glorify as the "cornerstone" of future Maori policy, so far as alleged promises of power and wealth sharing, biculturism, self-determination, and eternal "aboriginality" are concerned, is an example in point. The earliest date given for this "Maori version" is about 1975, suggesting recent construction, an emergent popular rationalization for current political aspirations. That is, it seems to be a modern factitious or mythic rendition, not a historically documented contemporaneous gloss or "aboriginal" understanding of this treaty that they refer to. We shall have to await a Hobsbawm's or a Ranger's honest scholarship to obtain an informed biography of what seems to be an invented tradition of contemporary origin, whether this version's authors are Maori or otherwise. In this as in other instances, Fleras and Elliott rarely peer beneath the symbolic surface of public relations broadsides.

As regards the history of policy dealings with the "aboriginals" of Canada and the United States, such uses or abuses of supposedly factual data are legion. The raw materials Fleras and Elliott deploy are mainly derivative, secondhand if not third- and fourth-hand stuff, carefully selected to buttress a conclusion, poorly digested and uncritically presented as evidence. Relying heavily on mass media renditions of current events, the one-sided briefs of attorneys representing their native clients' interests, and a selected array of partisan advocacy studies, what these authors have concocted reads as another variant of the orthodox Indian Story, with rather more hyperbole than is the norm. Their characterization of mid-19th-century U.S. Indian policy, for instance, is little more than *Time Magazine*'s MacNews style simplification of Charles F. Wilkinson's special pleadings.

Their errors of fact, confusions, and egregious exaggerations are far too numerous to list even in abbreviated form. It is not apparent to me, for instance, that either of the authors has so much as read a British, a Canadian, or an American Indian treaty, much less studied the records of their negotiation in any detail. Moreover, I cannot see that they understand the legal and sociological nature of these compacts, else they might have reconsidered classing such unilateral policy declarations and legislative acts as the British 1763 Proclamation or the Alaskan Natives Claims Settlement Act as "treaties." The Oneida Nations of Wisconsin and New York, in another counterfactual example, might be annoyed to be told (p. 137) that they sought to remain neutral during the Revolution and later fled to Canada. When given a choice of mortality rates for the Cherokees' legendary Trail of Tears, these authors arbitrarily opt for the most inflated figure extant (p. 137). How can a U.S. policy aimed at making Indians self-supporting, enfranchised citizens be defamed as "racist"? Under the Removal Policy of the 1830s, the Indians of the Southeast certainly were offered (and many thousands elected) an alternative other than "death." The "period of armed conflict" with Indians assuredly did not end in 1849, as these authors assert, and the so-called reservation policy began emerging that year, not in 1871.

Such piles of political rhetoric and historical falsifications these authors advance, they indicate, so as to help convert modern Americans into "full fledged allies with aboriginal peoples in their nationalistic cause" (p. xi). I suggest that if they wish to enlist many Americans as partisans in their cause, they might cease denigrating their ancestors. If academic sociologists stereotyped Jews or African Americans as rapacious, land-hungry, genocidal, greedy, bloodthirsty thieves, how many allies might they expect to enroll? Rather, how long would it take for the Anti-Defamation League or the NAACP to jump on their heads? Moreover, there are hundreds of thousands of modern American Indians who take great pride in their Indian Reorganization Act governments, which they certainly do not see as a "sham," as do Fleras and Elliott (p. 149).

In sum, this slim volume is basically a political tract barely disguised as a sociological treatise. It is organized in the style of thesis-driven research, around a set of prejudged conclusions and opinions, supported by a selected array of images that support its tenets. The authors seem to be preaching to already converted true believers in academic life, to university students, and to other "nonaboriginal" elites. I doubt that the general public will pay this volume any heed. Nor should they do so, for bad history and partisan sociology make for disastrous policy recommendations. Perhaps these authors ought to listen to the voices of some of those many "aboriginals" whom they characterize, with scarcely concealed contempt, as co-opted "moderates." By no means are all "aboriginals" as eager to rush to the "paradigm shift" barricades dreaming of separate nationhood, as these academic activists make them out to be.

