

ANTHROPOLOGY COMES PART-WAY HOME: COMMUNITY STUDIES IN EUROPE

◆9598

John W. Cole

Department of Anthropology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01003

INTRODUCTION

Robert Redfield's research in the Mexican village of Tepoztlan in the late 1920s marks the expansion of field research in social anthropology into complex societies. Certainly in the decades which followed this work there was a proliferation of research among peasants, pastoralists and fishermen. Anthropologists conducted field work not only in Latin America, but in the civilizations of Asia and Africa as well. In this general expansion, a few studies were conducted in Europe in the late 1920s and 1930s, notably by Arensberg in Western Ireland (5, 6), by Chapman in Sicily (30), and by Sanders (97) in the Balkans. But the cultures of contemporary Europe held little interest for the profession at large.¹ As a number of writers have noted, little social anthropological research was carried out in Europe until the 1950s (2, pp. 2-3; 5, pp. 9-13; 56, p. 743).

This was certainly not because of a lack of familiarity with the continent. The study of historical sources on the ancient civilizations of the Mediterranean and on the Celtic and Germanic "tribes" of antiquity played a prominent role in the formation of nineteenth century anthropological ideas. As John Davis (38, pp. 1-4; see also 76) has pointed out, Maine, Fustel de Coulanges, Robertson-Smith, Fraser, Durkheim, and Westermarck all drew on Mediterranean sources in formulating their comparative and theoretical schemes, and Maine especially made much use of material on the Irish Celts. Morgan drew on all of these societies in his evolutionary formulations, and anchored his work in classic Greece and Rome. Marx and Engels used the ancient civilizations as a kind of watershed. Writings which focus on the processes that led to the formation of capitalism began with these slave-based

¹Of these three studies, only Arensberg's found its way into print with relatively little delay. Sanders' work was not published until after World War II, and Chapman's was not published until the manuscript was "rediscovered" in 1970, more than 40 years after the original research.

societies, while those writings which deal with primitives end there. Thus the advancement of nineteenth century European and American understanding of civilizations elsewhere in the world, and of primitive cultures as well, was in comparison to historical materials on ancient Europe. However, this interest in historical Europe was not translated into an impulse to gather information in European communities.

Nor did personal experience on the continent lead to field research in Europe. Many, if not most, anthropologists in both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries had personal familiarity with contemporary Europe. Morgan, the founding father of American anthropology, spent an extended period traveling in Europe, but left his impressions only in private journals (116). British anthropologists regularly included the grand tour as a part of their education, and many of the leading figures in anthropology were of continental origin. Franz Boas, Robert Lowie, Bronislaw Malinowski, and Siegfried Nadel, to name a few, were all born and at least partly educated on the continent.

Malinowski even maintained a villa at Oberbozen in the South Tyrol where he and his students regularly vacationed. An entire generation of British anthropologists experienced invigorating walks in the mountains and enjoyed what Malinowski is said to have regarded as the finest scenery in all of Europe (50, pp. 4, 10; 78, p.34). But the discussions on these vacations were of research conducted far afield, and while all enjoyed the scenery, their professional gaze was across the seas, among the black and brown inhabitants of the dominions and colonies of the British Empire.

The beginnings of a more concerted effort on contemporary Europe are to be found in the enlistment of anthropology in the war effort of World War II and in the so-called cold war which followed. In the United States, anthropologists attempted to provide characterizations of "cultures of various societies which were inaccessible to direct observation" (88, p. xx). This effort resulted in a series of studies, both published and unpublished, and included a number on allies and enemies in Europe. Anthropologists from Columbia University had been prominent in the wartime studies, and it was Columbia University which fielded the largest contingent of researchers in Europe during the 1950s.² Others came from Harvard,

²The Columbia University group, founded by Ruth Benedict and later led by Margaret Mead, was interdisciplinary in nature and had strong psychological leanings. Its intent was to formulate statements about national character and its method was the study of "culture at a distance." This method was to compensate for the absence of direct field observation by interviewing people who originated in an inaccessible society and were living in or visiting in the New York area. Additional data were gleaned from movies, published sources, and other available cultural materials. The method and some of its results were published by Mead & Metraux (89) in 1953. Other findings were published in a series of monographs which appeared in the decade following World War II (e.g. 16, 95). Mead suggested that the method would continue to be valuable when the inaccessible societies were again opened up, and could be combined with direct observation. Except for several studies published by Rodnick over the years (57, p. 27), her advice has been ignored by Europeanists, even by those who received their introduction to an anthropology of Europe as members of the group.

Robert Lowie, working at the University of California, also contributed a volume on Germany based on war-time library research and a postwar visit. Although California has contributed its share of Europeanists, Lowie's work on Europe has not been influential.

Yale, and the University of California. Since that time the number of anthropological studies in Europe has increased at a geometric rate, and Europeanists are now being trained at many different universities. By 1975 the number of researchers was large enough that the American Anthropological Association determined to publish a directory of North American Europeanists (57).

During the same time period, field research in Europe by British anthropologists underwent a parallel expansion. Led by students from Oxford, field research in Mediterranean Europe got under way (38, pp. 237–46), and students from the London School of Economics and Manchester University conducted studies in Britain itself (53, 62). Moreover, a number of European scholars, especially on the western rim of the continent, have also worked in Europe. Norwegian and Dutch social anthropologists have been particularly active. Some of these scholars were trained in British or American universities, and they regularly report at least a portion of their findings in English-language publications.

All of these scholars, whether living in North America, Britain, or on the continent, regularly read one another's publications, review one another's books and exchange manuscripts and personal communications. They interact at national and international professional meetings. Moreover, it is *de rigueur* for North American anthropologists to visit colleagues in Holland or Britain on the way to and from field locations in Europe, and British and continental colleagues have lectured or taught for varying periods of time at American universities.

For better or worse, these interactions define an international intellectual community, an "Anglophone Anthropology" of Europe. It is by no means a closed community, since its participants are active in other intellectual pursuits as well, and some publish in other languages in addition to English. But the social anthropology of Europe has come to constitute an academic tradition with shared concerns and a distinctive literature. Not only have members of this community themselves produced a respectable volume of published material, but they have also marked out writings by demographers, European ethnologists, geographers, historians, political scientists, and rural sociologists for incorporation into an "essential literature." At this writing the total literature has reached formidable proportions.

The intention of this article is to discuss the directions that anglophone anthropology is taking, to outline its theoretical thrust, and to discuss some of its more important contributions and shortcomings. To do this, I believe it is necessary first to understand its relationship to the field of anthropology as a whole. In particular, I wish to raise the question of why anthropological interest was not fastened on contemporary Europe sooner and why it has become so vigorous in the 1960s and 1970s.

ANTHROPOLOGY: THE STUDY OF OTHERS

The origins of anthropology as a scholarly discipline in the nineteenth century in western Europe and North America revolved around two general sets of problems. One was an attempt to come to grips with the biological, linguistic, social, and cultural characteristics of the populations on other continents. Europeans had been in direct contact with these people for several centuries and during the nineteenth

century were in the process of consolidating colonial empires. Western European anthropologists directed their efforts primarily toward the populations of their overseas colonies, while American anthropologists were generally concerned with the indigenous populations of the Americas. The second set of problems had to do with attempts to understand the European past. The archaeologist's spade had proved that man's antiquity in Europe was far greater than recorded in historical sources, and intellectuals wished to explicate this long prehistory. If the bones and artifacts that the archaeologists found could not speak for themselves, then perhaps those populations elsewhere in the world who still used such ancient implements might speak for them. The expectation was that what the ethnographer learned from his studies of contemporary "savage" and "barbarian" cultures could contribute to an understanding of early stages in the evolution of European civilization.

Anthropology thus secured itself a place and a mission in the division of labor in nineteenth century social science. It developed a comparative approach in which the institutions of the peoples of other continents were compared to one another and to those of the European past. Society in modern Europe and North America was the province of a bevy of other social sciences which dissected it into various parts, each staking out its own exclusive subject matter. The institutions of Europe were regarded as unique, the distinctive product of an evolutionary process which had raised them to a stage unmatched anywhere else in the world. Therefore, while anthropology could contribute to an understanding of the antecedents of these institutions, it was not relevant to an understanding of their present forms.

During the first half of the twentieth century, anthropologists became skeptical of many of the evolutionists' claims, but they continued to focus on the exotic and the primitive. They were less interested in studying other cultures as representatives of past stages of European civilization, but continued to study primitive and peasant cultures in the purest state possible. Ethnographers were bent on describing these societies as they were believed to have been before they felt the impact of the European presence.

Even when the intent of research has been deliberately cross-cultural, the cultures of Europe were for the most part excluded. While A. L. Kroeber (77) may have claimed the peasants of Europe for anthropology in 1948, his claim is not substantiated by any body of monographs or comparative works extant at the time. Anthropologists, with the few exceptions mentioned above, did not do field work in Europe, and they rarely made use of materials on European society published by other scholars. Only those peoples who appeared to be most marginal to the mainstream of European civilization, and thus not fully European at all, were recognized as fit subjects for anthropological comparison. As recently as 1962, the culture area and ethnic group map of Europe in Spencer & Johnson's ethnographic atlas (108) included only non-Indo-European speakers (Basques, Finns, Lapps, Magyars), and those Indo-European speakers who were proving the most intractable in the face of modernization—the Albanians, Bretons, Irish, Latvians, and Welch. A perusal of other comparative compilations and of introductory textbooks in both general and social anthropology yields similar results.

The same separation between the study of Europeans and others also took place on the continent. Each of the European countries has a well-developed program for the study of their own "folk culture" and rural, social, and economic problems. But, as the Hungarian ethnologist Tamás Hofer (70, p. 6) has pointed out, ". . . ethnographers studying their own peoples form a separate body from those studying other, non-European peoples. They have their own chairs at the Universities and their own museums." In most instances, professors of European ethnology are in the humanities faculty while overseas ethnologists are in the social science faculty. Students in the two disciplines have entirely separate training.

