

DAVID COLLIER. — *Squatters and Oligarchs; Authoritarian Rule and Policy Change in Peru*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press [Burns & MacEachern Limited], 1976.

This slim volume is what social scientists like to call a "case study," but it is too slim to be a good example of the genre. Collier says at the outset that he believes that Lima has for thirty years been the scene of a game between internal migrants seizing unoccupied land in the city (squatters) and a group he loosely calls the oligarchy. He reveals that he was intrigued by a Peruvian asking him why the oligarchy would allow any squatter settlements to exist, let alone so many that they hold one-quarter of Lima's population of four million: the settlements are ugly, and old Lima is charming; the seizures are illegal, and the private-property system is basic to the oligarchy's power. Moreover, the established classes fear the potential political radicalism they see in the ring of settlements surrounding the capital. Collier declares that "members of the oligarchy, and political leaders who have represented their interests, have been directly involved in encouraging the formation of settlements." (p. 4) In examining how this has occurred since 1945, he paints a revealing portrait of the way authoritarian government has worked in Peru.

Collier devotes his first three chapters to background material. The first discusses modernization and political change, with specific reference to Peru; he draws attention to the speed of change in this century, which made Peru a "living museum" of old and new political groups and policies. The second chapter examines the Lima settlements, placing them in the Peruvian context and suggesting why they have been allowed to grow. The third chapter, "Government Support for Settlement Formation," shows how governments have given just that. The next four chapters examine the policies of Odria, the Liberals, Belaunde and Velasco toward squatter settlements; each policy was markedly different from the others, and Collier tells us why. The book ends with a conclusion that reiterates its points; Collier emphasizes, *inter alia*, that his findings are valid only for Peru.

But the study is too slight. Although we learn a great deal about how politicians and squatters have played their "game," we are never shown how "the oligarchy" participates. In one of his first footnotes, Collier refuses to define or describe the oligarchs to whom he repeatedly refers as a group. We are also asked to believe that all politicians in Peru — with the exception of those in APRA — represent the oligarchy; Collier offers no justification for this assertion. Moreover, despite a quick look at "elite-mass relationships" before 1945, Collier appears to believe that the postwar situation he dwelt on was new. The book might have been more successful if the "squatter-oligarch" relationship had been set in the context of the patrimonial state, the holdover from Hapsburg absolutism of which Peru is and has been an excellent example. Finally, the organization is irritatingly didactic: in each chapter, Collier artlessly tells us what he will do, does it, and then tells us what he has done.

Peter Seaborn SMITH,
St. Jerome's College, University of Waterloo.

* * *

KENNETH HUDSON. — *A Social History of Museums*. Toronto and London: Macmillan Co. of Canada, 1975.

The author, a British industrial archaeologist, has written a useful little book subtitled, *what the visitors thought*. He (with the help of Ann Nicholls, a collabo-