a constitution as the legal framework of political society which establishes func-
tional institutions and rights. This document of Wolf-Phillips refers to as "Con-
stitutional Enactments of the United Kingdom" with XIV substantive headings
covering the spectrum from Basic Rights & Liberties (I), through Parliament
(VI) to Emergency Powers (XIV). While many specialists will undoubtedly
quarrel with some details of organization, we are nonetheless provided with
a most useful index of fundamental statutes.

The author further asserts "From the point of view of the drafting of a
constitution one might expect that the degree of detail and the degree of codi-
fication (or 'integration') to be greater where there was a lack of unity or in-
stability within a state" (xii). While this is a most interesting notion, the ad-
vocacy of which is not limited to Wolf-Phillips, it appears to be contradicted
by two factors: (1) the briefest text included in the volume is that of the Con-
stitution of Indonesia, not noted for either unity or stability; (2) the continuum
from the *jus* constitutions (common law) of the ancient and medieval world
through the *lex* constitutions (statute law) of the modern world (xiii) suggest
that the most modern of constitutions would naturally be the most codified.

The commentaries in themselves while offering a bit of historical back-
ground to the constitutional text present neither an analytic framework of
comparability nor any explanation of how the society functions as a political
community. The best one might be able to do would be to categorize the
document within the context of the classifications offered in the introduction.
The Peoples Republic of China cannot be comprehended by a text illuminated
by a 650 word commentary, nor can Yugoslavia be understood by noting that
the position of Vice-President was abolished in 1967.

The task which Wolf-Phillips set forth is an admirable one. Hopefully
someday it will be realized.

McGill University, Montreal, Canada

S. J. Noumoff


Three years after its initial publication the volume stands as a compendium
of a kind which will probably not be attempted again for twenty or more years
when the era of scholarship and research conducted during the time and, in
some cases, under the auspices of colonial administration [primarily British]
may be fairly put to comparison with post-independence research. The time
period, the frame of reference, the very necessity to rely on established scholars
for their views, all are perhaps even more apparent in 1968 than was the case
in 1963–4 when much of this volume was being written.

The end of the second world war released funds and personnel in rapidly
increasing quantities for research to be undertaken in what now stands as an
interim period before the several grantings of national independence radically
changed the focus and opportunities for research. The survey reported on here
of the research done in such a clearly demarcated and distinctive period has
had, then, from its inception a kind of inherent rationale which amply justified the money and effort put into it.

The Ford Foundation, the African Studies Association, the editor and the several eminent contributors perceived and properly exploited the possibility of bringing together a comprehensive review of all the major disciplines central and marginal to the social sciences e.g. those fields of major concern in the African Studies Association.

The scope of the work is not, however, continental. As Pierre Alexandre points out in one of the few reviews of the first edition, the title is misleading: Francophone Africa and the work of German, Belgian, Franch and Italian scholar are quite inadequately represented in most sections. Some, psychology for example, are exceptions in this regard. However, understandably the conventional distinction between the portions of the continent north and south of the Sahara is also followed here with a complete concentration on the sub-Saharan.

The lack of any other review published by an anthropologist and the space allotted for review of such a complex volume, combine to suggest I focus on the anthropology section. Because anthropology of all the social sciences, has been associated with Africa most closely and over the longest period of time, the core of this book could have been a real overview of anthropology in Africa. Gulliver, to whom was given the considerable task of digesting the social and cultural anthropologist literature, chose a middle and topical course in the treatment of his subject. Where Doob could execute a comprehensive review of the literature in psychology and Kamarck could review problems in theory and data derivation faced by the western economist turning to African matters, Gulliver, in attempting to do both, has accomplished neither.

Gulliver could have directed his readers to other reference sources such as Helen Conover’s bibliography Africa South of the Sahara since he was [probably wisely] unprepared to engage in a “lengthy and profitless investigation to discover what proportion of these [tribal] units has been described,” (p. 91). He goes on to include the Ganda in a list for whom there is “sufficient information on almost every aspect of their lives,” when we know nothing about their kinship and domestic organization and no competent description exists on their ecology, and excludes the Nyoro who are relatively well described. Also excluded are the professional contributions of such established scholars as Winter, Gray, Goody, Maquet, Beibuyck, Skinner, Ottenberg (both), as well as Beattie. And what we know of the Gusi, Herero, Wolof, Yoruba and Swahili speaking peoples is informed by the excellent work of Levine, Gibson, Ames, Lloyd and Prins. Furthermore there is no hint on p. 100 that the not quite “moribund” discipline of anthropology could produce the work of younger scholars like Beidelman, Shack, Turnbull, Gibbs, Netting, Brokensha, Sangree Saberwal, Scudder and Herbert Lewis. Also, if we are to learn of Mukwaya’s work let us also hear of Busia and Kenyatta among the Africans. We have been given a far from authoritative review and one curiously restricted to those scholars (save for Gulliver himself and Southall, Cunnison and Colson) who are no longer active or involved in African research.

This volume so splendid in its inception appears as a period piece and has not become the historic work one wished to have. Despite its weaknesses the volume prepared under the auspices of the professional Africanists in the United