

racial groups. Such a perspective allows for a comparison of the families' distinctive features as well as their similarities. Also, the chapter summaries, which follow the case studies, do a good job of teasing out the key patterns of family life.

Despite these positive aspects the work is flawed. Taken alone, the case study descriptions are generally consistent with existing literature and offer little new information. And while Willie asserts that the real contribution of the study is the theoretical insights generated by the case studies, this assertion is not borne out because of fundamental problems in the research design.

There was inconsistency in the manner in which the families were interviewed. Some students had more extensive contact than others with the families interviewed; in some cases there was only one meeting. A lack of rapport is apparent in many of the one-shot interviews, making it difficult to substantiate the inferences and conclusions.

There was also variation in who was interviewed. In some cases the interview included both spouses together; in others, both separately. In other cases, one spouse in intact families provided the total information on family life. In still other cases, parents and offspring were interviewed together. All of these factors are potential sources of bias.

Willie's assertions about the complementarity and interdependence of social classes and racial groups is a critique of structural-functional perspectives that suggests system stability is predicated on similarities in life styles. Some scholars with structural-functional theses have argued that differential behavior exhibited by subgroups within society represents deviations from the core value system and promotes system instability.

In contrast, Willie argues that all social classes and racial groups share a common set of values, despite nuances in life styles. Such differences reflect varying situational contexts. While the argument is a variation of the situational perspective, the assumptions guiding the research are not systematically discussed.

A fundamental issue for those taking a situational perspective is the status of normative orientations. Willie attempts to legitimate working- and lower-class life styles through his discussion of the interdependence and complementarity of groups. While the arguments are humanistically oriented, it remains unclear why or how dominant groups would be motivated to include lower- and working-class family patterns into their life style repertoires, given the fact that they are largely generated by particularistic situational factors and by the fact that middle-class family patterns receive public endorsement.

Finally, a coherent analysis of the role played by situational contexts should ideally make reference to historical factors. If the social consequences of race are important, then one needs to subtly distinguish between historic patterns of racial discrimination and its potential cumulative effects and contemporary patterns. Similarly, a time frame should point to how the environment may have changed for white groups as well as Black.

### Religion and Ethics

*Feeling Good and Doing Better: Ethics and Nontherapeutic Drug Use*, edited by THOMAS H. MURRAY, WILLARD GAYLIN, and RUTH MACKLIN. Clifton, NJ: Humana Press, 1984. 219 pp. \$17.50 cloth.

CRAIG REINARMAN

*University of California, Berkeley*

In the intellectual trenches of the latest War on Drugs, bullets whizz overhead in but one direction. The government propaganda of past wars gets regurgitated almost whole and is echoed in simplistic (at times yellow) journalistic accounts of how this newest epidemic is causing the ruination not merely of another generation of youth but of the American economy itself. To these traditional warriors must now be added speakers from the burgeoning treatment industry, who at the drop of a helmet will trumpet tales of the countless lives lost to those age-old enemies, consciousness-altering substances. Surely many lives have been lost and many more damaged, but one would never guess that laws and policies were as much a part of the problem as a part of the solution.

The cultivated ideological myopia that usually prevents the learning of lessons from bygone battles is occasionally overcome in social science, if not in public policy. Such is the case with this relatively refreshing collection of essays drawn from dialogues convened at the Hastings Center. The parts are ecumenical in that they cross artificial disciplinary lines (philosophy, law, sociology, medicine, and psychiatry are well represented); the whole may be of interest to scholars and policy makers, and useful in courses on alcohol and drug abuse or public and health policy.

The topics range from social and political aspects of drug control, through philosophical and policy issues regarding pleasure- vs. performance-enhancing drug use, and into constitutional questions about privacy rights and what each has to do with the medical models that now dominate discourse. A core theme in the diverse papers is the debate between "pharmacological Calvinism" (3),

which holds that drugs are permissible only for "normalizing," and "psychotropic hedonism," according to which "optimizing" sensual and intellectual experience with drugs is good. This debate has been rendered nearly obsolete by emerging discoveries of the body's own organic opiates (endorphins), which suggest what many addicts have long known about self-medication and deficiencies. Thus, the authors (wisely) eschew these polar arguments in favor of reasoned discussions about how and where rational policies might draw socially useful lines.

