

Africa have not adapted themselves to the needs and aspirations of African society—is substantially correct. But to infer that this was due to intolerance or cultural nationalism on the part of the British pioneers who launched the new universities of West Africa is to do them little justice and to exaggerate the situation considerably. Hindsight is always a gift of dubious value, but never more so than when we attempt to judge in near retrospect the transplantation of key institutions from one culture to another. A university, perhaps more than many other aspects of a European culture, is a focus of its value-system, and these pioneers could give of their best only in terms of the best they knew—the best of their own values. To have asked them to do otherwise would have been to expect them to do something for which they were neither qualified nor experienced. Had they agreed to do so they would have earned neither the gratitude nor the respect of their African colleagues. Adaptation is seldom the task of the innovating pioneers from the sending culture; it is the task of those from the receiving culture who take over from them, for it is based on criteria which the foreigner cannot appreciate. When President Eliot of Harvard spoke of American universities as the slow and natural outgrowth of American social and political habits, this is what he meant—and this is what is now happening in the universities of tropical Africa.

P. C. C. EVANS

EXTRA-MURAL EDUCATION

University Extramural Education in England, 1945-62. A Study in Finance and Policy. By Prof. S. G. Raybould. (Michael Joseph Books on Live Issues.) Pp. 207. (London: Michael Joseph, Ltd., 1964.) 42s. net.

PROF. RAYBOULD is fast qualifying for the post of keeper of the universities' conscience in matters extra-mural. His first book on the subject was published in 1951 and dealt with the period 1924-49. Now he has given us in *University Extramural Education in England* a kind of supplement covering the years 1945-62. This volume, like the first, is mainly statistical, but from the statistics Prof. Raybould adduces three major criticisms of the present position. First, the university extra-mural departments are organizing too many short courses which do not call for serious student effort; secondly, they are employing too many non-university tutors; and thirdly, that since, in view of these facts, the financial link with the Ministry of Education has so signally failed to protect university standards, it is time this link was done away with and the extra-mural departments left to stand on their own feet with such funds as their universities can be persuaded to give them.

The trouble is, I think, that in support of these contentions Prof. Raybould relies too much on the raw statistics of extra-mural courses. These statistics certainly show, for example, that there has been a disproportionate increase in the number of courses of less than twenty meetings, but they do not show that many of these short courses are conducted at a very high academic level for students who bring to the work a considerable background of previous knowledge. The statistics also show that large numbers of non-university tutors are employed on extra-mural work in a part-time capacity, but they do not reveal to what extent these tutors are employed: in some universities, at least, they play only a very minor part.

If these qualifications are borne in mind, Prof. Raybould's criticism of the Ministry of Education loses much of its force. There is a good case to be made for abolishing the present system under which the extra-mural departments have received part of their funds from their universities and part from the Ministry, and substituting a system under which, like other university departments,

they receive their funds from the University Grants Committee. This case rests, however, not on statistical considerations such as Prof. Raybould has brought forward, but on the need for the universities to have full control and full responsibility for their extra-mural teaching.

None the less, it would be foolish to dismiss the criticisms that Prof. Raybould makes as entirely without substance. Extra-mural work has been passing since the Second World War through a period of pretty rapid expansion. My own impression is that the academic quality of the work, and its reputation inside the universities, has been steadily rising. However, the statistical record, though it may not mean as much as Prof. Raybould thinks it means, does point to certain real dangers against which the universities should be on their guard, and it is of great value to have this clear and cogently argued volume to direct attention to these dangers.

T. KELLY

SIGN-POSTS IN SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Explorations in Cultural Anthropology

Edited by Ward H. Goodenough. (Essays in Honor of George Peter Murdock.) Pp. xiii+653. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company; Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, Ltd., 1964.) 100s.; 12.50 dollars.

Other Cultures

Aims, Methods and Achievements in Social Anthropology. By John Beattie. Pp. xii+283. (London: Cohen and West, Ltd., 1964.) 32s.

Social Anthropology

By Prof. Paul Bohannan. Pp. viii+421. (New York and London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1963.) 6 dollars.

IT is presumably a sign of maturity in a subject when not only volumes of the *Festschrift* order celebrate the work of leading scientists but also enough firmness has been given to the framework of theory that diverse text-books embodying it can be written.

The essays in honour of Murdock's sixty-fifth birthday rightly celebrate the work of a man who has done a very great deal to systematize and stimulate our thinking about some of the basic aspects of family and kinship structure. Even those who have disagreed at times either with his terminology or with his generalizations have been stirred to further enquiry as the result of problems he has posed. It is appropriate, therefore, that much of this book should be concerned with questions of kinship and with refinement of methods of social and cultural enquiry. Hockett's reconstructed account of the putative 'parent' of the Central Algonquian kinship system a millennium or more ago, and Lounsbury's formal model of Crow- and Omaha-type kinship terminologies, are for specialists alone. Goodenough's componential analysis of the terminology of Lapp kinship from Perhson's account is also technically difficult; as with Conklin's paper on ethnogenealogical method, the effort is interesting and rich in analytical suggestion rather than complete and convincing in final statement.

Of the many other stimulating essays in *Explorations in Cultural Anthropology* one can only indicate a handful. Rouse examines Julian Huxley's and Kroeber's ideas on evolution from an archaeological point of view, and Whiting considers how far climate has had an effect through a long chain of nursing and sleeping habits on the practice of circumcision of boys. Voget examines the way in which warfare was formerly a primary focus for integration of Crow Indian culture; whereas Pospisil, equally sociological but more tough minded, represents the feud among an inland Eskimo group as being an