and ethnologist's tools and to return to the sources and find the Indian as he defined himself and his world." In an effort to continue this fundamental discussion, Martin invited eighteen scholars (including six Native Americans) to submit the essays that now comprise the book. The end product is a thoughtful but somewhat repetitious anthology that leaves us no nearer a resolution of this insoluble dilemma.

The best essays in this collection are also the most straightforward and least contentious. Standing Rock Sioux Vine Deloria, Jr., points out that the problem is not only ethnocentrism, but also a tendency to overgeneralize and create myths on both sides of the argument. The vocal Indian community is often as wrong in invoking historical examples as is the predominantly white historical community. On a more personal level, Robin Ridington, Peter Iversen, Peter Nabokov, Scott Momaday, and Henrietta Whiteman describe how their closeness to Native American traditional culture has allowed them to gain a perspective for which no amount of book learning or graduate education can properly compensate. But even for them, the elusive concept of "Indian world view" is admittedly something not fully comprehensible.

More argumentative are the articles by Richard Drinnon, Christopher Vecsey, and Haunani-Kay Trask. Drinnon lambasts historians and anthropologists alike for their arrogance and unwillingness to consider the innermost meaning of native cultures, but we are left only with his simplistic solution that "We shall have to stop our negations, become children of nature and lift ourselves to the Sioux truth: 'We are all related.'" Vecsey's discussion of the "double vision" concept reflects some of the same viewpoints, but it offers more concrete examples of the historical use of oral testimony and mythical tales. Trask, a native Hawaiian, finds similar value in the use of linguistic studies and the aria, or ancient stories.

None of the essayists in this book argue against a closer association of scholars and Native Americans to gain an "insider's" vantage point, but several warn about going too far by neglecting traditional white sources of information. The most strident expression of opposition to Calvin Martin's pronouncement is that of Wilcomb Washburn who provides specific examples of how the desire to achieve the "Indian point-of-view" has often been reduced to praise for anything that is pro-Indian and anti-white.

Precisely because of the variety of opinions raised in this collection, it deserves use in certain college classroom settings. It fits well into any undergraduate lecture course or graduate seminar on American Indians and could also be profitably utilized in an historical research class, but the students probably need more background in American Indian history and cultures to fully comprehend all its contentions. Because of a lack of this type of background among lower-level undergraduate students, it has limited value for survey courses in history or anthropology. Although the debate is not resolved by this collection of articles, it should generate more discussion inside and outside the classroom. That in itself was a worthy goal for Calvin Martin and his contributors.

University of Nebraska at Omaha

Michael L. Tate


Recent bicentennial celebrations and studies have often focused their attention upon George Washington. His services as commander of the Continental Army, as chair of the Constitutional Convention, and as first President have produce a rich flow of television programs, magazine articles, and celebratory activities that shape public perceptions of both the man and the monument. Teachers interested in utilizing current student interests
as part of course development may find that Washington now offers a particularly good route to understanding both the early republic and the rise of conscious nationalism.

Longmore's book is a useful study that teachers and undergraduates will find pulls together many of the strands of scholarship that currently contribute to our understanding of Washington. The author's focus is upon his subject's career in Virginia, as well as upon the perceptions of Washington that formed during the early months of his command of the Continental Army. The author thus operates both to describe Washington's own changing self-perception and to account for subsequent perceptions others held of him.

To deal with the first of these topics, Longmore strives to link two major themes of contemporary scholarship. One is the recent emphasis upon economic change in the Chesapeake region. Here Washington emerges as representative of the tidewater planters whose carefully constructed mixture of political and economic interests in land speculation and tobacco culture broke up rapidly in the 1760s. Faced with a combination of challenges from Britain, Washington is portrayed as a leader who ultimately realized that economic and political independence went hand in hand.

Longmore's second strand is a sustained attempt to place Washington within the context of Whig political ideology. Contrary to usual perceptions of Washington, the author seeks repeatedly to demonstrate that his subject was intimately acquainted with nearly all of the significant books and pamphlets of the revolutionary era. Everything from studies of Washington's library holdings to reports of his conversations are called forth to place him within the Whig and classical republican political ideologies that so interest modern historians.

Longmore goes to some lengths to reject most of the mythic elements that nineteenth-century writers often inserted into Washington's early career. Ambition, energy, and aristocratic pretension all receive attention, although central emphasis remains with the concepts of gentlemanly honor that Washington accepted and sought to exemplify in his public behavior.

Each of these elements serve to place in context the most interesting part of the study, Longmore's analysis of the rise of a mythic Washington in the years between 1775 and 1778. By concentrating upon public perceptions, the author seeks to illustrate the ways in which contemporaries saw and interpreted the commanding general. The central theme is that Washington replaced George III as the focus of popular loyalty, in large measure by substituting his own patriotic persona for that of the patriot king. Using images that evoked the role of Cato in ancient Rome, Washington became the central embodiment of republican virtue in his time.

Longmore's study is not without problems. In seeking to join discussions of political thought to a chronological narrative, the author unnecessarily repeats himself at several places. And by leaving most of his arguments regarding Washington's literary interests to a lengthy appendix, Longmore's main text often fails to draw the explicit links between ideas and actions that he obviously believes shaped the young Washington. One must still wonder if access to ideas was sufficient to assure the use of those ideas.

Butler University

George W. Geib


Carol Bleser of Clemson University established herself as a fine editor with the original hardcover edition of this volume in 1981. The paperback reissue was due in part to the recent popularity of family and social history, but also as a prelude to her 1988