exhibit features indicative of the Late Prehistoric Period. From the data presented, I do not follow this reasoning. Her ceramic descriptions show Manitoba Cordmarked Ware as being found at the Elliot Village, in the Arden "area" and as a pot from Mound R. Regina Ware was not recovered from a mound. The Mandan Ware was retrieved from an old sod line level under Mound R and the Winnipeg Fabric-Impressed was associated with a premound feature at Mound B (p. 43). Suffice it to say that the majority of the tumuli did not yield pottery and ceramic evidence of a late period of mound construction is very dim. Nor is the presence of grooved axes diagnostic of a late period. Their archaeological and artifactual associations are quite different in Mound G, Moore C and Calf Mound, and none of these three contained Plains Side-notched projectile points which supposedly mark the Late Prehistoric Period. Although the Southern Cult is considered to be protohistoric in Manitoba, only two tumuli, the Calf and Lone mounds, have rather niggardly collections that may be Southern Cult. Nevertheless, marine shell pendants, gorgets and beads, even when associated with native copper, do not necessarily connote Southern Cult. The author also relies upon physical anthropological evidence identifying the skeletal remains as Lakotid and thus protohistoric. We are not told how many or which bones were measured; presumably skulls. But from which tumuli? Nor am I sure that Hrdlicka's measurements of 63 adult, Dakota, male crania, upon which the Lakotid Variety was based, will stand the test of time.

I am in agreement with the author when she states that southern Manitoba mounds show influences from various areas in Minnesota and the Dakotas, but unlike her I see a succession of influences that began 1,500 years ago and extended up into the early historic period.

The maps, charts and plates are clear and the publication will be useful. The price of the book is not stated.

Robert W. NEUMAN
Missouri Basin Project
Smithsonian Institution
Lincoln, Nebraska

*
* *

The Fern and the Tiki. An American View of New Zealand National Character, Social Attitudes, and Race Relations. David P. AUSUBEL. New York, Toronto, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965. 232 pp. $1.95 paper.

The author of this work, which was first published in Australia in 1960, has several purposes, some explicit, some implicit.

The most serious claim, and the one which is least well performed, is that this is a systematic study of New Zealand national character, based on the view that national character is formed during the whole of the lifetime of individuals and through the operation of national institutions, rather than

through mechanisms such as those of toilet training which are stressed in some psycho-analytic approaches. Good studies along these lines are few and far between; we can think of Benedict on Japan, the classical de Tocqueville, Lowie on Germany, and in recent years de Rougemont on Switzerland and Barzini on Italy. Each one of these works is highly controversial, and succeeds in stimulating through the disciplined yet intuitive juxtaposition of contemporary observation (except in the case of Benedict) with historical analysis and a sense of historic direction, a dissection of the most influential institutions such as those of politics and religion, and a humanistic assessment of national mythology, national heroes, the strengths and weaknesses of cultural achievement, and the kinds of individuals who have come to the forefront of the nation's life.

Ausubel states in the preface to his American edition that the work which is closest to his in spirit is Barzini on Italy. There are some parallels. In particular, both are critical of the national character they are describing, and both make comparative reference to the United States (though Barzini shows no evidence of preferring the United States to Italy, despite his criticisms, and is in fact full of affection for his countrymen).

There the parallel ends. Ausubel is highly selective in his subject matter; he is best and most extensive when he deals with the educational system and with race relations for these were the areas of his primary interests when he was in New Zealand. He has almost nothing to say about New Zealand history, hero figures, literature, outdoor recreation, religion, gambling, travel, emigration and immigration, all of which are extremely illuminative of regularities of national character in New Zealand, and which are the kind of material used extensively by Barzini. Except for a somewhat one-sided treatment of the secondary school, and a justified side-swipe at the New Zealand press, there is not a single detailed study of the workings of any organized institution (Barzini, who is not a social scientist, did better than this with the Mafia.)

It is very soon evident that this is not a detached and systematic analysis of national character. What then is it? Ausubel provides part of the answer. It is *criticism*, a criticism frankly based upon a clearly declared American view. As such it may be taken as a case study in the relations between a foreign guest and a national host, but even here in many respects not a typical one. New Zealand shocked Ausubel profoundly, and as a result of this shock he writes many things bluntly, bitingly, but often perceptively and usually, to this reader at least, with justification. There can, from a certain viewpoint, be no more irritating country than New Zealand; so smug, it seems, so self-satisfied, so certain that everything done in God's own country is the best in the world, so resentful when foreigners hint that this is not so, so blunt, downright and earthy in language.

