

was "motivated by an attempt to overturn sexist research methods" and quotes my brief summary of alternative methods of inquiry that might better serve feminists attempting to understand violence. (89) But she passes over my discussion of the political economy of research funding, that is, my material explanation of what Judith Stacey and Barrie Thorne call "the missing feminist revolution in sociology." ("The missing feminist revolution in sociology," *Social Problems* 32 (1985), 301-316.) I claimed that part of what was wrong with mainstream methods of sociological research on battering was that the people with the funding were committed to one sort of research, of which the people committed to *women* were extremely critical. But what troubles me about Reinhartz's omission is not that my (admittedly inelegant) analysis drops by the wayside. The problem is that her empiricist approach, and her effort to provide a constructive digest of feminist research methods, erases the feminist analysis of knowledge (and therefore method) as being fundamentally about power.

Feminist Methods in Social Research is a conciliatory monument to contentious times. The sheer mass of the proof that feminists have persisted in building a lively and creative body of social research is a welcome addition to the literature. Reinhartz treats the reformist (or revolutionary!) agendas of feminists in the social sciences with the respect they deserve. Moreover, her "just do it!" approach to social research is a potent antidote to the epistemological handwringing engendered by the resistance so many of us encounter in our engagements with our disciplines. Reinhartz's pragmatism is not only attractive but probably right. My only wish is that we simultaneously sustain the critique, not just of non-feminist scholarship, but also of the conditions under which we choose our methods, our questions, and our battles.

Lisa D. Brush
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Georges Sioui, *For an Amerindian Autohistory, An Essay on the Foundations of a Social Ethic*, trans. by Sheila Fischman (Montreal-Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press 1992).

The time has finally come, after five hundred years of Amerindian culture on the defensive, for 'the Americanization of the World.' This is one of the concepts underlying the daring redefinition of history in Georges Sioui's *For an Amerindian Autohistory*. The understated aim of the essay is to present guidelines for the study of Native History from an Amerindian point of view.

What Sioui has done is to sketch out the theoretical basis for an elaboration of an alternative paradigm, used here in the dual sense ascribed to it by Kuhn. Sioui presents a "global paradigm" or alternative vision of the world with all the beliefs, values ... and techniques common to people functioning within it and an 'orientation paradigm' that defines for social scientists and historians a new set of problems to examine, questions to ask, and solutions to posit." (See Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*) Sioui argues that this alternate world view does not imply any inherent superiority in an Amerindian view. Rather, it is the result of the isolation of the Americas and thus developed according to ideological concepts fundamentally disconnected with those that animated and motivated the non-Americans. (11)

The first half of *For an Amerindian Autohistory* defines Amerindian Autohistory as both a vision of the world and a methodological orientation. Sioui argues that Western Civilization has been trapped in a myth of evolution and enthralled by a belief in the superiority of European culture and morality, which has served as the ideological foundation for the acquisition of other peoples' territories and resources. The myth's 'scientific' name is the theory of social evolution, which Sioui demonstrates as effectively leading to attitudes reminiscent of Kipling's "white

man's burden." Sioui calls this the evolution myth. This theory, or more appropriately this paradigm, has produced Western linear history with its own myth of the disappearance of the "Native."

Sioui's alternative paradigm is the Native vision of the sacred circle of life. He argues that it offers a timely option to a modern society undergoing a crisis of values. (xxii) Sioui's view presumes the continuing existence of an idea of the world common to all Native American cultures. Such a conception accounts for the fundamental unity of Amerindian philosophy. It also explains the absence, not of strife, but of religious and economic wars in pre-contact America. The reality of the sacred circle of life, wherein all beings, material and immaterial, are equal and interdependent, permeates the entire Amerindian vision of life and the universe:

This order is called the Great Mystery. To the traditional Amerindian, life finds its meaning in the implicit and admiring recognition of the existence, role, and power of all the forms of life that compose the circle. (9)

Simply put, the Amerindian genius acknowledges the physical and spiritual interdependence of all beings and tries to establish intellectual and emotional contact between them, so as to guarantee abundance, equality, and, therefore, peace. In the evolutionist conception of the world beings are unequal, often negated, jostled, and made obsolete by others who seem adapted to evolution. (xxi)

Based on the presumptive cultural differences described above, Sioui advocates a new historical method called Amerindian Autohistory (the study of correspondence between Amerindian and non-Amerindian sources) arguing that the Native American cultural (or spiritual) being is as far from disappearing today as at the time of contact. Contrary to conventional historical discourse, Sioui argues that ever since the 'discovery' of America, world society has been engaged in a process of ideological unification in which the essence of original American Thought has been communicated to the other continents. This process may be called simply "the Americanization of the world." We are therefore facing a phenomenon of assimilation occurring at a rhythm dictated by history, that is the reverse of the assimilation process dis-

cussed in European history. In essence, the technique of Amerindian autohistory is based on a 'positivist' premise that Amerindian philosophy (circle of life) has a distinctive, dynamic dimension which represents a potential source of insight into the human conditions for society writ large. This technique also has the 'activist' assumption that historical science cannot ignore, under any circumstances, the ideas and feelings of the people who make up Amerindian society today.

In the history we are making, Native people, instead of being the stepping-stones for "true civilization" in America, become the guides who will take their white visitors towards Amerindian civilization, a truer and more humane one. Slowly but uninterruptedly, this culture has transformed and continues to transform the views and attitudes of all other civilizations.

In the second half of his essay Sioui takes the elaborated paradigm and uses the associated methodology to reexamine a much discussed historical event, the destruction of Huronia. Sioui sees the Huronian myth as the cornerstone of traditional Amerindian historiography. He argues that his two-fold aim is an historical rehabilitation of the Iroquois and a demonstration of their profound adherence to the Amerindian (circle of life) value system. Despite the actions of the Five Nations towards the Europeans, particularly the French, which was a fight to the finish between two civilizations, the Iroquois continued to live according to essential Amerindian values.

The second half of the work is the weaker half, not so much because the framework of analysis is not convincing, but because the use of autohistory as a *methodology* is unclear. Sioui's analysis is based on European sources whose worth is subjectively evaluated by him. Though he does speak of the Wendat and other traditions, sources are not cited. Are the traditions mentioned his recollections of Elders' discourses? his family? the village? or his internal consensus? Are there variations in the accounts? Contradictions? Perhaps it is because of this writer's interest in oral (linear?) history, but I am sceptical and want to know the *mechanics* of Sioui's data gathering. These questions do not invalidate Sioui's line of reasoning and general conclusions. They do, however, indicate that methodological 'fine tuning' is needed. Perhaps his soon-to-be-

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 Americanize 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 circular, 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

Allen P. Stouffer, *The Light of Nature and the Law of God: Anti-Slavery in Ontario, 1833-1877* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press 1992).

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