

The letters help fill a void of native voices from this tragic era. In addition to the longing for their families and their release, the letters describe the hardships of the internment. The Dakota prisoners were not treated as prisoners of war but as criminals: there was insufficient food and poor sanitation; they were mistreated by the guards, often kept in chains, and suffered deaths from smallpox and measles. Residents in Davenport were allowed to view the prisoners as if the camp was a zoo. Some prisoners were allowed to work for Davenport residents on nearby farms; some residents, however, complained of their presence. With the end of the Civil War, Camp McClellan was no longer needed. In May 1866 the prisoners were released. In 1867 the government established Fort Traverse Reservation, where the prisoners, their families, and other Dakota were relocated.

The letters are more than historic documents. They are treated as sacred texts to honor and memorialize the spirits of the prisoners. The memory of these events is part of today's oral tradition among the Dakota. There is a yearly commemorative march. The translations will be valuable in rewriting the history of the era since most sources are from non-Indians. A strong point is that the English translations carry the cadence of Dakota; Dakota speakers, for example, end many sentences with "do" or "it is so," as in "I want you to help me with this—it is so" (51). The repetition captures the cadence of the language. The only element missing is a bibliography. There are some references in the notes, but a brief bibliography would have been helpful. Also, the excellent article by Sarah-Eva Ellen Carlson on the Davenport internment that was published in the *Annals of Iowa* (Summer 2004) is not mentioned.

*The Jury in Lincoln's America*, by Stacy Pratt McDermott. Ohio University Press Series on Law, Society, and Politics in the Midwest. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2012. xiv, 258 pp. Chart, illustrations, appendix, notes, bibliography, index. \$54.95 hardcover.

Reviewer David J. Bodenhamer is professor of history and executive director of The Polis Center at Indiana University–Purdue University, Indianapolis. His publications include *Fair Trial: Rights of the Accused in American History* (1992).

Trial by a jury of one's peers was a bedrock principle of English law long before the colonial period, and during the American Revolution the alleged abuse of this guarantee defined the scale of British tyranny for many alarmed colonists. Enshrined in the revolutionary state constitutions and the U.S. Constitution, with renewed emphasis in the Bill of Rights, the jury quickly became an emblem of American commitment

to liberty, justice, and democratic local government. Ironically, popular attachment to the jury in all its forms—civil, criminal, and grand jury—grew stronger as the institution itself became less central to law enforcement or to the resolution of legal disputes. Today, many Americans view jury duty as a sacred civic duty they would just as soon avoid.

Significant scholarship exists on the law and practices of the jury in the twentieth century, but, oddly, these bodies have gone almost unstudied in the nineteenth century when they were most venerated. Stacy Pratt McDermott addresses this gap in the literature in her well-written, exhaustively researched study of midwestern juries. In doing so, she makes valuable contributions to both legal history and midwestern history.

With few exceptions, historians have been content to cite legal treatises or, more likely, handbooks written to guide local officials and newspaper accounts on those occasions when petit or grand juries compelled their attention. Not so for McDermott, who combed antebellum court dockets, fee books, trial records, county histories, and the large collection of materials on Lincoln's law practice—he handled 5,200 cases in his legal career—to create a veritable roster of antebellum juries for Sangamon County, Illinois (Springfield), which she uses as a lens into midwestern legal and community culture. Then she searched for information on who those jurors were, thereby developing a demographic profile that may be unrivalled in its scope. She also read the relevant appellate opinions from a number of midwestern states, as well as the stories about juries contained in newspapers and other forms of popular literature. This in-depth analysis gives us an unparalleled sense of how juries worked, what juror status meant for the outcome of legal cases in the four topic areas she examined (drinking and gambling, divorce, slander, and race), and what it suggests about legal, political, and social culture in this county—and by extension in the larger Midwest. It is an impressive accomplishment.

So what do we learn? First, the jury pool was small. Because of various restrictions on who could serve—propertied citizens (white men) of good moral character who voted—only 15–17 percent of the population was eligible and only 5–6 percent ever served. Jurors, in brief, were gentlemen of good standing within their communities. That circumstance made it easier to revere the jury and proclaim it a bulwark of democracy. Those juries were also competent; as the economy grew more complex and as society became more mobile and diverse, they demonstrated the ability to sort out complicated evidence and follow sophisticated legal arguments, developing an expertise that corresponded to the rise of a professional bar. Ironically, in McDer-

mott's telling, this competence set them up as rivals with the bench and bar and paved the way for their decline in the late nineteenth century. Finally, antebellum Sangamon County jurors were the connection between individuals and the legal system. Although paternalistic, they were not patriarchal; instead, they controlled trial outcomes in a way that corresponded with the expectations of local justice and local culture.

On the whole, McDermott paints a compelling portrait, even if it is uncertain whether the experience of Sangamon County reflects the circumstances of other midwestern states. Indiana, for example, gave the legislature power to abolish its grand juries in its Constitution of 1851, and proposals to reform the institution were rife in other states during the later antebellum years. It is unclear whether Illinois had the same debate when rewriting its constitution in 1848. Also, the widespread debate over the respective powers of judge and jury surely influenced Sangamon County jurists, but if so we do not learn about it here. These quibbles should not detract from the significant contributions McDermott has made to our understanding of the antebellum jury in law and practice. Anyone who wants to understand the history of this vital democratic institution must begin with her work.

*Necessary Courage: Iowa's Underground Railroad in the Struggle against Slavery*, by Lowell J. Soike. Iowa and the Midwest Experience Series. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2013. 275 pp. Maps, illustrations, notes, suggested readings, index. \$24.95 cloth.

Reviewer Jennifer Harbort is assistant professor of black studies at the University of Nebraska–Omaha. Her Ph.D. dissertation (University of Iowa, 2008) was on African American political culture and the settlement of the antebellum and wartime Midwest.

Scholars of the antebellum Midwest, the Underground Railroad, and famed abolitionists such as John Brown will welcome this detailed account of Iowa's role in the destruction of slavery. As these scholars know all too well, the history of Iowa (and its surrounding "free" and border states) is complex and frustrating. Slavery was not legal in states like Iowa and Illinois, but citizens of those states also made sure that oppressive "Black Codes" not only discouraged but penalized African American settlement. To the south, slavery was legal in Missouri, although slaveholders made up less than 10 percent of white families in that state. To complicate matters more, invalidation of the Missouri Compromise in the U.S. Supreme Court's Dred Scott decision in 1857 offered no immediate hope of citizenship for African Americans anywhere in the United States. Furthermore, the rights of slaveholders