King Philip's War: Colonial Expansion, Native Resistance and the End of Indian Sovereignty. By Daniel R. Mandell. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010. 176 pages. $45.00 cloth; $20.00 paper.

Few people realize how long the bitter legacy of King Philip's War (1675–76) has lasted. In the mid-1990s, northeastern Native American activists discovered Massachusetts' 1675 Indian Imprisonment Act, which authorized the arrest of American Indians who entered the city of Boston, and began lobbying for its repeal. In an instance of William Faulkner's observation that "the past isn't dead. It isn't even past, " in 2005 the Boston city council and the state legislature repealed the archaic 330-year-old law in order to secure the "Unity: Journalists of Color" convention business for the city.

A hundred years before the American Revolution, King Philip's War was the bloodiest war per capita in American history. Daniel R. Mandell's book, *King Philip's War: Colonial Expansion, Native Resistance and the End of Indian Sovereignty*, provides readers with a multicultural context for critically examining the conflict and accommodation of what Colin Calloway calls the "shared past" of American history. Analyzing an "irresolvable conflict" that was more complex and multifaceted than many realize, this book is an outstanding contribution to colonial American and Native American history. Intended for senior high school and college students as well as general readers, this concise yet comprehensive work is a pleasure to read, written in a direct and fluid style that rarely succumbs to academic jargon. Nine informative maps of southern New England by William Keegan help the reader follow the ebb and flow of this widely scattered war of Indian raids and English counter-raids over two years. The Suggested Further Reading end section is excellent.

The book establishes the complicated historical and cultural context in which relations between the Native peoples of New England and the English colonizers took place. Mandell stresses that the diplomatic and political landscape of seventeenth-century southern New England created a "many-sided, complex conflict" that cannot be reduced to a strict antithesis of English versus Native Americans (19). A major consequence of English colonization was the radical reordering of intertribal relations among regional Native communities, changes that led to greater conflicts over the growing assertion of English sovereignty. Changes in land use and subsistence practices, combined with Native demographic decline due to epidemic diseases, led to conflicts over the assertion of English jurisdictional authority over Native peoples who now were being regarded as subjects, rather than allies.

Mandell effectively explains why the initially good relations between the Wampanoag sachem Massasoit and the English in the 1620s then deteriorated in the 1660s ("King Philip" was the name the English gave Massasoit's

son Metacom). A generational shift accompanied an inexorable swing in the balance of power favoring the English at the expense of native resource utilization and intertribal amity. A half-dozen neighboring tribes had achieved a stability of opposing forces balancing each other, with the weaker paying tribute to the stronger. The Wampanoag had sufficient numbers to defend their territory against their nearest rivals, the Narragansett, while bountiful resources eased intertribal conflicts. But by 1675, struggles over "land uses and economic habits" led to the outbreak of King Philip's War because, as Quaker deputy governor John Easton of Rhode Island noted, "the English said the Indians wronged them and the Indians said the English wronged them" (29).

English colonization of Native homelands meant control over land and its resources (fertile soil for farming and pasture, timber, furs, and fish). In agreement with such studies as William Cronon's *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England*, and Virginia DeJohn Anderson's *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America*, Mandell states that "the greatest cause of conflict came with English cattle and pigs." The ecological consequences devastated Native economies, evidenced by the Naragansett sachem Miantonomi's testimony that "these English having gotten our land, they with scythes cut down the grass, and with axes fell the trees; their cows and horses eat the grass, and their hogs spoil our clam banks, and we shall all be starved" (27–28).

The war was both intertribal and intercolonial, involving various villages, alliances, factions, and shifting counter-alliances of Wampanoag, Nipmuc, Narragansett, Wabanaki, Mohegan and Mohawk, either contesting or allied with the colonies of Plymouth, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and coastal Maine. The author explains that "both sides knew victory or death hinged on securing Native allies" (60). Metacom's motivations, strategies, and goals can be summed up by his aggravated cry, "till I have no more country." This frustration resulted in Metacom's desperate attempt to retain Wampanoag "peoplehood" (i.e., inherent sovereignty) via armed conflict. He was caught amidst conflicting historical forces beyond his control. Ultimately, the Mohawk intervention on behalf of the English tipped the scales of war in favor of the colonists. The outcome of King Philip's War was devastating to the way of life for many Native peoples (Wampanoag, Nipmuc, Narragansett, Wabanaki, and Mohegan) in New England. It also ended the ideal of the New England Puritan "errand in the wilderness."

