

and a ravaged landscape. The authors offer some comparisons between the anthracite region's industrial decline and those occurring internationally, with particular reference to coal mining in Great Britain. This is an attempt, albeit brief, to suggest other governmental and institutional actions that might have offset economic crises or ameliorate their worst effects. Simultaneously, *The Face of Decline* is a familiar story and a distinctive one; in the 500-square mile area rich with unique coal we find a region that correlates to and reflects the economic health of the state and the mid-Atlantic, and holds lessons for a national story of economic exigencies and reindustrialization trials and errors during the second half of the twentieth century. Residents' (and former residents') recollections and, at times, contested narratives, capture generations of reactions and strategies to cope with long-term economic transformations.

RACHEL A. BATCH  
Widener University

Susan Kalter (editor). *Benjamin Franklin, Pennsylvania, and the First Nations: The Treaties of 1736-1762*. (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2006. Pp. xiv, 453. Glossary, index. \$45.00).

The word *treaty* may call to mind a scribed, signed, and sealed document recording a legal agreement between several European nations. To eighteenth-century Native North Americans, however, "treaty" also referred to the actual diplomatic conference during which they hashed out interethnic agreements. These conferences were elaborate affairs, attended by hundreds of Indian men, women, and children and equally-large numbers of white officials, translators, scribes, and onlookers. They commonly featured lavish feasting, dancing, gift exchanges, and richly-metaphorical speeches by both Indian and European speakers, who endeavored through their words to create a ceremonial atmosphere conducive to peace. Indian treaties were, in short, dramatic spectacles, jointly choreographed by their Indian and European participants. Benjamin Franklin viewed them as a form of Native American literature, akin to a stage play, and believed there might be a literary market for transcripts of treaty conferences. Not one to avoid commercial experiments, Franklin, between 1736 and 1762, published the minutes of fourteen treaties between the government of Pennsylvania (joined periodically

///

by other colonies' representatives) and neighboring Indian nations, particularly the Delawares and the Six Nations of Iroquois.

However commercially successful they may once have been, the Franklin treaties have only rarely been in print since 1762. Both Susan Kalter and the University of Illinois Press deserve high praise for bringing these documents back into print, as they are extraordinarily-useful sources for colonial historians and students of Native North America. For the latter group, the Franklin treaties are mines of evidence on the dynamics of Woodland Indian diplomacy. The conference minutes describe, for example, the wampum belts that Native American speakers exchanged with officials to certify the truthfulness of their words and serve as records of their speeches. They identify the metaphors of condolence – the wiping away of tears and blood, the clearing of a listener's eyes and ears, and the covering of graves – that Iroquois and other northeastern Indian diplomats (and their white counterparts) used to restore harmony between disaffected or hostile peoples. They remind us that Indian treaty conferences tended to be very long and deliberate affairs, with frequent pauses to allow chiefs to discuss Europeans' speeches and reach consensus on a reply. Finally, they let readers hear Indian voices, most notably those of the Onondaga speaker Canasatego and the Delaware "king" Teedyuscung. Though their words are filtered through white translators, these speakers furnish us with otherwise-inaccessible Native American views of the history of Indian-white relations – trade, land deals, military alliances, and war.

For colonial historians, these treaty minutes are essential complements to works by Francis Jennings, James Merrell, and Jane Merritt on Indian-white relations in eighteenth-century Pennsylvania. The early treaties (1736–45) illuminate the development of the British colonies' "covenant chain" alliance with the Iroquois, and their efforts to use that alliance to exploit other Indian nations. While the Iroquois viewed the covenant chain as a simple commercial and military partnership with the English, colonial officials perceived it as a feudal relationship, in which the Six Nations' loyalty to the British Crown and supposed "conquest" of their Indian neighbors gave British colonists the right to bully those Indian "dependents" and take their lands. During the early conferences, Pennsylvania authorities had the Iroquois strong-arm the Delawares into leaving the lands they had lost in the fraudulent "Walking Purchase;" Virginia commissioners purchased from the Iroquois the Indian claim to the lands west of the Appalachian Mountains; and Massachusetts officials tried to persuade Iroquois warriors to attack that colony's Abenaki adversaries.

