

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Crown and Calumet: British-Indian Relations, 1783-1815. By Colin G. Calloway.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1d32j6c0>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 11(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Washburn, Wilcomb E.

Publication Date

1987

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

day mineral resources constitute "the Navajo Tribe's principal source of income" (p. 75), and "the most important product of Navajo resources is energy" (p. 79) gained from petroleum, natural gas, coal and uranium. Ironically, virtually all of this energy is exported to California, Arizona, Texas and New Mexico, while "only limited areas of the Navajo Reservation have access to electricity" (p. 79). Despite their difficulties, the Navajo people and their land have a future worthy of hope. One looks forward to further records of that future contained in revised editions of *The Navajo Atlas*.

Christopher Vecsey
Colgate University

Crown and Calumet: British-Indian Relations, 1783-1815. By Colin G. Calloway. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987. 345 pp.

In the vast literature of Indian-White relations, the amount of work devoted to British-Indian relations between the American Revolution and the War of 1812 is surprisingly limited. Reginald Horsman has covered this period most effectively, but Colin Calloway provides a welcome addition to Horsman's work. Calloway did the bulk of the research for the book as a dissertation at the University of Leeds, England, for which he received the Ph.D. in 1978. Since that time he has moved to the United States where he is editor and assistant director in the D'Arcy McNickle Center for the History of the American Indian, at the Newberry Library, Chicago and has since left the Newberry.

Calloway does not force us to change our views on the history of Indian-White relations in the period, but he provides rich and evocative details from primary sources on both sides of the Atlantic, and his narrative is solidly based and persuasively argued. Unfortunately the text also reflects its origin as a doctoral dissertation, with the progression of research notes only slightly concealed. While some of the traditional stereotypes about the Indians of the period are now no longer held by scholars, Calloway usefully reminds us that the Indians "were accomplished politicians, formidable warriors, and canny traders who held their own civilization in high esteem and saw little in the subjects of George III to make them change their minds" (preface, xii).

While the Indians had little choice but to rely on English support against the emerging American nation following the American Revolution, their "abandonment" by the British in 1783, "to a lesser extent in 1794, and again in 1814, constituted betrayal even in British terms and represented a breach of the alliance as they understood it" (p. 5).

Much of the book is devoted to trade, government policy, and war, and Calloway makes appropriate references to Lewis Saum and Reginald Horsman in their works on these subjects. But Calloway's interpretation is a worthy addition to the secondary literature. Calloway is particularly sensitive to the independent role played by the Indians, an independent role that was nevertheless sustained only by dependence upon either Great Britain or the United States. For the Indians of the Old Northwest, that dependence was primarily upon Great Britain and was marked by repeated breaches of faith on the part of the British, breaches that nevertheless left the Indians with no other place to turn. Hence, Indian alienation from their fickle English allies was never complete, since hope springs eternal. But to be caught between "the British and the American millstones," as Calloway puts it (p. 239), or between the blades of a pair of scissors, as John Heckewelder heard Indians put it (p. 239), was an unenviable prospect.

While the Treaty of Ghent ending the War of 1812, unlike the Peace of Paris ending the American Revolution, included an article requiring that the Indians be restored to their situation as of 1811 and that separate treaties of peace be made with the various tribes, this article was, in the words of Calloway, "a facade, affording the Indians no security against conquest by their enemies" (p. 241). It did not include a provision requiring the British to guarantee Indian territories against future aggression by the Americans, and no agreement was reached upon the Indian-U.S. boundary or continuing rights of such Indian nations as the Creeks.

Crown and Calumet, thus, is a welcome addition to the literature on the important period in which most of the Indian nations east of the Mississippi began as independent actors on the international scene and ended as dependent actors in a national context.

Wilcomb E. Washburn
Smithsonian Institution