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In her final section, "Adaptation and Removal," Murphy explains why the toleration and cooperation so common among the French lost ground to removal and segregation in the nineteenth century. For one, lead mining was a low-cost venture for young men willing to work hard. Consequently, American miners used force, bribery, and various forms of deceit to remove Indian people from mines owned and operated by Indian tribes. The U.S. government assisted American miners by insisting on the validity of the Sac and Fox Treaty of 1804, which ceded all of the tribes' land east of the Mississippi River. Consequently, Sauk and Meskwaki miners lacked legal title to their lands in Illinois. Conflict over the mines and the legality of the 1804 treaty led to the Black Hawk War and the removal of the Sauk and Meskwaki peoples from Illinois and eastern Iowa.

Both *Indian Women and French Men* and *A Gathering of Rivers* revise long-held assumptions about Indian women in the Great Lakes region. More importantly, both authors devote much-needed attention to the histories of midwestern tribes after the War of 1812. Their efforts suggest that American settlers were primarily responsible for Indian removal. Indian tribes across the Midwest adapted and accommodated, but they were often forcibly removed from their lands because they controlled important sectors of the economy. These books suggest that historians and teachers alike should no longer ignore Indian women or the idea that Native Americans stubbornly resist change.

Lucy Eldersveld Murphy won the Benjamin F. Shambaugh Award for *A Gathering of Rivers: Indians, Métis, and Mining in the Western Great Lakes, 1737–1832*. With this award, the State Historical Society of Iowa recognizes the most significant book(s) on Iowa history published each year.—Ed.


Environmental historians often trace the origins of American environmental consciousness to the writings of George Perkins Marsh in the mid- to late nineteenth century. Only then, many believe, did proper land stewardship and the consequences of reckless tillage creep into public debate about the American agricultural empire. Steven Stoll
seeks to rewrite this chronology. He argues that as early as the 1820s a group of farmers and agricultural writers began to advocate agricultural “improvement.” Their advocacy was premised on what they saw as the exhaustion of agricultural resources on the eastern seaboard due to imprudent farming techniques, a process that, in part, necessitated the expansion of agricultural settlement into the fertile fields of Iowa and the Midwest and West in general.

The improvers of the 1820s were concerned about the exhaustion of eastern soil and the resulting depopulation of eastern counties. In 1819 the great agrarian John Taylor proclaimed, “Let us boldly face the fact. Our country is nearly ruined.” The improvers sought to remedy the depletion of the land through the “creation of stable agro-environments” in which farmers avoided dangerous tillage techniques and used manure from their own livestock to regenerate their soil. The improvers’ efforts, Stoll constantly reminds readers, took place before the age of machinery and before the heavy hand of technology transformed farming.

The early nineteenth-century advocates of “improvement” and simple farming, however, did not carry the day, as the application of technology became the core catalyst of nineteenth-century agricultural change. “As the distant ancestor of organic farming, the old husbandry of the 1820s might be upheld as evidence that history took a wrong turn in the 1850s, that things could have been otherwise than the technological morass that furnishes food for the developed countries of the twenty-first century” (209). Such fears of creeping technological control over farming were classically chronicled in Leo Marx’s Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Idea in America (1964), which richly recounted decades of literary and artistic hand wringing over the ultimate technological and industrial domination of farming. Stoll is less strident than some agrarians, however. He concedes that even the advocates of technology believed, in their own way, that an agriculture that embraced technology could provide a stable social environment and the necessary protections for nature. He notes that advocates of agricultural technology “shared important similarities and a common creed of progress with nineteenth-century agrarian reformers” (209).

Stoll’s concession that early nineteenth-century advocates of agricultural “improvement” were fellow travelers in the ideology of progress weakens the argument that they were unique, or that they were dissenters from the sweeping trends or themes of history. Stoll notes that “improvement rests firmly on the continuum of progress that historians thread through the Renaissance to the Industrial Revolution. It was fully the heir of the marriage of science and capitalism that took
place between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries in Europe and North America" (210). Improvement, then, may have represented a competing school of progressive thought contending with the advocates of technology, but it was not a flight from modernism. Stoll understands that “improvement stood at the beginning of the very technological surge that eventually brought farmers to adopt DDT and tomatoes enhanced with flounder genes” (211). Stoll makes a distinction, however, between his improvers, who worked within the limits and rhythms of nature, and the advocates of technology, who worked to overcome it. Stoll’s improvers were the fathers of conservation advocates, who simply had a different notion of progress. “Conservation did not challenge basic assumptions of material progress; it recast progress as timber left standing, as waters running clear, as habitat undiminished” (213). Stoll’s improvers ultimately inhabit the terrain of American progress that historians have been researching for generations, but also prove to be precursors of later critics of the marriage of agriculture and technology and all its consequences for nature.


Reviewer Loren N. Horton is the retired senior historian for the State Historical Society of Iowa. His research emphases are the social history of the nineteenth century, and Iowa aspects of Mormon history.

This fine biography is especially good in two regards. The biographical information about Lewis Barney and his family is thorough and relatively objective. Even better is the material that establishes a context for his life. So many “life and times” books are about famous people for whom an abundance of source material is available. In this case there is more original material than common for an ordinary person, and the author has been imaginative and energetic in seeking out additional primary information.

Two other factors make this book unusually interesting. Following the trail of the Barney family from Massachusetts to New York to Ohio to Illinois to Iowa is a case study of frontier migration. The motivations for movement and the physical, social, and religious milieu to which the family had to react reflect the generalizations made by generations of frontier historians. But the Barney family is real.

The other feature of special note is the story of the conversion of family members to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The family migrated to Henry County, Iowa, in 1839, moved to Nauvoo in