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FOREWORD

Professor Leo Despres has asked me to contribute a foreword to his study of pluralism in Guyana, for I have long advocated the relevance of this concept for the study of Caribbean societies. I am happy to accept this invitation, as it allows me to indicate briefly some of the monograph's merits which, being passed over lightly by the author, may escape immediate notice.

In this book Professor Despres presents an account of Guyanese society and its development during the closing years of colonial rule. These decades witnessed the rise, arrest, and fragmentation of a popular movement for local independence from British domination. The monograph accordingly provides an arresting case study of an independence movement which dissolved into bitter sectional strife before achieving its goal. Like Cyprus and India, in advance of independence, Guyana experienced those sectional hostilities that the Congo, Malaya, Uganda and Nigeria encountered thereafter. Despite this, Guyana obtained independence in May 1966; and since then the country has made brave efforts under new direction to contain the destructive forces released by its independence struggle. Dr. Despres' elegant and comprehensive study of these Guyanese developments should thus be of interest to all social scientists concerned with the processes of decolonization and the problems of emergent nationhood and unity.

The monograph also shows how anthropologists can investigate complex societies as total units and analyse them systematically by combining relevant data from institutional and community studies with others from early and recent historical periods. In this way the author combines his analyses of this complex society and its tortuous experience during the last decade of colonial rule, when the great
popular movement for national independence broke into two rival blocks based on racial and cultural exclusions, with consequent uncertainty, bitterness, and bloodshed. The monograph accordingly enriches our understanding of such disintegrative movements by documenting the forces, phases, and strategies involved, and by analysing these political developments in relation to their changing societal contexts. Political scientists will readily appreciate the significance of such analysis and data for the general study of societal development from plural integration to national unity.

Professor Despres may identify himself as a cultural anthropologist; but no sociologist can overlook his central concern with the sociological implications and conditions of cultural divergence; and, throughout, the text systematically relates cultural differentiae to the systems of social relations within each of the two main ethnic blocs of Guyanese society. It is therefore excusable to regard this work as a notable union of social and cultural anthropology.

A major focus of the present analysis is the integration of Guyanese society. Excluding its peripheral Amerindians and creolized Chinese, and despite its poverty and relatively small size, this society is sharply segmented and imperfectly knit—an awkward combination of mutually exclusive ethnic groups, Anglo-Saxon, Portuguese, East Indian and Creole or Afro-Guyanese, themselves subdivided by differences of situation, culture, and colour. Together, these last two ethnic blocs account for over 90 per cent of the colonial population, and their cultures and interrelations provide the principal foci of study.

On the basis of intensive fieldwork in several Creole and East Indian communities (carefully matched for ecological and administrative variables), the author examines their social systems separately and compares them. Since Afro-Guyanese ‘retire’ to their native villages after working in urban and industrial fields, while East Indians for the most part remain in the country, these village descriptions indicate the differential participation of the two ethnic blocs in the urban industrial sectors of Guyanese society; and, by skilful use of census, official and other data, including field interviews, the author systematically describes the differential relations of East Indians and Afro-Guyanese to colonial institutions of government, education, religion, and economy. These data obliquely describe the general character and composition of Guyanese townships, especially Georgetown, the capital, and Mackenzie City in the bauxite belt.

To investigate societal cohesion, Professor Despres analyses the structures of these East Indian and Creole communities, separately and comparatively to determine how their characteristic institutional organisations and activities foster or impede their local, sectional, or societal integrations, by sustaining common or differential alignments with the colonial institutional system. Societal integration is thus analysed systematically and at several levels, the integration of colonial society being distinguished from that of its major ethnic components, as these sectional integrations are also distinguished from the integration of local ethnic communities.

