The Three Lives of Edward Cornwallis

by John G. Reid

Read before the Royal Nova Scotia Historical Society 16 January 2013

Figure 1. Portrait of Edward Cornwallis by Sir Joshua Reynolds, circa. 1756

For some twenty years now, a lively controversy has flourished over the reputation of the first Halifax-based governor of Nova Scotia, Edward Cornwallis. Was Cornwallis a courageous and far-sighted founder of Halifax and builder of colonial Nova Scotia, or was he a genocidal imperialist whose chief claim to notoriety was his placement of a price on the heads of all indigenous inhabitants of Mi'kma'ki?[1] Should Cornwallis continue to be distinguished by the prominence of his statue in downtown Halifax, or should all public marks of his existence—statue, names of places and streets—be erased? Insofar as I have made previous public comments on such issues, I have expressed concern about the application of the twentieth-century term 'genocide' to an eighteenth-century situation, but have applauded the action of the Halifax Regional School Board in renaming Cornwallis Junior High School and have suggested that the statue belongs in a museum with an appropriate interpretive panel rather than in its current place of public display. My focus in this essay, however, is rather different. I will offer a historical portrayal of Cornwallis in three contexts. The first will be the eighteenth-century Cornwallis. What, from the viewpoint of historical analysis, is or is not significant about the Nova Scotia career, brief as it was, of this early governor? The second will be the Cornwallis of the statue. The raising of the statue in 1931 had very specific antecedents, and an ideological basis—as well as a commercial purpose attributable to Canadian National Railways—that was particular to its time. The third will be the Cornwallis of the controversy that has spanned the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. What do these debates have to tell us about historical memory—or historical memories plural—in these eras? Then I will conclude with some observations designed to bring the governor's three lives into a more integrated perspective.

Edward Cornwallis was born in London on 22 February 1713. He came from an aristocratic family, his father being the fourth Baron Cornwallis, but as the sixth son he was never likely to inherit the title. After attending Eton College, he followed the path of many younger sons of his social class by entering the army as an Ensign. He was seventeen years old, and at eighteen he rose to the rank of Lieutenant. He was a Captain at 21, a Major at 29, and was first elected as a Member of Parliament—though to a family seat, a 'pocket borough'—at 30 years of age. With the 20th Regiment of Foot, he fought in his first major action at the battle of Fontenoy on 11 May 1745, surviving that bloody defeat for British arms at the hands of the French and subsequently becoming Lieutenant-Colonel of the 20th as it was recalled to the British Isles to combat the Jacobite army of Charles Edward Stuart. In this capacity, Cornwallis took a full role in the decisive battle of Culloden in April 1746 and in the punitive campaign in the Scottish Highlands that followed. Relinquishing the lieutenant-colonelcy in 1748, amid suggestions of ill health, to his junior officer James Wolfe, Cornwallis nevertheless gained appointment in March 1749 as Colonel of the 24th Regiment of Foot and also accepted the governorship of Nova Scotia.

Arriving in Nova Scotia in June 1749, he stayed for just over three years, and ill health was again associated with his resignation and departure. Cornwallis then spent a decade as a Whig politician, again gaining election to the House of Commons in 1752 and in the following year making a politically advantageous marriage to a daughter of the celebrated Charles "Turnip" Townshend, second Viscount Townshend. Cornwallis became a reliable supporter of the Whig regimes of the Duke of Newcastle, but also concurrently resumed his military career with the outbreak of the Seven Years' War. Participating in 1756 in the failed expedition to relieve Minorca, Cornwallis faced a court of inquiry over his part in prompting the retreat of the British force, but was exonerated and so avoided any danger of sharing in the fatal verdict passed on the expedition's naval commander, Admiral John Byng. Instead, he joined in the leadership of yet another failed expedition, this one to the French naval centre of Rochefort, but nevertheless advanced to the rank of Lieutenant-General, and in 1762 gained the prestigious post of Governor of Gibraltar. Cornwallis held the governorship until his death, although his tenure was punctuated by extended leaves and as early as in 1765 he was again in ill health, complaining that "a disorder in my head which has plagued me several years at times has grown so much worse as to often stupefie me…."[2] He died on 14 January 1776 at 62 years of age.

As a 36-year-old neophyte governor of Nova Scotia, Edward Cornwallis entered into a volatile military and administrative environment of which it is doubtful whether he had any solid understanding. The existence of a colony of Nova Scotia was, for the most part, a polite fiction. The British conquest of Port Royal, promptly renamed Annapolis Royal, had taken place almost forty years before. However, dur-

ing the intervening period the British presence had been entirely peripheral to the continuing existence of Mi'kma'ki, and the non-indigenous population—although even it was centred primarily in a few scattered locations around the Bay of Fundy—had been overwhelmingly composed of Acadians. Annapolis Royal, intermittently tolerated by Mi'kmaw neighbours just as previous European regimes had been tolerated in the same location, had provided a relatively safe haven for the daily raising of the Union flag, but the cynical verdict of an earlier governor, Richard Philipps, was just as valid as 1749 began as it had been when first delivered in 1720. "This has been hitherto no more than a mock Government," Philipps had informed London, "Its Authority haveing never yet extended beyond cannon reach of this ffort."[3] As the later military officer John Knox put it, during that era "the government of Nova Scotia was merely nominal."[4]

The 1749 expedition was intended to upset the status quo in at least two key respects, neither of which—once recognized—was destined to sit well with Mi'kmaw leaders who, while their own direct experience with British imperial activity had been limited to diplomatic exchanges and occasional hostilities, were well aware from Wabanaki allies as to the likely implications and what was at stake. First, the expedition was a military incursion aimed at the establishment of a new major fort—that is, Halifax—in Mi'kma'ki, as well as subsidiary outposts established in succeeding years. While from a British perspective the military purpose would have been defined primarily in terms of imperial conflict and the need to counter the French stronghold of Louisbourg, from an indigenous perspective unauthorized British fort-building had long been a source of tension for the Wabanaki and was hardly likely to pass unchallenged in Mi'kma'ki.[5] More insidious and ultimately more dangerous, however, was the second major purpose of the establishment of Halifax, the launching of British colonial settlement. No responsible indigenous leader could escape the reality that environmental change brought about by agricultural settlement was the most lethal threat imperial expansion could pose to the existing economy and to the livelihood and health of the inhabitants of Mi'kma'ki. Ultimately, unless curbs could be put into effect, survival itself would be at stake.

Edward Cornwallis, as the incoming governor of what the British referred to as Nova Scotia, had no reason to be in doubt as to the significance of relations with the Mi'kmaq, Maliseet, or Passamaquoddy. His instructions—as had been those of all previous Nova Scotia governors since 1719—were based on the principle of imperial-indigenous friendship. On arrival, Cornwallis was to "send for the several heads of the said Indian Nations or Clans and enter into a Treaty with them promising them Friendship and Protection on Our Part [the Crown] and bestowing upon them in our name as your Discretion shall direct such presents as you shall carry from hence for their use." The governor was also instructed to encourage and reward intermarriage between indigenous inhabitants and Protestant settlers.[6] At first all seemed to

go well. Cornwallis reported on 24 July 1749 to the British Board of Trade—the administrative body in London that conducted much of the direct correspondence with colonial governors—that "I have seen many of the Indians and some of their Chiefs, they are at present quiet and peaceable, they say they will send Deputys to enter into treaty, take English Commissions, instead of French and receive His Majesty's Presents."[7] In the following month, a new treaty was made with Maliseet and Passamaquoddy diplomats, and possibly Mi'kmaq from the Chignecto region, although Cornwallis's report to London only specified deputies from the "St. John Indians." The treaty renewed the terms of the earlier treaty of 1726, although Cornwallis chose to regard it as a "Submission to His Majesty."[8]

Matters, however, were never going to continue as simply as that. No existing treaty had contained a land surrender, nor did friendship imply submission. As construction of the fort got under way and settlers continued to enter Halifax and extend to the opposite side of the harbour, and as discussions proceeded among Mi'kmaw leaders and their recent French allies, a challenge became inevitable. In September 1749 a letter was directed to Cornwallis in the name of Cape Breton Mi'kmaq that challenged any British entitlement to Chebucto and declared that, "Je suis sorti de cette terre comme une herbe moi Sauvage…. Cet endroit est ma terre, je le jure."[9] In what, as Trudy Sable, Bernie Francis, and Roger Lewis have recently shown, was and remained a comprehensively named and "sentient" Mi'kmaw landscape, this was a purposeful statement.[10] Already, Cornwallis had noted that he had "Intelligence from Cap Breton and all parts of this Province that the Micmacs design to make some attempts against this Settlement—they are joined by the St. John's Indians and headed by one Loutre a French priest."[11] In the possibility of armed conflict, however, the governor saw opportunities beckoning, as he explained in detail to the Board of Trade:

> Tis firmly my Opinion, My Lords, that if the Indians do begin, we ought never to make peace with them again. It will be very practicable with an addition of Force by Sea and Land to root them out entirely; This woud have another Effect of great Consequence, It woud take from the French Inhabitants the only pretext they have for refusing to be quite upon the same footing with the English—Coud we once depend upon their Fidelity, I take it this woud be the Strongest Colony His Majesty possesses.[12]

