

assessment of racial achievement gap in history” (61). A 1913 study by Marion J. Mayo, *The Mental Capacity of the American Negro* predated the Army study by three years and actually used student grades in New York, St. Louis, Memphis, and Nashville to suggest that black-white disparities may be due more to environment than hereditary endowment. A more egregious error was the authors’ use of a speech by Kelly Miller “of Hampton Institute” to represent the racial thinking of “white intellectuals” at the time (57). Miller never taught at Hampton and was actually a professor at Howard University. More significantly, Miller was black, not white. By getting Miller’s race wrong, the authors not only made an unfortunate factual error, but they squandered an opportunity to discuss how some black intellectuals absorbed and employed some of the racist theories put forth by whites in a desperate attempt to reach a broader audience for their ideas. By chapter 4, things improve significantly, as the authors discuss the shift from innate to cultural explanations of racial deficits in the 1960s, and trace how legal structures, social policies, and curriculum tracking have exacerbated segregated schools in recent years. They conclude with additional evidence for racial disparities in education and suggest that administrators de-track their schools and compile a “Color of Mind index” to record and reduce racial disproportionalities. The authors see the achievement gap as mainly an administrative issue, so there is no discussion of pedagogy, curriculum, or instruction.

Darby and Rury were not likely aiming to make a major historiographical contribution with this book. The intended audience seems to be school administrators and policy makers. With this in mind, the book succeeds in putting information about racial disparities in education in one place by providing a readable and concise account of the history of the social construction of the achievement gap. However, as mentioned above, other scholars have addressed this topic with greater precision and depth, and readers looking for ideas for how teachers can tackle the achievement gap from an instructional or pedagogical perspective will need to look elsewhere, such as Tyrone Howard’s *Why Race and Culture Matter in Schools: Closing the Achievement Gap in America’s Classrooms*.

Thomas Fallace

William Paterson University

Cecilia Morgan

Travellers through Empire: Indigenous Voyages from Early Canada

Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queens University Press, 2017. 326 pp.

In this superb study of Indigenous mobility throughout the nineteenth-century Atlantic world, Cecilia Morgan argues that Native travellers resisted colonialism in Upper Canada by “deliberately” crossing “numerous boundaries and borders” (3). Indigenous mobility, however, is not the newest of historiographical stories. For decades historians have written about the centrality of mobility to Shawnee survival,

Indigenous “diasporas,” and even the “Red Atlantic” created by transatlantic travellers. So what makes Morgan’s examination of “Indigenous voyages” different? Rather than treat the aforementioned sorts of movement as separate phenomena, Morgan contextualizes the mobility of transatlantic Indians. They were not, in other words, “historical curiosities without wider meaning and significance” (5). And when Morgan does highlight their experiences across the Atlantic, she centers “the travellers themselves” (9) rather than the reactions of European audiences that have captured the attention of previous historians. By focusing on “their own motivations and purposes” (6) for travelling throughout North America and across the Atlantic, Morgan illuminates the long histories of mobility for many Indigenous peoples.

Travellers through Empire is divided into seven chapters and driven by a biographical approach. The book begins by detailing the exploits of a man named John Norton. Born in Britain to a Scottish mother and a Cherokee father, Norton traversed the Atlantic for the first time in the opposite direction of most of his Indigenous brethren. Using his “ability to move across ethnocultural boundaries” (24), Norton became a part of the Mohawk community of Grand River. And it was at the behest of these people—and in response to their concerns about land ownership and political sovereignty—that Norton first returned to his home island. A year later, Norton embarked upon another sort of voyage—he visited the childhood home of his father. Drawing chiefly on Norton’s published journal, Morgan provides a fascinating description of his interactions with—and interpretations of—Cherokees. While Morgan quickly moves on to another of Norton’s transatlantic voyages with little analysis of his time in the southern Appalachians, sandwiching this brand of mobility between two trips across the ocean does much to contextualize what movement meant to nineteenth-century Indigenous people. Not only was it relatively common, it was necessary—especially when negotiating with growing empires.

The next two chapters (2 and 3) examine the transatlantic travels of several Anishinaabeg. While some of those voyages were motivated by land disputes, much of what pushed people like Kahkewaquonaby (Peter Jones) across the Atlantic were religious concerns. As Morgan argues about Jones, for example, his “overseas trips... were undertaken as a result of his own success in Upper Canada” (60) preaching to white and Indigenous audiences. It is in these two chapters in particular where the analytical payoff of Morgan’s biographical methodology is most apparent. Not only do these chapters demonstrate that these transatlantic travellers were comfortable with travel from years of mobility throughout Upper Canada, but also that their choice to visit various cities throughout Britain “represented carefully made choices and decisions” (65). In other words, these mobile people were more than victims of colonialism. Furthermore, by focusing on individual travellers, Morgan is able to highlight their reactions to British society. Jones, for example, noticed that the English were “very fond of ‘novelties’” (74).

If chapters 2 and 3 are tied together by the same Anishinaabeg actors, chapters 3 and 4 are bound by Morgan’s use of intimacy as a lens of historical analysis. While chapter 3 profiles the “varied combinations” (100) of relationships between a number of Anishinaabeg and their British counterparts—and the centrality of transatlantic

networks to the success (and failure) of their unions—chapter 4 focuses on “a number of children of Cree-British backgrounds” who were sent across the Atlantic to attend school (129). Though their mobility was “brought about through British imperial expansion” (130), some of these children of the fur trade became part of powerful British networks. In the case of two brothers—Donald and Duncan McTavish—their eventual success as “settlers...in Australia” was predicated on robust “imperial networks combined with particular circumstances” (171). And as their final destination demonstrates, as the nineteenth century progressed, Indigenous travellers crossed more oceans than just the Atlantic.

The final two chapters focus on performers who sailed across the Atlantic to ply their trade. These travellers did not visit London for political or religious reasons like the people who populate the preceding chapters, but to “display themselves” and “indulge their own curiosity” about Europe (175). By analyzing how gender informed the performances of Indigenous travellers, Morgan is able to illuminate how their “complex strategies of representation and negotiation” (233) fit within the larger context of transatlantic imperialism. Like each of the preceding chapters, these two do an excellent job of revealing the reasons for transatlantic travel.

Though Morgan does a remarkable job of demonstrating the centrality of mobility in the lives of a number of Indigenous men, women, and children—and its importance for understanding both Indigenous peoples and the British Empire—it also leaves a bit to be desired. Her description of Norton’s experiences prove especially noteworthy on this front. While Morgan mentions the “four Indian kings”—Mohawks who traveled to England in 1710—in the footnotes of her introduction, it is a curious choice to leave these travellers out of her analysis of Norton’s travels. He crossed the Atlantic, after all, on behalf of Mohawks. Surely this earlier voyage played a role in later transatlantic trips. Furthermore, Norton visited the Cherokees between his two trips across the Atlantic. In addition to having their own history of transatlantic travel, many Cherokees also believed that certain bodies of water acted as portals to different worlds. How did this belief influence Norton’s outlook on transatlantic travels? With a deeper dive into Indigenous histories, Morgan could have made her argument about the importance of context to our understanding of Indigenous travellers even more powerful. In the end, however, *Travellers through Empire* is an excellent addition to the growing body of literature on Indigenous mobility.

Nathaniel Holly

College of William & Mary