48). This reinvented anthropology must be characterized by a suspension of judgment on the "received notions" of the establishment (Kurt H. Wolff), which is to be attained by self-examination through a "reflexive ethnology" (Bob Scholte) because its central purpose is self-knowledge (Stanley Diamond). It must be characterized by humanism, accountability, relevancy, and the end of hypocrisy (Joel Berremann). In the fulfillment of these goals, it should turn to the examination of urban culture and recognize the existence of an Afro-American cultural tradition (William S. Willis, Jr., John F. Szwed). It is imperative that it understand the role of imperialism in the research on subordinate cultures since anthropology is handmaiden to this imperialism (Mina Davis Caulfield), understand the problem of power in social relationships (Eric Wolf), and understand the relationship of these to the ecological disasters that characterize the modern world (E. N. Anderson, Jr.). This means, among other things, that it must concern itself with the study of elites in our society (Laura Nader) and examine the results of a controlled communication system in our "wired planet" (Sol Worth). In the process, it should involve the subjects of study in its research (Kenneth Hale; also Willis and Szwed), should take cognizance of the virtues of native cultures, whether these are exotic peoples or submerged elements in our society (Richard O. Clemmer and Robert Jay, but many of the other essays as well), and most particularly should evoke in the anthropologist an examination and reevaluation of himself (Jay, but also Scholte and others).

If all of this seems to be neither new nor radical, the reader has my sympathy. If it seems programmatic, I have made the authors' case too well, for it is at best preprogrammatic—a statement of general intent which the authors occasionally (for example, Scholte, p. 451, note 9) say they do not know how to put into practice—or praxis, as they like to call it.

One might expect that a series of essays critical of the current state of a discipline would demonstrate the existing inadequacies, but this is not the case. Most of the essays avoid discussion of what anthropology has been doing for over a generation. There are many more references to the philosophical underpinnings of anthropology, from Aristotle to Marx, than to current work or theory. Thus Nader appears to discover that anthropology should study elites of our society, but takes no cognizance of the extensive work of Lloyd Warner, of Hortense Powdermaker and Leo Rosten in Hollywood, or of the many community studies in the tradition of the Lynds. The authors appear not to recognize that their recurrent theme that anthropology should be made to reveal ourselves (both as a society and as persons) has been a cliché in anthropology since Clyde Kluckhohn expressed it in the title of his popular book *Mirror for Man*, and indeed since Tylor and Maine. The authors might have recognized the anthropologists' concern with relevance by finding in the *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* the article on the anthropological study of modern society, with its lengthy but still very incomplete bibliography, or by taking note of the fact that the Society for Applied Anthropology has been publishing a journal for over 30 years. Had they demonstrated that these endeavors have largely failed the services of a humanized society (as I think is in fact the case), and that this is because they have paid inadequate attention to the power structure (which I also think is the case) or because the authors are a part of that power structure (which I doubt), they might have done something to make anthropology the phoenix they would like it to become.

The shared disaffection with Western civilization that characterizes these authors (as it does most anthropologists) results in a subliminal theme that is essentially Rousseauean, a characterization of native society as homogeneous and personal rather than power-oriented and depersonalized. This is one of those "received notions" which the book warns us we must be wary of. We need not look to Colin Turnbull's Ik for examples of depersonalization; the objectification of others which these authors find characteristic of our society is, for example, implicit in the widespread custom of bride-price.

There are two essays that do not fit this general characterization. Clemmer deals with the research in the Hopi cultural revitalization in an essay that is poignant and important, though its conclusions are by no means novel. A. Norman Klein analyzes the "countercultures" of the '60's from the perspective of a true participant observer (as distinct from the anthropological *pretense* at participant observation) and demonstrates that their form in different countries reflects the culture—the cultural hegemony, as he calls it—of each period. In this exercise he is demonstrating the validity of the traditional approach of anthropology, namely that there are generalizations to be made and that these can be formulated in terms of that classic concept of the discipline.

If these essays are representative of what radical anthropology has to offer for the future, it would appear that the establishment has little to fear from it, and the liberals little to hope.

WALTER GOLDSCHMIDT
Department of Anthropology,
University of California,
Los Angeles

Personality: Adaptation and Individuation

Culture, Behavior, and Personality. An Introduction to the Comparative Study of Psychosocial Adaptation. ROBERT A. LEVINE. Aldine, Chicago, 1973. xvi, 320 pp., illus. $12.50.

The field of culture and personality emerged as a distinct focus of interdisciplinary study in the early 1930's. From the start it had wide appeal to students of anthropology, psychology, and sociology; viewing the development of personality within a sociocultural matrix promised a richer and more significant understanding of person, society, and culture. Many of the pioneers in the field were gifted writers. Poetic vision as well as exotic illustrations graced their writings.

For some early students, personality was little more than the subjective aspect of culture; in Ruth Benedict's phrasing, personality was "culture writ small." Other pioneers drew upon psychoanalytic formulations to propose linkages between child training techniques and cultural systems. For the most part, however, the studies were largely atheoretical, and personality types were posited rather than established through careful individual study. With World War II came "national character" studies, imputing traits and motives to allies and enemies in the service of war aims. The critical assessments that followed led to widespread rejection of the field and especially of the label "culture and personality," though they by no means diminished the significance and challenge of the basic questions in this area where so many of the behavioral sciences intersect.