Moreover, the incorporation of an anthropology of Europe into general anthropology has met with substantial resistance from within the anthropological ranks and continues to face accusations of illegitimacy. Consider a letter which appeared in the *Anthropological Newsletter* in 1972 (51). Entitled "Peasants' Revolt," the letter purports to express the gratitude of those European peasants only recently discovered by American anthropologists. It has two main themes. One of these is the absence of privation experienced by European researchers: "Situated in countries where neither cobras, nor poisoned arrows, nor temperatures in the range of -40°F make daily life miserable, the American discoverers of new frontiers can safely engage in skiing, lake swimming and occasional opera visits while studying us natives." The second theme is a suggestion of triviality. After mentioning the "milliards of volumes" produced by European scholars about their own cultures, the letter goes on to ask, "What is that compared with the abysmal insight gained by an American undergraduate who, under the paternal supervision of the Peasantry Guru of his department, finds out how the Swiss plant potatoes and what brand of transistor radio is preferred in a Serbian village."

The letter is signed by five names which pretend to be those of European peasants. To my knowledge, this is the only pseudonymous letter ever published in the *Newsletter*: it is accompanied by an editor's statement that "The *Newsletter* will not make a practice of publishing pseudonymous letters." The publication of this letter in an official organ of the American Anthropological Association is a symptom of widespread *sub-rosa* resistance to European anthropology in the discipline.

Such resistance is apparently not confined to the United States. Commenting on the British scene, John Davis reports that, "It is not uncommon, at any rate in England, to meet backwoods anthropologists who clearly convey their sense of superiority" (over those who study in the Mediterranean). According to Davis, they hold that "Anthropology is only anthropology if it is done very much abroad, in unpleasant conditions, in societies very different from the ethnographer's habitat, very different indeed from the sort of place where he might go on holiday" (38, p. 7). In the United States one hears Europeanists complain of tenure refused, of articles rejected, and of grant requests denied because of their area of interest. While such complaints may well be rationalizations for actions which were in reality based on relative merit, it is significant that Africanists, Oceanists, and Americanists do not rationalize their failures in similar ways.

On the surface such attitudes apparently refer to the role of field work as a rite of passage which is necessary for full acceptance into the anthropological clan. The

suggestion is that the field experience in Europe is not sufficiently traumatic or physically demanding to serve this initiation function. Research in Europe is really not anthropology at all, but sociology, and that is better left to those with formal training as sociologists. Such attitudes may appear trivial, little more than expressions of private insecurity, professional jealousy, or barroom and hallway banter. However, I believe that they are a surface expression of a more deep-seated and significant phenomenon. Focus on the conditions under which anthropology is conducted in Europe draws attention away from the content of this research. It is a way of attempting to discredit it without considering what it has to say. It masks the uneasiness that some anthropologists continue to feel at the application of the same methods and theories used in the study of "primitives" to the study of "civilized" Europe.

Resistance within the profession is paralleled by the resentment that many European intellectuals feel when they learn that their countrymen are to be the subject of social anthropological enquiry. Anthropologists regularly experience confrontations with educated Europeans who, more or less politely, voice their objections to the research. I am not referring here to the sophisticated objections which are sometimes raised to research in Europe by any North Americans on the grounds that it is an aspect of American imperialism. Rather, I am referring to the objections to anthropological research by individuals who know anthropology (or ethnology) as the study of noncivilized peoples of other races. To be studied by an anthropologist is therefore to be put into the same category as "primitives." It is taken as an insult by these individuals, to be put into the same category as people whom they regard as fundamentally different from and inferior to themselves and their civilization. Their resentment is compounded because they assume the same attitudes are held by the anthropologist.

In the words of Del Hymes (73, p. 5), anthropology has developed as "an autonomous discipline that specializes in the study of others." As such, an anthropology of Europe (or America) is a contradiction in terms. Until the post-World War II period such a contradiction did not exist. One set of social sciences developed to explain human society and behavior in Europe and America, and anthropology developed to explain it in the rest of the world. Whether Europeans and Americans regarded the social forms of a non-European society as worthy or not, these forms were seen as the products of the society's own past. Poverty and misery might even be their lot, but that too could be laid to their traditions and customs. Research into the traditions and customs of primitives could illuminate the nature of *their* problems, but it could have little meaning for the citizens of modern Europe or America. Organized into modern, industrial nation states, the social forms of Europe and America were of a different order from those in the rest of the world.

Such an intellectual division of labor was congenial to the division of economic and political power in the world. It served to mask the nature of the relationships which bound all of the societies of the world into a single political-economic system where wealth and power in one corner of the globe were gained at a cost of poverty and underdevelopment elsewhere (65, 74). To focus on the nature of these relationships and their role in producing and maintaining the conditions which had once

been attributed to the survival of traditional social forms was to attack the ideological underpinnings of the world system. To scrutinize European communities and social institutions with an anthropological lens polished in the villages of Africa and Asia and the barrios of South America further threatened this ideology. It held out the potential of debunking the myth of the innate uniqueness and superiority of European society.

BEGINNINGS IN EUROPE

Since an anthropology of Europe was not a viable possibility in the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth centuries, and since substantial objections to it persist in the present, the question remains of why it has become well established now. It is not enough to note that there was an expansion of anthropological concern to include complex societies, including those in Europe. The question is why this expansion took place when it did. I would like to suggest that the rise of an anthropology of Europe was related to changes which took place in the world political economy in the period following World War II and to the new intellectual problems which this raised for social science research.

One aspect of this altered world situation is that anthropologists are finding it more difficult to conduct research in the places where they used to work, either because the groups they once studied as isolated tribesmen or rural folk have been transformed into something else, or because they are no longer allowed access to the areas where they live. Before World War II anthropologists could carry out research in European colonies or client states with impunity, and in the euphoria of the early days following liberation, when it was assumed that political independence would automatically be followed by modernization and development, anthropologists and other scholars were also welcome. Western scholars and technicians would contribute to the process of modernization through studies which pinpointed problems to be overcome and would help to outline methods to overcome them. But when this did not happen, suspicions arose that the development projects and the scholarly studies which underlay them might be a part of the problem. As Eric Wolf has put it:

Gone is the halcyon feeling that knowledge alone, including anthropological knowledge, will set men free. . . . the pacific or pacified objects of our investigation, primitives and peasants alike, are ever more prone to define our field situation gun in hand. A new vocabulary is abroad in the world. It speaks of "imperialism," "colonialism," "neocolonialism," and "internal colonialism," rather than just of primitives and peasants, or even of developed and underdeveloped. Yet anthropology has in the past operated among pacified or pacific natives; when the native "hits back" we are in a very different situation from that in which we found ourselves only yesterday (119, pp. 257-58).

As the borders were shut in Africa, Asia, and South America, and as even reservation Indians in North America became hostile to anthropology, some anthropologists, needing field research to support their professional careers, turned to one of the few areas still open to them, the nations of Europe.

Certainly substantial numbers of anthropologists with experiences in many different corners of the globe expanded their interest in the 1960s to include research in Europe. This involved some of the most respected members of the profession. A few of this distinguished group, and their areas of former research, are Bailey (India), Barth (Middle East), E. Friedl (North America), Hammel (South America), Honigmann (North America), Meggit (Oceania), Netting (Africa), Peristiany (Africa), Pospisil (Oceania), Pelto (Mexico), Reining (Africa), and Wolf (Latin America). Without speculating on the particular reasons which motivated any individual anthropologist to come to Europe after beginnings elsewhere, it is more than a coincidence that so many members of the profession have established a European research interest during a single decade which coincides with constricting opportunities for research elsewhere. Joining those anthropologists who had made a beginning in the fifties, these professors formed a cadre available for the training of Europeanist anthropologists.

While the closing of traditional research areas was providing a push, the establishment of resources for European research exercised a pull. The Council for European Studies, the Ford Foundation, and the International Research Exchanges Board (IREX) all made an effort to increase funds or create new funds for the express purpose of supporting European research. At the same time they announced that anthropologists were welcome to apply for these grants and in some cases singled out anthropology for special encouragement.³

Younger students who conducted doctoral research in Europe in the sixties and seventies were well aware that European anthropology was an expanding field, but their interest in the continent did not involve a shift in commitment as it had for their teachers. Rather, with an experienced staff available and foundations willing to fund their research, Europe was but one alternative out of a number which were available. In spite of the considerable resistance I have noted above, countervailing forces carried the day and an anthropology of Europe was established and "normalized" in a single intellectual generation.

³The reason for the increase in funds available for European research in the 1960s and 1970s is a matter for further research. The expansion of funds for European research accompanied the rapidly changing nature of the international climate in Europe in the 1960s. Whereas throughout the Cold War period Europe appeared to be divided into two well-integrated camps, one led by the United States and the other by the Soviet Union, dissensions appeared in the late fifties and sixties, and some states within both camps began to assume more independent international stances. As long as they had remained unwavering allies (Western Europe) or puppet satellites (Eastern Europe) there was little point to research. But once they began to become independent actors on the European scene information was required by power brokers in order to be able to predict and influence their course of action. This meant, among other things, more money for social science research.

In Britain interest in Europe may very well be tied to the loss of colonies and the reluctant reorientation of Britain to the continent. It parallels in time the switch from Britain's status as a world colonial power to a relatively underdeveloped member of the European common market.

The transformation of the world political economy affected anthropology in a second way which contributed to the establishment of an anthropology of Europe and provided it with an intellectual rationale. Into the 1950s anthropology had regularly regarded the communities and societies it studied as relatively autonomous and as variations on the theme of "traditional" and "primitive" societies which coexisted in the world with modern industrial nation states. While well aware of the inroads which had been and continued to be made by institutions such as Christian missions, slave raiding, the fur trade, the development of plantation economies, the introduction of cash crops, and the imposition of colonial or reservation administration, the impact of such institutions on the social organization of the communities which were being studied was rarely taken as a matter of anthropological interest. Where there was an interest in change, as in some personality and culture studies, the focus was on enculturation of individuals and their personal adjustments to new situations (as in the Harvard value studies in the American Southwest).

