
BOOK REVIEWS

Historic Acadia National Park, The Stories Behind One of America's Great Treasures. By Catherine Schmitt. (Guilford, CN: Lyons Press, 2016. Pp. 226. Paper. \$16.95)

The cool sea-breeze and granite mountains of Mount Desert Island have attracted millions of visitors to tour its scenery, and innumerable authors to describe its history. *Historic Acadia National Park*, by Catherine Schmitt is one of the more recent forays into uncovering the origins of a much beloved island and national park. As Schmitt duly acknowledges, writing about such a well-known environment “is an honor and a gift, and also a challenge” (iv). Schmitt currently serves as the communications director for the Maine Sea Grant Program at the University of Maine while also teaching science writing and composition, and therefore brings significant scientific experience and narrative style to this challenging topic.

In twelve story-filled chapters, Schmitt outlines significant forces in shaping the island we recognize today. The chronology of each chapter is not a plodding linear narrative; instead they are thematically grouped stories that often span hundreds (if not thousands) of years. For example, the first three chapters (entitled *Foundations*, *Scenery*, and *Gathering* respectively) include longue-durée history of geology, vegetation, and Indigenous habitation, yet frequently cast readers forward to modern developments. Beginning with volcanic and glacial origins of the island, Schmitt frequently vaults forward to modern topics, such as the 19th century scientific and religious debates over landscape genesis, the development of purposefully scenic places for tourism, and modern Wabanaki permanence and

visibility. Though casual readers may find later chapters more relatable, the first three sections advance Mount Desert Island literature by introducing accessible environmental history and messages of Indigenous permanence to a wider audience. The remaining nine chapters are stylistically similar, while generally constricting their focus generally to the colonial through modern eras. Here, one can find the titular focus of the text on Acadia National Park which includes central figures like Charles Eliot, George B. Dorr, and John D. Rockefeller jr., while elevating other local actors that crafted the modern image of the island. Refreshingly, Schmitt utilizes the last two chapters (*Addition* and *Archipelago*) to feature recent problems in the historic landscape such as park boundary issues and environmental complications with DDT and the locally-nesting peregrine falcons.

Readers familiar with Mount Desert Island and Acadia's history will recognize many key figures or events, but will be pleasantly surprised by new or little-known narratives. This is perhaps the best indicator of an intended audience as the presentation appears to be designed for locally-informed readers, rather than as an academically-gearred monograph. Regrettably, this text misses an opportunity to become part of the growing collection of modern historical scholarship on Mount Desert Island. Without an introduction to the text for stylistic guidance, readers are plunged into topical chapters without formal orientation or context. More significantly, notation by footnote or endnote is entirely absent (though extensive research labor has clearly been invested, as demonstrated by the varied bibliography and numerous archival locations).

In short, Schmitt condenses many familiar island-tales of formation, habitation, and development, while elevating rarely-heard supporting stories. The text most closely resembles an eloquent conference between Mount Desert Island experts or well-informed National Park Ranger-Led programs; a comfortable sharing of accounts for the reader to soak up, spanning millennia and across a myriad of subjects. Schmitt's work is clearly a labor of love, influenced by a personal attachment to the land and sea-scapes of coastal Maine. As such, readers can easily

connect with the beautiful portrayals of people and place, while envisioning their next visit to the historic island and National Park.

Sean Cox
University of Maine

Without Benefit of Insects: The Story of Edith M. Patch of the University of Maine. By K. Elizabeth Gibbs. (Orono: Maine Agriculture and Forest Experiment Station, 2014. Pp. 151. Paper. Free download available at https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/aes_miscpubs/23/)

While many credit the 1962 book *Silent Spring* with elevating public concerns over the negative impacts of pesticides and sparking the twentieth-century environmental movement, author Rachel Carson had a lesser known predecessor who, nearly thirty years prior, began calling for restraint in the use of insecticides. Edith Marion Patch (1876–1954)—first woman president of the Entomological Society of America (ESA), world-renowned aphid expert, and founder of the entomology department at the University of Maine—by the mid-1930s, began openly cautioning against overuse of pesticides and advocating more research on biological controls. She also warned the entomological community about the potential dangers of Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT)—the subject of Carson’s eventual book—while it was still undergoing field trials in the early 1940s.

