

NORDENSKIÖLD felt that the New World metallurgical complex provided the best proof for independent invention, whereas HEINE-GELDERN attributes the same complex to Dongson influence and considers it a clear instance of trans-Pacific diffusion from southeast Asia.

It becomes increasingly clear to many that independent inventions do occur, but that the claim of the obsessive partisan isolationist, that it invariably occurs wherever cultural parallels exist, is only an alternative working hypothesis that remains to be proven. Undoubtedly, the progress of anthropological knowledge during recent decades will prevent the old "Kulturkreislehre" from ever turning up again in its original extremist shape. But to stop the pendulum nearest possible to its present balanced position, stronger evidence must be mustered against sporadic oversea voyages prior to Columbus. The difference in opinion calls for a cautious and fully unbiassed attitude from both parts, and the isolationist should divide his efforts equally between his rebuffing of the diffusionist's evidence and a search for positive evidence in support of his own view. Although the burden of proof falls heaviest on the diffusionist, it does not fall on him alone, and until either part has conclusively demonstrated the validity of his own case, the scientific controversy is bound to continue.

As stated, an increasing number of modern scholars, perhaps the great majority, seem of recent years to have chosen to follow a cautious middle course. They do not side with any of the two extreme doctrines, but admit that currents may have carried individual craft with surviving aboriginal crew to or from America without representing population movements of major scale. It seems to me that some of the scholars, who have argued their own case for stray drift voyages from personally encountered evidence, have unjustly been labeled diffusionists by their opponents. If an archaeologist finds aberrant pottery in Ecuador which makes him suspect a casual arrival with the extended Japan current, he must be prepared for reasonable opposition, but he is not necessarily a declared diffusionist. Nor is it diffusionism to expose and present archaeological evidence for a pre-Columbian Norse house site on New Foundland. I also fail to see how it can be termed diffusionism to propose a voyage of 2 000 miles from South America to Easter Island, while it is *not* diffusionism to propose a voyage of some 10 000 miles from Asia to the same island, and even against the winds and currents.

I would use the term *diffusionist* for one who generally favors human contact as explanation wherever cultural parallels occur, and *isolationist* for one who dogmatically believes that the oceans surrounding the Americas were unpassable before A. D. 1492. Against this definition it would seem as if the isolationists have been so eager in their admittedly worthwhile attempt of showing the defects of diffusionism that they sometimes have thrown the baby out with the bath water (to use another of ROWE's expressions).

It may be acknowledged that most of the theories of transoceanic contact are not extremely strong if put to a critical test for actual proof. It may be worthwhile to investigate if the evidence for isolation stands better up to a