



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS



Review

Author(s): Olive Patricia Dickason

Review by: Olive Patricia Dickason

Source: *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 95, No. 5 (Dec., 1990), pp. 1654-1655

Published by: [Oxford University Press](#) on behalf of the [American Historical Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2162929>

Accessed: 14-08-2015 19:17 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Oxford University Press and American Historical Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Historical Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

study might wonder if yet another examination of Hoover's FBI activities is justified or necessary. The answer is a resounding yes. Garrow's *FBI and Martin Luther King, Jr.* is a comprehensive but limited study of the 1960s civil rights leader's confrontations with Hoover, and, although Powers's *Secrecy and Power* also includes discussion of the FBI's involvement in civil rights, it is essentially biographical. O'Reilly attempts to produce an in-depth account of the FBI's role—from silent observer to active agitator—in the civil rights movement, and he creates a superbly written study.

Although Powers deals with Hoover's well-known racism at length, O'Reilly demonstrates how unrealistic it was to expect Hoover—who was convinced that the 1954 *Brown* decision would put “the country on a course toward racial crisis”—to direct his agents to protect civil rights workers (p. 41). On the contrary, the FBI's numerous transgressions during this critical period are mind-numbing, and the author makes it clear that, because Hoover was incapable of putting aside his own prejudices, the nation's most esteemed law enforcement agency actually exacerbated the situation.

Hoover's resistance to the civil rights movement, it seems, took two forms. On the one hand, it was passive, claiming, for example, that a federal agency should not interfere with state laws and prohibiting agents from making arrests, thus limiting them to investigative work. On the other hand, Hoover's interference was more direct, as on the occasions when the FBI would not cooperate with the Justice Department's civil rights division. Hoover wanted to derail not only the civil rights movement but its leaders as well. To accomplish this, Hoover eventually approved the use of counter-intelligence tactics in Division Five, within the domestic intelligence division, as well as “all possible investigative techniques” to expose the “communist influence on the Negro” (p. 136). The primary target of the operation, of course, was Martin Luther King, Jr., whose home in Atlanta and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference offices in New York were under the surveillance of fourteen wiretaps, none of them approved by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. In addition to the wiretaps, Division Five also proposed to infiltrate the King camp with black agents, although O'Reilly does not elaborate on whether this was actually done.

Many of the episodes, though tragic, are familiar: the murder of Emmett Till for whistling at a married white woman in Money, Mississippi; the brutal assaults against freedom riders in Anniston, Alabama; the bombing of Birmingham's Sixteenth Street Baptist Church that killed four young girls; the murders of three civil rights workers in Neshoba County, Mississippi; and the shotgun assassination of Viola Liuzzo, who Hoover once claimed was promiscuous and “had indications of needle marks in her arms” (pp. 218–19). Although both allegations against Liuzzo were proved false, this kind of defamation was indicative of Hoover's unsympathetic attitude toward white sympathizers as well as black “agitators.” Although these events and their outcomes are commonly known,

O'Reilly never fails to capture and sustain the reader's interest with a well-paced and smoothly written narrative of the grim reminders of the price of freedom.

In terms of Hoover's posture on civil rights, the author cites the 1963 March on Washington as a watershed that convinced Hoover that the civil rights movement was not ephemeral, that it was more than a haphazardly organized group of communist-inspired radicals, and that it would have to be destroyed before it caused irreversible damage to Hoover's America. When Hoover realized that communists were not deeply involved in the movement, the FBI did not back off but pressed even harder to find evidence of their involvement.

Like Powers, O'Reilly is very much aware of Hoover's lifelong concern for “his” America and the vision of himself as the preserver of traditional American values. The civil rights protestors threatened these values because they “were not part of the real America, ‘the hard-working, tax-paying, law-abiding people of this country’” (p. 258). That O'Reilly frequently reminds the reader of this is a very minor flaw in what is otherwise a provocative and well-conceived contribution to our understanding of the struggle for civil rights.

Perhaps the most disturbing question that comes to mind while reading O'Reilly's account is not how Hoover worked to discredit black leaders by linking them to communism, or how he labored to avoid direct intervention, but how much violence and bloodshed might have been avoided had the director ordered his agents to protect the activists rather than spy on them as suspected subversives. Because Hoover maintained that the FBI was an investigative and not an enforcement agency, he impeded the movement and contributed to political and public misconceptions about civil rights.

This study (the title is taken from the file Hoover used to gather information about suspected black troublemakers) is extensively researched as evidenced by O'Reilly's use of the Freedom of Information Act to procure documents and his interviews with many FBI agents and participants in the civil rights movement. O'Reilly succeeds in producing a vivid and insightful look at how this nation's premier law enforcement agency stood as a barrier against black Americans' struggle for equality and participation in the democratic process.

JOHN C. MCWILLIAMS
*Pennsylvania State University,
 University Park*

CANADA

J. R. MILLER. *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens: A History of Indian-White Relations in Canada*. Buffalo: University of Toronto Press. 1989. Pp. xi, 329. \$35.00.

