the population by virtue of the common valuations which it represents. Thus Henriques summarises the Jamaican situation as follows: “today the whole colour-class system is dependent upon the almost complete acceptance by each group of the superiorit of the white, and the inferiority of the black” (ibid, p. 41). Braithwaite’s view of Trinidad is essentially similar: “here again, we see that the key to the unity in the diversity of judgments is the acceptance of the upper class as the upper class. In this case, however, we have the main common values shared by all the groups in the society” (Ibid, pp. 52-3). Now this really consists in explaining social stratification in terms of itself after first assuming that it forms the general framework of these social structures, without detailed empirical examination of this question. Agreement upon these points however, does not rule out differences of their interpretation. Thus Henriques emphasises the disnomic or disbalanced condition of Jamaican society, whereas Braithwaite sees Trinidad undergoing a process of change from adherence to a paramount common value system of a particularistic ascritice type towards one stressing universalistic achievement. But Braithwaite notes cautiously that “the change may be expected to lead to a certain amount of conflict within the system; and the contradictions between the rival systems of values will be likely to lead to tendencies towards disintegration within the social system” (Ibid, p. 170). This can only be taken to indicate that the “common valuesystem” is not truly common at all; and such a view is supported by the data which Braithwaite provides illustrating the divisive effects of the caste, colour, class patterns and values obtaining in Trinidad. Given these divisions, the type of consensus which is presupposed by common values has marginal significance compared with the type of differentiation which obtains. It may well be the case that recent changes in the contemporary situation of Trinidad place primary emphasis on universalistic standards, and even that certain elements of Trinidadian society would gain by these; but such conditions refer to the context of Trinidad, and do not directly warrant inferences about their acceptance by the society itself.

Henriques’ conception of Jamaica as disnomic directs attention to the low level of integration within Jamaican society. This can only mean that the hierarchy of social divisions as a ranked series of white, brown and black strata, has a primarily divisive rather than integrative function. Such a view does not conform to those theories of stratification which define it in terms of integrative functions. Now since social integration is an aspect of adherence to common institutions, such an association of stratification with disnomic conditions as Henriques observes in Jamaica would seem to indicate that institutional divergences characterised the different strata in greater or less degree. And this in turn would indicate that stratification is definable to a large extent in terms of associated levels of cultural differentiation under such conditions. However we find Henriques demurring to Kerr’s conception of conflicting cultures in Jamaica, and describing Jamaican ‘culture’ in terms of synthesis and syncretism (1953, p. 172; 1953b, p. 62).

The question of importance here concerns the form and level at which this synthesis or syncretism obtains. We can illustrate this point from the work of Herskovits. When Herskovits speaks of ‘the Old World cultural province’ as a unit, he refers to certain generalised forms which obtain throughout that area. In a sense therefore, he presents a synthesis of Old World cultures of a very abstract character under the concept of a single cultural province. Of course, Herskovits is quite aware of the abstract and classificatory nature of such a synthesis. The question raised by Henriques’ account of Jamaica is whether the cultural ‘synthesis’ of which he speaks is not a conception of this kind, a classificatory, methodological device, subsuming or obscuring many diverse elements. On the evidence which he presents, this would seem to be the case. “Assimilation of European culture for the middle and upper classes has been successful. . . . The problem for the lower class in the elaboration of its institutions has been to endeavour to find avenues of expression denied it by the greater society,” (Ibid, p. 172). This can only mean that the institutions of the lower class differ from those of the upper and middle classes, in which case the Jamaican cultural synthesis is a heuristic taxonomic device of the student, rather than a concrete observable field datum.

Similar problems of the level of generality and abstraction invest the concept of cultural syncretism, as used by Henriques. Cultural syncretism connotes the identification of elements from two or more different traditions. Defined in this way the concept has objective reference to defined complexes and traits, and is clearly valuable, as for instance in the work of Herskovits (72). In contrast with this definition in terms of specific cultural patterns, Henriques seems to extend the notion of syncretism to all aspects and forms of cultural process simultaneously. Now even if this use of the concept was accepted, such a syncretism would have to be demonstrated in any particular case. But Henriques makes no effort to do this, and in fact, as can be seen from the quotation just given, recognises the institutional differen-
tion characteristic of Jamaican society. It is clear therefore that when he postulates cultural syncretism in Jamaica he does so on grounds which do not derive from field materials; and these grounds can only be theoretical or methodological in nature. Possibly these two conditions are integrated, and require the conception of a single cultural field, whether as synthesis or syncretism, if the type of analysis Henríques offers is to be possible at all. “Complete disnomia is difficult to conceive as such a state implies an entire lack of order in which a society could not exist”. (ibid, p. 160).