Of Mice and Women: Aspects of Female Aggression. *Kaj Bjorkqvist* and *Pirkko Niemela*, eds. San Diego: Academic Press, 1992. 440 pp.

VICTORIA BURBANK
University of California

Addressing the topic of female aggression in humans and other species, this multidisciplinary compilation of papers from an international collection of authors is dedicated to Professor Kirsti Lagerspetz. Its title's use of modified Steinbeck (or Burns) is particularly apt, for Professor Lagerspetz's research interests span the genetics of aggressive and nonaggressive strains of mice to investigations of indirect aggression in schoolgirls. And, as the editors tell us, many of the papers contained in this volume are inspired by her work.

Observing that female aggression has been largely ignored by the academic community, the editors of this volume intend to provide researchers and teachers with an assorted sampling of work on this topic. Authored by psychologists, anthropologists, animal behaviorists, and literary critics, the 34 papers in this volume address a vast array of topics. Among these are the role of testosterone in human aggression, coronary heart disease and Type A behavior patterns, aggressive themes in the life histories of Finnish women, Lady Macbeth's aggressive character, the effects of alcohol use on women's aggressive impulses, student reactions to film clips of female fighters, the Jungian archetype of the Great Mother, aggression among female gorillas and chimpanzees, agonistic behavior and dominance in dogs, and maternal aggression in mice. Contributions by anthropologists include descriptions of women's aggression in Venezuela, Zambia, and China, among the Zapotec of Mexico, and on the Solomon Island of Bellona. Similarly, a diversity of theoretical orientations and methodologies are brought to bear in these papers. Some are primarily descriptive; some explore various antecedents of aggressive behavior. A number of the authors examine and challenge biases that have characterized previous studies of aggression and gender difference.

This diversity of approach and subject is both a blessing and a curse. On the one hand, this volume invites readers to explore beyond their disciplinary range. However, the advantages of doing so need to be made more explicit. This volume does not have an introductory chapter and it needs one. As a cultural anthropologist, I am, for example, interested to read that aggressive behavior and maze-running ability are correlated in some strains of laboratory-bred female mice. But I also wonder at the relevance of this information for my questions about women and aggression. Similarly, the biological anthropologist may ask why an analysis of the vampire motif in the writing of Isak Dinesen is of interest. I realize these are difficult connections to make, but we must at least strain toward them to keep our work from spinning into triviality. As it stands, the volume provides only a Rorschach for our views on relationships between women and girls, females of other species, and the plethora of behaviors and dispositions we label "aggression." Nevertheless, *Of Mice and Women* indicates the promise of research and theoretical efforts in this area, especially by demonstrating so well that female aggression is very much a part of our world.

Postmodernism, Reason and Religion. *Ernest Gellner.* New York: Routledge, 1992. 118 pp.

LAMONT C. LINDSTROM
University of Tulsa

Ernest Gellner poses himself as the Edmund Burke of the postmodern revolution. Surveying gloomily the wreckage and intellectual spoilation of anthropology occasioned by postmodernity's excessive narcissism, loss of faith, and bad language, he harkens back to the good old days of the ancien régime of social scientific truth.

This is a curious book. It was meant to be a jointly authored essay in which Gellner and Akbar Ahmed together debated the merits of religion, rationalism, and relativism. It was meant, thus, to be a "dialogic" text (a genre that Gellner, in fact, rebukes as a postmodern literary extravagance). For undisclosed reasons, Routledge chopped the book in two and is peddling the halves separately. A discussion of the contemporary global significance of Islam still survives at the front of the book, but this is peripheral to Gellner's main purpose: to demonstrate the demerits of relativism and postmodern theory. Gellner cozies up to Islam as an intellectual ally in the assault on postmodernism insofar as Islam also accepts the existence of truth; but he criticizes Islam's tenet that the truth has been revealed and its denial that it is discovered by means of rational scholarship.

The remnant presence of Islam in the book, however, ultimately derails Gellner's argument—or, rather, demonstrates its elitism. Gellner decries the postmodernist refusal to admit that "transcultural" knowledge exists. European enlightenment rationality transcends any one culture; moreover, cul-