so pages deal mainly with technical medical matters. The last half of the volume includes chapters on the treatment of addicts, legal controls, addiction and crime, juvenile addiction, and addict argot. There is an index. The volume suffers from the authors' efforts to include too much in too little space.

To understand the views expressed and the limitations of this work it should be kept in mind that Dr. Vogel is a member of the Public Health Service and formerly was medical director of the Lexington Hospital for addicts. The manuscript was cleared for publication by the Headquarters of the P. H. S. in Washington. The authors may therefore have been under some constraint in the expression of opinions that might have been deemed critical of official ideology and of what may be called the "Washington line" determined mainly by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics.

It may be for the reason indicated above that Maurer and Vogel are rather cautious in suggesting that addiction per se should not be viewed as a crime, that the evil effects of marihuana have been grossly exaggerated, that the social evils connected with alcoholism far eclipse those connected with drugs, that opiates do not directly cause crime, and that the current trend toward harsher penalties indiscriminately applied to addict and peddler alike is neither just nor effective. At the same time that they venture these departures from orthodox opinion they also appear to support the status quo and to deny the implications of the above heresies. They favor compulsory treatment and do not clearly oppose present penal practices with respect to addicts. They flagrantly fail to discuss the apparent success of nonpenal control systems used in Europe, they do not adequately emphasize the dependence of the illicit traffic on drug prohibition, and their discussion of the clinic idea is grossly unfair, unrealistic, and incomplete.

The authors cite their own previous publications somewhat too liberally even when they are of only peripheral relevance and in one instance at least do not acknowledge a source of borrowed materials. There is also some overemphasis on publications and accomplishments of the Lexington institution where Vogel was stationed for a time.

Apart from the limitations and biases indicated, this work is far superior to most current publications on this subject. Its authors have wide and direct acquaintanceship with the problem, and their discussion of its social aspects is usually moderate and sensible.

ALFRED R. LINDESMITH
Indiana University

LOOMIS, CHARLES P., JULIO O. MORALES, ROY A. CLIFFORD, and OLEN E. LEONARD (Eds.). *Turrialba: Social Systems and the Introduction of Change.* Pp. viii, 288. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1953. $3.50.

This book is described as a report on "the results of an interdisciplinary research program on the introduction of change and the nature of the social systems in the Central American community of Turrialba, Costa Rica" (Preface, p. v). The chapter headings, after an Introduction, are: The Setting of the Study, Social Status and Communication, Informal Social Systems, Economic Systems, The Ecological Basis of Social Systems in Turrialba, Demographic Characteristics of the Population, Health Systems, Religious Systems, Educational Systems, Agricultural Extension Systems, Political Systems, Levels of Living on Haciendas and Small Farms, Study of the Strategy of Changes on Large Estates and Small Farms in Latin America. This is an extensive program for a single monograph, even when done by several authors; but this work does manage to give at least a survey of the main aspects of each of its topics.

One reason for the comparative success of the book is that the frames of reference have been explicitly stated (p. 2–3). The research concentrated on "social relationships," organized into "social systems . . . which structure activities as individual and group needs are met," the structuring being "influenced in important ways by ecological and demographic factors." Change involves "changing the relative importance of the different social systems," "creating new social systems," and "changing rela-

tions of the individuals to their social systems."

Throughout the study much is made of the difference between the "formal" and "informal" systems. As "formal" is used here it refers to the structural arrangements of hierarchies on the haciendas, to the school system, to the health services, to the church and its rituals. "Informal" refers to the communication systems between individuals, to "key" persons, and to "elites." The reviewer finds this dichotomy an advance over the more usual studies of this kind which treat everything at one level. He suggests, however, that the two terms are not enough, and that there are actually three levels of systems, for which he uses the terms *formal, informal, technical.* Most of the things here treated as "formal" are in what he would call the technical sphere (school system, health service, religious rituals). A few (church beliefs, attitudes toward hacienda owners) are in his formal category—traditional, unquestioned, hard to change. Much of what is called "informal' is actually his formal—for example, traditional relations between social levels, who speaks to whom, and so forth. The real informal behavior —largely out of awareness, and hardly subject to verbalization by its practitioners—is not made very explicit. In changes of culture, the informal systems, which are the individual's adaptations to his formal culture, become technicalized; then the technical systems—easiest to change and replace—become more and more out of keeping with the formal culture, and finally bring about the erection of new formal systems; then the process begins again. Formal systems change only from within; informal ones by being brought into awareness; technical ones easily, by explicit description. In the book under review, with its two-fold characterization of cultural systems, this process is blurred and the dynamics of change are not made clear.

The book is lithoprinted from typewritten material, with uneven right margins, and some of the figures are too small to be read easily, but the general appearance is pleasing.

GEORGE L. TRAGER
Georgetown University

MACKENZIE, GORDON N., and STEPHEN M. COREY, in association with JAMES HALL, VERONICA CASEY, MARY NEEL SMITH, and others. *Instructional Leadership.* Pp. xiii, 209. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1954. $3.25.

This book is dreary reading. Vague and unexplained phrases, such as "bench marks," and fabricated postulates, like "action research," confuse the reader and impede communication. The slovenly practice of yoking nouns together, such as "behavior modification" and "problem definition," adds to the reader's burden. In the face of these and other difficulties the conscientious reader will wonder whether the heights of profundity that glimmer dimly just beyond his perception are real or whether he is bedazzled by semantic mirages. In places he will become quite certain that he is witnessing the garrulous unveiling of the obvious.

These deficiencies in communication are regrettable, because the book makes three significant contributions—contributions that are valuable in other areas as well as in education. First, the authors strip the concept of leadership of its false trappings and let the whole world see that the collection of tricks and techniques displayed on the dais of status are empty baubles. This exposure and analysis of what has hitherto masqueraded as leadership are pitiless, complete, and overwhelming. Leadership consists of action and not qualities.

The second contribution is interwoven with the first. The authors demonstrate that leaders are merely procurers of means for individuals and groups and not forerunners or commanders. Politics as well as education should henceforth divest itself of the phony chatter about the need of strong leaders, towering personalities, and men of action.

The third contribution is the demonstration that group dynamics in all its ramifications can be used to develop leadership, and that status leaders need training in leadership almost as much as unlabeled privates.

These contributions grew out of a prolonged experiment among the principals, co-ordinators, and supervisors of the Den-