Now the type of analysis which Henríques offers assumes a single continuous system of stratification. This in turn implies some level of consensus about values among the population, some integrative functions of the stratification, and some level of cultural synthesis or syncretism. The questions of interest here are whether these assumptions are liable to empirical demonstration; whether they derive from empirical materials or deductive theories; whether in fact the nature and form of social differentiation in Caribbean colonies may not be more complex than such analytic schemes can handle adequately. Leonard Broom’s view of Jamaica would seem to imply that this is the case; “Social stratification in Jamaica cannot be understood as an uninterrupted continuum of status positions. No matter what empirical criteria are employed, gross discontinuities are to be found. Given the historical forces briefly outlined, this fact should cause no surprise, but the extreme character of this status cleavage affects all facets of Jamaican society”. (1954, p. 119).

Both Henríques and Braithwaite devote great attention to colour differences in their studies of stratification. But neither appear to handle this problem consistently or systematically. Thus Braithwaite identifies his classes with castes, and defines both in terms of colour factors; but his diagram of the colour distributions obtained in the contemporary stratification of Trinidad society indicate considerable departures from these definitions. (op. cit. pp, 47, 156). Henríques similarly defines his strata in terms of colour-class, and notes that ‘this colour-class division is not at all rigid’ (1953c, p. 42), wealth being an important variable; but he gives a good deal of evidence which suggests rigidity in several spheres. “Each colour category has a series of stereotypes for all the other categories, and for itself” (ibid, p. 52); and he concludes that “in fact colour can be said to pose the whole problem of ‘cultural’ values in the Caribbean” (ibid, p. 168). If this is so, then a systematic analysis of the colour complex would appear to form an essential preliminary to the development of any adequate models for the study of Caribbean societies. And it is to this analysis that we must now turn.

Colours in the British Caribbean.

In most mixed Negro-White populations, the concept of colour is critical and pervasive, hence we can expect on general grounds that it may have several distinct though overlapping referents. A systematic analysis of the colour concept therefore consists in the isolation of these different meanings, and the determination of relations between them.

As normally used in the British Caribbean, the term ‘colour’ connotes a combination of physical characters, such as skin-colour, hair-type, form of facial features, prognathism or its absence, and so forth. This is the sense in which Braithwaite and Henríques use the term, and will be referred to here as phenotypical colour. The phenotypical colour of an individual is simply his or her racial appearance. In British West Indian colonies there is a clear overt rank-order of different phenotypical colours in terms of a prestige scale, which places white phenotypes at the highest and black phenotypes at the lowest points. The phenotypical colour of an individual is therefore a factor of importance in his status placement in these societies.

But the matter does not rest there. Often enough, someone who is phenotypically black will claim that he has ‘white blood’, while someone who could be mistaken for white is known to have a mixed ancestry. These conditions direct attention to the biological variation of phenotype associated with varying degrees of racial mixture, and thus to the difference between genealogical colour—the biological status of an individual as defined in terms of his purity or mixture of racial descent—and phenotypical colour or appearance. The classic instance of status ascription on the basis of genealogical colour in our field is of course the American system of colour-caste; but although British Caribbean societies do not formalise status ascriptions solely in terms of this aspect of the colour concept, it receives attention in all of them. Two phenotypically equivalent individuals may be dissimilar in terms of genealogical colour, while two genealogically identical individuals, such as brothers, are frequently phenotypically distinct. This variability in the association of phenotype and genealogy guarantees that, where colour values loom large in social organisation, attention will be directed to both these conditions, even although they may not be generally distinguished with any consistency or precision. Between them, these two categories define and exhaust the genetic aspect of colour.

By themselves, however, phenotypical and genealogical colour can have no direct or necessary significance in society. This will be apparent immediately the lack of role differentiation on grounds of colour in such racially mixed Muhammadan
societies as Hausa-Fulani Zaria is brought to mind. In Zaria, light skin-colour is regarded as an attribute of beauty, but colour differences as such form no basis for role differentiation or status ascription (73). This example alone is sufficient to show the fact that status and role allocation on a basis of colour difference is subject to cultural determination. It also suggests that the general concept of colour may be an inadequate or misleading term of analysis unless its social and cultural components and their significance are clearly distinguished.

