

Kirkland, and the New York Iroquois sought to defend the cultural, legal, and spatial, boundaries of Iroquois sovereignty, New York power continued to impose new restrictive geographical borders, particularly by selling native soil. Throughout, readers gain a strong sense of the ramifications of the destruction of the borderland—the loss of Iroquois land, the restriction of native sovereignty, and the end of many intimate relationships between whites and natives.

The Divided Ground is a great book by a great scholar. It brings the politics of land to the center of intercultural negotiations on one early republic frontier, a space that shifted from a non-bordered region to one with defined borders. But Taylor's excellent history uses the story of land to do much more. He reveals much about the early American republic, an era of massive change, and about shifting notions of culture, law, politics, and sovereignty in that era. As Taylor weaves all these issues into a rich account of the dispossession of the Iroquois, he also brings many different people to the fore, including native chiefs, Anglo missionaries, and important politicians and land speculators from both Canada and the United States. Taylor has provided an immense contribution; in this spirit, *The Divided Ground* had this particular reader intensely pondering both the geopolitical consequences and the unyielding justification of today's imperialism among tribal peoples.

MARK A. NICHOLAS,
University of St. Thomas, Houston

Daniel P. Barr, ed. *The Boundaries between Us: Natives and Newcomers Along the Frontiers of the Old Northwest Territory, 1750–1850*. (Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 2006. xix + 261pp., notes, bibliography, index. Cloth \$52.00).

Of the eleven essays included in *The Boundaries between Us*, only the final two fail to reference Richard White's *The Middle Ground* in their endnotes. This does not come as a surprise, because this collection revolves around the Old Northwest Territory and because White's interpretive framework has loomed so large over American Indian historiography in the fifteen years since its publication. Yet the strength and popularity of the middle ground as a concept might be viewed as both a blessing and a curse. On the one hand,

scholars of Colonial, American Indian, and Early American histories have been forced to reconcile their arguments with the complex world of encounter White highlighted in his prominent study. The resulting scholarship has become increasingly sophisticated, as historians have had to investigate in more detail the interactions between natives and newcomers. On the other hand, the middle ground's omnipresence may hinder new developments, as scholars feel the need to pay their respects or dues to a concept of such importance and influence.

Daniel Barr alludes to this dilemma in the introduction to this collection. Though he notes the impact of White's work on historians of the Old Northwest Territory, he also points to other interpretations in the historiography that indicate new areas of focus and interest. Thus, he remarks, *The Boundaries between Us* "aspires to offer new avenues of inquiry for unfolding discussions in the history of the Old Northwest Territory, as well as the history of early America, the eastern frontier, and cultural interaction between natives and newcomers"(xii). As a collection of new scholarship it is intended to expand the discussion and push beyond the conceptual boundaries of the middle ground even as it remains geographically within the loosely defined confines of the pays d'en haut.

There are some noted successes. In "Two Paths to Peace: Competing Visions of Native Space in the Old Northwest," Lisa Brooks supplies one of the better essays in the book. She examines the diplomatic relations with the Ohio Indians in the early 1790s, a time during which the Indians in the region took a stand to establish the Ohio River as the southern boundary of their territory. Hendrick Aupaumut, a Stockbridge Indian, and Joseph Brant, a Mohawk Indian, worked hard to clear and maintain the titular two paths that are both metaphorical constructs and physical reality. Brooks's essay is a fascinating discussion that unpacks the complex relationships built and maintained by these two Indian diplomats. During the post-Revolution era, Indians living east of the Mississippi River tried to negotiate their place within the newly established United States. Brooks uses Aupaumut and Brant to illustrate the native conceptions of space, peace, and authority during this period, and thus reveals a world that contemporary federal officials often failed to recognize and did not understand.

