

social, cultural, and economic conditions giving rise to the earliest trickle migrations after 1898, the great migrations of the early 1950s, and subsequent waves which continue into the 1980s.

Fitzpatrick's references frequently seem to come from the standard and classical studies, and only occasionally from the newly emerging literature now being produced by mainland scholars, many of whom are Puerto Rican. During the last fifteen years we have witnessed a steady growth of new social science research literature in the form of doctoral dissertations, conference presentations, and journal articles. For the most part, this has come from second generation Puerto Ricans educated primarily in the U.S., and greatly influenced by the urban activist experience of the 1960s and early 70s. Sometimes descriptive, at other times experimental, this new work has focused on refined research problems in language, education, labor, community histories, religion, psychology, popular culture and literature. While Fitzpatrick's work may seem to represent a marked contrast with the emergence of these highly discrete narrower research studies, there is certainly a continuing need for both. The comprehensive inclusiveness of his latest work harkens back to a time when scholars of the Puerto Rican experience were interested in studying and reporting on the broadest parameters of the migrant community.

Throughout, Fitzpatrick proposes several interesting scenarios for the new Latino immigrants as they begin to find themselves sharing the same socio-economic and political realities with Puerto Ricans, Afro-Americans, Native Americans and others. While there may be disagreement with some of his predictions, speculations, and observations about the future of the Puerto Rican community, the new Latinos, the coalitions with the black community and indeed the ever-changing face of New York City and the nation, readers of this new edition will, nonetheless, find themselves informed and challenged by the latest Fitzpatrick offering.

—Jesse M. Vazquez
Queens College, City University of New York

Richard F. Fleck. *Henry Thoreau and John Muir Among the Indians*. (New Haven: Archon Books, 1985) 103 pp., \$17.50.

The idea behind this book, a comparative study of Henry David Thoreau's and John Muir's attitudes toward American Indians, is excellent. Muir, born in 1838, was twenty one years younger than Thoreau. He first read *Walden* and *A Week* at the University of Wisconsin in 1862, the year of Thoreau's death. His early writings, although not published until much later, contained generally pro-Indian sentiments similar to Thoreau's, while he also had a Thoreau-like

squeamishness about Indians being dirty, lazy, superstitious, and demoralized by contact with whites. "Perhaps if I knew them better, I should like them better," he wrote in *My First Summer in the Sierra*. "The worst thing about them is their uncleanness."

Muir did come to know Indians better on his trips to Alaska, as Thoreau did on his trips to Maine. In the Alaska panhandle he was impressed by the uncanny accuracy of dance-imitations of animals. He made drawings of totem poles and wrote that "the childish audacity displayed in the design, combined with manly strength in their execution, was truly wonderful." Listening to Indians at a campfire ask a missionary whether wolves have souls, Muir liked the Indians for believing that they did. He understood the ecological balance between deer and wolves that the Indians understood, and also appreciated death rites, shamanism, and mythology. As the son of a harsh Calvinist, Muir liked Thlinkit gentleness with children. "Toward the end of his third excursion (July 1890)," says Fleck, "Muir began to speak a little Chinook," realizing the relationships between language, environment, and wisdom.

On trips to the Arctic, Muir marveled at Eskimo good humor, and skills in hunting and house-building. His trips to Alaska were longer than Thoreau's to Maine, and he accordingly learned more. He also had more to say about U.S. Government policy. He favored supplying Alaska natives with common rifles rather than repeating rifles, "partly on account of the difficulty of obtaining supplies of cartridges, and partly because repeating rifles tempt them to destroy large amounts of game which they do not need." He recommended that Eskimos domesticate reindeer herds. And he strongly opposed the sale of alcohol.

The weaknesses of this book are numerous typos and several errors of fact, as in calling John Heckewelder a "Quaker Indian historian" rather than a Moravian missionary. Fleck uses the misleading title "Indian Notebooks" for the extract books Thoreau himself called his "Indian Books." Fleck also seems unaware that "Jamake Highwater" is not an Indian. A more serious weakness is a prejudgment that there is "a clear relationship between [Muir's] environmental philosophy and that of primal cultures." Trusting the imposter who wrote *The Primal Mind*, Fleck assumes that Indians were born environmentalists. "The Indians of California and Alaska," he writes, "not only confirmed Muir's belief in the need for a harmonious relationship with nature but also inspired him to an even greater awareness of the intricacies of this relationship" (28). But if Muir found Indians so wise, why did he fear their having repeating rifles? The evidence Fleck assembles shows that Muir developed an admiration for Indians and had affinities with them, but it does not show that they really "inspired him." Still, these defects aside, the book is instructive and original.

—Robert F. Sayre
University of Iowa