

Stevens. George Stephen of the CPR is accused of having a law changed (II, 8); in the *Monetary Times* article cited as evidence Stephen suggests to a reporter that the law should be changed. A *Monetary Times* editorial pointing out that a high tariff will induce American competition is turned into a claim that the journal "fretted, lest the tariff be inadequate to tempt firms to jump over it" (II, 71). An article claiming that Tilley's 1884 loan signified "the highest mark in the steady rise of the country's credit" is used to support a judgment by Naylor that London was not very receptive to Canadian loans. In the next sentence Naylor distorts comments made by Tupper and attributes them to Tilley (I, 236).

This account of Naylor's inaccuracies is not selective and could be extended at great length. In one afternoon's excursion into the *Monetary Times* I went through 57 footnotes. Naylor's statements seemed to me a completely fair inference from 32% (18) of the sources checked. I had moderate quibbles about his inferences from 26% (15) of the sources, and seriously disagree with the inferences drawn from an extraordinary 35% (20). The other four citations were completely garbled and could not be checked.

Nobody can withstand a determined footnote checker, and it is a common enough dirty trick to highlight isolated errors in a scholar's work. The errors in Naylor's work are not isolated. Nor does the way most of them tend to reinforce his prejudices suggest that they are due to random carelessness. Professor J.T. McLeod, who is effusively thanked in the introduction to this work, revealed in a laudatory review in the *Toronto Star* (March 27, 1976) that an earlier draft of it had been turned down as a Ph.D. thesis at Cambridge. In my judgment this draft of *The Business History of Canada* would also be rejected as a Ph.D. thesis because it does not meet reasonable standards of scholarship.

In general, there is little reason to take seriously a work laden with factual errors, framed in an untenable conceptualization, unsupported by significant statistics, and based on a thorough contempt by the author for his subjects. Surely radical scholarship can do better than this. A comparable history of Canadian labour from the opposite end of the theoretical spectrum would be written by a disciple of Ayn Rand dedicated to arguing the thesis that Canadian trade unions developed as a tacit conspiracy by lazy workers to suppress the energies of industrious workers. Reviewers would not know whether to laugh or cry. The extent to which *The History of Canadian Business* is recognized as an important and reliable contribution to Canadian history will reveal much about the drift of standards and interests in our Magic Kingdom.

Michael BLISS,  
*University of Toronto.*

FRANCIS JENNINGS. — *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1975.

In this publication of the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Jennings's intention is to rewrite the history of the colonial period in order to give the Indian his due and the white man what he deserves. Among the whites he singles out the Puritans, for whom he admits a "strong aversion," for particular disapprobation. Along the way Jennings takes to task various historians who have preceded him in the field, and again he has a favorite target. This time it is Alden T. Vaughan, whose defence of Puritan dealings with the Indians appeared in 1965.

Jennings divided his presentation into two sections. The first, which occupies over half of the volume, consists of a series of ten essays on topics in Indian-white relations. These include warfare, missionary activity, and the contributions of Indians to contemporary American culture. Nor surprisingly, the author finds no significant differences between the approach of the Indians and the white men to war, although history generally has referred to one as savage and the other as civilized warfare. Missionary activity earns no praise, although Jennings finds French Catholic efforts less reprehensible than those of the Puritans, whose John Eliot he holds up to scorn as the so-called Apostle to the Indians. Although he obviously would like to have found otherwise, Jennings concludes that Indian societies contributed little to the makeup of modern American society. Indeed, he says that the principal Indian contribution was the assistance he provided whites in the exploration and settlement of the continent. In this and the other essays the author reveals his thorough knowledge of not only the historical literature but also the contributions of anthropologists.

Jennings is so anxious to make his case for the Indians — and against the whites — that he sometimes overdoes it. For example, there is his question: "Is there any good reason to think that the Mississippi Valley would be more highly developed today than the Australian outback if the Indians of North America had not existed?" This manages to ignore both the contrasting geographical features of the two continents and the existence of the Australian aborigines. In his discussion of scalping, Jennings at least refrains from blaming white men for the introduction of that practice, however he does attribute its spread to them, citing the familiar bounty argument.

The same attitudes carry over into the second section of the book which is a history of Indian-white relations in New England through King Philip's War. As most of his examples for his essays were drawn from New England experience, the result is considerable repetition in this second section. However, it has the advantage for the reader of being a narrative history whose flow is marred only now and then by the author's insistence on pausing to argue the evidence. Forced like his predecessors to rely on strictly white sources, Jennings is reduced to finding new meanings in them or hinting darkly at the suppression of evidence. If there was suppression of evidence it probably stemmed from the inter-colonial struggles for survival rather than from a design to improve their image in Indian relations. The Puritans were too confident of their superiority to the savages to worry too much on that account.

Perhaps John Eliot needed to be diminished in stature, and we should give more weight to the Mohawk role in helping crush King Philip, to mention only two of Jennings' themes. Nevertheless, he might have been more persuasive had he written a briefer, less argumentative volume. Contrary to the impression left by Jennings, the Puritans have had their share of scholarly critics in this century, Vaughan's approach being somewhat of an aberration. *The Invasion of America* is a good antidote to the flood of patriotic nonsense that is inundating the United States this bicentennial year, however it is unlikely that most of those whose knowledge of history is informed by the bicentennial minutes will ever encounter this volume or be able to plough through it if they did.

William T. HAGAN,  
State University of New York, Fredonia.