

5-2011

The Grand Derangement in the Context of the Eighteenth - Century British Empire

Derek A. Jones

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/honors>

Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jones, Derek A., "The Grand Derangement in the Context of the Eighteenth - Century British Empire" (2011). *Honors College*. 474.
<https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/honors/474>

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors College by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact um.library.technical.services@maine.edu.

THE GRAND DERANGEMENT IN THE CONTEXT OF THE EIGHTEENTH –
CENTURY BRITISH EMPIRE

by

Derek A. Jones

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for a Degree with Honors
(History)

The Honors College

University of Maine

May 2011

Advisory Committee:

Jacques Ferland, Associate Professor of History, Advisor

Scott See, Libra Professor of History

Stephen Hornsby, Professor of Geography & Canadian Studies, Director
Canadian-American Center

Kristina Passman, Associate Professor of Classical Language and Literature,
Honors College

Alexander Grab, Adelaide & Alan Bird Professor of History

Abstract

Since the 1960's there has been a fierce debate on the criminality of the deportation of the Acadian people from the Maritimes. Since then, many historians have compared the deportation of the Acadians, also known as the *Grand Dérangement*, to modern acts of 'ethnic cleansing'. However, these comparisons take the *Grand Dérangement* out of context. This thesis compares the *Grand Dérangement* to the transportation of Scottish and Irish rebels after the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745 and United Irish Rebellion of 1798 in an effort to establish that the *Grand Dérangement* was extraordinary in the context of the 18th-century British Empire.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank his advisor, Dr. Jacques Ferland, for his help and guidance in the completion of this thesis, Dr. Kristina Passman for her moral support throughout his undergraduate career, and Dr. Scott See, whose capstone class prepared the author for this undertaking.

Table of Contents

Table of Maps	v
I. Introduction:	1
II: Historical Context:	
A. Conflict Between England and France:	4
B. A Brief History of Acadia Before the Grand Dérangement:	7
C. The Grand Dérangement:	13
III: Comparison of the Deportations:	
A. The Rationale for Deportation:	17
B. On What Basis Were People Selected for Deportation:	25
C. The Absolute Number of People Deported:	28
D. The Method of Deportation and Treatment:	30
E. What Was Done with the Possessions of The Deported:	36
F. The Ultimate Fate of the Deported:	39
G. Opinions of Other Authors:	42
IV. Conclusion:	47
V. Bibliography	50

List of Tables & Maps:

Table I: Destination of Exiled Acadians:	15
Table II: Irish Execution Verdicts:	27
Table III: Irish Transportation Verdicts:	27
Table IV: Irish Banishment Verdicts:	27
Table V: Scottish Prisoners Sent Abroad:	29
Table VI: Irish Prisoners Sent Abroad:	29
Table VII: Acadians Sent Abroad:	29
Table VIII: Deaths of Acadians Aboard Transport Ships:	31
Map: Acadia Circa 1740:	49

I. Introduction

In the late nineteenth century, authors such as Edouard Richard began to write critically about the removal of the Acadians from Nova Scotia between 1755 and 1763, or the *Grand Dérangement*.¹ Richard's two-volume work *Acadia, Missing Links of a Lost Chapter in American History*, published in 1895, was one of the very first works to address the criminality of the *Grand Dérangement*. Since Richard, many historians, most notably Bona Arsenault in *History of the Acadians* (1966), Dudley J. LeBlanc in *The Acadian Miracle* (1966), and N.E.S. Griffiths in works including *The Acadian Deportation: Deliberate Perfidy or Cruel Necessity* (1969), have sought to address, to some extent, whether or not the actions of Charles Lawrence, the Governor's Council of Nova Scotia, and the British Government were legitimate or criminal, even possibly amounting to an act of 'ethnic cleansing'.² The discourse on the subject has become more heated since the nineteen-sixties when LeBlanc first made the case for the *Grand Dérangement* as an act of 'ethnic cleansing'. Many Acadian groups have since put pressure on the governments of Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States to issue formal apologies, and in some cases, make reparations. Many works have compared the deportation of the Acadians to modern acts of 'ethnic cleansing' that involved mass murder (genocide) such as the atrocities in Rwanda, Yugoslavia, and Nazi Germany.

Examining the *Grand Dérangement* in a modern context leads to unsatisfactory

¹ Richard, Edouard, *Acadia: Missing Links of a Lost Chapter in American History vol. I* (Montreal: John Lovell & Son, 1895)

² Arsenault, Bona, *History of the Acadians*, Brian M. Upton and John G., McLaughlin trans. (Quebec: L'Action Sociale Ltee, 1966); LeBlanc, Dudley J., *The Acadian Miracle* (Lafayette: Evangeline Publishing Co., 1966); Griffiths, N.E.S., *The Acadian Deportation: Deliberate Perfidy or Cruel Necessity?* (Mississauga: Copp Clark Publishing Co., 1969).

arguments. The actions of many historical figures that were acceptable in the context of their own times become criminal when examined in the context of our time. The *Grand Dérangement* must be examined in the same way, in its context. Authors such as Geoffrey Plank in *An Unsettled Conquest* (2001) and John Mack Faragher in *A Great and Noble Scheme* (2005) have both addressed this point. Moreover both authors have put forth the idea of a connection between the clearances of the Jacobites from the Highlands of Scotland and the deportation of the Acadians.

Plank, in *Rebellion and Savagery; The Jacobite Rising of 1745 and the British Empire*, again explored this idea in 2005.³ Plank asserts that, in terms of ideology and tactics, the expulsion of the Acadians was not extraordinary. The British military burned homes, looted belongings, and committed random acts of violence during the *Grand Dérangement* just as it did in all the other campaigns against Britain's other rebellious subjects. Attempting to forcibly assimilate subjects with dissenting views was also nothing new. Lastly, expelling foreign nationals from newly conquered areas was common. Faragher makes this point through his mention of the French expulsion of English settlers from St. Kitts in 1666 and Newfoundland in 1697 and through his discussion of Guillaume-Thomas-François de Raynal's works in his conclusion. Raynal's conclusions in his short history of the *Grand Dérangement*, which framed the event as a case study in the corruption of the modern nation-state and the result of modern imperial aspirations, argues that it was not uncommon for the time.⁴ However, there has yet to be an attempt to put the *Grand Dérangement* into the context of its time through a careful

³ Plank, Geoffrey, *Rebellion and Savagery: The Jacobite Rising of 1745 and British Empire* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).

⁴ Faragher, John Mack, *A Great and Noble Scheme* (New York: W.W. Norton & co., 2005), pp. 448-449.

comparison of the event to other similar attempts to assimilate dissenting cultural groups in the context of the 18th-century British Empire.

This paper will show, through a comparison of the expulsion of the Acadians between 1755 and 1763 and the Highland clearances of 1745 and the aftermath of the rebellion of 1798 in Ireland, that the deportation of the Acadians was extraordinary in the context of the time. The Highland clearances of 1745 and the treatment of the Irish after the abortive rebellion of 1798 provide the perfect comparison for a variety of reasons. First both events, as with the *Grand Dérangement*, took place during the great struggle for empire between Britain and France, which some historians have called the “Second Hundred Years’ War.”⁵ Second, many of the officers involved with the Highland clearances also participated in the events in Acadia. Whereas none of them were involved with the events in Ireland, the case of the Irish rebellion of 1798 nevertheless can serve as a post-Acadian deportation point of reference. It is important to note that the treatment of the indigenous people of North America at this point in history would not be an equal comparison because the British regarded the Acadians as European, which is evident from their term for the Acadians: *French Neutrals*.

The comparison between the deportation of the Acadians (1755-1763), the Highland Clearances of 1745, and the United Irish Rebellion of 1798 will be based on several criteria: the method of deportation, the selection process for deportation, the destination of the deported, the absolute numbers and relative proportion of people deported, their treatment, and the ultimate fate of the deportees. The paper will then consider the opinion of the secondary sources on the matter before providing a

⁵ Brumwell, Stephen, *Redcoats: The British Soldier and War in the Americas, 1755-1763* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 11.

conclusion. The author wishes to make clear that it is not his intention to assign blame for the transportation of the Acadians or to determine whether or not the event should be labeled as ‘ethnic cleansing’. Instead, this paper seeks to establish that the *Grand Dérangement* was exceptional even in the context of the period.

II: Historical Context:

A. Conflict Between England and France:

The conflict between England and France over the New World had its origins in the Reformation, for it is because of this event that both these nations’ imperial aspirations would come into conflict. When the Protestant Reformation began in the 16th century, England and France found themselves hurled into religious conflict both internally and with their neighbors. For nearly a hundred years the two nations were far too preoccupied with the situation in Europe to make any serious attempt at establishing a colony in the New World. Meanwhile, Spain and Portugal were able to carve out vast empires in modern-day Central and South America. As a result of their later colonial ventures, England and France established their North American colonies in relatively close proximity. Therefore, the imperial interests of the two realms were at odds from the beginning of colonial settlement, from Samuel Argall’s attack on Port Royal in 1613 and the Kirk brothers’ siege of Quebec in 1629 to the Seven Years’ War. Moreover, the religious turmoil of the 16th century had left England a Protestant nation and France a Catholic one. However, before the Glorious Revolution, the religious rivalries and competing colonial claims did not generate greater hostilities between France and England than with Spain or the Dutch Republic.

