

ever. For example, the author asserts that anthropologists are doing more to give the Native American his rightful place in American history than historians. This statement is a bit too facile.

Occasionally (far less than most writers), the author falls into the use of paradoxical phrases. He refers to the Mayan Classic Age as ". . . primitive, wise, poetic, placid, the unique example in the history of the world lost in thought." Why use the word "primitive"? Perhaps "natural" would be a better term. Far more often Mr. Brandon comes up with some interesting parallels. In the sixteenth century, the chief European expansionist power, the Ottoman Turk, conquered and held more territory than the Spanish managed to take in the same period from the Indians in the New World.

In the final analysis, the work remains well organized, readable, and pro-Indian. Although the author proves his point, the book has very little to offer in the way of new interpretations. More important, the author takes recent scholarly research and makes it available and understandable to the general public. For the more serious student, the vague documentation is vexing at times. The section on Indian poetry is very beautiful, for it is in this way that Indian people express their history, desires, and disappointments most effectively. *The Last Americans* is a must for the general reader and for some specialists if they have not read the earlier edition.

Department of History
State University College at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

DONALD A. GRINDE, JR.

The Middle Colonies and the Coming of the American Revolution. By

JOHN A. NEUENSCHWANDER. (Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1973. Pp. 273. Notes, bibliography, index. \$12.50.)

Most scholars have neglected the role of the Middle Colonies in the study of the origins of the American Revolution, concentrating instead on New England and the South. John A. Neuenschwander takes a fresh approach by dealing with the Middle Colonies as a section, arguing that they played a pivotal role in the decision for independence.

Merrill Jensen and John M. Head have already suggested that the Middle Colonies possessed certain common interests that held them more closely to the British Empire than the provinces to the north or south. Neuenschwander, in *The Middle Colonies and the Coming of*

the American Revolution, emphasizes those common interests and concludes that the colonies of Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware shared an unarticulated sense of regionalism that surfaced in the period 1774-1776. The middle colonists, especially the merchants and landed gentry of Pennsylvania and New York, were anxious to maintain the stability and prosperity of peace within the empire. When New England pressed for independence, the middle provinces drew back and drew together. They feared not only that the New Englanders would destroy the empire for their own selfish interests but that they were also conspiring to establish hegemony over the middle area. Thus, according to Neuenschwander, sectional awareness in the Middle Colonies was born of fear, particularly as the drive toward independence reached major proportions following the passage of the Coercive Acts to punish Boston in 1774.

Neuenschwander does not suggest that the middle provinces developed a strong, long-term kinship as in the South or New England, but the specter of revolutionary chaos and New England imperialism did temporarily raise their level of sectional consciousness. Samuel Seabury, Thomas Chandler, and other Tory essayists played upon the middle colonists' Yankeeophobia, concentrating on the threat that the New England aggressors posed to continued peace and prosperity under the empire. Especially in the Continental Congress, the leaders of the Middle Colonies opposed New England and supported rapprochement with Britain down to 1776. John Dickinson, in particular, struggled to build sectional accord in Congress to block independence.

Relying heavily on work already done by H. James Henderson and Curtis Nettels, Neuenschwander emphasizes that the Middle Colonies, members tended to vote as a bloc. Twenty-eight of the thirty-six men who represented the middle provinces in the Second Continental Congress worked for reconciliation, staking their hopes on the Olive Branch Petition. But it failed in England, and in 1776 the radical colonial Whigs overthrew the government of Pennsylvania, thereby stripping the Middle Colonies of their key sectional leaders. Independence followed. And when New England proved to be quite unaggressive toward the middle provinces, the "sense of regional peril" that had brought them "closer to a conscious sectional identity than at any other time in their history" quickly dissipated. The peace advocates from the Middle Colonies had been able to delay the decision for independence in Congress for several months; once they lost out to the radicals the sectional consciousness they represented was also lost.

Neuenschwander presents a fairly convincing case for the sense of sectional awareness among the leadership elite of the Middle Colonies in the two years preceding independence, particularly among the members of the Continental Congress. He does not, however, cast his work in a sufficiently broad context to test the degree of sectional cohesion among the people of Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware. He asserts that they held an unarticulated sense of regionalism inspired by common economic interests, ethnic diversity, religious diversity, and political tensions, but he does not develop this view in sufficient depth.

Neuenschwander's study is valuable as a suggestive interpretation centering primarily on the role of the political elite of the Middle Colonies. That is a useful contribution. More important, however, are the issues he raises which invite further study. There is room for more exploration of the causes of the exaggerated fear of New England among the middle colonists, and there is a need for additional investigation into the elements of sectional cohesion in the middle area.

Department of History
California State University
San Diego, California

ROBERT C. DETWEILER

Sir Harry Vane, His Life and Times (1613-1662). By J. H. ADAMSON and H. F. FOLLAND. (Gambit Incorporated, Boston, 1973. Pp. 480. Foreword, illustrations, epilogue, bibliography, index. \$10.00.)

First, to introduce the coauthors of this well-written biography of Sir Harry Vane, second governor of Massachusetts. Both men teach at the University of Utah: Jack H. Adamson is a professor of English; Harold F. Folland, a professor of English and theater.

The first five chapters of the book tell the story of young Harry Vane's brief governorship of Massachusetts colony, when his utopian dreams about the New World turned into a kind of nightmare. The rest of the book shows Sir Harry Vane as a Puritan leader in the English Civil War, with many Englishmen and Scots rating him as the most powerful man of the times.

The English Civil War, related in unusually compact and lucid fashion, furnishes a backdrop for Sir Harry Vane, Charles I and II, Cromwell, Laud, Strafford, merchants, Scots, country gentry, and the people. One wonders whether this approach came about through Mr.