But studies of society were overwhelmingly dominated by a concern with stability. Not only in anthropology, but throughout Western social science structural-functional analysis of society held sway (65). This mode of analysis—paradigm—consistently emphasizes social order. Society is seen as a static entity made up of a variety of institutions. The behavior of individuals is explained in terms of rights and duties determined by the formal positions they hold in these institutions. The institutions serve both to maintain the society as a whole and to fulfill the social, psychological, and biological needs of the members of the society. Change is seen as coming from outside of the system and social process works to resist these pressures and to return the society to the status quo.

As indigenous movements led to political independence throughout the world and to a universal commitment to programs of economic, social, and political development, the focus of social science research began to shift from the study of social equilibrium to the factors which promote and retard social change. The theoretical systems which were erected to handle these new interests were initially Eurocentric and incorporated a duality between a traditional past and a modern present or future. Modernization for the Third World was seen as the emulation of the program for development which had been undergone in western Europe. This resulted in a proliferation of theoretical works which attempted to clarify this process and to explain its applicability for the new nations (15, 45, 60, 72, 82, 96, 113). In this view the underdevelopment and poverty which was the lot of most communities throughout the world was equated with the characteristics of traditional societies, whether primitive or peasant. These conditions could be alleviated through the shedding of traditional characteristics and the acceptance of modern technology, social organization, politics, and values. Community studies were then structured to take this transformation into consideration.

The monographs which result from such research are all variations on a single format. There is a chapter on "the setting" which contains statements about the community's location and history. This is "background" which figures little if at all into the analysis. The remainder of the book consists of a presentation of the

traditional characteristics of the community and of the changes which have taken place. The traditional character of the community is examined for aspects which either inhibit or promote change. There may or may not be a discussion of a few of the external influences which are seen as agents for change. Concepts such as "Culture of Poverty" and "the limited good" were attempts to develop generalizations about those aspects of traditional societies which inhibited beneficial change.

FROM TRADITIONAL TO MODERN

The anthropology of Europe drew its rationale from this developmentalist perspective. Studies of communities located in developed countries could serve as models of what the new nations were attempting to achieve. At the same time, studies conducted in European countries which still had traditional communities could also be informative. Although traditional, they *were* European and therefore they were generally farther along the path of modernization. They could be taken as representative of stages through which Third World communities would have to pass on their way to full modernization. Moreover, since these European nations already had considerable experience with modernization programs and the problems associated with them, non-European states could benefit from an understanding of their successes and failures.

In putting European communities together with those in other parts of the world into a framework of modernization, anthropologists follow two different lines of reasoning. One is to banish the traditional communities from Europe and the other is to continue to insist on the integrity of Europe in contrast to the rest of the world.

The first is represented by Banfield's well-known study of Montegrano in southern Italy. He puts southern Italy into the non-Western world, maintaining the dichotomy between us and others, by expanding the other now to include the parts of Europe left behind by modernization. He maintains that people in such areas are different from ourselves and even argues that "There is some reason to doubt that the non-Western cultures of the world will prove capable of creating and maintaining the high degree of organization without which a modern economy and a democratic political order are possible" (11, p. 8). It is their traditions which hold them back, but "While it is easy to see that culture may be the limiting factor which determines the amount and character of organization and therefore of progress in the less developed parts of the world, it is not obvious what are the precise incompatibilities between particular cultures, or aspects of culture, and particular forms or levels of organization" (11, p. 9). The purpose of the community study thus becomes evident: it is to discern those characteristics which inhibit progress. Thus Banfield discovered among the Montegranesi an "amoral familism" in which individuals act to "maximize the material, short run advantage of the nuclear family; assume that others will do likewise" (11, p. 83). The result of such behavior is that "In a society of amoral familists, no one will further the interest of the group or community except as it is to his private advantage to do so" (11, pp. 83-84). Such a traditional ethos, inherited from the past, prevents modernization and explains Montegrano's backwardness.

The emphasis on tradition preserved has not been a mere passing phase in European research. This is demonstrated by its domination of numbers of recent studies (1, 2, 27, 36, 54, 85). One example is Golde's (64) recent monograph on villages in Baden-Württemberg. He describes a transition from a traditional type of family farm into a modernized and highly rationalized family farm. However, the two villages he studied do not change in exactly the same way or at exactly the same speed. The differences are attributed to contrasting religious traditions; one community is Protestant, the other Catholic. Another example is provided in du Boulay's sophisticated structural analysis of domestic relations in a Greek village. In her epilogue she offers the observation that, "The structure which has been examined in this book represents on the whole a static pattern which is based on respect for traditional knowledge and an unquestioning acceptance of the social forms in which this knowledge was preserved" (41, p. 257). She goes on to speculate about what happens when the stability of such a society is threatened by modernization and the rationale for this knowledge is lost:

... preservation without understanding produces a precarious equilibrium which is easily upset when violently challenged by an opposing system, and is liable to two dangers. One is that an inflexibility, leading to ignorance and even to barbarism, should develop through a lack of enlightenment from within; the other that the inherited conviction of the validity of these forms should succumb easily to a philosophy with a more readily comprehensible rationale (41, p. 257).

Although the three authors cited here agree in that each has presented an analysis of tradition preserved, the fates of the three communities are widely divergent. While the Italian village clings tenaciously to its traditional ways, the German communities are rapidly evolving into modern mechanized farming villages and the Greek villagers are just as rapidly abandoning their village for an urban life.

These authors share Banfield's view of some European communities as bastions of ongoing traditions which impinge on the forces of modernization, but neither accepts the banishment of their communities from Europe nor Banfield's moral judgment. While Banfield regrets the tenacity of tradition, Golde is objectively indifferent and du Boulay regrets the passing of traditional values. The latter two also diverge from Banfield in seeing their communities as integral parts of European civilization, implicitly accepting the time-honored dichotomy between Europeans and others [although du Boulay expresses her fears about a lapse into "barbarism" and "savagery" and detects such a lapse in some Greek communities (41, pp. 257-58)].

The few attempts to survey the results of community studies in Europe are anchored to the concept of a traditional modern dichotomy and have at the same time labored to set forth the characteristics which define a European civilization and differentiate it from other cultures of the world. One of the first modern anthropological attempts was by Arensberg in 1963 (4). Europe, together with other civilizations, is set off from all others as being "Peoples of the Book"; within this grouping it is combined with the Middle East and contrasted with other civilizations on the basis of a distinctive bread-milk-meat subsistence base; finally, it stands unique even

in contrast with the Middle East on the grounds of distinctive social organization. In this way a *European Culture Area* can be defined, based on a unique constellation of enduring culture traits. It is a matter of identifying persistent traditions great and small, which are common to all parts of Europe, and which are of great antiquity. He explains that there are both practical and theoretical reasons to understand Europe's uniqueness even today, as these traditions continue to act in the face of modernization. By identifying the way in which traditional elements have influenced European development, we can then also identify more clearly what the essence of development is. This knowledge will be useful to countries where development is now diffusing. In fact, this understanding "is essential if nativistic reaction is to be weathered and viable amalgamations of native culture and imported institutions are to be evolved for the developing nations of the globe" (4, p. 77).

In the early seventies Anderson came out with a pair of studies (1, 2) which further developed these ideas. He explains traditional or feudal Europe as made up of three cultures or classes—aristocrats, burghers, and peasants. These are functionally integrated in any given locale through patron-client ties. Aristocrats and burghers are tied to other members of their class in different locations through networks which they use to transmit culture. This serves to maintain a single shared cultural tradition or civilization throughout the continent. Centers of cultural innovation rise and fall in different places, but members of these classes, regardless of where they live, keep up with the times as a result of their active networks. Peasants, on the other hand, do not move much from place to place and so regional differences among them are more pronounced. Similarities among peasants are mostly the result of shared patterns of dominance which have been diffused among the aristocracy. This civilization began in western Europe and diffused outward so that it was expanding into eastern Europe at a time when it was already declining in the west.

The two volumes go on to speak of the modernization of Europe in terms of the development of an urban-industrial order in northwestern Europe which created a middle class, a working class, and converted subsistence-oriented peasants into market-oriented farmers. This new order then proceeds to spread from the northwest across all of Europe, wiping out tradition as it goes. Thus:

The end of the traditional way of life and the beginning of the modern may be dated as the time of urban-industrial growth. For Europe, this means the nineteenth century in the low valleys and great plains of the northwest, including Great Britain. It means the twentieth century for isolated areas in the west and for most of the east, far north and Mediterranean south. For certain parts of England it means the last part of the eighteenth century. For convenience we take the eighteenth century as the last century of Traditional Europe (1, p. 72).

Arensberg's contribution was an attempt to identify the characteristic traditions which establish the uniqueness of Europe. Anderson has taken this lead, elaborated on it, and added a focus on the transformation from traditional to modern. Implicit in their writings is a view that the transformation of Europe carries a message for the rest of the world. It is this theme that George Dalton has picked for elaboration. In the process he has provided an explicit rationale for anthropological research in

Europe. He suggests "that to understand today's peasantries in India or Peru it is useful to study European serfs in the tenth century and European farmers in the twentieth century because we must know what Third World peasantries changed from and what they are changing into. Looking at a thousand years of European peasantry shows us what peasants were before, during and after modernization seriously began" (36, pp. 385-86). For Dalton then the study of European peasant communities can provide an agenda for the transformation of the rest of the world.

