to build godly church and society—which confronted them. But it would be both ungenerous and misleading to dwell on any minor disappointments. This is an impressive achievement, and one looks forward to the publication of the second and certainly more difficult volume.

University of Minnesota (Duluth) JAMES FULTON MACLEAR

Apache, Navaho, and Spaniard. By Jack D. Forbes. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960. xxvi + 304 pp. Illustrations, maps, notes, bibliography, and index. $5.95.)

Dr. Forbes's history of the Apache Indians in the Southwest to 1700 exhibits three major weaknesses: first, a prejudice against everything Spanish; secondly, a failure to utilize some important investigations by other scholars; and, finally, a lack of balance, since the bulk of the study concerns the Pueblo Indians, and not the Apache. Examples of bias abound. Illuminating are the author's statements that most of the cultural influences of Spanish frontier society were probably evil (p. 34), and his implication that religious conversion was "brain washing" (p. 39). Throughout the book Spaniards are treacherous and Indians who aided them are traitors (p. 263). Such comments will disturb any scholar using this work.

If Forbes had carefully noted France V. Scholes's warning in *Some Aspects of the Jumano Problem* that "Mere use of the name [Jumano] . . . can no longer be accepted as presumptive evidence that such Indians were true Jumanos," he would not have assumed that virtually all Jumanos were Apache. Though he utilized the José Antonio Pichardo documents in Madrid, he did not examine Charles W. Hackett's notes on the Apache in his monumental work on Pichardo. Concerning the Sonoran frontier, Dr. Forbes's book reflects failure to grasp the character of Herbert E. Bolton's work in his Kino studies; and apparently he is not familiar with Father Peter M. Dunne's work on the Tarahumara. An examination of Scholes's studies on seventeenth-century New Mexico would have prevented him from taking Governor Rosas to Sonora and identifying the Ypotlapiguas Indians as Opatas (p. 134). Scholes shows that these Indians were dwelling southwest of Zuñi. Forbes's interpretation of Diego de Peñalosa's use of the word "reduced" as the destruction of the Taos settlement among the Apache at El Cuartelejo is an error (p. 157). "Reduced" here simply means that Peñalosa had the Taos Indians returned to their pueblo. Moreover, Peñalosa's statement that he laid waste to El Cuartelejo for more than two hundred leagues beyond New Mexico is a fantasy. Finally, if Dr. Forbes had consulted Bolton's account of Francisco de Escobar's journey with Oñate, he would not have confused the Yavapai with the Western Apache (pp. 60, 86).

Throughout, Dr. Forbes attacks scholars for believing that Apache were largely responsible for Pueblo decline and insists that the "deadly nature of

HP021611

Spanish exploitation was chiefly to blame" (p. 139). Conversely, he believes that, on the whole, before the coming of the Spaniards friendly relations existed between Apache and Pueblo-Pima-Sobaipuri groups. Bolton's *Kino*, Adolph Bandelier's *Contributions* (not used), J. Manuel Espinosa's *Crusaders of the Rio Grande* (not used), Charles C. Di Peso's *Sobaipuri Indians* (not used), and Scholes's seventeenth-century New Mexican studies, to mention only a few, all have data contradicting this thesis.

Even though Dr. Forbes has permitted his judgment to be warped by his prejudices, he has made the first attempt to organize Apache history in the seventeenth century. Moreover, with his ability to carry on archival research, and his valuable independence of mind, he could present a needed scientific statement of Apache, Pueblo, and Spanish relations. This reviewer hopes that if he continues his study into the eighteenth century he will adopt a more scientific attitude toward his materials.

University of Alabama ALFRED B. THOMAS

Origin of the American Revolution, 1759-1766. By Bernhard Knollenberg. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960. x + 486 pp. Appendixes, notes, bibliography, and index. $8.50.)

This book is a careful list of colonial grievances against Great Britain before the outbreak of the American Revolution. It is marked by a painstaking attention to detail and the use of a considerable amount of new manuscript material. It is a worthy contribution to its field.

The central thesis is not new. It argues that a promising era for the British Empire opened with the Peace of 1763; but it was ruined "by fresh and ever more provocative British measures affecting the colonies." There were the decision to garrison the backcountry, the Grenville ministry's search for colonial revenue, the restrictions on American trade, the Townshend taxes, and a host of minor irritants, including the ambition of Archbishop Secker to establish an American episcopate. Little attempt is made to present any of these within the imperial context; and scant note is taken of American provocations of the Mother Country. (The burning of the *Gaspée* is relegated to a footnote.) Indeed, Britain is prosecuted with the skill of the lawyer, and, the title notwithstanding, charges are drawn from the whole of the colonial period. (One of the longest chapters, the Epilogue, is devoted to the years from 1766 to 1775.) The author thus takes his place in the long and eminently respectable list of colonial historians of the traditional school. There is no influence of Namier or of Alvord.

In making his case, Mr. Knollenberg is occasionally led into inconsistency. He attacks, for example, both the expediency and the motive of the British government's decision to station troops along the western frontier. Rejecting Beer's contention that the step was necessary to counter the Indian threat, he

HP021612