During the seventy-five years between the Glorious Revolution and the conquest of New France, England and France were in open military conflict for nearly thirty years. The intervening periods of peace saw no decrease in animosity or tensions, particularly between King William's War (1689-1697) and Queen Anne's War (1703-1713) and between King George's War (1744-1748) and the coinciding French and Indian War (1754-1763) and Seven Years' War (1756-1763). In itself the conquest of Acadia, confirmed in 1713, resulted in a fifty-year 'cold war,' involving increases in fortifications, more militant missionary activities, indigenous raids, and a battle for Acadian allegiance. In short, following the Glorious Revolution, it is not an exaggeration to represent the Anglo-French rivalry in North America as a "constant state of mind."⁶

Preceding the 18th century, there was a fundamental change in warfare. Before the Thirty Years' War European armies were composed primarily of mercenaries and part time soldiers, compelled to leave their farms and fight for their king or lord for specific campaigns or conflicts. The nearly constant fighting of the Thirty Years' War and other wars of religion in Europe led to the adoption of standing professional armies in many European nations. England was no different. During the English Civil War the Parliamentarian forces fielded the New Model Army. The New Model Army was made up of full-time professional soldiers. These men accepted harsh discipline in exchange for regular pay and supplies funded by the government. The New Model Army was disbanded when Charles II became King; however, the new trend prevailed, providing both England and France with a permanent mobile military force capable of waging war in Europe as well as in Iroquoia, Acadia, and even deep into the Ohio River Valley.

⁶ Faragher, *Great and Noble*, pp. 71-125; Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery*, pp.1-68.

Greater training and discipline were key characteristics of these professional armies. Without discipline, the soldiers could become as dangerous to their own governments as to the enemy. During the Thirty Years' War, armies had laid waste to vast swathes of European countryside. Because of this widespread destruction of life and property, the career officers of these new professional forces adopted certain codes of ethics by which to fight, in order to prevent atrocities during wars. England first adopted its set of "Articles and Ordinances of War" in 1689.⁷

Three years after the deportation of the Acadians, Emmerich De Vattel published *The Law of Nations* or *The Principles of Natural Law*. Though this work could not have been known to Lawrence or any of the members of the Governor's Council in 1755, it arguably represents a shift in the opinion of the European intelligentsia concerning the morality of warfare. Vattel asserts in book II section 90 of this work that "whoever agrees that robbery is a crime, and that we are not allowed to take forcible possession of our neighbor's property, will acknowledge, without any other proof, that no nation has a right to expel another people from the country they inhabit, in order to settle in it herself."⁸ Vattel actually refers to the Treaty of Utrecht, and by implication, to Acadia in section 91 of the same book:

⁷ Childs, John, *British Army of William III, 1689-1702* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987), p. 86.

⁸ Vattel, Emmerich De, *The Law of Nations: New Edition*, Joseph Chitty ed. (Philadelphia: T. & J.W. Johnson & Co., 1883), sec 91.

If those who drew up the treaty of Utrecht had bestowed on so important a subject all the attention it deserved, we should not see France and England in arms, in order to decide by a bloody war what are to be the boundaries of their possessions in America. But the makers of treaties often designedly leave in them some obscurity, some uncertainty, in order to reserve for their nation a pretext for a rupture: an unworthy artifice in a transaction wherein good faith alone ought to preside! We have also seen commissioners endeavouring to overreach or corrupt those of a neighboring state, in order to gain for their master an unjust acquisition of a few leagues of territory. How can princes or ministers stoop to dirty tricks that would dishonour a private man?

In summation, by the time of the removal of the Acadians, warfare itself had begun to evolve from the part-time militia armies and mercenaries fighting each other in poorly organized fashion to a highly organized and ritualized affair. Britain and France were locked in an epic struggle for empire that would last roughly one hundred years. Suddenly, small rebellious groups within the British Empire had become potentially deadly enemies when supplied and aided by the French. The British now had a vested interest in cultural imperialism in order to prevent such rebellions. It was against this backdrop that the removal of the Acadians took place. It is in response to this conflict's growing impact on non-combatants, particularly those who occupied contested terrain, that writers such as de Vattel began to voice those values and principles that would much later serve to identify instances of 'ethnic cleansing'.

B. A Brief History of Acadia Before the *Grand Dérangement*:

A brief explanation of the history of the Acadian people, with a focus on their interaction with New England and Britain, is essential to understanding the *Grand Dérangement* and the debate that surrounds it.

In 1603, Pierre du Gua, sieur de Monts, a French Protestant trader, was granted a ten-year trade monopoly over New France and Acadia by King Henri IV of France.⁹ In exchange for this grant, de Monts was to “populate, cultivate, and fortify” the land and convert the indigenous peoples to Christianity.¹⁰ Prompted by this award, de Monts, accompanied by seventy-five male colonists, sailed to North America in 1604.¹¹ The expedition originally set up a colony on an island in the St. Croix River. However, a harsh winter, which claimed close to half of the expedition, forced the survivors to relocate to Port Royal in what is now Nova Scotia. The settlers lived there for four years, relying heavily on the Mi’kmaq to survive, until, in 1608, other French traders convinced King Henri IV to revoke the monopoly granted to de Monts, thus forcing the colonists to return to France.¹² Following Henri’s assassination, the Acadian colonial venture was allowed to resume and the colonists returned.

During the next eighty years, France generally neglected Acadia. This neglect forced Acadia to rely on foreign trade, mostly with New England, to survive. Moreover, the lack of any significant shipments of settlers from France forced the Acadians to intermarry with the local Mi’kmaq. The lack of a meaningful government presence allowed the Acadians to spread out across modern-day Nova Scotia, which made the colony even more difficult to govern. As a result of this, the Acadians became a fiercely independent and unique people. This period would also see two English occupations of Acadia, from 1621 to 1632 and from 1654 to 1667. These occupations only served to

⁹ Daigle, Jean, ed. *The Acadians of the Maritimes: Thematic Studies* (Ottawa: Ministry of Supply & Services, 1982), p. 18.

¹⁰ Arsenault, *History of the Acadians*, p. 10.

¹¹ Faragher, *Great and Noble*, p. 2.

¹² LeBlanc, *The Acadian Miracle*, p. 8.

reinforce the Acadians' independent nature by breaking ties with France and because the English largely left them to their own devices, keeping only minimal defenses and government in the region.¹³

In 1689, King William's War, an extension of the War of the Grand Alliance in Europe, erupted in North America. In reprisal for attacks on New England early in the conflict, orchestrated in Quebec, the Governor of Massachusetts sent William Phipps to attack Port Royal and exact revenge.¹⁴ Various other expeditions brought great destruction to Acadia during the conflict. These expeditions from New England took control of Port Royal and several other Acadian settlements. As a result of raids conducted by the French and their native allies during the war, such as those on Dover and Durham, New Hampshire, and York, Maine, the colonists of New England had come to view the Acadians as a threat to their security. So when Acadia was returned at the end of the conflict, in 1697, many New Englanders were outraged.¹⁵

In 1702, the War of Spanish Succession found its way to North America as Queen Anne's War. Two expeditions from Massachusetts, commanded by Benjamin Church, raided Acadian settlements.¹⁶ In 1710 Britain dispatched a squadron of warships and a regiment of regular infantry to the region that captured Port Royal the same year.¹⁷ As a result of this conquest, Acadia was ceded to Britain at the end of the war by the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713. Queen Anne's War saw more native raids on New England, such as the

¹³ Faragher, *Great and Noble*, p. 30-32.

¹⁴ LeBlanc, *The Acadian Miracle*, p. 43.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

infamous raid on Deerfield, Massachusetts, which only served to reinforce New England's misgivings about their Acadian neighbors.

The Treaty of Utrecht allowed Acadians to either leave Acadia and forfeit their land or stay and continue to practice Catholicism, provided they did not violate the laws of Great Britain.¹⁸ Queen Anne even had boats provided for those Acadians who wanted to leave. However, these were not given to the Acadians by British authorities in the region because they could not afford to let the Acadians leave, for they would be without a source of food and labor to run the colony and support the region's defenses.¹⁹ From this time on, various British governors attempted to force the Acadians to swear an unconditional oath of allegiance to Britain with little success.²⁰ They all backed down out of fear that the Acadians would take the French government up on its offer to move to Cape Breton, thus weakening the British position in Acadia and reinforcing the French position in Cape Breton, particularly at the fortress of Louisbourg. Finally, in 1729, under Governor Philipps, an agreement was reached. The Acadians swore a conditional oath that did not hold them to take up arms against the natives or the French.²¹ However, the conditions did not receive Governor Philipps' signature; it was a verbal agreement.²²

Again this peace did not last. King George's War broke out in 1744, and, from their stronghold in Louisbourg, the French tried to retake Acadia. The attempt failed. Though the Acadians gave no aid to the French and honored the terms of the oath, their

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 54.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 63.

²⁰ Daigle, *The Acadians of the Maritimes*, p. 36.

²¹ Richard, *Acadia: Missing Links*, p. 147.

²² Ibid., p. 148.

very presence worried many New England and British officials.²³ The British then took Louisbourg and Cape Breton from France in 1745.

According to LeBlanc and Arsenault, various British officials in Acadia expressed the desire to have the Acadians removed before, during, and after King George's War. The government of Massachusetts and officials in London even had the matter looked into. However, the end of King George's War prevented these plans from ever being brought to fruition. The Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748 restored the boundaries that had been in place before the war. Louisbourg was back in French hands. Because of the renewed threat from Louisbourg, the British formulated a plan to reinforce Acadia by building their own fortress town called Halifax. Cornwallis arrived in Acadia in 1749 with over a thousand settlers to establish the new settlement.

The French mirrored the change in British policy in the region with their own military build up. The French began to encroach on the province again, building forts and settlements close to the peninsula, encouraging their native allies to act against the British, and even convincing some Acadians to relocate to these new positions.²⁴ These actions made the British authorities in Acadia and the governments of the New England colonies, particularly that of Massachusetts, very uneasy. They feared that, if another conflict broke out, the Acadians, not having sworn allegiance to Britain, might help France retake the province.

In hopes of solidifying the Acadians' loyalty, Lieutenant General Edward Cornwallis, the Governor at the time, demanded that the Acadians swear a new

²³ LeBlanc, *The Acadian Miracle*, pp. 79-81.