Further, by exploiting the historical dimension at two strategic levels, the early and contemporary periods, the author shows how the integration of these ethnic segments in colonial Guyana altered in character and scope as Guyanese society underwent structural realignments linked with its changing political and economic context. Societal integration is thus shown to vary in scope, character, and intensity as an aspect of institutional articulations within and between the major ethnic divisions of the colonial society. Moreover, having isolated the forces that sustain this colonial order and identified their preconditions and implications, the account of the independence movement shows how tendencies towards polarization increased in salience and scope as decolonization proceeded. The ensuing analysis of ethnic oppositions exhibits the alternative aspects of ethnic integrations clearly. Eufunctional to its adherents, a distinctive ethnic structure may be positively dysfunctional for the society. Alternatively, once conditions have changed, such a structure may lose its functional values with minimal changes of form, or it may preserve these values despite formal changes. Such possibilities require us to discriminate the levels, ranges, units, conditions and changes of social integration and contain important suggestions for further studies of their relations. What merits particular notice is the combination of approaches, conceptions, and data that such analyses presuppose. In this monograph, Professor Despres combines diachronic and synchronic approaches with community studies and systematic controlled comparisons to investigate the integrative and divisive features of ethnic institutional patterns under similar and differing social conditions. In the process, he demonstrates the capacity of anthropological analysis to embrace complex societal structures and to illuminate their processes of change by treating them rigorously as single systems of interacting parts whose inner and reciprocal articulations are central to their integration. In this respect the present study is a pioneer attempt at macro-
sociological analysis of structural transformations by strictly anthropological conceptions and procedures. It demonstrates the value of ordinary field methods of social anthropology in such investigations, provided that their central problems are clearly formulated, evaluated for analytic significance, and organised in an appropriate research design. In these respects, the present monograph offers a model well worth study by all who seek a rounded sociological analysis of structural change in segmental multi-ethnic societies.

Faced with such multi-ethnic aggregates as Guyana, anthropologists have normally elected to investigate one particular ethnic segment or some characteristic institution thereof, often without restricting their observations to the problem or unit studied. Recent sociological studies of British Guiana illustrate this tendency. Thus, after studying three Afro-Guyanese communities, Raymond Smith generalised about the colonial social order (1956: 191–203), before investigating the East Indians in association with C. Jayawardena. Following these studies of the East Indians, Raymond Smith published a general account of Guyanese society that differs sharply from the findings of Professor Despres (1964: 1051–1077). According to Professor Smith, “the Indians are already assimilated to a common way of life” (1962: 141). “There is no problem of ‘tribalism’ in British Guiana... The whole society shares a common cultural equipment” (1962: 198). According to Dr. Jayawardena, “cross-cutting membership in distinct and opposed groups tends to integrate the total society. Thus class affiliations cut across industrial groups and ethnic affiliations cut across classes” (1963: 10). These statements express a view of Guyana that Professor Despres calls ‘reticulated.’

In the present work, Professor Despres subjects all possible bonds of inter-ethnic assimilation in Guyana to intensive scrutiny. Having documented the differential implications of specific structures for East Indians and Creoles by comparative analysis of their ethnic milieux, he shows the limited range and scope of such inter-ethnic assimilations. Thus to determine precisely how they affect the differential incorporation of East Indian and Creole cultural sections in Guyana at differing periods of its development, he examines the mass communication media, unionism, educational arrangements, colonial land programmes, the civil service, and other societal institutions in turn. Given the colonial history and social structure, this analysis shows why it was almost inevitable that emergent political parties would also enhance the exclusive incorporations of these ethnic blocs.

Whereas ‘reticulated’ models of Guyanese society stress its relative cohesion and assimilation of disparate stocks within a common inclusive economic and occupational system and an inclusive, consensual stratification, Professor Despres shows that, in their divergent social contexts, such occupations as teacher, peasant, labourer, or shopkeeper have very different functional and structural implications for Creole and East Indian Guyanese. Whereas to Professor Raymond Smith, East Indian patterns of family, marriage and kinship are only “superficially” different from those he observed among rural Afro-Guyanese (1962: 131–2), by careful comparison of his own field data on these two family systems, Professor Despres demonstrates the magnitude and pivotal significance of the differences which, reinforced by other factors, effectively seal off the two ethnic blocs from interbreeding, and thus preserves their racial and social separation by segregating the ethnic contexts of family, socialization, kinship and community.

Ever since the decline of Afro-American orientations to Caribbean studies, the sociology of this region has been canvassed by three competing theoretical approaches: the ‘plantation’ framework of Wagley (1957), Rubin (1957, 1959) and Mintz (1959); Parsonian structural-functionalism in various modes (Braithwaite, 1953, 1960; R. T. Smith, 1956); and analyses based on the model of plural societies advanced by J. S. Furnivall (1948). Thus far, with minor exceptions, no Caribbean society has been subjected to extended analyses from two or more of these competing viewpoints. However, with this publication we can now compare monographic analyses of a single Caribbean society from two divergent theoretical perspectives. Parallel studies of societal integration in other Caribbean units may help to clarify the issues at stake, and to improve our theoretical models and analytic techniques.