In *Without Benefit of Insects: The Story of Edith M. Patch of the University of Maine*, author K. Elizabeth Gibbs tells this story, revealing that Patch was part of a small but vocal community of professionals in her field who stood in opposition to the growing tendency among “economic entomologists” (100) to only advocate chemical solutions to the problems of agricultural pests. As president of the ESA, Patch brought these concerns to light in her 1936 address to the organization, entitled “Without Benefit of Insects.” The book opens with this anecdote and later describes it in more detail, including passages where Patch lamented declines in native bees and predicted a grim future in

which pesticides destroy nearly all insect life by the year 2000.

Despite Patch’s precocious efforts to discourage chemical insecticides and encourage more research on beneficial predators and other natural pest-control methods, few scholars of American environmentalism know of her. In *Without Benefit of Insects*, Gibbs seeks to correct this oversight, taking readers on a chronological tour of Patch’s life, punctuated by colorful anecdotes and bits of correspondence and poetry, which show not only what she accomplished professionally, but who she was and why she deserves a more prominent place in the annals of history. Winding its way through early years spent outdoors and an academic career marked but not thwarted by gender discrimination, her book brings Patch to life as a determined scholar and a dynamic leader in her field, willing to risk prestige in service of the public good. Through written correspondence, Gibbs sheds light on Patch’s wit and collegiality, her enthusiasm for exchanging ideas with peers, her willingness to offer practical advice to prospective students and junior colleagues, and her care in providing the constructive critique that is the lifeblood of academic discourse. Occasionally lacking subtlety, but rarely unkind, Patch emerges from the pages of Gibbs’s book a refreshingly relatable figure.

Gibbs also excels at conveying to readers a sense of the inner workings of the early-twentieth-century entomological community—how researchers communicated and shared knowledge; how they responded to changes within American agriculture and the land-grant system; and how they struggled with a rapidly shifting insect taxonomy and research landscape during the early years of scientific professionalization. Perhaps it is Gibbs’s own background as a professor emerita of entomology at the University of Maine, which gives her this special insight into Patch’s professional life and the importance of her research. She devotes many pages to this research, most of it on aphids of significance to Maine agriculture, but she does so without excessive technical language so that any reader might comprehend it. She also showcases other women in entomology, many of whom were inspired by Patch but never received formal recog-

nitition. Like Patch, who initially accepted positions and pay arrangements that were beneath her skill and education level, these women struggled to cobble together a living in a male-dominated field.

It is possible that Patch's early experiences on the margins of academia informed her willingness to engage with the public in ways that her male colleagues strongly discouraged. As Gibbs shows, she was unique among her peers in that she was willing and able to write for a diverse readership—from top researchers in her field to home gardeners and school children, and her published works included an eclectic mixture of scholarly articles, technical bulletins, textbooks, magazines articles, children's fiction, and poetry. Gibbs's account of Patch depicts a scholar at home in academe and a citizen committed to engaging the public. Patch felt that everyone, especially children, should be knowledgeable about the natural world. And, in pursuit of this ideal, she wrote stories that educated young readers about the ecological relationships she devoted her life to understanding and, increasingly, to defending. Gibbs highlights that Patch risked her hard-won scholarly prestige in writing for children and the general public, and she did so during a time when her field was increasingly defining itself in opposition to insect life. She also identified as a pantheist, according to Gibbs, and was somewhat open in sharing her nature-based spiritual proclivities.

