region", correlating the Upper Siberian Paleolithic inventory of the Mousterian type with the Levallais-Mousterian traditions of neighboring Middle Asia (Soviet Central Asia, Mongolia, and northern China). A route to northern Asia was also opened from the south, out of the Mongolian steppes. To the south, in eastern and southeastern Asia, was located the home of Homo erectus. In several Paleolithic sites in Siberia (Ulalinka, Makarovo, Osinovka) some pebble-choppers were found, perhaps indicating a connection between these Paleolithic settlements and the more ancient southern regions of Asia (Okladnikov and Pospeleva, 1982).

The third route of Early Man into Siberia, from the Trans-Ural region and the Russian Plain, likewise cannot be excluded. The supporters of this concept were the pioneers of Russian archaeology, who appear to have been strongly influenced by the early evolutionist school; they include Savenkov, Petri, Gerodkin, Denisov, and Agranov. These theories are supported by the magnificent discoveries in the Paleolithic sites of Mal'ta and Buret' in cis-Baykal.

It thus follows that the settlement of Siberia by Paleolithic man proceeded not from one center and not in one direction, but from at least three centers and three directions: Soviet Central Asia, central and southeastern Asia, and eastern Europe. Each of these areas, as the origin of settlement movements, has had supporters among archaeologists who have endeavored to produce more convincing evidence concerning the settlement of Siberia by Early Man.

According to Okladnikov's and Yas'levsky's articles, the pebble-choppers and especially Levallais techniques are evident for the earliest Paleolithic sites of Siberia, Sakhalin Island, Japan, and North America. These earliest Siberian sites were radiocarbon-dated to 45,000-30,000 B.P. The Levallais tradition developed through the Late Pleistocene and Early Holocene traditions of the North Pacific. Some elements of the Levallais technique were recognized in the lithic assemblages of southwestern Alaska by Ackerman, Carlson, and Hobler. For example, Ackerman points out that microcore and microblade technology as a late variation of Levallais tradition first came to North America from Asia about 12,000 years ago, and the differences between the microblade industries of the two continents are a result of cultural adaptation to a specific environment.

In his article, Dikov also attempts to correlate North Asian and American Late Pleistocene-Early Holocene archaeology by using the data from Kamchatka, Chukotka, and the upper Kolyma River. Dikov finds that the lithic assemblages from the Ushki Lake sites, specifically the technological-typological similarity of some stemmed projectile points of Asia, blade points of northwest America, and Denali and Akmak assemblages of Alaska, have a common origin. While Dikov's hypothesis is provocative, his archaeological data are limited to only a few poorly defined and dated archaeological sites in northern Asia. These limitations should be considered critical ones for the comparative analyses of archaeological assemblages. To my knowledge, the lithic assemblages of the Ushki Lake sites and ecological settings have some common traits with the Early Holocene southern Alaskan traditions, rather than with the central (Denali) and northwestern (Akmak) Alaskan traditions. Archaeologically and ecologically the Denali and Akmak are more similar to the Dyuktay complex of the middle Aldan Basin, defined by Mochanov. Furthermore, many American anthropologists, particularly Bryan in his paper, point out the difficulties in observing the technological origin of Paleoleidian traditions of North Asia and Alaska. Based on this data, Dikov concludes that the Early Man remains from the Old Crow site of the northern Yukon River, he dates the appearance of Early Man in North America to 25,000-40,000 years ago.

In sum, this monograph, as a joint work of specialists from USSR, USA, Canada, and Japan, demonstrates the necessity of comparative analyses and cooperative research for the study of North Pacific prehistory, since in the past it was a heterogeneous cultural area where the development of Early Man took place. One important aspect of Soviet archaeological methodology must be mentioned, the traditional artificial and economic orientation. While ecological principles are currently very popular for the explanation of culture change in the Soviet Union (Dolukhanov, 1978), there has hardly been any research undertaken by Siberian archaeologists which has conceptually and quantitatively utilized ecological data for explanation of human behavior. But it would be worthwhile to try this.
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This ambitious work presents an extremely broad range of basic information on Canada north of 60°. Its detail, wealth of tables and figures, careful attention to regional variations across the North, and the amendments which will be issued periodically to update it will make the Manual a valuable reference for Canadian Arctic Resources Committee find their way into the chapter outside their areas of expertise. However, specialists will not find this volume very helpful in their own research because shallowness is the inevitable price of the Manual's breadth. Every specialist will find a particularly galling omission; for a political scientist, the absence of public accounts is most unfortunate. To their credit, the anonymous authors do acknowledge the limitations of the Manual and attempt to rectify the resulting problems by closing most of the chapters with bibliographies. These ought to be expanded to include more non-governmental publications, but they do at least indicate some supplementary sources of information.