All of this, of course, was pure fantasy. Nevertheless, it represented the strain of thinking that led directly to new measures taken by Cornwallis and the Nova Scotia Council some three weeks later, following a Mi'kmaw raid on Dartmouth in which four military woodcutters were killed and one captured.[13] The Board of Trade itself lost no time in expressing scepticism, bordering on alarm, regarding the governor's

comments, although it would take several weeks before its letter of 16 October 1749 would reach Halifax. Couched initially in the board's customary respectful language and bracketed with commendation for Cornwallis's conduct up until mid-September, the letter continued:

> As to your Opinion however of never hereafter making Peace with them and of totally extirpating them, We cannot but think that as the Prosecution of such Design must be attended with Acts of great Severity, it may prove of dangerous Consequence to the Safety of His Majesty's other Colonies upon the Continent, by filling the Minds of the bordering Indians with Ideas of our Cruelty, and instigating them to a dangerous spirit of Resentment.[14]

Coming from the Board of Trade, this was strong language. Nevertheless, in the meantime, the Nova Scotia Council had declared on 1 October 1749 that, while it would not make any formal declaration of war against the Mi'kmaq because they were no more than "Banditti Ruffians or Rebels to His Majesty's Government"—a convenient way around the governor's obligation to promise friendship and protection in the name of the Crown—yet ranger companies should be recruited to "scour the woods" and a ten-guinea bounty should be placed on any Mi'kmaw taken or killed.[15] The governor did not govern alone, and it may well be that the presence of New Englanders on the council influenced the adoption of the bounty, a measure with New England precedents. Yet executive authority rested in the governor, and two days later it was Cornwallis's proclamation that implemented the bounty.[16]

Cornwallis's revealing dialogue with the Board of Trade continued. Responding to the board's expression of concern regarding his methods, the governor insisted in March 1750 that "it was never in my thoughts to exercise any Cruelties upon the Indians," while also noting that he had ordered the armed sloop commanded by the sea militia captain Silvanus Cobb to Chignecto with a view not only to seizing the French missionary Jean-Louis LeLoutre—whom Cornwallis blamed for instigating indigenous hostility—but also so as "to surprise as many old Indians Women and Children as he coud."[17] Cobb's expedition, according to the Nova Scotia Council member John Salusbury, was unsuccessful,[18] and the question arises as to how much actual damage was done on either side during these years of conflict, as Mi'kmaw forces attempted with considerable success to contain any British expansion from Halifax. Mi'kmaw raiding warfare, whether in its commonest form of vessel seizures or in the form of attacks on British settlements, involved incursions that were short and sharp. The single episode that caused the greatest British consternation was the raid on Dartmouth that took place in May 1751. As ever with such episodes, evidence on loss of life was mixed. Writing the day after the raid, Salusbury cited "near twenty Kill'd and Taken Men women and Children."[19] The later published ac-

count of John Wilson said that the "inhuman Cannibals" had "killed fifteen Persons, including Women and Children; and wounded seven, three of whom died in the Hospital; six Men were carried away, and never heard of since."[20] Cornwallis, meanwhile, reported to London that the raiders "did some damage by Killing some of the Inhabitants I think four and took six Soldiers."[21]

Details as to Mi'kmaw scalps taken by British and New England forces were similarly murky, although Salusbury's repeated references to the "secret expedition[s]" of ranger companies suggests that such activity did take place, and Cornwallis's instruction to Cobb suggests further that neither age nor sex provided any shield.[22] British sources are much less explicit in this area than when reporting on the killing of settlers, perhaps in part because of doubts regarding the propriety of the bounty on the heads of Mi'kmaw inhabitants. While the scalp proclamation was by no means unprecedented, its New England antecedents going back to the 1670s, and mirrored such practices by the French at Louisbourg, those few British observers whose recorded comments have survived expressed doubts.[23] William Tutty, Church of England clergyman and missionary in Halifax of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG), advanced an extended justification that succeeded mainly in highlighting his own moral misgivings. The governor and council, he explained, had been "obliged to raise two companies to scour the woods, with a premium of ten guineas for every Indian, whether taken or destroyed. This may seem to civilized people an extraordinary way of making war, but is the only effectual way of fighting such an enemy with the prospect of success. To offer premiums for the destruction of whole bodies of men sounds harsh to humanity, and it was not without difficulty that the Governor assented to it; but such is the cruelty and cowardice … of these savages, that there is no safety without their extirpation. The last word shocks me when I wish success to such an enterprise, but self-preservation, in spite of humanity, extorts it from us here."[24] More concise than Tutty's elaborate attempt at self-persuasion was the retrospective verdict of the Presbyterian minister Hugh Graham that the bounty was "a Blot on Britain's Escutcheon."[25] The Board of Trade, meanwhile, did approve in the spring of 1750 the sending of an Irish regiment with a view to meeting the Mi'kmaw threat reported by Cornwallis, but at the same time powerfully reasserted the more traditional strategy of friendship. "You would do well," the board informed Cornwallis, "to keep up not only all Appearance of Harmony, and perfect Peace with them, but, as far as they will suffer you, the Reality of it too."[26]

Easy enough, perhaps, for the Board of Trade to say. The larger reality was that the 1749 expedition represented a military and environmental invasion of Mi'kma'ki that would be resisted, often bitterly, until the treaty-making of 1760–61. Whether the board's preferred strategy would have succeeded in the face of that necessarily intractable conflict between British and Mi'kmaq, heightened by French ambitions to treat Mi'kmaw forces as a proxy weapon against British consolidation, is impos-

sible to determine historically. What is clear is the failure of the strategies initially favoured by Cornwallis and the Nova Scotia Council. By the summer of 1751, Cornwallis had turned to the former provincial administrator Paul Mascarene to represent Nova Scotia at a conference at St. George's with Wabanaki and Maliseet delegations, and the governor reported in September that "by the behaviour of the Indians lately I have some Glimmering of hopes."[27] Some months later, it was Cornwallis's initiative that led to negotiations through which his immediate successor, Peregrine Hopson, would conclude the British-Mi'kmaw Treaty of 1752.[28] Yet in the interim the Board of Trade had reported to the Secretary of State, the Duke of Bedford, on the wreckage of settlement plans for Nova Scotia outside of Halifax, and in March 1752 the board peremptorily stated to Cornwallis himself its belief that the ranger companies "may safely be dismissed, because you have never in any of your Letters expressed any great Sense of their Utility, nor given Us any Instance of their Service."[29] Hopson, shortly after Cornwallis had left the colony in October 1752, noted that prime among the reasons why his predecessor had been "extreamly distressed" prior to departing had been his inability to place settlers outside of Halifax "because he had great reason to apprehend they might have been molested by the Indians wherever they were sent he not having in his power to protect them."[30] The establishment of Halifax had given the British a bare foothold in Mi'kma'ki, but the colony of Nova Scotia remained largely as fictional as ever, and the much later verdict of the historian Winthrop Pickard Bell was telling: "so far as one can tell, … [Cornwallis] never got beyond Chebucto in the three years of his governorship."[31]

To be sure, any overall assessment of the role of Edward Cornwallis as colonial governor must also take into account the multiplicity of his responsibilities. Attaining a degree of security adequate for imperial purposes would certainly have come top of the list. But also, Cornwallis—in conjunction with his aide-de-camp, Richard Bulkeley, the council and with junior officers such as the later governor Charles Lawrence—had to supervise the construction of a new colonial settlement and its fort, deal with representatives of the Acadians who claimed (with reason) to be governed by a conditional oath of allegiance granted to them years earlier by Governor Philipps, and cope with the political hostility of a merchant group headed by Joshua Mauger.[32] Add to that the supervision of would-be settlers cooped up in Halifax, ranging from the initial group consisting largely, according to Cornwallis, of "poor idle worthless vagabonds"[33] to the more industrious but often fractious Foreign Protestants, and then add again the normal business of dispensing patronage, corresponding with London, and so forth, and it becomes clear that the governorship was a difficult and demanding daily task. Most perplexing of all must have been the disconnect between the theoretical possibility of a Nova Scotia that could become comparable with the colonies of settlement further to the southwest and the reality of a territory that was generically different from any such model. In the ramshackle

empire that predated the battles of Plassey and Quebec, there was nothing unusual about an outpost that exercised little influence and even lesser power outside of its immediate defences. But the proximity of the colonies of settlement created the illusion that Nova Scotia should be more than just that, and the struggle to make it so was not only in vain in this era but eventually created, following the Deportation of Acadians, what John Knox—who served in the region in the late 1750s—would describe caustically as "this desert province."[34]

All of Cornwallis's problems were exacerbated by another constraint that he shared with other colonial governors, namely his obligation to stay within a strict budget that would be policed by the Board of Trade. It was in this area that he and the board came into conflict most acutely, as Cornwallis argued that the demands of his unsuccessful pursuit of colonial security made it impossible to live within his allocated funds. The board, in a long letter of 6 March 1752 informed Cornwallis that Parliament had been induced to vote additional sums of some £21,000 to cover the over-runs of the preceding year and more than £40,000 to cover those of the current year, but also demanded economies and retrenchments. In his efforts to justify the colony's expenditures, Cornwallis did not help his own cause by alternately withholding correspondence with London and then arguing his case in a tone of extreme defensiveness. In June 1751, the Board of Trade expressed itself to Cornwallis as being "greatly surprised and Concerned"—strong language again—that it had had no significant communication from the governor for more than seven months, so that "we are totally ignorant of the Affairs of the Province since November." Moreover, the board added, "our uneasiness is the greater, as many disagreeable Reports are daily spread about" as to the security situation in Nova Scotia.[35] Cornwallis finally broke his silence in a letter written later in June which undoubtedly crossed with the board's in mid-Atlantic, regretting but justifying his cost over-runs, and then in a letter written after he had received the board's communication he sought to "Exculpate" himself by throwing back at the board a series of bitter complaints. Ultimately, however, he fell back on making a remarkable appeal to the finer feelings of the board's members: "Did your Lordships consider the difficulties the distresses and disappointments I have met with and Struggled thro' I should flatter my self you would rather pity and Cherish than censure and discomfort."[36]