²⁴ Daigle, *The Acadians of the Maritimes*, pp. 43-45.

unconditional oath to Britain, but they refused. Cornwallis, like the other governors before him, backed down; Cornwallis needed the Acadians to supply the young settlement at Halifax. The tension in the region was growing. Mi'kmaq raids had intensified and were even joined by Acadian militia from Ile Royale and Ile Saint-Jean.²⁵

In 1752, Governor Cornwallis resigned and was replaced with Governor Peregrine Hopson.²⁶ Hopson understood the need to keep the Acadians in the province and sympathetic to Britain. To this end, he took many steps to please the Acadians. His approach was completely different from that of Cornwallis. He treated them well, as deserving subjects. Hopson went so far as to convince the Board of Trade not to require an oath, for the moment. He signed a peace treaty with some of the natives, and even listened to the grievances of the Acadians. He also moved many of the Protestant settlers away from the Acadians to prevent them from coming into conflict. This strategy made both groups more content. However, Hopson's moderate governance came to a quick end; he returned to Britain in 1753 because of an eye infection. In his absence, he left Lieutenant-Colonel Charles Lawrence in charge of the colony. Lawrence essentially abandoned the moderate policies of Hopson; instead, he modeled his style on that of Cornwallis.²⁷ Soon after becoming acting Governor, Lawrence sent a letter to the Board of Trade outlining his belief that the Acadians needed to be deported.²⁸ The Board of Trade replied to the letter that, in short, they would consult with King George II on the matter with the caveat that, if it was done, it must have legal justification.²⁹ Before

²⁵ Ibid. p. 271.

²⁶ Ibid. p. 272.

²⁷ Ibid. p. 294.

²⁸ LeBlanc, *The Acadian Miracle*, p. 114.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 115.

Lawrence received this reply, the hostilities that would become known as the French and Indian War had begun.

C. The *Grand Dérangement*:

The French and Indian War gave Lawrence and other British leaders in the region the justification they needed to attempt to seize the French forts that bordered Acadia, which they blamed for facilitating Indian raids in the region. Militia regiments from Massachusetts were brought to Acadia to help the garrison there reduce Fort Beausejour, which fell on June 16, 1755, and Fort Gaspereau, which fell the day after.³⁰ On June 4th, before the attack on Fort Beausejour, Lawrence issued a proclamation that all Acadians were to turn over their arms to the government, and ordered Captain Alexander Murray to conduct several surprise raids to this end.³¹ Lawrence was afraid that the Acadians might attempt a rebellion if he did not disarm them. Inside the walls of Beausejour the British force found a number of Acadians in arms.

Historians disagree over the reasons and motives for the next actions of Lawrence and the Governor's Council. Some believe that, because of previous plans and suggestions to deport the Acadians, the Acadians found in arms inside Beausejour were used as an excuse to bring up the question of the unconditional oath again, which the British knew the Acadians would refuse, so that the government of Nova Scotia would have a pretext to deport the Acadians. Others believe that the poor defenses in Nova Scotia, set backs in the war, and fear of a rebellion, frightened Lawrence and the Governor's Council into removing the Acadians. Whatever the reason, Lawrence then

³⁰Arsenault, *History of the Acadians*, p. 117; Faragher, *Great and Noble*, p. 309.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 313.

ordered that deputies from several districts present themselves before the Governor's Council and demanded that they take an unconditional oath of allegiance to the king and to Britain. They all refused. For this Lawrence had them imprisoned. Lawrence then called a meeting of the Governor's Council and they decided to deport the Acadians.

The removal of the Acadians began in August of 1755. Monckton's command first removed the Acadians from Chignecto and Chipoudy Bay as a test run and learning experience for his force before sending off individual commands to remove the Acadians from the rest of Nova Scotia. The commanders told the male inhabitants of the Acadian settlements to attend a meeting, arrested them, and then ordered their families to come give themselves up, using the men as collateral.³² During the campaign the towns of Tatamagouche, Au Lac, Tantramar, and Baie Verte, among others, were burned.³³ Despite orders to the contrary, troops plundered, looted, and made off with livestock. At Minudie, New England troops surrounded the houses of the Acadians in the dark hours of the morning and gave a volley to wake the inhabitants. The terrified inhabitants tried to swim away, while the New England militia fired at them.³⁴

At Grand Pre and Minas, Winslow's command waited for the Acadians to harvest their crops before arresting them. Winslow planned to use the harvest to supply his force and the Acadians during the process of deportation. After the harvest, in September, Winslow ordered all the men to appear at the church, had them arrested, and held them hostage against the surrender of their families.³⁵ He then confiscated all their possessions too large to be put in the transports. Several skirmishes between Acadians, French troops,

³² Ibid., p. 348.

³³ Ibid., p. 349.

³⁴ Ibid., p. 350.

³⁵ Arsenault, *History of the Acadians*, p. 136.

and Mi'kmaq and the New England and British forces erupted in the course of the deportations that resulted in a number of deaths on both sides.³⁶ In his journal Joshua Winslow cataloged 255 homes, 276 barns, and 11 mills and one mass house destroyed.³⁷

The boats on which the Acadians were loaded were cramped: two people shared a space four feet high, four feet wide, and six feet long.³⁸ Captain Murray had 920 Acadians loaded onto boats meant to carry no more than 650 persons.³⁹ By the end of 1755, roughly 7,000 Acadians had been forcibly removed, and an unknown number turned into refugees.⁴⁰ The deported Acadians were dispersed to various British North American colonies. The following is the widely accepted estimate of how many Acadians were sent to the colonies:

Table I: Destination of Exiled Acadians⁴¹

Colony	Number of Exiled Acadians
Massachusetts	2,000
Virginia	1,100
Maryland	1,000
Connecticut	700
Pennsylvania	500
North Carolina	500
South Carolina	500
Georgia	400
New York	250
Total	6,950

³⁶ Ibid., p. 134.

³⁷ Faragher, *Great and Noble*, p. 363.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 361.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 364.

⁴¹ Plank, Geoffrey, *An Unsettled Conquest: The British Campaign Against the Peoples of Acadia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), p. 149.

All the Acadians that were deported did not arrive at their assigned destinations. In all, roughly one-seventh, or one thousand Acadians, died during the transport.⁴² The campaign to remove the Acadians in 1755 succeeded in removing roughly one half of the Acadian population. The rest of the Acadians became refugees, fleeing to other places within the Maritimes.⁴³ Many of the Mi'kmaq went with them. British patrols soon began to search the interior of the peninsula and elsewhere for these dispossessed Acadians. The search for the Acadians and Acadian raids in search of food, resulted in a bloody guerilla war that lasted for nearly two years. Both sides resorted to scalping and other atrocities. Many Acadians left for Quebec.

During those two years of guerilla warfare in Acadia, the British suffered several setbacks in North America; this prevented any real relief or support from being sent to Acadia from Britain, except for two regiments from Ireland. This situation changed after Prime Minister William Pitt the younger was made colonial minister in 1757. Pitt committed a huge amount of capital and troops to the North American theater, which resulted in the fall of Louisburg in 1758 and Quebec in 1759. After the capitulation of Louisburg the British removed the Acadians from Ile Saint-Jean.⁴⁴

Removals of the Acadians from Ile Saint-Jean, modern-day Prince Edward Island, began in August of 1758. Lieutenant-Colonel Andrew Rollo was sent with five hundred troops to effect the removal of the Acadians there. By most accounts this removal was far more violent than the one in 1755. In all 3,100 persons were removed and shipped to

⁴² Faragher, *Great and Noble*, p. 372, he credits Griffiths with this estimation.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 395.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 401-402.

France with some 1,649 dying en route. British patrols also burned Acadian settlements along the Gaspé Peninsula and Miramichi Bay that same year.⁴⁵

In November of 1758, Major George Scott sailed up the Petitcodiac River, with a few hundred men. Simultaneously, Colonel Monckton, with two thousand troops, sailed up the Saint-John River. Both parties destroyed all Acadian habitations and resources they found.⁴⁶ Most of the Acadians saw the British coming and fled into the woods, knowing what the British intended to do with them. These raids, along with harsh winters, meant that the Acadians were barely able to survive. Because of their desperate situation, when, in October of 1759, when General Edward Whitmore offered them a conditional surrender, that they might keep their possessions and religion if they surrendered, or face death, the Acadians took the bait.⁴⁷ Once all the Acadians had surrendered, they were deported to England.

III: Comparison of the Deportation of the Acadians, Jacobite Scots, and United Irishmen.

A. The Rationale for Deportation:

According to J. Macbeth Forbes, in *Jacobite Gleanings from State Manuscripts*, transportation was first used by the Privy Council during the reign of Charles II and became an official form of punishment under the Act of 1701.⁴⁸ The theory behind transportation was simple: the English government could not, on principle, execute everyone who committed an act of treason, sedition, rebellion, or the like. Likewise, the

⁴⁵ Ibid., pp. 403-404.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 405.

⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 41.

⁴⁸ Forbes, J. Macbeth, *Jacobite Gleanings from State Manuscripts* (Edinburgh: Oliphant Anderson and Ferrier, 1903), p. 38.

government could not afford to imprison everyone who committed a crime, from a budgetary standpoint. Therefore from 1701 on, the English government would send its political dissidents and criminals off into military service or to settle the colonies. The colonial expansion of the 1700's, the resulting need for men to colonize new lands, and the need for soldiers to fight the French, gave an added incentive for the government to transport prisoners.⁴⁹ During the War of Austrian Succession, the idea was expanded to the deportation of entire communities, most notably of the French inhabitants of Ile Royale to France in response to Mi'kmaq raids. As early as 1720, the idea that transportation could be used to assimilate dissenting groups was floated by Governor Philipps when he suggested that the Acadians "must be transported to some place where mingling with our subjects, they will soon lose their language, their religion, and the remembrance of the past."⁵⁰

In the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745, Cumberland suggested to Newcastle, the Leader of the House of Lords and Secretary of State for the Southern Department, that:

...the only sure remedy for establishing Quiet in this county...the transporting of particular Clans, such as the entire Clan of the Camerons and almost all the Tribes of the M'Donalds and several other lesser Clans, of which an exact list may easily be made.⁵¹

However, during the ensuing debate about what to do with the Highlanders, the government came to the conclusion that the Jacobites could be assimilated in place. Therefore, the clans were not transported en masse. Those Highlanders who had taken an active part in the rebellion would be transported, but the rest of the Highlanders would

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 44.