We thus stand, in the mid-seventies, with a collection of monographs analyzing "traditional" communities undergoing "modernization" as a result of external pressures for change which are diffusing across the European culture area. A few survey and theoretical works support this perspective, and all tie in to the general literature on modernization cited earlier. As a whole, this literature both supports the division of the world into Europeans and others, and sets up the transformation of Europe as a model for others to emulate.

ENTREPRENEURS, NETWORKS, PROCESSES

While many anthropologists continue to think in terms of a traditional/modern dichotomy, culture areas, and diffusion, serious questions about the validity of this paradigm have been raised and alternative perspectives have been advanced. One of these alternatives has developed as a critique of structural-functionalism and can be referred to as either the "social process" or the "entrepreneurial" approach. It has two major objections to structural-functionalism. The first is that it is a static model which is not only incapable of analyzing social change, but supports stability as normal and opposes change as abnormal. The second is that it was developed as a mode of analyzing traditional societies in which social relations are attributed to roles which are based on membership in a small number of corporate groups. In these analyses people appear to passively play out the roles that are assigned to them.

If this view is accepted, social process analysts argue, then it follows that social organization is determined differently in small scale societies than in large scale modern ones, since people in modern societies actively determine their social roles. In the social process view, people, whether in simple or complex societies, are active determiners of social relations, and society is not static. As Boissevain has put it, "Instead of looking at man as a member of groups and institutional complexes passively obedient to their norms and pressures, it is important to see him as an entrepreneur who tries to manipulate norms and relationships for his own social and psychological benefit" (23, p. 7). The interaction of these manipulating human beings gives society a dynamic which is the basis for all social process, including change (14, 22, 23). This method is used in the analysis of social process in particular places, but it is also used to generalize about the nature of social process in all societies. In its generalizing aspect the particulars of tradition and history are stripped away to lay bare the essence of social process and of the human behavior which underlies it.

The concept of social networks has been an important aspect of the entrepreneurial approach, and has developed in the study of complex societies. Here social relations are developed on an expedient basis from among a large number of possible alternatives, so students of these societies needed a method which could be used to describe the formation, maintenance, and function of social ties. The concept was first used explicitly over 20 years ago and has been vigorously developed in the intervening years. This literature has been subjected to several thorough reviews in recent years (13, 91), so here I simply want to call attention to its use both in Europe and in other areas of the world. While some of the earliest formulations of the network concept came out of research in Norway (12) and England (26) beginnings were being made in Africa and Latin America at about the same time. A number of monographs using network analysis in specific societies have appeared as well as collections which bring together under one cover case studies from different world areas (25). In these, in Boissevain's (23) theoretical volume, and in the volumes mentioned above, network analysis is presented as an abstract, generalized method which is equally applicable in a British or an African city, in a Norwegian parish or in rural Tanzania.

Bailey has developed a variant of the entrepreneurial approach in the study of politics which is relevant here because much of its application has been in Europe. His theory is set forth in *Strategems and Spoils* (8) and is predicated on the assumption that in any given society the political actors are agreed on the parameters of political behavior such as the nature of political goals and how one competes to obtain them. Generally people play by the rules, but sometimes individuals will try to establish new rules so that the going gets nasty and the political system may change as a result. In the chapters of this book he lays out what he regards as universals about the ways in which politics are conducted, whether these be in an Indian village in Orissa or in the halls of Whitehall. Case studies applying the method, mostly by his students, are presented in two additional volumes which cover different aspects of political behavior, broadly defined (9, 10). All of the case material here comes from European communities, but the referent is the theoretical model with its claims to universal applicability. Indeed, entrepreneurial analysis has much in common with the "processual" approach worked out by Marc Swartz and his colleagues (111) with its case studies drawn from all parts of the world.

The incorporation of European data into these schemes has done much to break down the arbitrary distinctions between the nature of the European and the inhabitants of other continents. To attribute differences between populations to age-old but unexplained traditions is both arbitrary and mystifying. It is arbitrary because whether a society is to be included or excluded from a particular culture area is decided first and only then is the rationale for the classification developed. It is mystifying because the grounds for selecting the identifying traditions are not specified. There is no method that one can learn which can be applied in any situation to determine culture area affiliation. The entrepreneurial approach is demystifying because it strips away the differences and discovers modes of behavior which are common to all societies.

The entrepreneurial approach has made a second major contribution in its focus on process. When social analysis is based on the study of structure the social analysis of change is difficult if not impossible. Structure implies stability, or equilibrium, and while structural-functionalists can analyze one set of institutions and compare them to another set which develops in the same society after a period of change, they cannot analyze the change itself. The logical result, which Gluckman has advocated, is that change is banished from social inquiry and assigned to history while the social anthropologist confines himself to the analysis of equilibrium situations (33, pp. 783–85; 63). But when society is seen as consisting of processes rather than structures, social analysis becomes the study of motion. Processes may remain repetitive—in equilibrium, if you will. But processes may also alter their direction either as the result of an internal dynamic or because of a change in the biophysical or cultural environment. In this paradigm the absence of change is as problematic as change.

The implications of this for social analysis are profound. We can no longer accept a traditional, unchanging society as the base of our analysis and seek only to explain what changes while assuming that what does not change requires no explanation. Indeed, we cannot assume that any given society has been static—that it has been tenaciously clinging to traditional forms perhaps because of a peasant ethos of conservatism. Whether the social processes we are investigating are repetitive or changing, we must explain what is happening.

However, in spite of its very substantial contributions, the entrepreneurial analysis alone is ultimately incomplete. While concentrating on the underlying similarities in the social processes of different societies does serve to break down the credibility of assumptions of innate differences between societies or culture areas, it begs the question of why they are different in the first place. It offers nothing to replace the use of tradition as an explanation for why differences occur. It would not, for example, offer us insights into why the south German villages I mentioned above are modernizing production while Banfield's south Italian villagers are resisting change and the Greek village du Boulay analyzed is being abandoned. As Sydel Silverman has pointed out in her review of the work of Bailey and his students (104, p. 120), the study of social process is ultimately subject to the same criticism that has been leveled at structural-functionalism, namely that "it directs attention away from the critical analysis of the social order." The question of how particular social processes are initiated, perpetuated, or changed remains.

COMMUNITY, REGION, WORLD SYSTEM

Concomitant with the development of anglophone anthropology of Europe, anthropology as a whole has been undergoing a radical reappraisal. This has been developed in such books as *The Culture of Poverty, a Critique* (80), and *Reinventing Anthropology* (74), and in the journals *Critique of Anthropology*, founded in London in 1974, and *Dialectical Anthropology*, founded in New York in 1975, as well as in articles in the older anthropological journals and elsewhere. This reappraisal has been brought about by the same political economic developments discussed above

that have led to the expansion of European research. At the heart of this critique is a rejection of the idea that the societies which anthropologists have studied are traditional peasant or primitive communities which have survived into the present and are now undergoing modernization. Instead it points out that these societies have for centuries been integrated into large scale political and economic processes. Most have been subject peoples, and the nature of their subjugation has played a leading role in determining the nature of their social organization. Embedded in this perspective is an understanding of poverty and underdevelopment, not as aspects of conservative tradition, but as results of inclusion in the overseas and internal hinterlands of industrial states. In addition, many regions had previously been subjected to the political and economic control of tribute-collecting empires. Being subjected to such political and economic domains has an impact on all aspects of community life: it affects how the people use their environment and make a living, how their social relations are structured, and what they think about the universe and their place in it.

This perspective necessarily calls into question the concept of tradition. It rejects the assumption that social and cultural patterns, once laid down, will persist tenaciously and questions research based on this assumption. Instead, it insists on knowing what produces social processes and what acts to maintain or change them. In this view the concept of tradition and the attribution of the persistence of tradition to a peasant ethos of conservatism is a substitute for analysis.

Once capitalism was established in the sixteenth century, a geographical division of labor and capital developed. Involved in this division are *cores* or *metropolises*, which import primary products and export manufacturers, and *peripheries* or *hinterlands*, where the primary products originate and which receive some of the manufactured goods (114, 115). The result of these interactions was to modernize both kinds of regions. Modernization in the core areas, in western Europe, and North America, and later in Japan and Soviet Russia, resulted in urbanization, industrialization, capital accumulation, and in the formation of nation states which were either parliamentary democracies, as in Holland, Britain, France, and the United States; authoritarian, totalitarian as in Germany and Japan; or state socialist as in Stalinist Russia (68, 92). But in the hinterlands modernization resulted in what Wolf has called the "triple crisis" (118). This consists of structural overpopulation, modes of production which gear hinterland production to the demands of the core and the erosion of power of precapitalist elites. Thus what we have been used to calling "traditional" or "underdeveloped societies" turn out to derive their characteristics not from tenacious social forms transmitted from the remote past, but from constellations of characteristics developed within the past few hundred years. Moreover, while some hinterlands have managed to resist or overthrow the hegemony of the industrial core and have undertaken genuine development, most have remained in this peripheral relationship for a long period of time. The nature of this ongoing relationship is a principal factor in the maintenance of social organization in both core and periphery.

Armed with the insights provided by this perspective, new methods of community research have been developed. These involve an understanding that the communities

we study are a setting for the interplay of a variety of forces. Some of these stem from the nature of the community's environment and the methods it uses to exploit it. Others are derived from patterns of social and economic interaction between communities. Still others originate in processes of national integration and the place of the communities we are studying in these processes. As a result of this understanding we have learned to appreciate the region as a unit of analysis (107).

As Schneider, Schneider & Hansen (100) have pointed out, a region is not just an expression of geography, nor is it a culture area in the sense of a collection of communities with a shared cultural tradition. Rather it is a unit of *political ecology*, where local resources and people are organized by an elite which is interposed between community and nation—and which may even bypass the nation in its relations with the world system. While the relative autonomy of such regions may be broken down in the process of national integration, regions have in the past played, and continue in the present to play, major roles in shaping the fortunes of both nation and community. In the villages and towns, people must reconcile ecological and social forces generated on the local scene with pressures which emanate from the political goals and strategies of elites. A more rewarding approach to the study of the community has come out of understanding it as a stage in the playing out of these forces. By coming to grips with the region, the researcher can approach an understanding of what goes on in the village. Conversely, when informed by this perspective, community research can contribute to an understanding of the region (55, pp. xiii–xviii).

