tion. One of the tasks he accepts is the explanation of the criteria that define these two groups and their perspectives in Starkey. What he finds and specifies are moral respectability (usually defined in terms of drinking or non-drinking and churchgoing) and participation in community affairs. Wealth becomes a factor — in fact an important one — only after World War II in his interpretation.

Do we have in pre-World War II Starkey another utopia, a place in which wealth bears no relation to the existence and behaviour of an establishment? If so, the war surely represents the great change, even a fall from grace. Hatch says: "I have no evidence that this factor [wealth] entered into the division before World War II" (p. 231). What evidence did he use or look for? Here the method of this book poses problems. We do not know what documents he looked at. Nor those he neglected. We depend upon his recapitulation of two years of conversations and interviews (subjective reporting of subjective statements). Yet even without knowledge of what he left out, the evidence he offers lends a strong presumption of a decisive economic division in early twentieth-century Starkey. He observes that the most powerful (and establishment) organization in the town was the Farm Bureau Federation. Without a glint of recognition of the implications of his statement he reports that for some reason most of the "agin'ers" or non-establishment people had ties, by contrast, to the local Grange. If his reading in history had gone beyond Page Smith on small towns and Paul Johnstone and Richard Hofstadter on the agrarian myth to Grant McConnell's *Decline of Agrarian Democracy* (1953), he might have recognized the evidence he had. Had he been as aware of gender as is Dublin, he might have pondered somewhat more the fact that in the later pre-World War II period the most significant non-establishment and by definition non-respectable organization in Starkey was the Women's Club, organized by Hazel Joseph, a woman who drank.

Hatch's work misses too much and does too little to change conventional understandings of community change over time. It offers little to historians. Dublin's book takes a much studied topic and place, and he tells much we did not already know. His book is of value not only to historians but to anyone interested in community formation and social change in the industrial era.

Thomas BENDER,
*New York University.*

* * *

L. F. S. UPTON. — *Micmacs and Colonists.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1979. Pp. *xvi*, 243.

In recent years Native studies and Indian-White relations have become popular subjects and Upton's book is one of the most recent contributions to this field. He states that "the object of this book is to trace the interaction of the Micmac Indians and British colonists over a period of one hundred and fifty years" (p. *xi*). In the light of this statement, his subtitle, "Indian-White relations in the Maritimes, 1713-1867", is somewhat of a misnomer since he decided virtually to ignore the other Indians in the Maritimes, mentioning them "only when their activities shed light on the relations of Micmacs and colonists" (p. *xv*).

The book contains five sections. The first deals with the Micmacs before the coming of the Whites and their relationships with the early French explorers, missionaries and colonists, and serves as an introduction to the rest of the book.

In his general introduction. Upton claims that the experience of the Micmacs in the first two hundred years of contact with Europeans, in which they were "the first to be exposed to European disease, hardware and Christianity", saw them develop "a resilience in the face of encroachment that set them apart from other Indians in Canada" (p. *xii*). Their resistance to British occupation in the period 1713-83 forms the second section of the book, where the author claims that in this period, "unique among Canadian Indians, the Micmacs fought for their lands" (p. *xiii*). I am not convinced by his arguments that the case of the Micmacs is very much different from that of other Indians who occupied lands in New Brunswick, and frequently in making his points he relies on examples from the experience of the Malecites and Passamaquoddies. These Indians also fought for their lands. They were involved in the French-English wars as allies of the French just as often as were the Micmacs and if there was an Anglo-Micmac war, as. Upton claims, then it should be called an Anglo-Indian war because the Malecites and Passamaquoddies were certainly involved. He also says that the Malecites were not challenged by the British until late in the eighteenth century, while the Micmacs faced this challenge earlier. But not all Micmacs were challenged before the 1760s — only those who lived in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton. Also it was the Malecites in the 1730s who first protested against the encroachment of Whites on Indian lands in what eventually became the province of New Brunswick, not the New Brunswick Micmacs.

It was also the Malecites whom the authorities feared the most, which is why Governor Armstrong in 1732 recommended the construction of a truck house on the Saint John River to serve the most important tribe in the region. It was also the Malecites in the 1760s who successfully resisted the expansion of British settlement into what is now New Brunswick, not the Micmacs. The Malecites, as Upton admits, successfully restrained British colonists from settling above Maugerville in the early 1760s, while the Micmacs made no attempt to stop the first English-speaking settlers from moving into the Miramichi region in the north-eastern part of the province in the same period. It was not until the Loyalists arrived that the Malecites were dispossessed of their land. Passive resistance, as the author says, was the path taken by the Micmacs after 1760, and it was also the path taken by the Malecites and Passamaquoddies in the late eighteenth century. But did they really have any other choice? Lacking the encouragement of an ally like the French in the earlier period or the Americans in the period before the arrival of the Loyalists, no other type of resistance was possible. Nevertheless, the struggle for Acadia was certainly over in 1783.

Throughout this second section of the book, Upton emphasizes that the Micmacs were able to make their own decisions. He provides convincing evidence that during the Anglo-French struggle they were not merely the dupes of the French but rather were able to choose sides consciously. If this was true for the Micmacs, then it also applied to the Malecites and Passamaquoddies. The last real opportunity for choice came during the American Revolutionary War when some Micmacs resisted the British by siding with the American rebels, as did the Indians in New Brunswick. The Malecites and Passamaquoddies made their last stand in attempting to drive the English from their lands, causing the British authorities more difficulties than did the Micmacs. It was among these Indians that the rebel leader Colonel John Allen concentrated his efforts rather than among the Micmacs. All through the period 1713-83 these tribes resisted just as the Micmacs did.