With a total estimated population of 80,000 in New England, the 9,000 total casualties of King Philip's War represent a death rate of 11.25 percent. The toll on the English colonists was 3,000 slain with a generation of settlements that extended twenty miles west of Boston attacked, pillaged, or razed. It would take decades for the English to rebuild and recover from the psychic

and physical damage. Of the Indian peoples, 6,000 were killed or enslaved (which, given the disease vector, meant almost certain death). Hundreds of Indians who fought with Metacom were executed or transported into slavery in the West Indies (including his wife and son), while others, mainly women and children, were sold as indentured household servants in New England.

Despite competing interests and conflicts, the New England colonists shared the same assumptions in terms of Indian policy. Loyal to King Charles II, the English assumed superior sovereignty and plenary (exclusive and unlimited) authority over Native peoples and territory. This resulted in the steady erosion of tribal sovereignty that left Metacom and his allies with no rightful claim to their homeland, and a diminished status as dependent subjects (whereas they were formerly considered independent allies) turned rebels and traitors who would be shown no quarter or mercy. Mandell concludes that King Philip's War represented a "fundamental turning point in relations between Anglo-Americans and Natives" (144).

Not all scholars will agree with the author's thesis that "while there were previous explosions over resources, such as the Pequot War (1637) in New England and the Powhatan uprisings in Virginia (1622, 1644), this was the first war driven by the irresolvable clash between Native and colonial claims to sovereignty" (143–144). Arguably the impetus for all three wars, as well as Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia (1676) and the Pueblo Revolt (1680), stemmed from the colonizers' perception of Indians as "obstacles" (and therefore a threat) to all of the English economic, political, legal, cultural, and religious goals or ambitions. As the demographic, tactical, and strategic balance of power swung in favor of the English, they did not hesitate to assert their sovereignty over Native lands and communities by force.

In an extensive footnote, Mandell summarizes sovereignty as "the power of an independent state with a distinct territory." Yet earlier in the same footnote, Mandell concedes that this definition "does not fit how Native communities and sachems viewed authority, politics or law" (148). Perhaps a more nuanced representation of the inherent nature of tribal sovereignty could have been derived from Tom Holm's "peoplehood" matrix of Native land, language, ceremonies, history, and kinship, one that can be widely applied to American Indian tribes and nations. But however one defines sovereignty, I think the author would agree with Holm's characterization that "colonization is the denial of another group's sovereignty" ("Peoplehood: A Model for the Extension of Sovereignty in American Indian Studies," *Wicazo Sa Review* 18, No. 1 (Spring 2003): 17).

Both King Philip's War and the Pueblo Revolt can be viewed as fights for Native independence. While Metacom and the Wampanaoag were defeated by the English and their Indian allies, Popé and the Pueblo people drove the

Spanish out of New Mexico for a time. By the end of the seventeenth-century, European colonizers in New England, Virginia, and New Mexico weathered fierce Native resistance. But, in the words of James Merrell, North America had become a "new world for all"—Native and European—as the distribution of power shifted away from Indian peoples irrevocably.

John M. Shaw
Portland Community College

Kiowa Military Societies: Ethnohistory and Ritual. By William C. Meadows. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2010. 472 pages. $75.00 cloth.

Anthropologist William Meadows's *Kiowa Military Societies: Ethnohistory and Ritual* is an ethnography of contemporary martial clubs among the Kiowa of Oklahoma. The term *military societies* describes a unique social institution rooted in warrior traditions of the Plains. As did the warriors of former times, the soldiers of today gather for social, ceremonial, and ritual purposes. The first comprehensive account of military societies in this tribe since Robert Lowie's *Societies of the Kiowa* (1916), Meadows's book is rich in new records of current practices associated with individual and group participation in pre- and post-warfare activities, and it further contributes to the ongoing reevaluation of past ethnographic knowledge. In explicit dialogue with other anthropologists who conducted research in the southern plains (such as Eric Lassiter and Thomas Kavanagh), Meadows offers a well-balanced, clearly argued, and methodologically solid account of the history and internal dynamics of Kiowa military societies, and their role in tribal life. Two dozen black-and-white pictures by the author complete the narrative. This comprehensive work adds to the growing body of anthropological knowledge about the social and ceremonial institutions of Plains Indians and the cultural renaissance of indigenous peoples.

Using an approachable style, *Kiowa Military Societies* systematically examines the long history of a social institution that played a paramount role in the redefinition of the Kiowa as a nation with a common past and a shared identity. In a significant move that recognizes the function of Kiowa women in the cultural preservation of the tribe, the book combines an account of Kiowa's nine military societies for men with an ample treatment of women's clubs. Current literature on Plains Indian women's societies and social life is scanty, and this chapter largely fills some gaps left by scholarly neglect. Hopefully more research will be carried out on similar women's organizations among other nations.