
In 1983, when Wayne State University Press published The Iroquois Restoration: Iroquois Diplomacy on the Colonial Frontier, 1701-1754, its author Richard Aquila was trying to fill a gap in the history of Iroquois diplomacy by answering the question, "What were the Iroquois doing between 1701-1754?" (p. 2). He did an admirable job. His book has been much cited in subsequent work which has made the hole even less gaping. It has been out of print for some time, available only for a hefty price through Books on Demand. The University of Nebraska Press, however, has now published it in a paperback edition.

The historical picture that Richard Aquila presents for 1701 to 1754 is based on the Iroquois, not the Euro-American, perspective. This was refreshing in 1983 and is no less so today. Although readers are rarely given glimpses of individual actors, the Iroquois are at the center of his analysis. Aquila characterizes the goals of Iroquois diplomacy during the first half of the eighteenth century as having been to establish and maintain: (1) neutral relations with the French and the English; (2) peaceful relations with Indian nations to the north and west of Iroquoia; (3) hegemony over Indians of Pennsylvania; and (4) warfare with Indians to the far south of Iroquoia, particularly the Catawbas. Whether these were goals or outcomes is open to question.

Historical study of the Iroquois (Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, Seneca, and Tuscarora) is extensive. There are several reasons for this. Their renowned confederacy has gained much attention through time. Written documents pertaining to the Iroquois are numerous because of their strategic geographic location in Northeastern North America. The relations in which they have been involved have been complex and often perplexing to historians and anthropologists. They extend from matrilineal kinship ties within individual villages, in individual nations and throughout the confederacy, to relations with people of both Indian and non-Indian nations outside the confederate structure. The confederacy has been characterized by both unity and diversity, leading scholars to debate still how it worked before the advent of written constitutions.

A significant contribution of The Iroquois Restoration has
been to bring some order to the study of the complexities involved in early eighteenth-century Iroquois diplomacy, without oversimplifying or minimizing them. This is not an easy task, and Aquila's use of the term "policy," although accomplishing the former, has the potential of jeopardizing the latter. As he points out himself, it is a problematic term. It tends to imply concerted, conscious articulation of a stance vis-à-vis people of other nations. This may have categorized Iroquois diplomacy. If so, we are not privileged with specific evidence of it. Data on Iroquois motivations are rare. Unfortunately, primary records from the period are from Euro-Americans. Aquila argues, however, that available evidence demonstrates that there was a coherence of actions and approaches by the Iroquois as they strove to restore their position relative to other nations after the somewhat devastating Twenty Years War "from the late 1670s until 1701," during which time they were involved in persistent warfare with Indian nations to the west and north of their country and the French allies of these nations.

Aquila is careful to qualify his use of the word "policy." He defines it as evolving, multifaceted, arising out of as well as determining interactions with people of other nations. This probably comes closer to reality than the one-dimensional model that usually comes to mind with use of the term. It is important for readers of his work to keep his qualifications in mind.

There were wrinkles in "policy" and Aquila allows for them. There were ripples, for example, in the neutral stance of the Iroquois at points from 1701 to 1754 as occasional war parties fought either the French or the English. Nonetheless, an overall position of neutrality was maintained by the Iroquois and acknowledged by Euro-Americans throughout the period. When, for instance, in 1709 and in 1711 a number of Iroquois warriors joined the English in what were supposed to be fail-safe invasions of Canada, both of which floundered, the transgressions were quickly overlooked by the French when faced with Iroquois apologies and professions of neutrality, because the French desired neutrality and knew that many, if not most, Iroquois were anxious to maintain it.

The roles of the constituent elements of Iroquois politics (confederate, national, village councils, sachems, warriors, war chiefs, women, and the general populace) are still very much open to research and debate. William N. Fenton's recent publication, *The Great Law and the Longhouse: A Political History of the*
Iroquois Confederacy (University of Oklahoma Press, 1998), is an important new contribution. Whether cohesion came by way of a concerted policy advocated by one group such as the confederate council or was the outcome of interrelating parts of Iroquois polity remains open to question. Direct evidence of confederate council action in the first half of the eighteenth century is rare. To his credit, although Aquila sees concerted action, he does not pretend to be able to describe the mechanisms by which it was accomplished. This is correct, given the limits of his analysis and the holes in research on Iroquois political structure for the time period in question, both in 1983 and today. From 1701 to 1754, however, although there was not perfect unity in actions and approaches, there does seem to have been a coherence in them along the lines that Aquila discusses. The outcome of Iroquois actions did follow the general patterns described in The Iroquois Restoration. The mechanisms by which this happened are still open to question and are ripe for research.

In the nearly twenty-five years that passed between the initial publication of The Iroquois Restoration and the publication of the paperback edition, other scholars have worked further to fill in the gap between 1701 and 1754 in Iroquois historical studies, acknowledging Aquila’s work in the process. Much of their work addresses the issue of the extent and nature of Iroquois power and influence, and adds detail to study of the time period involved. In his introduction to the paperback edition, Aquila discusses some of the principal studies, most particularly Francis Jenning’s The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Indian Tribes with English Colonies (W.W. Norton and Company, 1984) and Beyond the Covenant Chain: The Iroquois and Their Neighbors in Indian North America 1600-1800 (Syracuse University Press 1987). The argument put forth in these works is that the notion of an Iroquois empire is a myth created by Euro-Americans and bought by the Iroquois. The Iroquois Restoration certainly lends itself to this interpretation. Aquila points out, however, that if Iroquois empire is a myth, his study indicates that it certainly influenced reality during the first half of the eighteenth century, thereby playing a considerable role in the history of this period. There are few, if any, scholars who would argue with this.

With the exception of the addition of “Introduction to the Paperback Edition,” everything remains the same in the paperback edition of The Iroquois Restoration as in the original. Pagination is identical. The original introduction is included. The
glossary, index, bibliography, and illustrations remain as they were. This is perfectly acceptable, although at times I found myself wishing that the author had chosen to add (in bracketed footnotes or as marginal notes) comments on recent work that addressed the issues presented. For example, the study of Iroquois warfare in the years since first publication of *The Iroquois Restoration* has put much more emphasis on it as part of a cultural complex involving replacement of the dead in Iroquoia—deaths coming often from disease, sometimes from warfare—and less on it as an activity undertaken simply for “glory and revenge” (p. 206) or for economic advantages. The term “mourning wars” is commonly used by scholars today. Reference to recent work that has been undertaken on this subject, such as Daniel K. Richter’s *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (University of North Carolina Press, 1992), would have added depth to the paperback edition of *The Iroquois Restoration*.

Much work has been done in Iroquois studies since 1983 on the time period that Aquila covers. Although he discusses this work in general in his “Introduction to the Paperback Edition,” references to recent work in specific instances would have been illuminating and welcome, and would have served both to point out the extent to which his work has endured, as well as to enrich its republication. The University of Nebraska Press paperback edition, however, makes readily available an important study of early eighteenth-century Iroquois diplomacy. It lacks the richness in detail of later studies, but, as it did in 1983, *The Iroquois Restoration* still provides a general, sophisticated overview of Iroquois diplomacy from 1701 to 1754.
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For a generation, now and again, I have asked my students to read photocopies of George Copway’s 1847 “Life, History, and Travels.” The Ojibwa convert to Christianity, one of the first Native Americans to compose his autobiography, has cut a