Perhaps the best chapters in the book are those in Section Three, where Upton analyses the situations that developed in each of the three Maritime provinces after 1783. Although this material has appeared elsewhere, it is the best work that has been done on this topic, showing that the pattern followed in all three provinces was similar: reluctance to guarantee Indian land rights, encroachment on their lands and general neglect by government.

The fourth section of the book deals with "The Micmacs and Colonial Society". There are three chapters in this section dealing with Micmacs and colonists, Micmacs and the law and Micmacs and the Church, matters which Upton claims "knew no provincial boundaries" (p. *xv*). The one on "Micmacs and the Law" is the most interesting since it shows the interaction between Indians and Whites rather than simply the interaction between Indians and White institutions. Here, as well as in the chapter on Micmacs and colonists, it is possible to get some indication of how they felt about each other. There are a number of statements in this chapter, however, that cannot be accepted as fact, especially the one concerning court records. Upton writes: "Fairly good for Nova Scotia, they are either lost or inaccessible for the other two provinces" (p. 146). This is certainly not true. I know that some court records exist in Prince Edward Island, but I am not sure how accessible they are. Court records not only exist in New Brunswick, many have been easily accessible for years. At present there are 3,500 feet of court records in the Public Archives of New Brunswick at Fredericton, many going back to the creation of the province. Records exist for many of the county courts, including those of the courts of the Quarter Sessions for Northumberland County, which for many years included all of present-day Kent, Gloucester, Restigouche and Northumberland counties, where most of the Micmac reserves are located.

As the author admits, all his generalizations in this chapter are based on Nova Scotia records, but there is no evidence to show that he used county records. The New Brunswick records contain information that would either support or change some of Upton's claims, for example, his statement that, "there are only two cases of assault on Indians on record, and none of an assault by Indians, in the whole period from 1760 to 1867" (p. 146). This may be true for Nova Scotia, but a brief check of Northumberland County records for a twenty-year period shows one case of an assault on an Indian in 1791 and two in 1807. The records of other counties would probably provide other examples. In discussing the rare cases of Indians being convicted for murder in Nova Scotia, Upton assumes there were no precedents since no Indian had ever been convicted of a capital offence. "A few had been hanged in the other Maritime provinces, the judges thought, but they were not sure." (p. 147) There were at least two cases in New Brunswick, probably more, which might have strengthened Upton's comments about the Micmacs and serious crimes. One case in 1798 in Northumberland county shows how Whites and Indians were often treated differently by the courts. A Micmac was convicted of arson in that year and the local Indian leaders recommended that, instead of being executed, he be banished from the country and the court agreed to make this request known to the Lieutenant Governor. A Micmac was also executed for murder in 1820 in New Brunswick and other examples would probably be found if the records were searched. Also it may be true that no Indian was ever flogged in Nova Scotia, but at least one Indian was flogged in New Brunswick in 1810. This was a Micmac boy accused of stealing. He was found guilty and sentenced to receive ten lashes which were delivered by another Indian.

Upton also points out that few Indians ever appeared in the courts of Nova Scotia charged with public drunkenness. A check in New Brunswick records suggests that this may also be true for New Brunswick, but it does not mean that

the courts never discussed or recognized the problem of drunkenness among the Indians. It was discussed a number of times in Northumberland County and in 1803 and 1807 the magistrates ordered retailers of spirituous liquors to refrain from selling any but small quantities of liquor to Indians. Also there is considerable evidence that in the 1845 drunkenness was a problem on some Micmac reserves and had been for many years. Cases of civil disorder and drunkenness were often referred to the local priests and magistrates to solve, which meant that those involved rarely appeared in court. The same was probably true in Nova Scotia.

In spite of what has been said, Upton's main point is probably correct. In proportion to their population fewer Micmacs than Whites appeared in the courts charged with serious crimes. A more detailed search of court records would support this and probably many other points made here, but the chapter as it stands really refers to Micmacs and the law in Nova Scotia and not to New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

The last section of the book is merely a brief epilogue covering the last hundred years, because, as the author maintains, "there is no conclusion to the subject matter of this book" (p. *xvi*).

The book contains some interesting illustrations and one map of the Maritime Provinces. Additional maps showing Indian reserves and perhaps the extent of British settlement at various periods would have helped readers who are not familiar with the region or its history. Nevertheless, *Micmacs and Colonists* is a very well-written and interesting book. In a sense it is more of a beginning than a definitive study of the subject, since it raises more questions than it answers and it opens up a number of avenues for further research. In many ways it complements A. G. Bailey's *The Conflict of European and Eastern Algonkian Cultures, 1504-1700*. Had the subtitle served as the title and the emphasis on the uniqueness of the Micmacs and their experience been broadened to include the Malecites and the Passamaquoddies, it would have been an even better book.

William A. Spray,
*St. Thomas University*.

* * *

Nive Voisine. — *Louis-François Laflèche, deuxième évêque de Trois-Rivières*. Tome 1. *Dans le sillage de Pie IX et de Mgr Bourget (1818-1878)*. Saint-Hyacinthe, Édisem, 1980. 320 p.

Avec cette étude, Nive Voisine illustre d'excellente façon la renaissance au Québec de la biographie, un genre qui avait été quelque peu oublié depuis une dizaine d'années; il lui rend pour ainsi dire ses lettres de noblesse.

Malgré la volumineuse étude de Robert Rumilly, *Monseigneur Laflèche et son temps*, parue en 1938, il y avait place pour un portrait renouvelé de l'évêque. À l'étude de Rumilly, Nive Voisine ajoute un tableau du milieu familial et de l'évolution du personnage jusqu'à sa nomination à la coadjutorerie de Trois-Rivières. De plus, nous acquérons ici une meilleure compréhension de la psychologie de Laflèche et nous sommes maintenant en mesure d'apprécier partiellement son œuvre pastorale.