

**John Fahey. *The Kalispel Indians*. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1986) xiii, 234 pp., \$18.95**

Over time the Kalispel Indians of northeastern Washington resisted all federal attempts to remove them from their original homelands. Their tenacious attachment to the land eventually enabled them to gain title to a small reservation on the Pend Oreille River. Never fully satisfied with the size of their reservation (4,269.27 acres) and determined to ensure their cultural survival, the Kalispels initiated a land claims case in 1950. Thirteen long and politically difficult years later the tribe settled for three million dollars. Thereafter, they used the settlement to secure their economic future.

John Fahey takes this important period in Kalispel history and skillfully weaves it into a narrative set in the larger context of Kalispel-white relations. To support his text, Fahey relies heavily on non-Indian documents compiled to assist the tribe's legal claims to the land. In his bibliography Fahey explains why he uses few oral histories; it is because "modern Kalispels recall little of their past and the elders who once might have offered oral continuity died a generation ago." Readers ought to wonder why Kalispels remember so little of their past. Could it be because it is a past defined by traditional scholarship rather than by the Kalispels themselves?

*The Kalispel Indians* is an important source of information about the relationships between white institutions and the Kalispel tribe, but it should not be misconstrued as a tribal history. One reason why the history is limited in this way is Fahey's choice of methodology; that is, his almost sole reliance on non-Indian documents. Moreover, because a narrative style tends to let documents "speak" for themselves, the careful analysis that could make these non-Indian documents more useful is absent.

The text's weakness is exemplified by Fahey's discussion of how the roles of Kalispel women changed after contact with whites. Fahey quotes a Jesuit missionary who, when writing about Kalispel women, surmised that "all the work falls upon the woman," and that a typical wife "depends on her husband for a living, and although not so much a slave as among buffalo hunters, still she is submissive and affectionate." In his discussion of women's roles Fahey also employs ethnohistorical documents. This evidence is based, in part, on oral testimony and suggests that Kalispel women were also "known to sit in tribal assemblies and speak their minds." Interestingly, these records counter the stereotypical image of Indian woman as drudge conjured up by the missionary's recollections. So while Fahey's inclusion of women in the text deserves applause, the absence of critical analysis means that the reader is left to choose between contradictory images.

Fahey's more than occasional use of ethnocentric language, likewise, reinforces stereotypical images of Indians. Commenting on the arrival of

whites in Kalispel country, Fahey writes that “in more than a generation, the traditional base of Indian life vanished.” The very fact that Fahey takes the Kalispels’ story well into the twentieth century is evidence enough to suggest that the Kalispel culture has not vanished, but like all cultures it has changed with time. Fahey’s text contains a wealth of information and should not be overlooked by persons interested in the Kalispel tribe. But because of its style and language, *The Kalispel Indians* should be read with care.

—Gretchen Harvey  
Arizona State University

**Adam Fairclough. *To Redeem the Soul of America: The Southern Christian Leadership Conference and Martin Luther King, Jr.* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987) x, 509 pp., \$35.00; \$17.95 paper.**

Following David J. Garrow’s 1986 Pulitzer Prize-winning biography, *Bearing the Cross*, Adam Fairclough makes extensive use of information gleaned from FBI wiretaps as well as other sources in an effort to peruse the soul of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) and its president, Martin Luther King, Jr. Fairclough’s subtitle is no accident, for he focuses at least as much on the SCLC as he does on King. Significantly, this emphasis causes him to add a chapter about the SCLC after King’s death, a postscript not available in other books about King.

Concentrating almost exclusively on the internal dynamics and structure of SCLC, Fairclough contrasts the flexibility and spontaneity of the SCLC to the bureaucratic rigidity of the NAACP. But he also presents the personal and political wrangles within SCLC that hampered its effectiveness. In describing the perplexing organizational snarl that was the SCLC, Fairclough documents the misappropriation of both time and money by key staff members as well as their seemingly constant in-fighting, their frequent clashes of ego, and their often hectic and impromptu decision-making.

Countering Garrow’s contention in *Protest at Selma*, Fairclough argues that the Birmingham crusade proved as effective as the Selma campaign; he also offers a valuable qualification to Garrow’s claim that the SCLC intentionally provoked white violence. Fairclough suggests that King evinced a Hamlet-like indecisiveness not only at Selma but also at Birmingham, where, according to Fairclough, James Bevel—not King—first authorized the daring strategy of marching children down the streets and into Birmingham jail.