The social aspect of colour differences refers to the part which they play in individual and group association. It is thus to be determined by empirical study of formal and informal associations within a society, and can therefore be expected to vary from one society to another. We can most briefly isolate this dimension of the colour complex under the term associational colour. The associational colour of an individual is simply the expression of his associational habits in terms of the colour of the persons with whom he typically associates on terms of equality, familiarity, and intimacy. Thus a white man who habitually associates with black persons is associationally black, while a black man who habitually associates with white persons is associationally white. Now there is room for misconception of the associational colour of an individual, but this reflects misconceptions about the nature and type of his associational habits. Frequently enough, of course, an individual misconceives his own situation in this way, and this can be expected especially of mobile individuals. The point to note is that the associations which an individual forms, and in terms of which his associational colour, or "class-colour," is estimated, may vary at different times of his life, within limits which reflect the influence of other factors. For instance, as sometimes happens, a person whose fortunes change for better or worse may seek to change his associates correspondingly, and by this social mobility either acquires a new associational colour, or has to reconcile himself to a position of relative isolation. The concept of associational colour therefore permits a classification of individuals in terms of upward or downward mobility on the one hand, and static or isolated positions on the other. That is to say, besides allowing a formal classification of the population in terms of associational colour categories, this concept focusses attention on the dynamics of such systems. It goes a long way towards making possible the direct and systematic study of differences between the observable phenotypes of persons and their classification in colour terms within such societies. For, where colour differences have social significance, although the colour concept reflects this in its com-


plexity, there is normally a ranking of persons in terms of colour, a sort of chromatic status scale, and it is in these terms that the equation between an individual's associational and phenotypical colour is defined.

So far nothing has been said about behaviour, although associational patterns have behavioural content and aspects. Yet behaviour per se, the institutions, mores, conventions, and value patterns, which together constitute the culture of a population, besides giving definition and cohesion to the social form, also defines the colour complex itself. Hence behavioural patterns are clearly significant to the definition of individual and group statuses within society, and where social differentiation in terms of relativistic colour concepts obtains, can be expected to influence or correspond with this differentiation in greater or less degree.

The relevance of this point of cultural identity or difference, real or assumed, for our present analysis can be readily appreciated by consideration of the lack of status ascription on colour bases in multi-racial Islamic societies which for religious reasons are intolerant of internal cultural differentiation. In contrast, role and status ascription on racial and colour bases are characteristic of multi-racial societies where the racial divisions are, or until recently, have formed, culturally distinct groups. Under conditions of the latter type, the alternative to the complete disomia which puzzled Henriques consists in an hierarchic organisation of these culturally distinct groups, and the domination of one of these racial or cultural groups over the others provides the basis for a general prestige scale of their distinctive characters, phenotypic or other, such as we are now concerned to dissect. This simply means that, where culturally divergent groups together form a common society, the structural imperative for maintenance of this inclusive unit involves a type of political order in which one of these cultural sections is subordinated to the other. Such a condition derives from the structural requisites of society on the one hand, and the condition of wide cultural differences within some populations on the other. It is under such conditions that differences in race and colour acquire general social significance.

We can illustrate the relation between race and culture briefly by considering the two opposite types of limiting case. Muhammadan Zaria presents an instance of the type in which cultural uniformity obtains within a multi-racial society, and race and colour differences do not provide bases for status determination or role allocation. Although the governmental structures are hierarchic in type, office is open to members of all races within the society. Under conditions such as these differences of race and colour lack social significance and hence are not socially
systematized. Cultural community overrides these racial differentiae.

The other type of limiting case obtains where culturally differentiated groups of the same race form a common society, characterised by the domination of one group by the other, and the expression of this cleavage in racial terms. This seems to be the position in contemporary Guatemala, since racial differences which lack biological foundations are postulated between Ladino and Indian. Similar conditions obtained in Britain after the Norman Conquest, and persisted until the Tudor Period, when the cultural differences of Norman and Anglo-Saxon having lapsed, together with the form of feudalism in which they were expressed, the concept of a general English culture, and of the Englishman as distinct from either Norman or Anglo-Saxon, developed. Later, similar racial differences were mooted as an aspect of the cultural cleavage between the British and the Highland Scots, but attention to these racial factors also lapsed with the destruction of Scottish Highland culture in the years after 1745.