So unusual was the governor's behaviour that it raises the question of his mental stability. His successor's statement quoted above that he was, towards the end of his governorship, "extreamly distressed" was noteworthy in itself. While Cornwallis no doubt also suffered from rheumatism, his comment some thirteen years later—also quoted above—regarding his longstanding trouble with "a disorder in my head" may also contribute to explaining his repeated instances of ill health. Interpreted by one historian as possibly denoting a brain tumour, it could equally well be read as an indication of poor mental health.[37] Within the space of little more than a

year in 1745–46, he had gone through the grinding defeat at Fontenoy, and had then taken a full role in the slaughter at Culloden and during its aftermath. As the historian Geoffrey Plank has pointed out, the evidence associates Cornwallis with deeds of extreme violence during the punitive campaign in the Scottish Highlands. Michael Hughes, who served under Cornwallis during his march through Moidart in the summer of 1746 and considered him "a brave Officer of great Humanity and Honour," described how the party spent its time "burning of Houses, driving away the Cattel, and shooting those Vagrants who were found about the Mountains."[38] The Presbyterian minister (and Jacobite) John Cameron was not entirely certain that Cornwallis's party was responsible for killing an elderly man and woman and performing "things shocking to human nature" on the woman, but confidently attributed random killings to the group.[39] While caution is obviously required in attributing either medical or psychological disorders to any historical subject, since the criteria for diagnosis can never be met, the reality is that eighteenth-century human beings were no more able than twenty-first-century human beings to be impervious to the effects of violence inflicted either on them or by them, and Cornwallis had had ample experience of both. That he may have been psychologically damaged long before he set foot on the shores of Nova Scotia is far from implausible.[40]

Mentally stable or not, he was a governor who spent only a short time in the province before declaring to the Duke of Bedford in September 1751—in a letter written on the same day as his counter-attack on the Board of Trade—that he wished to be relieved as governor, having anticipated staying only two years. "My health is not very good," he continued, "and my Constant attending to Business must make it worse."[41] His sojourn had been eventful, and counted among its results the establishment of a British bridgehead in Mi'kma'ki. Undoubtedly both he and the imperial government had expected more, although the expectation was based on flawed assumptions regarding the possibility that British power could be projected effectively. Although Cornwallis's eagerness to depart from the traditional policy of seeking peace and friendship with indigenous inhabitants, expressed most clearly in the scalp bounty, never earned him a direct disavowal by London, it did prompt strongly-worded expressions of concern by the Board of Trade. Ultimately, Cornwallis was a governor of some significance in that he was the first to be based in Halifax, but one whose efforts—perhaps inevitably—fell far short of attaining the success that both his own ambition and the imperatives of empire would have demanded.

For a century and a half after Cornwallis departed from Halifax, limited attention was paid to him by historians. The reason was partly that there were few historians. Thomas Chandler Haliburton and Beamish Murdoch confined themselves to largely factual accounts of Cornwallis's sojourn, although Duncan Campbell was much warmer, praising Cornwallis's "judicious appointment" and crediting his administration as having been "most effective, proving him to have been a man of

rare gifts for government."[42] Promulgation of the later notion that Cornwallis might be considered in some sense memorable as "the founder of Halifax" fell to James S. Macdonald in a paper delivered to the Nova Scotia Historical Society in 1899. Macdonald's tribute to the governor's work in Halifax was largely an encomium, although his assessment of other parts of Cornwallis's career was more mixed. For reasons that were no doubt connected with Macdonald's surname and his prominent involvement with Halifax's North British Society, he noted pointedly that Cornwallis had received the thanks of the British government for his part in the "merciless extermination of men, women and children in several rebel districts" following the battle of Culloden.[43] Be that as it might, Macdonald's paper pointed the way directly to the second "life" of Edward Cornwallis.

As Carl Berger pointed out many years ago, the late nineteenth century saw the growth of a form of Canadian nationalism that was inseparable from the British Empire of the day, and in particular the role of the settled dominions in advancing globally the benefits of British civilization and the laws and constitution that went with it.[44] And as Paul Williams has demonstrated, an expression of this brand of imperialism was seen on the outskirts of Halifax in 1912 with the inauguration of the Halifax Memorial Tower (sometimes known as 'the Dingle tower') to commemorate 150 years of representative government in Nova Scotia. In a ceremony choreographed by Dougald Macgillivray—a banker and president of the Canadian Club of Halifax—and stemming from an idea originated and advanced by Sir Sandford Fleming, the governor general and the lieutenant-governor of the day headed an extended list of dignitaries who witnessed the unveiling.[45] While the First World War dealt a blow to imperialist idealism, not least through the cynicism of returning veterans, for those committed to the imperial cause this challenge could be seen as a reason for more, not fewer, public commemorations. Anniversaries had particular attractions, and Halifax's Natal Day of 1924 marked 175 years since the establishment of the city. There was no doubt initially that the centrepiece of the celebration was not so much historical as naval, with the visit of the almost brand-new though ill-fated and already obsolescent battlecruiser H.M.S. *Hood*, which some 17 years later would be lost with more than 1400 souls when its magazine was ignited by a shell fired by the battleship *Bismarck*. For the Halifax *Herald* on 5 August 1924, however, a simpler reality was encompassed in the headline, "Mightiest Warship in Halifax Today."[46] The newspaper had previously noted that, as for the commemoration of the anniversary, "the real reason for the carnival is the desire to entertain the visiting naval men in a fitting manner, and show them Halifax in gala attire."[47]

Nevertheless, history—of sorts—had its day on 6 August, and the next day's headline proclaimed, "Cornwallis Again Visits Halifax." Following a landing from a replica of Cornwallis's vessel the *Sphinx*, in front of a crowd of some 10,000—the newspaper adding that the actual landing in 1749 had been witnessed only by "half

a dozen French and peering savages"—a brief pageant unfolded during which "two friendly Indians" led Cornwallis to a parley at which "headed by their chieftain, wearing a gaudy head-dress of gay feathers, the little band of Mic Mac Indians approached the Governor's party with upraised hands in signal of greeting." For good measure, three Acadians refused to swear an oath of allegiance.[48] The ceremony had thus succeeded in implying both that the British incursion had been sanctified by Mi'kmaw approval and that the Acadians were intransigent, but for the Dalhousie professor Archibald MacMechan it was clearly not enough. Writing in the *Dalhousie Review*, MacMechan—who would later be a member of the committee responsible for raising the Cornwallis statue—declared in an article on Cornwallis and the founding of Halifax that "men of English blood all the world over are accustomed to feel and give voice to a just pride in the achievements of their race, as a colonizing power, wherever ship could sail." But Edward Cornwallis, despite his "sterling manhood," had never received his due: "In the face of almost every conceivable difficulty, he triumphantly brought order out of chaos, and left a city where he found a houseless forest. And yet, from that day to this, his merits have never been fully recognized."[49] For MacMechan, Cornwallis was "a true patriot," but the indigenous population fared less well in his estimation. For the "wild Indians" who met with Cornwallis in August 1749 aboard the warship *Beaufort*, this was "probably the first time these children of the forest had set foot on such a big canoe," while on the whole the governor had "a native race, whose cruelty and cunning were a proverb, continually to guard against."[50]

The antecedents of the move to raise a statue of Cornwallis were characterized, therefore, partly by an imperialist sensibility that exalted the civilization of the British world and partly by a racially- and gender-based binary that pitted the manliness of that civilization against a cruel and at the same time childlike savagery. Two other elements would soon enter in. One of them, the involvement of the government of Nova Scotia, had its origins some years earlier in efforts to locate an authentic portrait of Cornwallis to be displayed appropriately in Halifax. The search had been initiated by John Clarence Webster, the retired surgeon and now-historian sometimes referred to as "the Laird of Shediac," who in 1923 had made contact while in England with the Cornwallis family and had acquired a copy of a portrait of Edward Cornwallis which he then presented to Nova Scotia's lieutenant-governor.[51] However, questions soon arose as to whether the portrait really was of Edward Cornwallis, and it was subsequently determined to represent his brother Richard. In 1927, Webster located in London a portrait of Cornwallis that he believed had better attestation and provenance. This time, he alerted the provincial premier, E.N. Rhodes, who promptly raised from among his friends the amount of $7500 needed to secure it for the province, where by the summer of 1929 it was hanging in the Red Room at Province House.[52] Thus Rhodes's attention was already on Cornwallis when the pos-

Figure 2. Unveiling ceremony for Cornwallis Statue, 22 June 1931

sibility arose of including a statue of the governor in the development by Canadian National Railways (CNR) of the new station and hotel on Hollis Street in Halifax.