Canadian historical writing in regard to Amerindians had its moment of truth with the publication in 1971 of

the first of James Walker's articles pointing out the deplorable treatment of New World peoples. Walker's papers accelerated a trend that emerged after the Second World War to reassess accepted historical assumptions. It is from selected items in this body of material that J. H. Miller's book is drawn.

With earnest dedication to the Amerindians' cause, Miller has synthesized these secondary works to survey Amerindian-white relations in Canada from the days of Jacques Cartier (following a brief mention of the Norse) to the present. As he reports it (p. 40), harmony and cooperation prevailed at the beginning as the French were only interested in "fish, fur, exploration, and evangelization" (apparently he has not read the royal commissions of Cartier and Jean-François de La Roëque, Sieur de Roberval, among others), a happy situation that disintegrated through time and various political tides until the Amerindians became a marginalized people, a condition from which they are only now emerging.

Instead of judiciously examining the basic issues involved in the first contacts between Europeans and Amerindians, Miller has allowed his desire to do justice to the Amerindians to overtake his sense of history, and we are treated to a version of first contacts as they might have been. His wonder at the cooperation that existed (p. 20) should be tempered by the fact that cooperation was by no means universal, as even a cursory look at the record quickly reveals.

He also falls in line with some recent attempts at "rectifying" the record that would be better forgotten. One of these is to try to remove the sting from the appellation "sauvage" by restricting its meaning to a neutral ground. If he had consulted sixteenth- and seventeenth-century sources, he would have found that "sauvage" had a complex of meanings; one of the kinder was "living according to nature," which was equated with existence without law and order, "like beasts in the woods." Once a "sauvage" was Christianized, he was "humanized" and thus no longer fully a savage. Miller's statement that Amerindians were "perceived positively on the whole" (p. 94) is simply not supported by the evidence.

An obvious consequence of these attitudes was the assumption on the part of European monarchs that they had the right to claim vast tracts of New World lands regardless of whether or not there were Amerindians already living there. When Miller states that the French "did not assert title to land and political sovereignty over the indigenous people with whom they came in contact" (p. 257), he is ignoring not only these royal charters but also the fact that French settlements were of necessity in Amerindian territories. He does, however, admit that this expansion was done by means of legal fictions to which Amerindians were not privy.

The British, when they took over from the French, lost no time in issuing the Proclamation of 1763, which assumed underlying British sovereignty over Amerindian territory, a direct consequence of those early notions about the nature of Amerindian occupancy.

Canada's first aboriginal rights case, *St. Catherine's Milling v. The Queen*, fought between 1885 and 1889, clearly restated these ideas. The court went along with them and ruled that Amerindians had no proprietary title to the soil. A lone dissenting opinion held that Amerindians had "a personal and usufructuary right, dependent upon the goodwill of the Sovereign." Far from breaking new ground, as Miller implies, this was a reaffirmation of a principle that had already been acknowledged in earlier treaties, such as those of Portsmouth in 1713 and Boston in 1725. It is an early version of aboriginal right, a concept that in Canada remains to be fully defined either by the Constitution or the courts.

Historian John Huxtable Elliott once observed that much historical writing today is bogged down in philosophical speculation and historical assertion rather than rigorous historical enquiry. It is to be regretted that Miller has followed this trend, because his purpose is praiseworthy. The Amerindian side of Canada's history does need to be told but with the same high standards for investigative rigor that is demanded of the discipline in general.

OLIVE PATRICIA DICKASON
University of Alberta

PETER DOUGLAS ELIAS. *The Dakota of the Canadian Northwest: Lessons for Survival*. (Manitoba Studies in Native History, number 5.) Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press. 1988. Pp. xvii, 262. \$34.95.

The historical literature of American Indians contains numerous volumes on warfare and policies. Some studies focus on cultural change, but rarely do they deal with the many ways in which Indian people adapted to their rapidly changing world. Peter Douglas Elias has provided an excellent work that details how the Dakotas survived in the Canadian Northwest after facing the onslaught of expansion, war, and Indian policy in the United States. The Sioux in Minnesota lost the war in 1862, and, by year's end, some of them began to move into Canada. First, Little Crow's band migrated, and then others followed, seeking sanctuary on British soil. By 1865 the Dakota bands had become distributed in a pattern that remains largely unaltered to this day. The Dakotas settled on land once claimed by the Cree, Métis, Assiniboine, and Ojibway. Part of their existence depended on the successful peace established between themselves and the various tribes in the region.

The Dakota bands moved onto land that they considered most suitable for their survival. The M'dewakonton occupied territory close to the forests, while the Sissetonwon moved onto the prairies. The Wahpeton chose land in between that contained both forest and grassland. Those choices represented adaptations to environments similar to the ones the bands had known in Minnesota. Between 1862 and 1870 the Dakotas used their prowess to survive in Manitoba. The Indians