These instances show that race-differences may be predicated even whereof marginal character, provided that cultural cleavages of a certain order exist within a society. They also show that race-differences lack formal expression where cultural uniformities obtain between the two groups within a single society. It is thus clear that hierarchic race relations reflect conditions of cultural heterogeneity in the societies in which they obtain, and that they tend to lapse or lose their hierarchic character as cultural uniformity increases. It follows that multi-racial societies which invest racial or colour differences with social status significance display cultural heterogeneity; and also that in such societies, the dominant culture will have high prestige, the subordinate less.

For societies such as those of the British Caribbean, this conclusion implies the existence of a scale of cultural colour, in which ‘white’ and ‘black’ cultures provide the poles. Moreover, it implies that all the members of such societies will be ranked in terms of their behavioural conformity to one or other of these traditions. Thus we arrive at the notion of cultural or behavioural colour, that is the extent to which an individual’s behaviour conforms to the norms associated with one or other of the hierarchically ranked cultural traditions of the society, as these norms themselves are associated with colour-differentiated groups. Thus, in Jamaica for example, there is a set of expectations which define the behaviours of whites, browns, and blacks. In terms of these expectations, a white person whose behaviour conforms more closely to that of the brown population is culturally brown. Similarly, a pure Negro may be culturally white or brown, which simply means that his behaviour is analytically homologous with that distinguishing these colour groups as cultural groups.

This type of colour concept is implicit in much of the American literature, but requires explicit formulation for the analysis of societies in which colour ‘can be said to pose the whole problem of cultural values’. Powdermaker illustrates the concept when she introduces her discussion of Negro acculturation in Cottonville with the following remark, “some Whites deplore the process, and question how far it can go, believing the Negro incapable of becoming ‘sociologically White’.” (1939, p. 354). Broom makes a similar point in his recent analysis of Jamaican social differentiation. “Certainly the differential statuses which are all too apparent in the 1943 census are reinforced by the selective perception of census takers. For example, a phenotypically black civil servant of the upper categories is most likely to be classified as ‘coloured’. A dark-coloured peasant is most likely to be classified as ‘black’.” (1954, p. 117). In Grenada the folk use the term ‘African’ to denote persons who adhere to African cultural traditions, as for instance, ritual forms, such as the African Dance (Shango), whatever their racial or colour characteristics. At the same time, Grenadians describe wealthy black persons who practise the same culture as that of the Whites, as ‘white’.

Where two cultural traditions coexist within a society, and their hierarchic relation does not closely approximate to caste, then social mobility and acculturation proceed simultaneously with sufficient volume to produce an intermediate cultural tradition, a sort of hybrid culture, which, although approximating more closely to one of the two homogeneous original traditions, contains elements of both, and by virtue of its hybrid nature occupies a middle position in the cultural prestige scale. Where the two terms of this cultural scale are identified with white and black, this intermediate culture, the product of fusion, acculturation, and syncretism, is classified as coloured or brown.

There is a tendency for genealogical and phenotypical colour to correspond. There is also a tendency for associational and cultural colour to correspond. This latter correspondence simply reflects the fact that people tend to associate with those whose behaviour conforms to the norms which they themselves hold, rather than with those who hold different norms. But this latter convergence is at one and the same time more open to the influence of other factors and more variable, than is the association of phenotype and racial composition, which once given remains unalterable. The nature, basis and range of variability in this association of cultural and associational colour forms an important aspect of the typological definition of the social systems.
in which such multiple stratifications obtain. The same point holds for the association between the cultural and social colour-scales on the one hand, and the biological scales on the other. In conditions such as American colour-caste, cultural uniformities between Whites and Negroes are not yet recognised as an adequate ground for their equal association, although there is a trend towards revision of the caste line as acculturation proceeds, and in terms of our preceding discussion, we can expect 'caste' to disappear as cultural uniformity extends to all levels of institutional behaviour. Where colour-caste does not obtain, cultural colour, subject to certain other factors, such as wealth on the one hand, and genealogy, or phenotype on the other, tends to provide a basis for individual and group association of various kinds.

