and unsubstantiated. There is carelessness concerning details. A master's thesis that used the trial record in discussing the case is itself described as a primary source concerning the slaying (p. 55); the murder of Malcolm X's father is mistakenly said to have occurred in Omaha, Nebraska, rather than in Lansing, Michigan; and the author generalizes with regard to the cases of Wayne Williams and Joan Little, while citing little in the way of supporting evidence. On the level of a conceptual approach to racist violence, Whitfield does not recognize the significance of white male aggression against black women as a source of lynching. He presents an unfocused defense of Susan Brownmiller's blurring of distinctions between Till and his murderers, expressed in her notion that they were all somehow linked in a common understanding of the aggression implicit in the boy's alleged sexual gestures. The author is unconvincing when he denies that Till's death was that of a martyr.

The wider ramifications of the murder are not fully grasped. Whitfield is excessively cautious in assessing the impact of this killing on the Montgomery movement, and this caution relates to a failure to assimilate into the book the extremely broad scope of the nationwide protest against the Mississippi brutality. That protest was a vital factor in establishing the context within which the bus boycott emerged. The episode is also isolated from its national setting when the author argues that "the Till murder needs to be understood as far more specifically a regional phenomenon" (p. 140). The violence took place in Mississippi, but it cannot be adequately understood if we do not take into account long-existing national policies that committed federal authorities to inaction against southern racism. Bertrand Russell may after all have been closer to the truth when he viewed the episode as proof of American intolerance and bigotry.

Whitfield's book movingly conveys some of the drama and tragedy inherent in the events, but we do not yet have the book that systematically explores the facts about the Till case and draws from them what can be learned about American patterns of racial violence.

HERBERT SHAPIRO
University of Cincinnati

IRWIN UNGER and DEBI UNGER. *Turning Point: 1968*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1988. Pp. viii, 568. $24.95.

The tumultuous events of 1968 inspired Irwin Unger and Debi Unger to write this work, a history book with a thesis, namely, that 1968 was a crucial year that changed America in many ways. It was not only the year of assassinations, of the Tet offensive, of the Columbia University rebellion, and of the destruction of the government of Alexander Dubček in Czechoslovakia but also the year that marked the end of the old Democratic party coalition. It was the year in which American liberalism destroyed itself and the year in which traditional conservative Americans embarked on the reconquest of political power that culminated in the presidency of Ronald Reagan.

The title of the Ungers's work is, however, somewhat misleading, because their book, instead of focusing narrowly on 1968, is, in reality, an abbreviated history of the entire decade. In seven chapters, they deal with the U.S. economy and the Great Society, the Vietnam War, the civil rights movement, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the New Left, the hippies and the cultural revolt, and Democratic-Republican party politics.

As a history of the 1960s, the book is a very good summary of the period, set forth in thoroughly entertaining, journalistic prose. From a stance of tolerant, amused detachment, the authors describe the passionate politics of the era, but they make no pretense of ever having been personally involved in the history about which they write. And herein lies part of the dilemma of their book. For those who lived the history of the sixties, Todd Gitlin's *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (1987) is an infinitely more satisfying book. For others, who view the sixties as simply a segment in the Democratic-Republican political continuum, the tale of liberalism's demise has already been told wonderfully well in Steven M. Gillon's *Politics and Vision: The ADA and American Liberalism, 1947–1985* (1987).

It would appear that nearly everyone who has dealt seriously with the decade has been tempted to view the year 1968 as a "raging vortex," or a sort of historical "Venturi tube" through which events were forced under pressure to emerge in different forms and shapes. But, as it turns out, history will not sustain the thesis except as it applies to electoral politics. The civil rights movement had long since abandoned nonviolence, and Martin Luther King's following was fragmented. His strength was spent. The American public could not bring itself to reject the carnage in Vietnam and demand immediate withdrawal as their acceptance of Richard Nixon's "Vietnamization" policy shows. Progressive labor had already infiltrated the SDS, and the SDS had already spread itself so thin, and wandered so far from the Port Huron Statement, that its own failure was easily predictable. The changes wrought in the cultural revolt were, in 1968, still incomplete and tenuous.

