Research. The grant was unbelievably large compared with the "slim pickings" of earlier years.

Since the book deals to a large extent with the development of anthropology, wherein Dr. Mead sees Ruth Benedict as playing a transitional role between Franz Boas and the kind of national character studies being carried on by Dr. Mead, a few comments are in order. Ruth Benedict can properly be considered transitional to the approach which seeks to understand national character by paying attention to infant care and child training. It should be noted, however, that just before World War II, Ruth Benedict, Ralph Linton, Abraham Kardiner, a psychoanalyst, and others held a series of important symposia at Columbia University. This was the turning point in the development of what was called the "culture and personality" approach. It is surprising that Dr. Mead does not mention this.

It should be made clear that the transition to the culture and personality and national character approaches was but one of many transitions from the broad range of interests involved in Boas' work. Dr. Mead's statement (page 429) that when Ruth Benedict returned to Columbia University after the war she had to work "in isolation in a department which had been sedulously swept bare . . . of any signs of the Boas tradition" is both unkind and inaccurate. The appointment of Ralph Linton and W. D. Strong to the department just before the war and my appointment just after meant a diversification of the tradition, not a break with it. Dr. Mead herself says (page 345) of the so-called "Boas school" that "there was actually no such thing." Boas was the intellectual grandfather of most American anthropologists, and few advocates of any contemporary approach would presume exclusive rights to his mantle.

As a scientific exposition, Dr. Mead's book must be taken with the qualifications just suggested. As a fascinating source of insights into a remarkable woman presented by another remarkable woman, it will well reward any reader.

JULIAN H. STEWARD
Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Illinois

Solving the Scientist Shortage. David C. Greenwood. Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1958. 69 pp. $2.

Many speeches and reports that have been made over the past few years about the apparent shortage of scientists are summarized in this publication. After a sketch of the nature of the problem and the educational outlook, Greenwood turns to efforts (mostly proposals) from governmental groups, private (mainly industrial) groups, and professional scientific and engineering groups. From an extensive bibliography he then selects a large number of recommendations for action. Probably his most significant suggestion is that for a single major organization to carry through various inquiries and to develop major and consistent lines of action.

Almost everyone has "gotten into the act" on manpower needs. A wide range of viewpoints and vested interests is represented by the proposals Greenwood reviews. To bring any order out of this mixture of special pleading, confusion, and contradiction would require many more than the 68 pages he has used. His eclectic approach, with brief descriptions of some industrial activities but without analysis of their significance, leads to citation of isolated authors and to contradictory proposals.

On the role of women in science and engineering, on page 13, he notes that in the U.S.S.R. women currently constitute 50 percent of all professionals. Then, on page 59, he cites a survey made in 1957 reporting that "only thirteen per cent of the nation's college women are there primarily to receive an intellectual training" (one wonders what percentage is reported for the men!) and then proposes that all the 87 percent with "other primary purposes" be dropped out of college. Just how this is to be done, when, and by whom, and whether this would not cut even further into the potential womanpower pool, is not mentioned.

Greenwood's proposals range widely in diversity and difficulty of accomplishment. On page 52 (number 26 under "Industry") he states, "canteen meals in industrial plants should be scientifically planned to provide the maximum amount of energy-building nutrients." On page 57 (15 under "Government") he states, "The Defense Department would be reduced in size to a small policy-making and coordinating agency, as has been proposed independently by Donald Douglas, Sr., chairman of the board of Douglas Aircraft." Does he want to try to do this?

Just how all these "shoulds" are to be accomplished, by whom, and with what finances is never mentioned. Consider, for example, page 62 (3 under "Colleges and Universities"): "The number of engineering places available in the nation's colleges should be doubled immediately"—*immediately* no less!

In his comments on grade school and high school Greenwood cannot avoid poking at the so-called "progressive educationists," whatever that may mean. However, note the contradictions here: on page 60 (item 10) he says, "All steps should be taken to make the teaching of the technical subjects as inspiring as possible" (what does "inspiring" mean?), while on page 61 (item 10) he states, "Any steps which teachers can take to raise the academic tension in schools, and remove the 'Let's learn for fun attitude,' would be deeply appreciated by the majority of business and industrial leaders." Is he proposing that in school, in business, and in industry learning and creative work be made distasteful? Why do people do creative work anyway?

In short, Greenwood's approach is eclectic and uncritical; his book lacks synthesis, is contradictory, and is filled with impossible "shoulds."

FLETCHER G. WATSON
School of Education, Harvard University

The Black Fens. A. K. Astbury. Golden Head Press, Cambridge, England, 1958 (distributed by W. Heffer, Cambridge, England). xi + 217 pp. Illus. 42 s.

Of all regional divisions on the palimpest of Britain's cultural and physical geography, the Fens are the most distinctive. Formed from the lower flood plains of rivers draining to the Wash, on the east coast of England, the Fens are low, dead flat, and highly fertile and are kept free of water only by means of a complex artificial drainage system. The region has two distinct parts: silt Fens in the north, with essentially mineral soils, and black Fens in the south, with peat soils. A. K. Astbury's book *The Black Fens* represents yet another addition to a vast literature of British regional studies. Most have an almost purely local interest. Astbury's work, however, deserves wider attention, because of the unusual interest and agricultural importance of the black Fens.

The Black Fens is written in the didactic, slightly chaotic, British style typical of many such regional studies. Astbury addresses himself mainly to the reader with nonprofessional interests. Lack of bibliography or documentation reduces the volume's usefulness for American readers.

The Black Fens covers the formation, physical characteristics, hydrography, farming, settlement, transportation, and reclamation of the English peat Fens. Expressed thus, the coverage sounds fairly complete. However, the principal emphasis is on past and present waterways (perhaps not too surprising in a discussion of an area that would be largely submerged without artificial drainage). Much of this is rather tediously detailed for the casual reader; much of it also seemed rather speculative to me. Because of the author's focus of attention, little space is left for matters that do not have to do with running water. This is a pity,