A second quibble concerns a practice found in many texts about Native America. This is the anthropologist-imposed custom of naming the whole group of Choctaw people in the singular—"the Choctaw." The effect is to reduce tribal peoples to anthropological objects rather than allowing them a vivid individuality and particularity. Skeptics may experiment with substituting any other ethnic group's name in the place of "the Choctaw," so that all Italians are known as "the Italian" ("the Italian believes that. . . ."), or all Asians are described as "the Asian." No one would do this unless intent on denigrating that group, yet Native nations continue to find themselves rendered in the singular, even by members of the nations themselves. I wish Pesantubbee would abandon this outsider-imposed practice so that her future work will not produce that constant sense of dislocation from the world of every other group of people. Nevertheless, this is a small objection. In general, Pesantubbee's book is useful, not least for those who have long argued that the historical record's silence on women's lives is not an accurate reflection of their significance in Indian history.

Patricia Penn Hilden
University of California, Berkeley

A Colonial Complex: South Carolina's Frontiers in the Era of the Yamasee War 1680–1730. By Steven J. Oatis. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004. 399 pages. $65.00 cloth.

Recently, scholars of Native American history have been seeking to reevaluate the colonial history of the American Southeast. This book, written by Steven J. Oatis, makes a contribution to that effort. It seeks to define the Southeast as a "frontier complex" (Jack Forbes's words), which the author alleges will allow for a "more complete and balanced picture of South Carolina's frontier relationships" (8).

Oatis's methodological approach is admirable and, as a Yamasee Indian and scholar of the history of American Indians, I must confess that I was attracted to his methods of analysis regarding the behavior of empires. Indeed, Oatis has used the traditional white colonial sources quite effectively. He also has parsed the works of the last generation of American Indian historians and benefited from their methodological successes and mistakes. He is to be applauded for envisioning a new way of looking at the frontier.

However, I was disappointed in his failure to understand and research Yamasee society in the past and in the present. Usually American historians are monoculturalists even when they study Native American societies, and this work is no exception. The established history and ethnology of the Yamasee people is totally absent from this book. Since this book is the author's revised dissertation, I was perplexed that he was never pointed in the direction of previous scholarship on Yamasee people. Oatis never draws upon James Howard's "The Yamasee: A Supposedly Extinct Southeastern Tribe Rediscovered," *American Anthropologist* 62, no. 4 (August 1960). In 1962,

James Shaffer (Yamasee) and James Howard wrote "Medicine and Medicine Headresses of the Yamasee," *American Indian Tradition* 8, no. 3 (1962). In 1948, William H. Gilbert referred to the existing Yamasee band in *Surviving Indian Groups of the Eastern United States,* Smithsonian Institute Annual Report (1948). As a Yamasee Indian and academic historian, I have written a chapter on Yamasee history in Donald A. Grinde and Bruce E. Johansen, *Ecocide of Native America* (1995), as well as an essay on "Yamasee Political and Legal Traditions" in Bruce E. Johansen, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Native American Legal Tradition* (1998). I list these works because such omissions are frequently found in Southern colonial Native American history even though the data is in annual reports by the Smithsonian Institution and journals like the *American Anthropologist.* American Indian historians of the Southeast still use John R. Swanton's *Early History of the Creek Indians and Their Neighbors* (1922) uncritically and do not dig deeper to realize its severe historical and ethnological shortcomings. I confess that I feel ambivalent about touting the works of anthropologists and ethnologists, but their work must be consulted in writing histories of Native peoples. I just wonder why these omissions of Yamasee ethnology and history were not caught by readers at the University of Nebraska Press.

But I digress; in general, this book expands our understanding of the American Southeast compared to the earlier works on the subject. We are treated to a deeper examination of the motives of the South Carolinians, the Spanish, the French, African Americans, and to a lesser degree the Native peoples in the clash of cultures and empires. It is a much-needed update on the imperial history of the American Southeast, and, in a limited way, it gives us some new insights into the American Indian history of the Southeast. Realistically, Oatis achieves a limited degree of success in his stated goal of portraying a more balanced view of the colonial empires of the Southeast. In the end, despite my criticisms of this book relating to the omissions of Yamasee history and ethnology, I still highly recommend it for graduate students and research scholars of Southern American history. It is well researched on the European empire side, and perhaps the tribal and cultural histories of Southeastern Indians such as the Yamasees are best left to those who have a more multidisciplinary and multicultural frame of mind.

Donald A. Grinde, Jr.
State University of New York, Buffalo

Demanding the Cherokee Nation: Indian Autonomy and American Culture, 1830–1900. By Andrew Denson. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004. 327 pages. $55.00 cloth.

In the English-language translation of the treaty negotiated in November 1785 between representatives of the governments of the United States and the Cherokee Nation at Hopewell, South Carolina, both parties agreed that Cherokee political leaders "shall have the right to send a deputy of their