Those who read *Without Benefit of Insects* will find that it is well researched and scientifically informed. In terms of the primary-source record on Patch, Gibbs appears to have left no stone unturned and was surely aided in her interpretation of Patch's work by her own expertise and experience with the entomology program that Patch founded. As such, she has produced a study that should be of great interest to the scientific community as well as to faculty and students and the University of Maine and other land-grant institutions. Her subject matter should also pique the interest of women's and gender studies scholars, historians of science and technology, and environmental historians. Those in this latter camp, however, may find the book wanting for a review of the relevant literature on women in science, the evolution of en-

vironmental thought, or agricultural shifts during the first half of the twentieth century. They may also find themselves wondering whether *Without Benefit of Insects* might have benefitted from a stronger emphasis on critical analysis than chronology.

Nevertheless, Gibbs has made an important contribution to the ongoing effort to render women more visible within the history of science and early environmentalism, and she provides an excellent starting point for those looking to more deeply explore the history of an entomological community in great flux—both socially and scientifically—during the early-to-mid twentieth century. She effectively makes the case that Patch deserves closer examination by scholars and more recognition among the general public, and she includes tantalizing details about Patch's personal and professional life, which are sure to leave readers with compelling questions and future research avenues to explore. And as recent studies around the world have revealed dramatic declines in insect populations since the middle of the twentieth century, perhaps it is important now more than ever for scholars to familiarize themselves with the efforts of those who stood at the precipice of these changes and sounded the alarm.¹

Eileen Hagerman
University of Maine

1. See Francisco Sánchez-Bayo and Kris A. G. Wyckhuys, "Worldwide Decline of the Entomofauna: A Review of Its Drivers," *Biological Conservation* 232 (April, 2019): 8–27, accessed 1 December 2019, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0006320718313636>

French & Indian Wars in Maine. By Michael Dekker. (Charleston: The History Press, 2015. 155 pgs. Paper \$21.99)

Michael Dekker's book, *French & Indian Wars in Maine*, is a popular history of the Indian wars in Maine. In chronological order, from 1675 to 1759, Dekker takes the reader through six significant conflicts that shaped Maine's colonial period. These conflicts include: King Phillip's War (1675–1678), King William's War

(1688-1699), Queen Anne's War (1703-1713), Dummer's War (1721-1726), King George's War (1745-1749), and the French & Indian War (1755-1759). Dekker seeks to challenge popular conceptions that claim that nothing significant ever occurred in Maine during the colonial period. According to Dekker, Maine was not a quiet backwater colony on the periphery of the various imperial struggles for North America (10). Quite the contrary, Maine was an actor in these colonial Indian Wars. Unlike other regions in North America whose Indian Wars were usually fought over the broader context of conflict between France and Britain, Maine's conflicts were fought over local struggles "between competing cultures" (10, 16). Thus, Maine's Indian Wars were "parallel wars" waged within the broader context of imperial struggle (16). Geographically, Dekker's book focuses on the Maine frontier. More specifically, it gives attention to the midcoastal region "from the eastern portions of Casco Bay to the Penobscot River" (10).

Since the book covers six distinct colonial Indian Wars, Dekker narrates the whole story from the buildup of conflict to the eventual climax of each specific localized war. In doing so, the similarity in which conflicts were fought in colonial Maine becomes apparent. Misunderstandings between indigenous populations and European settlers, usually over territorial disputes, vigilante violence, and legal justice, or lack thereof, for Native Americans in colonial courts, in peacetime led to war (43). Raids were the most common form of violence that plagued the Maine frontier during the colonial period. Remote English settlements were the most popular choice for Indian raids, which were sometimes encouraged and accompanied by the French (61-62). As a result of deadly Indian raids, the English launched military expeditions throughout Maine's frontier to reclaim lost territory and to punish native insurrection. Trade was also disrupted from conflict forcing the natives, who had become dependent on European trade goods, to the bargaining table if they were unable to secure such trade goods from their French allies in Canada (96). Despite peace which resulted from war, the root causes of each conflict remained unsolved (43). Through his narrative, Dekker shows how each Indian War

in Maine propelled the regions inhabitants into conflict which exacerbated other local issues. As such, broader imperial struggles encouraged outright hostilities.

