

The Indian in Canadian Historical Writing

James W. ST. G. Walker

Volume 6, numéro 1, 1971

St. John 1971

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/030455ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/030455ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada

ISSN

0068-8878 (imprimé)

1712-9109 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Walker, J. W. S. G. (1971). The Indian in Canadian Historical Writing. *Historical Papers / Communications historiques*, 6(1), 21–51.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/030455ar>

THE INDIAN IN CANADIAN HISTORICAL WRITING

JAMES W. ST. G. WALKER

Dalhousie University

I began this paper with two questions: what is the place of the Indian in Canadian history, according to the writers of that history, and secondly, why is it so? My answer to those questions is what follows. To reach it I conducted a survey of the books appearing most frequently on undergraduate bibliographies for Canadian history at Canadian universities. Those books, numbering eighty eight titles by seventy four authors, range in publication date from 1829 to 1970 and they include general, regional and specialized histories in both official languages. I have divided my findings and my observations on them into four sections: the picture that is given of the Indian as a human being, and of his society; the role that is assigned to the Indian as a participant in Canadian history; some suggestions concerning the reasons for that picture and role; and finally, an attempt to discover whether the treatment of Indians varies according to the historian's language group, his time of writing, or the major emphasis of his book.

In the course of my reading I found myself asking another question, concerning the nature of Canadian history or, rather, concerning the proper and legitimate subject of study for a student of Canadian history. This supplementary question remains unanswered. I do believe, however, that I have discovered what Canadian history is not, in at least this one respect. I recognize the limitations not only of this paper but of my own experience and sophistication in our national history, but because they are honestly offered I hope that by observations will be charitably received. Robin Winks has suggested that "one often learns more about a people from the history they write than from the history they have made".* If this is so, then it may be possible to learn more from a study of the Indian in Canadian historical writing than I at first imagined on undertaking this project.

I

The picture of the Indian as a human being that is presented by writers of Canadian history is confusing, contradictory and incomplete. Clearly he is not often considered to be deserving of serious attention, or his society of scholarly analysis. Because the native Canadian appears

so fleetingly in our national story it is interesting to note the terms in which he is clothed when he does appear, for these terms serve to give an impression of the whole Indian character. Of the long string of epithets used to describe the Indian, "savage" predominates.¹ He is further noted as being "cruel",² "treacherous",³ "bloodthirsty",⁴ "dirty",⁵ "cowardly",⁶ "lazy",⁷ "barbaric",⁸ "fiendish",⁹ "credulous",¹⁰ "grotesque",¹¹ "superstitious",¹² "gluttonous",¹³ and "fickle".¹⁴ Besides being a savage, the Indian is a "thief",¹⁵ a "prowling ogre",¹⁶ a "scourge",¹⁷ a "brigand",¹⁸ a "red skinned vagabond",¹⁹ a "drunkard",²⁰ a "butcher",²¹ a "red devil",²² a "scoundrel and rascal",²³ a "demon",²⁴ and even a "hobgoblin".²⁵

A corresponding, though shorter, list of complimentary terms is scattered throughout the same historical accounts. In spite of his many failings, the Indian is portrayed as "brave",²⁶ "hospitable",²⁷ "happy",²⁸ "devoted" and "faithful",²⁹ "dignified",³⁰ and "intelligent",³¹ and when he is on the right side he might even be called a "bronzed stalwart" or a "copper-hued patriot".³² Perhaps Abbé Lionel Groulx put it most succinctly when he described the Indian race as "*un mélange d'homme et de démon, un peuple à contrasts*",³³ though from a reading of Canadian history books one could be forgiven for placing emphasis on the "*démon*".

The most common illustration of Indian savagery is to be found in his treatment of prisoners. From Champlain's observations in 1609 to the vivid and outraged descriptions of the Jesuit martyrdoms, almost all histories at least allude to Indian torture of prisoners and many feel obliged to satisfy their readers' baser instincts with the goriest of unnecessary details.³⁴ Closely rivalling torture as proof of the Indian's savage nature is his method of waging war. "To steal stealthily [*sic*] at night through the mazes of the woods, tomahawk their sleeping foes, and take many scalps", claims Bourinot, "was the height of an Indian's bliss."³⁵ Disapproving references to this unorthodox method of waging war abound in our histories,³⁶ though the favourite specimen to substantiate the generality is the "Lachine Massacre" of August 1689, "the most horrible massacre in all Canadian history".³⁷ In an orgy of descriptive prose the reader is treated to the bodies of pregnant women being hacked open, babies roasted on the spit, and the cannibalism of the victorious Iroquois.³⁸

A few of our historians make the effort to place Indian warfare in its context, and without suffocating the facts they are able to create a

quite different impression. Glazebrook points out that the guerrilla tactics of the Indian were "adapted to the forest scene", and as such *appeared* cowardly or cruel to seventeenth-century Europeans.³⁹ Eccles and Bishop make the important distinction between pre- and post-contact warfare: before the European intervened, Indian wars were of the nature of an organized blood sport, likened by Brebner to "the contests of Arthurian chivalry".⁴⁰ It was Champlain who broke the rules and transformed the running feud into a war of conquest and extermination.⁴¹ The best accounts include a parallel mention of the savagery of seventeenth-century European warfare and of European torture methods, by which Indian atrocities are seen to be in no way unique given their historical period.⁴²

Appearing side-by-side with the evil deeds of the Indian there is, by strange contrast, the concept of the "noble savage". The kindness, generosity and hospitality of Indian peoples on receiving European strangers is as well documented, if not as much emphasized, as their brutality.⁴³ Before the arrival of the European, Indian life is pictured as simple, honest and free, a childlike existence shattered by the intrusions of civilization.⁴⁴ Unfortunately even such sympathetic references serve to reinforce the image of the Indian as a man of inferiority to whites. Using material culture as the only criterion, a judgement is made that a technological stage through which Europe had passed centuries before represented an earlier stage in human development. The stone-age implements of the Indian are taken as a reflection of some lower level of evolution. Abbé Groulx bluntly speaks of the Indian as belonging to "*racés moins évolués*",⁴⁵ a sentiment which is echoed in less precise terms elsewhere. Despite attempts to assimilate them, sometimes through intermarriage, into the higher civilization,⁴⁶ the implied backwardness of the Indians prevented them from accepting or understanding the advantages of European culture. "It was probably better this way for the colony", Lanctot concludes, "for the [Canadian] race grew stronger being free of native cross-breeding." Besides "it was an impossible objective. . . . No European peoples in any country have ever succeeded in rapidly transforming neolithic savages into civilised men."⁴⁷

Evidence of this inferior nature is provided in descriptions of the Indian living obliviously amidst "vermin", "filth", "disease" and "squalor", an "animal-like existence" in a "miniature hell".⁴⁸ Under the heading "Indian filth and Indian carnality", Lower gives us an example of "native beastliness" the fact that they ate dogs.⁴⁹ Eating

habits receive some attention generally, particularly gluttony and their lack of discretion in choice of foods.⁵⁰ MacInnis expresses his admiration for the missionaries who “shared (the Indians’) rude and often repulsive life around the campfires or in crowded communal shelters filled with smoke and filth and the stench of unwashed humanity”.⁵¹ A note of historical realism is injected by Eccles who, after describing a Huron village, adds that “for those from the lower elements of European society it could not have been much worse than what they had known in the crowded sections of Europe’s cities”.⁵²

Canadian historians, with the North American reverence for womanhood, seem impressed with the treatment an Indian meted out to his squaw, and offer it as a further demonstration of Indian backwardness. The woman is depicted as a “slave” and a “beast of burden” who did all the work while the men smoked and talked.⁵³ Sir Harry Johnston would have his readers believe that “if food was very scarce, the husband as likely as not killed and ate a wife; perhaps did this before slaying and eating a valuable dog.”⁵⁴ But such was only a small part of the Indian’s reluctance to observe civilized moral standards. Lower hesitates to print some of their more “pornographic” practices, though he does cite as an instance of immorality the fact that women stripped naked to serve the men their parting meal as they left for the warpath.⁵⁵ According to Trudel the fact that “Indians went nude in the summer” shows that they lacked “the notion of decency”.⁵⁶ The freedom of the women with their charms draws the most puritan comment. From Champlain’s being propositioned by a Huron maid in 1615 to Indian prostitutes in northern mining camps, the histories take liberties with the reputation of the Indian woman.⁵⁷ Immoral, too, in his greed, the Indian would do almost anything to acquire a few European goods, except work.⁵⁸ And the one European product that he desired above all was alcohol. For a drink or two he would steal or lie, or sell all his furs, his wife, or even his soul.⁵⁹ The histories are replete with references to Indians, somehow unable to drink like gentlemen, committing all sorts of excesses from sexual indecencies to murder.⁶⁰ In an exceptional and penetrating article André Vachon explains the cultural and religious roots of Indian drinking habits, tracing their origin to the trances and spirit possessions that were traditional in the pre-contact experience.⁶¹