It is methodologically useful as well as revealing to assume initially that there is a complete correspondence of cultural with associational colour, and of both with the biological dimension, in non-caste societies; and then to proceed to the empirical examination of this assumed correspondence, to determine the extent to which it in fact obtains, the conditions under which it does and does not obtain, and the variability in its actualisation and associated conditions at different levels of the system. An empirical study of this type, focussed on colour-scale correspondences and divergences, will direct attention to the fifth and final dimension of the colour concept, structural colour. The structural dimension consists in those factors and aspects of social process, and the relations between them, which give the society its distinctive form as an arrangement of units and processes. Thus the structural dimension is an abstract analytic category reflecting the distributions and types of power, authority, knowledge, and wealth, which together define and constitute the social framework. When we speak of structural colour, we imply an allocation of these variables among colour-differentiated groups which obtains presently and reflects historical conditions. Thus structural colour connotes the empirical distribution of these variables among the colour-differentiated population. If we like, we can distinguish between contemporary and historical scales of structural colour, and for certain purposes, such as the analysis of a rapidly changing situation, a distinction of this type may be essential. To the extent to which it is unnecessary, the society under study conforms to conditions of stationary equilibrium, under which the expected distributions of power, wealth, authority, and knowledge among the population are empirically confirmed. In such a scale, the structural colour of an individual expresses his equation with the expected or empirical distribution of these controls among the population classified in a colour scale. Thus a black man possessed of wealth, and other structural criteria normally associated with the white population in such a scale is structurally white. Similarly the 'Poor White' as the term implies, is not structurally white, and for this reason, although he may adhere to white institutions completely, ceases to be associationally White, and forms a separate community of his own, where conditions permit. The analysis of discrepancies and consistencies between the empirical and the assumed correspondence of the first four colour-scales will thus expose the fifth dimension of this complex, and at the same time lay bare the social dynamics to concrete analysis. For the reasons given above, it will be apparent that any society which is characterised by role ascription on a colour or cultural basis is also characterised by a scale of structural colour.

In the analysis of such social systems, we are therefore presented with the problem of determining by examination of the correspondences or lack of correspondences of the various colour scales, the bases and conditions of superordination and subordination, and the relative significance of these forms and factors at different points of the system, by an inductive empirical study of deviant and typical cases together. This means simply that the definition of such social structures as a particular set of relations holding between certain critical variables, such as power, wealth, authority, and knowledge, and reflecting their distribution among the population, can only be approached after the position of a sufficient number of individuals within a composite colour-scale representing the four dimensions of phenotype, genealogy, association, and institutional adherence, has been determined; and when the correspondences, or lack of correspondences, between these several distributions have been inductively analysed in terms of the structural variables.

Analytic Models for Caribbean Societies.

The type of theoretical model which emerges from this examination of colour in the Caribbean has several interesting features. It is eclectic in the sense that it seeks to analyse and relate the parts played by such factors as race, culture, association, and power in the social system without predetermining any initial priority or order among them. It is eclectic also in the sense that it provides a common framework for the integration and co-ordination of the various lines of research which we have been reviewing, and attempts their synthesis. It has heuristic values as a hypothesis about such societies; but the model is merely a guide to field studies, and its revision, elaboration, or abandonment will surely follow from the empirical researches which it may influence or stimulate. In other words, it is a goad to investigation, not a narcotic; and it defines the methods of field research as quantitatively and qualitatively inductive, their focus
Multi-racial societies vary in the social significance which they ascribe to racial difference. In those societies where racial factors play a prominent part in status placement and role allocation, contemporary or historical conditions of cultural differentiation obtain. Thus such societies are characterised by a tradition of cultural plurality. To the extent that this condition persists as a contemporary fact, then such societies approximate the model of plural societies. Thus the first problem of field research is the determination of the levels and areas of institutional cultural differences or continuities within the population. Plurality is an aspect of cultural differentiation; not a finite thing, but a dimension, in terms of which some societies are more or less plural or homogeneous in their culture, and may be so variably in different fields. It is therefore essential in the comparative study of institutions and other general cultural forms, to ascertain their uniformity or difference, formally and functionally. Since the major institutions, such as family, mating, kinship, religion, law, education, government, property, and the like, constitute the basic complexes and units of culture and society alike, the study of cultural and social differentiation must focus on the variability of their definition and the distribution of their different forms throughout the population. The analysis of these results will show the degree to which and the fields in which the society under study approximates the extreme condition of cultural pluralism.

