

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,

thickness of tympanic plate, presence of a sagittal keel, degree of gonial eversion, size of palatine torus, and size of the mandibular torus. These are scored on a five point scale and all observations were made by Oschinsky. Notes on scoring and figures demonstrating both measurements and morphological observation help greatly to objectify this type of non-metric data.

The report is well documented (there are 160 references). Printing is good and the basic anthropometric measurements and scores on the morphological traits are clearly printed in 17 tables which take up 32 pages.

It is encouraging to see a revival of interest in non-metric morphological traits.

William M. BASS
University of Kansas.

*

*

*

Organizational Analysis: Political, Sociological and Administrative Processes of Local Government. Charles A. JOINER. East Lansing, Michigan State University, Institute for Community Development and Services, 1964, 61 pp.

An editorial in the *New York Times* of December 12th, 1965 began:

Planning is the vital, broad-range, long-term process that links needs to solutions, that tells a city where it is going and how best to get there. In New York, planners don't plan. They advise, and are often ignored and overridden. They work hard, they mean well, and they have a lot of answers. But officially, nobody needs to listen.

The planning literature is full of breast-beating about the plight of planners whose views are ignored or distorted as the modern dragon, the city, rampages out of control. But why don't people listen to planners? Why do planning agencies appear to be so ineffectual? Charles A. Joiner, Associate Professor of Political Science at Temple University focuses his study of organizational analysis on the role of planning agencies in the governmental structure, and provides a number of answers to these questions.

The author begins by reviewing the literature on organizations. He discusses the various definitions of the word, and the dimensions and typologies of organizational variability, and then examines the peculiarities of government organizations. He sees governmental organizations as processes of converting inputs to outputs — the inputs being both demands and supports, and the outputs taking the form of policies and political decisions.

The second chapter analyses the structure of organizations. Chapters three and four deal with planning organizations, and with governmental administrative organizations and multiple structure universes. A fifth chapter summarizes the discussion, and notes that all government organizations and their accompanying processes of inducement-contribution exchange are political,