Genette Aley's essay is another highlight because it tackles the intricacies of relationships and encounters during the Indian removal era. More specifically, Aley deftly reveals the actions underlying the simple narrative of American land hunger and Indian dispossession. As she states, "the internal

improvement movement and market development in the Old Northwest cannot fully be understood apart from their relationship to contemporary federal Indian policy, to the consequences for American Indians, and to the difficulties facing settler-farmers in their aspirations to become not only landowners but also prosperous producers for the market”(199). In Indiana in particular, the push for the removal of the Potawatomis and Miamis in the 1830s was directly linked to the state’s desire for a canal that could produce benefits similar to those created by the recently completed Erie Canal in New York.

Several other essays in *The Boundaries between Us* reveal both the potential and the difficulty of examining the history of the Old Northwest Territory. Phyllis Gernhardt’s essay on traders and Indian removal in Indiana joins Aley’s work by focusing on the neglected area of northern Indian removal. It is an important topic that deserves further analysis, but it is also critical to note that the influence of fur traders is not a new development. Instead that influence is part of a larger fur trade network that had been built up over years and years. Indeed, it is surprising that Gernhardt does not make reference to Susan Sleeper-Smith’s work on the interconnected worlds of Indian women and French men in the Great Lakes region. Donald Gaff’s discussion of identity in the Old Northwest likewise suffers from its limited reference to pre-existing works on the subject. His comparison of the experiences of Little Turtle, Jean Baptiste Richardville, and William Wells, is cast as a critique of well-defined poles of identity. Gaff argues that the lives of the three men suggest “a fluency in the cultural vernacular of both Indian and Euro-American worlds”(143). Yet his discussion is unable to escape those two poles, and his reference to Little Turtle’s shift from a “purely Indian identity” to one that contained numerous American components is an instance where his interpretation cannot elude his own critique.

For the most part this collection accomplishes its goal and successfully presents a varied history of the region both chronologically and geographically. Some essays are stronger than others, and Brooks and Aley are two of the best in the book. Work from Ian K. Steele, David Dixon, and Thomas J. Lappas likewise provide a solid foundation for the collection through their respective examinations of Shawnee captives, Pontiac’s War, and Keokuk’s leadership practices. In the end, the historians who contributed to *The Boundaries between Us* have taken an important step by suggesting ways in which new perspectives can expand our understanding of the Old Northwest. But work remains

if these scholars and others are going to make a more substantial move beyond the framework of the middle ground.

JOHN P. BOWES
Eastern Kentucky University

Thomas Dublin and Walter Licht. *The Face of Decline: The Pennsylvania Anthracite Region in the Twentieth Century*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005. Pp. 275, appendices, notes, bibliography, acknowledgements, index. Paperback \$24.95).

Recent studies of deindustrialization capture the phenomenon as multi-dimensional and exceedingly complex. Historians have documented the growth of the core industries that drove an industrial revolution, like railroads, coal, and steel, and have demonstrated the troubling fault lines in the industries before the economic crisis of the 1930s. Thomas Dublin (SUNY-Binghamton) and Walter Licht (University of Pennsylvania), finding economic decline in Pennsylvania's anthracite region to be uneven yet persistent, continue this story of decline through the twentieth century. Still, measures of declining tonnage or annual employment figures fail to capture how communities, former mineworkers, and their families faced industrial collapse. We may tabulate collieries' closings and enumerate dwindling jobs, but the meanings of these effects need to be understood in personal terms. Dublin and Licht's new study *The Face of Decline* offers just this perspective.

"Unemployment," "displaced worker," and even "diaspora" are common descriptors of deindustrialization in Pennsylvania. While such terms may have captured national headlines in the 1970s and 1980s, anthracite coal communities in Pennsylvania's Lackawanna, Luzerne, Carbon, and Schuylkill counties had been facing such economic and social dislocations for generations. There, the mining industry's decline began in 1917 after a highpoint in that year's reported coal production of 100 million tons. Dublin and Licht focus on an accelerated "second stage of decline" in the post-World War II decades and have written a valuable contribution to historians' understanding of causes, effects, and, most notably, the meanings of deindustrialization which the people of anthracite mining communities who experienced this long-term economic transformation constructed. The authors use several lenses to view deindustrialization over decades and through generations of