While the factual presentation is generally laudable given the constraints of available space, as soon as the Manual moves away from the strictly factual, the perspective of its analysis becomes ambiguous and its credibility suffers. What is never clear are the true proportions of disinterested analysis and "official line" in the Manual. It is hard to avoid the feeling that the text is designed to present a vision of the North which reflects most favourably on DIAND or at least which pays more respect to DIAND's policy needs than to the reader's need for insight.

The bias takes several forms. The first is to print a generally rosier picture of the North than would most observers. The Manual does not tell the reader that the Yukon economy is on its knees, that while the text was being written not a single mine was operating in the Territory nor that the problems of the White Pass and Yukon Railway have become so severe as to lead to the suspension of its operations. Similarly, the reader is not troubled by information on the severe market difficulties facing the fur industry or on the disappoiting history of native employment in the mining and oil and gas sectors of the economy. Northern social problems are acknowledged, but only in a brief and partial fashion.

A second, equally tendentious, pattern is the Manual's presentation of the policies of the Government of Canada in the most favourable light, while negative aspects of these policies receive little or no attention. For example, the discussion of Ottawa's policy regarding native claims presents it as a most benign position, downplays Ottawa's disdain prior to the 1973 Calder court case, and ignores completely the great controversy surrounding Ottawa's insistence on extinguishment clauses in the settlements it negotiates. In contrast, criticism of DIAND policy is conspicuously absent; it is noteworthy that the excellent, moderate, and constructive, though often critical, publications of the Canadian Arctic Resources Committee is conspicuous in its absence.

The confusion as to whether the Manual should be read as one would read the annual report of a governmental department or an official statement of policy, or should be treated as an independent and nonpartisan reference, produces a third problem. This is that any judgment that it offers which goes beyond existing officially-established policy may be interpreted as a statement of policy or at least as a precursor of policy. Particularly regarding questions involving stakes which are both very high and dependent on future governmental decisions, prudence compels the Manual to avoid offering judgments or even background information. Because of the risk involved, the chapter on northern hydrocarbon transportation proposals is silent about the respective prospects of the projects it outlines and even about the considerations which define these prospects. In the case of the Alaska Highway Gas Pipeline, the Manual reports neither the favourable information that the project is authorized by the Northern Pipeline Act nor the unfavourable financing prospects facing the project. Similarly, the marketing problems facing the Arctic Pilot Project are not even hinted at. Particularly as no bibliography is provided for
this chapter — despite the great many informative works available — the aver-
age reader is denied any of the context essential for grasping the political economy of these crucially important projects. The caution that produces this avoidance of interpretation similarly denies the reader the background needed to understand the politics of a variety of other issues, such as regional government, land use planning, and environmental protection.

Future editions of this potentially extremely valuable reference must specify its stance and status so that its contents can properly be interpreted. Ideally, DIAND will disclaim authorship or endorsement of the contents of the Manual and explicitly vest responsibility for it in an editorial board of statute which will then be free to recognize fully the contributions which are needed to the North. Until this clarification is offered, the Manual will serve as a useful source of facts, but not of insights.
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Northern policy research is growing up. Until recently social science regarding the Canadian North has been hampered by the lack of specialized bibliographic and reference works which organize relevant documentation, facilitate the dissemination of new information, and bridge subspecialties in more mature areas of scholarship. Directories have been published in the past, but these have focused on researchers or projects rather than documentation, and they and the available northern indexes tend not to report the more ephemeral, but in many cases timely and extremely important materials.

Northern Politics Review 1983 makes a major contribution to remedying this lack of integration in the study of public policy in the Canadian North. Intended as an annual publication and with entries in both English and French, this bibliography reports an extremely broad range of materials, including speeches, consultants’ reports, submissions to public inquiries, and unpublished materials, as well as the more standard books, articles, government documents, and conference proceedings. The citations encompass the full range of public policy issues, a strength of the volume which may not be apparent to prospective readers who take the word “politics” in the title to suggest political process narrowly construed rather than the wealth of substantive issues which the Review actually covers.

The Review is organized by subject categories, further subdivided by topic or region. The classification is appropriate, with two exceptions. Unfortunately, the Review treats renewable resources as a subcategory — and the last one — in its economic development. This approach might be taken as offering aid and comfort to those who view hunting, fishing, and trapping as vestigial and insignificant elements of the northern economy. It will offend the native peoples whose insistence on the crucial importance of these activities is supported by many academic, governmental, and other observers.