However, a word must be said about the structural limit of extreme differentiation. This structural limit is itself inherent in the nature and concept of society as an order or system of relations, that is, a type of unit. The unity of a population characterised by extreme differences of institutional culture is only possible where one of these culturally differentiated sections controls the destinies of the total unit. The alternative to this is disunity, that is, the existence of several societies as separate units having external relations with one another. Thus, within units characterised by cultural heterogeneity, governmental institutions, such as law, administrative, political and military systems, are by definition under the ultimate or exclusive control of one or other of the culturally differentiated groups. And in this way the maintenance of social unity is interdependent with hierarchic sectional relations of dominance and subordination. It follows, therefore, that within plural societies plural political institutions

of a formal character equivalent to their other institutional divergences cannot obtain. Such political pluralism really connotes the existence of different societies, each possessing internal autonomy in greater or less degree. Thus, the Hausa states of Northern Nigeria which have continued to be administered under the British policy of Indirect Rule through their own chiefs and political institutions are not part of an Anglo-Hausa plural society, but form separate societies of their own. Where cultural plurality obtains within a single polity however, it follows that the formal political institutions and organisation of subordinate cultural sections of that unit have been repressed as a condition of the political unity of the total society under the control of the dominant group.

We can describe that part of the population of a culturally heterogeneous society which practises a distinctive and uniform system of institutions, that is to say, a separate culture, as a cultural section. The boundaries of such a section, and the definition of its culture, are both matters for determination by field studies. Theory guides such investigations by directing attention to the problem of institutional variations, and their distribution within a population. It also provides a frame for the analysis of systems characterised by institutional variability of different types and orders; but does not predicate these orders or types. It is important to grasp this point, as it contains the difference between an ideology, which is often unverifiable by nature, and may well hinder rather than help research, and a frame of hypotheses which defines field problems, systematizes their study, and is itself revised by their results.

Now, as we saw from our discussion of colour, associational patterns may obtain between persons who practise different cultural traditions within plural units, and may also serve to distinguish persons who practise an identical culture. It is inherent in the nature of the hierarchic relations between culturally differentiated sections, which express and maintain the political order of a plural society, that the status divisions between these cultural sections should be of an extreme kind. Consequently the intimate and habitual association of members of different cultural sections on terms of equality will normally be marginal within static pluralities, absent in homogeneous societies, and of a changing character and range under dynamic conditions of structural change in plural societies. We can therefore conceive of plural societies in terms of a series of associational continua, between which marked status gaps obtain, and within each of which, though not between them, to the extent that these continua correspond with cultural divisions, class stratification may obtain. We can describe these associational continua as social or
status sections, and the marginal areas resulting from their bi-section of cultural boundaries can be classified as active or inactive margins, in terms of their relation to the processes of structural change of such societies. Active margins will consist of groups associating primarily with adherents of different cultural traditions. Inactive margins are formed by groups associating primarily with members of their own cultural section, but also with members of active margins. The diagram which follows illustrates one possible set of relations between these structural categories in a plural society of three cultural and social sections. Despite its schematic character and oversimplification, such a model has the virtue of directing attention to certain characters of decisive importance in the comparison and analysis of plural systems. These characters include the nature of the status gap, the nature of the cultural diversity, the number of social and cultural sections, the correspondence between them, the margins of their overlap, and the stability, change, and conditions associated with these margins.

In terms of such a model we can compare societies according to the number and arrangement of their cultural and social sections; and in this comparison the variations in the correspondence and relations of these two dimensions of internal differentiation are clearly of critical importance. On this basis we can distinguish between those pluralities within which associational divisions are defined without respect to cultural differentiation on the one hand, and those in which they are defined primarily in cultural terms. In the first of these two types of plurality, associational sections will normally have rigid boundaries and sharp definition, in the second type of society less so. Where associational discontinuities are uniformly instituted, irrespective of cultural similarity or difference, they will normally be defined in terms of some single and rather obvious variable such as language or race. In certain American communities this is the type of condition represented by colour-caste. Haiti and Guatemala which give the appearance of conforming to this American model are substantially different, in that the associational divisions are primarily cultural in base. The distinction between American colour-caste and Haitian or Guatemalan cultural and social stratification consists in the vertical division of American society on the one hand, and the horizontal divisions of Guatemalan and Haitian societies on the other. In the American system rigidity with regard to racial definition is consistent with cultural continuities across this line, as well as discontinuities within each racial segment. In Haiti and Guatemala, the caste-like structure, for all its posited racial and linguistic bases, really consists in the cultural cleavage of which it is the social expression, and could not obtain without this condition. We find therefore that there are three principal alternative forms of social differentiation within societies characterised by cultural heterogeneity: the American pattern, under which social differentiation is defined rigidly without respect to cultural variables on the one hand, and relativistically within its racial segments in cultural terms on the other; the Guatemalan or Haitian pattern in which social and cultural differentiation correspond completely; and the type of pattern represented by our diagram, in which cultural and social differentiation vary to some extent independently of each other, although within limits set by other aspects of their inter-relation within a single structural unit. Where cultural differentiation provides the general and historical basis for associational differentiation, but overlaps and margins occur, then a system of multiple criteria provides the basis of status ascription, and the relativism of individual ranking, which con-
trasts with the rigidities of American or Guatemalan 'caste', requires for its examination the type of concept and method outlined above in our discussion of Caribbean colour.