The fourth element to influence the raising of the Cornwallis statue was explicitly commercial, stemming both from the wish of the railway itself to make a park out of the property it owned opposite the station and hotel—built, along with the park, as a single project—and from the more general goal of attracting tourists.[53] The premier was directly involved, informing Webster on 16 October 1929 that "you will, I know, be delighted to learn that a movement is on foot here to have erected a statue of the Hon. Edward Cornwallis, and Massey Rhind, the Sculptor, has been engaged to prepare a model and specifications, and if the money is raised, which I have every expectation it will be, he will be engaged to do the work."[54] Rhodes cautioned Webster to treat the matter as strictly confidential, and it was another seven months before the premier was ready to send out invitations to his personally-selected candidates for the Cornwallis Memorial Committee. Acceptances were soon received from, among others, Dougald Macgillivray as chair and Archibald MacMechan, while the others included two nominees of the CNR.[55] The committee's first meeting heard on 6 June 1930 not only that "the personnel of the committee was selected by premier Rhodes," but also that of the projected total cost of $20,000 approximately $15,000 would be contributed by CNR.[56] As Macgillivray and fellow-committee member C.H. Wright—district manager for General Electric and a prominent member of the Halifax business community—explained, "an offer a few months ago of an excellent site by the Canadian National Railways in the new park

in front of their station and hotel, as well as a substantial money contribution, led to the formation of a Committee of citizens to take in hand the erection … of a statue to the Honourable Edward Cornwallis, the 'Founder of Halifax.'"[57] Wright, even before the committee's formation, had assured the CNR's regional manager that "seeing a statue such as that of Lord [*sic*] Cornwallis in front of the Hotel, would immediately create an interest on the part of tourists, particularlAmerican tourists."[58]

The statue, as Rhodes had indicated, was quickly commissioned from the Scottish sculptor J. Massey Rhind, whose work already formed part of the Halifax Cenotaph and the New Glasgow War Memorial. Rhind accepted the commission with enthusiasm. "I have endeavoured," he noted to one correspondent, "to illustrate the dominating courage and spirit of Cornwallis, the Military Martinette, and while it will be a monument to him, it will also be an interesting way of recording the founding of the City."[59] The statue duly arrived in Halifax in late May 1931, and was installed so as to be ready for its unveiling on 22 June, to be treated as the 182nd anniversary of Cornwallis's arrival and observed as Natal Day.[60] The ceremonies went off with speeches and singing. Although the president of the CNR, Sir Henry Thornton, had to cancel his attendance at the last moment and the regional manager was otherwise engaged, the railway was represented by its counsel, the future Supreme Court justice Ivan C. Rand, who committed the statue to the custody of the city. Others in attendance included Rhodes—now federal Minister of Fisheries—and his successor as premier, Gordon Harrington, as well as Mayor G.E. Ritchie of Halifax, John Clarence Webster, the sculptor Rhind—who declared the statute "the most interesting work he had ever done"—and other guests who included the presidents of the St. George's Society, the Charitable Irish Society and even the North British Society. The unveiling itself was carried out by the province's newly-appointed Chief Justice, Joseph Andrew Chisholm, with Dougald Macgillivray presiding.[61]

The rhetoric that prevailed in the speeches at the public ceremony and at the luncheon that followed, predictably enough, emphasized both the personal qualities of Cornwallis and the significance of his imperial incursion. The *Evening Mail* had commented in advance regarding the statue that "the tall figure of the Honorable Edward Cornwallis looks seaward, and it is a virile, strong, steadfast face with a touch of sternness in it which is usually to be found in the faces of all men who achieve—all leaders of men and all pioneers."[62] The theme was taken up by speakers such as Macgillivray, who emphasized the imperial significance of Cornwallis's "remarkable and romantic expedition,"[63] and Rand, who noted to the dignitaries gathered at lunch that "if the Hon. Edward Cornwallis could return to Halifax today he would look into your minds and hearts to see if you have been faithful to the traditions of the British race. He would find that through the generations you have lived up to the obligations of forward looking and forward thinking British citizens."[64] The latter point linked the imperial with another major theme that

had predominated in the public comments made by civic and business leaders: the glowing future that awaited a Halifax that had carried forward the intrepid spirit of Cornwallis to a new era of tourism and other economic pursuits. For Mayor Ritchie, the building of the Nova Scotian Hotel—along with the Lord Nelson—meant that the city was "in the position of being an ideal point for Conventions of various kinds as well as being a tourist paradise." The unveiling of the statue would add "another to our famous spots in Halifax."[65]

Yet, in important respects the statue had only limited connections either with history or even with the city of Halifax. City Council, faced with a request to contribute $5000 towards the estimated cost for the statue of $20,000, at first refused altogether but at a subsequent meeting agreed to provide $2500 in what Macgillivray described as "a close vote."[66] The city's school board declined the suggestion that collections should be taken up in classrooms so that children should be enabled to "give their pennies to the fund to erect a statue to the Founder of the City" and thus "emphasise the history lesson."[67] The results of a public appeal were disappointing, and Macgillivray explained to Thornton as CNR president that "it got into the public mind that the idea of the Memorial originated with you, and that as it was to form a conspicuous part of the station, hotel and park development, its cost should be included in their budget." The whole affair, for Macgillivray, "reflected a curious lack of local pride in the City's history and origin."[68] But any kind of historical context for Cornwallis was also in short supply. Webster, requested by Macgillivray to "send a short and snappy letter" to the press, "commending the move to erect here a Memorial to the Founder," responded by highlighting the need for donations through a seven-paragraph analysis of the imperial antecedents of the 1749 expedition.[69] Webster also, in his speech at the luncheon following the unveiling, emphasized the "historical renaissance" in Halifax that was symbolized by the construction of the new building for the provincial archives,[70] but in general it was imperialism and boosterism that were the orders of the day, not history.

As for indigenous inhabitants of Mi'kma'ki, there were few remembrances. A short official biography of Cornwallis was extensively circulated by the memorial committee and was reproduced by the *Evening Mail* on 20 June 1931.[71] Using language suitable to denote the supposedly childlike simplicity of Mi'kmaw thinking, the sketch noted only that "the Indians opposed the ominous big camp of the white men."[72] Beyond occasional passing references to Indians as an obstacle to settlement, the only other recorded reference of any note came in a poem specially written by the United Church minister and extensively published poet Alexander Louis Fraser, and distributed as a supplement by the *Herald* and *Mail* newspapers. Among the sorrows of early Halifax residents, one of its stanzas declared, were those occasions when "fear filled every denizen with pain/And when thy wooded shores oft heard the cry/Of those who were by crafty Indians slain."[73]

The second "life" of Edward Cornwallis, therefore, as "the Founder of Halifax," reached its apogee with the raising of the statue in 1931, although it can be dated from the delivery of James S. Macdonald's paper in 1899 and lingered as far forward as the 1949 visit to Halifax of Lord Cornwallis, whose father and predecessor in the title had been unable to attend the unveiling of the statue because of a Masonic commitment, but did inspect it later in 1931 while on a Masonic visit to Halifax.[74] A highlight of the 1949 visit—in connection with Halifax's 200th anniversary—was the laying of the cornerstone, on Dominion Day, of the new Cornwallis Junior High School.[75] A special section of the *Chronicle-Herald* on 20 June 1949 made brief mentions of the scalp bounty but focused on what it portrayed as Mi'kmaw decline and also alluded to centralization: "today the entire Indian population has been reduced to a few thousand, most of them located on two central reserves. Few, if any, still reside on the peninsula on which Halifax stands today."[76] In the celebrations of the role of Edward Cornwallis during this 50-year period, any affinities with the eighteenth-century Cornwallis were strictly coincidental. The historical memory of Cornwallis that was symbolized by the statue, with the exception of brief remarks by Webster, was governed not by history but by a potent mixture of imperialism, a racially-charged triumphalism based on the savagery-civilization binary, state promotion, and an economic agenda. It led in turn to the governor's third "life," which began during the early 1990s.

In 1993, Daniel N. Paul published *We Were Not the Savages: A Micmac Perspective on the Collision of European and Aboriginal Civilization*.[77] The book offered an alternative view of the colonizing process in which the savagery-civilization binary was turned on its head. "Micmac civilization," the conclusion stated, "was a classic example of a free and independent people forming a society based upon the principle of mutual support and respect," while the British—like other European colonizers elsewhere—were guilty of "outrages and excesses" that amounted to "physical and cultural genocide."[78] The body of the work made this case through an extended narrative that went from the pre-colonization era as far as the 1991 decision (subsequently appealed) of the British Columbia Chief Justice Alan McEachern in the *Delgamuukw* case. A chapter on Edward Cornwallis highlighted the scalp proclamation, along with adding the accurate statement that the Board of Trade, worried as it was by Cornwallis's action, did not explicitly disavow it. However, this was only one chapter among many, and the greatest immediate impact came not from the book itself but from a related article already contributed by Paul to the *Micmac-Maliseet Nations News* a few months before the book's appearance. Although also attributing barbarian values and behavior to the broader colonizing process, the article kept its strongest language for Cornwallis, whose scalp bounty made him "an unrepentant war criminal" who had launched a genocidal attack on the Mi'kmaq that in a moral sense was fully equivalent to Nazi crimes.[79]