Another theme is the deficiencies of the disease model. The "language of disease" (17) smuggles into our ongoing debate a medical hegemony over issues that are only partly medical, and smuggles out most questions about informal social controls, self-regulation, and the value some fifty million citizens find in getting high. Because the use and control of potentially dangerous substances entail fundamental moral, philosophical, and social dilemmas, "science offers us little assistance" (178) in sorting them out. The fact that minute amounts of drugs that rarely harm most users still put them in the same criminal category as rapists and armed robbers suggests that "more powerful passions are at work here than those that produce the average consumer safety law" (17). Indeed, that marijuana is still perceived as a serious threat to the social fabric and the moral order places Reagan's America closer to the Ayatollah's Iran than we fancy.

The contributions in this collection are uneven: some are bashful, others bold; plodding page-long paragraphs sit aside sprightly sentence structure. The thorough reviews of legal and philosophical issues are, for nonspecialists, too loosely linked to drug questions. More might have been done to set the stage and to synthesize shared conclusions. Yet what remain are valuable maps to the exceedingly tangled terrain on which struggles over drug use and control are fought. With them, one can better navigate the thickets of inconsistency, hypocrisy, and genuine confusion that characterize existing control systems and see how much of this is pharmacological and how much political, how much the debate turns on empirical fact-finding about the possibility of controlled use and how much on ethical ax-grinding by puritanical prohibitionists.

#### **Social Change, Colonialism, Modernization, and World Systems**

*Development Theory in Transition: The Dependency Debate and Beyond: Third World Responses*, by MAGNUS BLOMSTROM and BJORN

HETTNE. London: Zed Books Ltd., 1985. 215 pp. \$26.65 cloth. \$10.25 paper.

PAGET HENRY  
*University of Virginia*

This book is an important contribution to the field of development theory. Its primary aim is to provide a comprehensive survey of the rise, spread, and decline of dependency theory as applied to Latin America, the Caribbean, Asia, and Africa. The book's significance results from the comprehensiveness of the survey and its consistency in presenting the theory as a distinctly Third World contribution. Its major weakness derives from the authors' reservations about vigorously situating this fascinating process of paradigm change within a theoretical perspective.

Blomstrom and Hettne begin with Marx and Lenin, and they move to a discussion of development theory as it emerged between 1950 and the early 1970s, including the economic models of Harrod, Domar, Arthur Lewis, and Rostow; the structuralist theories of Dudley Seers and Hans Singer; and the modernization paradigm as it developed in sociology, economics, and political science. It is against this theoretical background that they attempt to situate the rise of dependency theory.

They suggest that the theory "emerged from the convergence of two intellectual trends: one often called 'neo-marxism' and the other rooted in the earlier Latin American discussion on development that ultimately formed the ECLA [the United Nations' Economic Commission for Latin America] tradition" (27).

Having established the origins of the school in Latin America, Blomstrom and Hettne then go on to "account for the development debate related to the issue of dependence in other third world contexts (the Caribbean, Asia and Africa)" (96). In the Caribbean, the discussion focuses on the rise of the New World Group in Jamaica as an alternative to the theories of Arthur Lewis, and the group's involvement in the Democratic Socialist regime of Michael Manley. As in a number of other cases, the failure of the Manley regime to halt the decline of the Jamaican economy exposed the works of these theorists to increasing criticism.

The discussion of Asian dependency theory is the weakest of the case studies. However, it is important that this weakness not be confused with the fact that the development of a dependency perspective is probably weakest in Asia. Rather, the authors fail to give an adequate explanation of this Asian phenomenon, and they also overlook the work of Susantha Goonatilake on India which is