We have therefore to deal with culturally homogeneous or plural societies on the one hand, and with relativistic or rigid systems of social differentiation on the other. It will at once be apparent that both forms of social differentiation may co-exist in either type of society. Thus, a homogeneous society may contain two rigidly differentiated categories of persons, within each of which ranking by multiple criteria of similar or different kinds reflects relativism. This would appear to be the American position, looked at from a national point of view. A plural society may have similar structure. In the British Caribbean, for instance, it is possible that Barbados, Antigua and St. Kitts, which share a common ethnic and cultural composition, are examples of this structural type. Trinidad and British Guiana, which have a more complex ethnic and cultural composition, also belong in this category. In plural societies of this type, the racial variable, as culturally defined, provides a rigid uniform basis for the social differentiation of particular ethnic groups, within each of which relativistic ranking may obtain on similar or different lines, reflecting their internal cultural diversity.

In effect, therefore, we emerge with six possible structural types, looked at from our present point of view: plural or homogeneous societies having either rigid or relativistic ranking systems on the one hand, or those containing both types on the other. Clearly the co-existence of these two modes of differentiation within a society is only possible where a rigid division of the spheres and conditions in which each has significance for the other obtains. A similar point applies to the distinction between homogeneous and plural societies, which can be illustrated by consideration of the ambiguous position of Brazil and the U. S. A.

There is a good deal of evidence of pluralistic conditions in the U. S. A. for instance, though these conditions occupy a minority status in terms of national American culture. This means that the significance of localised cultural plurality is marginal for the classification of American national culture or society in terms of homogeneity or plurality. Despite the sharp differences of Brazilian and American race relations, these two societies occupy a similar position in that both contain within their national framework localised pluralities having a minority status. This similarity between Brazil and America reduces to three related conditions. In both societies the dominant culture which also enjoys the highest prestige is practised by the overwhelming majority of the population. Divergent cultures therefore have true minority status at the national plane, although their local significance is often great. It is very probable that the concept of a homogeneous society containing culturally pluralistic elements is only applicable under the combination of limiting conditions which characterises Brazil and the U. S. A. It is notable that different patterns of race relations may obtain in such conditions, without in any way distinguishing between them at the present level of discussion.

Granted the presence of two or more cultural traditions in Caribbean and Middle American societies generally, that is to say, their pluralistic character, then after the determination of these traditions, the first task in their comparison consists in the study of their various systems of differentiation and stratification, that is, the comparative analysis of their intersectional and intrasectoral frameworks. Such study consists largely in an examination of the interrelation of cultural and social patterns within and among these various populations; and it focusses on the definition of relations holding between each of these systems separately, and both together, especially as these relations and their variability are essential to the understanding of particular social forms.

The appropriateness of such an approach is apparent from a consideration of social mobility in the Caribbean. In a plural society, social mobility has two forms, individual mobility, and sectional mobility. Sectional mobility is initially expressed through changes in the sizes and directions of intersectional margins, and is indicative of general structural change, such for instance as may now be underway at different rates in the various British Caribbean colonies. Individual mobility in a plural society may be upward, downward, or lateral. Vertical individual mobility is of course found in many homogeneous societies, but both sectional and lateral individual mobility cannot by definition develop within them. Lateral mobility occurs when a person, usually already marginal in some degree, alters his behavioural pattern to conform with a culture different from that which he formerly practised without effecting any corresponding alteration in his social position. In terms of the total society, the marriage of 'peasants' after years of 'faithful concubinage' is an instance of lateral mobility, even when associated with changes in other institutional patterns, such as religion, land-tenure, and the like. It is this difference between cultural movement and social mobility which to a large degree accounts for the failure of acculturation programmes instituted by the dominant section of a plural society to win much acceptance from subordinate sections.