The Halifax *Chronicle-Herald* picked up on Paul's article, and not only made it the subject of a front-page story by Gordon Delaney on 4 March 1993—headlined "Honoring Criminals?"—but also on the following day included a more extended analysis by Delaney as well as another front-page story focusing on the vigorous debate that had emerged over the preceding twenty-four hours. While a number of voices had been raised in favour of changing place names recognizing Cornwallis and other imperial figures, others had doubted whether it was useful to do so. An "Amherst history buff" argued that it was "ludicrous to blame those living today for events of 200 to 300 years ago," and a Kentville town councillor commented that "we shouldn't rewrite history." The Mayor of Halifax, Walter Fitzgerald, admitted to being "shocked" at Cornwallis's actions, although he did not commit to any action to rename streets in the city.[80] When Paul's book was launched in November 1993, the recently-elected Premier John Savage spoke at the launch and underlined his estimation of its importance while also emphasizing that it was written "from a Micmac perspective."[81]

Any expectation that debate would turn to action on removing the Cornwallis name from sites of public historical memory was soon dampened, and instead the controversy would break forth intermittently over a period approaching twenty years. It did so sharply at the time of the 250th anniversary of Halifax's establishment in 1999, when Fitzgerald—by now mayor of the amalgamated Halifax Regional Municipality—suggested that "the Mi'kmaq tribes killed a lot of white people, probably more than we did" and expressed doubt as to the existence of the scalp bounty. The director of the Nova Scotia tattoo, meanwhile, was quoted as defending the portrayal of Cornwallis in an anniversary tableau named after Thomas Raddall's *Halifax: Warden of the North* by saying that "we owe the memory of Cornwallis a debt of gratitude for founding this city. What else he may have done I can't comment on."[82] The debate threatened years later to descend into a dark form of farce, when a local purveyor of hairdressing supplies decided—apparently in all innocence—to use the statue as the backdrop of a photo-shoot for advertising hair extenders,[83] but regained a more serious tone when Kirk Arsenault, Mi'kmaw representative on the Halifax Regional School Board, successfully proposed to the board that Cornwallis Junior High School should be renamed. On 22 June 2011, the board unanimously endorsed the change to a new though unspecified name, prompting Daniel Paul to look forward to the removal of the statue as a next step.[84]

The renaming of the junior high school was the first practical concession to the argument that Paul had been making for more than eighteen years. At the same time, it raised the question of what the controversy had really been about, and what was at stake. A week after the school board had made its decision, the *Chronicle-Herald* published two op-ed pieces that offered contrasting views. For Ben Sichel, Mi'kmaq Studies teacher and supporter of the school board's action, the renaming of

the school was "a small gesture of healing and reconciliation," while for educational consultant Paul W. Bennett it was "ill-advised" and had set "a dangerous precedent." The debate was partly about history and thus about the eighteenth-century Cornwallis. While Bennett insisted that Paul's book had been based on outdated research and offered a view of Cornwallis that was "incredibly one-sided," Sichel saw the one-sidedness as predominating in more traditional approaches to history in which "European colonists like Cornwallis were portrayed as heroic or neutral at best, while the morality of taking over another people's country was rarely questioned."[85] Sichel's comment was consistent with Paul's own contention that, until he had embarked on setting the record straight, "history books and other publications had practically ignored Mi'kmaq existence."[86]

To this, academic historians might well respond that it had been a very long time since Canadian scholars who took indigenous history seriously—such as A.G. Bailey in the 1930s, or E. Palmer Patterson in the early 1970s—had had to contend with being isolated figures in their discipline.[87] Had not Cornelius Jaenen, W. J. Eccles, J.R. Miller and others made sure that this particular corner was decisively turned?[88] And that is not to mention U.S. historians such as Francis Jennings—author in 1975 of the celebrated *The Invasion of America*—James Axtell, and Daniel K. Richter among many others.[89] At the same time, Mi'kmaw and Maliseet history was being explored by such scholars as L.F.S. Upton and Andrea Bear Nicholas, as well as from the 1990s onwards—again among others—by those who were called to testify in legal cases on aboriginal rights and treaty rights and wrote works influenced by them, such as Stephen E. Patterson, William Wicken, and myself.[90]

Yet, well and good as all of this may have been, there were some serious points to be considered before any academic historian could justifiably contend that the scholarship had been misunderstood and misrepresented. One of them concerned the persistence even in well-regarded and relatively recent historical work of egregiously stereotyped representations of indigenous people. It is not especially difficult to find historians whose work was still current during the late 1980s, when Paul was beginning on the immediate work for his book, who neglected to use quotation marks when using the term "savage" or who used other heavily-fraught terminology. Secondly, even to the extent that new work was changing interpretive understandings, it was questionable how large an audience it was reaching by comparison with, say, educational textbooks that tended at best to allow indigenous societies to disappear except as a brief preliminary to the more important business of European settlement.[91] Finally, there were areas that had been genuinely neglected by historians, which *We Were Not the Savages* contributed to highlighting. The role of violence in the colonization of Nova Scotia as in other colonizing processes was one such, and it was no accident that Geoffrey Plank—whose work has been essential in this area—lost no time in drawing attention to Paul's book in a groundbreaking article.[92]

Paul's book also reinforced the seemingly self-evident but often-neglected principle that imperial history cannot be understood without also taking serious account of indigenous history, and that it is foolish to try to do so. Overall, while Paul's work undoubtedly traveled further down the road of engaged history and even participant history than many other historians would be comfortable in going, let it not be forgotten that engaged history and participant history have extended traditions that compel acknowledgment and respect.[93]

When it came to the specific controversies over the statue and other contexts in which the Cornwallis name appeared publicly, however, the third 'life' of Cornwallis was concerned with history only in the most tangential way. In a general sense, the eighteenth-century Cornwallis was a symbolic target, representing the broader reality that colonization was not a benign process in which the significance of indigenous people was just that they were an inconvenient obstacle, but rather was an invasion and—like all invasions—was bitterly resisted. The more direct target was the manufactured "Founder of Halifax" who was embodied in the statue, commemorated in the name of the school, and had gathered a number of other place names at various points in time. This Cornwallis was not a creature of history but rather of historical memory—that is, the way in which people in a later era choose to remember the past. To place Edward Cornwallis on a pedestal, especially with the pose and features sculpted by Massey Rhind and defined with entire accuracy by the *Evening Mail* as quoted above, denoted a highly explicit form of historical memory based on the complex of triumphalist and related ideologies that had influenced the raising of the statue. The naming of Cornwallis Junior High School in 1949 had been a late expression of a similar view of the city's perceived founder. Thus, the focus of the debates was never in reality, as some participants contended, about rewriting history. Rather, the conflicting viewpoints bore on an area that was entirely and legitimately within the control of current generations: how the past should be publicly remembered.

This was also, during the relevant era, a matter being paid increasing attention by the state itself, as embodied in various levels of government. As Jerry Bannister and Roger Marsters have recently shown, the enlistment by the state of what they defined as "the heritage gaze" has seen since the late twentieth century a series of efforts to atone for past events and processes that were deemed to have been unjust. At the federal level, major instances would include the 2002 designation of Africville as a National Historic Site, the 2003 Crown proclamation acknowledging the unsound basis for the deportation of the Acadians, and the 2008 apology for the wrongs inflicted by Indian Residential Schools.[94] The province of Nova Scotia apologized in 1990 to Donald Marshall Junior and ordered a full enquiry into his wrongful imprisonment, and in 2010 it apologized to the family of the late Viola Desmond and pardoned her for her 65–year-old conviction for resisting segregated seating in a New Glasgow movie theatre.[95] Although these were apologies to indi-

viduals, there was no doubt that they were also by extension apologies for systemic injustices directed against indigenous and African-Nova Scotian people. Municipally, the Halifax Regional Municipality's apology in 2010 for the destruction of Africville was a similar acknowledgment.[96] Regarding the measures taken by Edward Cornwallis against the Mi'kmaq, the role of the state was more ambiguous. The speech delivered by the provincial Premier at the launch of *We Were Not the Savages*, sent a signal but was essentially an informal endorsement. Mayor Fitzgerald, in early 1999, was quoted as having written to Don Julien, director of the Confederacy of Mainland Micmacs, that "while we cannot change history, I sincerely apologise for any atrocities which were committed against the Mi'kmaq after the founding of Halifax in 1749."[97] The impact was offset, however, by the mayor's statements a few months later in the context of Halifax's 250th anniversary, quoted above. Provincially, in November 2000, the legislature passed a resolution proposed by then-Minister of Health Jamie Muir to congratulate Daniel Paul on the publication of the second edition of *We Were Not the Savages*, but offered no comment on the substance of the ongoing debates.[98]

Figure 3. Cornwallis Statue, current appearance

As Bannister and Marsters also pointed out, the involvement of the state in acts of atonement for past injuries carried significant dangers in its tendency to create "a selective view of the past that treats history as a political commodity."[99] In the case of the events of 1749–52, however, there was an additional reason for the ambiguities of state responses. As all participants in the debate clearly recognized, the stakes were higher than in cases where specific injustices might be recognized. The legitimacy of Nova Scotia's colonial settlement itself—moral if not legal—was always on the brink of coming into question. The ideology that had underpinned the raising of the statue had offered a strong and positive answer to any such concerns—the establishment of Halifax was a triumph of civilization over savagery, and Cornwallis was the city's courageous founder. By the early twenty-first century, such certainty was not available to the proponents of Cornwallis. Its racially-charged implications would have given rise to widespread offence and, just as importantly, would have been unacceptable to those who continued to argue that the establishment of Halifax and the building of Nova Scotia should inspire legitimate pride. Thus emerged the contentions that Cornwallis should not be defined by the scalp bounty, harsh as it

may have been, and that in any case there was an equivalence between his actions and the raiding warfare conducted by Mi'kmaw forces in that both were products of a brutal frontier conflict that was now best forgiven and forgotten on all sides.[100] Yet the unresolved difficulties remained that settler colonization itself was not a neutral process, that eventually there were winners and losers, and that broader reconciliation (if, as some indigenous leaders doubted, it could ever be achieved) depended on a negotiation—the Made-in-Nova Scotia Process—that nobody had ever pretended would be simple or quick.[101] And, whether or not the exhaustive re-naming of places that had characterized Nova Scotia from 1749 to 1784 deserved to be reversed in some instances—another dimension of the debates—it was unmistakable that the Cornwallis statue was an assertion and a resounding expression of imperial triumph.

