

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Dominion and Civility: English Imperialism and Native America, 1585-1685. By Michael Leroy Oberg.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/26p831gw>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 25(2)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Breen, Louise A.

Publication Date

2001-03-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

The book's one weakness is the extent to which Smith presents contested ideas as facts. For example, Smith takes for granted that he and his colleagues have correctly identified the route of the de Soto entrada, while in fact there has been some controversy about segments of their reconstruction. Perhaps most important to this work, the identification of the Little Egypt site as the location where de Soto met the chief of Coosa has been contested, yet here Smith takes it as a given. In some ways these are nitpicky points, for such controversies cannot be adequately handled in a short work intended for both lay and academic audiences. On the other hand, Smith overstates the real knowledge we have of the Coosa chiefdom and in doing so seems to cross the boundary between what is posited and what is known without clearly marking that divide.

The University Press of Florida should be congratulated for publishing this work, and for the solid binding, handsome typeface, and clear illustrations with which it has been produced. The one complaint I have is the book's price, which will make many potential buyers balk and may make the book too expensive to use as a supplemental text in North American archaeology courses, for which it would otherwise be ideal. *Coosa: The Rise and Fall of a Southeastern Mississippian Chiefdom* is the product of high quality research and writing, and it will be enjoyed by generations of students and scholars alike. It should be considered essential reading for anyone interested in the later prehistory of North America, the Native Americans of the southeastern United States, or the effect of contact on Native American cultures.

Peter N. Peregrine

Lawrence University

Dominion and Civility: English Imperialism and Native America, 1585–1685.
By Michael Leroy Oberg. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999. 239 pages.
\$42.50 cloth.

This book sets out to explain the “tragic” failure of seventeenth-century Englishmen to live up to their best imperial vision. According to Oberg, early English colonial ventures contained a significant “metropolitan” element, which sought to incorporate Native peoples into empire by cultivating diplomatic alliances, fostering trade relationships, and spreading the Gospel. But this metropolitan vision proved too fragile for early America. It was resented, thwarted, and eventually defeated by settler populations more eager to engross Indian lands than to Christianize, trade, or ally with their neighbors; and it was resisted by Algonquians unwilling to be “civilized” on the English model. In each British mainland colony Oberg studies, a deadly pattern emerged in which metropolitan leaders lost political control as greedy frontier interests, more adept at dealing with the “exigencies” of survival, asserted themselves and finally prevailed. On all frontiers, indigenous peoples experienced increasingly harsh treatment, violence, and ultimately removal, once the metropolitans were eclipsed by their bumptious frontier rivals.

Oberg examines the adversarial relationship between metropolitan and frontier sensibilities in an impressive range of English colonies, but focuses most of his attention on the eastern seaboard. In covering the various attempts to settle Virginia, he shows how the framers of each successive venture shared a Renaissance perspective regarding Native peoples: Walter Raleigh, Richard Hakluyt, and John White of the Roanoke venture, and Edwin Sandys and George Thorpe of the Virginia Company, believed that Indians would recognize the superiority of English culture and religion, and willingly work to become "civilized" under the newcomers' tutelage. But the metropolitan ideals these individuals tried to promote in the first colonies were scorned and undermined by strong frontier figures, such as Ralph Lane at Roanoke and John Smith at Jamestown, who believed that Native peoples would respond only to violent coercion. Later on, in the wake of the Anglo-Powhatan wars, and Opechancanough's uprising of 1644, metropolitan leaders may have become disillusioned by Native intransigence; but, even in the second half of the century, royal governor William Berkeley still sought to maintain alliances with friendly Indians on the frontier and to curb the engrossment of lands belonging to Native peoples, these policies inspiring many ordinary colonists to rise in rebellion under Nathaniel Bacon.

In the Puritan colonies of Plymouth, Massachusetts, and Connecticut, meanwhile, first-generation leaders like John Winthrop and William Bradford evinced a metropolitan outlook largely for religious reasons; they wanted to convert the Indians. But population pressure, the self-seeking policies pursued by the individual colonies in the aftermath of the Pequot War, and an ever-intensifying Anglo-Indian competition for land and other resources, doomed these more benevolent impulses to defeat, just as they had in the Chesapeake. When the frontier erupted in King Philip's War in 1675, colonial leaders with a metropolitan outlook had difficulty retaining power, just as Berkeley did, at precisely the same chronological moment, in Virginia. In Massachusetts, however, the failure to make the frontier peaceful and profitable was even more dangerous, for it invited royal intervention in the persons of Edward Randolph and Edmund Andros.

Dominion and Civility succeeds admirably in showing how Massachusetts and Virginia, often conceptualized in the scholarly literature as polar opposites, were shaped by similar processes. In addition to treating these English zones of settlement, Oberg also makes ambitious forays into New Netherland and New France. His efforts to deal with these areas are necessarily thinner and less varied than other parts of the book. The inclusion of this material is significant, however, because he shows that the colonizers of non-English regions were, like their English counterparts, driven by clashes between metropolitan and frontier interests. Oberg illustrates, for example, how the Dutch West India Company's efforts to increase the population of New Netherland's Hudson Valley touched off a series of Munsee uprisings and brutal reprisals under Director General William Kieft, who allowed the "frontier thugs with whom he sympathized" to hold sway in the colony (p. 139). Future researchers will be able to use Oberg's conceptual framework as a tool for making systematic and direct comparisons among all North American colonies, not just those of the English.