CONTEMPORARY RESEARCH IN EUROPE

A few anglophone anthropologists have carried out research in urban areas in the more industrialized parts of Europe, mostly in Britain (47, 53), but by and large they have chosen town or country for their research sites, and these mostly in the parts of Europe which are the least industrialized. A case can certainly be made for the use of anthropology in urban research, but in Europe at least this assumption is supported by very few monographs and articles. While these studies individually present some useful insights into urban life, the number of studies is too few to generate any substantial trend which could serve as the basis for the characterization of an urban anthropology of Europe. Thus the anglophone anthropology of Europe is overwhelmingly the study of rural Europe. I note this with neither regrets nor apologies. In the total of social science and historical writings on Europe, peasants and other country folk have been rather badly neglected in comparison to other segments of society. But we know enough to be able to say that the ignorance of social forces generated in the countryside is at the peril of both intellectual understanding and political process in the modern world (66, 69, 79, 118).

In entering into research on rural Europe, investigators armed with anthropological training bring certain positive elements. They are trained in making close observations of behavior within a community over an extended period of time and they have techniques to record and organize their data based on an understanding of the genealogical method, of networks and coalitions, and of ecological relations. They

know how to interview people and are alert to discrepancies between what people say they do and what they do. Increasing numbers of investigators also know how to talk to a computer and have an appreciation for the results which can be obtained from gathering data in quantities, however arduous that may at times be. Without too much straining of their anthropological "tradition," the investigators can also be taught to use documents and other archival material. And, of course, they have at hand the theoretical awareness of the community as a product of its past and present integration into both its local setting and regional and national processes.

While thus methodologically and theoretically equipped to gather data in European communities, anthropologists initially were handicapped by a real ignorance about Europe itself. I have already discussed the virtual absence of writings on Europe in the anthropological literature. American and British anthropologists had some familiarity with European ethnology (112), but little of this focused on the questions of power, economy, and social organization which form the central concerns of anglophone anthropology. While there was a vast literature on different aspects of European history and society, the amount which dealt with rural European societies was relatively small. The study of rural communities in Europe was probably most advanced in Eastern and Central Europe, where it dated well back into the nineteenth century. But this was written in languages which were not widely read in the West and remained virtually unknown until quite recently. As a result of this ignorance, their research reports often included "some rediscoveries of truths long known outside the autarky of the English-speaking world" (102, p. 12). But most English-speaking anthropologists did consult with peasant specialists in the countries where they conducted their research and began to incorporate the insights of these scholars into their interpretations. A few European scholars, such as Hofer (49, 70) and Shanin (102, 103), took the trouble to draw our attention to this literature. They were joined by others with the necessary linguistic abilities who began to translate some of this material into English, or to write books which drew on the national literature of one or another European country.

As a result of these efforts a number of the most important works by Russian and Polish scholars are now available. Both Lenin's (81) and Marx's (87) interpretations of peasants and their relationship to capitalist development are available, as well as Preobrazhensky's formulations (94) from the pre-Stalinist period on how to strengthen peasant production and use it to finance industrial growth. While these works are largely programmatic, Chayanov's (31) researches provided much data on the nature of the peasant village and family economics. More recently, Shanin has drawn on Russian sources to analyze the transformations of life in European Russia from the turn of the century up until 1925 (101). While providing his own insights into the permutations of rural life during this period, he also carefully sets forth what contemporary Russian scholars saw as problems and how they analyzed them at the time. The remarkable *Smolensk under Soviet Rule* (48) details the transformations of one *oblast* (region) under the Soviets by analyzing extensive documents captured by the German army during World War II. Additional contributions have been made by Stephen and Ethel Dunn (44) in translating into English material by contemporary Russian ethnologists and in Benet's (17) translation of

the study of the Russian village of Viriatino, where Russian scholars conducted research both before and after the 1918 revolution. Also see the evaluation of this work by the Russian emigré ethnologist, Zil'berman (120), and replies by the Dunns (42, 43).

There has also been a substantial development of historical and sociological studies of rural society in Poland. This has been informed not only by research on the Polish rural population, but by Marxist theory and anglo-American anthropology as well. The historian Kieniewicz's study (75) of the effects of modern capitalist penetration into the Polish countryside in the nineteenth century is an excellent example of the nature of capitalism in a hinterland area, and Galeski's *Basic Concepts of Rural Sociology* (59) must be regarded as a major theoretical work on rural social organization and its permutations in the modern world.

Work by scholars in western Europe were better known and more accessible since German and French are more widely read in English-speaking countries. Nevertheless, translations of works such as Bloch's (20) on feudal Europe, Slicher van Bath's (106) on agrarian history, Braudel's (28) on Mediterranean Europe, Doving's (40) on peasant farming, Mendras's (83, 90) on French peasants, and Elias's (46) work in English on state formation have done much to advance our understanding of social and economic aspects of rural life in Europe in the past and present.

Familiarity with these and related works by European scholars has had a three-fold impact on anglophone anthropology. First, it has been useful in the very specific way of providing information about particular places in Europe at particular times. Second, because these scholars deal with larger areas and longer time spans than anthropologists usually deal with in their field research, their publications have served to help the anthropologist put his work into a wider perspective. Anthropologists have become more aware of the relationship of their communities and regions to long-term historical processes of national and international scope. This is reflected in many of the studies which have been conducted in Europe over the past 10 years (24, 35, 71, 93). Of course, this relationship has not been all one way. While rural sociologists and social historians are often interested in the same sort of interplay between social, political, economic, and ideological phenomena as anthropologists, they habitually look at these relationships in terms of regional or national aggregates and statistically determined trends. These often mask substantial variation both within communities or regions and between them. Detailed local studies help to make clear the rich variation in rural life which these aggregate approaches overlook.

Finally, the theoretical thrust of the European social science I have discussed above is to see rural communities and regions as integral parts of larger social entities. These investigations seek not only to describe the conditions of rural life, but to explain why they are the way they are. While they, too, sometimes speak of tenacious tradition as a deterrent to "progress," they are more likely to look to the nature of relations between rural communities and other social categories to explain rural life. These views developing in Europe have been congenial to those which have developed in America and Britain; in recent years there has been a growing dialogue between them.

The result has been that increasing numbers of Europeanist anthropologists and other social scientists working in Europe have found the boundaries of their academic disciplines confining. While continuing to publish in standard professional journals, these have not reached this growing international "antidisciplinary" audience. One result of this dissatisfaction has been the formation of a series of new journals which focus on interests common to several established disciplines. The European Society for Rural Sociology was founded in 1957, and in 1960 it began publishing an international journal, *Sociologia Ruralis*. Today social scientists from many different disciplines, including anglophone anthropology, use its pages to communicate with one another. Other journals such as *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, *Economy and Society*, the *Peasant Studies Newsletter*, and *Review*, while by no means exclusively concerned with European rural society, carry the kind of antidisciplinary and critical scholarship which is beginning to characterize the study of rural Europe.

The development of a world system divided into urban-industrial nation states and agrarian hinterlands is not simply a division between Europe and the rest of the world. Europe itself was divided into cores and peripheries. As capitalist nation states emerged in northwestern Europe they established economic dominance over southern Europe and contested eastern Europe with the Moscovite, Polish, and Ottoman empires that were already present. Capitalist penetration into these areas did not result in capital accumulation, industrialization, and mechanized agriculture there. But it did transform southern and eastern Europe as they became geared to production for export to the West. The peasantry did not become workers and farmers, but they were transformed into new types of peasantry, and new forms of elites arose to exploit the opportunities which the new economic relations presented. Accompanying these emerging forms of political economy were new ideologies. Conservatives glorified an idealized version of the past while liberals extolled the potential of capitalism to improve the human conditions and leftists of various sorts saw an unjust present giving way to a more human future through a radical transformation of society.

Moreover, relationships both within and between core and periphery were not static. The entire system was dynamic with changes in the core being matched by those in the peripheries. As mines and soils were depleted in one area, new resources were developed in another; peasant revolts in peripheries were matched by worker unrest in the cores; elites of different colors succeeded one another, changing internal policies and international allies; wars were fought; nationalist movements succeeded or failed; ethnic and regional minorities strived for rights, recognition, and special status; regions were transferred from one political system to another; new nations arose and old ones disappeared. It can hardly be assumed with conviction that rural communities anywhere in Europe have escaped with their social processes unchanged from the turbulence of the past few centuries. However, since few of the research reports which have been written about Europe have explicitly considered the relationship of local processes to large scale ones, much reevaluation is in order. Moreover, future research can expect to be examined for its effectiveness in analyzing such relationships.

CURRENT DIRECTIONS

Not all research being conducted in Europe today demonstrates all of the characteristics which I am suggesting here. But there has been a substantial increase in the awareness of the importance of looking at how village social processes have developed through time. A number of recent monographs and articles have explicitly advocated this and have quite successfully demonstrated how it can be done, and Davis, in his review of Mediterranean research, has fashioned an explicit argument for the necessity of incorporating historical perspectives into social anthropological analysis (38, pp. 239–58). At the same time, there are increasing numbers of studies which show an appreciation for the importance of understanding the nature of village integration into its regional setting. The best of the recent studies have shown an appreciation for both regional integration and for the way in which this has developed through time. Moreover, anthropological understanding of the large scale social processes in Europe has been expanding so that community and regional studies show more sophistication in investigating the interplay between local, regional, and national processes. In the final section of this paper I want to discuss briefly some of the specific works which seem to me to best exemplify these trends.