The three "lives" of Edward Cornwallis, therefore, were intricately linked, and yet each differed substantially from both of the others. The eighteenth-century Cornwallis was a governor of short duration, whose principal accomplishment—the establishment of a small fortified town on the fringes of Mi'kma'ki—fell far short of his own or imperial aspirations. The Cornwallis of the 1899–1949 era, and notably of the 1920s and 1930s, carried a much heavier ideological freight as a flag-bearer for civilization, as well as representing in some sense the go-ahead spirit attributed to twentieth-century Halifax and the economic opportunities it conveyed. The Cornwallis of the era from 1993 to the present day was a divisive figure, representing for some the atrocities that were inseparable from colonial expansion and for others the creative achievements that could still emerge from that admittedly brutal phase of the distant past. How to bring the three lives together in a way that may have something productive to say in 2013? Here I offer only a few reflections as one citizen among many. The eighteenth-century Cornwallis is perhaps best left to the historians, with the melding of approaches derived from indigenous, imperial, and colonial history providing for balanced analysis. The Cornwallis who figured as "the Founder of Halifax" during the first half of the twentieth century can surely be left behind, at least in a public or heritage-related sense, and studied as an example of the cultural climate of the era rather than held up for celebration. As for the Cornwallis of the era surrounding the turn of the present century, I remain unreconstructed on the views to which I alluded at the beginning of this essay. Historical memory can and should evolve with each succeeding generation, and in our generation the integration of all three lives of Edward Cornwallis must form an important element of the evolution.

Endnotes

1. In accordance with accepted usage, this essay will normally refer to the Mi'kmaq (plural), Mi'kmaw (singular and adjectival), and Mi'kma'ki (homeland). However, 'Micmac' will be left unchanged where it appears in quotations and titles of sources.

2. Cornwallis to Earl of Halifax, 17 May 1765, United Kingdom National Archives (UKNA), CO91/14, cited in John Oliphant, "Edward Cornwallis," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/56651 (accessed 22 May 2012). This biographical summary is based primarily on Oliphant, "Edward Cornwallis," and J. Murray Beck, "Edward Cornwallis," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, http://www.biographi.ca/009004–119.01-e.php?BioId=35941 (accessed 12 June 2012). Cornwallis has also been the subject of a recent full-length biography: Jon Tattrie, *Cornwallis: The Violent Birth of Halifax* (East Lawrencetown, NS: Pottersfield Press, 2013).

3. Richard Philipps to Board of Trade, 27 September 1720, UKNA, CO217/3, No. 18.

4 . John Knox, *An Historical Journal of the Campaigns in North America For the Years 1757, 1758, 1759, and 1760*, ed. Arthur G. Doughty (3 vols.; Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1914–16), I, 309.

5. On the significance of fort-building, see John G. Reid, "The Sakamow's Discourtesy and the Governor's Anger: Negotiated Imperialism and the Arrowsic Conference, 1717," in John G. Reid, with contributions by Emerson W. Baker, *Essays on Northeastern North America, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), pp. 163–4. Also Lauren Benton, "Possessing Empire: Iberian Claims and Interpolity Law," in Saliha Belmessous, *Native Claims: Indigenous Law against Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 32–3; Saliha Belmessous, "Wabanaki versus French and English Claims in Northeastern North America, c. 1715," in Belmessous, *Native Claims*, pp. 113–14. I am grateful to my colleague Dr. Richard Field for drawing the latter volume to my attention. On diplomatic contacts between Mi'kmaq and Wabanaki, and Mi'kmaw awareness of Wabanaki-British issues, see John G. Reid, "Imperialism, Diplomacies, and the Conquest of Port Royal," in Reid, with Baker, *Essays on Northeastern North America*, pp. 110–19.

6. Instructions to Edward Cornwallis, 29 April 1749, UKNA, CO218/3, ff. 25–6. On the importance of friendship, see John G. Reid, "Imperial-Aboriginal Friendship in Eighteenth-Century Mi'kma'ki/Wulstukwik," in Jerry Bannister and Liam Riordan, eds., *The Loyal Atlantic: Remaking the British Atlantic in the Revolutionary Era* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), pp. 75–102. On the treaty relationship inaugurated during the 1720s, and the different understandings on British and indigenous sides, see also William C. Wicken, *Mi'kmaq Treaties on Trial: History, Land, and Donald Marshall Junior* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002), esp. pp. 116–17.

7. Cornwallis to Board of Trade, 24 July 1749, UKNA, CO217/9, f. 73.

8. Cornwallis to Board of Trade, 20 August 1749, UKNA, CO217/9, f. 82.

9. Mi'kmaq of Cape Breton and Antigonish to Cornwallis, 23 September 1749, UKNA, CO217/9, f. 116.

10. Trudy Sable and Bernie Francis, with William Jones and Roger Lewis, *The Language of this Land, Mi'kma'ki* (Sydney, NS: Cape Breton University Press, 2012), esp. pp. 42–53.

11 . Cornwallis to Board of Trade, 11 September 1749, CO217/9, f. 89.

12. *Ibid*., ff. 89–90.

13. Cornwallis to Board of Trade, 17 October 1749, CO217/9, f.108.

14. Board of Trade to Cornwallis, 16 October 1749, UKNA, CO218/3, f. 85.

15. Minutes of Nova Scotia Council, 1 October 1749, CO217/9, f. 117.

16. Proclamation, 7 October 1749, *Ibid.* The bounty was subsequently increased in June 1750 to the large sum of 50 guineas, and was cancelled on 17 July 1752 after the resumption of discussions between the British and Mi'kmaw leaders. A new scalp bounty was effected in May 1756 and never formally cancelled. See Wicken, *Mi'kmaq Treaties on Trial*, p. 181; also Minutes of Nova Scotia Council, 17 July 1752, NSA, RG1, vol. 186, 187–8; 14 May 1756, *Ibid.*, vol. 187, 428–9. On the general history of scalping and scalp bounties, see James Axtell and William C. Sturtevant, "The Unkindest Cut, or Who Invented Scalping?, *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, 37:3 (July 1980), pp. 451–72, esp. 470–1; on the constitutional relationship between governor and council, see Leonard W. Labaree, *Royal Government in America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1930), p. 158; also J. Murray Beck, *Politics of Nova Scotia, Volume One, Nicholson-Fielding, 1710–1896* (Tantallon: Four East Publications, 1985), p. 19.

17. Cornwallis to Board of Trade, 19 March 1750, UKNA, CO217/9, ff. 189–90.

18. Ronald Rompkey, ed., *Expeditions of Honour: The Journal of John Salusbury in Halifax, Nova Scotia, 1749–53* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1982), p. 78.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 111.

20. John Wilson, *A Genuine Account of the Transactions in Nova Scotia, since the Settlement, June 1749, till August the 5th 1751* (London: A. Henderson et al., [1751]), pp. 13, 15–16.

21. Cornwallis to Board of Trade, 24 June 1751, UKNA, CO217/9, f. 84.

22. Rompkey, ed., *Expeditions of Honour*, pp. 78–80.

23. See Axtell and Sturtavent, "The Unkindest Cut, or Who Invented Scalping?," pp. 470–1; on French payments for British scalps, see Geoffrey Plank, "The Two Majors Cope: The Boundaries of Nationality in Mid-18th Century Nova Scotia," *Acadiensis*, 25:2 (Spring 1996), p. 32.

24. William Tutty to SPG, 29 September 1749, *Collections of the Nova Scotia Historical Society*, VII (1891), p. 101. Although the letter was dated in late September, the content makes clear that it was written over an extended period, and the author notes that it was a duplicate of one dispatched on 2 November 1749. *Ibid.*, p. 107.

25. Letter of Hugh Graham, 1791, quoted in Knox, *An Historical Journal*, I, 197.

26. Board of Trade to Cornwallis, 2 April 1750, UKNA, CO218/3, ff. 111–12; quotation from 112.

27. Cornwallis to Board of Trade, 4 September 1751, UKNA, CO217/13, f. 20.

28. See Wicken, *Mi'kmaq Treaties on Trial*, p. 183.

29. Board of Trade to Bedford, 16 July 1751, UKNA, CO218/3, f. 159; Board of Trade to Cornwallis, 6 March 1752, UKNA, CO218/4, f. 69.

30. Hopson to Board of Trade, 16 October 1752, UKNA, CO217/13, f. 268.

31. Winthrop Pickard Bell, *The 'Foreign Protestants' and the Settlement of Nova Scotia: The History of a Piece of Arrested British Colonial Policy in the Eighteenth Century* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961), p. 337.