Meanwhile, several features of the present study seem especially promising for social anthropological analyses of multi-ethnic societies undergoing structural change. To specify the principal dimensions and components of such units in terms of their scale, composition, situation, history, mechanisms of identity, and internal and societal articulations is clearly a primary task; and for this purpose Professor Despres’ distinctions between local or minimal cultural sections and maximal or societal ones, and between local and broker institutions, are valuable instruments. This notion of broker institutions seems especially promising for operational study of complex societies focussed on the parallel, unitary, or differential integrations of their communal
components. Another fertile notion for such structural analyses is the concept of isomeric social systems, which differ in their internal and external articulations despite many shared elements. Finally, to examine endogenous processes of change in the structure and articulation of multi-ethnic units, the notion of 'organizational strategy' enhances discrimination, wherever organized groups or powerful leaders are present and active.

Inevitably there remain several loose ends, unanswered questions in this—as in any pioneer study. Substantive issues are assured in advance of vigorous debate in Caribbean circles. Caribbean historians may also be stimulated by the present summary of Guyanese history to re-examine the evidence and to re-assess the structural relevance of different phases and elements of the colonial order for local developments since 1945. The monograph's wider implications for the general analysis of structural change in multi-ethnic societies should promote more diverse discussions among scholars.

One theoretical question of some significance concerns the cause of the split in the P.P.P. following the debacle of 1953. In guarded style, Professor Despres suggests that changes in the external context of Marxists within the P.P.P., linked with the collapse of the Caribbean Labour Congress and with the activities of American labour unions, may have served as precipitating factors. In support, he argues that we should seek exogenous determinants for this split since "we cannot invoke a constant (e.g., the plural structure of Guyanese society) to explain a variable (e.g., the success or failure of the nationalist movement to solve the organizational problems that confronted it)" (p. 281 below). This argument seems questionable on various grounds. Generalised as a methodological postulate, it directs us always to seek extrinsic 'causes' or 'precipitants' for structural change, since all social structures, plural or other, represent relatively durable and well defined milieux for such processes and events. As Marx and Durkheim perceived, such arguments are often misleading.

In the present case, this postulate exaggerates the fixity of the 'plural structure of Guyanese society' despite the profound changes it underwent between 1945 and 1953. The record shows that several major changes in Guyanese institutional and sectional relations between 1950 and 1952 were wholly endogenous in origin. It should not be assumed that 'the plural structure of Guyanese society' retained an unchanging character, form, and significance throughout these developments, since the record suggests otherwise. For P.P.P. leaders at any rate, the nature, scope and composition of this plural structure varied greatly at different phases of the political struggle, as their changing organisational strategies indicate. It is advisable then to seek sociological 'explanations' of the rise, composition and split of the P.P.P. within the context of Guyanese colonial society, rather than in extrinsic conditions, influential as these undoubtedly were.

Professor Despres relates how the P.P.P. was put together by Jagan and his associates after an eligible Afro-Guyanese counterpart appeared in L. F. S. Burnham. Under the colonial regime this coalition of Creoles and East Indians, Marxists and non-Marxists, was obviously essential to mobilise the Guyanese masses in pursuit of local autonomy. Nonetheless, this union of anti-colonial forces was clearly fragile, artificial, and instrumental ab initio. Some of its leaders conceived the Guyanese independence struggle merely as a local theatre in the international cold war, while others regarded independence as the necessary and sufficient condition of societal unity and nationhood. Even before the elections of 1953, Burnham's destruction was being planned. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the split and subsequent strife had its source in those Marxist commitments that divided the popular leadership with respect to the values and implications of Guyanese independence.

The integrated analysis of the organisation, ideology, and vicissitudes of this nationalist movement is a central concern of the present work, and one of its major achievements. The study accordingly illustrates the differences and relations of 'nationalism' as ideology and as a social movement. Nationalist ideologies may be employed to mobilise and direct mass movements for local autonomy as an organisational strategy of leaders whose primary commitments and ultimate goals are far removed. Such manipulatory leadership need not be cynical in advocating nationalist ideals, if local autonomy is prerequisite for pursuit of their ultimate goals. However, insofar as these ulterior objectives diverge from nationalist ideals, the variable relations of ideology and organisation in independence movements are exposed; and by his detailed treatment of the leadership, composition, programs and history of this Guyanese independence movement, Professor Despres provides a vivid example of the ambiguous and changing roles of ideology in mass movements directed towards structural change in multi-ethnic colonial milieux.

