

and federal officials failed to protect the Nebraska Indians' villages from attacks by plains tribes who had access to the most up-to-date weapons. Wishart's book, indeed, amounts to a harsh but objective indictment of federal policies and their implementation, an indictment that is borne out in his final chapter, which deals largely with the Nebraska Indians' claims cases after World War II.

Although this book is very much a history, Wishart's geographic background is also apparent. His maps, both those drawn for the book and ones selected from nineteenth-century sources, and his numerous statistical charts and graphs complement and enrich his text. Similarly, his discussion of demography provides important insights into various factors, especially repeated epidemics, that produced population declines.

Those who prefer their history sugarcoated should not read this book. The story of the Nebraska Indians is truly one of "unspeakable sadness." If there is anything inspiring in Wishart's fine treatment, it is the Indians' remarkable cultural persistence and their heroism in a prolonged struggle for survival.

DONALD L. PARMAN, a member of the History Department, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, recently published *Indians and the American West in the Twentieth Century* (1994). He is currently editing the autobiography of William Graham, a nineteenth-century Methodist minister who spent most of his career in northwestern Indiana.

Crow Dog's Case: American Indian Sovereignty, Tribal Law, and United States Law in the Nineteenth Century. By Sidney L. Haring. (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1994. Pp. xiii, 301. Notes, illustrations, index. Clothbound, \$54.95; paperbound, \$17.95.)

In American Indian affairs today, no issue looms larger than that of tribal sovereignty. *Crow Dog's Case* is a study of nineteenth-century legal cases that brought to the deliberation of U.S. courts the issue of tribal sovereignty that stems directly from the treaty relationship between the federal government and Indian tribes. By examining the historical development of the U.S. legal doctrine of tribal sovereignty and by exploring indigenous legal concepts of the tribes themselves, this study provides a valuable foundation for understanding the complexities of the legal relationship between the federal government and Indian tribes.

The book takes its title from the celebrated case of Crow Dog, a Brulé Sioux, who murdered the tribal chief, Spotted Tail, in 1881. Following tribal law, the murderer's family compensated the family of the deceased with valuables. Under U.S. law, however, Crow Dog was jailed and tried by the Dakota territorial court, found guilty, and condemned to hang. The court's decision was overturned by the

Supreme Court, which argued in 1883—recognizing both tribal law and the sovereignty sanctioning its application—that the laws of the United States did not apply to crimes committed by Indians against Indians in Indian country. Crow Dog was set free, but the next year Congress passed the Major Crimes Act, extending federal criminal jurisdiction over specific types of crime on reservations.

On the basis of his historical survey the author identifies four distinct legal models that structured nineteenth-century Indian-white relations. In the first, states asserted their own sovereignty and, in defiance of the federal government, claimed complete jurisdiction over Indians living within their boundaries. The case of Corn Tassel (1830), a Cherokee Indian tried and sentenced in Georgia for a crime committed on Indian land, exemplifies this model. After he appealed to the Supreme Court, Corn Tassel was summarily hanged by the state.

The Corn Tassel case set the stage for the second model of Indian-white relations, articulated in the classic 1832 case of *Worcester v. Georgia* in which Supreme Court Chief Justice John Marshall upheld the sovereignty of Indian tribes as “domestic dependent nations.” The book examines cases from the history of the five tribes (Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, Chickasaws, and Seminoles) that were removed in the 1830s from the South to Indian Territory, later Oklahoma, and that established national governments and legal systems which were in effect throughout the nineteenth century.

The third model was the rejection of Indian sovereignty by Congress and the imposition by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of a program of forced assimilation on the reservations. This model, a direct outgrowth of the Crow Dog case, is exemplified by *United States v. Kagama* (1886). The decision in this Supreme Court case articulated the first statement of the plenary power doctrine, which asserts essentially unlimited federal power over Indian tribes, thereby relegating them to the status of wards of the government. The book chronicles successive restrictions on tribal sovereignty by the vastly increased number of Indian legal cases during the last two decades of the nineteenth century. As the author notes, this model “represents the deliberate use of U.S. law to destroy the Indian tribes” (p. 23).

The fourth model is specific to Alaska, where an 1872 court decision gave individual natives the same rights as non-Indians but did not recognize native legal or political institutions. In short, the sovereignty of Alaskan native tribes was not recognized, and the situation there in the 1870s approximated what the state of Georgia had attempted to impose in the 1820s. The Tlingit serve as the case study for this model.

The penultimate chapter discusses “U.S. Law and the Indian Wars” and is a fine illustration of the point made in the concluding

chapter that although historians have long focused on the processes of forced assimilation that transformed Indian tribes during the late nineteenth century, they have neglected the role of the law in shaping that transformation. Sidney L. Harring's work shows what a rich field of study this can be.

RAYMOND J. DEMALLIE is professor of anthropology and director of the American Indian Studies Research Institute, Indiana University, Bloomington. He has published on Plains Indian ethnohistory and is the editor of the forthcoming Plains volume of the Smithsonian Institution's *Handbook of North American Indians*.

I've Got the Light of Freedom: The Organizing Tradition and the Mississippi Freedom Struggle. By Charles M. Payne. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995. Pp. xiv, 525. Map, illustrations, bibliographic essay, notes, index. \$28.00.)

If any questions linger about whether the Mississippi freedom movement was an organic resistance movement, then Charles M. Payne's *I've Got the Light of Freedom* should erase all doubt. The movement was created and sustained by an organizing tradition that stretched back to the early 1940s. It featured an "activism of an earlier, socially invisible generation," including war veterans, ministers, civic-minded businessmen, and ordinary laborers. Greenwood is the focus of Payne's story, and the peak years of movement activity there were 1962–1964, during which time local activists waged a very valiant struggle for political access, economic justice, and social equality.

Payne begins with a detailed and graphic "reminder" of the racial terror that was so endemic to the Magnolia state prior to World War II. After the war significant changes resulted in socioeconomic conditions more favorable to a budding protest movement. The character and instances of racial terror waned by the late 1940s and early 1950s. A virtual collapse of the cotton-based economy weakened any inclination toward control of black labor through the usual forms of violence such as lynching. In addition, black Mississippians became more militant because of the widening influence of returning veterans.

African Americans responded by taking advantage of these changes. In the 1940s the pace of political mobilization stepped up appreciably. Organizations formed; black newspapers printed strong endorsements of local registration drives; membership for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) increased significantly, as did the numbers of black voter registrants.

Many of those associated with the postwar Mississippi activism were veterans who would lay the foundation for the movement that