

ways that diplomacy evolved in the 1790s as Federalists and Jeffersonian Republicans debated the proper balances of power within the federal government; and, finally, how as the United States was accepted into the European-centered system of diplomacy among sovereign states, Native peoples lost any ability to participate in that system.

A prologue on Sir Alexander Cuming's self-appointed mission to the Cherokees in 1730 and an epilogue on William Wirt, the lawyer hired by the Cherokee nation in 1830 to plead its case before the US Supreme Court, book-end these chapters and serve to underscore the striking changes wrought in the intervening century. Sadosky presents the growth of US potency and the diminishment of Native strength as a kind of zero-sum game, so that his story of "how the United States of America came to be" is also the story of "how many of the powerful and independent American Indian nations of eastern North America came to be much less than they once had been" (8). Cherokees were courted as valued allies in the fluid, shifting world of 1730; in 1830, they were forcibly removed from a more rigidly defined state despite having done nearly everything right within that prevailing system to save themselves and their property.

To be sure, this theme of Native diminishment and the sense that the futures of the United States and Native groups were locked in a zero-sum game tends to flatten the diverse experiences of specific Indian peoples, and the idea that Native American history is one long declension narrative is frequently complicated by more nuanced looks at particular peoples and places. Yet Sadosky compellingly demonstrates how the success of the United States was built on the dispossession and marginalization of Native peoples, and he should be applauded for creating a diplomatic history that encompasses and integrates colonists-turned-citizens' dealings with both European and Native powers.

*Omohundro Institute for Early  
American Culture and History*

LAURA KEENAN SPERO

*Indians and British Outposts in Eighteenth-Century America.* By DANIEL INGRAM. (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2012. 272 pp. Illustrations, notes, bibliography, index. \$69.95.)

The Seven Years' War militarized the frontier of colonial North America. French, British, and provincial armies built forts and roads to secure their possession of disputed territory, but more often than not, these projects unsettled the frontier by upsetting delicate diplomatic equilibriums with Native peoples and making it easier for colonists to invade their lands. Forts, meant to establish unchallenged possession for imperial powers, invariably became sites of local

contestation and negotiation. In his new book, Daniel Ingram examines the legacy of such forts built and occupied between 1755 and 1796. Taking aim against the romantic narratives popularized by James Fenimore Cooper and Francis Parkman in the nineteenth century, Ingram rejects the idea that these forts represented the tentative footsteps of European civilization into a savage wilderness. Instead, he argues that frontier forts became sites of “cultural confluence” (24) where Indians and Europeans “often found cultural common ground in spite of their larger purposes and prejudices” (4).

Ingram focuses his analysis on five forts: Fort Loudoun in the Overhill Cherokee country of eastern Tennessee, Fort Allen in northeastern Pennsylvania, Fort Michilimackinac at the tip of the Michigan peninsula, Fort Niagara at the outlet of the Niagara River into Lake Ontario, and Fort Chartres on the Mississippi River in the Illinois Country. Although he never explicitly explains why he has chosen these forts from among many others, his logic becomes clear in passing; each illustrates the agency of local Indians in shaping the fort’s mission and survival. Ingram’s central theme boils down to this: no matter what the original intention or purpose for a fort, it was the interaction of the communities of soldiers and Indians it brought together that determined its fate.

Ingram’s five forts also provide the reader with an interesting spectrum of experiences. Niagara, Michilimackinac, and Chartres were all parts of New France’s fur trading network before the British took them over, Fort Loudoun was built by the British at the Cherokees’ request, and Fort Allen was hastily constructed by the Pennsylvania government in 1755. At Forts Niagara, Michilimackinac, and Chartres, the British stepped into French shoes awkwardly, upsetting local economies and alliances that had developed long before their arrival. Ingram describes, for example, how British efforts to provision Fort Michilimackinac from afar upset the nearby Odawa Indians, who were used to selling their surplus maize to the fort’s garrison. Fort Loudoun began with great promise because the Cherokees had invited its construction, expecting that it would supply them with a more plentiful and better regulated fur trade. The military engineer charged with its construction even told his commanding officer to “shoot him through the Head” (45) if he was going to insist on listening to the Indians’ wishes over his own.

Fort Allen in Northampton County, Pennsylvania, is the runt in Ingram’s litter. Built and garrisoned by inexperienced provincials rather than seasoned redcoats, it was never likely to defend anyone from anything, but it did become a favorite haunt of the Delaware Indians traveling between the upper Susquehanna Valley and Easton for diplomatic conferences during the Seven Years’ War. Although it originated in Pennsylvania’s anti-Indian panic of 1755, it rapidly became “the kind of outpost that visiting Indians like best: able to provide provisions and presents without threat of permanent settler farms or overwhelming troop strength” (72).

Although each chapter tells a different story about a different place, Ingram's book succeeds very well in its overall objective of reorienting our perspective on frontier outposts. The uneasy symbiosis of military and native communities at these sites, the ways in which they cooperated in trade and survival, and the reasons why they fought and grew apart are expertly reconstructed in these pages.

*Gettysburg College*

TIMOTHY J. SHANNON

*Culture and Liberty in the Age of the American Revolution.* By MICHAL JAN ROZBICKI. (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011. 288 pp. Notes, bibliography, index. \$35.)

Michal Jan Rozbicki has written an ambitious and intellectually rigorous book that challenges the historiographical and popular assumptions surrounding the concept of liberty before, during, and after the American Revolution. Readers seeking a conventional narrative history of the Revolution or a philosophical examination of liberal political thought are encouraged to look elsewhere. Instead, Rozbicki wants the reader to understand what liberty meant to Americans on the eve of their revolution. Embracing the tools of cultural analysis, including semiotics and poststructuralism, to uncover the cultural, social, and political constructs that created this ideal, Rozbicki concludes that eighteenth-century American liberty belonged to—and was jealously guarded by—the elite and the privileged. The more broadly based understanding of liberty came about reluctantly and symbolically as American elites elicited popular support to both legitimize their break from Britain and retain their social and political status. Having sold the promise of liberty as an essential element of the American Revolution, the ruling elite would struggle to contain its influence in the factional politics of the 1790s.

Rozbicki's book, part of the Jeffersonian America series from University of Virginia Press, unabashedly concerns itself with ideas, both historical and historiographical. First, it offers a detailed history and contextualization of the meanings and promises of eighteenth-century liberty as this idea evolved from its British origins through its application during the American Revolution. Aside from tracing the history of eighteenth-century liberty, Rozbicki's book does not offer a comprehensive historical account of Revolutionary society or politics. Secondly, Rozbicki boldly makes his mark on Revolutionary historiography, successfully challenging the ideological interpretations of Gordon Wood and Bernard Bailyn, who, he believes, mistakenly offer a modernist and essentialist understanding of Revolutionary liberty based in freedom and rights for all.

This book also embraces the methodological approaches found in the recent and growing literature exploring early American political culture, both at the