Northwestern Europe might be expected to bear the closest resemblance to the developmentalist perspective since it served as the model on which it was based. Amazingly enough, we find research in the twentieth century which reports on areas in Ireland, or in Britain itself, as if they were traditional and which have little or nothing to say about the relationship of community to nation, except to report changes going on in the present. There are exceptions. Frankenberg's (52) short yet detailed account of relations between classes and between locals and outsiders in a Welsh border village, in spite of its overall structural-functionalist tone and an absence of historical depth, shows a keen awareness of the integration of the community into British society. He does not use its remote location as a justification for regarding it as a traditional village, but instead looks at the nature of its linkages to the outside and how these are related to its internal processes. In similar fashion, in his later review of community studies in Britain, he does not accept researchers' assertions about the traditional state of their villages, but instead notes that each has in one way or another been integrated into the British polity and economy (53).

For Ireland, we now have Hecter's (67) detailed analysis of how that island has been tied to Britain since at least the sixteenth century in such a way as to siphon off capital and labor to benefit British development while simultaneously creating and perpetuating Irish poverty. Since for much of its history Ireland was directly under British rule, Hecter calls this relationship *internal colonialism*. Writing earlier than Hecter, but clearly thinking along the same lines, Gibbon (61) has used the occasion of the publication of several new Irish community studies to review the state of anthropological research on Ireland. Using information about agriculture, land holdings, and mental illness available from several statistical sources (including some available when the first research was conducted in the 1930s), he questions the assumption that *any* community in Ireland could have been traditional (the "real Ireland") in the twentieth century. Other investigators have seen harmonious, paro-

chial communities, characterized by internal egalitarian relations and insulation from outside influences, still existing in the 1930s. But Gibbon finds cash cropping, high incidence of mental illness, and internal differentiation, all of which he attributes to the nature of their integration into the national political economy. On the basis of data he has assembled, he suggests that these conditions date *at least* to the turn of the century. This is in contrast to the modern studies he reviews, which see these as happening only in the present.

Gibbon's treatment of "cooring," usually presented as a traditional system of mutual aid between equals, is an example of the kind of rethinking of past analyses that needs to be carried out. He notes that farmers with larger holdings also participated in this system, and that there is some evidence that they exchanged mechanized labor for hand labor. Since farm machinery was in short supply, the farmers who owned it could control the timing of the exchange. Moreover, while the owner could carry out his end of the exchange by working alone with his machine, thus keeping his family at work at home, his partner in the exchange would have to reciprocate by turning out with his entire family. The exchange thus worked to the advantage of the big farmer since he could get all the labor he needed without having to hire it. "... in many respects the participation of the larger farmer in the cooring system seems to have represented for him a rational adjustment to the post-famine problem of maintaining plentiful supplies of labour for relatively under-capitalized holdings" (61, p. 487). He also suggests that its impact on the smaller farmers was demoralizing since it deflected their labor away from their own holdings. This may well have contributed to the well-documented decline of small scale agriculture and the high frequency of mental illness in Ireland.

While the evidence for Gibbon's interpretation is only suggestive, his analysis is plausible. This particular analysis will have to be tested by further research, but Hecter's detailed account of the transformations of Irish society, coupled with the questions Gibbon has raised about the validity of many of the conclusions presented in existing Irish community studies, should alert future research to the problems of community integration into the Irish political economy.

Developmentalist perspectives see modernization in the Mediterranean, the Alps, East Central Europe, and the Balkans as the result of diffusion. This process, developmentalists feel, is not yet complete because of culture lag and traditions which differ from those of northwestern Europe and which are more tenaciously resistant to change (e.g. 27, pp. 8-13). But instead we now see that these areas were in fact modernized beginning in the sixteenth century as their agriculture began to be redirected toward the requirements of capitalist core that was beginning to emerge in Western Europe. While Italy and the Iberian states were themselves core areas as capitalism began to emerge, they were reduced to peripheries by the seventeenth century. Since that time, as the Steins (110), among others (28), have pointed out, they became economic colonies of the industrializing northwestern core.

Alpine research, since its inception in the early 1960s, has had an ecological orientation. It has in the main been directed toward explaining the relationship between village social organization and patterns of exploitation of the Alpine envi-

ronment. Thus it has not simply accepted local social processes as given, but has attempted to explain why they persist through time by examining them in relationship to local circumstances. Most of these studies are also concerned with the changes which are now taking place in the economic and political relations of these communities with the outside and have examined how both the use of local resources and local social organization have responded to these changing circumstances. While the idiom of tradition is sometimes used in these studies, it is in reference to these patterns of adaptation; that is, traditions here are explained rather than simply accepted as given (3, 58).

Research in the Alps has also been characterized by a concern with local history, and many of the studies have a time depth in their analysis which is not found in most community studies. However, past integration of these communities into large scale political and economic processes has been underplayed in most analysis. Instead of following Frankenberg's lead and showing how these communities, although remote, are integrated into the region, they rely on the concept of marginal location and isolation as a justification for concentrating almost exclusively on adaptation to local circumstances.

This does not seem to be warranted. Many upland communities were initially settled under the sponsorship of lowland elites, and in any case, the nature of their ongoing relationship with elites, with lowland communities, and with processes of regional and national integration have been major forces in shaping their social, economic, and political organization. Throughout the Alps, upland villages have relied on out-migration of up to 50 percent of each generation as a means of removing excess population from the villages and maintaining the viability of their social organization. Moreover, in most Alpine areas, substantial numbers of households depend on wage labor as a supplement to farm income. Some members of these households are regularly dispatched to the lowlands as workers to earn these wages. This suggests that upland communities are in fact serving as a labor reserve for the relatively urban and market oriented lowlands.

Such patterns are not new, but have been developing over the past several hundred years. Moreover, the nature of upland family organization, patterns of land tenure and inheritance, village political organization, and virtually every other aspect of upland life have developed not just in response to local conditions, but have grown out of the way in which environmental requirements have been balanced by villagers against pressures which emanate from the regional political economy (35).

Without a doubt, the Mediterranean region has attracted more anthropological attention than any part of Europe to its north, and this attention has resulted in some of the most successful recent community and regional studies. Davis's *Peoples of the Mediterranean* (38) evaluates the bulk of the research produced up to 1975. He thoroughly discusses each of the topics and issues that have concerned Mediterranean anthropologists, accurately presenting the work of others and adding his own penetrating insights. The work is intended not only to report on what has been done, but also draws attentions to problems and failures, and includes recommendations about what he feels are the most promising directions for future research. What he

advocates is in accord with the thrust of this essay; in his words, this is the study "of the creation of history locally, of its reciprocal relation to national events and processes, of concomitant variation among a number of communities . . ." (38, pp. 256-57).

In this work, Davis specifically rejects the concept of tradition:

Mediterranean social order does not therefore refer to an aboriginal society, the institutional equivalent to the grunts and glottal stops of some primordial language. Nor was it ever a complete social order, in the sense that there was a complete and uniform range of social institutions . . . It is, rather, those institutions, customs and practices which result from the conversation and commerce of thousands of years, the creation of the very different peoples who have come into contact around the Mediterranean shores (38, p. 13).

To this one can add that the populations of the Mediterranean on both the northern and southern shore have been drawn into economic and political relations with the northwestern European industrial core as markets and sources of raw materials (28, 114), as areas for colonization (18), and as sources of unskilled labor (29). The way in which peripheral status has developed in the Mediterranean has much to do with the characteristics of local and regional social processes there (100) and is what justifies it as a unit of study. In this light, the north shore has more in common with the south shore than it does with the industrial states across the Alps.

In the past three years a number of monographs have appeared which in varying degrees practice the kind of analysis that Davis and I are advocating. Davis's own analysis of social and economic relations in the south Italian town of Pisticci shows how these have grown largely out of the integration of the south into the Italian market economy (37). Blok's volume (21) and that of the Schneiders (98, 99) focus on the relationship between the growth of mafia and related social and economic institutions and the nature of western Sicily's past and present integration into the Italian and world political economy, and Silverman (105) has analyzed the development of the political economy of a central Italian hill town as a manifestation of its integration into the Italian state.

Other recent research has been directed toward the characterization of regional processes. Aya (7) has contributed a study of the failure of rural revolts in southern Spain and Sicily. He notes that these areas have experienced the same depredations from capitalist penetration as other areas where revolutions have succeeded, but here uprisings were suppressed. His comparison of success with failures stresses the relationship of the peasantry to public and private power holders and calls attention to variations in the political economy of different hinterland areas. At the other end of the Mediterranean, Markides (86) has documented the interplay between internal and external political and economic pressures which have molded life on the island of Cyprus. He focuses especially on political processes and skillfully traces how the movement for union with Greece during the British colonial period was diverted into an independence movement, and how Greek and Turkish interference in Cypriot affairs is related to the nature of local politics within the island. Finally, there is the encyclopedic assault on the regional variations within Greece edited by Dimen & Friedl (39). This contains over 40 contributions including reports of research on

modern communities and regions, various topical essays, and some historical and prehistoric analyses. Although the contributions are uneven and there is no attempt at formulating an overview which would systematically account for the similarities and differences between areas and within areas through time, the possibility of developing such an analysis is implicit in the organization of the material into sections and in the content of many of the articles.

Eastern Europe, like the Mediterranean, has long been integrated into the economic sphere of western Europe. The Steins note that, "Paradoxically, as west European economic development brought social differentiation, mobility and greater personal freedom to peasant proprietors and urban and rural wage laborers, in peripheral areas of the west European economy, labor became more 'unfree.' In Central and eastern Europe it became the 'second serfdom.' In America it took various forms: *encomienda*, *repartimento*, *mita*, and ultimately debt peonage and slavery" (110, pp. 33-34). This insight, made in passing by the Steins, has been carefully documented in detailed studies of eastern Europe. For example, the Hungarian economists Berend & Ranki (19) have traced the penetration of capitalist economic relations in these areas, concentrating especially on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Their study details the way in which this penetration tied agricultural production in the East to the requirements of the West, inhibited the development of industry, and served to perpetuate the agrarian nature of these societies. These ties became especially intense as Eastern Europe was integrated into the German war economy during the decade before World War II.