After reading this book, its length really stands out. Just 155 pages, it is not a definitive history of the French & Indian Wars in Maine (10). The author even comes right out and states that he omitted much information from the history of Maine's French & Indian Wars to "streamline [the] narrative" (10-11). This, however, does not point to bad scholarship. Quite the contrary. Dekker's research covers all the important information, doling out facts on an "as needed" basis. The result is a well-written book with a fresh perspective that offers a comprehensive narrative of the French & Indian Wars in Maine, an understudied perspective in scholarship on the colonial period. By placing Maine at the center of scholarship during the various colonial French & Indian Wars, Dekker fills a much-needed gap in popular accounts of the colonial Indian Wars which tend to focus on conflicts further west.

George Kotlik

University of North Florida

Wabanaki Homeland and the New State of Maine: The 1820 Journal and Plans of Survey of Joseph Treat. Edited by Micah Pawling. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007).

The history of English colonial expansion in New England is complicated. Marking a transition following Metacom's War (King Philip's War) at the end of the 1670s, Massachusetts's engagement with the southern and northern parts of the territory it claimed was fundamentally different. Indeed, as Emerson Baker and John Reid, eloquently noted nearly twenty years ago, well into the eighteenth century, colonial incursions onto Wabanaki territory were "severely limited."¹ Extending from this idea, although we might situate the roots of settler colonial systems of power firmly within the context of seventeenth-century southern New England – embodied perhaps in Metacom's war itself – in the north, specifically in what would become

known as Maine, it took much longer for settler power to manifest itself.

Few books make this point more clearly than Micah Pawling's *Wabanaki Homeland and the State of Maine*. Centring on an edited and annotated journal and survey of a canoe journey taken along the Penobscot and Wolastoq (Saint John) Rivers in 1820, the book beautifully demonstrates through its transcribed journal entries and reproduced maps, the overlapping ways in which Wabanaki nations, colonists, and governments often competed, though sometimes collaborated, in occupying and laying claim to the land and resources within, and along, these watersheds.

There is no better example of the complicated relationships that defined this time and place than that between Joseph Treat, a prominent Bangor colonist and surveyor, and John Neptune, Lieutenant Governor (second chief) of the Penobscot Nation. Though working and travelling together to survey this space in 1820 – and once earlier in 1804 – Pawling's introduction to Treat's work demonstrates well that over the previous two decades Treat had been a leading figure (among many others) in questionably acquiring Penobscot lands and compromising their fisheries. Neptune, in contrast, was a leading voice in Penobscot diplomacy whose interest in working with Treat – though never explicitly stated – was focused on community resilience. In Pawling's estimation, Neptune's work on this government-sponsored survey “helped to accomplish the retention of Penobscot place-names and stories on the landscape.” (58)

In calling attention to this document, and the treaties related to it, Pawling not only focuses on the founding of the state of Maine, two hundred years ago this year, but also to the decades before, and after, this significant political transition. Framing the journal within a culture whereby understandings of the first treaty to cede land in the Penobscot watershed – signed in 1796 – was contested, Pawling well illustrates how Penobscot diplomats, settlers, and the Massachusetts, then Maine, government navigated disagreements between oral and written accounts of the treaty. Some of this was remedied in 1820, when Penobscot Nation relinquished

its ties with Massachusetts in favour of the newly formed state of Maine – a process in which both Neptune and Treat participated – but much uncertainty remained. In tracing Neptune and Treat's journey along the upper Wolastoq River, Pawling emphasizes that much of the fluidity that defined the eighteenth century remained. There, Americans, Anglo-New Brunswickers, and resettled Acadians lived in relationships that defied government claims over their citizenship and subjecthood. As Maine marks its 200th anniversary this year, Pawling's book serves as a good reminder that 1820 marks only a beginning for the state, much – including its borders – remained to be determined and negotiated over the decades to come.