32. See Donald F. Chard, "Joshua Mauger," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, http://www.biographi.ca/009004–119.01-e.php?&id_nbr=2057&terms=de (accessed 5 November 2012).

33. Cornwallis to Board of Trade, 24 July 1749, UKNA, CO217/9, f. 70.

34. Knox, *An Historical Journal*, I, 308. On the economic impact of the Deportation, see also Julian Gwyn, *Excessive Expectations: Maritime Commerce and the Economic Development of Nova Scotia, 1740–1870* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1998), p. 27.

35. Board of Trade to Cornwallis, 14 June 1751, UKNA, CO218/4, ff.30–1.

36. Cornwallis to Board of Trade, 24 June 1751, UKNA, CO217/12, ff. 82–6; Cornwallis to Board of Trade, 4 September 1751, UKNA, CO217/13, ff. 19–21. During the elapsed period between his communications to the Board of Trade, Cornwallis had continued to preside over regular meetings of the colonial council, but his parallel correspondence with the Secretary of State had a similar gap, punctuated only by a letter of 8 February consisting of two short paragraphs that primarily informed the Duke of Bedford that "we have had no extraordinary occurrences since my Last." Cornwallis to Bedford, 8 February 1751, UKNA, CO217/40, f. 310.

37. Oliphant, "Edward Cornwallis."

38. Michael Hughes, *A Plain Narrative and Authentic Journal of the Late Rebellion Begun in 1745* London: Henry Whitridge, 1747), pp. 53–4. Although it is tempting to gloss "Vagrants" as meaning "fugitives," no support for this is found in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, leading to the inference that these were random killings. See http://www.oed.com/search?searchType=dictionary&q=vagrant&_searchBtn=Search (accessed 7 November 2012).

39. "Journal by Mr. John Cameron, Presbyterian Preacher and Chaplain at Fort-William," in Henry Paton, ed., *The Lyon in Mourning, or a Collection of Speeches Letters Journals etc. Relative to the Affairs of Prince Charles Edward Stuart by the Rev. Robert Forbes, A.M., Bishop of Ross and Caithness, 1746–1775* (3 vols.; Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1895), I, 92–3. I owe this reference to Geoffrey Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery: The Jacobite Rising of 1745 and the British Empire* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006); see also the discussion at p. 66.

40. Although translating modern concepts of psychological disorders into historical terms is inherently difficult, an important effort to do so can be found in Michael R. Trimble, "Post-traumatic Stress Disorder: History of a Concept," in Charles R. Figley, ed., *Trauma and its Wake: The Study and Treatment of Post-traumatic Stress Disorder* (New York: Brunner/Mazel, 1985), pp. 5–14. The experience of battle during the 'long' eighteenth century is explored through the example of the Battle of Waterloo, with concluding observations added on battle more generally, in John Keegan, *The Face of Battle* (New York: Viking, 1976); see especially, on the act and the implications of killing, pp. 314–24; and, on the psychological effects of battle, pp. 325–36. I am grateful to my colleague Dr. Jonathan Fowler, for directing me to this source.

41. Cornwallis to Bedford, 4 September 1751, UKNA, CO217/40, f. 349.

42. Thomas C. Haliburton, *History of Nova Scotia* (2 vols.; Belleville, ON: Mika Publishing, 1973; first published 1829), I, 139–41, 157–9; Beamish Murdoch, *A History of Nova Scotia or Acadie* (3 vols.; Halifax: James Barnes, 1865–7), II, 136–212 passim; Duncan Campbell, *Nova Scotia in its Historical, Mercantile and Industrial Relations* (Montreal: John Lovell, 1873), pp. 97–111, quotations from 99, 110.

43. James S. Macdonald, "Hon. Edward Cornwallis, Founder of Halifax," *Collections of the Nova Scotia Historical Society*, XII (1905), pp. 1–17, quotation from 5.

44. See Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867–1914* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970).

45. Paul Williams, "Erecting 'an instructive object': The Case of the Halifax Memorial Tower,"

Acadiensis, 26:2 (Spring 2007), pp. 91–112; *Visit of H.R.H. Duke of Connaught, K.G.: Dedication of Memorial Tower 1912* http://www.halifax.ca/archives/documents/394.4VMemorialTowerProgrammeCompressed.pdf (accessed 22 October 2012).

46. *Herald* (Halifax), 5 August 1924.

47. *Herald* , 31 July 1924.

48. *Herald* , 7 August 1924.

49. Archibald MacMechan, "Ab Urbe Condita," *Dalhousie Review*, 7:2 (July 1927), p. 198.

50. *Ibid.*, pp. 198–9, 205.

51. John Clarence Webster to MacCallum Grant, 22 May 1923, Nova Scotia Archives (NSA), MG100, Vol. 126, No. 20. On Webster, see George F.G. Stanley, "John Clarence Webster: The Laird of Shediac," *Acadiensis*, 3:1 (Autumn 1973), pp. 51–71.

52. J. Clarence Webster, "Hon Edward Cornwallis and his Portrait," n.d., NSA, MG100, Vol. 126, No. 20F; H. Oakes-Jones, "An Unidentified Portrait," *Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research*, VI (January-March 1927), pp. 10–15; E.N. Rhodes to John Clarence Webster, 23 July 1923, New Brunswick Museum (NBM), J.C. Webster Papers, S198, F531; *Chronicle* (Halifax), 23 July 1929.

53. The station had opened in 1928, following a number of years during which a temporary building occupied the site. The hotel opened on 23 June 1930. See http://www.historicplaces.ca/en/rep-reg/place-lieu.aspx?id=4521; http://www.thewestinnovascotian.com/history (both accessed 5 November 2012). The project had dated from 1927: *Chronicle*, 12 December 1927; for details of its progress, see Library and Archives Canada (LAC), RG43, 15,927, F.6, "Erection of Combined Station and Hotel at Halifax." Macgillivray noted in a letter of July 1930 that, although owned by the CNR the park would be fully open to the public. It was, he continued, "the development in connection with the handsome new hotel and railway station recently completed and opened for business." Macgillivray to Commissioner of Customs, 26 July 1930, Correspondence of Cornwallis Memorial Committee, Folder 1, NSA, MG20, Vol. 667.

54. Rhodes to Webster, 16 October 1929, NBM, J.C. Webster Papers, S198 F531.

55. E.N. Rhodes to H.W. Thornton, 30 May 1930, NSA, Rhodes Papers, MG2, Vol. 653, No. 40720; Dougald Macgillivray to Rhodes, 2 June 1930, *Ibid.*, No. 40708; A. MacMechan to Rhodes, 2 June 1930, *Ibid.*, No. 40712; C.H. Wright to Rhodes, 2 June 1930, *Ibid.*, No. 40707; H.W. Thornton to Rhodes, 2 June 1930, *Ibid.*, No. 40714.

56. Minutes, 6 June 1930, Correspondence of Cornwallis Memorial Committee, Folder 1, NSA, MG20, Vol. 667. The eventual amount of the CNR's contribution was rather less. The final accounts of the project broke down the revenues as follows: CNR $11,600.00; Province of Nova Scotia $2500.00; City of Halifax $2500.00; Other contributions $3758.89; Bank interest $63.59. The total of $20,422.48 exceeded the total expenditures by $247.48, resulting in a rebate of that amount to the CNR. Audited accounts, [31 July 1931], Correspondence of Cornwallis Memorial Committee, Folder 1, NSA, MG20, Vol. 667.

57. Macgillivray and Wright to the Editor, *Herald*, [1931], *Ibid*.

58. C.H. Wright to W.U. Appleton, 7 April 1930, NSA, MG100, Vol. 152, No. 12a.

59. Rhind to W.H. Dennis, 15 October 1929, 20 January 1930, Correspondence of Cornwallis Memorial Committee, Folder 4, NSA, MG20, Vol. 667.

60. Announcement, 30 May 1931, *Ibid.*, Folder 1.

61. *Herald*, 23 June 1931.

62. *Evening Mail* (Halifax), 20 June 1931.

63. *Chronicle* , 23 June 1931.

64. *Herald*, 23 June 1931.

65. *Evening Mail*, 20 June 1931.

66. Macgillivray to Sir Henry Thornton, 21 November 1930, Correspondence of Cornwallis Memorial Committee, Folder 5, NSA, MG20, Vol. 667.

67. Macgillivray to H.F. Bezanson, 6 October 1930, *Ibid*.

68. Macgillivray to Thornton, 21 November 1930, Correspondence of Cornwallis Memorial Committee, Folder 5, NSA, MG20, Vol. 667. The committee's correspondence also contained a number of letters from those approached to be donors. See, for example, D.M. Owen to Macgillivray, 12 February 1931, Correspondence of Cornwallis Memorial Committee, Folder 4, NSA, MG20, Vol. 667. It was reported in late 1930 that of 300 approaches made, only 48 contributions had been received. *Evening Mail*, 29 October 1930. Ultimately, the CNR contribution of $11,600 represented well over half of the cost of the statue, with provincial and city contributions of $2500 each and other contributions reaching just over $3750. Accounts, [31 July 1931], Correspondence of Cornwallis Memorial Committee, Folder 1, NSA, MG20, Vol. 667. Perspective on the CNR contribution can be found in the reality that the cost of the Nova Scotian Hotel had been put officially at $2,358,418.30. See LAC, RG30, 9000-1-22, f. 343.