Following the war, ties to the West were abruptly severed as Communist parties came to power in the various countries. While in the early years of Communist rule it appeared as if Eastern European states were carefully controlled "satellites" of the Soviet Union, it is now clear that each has its own distinctive brand of "socialism." This is theoretically expected and empirically demonstrable; the present social processes in these Eastern European states are the result of interaction of their distinctive pasts and geographical circumstances with their present Marxist-Leninist political economic organization and ideologies.

Because these societies explicitly promote the development of planned societies and reject Western models of development, and since they have in the past shared hinterland status with Third World areas such as Latin America, the potential rewards for Eastern European research are high. Moreover, opportunities for research there have expanded markedly in recent years although few full scale studies have yet appeared.

A recent monograph by the sociologist Daniel Chirot (32) traces the development of ties of dependency with the West in Wallachia, one of the regions which make up present-day Romania. Drawing on the theoretical model of Wallerstein (114) and the brilliant analyses of the Romanian sociologist Henri Stahl (109), Chirot explains that the so-called "traditional" or "feudal" social processes in Wallachia are in reality the product of its colonial status. While Chirot's analysis ends with World War I, his examination of the interplay of local and international processes is precisely the kind of analysis required if we are to come to grips with the way in which social processes have been formed, maintained, and transformed in Eastern

Europe. Other recent studies in Eastern Europe have been concerned with the integration of communities and regions into large scale processes, but have been less theoretically explicit on this point than Chirot. These include research on social transformation since the advent of communism in a county in the south of Romanian Transylvania (34); a study of contrasts in the kinds of social integration within Bosnian villages and between villages in the marketplace (84); and a study of social and economic transformations in a Slovenian village (117).

CONCLUSIONS

In this essay I have offered an explanation for the establishment of an “anglophone anthropology” of Europe and have traced its theoretical and methodological development. I have not attempted to provide complete coverage of Europeanist literature, or of the topics which interest Europeanists. My contention is that whether one is interested in household demography, inheritance patterns, peasant revolts, marriage customs, or anything else, the goal of research is to explain how phenomena come into being, how they have been perpetuated, or how they have been transformed. A reliance on the concepts of tradition and modernization will not provide this understanding since it is clear that what we have been calling “tradition” is a product of social forces, mostly of relatively modern origin. While much research in Europe continues to rely on these outmoded concepts, there has been an upswing in the number of studies which are informed by a more promising perspective. In this perspective the integration of community into regional and national processes is as decisive for community and region as local ecological and social relations. Regional processes, moreover, can be understood only in reference to the position of the region in the world political economy. Future research reports can expect to be evaluated in terms of how well they are able to explain local social phenomena in terms of the interrelationship of local, regional, national, and international pressures.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my colleagues in the Romanian Research Project at the University of Massachusetts—Sam Beck, David Kideckel, Marilyn McArthur, Marin Popescu, Steve Randall, and Steve Sampson—not only for their constructive criticism, but for allowing me to temporarily set aside our joint undertaking in order to complete this manuscript. I also want to thank Dick Woodbury for taking the trouble to ferret out the “Peasants’ Revolt” letter for me from his file of *Newsletters*. Finally, I want to thank Ellan Cole, Sydel Silverman, and Eric Wolf for critical reading of the manuscript.

Literature Cited

1. Anderson, R. T. 1971. *Traditional Europe: A Study in Anthropology and History*. Belmont: Wadsworth. 195 pp.
2. Anderson, R. T. 1973. *Modern Europe: An Anthropological Perspective*. Pacific Palisades: Goodyear. 163 pp.
3. *Anthropological Quarterly* 1972. Dynamics of ownership in the circum-Alpine area. *Anthropol. Q.* (special issue) 45:117-205
4. Arensberg, C. M. 1963. The old world peoples: the place of European cultures in world ethnography. *Anthropol. Q.* 36:75-99
5. Arensberg, C. M. 1968. *The Irish Countryman*. Garden City: Natural History Press. 197 pp.
6. Arensberg, C. M., Kimball, S. T. 1968. *Family and Community in Ireland*. Cambridge: Harvard Press. 417 pp. Rev. ed.
7. Aya, R. 1975. *The missed revolution: The fate of rural rebels in Sicily and southern Spain*. Papers on European and Mediterranean Societies No. 3. *Anthropol.-Sociol.* Centrum, Univ. Amsterdam. 159 pp.
8. Bailey, F. G. 1970. *Stratagems and Spoils: A Social Anthropology of Politics*. Oxford: Blackwell. 240 pp.
9. Bailey, F. G., 1971. *Gifts and Poison: The Politics of Reputation*. Oxford: Blackwell. 318 pp.
10. Bailey, F. G., ed. 1973. *Debate and Compromise: The Politics of Innovation*. Oxford: Blackwell. 343 pp.
11. Banfield, E. C. 1958. *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*. New York: Free Press. 188 pp.
12. Barnes, J. A. 1954. Class and committees in a Norwegian island parish. *Hum. Relat.* 7:39-58
13. Barnes, J. A. 1972. *Social Networks*. Modular Publ. *Anthropol.* 26. Reading: Addison-Wesley. 29 pp.
14. Barth, F. 1966. *Models of Social Organization*. Occas. Pap. No. 23, *R. Anthropol. Inst.* 33 pp.
15. Bendix, R. 1967. Tradition and modernity reconsidered. *Comp. Stud. in Soc. Hist.* 9:292-347
16. Benedict, R. 1972. *Rumanian Culture and Behavior*. Occas. Pap. *Anthropol.* No. 1, Colorado State Univ. 55 pp.
17. Benet, S., ed. 1970. *The Village of Viriatino: An Ethnographic Study of a Russian Village from Before the Revolution to the Present*. Garden City: Doubleday. 300 pp.
18. Benounne, M. 1976. The origin of the Algerian proletariat. *Dialectical Anthropol.* 1:201-24
19. Berend, I., Ranki, G. 1974. *Economic Development in East-Central Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. New York, London: Columbia. 402 pp.
20. Bloch, M. 1961. *Feudal Society*. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 2 vols. 498 pp.
21. Blok, A. 1975. *The Mafia of a Sicilian Village*. New York: Harper & Row. 293 pp.
22. Boissevain, J. 1973. Preface. See Ref. 25, pp. VII-XIII
23. Boissevain, J. 1974. *Friends of Friends: Networks, Manipulators and Coalitions*. Oxford: Blackwell. 285 pp.
24. Boissevain, J., Friedl, J., eds. 1975. *Beyond the Community: Social Process in Europe*. The Hague: Dep. Educ. Sci. The Netherlands. 184 pp.
25. Boissevain, J., Mitchell, J. C., eds. 1973. *Network Analysis: Studies in Human Interaction*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton. 271 pp.
26. Bott, E. 1971. *Family and Social Networks*. New York: Free Press. 363 pp.
27. Brandes, S. H. 1975. *Migration, Kinship, and Community: Tradition and Transition in a Spanish Village*. New York, London: Academic. 220 pp.
28. Braudel, F. 1972. *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Phillip II*. New York: Harper & Row. 1375 pp.
29. Castles, S., Kosack, G. 1973. *Immigrant Workers and Class Structure in Western Europe*. London: Oxford. 514 pp.
30. Chapman, C. G. 1971. *Milocca: a Sicilian Village*. Cambridge, London: Schenkman. 253 pp.
31. Chayanov, A. V. 1966. *The Theory of Peasant Economy*. Homewood, Ill: Irwin. 317 pp.
32. Chirot, D. 1976. *Social Change in a Peripheral Society: The Creation of a Balkan Colony*. New York, London: Academic. 179 pp.
33. Cole, J. W. 1973. Social process in the Italian Alps. *Am. Anthropol.* 75:765-86
34. Cole, J. W., Kideckel, D., Randall, S., Sampson, S., McArthur, M., Beck, S. 1976. Field work in Romania. *Dialectical Anthropol.* 1:239-85, 321-75
35. Cole, J. W., Wolf, E. R. 1974. *The Hidden Frontier: Ecology and Ethnicity in*

