

Fathers wielded these tools, each believing that he was defending the republic against an opponent's attempts to undermine it.

The arsenal of political tools included not only written and spoken words but also activities such as nose-tweaking, caning, and the ultimate weapon, dueling. Freeman incorporates her earlier academic research on the Burr-Hamilton duel of 1804 to explain the political aspects of duels and the carefully ritualized process and language connected with them. She shows that political duels were fought to influence the general public, were synchronized with larger political events, and "conveyed carefully scripted political messages" (p. 167).

The presidential election of 1800 reveals "the grammar of political combat in action" (p. 210). With Aaron Burr as the focus of her investigation, Freeman concludes that personal honor bound the nascent political parties together more than partisan loyalty and that Burr's more modern style of politics contributed to his characterization as a man without honor. Burr, however, did value his political reputation, and he attempted to salvage his honor, not only by dueling with Hamilton, but also by using a popular political weapon, the personal memoir, to redeem his reputation for posterity.

Although this book almost totally neglects ideology as a factor in national politics and omits a comprehensive examination of the writings and career of George Washington, for whom reputation was an ever-present concern, Freeman successfully discloses how a code of honor influenced the words and actions of the Founding Fathers. Historians probably will never look at the political tools outlined by Freeman without reference to the "culture of honor" she so aptly reveals.

CHRISTINE STERNBERG PATRICK is an assistant editor for *The Papers of George Washington, Presidential Series*, at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Andrew Jackson and His Indian Wars. By Robert V. Remini. (New York: Viking, 2001. Pp. xvi, 317. Maps, illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$26.95.)

Andrew Jackson, as we know him, could not have existed without Native Americans. Virtually every element of his life and career bore some Indian connection. He fought them and fought alongside them. He negotiated the purchase of their lands and advised others how best to conduct such negotiations. His enemies compared him to them. And of course he participated in the campaign to remove a great many of them from the eastern United States. Indians made Jackson, a point struck forcefully (if perhaps unintentionally) by Robert V. Remini in his latest examination of the Old Hero.

Remini, the dean of Jackson biographers, intends this new book to set the record straight on Jackson's relations with Native Ameri-

cans, in particular his advocacy of removal. Yes, Remini affirms, Old Hickory was a racist. Like most white Americans, Jackson believed that Indians belonged to a lower order of humanity and that the federal government had the right to deal with them as it saw fit. Remini worries, however, that Americans today remember Jackson as a kind of anti-Indian bogeyman, Robert Montgomery Bird's Nick of the Woods elevated to the presidency. That memory distorts Jackson's record and motivations, Remini maintains, especially when it comes to the removal policy. Jackson saw removal as the only realistic way to avoid perpetual frontier warfare. As long as Indians remained in close proximity to white settlements, whites would abuse them, encouraging the kind of violence that weakened the economy, complicated politics, killed American citizens, and might lead ultimately to the annihilation of the eastern tribes. His support for removal, Remini contends, came less from his own Indian-hating than from an awareness, born of long western experience, that white Americans' racism and land hunger permitted no other reasonable course.

Very little here is new. Remini mines his own earlier works for Jackson's biography. The Indian relations material comes from military scholars and occasionally the work of Native American historians. The analysis of removal rests largely on Francis Paul Prucha, the great student of American Indian policy. It is still interesting, however, to have an Indian relations biography of Jackson. For one thing, the book offers a detailed look at the creation of an Indian hater. Jackson learned to fear Native Americans as a boy in the Southeast, and as a Tennessee pioneer, lawyer, and land-grabber he learned to fight them. By the time he began his military and political careers, the ideas about Indians that Jackson would carry with him for the rest of his life were firmly established. Native Americans were extremely dangerous children, unruly and treacherous people who required firm management for the protection of western whites and for their own good, as well. Adhering to that definition, Jackson and other antebellum Americans could explain virtually any force or violence employed against Indians as self-defense or even philanthropy toward the Indians themselves.

That of course brings us to removal. Remini's book makes especially clear just how unlikely it would have been for Jackson to question the logic of the removal policy. He was not the first American to advocate removal, but he supported the idea from a very early point in his career and apparently never wavered. His military experience continually reinforced his belief that white Americans and Indian people could never live alongside one another without the strongest possible regulation. It was so much more rational, from an American point of view at least, to place eastern Indians beyond the convenient natural barrier of the Mississippi River.

Unfortunately, Remini leaps from this quite sound explanation to the rather silly conclusion that Jackson saved the eastern Indi-

ans from “probable extinction” (p. 281). To agree with that point, one must forget that large numbers of Native Americans remained in the East and are still there today, quite unextinct. One must also forget that removal did not fix America’s “Indian Problem” but merely transferred it to new territories. The Mississippi proved a rather permeable barrier, whites crossing the river and recreating in sections of the West the situation that removal had supposedly resolved. (Quite a few Native Americans, incidentally, told removal advocates that this would happen.) If Indian-white interaction pointed toward “probable extinction” in the Southeast, then why not in the West? Jackson was not a liar; he no doubt believed that he had saved the eastern Indians. But to concur with the Old Hero in this matter is to erase a great deal of Indian and American history.

This raises a more general problem, which is that Remini makes insufficient use of the literature on nineteenth-century Native Americans. In a study that relies so heavily on previous research and secondary sources, one expects Remini to integrate into his narrative some of the ethnohistorical scholarship on the peoples with whom Jackson fought and negotiated. This work appears occasionally in the footnotes and bibliography, but very few of its insights find their way into the main text. For example, Remini cites Joel Martin’s excellent study of the 1813–1814 Creek war (*Sacred Revolt: The Muskogees’ Struggle for a New World*, 1991) but seems not to have considered using the book to provide the perspective of Jackson’s enemies in that war. This is unfortunate, because Remini is a fine enough scholar and writer to have woven together both Jackson’s story and the stories of the native people who made him.

ANDREW DENSON teaches history at Butler University, Indianapolis.

Beloved Strangers: Interfaith Families in Nineteenth-Century America. By Anne C. Rose. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001. Pp. xii, 288. Illustrations, appendix, notes, index. \$39.95.)

Anne C. Rose’s interesting study of interfaith (i.e., Protestant-Catholic, Protestant-Jewish, and Catholic-Jewish) marriages in the United States during the century between 1815 and 1914 is at the same time an important pioneering monograph and a work of limited significance. The book jacket identifies this work as “the first historical study of religious diversity in the home.” Why has this subject received so little attention? The answer, Rose tells us, is the paucity of public records—“interfaith families. . . are barely visible in religious and civil records” (p. 12). Therefore to tell her story the author relies on the letters, journals, and memoirs of those participants in religiously-blended marriages who have left personal written materials. Consequently, this study is a narrative history based upon a very