As Pennsylvanians' economic interests expanded beyond the Susquehanna, however, and as the colony became embroiled in the Seven Years' War, Pennsylvania officials had to negotiate directly with the nations for whom the Iroquois had once acted as intermediaries. This process began as early as 1748, when provincial commissioners first met with emissaries from the distant Miami Indian nation in present-day Indiana. At later treaty conferences (1753–62), colonial officials increasingly sidelined the Iroquois in order to negotiate with Teedyuscung, the principal speaker for the eastern Delawares, and with the chiefs and captains of the Ohio Valley Indian nations. Finally, at the Treaty of Easton (1758), Lieutenant Governor William Denny announced a diplomatic coup: the French-allied Indians of the upper Ohio Valley had agreed to abandon their alliance with France and make peace with the Pennsylvanians. This short-lived entente would help force the French out of Fort Duquesne, and would also dramatically undermine Iroquois influence and the importance of the covenant chain.

Susan Kalter does an able job of editing these documents. Her introduction provides a clear summary of the treaties' historical and cultural context, her glossary identifies key European and Indian speakers at the fourteen conferences, and her notes, among their other uses, help remind us that Franklin was not always the most objective reporter on these conferences. Franklin twice served as a treaty commissioner, and later sought to use the Delawares' account of the Walking Purchase to charge the Penn family with malfeasance. Kalter's annotations tend to be more discursive than explanatory, however, and one might like the editor to have provided more detailed notes – for instance, students of material culture might have benefited from identifications of some of the textiles and other goods given the Indians as gifts.

The only serious shortcoming of Kalter's editorial work is her devotion of six pages to a vindication of the "Iroquois influence" thesis: the idea that the Iroquois League influenced the development of the U.S. Constitution. A scholarly forum in the *William and Mary Quarterly* ("The 'Iroquois Influence' Thesis-Con and Pro," Third Series, 53 [July 1996], 587–636) persuasively demonstrated that this hypothesis was at best wishful thinking, but Kalter, while she admits the paucity of documentary evidence, insists that the concept is valid. She rests her support for it on the following argument: "[T]hose who deny all Native American precedents to U.S. political thought may eventually concede that to privilege text and artifact over formal rhetoric, casual conversation, and the ephemeral is impossible" (p. 26). Kalter will be waiting a very long time for this concession. The day that historians

“privilege” conversation and ephemera over written texts is the day that they cease to be historians, for such texts, with all their shortcomings, are the most reliable guides we have to the past. That is why we are indebted to Franklin for turning the ephemera of Native American treaty conferences into written documents, and why, despite her devotion to a hypothesis she cannot prove, we are indebted to Susan Kalter for reviving those documents and interpreting their contents for modern readers.

DAVID NICHOLS  
*Indiana State University*

Cathy Matson, ed., *The Economy of Early America: Historical Perspectives and New Directions* (University Park, Pennsylvania: Penn State Press, 2006. Pp. viii, 380, notes, index, list of contributors. \$55.00).

This collection of essays provides a state of the art assessment of the past, present, and future state of economic history in early America. The twelve chapters represent a mixture of historiographical essays and detailed treatments of specific problems or questions. Cathy Matson's introduction is a 70-page historiographical tour-de-force, and provides an excellent overview of 20<sup>th</sup> century trends in economic history and highlights along the way the key questions and debates. Her footnotes supply a detailed bibliographic guide to the literature, and her piece skillfully links the essays in the present volume to the larger questions she analyzes. The goal, Matson notes, is to “initiate a dialogue about an expansive conceptualization of what is ‘economic’ in early American life, to incorporate both economic and historical studies, and to blend the voices of deeply divided interpretations of the past” (p. 68). She laments the long-standing disconnect between economists and economic historians, suggesting that each group has much to say to the other but that methodological and theoretical differences have often left them at odds and the field unnecessarily fragmented. But the developing trends which these essays reflect are moving economic history in promising directions. Economists are now blending narrative, context, and cultural understanding into their work; historians have engaged with, incorporated, and been influenced by economic historians' use of detailed data sets and models. While Matson concludes that an unfortunate “conceptual and professional sequestering” (p. 70) of economists and historians