Individual upward mobility presents some interesting problems in the study of British Caribbean societies. It throws a good deal of light on the relative significance of components in the
structural colour scale, and also on the variability of their relations at different structural levels. Let us briefly explore a set of hypothetical cases in which differently placed individuals all return to their homeland with equal increases of wealth. We have then a situation in which one factor, wealth, is constant, while others vary. Assuming a relativistic ranking system, our problem consists in the relative mobility of individuals drawn from different sections of the totality; for example, three brown men, one of whom is culturally white, another culturally intermediate or brown, and the third culturally black; or three white men, distinguished similarly; or three black men; or one white, one brown, and one black man, all belonging to the same cultural section. And so on. It is clear that the rate, range, and type of upward mobility will vary in respect of these differences. Similarly, if we considered the probabilities of downward mobility for such persons, consequent on an equal loss of wealth, similar differences of type, rate, and range would be noticeable; and the systematic character of the relations between colour, cultural adherence, wealth, and individual mobility in such societies could be determined and subjected to predictive tests.

Acculturation as an aspect of process in the life of Middle American and Caribbean societies has received extensive attention. It has provided a field for such studies as those of Herskovits and Redfield. Of itself, this fact indicates the relevance of our pluralistic concepts for the analysis of such societies. As a process occurring within populations sharing common political institutions, acculturation implies a high degree of their internal cultural differentiation, that is, their pluralistic character. Thus such acculturation processes define the societies in which they occur as pluralities of greater or less degree. Even where such societies show marginal plurality on the national plane, as for instance, true of Brazil and America, the condition of acculturation indicates pluralism of significance at the local or community level. Thus, despite their differing orientations and problems, both Afro-American and Folk-Urban studies reflect and imply as their field of investigation, a type of social system containing culturally differentiated sections, that is to say, a condition of pluralism.

Other writers with less explicit theoretical interests than Redfield and Herskovits provide impressive evidence of the nature and extent of this cultural heterogeneity in the Caribbean and Middle America, and sometimes distinguish clearly between folk and elite within such societies (74). Such coincidence can hardly be accidental, and its theoretical implications cannot be ignored, considering the multiplicity of approaches which such studies represent: administrative, political, anthropological, folk-loreist, social psychology, and race relations. Their convergence provides most impressive evidence of the condition and nature of society in this region, and of the appropriateness of the plural framework to the analysis of such units. Such consensus is especially impressive in that it contains or reflects no hint of an explicit conception of the societies and cultures concerned in terms of plurality, as we have defined it. Yet we have shown that the deficiencies of the various approaches to the study of these societies all reflect an inadequate treatment of the interrelated planes of social and cultural differentiation; and that some conceptualisation of these relations in terms of plural systems alone provides a basis for the systematic and detailed study of such conditions. In terms of such a programme of studies, economist, historian, political scientist, anthropologist, social psychologist, folk-loreist, and sociologist, can all contribute to one another's understanding of the common field equally and continuously. It is also worth mentioning here that concepts of pluralism such as we have discussed above have already been applied by Van Lier to Surinam, and by Beals to certain Middle American societies (75).

Conclusion.

Our analysis of the literature has been necessary and rewarding. It has revealed the principal current approaches to the social and cultural study of our area. These approaches consist in: Afro-American studies, the Folk-Urban theory, studies of stratification, and psychological research which initially relies on concepts drawn from cultural and social analysis. We have seen how a competition of models tends to obtain, acculturation studies presenting one framework, while stratification theory offers another. We have seen that each of these separate models is inadequate for the systematic and comprehensive study of these societies, and that both try to disguise their inadequacies behind a screen of vague unverifiable assumptions and indeterminate concepts. It has also been shown that when combined in terms of a theory of plural societies and cultures, these competing approaches provide a unified and refined frame of concepts which is of equal use in defining the problems under study as a system of area research, in guiding the investigations of psychologists, and in providing an integrated comparative framework for the study of this region.

(74) See Table of References for works by, Beckwith, Blishshard, Campbell, Carr, Clarke, Deren, Gellin, Hadley, Kerr, Leyburn, Lobb, MacMillan, Pearse, Matthews, Pierson, Puckett, Simpson, Willems, Wagley.
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