

globigerina ooze containing Eocene foraminifera, indicates a comparatively recent volcanic origin. Some time before the beginning of the Tertiary the volcanic mountain was truncated, and in the submergence that followed, the rate of sinking was too rapid for coral growth to keep pace. Therefore, no reef material accumulated as it did to a thickness of several thousand feet on the more slowly subsiding foundations of nearby Eniwetok and Bikini atolls.

There are a score of other contributions in this collection that are equally deserving of mention, but space is limited. Fortunately, the individual chapters can be obtained separately, and the title of each is sufficiently distinctive for a specialist to identify the ones most likely to be of interest to him. The range in price is wide, however, with a high of \$9.00 (for chapter a) and a low of 20 cents (for chapter s). The total cost (\$24.15) is likely to be too high for the average academician's already overextended book budget, or even for that of all but the most affluent institutional libraries.

The one element lacking in this stimulating collection of papers, I believe, is a section synthesizing the findings of the various contributors. This deficiency is remedied to some degree by Roger Revelle's foreword, but this is quite brief and was written largely before all the papers were published; it appeared in 1954, and chapters in this series continued to appear through 1959. The volume of material in this publication is too diverse and too highly specialized to be of general concern, yet the problem of coral reefs is of compelling interest, and a broad, comprehensive review of the findings of this 20th century expedition in terms of their relationship to past discoveries, to our present state of knowledge, and to the nature of problems still to be solved would have been most welcome.

The Geological Survey is to be congratulated on its excellent presentation of the results of this endeavor. The illustrations are of uniformly high quality, and the colored maps and charts of Bikini and other Marshall Islands atolls are superb examples of cartography; in fact, they are works of art in their own right.

The collating and publishing of this imposing accumulation of information of purely scientific interest is an achievement in the great tradition of the Survey's founders, notably such men as Powell, Gilbert, Dutton, and

Walcott. We can surely hope that an approach as successful as this one proved to be may establish a pattern to be employed more frequently in the future in a vigorous, wide-ranging series of investigations which may help us with the solution of the many riddles still confronting us about the nature of the earth and its past history.

WILLIAM C. PUTNAM
*Department of Geology,
University of California, Los Angeles*

From Field to Factory. New industrial employees. James Sydney Slotkin. Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1960. 156 pp. \$4.

The central purpose of this study is to place the problem of labor in economic development (or, better, the problem of recruiting labor for industrialization) within a context of cultural anthropology. While the author is concerned with the problem of developing an anthropological theory about recruiting and committing labor in the underdeveloped areas now undergoing or about to undergo industrialization or modernization, he has not developed a series of interrelated propositions about this process.

What is of particular value in the study is the spelling out of a number of cultural factors that affect the industrialization process, but the propositions about the process are at such a high level of abstraction that they add little to the theoretical literature on industrialization or culture change written from other perspectives. In fact, the theory of culture change has advanced considerably beyond the framework of acculturation which is heavily used by Slotkin, and it is somewhat more sophisticated than is apparent from such conclusions as, "When a culture becomes inadequate in providing desired goods and services industrialism is adopted voluntarily" (page 143). It has long been known that cultures are particularly prone to change under stress, but just what combination of conditions are most favorable for initiating the industrialization process in underdeveloped areas is not apparent from this study. As a first step to a general theory, however, the work is of value.

ALLAN R. HOLMBERG
*Department of Sociology and
Anthropology, Cornell University*

Science and State Government. A study of the scientific activities of state government agencies in six states. Frederic N. Cleaveland. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1959. xvii + 161 pp. Illus. \$3.50.

As an "interpretive summary" of the findings of reports on scientific activities in state government, this small volume tells the determined reader more than he wants to know and, possibly, more than he needs to know. It is long on fact, short on analysis and opinion; this is not always a virtue.

In 1954 the National Science Foundation contracted with the Institute for Research in Social Science at the University of North Carolina for a systematic study of science as a function of state government. Six states—California, Connecticut, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, and Wisconsin—were selected as representative in their diversity. Using a common research design, teams of researchers converged on each of the states. The final reports afforded the basis for a statistical summary of the essential data by the National Science Foundation [*Scientific Activities in State Governments, Summary Report on a Survey Fiscal Year 1954* (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1958)].

Presumably this is the final effort to extract the last ounce of benefit from the reports, which must have been costly both in dollars and research travail.

If there is a "profile" of science in the six states, it is extremely fuzzy and indistinct. Indeed, the recitation of statistical differences tends to obscure the common features of scientific activity as a function of state government. There are common features—and significant ones—in the relationship of science to state government. But these are, perhaps, the ones least susceptible to analysis and appraisal by objective data.

Several observations are in order. First, the notion of shared responsibility between the federal government and the states in scientific activity is extravagant nonsense. The big money comes from Washington; the pattern and pace of government research effort is determined in Washington, whether in research on agriculture or on mental illness. Second, it is doubtful whether support for science in state government is "big business," as the author suggests. Less than 2 percent