⁵⁰ LeBlanc, *The Acadian Miracle*, p. 146.

⁵¹ Prebble, John, *Culloden* (Atheneum, 1962), p. 245.

stay in Scotland and the government would bring the necessary tools of assimilation to them. Parliament passed the Act for the Pacification of the Highlands of Scotland and the Act for the Abolition of Heritable Jurisdictions; these acts banned the wearing of Highland dress, disarmed the clans, and removed the last vestiges of the feudal system from Scotland.⁵² Missionaries and investors were also dispatched to the Scottish Highlands in an attempt to convert the Jacobite clans into ‘hard-working Protestants’; Plank cites a statement by one of the investors as evidence of the intent to assimilate the Scots: “ make then the Highlanders as rich and industrious as the people of Manchester and they will be as little apt to rebel.”⁵³

During the debates on what to do with the Jacobite clans the Duke of Cumberland suggested moving the Acadians to make room to bring over the Jacobites, thus solving both problems.⁵⁴ While this idea would not come to fruition, Sir William Pepperell of Massachusetts’ suggestion that Jacobite prisoners be used to fight the French in Louisbourg would. Ultimately, 400 Jacobites were transported to Cape Breton to serve with the regiments there.⁵⁵ Admiral Charles Knowles, who had been stationed in Scotland to protect the coast during the Jacobite Rebellion, had been made Governor of Ile Royale and involved the Governor of Massachusetts, William Shirley, in the debate on what to do with the Highlanders. They both advocated for the removal of some of the Acadians to the south and replacing them with Protestant settlers so that over time the Acadians

⁵² Hartman Cyril Hughes, *The Quest Forlorn: The Story of the ‘Forty-Five* (Portsmouth: William Heinemann Ltd., 1952), p. 229.

⁵³ Plank, *Unsettled Conquest*, p. 116.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Forbes, *Jacobite Gleanings*, pp. 44-45.

would become Protestants themselves.⁵⁶ During the following discourse, Newcastle suggested to Shirley that a plan for the deportation of the Acadians be drawn up. The plan called for Acadians to be scattered about New England, where they could be assimilated, and replaced with Protestant New England settlers.⁵⁷ However, the end of the War of Austrian Succession effectively killed the willingness of the Board of Trade to go through with any such plan.

As a result, Shirley had another plan drawn up. In this plan Protestant settlers from Europe would be brought over to settle Nova Scotia; the Acadians would be moved closer to these settlements to force interaction just as the government had done in the Highlands.⁵⁸ It was hoped that the close proximity of the two groups would result in the assimilation of the Acadians. This plan was enacted in 1749 and General Edward Cornwallis was ordered to Nova Scotia to facilitate it as Governor. Cornwallis was also a veteran of the 1745 Jacobite Risings. However, this plan did not have the desired effect: the Acadians did not convert to Protestantism nor did they agree to swear an unconditional oath of allegiance to the Crown. Governor Hopson eventually abandoned the plan and moved the Protestant settlers farther from the Acadians to appease both groups.

Five years later, Charles Lawrence, acting as Governor, called a meeting of the Governor's Council to decide what to do with the Acadians after a number of them were found in arms at Fort Beausejour. He proposed that the council send them, broken up into

⁵⁶ Plank, *Unsettled Conquest*, p. 116.

⁵⁷ Faragher, *Ibid.*, p. 241.

⁵⁸ Plank, *Unsettled Conquest*, p. 121.

smaller groups, to the south to the other British colonies of North America to prevent them from ever becoming a people again. Lawrence stated that the:

... only practicable measure was to divide them among the colonies, where they may be of some use, as most of them are healthy strong people. And as they cannot easily collect themselves together again, it will be out of their power to do any mischief.⁵⁹

Lawrence also circulated a letter to the governors of the provinces that were to receive the Acadians in which he states his fear for the repercussions of simply deporting the Acadians to French territories. In the same letter, he also states the ultimate goal of the transportation:

This population numbers about seven thousand, and there is no doubt that it will go and reinforce the population of Canada, if, after being expelled, it is left free to go where it pleases, Canada not having cleared land for so great a number of inhabitants, those who are able to take up arms will immediately be employed in disturbing this colony and the neighboring colonies. In order to prevent, that there is no other particle means than to distribute them by groups in the colonies where they can be useful; for the greater number of those inhabitants are strong and enjoy excellent health. Thus it will be very difficult for them to gather again and impossible for them to do anything wrong; later they can render services; and in time become good subjects⁶⁰

On the Governor's Council were Admirals Boscawen and Mostyn. In 1745, Boscawen had held a command under Admiral Martin who was charged with stopping any French forces in the Channel trying to support the Jacobite cause. Admiral Mostyn had also commanded a ship under Admiral Martin with the same task. Both Boscawen and Mostyn, along with the rest of the council, supported the plan to remove the Acadians.⁶¹

Therefore, continuity existed in British policy. The idea to deport the Acadians did not just appear out of thin air. The government was seeking to assimilate the

⁵⁹ Faragher, *Great and Noble*, p. 328.

⁶⁰ LeBlanc, *The Acadian Miracle*, p.149.

⁶¹ Hartman, *The Quest Forlorn*, p. 117.

Acadians in the same way they had sought to assimilate the Highlanders. However, the Highlanders assimilated much more readily than the Acadians. Within fifty years of the Jacobite Risings, Highlanders were helping the British in policing their far-flung empire as loyal British subjects. The Acadians did not assimilate as the Scots did, despite the settling of Protestants in their midst and the establishment of Halifax in 1749. Because of this failure to assimilate the Acadians, Lawrence and the Governor's Council took more extreme measures to bring the assimilation of the Acadians to fruition. Later on, after Wolfe's conquest of Quebec, the British would attempt assimilation in French Canada, although without the same urgency as in Acadia, because the French threat in North America had been neutralized.

The British would continue to make these attempts at forced assimilation later in the century. In Ireland, before the Rebellion of 1798, martial law was declared in Ulster, and then throughout the nation during the rebellion. Harsh measures were used to subdue the rebellion as the British tried to destroy all opposition and frighten the Irish into conformity. After the rebellion, the British attempted to assimilate Ireland through less violent means. Between 1798 and 1801, General Lord Charles Cornwallis commuted the death sentences of 245 rebels, mostly to transportation, overruled ten acquittals of rebels, changing them to transportation, and overruled 40 more acquittals, giving the rebels banishment instead, in an attempt to remove the subversive elements so that the process of assimilation could run more smoothly.⁶² The story of Richard Caldwell exemplifies this. He was put on trial and sentenced to death but, in exchange for his life, his entire

⁶² Smyth, Jim ed. *Revolution, Counter-Revolution and Union* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 131.

family agreed to leave Ireland.⁶³ In addition to removing rebellious elements through these actions, Cornwallis sought to improve the public perception of the British government to ease the assimilation process. The Rebellion of 1798 was followed by the Act of Union, which literally turned Ireland into part of Great Britain. This act also took away much of the power of the Protestant Ascendancy in Ireland and gave more rights to Catholics. The act was designed to make the Irish Catholics into loyal subjects notwithstanding their Catholic faith.

Great care was given to providing legal pretext to the deportations. In the case of the Jacobites, the government could not, at that time, sentence them to transportation; rather, the convicted party had to request it in lieu of a previous sentence. To circumvent this system, the government had common Jacobite rebels draw lots to stand trial for treason, and ultimately be executed. Knowing that the rebels would surely choose transportation, the government gave the rest of them the option between transportation or a trial, which would almost certainly result in their execution. To ensure the convictions the government required that those who did stand trial were tried in England. This decision was of dubious legality at best, it being a violation of Article XIX of the Act of Union of 1707, in the case of those prisoners of Scottish nationality captured in Scotland.⁶⁴ Even if trying them in England was a violation of the Act of Union, the rebels would at least have a trial, and such a legal procedure was viewed as legitimate enough for the job at hand. Thus some 1,158 Jacobites were deported. In Ireland the government also went to the trouble of putting each rebel on trial, even though these trials, run by the Protestant Ascendancy, were biased at best.

⁶³ Ibid., p. 133.

⁶⁴ Hartman, *The Quest Forlorn*, p. 121.

A similar attention to legal justification characterized the Acadian deportation. Lawrence and the Governor's Council asked Chief Justice Belcher to comment on the idea of deportation and lend it some sort of legal pedigree. A year earlier, on October 29, 1754, the Board of Trade had even suggested that Lawrence consult Belcher on the matter.⁶⁵ Belcher went on record as saying that allowing the French Neutrals to stay after refusing to take an unconditional oath of allegiance "would be contrary to the letter and spirit of His Majesty's instruction to Governor Cornwallis and in my humble apprehension would incur the displeasure of the Crown and Parliament."⁶⁶ The decision by Belcher seemed to give the deportation of the Acadians just as much legal weight than as the trials of the Scots held in England or the banishment of those already acquitted in Ireland.

The deportation of the Acadians, then, as an idea, was not out of the ordinary. In fact, the principle of deporting troublesome subjects was commonplace, as was the idea of trying to forcibly assimilate or otherwise break up nonconforming elements of society. The legality of the idea was, even then, dubious; however, this dubious legality was reflected in other instances during that time period. However, the deportation of the Acadians was also quite different. In the aftermath of the Jacobite Risings the government did consider deporting entire clans but this idea never came to fruition. The *Grand Dérangement* saw the idea actually put into practice.

⁶⁵ Arsenault, *History of the Acadians*, p.122.

⁶⁶ Faragher, *Great and Noble*, p. 320.

