The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest
only by increasing production in the United States, but also by promoting agrarian progress in less developed countries. This section, striving for timeliness, becomes time-bound. Writing in 1974, with prices for grain at exceptionally high levels, Shover assumes that the traditional American “farm problem” of chronic overproduction has dissipated, and that the dilemma thereafter will be to keep pace with demand. However, plunging prices in 1976 showed that the farm problem was as devilish as ever and had been eclipsed only temporarily.

Farmers—the last minority—will find their views given little treatment in this book. Shover feels nostalgia for the rural past, but adopts a consumer’s view of the agricultural present. He views sales of grain to the Soviet Union as a betrayal of national interest. Thus *First Majority—Last Minority* represents an unusual type of minority history that stands outside the group treated, refusing to plead its cause. The book has special value because of this, but risks becoming uprooted from its own protagonists.

—Thomas D. Isern
Sam Houston State University


“The Cattle you raise are your own; but those which are Wild are still ours,” insisted an Oneida chief in defense of the ways of his people. The quotation from Francis Jennings’ book is one example of the wealth of material used to define and describe Indian culture during the “invasion of America” by European colonizers. Jennings, professor of history at Cedar Crest College in Pennsylvania and past president of the American Society of Ethnohistory, is determined in this remarkably informative volume to present the culture of the Atlantic coast Indians as co-equal to that of the European invaders. The Indian in his account is no mere pawn or foil; he is one of the central characters in a great human drama (and a tragic one as Jennings relates in Part II where he recounts white-Indian relations in colonial New England). The comment of the Oneida chief symbolizes Jennings’ strategy; the Indians had their methods of managing stock just as did the Europeans. Except for the dog, Indian livestock had never been domesticated; the English, on the other hand, kept herds of domesticated animals as part of their livestock management. The Indians cleared the woods for grazing pasture as a communal effort; the English as a private one. But both were engaged in animal management; as a matter of fact, colonists during their early contacts with the Indians preferred to acquire pasture land already cleared by the Indians in order to avoid the back-breaking labor of clearing pastureland.

In some ways Jennings’ history is two books. In the first part he summarizes what is known about the Atlantic Coast Indian during the colonial
period. It is a topical analysis, which includes such subjects as agriculture, hunting, and trading (not to mention the just discussed animal management). In Part II Jennings uses colonial New England as a case study to show the tumultuous, sometimes terribly violent, relationship between Indians and colonists. His assessment of Puritan motives differs significantly from those of Alden T. Vaughan and Douglas Edward Leach, both of whom he feels viewed white-Indian relations from the Puritan perspective and equated Indian culture with savagery.

Of the two parts the first is by far the most stimulating. Jennings provides information that is both thought-provoking and exciting. His observations do much to shatter the old, popular stereotype of Eastern woodland Indians as nomadic hunters. Trading, for instance, was for them a universal experience. "Only one tribe in all of North America has ever been discovered that did not possess objects obtained through trade with other tribes; the exception was the Polar Eskimos, who lived so isolated an existence that they believed themselves to be the only people on earth." He convincingly demonstrates the national and international ramifications of the quest for fur. It was the basis for both commerce and industry; the careful preparation of skins by Indian women justifies the latter term. And agriculture was important too. The Narragansett tribe of Rhode Island cleared twice as much ground as they planted, so they could practice crop rotation. The Hurons of the Great Lakes used surplus corn in their trade with tribes in northern Canada. Early colonists from Europe "uniformly" depended upon Indian surpluses for survival.

Jennings’ book is a well-written, documented study, providing the reader with an ethnohistorian’s viewpoint concerning Indian-white relations in Colonial America. Unfortunately, Jennings’ treatment of the Indians is much more judicious and convincing than his handling of their European adversaries.

——Robert W. Larson
University of Northern Colorado

The Annals of Iowa


Scholars concerned with the biography of Nathanael Greene have had to rely, heretofore, on less than satisfactory or incomplete efforts. In his two-volume biography, published in 1822, William Johnson was uncritical and careless with the facts. George Washington Greene, the general’s grandson, was more accurate and objective in his three-volume biography which appeared in 1876, but this did not fulfill his dream of publishing an extensive