- an Alpine Valley*. New York: Academic. 348 pp.
36. Dalton, G. 1972. Peasantries in anthropology and history. *Curr. Anthropol.* 13:385-407
 37. Davis, J. 1973. *Land and Family in a South Italian Town*. London: Athlone. 200 pp.
 38. Davis, J. 1977. *People of the Mediterranean: An Essay in Comparative Anthropology*. London: Henley; Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 288 pp.
 39. Dimen, M., Friedl, E. 1976. *Regional variation in modern Greece and Cyprus: Toward a perspective on the ethnography of Greece*. Ann. NY Acad. Sci., Vol. 268. 465 pp.
 40. Doving, F. 1965. *Land and Labor in Europe in the Twentieth Century*. The Hague: Nijhoff. 511 pp.
 41. du Boulay, J. 1974. *Portrait of a Greek Mountain Village*. Oxford: Clarendon. 296 pp.
 42. Dunn, E. 1976. Reply to Zil'berman. *Dialectical Anthropol.* 1:157-60
 43. Dunn, S. 1976. Reply to Zil'berman. *Dialectical Anthropol.* 1:155-56
 44. Dunn, S., Dunn, E. 1974. *Introduction to Soviet Ethnography*. Berkeley: Highgate Road Soc. Sci. Res. Stn. 2 vols. 708 pp.
 45. Eisenstadt, S. N. 1968. *Modernization: Protest and Change*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall. 166 pp.
 46. Elias, N. 1972. Processes of state formation and nation building. *Trans. 7th World Congr. Sociol.* Geneva: Int. Sociol. Assoc.
 47. Elias, N., Scotson, J. L. 1965. *The Established and the Outsiders. A Sociological Inquiry into Community Problems*. London: Case. 199 pp.
 48. Fainsod, M. 1958. *Smolensk under Soviet rule*. New York: Random House. 484 pp.
 49. Fél, E., Hofer, T. 1969. *Proper Peasants: Traditional Life in a Hungarian Village*. Chicago: Aldine. 440 pp.
 50. Firth, R. 1957. Introduction: Malinowski as scientist and as man. In *Man and Culture*, ed. R. Firth, pp. 1-14. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 292 pp.
 51. Flannigan, P., Dupont, J., Valdez, J., Untermayer, H., Ivanovitch I. etc. etc. (sic) [pseudonyms]. 1972. Peasants' revolt. *Anthropol. Newsl.* 13 (1):4
 52. Frankenberg, R. 1957. *Village on the Border: A Social Study of Religion, Politics and Football in a North Wales Community*. London: Cohen & West. 163 pp.
 53. Frankenberg, R. 1966. *Communities in Britain: Social Life in Town and Country*. Baltimore: Penguin. 313 pp.
 54. Franklin, S. H. 1969. *The European Peasantry: The Final Phase*. London: Methuen. 256 pp.
 55. Freeman, S. T. 1970. *Neighbors: The Social Contract in a Castilian Hamlet*. Chicago, London: Univ. Chicago Press. 233 pp.
 56. Freeman, S. T. 1973. Introduction. In *Studies in European Social Organization*, ed. S. T. Freeman. *Am. Anthropol.* 75:743-50
 57. Freeman, S. T., Walters, L. W., compilers 1975. Europeanist social anthropologists in North America. *Am. Anthropol. Assoc. Spec. Publ.* 13. 34 pp.
 58. Friedl, J. 1974. *Kippel: A Changing Village in the Alps*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 129 pp.
 59. Galeski, B. 1971. *Basic Concepts of Rural Sociology*. Manchester: Manchester Press. 209 pp.
 60. Gellner, E. 1964. *Thought and Change*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson. 224 pp.
 61. Gibbon, P. 1973. Arensberg and Kimball revisited. *Econ. Soc.* 2:479-98
 62. Gluckman, M., ed. 1964. *Closed Systems and Open Minds: The Limits of Naïvete in Anthropology*. Chicago: Aldine. 274 pp.
 63. Gluckman, M. 1968. The utility of equilibrium models in the study of social change. *Am. Anthropol.* 70:219-37
 64. Golde, G. 1975. *Catholics and Protestants: Agricultural Modernization in Two German Villages*. New York, London: Academic. 198 pp.
 65. Gouldner, A. W. 1970. *The Coming Crisis in Western Sociology*. New York: Avon. 528 pp.
 66. Halpern, J. 1967. *The Changing Village Community*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall. 136 pp.
 67. Hecter, M. 1975. *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development 1536-1966*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: Univ. California Press. 361 pp.
 68. Hobsbawm, E. J. 1969. *Industry and Empire*. Baltimore: Penguin. 384 pp.
 69. Hobsbawm, E. J. 1973. Peasants and politics. *J. Peasant Stud.* 1:3-22
 70. Hofer, T. 1970. Anthropologists and native ethnographers at work in central European villages. See Ref. 71, pp. 5-22
 71. Honigsmann, J. J., ed. 1970. Modernization and tradition in Central European rural cultures. *Anthropologica* (Ottawa) n.s. 12 (1). 148 pp.

72. Hunter, G. 1969. *Modernizing Peasant Societies: A Comparative Study in Asia and Africa*. New York, London: Oxford Press. 324 pp.
73. Hymes, D. 1974. The use of anthropology: critical, political, personal. See Ref. 74, pp. 3-82
74. Hymes, D., ed. 1974. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Vintage. 470 pp.
75. Kieniewicz, S. 1969. *The Emancipation of the Polish Peasantry*. Chicago, London: Univ. Chicago Press. 285 pp.
76. Kluckhohn, C. 1961. *Anthropology and the Classics*. Providence: Brown Univ. Press. 76 pp.
77. Kroeber, A. L. 1948. *Anthropology*. New York, Burlingame: Harcourt, Brace & World. 856 pp.
78. Kuper, A. 1973. *Anthropologists and Anthropology: The British School 1922-72*. Baltimore: Penguin. 256 pp.
79. Landsberger, H., ed. 1973. *Rural Protest: Peasant Movements and Social Change*. New York: Barnes & Noble. 430 pp.
80. Leacock, E. B., ed. 1971. *The Culture of Poverty: A Critique*. New York: Simon & Schuster. 382 pp.
81. Lenin, V. I. 1972. *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*. Vol. 3 of *Lenin's Collected Works*. London: Wishart. 607 pp.
82. Lerner, D. 1958. *The Passing of Traditional Society*. New York: Free Press. 466 pp.
83. Lévi-Straus, L., Mendras, H. 1974. Survey of peasant studies: rural studies in France. *J. Peasant Stud.* 1:363-79
84. Lockwood, W. 1975. *European Moslems: Economy and Ethnicity in Western Bosnia*. New York, London: Academic. 241 pp.
85. Lopreato, J. 1967. *Peasants No More: Social Class and Social Change in an Underdeveloped Society*. San Francisco: Chandler. 281 pp.
86. Markides, K. C. 1977. *The Rise and Fall of the Cyprus Republic*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press. 224 pp.
87. Marx, K. 1965. *Pre-Capitalist Economic Formations*. New York: International. 153 pp.
88. Mead, M. 1976. Introduction. In *Communal Families in the Balkans: The Zadruga*, ed. R. F. Byrnes, pp. xvii-xxvii. Notre Dame, London: Univ. Notre Dame Press. 285 pp.
89. Mead, M., Metraux, R., eds. 1953. *The Study of Culture at a Distance*. Chicago, London: Univ. Chicago Press. 480 pp.
90. Mendras, H. 1970. *The Vanishing Peasantry: Innovation and Change in French Agriculture*. Cambridge: MIT Press. 289 pp.
91. Mitchell, J. C. 1974. Social networks. *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.* 3:279-99
92. Moore, B. Jr. 1966. *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon. 559 pp.
93. Pi Sunyer, O., ed. 1971. The limits of integration: ethnicity and nationalism in modern Europe. *Univ. Mass. Dep. Res. Rep.* 9. 186 pp.
94. Preobrazhensky, E. 1965. *The New Economics*. Oxford: Clarendon. 310 pp.
95. Rodnick, D. 1948. *Postwar Germans*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press. 233 pp.
96. Rostow, W. W. 1960. *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 179 pp.
97. Sanders, I. 1949. *Balkan Village*. Lexington: Univ. Kentucky Press. 291 pp.
98. Schneider, J. 1971. Of vigilance and virgins: honor, shame and access to resources in Mediterranean societies. *Ethnology* 10:1-24
99. Schneider, J., Schneider, P. 1976. *Culture and Political Economy in Western Sicily*. New York, London: Academic. 256 pp.
100. Schneider, P., Schneider, J., Hansen, E. 1972. Modernization and development: the role of regional elites and noncorporate groups in the European Mediterranean. *Comp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* 14: 328-50
101. Shanin, T. 1972. *The Awkward Class*. Oxford: Clarendon. 253 pp.
102. Shanin, T., ed. 1971. *Peasants and Peasant Societies*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. 448 pp.
103. Shanin, T., Worsley, P. 1972. Editors' preface. See Ref. 59, pp. vii-xvi
104. Silverman, S. 1974. Bailey's politics: review article. *J. Peasant Stud.* 2:111-20
105. Silverman, S. 1975. *Three Bells of Civilization: The Life of an Italian Hill Town*. New York, London: Columbia Univ. Press. 263 pp.
106. Slicher van Bath, B. H. 1963. *The Agrarian History of Western Europe, A.D. 500-1850*. New York: St. Martin's. 364 pp.
107. Smith, C. A., ed. 1976. *Regional Analysis*. Vol. 1, *Economic Systems*, 370 pp.; Vol. 2, *Social Systems*, 381 pp. New York, London: Academic
108. Spencer, R. F., Johnson, E. 1968. *Atlas*

- for *Anthropology*. Dubuque: Brown. 61 pp. 2nd ed.
109. Stahl, H. H. 1969. *Les anciennes communautés villageoises roumaines*. Bucharest, Paris: Académie Roumaine and C.N.R.S.
 110. Stein, S., Stein, B. 1970. *The Colonial Heritage of Latin America*. New York: Oxford. 222 pp.
 111. Swartz, M., ed. 1968. *Local Level Politics*. Chicago: Aldine. 437 pp.
 112. Theodoratus, R. J. 1969. *Europe: A Selected Ethnographic Bibliography*. New Haven: HRAF. 544 pp.
 113. Tipps, D. C. 1973. Modernization theory and the study of national societies: a critical perspective. *Comp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* 15:199–226
 114. Wallerstein, I. 1974. *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York, London: Academic. 410 pp.
 115. Wallerstein, I. 1974. The rise and future demise of the world capitalist system: concepts for comparative analysis. *Comp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* 16:387–415
 116. White, L. A., ed. 1937. Extracts from the European travel journals of Lewis H. Morgan. *Rochester Hist. Soc. Publ.* 16:219–289
 117. Winner, I. 1971. *A Slovenian Village: Zerovnica*. Providence: Brown Univ. Press. 267 pp.
 118. Wolf, E. R. 1969. *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century*. New York: Harper & Row. 328 pp.
 119. Wolf, E. R. 1974. American anthropologists and American society. See ref. 74, pp. 251–263
 120. Zil'berman, D. 1976. Ethnography in Soviet Russia. *Dialectal Anthropol.* 1:135–53