

alism of which he is presumed to be the political epitome is evident in most of the Quebec articles and in the general ones which mention Quebec. Only Louis Trotier and Terry Copp seem able to look at urban development and Montreal workers respectively without having to prove themselves against some nationalist criterion. And that nationalist criterion is given pride of place as *the* ideology in Quebec; in a book that is so provocative it is surprising to find the editors allowing Marcel Rioux to reappear painting the traditional picture of the great black cloud that overhung Quebec from 1840 to 1960. The painting in fact contains errors and is superficial: Rioux never investigates the spokesmen of the ideology; he never looks at competing elites in Quebec society; he accepts without question that the nationalist "ideology of conservation" guided the behaviour of the majority of the Québécois. Perhaps the fact that Rioux is a separatist will be sufficiently provoking to English Canadian students; he certainly is not the best example of a sociologist looking at French Canada's past.

Given the structure of the book and perhaps the current state of research it is hard to fault the editors for sins of omission. Cole Harris' article "Of Poverty and Helplessness in Petite Nation" would have given a better glimpse of mid-nineteenth century rural Quebec but might have required another section. Educational history too, the one area in which perhaps the most research has been done, would have necessitated yet another. Social welfare, crime, disease, family history and women's history will all in time carve themselves a niche in the ample halls of social history, or branch off, as some research areas have already done, into labour, urban and ethnic history. Students would be well advised to take a closer look than the editors allowed themselves in their bibliography at the major Canadian periodicals in the field: *Histoire sociale-Social History*, *Recherches sociographiques*, and the *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*. People wishing to pursue the field may then have to delve into economics, confront the computer, and be prepared to work in teams. But who would not want to be a social historians these days, since, as almost every author in this collection tells us, this approach is more important and more significant than any other previously used to unravel the mysteries of Canada's past!

Susan MANN TROFIMENKOFF,  
*University of Ottawa.*

\* \* \*

YVES F. ZOLTIVANY. — *Philippe de Rigaud de Vaudreuil, Governor of New France, 1703-1725*. The Carleton Library No. 80. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1974.

This is a life-and-times biography that pays especial attention to the post-Frontenac western policy of New France, a subject in which the author has earned authoritative status. As such, it will be a desirable reference addition to collections of colonial Canadiana. Governor Vaudreuil's rule was long and eventful, and his era is one of the less-explored periods of colonial history. Zoltivany's sources are prime and extensive, and the data are multitudinous for such a modest physical mass.

Regrettably they may be too numerous for easy readability. This difficulty may be inherent in the material. The interrelatedness of the empire's segments and their influence upon each other are so far beyond doubt that any good historian will try to explicate them. I may be merely caviling. It seems useful, however, to consider the book distinctly in its two aspects of biography and history.

Zoltvany was severely handicapped by a dearth of documents for Vaudreuil's personal life, but he has presented enough to give a lifelike picture. The data so painstakingly collected and set forth show a Vaudreuil who was authoritarian to the point of arrogance when he could get away with it, cunning and contriving when faced by opposing powers, remarkably unsentimental about his domestic life, thoroughly devoted to his noble family tradition and estate, and always intent upon his own advancement and enrichment. He was a classic military figure, not very bright, completely conventional in his social conduct, completely loyal to his king while practicing some discretion in obeying the king's orders, completely orthodox in his religion's ritual requirements while conveniently disregarding of its moral doctrines, and possessed of that knack for survival that helps the luck along. Zoltvany presents him as larger and more admirable than this, a "somewhat enigmatic" figure that grows to heroic scale "when his mental processes are penetrated." Now he is "the impassive frontier diplomat rising flanked by his staff of lieutenants and interpreters to address conclaves of bronzed warriors from the forests of North America; now the tough-minded old soldier grimly defending the frontiers of New France against English expansion; now the astute politician outmanoeuvring political enemies; now the wily administrator resisting attempts by the mother country to make him change his policy" (p. 218-219). That my different reading of the data can be made from the same book is a tribute to Zoltvany's scrupulous objectivity in reporting the facts without twisting them to his biases.

In one instance, however, I believe that the gap between interpretation and reportage is unacceptably wide. Zoltvany wants his Vaudreuil to be "basically honest." What "basically" may mean I do not know, but Vaudreuil was surely as adept as any other colonial official in feathering his own nest, and he started early. His means, as usual, was the fur trade. Zoltvany distinguishes finely: "Vaudreuil's aim when he engaged in the fur trade was not to accumulate wealth but to find the revenues he needed to sustain a very expensive lifestyle" (p. 178). Whatever the refinement of motivation, it produced very quickly after Vaudreuil's assumption of office a system that Zoltvany acknowledges might be termed an "extortion racket" (p. 190). And Vaudreuil did somehow accumulate large wealth in spite of his lavish expenses.