Local and foreign observers, unaware of the detailed social com-
position of such popular movements or the personal alignments of their leadership, normally attempt to interpret them primarily by reference to their publicly proclaimed ideological goals and means. The present work shows clearly how superficial and misleading such interpretations are likely to be. Ideology, organisation, and public support are complementary essentials of radical mass movements in all societies; but the ideological preferences, pronouncements, interpretations, and reinterpretations of the movement's leaders should be understood as choices designed to organize and extend their movement and to increase its solidarity and power, while weakening the support and legitimacy of its immediate opponents. Those structural conditions of the social context which generate the movement also govern the recruitment of its leaders and the character and composition of its supporters and its opposition, the strategies, organisation and ideology of the contraposed groups, their divergent orientations and relative positions in subsequent affairs. For documentation of some specific mechanisms and processes at work in one case of this sort, we need only to examine the present monograph. Such data also show how inadequate analyses of multidimensional mass movements in such complex and changing situations as that of Guyana after World War II must be, if their ideological aspects are treated as transparent or decisive. This caution applies to nationalist movements in other colonial plural societies as well.

Professor Despres' conceptual analysis of the ethnic context of Guyanese 'nationalism' must also be regarded as a major contribution to our study of pluralism, using this term in Furnivall's sense to denote congruent cultural and social cleavages within politically unified aggregates. Here the author makes several refinements in conceptualisation and analytic method; to distinguish cultural sections, he employs functional analyses to determine how far and in what ways these sectional systems are isomorphic or isomeric. Linked with the important distinction between minimal and maximal cultural sections are others between local and broker institutions, and between heterogeneous and plural societies. Professor Despres distinguishes the plural society as "one that contains maximal or national cultural sections" (p. 22) from "a society containing local or minimal cultural sections (which) is socially and culturally heterogeneous" (p. 22). While minimal cultural sections consist of local groups that remain separate though culturally similar and distinctive, lacking a common organisation or integration at the national or territorial levels, maximal cultural sections consist of culturally similar local groups integrated by coextensive 'broker institutions'. Whereas 'local' institutions maintain the cultural differentiation and separate integration of local groups by organising activities within their community contexts, broker institutions "function to link local activities to the wider spheres of societal activity" (pp. 23, 270). Maximal cultural sections are thus identified by the integrative effect of such broker institutions on culturally similar communities throughout the society. Among broker institutions, trade unions, political parties, economic, occupational, and other special-purpose associations, religious and educational structures are especially prominent. On the other hand, within local communities, social integration generally develops through institutions of kinship, affinity, neighborhood, production, patronage, and cult. Moreover, since "maximal cultural sections presuppose the existence of minimal cultural sections" (p. 270), broker institutions likewise presuppose the operation of local institutions, and societal integration corresponds in scope and intensity with the uniform effectiveness of broker institutions.

Although these are very useful and promising conceptions, they do not distinguish clearly those 'broker' institutions which are sectionally specific, extensive and autonomous structures such as the P.P.P. and P.N.C. after 1956 from those agencies of the central government which serve to coordinate activities and regulate relations throughout the inclusive society. Broker institutions of the first type, being sectionally specific, extensive and autonomous, may integrate a sectional aggregate, diffusely, indirectly and partially, as for example Hinduism and local exogamy do among Guyanese East Indians; or they may provide representative or inclusive sectional organisations through which the cultural section is mobilised for various purposes. Under the first of these two alternatives, given its cultural and social distinctness, the 'maximal section' remains a corporate category, a bounded persisting aggregate, which, despite its distinct identity, lacks extensive autonomous organisation for management of its own affairs. Under the second alternative, the 'maximal section' possesses this extensive autonomous organisation, and constitutes a corporate group capable of effective collective action through its coordinating structures (M. G. Smith, 1966).

