known events. For instance, the 1851 Fort Laramie Treaty conference garners far less discussion than a separate, all-Indigenous, peace conference between Lakotas and Crows that same year (220–21). Hämäläinen also pays special attention to events that appear in several winter counts, such as the shocking murder of Lakota leader Mato Oyuhi at American hands in 1854. Using Native sources to guide the historical narrative, Lakota America holds true to its goal of “decidedly [telling] a history of the Lakotas, written from sources that seek to convey their perspective” (8).

Lakota America is an important addition to the fields of North American imperial, Indigenous, and even environmental histories. Yet, like in Comanche Empire, Hämäläinen’s use of an imperial lens to compare settler colonial and Indigenous polities as near equivalents is problematic. As scholars such as Nick Estes have pointed out, Euro-American settler colonial states, with their emphasis on controlling land and racialization, are fundamentally different from Native societies, even at their most violent, expansionist, and exclusionary. Claiming the Western Sioux built a “Lakota Empire” as Hämäläinen does throughout Lakota America conceals more differences than it reveals similarities. Indeed, Hämäläinen comes close to admitting as much himself. “The Lakota empire was at its core, an empire of equals,” Hämäläinen argues, yet “unlike most empires, they did not rely on force or codified hierarchization . . . Lakotas’ was an expansive, all-embracing understanding of belonging that recognized no color line” (243–44). If Lakotas were able to embrace even former enemies as kin and as equals, one wonders if “empire” is the proper term for them at all. Using an imperial lens to describe Native survival and resistance in the face of Euro-America settler colonialism is inadequate, but in many other ways Lakota America is a fine piece of historical writing, of use to virtually any scholar of the American past.


Nicole Etcheson is the Alexander M. Bracken Professor of History at Ball State University in Indiana. She is the author of The Emerging Midwest: Upland Southerners and the Political Culture of the Old Northwest (1996) and most recently A Generation at War: The Civil War Era in a Northern Community (2011).

In 1986, the late Andrew R. L. Cayton’s classic The Frontier Republic: Ideology and Politics in the Ohio Country, 1780–1825 (1986) traced the tension
between Jeffersonian Republicans’ emphasis on democracy and Federalists’ promotion of order and economic development in the Ohio country. Cayton saw the two parties as achieving a synthesis of views with Republicans adopting many Federalist policies. While Cayton confined that study to his native Ohio, Kristopher Maulden expands the focus to look at Indiana and Illinois as well. Maulden claims a contribution to studies of the Federalist Party, little examined outside of New England, and the growing literature on the trans-Appalachian frontier.

Cayton and his historiographical predecessors such as John D. Barnhart in Valley of Democracy: The Frontier versus the Plantation in the Ohio Valley, 1775–1818 (1953) emphasized settlers’ desire for political power in a contest with Federalist elites such as the Northwest Territory’s Governor Arthur St. Clair. Maulden highlights the Federalist-built institutions that made frontier settlement possible: the military which wrested the frontier from its native inhabitants; the land office that provided secure titles to settlers; and expanded government that spent money on internal improvements and education. Maulden says that settlers “preferred the libertarian rhetoric of Jeffersonian and Jacksonian democracy,” (7) but they relied on the governmental structures Federalists created. The frontiersmen saw themselves as “rugged individualists” (7) even as they relied on and expected help from an activist government.

*The Federalist Frontier’s* narrative will be familiar to historians of the region and the era. The offer by the Ohio Company, a land speculation venture by Revolutionary War veterans, to buy land in the region spurred Congress to pass the Northwest Ordinance providing a government for the new territory. The Confederation and early national periods, however, coincided with war in the Ohio Valley as Indian tribes contested the intrusion of whites into the region. Under the presidency of Thomas Jefferson, officials such as William Henry Harrison, governor of Indiana Territory, used trade and treaties to acquire land from the Indians until resistance from the Shawnee leaders Tecumseh and Tenskwatawa caused Harrison to resort to military force. Maulden does not spend much time on the War of 1812, but has two chapters on the post-war period arguing that, despite the alleged death of the Federalists after the Hartford Convention, Federalists still influenced the region through their support for education and business.

In Maulden’s account, unlike other histories of the Old Northwest, there is less of the conflict between settlers and the territorial governments led by St. Clair in what became Ohio and William Henry Harrison in Indiana. Instead, Maulden concentrates on the legacy of Federalism in the region even after Jefferson’s election. Maulden contends that
Federalists remained influential in the region and that western Jeffersonians “repurposed Federalist institutions” (90). Although old Federalists lost political office, their program laid the foundation for the later Whig Party and its adherence to the American System of a national bank, protective tariffs, and government money for internal improvements. An epilogue looks at Abraham Lincoln as the heir of the Federalist frontier.

Maulden might do more to acknowledge the limitations of the activist government he sees in the Old Northwest. He frequently quotes the expansive language of public documents promising free public education. Although he acknowledges that “progress varied” (166), actual funding for educational systems in the states of the lower Midwest fell very much short of the rhetoric. In describing an arc that reaches from the Federalism of Arthur St. Clair to the Whiggery of Abraham Lincoln, Maulden misses the role of class. Lincoln may have embraced Federalist policies, but the democratic ethos of the Jeffersonians made possible the poorly educated, poorly dressed, homespun Lincoln’s rise to political power.

In effect, Maulden makes an observation about the early American frontier that many commentators have made about the modern West: small government Westerners rely more heavily on government subsidies than do Easterners. Both in the early republic and today, political rhetoric and political reality are often at odds.


A trifecta of biographies appeared in 1833: one each on Daniel Boone, the Sauk war leader Black Hawk, and David Crockett. Common to these books, according to Michael A. Lofaro, was a shift in Americans’ perception of the frontier and the persons—both Native American and white—who resided there. Central to this shift was the election of Andrew Jackson to the presidency in 1828 and the mythos of a new age that celebrated the self-made man who rose to prominence despite humble origins. Lofaro writes that these works, in presenting men cut