

help us to better understand the Nation's relationship to the landscape? While this book provides important groundwork, the answers to such questions, it appears, will await a scholar of the Cayugas at least as dedicated to understanding the precontact era as to promoting his or her own brand of contemporary political advocacy.

Jon Parmenter
Cornell University

Endgame for Empire: British-Creek Relations in Georgia and Vicinity, 1763–1776. By John T. Juricek. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2015. 338 pages. \$74.95 cloth.

Modern understandings of the eighteenth-century Native South have been greatly enriched by the work of John T. Juricek. Having served as editor of multiple volumes of the *Early American Indian Documents: Treaties and Laws* series (1979–2004), he is perhaps best equipped to pen a new Anglo-Creek diplomatic history of the interwar period. Intimate knowledge of colonial Georgia sources allows Juricek to pick up where his 2010 work *Colonial Georgia and the Creeks: Anglo-Indian Diplomacy on the Southern Frontier, 1733–1763* left off. If the first half of the eighteenth century was represented by a “negotiated” British presence in Georgia (viii), the years between the Seven Years’ War and the Declaration of Independence were embodied by the failures and breakdowns in these intercultural negotiations. *Endgame for Empire* focuses on the development of the British reform program in the wake of the Seven Years’ War and how the weaknesses of this program, fully articulated in the Proclamation of 1763 and the Plan of 1764, allowed both Euro- and Native American self-interested parties to circumvent policies to arrive at advantageous results. Juricek argues that this pattern of repeated circumvention, which includes the Wilkinson grant, the “New Purchase,” and the failed Bryan deed, contributed to the deterioration of intercultural relations between the Creeks and British colonial officials, allowing the patriot cause to prosper in Georgia.

The great value of this work lies in Juricek’s familiarity with his sources, which allows him to offer new insights into pivotal moments in backcountry politicking. For example, his impressive treatment of the Augusta Congress 1763 allows an explanation for “how the Creeks came to conclude that they had to offer” a land cession “and how that decision came to be announced” (53). Traditional Creek practice dictated that peace chiefs, in this case Tallechea, were entitled to offer initial comments on land agreements before intentions were confirmed by war chiefs. Juricek also accounts for the conspicuous absence of Upper Creek “talks” during the Congress: in an effort to diffuse the tensions due to recent Upper Creek attacks on traders, Lower Creek spokesmen worked in a dual representative capacity and “demanded” Upper Creek silence during negotiations (55).

With his analysis of the infamous Bryan deed of 1773, Juricek also offers an important revision to our understanding of what historian Colin Calloway in 2013

termed “the pen and witchcraft process” of the colonial South. Historiographically, Jonathan Bryan’s attempted frontier land swindle has not received much attention, with the exception being Alan Gally’s argument in 1989 that Bryan intended to use the Apalachee Old Fields to establish “a haven for disaffected Georgians outside the reach of the royal government” to aid the patriot cause (*The Formation of a Planter Elite: Jonathan Bryan and the Southern Colonial Frontier*, 129). Although most contemporaries and later historians consider Bryan a madman, Juricek considers Bryan “not crazy,” but rather a backcountry opportunist who attempted to use the recent history of Anglo-Creek land cessions to justify his transaction. Because Bryan was aware of the twenty-year-long Bosomworth controversy and observed the “New Purchase” unfold, Juricek argues that Bryan understood “that an Indian deed ‘of no Consequence’ in a British court of law could be near priceless” given an audience (204). To ensure an amenable court of opinion, in addition to Native support Bryan sought out the support of the chief justice of East Florida, William Drayton, by allowing Cowkeeper, the preeminent Seminole, to confirm his deed.

