

effective response to it in the form of a professional police force, the Detroit Metropolitan Police. Insulated by a state-appointed commission from the political influences that complicated policing in many other cities, the new force dealt effectively with the problem of crime as defined by wealthy reformers. Acting on the premise that crime stemmed chiefly from the transient population, the police concentrated their efforts downtown and, with a heavy hand, were able to control the criminal element located there. Thus, the combination of residential segregation and efficient police work restored order to Detroit by 1880.

Schneider's thesis can be applied, with appropriate modifications, to other cities such as Indianapolis. Supported as it is by a wise use of city directories and censuses as well as more traditional sources, the thesis makes sense. It is, however, a narrow sense, achieved by undervaluing non-spatial influences for disorder and order during the fifty years under study. Education and temperance, for example, are slighted, as are such other factors as changing patterns of immigration and of social mobility: the entry of German and Irish immigrants coincided with the period of greatest disorder, while the more orderly 1870s saw a significant increase in the proportion of professionals, proprietors, and other order-disposed components of Detroit's labor force. Schneider thus gives partial rather than definitive explanations. By providing a convincing demonstration of the influence of spatial arrangements on crime, riot, and policing, however, he has made a valuable contribution to the lengthening bookshelf labeled "the new urban history."

*Indiana State University,*  
*Terre Haute*

Edward K. Spann

*Savagism and Civility: Indians and Englishmen in Colonial Virginia.* By Bernard W. Sheehan. (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1980. Pp. xi, 258. Notes, bibliography, index. Clothbound, \$29.50; paperbound, \$6.95.)

*Savagism and Civility* is an intellectually deterministic work. Sheehan's thesis is that a mythology contrasting savage and civil society determined the actions of English colonists toward the Virginia Indians, leading inevitably to violence between the races. Even when reality contradicted myth, the myth prevented colonists from perceiving the truth.

The book falls neatly into two sections, the first part defining the myth, the second interpreting events in Virginia in the context of this myth. Savagism had a well-developed, para-

doxical meaning in the western world. A savage was immature, bestial, lacking in control and foresight, living without order or religion. Yet savages also were the inheritors of paradise, innocent, uncorrupted, enjoyers of a world uncluttered by civilization.

For colonists the dark side of this myth dominated, leading them to see no order, religion, or rationality in Indian life and to expect that Indians would be improvident and vicious. Colonists thus coerced food from the Indians, viewing Indian refusals as hostility and the later starvation of the tribe as confirmation that Indians lacked foresight and planning. Similarly, the colonial response to Indian religion was to order the killing of religious leaders because they were irrational barriers to conversion to civility. Likewise the English considered whites who "deserted" to the Indians as traitors to rationality and civility. At the same time, the English feared the attraction of savage freedom.

Sheehan insists that the massacre of 1622 was not a turning point in Indian-white relations. Whites were already convinced that savages were treacherous and that their duty to "civilize" the savages did not preclude salvation by force. The author argues that policy was violent from the beginning and did not shift until 1700, when Indian culture was thoroughly demoralized.

While the thesis is highly intriguing and does provide new insight into cultural conflict, including the importance of sex roles to the debate, several weak points remain. Firstly, the book demonstrates that intellectuals contrasted savagism and civility but not that the distinction reached into popular culture. Yet Sheehan assumes that ordinary settlers in Virginia thought in these patterns. Secondly, Sheehan makes questionable use of some materials. If Virginia sources are weak, he substitutes evidence from other parts of the new world. He also fits his information to his thesis; for example, he maximizes the number of runaways among the 120 new settler casualties in 1621 in order to emphasize the threat of savagism to English civility. Mortality rates would suggest otherwise.

On the whole this little volume is provocative, but not definitive, and the author's interpretation of the Indian massacre is sure to elicit comment from scholars who see the massacre as a turning point. Provoking discussion is no small accomplishment.

*St. Olaf College, Northfield,  
Minnesota*

Joan R. Gundersen