More important to history was Vaudreuil's management of his colony. He deserves some credit for having sense enough to continue certain vital policies of his predecessor Callière — détente with the Iroquois and neutrality with New York — but he certainly did not originate those policies. His brutal maintenance of Indian hostilities against New England is scrupulously reported. Indeed Zoltvany may have leaned over backward to be fair; there was plenty of imperialist adventuring and instigating being hatched on the English side also. As in New France, tension existed perpetually between the expansionists and the cultivators of their own gardens.

But I think that Zoltvany shows bias in another direction: he takes sides with rich and authoritative personages against the obscure and lowly who excite little of his interest and less of his sympathy. Although so much of his study deals with the fur trade and the west, he notices only the commandants; *coureurs de bois* remain anonymous and rabbleish. He misses the significance, for instance, of Michel Bisailon, barely mentioned on p. 142, whose activity and connections were possibly as influential historically as Vaudreuil's own. Bisailon and his brothers created a clandestine trade with Pennsylvania to match the familiar Montreal-Albany traffic, but Zoltvany does not notice the Pennsylvania trade until it reached full growth and menaced the French grip on the western tribes in the 1740s.

In 1717, when Vaudreuil imposed a *corvée* that aroused serious resentment in the seignery of Longueuil, Zoltvany has his hero go "to reason with" the people, but they became "insolent," and so his guardsmen gave them "rough treatment," after which Vaudreuil jailed ten of them for two months. Zoltvany is explicit that such treatment is not repressive (p. 156-157). I disagree with both the weaselish quality of the description and the substance of the conclusion.

His worst blind spot, however, is the Indian "savage." I have become intolerant of the Parkmanesque rhetoric that makes Indians into screaming animals, and Zoltvany even permits himself to speak of "the halfbreed Montour," which is about the same to my ear as if he had said "that frog Vaudreuil."

The rhetoric is not all. In dealing with the Indians, Zoltvany makes his one visible departure from objective reporting (as distinguished from interpretation). When the Iroquois attack Lachine, there is a "frightful massacre" in which "houses were burnt and men, women and children indiscriminately butchered" (p. 19). But when Vaudreuil destroys the Oneida village by means that could have been described in exactly the same language, Zoltvany quotes without dissent a characterization of the destruction as "gallant deeds" (p. 23). Numbers of casualties are not mentioned in either case, so that Lachine's French victims reverberate as multitudes, which they were not, and the Indian victims become mere vermin not worth numbering, which they were not. As regards Iroquois hostilities in Canada generally, "Statistics convey better than words the devastating results of their attacks. The population fell from 10,725 in 1685 to 10,303 in 1688" (p. 17). From a better source — W.J. Eccles, *The Canadian Frontier, 1534-1760* (1969) — we have it that, "Of a total population of just over 11,000, including the troops, over a thousand died." The statistics rhyme, all right, but Eccles also mentions that "an epidemic of smallpox and measles decimated the colony." With tomahawks, no doubt.

Francis JENNINGS,  
Cedar Crest College.

\* \* \*

EDWARD SCHRIVER, ed. — *The French in New England, Acadia and Quebec*. Proceedings of a Conference sponsored by the New England-Atlantic Provinces-Quebec Center, at the University of Maine, Orono. May, 1972.

The papers here published are an attractive mixture reflecting the interests of the politicians, social activists and scholars who were invited to participate in the 1972 conference at the University of Maine. I shall confine my comments to the work of the academics.

The first session brought together a paper on "The Loyalists and the Acadians" by Professor Mason Wade and one on "The Acadians in New England" by Father Clarence d'Entremont. "The Loyalists and the Acadians" is typical of the work which has made the reputation of Professor Wade: its strength is in the amount of intricate detail which has been drawn together from the archives consulted. One might have wished for a broader framework, and a much more detailed consideration of official policy towards the Acadians after 1764. It would have been pleasant if the details about Acadian experience in New Brunswick had been linked to the experiences of their kin during these years in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. But Professor Wade has produced a useful account of particular experiences of certain New Brunswick Acadians at the close of the eighteenth century. Father D'Entremont's paper is a very different matter: if