Robert LeVine has undertaken the

most systematic analysis to date of the conceptual and methodological issues of the field. At the start, he acknowledges that even now we cannot document in a wholly convincing way that there are significant psychological differences between populations. We know that there are great variations in institutionalized behavior—in beliefs, attitudes, and values—from one culture to another; but are there differences in the enduring organization of personality and in cognitive, emotional, and motivational aspects of personality? If so, how do such differences come about? If they are learned, how and when are they learned? In particular, how are psychological differences related to features of the sociocultural environment?

LeVine addresses himself to an analysis of the requirements that must be met if these questions are to be answered. His relatively brief overview of existing theories and methods identifies the major theoretical formulations linking personality and culture, notes the different disciplinary emphases in concepts of socialization among anthropologists (enculturation), psychologists (acquisition of impulse control), and sociologists (role learning), and examines the methods that have been used in attempting to assess personality cross-culturally. He is not interested in the substance of previous research but in the basic approaches taken and the assumptions they entail. The overview is terse but cogent, whether or not one agrees with all of LeVine's assessments.

The bulk of the book is devoted to two major tasks: the delineation of a Darwinian (variation-selection) model of personality adaptation within sociocultural systems that are themselves adaptive; and a detailed analysis of the problems of assessing enduring individual dispositions in varied social settings. Of the chapters that present and develop the evolutionary model of culture and personality, two were previously published as LeVine's contribution to the 1969 *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*. These present the general features of the model and its basic concepts: personality genotype, phenotype, and deliberate socialization. The personality genotype refers to enduring behavioral dispositions that may or may not find socially accepted expression. It reflects not only genetically determined characteristics but also the motivational residues of early experience and the adaptive organizations by means of which internal and external stimuli are monitored. To a large extent the phenotype is the resultant of interaction between genotype and later socialization demands. Socialization goals and techniques are themselves subject to considerable variation, and in addition they often have unintended motivational consequences. Several sources of variability then become the basis for differential adaptation (in child care customs, in genotypic personalities, in phenotypic personalities, and in the aggregate personality characteristics of populations). The new chapters in this section examine adaptive processes leading either to stability (whether through achieving conformity, accepting rational pluralism, or institutionalizing creative accommodations) or to changes in the institutional environment of the individual or in the distribution and expression of personality types.

LeVine's paramount concern is with the assessment of individual dispositions in varied social settings. The plethora of available personality tests offer very little hope in this respect. Even within Western culture, the validity of the constructs that the tests purport to measure is open to serious question.

Ideally, LeVine notes, to assess personality dispositions one needs information on ways in which the individual defines and responds to a wide range of situations over a significant period of time. Observed behavior almost always reflects both pressures from the immediate environment and tendencies generated by prior experience and genetic constitution. Since one must know how the individual interprets his experiences, observation alone is not enough.

The method that comes closest to yielding the desired data, LeVine feels, is that of clinical psychoanalysis. The ideal remedy for the deficiencies of past research would be "to carry out a complete ethnographic study and then psychoanalyze individuals from the society studied in the same way that individuals are analyzed in our own society." But, he notes, from what we know about ego functioning in other cultures, it is highly doubtful that most members of non-Western societies are analyzable in the usual sense. One must then adapt the method. The adaptation proposed by LeVine calls for collaboration between a psychoanalytically and ethnographically sophisticated Western behavioral scientist and an indigenous behavioral scientist trained in Western society. Few if any Western ethnographers can hope to master the indigenous language, and especially the subtle nuances that reveal what is going on beneath surface behavior. Hence the need for a sophisticated "indigenous ego."

Many chapters present useful contributions to the systematization of the field. In the later chapters, moreover, LeVine goes beyond the analysis of theoretical and methodological requirements to offer suggestions of fruitful foci for study. As "structures for comparative observation" he proposes bodily manifestations of affect, circadian rhythms of activity and inactivity, developmental phases in the individual life course, and responses to bureaucratic institutional structures of Western origin. To illustrate the potential contribution of the study of religious symbolism as a linkage between culture and personality, he analyzes the psychological functions of two different types of witchcraft belief.

Although LeVine emphasizes primarily the methodological problems to be overcome, holding that there are no serious theoretical disputes among contemporary workers in the field, this reader came away with the conviction that we have a long way to go before either theory or method is adequate to the development of a coherent body of knowledge on the relationships between culture and personality. Without doubt, there has been much fruitful research in this field, but the fragments do not yet fit together. In systematically assessing the tasks to be accomplished, LeVine's analysis both reveals why previous work does not add up and provides a point of departure for more sophisticated efforts in the future. As LeVine himself recognizes, there will be relatively few cultures where the Western behavioral scientist will be able to obtain the collaboration of a well-trained indigenous counterpart. Nevertheless, the suggested team approach does promise great advantages. Much remains to be spelled out in terms appropriate to the given culture, but LeVine's suggestions will be helpful leads.

Few students of culture and personality have combined so well the knowledge and skills required by this field of research. LeVine is able to draw upon his own field experience in Africa, on psychoanalytic training, and on the relevant literature in psychology and sociology as well as that of his own discipline, anthropology. This book will merit study by anyone with a general interest in the relationships between enduring dispositions of individuals and the social structures and cultures within which human development takes place.

JOHN A. CLAUSEN
Department of Sociology,
University of California, Berkeley