Although often praised as a brave and effective warrior, the common examples of Indian fighting present him as a coward, and untrustworthy ally and an inferior soldier. “With unusual boldness for

Indians"⁶² Pontiac's braves took Michilimackinac; more usual was their headlong flight from any odds that appeared capable of an even battle.⁶³ When they did not flee, Indian allies simply got in the way. "The Indians with Montcalm were doing little of value, delighted like the children they were with the whole panorama of battle and especially with the music of the siege guns."⁶⁴ Recent scholarship by George Stanley has revealed how mistaken is the traditional image of the Indian fighting man, and Wise points out that Indians fighting in the American Revolution were often more successful than the British regulars.⁶⁵

Perhaps most indicative of the treatment of the Indian as an inferior is the representation of him as a child in relation to white men. The term "child" or "child-like" is widely used,⁶⁶ and the implication arises even more widely. With tolerant amusement the story is told of the Iroquois bringing their sick to Cartier to be healed, and of their wonderment at the French beards and fair skin.⁶⁷ Indians settle for beads and cast-off implements in exchange for furs or land, they imagine that a red hat makes them civilized, and they believe that a chiming clock is really a captain regulating the time.⁶⁸ Their religion, described as silly superstition, is treated as a child's fear of the dark, and their medical system as playful charms.⁶⁹ Like a mindless child, the Indian was incapable of applying himself to anything for very long. The siege of Detroit in 1763, according to Tracy, was "the longest time, so far as I can learn, that any band of savages ever kept to one purpose in all the history of North America".⁷⁰ But while in McInnis' opinion the Indian was incapable of understanding higher European thought,⁷¹ G. M. Wrong quotes a Jesuit to the effect that the Hurons were "of higher intelligence than the French peasant".⁷² Eccles claims that the Iroquois had constant diplomatic victories over Frontenac, their astuteness in negotiations reminding that governor of the Venetian senate,⁷³ and Stanley quotes a disdainful prairie chief who was insulted with the offer of "a bit of red cloth" for his land.⁷⁴ Their superstitious medicine included a cure for scurvy which, as Eccles points out, "indicated that the Indians had some valuable knowledge hitherto denied Europeans".⁷⁵ As for their meaningless religion, Vachon offers the alternative view that "*Les sauvages avaient une religion bien établie, produit authentique de leur culture et qui répondait parfaitement aux besoins de leur société.*"⁷⁶

There are, of course, many skills and achievements of the native Canadian that receive attention. Their intricate stone implements, their

invention of the canoe and snowshoe, their longhouses and tipis, their totem poles and decorative quill work, and their forest and hunting sense, all are given fair credit, and are shown to have constituted an adaptation to the North American environment that enabled the Indian to survive quite well without European aid.⁷⁷ Often this is done in negative terms and in contrast to European technology, as in Wrong's statement that the pre-contact Indian had "no vehicles on wheels, no pulleys nor derricks, and no machinery".⁷⁸ The bottle may be half-empty or half-full. For McInnis the Indian was "almost totally ignorant of the art of agriculture",⁷⁹ while for Eccles "the extent of their agricultural knowledge was quite impressive" and "their diet was superior to that of Europeans."⁸⁰

The picture of Indian society is just as contradictory as his individual portrait. Some might describe Hochelaga and Stadacona as dirty and miserable assemblies of huts,⁸¹ and another claim that Iroquois life was "almost totally devoid of effective political organization",⁸² but Brebner calls the St. Lawrence villages "impressive",⁸³ and for Long the Iroquois League "is one of the most remarkable achievements recorded of a primitive people".⁸⁴ Indeed most writers describe the Iroquois confederacy in favourable terms, and the democratic nature of Indian tribal government, with its communalism, councils and meritocracy, has been likened to the Roman Republic and the Anglo-Saxon folkmoot system.⁸⁵

One of the major reasons for this confusion and contradiction is the lack of differentiation between various individuals, tribes and groupings. Careless makes clear that all Indians did not wear feathers or carve totem poles,⁸⁶ Lanctot, Glazebrook and A. S. Morton stress the cultural and even physical variety found among Indian groups,⁸⁷ and Bryce and Wright point out that Indians, like whites, are human beings with varying characters and all the human faults and virtues.⁸⁸ "To write of Indians as if they were one people", S. F. Wise comments forcefully, "is historically . . . absurd."⁸⁹ Yet most writers describe one or two traits or incidents and attribute them to all the Indians of Canada: an atrocity is suggested as representative of the Indian way of life; an instance of fine behaviour or of a particular achievement, on the other hand, is frequently explained as exceptional. For example the wily Kondiaronk, who instigated a Franco-Iroquois war, was "like all his people, quick to betray on the impulse of the moment".⁹⁰ On the other side of the coin whatever Joseph Brant gains by the praise heaped on him, the Indian people lose by comparison. Brant was "hu-

mane for an Indian",⁹¹ and had "a tenderness of heart unusual among the red men of his time".⁹² In the cases of both Kondiaronk and Brant the generality suffers, and the disapproving picture of native people is maintained. Though exceptions exist, and they have been noted above, the final impression taken from a reading of Canadian history books is without doubt one that is derogatory to the Indian.

II

Considering the rather limited worth of the Indian and his society, it is not surprising that his allotted place in Canadian history is also limited. Indicative of the Indian's historical position is the way in which he is first introduced into Canada's story, and the order of precedence followed with respect to other things or groups of people. Geography is the favourite opening subject in the histories consulted,⁹³ and the earliest people to appear are commonly the Vikings.⁹⁴ An account of European expansion,⁹⁵ John Cabot,⁹⁶ or the fur trade,⁹⁷ are other openings found in several books. Typically a general history of Canada will begin with a description of Canada's physical features. Then the Vikings arrive, followed by John Cabot, and finally by Jacques Cartier, when Canada's history can be assumed truly to have started.

Suddenly with no prior notice, much like the wives of Cain and Abel, the Indians are mentioned as being there. They welcome Cartier⁹⁸ or they materialize to kneel with him around the cross he has erected.⁹⁹ In one account the kidnapped chief Donnacona appears already en route to France;¹⁰⁰ in another the Indians make their entrance as "other reasons which help to explain the slow growth of the colony".¹⁰¹ If any attention is paid to the fact that Canada had pre-European inhabitants, it is usually included in the introduction or in the section on geography, squeezed in between the Flora and Fauna or the Land and the Latitude. In any case the Indians are treated as part of the setting, the environment in which the history of the European newcomers can unfold.

Once the white man has arrived, the Indian is given a role in the history of the European in Canada. The earliest settlements are acknowledged to have been completely dependent on Indian food supply, and the Indians' skills and implements taught the white man how to survive in the North American environment. The use of Indian guides, of the canoe and snowshoe, trapping and hunting lore, mocassins, toboggans, medicinal plants, new vegetables, pemmican, all made the European

establishment feasible.¹⁰² The most notable Indian contribution was with regard to the fur trade. Without furs, there would have been no New France or Hudson's Bay Company; without Indians, there would have been no furs.¹⁰³ But, though a debt to the Indian is generally recognized, he is frequently paid less attention than the beaver he trapped.¹⁰⁴ Innis and Stanley are exceptional in describing the effects of the Indian partners of Canada's first and greatest commercial enterprise.¹⁰⁵

Indirectly, too, the Indian served to encourage or support European establishment and expansion in Canada. Both Cartier and Champlain had as prime incentives the exploitation of Indian resources, whether the legendary riches of Saguenay or the furs of the Algonkians.¹⁰⁶ Groulx attributes the French settlement in Canada to the motive of carrying Christianity to the native,¹⁰⁷ and many others at least acknowledge the importance of the missionary stimulus.¹⁰⁸ Interior forts were built to counteract Iroquois attacks on French allies and, by eventually destroying the Hurons, the Iroquois forced the French to go themselves into the North American hinterland.¹⁰⁹ On occasion, particularly with regard to Haldimand, Simcoe and Brock, the Indian presence is seen to have influenced decisions of white administrators in ways that affected policies concerning the whole colonial population.¹¹⁰ Of such is the relevance of the Indian contribution to Canadian history.

According to the space devoted to them, the most significant place reserved for Indians in Canadian history belongs to the Iroquois, and that for their wars against the French. The attitudes and sympathies of Canada's historians are revealed in their choice of descriptions for the Iroquois and their warfare. They are termed the "Iroquois menace",¹¹¹ "*la nuisance*" and "*le peril iroquois*",¹¹² the "Iroquois peril",¹¹³ and the "scourge of New France",¹¹⁴ and their warfare "plunder" and "pillaging",¹¹⁵ likened to "the pirates of the sea",¹¹⁶ all of which at least imply unprovoked hostility or banditry on the part of the Indians. French attacks on their enemies are described as "clearing out the Iroquois",¹¹⁷ "quelling the Iroquois menace",¹¹⁸ "punitive expeditions"¹¹⁹ and "preventive war",¹²⁰ equally implying self-defensive action by the Europeans. Though many occasions are recorded when French actions initiated hostilities,¹²¹ and the opinion is given that it was commercial rivalry, not the fact of French settlement, that caused the Iroquois to threaten New France,¹²² still the impression remains of innocent *habitants* being harrassed by savages thirsty for blood or booty.