Published in 2007, Pawling's book was ahead of its time. The book aligns well with a more recent turn in the region's history towards cartographic history and the history of surveying. What makes Pawling's book different, however, from tomes like Stephen Hornsby's *Surveyors of Empire* (2011), Edelson's *The New Map of Empire* (2017), or Lennox's *Homelands and Empires* (2017), is its anchoring in a much more local and specific context.² Where these more recent books make important claims about the use of cartography and surveying in strengthening imperial influences over the course of the eighteenth century, Neptune's pivotal role in making possible Treat's survey demonstrates a more complicated lived reality. In this part of the world, the influence on Wabanaki Peoples of the United States (or nascent colony of New Brunswick), remained somewhat limited.

Much like in Nova Scotia, where, over the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, settler colonists and their governments also increasingly came to dominate Mi'kmaq and W last kwewiyik Homelands, Pawling's book demonstrates well that, throughout this period, the Peoples of the Dawnland defended their longstanding role as “river keepers” in the Penobscot watershed.³ Through the mechanism of the colonial survey, John Neptune, and the documents that were produced through his work guiding Joseph Treat, left an important legacy. In making this legacy apparent to readers, Pawling has done scholars – and Mainers

more generally – a great service. If there is one lesson to take away from this book it is this: Maine may have been founded 200 years ago, but the processes and culture of negotiation that underpinned this event continues today.

Thomas Peace
Huron University

1. Emerson Baker and John Reid, “Amerindian Power in the Early Modern Northeast: A Reappraisal,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, vol. 61, no. 1 (Jan 2004), 80.

2. See Stephen J. Hornsby, *Surveyors of Empire: Samuel Holland, J.F.W. des Barres, and the Making of The Atlantic Neptune*, (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2011); S. Max Edelson, *The New Map of Empire: How Britain Imagined America before Independence* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2017); Jeffers Lennox, *Homelands and Empires: Indigenous Spaces, Imperial Fictions, and Competition for Territory in Northeastern North America, 1690-1763* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017)

3. For comparison with Nova Scotia see John G. Reid, “Empire, the Maritime Colonies, and the Supplanting of Mi’kma’ki/Wulstukwik” *Acadiensis* vol. 38, no. 2 (Autumn 2009): 78-97.

The Many Captivities of Esther Wheelwright. By Ann M. Little. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016).

Ann M. Little’s monograph constructs a narrative around the life of a remarkable woman, Esther Wheelwright. In *The Many Captivities of Esther Wheelwright*, Little illuminates the complexities of women’s experiences in colonial North America through her in depth focus on the life of Esther, a woman who crossed many geographical, cultural, and ideological boundaries and experienced various types of freedoms and captivities that, while unique to Esther’s circumstances, also demonstrated commonalities and shared experiences between women’s lives across those borders. In doing so, Little also broadens the concept of captivity as a historical subject and shifts scholarly perspectives and understandings of concepts of female freedom and

limitation in colonial North America, redefining what it meant to be a captive.

The title of Little’s book, *The Many Captivities of Esther Wheelwright*, is shrewdly indicative of the complexity of captivity as a concept and as the point of departure from which Little probes and reconstructs Esther’s life. Unlike more traditional historical understandings of colonial captivity and the captivity narratives that emerged out of such events, Little demonstrates that the way we define who is a “captive” and what “captivity” means must reflect more than the simple dynamic between captive and captor, between freedom and unfreedom. Rather, captive was a flexible status in many communities and the experience of being taken captive could, in some instances, represent new opportunities to escape other types of captivity that dominated a captive’s former life. Little’s application of broader knowledge and methodologies about the colonial era, religion, material and immaterial culture, and ethnography, shows how Esther, and many other women, experienced various types of captivity in diverse cultures throughout North America, such as the confining clothing of Anglo-America, the strict pious lifestyle of French-Catholic nunneries, and Esther’s status as a Wabanaki captive, however flexible and short-lived that status may have been.

