thers of the American republic were heavily influenced by their knowledge of the governing structures of the League of the Iroquois (pp. 99-100, 106), even though ethnologist Elisabeth Tooker has persuasively demonstrated that there is little or no evidence of direct borrowing from the Iroquois by Franklin, Jefferson, and the rest. Similarly, Sioui treats as valid the environmentally friendly speech attributed to Chief Seattle (p. 108), although that, too, has been shown to be a fabrication by a non-Native.

Such critical comments are not meant to suggest that *For an Amerindian Autohistory* is unimportant or grievously flawed. In fact, Dr. Sioui's shortcomings are merely the occupational hazard that any historian faces: reliance upon a particular body of evidence that is congenial to the historian's interpretation. As with any history, the remedy for the defects that flow from such an approach is the multiplication of histories written by people of different viewpoints. Now that Georges Sioui has broken the path, it is to be hoped that it will be explored by other Aboriginal writers from various ethnic communities. In particular, one looks forward to an Amerindian autohistory of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries written by an Iroquois, preferably a Mohawk, scholar. It will be fascinating to see what such a historian will say in answer to Sioui's contention that the sixteenth-century occupants of the St. Lawrence valley were in fact from the Huron or Wendat community. The Mohawk of Kanesatake, Kahnawake, and Akwesasne invested a great deal of time and effort in the 1970s mounting a comprehensive

claim to a large portion of southwestern Quebec and the lower Ottawa River valley based on their tradition that it was members of the Iroquois Confederacy whom Jacques Cartier "discovered" in the 1530s.

*For an Amerindian Autohistory* is more than a "wampum." It not only confronts and resolves many of the emotions that cloud both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples' relations. It also provides students of Canadian history with a novel and attractive reinterpretation of previous centuries that has profound implications for the present and future of relations between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples in this land. That in some respects it is culturally bound and limited is not the issue. What is significant is that Dr. Sioui has pointed the way to new and valuable ways of perceiving and understanding the significance of our—both Natives' and non-Natives'—past. We are all in his debt.

J.R. Miller
University of Saskatchewan

---


Robert Pratt's study of the political and legal battles over school desegregation in Richmond, Virginia in the years following the U.S. Supreme
Court’s landmark 1954 *Brown v. Board* decision is a sobering case history of the persistence of racial segregation in the nation’s schools. Today, inner-city classrooms are cramped, underfunded, and demoralizing, while suburban schools only a few miles distant offer computers, swimming pools, and lessons in calculus and Greek. In the newspapers and in daily conversation, the term “inner-city schools” has become shorthand for predominantly black or Hispanic, poor, and largely ineffective schools; while “suburban school system” signifies whiteness, wealth, and the promise of a university education following high school.

While most of Virginia’s public schools shut down altogether rather than abide by the *Brown* decision, Richmond schools remained open but segregated. Having watched the demise of massive resistance, white Richmond residents pursued instead a policy of “passive resistance.” The Pupil Placement Board formed in 1956, for example, “relied on residential housing patterns and lower academic achievement to disqualify blacks” from enrolling in white schools (p. 22). The city went to absurd lengths to keep black students out of white schools; when one black family challenged a board ruling on the grounds that they lived closer to the white school than to the black school, the city deployed engineers who stooped to their hands and knees to measure the distance with a surveyor’s chain.

In spite of federal court rulings favourable to desegregation, white Richmond parents and city officials found ways to maintain the old order. After “freedom of choice” was federally mandated in 1966, for example, residential segregation made transportation to mainly white schools difficult for black children. White parents who lived near black neighbourhoods pulled their children out of local schools and enrolled them in more distant all-white schools. When the federal court ordered busing in 1970, whites fled to predominantly white neighbouring counties, altogether outside the Richmond school system.

Black leaders countered white flight by fighting for metropolitan school consolidation. But by the time the U.S. Supreme Court ruled on school consolidation in 1973 and 1974, the Court had shifted ominously to the right. While the Warren Court might have ruled in favour of consolidation twenty years earlier, the more conservative Burger court ruled 5-4 against the plan, with Nixon-appointed Richmond lawyer Lewis Powell casting the deciding vote. Thurgood Marshall, who had argued the *Brown* case in 1954, now sat dejectedly in the minority on a Court which would allow, as he wrote in his dissent, “our great metropolitan areas to be divided up each into two cities—one white, one black” (p. 84). This 1974 *Milliken* decision left blacks to fight for segregated schools with little further help from the courts.

Richmond’s schools, fifty-seven percent white in 1954, were eighty-eight percent black by 1989. In spite of the protracted efforts of the city’s black parents and lawyers, the city’s schools relapsed into segregation. Alice Calloway, a Richmond mother, told Pratt that “I pushed so hard for
integration because I knew that the city would appropriate sufficient funds for the schools as long as white children were in them, and that my children would benefit as a result of that. I've been around long enough to know that if the white child is there, the money will be there” (pp. 108-9).

Calloway’s reasoning is dead-on, but Pratt hopes for something different: desegregation, he writes, "means much more than black and white children sitting together in the classroom solely for the academic improvement of blacks. Desegregation means—or at least it should mean—that black and white children are conditioned at an early age to interact with one another on the basis of equality and mutual respect for the other’s cultural heritage. Only this kind of cooperation can offer hope that racism might one day disappear from our divided nation” (p. 109).

This is a book about political maneuvering, about the activities of lawyers, judges, committees, and school boards. We never see the inside of the city’s classrooms; the experience of students is secondary to battles fought by their parents. Apart from occasional references to the white fear that racial mixing would lead to violence, we do not hear white parents explain their anxiety about sending their children to integrated schools.

Nor does Pratt explore the relationship between segregation, the distribution of public funds, and the persistence of urban poverty. As Calloway’s comments suggest, and as Jonathan Kozol’s recent work illustrates, white flight created more than all-black classrooms. The erosion of the tax base also left urban schools with a crushing, unmanageable financial burden. Pratt’s analysis could have been complicated and enriched by adding these important economic dynamics to the mix.

This is a useful and instructive book which should be read not only by historians, but by public policymakers, educators, lawyers, judges—and the parents of schoolchildren. One hopes that historians of education will soon produce a more broadly ranging study of the nation’s school desegregation struggles—a post-Brown complement to Richard Kluger’s comprehensive Simple Justice. Like Pratt’s book, such a study must carefully examine the actions of local officials, the shifting goals and strategies of black and white parents, and the courts’ evolution on the legal questions posed by desegregation. It should also address the culture of segregation, the experiences of students and teachers, and the growing economic imbalance between urban and suburban school systems.

Bruce Fort
University of Virginia


Horace Mann Bond, 1904-72, was one of America’s foremost black scholars during the twentieth century.