Whatever prominence the Iroquois are given it is as participants in the white man's story, not for any interest they hold in themselves for the historians. As William Kingsford wrote eighty years ago, and attitudes have scarcely changed, the subject of the Indians "is totally independent of the History of Canada except so far as it bears upon the relations of the European Indian races."¹²³ And those relations are told exclusively from the European's standpoint, with white subjects and red objects, despite Bernard de Voto's assertion that "well into the nineteenth century, Indians were one of the principal determinants of historical events".¹²⁴ Any historical development of the Indian peoples is no more than "the savage prologue to the American drama".¹²⁵

The kind of participation relegated to the Indian in Canadian history reflects attitudes such as these. Beyond the fur trade and the Iroquois wars Indians enter Canadian history infrequently, and when they do the part they play is seldom positive or very significant. Their immoral habits are said to have been transferred to the colony, to the detriment of the French Canadian family structure.¹²⁶ The very presence of an Indian threat influenced the character and development of New France and its population, by impeding trade,¹²⁷ discouraging agriculture,¹²⁸ inspiring local patriotism¹²⁹ and forcing the centralization of authority into the hands of the governor.¹³⁰

Their most accustomed role is as allies in a white man's war. The Micmacs and Abenakis are credited with saving Acadia for France before Utrecht,¹³¹ and the War of the Austrian Succession seems more a conflict between opposing Indians than between rival European empires.¹³² In fact, one learns, "The defense of New France always rested upon the twin pillars of frontier fortifications and Indian alliances."¹³³ France's allies are eulogized, by Francophone historians, as being "the bravest of all the Indians" and "characterized by all the good qualities of the Indian."¹³⁴ The Indians fighting under Joseph Brant during the American Revolution receive corresponding compliments from the Anglophone historians, for their part in making possible a British North America. They were "loyal", "patriots" and "stalwarts",¹³⁵ and even Kingsford, who foreswears to mention any Indians in his history, makes an exception to pay tribute to the loyal Mohawks.¹³⁶ Tecumseh's impressive effort in the War of 1812 draws even greater applause. Canadian histories give the impression that, as in the Revolution, these "noblest of red patriots"¹³⁷ helped to save Canada for Britain.¹³⁸ "But for them", Morgan says, "it is probable, we should not now have a Canada."¹³⁹

Only a few of our scholars suggest that the Indians in many of these wars were in fact fighting for their own interests rather than for a Great Father overseas.¹⁴⁰ Of these perhaps Eccles and Wise are most emphatic in their presentation of Indian initiatives. "Always", Eccles states, the Indians "sought to play the French and English off against each other, supporting the side that seemed best to serve their interests and only for as long as this condition obtained."¹⁴¹ In Wise's opinion, "to deny the Indians some conception of their own interests would be to deny them humanity."¹⁴² Wise goes even further in his interpretation of Indian participation in the American Revolution. "The Revolution was not one war but two, waged simultaneously but for entirely different reasons and for entirely different ends." The second and generally unrecognized war within the Revolution was the one waged by the Indians against "the moving frontier of American settlement". Only the timing resulted from the coincidental outbreak of a conflict between the whites. "Had there been no revolution", Wise concludes, "an Indian explosion would still have occurred."¹⁴³

The variance at which these historians find themselves with other more traditional accounts is immediately obvious. Typically, Indian initiatives are ignored or emasculated. Though it gains wide attention,¹⁴⁴ even Pontiac's war of 1763, commonly treated as a problem in Imperial relations and a disruption in the fur trade, is robbed of its historical significance as an Indian event.¹⁴⁵ It is enlightening to see that the Indians who are personally singled out as worthy of praise, or even of mention, seldom go beyond Donnacona, Pontiac, Brant, Tecumseh, Big Bear and Poundmaker. All these men intruded on the white man's history, either as allies or as misguided obstacles, and only as such are they given consideration in most general accounts.¹⁴⁶

After 1812 the Indian almost entirely disappears from Canadian history. He emerges fleetingly during the various Red River disturbances to commit a few murders, but is greatly overshadowed by the whites and métis who were really doing the fighting.¹⁴⁷ Several writers take note, some of them critically, of the series of western treaties that moved the Indians onto reserves after 1871.¹⁴⁸ Their position again being overshadowed by the métis, Canada's Indians have a *pièce de résistance* in the North West Rebellion of 1885. Most histories are sympathetic toward the Plains Indians, explaining that American or métis spread discontent among them, that the buffalo, their chief source of sustenance, was gone, and that they had sent many petitions to Ottawa, all unanswered, seeking a peaceful solution.¹⁴⁹ "Nothing but

a real sense of wrong would ever induce them to take up arms against British authority", comments Mulvaney with typical sentiment, though he adds "Of course it is not saying they are wronged to say that they have experienced a sense of wrong."¹⁵⁰ Outside the works of George Stanley and those who acknowledge their debt to him,¹⁵¹ Indian participation in the events of 1885 is not widely described. Big Bear and Poundmaker are simply lumped together as "also-rans" with Louis Riel, and on occasion some report of the "Frog Lake Massacre" may be included.¹⁵² That Canada still has an Indian population, or that they are presently involved in a movement to reassert their identity, is almost entirely neglected.¹⁵³

III

The foregoing outline, gleaned from what is believed to be a representative selection of the books appearing on undergraduate bibliographies today, is the story of the native Canadian according to the historians of Canada. It will be noted that historical description often serves no more than to illustrate the list of epithets presented at the beginning of this paper. Of course exceptions exist, and they have been recognized, but there can be no doubt that a student of Canadian history gains an image of the Indian people much as it has appeared here.

Any attempt to explain the reasons behind this neglect and generally poor treatment of the Indian would have to take into account the sources from which the writers have gained their own impressions and materials. A reading of the bibliographies and notes appended to the books under consideration shows the most widely used source on Indians to be the *Jesuit Relations*. It comes as no surprise to learn that the Jesuit missionaries, devoted to Christian ideals and practices, frequently condemned the Indian life as hell and the Indian people as the damned. If they recognized much of value in Indian manners, they were also sacrificing their comfort and even their lives to change those manners. According to seventeenth-century European Christians exposure of the female body was indecent and sinful, and was moreover wont to be taken as indicative of a general lack of morality. When an Indian refused to observe the Sabbath and went instead after long-awaited game, the anxious priests would fear that it was evidence of his degraded nature. His incapability to grasp immediately the complications of a Holy Trinity in heaven and a Holy Father in Rome served to prove his

inferior mental and spiritual status. By relying on such a source, modern writers are perpetuating outdated attitudes to which most of the writers themselves would shudder to subscribe.

Early travel narratives and explorers' descriptions, such as those by Cartier, Champlain, Lescarbot and Radisson, are the second common source for facts about the Indians. Cartier came to North America hoping to find a route to Asia and easy wealth, or at least a northern Mexico with silver mines and magnificent cities. Instead he found the humble Iroquoian villages of Stadacona and Hochelaga. His disappointment was reflected in his writing, and it is still reflected and generalized upon by historians who are seeking only a wealth of knowledge. Like Cartier, they are searching in the wrong place. The later narratives were written at a time when Indians often stood in the way of European ambitions, and even when this was not so the narrators suffered the same cultural limitations as the Jesuits. If the impression they give is one of the forces of light versus the powers of darkness they can be condoned, but modern understanding and perspective should be able to exercise some selectivity and produce a more balanced record.

Other highly favoured sources are accounts written by early fur traders. Because they learned Indian ways and lived intimately with Indian bands, the traders might be expected to give accurate and objective descriptions of native life and character. Yet, as Lewis Saum stresses in his *Fur Trader and the Indian*, the traders were prone to describe and evaluate Indians in terms of their fur productivity and their cooperation with the Europeans. A tribe that would trade ten beaver pelts for a bottle of diluted rum was of more use to the trader than one that demanded more costly manufactures, or that defiantly refused to trade at all. The indiscriminate use of fur trader sources again passes on as fact highly prejudiced and often inaccurate accounts of Indian worth.

Generally speaking the times in which these early accounts were written made prejudice and ignorance inevitable. Their greater historical value may be in teaching about the men who wrote the original narratives rather than in their subject matter. The suggestion here is definitely not that all such accounts are useless for Indian material, but that unless they are scrutinized and sifted their real use is lost to modern students. The incomplete and biased picture of the Indian is not inevitable, even given our reliance on contemporary European sources. The example of Africa is a case in point, for scholars today

find that a reconstruction of pre-Colonial history is far from impossible. A recent publication on the Greenland Eskimoes gives an example even closer to home. In both these cases the bulk of written evidence was European, but through broad research, discriminating interpretation, and the cooperation of other disciplines, they have been able to put together native histories that expose Canadian efforts as less than satisfactory.