Ausubel's criticism is well written and clear. It is spoiled by failing to conceal the emotion which lies behind it, by over-statement and inaccuracy. Epithets such as Victorian (in the perjurative sense), incongruous, insidious,

and archaic abound. But New Zealand is a living, energetic, on-going society which satisfies a high proportion of its inhabitants a high proportion of the time. If criticism is to be telling, it should be based on understanding rather than frustration at the incongruity, and occasionally one should be able to laugh or find cause for praise. Only in race relations is there modified praise, and even, as on p. 15, when New Zealanders are obviously enjoying themselves Ausubel fails to see that they are laughing at his expense.

Even when considering the study as criticism, and perhaps accepting looser canons of argument than would apply in a scientific study, judgements are too frequently undisciplined (and by discipline, Mr. Ausubel, I do *not* mean authoritarian). He often writes, as on p. 58, as if the same people think disparate or opposing things, making this a conflict within them, and under-glossing the spread of public opinion. He cites the frequent and often misinformed deprecatory view that New Zealanders hold of American culture and education; but no New Zealander with any pretensions to culture himself would deny the greatest achievements of the United States in music, literature, the universities, science. Ausubel's statement is one-sided and prevents him from understanding the criticism when it does come. Other statements are made which may be perfectly correct in themselves, but for which no evidence whatsoever is cited (a common failing throughout the book). Thus, on page 64, the quality of medical and surgical care is said to be not as high as in the United States. Probably true on balance, but is there evidence? And what kinds of medicine, in specialties, in hospitals, in the home? Sometimes Ausubel lets his fancy run away with him, as with the New Zealand woman turned loose in an American department store; the experience of New Zealanders coming *to live* in the United States is not one based on the premise of a spending orgy. Too frequently, Ausubel turns arguments to suit his purposes. An example, by no means unique, is on p. 97. Ausubel complains of New Zealand interpretations of American blue jeans as school dress, since New Zealanders "fail to appreciate ... that national fashions in clothing are purely arbitrary", and on the page before he characterizes the short-pants uniform of the New-Zealand schoolboy as "children's clothing" indicating an almost deliberately stretched out infantilism. A footnote in this case shows that Ausubel is aware of a possible inconsistency; but he completely fails to put short pants into the context of the New Zealand myth of the great out-doors. (Dear me, what *would* he say of Australian bank clerks in short pants?)

A very high proportion of the book is taken up with summary statements of the American national character or of conditions in the United States (many of which are highly simplified and would not command universal acceptance in the United States). These are used partly to indicate the critical standards against which New Zealand is to be judged, but more significantly to correct the malinformation which is circulating in New Zealand, and to defend the United States against such unjustifiable criticism. (In doing so, at one point, and without the slightest evidence of humour, he criticizes New Zealand exchange teachers who come back from the United States spreading distorted information.)

More than this, Ausubel is itching to reform. He would dearly love to put the New Zealand school system to rights; he regards it as out-moded, authoritarian, and dreadfully out of line with the ideals of American education and modern educational theory. He was chagrined when his suggestions were rebuffed, apparently somewhat bluntly, by the New Zealand public (and press?). But he was sufficiently aware of his responsibilities as a visiting scholar to observe the "strict avoidance of patronizing attitudes" (p. 5) (no comment).

I have been very critical, and could be much more so. But if we read the book in another light, and if it had been presented to the reader in another way, I could have warmly recommended it. I like the book for its clear writing, its honestly held opinions, and because it says many things that many New Zealanders say about themselves. In the earnestness with which Ausubel reacts to the cultural shock which hit him with such a whammy there is a refreshing forthrightness which reveals the writer as very human and sincere, and New Zealanders should be the last people in the world to resent bluntness. (Don't mistake protest in equally blunt terms for resentment, Mr. Ausubel.) In England, Australia, Canada, the United States I have felt some of the things Mr. Ausubel has felt, and would feel them again were I to return to New Zealand. Read not as a statement of New Zealand national character, but as a description of a shock to the value system of one kind of visiting scholar, this is a very good book indeed.

Cyril S. BELSHAW
University of British Columbia

*

* *

The most ancient eskimos. Lawrence OSCHINSKY, Ottawa, The Canadian Research Centre for Anthropology, 1964, Paperback, 112 pages, 6 plates, 12 figures, 17 tables, $3.00.

One of the major problems still remaining in the study of Eskimo prehistory is the racial affinities of the people who created the Dorset Culture in the Canadian Arctic. Were they Indians who intruded into the Canadian Arctic from the south or were they the result of direct, close contact involving racial mixture between pre-Dorset and Indian? After a short discussion (there are only twelve pages of text in the book) Oschinsky states that the "Dorset people were morphologically Eskimo" (p. 32).

Facing this difficult problem of trying to determine the racial affinities of the Dorset people Oschinsky has attempted to analyse not only the metrical data from the skeletons but more predominantly what are known as non-metric morphological traits.

The cranial series have been examined for the following seven morphological characters; narrowness of the nasal bone, verticality of malar bone,