

written during the midst of the Battle at Bushy Run. Bouquet's forces, on their way to relieve Fort Pitt in August 1763, were ambushed by Indians in overwhelming numbers yet managed to outmaneuver them and get most of the military unit to Fort Pitt. The Swiss officer Bouquet and the Scottish Highland troops under his command became folk heroes to settlers in western Pennsylvania for their daring and fierce counterattack. The military history focus of most of Dixon's book is its strong point, yet this approach begs for a more nuanced discussion of causes and impacts.

Though Dixon promises "to offer readers new insight into the causes and important consequences" of Pontiac's War, seven of the eight chapters cover the military actions of the 1758-1765 period, with only the remaining eighth chapter cursorily devoted to the impact of the war on later times and peoples (p. xi). That last chapter is interpretatively the weakest, as Dixon cherry-picks events from 1765

to 1776 that involved persons from western Pennsylvania in an attempt to demonstrate a direct connection between the Paxton Boys and other Indian-hating terrorist groups and the call for independence from Britain. The supposed connection between the Paxton Boys and calls for independence requires more analysis than is offered here; the author has not proven precisely what role they and other backcountry settlers played in toppling British imperial power. The fact that those settlers remained just as disillusioned with the new government of the United States under the Articles of Confederation suggests at the least that they did not accurately foresee the impact of their actions.

GREG O'BRIEN is associate professor of history at the University of Southern Mississippi and the author of *Choctaws in a Revolutionary Age, 1750-1830* (2002).



Demanding the Cherokee Nation
Indian Autonomy and American Culture, 1830-1900

By Andrew Denson

(Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004. Pp. xi, 327. Notes, bibliography, index. \$55.00.)

Andrew Denson's contribution to the University of Nebraska's series on Indians of the Southeast joins a growing and timely debate about Indian sovereignty. Focusing on the Cherokees, one of the most acculturated of

the Five Tribes in the nineteenth century, Denson's text richly explores resources only marginally used by previous historians. Rather than depending upon Bureau of Indian Affairs materials, the book considers

United States House and Senate memorials, documents, and speeches prepared by the Cherokee leadership as examples of both meaningful resistance to American Indian policy and engagement of broader conceptions of Indian nationhood. Denson, whose approach to the sources draws on the literary criticism of Arnold Krupat and Homi K. Bhabha's theories of "cultural ambivalence," maintains that the Cherokees responded to changes in American life by arguing that the preservation of Indian nations, rather than their dissolution, would be the most effective means to progress.

The removal of the Cherokees from their homelands to Indian Territory provided them with an education in negotiating the political terrain of American politics, and established the outline for nineteenth-century arguments over the "Indian Question." At every major turning point in the dialogue, from removal to Civil War to the allotment process, the Cherokees built upon a platform of ideas that offered an alternative to consistent either/or demands from the U.S. government. Their arguments included: the existence of a distinct community pre-dating European intrusion, the success of an early treaty partnership with the government, the failure of the government to fulfill its obligations, the suffering attendant to Cherokee loyalty and failed government protection, the successful example of Cherokee assimilation, Cherokee leadership in Indian

Territory over Plains Indian cultures, and the virtue of Indian nations free of white interference as a safeguard against corruption.

One of the book's most fascinating aspects is its account of the many uses made by Cherokee leadership of reform sentiment within Gilded Age culture. Grant's paternalistic "Peace Policy" became a promotion of Indian autonomy, corruption in reservation administration was united to corporate scandals, and guarantees of Cherokee separateness became a model of successful reform worthy of the continuation of Indian Territory status. The Cherokee leaders went so far as to equate their nationhood with the distinct status of corporations, arguing in favor of legal rights and communal land ownership. The Okmulgee Council provided a six-year-long arena for the refinement of much of this rhetoric. In addition, the multinational Indian fairs held at Muskogee bolstered their positions by supplying evidence of Indian order, education, Christianity, industry, and agricultural advancement—the hallmarks of American progress.

Denson concedes that his work reveals very little about Cherokee culture and society. An educated Cherokee mixed-blood elite composed of representatives chosen by the Cherokee National Council constructed the responses to federal demands. Their arguments do not reflect the understandings or the attitudes of all Cherokees. Denson's work reveals, however, an inspired and dynamic

interaction of ideas among competing interests with enormous stakes at risk. This well-researched and beautifully written book will be a welcome addition for university courses in Indian history and law and U.S. history, as well as offering an intelligent discussion of Indian issues in nine-

teenth-century America for a general audience.

LINDA W. REESE teaches at East Central University in Ada, Oklahoma, and is currently at work on a history of freedwomen in Indian Territory, 1865-1890.



Lincoln's Defense of Politics
The Public Man and His Opponents in the Crisis Over Slavery
 By Thomas E. Schneider

(Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2006. Pp. x, 224. Abbreviations, notes, works cited, index. \$39.95.)

"Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable," declared Senator Daniel Webster in 1830, in a speech memorized by generations of schoolchildren well into the next century. This sentiment, largely uncontested since the Civil War, could not be taken for granted by Webster or his contemporaries. In fact, many people of his time viewed union and liberty as entirely different—even mutually exclusive—considerations. It was Abraham Lincoln who achieved the intellectual and political formulation that allowed the durable marriage of the two ideas in the body politic, an achievement brought into focus by this valuable little book.

Lincoln's Defense of Politics presents a series of intellectual portraits limning the thought of the major political figures of the antebellum era—including the usual suspects (John Calhoun and William Lloyd

Garrison) as well as some who are relatively overlooked as political philosophers (Frederick Douglass and Henry David Thoreau). As Thomas E. Schneider shows, abolitionists and pro-slavery theorists, for all their obvious differences, often shared surprisingly similar assumptions about the relationship between legal and moral law and about the possibilities and limits of the U.S. Constitution. In particular, many of these people bore deeply suspicions of politics—here understood as the necessity to resolve, pragmatically if not necessarily logically, the divergences of interest, ideology, and morality that are inevitably part of any social compact.

As Schneider shows, Lincoln proved unusual in his insistence on both the necessity for a highly imperfect Union and the ultimate—not immediate or even foreseeable, but eventual—end of slavery. Yet Lincoln