

Dr. Richards should consider this study merely as volume one. The Sutherland's case is so interesting we ought to be offered volume two hereafter.

Julian GWYN,
University of Ottawa.

* * *

BARBARA GRAYMONT. — *The Iroquois in the American Revolution*, Syracuse, Syracuse University Press, 1972.

The story of the disintegration of the Iroquois Confederacy during the era of the American Revolution is a sad one. It is especially sad because it does not recount how a people harmed themselves by their own policies and practices but rather how they were ruined by the policies and practices of others. When a nation or a people is trapped so that all available choices are potentially bad, the end result of the situation can be nothing but disastrous. This was the predicament in which the Six Nations found themselves during the conflict between those who would hold the eighteenth century British Empire together by force and those who would detach part of that empire, also by force. It is with this story that Professor Graymont's study is concerned.

In her first two chapters the author traces the history of the Iroquois to the eve of the Revolution. One very important point made is that during the Anglo-French wars between 1701 and 1763, most of the Iroquois remained neutral. Only toward the very end of the last war could the British speak with any real truth of their *allies*, the Iroquois. Perhaps it is too much to hope that the brief, cautious presentation of this truth will lay to rest the old myth (still perpetuated by too many historians who ought to know better) that Champlain and his arquebuses back in 1609 had made the Iroquois the enemies of the French forever and ever, amen. The Anglo-Iroquois alliance really came into existence only after the French had been defeated and Canada had been ceded to the British.

This alliance was to be short-lived for no sooner had it been effected than contending forces (this time English colonists and their mother country) would once again cause the Six Nations to seek in neutrality protection against the dire effects of the white man's wars. There were, however, too many factors beyond the control of the Iroquois which militated against their being allowed to pursue such a policy. Internally divided and pressured by both the American and the British, the Confederacy could not maintain its neutrality. As early as September 1775, some Mohawk warriors had fought against the Americans at St. John's, Quebec; by the end of 1777, both sides had made use of allies from the Six Nations; by 1779, the Oneidas and Tuscaroras were basically committed to the Americans, the Mohawks, Cayugas, and Senecas were attached to the British cause, and the Onondagas were divided into neutral, pro-American, and pro-British factions.

With the majority of the Iroquois having renewed and confirmed the Covenant Chain which bound them to King George III, the Americans sought to break the power of the pro-British Iroquois by carrying the war to their own towns in a massive campaign in 1779. The Sullivan-Clinton expedition terrorized the Indians but did not cause them to desert the British. The allies of the king, in their turn, not only renewed but intensified their campaigns of terror on the frontier raiding white settlements and the villages of their brethren who had sided with the rebels. Until the end of the war those who had helped the British remained steadfast only to see their "Father, the King" give their land to the Americans in order to obtain peace. Those who had aided the Americans probably fared worse.

The events sketched above (and others) are related in detail by Professor Graymont. Her's is basically a narrative account which nonetheless shows her to be a perceptive analyst; a writer of clear prose that combines original scholarship and synthesis. It is evident that the author's sympathies are essentially with the Indians (she is an honorary member of the Indian Defense League of America) but it is also obvious that, in her treatment of the plight of the Iroquois, she succeeded in maintaining a high degree of objectivity. Concerned with the culture of the Iroquois, their myths, symbols, and traditions, Professor Graymont has accomplished what she intended: she had made a worthwhile contribution to ethnohistory.

The author's style gives life and depth to her "characters" and thus she leads the reader through a myriad of facts without his feeling overwhelmed by detail. Nonetheless, Professor Graymont occasionally makes statements which might mislead the reader. When she writes that had Montgomery's army taken St. John's in September 1775, "the whole province of Quebec . . . would have lain open to the American armies" (p. 79) she implies that but for being delayed the Americans would have taken the province that fall. One cannot be that certain. Weak as the province was in September, Quebec City might well have withstood an American attack. The farther Montgomery's army went into Canada, the greater the problems of logistics and morale; furthermore, Arnold's supporting army had not yet left Maine.

This reviewer also believes that the statement that the pro-British Iroquois "succumbed to the persuasions of an intrepid warrior at the Eastern Door, and to rum and trinkets at the Western Door" (p. 128) is somewhat misleading. In fact, the author herself gives evidence elsewhere in the book that in the eastern extremities of the Confederacy other factors than Joseph Brant's persuasive powers alone were involved and that in the west far more than simply rum and trinkets helped convince the Senecas and Cayugas to take up the hatchet against the Americans.

In numerous places the author notes the dependence of the Iroquois on the whites for supplies and services but places perhaps too little emphasis on this factor. The importance of Iroquoian economic dependence has recently been given greater emphasis and is more clearly stated by Professor

Ralph T. Pastore,¹ who argues that the British, being far better equipped to provide for the Indians, had by the end of 1778, securely attached the majority of the Six Nations (including defectors from the pro-American Oneidas and Tuscaroras) to the King's cause.

As one counterweight to the attraction of British goods the Americans utilized the services of the missionary Samuel Kirkland whose influence among the Oneidas cannot be challenged. One wonders, however, why the author repeats the charge that Kirkland refused to baptize children (even dying infants) of unregenerate parents (p. 56) without repeating the missionary's reply that no one other than an Indian of a "most infamous character" had ever accused him of such rigidity. Except on this one point, Professor Graymont's account of Kirkland's role in attaching the Oneidas to the Americans appears correct although it is possible that some past disagreements between the Oneidas and the Johnsons worked to Kirkland's advantage. In March 1756, a French force destroyed the English forts, Bull and William, in the heart of the Oneida territory. The Oneidas had chosen not to warn either the commanders of the forts or Sir William Johnson of M. de Léry's approach. Twelve years later, after the French had met final defeat and the British were attempting to solve the Indian problem, it was the Oneidas who strongly objected to the establishment of the Fort Stanwix Treaty Line so far west. They had wanted it to be to the eastward so that they would have complete control of the Great Oneida Carrying Place. Their attitude on the question was basically the same as that of the Senecas who had zealously sought to maintain their rights at the Niagara portage in the days of the French Régime but by 1768 one of the European contenders for Iroquois allies had been eliminated and the Oneidas were unsuccessful. It is conceivable that they never forgave the architect of the treaty, Sir William Johnson, or his family.

Minor differences based on interpretation and emphasis do not, however, detract from the basic value of the work. As a result of the rising tide of interest in the North American Indian, it is hoped that a number of sound scholarly studies will be forthcoming. Those who have any intention of producing such works would do well to emulate Barbara Graymont.

William A. KEARNS,
Memorial University of Newfoundland.

* * *

MALVINA BOLUS, editor. — *People and Pelts. Selected Papers of the Second North American Fur Trade Conference*, Winnipeg, Peguis Publishers, 1972.

Many historians, for different reasons, will express disappointment with the selection of articles in this publication. This statement should not be

¹ "The Board of Commissioners for Indian Affairs in the Northern Department and the Iroquois Indians, 1775-1778," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, University of Notre-Dame, 1972.