It would appear that to repeat the African or Greenland accomplishments Canadian historians will have to adopt an interdisciplinary approach, and History Departments will have to encourage more specialization in native history. With scholarly monographs to draw upon, historians of Canada or of periods with considerable Indian involvement will be able to avoid presenting to the public a history that rejects the native Canadian. In the meantime one wonders why the currently available published material, anthropological and historical, is not put to greater use. In most of the exceptions noted in the above outline, the authors acknowledged their debt to anthropology and archaeology, to Diamond Jenness, George Stanley, Harold Innis, G. T. Hunt and A. G. Bailey. Trudel, Eccles. Hill, the Mortons and D. C. Masters' edition of Brebner, from which many of the more favourable examples were taken, show these works as sources on Indians. As Stanley and Innis have themselves become sources for certain works written since the 1930s, so will Eccles and others with similar scholarship serve as sources for succeeding historians. A lack of source material, though an undoubted problem, is not the acceptable excuse it was thirty or forty years ago, and need be even less so in the future.

Unfortunately not all the unfair treatment of the Indians can be attributed to an unwise use of sources. Many of our writers use terms of deprecation that are misunderstood and are besides unnecessary. Perhaps "savage" was a meaningful word, when used with regard to Indians, for historians fifty years ago. Today that word has taken on connotations that are no longer acceptable. If it is argued that it is not the people themselves but certain of their practices that may legitimately be called savage, it should be pointed out that those practices were by no means exclusive to Indians. That on comparable information an Indian atrocity may be condemned and generalized to apply to all Indians, while a European atrocity is assumed to be a rare exception, can be taken only as evidence of discrimination.

Torture of prisoners and a destructive and malicious method of waging war have been offered as proof of Indian savagery. European

law, too, allowed the torture of prisoners during the same period, and it is alleged that Jesuit priests and Governor Frontenac condoned it.¹⁵⁴ In September 1689 three Iroquois prisoners were tortured to death in the Place Royale, Montreal, while "the townspeople in the crowded square watched the long-drawn-out agonies of their foes".¹⁵⁵ G. M. Wrong reminds us that "In Europe, then and long after, the torture of prisoners was common . . . Executions were public spectacles watched by eager crowds; men and women were still burned at the stake; massacre often followed victory; the bodies of traitors were hacked to pieces and the ghastly quarters long remained in public places".¹⁵⁶ Condemned criminals in Quebec "were occasionally tortured before being strangled,"¹⁵⁷ and a murder sentence in 1690 called for the culprit to have his hand chopped off, receive six breaking blows on the legs, thighs and arms, and then to be broken on the wheel.¹⁵⁸ To call the Indians savage for similar actions is surely to adopt an unhistorical attitude. To generalize from Champlain's oft-noted refusal to participate in torture in 1609, as though he represented European standards, is to be dishonest, considering the fate of Francois Ravailac in Paris less than a year later.

Nor was Indian warfare, though undoubtedly ruthless, peculiar in its savagery. The 1666 Carignan-Salieres campaign, the payment of bounties for enemy scalps by both French and English, the seizure of peaceful Iroquois in 1688 and their public torture and condemnation as galley slaves, were equally unchivalrous by theoretical European standards. And how does the "Lachine Massacre" differ from the Canadian attack on Corlaer in 1690? "Late in the evening of February 18", Lanctot relates, "the invaders succeeded in getting inside the palisade and infiltrating the sleeping town. At the signal of an Indian war-whoop, they attacked the houses and killed the occupants." The houses were then burned to the ground.¹⁵⁹ Identical attacks took place in succeeding months on Salmon Falls and Casco, with the difference that in the latter case the slaughter occurred after the town had surrendered. If such things are mentioned they are excused as necessary under the circumstances, or as singular exceptions, or they are simply related without comment.¹⁶⁰

Because they yearned after European goods, Indians are described as "grasping" and "greedy". Not one of the histories consulted talks of Cartier in the same way, yet he and his colleagues travelled thousands of miles to gain easy Eastern wealth. Acquisitiveness was the major inspiration for Canada's first settlement attempt, for it was needed as

a base from which to search for the Kingdom of Saguenay.¹⁶¹ In duplicity, too, Cartier matched the Indians who are caused to bear the label of liar. He told the St. Lawrence Iroquois that his dedicatory cross of 1534 was meant only as a beacon for the return journey, and in 1541 that the kidnapped chiefs, in fact long dead, had married and were living as nobles in France.¹⁶² The Jesuit ruse of having a clock, dubbed the "Captain", order the Hurons back to work by chiming four o'clock is taken as evidence of Indian gullibility, rather than of European trickery.¹⁶³ Francis I and Cartier believed Donnacona's stories of having seen flying men, pygmies and spices, gold and rubies, in a fabled northern land. Donnacona has gone down in history as a liar, not the French notables as gullible.¹⁶⁴ Nicholas de Vigneau's tales of having seen the northern sea are excused as an effort to ensure his participation in the next expedition to Canada.¹⁶⁵ Donnacona might well have shared that motive.

In 1534-5 Cartier's scurried crew, relying on heavenly intervention, was near death when the Indians taught them how to cure their disease. On his return to France Cartier made a pilgrimage to Rocamadour as a thanks offering for his escape from death, having in the meantime kidnapped the men who had cured him. Father Jogues, whose torture by the Iroquois left him with a mutilated thumb and finger, was obliged to seek papal permission to continue saying mass, since he had lost the traditional digits used in the consecration.¹⁶⁶ Our historians describe Indians of the same period as being sunk in superstition.¹⁶⁷ We continue to portray as immoral the Indian girl who dared proposition Champlain. Champlain at age forty married a twelve year old girl and received a dowry of six thousand livres for doing so.¹⁶⁸ One wonders which action, by 1971 standards, would be considered immoral. Indians were thieves, but the men who took their furs and lands in exchange for liquor and trinkets were honest traders. All of this is to point out that a double standard exists in our judgment of different peoples in the same historical period. We need not, indeed we must not, condemn the European savagery, greed, superstition and duplicity without explaining their historical context. At the same time we must show equal restraint and understanding in our descriptions of other cultures.

Problems with source material and the practice of a double standard can be well documented. A third and more speculative reason for the neglect of the Indian may be offered in the suggestion that it reflects the approach that Canadians have toward their national history. The

Canadian historical attitude has been imposed upon the Indian story; that story is in effect a microcosmic representation of Canadian historiography, with its heroes and legends, rivalries and prejudices.

Canada, like every nation, needs heroes in her past. When a genuine hero presents himself, his position must be preserved. Champlain, "the most outstanding figure on the threshold of our national history",¹⁶⁹ plays such a role and therefore enjoys the proper respect of the historians.¹⁷⁰ He *was* the Father of New France, and he *did* make possible the permanent establishment of Canada's national ancestors on this continent. Like all heroes, he had obstacles to surmount, and among them were certain groups of Indians. The Indians who resisted him, or whom he attacked, cannot be treated sympathetically or themselves be considered as heroic defenders of their homeland, for to do so would tarnish the epic struggle of Champlain.

Even more important for the concept of a heroic past is the preservation of the memory of the Jesuit martyrs. "Here was heroism, stark fearless heroism, heroism purged of all the dross of worldliness."¹⁷¹ Lower places the martyred saints at "the very base of French Canada's story",¹⁷² and Groulx esteems them as "*la parure d'une histoire*".¹⁷³ They "passed into the traditions of the French in Canada, and confirmed their belief in a religion which had produced so selfless a devotion";¹⁷⁴ their deaths "constitute one of the great epics of Christendom".¹⁷⁵ One almost imagines that any defence of the Iroquois would be considered sacrilege or treason. Martyrs must have murderers, they must be righteous and wronged. No justifiable homicide is possible. The Iroquois made possible the martyrdoms and therefore must themselves be martyred to the memory of the martyrs.¹⁷⁶

Long Sault, where in 1660 "the gallant fight-to-the-last of Adam Dollard" saved Montreal,¹⁷⁷ has been likened to a Canadian Thermopylae.¹⁷⁸ Of all the single acts of bravery in Canadian history, none is so inspirational or so often cited as Dollard's defiant stand and sacrifice.¹⁷⁹ He preserved New France; his example teaches that New France, and Canada, are worthy of selfless dedication. He fought off the forces of evil and destruction in the shape of the Iroquois warriors. Though Lanctot maintains that Dollard was moved only to seize Iroquois furs and was ignorant of a potential attack, and claims that documents have been falsified to perpetuate the myth of Long Sault,¹⁸⁰ still Dollard has been immortalized as the man who prevented the Indians from undoing Canada's national destiny.