B. On What Basis were People Selected for Deportation:

In Scotland the prisoners were separated into four groups: proper gentlemen, not gentlemen but above the rank of common man, lower than the preceding, and common men.⁶⁷ Those who were above the common man were taken out of the gaols and housed in better lodging. The government was worried that Scottish courts could not be trusted, and for this reason all prisoners, except those being tried for desertion by military court martial, would have to be brought back to England to be tried. Since it would have been impracticable to bring all the common prisoners to trial, it was decided that all peers and deserters would stand trial, but that the common men of the rebellion would draw lots to decide who would stand trial for their lives. The rest of the common men, those who would not stand trial, were given the option of volunteering to be transported or stand trial for their lives. Given this choice, the Jacobites chose to volunteer to be transported, knowing that a trial would almost certainly result in a death sentence. At first, many were sold into indentured servitude, in Virginia or the West Indies, for a period of no less than seven years. Later on the prisoners were simply banished, given free passage to the Americas and told not to return. Of the women captured, ladies of rank were released and some twenty-seven of the “regimental women” of the Jacobite force were transported. No families or civilians not found with the army were transported.⁶⁸

In Ireland, each rebel was given a trial. The proceedings, in almost all cases, were by court-martial.⁶⁹ However, as stated above, Cornwallis reviewed each sentence. Because of the prejudice and inexperience of most of the courts, to improve public

⁶⁷ Prebble, *Culloden*, p. 253.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 253-260.

⁶⁹ Smyth, *Revolution*, p. 132.

opinion of the government, and because he realized deportation was as effective at removing rebellious elements as execution, Cornwallis often changed the sentence from death to transportation (see tables II, III, and IV).⁷⁰ In some cases, Cornwallis even reversed acquittals to be sure that ‘subversive elements’ were transported. The Insurrection Act of 1796 gave magistrates the right to forcibly enlist or deport anyone found to be “disorderly or idle,” provided another magistrate would sign off on the order making removing rebellious elements easier than ever.⁷¹ Cornwallis and Castlereagh wanted to make sure that the proceedings did not damage public opinion any more than was absolutely necessary since there was a planned Act of Union between Great Britain and Ireland. Therefore, men found guilty of simply being involved in the rebellion and those men for whom the government’s evidence was lacking, were simply banished to a nation not at war with Britain.⁷² Those who were fit, found guilty of being in the rebellion and of some other more serious, but not infamous crime such as murder, were enlisted into the British and Prussian armies. Those found guilty of being part of infamous crimes during the rebellion and not sentenced to death were transported to Botany Bay.⁷³

⁷⁰ Ibid., pp.131-133.

⁷¹ Durey, Michael, “The Fate of the Rebels after 1798” (*History Today*, Vol. 48, Issue 6, p21, 1998).

⁷² Smyth, *Revolution*, p. 137.

⁷³ Ibid., pp. 131-137.

Table II: Irish Execution Verdicts⁷⁴

Year	Execution Verdicts	Sentences after Review
1798	419	290
1799	245	163
1800	57	40
1801	47	30
Total:	768	523

Table III: Irish Transportation Verdicts

Year	Transportation Verdicts	Transportation after Review
1798	330	304
1799	153	176
1800	46	49
1801	27	37
Total:	556	566

Table IV: Irish Banishment Verdicts

Year	Banishment Verdicts	Banishment after Review
1798	21	58
1799	0	3
1800	0	0
1801	0	0
Total:	21	61

In both the cases of Ireland and Scotland, the government tried to select individuals specifically deemed dangerous to the government for transportation. In the case of Acadia, every Acadian man, woman, and child was selected for deportation. The entire population, regardless of personal guilt or involvement in rebellious activities, was deported. This is extraordinary when considered against the pains taken by the British

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 131.

government in Scotland and Ireland to avoid such actions as deporting an entire population to remove the rebellious elements therein.

C. The Absolute Number of People Deported:

The number of Acadians deported was significantly higher than Scots or Irish in absolute numbers and in percentages. In Scotland, 936 Jacobite men were transported and 222 were banished. There were another 684 prisoners for whom there are no records. Therefore, 1,158 Scots are known to have been exiled, with a possibility of 684 more for a maximum of 1,842 individuals. In Ireland, 3,450 persons were expelled from the country, only 750 of them actually being deported, the rest being forcibly enlisted into the British or Prussian armies. In Nova Scotia, 6,950 Acadians were deported. From Ile St Jean roughly 3,100 Acadians were deported.⁷⁵ The grand total is around 12,250 Acadians deported between 1755 and 1763.⁷⁶ The total Acadian population in North America was only roughly 15,000 people in 1755.⁷⁷ Therefore nearly 82% of the Acadian population was deported, whereas the 1,158-1,842 Scots and 3,450 Irish who suffered a similar fate amounted to only a tiny fraction of the total populations of the respective countries or even of the regions from whence they were taken. Tables V, VI, and VII show a breakdown of the number of people deported in each instance:

⁷⁵ Faragher, *Great and Noble*, p. 404.

⁷⁶ Hornsby, Stephen J., Michael J. Hermann, Matthew Cote cart. "Explanatory Maps of Saint Croix & Acadia - Acadian Deportation, Migration, & Resettlement," <http://umaine.edu/canam/publications/maps/st-croix/acadian-deportation-migration-resettlement/> (March 2011).

⁷⁷ Griffiths, N.E.S., *The Contexts of Acadian History, 1686-1784* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992), p.68.

Table V: Scottish Prisoners Sent Abroad⁷⁸

Transported	936
Banished	222
Disposal unknown	684
Total Sent Abroad	1,158 to 1,842

Table VI: Irish Prisoners Sent Abroad⁷⁹

Banished	400
Volunteered into the Army	900
Sent to Prussian Army	350
Drafted into Condemned Regiments	1,450
Transported to Botany Bay	350
Total	3,450

Table VII: Acadians Sent Abroad⁸⁰

To American Colonies in 1755	6,950 ⁸¹ , 1,100 later shipped to England
To France 1758 on	3,800
To American Colonies after 1755	1,500
Total	12,250

It is worth noting that a report of the Royal Historical Commission states that 10,000 people were forcibly deported through the Old Bailey Prison alone between 1717 and 1775, and that 50,000 persons were forcibly deported from the whole of Britain in that time.⁸² However, these persons were prisoners, convicted of some crime, not civilians taken from their homes by force without trial or due process and, though the

⁷⁸ Prebble, *Culloden*, p. 246.

⁷⁹ Smyth, *Revolution*, p. 129.

⁸⁰ Hornsby, "Explanatory Maps."

⁸¹ Plank, *Unsettled Conquest*, p. 149.

⁸² Forbes, *Jacobite Gleanings*, p. 63.

numbers are similar, the time period over which these deportations took place was much greater than the time period over which the Acadians were removed.

D. The Method of Deportation:

In the case of the Acadians, the Governor's Council first ordered the confiscation of all firearms to limit the threat of rebellion. The army and New England militia then marched to each town and ordered a meeting of all adult male inhabitants, without making their true intentions known, and then arrested them.⁸³ The men were then held hostage against the surrender of their families. In some cases the villages were burned and livestock killed or confiscated before the women and children were arrested, thus leaving them to fend for themselves without supplies or shelter.⁸⁴ Faragher cites the bishop of Quebec reporting that: "tearful women fled with their children into the forests, exposed to the ravages of the weather and disastrous consequences of general famine."⁸⁵ After the men were arrested they were either loaded onto transports or brought back to the various British forts to be held until the transports were ready. In most cases the women and children were not loaded onto the transports until they were ready to set sail in order to prevent unnecessary suffering.

Once loaded onto the transports, the Acadians faced deplorable conditions. The transports were over packed; as stated previously, two people shared a space four feet high and wide and six feet long.⁸⁶ Captain Murray had 920 Acadians loaded onto boats

⁸³ Arsenault, *History of the Acadians*, p. 136.

⁸⁴ Faragher, *Great and Noble*, p. 349.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.* p. 349.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.* p. 361.

meant to carry no more than 650 persons.⁸⁷ These conditions lead to disease and ultimately the death of roughly one seventh of the Acadians during the voyage either to the American colonies or to France and England.⁸⁸ Table VIII shows the number of Acadians that perished en route on five of the transport ships, for which there are records.

Table VIII: Deaths of Acadians Aboard Transport Ships⁸⁹

Ship Name	Number of Acadians on board at time of departure	Number of Acadians on board at time of arrival	Destination
<i>Union and Boscawen</i>	582	None, both sank	Philadelphia
<i>Endeavour</i>	166	125	Boston
<i>Ranger</i>	263	205	Boston
<i>Cornwallis</i>	417	210	South Carolina

To ensure that those left behind had nothing, all habitations were burned, crops destroyed, and livestock either taken for British use or destroyed. Raiding parties were ordered out to hunt down any Acadians left. Several skirmishes erupted between the Acadians that were left behind and the New England militia.

The situation in Nova Scotia in 1755 closely parallels that in Scotland in 1745. Immediately after the Battle of Culloden, which ended the Jacobite Rebellion, dragoons chased the retreating Jacobites, cutting them down on the road to Inverness.⁹⁰ Sentinels were posted over the moor with orders to prevent the escape of wounded Jacobites.⁹¹ Two days later the sentinels were ordered to finish off all the wounded that had yet to die

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Ibid. p. 372. Faragher credits Griffiths with this estimation.

⁸⁹ Ibid., pp. 368-371.

⁹⁰ Hartman, *The Quest Forlorn*, p. 188.

⁹¹ Prebble, *Culloden*, p. 130.

on the field.⁹² This order was justified on the basis of a fabricated order supposedly authored by the Jacobite General, Lord Murray, instructing the Jacobites to give no quarter.⁹³ As the week went on, detachments were sent out onto the moor to ensure the sentinels had done their jobs. Huts that sheltered wounded Jacobites were torched with the wounded still inside.⁹⁴ The Jacobites were thrown into churches and common gaols, which soon were over-filled. The prisoners were refused medical attention. When the gaols had filled up, prisoners were put on transports in the Firth of Forth. Large numbers of Jacobite prisoners died of disease, starvation, and unattended wounds. Cumberland dispatched detachments to the glens with instructions to burn all rebel homes, bring back their cattle, and to kill any who resisted or tried to make off with arms.⁹⁵

In May, Cumberland ordered the bulk of his army to what remained of Fort Augustus. From Fort Augustus raiding parties were sent out. They were ordered to burn the homes of rebels and bring back their belongings. In fact, homes of both rebel and non-rebel Highlanders were burned; which homes were burned depended more on the officers present than the evidence.⁹⁶ At Fort Augustus, as at Inverness, the army had a huge problem with maintaining discipline. To be sure, there were orders to plunder and burn, however, the amount of plundering and burning seems to go far beyond what was ordered by all accounts. There were constant lashings doled out to soldiers for looting without permission. Courts-martial were held almost daily. Some officers were even

⁹² Ibid., p. 132.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 135.

⁹⁵ Ibid., pp. 159-173.

⁹⁶ Ibid., pp. 190-192.

cashiered and had their commissions revoked. None of this seemed to prevent looting and savagery on the part of the army.⁹⁷

The patrols continued to bring in Jacobites. Odd skirmishes erupted when Jacobites were cornered. Soldiers, rebels, and civilians were still dying. The women and children fared the worst. The families of the Jacobites being held at Fort Augustus, their homes having been burnt, came to beg for food. Cumberland ordered that no man provide or sell any to them, under penalty of a lashing. The bodies of women and children who starved to death were being found throughout the Highlands.⁹⁸ The mansion of Esquire Cameron, the entire settlement of the Macgregors in Craighroyston, the Castle Glengarry, and the home and lands of Lochiel were all destroyed. Parties of soldiers shot many of the inhabitants indiscriminately.⁹⁹ After drawing lots the men selected for transportation were taken from the gaols and prison ships and loaded onto private merchantmen and transported to the plantations of Virginia and the West Indies or to the regiments in North America.¹⁰⁰ A single company was selected to transport the Scots: Messrs. Gildart & Smith of Cateaton Street, in London.¹⁰¹

On board the transport ships, the Jacobites had a similar experience to that of the Acadians. In *Jacobite Gleanings from State Manuscripts*, J. Macbeth Forbes states: “Life on shipboard was a terrible torture, and from excessive numbers crowded into a very limited space, one could readily realize the meaning of the words cabined cribbed, and

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 198.

⁹⁸ Ibid., pp. 200-205.

⁹⁹ Ibid., pp. 207-210.

¹⁰⁰ Hartman, *The Quest Forlorn*, p. 230.

¹⁰¹ Forbes, *Jacobite Gleanings*, p. 46.

confined.”¹⁰² Later in the text, Forbes evokes a description given by a guard who went into the hold of the ship *Pamela*: “the uncleanness of that place is surpassing imagination, too nauseous to describe, so that that, together with the malignant fever raging among them, and another odious distemper peculiar to Scotchmen, may terminate in a more dreadful disease.”¹⁰³

The treatment of the rebels in Ireland was very similar. Even before the rising began, paranoia and an abortive French invasion of Ireland caused the Irish Parliament to pass the Insurrection Act, which had provisions against oath taking and secret societies, imposed curfews, gave control over certain areas to military commanders, and suspended *habeas corpus*.¹⁰⁴ Much of the Irish working class, Catholics and Presbyterians alike, had grown tired of the domination of the Irish government by the largely Anglican Protestant Ascendancy. Inspired by the American and French revolutions, groups such as the United Irishmen had begun to push for further enfranchisement. Initially, the Irish government acquiesced, but as the demands grew larger and fear of a rebellion caused the government to take drastic measures. The forces of General Lake, British military commander in Ireland at the time, moved through areas known for United Irish activity, where they broke into homes to search for weapons, and then robbed them. When they found weapons they looted the homes, burned them, and flogged the owners or worse. The troops took hostages and sentenced them to death before pardoning them to ensure the

¹⁰² Ibid., p. 34.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 35.

¹⁰⁴ Bartlett, Thomas, Kevin Dawson, and Daire Keogh, *The 1798 Rebellion; An Illustrated History* (Niwot: Roberts Rinehart Publishers, 1998), p. 57.

docility of their friends and neighbors. The Orange Order also took advantage of this climate of fear in Dublin Castle. They participated in the excesses of Lake's forces.¹⁰⁵

On March 30, 1798 all of Ireland was placed under the Insurrection Act. British troops searched the countryside for rebels and arms; no one was safe. Floggings, looting, and house burnings were commonplace across much of Ireland. Murder and rape were also frequent. The actions of the government generated an open rebellion, which resulted in even worse atrocities on both sides. After the rebellion, each rebel was given a trial and either enlisted into military service, banished and told to make his or her own way out of the country, or transported to Botany Bay. By 1798, there was already a well-established system of transporting prisoners to the penal colonies in Australia. So the Irish who were exiled were normally placed in the regular shipments of prisoners.¹⁰⁶

The method of deportation, therefore, was very different among the three groups. The Acadians found themselves in the worst conditions for their voyages. However, the treatment of individuals seems to have been worse for the Scots and Irish. Though all three instances saw savagery, looting, and criminal acts, the Scots and Irish fared the worst. The New England militia and British soldiers in Nova Scotia seem to have treated the Acadian families far better than their counterparts in the British Isles treated the Jacobites and United Irish rebels.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 73.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 87.

E. What Was Done with the Possessions of The Deported:

LeBlanc, in *The Acadian Miracle*, and Edouard Richard, in *Acadia, vol. II*, both speak of the theft of Acadian possessions by Lawrence.¹⁰⁷ Edouard particularly accuses Lawrence of using the whole scheme as a way to get rich off Acadian possessions. Leblanc finds supporting evidence in the letter sent from Lawrence to Monckton, on July 31, 1755, in which Lawrence makes his first official mention of what is to be done with the possessions of the Acadians:

As their whole stock of cattle and corn is forfeited to the Crown by their rebellion, and must be secured and applied towards a reimbursement of the expense of the Government, in transporting them out of the country, care must be had that nobody make any bargain for purchasing them under any colour or pretense whatever; if they do the sale will be void, for the inhabitants have now no property, in them nor will they be allowed to carry away the least thing but their ready money and household furniture.¹⁰⁸

Edouard uses the cases of a merchant who was instructed to take several of the finest horses from the Acadians, without paying for them, as further evidence against Lawrence. Livestock was also slaughtered and used to feed the Acadians on their voyage or transported to New England to offset the cost of the venture. The sale of Acadian livestock was also cited as evidence against Lawrence. However, it seems that this interpretation of events has fallen out of favor with historians, as contemporary historians such as Faragher and Plank do not attempt to make a case for it. At any rate, whether Lawrence profited from the confiscation of Acadian livestock and property, it seems that the confiscation of property, or the destruction thereof, was a common practice for the time.

¹⁰⁷ LeBlanc, *The Acadian Miracle*; Richard, *Missing Links*.

¹⁰⁸ LeBlanc, *The Acadian Miracle*, p.145.

In Scotland, two days after the Battle of Culloden, Cumberland sent out an order to bring all loot of value to an ensign to be looked over so the army could purchase it for general use if it was useful.¹⁰⁹ Cumberland also dispatched small parties to the nearby glens to read out his orders to surrender Charles, the rebel leaders, and all arms, or be hanged; the detachments were also instructed to burn all rebel homes, bring back their cattle, and to kill any who resisted or tried to make off with arms. Brigadier-General John Mordaunt, commanding four hundred men of the Royal Scots and Cholmondeley's regiments, was sent to raid the lands of Lord Lovat. His forces were ordered to take all the things that were movable and burn the rest.¹¹⁰

When Cumberland moved his army to Fort Augustus in May, he brought more of the same looting and savagery to the "great glen"; the army was ordered to burn the homes of rebels and bring back their belongings. In Ireland, before any rebellion had taken place, Lake's forces had begun to loot and burn homes in Ulster. The government forces confiscated or burned all the possessions of suspected rebels.¹¹¹

In Acadia, homes were burned and livestock was taken, but the Acadians were, in theory, allowed to keep their money and any personal possessions small enough to fit on the transports. This was not the case of the victims of the punitive campaigns in Scotland and Ireland. In Scotland and Ireland the British meant to completely deprive the rebels of all their property. Also, as shown by the order from Cumberland to bring any valuable loot to an ensign to be bought for the army, the government did not even seek to keep the loot for the Crown. The soldiers were allowed to keep it as bounty for themselves. The

¹⁰⁹ Prebble, *Culloden*, p. 132.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp.173-175.

¹¹¹ Bartlett, *The 1798 Rebellion*, p. 73.

situation in Ireland was similar. This is not to say that the New England militia or British soldiers of the *Grand Dérangement* did not keep loot for themselves. However, the officers in Acadia were told that all loot must be turned over to the Crown as shown by the orders quoted above. It should also be noted that in many cases the possessions of the Acadians were just left behind by the militias and British soldiers.¹¹² In each situation the government forces stole property. Moreover, the possessions taken or destroyed in these campaigns were family possessions, used to feed and shelter women and children, just as were the possessions of the Acadians. Therefore, the destruction of property during the *Grand Dérangement* was not extraordinary.

Finding reliable data to compare property damage is very difficult. In Scotland and Ireland, the government only kept records of the damage done to loyalists, not about the property taken from rebels or their damages. Accurate information is equally hard to come by in Acadia. By multiplying Winslow's estimates of livestock taken in certain hamlets so as to encompass all of Acadia, Edouard Richard estimated that roughly 43,500 cattle, 48,500 pigs, 23,500 sheep, and 2,800 horses were taken by the government.¹¹³ This is as close to an estimate of sheer number of livestock, or any kind of property, that was taken or lost. These Acadian numbers are no doubt higher than the ones that would come from Scotland considering how many people were involved. However, the number of deaths in Ireland as a result of the uprising, estimated at 20,000-25,000, would indicate that the property damage there must have been greater or at least on par with that in Acadia.¹¹⁴

¹¹² Plank, *Unsettled Conquest*, p. 150.

¹¹³ Richard, *Missing Links*, pp. 124-125.

¹¹⁴ Smyth, *Revolution*, p.100.

F. The Ultimate Fate of the Deported:

Of the 1,158 Scots known to have been deported after the Jacobite Rising of 1745, 750 were destined for the regiments (250 to the Leeward Islands, 100 to Jamaica, and 400 to Cape Breton).¹¹⁵ These men were given a pardon for agreeing to enlist in the army. However, we can safely assume that most of them died before their terms, ranging from seven years on, were up. The force at Cape Breton, under Shirley and Pepperell, experienced an astronomical attrition rate; eight or ten men a day were lost to disease.¹¹⁶ The rest of the prisoners that were transported, numbering some 186, were transported to the plantations in the Americas (i.e. Maryland, Virginia, the Leeward Islands, Barbados, and Jamaica) to be indentured servants. Of the men enlisted or to be forced into indentured servitude and shipped to the Caribbean, some 150 were captured by the French en route and there is no record of them thereafter.¹¹⁷ Beyond this, very little is known about the fate of the transported or banished Scots. Because so many persons were transported for crimes or debt to American plantations or forced into military service, they undoubtedly blended in.

The fate of the United Irishmen shipped abroad was more diverse than that of the Jacobites. Of the Irish prisoners banished, it is known that roughly 300 of them made their way, illegally, to the United States; there is no record for the remaining one hundred banished rebels.¹¹⁸ The rebels that “volunteered” for military service were either shipped to Europe or the ‘condemned regiments’ of the West Indies. Those who did not volunteer before the end of the rebellion were forced into so called ‘condemned regiments’ in the

¹¹⁵ Forbes, *Jacobite Gleanings*, p. 45.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

¹¹⁸ Durey, “The Fate of the Rebels.”

West Indies and, unquestionably, many of those that reached their assigned regiments perished of disease soon after. Those who were enlisted into the Prussian Army did not end up fighting for Prussia. Durey states:

The King of Prussia failed to join the Second Coalition in 1799. As a result, according to Miles Byrne, who fought in Napoleon's service, some Irishmen were put to work in the salt mines of Silesia, but following Prussia's defeat by Napoleon at the battle of Jena, many of the surviving Irish recruits deserted to the Irish Legion of the French army. There they once again met up with other 1798 rebels and fought under their leadership against the British in Spain.

Of the Irish rebels transported to Botany Bay, a large number died en route due to disease on the convict ships. There were also mutinies on the ships *Anne* and *Hercules*. Once the convicts did arrive in Australia, they plotted to overthrow the local government. Many of the Irish convicts were involved in an open revolt in 1804, known as the Castle Hill Rebellion, which was put down by the government of New South Wales.¹¹⁹

If the ultimate fate of the Irish rebels was diverse, then no word exists to describe the complexity or diversity of the fate of the Acadian people. Two thousand Acadians were sent to Massachusetts; to which refugees were added 500 Acadians of the transports destined for South Carolina that were forced to dock as Boston due to bad weather. These Acadians were distributed amongst the localities of Massachusetts and contracted to colonial families in need of workers. They were prohibited from moving out of their assigned locality without the benefit of a pass. The 700 Acadians who were sent to Connecticut were also divided amongst different communities and prohibited from leaving them, but otherwise they were treated well; many were later allowed to leave and go to Montreal or France. Two groups of Acadians, totaling roughly 300 persons, were transported to New York, the first from Nova Scotia and the second from Prince Edward

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

Island. Roughly 249 of these Acadians were sent back to various French territories in the Caribbean or to Canada and Louisiana after the war. Pennsylvania did not know what to do with the Acadians when they first arrived, and roughly 150 would die waiting aboard ships while the government pondered their fate. The survivors would eventually be scattered across Pennsylvania until the end of the conflict, after which they were moved to Louisiana or Canada. It is important to note that in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and New York the children were taken from their families and adopted by local colonists.¹²⁰

In the south, 1,000 Acadians were brought to Maryland, 1,100 to Virginia, 1,000 to the Carolinas, and 400 to Georgia. The Acadians transported to Maryland fared much better than any of the other groups. They were well received by Maryland's Irish Catholic population, which helped them set up small communities in and around Baltimore. At the end of the war many of them left for Louisiana or Canada as the Acadians in other colonies did; however, a number of them did stay in Maryland. Virginia refused to accept the Acadians and sent them to England where they stayed, in terrible conditions, until the end of the war in 1763, after which they were given over to France. They then made their way to Louisiana nearly twenty years after they had originally been deported. Of the 1,000 Acadians sent to the Carolinas, all but 280 of them left before 1763 to attempt to make their way home to Acadia, the rest drifted to Louisiana and the Caribbean. The 400 Acadians sent to Georgia were initially put to work on plantations alongside slaves but then allowed to leave the area. They all attempted to go north. Some were captured before reaching their destinations and sent back, others reached Prince Edward Island and

¹²⁰ LeBlanc, *The Acadian Miracle*, p. 153-155.

were then deported again in 1758, and the remainder settled in the Madawaska region. Those who stayed behind left for Louisiana after the signing of the Treaty of Paris.¹²¹

As discussed above, neither the Irish nor the Acadians were assimilated. Given the choice or the opportunity the Acadians left the colonies they were assigned to for other French speaking Catholic settlements, with the exception of Maryland. However, they were not assimilated there either. LeBlanc cites testimony from a chaplain of Rochambeau's troops, staying in Baltimore in 1781, stating that there was a flourishing Acadian community in Baltimore that still conversed in French and practiced Catholicism.¹²² The Irish did much the same, settling in Catholic regions outside the British Empire, i.e. the United States, or rebelling against British governance as in the case of those sent to Australia. The Irish sent outside of the British Empire even fought against British causes, as is the case of those men freed from Prussian military service that joined free Irish regiments in Napoleon's army or those Irishmen who joined the Fenian Brotherhood in the United States. In this sense, the ultimate fate of the deported Irish and the Acadians was similar. Both groups ended up keeping their cultural identity, rendering their deportations as nothing more than a frivolous exercise in cruelty. Secondly, in both cases, after the government felt that conflict was over and the threat was gone, the deportees were ignored and allowed to settle wherever they pleased. Insofar as the fates of the Irish and Acadian deportees are similar, it is important to emphasize that there was one important difference: children. Acadian children were given over to Protestant colonists to be raised. This did not happen in Ireland or Scotland.

¹²¹ Ibid., pp. 155-158.

¹²² LeBlanc, *The Acadian Miracle*, p.156.

G. Opinions of Authors:

In addition to comparing the *Grand Dérangement* to other contemporary events in trying to ascertain if the *Grand Dérangement* was extraordinary in the context of the 18th-century British empire, it is important to consider the opinions of other authors and historians who have attempted, in some form, to address the issue.

Dudley J. LeBlanc was one of the first authors to make an argument for the *Grand Dérangement* as an act of ‘ethnic cleansing’ in his work *The Acadian Miracle* (1966), though he did so before the U.N. officially defined the phrase. LeBlanc states:

England attempted to kill the faith and nationality of the Acadians, failing to do this, she determined to exterminate them as a race by causing them to lose their identity among the English Colonists. Though stripped of their lands, their goods, their guns, their children, and their very names; though lost in the multitudes ‘like leaves of autumn,’ the Acadians were stronger than the enemy.¹²³

His description makes his stance clear: Britain sought to destroy the Acadian people.

However, LeBlanc made no real attempt to compare the deportation of the Acadians to other similar contemporary events, nor did he attempt to compare it to similar cases of modern ‘ethnic cleansing’. Like many before him, LeBlanc focused narrowly on the criminality of the act when passing judgment. He did not seek to address whether the deportation of the Acadians was extraordinary for the time.

In the same year, Bona Arsenault published *History of the Acadians*. In this work he sought to provide an impartial history of the Acadian people. However, he did allude to the illegality of the removal of the Acadians:

¹²³ Ibid., p. 365.

No English law of the time carried provisions for the confiscation of the properties of a father of a family, or the punishment of his wife and children, for an offence that could have been committed by the father. The law provided severe sanctions for political crimes and acts of treason, but never the confiscation of the lands or any other possessions of an entire group of persons and their banishment for any motive whatsoever.¹²⁴

Arsenault did not attempt to compare the event to other similar events of the time. He did, however, make an interesting statement in his conclusion about the context of the Acadian deportations:

With the distance of time, and considering the rude and cruel world in which our ancestors live hundreds of years ago, in comparison to the more civilized conditions which prevail among free men today under our present democratic way of life, one would be expected to meditate on the misfortunes of the Acadians without leaning towards the prejudices of a past which is no more.¹²⁵

In this statement, Arsenault indicates that the norms and conditions of the past may now be set aside to consider the experiences of the Acadians in an unbiased light. Whether he intends for this to lead to the indictment of the British for an act that today would be considered criminal or their absolution given the “rude and cruel” world of the time is not clear.

Three years after LeBlanc and Arsenault, N.E.S. Griffiths published *The Acadian Deportation: Deliberate Perfidy or Cruel Necessity?*, in which she provides the opinion of Guy Fregault, “a distinguished twentieth-century Canadian historian” as “not perhaps the last word, but an apposite last remark”:

¹²⁴ Arsenault, *History of the Acadians*, p. 122.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 240.

Nova Scotia was at war and she was part of an intensive movement for colonization. The expulsion of the Acadians was an episode in this war and in this movement... It was necessary that they should be liberated, assimilated or broke. Liberation was impossible. France was tempted partially to re-conquer the Acadian country, but this effort, begun badly, too late, and with insufficient force, was an abortive disaster. Acadia could only die, either through being exterminated by the conqueror or by continuing to decay slowly, in the sunlight of the British world, and this would, by definition, come to very much the same thing.¹²⁶

Griffiths, through this last remark, puts forth the idea that Acadia, i.e. a Nova Scotia occupied and dominated by Acadians, was destined to die. She does not claim that the deportation of the Acadians was an absolute necessity, but that all possible outcomes led to the same thing, the destruction of Acadia. Griffiths does not say whether the event was extraordinary in this work, but she does imply that the deportation of the Acadians was not just “cruel perfidy” and that it must be viewed in the context of the period’s imperial aspirations.

Geoffrey Plank in *An Unsettled Conquest* (2001) views the *Grand Dérangement* in a very different light. Plank casts the deportation of the Acadians in a context of a British Empire trying to determine what exactly it meant to be a British subject. Plank asserts that the deportation was not just an attempt to assimilate the Acadians and turn them into loyal Protestant British subjects, but also to separate them from the Mi’kmaq thus depriving the Mi’kmaq of their source of supplies and support so that they too might be turned into loyal subjects. Plank does not make any mention of these acts as being ‘ethnic cleansing’.

In a later work, *Rebellion and Savagery* (2006), Plank again addresses the issue of the *Grand Dérangement*. In this work Plank catalogues the influence of the Jacobite Rebellion in 1745 on British imperial policy. He states: “The decision to transport the

¹²⁶ Griffiths, *The Acadian Deportation*, p. 163.

Acadians was made in Nova Scotia, but it represented in many respects the culmination of a set of policy initiations that Cumberland and his officers had supported for years.”¹²⁷ Plank focuses on the context of the event and in doing so he shows how, in the context of the time, the event was not necessarily out of the ordinary.

In his conclusion, John Mack Faragher addresses the comparison of the *Grand Dérangement* to other acts of ‘ethnic cleansing’:

Across the centuries, the similarities are stunning. Before 1755 there were many instances of horrible violence against innocent peoples in North America. But the removal of the Acadians was the first episode of state-sponsored ethnic cleansing in North American history.¹²⁸

Faragher asserts that because the operation included the forced deportation of civilian populations, the cruel and inhumane treatment of prisoners, the plunder and wanton destruction of communities, and was premeditated, the *Grand Dérangement* was an act of ‘ethnic cleansing’ as defined by the Security Council of the United Nations.¹²⁹ This definition states that the purpose of ‘ethnic cleansing’ “appears to be the occupation of territory to the exclusion of the purged group or groups.”¹³⁰ Faragher asserts that because the deportations were followed by government sponsored Protestant settlement the *Grand Dérangement* meets the requirements of ‘ethnic cleansing’. Faragher compares the *Grand Dérangement* to the operations of the Ottoman Turks against the Armenians, the Nazis against the Jews, the Hutu violence in Rwanda, and the like. Faragher admits that mass murder differentiates these instances from the deportation of the Acadians but makes the claim that mass murder “...became a consistent feature in episodes of ‘ethnic cleansing’

¹²⁷ Plank, *Rebellion and Savagery*, p. 164.

¹²⁸ Faragher, *Great and Noble*, p. 473.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 469-473.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*

only after the introduction of industrial weaponry...” as if to imply that the transportation of Acadians, had those responsible had the technology, would possibly have turned into the mass murder of Acadians. In this comparison, Faragher frames the *Grand Dérangement* as an ancestor of modern war crimes somewhere down the family tree in the evolution of military violence. Faragher acknowledges the influence of the Highland clearances in the aftermath of the rebellion of 1745 on the deportation of the Acadians, but views the happenings in Acadia as very different and much worse.

IV. Conclusion

There are many similarities between the deportation of the Jacobites and United Irish rebels and the Acadians. In fact, it can be argued that the idea to attempt to assimilate the Acadians by planting Halifax in their midst, and then the rationale for their deportation, evolved from British military doctrine and government policy practiced in the Highlands of Scotland after the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745. In Scotland, ten years before the *Grand Dérangement*, and in Ireland, forty years after, the cruelty and savagery inflicted upon those perceived to be rebellious subjects by the British government was analogous. The theft of property in all instances seems to be comparable. Even the legal pretexts applied to the three situations were of an equally dubious nature. Moreover, the goal of the British government in each instance seems to have been exactly the same: forced assimilation. However, there are several important differences that make the *Grand Dérangement* extraordinary for the time period.

The government tried to assimilate the Acadians using methods similar to those used in Scotland but with little success. The government then took more drastic measures, the likes of which had been suggested in the Scottish instance ten years before,

but dismissed as too costly. Would the British government have deported entire clans had the cheaper alternative not shown progress? No one can say. However, this is where the *Grand Dérangement* becomes extraordinary. The British government did not deport entire clans in Scotland, nor did the British government deport the entire populations of specific localities in Ireland. Moreover, neither of these other instances of forced transportation involved families. The transportations in Scotland and Ireland involved rebels. This is the most important difference. In addition, the *Grand Dérangement* involved, in some instances, the institutionalized separation of children from their families, which did not occur in the Highlands or Ireland. These differences elevate the *Grand Dérangement* above the Highland Clearances after the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745 and the deportations of United Irishmen after the United Irish Rebellion of 1798. Additionally, the 1,158 to 1,842 Jacobite rebels and 3,450 Irish rebels sent abroad cannot compare to the more than 12,000 Acadian civilians deported. Therefore, the *Grand Dérangement* was extraordinary in the context of the 18th-century British Empire.

V. Bibliography

Primary:

Vattel, Emmerich De, *The Law of Nations: New Edition*, Joseph Chitty ed. (Philadelphia: T. & J.W. Johnson & Co., 1883)

Webster, John Clarence, *The Career of the Abbe le Loutre in Nova Scotia: With a Translation of His Autobiography* (Shediac: privately printed, 1933)

Willard, Abijah, *The Journal of Abijah Willard*, ed. Dr. J.C. Webster (Saint Johns: New Brunswick Historical Society)

Winslow Joshua, *The Journal of Joshua Winslow*, ed. Dr. J.C. Webster, C.M.G. (Sackville: Tribune Press, 1936)

Secondary Acadian:

Arsenault, Bona, *History of the Acadians*. Brian M. Upton and John G., McLaughlin trans. (Quebec: L'Action Sociale Ltee, 1966)

Brebner, John Bartlet, *New England's Outpost: Acadia before the Conquest of Canada* (Columbia: Columbia University Press, 1927)

Brumwell, Stephen, *Redcoats: The British Soldier and War in the Americas, 1755-1763* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)

Daigle, Jean, ed. *The Acadians of the Maritimes: Thematic Studies* (Ottawa: Ministry of Supply & Services, 1982)

Herbert, Timothy. "Maps of Acadia- Acadian and Cajun Genealogy and History" <http://www.acadian-cajun.com/maps.htm> (May, 2011)

Jennings, Francis, *Empire of Fortune: Crowns, Colonies & Tribes in the Seven Years War in America* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1988)

Faragher, John Mack, *A Great and Noble Scheme* (New York: W.W. Norton & co., 2005)

Griffiths, N.E.S., *The Acadian Deportation: Deliberate Perfidy or Cruel Necessity?* (Mississauga: Copp Clark Publishing Co., 1969)

Griffiths, N.E.S., *The Contexts of Acadian History, 1686-1784* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992)

Hornsby, Stephen J., Michael J. Hermann, Matthew Cote cart. "Explanatory Maps of Saint Croix & Acadia - Acadian Deportation, Migration, & Resettlement," <http://umaine.edu/canam/publications/maps/st-croix/acadian-deportation-migration-resettlement/> (March, 2011)

LeBlanc, Dudley J., *The Acadian Miracle* (Lafayette: Evangeline Publishing Co., 1966)

LeBlanc, Robert George, *The Acadian Migrations* (Orono: University of Maine Press, 1962)

Morse, William Inglis, *Acadiensia Nova vol. I* (London: Bernard Quartich Ltd., 1935)

Morse, William Inglis, *Acadiensia Nova vol. II* (London: Bernard Quartich Ltd., 1935)

Peterson, Jean, *The Loyalist Guide: Nova Scotia Loyalists and Their Documents* (Halifax: Nova Scotia Public Archives, 1983)

Richard, Edouard, *Acadia: Missing Links of a Lost Chapter in American History vol. I* (Montreal: John Lovell & Son 1895)

Richard, Edouard, *Acadia: Missing Links of a Lost Chapter in American History vol. II* (Montreal: John Lovell & Son, 1895)

Plank, Geoffrey, *An Unsettled Conquest: The British Campaign Against the Peoples of Acadia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001)

Winzerling, Oscar William, *Acadian Odyssey* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1955)

Secondary Scotland, Ireland, other:

Bartlett, Thomas, Kevin Dawson, and Daire Keogh, *The 1798 Rebellion; An Illustrated History* (Niwot: Roberts Rinehart Publishers, 1998)

Buist, Francis and Katherine Tomasson, *Battles of the '45* (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd., 1962)

Canny, Nicholas, *Making Ireland British 1580-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)

Childs, John, *British Army of William III, 1689-1702* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987)

Durey, Michael, "The Fate of the Rebels after 1798" (London: *History Today*; Vol. 48 Issue 6, p21, 1998)

Forbes, J. Macbeth, *Jacobite Gleanings from State Manuscripts* (Edinburgh: Oliphant Anderson and Ferrier, 1903)

Fulton, John, *The Tragedy of Belief: Division, Politics, and Religion in Ireland* (Wotton-under-Edge: Clarendon Press, 1991)

Grove, Doreen, *Fortress Scotland and the Jacobites* (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd., 1995)

Hartmann, Cyril Hughes, *The Quest Forlorn: The Story of the 'Forty-five* (Portsmouth: William Heinemann Ltd., 1952)

Lenman, Bruce P., *Integration and Enlightenment: Scotland 1746-1832* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1981)

Plank, Geoffrey, *Rebellion and Savagery: The Jacobite Rising of 1745 and British Empire* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006)

Prebble, John, *Culloden* (New York: Atheneum, 1962)

Smyth, Jim ed. *Revolution, Counter-Revolution and Union* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Szechi, Daniel, *1715 The Great Jacobite Rebellion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006)

Taylor, Alistair and Henrietta, *1715: The Story of the Rising* (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1936)

Authors Biography

Derek A. Jones graduated from Hampden Academy in 2007. He began attending the University of Maine in 2008. While at the University of Maine, he was a member of the Phi Kappa Sigma fraternity, served as a Student Senator for three years, was a Dirigo Tour Guide, the Treasurer of the Class of 2011, Secretary of the Inter-Fraternity Council, and was a member of the Order of Omega, Pi Sigma Alpha, and Phi Alpha Theta honor societies. Derek also served as an intern in the Bangor offices of Senator Susan Collins and Representative Mike Michaud.