The Ungers clearly have not written their book from all printed and documentary sources available. All the same, without the burden of having to prove the remarkableness of the year 1968, the volume remains an excellent, brief survey of the major events of the 1960s. It is particularly strong in the area of economics, where many historical accounts are weak. The Ungers's analysis of the relationship between the catastrophic Vietnam War and America's relinquishment of world economic leadership is especially good. And yet, in their liberal objectivity and in their attachment to

mainstream politics, the Ungers miss the essential *Geist* of the decade.

DEAN ALBERTSON†
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

LAURENCE M. HAUPTMAN. *Formulating American Indian Policy in New York State, 1970–1986*. Albany: State University of New York Press. 1988. Pp. xiv, 215. Cloth $49.50, paper $16.95.

This is Laurence M. Hauptman's third successive book on the Iroquois and American government–Indian relations. His first two were *The Iroquois and the New Deal* (1981) and *The Iroquois Struggle for Survival: World War II to Red Power* (1986). This slim volume focuses on Iroquois relations with the state government of New York from 1970 to 1986. Hauptman investigates the neglect by the state of the Iroquois and their conditions, and he recommends a series of policy reforms to effect a statewide Indian policy. In brief, the author asserts that New York serves the rest of its population, while using resources from ceded Indian lands.

This case study began as a report prepared by the author in 1986 for the governor of New York and for American Indian nations. Expanded and revised for publication, it is a comprehensible description of the issues of the loss of Indian land, land claims, state criminal and civil jurisdictional problems, biased state services, chaotic federal and state responsibilities, conflicting state powers of taxation, tribal versus state sovereignty, exploitable Indian burial sites, and American Indian underemployment in the state government.

The plethora of data is the book's strength, but the difficult transition from report to book has weakened conceptual analysis. For instance, an account of Indian reaction to state policy actions and an exploration of the sociocultural dynamics between Indian communities and the state government would have enriched this study (as evidenced by the author's two earlier works). It is well known that the Iroquois are and have been among the most politically and culturally active Indian groups. Political relations, primarily New York's poor service of its Indian communities, are the thrust of this work. Graphically, three maps and six appendixes supply additional information covering population comparisons, sizes of reservations, tribal enrollments, health statistics, road development on reservations, and museum commentary on burial sites.

This case study serves as an example for future works regarding tribal-community developments. Too often, policy studies focus on national programs and federal-tribal cases, disregarding state-Indian interaction, which occurs on a daily basis. Policy makers and government officials would benefit from reading this book, as would scholars and those readers interested in state-Indian relations.

DONALD L. FIXICO
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

CANADA

HANA SAMEK. *The Blackfoot Confederacy, 1880–1920: A Comparative Study of Canadian and U.S. Indian Policy*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. 1987. Pp. xii, 236. $27.50.

It is commonly asserted that Canadian Indian policy has consistently been superior to U.S. policy, in terms of both day-to-day administration and concern for native rights. In a comparative analysis of Canadian and U.S. relations with the confederated Blackfeet, Hana Samek questions many common assumptions while providing useful insights into the historical problems that confronted Indians and Indian policy makers on either side of the border.

Samek's study begins with a realistic assessment of the historical background of Indian policy in the United States and Canada. The differences between Canadian and U.S. policies, in Samek's view, stemmed from several related, historically rooted factors. First, the relatively slow growth of Canada's western frontier made rapid Indian dispossession less necessary north of the border, eliminating one of the key causes of the harsher policies in this regard in the United States. Second, in part because of the slow frontier expansion and in part because of the continuing prevalence of British attitudes toward law and order, Canadians in general and even Canadian frontiersmen were willing to comply with a significantly more authoritarian and centralized scheme of Indian administration than was possible in the United States. Finally, as a result of all of the above factors, Canadian policy makers tended to be more conservative in the formation and implementation of policy than were Americans. Although this occasionally resulted in disastrously slow adaptation to changing conditions, the general outcome was to minimize the disruptive effects of constantly fluctuating policies that were a natural consequence of the more progressive and experimental approach to policy making in the United States. In all, these have shaped the popular perception of Canadian policy as more enlightened than that of the United States, but Samek argues cogently and convincingly that these differences were the product of historical circumstances and not of greater sensitivity or wisdom on the Canadians' part.

In fact, despite popular misconceptions to the contrary, Canadians were apparently no more respectful of Indian sacred and secular culture than were Americans, and the author illustrates the many shared opinions that motivated white administrators in both countries. Samek reveals that the primary purpose in the policies of both nations emphasized the destruction of Indian culture and the "mainstreaming" of the Indian