French Canada has a "trial-by-fire" tradition that gives it strength even today,¹⁸¹ the tradition of simple and quite ordinary *habitants* who fought the threatening Indians: and won. Canadian hearts go out to the memory of their tenacious ancestors. The teen-aged Madeleine de Vercheres, who stood off the Indians for three days, animates our pride and devotion, and creates respect for the ideals and principles upon which this nation was based.¹⁸² The early folk legends are glorious only if their participants, the brave *habitants*, were in the right. One need not look much further to discover the basis for the historians' attitude toward the Iroquois.

A further point of attention in Canadian history has been the relationship between members of the two language groups. The Indian is forced into the conflict sometimes created, just as he was forced into the colonial wars, and he is often passed over so that historians can indulge in one of their favourite subjects. Some Francophone writers blame the English colonists for the Indians' debauched nature and for much of their hostility,¹⁸³ while some Anglophone writers attribute Pontiac's war and other Indian atrocities to French inspiration.¹⁸⁴ Few of the historians dealing with the 1885 Rebellion even mention the end of the story as far as the Indians are concerned. Once Big Bear and Poundmaker have safely surrendered, interest in the Indians, their issues and grievances, is dropped, and attention shifts to the effects on English-French relations from the execution of Louis Riel.

Almost as popular in inter-lingual relations has been Canada's position with regard to the United States. Perhaps part of the explanation for the importance assigned to Brant and Tecumseh is to be found in the fact that they were loyal fighters against American encroachment. Certainly the accounts of Brant and particularly of Tecumseh are filled with anti-American sentiment.¹⁸⁵ Like the rest of British North America, Indian lands were coveted by the aggressive and presumptuous Americans. The Indians therefore united with the other innocent inhabitants of the continent to keep the Yankee in his place. Even the North West Rebellion is blamed to some extent on American whiskey traders and the Indian wars south of the border.¹⁸⁶

Finally Canadian historical writing reflects a belief in the manifest destiny of European civilization spreading across the continent from sea to sea. The good Indian was he that assisted the white movement, that occupied his reserve, that signed away his land without resistance. Though frequent attention, particularly in the western histories, is paid

to Indian claims to land title,¹⁸⁷ the implication is that he was not using it properly and therefore deserved to lose it. If his culture was so weak as to be unable to withstand the European onslaught, then the lesson of Darwinism indicates that it was worthy of survival.¹⁸⁸

It will have been noticed that whenever the Indian appears in Canadian history, from Donnacona through the Iroquois wars and the fur trade to Tecumseh and Poundmaker, he is forced to fit into one or more of these major themes. Apart from them, given our national obsessions, he can have no historical role.

IV

Throughout this paper individual exceptions to the general rule have been pointed out. As a final exercise it may be of interest to discover whether, from among the works under consideration, there are any differences in the treatment of the Indians by the various categories of authors consulted. For the sake of convenience it is possible to divide the authors by language, date of publication and subject, that is whether it is a general, regional or specialized work.

Among the earlier Anglophone histories of Canada, such as those by Bryce (1887) and Tracy (1908), it was found that a considerable amount of material on the Indian was included, and even that there was a separate section devoted to the Indian. This same practice is followed by most Francophone historians of whatever date, from Garneau (1913 edition) to Lanctot (1963). Modern writers in English do not generally have as much Indian content. Considering the limitations of the bibliography used for this paper in the French language, it may be unwise to project any kind of pattern into this observation; still it is striking that early English- and all French-language writers acknowledge that the Indian is worthy of considerable attention. Of course more coverage does not necessarily mean better treatment, for in fact the problems of sources and the double standard are just as evident here as elsewhere, but the message is that the Indian did have a part to play in Canadian history of which he is robbed by modern English-writers.

Of the histories published since the 1930s, when Stanley, Innis, Bailey and Jenness have been available, McInnis (1947), Glazebrook (1950), Cornell et al. (1967), and Brebner (1970 edition), attempt some separate description of Indian society. McInnis does so almost exclusively in negative terms; the other three are more positive. The other

general histories consulted mention the Indian only in passing, and invariably on occasions of white-Indian contact. Lower (1957, 1958) matches McInnis in his denunciation of the Indian was of life, while Creighton (1962), W. L. Morton (1963), and Careless (1965), are far less free with the epithets. From all of them it is evident that the Indian is considered totally peripheral to the study of Canada. Date of publication, within this period, appears to be no criterion. Glazebrook (1950) and Graham (1950) are quite opposite in their estimate of the Indian's participation.

Regional histories naturally vary according to the region under study. Narratives of New France, of whatever date or language, not unexpectedly take most regard of the Indian presence. The recent works of Stanley (1968) and Eccles (1969) give the most objective account, in terms of their descriptions of Indian life and the value of Indian participation as independent determinants of the course of our history. Interestingly Eccles' earlier works (1959, 1964), though their subjects invite Indian content, show a relative neglect in that respect. Parkman (1878, 1892) contains the greatest wealth of descriptive material, not always complimentary; Groulx (1952) and Trudel (1963) follow the pattern noted among general histories in their language, with Trudel making clear his use of the latest specialized scholarship on Indians. For the Maritime colonies, again reverting to the previous pattern, the older histories by Haliburton (1829), Hannay (1909) and Allison (1916), devote more space and attention to the Indian than does MacNutt (1963, 1965). At the risk of promulgating a facile theory it may also be noted that A. S. Morton (1938, 1948) pays more regard to Indians than W. L. Morton (1967).

Books concerning the fur trade, like those of New France, must take the Indian into serious account. Rich's chronicle of the Hudson's Bay Company (1960) acknowledges the partnership of Indian and trader, but still the Indian is introduced only in his dealings with Company agents. Innis (1930), as has been mentioned, ranges much further into native life. The Indian appears more the barbarian in Richardson's relation of the War of 1812 (1902) than he does in Gilpin's (1958) or Hitsman's (1965), but it is also true that Richardson takes more notice of the Indian contribution to the war.

If any trend can be discerned in all of this it is probably that Canadian history begins at different points for the different categories of historians. The earliest period of our history, that with the greatest

and most obvious Indian involvement, is closer to the consciousness of Francophone historians, many of whose cultural roots can be traced back that far. It was also closer to the consciousness of Anglophone historians of previous generations, for they were telling the story of Canada's foundation and expansion as an outpost of empire. Certainly the beginning of that story and many of its later episodes depended for their telling on some awareness of the Indian presence. Since about 1950, in English Canada, the received view of history has been concerned with our political and constitutional development as a separate entity and a separate identity. History can therefore begin in 1759, or 1791, or even in 1867, regardless of the actual period under study. What is past is not necessarily prologue for this view of history, unless it is relevant, ultimately, to twentieth century politics. Indian history can be overlooked with increasing convenience.

This however only serves to explain the amount of attention accorded to the Indian. The seriousness of that attention or the relative fairness of the Indian image does not appear to depend on the historian's language, date or topic. Perhaps a clue is to be found in that certain recent specialized works on a variety of specific subjects, and one thinks in particular of the Canadian Centenary Series edited by W. L. Morton and D. G. Creighton, offer a much more balanced view of the Indian's character and the part he has played in the shaping of our national heritage. Here there are neither "bronzed stalwarts" nor "hobgoblins", and if the double standard is not avoided completely at least the breadth of research has eliminated any reliance on centuries-old opinions. One can therefore conclude with an observation, and a hope. The observation is that although certain variables may affect the measurement of Indian content, still the depth of treatment is a direct result only of the author's scholarship. The hope is for more of that kind of scholarship, for a greater research interest in Indians, a more objective use of primary sources, and a greater recognition of published material both within and without the traditional historical discipline. This can, after all, be applied to any group of people or subject, for how else is Canada's history to be written?

NOTES

* Robin W. Winks, "Canada", in *The Historiography of the British Empire-Commonwealth* (Durham, 1966), p. 70.

¹ The following authors use the term "savage", to mean Indian, in one or more of their works listed in the bibliography: David Allison, George Bryce, A. L. Burt, Alexander Casselman, D. G. Creighton, W. J. Eccles, F.-X. Garneau, Lionel Groulx, T. C. Haliburton, James Hannay, Sir Harry Johnston, William Kingsford, Gustave Lanctot, A. R. M. Lower, Grant MacEwan, Douglas MacKay, W. S. MacNutt, T. G. Marquis, Edgar McInnis, A. S. Morton, Francis Parkman, E. T. Raymond, E. E. Rich, Paul Sharp, Jack M. Sosin, George Stanley, F. B. Tracy, Marcel Trudel, André Vachon, Louis Wood, G. M. Wrong.

² J. G. Bourinot, P. F. X. de Charlevoix, Groulx, Hannay, Kingsford, Lower, MacKay.

³ Bourinot, Hannay, Lower, Marquis.

⁴ Lanctot, Lower, McInnis, Wrong.

⁵ Johnston, Tracy.

⁶ Tracy.

⁷ Bourinot, MacKay, Rich.

⁸ Creighton, Groulx, Hannay, Tracy, Wrong.

⁹ Marquis, Tracy, Wrong.

¹⁰ Tracy.

¹¹ Marquis.

¹² Bourinot, Johnston, McInnis, Raymond.

¹³ McInnis, Wrong.

¹⁴ Lanctot, Wrong.

¹⁵ Haliburton, Bernard G. Hoffman, Lower, Wrong.

¹⁶ Johnston.

¹⁷ Bourinot, McInnis, Kenneth McNaught.

¹⁸ Groulx.

¹⁹ Hannay.

²⁰ Lower, MacKay, MacNutt, Rich, Wrong.

²¹ Bryce.

²² Tracy.

²³ Lewis O. Saum.

²⁴ Lanctot.

²⁵ Parkman.

²⁶ Bourinot, Charlevoix, Lanctot.

²⁷ Bourinot, Groulx, Trudel, Wrong.

²⁸ Johnston, J. F. C. Wright.

²⁹ Groulx, Johnston, Lower.

³⁰ Saum.

³¹ Creighton, Lanctot, W. L. Morton, Charles P. Mulvaney, Wrong.

³² Wood.

³³ Lionel Groulx, *Histoire du Canada Francais* (3 vols., Montreal, 1952), Vol. I, p. 156.

³⁴ Bourinot, J. B. Brebner, Casselman, Creighton, Eccles, Garneau, Alec R. Gilpin, G. P. de F. Glazebrook, Groulx, Haliburton, Lanctot, Lower, MacKay, Marquis, Philip P. Mason, Parkman, Tracy.

³⁵ J. G. Bourinot, *Canada* (London, 1897), p. 125

³⁶ Brebner, Gilpin, Haliburton, Joseph K. Howard, Johnston, Mason, McNaught, W. L. Morton, Mulvaney, Sosin, Stanley, Wood.

(London, 1950), p. 22; Groulx, I, pp. 61, 157; Long, I, p. 41; A. S. Morton, *Canadian West*, p. 35; Parkman, *Jesuits*, pp. xlviii, lvi-lvii; Stanley B. Ryerson, *The Founding of Canada. Beginnings to 1815* (Toronto, 1960), pp. 15-6; Sharp, pp. 23-4; Stanley, *Birth of Western Canada*, pp. 196, 364; Trudel, "Discoveries and Amerinds", p. 19.

⁸⁶ Careless, p. 21.

⁸⁷ Glazebrook, p. 2; Lanctot, I, pp. 11-16; A. S. Morton, *Canadian West*, pp. 12-3.

⁸⁸ Bryce, p. 102; Wright, p. 27.

⁸⁹ S. F. Wise, "The American Revolution and Indian History", in J. S. Moir, *Character and Circumstances* (Toronto, 1970), p. 183.

⁹⁰ Lanctot, II, p. 109.

⁹¹ Bryce, p. 265.

⁹² Louis A. Wood, *The War Chief of the Six Nations. A Chronicle of Joseph Brant* (Toronto, 1964), p. 66.

⁹³ E.g. Bourinot, Careless, Long, MacNutt, McInnis, Ryerson, Wittke.

⁹⁴ Bishop, Bourinot, Jean Bruchesi, Creighton, W. L. Morton, Tracy, Trudel. It is interesting to note that there is a C.H.A. publication on the Vikings, T. J. Oleson's *The Norsemen in America* (C.H.A. Historical Booklet No. 14, Ottawa, 1963), but none on the Indians.

⁹⁵ David Allison, Garneau, Graham, Lower, Ormsby, Trudel, Wrong.

⁹⁶ Haliburton, Hannay.

⁹⁷ Hill, W. L. Morton, Wright.

⁹⁸ Bourinot, Hannay, Tracy, Wrong.

⁹⁹ Bruchesi, Creighton, Garneau.

¹⁰⁰ A. R. M. Lower, *Colony to Nation. A History of Canada* (Toronto, 1957).

¹⁰¹ Graham, p. 21.

¹⁰² David Allison, *A History of Nova Scotia* (3 vols., Halifax, 1916), Vol. I, p. 68; Brebner, *Canada*, p. 8; Brebner *Explorers, passim*; Careless, pp. 21-2; Clark, pp. 28-9; Eccles, *Canadian Frontier*, pp. 5, 24; Glazebrook, p. 26; Haliburton, I, p. 21; Long, I, p. 41; MacEwan, p. 6; Kenneth McNaught, *The Pelican History of Canada* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1969), p. 19; W. L. Morton, *Manitoba. A History* (Toronto, 1967), pp. 14-20; Trudel, "Discoveries and Amerinds", p. 19; Wright, p. 26.

¹⁰³ Cf. Campbell, pp. 6-9; Careless, p. 27; Creighton, pp. 10-11, 27, 31, 67-8; Eccles, *Canada Under Louis XIV*, p. 60; Eccles, *Canadian Frontier*, pp. 19, 36; W. J. Eccles, "Frontenac and the Iroquois, 1672-1682", *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 1 (March, 1955), p. 1; Groulx, I, p. 52; Hill, p. 10; H. A. Innis, *The Fur Trade in Canada* (Toronto, 1956), pp. 10, 13-4, 143, 235-36; Lanctot, II, 63; A. S. Morton, *Canadian West*, p. 53ff.; Ryerson, pp. 18, 86, 90; Trudel, "Discoveries and Amerinds", p. 13; Carle Wittke, *A History of Canada* (Toronto, 1935), p. 33.

¹⁰⁴ E.g. Lower, *Colony to Nation*.

¹⁰⁵ Innis, *passim*; Stanley, *Birth of Western Canada*, p. 198ff. See also Vachon, p. 27, for an indication of how commercial hunting practices disrupted Indian family life and culture.

¹⁰⁶ Creighton, pp. 5-7; Joseph E. King, "The Glorious Kingdom of the Saguenay", *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. XXXI, No. 4 (December, 1950); Lanctot, I, pp. 57, 65; Trudel, "Discoveries and Amerinds", p. 9.

¹⁰⁷ Groulx, I, p. 59.

¹⁰⁸ E.g. Careless, p. 25; Creighton, p. 30; Eccles, *Canadian Frontier*, pp. 7, 36; Hannay, I, p. 5; McInnis, p. 24.

¹⁰⁹ Careless, p. 52; Creighton, pp. 47, 65, 87; Stanley, *New France*, p. 76.

¹¹⁰ A. L. Burt, *The Old Province of Quebec* (Toronto, 1933), pp. 368-71; G. M. Craig, *Upper Canada: the formative years, 1784-1841* (Toronto, 1963), pp. 4-5, 23-4, 68-73; Wise, "The Indian Policy of John Graves Simcoe", pp. 36-44.

- 111 Brebner, *Canada*, p. 40; Careless, p. 49; Eccles, *Canada Under Louis XIV*, p. 61; Glazebrook, p. 68; McInnis, pp. 12, 41; W. L. Morton, *The Kingdom of Canada. A General History from Earliest Times* (Toronto, 1963), p. 36; Wrong, I, p. 342.
- 112 Groulx, I, pp. 75, 124.
- 113 Careless, p. 44; Graham, p. 48; McInnis, p. 55.
- 114 McNaught, p. 23.
- 115 Eccles, "Frontenac and the Iroquois", p. 5.
- 116 Wrong, I, p. 303.
- 117 Lower, *Colony to Nation*, p. 17.
- 118 Eccles, *Canada Under Louis XIV*, p. 61.
- 119 *Ibid.*, p. 41; Lanctot, II, p. 130.
- 120 Eccles, *Frontenac*, p. 197.
- 121 Eccles, *Canadian Frontier*, pp. 31, 125; Eccles, *Frontenac*, Ch. VI; Eccles, "Frontenac and the Iroquois", p. 5; Lanctot, I, p. 121, II, pp. 104-06; McInnis, p. 87; McNaught, p. 23; Ryerson, pp. 90, 119, 143.
- 122 Innis, p. 42; Trudel, "The Establishment of New France", in Cornell et al., p. 25.
- 123 William Kingsford, *The History of Canada* (10 vols., Toronto, 1888), Vol. II, p. 166.
- 124 Quoted in Saum, p. ix. See also Glazebrook, pp. 12-3.
- 125 Parkman, *Jesuits*, p. xxiii.
- 126 Clark, pp. 28-9, 33-4, 57-9.
- 127 Jean Bruchesi, *A History of Canada* (Toronto, 1950), p. 16; Careless, p. 44; Eccles, *Canada Under Louis XIV*, pp. 4, 25, 46; Graham, p. 22; Groulx, I, p. 49; McInnis, p. 12.
- 128 Creighton, p. 99; Graham, p. 22.
- 129 Clark, p. 36; Stanley, *New France*, p. 207. For a similar development in British Columbia see Ormsby, p. 127.
- 130 Clark, pp. 35-6.
- 131 Allison, I, p. 227; J. B. Brebner, *New England's Outpost: Acadia Before the Conquest of Canada* (New York, 1927), pp. 58, 69, 79; Creighton, p. 132; Haliburton, I, p. 203; Hannay, I, p. 25; Lanctot, II, pp. 165, 172, 175-78; W. S. MacNutt, *The Atlantic Provinces* (Toronto, 1965), p. 10; MacNutt, *New Brunswick*, pp. 2, 79; George F. G. Stanley, "The Indians in the War of 1812", *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. XXXI, No. 2 (June, 1950), p. 145; Marcel Trudel, "The Conquest", in Cornell et al., p. 98.
- 132 Groulx, II, p. 76; Haliburton, I, pp. 107, 111; Stanley, *New France*, pp. 1, 13, 20, 27-8, 64-5.
- 133 Stanley, *New France*, p. 76.
- 134 Lanctot, II, pp. 165, 172.
- 135 Bryce, pp. 91, 264; W. L. Morton, *Kingdom*, p. 167; Wood, p. 38. See also Bourinot, p. 300; Burt, p. 282; Lower, *Colony to Nation*, pp. 116-17; W. S. Wallace, *The Macmillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography* (Toronto, 1963), p. 80.
- 136 Kingsford, II, p. 166, and VII, p. 200.
- 137 Raymond, p. 150.
- 138 Brebner, *Canada*, p. 114; Bryce, p. 321; Careless, p. 133; Casselman, p. 204; Craig, pp. 68-73; Horsman, pp. 65, 74; Kingsford, VII, p. 196; McInnis, p. 191; Raymond, pp. 105, 109; Ryerson, pp. 295, 312; Wallace, p. 740; Wittke, p. 83.
- 139 Morgan, p. 184.
- 140 Burt, p. 368; Craig, p. 4; MacNutt, *Atlantic Provinces*, p. 30; Stanley, *New France*, p. 80; Wise, "The Indian Policy of John Graves Simcoe," p. 38.
- 141 Eccles, *Canadian Frontier*, p. 6.

- 142 Wise, "The American Revolution and Indian History", p. 192.
- 143 *Ibid.*, pp. 193, 198, 200.
- 144 E.g. Brebner, *Canada*, Bryce, Careless, Cornell et al., Glazebrook, Kingsford, V, Marquis, McInnis, A. S. Morton, *Canadian West*, W. L. Morton, *Kingdom*, Tracy, II.
- 145 Brebner, *Canada*, p. 76; Careless, p. 99; Glazebrook, pp. 91-2; Marquis, p. 137; McInnis, p. 129; W. L. Morton, *Kingdom*, p. 150; F. Ouellet, "The Military Regime", in Cornell et al., p. 149.
- 146 This observation, which applies to almost all the histories consulted, is reinforced by the popular surveys of Canadian biography, viz: Morgan, pp. 7, 55, 96, 184, and Wallace, pp. 56, 80, 164, 602, 740.
- 147 Campbell, pp. 212-13; MacKay, p. 143; A. S. Morton, *Prairie Settlement*, p. 18.
- 148 Careless, p. 284; Ramsay Cook, *Canada: A Modern Study* (Toronto, 1963), p. 121; J. Hamelin, "The Difficult Years", in Cornell et al., p. 290; Hill, p. 194; MacEwan, pp. 55, 73; McInnis, p. 336; A. S. Morton, *Prairie Settlement*, pp. 48, 61; W. L. Morton, *Manitoba*, p. 155; Ormsby, p. 284; Sharp, pp. 134-36; Stanley, *Birth of Western Canada*, pp. 209-13; Wittke, p. 205. Stanley supplies a map, between pp. 210-11, outlining the areas covered by Treaties 1 to 7.
- 149 Bryce, p. 472; Careless, p. 287; Cook, p. 122; Creighton, p. 362; Hill, p. 191; Howard, p. 350ff.; McInnis, pp. 336-37; W. L. Morton, *Kingdom*, p. 366; Mulvaney, pp. 55-6, 186-93, 307; Stanley, *Birth of Western Canada*, pp. 202-19; George F. G. Stanley, "Gabriel Dumont's Account of the North West Rebellion, 1885", *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. XXX, No. 3 (September, 1949).
- 150 Mulvaney, p. 53.
- 151 Stanley, *Birth of Western Canada*; Hill; Sharp.
- 152 Cook, p. 123; Howard, pp. 347-50; MacEwan, pp. 74-5; Mulvaney, p. 89; Wallace, pp. 56, 602.
- 153 Among the few exceptions are Brebner, *Canada*, pp. 543, 554, and W. L. Morton, *Manitoba*, pp. 492-94.
- 154 Lower, *Canadians in the Making*, p. 51; Parkman, *Old Regime*, p. 69; Edmund Wilson, *Apologies to the Iroquois* (New York, 1960), pp. 19-32.
- 155 Eccles, *Canada Under Louis XIV*, p. 166.
- 156 Wrong, I, p. 180.
- 157 Parkman, *Old Regime*, p. 283.
- 158 Lower, *Canadians in the Making*, p. 52.
- 159 Lanctot, II, pp. 115-16.
- 160 Bourinot, p. 196; Bryce, p. 198; Creighton, p. 56; Eccles, *Canada Under Louis XIV*, pp. 44, 151, 187; Eccles, *Frontenac*, p. 186; Garneau, I, pp. 328-29; Haliburton, I, pp. 156-57; Lanctot, II, pp. 29, 88, 93-4, 104-07, 180; W. L. Morton, *Kingdom*, p. 78; Tracy, I, pp. 169-70, 271; Wrong, II, p. 504.
- 161 Cf. Creighton, p. 6; Eccles, *Canadian Frontier*, p. 16; King; Lanctot, I, p. 65; Trudel, *Histoire*, I, p. 88.
- 162 Bishop, p. 31; Trudel, *Histoire*, I, pp. 80-2.
- 163 Wrong, I, p. 231.
- 164 Brebner, *Canada*, p. 21; Creighton, p. 6; Lanctot, I, pp. 62-4.
- 165 Lanctot, I, pp. 107-08.
- 166 *Ibid.*, I, pp. 62-3, 177.
- 167 E.g. Bourinot, p. 127; Bryce, p. 121; Glazebrook, pp. 5-6; Johnston, pp. 173, 176; Lanctot, I, p. 164, II, p. 58; Long, I, p. 32; Stanley, *Birth of Western Canada*, p. 196; Wrong, I, pp. 231-32.
- 168 Lanctot, I, pp. 106, 110.
- 169 *Ibid.*, I, p. 156.
- 170 Bishop; Careless, pp. 38, 45; N. E. Dionne, *Champlain* (Toronto, 1963); Eccles, *Canada Under Louis XIV*, p. 66; Lower, *Canadians in the Making*, p. 3; McInnis, p. 28; Wrong, I, p. 176.

- 171 Lower, *Canadians in the Making*, p. 24.
- 172 *Ibid.*
- 173 Groulx, I, p. 65.
- 174 Wrong, I, p. 337.
- 175 Brebner, *Canada*, p. 40.
- 176 Cf. Bourinot, p. 142; Careless, p. 43; Eccles, *Canada Under Louis XIV*, p. 225; Groulx, I, pp. 63-5; Lower, *Colony to Nation*, p. 26; McInnis, p. 77; Tracy, I, pp. 84, 109-10; Wittke, p. 9; Wrong, I, pp. 294-309.
- 177 Careless, p. 46.
- 178 Bourinot, p. 150.
- 179 E.g. Bruchesi, p. 16; Bryce, p. 196; Charlevoix, III, p. 33; Glazebrook, p. 25; Groulx, I, p. 49; McInnis, p. 40; Tracy, I, p. 153; Wrong, I, p. 336.
- 180 Lanctot, I, pp. 242-43.
- 181 Lower, *Colony to Nation*, p. 19.
- 182 E.g. Bourinot, p. 196; Eccles, *Canada Under Louis XIV*, pp. 3-4; Groulx I, p. 75; Lanctot, II, p. 127; Lower, *Colony to Nation*, pp. 18-9; Tracy, I, p. 278.
- 183 Charlevoix, III, p. 192, VI, p. 68; Lanctot, II, pp. 86, 127.
- 184 Allison, I, pp. 227-29, 279; Kingsford, V, p. 9ff.
- 185 E.g. Raymond, p. 7ff. See also Careless, pp. 130, 133; Morgan, p. 184; W. L. Morton, *Kingdom*, p. 201; Wittke, p. 83.
- 186 Hill, pp. 192-93; Mulvaney; Sharp, p. 55ff.; Stanley, *Birth of Western Canada*, pp. 199-202.
- 187 Burt, p. 368; Craig, p. 5; Eccles, *Canadian Frontier*, pp. 5, 15; Lanctot, II, p. 168; A. S. Morton, *Canadian West*, p. 554; W. L. Morton, *Manitoba*, pp. 105, 154; Sharp, p. 133; Stanley, *Birth of Western Canada*, pp. 177, 193, 204, 206, 207; Wrong, I, p. 216.
- 188 E.g. Careless, p. 22.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allison, David. *History of Nova Scotia*. 3 Vols. Halifax, 1916.
- Bishop, Morris. *Champlain: The Life of Fortitude*. New York, 1948.
- Bourinot, J. G. *Canada*. London, 1897.
- Brebner, J. B. *Canada. A Modern History* (revised by D. C. Masters). Ann Arbor, 1970.
- . *New England's Outpost: Acadia Before the Conquest of Canada*. New York, 1927.
- . *The Explorers of North America: 1492-1806*. London, 1933.
- Bruchesi, Jean. *A History of Canada*. Toronto, 1950.
- Bryce, George. *A Short History of the Canadian People*. London, 1887.
- Burt, A. L. *The Old Province of Quebec*. Toronto, 1933.
- Campbell, Marjorie. *The North West Company*. Toronto, 1957.
- Careless, J. M. S. *Canada: A Story of Challenge*. Toronto, 1965.
- Casselmann, A. C. (Ed.) *Richardson's War of 1812*. Toronto, 1902.
- Charlevoix, P. F. X. de. *History and General Description of New France*. 6 Vols. Chicago, 1870.
- Clark, S. D. *The Social Development of Canada*. Toronto, 1942.
- Cook, Ramsay. *Canada: A Modern Study*. Toronto, 1963.
- Cornell, P. G. et al. *Canada: Unity in Diversity*. Toronto, 1967.
- Craig, Gerald M. *Upper Canada: the formative years, 1784-1841*. Toronto, 1963.
- Creighton, D. G. *Dominion of the North. A History of Canada*. Toronto, 1962.
- Dionne, N. E. *Champlain*. Toronto, 1963.
- Eccles, W. J. *Canada Under Louis XIV. 1663-1701*. Toronto, 1964.
- . "Frontenac and the Iroquois, 1672-1682". *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 1, March 1955, pp. 1-16.
- . *Frontenac: The Courtier Governor*. Toronto, 1959.
- . *The Canadian Frontier, 1534-1760*. New York, 1969.
- Garneau, F.-X. *Histoire du Canada*. 2 Vols. Paris, 1913.
- Gilpin, A. R. *The War of 1812 in the Old Northwest*. Toronto, 1958.
- Glazebrook, G. P. de T. *A Short History of Canada*. Oxford, 1950.
- Graham, G. S. *Canada: a short history*. London, 1950.
- Groulx, Lionel. *Histoire du Canada Français*. 3 Vols. Montreal, 1952.
- Haliburton, T. C. *An Historical and Statistical Account of Nova Scotia*. 2 Vols. Halifax, 1829.
- Hannay, James. *A History of New Brunswick*. 2 Vols. St. John, 1909.
- Hill, Douglas. *The Opening of the Canadian West*. London, 1967.

- Hitsman, J. M. *The Incredible War of 1812*. Toronto, 1965.
- Hoffman, Bernard G. *Cabot to Cartier. Sources for a Historical Ethnography of Northeastern North America, 1497-1550*. Toronto, 1961.
- Howard, Joseph K. *Strange Empire*. Toronto, 1952.
- Hunt, G. T. *The Wars of the Iroquois. A Study in Intertribal Trade Relations*. Madison, 1960.
- Innis, H. A. *The Fur Trade in Canada*. Toronto, 1956.
- Jenness, Diamond. *The Indians of Canada*. Ottawa, 1932.
- Johnston, Sir Harry H. *Pioneers in Canada*. London, n.d.
- King, Joseph E. "The Glorious Kingdom of the Saguenay". *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. XXXI, No. 4, December 1950, pp. 390-400.
- Kingsford, William. *The History of Canada*. 10 Vols. Toronto, 1888.
- Lanctot, Gustave. *A History of Canada*. 3 Vols. Toronto, 1963.
- Long, Morden H. *A History of the Canadian People*. 2 Vols. Toronto, 1942.
- Lower, A. R. M. *Canadians in the Making. A Social History of Canada*. Toronto, 1958.
- . *Colony to Nation. A History of Canada*. Toronto, 1957.
- MacEwan, Grant. *Between the Red and the Rockies*. Toronto, 1952.
- MacKay, Douglas. *The Honourable Company. A History of the Hudson's Bay Company*. New York, 1936.
- MacNutt, W. S. *New Brunswick, a History: 1784-1867*. Toronto, 1963.
- . *The Atlantic Provinces*. Toronto, 1965.
- Marquis, T. G. *The War Chief of the Ottawas. A Chronicle of the Pontiac War*. Toronto, 1964.
- Mason, Philip P. (Ed.) *After Tippecanoe: Some Aspects of the War of 1812*. Toronto, 1963.
- Masters, D. C. *The Rise of Toronto. 1850-1890*. Toronto, 1947.
- McInnis, Edgar. *Canada. A Political and Social History*. New York, 1947.
- McNaught, Kenneth. *The Pelican History of Canada*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1969.
- Moir, John S. (Ed.) *Character and Circumstance Essays in Honour of Donald Grant Creighton*. Toronto, 1970.
- Morgan, Henry J. *Sketches of Celebrated Canadians*. Quebec, 1862.
- Morton, A. S. *A History of the Canadian West to 1870-71*. Toronto, 1948.
- . *History of Prairie Settlement*. Toronto, 1938.
- Morton, W. L. *Manitoba. A History*. Toronto, 1967.

- . *The Kingdom of Canada. A General History from Earliest Times*. Toronto, 1963.
- . *The West and Confederation, 1857-1871*. C.H.A. Historical Booklet No. 9, Ottawa, 1958.
- Mulvaney, Charles P. *The History of the North-West Rebellion of 1885*. Toronto, 1885.
- Oleson, T. J. *The Norsemen in America*. C.H.A. Historical Booklet No. 14, Ottawa, 1963.
- Ormsby, Margaret A. *British Columbia: a History*. Vancouver, 1958.
- Parkman, Francis. *The Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century*. Boston, 1878.
- . *The Old Regime in Canada*. Boston, 1892.
- Prowse, D. W. *A History of Newfoundland*. London, 1895.
- Raymond, Ethel T. *Tecumseh. A Chronicle of the last Great Leader of his People*. Toronto, 1964.
- Rich, E. E. *Hudson's Bay Company, 1670-1870*. 2 Vols. Toronto, 1960.
- Ryerson, Stanley B. *The Founding of Canada. Beginnings to 1815*. Toronto, 1960.
- Saum, Lewis O. *The Fur Trader and the Indian*. Seattle, 1965.
- Sharp, Paul F. *Whoop-Up Country*. Helena, Montana, 1960.
- Sosin, Jack M. "The Use of Indians in the War of the American Revolution: a Re-Assessment of Responsibility". *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. XLVI, No. 2, June 1965, pp. 101-21.
- Stanley, George F. G. "Gabriel Dumont's Account of the North West Rebellion, 1885". *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. XXX, No. 3, September 1949, pp. 249-69.
- . *Louis Riel: Patriot or Rebel?* C.H.A. Historical Booklet No. 2, Ottawa, 1964.
- . *New France, the last Phase, 1744-1760*. Toronto, 1968.
- . *The Birth of Western Canada. A History of the Riel Rebellions*. Toronto, 1960.
- . "The Indians in the War of 1812". *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. XXXI, No. 2, June 1950, pp. 145-65.
- Tracy, F. B. *The Tercentenary History of Canada: From Champlain to Laurier*. 3 Vols. New York, 1908.
- Trudel, Marcel. *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*. 2 Vols. Montreal, 1963.
- Vachon, Andre. "L'eau-de-vie dans la Societe Indienne". *C.H.A. Annual Report*, 1960, pp. 22-32.
- Wallace, W. S. *The Macmillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Toronto, 1963.
- Wilson, Edmund. *Apologies to the Iroquois*. New York, 1960.

- Winks, Robin W. (Ed.) *The Historiography of the British Empire-Commonwealth. Trends, Interpretations and Resources*. Durham, 1966.
- Wise, S. F. "The Indian Diplomacy of John Graves Simcoe". *C.H.A. Annual Report*, 1953, pp. 36-44.
- Wittke, Carle. *A History of Canada*. Toronto, 1935.
- Wood, Louis A. *The War Chief of the Six Nations. A Chronicle of Joseph Brant*. Toronto, 1964.
- Wright, J. F. C. *Saskatchewan. The History of a Province*. Toronto, 1955.
- Wrong, G. M. *The Rise and Fall of New France*. 2 Vols. Toronto, 1928.