69. Macgillivray to Webster, 5 September 1930, NBM, J.C. Webster Papers, S198 F530; *Gazette* (Montreal), 20 September 1930; Webster to Macgillivray, 17 September 1930, Correspondence of Cornwallis Memorial Committee, Folder 1, NSA, MG20, Vol. 667.

70. *Herald*, 23 June 1931.

71. *Evening Mail*, 20 June 1931; "Honorable Edward Cornwallis, Founder of Halifax, N.S.," Correspondence of Cornwallis Memorial Committee, Folder 1, NSA, MG20, Vol. 667. Multiple copies of this single-sheet document were filed with the committee's correspondence. It may have been the biographical sketch originally prepared by a Wolfville clergyman, J.H. MacDonald, for the Dominion Atlantic Railway. See C.L. Baker to Macgillivray, 6 February 1931, Correspondence of Cornwallis Memorial Committee, Folder 1, NSA, MG20, Vol. 667; Magillivray to Baker, *Ibid*.

72. "Honorable Edward Cornwallis, Founder of Halifax, N.S.," Correspondence of Cornwallis Memorial Committee, Folder 1, NSA, MG20, Vol. 667.

73. "To Halifax on its 182nd Natal Day," NBM, J.C. Webster Papers, S198 F530.

74. *Chronicle*, 8, 9 October 1931.

75. *Mail-Star* (Halifax), 2 July 1949.

76. *Chronicle-Herald* (Halifax), 20 June 1949, Special Section, esp. pp. 47, 52.

77. Daniel N. Paul, *We Were Not the Savages: A Micmac Perspective on the Collision of European and Aboriginal Civilization* (Halifax: Nimbus Publishing, 1993). The book subsequently went through second and third editions (2000 and 2006), both published by Fernwood Publishing.

78. *Ibid*., pp. 338–40.

79. Daniel N. Paul, "Micmacs Still Victimized by Racist Attitudes!", *Micmac-Maliseet Nations News*, 4:2 (February 1993), pp. 1, 4–5.

80. *Chronicle-Herald*, 4, 5 March 1993.

81. See http://www.danielnpaul.com/Col/2003/HonoraryChief-PremierJohnSavage-MadeADifference.html (accessed 29 October 2012); quotation, which drew upon the subtitle of the book, is from the author's recollection of the event.

82. *Chronicle-Herald*, 22, 24 June 1999.

83. *Chronicle-Herald*, 25 April 2010.

84. "First Nations Rep Calls for Cornwallis School Renaming," http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/nova-scotia/story/2011/06/20/ns-cornwallis-renaming-request.html (accessed 29 October 2012); "Halifax Founder's Name to Disappear from School," http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/nova-scotia/story/2011/06/23/ns-halifax-cornwallis-school-rename.html (accessed 29 October 2012).

85. *Chronicle-Herald*, 29 June 2011. On the subsequent development of debate over the naming of the school, summarized by Paul W. Bennett, see http://www.openfile.ca/halifax/halifax/text/renaming-cornwallis-junior-high-leads-war-words (accessed 29 October 2012).

86. Daniel Paul, "Shining a Light on Mi'kmaq Civilization," *Chronicle-Herald*, 29 September 2000, at http://www.danielnpaul.com/Col/2000/ShiningALightOnMi'kmaqCivilization.html (accessed 29 October 2012).

87. Alfred G. Bailey, *The Conflict of European and Eastern Algonkian Cultures, 1504–1700: A Study in Canadian Civilization* (Saint John: New Brunswick Museum, 1937); E. Palmer Patterson II, *The Canadian Indian: A History* (Don Mills, ON: Collier-Macmillan, 1971).

88. Cornelius J. Jaenen, "Amerindian Views of French Culture in the Seventeenth Century," *Canadian Historical Review*, 55:3 (September 1974), pp. 261–91; W.J. Eccles, "Sovereignty-Association, 1500–1783," *Canadian Historical Review*, 65:4 (December 1984), pp. 475–510; J.R. Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens: A History of Indian-White Relations in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989).

89. Francis Jennings, *The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest* (Chapel ill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975); James Axtell, *The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Early America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981); Daniel K. Richter, *The Ordeal the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (Chapel Hill; University of North Carolina Press, 1992).

90. L.F.S. Upton, *Micmacs and Colonists: Indian-White Relations in the Maritimes, 1713–1867* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1979); Andrea Bear Nicholas, "Mascarene's Treaty of 1725," *UNB Law Journal*, 43 (1994), pp. 3–18; Stephen E. Patterson, "Indian-White Relations in Nova Scotia, 1749–61: A Study in Political Interaction," *Acadiensis*, 23:1 (Autumn 1993), pp. 23–59; Wicken, *Mi'kmaq Treaties on Trial*; John G. Reid, "*Pax Britannica* or *Pax Indigena*? Planter Nova Scotia (1760–1782) and Competing Strategies of Pacification," *Canadian Historical Review*, 85:4 (December 2004), pp. 669–92.

91. See, for example, "30-Year-Old Texbook Still in Use in Halifax Schools," http://www.openfile.ca/halifax/halifax/text/30-year-old-textbook-still-use-halifax-schools (accessed 29 October 2012).

92. See Geoffrey Plank, "The Two Majors Cope: The Boundaries of Nationality in 18th-Century Nova Scotia," *Acadiensis*, 25:2 (Spring 1996), pp. 18–40; see also Plank, *An Unsettled Conquest: The British War Against the Peoples of Acadia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001).

93. On historians as engaged intellectuals, and critical analysis in this area, there is no better source than the essays and reviews collected at www.activehistory.ca; see also the conference announce-

ment at http://www.sbthh.ufop.br/informativo/view?ID_INFORMATIVO=159 (both accessed 29 October 2012). On participant history (relevant to the passages of *We Were Not the Savages* that draw upon Daniel Paul's specific life experience), see Doug Munro, *The Ivory Tower and Beyond: Participant Historians of the Pacific* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009).

94. Jerry Bannister and Roger Marsters, "The Presence of the Past: Memory and Politics in Atlantic Canada since 2000," in John G. Reid and Donald J. Savoie, eds., *Shaping an Agenda for Atlantic Canada* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2011), pp. 121–2; http://www.cbc.ca/archives/categories/society/racism/africville-expropriating-black-nova-scotians/africville-declared-a-national-historic-site.html (accessed 10 December 2012); http://www.law.ualberta.ca/centres/ccs/issues/legrandderangement.php (accessed 10 December 2012); http://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1100100015644/1100100015649 (accessed 31 October 2012).

95. *Windspeaker*, 7:49 (9 February 1990), p. 2; http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/nova-scotia/story/2010/04/15/ns-desmond-apology-dexter.html (accessed 31 October 2012).

96. http://halifax.ca/Africville/apology.html (accessed 31 October 2012).

97. Daniel Paul, "Fitzgerald's Apology Step in Right Direction," *Chronicle-Herald*, 12 February 1999.

98. Nova Scotia Legislature, 15 November 2000, Resolution No. 3297, http://nslegislature.ca/index.php/proceedings/hansard/C52/58_1_h00nov15/ (accessed 10 December 2012).

99. Bannister and Marsters, "The Presence of the Past," 121.

100. See, for example, op-ed articles by John Boileau, *Chronicle-Herald*, 14 October 2008, and Len Canfield, *Chronicle-Herald*, 25 March 2012.

101. See http://www.mikmaqrights.com/page.asp?ID=16; http://www.gov.ns.ca/abor/office/what-we-do/negotiations/ (both accessed 31 October 2012).

Photo Credits

Figure 1. Courtesy of Art Gallery of Nova Scotia (AGNS). The author is grateful to Dianne O'Neill of the AGNS for guidance on Cornwallis portraiture.

Figure 2. Courtesy of the Nova Scotian Archives.

Figure 3. Courtesy of Dreamstime.com.

An architect graduating in London in 1955 with a fifth year prize, Allen Penney practised in London and Boston, taught at the AA School, London, Cambridge University, and the GSD at the University of Pennsylvania. He taught architecture in Halifax from 1969.

Dalhousie-educated Ian McKay has taught at Queen's University since 1988. Co-author with Robin Bates of *In The Province of History: The Making of the Public Past in Twentieth-Century Nova Scotia* (2010), he is working on a biography of D.C. Harvey.

Gordon MacKay Haliburton, born in Wolfville, N.S. (1928) studied at Acadia. Dalhousie and London Universities. He spent several decades in Africa researching and teaching African History. More recently in Nova Scotia he has researched and published local history and genealogy.

Alison Froese-Stoddard is studying at the School of Information Management at Dalhousie University. Her research interests lie in the intersections between policy, social history, and community development, which have led to research projects in immigrant integration strategies in Halifax, Canadian food security issues, and Nova Scotian environmental history.

John G. Gibson is a researcher-writer on Scottish-Nova Scotian cultural affairs,1745–present. Edinburgh-born, he was educated first in Glenfinnan and received an M.A. and Ph.D. (ethnography, Edinburgh). He has had two books published by McGill-Queen's University Press and was a Guggenheim scholar/writer, 2005. He has lived in Cape Breton since 1972, and in Judique since 1979.

John G. Reid is a member of the Department of History at Saint Mary's University, and Senior Fellow at the Gorsebrook Research Institute. His recent published work includes co-editing *Britain's Oceanic Empire* (Cambridge University Press, 2012). He is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada.