published book on the Wendat will address some of these concerns.

Sioui’s work is, above all else, a political tract very much in the tradition of Marx and Engel’s *Communist Manifesto*. For an *Amerindian Autohistory* offers an alternate world view and an accompanying mode of analysis grounded not least in the political activities of the author. It is not simply an academic exercise. There is a clear message and purpose in the work. Though Sioui comments in his epilogue that in the Amerindians’ world of plenty no one is required to believe in the ideology of another, it is evident that he thinks Western ideological and social make-up are putting us all on a course of environmental and economic disaster. Euroamericans need to become responsible, to better Americize themselves. (102) Sioui argues that a new rationalism enlightened by a will to survive will put an end to the age of evolutionism. “Humans have already ‘evolved’ far too much”! (101) Only when the Amerindian circula, non-evolutionist, world vision gains wide spread credence will humanity, in fact all living things, have hope for a meaningful salvation.

Is this reviewer convinced? One manifesto is not enough to shift a world view that has been entrenched by the academic training process. But I am curious to see a more detailed elaboration of Amerindian autohistory, and that is exactly what a manifesto such as Sioui’s should accomplish.

Nicole J.M. St-Onge
Université d’Ottawa


As the works of Marcel Trudel and Robin Winks in the 1960s made clear, people living in what became Canada may have lacked the economic opportunities to use slaves in large numbers, but, like most of the rest of the Western World, they did not lack the predisposition to see indigenous peoples and blacks as potential bondsmen. The fascinating tensions between this predisposition (allied with an economic imperative to enslave) and the central fact that only Western societies have ever formally abolished and actively suppressed slavery as an institution has spawned a number of memorable books in intellectual, cultural and economic history. The resolution of these tensions was overwhelmingly a nineteenth century phenomenon, played out around the Atlantic basins. The present volume examines the process in the Canadian context, or more precisely, the English-speaking Central Canadian context.

The core of the book is a well-researched narrative of the ending of slavery, and the subsequent and largely unavailing efforts to sustain an anti-slavery movement (aimed at the U.S. South) in what became Ontario. Continuous institutional Anti-Slavery was actually confined to the early 1850s in the aftermath of the draconian U.S. Fugitive Slave Law of 1850. There is new material on the concurrent and rather more successful movement to establish black (how many were actually ex-slaves is not yet clear) communities in the south-west of the province. Fund raising for these activities was the main tangible outcome of Canadian abolitionism. A new data-set culled from a wide variety of sources examines the background of Canadian leaders of anti-slavery, and shows that the great majority were foreign born and bred, mainly British. As all this implies there was a profound ambivalence in Upper Canadian society toward slavery. In an echo of the post-1789 years in England, anti-slavery was associated with reform in the aftermath of the 1837 rebellion, and more important, mainstream churches, anxious to preserve their ties with their U.S. counterparts, largely avoided all anti-slavery activity. Wesleyans in particular maintained a fairly strict neutrality. In a chapter that has already appeared in a 1984 *Ontario History* article, English Canadian press reaction to Reconstruction and its immediate aftermath in the U.S., is shown here as an important aspect of this ambivalence. Even newspapers that were sympathetic to the ex-slaves, exhibited overt racism. Stouffer suggests that an “undercurrent of prejudice” muted anti-slavery in the pre-Civil War era as well.

This aspect of the topic will be of most interest to observers of the nineteenth century Canadian scene. As a particular manifestation of a tension felt in many other societies, it
actually has the potential to be of great interest to many others besides. Yet the analysis here does not really do justice to the topic. Racism is taken as a constant, whereas in all western countries it fluctuated in intensity, particularly in the course of the nineteenth century. Abolitionism is dealt with largely in terms of formal organizations and personalities. The author is very aware of the broader context, and indeed in the British case has called on primary sources, mainly in the form of provincial newspapers, to enlarge our knowledge. Yet the great themes and paradoxes that have preoccupied Eric Williams, Eric Foner, James Macpherson, David Davis, Seymour Drescher and others — and have generated such intellectual excitement in the last few decades — are absent in these pages. Indeed, of the three secondary sources that the author relies on most for the British background one, is over twenty years old and another was published in 1926. In the American case, George Frederickson’s 1971 book, *The Black Image in the White Mind*, is put to good use. The author’s subject is clearly nineteenth-century Ontario, not the Western World, but it seems a lost opportunity not to have called on more of the rich body of ideas developed to explain race, abolitionism and the activities of ex-slaves in other circum-Atlantic contexts.

David Eltis
Queen’s University


In a 1948 speech entitled “The Dilemma of the Negro Novelist in the United States,” the African-American author Chester Himes argued that an honest look at the effects of racism on black Americans would reveal a process of scarring that has wreaked considerable psychic havoc. If this plumbing for the truth reveals within the Negro personality homicidal mania, lust for white women, a pathetic sense of inferiority, paradoxical anti-Semitism, arrogance, Uncle Tomism, hate and fear and self-hate, this then is the effect of oppression on the human personality. These are the daily horrors, the daily realities, the daily experiences of an oppressed minority.

Unfortunately, Himes’ insight has become clouded over the last three decades by the polemics of the scholarship on race. Since the publication of Stanley Elkins’ *Slavery* (1959), the debate has become largely polarized over the extent to which African Americans succumbed to or resisted the dehumanizing aspects of racism. On the left, scholars usually have emphasized both the oppressive nature of racism in the United States and the history of resistance on the part of black Americans. But, as Peter Novick has pointed out, this vision presents the same fundamental problem Dwight Macdonald once identified as central to socialist theory — if the capitalist system was as dehumanizing as its critics maintain, then it must have done irreparable psychological damage to its victims. However, if the working-class tradition was one of noble resistance to capitalism, then could the system really have been so brutally oppressive as its critics contend?

The advantage, then, of a book like this is that it largely escapes the parameters which have limited the academic debate on the issue of race. The subjects of Terkel’s oral history are willing to confront the contradictory and even pathological effects of racism on both blacks and whites (as well as, on occasion, Hispanics and Asians). As a fifty-year-old African-American insurance broker tells Terkel:

Being black in America is like being forced to wear ill-fitting shoes. Some people adjust to it. It’s always uncomfortable on your foot, but you’ve got to wear it because it’s the only shoe you’ve got. You don’t necessarily like it. Some people can bear the discomfort more than others. Some can block it from their mind, some can’t. When you see some acting docile and some acting militant, they have one thing in common: the shoe is uncomfortable. It always has been and always will be. (136)

The ramifications of that cultural deformation are evident today in many of the responses of the black community. As Salim Muwakkil, an African-American journalist, says,

I understand that black people needed some serious therapy to get us out of the situation we were in. It was historically unique, the legacy of slavery. The Nation of Islam tries to take a shortcut to cultural development through a totalitarian method, coercing people toward a certain kind of behavior.

Being black in America is like being forced to wear ill-fitting shoes. Some people adjust to it. It’s always uncomfortable on your foot, but you’ve got to wear it because it’s the only shoe you’ve got. You don’t necessarily like it. Some people can bear the discomfort more than others. Some can block it from their mind, some can’t. When you see some acting docile and some acting militant, they have one thing in common: the shoe is uncomfortable. It always has been and always will be. (136)