This informed knowledge of previous land grants also resulted in Bryan’s own innovation to intercultural land brokering: instead of seeking out a direct land transfer, Bryan framed his agreement as a ninety-nine year, long-term lease. This established the agreement outside the jurisdiction of the Georgia prohibition on private purchases from Indians as well as the Royal Proclamation of 1763. As the Bosomworths had done before, this deed represented a document trail to help express the validity of Bryan’s claims. Lower Creek rationale for agreeing to such a scheme, especially in light of the recent controversy regarding the “New Purchase,” can be found in the proposed reorientation of the British trade from the overland paths to easier access of goods from the Gulf. In a trade that was increasingly threatened by diplomatic embargoes by British officials—an especially favorite tactic of Georgia governor James Wright—proximity to goods took on a newfound significance for many towns.

It is difficult to write any history of the Anglo-Creek relations in a vacuum. Although Juricek is able to deftly incorporate and relate Cherokee justifications for engaging in “lawful” cessions with the British at the regional and town levels (154), the Choctaw, arguably the most important antagonist to Creek ambitions, come across as an ethereal group that floats in and out of the narrative. In fact, the entire period under investigation, 1763 to 1776, can be viewed as a state of constant warfare between the two Native groups. An explanation of the outbreak of the most intense period of violence between the Choctaw and Creek—indeed, any discussion of Choctaw rationale at all—is noticeably absent. Importantly, the developments of early 1766 are overlooked. Violence erupted after a Weokay warrior went missing in January that year, and “after a fruitless Search in the Woods for him” the Creeks “concluded the Chactaws had killed him.” In response, eleven Weokays scalped one Choctaw in mid-March “near Tombegby Fort” (*Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763–1766: English Dominion*, 1911, 516) and it was this action that prompted the Choctaw war message that Emistisiguo received in late May.

Criticism aside, *Endgame for Empire* is a laudable work of synthesis that will interest scholars of eighteenth-century Creek history, and contributes to the recent burgeoning

interest in British failures in the Revolutionary South that has seen recent contributions by the likes of Kathleen DuVal and Andrew Jackson O’Shaughnessy. It will also serve as a methodological model, due to Juricek’s ability to distill complicated—and sometimes even contradictory—evidence and illustrate how these disparate sources fit into a comprehensible narrative. This is a skill that everyone, both established scholars and graduate students alike, can appreciate and learn from.

Matthew J. Sparacio
Auburn University

From Tribute to Communal Sovereignty: The Tarascan and Caxcan Territories in Transition. Edited by Andrew Roth-Seneff, Robert V. Kemper, and Julie Adkins. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2015. 272 pages. \$55.00 cloth.

This anthology is an excellent collection of studies from renowned scholars of west-central Mexico who, with an extensive trajectory of research on the region, have written important works regarding the region’s indigenous populations, some of them now classic. It includes archeologists, historians, and anthropologists interested in providing a broader perspective of the historical processes that have led to the transformations that indigenous groups have experienced in the region from the prehispanic period to the present. Although *From Tribute to Communal Sovereignty* clearly is not inclusive of all indigenous groups, nor a comprehensive analysis of all those historical processes, nonetheless the authors provide a series of impressive studies that highlight the dynamic interactions of the region’s indigenous populations. Divided into four parts, the first of the collection consists of some background information and a general discussion of the main theoretical debates included in the work. The next three parts address the historical context in the prehispanic period, the impact of conquest and consolidation of the Spanish colonial system, and recent case studies that show the persistence of indigenous cultural systems in an interconnected global context. In this review, I consider the three most significant contributions of this work: its emphasis on a long-term, broader perspective of the historical processes taking place in the region; its discussion of indigenous ethnic identity; and finally, its analysis of the changes and continuities observed in indigenous societies of west central Mexico since the arrival of the Spaniards to the region.

In the first part, archeologists and ethnohistorians Phillip Weigand and Helen Pollard provide the historical context for the prehispanic and early colonial period in Nueva Galicia and Michoacan. By incorporating archeological findings along with early colonial-period primary sources, Weigand and Pollard are able to demonstrate how significant the long-term context of the region is to understand the transformations that the area has experienced. In two extraordinarily informative chapters, Weigand presents an overview of the development of the “trans-Tarascan” and the Caxcan areas from the prehispanic to the early-colonial periods. Weigand convincingly demonstrates the complexity of the societies that the Spaniards encountered