To illustrate his distinctions between minimal and maximal cultural sections and between plural and heterogeneous societies, Professor Despres cites Nigeria as a plural society, composed of or-
organised maximal sections, in contrast with society in the United States, where “although many cultural groups . . . are integrated at local levels, . . . there are practically no institutional structures (e.g., labor unions, political parties, religious associations, etc.) that serve to separately integrate each of these groups at the national level of socio-cultural integration. In Nigeria, on the other hand, the Ibo, the Yoruba and the Hausa are not only culturally differentiated and locally integrated, but institutional structures exist (e.g., political parties) which serve to maintain their cultural differentiation at the national level” (p. 22).

This contrast suggests that maximal cultural sections are conceived as autonomously organised corporate groups having sectionally specific institutional structures of representative or inclusive character. This interpretation is supported by the statement that “when institutional activities serve to integrate similar cultural groups and differentiate them from other cultural groups at the national level, such groups constitute maximal or national cultural sections” (p. 22).

However, Professor Despres sometimes employs his concept of maximal sections to denote aggregates of a rather different character, namely those that lack their own extensive, autonomous organisations, while maintaining differential relations with societally extensive institutional structures under external control. Such differential articulations with societal structures as these culturally distinctive aggregates exhibit must normally perpetuate their cultural distinctness; but these differential relations do not normally promote separate sectional integrations, as the following accounts of Creole and East Indian relations to the institutions of colonial Guiana indicate. Moreover, although the institutional superstructure of a plural society may provide bases for separate sectional integrations, as for example in Nigeria, Cyprus, colonial Uganda, and Morocco, this is neither necessary nor normally the case; and in Guiana before 1945, despite Professor Despres’ arguments, the differential relations of East Indians and Afro-Guyanese to colonial economic, educational, religious, and bureaucratic structures, while preserving their cultural differentiations, did not integrate the various local communities in either section at a societal level. Instead these differing sectional articulations served to perpetuate sectional fragmentations. Throughout this period East Indians and Afro-Guyanese remained minimal sections, unorganised aggregates of local groups, categorically distinguished by their differing cultural and racial features, diffuse intra-sectional ties, and distinct contexts and modes of subordination.

It seems desirable then to distinguish those ‘maximal sections’ which, despite distinctive structural and cultural features, remain unorganised corporate categories, from others that exhibit autonomous sectional organisations of a representative or inclusive kind that identify them as corporate groups. It is necessary also to distinguish those ‘broker’ institutions which are sectionally specific, extensive and autonomous, such as the P.P.P. and P.N.C. with their allied trade unions after 1956, from others which are societally inclusive, heteronomous and exogenous to the cultural sections whose differential subordinations, fragmentation, and segregations they maintain. Broker institutions of the first sort convert fragmented cultural sections into solidary and extensive corporate groups; broker institutions of the second sort preserve the cultural distinctness and fragmentation of these aggregates, as politically immobilised corporate categories. As presently defined, the correlative conceptions of maximal sections and broker institutions overlook the critical differences between these alternatives. Moreover this ambiguity affects the distinction between plural and heterogeneous societies, since on one reading, colonial Guyana before 1945 should be regarded as a plural society of differentially articulated cultural sections, while on the other, it should not, since neither of its massive subordinate sections were then integrated separately as corporate groups under their own extensive independent structures. Rather at this period, the regime exemplified the principle of ‘Divide, subdivide, and rule,’ and only the dominant British possessed sectionally integrative autonomous structures.

Other difficulties with these conceptions of maximal sections and broker institutions emerge in comparative analysis. For example, colonial Surinam, Congo, Algeria, South Africa, Hapsburg Austria, or Guatemala all contained subordinate populations isolated from one another and from the centres of societal control under institutions that fostered their sectional fragmentation and cultural distinctness. These societies all contained two or more culturally distinct collectivities, differentiated sharply in political and social organisation, and in their articulations with the status order. In all, one social section was organised as a ruling minority under its exclusive institutions, while the others remained fragmented, immobilised, and subordinated by the ‘broker’ institutions of the rulers, which preserved their fragmentation and their cultural distinctness together. Is it analytically useful or appropriate to treat such societies as heterogeneous merely because their subordinate local groups of similar culture lack any autonomous organisations to integrate them? Alternatively, is it useful
or appropriate to classify these societies with others such as Nigeria, Cyprus, or India on the eve of independence in which culturally distinct sections were integrated separately by autonomous institutions, as in Guyana after 1956? To avoid these difficulties, we need only to develop the conceptions of maximal cultural sections and broker institutions to distinguish the alternatives cited above. That the author's conceptual framework can accommodate such distinctions without impairing his substantive analysis indicates the soundness of his work.

Like other scholars, Professor Despres finds the notion of 'basic institutions' an unsatisfactory tool for societal classification and analysis. However, his primary objections seem to flow from the cultural framework he prefers. Thus, he asks "If a culture is understood to be an integrated pattern of standardised social usages, then which of these usages can be considered basic or compulsory? Might not all of them be considered basic to the cultural pattern?" (p. 20). Accordingly "all institutions must be considered equally functional in the expression of culture. Therefore, as far as the expression of culture is concerned, the analytical distinction between basic, alternative and exclusive institutions is spurious, and serves no theoretical purpose" (p. 21).

On this matter, my differences with Professor Despres reflect divergence of analytic frameworks. While stressing the cultural conditions of social process and structure, my focus is on the inner organisation and external relations of social systems whereas Professor Despres apparently gives priority to the 'expression of culture.' However, although in terms of cultural expression all institutional elements may be equally functional, they are likely to differ in their significance for cultural maintenance and coherence. At the sociological level, such equivalence of institutions is also qualified by their differing significance for the maintenance of social systems. This derives from the fact that as self-perpetuating systems, societies must meet certain essential conditions. These minimum conditions of societal organisation and continuity may be isolated by logical or by comparative analysis; and the institutional arrangements that routinely fulfill these conditions may be isolated as their "basic institutional systems." This system "embraces kinship, education, religion, property, economy, recreation and certain sodalities" (M. G. Smith, 1965: 82). Such institutions are 'basic' or 'compulsory' in the sense that without them societal organisation and continuity are impossible. Whether these institutional arrangements are segregated in different structures or contained within a few functionally diffuse groupings is mainly significant for the discrimination of societal types for the comparative or internal analysis of social structure and integration. It follows then that societal similarities or differences, continuity, or change should be evident in the structures of these basic institutional systems. Societies may therefore be compared and analysed by examining the structures and internal diversity or uniformity of their basic institutional systems.

Though Professor Despres formally rejects these conceptions, his distinctions between local and broker institutions are substantively similar. His list of 'local institutional patterns' embraces the basic requisites of social life, "language (dialects), family and kinship, work, religion, socialization (and possibly education), recreational activities, associational activities, and communal activities (e.g., local governmental)" (p. 23). With due allowances for differing terminology, these local institutions correspond closely with my description of the 'basic institutional system' cited above. On the other hand, 'broker institutions' which link local communities with the wider levels of societal activity include "markets (labour and consumption), corporations, religious associations, public and/or private school associations, social and civic associations, labor unions, ethnic associations, political parties, and various governmental agencies" (p. 25). Again, except possibly for 'religious associations', these structures are all 'alternative' or 'exclusive' institutions. Moreover, since maximal sections, integrated through broker institutions, presuppose minimal ones, integrated through local institutions, the latter are prerequisites of the former and of community life as well. They may thus be appropriately described as 'basic.' Thus Professor Despres' distinction between local and broker institutions corresponds closely to that between basic institutions and others. However, his conceptions enable us to isolate these structures for field study and functional analysis more systematically and more effectively.

These remarks illustrate the cogency and fertility of Professor Despres' ideas of minimal and maximal sections, local and broker institutions, isomeric social systems and organisational strategies as elements in structural change. Whether we choose to regard the transformations of Guyanese society described in the text as conversions of previously inarticulate and immobilised corporate categories into militant and contraposed corporate groups, or as processes by which
culturally similar minimal sections were integrated as maximal ones remains indifferent, provided only that we can operationalise either conceptual alternative and investigate the structures and processes involved with equal clarity and detail. Certainly in his methodical specifications of issues, criteria and procedures for the study of maximal and minimal cultural sections and their internal and external articulations in each institutional sphere, Professor Despres makes some notable contributions to the comparative and intensive analysis of plural societies in changing and stationary conditions. In demonstrating by controlled comparison the specific structural and functional differentiae of isomeric systems, and their implications for integration and change, he provides another important instrument for theoretical analysis and for field studies of social integration in plural and heterogeneous societies. Contributions of this order and variety merit general attention by social scientists.
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