Oberg's book is to be applauded for heightening our awareness of the complexities of English colonization. Yet even though his emphasis falls primarily on explicating how Englishmen differed among themselves as to the proper objectives and best means for establishing new world dominion, he nonetheless makes an effort to flesh out the ways Native actors, such as Wingina, Powhatan, Miantonomo, Uncas, Ninigret, and Waban, developed strategies, both of resistance and adaptation, for dealing with the newcomers. It should be pointed out too that Oberg has no illusions about the extent of metropolitan benevolence. The metropolitan vision was an inclusive one, but those who espoused it had no intrinsic use for Indians or their culture, praising only their ability and will to ascend the English-conceived ladder of "civilization."

My one quibble with Oberg's work is that he tends to homogenize those individuals forced together under the metropolitan and frontier umbrellas. The metropolitan category is made to accommodate all individuals who advocated establishing ties with Native peoples as a means of furthering the goals of empire. But this turns out to be an incredibly diverse lot, encompassing, in the case of Massachusetts, both Puritan leaders and their imperial nemeses, Edward Randolph and Edmund Andros. Oberg is well aware that the restored monarchy was eager to reassert its authority over Massachusetts, and that Puritan leaders in the era of King Philip's War were desperate to prove their ability to effectively manage the frontier so as to forestall imperial intervention. But because he is interested primarily in locating colonizers on one side or the other of his frontier-metropolitan divide, Oberg does not explore, except in a cursory way, the diverse shades of metropolitan opinion. Puritan magistrates and royal officials harbored distinct, and in some cases diametrically opposed, definitions of what constituted "dominion," "civility," and the good colonial society.

The frontier category also seems frustratingly ill-defined. It is unclear, for example, why Oberg attributes a frontier orientation to the Indian trader Thomas Morton, whose activities at the provocatively named post of Ma-Re Mount were vilified by Puritan leaders in New England. In most cases, Oberg depicts frontier sorts, such as Ralph Lane or John Smith, as having developed harsh ways of dealing with indigenous peoples as a result of experiences in the "marchlands" of empire. Morton does not seem to have had this kind of background and his dealings with the local Algonquians seem particularly harsh compared with those of the Puritan magistrates. Morton, who deliberately flouted Puritan values, was punished severely both in Plymouth and Massachusetts, because, says Oberg, the leaders of these colonies wanted to establish order on the frontier by strictly regulating the contact between Indians and Englishmen. But if Morton favored those Indians who complied with his wishes and punished those who did not, he was behaving no differently than the magistrates of Massachusetts and Connecticut who, in the wake of the Pequot War, engineered the execution of the recalcitrant Narragansett sachem Miantonomo and set up Uncas of the Mohegans as a client. Morton understandably chose different Indian allies than his Puritan neighbors; but in no way did he eschew the idea of

incorporating Indians into colonial society, a necessary characteristic for Oberg's other expositors of the frontier ethos. Even though Morton may have been more interested in his own bottom line than the larger goals of empire, his actions probably kept more with the wishes of imperial officials than those of the Puritans. As Oberg himself points out, Morton evinced concern with the religious conversion of the Indians and ridiculed the Puritans for their failure in this regard. To argue that the Puritan magistrates, themselves defying the imperial will of the crown, were more metropolitan than Morton, does not ring true. Those who agreed that Indians should be integrated into the English new world empire did not necessarily see eye to eye on all other matters, and may indeed have viewed one another as enemies.

Michael Oberg is not the first historian to chronicle the demise of inclusive frontiers in the English colonies of North America. Edmund Morgan's classic *American Slavery, American Freedom* (1975) traces the abandonment of plans for a multiethnic and economically diverse society in colonial Virginia and argues that a growing emphasis on racial difference as opposed to class distinction helped foster "democracy" in early America. Oberg's metropolitan-frontier dichotomy is too blunt an instrument to fully comprehend all the factional infighting that shaped Virginia, much less the numerous other colonies he studies; nor is he able to explain as eloquently as Morgan the long-term influence of the transition from metropolitan to frontier leadership on subsequent American history. The virtue of Oberg's book, however, is that he applies a single interpretive tool to a wide variety of colonial situations, thus providing a fitting point of departure for cross-regional and cross-cultural comparison. In a field where the lack of synthesis has been keenly felt and almost universally decried, this book is no small accomplishment.

Louise A. Breen

Kansas State University

Dreaming the Dawn: Conversations with Native Artists and Activists. By E. K. Caldwell. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999. 143 pages. \$25.00 cloth.

Dreaming the Dawn is a collection of previously published interviews by E. K. Caldwell with twelve indigenous artists and activists. It is a relatively small book and includes an introduction by Elizabeth Woody. The twelve interviews are each prefaced by a brief biographical summary, which provides context and explains why each interview is framed as it is. The list of interviewees includes John Trudell; Elizabeth Woody; Norman Guardipee; Rick Bartow; Bonnie Blackwolf; Sherman Alexie; Litefoot; Jesse Hummingbird; James Welch; Winona La Duke; Dino Butler; and Buffy Sainte-Marie. As this list indicates, the emphasis is more on artists than activists, although as several of the interviewees make clear, the distinction between those categories is perhaps more blurred than is often recognized.

The book is reminiscent of other edited collections published in the last decade or so that bring a number of Native voices to bear on a single issue or