The classification also needs revision to clarify the relationship between aboriginal claims on the one hand and the Denende and Nunavut proposals on the other. The point is that the latter are being sought, outside the claims negotiation processes, as public governments. They should be treated as matters of constitutional development, not confused with native claims, regardless of how closely linked they are with native aspirations.

Each section of the Review opens with a thumbnail survey of the relevant events and issues of the year. These are useful, particularly in integrating northern studies by suggesting the context of the cited items. Northerners interested in understanding debates and policies which fall outside their area of specialization but which impinge on their work because of the great interdependence of issues in the North particularly stand to benefit from this type of introduction. However, as with all annual reviews, these sketches fall prey to two shortcomings. The first is that their time frame is not that of public policy. The summaries in Northern Politics Review fail to convey a full sense of the history and evolution of issues; their focus is events, not process. The second problem is that the Review resolves the inevitable trade-off between space constraints and depth of discussion in favour of the former. While the highlights are reported, and in an admirably non-judgmental fashion, so little of the detail and flavour is conveyed to those who can benefit most from the Review — those who need to have things spelled out for them — will find that the summaries point them in the right direction, but do not give them the purchase on the issues they require. The introductory reviews should be at least twice as long.

In contrast, the extent of the bibliographies is impressive, particularly for a first exercise. The Review, on its first time out, has established itself as an indispensable reference for students and practitioners of northern policy. Of course, there is room for improvement. The section on the Northwest Territories is particularly skimpy, even given the lack of literature on the subject. If the editors have accepted the challenge of including the provincial North in their definition of the North, they must develop methods for ferreting out the literature that does exist on this topic. The Review would be more useful if it gave some sense of the business of the territorial and federal governments. Even a few pages summarizing budgets (or, in the case of Ottawa, relevant budget lines) passed during the year, and noting the titles of relevant legislation passed and the most important sessional papers tabled in the territorial legislative assemblies, would be most useful in bringing otherwise scattered information between the covers of a single volume. In addition, because many of the items are not available through conventional channels, it would be a conveniences for researchers if the citations of the most accessible items included information on their availability, price, and the addresses from which they could be bought.

While these marginal improvements would strengthen the Review, its editors must be saluted. The Review’s comprehensiveness, timeliness and organization make a major contribution to the integration of the field which is a prerequisite for a more mature and coherent study of public policy in the Canadian North.

Gurdon Dacks
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Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
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Marching to the Beat of the Same Drum is a remarkable work. It is also remarkably disappointing as a study of the issues and crises surrounding the transportation of gas and oil north of 60°. The positively remarkable part is that it took several years to gather the evidence heard by the Senate Committee on the study of transportation of gas and oil in the far north. The Committee travelled across the north and heard evidence from the widest variety of witnesses: industry spokesmen, transportation industry experts, Inuit and Dene leaders and villagers. The Committee was tilted slightly toward western representation but included Senators from across Canada, including the two northern Senators. The disappointing part is that the report fails to come to grips with both its original mandate and the changing economic conditions, on which the Committee was hearing evidence. The Committee attempted to deal with the logistics of northern transportation of gas and oil, the effects of a complex high-technology transport system on northern residents, and the confusion of regulatory mechanisms affecting northern development. It is clear that the Senators’ strength lies in dealing with the welter of regulatory processes centred in Ottawa, because that is the place where the report shines.

The report tries to identify the best means of transportation to be put into place to help make Canada self-sufficient by 1990. This goal was taken from the National Energy Program (NEP) which came down about the time the Committee was beginning its work. In fact, the Special Committee was beginning its work about the time the National Energy Program (NEP) came down about the time the Senate Standing Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce was holding its hearings on the last of the bills to implement the NEP in the early summer of 1982.

Perhaps if the report had been able to surface by the fall of 1982, it would have seemed more in line with what was actually going on in the world. Unfortunately for the Senators who had performed a labour of love on the time, they reached a consensus on what they wanted to say, the last of the financial calculations on which the NEP and the drive for massive and rapid development in the north were based were no longer operative. In retrospect, it seems the Senate Committee engaged in an exercise of refining a government policy when the policy was collapsing and all the expert testimony against the policy was being borne out.

The whole question of aboriginal land rights was an area where the Committee itself was simply insensitive. The report suggests that the federal government push through aboriginal land agreements (land claims settlements) so that development can begin. While the Senators may have related well to the local communities which they visited, it is clear they did not come to terms