Esther’s experiences with captivity of all sorts were not uncommon to women in colonial North America. However, it is the agency that Little suggests Esther wielded in her choices between captivities that makes her experience unique. At certain times in her life, Esther was presented with the choice to convert to Catholicism and to join an Ursuline convent in Québec. While there is little evidence left behind by Esther to suggest that she was a willing and enthusiastic convert with much choice in the matter, Little has chosen to err on the side of maintaining Esther’s agency over her own life rather than presenting Esther as a neutral character in her own narrative that is so often assumed when one studies captive women. Little’s characterization of Esther’s life and “captivity” as guided by the choices she made reasserts Esther’s ability, and the ability of all colonial women, to exert various levels of agency over their own lives. In

doing so, Little challenges historians to reconsider the agency of their subjects even within the confines of such limiting contexts as captivity.

Hannah Schmidt
University of Maine

Our Beloved Kin: A New History of King Philip's War. By Lisa Brooks. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2018. Pp. 448, Paper, \$22.00)

Lisa Brooks presents a new and remarkable interpretation of King Philip's War, or the First Indian War, that ripped through colonial New England in the late seventeenth century with her publication, *Our Beloved Kin: A New History of King Philip's War*. Hers is an alternative representation of the war that, through exploring underutilized perspectives and archival sources, forces the audience to reconsider how it understands the First Indian War and early settler colonialism in general. Rather than follow a traditional narrative progression, Brooks tells her story through an episodic structure that emphasizes two overlooked but important figures: Weetamoo, a Wampanoag *saunkskaw*, or female sachem, and James Printer, a Nipmuc publisher and Harvard graduate.

A series of court cases and land deeds show Weetamoo defending the Wampanoag land for which she is responsible from English encroachment that eventually erupted into armed conflict. Weetamoo's actions demonstrate her importance to the story and that men and women shared power and influence within Indigenous communities, a fact the English ignored as they understated the importance of women in their own records of events. She juxtaposes Weetamoo's experiences with power and diplomacy with perspectives like that of comparatively disempowered Ann Tallman or that of the Puritan farmers hungry for land to pass to their sons.

James Printer's tale shows how indigenous peoples adapted to live within Puritan society without forsaking their tribal identities. Nipmuc and Narragansett men educated at mission

schools like Printer became "complex men who negotiated within colonial political systems and Indigenous networks," rather than powerless victims of lost culture (p. 106). His experiences inserting Native interpretations into colonial narratives, captivity during the fighting, and surviving racial discrimination give new dimensions to the experience of King Philip's War.

Brooks's narrative prioritizes the experience of being in a state of war over chronicling the war's progression. Weetamoo evacuating her people from the disputed territory to escape the ravages of colonial war, the Wampanoag chief Philip's military tactics to instill chaos and fear rather than indiscriminate slaughter, the captivity of a Puritan woman named Mary Rowlandson by Weetamoo herself, James Printer's publication of Rowlandson's story, and the expansion of the conflict into Wabanaki territory in what is now Maine result in a people's history of the war the emphasizes lived experience. Historical fiction cutaways enhance this method of storytelling, encouraging the audience to place itself within this living history.

Our Beloved Kin ultimately rejects the narratives of first-blood justifications that pervaded earlier histories in favor of contextualizing the violence within a long history of encroachment and ill treatment by the English. Brooks's conclusion marks not the end of a single war but the beginning of decades of Anglo-Wabanaki wars begun for the same reasons of encroachment and aggressive land acquisition that caused King Philip's War. Brooks's episodic story structure can be difficult to follow chronologically by her own admission, but this structure, along with her original use of primary sources, expertise in Indigenous languages, and alternative perspectives create a new history of the colonial period that sets the story firmly on Native ground.

Eric Toups
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign