due not only to its beauty but also to the love and care truly invested in each piece that brings the raw clay to life.

Gina Lola Worthington
University of California, Los Angeles

John Stuart and the Struggle for Empire on the Southern Frontier. By J. Russell Snapp. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996. 238 pages. $42.50 cloth.

In 1928 historian Verner Crane suggested that the fate of empires ultimately was determined more by localized developments along the frontier than by official political decisions made in faraway capitals or on "decisive" battlefields (*The Southern Frontier: 1670-1732*). His thesis inaugurated a half-century of borderland studies, in which Native peoples often emerged as a crucial factor in regional politics.

Although Crane's framework led to tremendous advances in understanding the interplay between the mainstream and the frontier, a shortcoming in subsequent studies was the tendency to view the players involved homogeneously—British versus French versus Indian, for example—without regard to internal ideological distinctions affecting behavior or an analysis of how these factions impacted others.

John Stuart and the Struggle for Empire presents a critical reexamination of the southern frontier after 1760, dissecting the various interest groups that staked their economic and cultural survival on the form that colonial frontier policy should take. Author J. Russell Snapp cogently depicts the bitter ideological tussle that emerged between an American Creole elite desiring a provincial "insiders" control of the frontier (promoting private trade and expansion onto Indian lands) versus representatives of the British Crown who favored imperial control and the curbing of free enterprise in order to preserve stable British-Indian alliances. Within these two camps was a slew of individuals with complex, often conflicting interests: traders, land speculators, settlers, government officials, Creoles, Brits, Scots, and the Indian nations themselves (also internally factionalized).

Snapp's examination begins with the early frontier centering on the Charleston Indian trade of the seventeenth century and briefly outlines events leading up to the French and Indian War. Once this background is laid, Snapp paints an intelligent picture of the sweeping changes occurring after 1763, when

unprecedented capital flowed into the Indian trade along with an alarming number of new traders and merchants. A simultaneous influx of settlers and the subsequent alienation of Indian lands (often privately negotiated by traders to annul debts prompted through rum traffic) opened the frontier to the outside world as never before. Ironically, revenue from the Indian trade financed development schemes and greatly accelerated expansion into frontier (Indian) areas.

Snapp adeptly explores this highly charged, combative arena and the intricate factional threads woven through it, demonstrating how various ideologies coalesced around the policies of the Scottish-born, British Superintendent for Indian Affairs in the South, John Stuart. Appointed by the Crown in 1762, Stuart—an imperial "outsider"—quickly came to define the conflict and indeed to represent the debate itself: Should government or private interest determine the form that Empire would take on the southern frontier?

Central to Stuart's vision was the concept of regulation and order. An unregulated frontier of conflicting provincial jurisdictions, traders acting independently as frontier diplomats, trade abuses, and unchecked encroachment onto Indian lands represented chaos, disorder, and the obvious potential for conflict. For Stuart, the solution was clear: Curtail the power of the colonies and create a centralized frontier government based on stable British-Indian alliances and regulated trade as the only assurance of continued peace and prosperity.

Stuart's policy immediately enmeshed him in bitter conflict, and Snapp details the agonizing vagaries of persecution and support that plagued Stuart's career. Seemingly, there was no neutral opinion, a telling commentary on how hotly the issues were perceived. The centralizing measures of the superintendent's policy threatened the autonomy the southern Creole elite had enjoyed for a century and defined, as never before, issues of self-government they associated with liberty. Stuart, in seeking to control the frontier by promoting imperial order, subverted colonial interests and polarized the population. Snapp makes an interesting argument that an "insider" versus "outsider" perspective resulted, fueling the broader struggle over the role of government which ultimately culminated in the American Revolution. Southern revolutionaries who fought against the British perceived the struggle as an outgrowth of frontier events preceding it. Thanks to Stuart, many more people joined the revolutionary cause than might other-

wise have done so—and in taking a stand, thwarted the ability of power-hungry outsiders (the British) to ignore local circumstances and concerns. All this, of course, makes for a very fascinating argument, and one well worth consideration.

The polarization into insiders and outsiders, Indian people versus non-Indians, Scots (Stuart and many of his supporters were Scottish) versus British, established a racial paradigm in the South. Snapp theorizes that control over Indian nations and black slaves free from outside (i.e., British) regulation was a chief motivator in drawing many Southerners into the revolution. The idea of race, not class, emerged as the fundamental determinant in Southern society, shaping the entire character of the region. The revolution, which served to strengthen an "instinctive fear of outside interference in local affairs, and particularly in local race relations" and which itself was born of Stuart's policies along the Southern frontier, had long-term ramifications which culminated in the Civil War one hundred years later.

Snapp's intriguing analysis is slightly less certain in treating factionalism within Indian nations. This is party due to the fact that the book's focus is on the British-American struggle for empire and their perceptions of the southern nations, not the other way around. In addition, Snapp relies on secondary sources to describe internal Indian politics, which is a shame. As usual, even the terminology ("nativist," "traditionalist") does not jibe with the usage the nations themselves employed to describe their various factions. A clear sense of which elements supported Stuart's policies never fully emerges, and yet the fact that such divisions are acknowledged is a credit in itself.

One problem, however, is that because Indian nations are treated rather vaguely, Indian behavioral responses are glossed over as being merely economically determined. For example, the tendency of many southern nations to support the British in the revolution is attributed to the greater ability of the English to secure a steady supply of trade goods (and thereby keep the nations happy and economically solvent) and also because American settlers aggressively pursued Indian lands in opposition to the Crown. This argument has its merits, and yet one can't help but feel that there should be more to the story. Indian people were not puppets, and although economics played a part in determining activity, so did ideology. Indian nations remember their heroes during this period, and present a history to themselves that has just as much richness and vigor as American Revolutionary accounts of the minutemen, Paul

Revere, and a hero with enough bravado to hurl at the British *"Give me Liberty or give me death!"* Economics—taxation without representation, for instance—is a part of the American picture, but by no means the whole. It's the cultural, ideological elements that take hold in the imagination—ideas of liberty, freedom, heroism, and democracy.

Yet, traditionally, whenever non-Indian historians consider Indian responses, rarely are any such ideological motivations considered. What of Dragging Canoe, the greatest of all Cherokee resistance leaders, who cried, "Should we not therefore run all risks, and incur all consequences, rather than submit?! Such treaties may be all right for men who are too old to hunt or fight. As for me, I have my young men about me. We will have our lands!" Or Onitositah who boldly declared to officials that the Cherokee "are not created to be your slaves. We are a separate people!" These are speeches and sentiments worthy of a retelling comparable to that of American history, motives that reveal ideals more lofty than mere economic determinants. Indeed, Indian nations never saw themselves or their lands as Snapp summarizes them, as "pawns and victims of a struggle among whites for control" (p. 217). What they *did* see was a stronger picture—Indian nations that employed the lack of unity among Europeans and Americans to their own advantage to survive, just as outsiders did to them.

Nevertheless, Snapp's acknowledgment that Indian nations were far from homogenous during the colonial period and that factions did exist represents a refreshing approach and suggests a strong direction for future colonial Indian studies. His model of the southern frontier offers exciting possibilities for those wishing to pursue them into Indian realms, matching the complicated lines of political opinion among colonial whites to factions within the Indian nations. *John Stuart and the Struggle for Empire* is a thought-provoking volume, which is highly recommended.

Lee Miller
Native Learning Foundation

Like a Hurricane: The Indian Movement from Alcatraz to Wounded Knee. By Paul Chaat Smith and Robert Allen Warrior. New York: The New Press, 1996. 279 pages $25.00 cloth.

In 1969 American Indian people moved into the national arena of civil rights movements which had heretofore focused on