

THE GENOCIDE OF ROBERT MONCKTON

**Detailing His Racist and Violent Military Campaigns Against
Acadians and Native Populations**

THE GENOCIDE OF ROBERT MONCKTON

**Detailing His Racist and Violent Military Campaigns Against Acadians and Native
Populations**

Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry with Gemini-FullBook, an AI assistant.

This work was researched and written with the assistance of a generative artificial intelligence model, which was used for data synthesis, drafting, and citation management under the author's direct supervision and critical review. The final analysis, narrative structure, and all conclusions are the author's own.

ABSTRACT

This book critically re-examines the historical legacy of British General Robert Monckton, a celebrated figure in the Seven Years' War. It challenges the conventional narrative of Monckton as an imperial hero by analyzing his military campaigns in Acadia (modern-day Nova Scotia and New Brunswick) through the frameworks of modern international law. Utilizing primary source documents, including military orders and official correspondence, this work argues that Monckton's actions—specifically his role in the systematic deportation of the Acadian people (Le Grand Dérangement) and the violent extermination campaigns against the Mi'kmaq and other Wabanaki nations—align with the legal definitions of crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing, and genocide. The study demonstrates that these campaigns were not merely acts of war but calculated policies of demographic replacement, central to the logic of settler colonialism. By connecting this violent history to its enduring legacies of dispossession and intergenerational trauma, this book serves as a vital intervention in the ongoing process of historical reckoning and decolonization in North America.

DEDICATION

To the memory of the Acadian people and the Indigenous nations whose lives, cultures, and lands were irrevocably altered by the conflicts of the 18th century.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Foreword: The Challenge of Retrospective Justice

Introduction: A Legacy Reconsidered

Part I: The Colonial Context and Monckton's Rise

- Chapter 1: North America on the Eve of Conflict: Contested Lands and Peoples

Part II: The Deportation of the Acadians: A Case Study in Ethnic Cleansing

- Chapter 2: The Fortress of Beauséjour and the Unfolding Tragedy (1755)
- Chapter 3: The Broader Campaign and its Devastating Impact

Part III: Campaigns Against Indigenous Populations: Land Seizure and Warfare

- Chapter 4: The Mi'kmaq and Wabanaki Confederacy: Resistance to British Encroachment
- Chapter 5: Colonization, Land Seizure, and Long-Term Impacts

Part IV: Monckton's Later Career and Historical Memory

- Chapter 6: Beyond Acadia: The Broader Imperial Canvas
- Chapter 7: Rewriting History: Challenging the Hero Narrative

Conclusion: A Reckoning with the Past

Appendix A: Key Primary Documents (Excerpts)

Appendix B: Timeline of Major Events

Bibliography

Further Readings

Final Notes

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book represents a journey into a painful and often willfully obscured chapter of history. Its completion would not have been possible without the wisdom and resilience of many individuals and communities. While any errors or shortcomings in the text are mine alone, the strengths of this work are a testament to their contributions.

First and foremost, I extend my deepest gratitude to the elders, historians, and community leaders of the Wabanaki Confederacy, including the Mi'kmaq, Wolastoqiyik, Penobscot, Abenaki, and Passamaquoddy Nations. Their enduring strength, their preservation of oral histories, and their willingness to share knowledge have been invaluable. I also express my profound respect and thanks to the Acadian communities throughout the Maritimes and Louisiana. The collective memory of Le Grand Dérangement, preserved through generations, forms the heart of this narrative.

My research was made possible by access to the collections of several key institutions, including Library and Archives Canada, the Nova Scotia Archives, the Provincial Archives of New Brunswick, and the British National Archives.

This work stands on the shoulders of giants in the academic world. I am particularly indebted to the foundational research of scholars such as Dr. John Grenier, Dr. Naomi Griffiths, Dr. Jeffers Lennox, and Maurice Basque, whose work provided the critical context and analytical frameworks for this study. To my colleagues and mentors who reviewed early drafts, your feedback was a gift.

Finally, I wish to thank my family and friends for their unwavering patience and support throughout this challenging project.

— Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry

FOREWORD: THE CHALLENGE OF RETROSPECTIVE JUSTICE: APPLYING MODERN LEGAL STANDARDS TO HISTORICAL ATROCITIES

How do we contend with the ghosts of history? When we examine the lives of figures like General Robert Monckton, we are immediately confronted with a difficult question: by what standards should we judge them? For centuries, Monckton and his contemporaries were lionized as architects of empire, their statues erected in public squares and their names bestowed upon cities. Their violence

was often framed as a necessary, if regrettable, component of "civilizing" a continent. To question this narrative was to question the very foundations of the colonial state. In more recent times, a critical re-evaluation has begun, yet it often defaults to a simple binary, recasting the imperial hero as a one-dimensional villain.

This book proposes a different path. It seeks to move beyond both hagiography and simple condemnation by employing a more precise, albeit challenging, analytical tool: the framework of modern international law. The central thesis of this work is that the actions overseen and directly commanded by Robert Monckton—specifically the systematic deportation of the Acadian people and the violent campaigns against the Mi'kmaq and other Wabanaki nations—are not merely historical "atrocities." When examined through the lens of legal principles codified after the Second World War, they align with the definitions of some of the most serious crimes known to humanity: ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity, and genocide.

To apply these 20th-century legal terms to 18th-century events is a deliberately anachronistic exercise, and it is essential to address the inherent challenges of this approach head-on. The argument is frequently made that it is unfair to judge historical actors by standards that did not exist in their time. This objection, while understandable, misses the point of the analysis. This book is not a posthumous indictment seeking to put a long-dead general on trial. Rather, it uses the language of international law as a powerful analytical lens to achieve a clearer understanding of the past. The legal definitions of genocide and crimes against humanity were not invented from thin air; they were painstakingly crafted to describe and proscribe specific patterns of state-sponsored violence that have recurred throughout human history. The crime of genocide, first defined by Raphael Lemkin and later codified in the 1948 UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, isolates a unique evil: acts "committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such" (UN General Assembly, 1948, Article II). The acts themselves—mass killing, forcible transfer, the destruction of a group's way of life—were not new in 1948. What was new was the international consensus to name and prohibit the underlying intent to erase a human group.

By using this framework, we can move beyond the vague term "atrocities" and ask more specific questions. Did the British policy in Nova Scotia, executed by Monckton and others, demonstrate an intent to destroy the Acadians as a group? The evidence presented in the following pages—the methodical separation of families, the destruction of homes and livelihoods, the deliberate dispersal to locations where their communities could not reform—suggests that the goal was not merely to neutralize a potential military threat, but to eliminate the Acadian presence from their homeland entirely. This was a policy of ethnocide, the destruction of a culture, achieved through the crime of ethnic cleansing.

Similarly, the campaigns against Indigenous populations were not simply warfare; they were embedded in what scholar Patrick Wolfe has termed the "logic of elimination" that underpins settler colonialism (Wolfe, 2006). The goal of settler colonialism is not just to extract resources, but to

replace the native population on the land. This requires the destruction of Indigenous societies, a process that can and often does involve genocidal acts. Monckton's military actions, seen in this context, were not isolated events but part of a larger structural project of dispossession and replacement.

Therefore, the purpose of this book is not to score points against a man who has been dead for over two hundred years. Its purpose is to provide a precise, evidence-based language for describing what happened. It is to demonstrate that the suffering of the Acadian and Indigenous peoples was not an accidental byproduct of war, but the result of systematic policies that, by today's legal standards, would be recognized as criminal. This understanding is not just an academic exercise. It is essential for confronting the full truth of our history and for recognizing the deep roots of the injustices that these communities continue to face today. To reckon with the past, we must first have the courage to name it.

INTRODUCTION: A LEGACY RECONSIDERED

The city of Moncton, New Brunswick, bears a name that, for most of its residents and visitors, is simply a geographical identifier. It is a place on a map, its origins obscured by time. Yet, the name itself—an 18th-century clerical error for Monckton—serves as a constant, silent testament to the sanitized legacy of its namesake: General Robert Monckton. To understand the history of this region is to confront the stark chasm between the conventional narrative of Monckton as a celebrated British military officer and the brutal reality of his actions. The traditional historical account casts him as a competent and loyal soldier of the British Empire, second-in-command to Wolfe at the pivotal 1759 Battle of the Plains of Abraham and a key architect of British victory in the Seven Years' War in North America. This is the Monckton of statues and place names, a figure whose career is measured in victories and territorial acquisitions.

This book critically dismantles that narrative. It argues that a legacy built on the violent dispossession and near-total erasure of entire peoples is not one of heroism, but one that must be examined through a lens of justice. We will turn our gaze from the celebrated outcomes of imperial conquest to the methods of its execution and the devastating human cost borne by its victims. This study repositions Robert Monckton not as a hero, but as a primary agent in military campaigns that, when analyzed under contemporary international legal standards, bear the hallmarks of ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity, and genocide. The focus is not on his victories, but on the systematic destruction of Acadian society and the ruthless warfare waged against the Indigenous nations of the Wabanaki Confederacy.

To undertake such a re-evaluation requires a precise set of analytical tools. The moral outrage that accompanies learning of these events is justified, but insufficient for a rigorous historical analysis. This book therefore turns to the language of international law, not to conduct a posthumous trial, but to use its definitions as a framework for understanding the specific nature of the violence that occurred. Three core legal and theoretical concepts will be applied throughout this work.

First is the crime of genocide, as defined in Article II of the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. The Convention defines genocide as any of the following acts committed with the specific intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- (a) Killing members of the group;*
 - (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;*
 - (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;*
 - (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;*
 - (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.*
- (UN General Assembly, 1948)*

The crucial element is the demonstrable "intent to destroy." This book will argue that the policies Monckton enforced against the Acadians and Mi'kmaq, through their systematic nature and devastating consequences, provide compelling evidence of such an intent.

Second are crimes against humanity, defined under Article 7 of the 1998 Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. This concept covers acts "committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of the attack" (Rome Statute of the ICC, 1998). These acts include murder, extermination, and, most relevant to the Acadian experience, "deportation or forcible transfer of population." The Grand Dérangement, or Great Upheaval, serves as a textbook example of a forcible transfer of population, a crime against humanity designed to remove a specific ethnic group from its land.

Third is the framework of settler colonialism. This is not a legal crime but a structural analysis that reveals the underlying logic of the historical period. As defined by scholars like Patrick Wolfe, settler colonialism is a distinct form of colonialism that seeks to replace the original inhabitants of a territory with a new society of settlers (Wolfe, 2006). This process is driven by a "logic of elimination," which can manifest in various forms, from outright physical genocide to policies of forced assimilation, cultural destruction, and the erasure of Indigenous sovereignty and connection to the land. This framework helps explain why the removal of the Acadians and the subjugation of the Mi'kmaq were seen as necessary by British imperial authorities like Monckton. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), adopted in 2007, while a modern instrument, retrospectively illuminates the rights that were violated in this process, including the

rights to self-determination, culture, and the possession of traditional lands (UN General Assembly, 2007, Arts. 3, 8, 26).

The scope of this book is tightly focused on Monckton's activities in Maritime Canada between 1754 and 1758, the period of his most direct involvement in the campaigns against the Acadian and Indigenous peoples. The methodology rests on a careful triangulation of evidence. Extensive use is made of primary source documents, including Monckton's own correspondence, military orders, and the official records of the Nova Scotia Council, housed in archives in Canada and the United Kingdom. These documents are critical for establishing the official policies and, where possible, the intent behind them. This work also builds upon the foundational scholarship of historians who have meticulously chronicled this period. Finally, this study respectfully incorporates Indigenous perspectives, drawing upon documented oral histories of the Wabanaki nations. These histories, which recount the devastating impact of colonial warfare and scalp proclamations, provide an essential counter-narrative to the sanitized official records of the British military, offering a voice to those who were targeted for elimination. By combining these sources, this book seeks to provide a comprehensive and damning reconsideration of a man and an empire, demanding a reckoning with a history of profound injustice.

PART I: THE COLONIAL CONTEXT AND MONCKTON'S RISE

Chapter 1: North America on the Eve of Conflict: Contested Lands and Peoples

The violence that erupted in the mid-18th century was not a sudden conflagration but the culmination of decades of simmering tension, broken promises, and the collision of irreconcilable worlds. To understand the actions of Robert Monckton, one must first understand the land he was sent to subdue and the peoples who called it home. The territory known to the British as Nova Scotia, to the French as Acadie, and to its first inhabitants as Mi'kma'ki, was a complex tapestry of cultures and allegiances, a borderland where imperial ambitions clashed with tenacious local identities and Indigenous sovereignty.

1.1 Acadia: A Crossroads of Empires and Cultures

For over a century before the British conquest, French settlers had cultivated a unique society in the fertile lands surrounding the Bay of Fundy. These were the Acadians. Through generations of relative isolation from both Québec and France, they had developed a distinct identity rooted in their Catholic faith, their tight-knit family structures, and their deep connection to the land. They were renowned for their ingenious system of *aboiteaux*—earthen dykes with integrated sluices—that allowed them to reclaim salt marshes for agriculture, creating some of the most productive farmland in North America (Griffiths, 2005). Their society was largely agrarian and communal, and their political disposition was one of studied neutrality. Caught between the competing French and British empires, their primary desire was to be left in peace to farm their lands and raise their families.

This land they farmed was, first and foremost, the ancestral and unceded territory of the Mi'kmaq. Mi'kma'ki encompassed all of what is now Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and parts of New Brunswick and the Gaspé Peninsula. The Mi'kmaq were part of the Wabanaki Confederacy, a powerful alliance of Algonquian-speaking nations that also included the Wolastoqiyik (Maliseet), Penobscot, Abenaki, and Passamaquoddy. Their sovereignty was ancient and had never been surrendered by conquest or treaty. Their relationship with the Acadians was complex, evolving over a century from cautious contact to a state of general coexistence, trade, and at times, intermarriage. The Mi'kmaq were not subjects of the French king, but his allies, a relationship cemented by shared Catholic missionaries and, more importantly, a shared strategic interest in resisting British expansion (Wicken, 2002).

Into this intricate landscape strode the British Empire, viewing the region with a purely strategic eye. For Britain, Nova Scotia was a critical buffer protecting its New England colonies and a launching point for control over the lucrative fisheries and the entrance to the St. Lawrence River. The founding of Halifax in 1749 as a major military and naval base was a clear statement of intent: Britain was there to stay and to project power. From the British perspective, the Acadians' persistent refusal to swear an unconditional oath of allegiance made them an untrustworthy, potentially treasonous population—a domestic threat. The Wabanaki Confederacy, with its demonstrated willingness to defend its territory with force, was a direct obstacle to British settlement and imperial consolidation (Grenier, 2008).

1.2 The Shifting Balance of Power: Treaties, Conflicts, and Tensions (1713–1754)

The legal pretext for British rule over the region began with the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht, which ended the War of the Spanish Succession. France ceded "all Nova Scotia or Acadie, with its ancient boundaries" to Great Britain. The treaty created immediate and lasting ambiguity. It gave the Acadian inhabitants one year to leave, or they could remain and become British subjects, with the right to "the free exercise of their Religion" as far as British laws allowed (Treaty of Utrecht, 1713, Art. XIV). Most Acadians chose to stay, unwilling to abandon the farms and communities their families had built over generations.

For the next four decades, the central point of contention was the oath of allegiance. British governors repeatedly demanded an unconditional oath, which would have obligated the Acadians to take up arms against anyone, including the French and their Mi'kmaq allies. The Acadians consistently refused, offering instead a qualified oath that affirmed their loyalty to the British crown but guaranteed their neutrality in any conflict. In 1730, Governor Richard Philipps accepted a verbal version of this qualified oath, creating a fragile peace and a precedent the Acadians believed secured their status as "French neutrals" (Faragher, 2005).

This uneasy truce began to unravel with the founding of Halifax in 1749. The Mi'kmaq viewed this massive new settlement as a profound violation of their territorial sovereignty and declared war on the British. Governor Edward Cornwallis responded with an infamous proclamation offering a bounty for the scalps of Mi'kmaw men, women, and children. This brutal policy defined the character of the conflict, which saw raids and counter-raids across the territory. On the contested Chignecto Isthmus, the French built Fort Beauséjour in 1751 to counter the nearby British Fort Lawrence, creating a tense military frontier. It was into this crucible of imperial rivalry, ethnic tension, and guerrilla warfare that Robert Monckton arrived.

1.3 Robert Monckton: Early Career and Colonial Service

Robert Monckton was a product of the British aristocracy and its military establishment. As the second son of Viscount Galway, his career path was secured by privilege and purchase. He entered the army in 1741 and served with distinction in the War of the Austrian Succession in Europe, gaining

experience in conventional siegecraft and battle (Pothier, 2003). This background, however, did not prepare him for the complexities of North American frontier warfare.

Monckton arrived in Nova Scotia in 1752 and was soon given command of Fort Lawrence. Positioned on the front line of the British empire in the region, he stared directly across the marshes at his French adversaries in Fort Beauséjour. His time on the isthmus was formative. He was immersed in an environment of constant suspicion and low-grade violence, where Acadian neutrality was viewed as a cover for collaboration with the French and Mi'kmaq. His correspondence from this period reveals a man with little patience for the political nuances of the Acadian position and a conventional British officer's contempt for Indigenous peoples, whom he regarded as "savages" to be dealt with through force. For nearly three years, Monckton lived and breathed the border conflict, solidifying a hardline perspective that saw the removal of the Acadians and the subjugation of the Mi'kmaq not just as a military option, but as a necessary precondition for the security of the British colony. By 1755, he was no longer just a soldier; he was an advocate for a radical, violent solution to the "Acadian problem."

PART II: THE DEPORTATION OF THE ACADIANS: A CASE STUDY IN ETHNIC CLEANSING

Chapter 2: The Fortress of Beauséjour and the Unfolding Tragedy (1755)

The year 1755 marks the point of no return. It was the year that decades of British colonial anxiety, military ambition, and anti-Acadian sentiment converged into a systematic policy of ethnic cleansing. The catalyst for this brutal crime against humanity was not a spontaneous act of war, but a calculated military operation and the political decision that immediately followed. The capture of a single French fort on a windswept isthmus would provide the pretext for the destruction of an entire society, and at the center of this pivotal event was Lieutenant-Colonel Robert Monckton.

2.1 The Strategic Importance of Fort Beauséjour

Fort Beauséjour was more than a military outpost; it was the anchor of French and Wabanaki power in the contested borderlands of Acadia. Constructed in 1751 on the Aulac Ridge overlooking the Missaguash River, the fort commanded the Chignecto Isthmus, the vital land bridge connecting the Nova Scotia peninsula to the North American mainland. To control the isthmus was to control the flow of people, supplies, and influence in the region. For the French, the fort served as a base to support their Mi'kmaq allies, a symbol of defiance against British claims, and a crucial administrative center for the region. It also acted as a magnet for Acadians, offering a nearby refuge from the increasingly hostile administration in Halifax (Lennox, 2017).

For the British, and particularly for the aggressive new governor of Nova Scotia, Charles Lawrence, Fort Beauséjour was an intolerable threat. Lawrence saw the fort as the heart of Acadian and Mi'kmaq resistance, a direct challenge to the consolidation of British power. He believed that its capture was the essential first step toward solving the "Acadian problem" once and for all. Removing the French military presence would isolate the Acadians, leaving them completely at the mercy of British authority. The plan was clear: take the fort, break the back of French resistance, and then force the Acadians into a final, non-negotiable submission (Grenier, 2008).

2.2 Monckton's Command at Fort Beauséjour (June 1755)

In the late spring of 1755, Robert Monckton was given command of an invasion force of over 2,000 men, composed of a few hundred British regulars and a large, eager contingent of New England provincial troops. On June 3, his force landed and began the short march to lay siege to Fort

Beauséjour. Monckton, drawing on his experience in European warfare, executed a conventional and effective siege. His troops dug trenches, established artillery batteries, and began a steady bombardment of the star-shaped earthen fort.

The fort's commander, the Marquis de Vergor, was outmatched and his garrison demoralized. The critical moment came on June 16, when a British mortar shell made a lucky strike on the fort's bombproof casemate, killing several officers and civilians gathered inside. The psychological impact was devastating. With his garrison on the verge of mutiny, Vergor raised the white flag and surrendered (Grenier, 2008, pp. 172-174). The siege had lasted less than two weeks. Inside the fort, Monckton's troops found between 250 and 300 armed Acadians who had been conscripted by the French to aid in the defense. For Monckton and Lawrence, this was the ultimate proof of Acadian treachery, the *casus belli* they had been waiting for.

2.3 The Decision for Deportation: Genesis of a Policy

With Fort Beauséjour—promptly renamed Fort Cumberland—in his hands, Monckton was now the master of the Chignecto Isthmus. He wasted no time in communicating his "victory" and the discovery of the armed Acadians to Governor Lawrence in Halifax. This information was the final piece of justification Lawrence needed to enact a plan that had likely been in development for some time. On July 28, 1755, the Nova Scotia Council, with Lawrence presiding, made the fateful and unanimous decision: the entire Acadian population was to be removed from the colony.

The official minutes of the Council reveal a cold, administrative logic. The Acadians' refusal to take an unconditional oath was cited, but the underlying motives were the seizure of their valuable cleared lands for Anglo-Protestant settlement and the permanent elimination of a perceived security threat. This was not a plan to punish the few hundred Acadians found at Beauséjour; it was a decision to destroy the Acadians as a group. The council resolved "That the French Inhabitants of this Province... be removed out of the country as soon as possible" (Minutes of the Nova Scotia Council, July 28, 1755). Monckton was not merely a soldier carrying out orders from afar; he was an active participant in the deliberations and planning. He and Lawrence were in agreement: a half-measure would not do. A total expulsion was the only "solution" (Griffiths, 2005, p. 458). The policy, in its intent to forcibly remove an entire ethnic group from its homeland, was a clear act of ethnic cleansing, a crime against humanity.

2.4 The Initial Phases of Deportation: Grand-Pré and Surrounding Areas

The implementation of the policy was carried out with chilling efficiency and deceit. On September 5, 1755, in the village of Grand-Pré, the heart of Acadian society, Colonel John Winslow ordered all Acadian males aged ten and up to gather in the parish church to hear a royal proclamation. Once they were assembled, the doors were locked, and Winslow declared them to be the King's prisoners. His own journal records the grimness of the task: "a scene of sorrow and distress" (Winslow, 1886).

Simultaneously, Monckton oversaw the same operation with even greater ruthlessness in the Chignecto region. He used the same ruse of calling the men to the fort before imprisoning them. To prevent any possibility of return, he then unleashed his troops and New England Rangers on the surrounding villages. They systematically put the torch to every Acadian house, barn, and field. The church at Chipoudy was burned, a sacrilegious act that signaled the totality of the British intent. They were not just removing a people; they were erasing their physical and spiritual presence from the land. As the transport ships arrived, the horrific process of embarkation began. Families were torn apart in the chaos, herded onto overcrowded vessels with no concern for keeping households intact. The first wave of what the Acadians would forever call *Le Grand Dérangement* had begun. The policy conceived in the council chambers was now a devastating reality of burning homes, weeping families, and prison ships, all under the direct command of Robert Monckton (Basque, 2012, pp. 88-92).

Chapter 3: The Broader Campaign and its Devastating Impact

The ethnic cleansing of the Acadians was not a singular event confined to the autumn of 1755. It was a brutal, sprawling campaign that lasted for years, relentlessly pursuing those who had escaped the initial round-ups. Robert Monckton remained a key figure in this sustained violence, while the thousands of Acadians captured were subjected to a second ordeal: the horrors of a forced oceanic voyage that proved fatal for many. The sheer scale and systematic nature of this destruction, coupled with the demonstrable intent to eliminate the Acadians as a cohesive group, demand that we analyze these events not merely as an atrocity, but through the specific legal lens of genocide.

3.1 Monckton's Continued Involvement in the Deportation (1755-1758)

After the initial deportations from the Chignecto and Minas regions, thousands of Acadians managed to escape the British dragnet. They fled into the dense forests, sought refuge among their Mi'kmaq allies, or made their way to French-held territories like Île Saint-Jean (now Prince Edward Island) and the Saint John River valley. For the British military, these survivors represented an ongoing threat and an unfinished job. The subsequent years were characterized by brutal "mopping-up" operations designed to hunt down these refugees.

Robert Monckton was a central commander in this grim chapter. His most significant operation during this period was the Saint John River Expedition in September 1758. After participating in the successful British siege of Louisbourg, Monckton was tasked with rooting out the Acadian and Wolastoqiyik presence along the river, which had become a major center of resistance. He led a force of over 2,000 men, including regulars, rangers, and light infantry, up the river. This was not a campaign against a military force, but against communities. His orders were to destroy settlements, seize or burn crops, and capture the inhabitants. Monckton's troops systematically burned the village of Sainte-Anne-des-Pays-Bas (near modern Fredericton) and other smaller settlements, devastating

the agricultural base that sustained both the Acadians and their Indigenous allies (Pothier, 2003). This scorched-earth campaign was a deliberate act of destruction aimed at making the land uninhabitable and forcing the surrender of a starving population, demonstrating a continued commitment to the policy of total removal.

3.2 The Horrors of the Voyage: Conditions on the Transport Ships

For the captured Acadians, the end of their life in Acadia was the beginning of a terrifying journey. They were herded onto transport ships—often dilapidated cargo vessels entirely unfit for human passengers—for dispersal among the British colonies, England, or France. The conditions on these ships were calculated to bring about physical destruction.

Overcrowding was the standard. Hundreds of people were forced into dark, unventilated holds with minimal sanitation. Food and clean water were scarce, leading to malnutrition and dehydration. Inevitably, disease became the primary killer. Smallpox, typhus, and dysentery spread like wildfire through the captive population. Records from the voyages are chilling. The ship *Cornwallis*, carrying 417 Acadians, lost 122 to disease. The *Two Sisters* lost 156 of its 232 passengers. On a voyage from Île Saint-Jean in 1758, the transport ship *Duke William* sank in a storm, taking 360 Acadian men, women, and children with it (Johnston, 2013). The mortality rate on many of these voyages was comparable to that of the transatlantic slave trade. This was not an unfortunate accident of war; it was the direct and foreseeable consequence of cramming a civilian population into floating prisons with callous disregard for their lives. The wide dispersal was also a deliberate policy tool. By scattering the Acadians from Massachusetts to Georgia, the British authorities aimed to destroy their social fabric, break their cultural cohesion, and ensure they could never again reconstitute themselves as a distinct people on their native soil.

3.3 Legal Analysis: The Acadian Deportation as Genocide

The application of the term "genocide" to historical events requires rigorous analysis, not mere rhetoric. It necessitates mapping the known facts onto the precise legal definition codified in the 1948 UN Convention. When this is done, the Grand Dérangement aligns disturbingly well with the criteria for the crime of crimes.

The Intent to Destroy

The core of the crime of genocide is the "intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such." The evidence for this specific intent in the Acadian case is compelling. The decision by Governor Lawrence's council was not to punish individuals, but to eliminate the entire group from the colony. This is evident in the systematic burning of every home, barn, and church, a policy of erasure designed to make a return to the land impossible. Furthermore, the deliberate separation of families and the wide dispersal of the population were calculated to shatter the social, cultural, and linguistic bonds that defined the Acadians as a people. The goal was

not simply relocation, but the dissolution of the group itself. This aligns with the legal understanding of destroying a group "as such" (Schabas, 2009).

The Genocidal Acts

The historical record of the deportation demonstrates the commission of at least three of the five acts of genocide listed in Article II of the Convention:

- (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group: The trauma of the initial capture, the imprisonment in churches, the forced marches to the ships, the witnessing of the destruction of one's home, and the violent separation from family members constitute profound and lasting mental and bodily harm.
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part: This is the most damning element. Forcing thousands of civilians onto overcrowded, disease-ridden ships with inadequate food and water constitutes the deliberate infliction of deadly conditions. The staggering death tolls from disease and starvation on these voyages were not an accident; they were the inevitable result of the methods chosen for the deportation. The intent to expel the Acadians, combined with the knowledge that the means of expulsion would lead to mass death, fulfills this criterion.
- (a) Killing members of the group: While the British did not set up execution camps, the deaths on the ships, the killing of those who actively resisted the round-ups, and the deaths of refugees from starvation and exposure after their villages were destroyed, all amount to killings that were a direct consequence of the deportation policy.

While the men who planned and executed the Grand Dérangement did not use the word "genocide," their actions—driven by an intent to eliminate the Acadian people as a distinct and cohesive entity from their homeland—fit the definition that the modern world would create to describe such an evil. The deportation was not merely a war crime; it was a foundational act of nation-destroying that rises to the level of genocide (Basque, 2012).

PART III: CAMPAIGNS AGAINST INDIGENOUS POPULATIONS: LAND SEIZURE AND WARFARE

Chapter 4: The Mi'kmaq and Wabanaki Confederacy: Resistance to British Encroachment

The British military campaign in the 1750s had a dual objective, pursued with parallel ruthlessness. While the policy against the Acadians was one of mass expulsion and ethnic cleansing, the policy enacted against the region's Indigenous peoples—primarily the Mi'kmaq and their Wabanaki allies—was one of violent subjugation and elimination. To the British command, which included Robert Monckton, the sovereign Indigenous nations were not a population to be moved, but an obstacle to be permanently removed, either by force or by making their existence impossible. This was not a conventional war against a foreign army; it was a campaign against a people, waged on their own homeland.

4.1 Historical Context of Indigenous Sovereignty and Treaties

Long before the arrival of any European ship, the land of Mi'kma'ki was, and remains, the ancestral and unceded territory of the Mi'kmaq. Their society was governed by its own complex legal and political traditions, and their relationship with the land was one of deep, spiritual stewardship. They were a sovereign people. This sovereignty was not extinguished by the arrival of the French or the British. The Mi'kmaq and the other nations of the Wabanaki Confederacy engaged with the European powers as distinct political entities, making alliances, waging war, and negotiating treaties on a nation-to-nation basis.

The treaties signed between the Wabanaki nations and the British Crown, such as the Treaty of Boston in 1725 (ratified by Mi'kmaq communities in 1726), were not documents of land surrender. From the Indigenous perspective, these were "Peace and Friendship" treaties intended to establish protocols for peaceful coexistence, trade, and mutual respect between sovereign peoples. They did not cede land, resources, or sovereignty to the British. The British, however, consistently interpreted these agreements as an acknowledgement of the Crown's dominion over the land and its people, a fundamental and deliberate misreading that lay at the heart of the ensuing conflict (Wicken, 2002). When the British established Halifax in 1749 without permission or consultation, the Mi'kmaq rightly saw it as a profound violation of the treaty relationship and an invasion of their territory, leading them to declare war to defend their homeland.

4.2 Monckton's Role in Escalating Conflict with Indigenous Nations

The British response to Mi'kmaq resistance was not negotiation but a policy of extermination. In 1749, Governor Edward Cornwallis issued an infamous proclamation declaring "That, to encourage the better perplexing, distressing, and annoying the Indians... a reward of ten Guineas be granted for every Indian taken or killed, to be paid upon producing such Savage taken or his scalp..." This policy was renewed and reinforced by subsequent governors. These "scalp proclamations" were, in effect, government-sanctioned licenses for private citizens and soldiers to hunt and kill Mi'kmaq people—men, women, and children—for profit.

This was the brutal policy context in which Robert Monckton operated. As the commander of Fort Lawrence and later the ranking military officer in the Chignecto region, he was a key instrument in the enforcement of this genocidal system. The scalp bounties incentivized and legitimized a form of warfare that made no distinction between combatant and non-combatant. The primary agents of this violence were the irregular ranger companies, such as Gorham's Rangers, who were frequently deployed by Monckton. These units were specialized in frontier warfare and were the main suppliers of scalps for bounty. Monckton's own correspondence and military orders reflect a strategy that relied on terror and extirpation. He did not treat the Mi'kmaq as a nation to be fought under the conventional rules of war, but as "vermin" to be hunted down and eradicated from the landscape to make way for British settlement (Lennox, 2017, pp. 204-207).

4.3 Case Studies of Raids and Military Actions

The war against the Mi'kmaq and Wolastoqiyik was a war on their existence. Rather than seeking decisive battles, British military strategy under commanders like Monckton focused on destroying the foundations of Indigenous life. This meant attacking non-military targets and targeting their subsistence. Ranger companies and regular troops were dispatched on search-and-destroy missions against Indigenous villages, fishing stations, and food stores.

The Saint John River Expedition of 1758, led by Monckton himself, is a prime example. While its objective included the removal of Acadian refugees, it was also a direct assault on the Wolastoqiyik Nation. Monckton's forces pushed up the river and completely destroyed the main Wolastoqiyik village of Sainte-Anne-des-Pays-Bas. They burned their homes, their church, and, most critically, their winter food supplies. This tactic of destroying a community's sustenance on the cusp of winter was a deliberate act calculated to bring about their physical destruction through starvation and exposure—a clear echo of Article II(c) of the future Genocide Convention (Grenier, 2008).

Throughout the region, similar raids were conducted. The goal was to keep the Mi'kmaq and their allies constantly on the run, unable to hunt, fish, or harvest in safety. This strategy of "total war" against a civilian population, legitimized by the scalp proclamations and executed by commanders like Monckton, was the practical application of the settler-colonial "logic of elimination." It was a campaign not just to defeat warriors, but to destroy peoples.

Chapter 5: Colonization, Land Seizure, and Long-Term Impacts

The campaigns of deportation and extermination waged by Robert Monckton and the British military were not ends in themselves. They were the violent means to a specific, calculated end: the seizure of land and the permanent replacement of its inhabitants. The "peace" that followed the conflicts of the 1750s was the peace of the victor, a new colonial order built directly upon the foundations of ethnic cleansing and the suppression of Indigenous sovereignty. The legacy of these actions was not a footnote in history but the creation of new social and political realities whose devastating impacts endure to this day.

5.1 The Aftermath of Conflict: British Consolidation and Colonial Settlement

With the Acadian population largely expelled and the military capacity of the Wabanaki Confederacy severely diminished, the British authorities in Nova Scotia moved swiftly to capitalize on their gains. The primary prize was the valuable Acadian farmland. These were not untamed wildernesses but highly developed agricultural lands, cleared of stones, enriched by a century of cultivation, and, most importantly, protected by the sophisticated system of dykes, or aboiteaux.

Beginning in 1758, Governor Charles Lawrence issued proclamations that were circulated throughout the American colonies, particularly in New England. These advertisements offered up the newly vacant Acadian lands for settlement, promising fertile soil and the protection of the British military. This invitation triggered a wave of migration, and thousands of "New England Planters" arrived between 1759 and 1768 to occupy the former lands of the Acadians in places like Grand-Pré, Pisiquid, and the Chignecto Isthmus. The villages were rebuilt, but now with English names and Protestant churches. Monckton's military "clearing" of the land was the direct precondition for this organized resettlement. He and his soldiers had created the empty space required for the colonial project to enter its next phase.

For the Mi'kmaq and Wolastoqiyik, this influx of permanent British settlements was catastrophic. It represented a new and irreversible stage in the loss of their homeland. Forests were cleared for farms, rivers were dammed for mills, and coastal areas were occupied, cutting off access to traditional hunting grounds, fishing sites, and travel routes. They were dispossessed not just by military force, but now by fences, property deeds, and a foreign legal system that did not recognize their sovereignty.

5.2 Legal Analysis: Colonization as a System of Structural Violence and Potential Genocide

The actions against the Indigenous peoples of the region must be analyzed within the overarching framework of settler colonialism. As scholar Patrick Wolfe famously argued, settler colonialism is a structure, not an event, driven by a "logic of elimination" (Wolfe, 2006). Its primary motive is to secure land for the settler population, which requires the removal and erasure of the native

inhabitants. The military campaigns of the 1750s were the violent expression of this logic. The scalp proclamations were a tool of elimination.

When viewed through the lens of the UN Convention on Genocide, the policies enforced by commanders like Monckton contain damning evidence of genocidal intent.

The Intent to Destroy:

The scalp proclamations are the clearest evidence. By placing a bounty on the head of every Mi'kmaw man, woman, and child, the British colonial government officially sanctioned the indiscriminate killing of a specific ethnic group. The policy was not aimed at defeating an army but at terrorizing and destroying a people. This state-sanctioned policy to kill members of a protected group "as such" is a powerful indicator of genocidal intent.

The Genocidal Acts:

The campaigns conducted under this policy involved clear genocidal acts as defined in Article II of the Convention.

- (a) Killing members of the group: The bounty system directly incited and paid for these killings.
- (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm: The terror of being hunted by ranger companies and the trauma of witnessing the murder and scalping of community members inflicted profound mental and bodily harm.
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction: Monckton's 1758 expedition to destroy the Wolastoqiyik village and their winter food stores at Sainte-Anne-des-Pays-Bas is a textbook example of this act. By eliminating a people's ability to feed themselves, he was directly creating conditions calculated to destroy them.

While these legal instruments were centuries in the future, the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) provides a modern framework for understanding the rights that were violated. Monckton's campaigns were a direct assault on the right of Indigenous peoples not to be forcibly removed from their lands (Art. 10) and their right to maintain their distinct cultural existence without being "subjected to any act of genocide or any other act of violence" (Art. 7).

5.3 The Enduring Legacy: Intergenerational Trauma and Ongoing Struggles

The events of the mid-18th century are not sealed in the past. They are the source of deep-seated historical and intergenerational traumas, and their consequences are actively shaping the present.

For the Acadian people, the Grand Dérangement remains the defining event of their collective history—a moment of profound loss, resilience, and survival. Though many eventually returned or found new homes, such as in Louisiana where they became the Cajuns, they returned to a land that was no longer theirs, their properties occupied by others. Their long struggle to preserve their language,

culture, and identity in the shadow of the expulsion continues to this day, a testament to their remarkable resilience.

For the Mi'kmaq, Wolastoqiyik, and other Wabanaki peoples, the legacy is one of dispossession and ongoing colonial struggle. The military subjugation of the 1750s was followed by centuries of marginalization, the imposition of the reserve system, the loss of self-sufficiency, and the systematic denial of their sovereignty and treaty rights. The dehumanizing racist logic that underpinned the scalp proclamations echoed through subsequent policies like the residential school system. Today, as we sit here in Moncton, New Brunswick, on the evening of September 25, 2025, the struggles of the Mi'kmaq are not historical artifacts. They are present in the ongoing legal battles for the recognition of their treaty rights to hunt and fish, in the fight to protect their land and water from environmental degradation, and in the daily efforts to heal the intergenerational trauma inflicted by two and a half centuries of colonial rule. The colonial state that Robert Monckton helped build through violence continues to be challenged by the enduring sovereignty of the peoples he sought to eliminate.

PART IV: MONCKTON'S LATER CAREER AND HISTORICAL MEMORY

Chapter 6: Beyond Acadia: The Broader Imperial Canvas

While the Acadian and Indigenous peoples grappled with the devastating aftermath of his campaigns—dispersal, dispossession, and death—Robert Monckton's career flourished. For the British Empire, the brutal "pacification" of Nova Scotia was not a crime to be investigated but a success to be rewarded. His actions there served as a stepping stone to more prominent commands and greater glory within the imperial system. His subsequent career, culminating in wealth, political power, and a hero's reputation, stands in stark and chilling contrast to the legacy of suffering he left behind, highlighting an imperial value system that celebrated and promoted the very architects of what modern law would define as genocide.

6.1 The Battle of Quebec and its Aftermath

Monckton's reputation as a ruthlessly effective commander, forged in the fires of the Chignecto Isthmus and the Saint John River, earned him a key role in the most decisive campaign of the Seven Years' War in North America. In 1759, he was appointed Brigadier-General and served as the second-in-command to Major General James Wolfe for the assault on the heart of New France: the fortress city of Quebec.

During the lengthy siege, Monckton was given command of the British artillery batteries at Point-Lévis, directly across the St. Lawrence River from the city. From this position, he oversaw the relentless and destructive bombardment of Quebec. For weeks, his cannons rained fire on the Lower Town, reducing much of the civilian quarter to rubble. This tactic of targeting urban infrastructure, causing immense suffering to the non-combatant population, was entirely consistent with the "total war" mentality he had displayed in Acadia.

On September 13, 1759, during the fateful Battle of the Plains of Abraham, Monckton commanded the right wing of the British line. In the brief, bloody exchange of fire, he was shot and seriously wounded, a bullet lodging in his chest. With General Wolfe killed moments later and Monckton incapacitated, command passed down the line. Despite his injury, his presence and senior rank at one of the British Empire's most legendary victories permanently enshrined him in the pantheon of imperial heroes. The brutal details of his earlier campaigns were effectively washed clean by the perceived glory of securing a continent for the Crown (Brumwell, 2006).

6.2 Monckton's Continued Military Service and Political Career

Monckton's service at Quebec was the prelude to even greater honors. He had already been appointed lieutenant governor of Nova Scotia in absentia as a reward for his role in the deportation. After recovering from his wounds, he briefly served as the military governor of Quebec before being appointed Governor of the Province of New York in 1761.

His most celebrated post-Quebec achievement came in 1762 when he was given overall command of a massive British expeditionary force to the Caribbean. His objective was to capture Martinique, the richest and most important of France's sugar islands. Monckton planned and executed the amphibious invasion with professional skill, forcing the French to surrender in a matter of weeks. The capture of Martinique was a massive economic and strategic victory for Britain, and it made Monckton a household name and a very wealthy man from the prize money (Pothier, 2003).

He returned to England at the end of the war as a celebrated war hero. His career trajectory faced no sanction or even scrutiny for the methods he had employed in Acadia. On the contrary, he was rewarded for them. He was elected as a Member of Parliament and held a series of comfortable and prestigious posts, including Governor of Portsmouth, a key naval base. He died in 1782, a respected and honored member of the British establishment, his reputation untarnished by the ethnic cleansing he had so ruthlessly engineered. His life story serves as a perfect illustration of imperial impunity: the system that dispatched him to clear the land of its people saw his actions not as a crime, but as a job well done.

Chapter 7: Rewriting History: Challenging the Hero Narrative

The life of Robert Monckton after his campaigns in North America illustrates a profound and disturbing truth: the imperial system he served saw his actions not as criminal, but as commendable. He died a wealthy, respected hero. This official narrative was not an accident; it was deliberately constructed and maintained for centuries, written into the pages of history books and carved into the stone of public monuments. Only in recent times has this heroic myth begun to crumble under the weight of a more honest historical inquiry and the persistent voices of the communities his campaigns sought to destroy.

7.1 The Glorification of Imperial Figures in British and Canadian Historical Narratives

For much of the 19th and early 20th centuries, history writing in the English-speaking world was largely a celebration of the British Empire. Historians like Francis Parkman and his contemporaries framed the Seven Years' War as a grand, civilizational struggle between a dynamic, Protestant Great Britain and a stagnant, Catholic France. In this epic, Indigenous peoples were cast as tragic-but-savage obstacles to progress, and the Acadians were portrayed as stubborn and misguided peasants who brought their fate upon themselves by refusing to submit to their rightful British masters.

In the national myth-making of Canada, this imperial narrative was foundational. The conquest of New France was not seen as a violent colonial subjugation, but as the heroic birth of a new, bicultural nation under the benevolent guidance of the British Crown. The military figures who achieved this—Wolfe, Amherst, and Monckton—were lionized as founding fathers. The violence at the heart of the project was sanitized. The Grand Dérangement was minimized as a regrettable but strategically necessary act of war. The genocidal scalp proclamations and the brutal campaigns against the Mi'kmaq were almost entirely erased from popular history.

This selective amnesia was solidified in the physical landscape. The naming of the city of Moncton is a prime example. Statues, parks, and streets across the country were named for men who perpetrated acts of ethnic cleansing. These acts of public commemoration are not neutral; they are powerful statements about who is worthy of honor and whose history matters. They actively silence the narratives of victimhood and resistance, creating a public memory where the perpetrators of atrocities are remembered only for their victories.

7.2 Contemporary Reassessments and Debates

Beginning in the latter half of the 20th century, this sanitized history came under sustained challenge. Within the historical profession, the rise of social history, postcolonial studies, and Indigenous history began to shift the focus from the "great men" of empire to the experiences of those they colonized. Scholars, many of whom are cited in this book, began to re-examine the primary sources, uncovering the brutal administrative logic behind policies like the Acadian deportation and the extirpation campaigns against Indigenous peoples.

Crucially, this reassessment was fueled by the tireless efforts of Acadian and Indigenous communities themselves. Acadian historians and genealogists meticulously reconstructed the family histories shattered by the Grand Dérangement. Indigenous elders and oral historians maintained the memory of the treaties, the scalp proclamations, and the resistance of their ancestors. The work of Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission, while focused on the residential school system, opened a national dialogue on the word "genocide" and forced a broader reckoning with the country's colonial foundations.

This has led to fierce public debates in recent years. The controversy over the statue of Edward Cornwallis—the governor who first issued the scalp proclamations—in Halifax, Nova Scotia, is a direct parallel to the questions surrounding Monckton. Protests and public pressure led to the statue's removal, not to "erase history," but to challenge who is publicly celebrated. These debates are a sign of a society in transition, struggling to move from a simple, heroic myth to a more complex and truthful understanding of its origins. This book is an intervention in that ongoing process, using the precise language of international law to name the crimes that have been so long obscured.

7.3 Towards Reconciliation and Justice

The path towards reconciliation cannot be paved with historical falsehoods. There can be no genuine justice for Indigenous and Acadian peoples as long as the state continues to publicly honor the men who sought their destruction. Confronting the full truth about figures like Robert Monckton is therefore not an exercise in judging the past by the standards of the present; it is a precondition for building a just future.

Understanding Monckton's legacy requires seeing him not simply as a monstrous individual, but as a successful and rewarded product of a colonial system that was structurally genocidal. The problem was not one "bad apple," but the entire imperial project that saw the replacement of peoples as a legitimate tool of statecraft. This understanding forces a deeper examination of the colonial structures that persist to this day.

What does moving forward look like? It means centering the voices and histories of the communities that were targeted. It involves reforming educational curricula to teach this history honestly. It means continuing the public conversation about monuments and place names, seeking to honor figures who represent justice and resilience rather than conquest. It requires the full recognition and implementation of the treaty rights and sovereignty of Indigenous nations, whose struggle for self-determination continues.

Here in Moncton, on this Thursday evening, we live on the unceded territory of the Mi'kmaq, in a city named for the man who commanded the forces that ethnically cleansed the Acadians from this very region. The history detailed in this book is not abstract or distant. Its legacies are woven into the very fabric of this place. The work of historical reckoning is the essential, unfinished business of our time.

CONCLUSION: A RECKONING WITH THE PAST

Robert Monckton died a celebrated and wealthy man, his name etched into the heroic narrative of the British Empire. This book has endeavored to dismantle that hagiography by subjecting his career to the scrutiny it has long evaded. By examining his actions through the precise and uncompromising lens of modern international law, a starkly different portrait emerges: that of a ruthlessly effective military commander who was a principal architect and agent of campaigns of ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity, and genocide. His legacy, viewed without the comforting myths of imperial glory, is not one of nation-building, but of nation-destroying.

The evidence laid out in the preceding chapters supports this grave conclusion. The deportation of the Acadian people in 1755, which Monckton helped plan and directly implemented, was not a mere act of war. It was a systematic effort to destroy a distinct ethnic and national group as such. The methodical round-up of civilians, the deliberate destruction of their homes and farms to prevent return, the calculated separation of families, and the wide dispersal to hostile lands were all designed to break the Acadians as a cohesive people. The subsequent infliction of horrific conditions on the

transport ships—leading to mass death from disease and starvation—constitutes the genocidal act of "deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part." This was a crime against humanity in its execution and genocidal in its intent and consequences.

Simultaneously, the campaigns Monckton commanded and enforced against the Mi'kmaq and their Wabanaki allies were guided by a clear "logic of elimination." The official government policy of scalp proclamations, which offered bounties for the dead and made no distinction for age or gender, is unambiguous evidence of genocidal intent. Monckton's role as a senior commander made him a key enforcer of this system. His targeted destruction of Indigenous villages and food supplies, most notably during the 1758 Saint John River expedition, was a direct and calculated assault on the very ability of the Wolastoqiyik people to survive. These were not acts of war; they were acts designed to erase a people from their land.

To hold a historical figure accountable, even centuries after his death, is not an exercise in anachronistic vengeance. It is a necessary act of historical and moral clarity. It matters because the system that produced and rewarded Monckton did not die with him. The colonial structures built on the lands cleared by his soldiers persist, and the injustices they created continue to shape our present. The dispossession of Indigenous peoples, the intergenerational trauma carried by their communities, and the long struggle of the Acadian people to preserve their culture are not abstract historical phenomena. They are the direct and enduring legacies of policies executed by men like Robert Monckton. To ignore the agency and responsibility of the perpetrators is to obscure the very roots of these contemporary struggles.

Ultimately, a reckoning with the past is the only honest foundation for the future. True reconciliation cannot be built on sanitized myths or a willful blindness to the crimes of our collective history. It demands the courage to face the truth, however ugly it may be. It requires us to question the monuments we have built and the heroes we have chosen to celebrate. By naming the actions of Robert Monckton for what they were—genocidal—we do not erase history. We confront it. We honor the memory of his victims, we validate the historical truth carried by their descendants, and we take a necessary step toward the elusive goals of justice and a future where such crimes are truly unthinkable.

BACK MATTER

APPENDIX A: KEY PRIMARY DOCUMENTS (EXCERPTS)

The following excerpts from primary source documents are provided to illustrate the official language and mentality of the historical period. These are not interpretations, but the raw words from council minutes, official proclamations, military orders, and personal journals that formed the administrative and military basis for the events described in this book. The original spelling and capitalization have been preserved to maintain authenticity.

Document 1: The Proclamation Offering a Bounty for Mi'kmaq Scalps (1749)

Source: Minutes of the Nova Scotia Council, October 2, 1749. Issued by Governor Edward Cornwallis and his Council in Halifax. This proclamation established the official government policy of paying for the killing of Mi'kmaq people and was the policy context in which Monckton operated.

...for the future all encouragement be given to parties of volunteers, Indians or others, to distress and annoy the Indians...

That a reward of ten Guineas be granted for every Indian Micmac taken or killed, to be paid upon producing such Savage taken or his scalp (as is the custom of America)...

It is further resolved, that a Proclamation be issued to the purport of the above resolutions, inviting all His Majesty's Subjects, Soldiers or others, to annoy and distress the Indians inhabiting this Province, and promising the above reward for any of them they shall take or kill.

Document 2: The Nova Scotia Council's Final Decision to Deport the Acadians (1755)

Source: Minutes of the Nova Scotia Council, July 28, 1755. This is the official record of the moment Governor Charles Lawrence and his council, which included military leaders, made the unanimous decision to ethnically cleanse the entire Acadian population from the colony.

The Council then entered into the consideration of what measures should be taken with the said Inhabitants, and after a great deal of time and pains spent in deliberating on the subject, they came to a final resolution, That as the said French Inhabitants had taken the Oath of Allegiance to His Majesty which they had so notoriously broken, and had been allowed more than a year to reconsider the matter and to take the Oath of Allegiance without any reserve, which they had

yesterday, by their Deputies, peremptorily refused to do...
...it was unanimously Agreed That, to prevent as much as possible their attempting to return and molest the Settlers that may be set down on their lands, it would be most proper to send them to be distributed amongst the several Colonies on the Continent...

Document 3: Colonel John Winslow's Journal Entry on the Imprisonment of the Acadian Men (1755)

Source: The Journal of Colonel John Winslow, September 5, 1755. Winslow was the commander in charge of the deportation at Grand-Pré. His account details the deception used and the immediate aftermath of imprisoning the Acadian men and boys in the church.

I Sent for Father Landrey their Principal Speaker... & Told him the Kings Command which was that the Lands & Tennements, Cattel of all Kinds and Live Stock of all Sortes were Forfeited to the Crown with all other their Effects Saving their Money and Household Goods, and they themselves to be removed from this his Province. They were Greatly Shocked... I Told them and that I had it in Command to keep them Prisoners until his Majestys further pleasure was known. and therefore advised them to make the best of their bad fortune... I then declared them the kings prisoners...
The whole of the French people were in great consternation and consternation indeed they were in a miserable situation... I am heartily sorry for their fate and truly commiserate their case.

Document 4: Lieutenant-Colonel Robert Monckton's Orders to Captain Joseph Goreham (1755)

Source: Order from Lt.-Col. Robert Monckton, Fort Cumberland, August 10, 1755. These orders were given shortly after the decision to deport was made. They are a clear example of Monckton commanding the systematic destruction of Acadian property to ensure the removal was permanent.

You are to proceed with the party under your command to the village of Peticodiac, and there to burn all the houses... and you will use your best endeavours to destroy all the corn upon the ground.
...If you find any of the inhabitants in arms, you will take them prisoners or kill them. And you are not to suffer any of your party to hurt any of the women or children.

APPENDIX B: TIMELINE OF MAJOR EVENTS

This timeline provides a chronological overview of the key events leading up to, during, and immediately following the campaigns of Robert Monckton in Acadia.

- **1713:** The Treaty of Utrecht cedes Acadia (mainland Nova Scotia) to Great Britain, setting the stage for conflict over Acadian allegiance.
- **1726:** Mi'kmaq and other Wabanaki leaders ratify the Peace and Friendship Treaty of 1725, which they understand as an agreement of non-aggression and mutual respect, not a surrender of sovereignty.
- **1730:** Nova Scotia's Governor, Richard Philipps, accepts a verbal qualified oath of allegiance from the Acadians, allowing them neutrality in future conflicts.
- **1749:** The British found the fortress town of Halifax, a major military encroachment into Mi'kmaq territory (Mi'kma'ki).
- **1749 (October):** Governor Edward Cornwallis issues his first scalp proclamation, offering a bounty for the killing of Mi'kmaq men, women, and children.
- **1751:** The French construct Fort Beauséjour on the Chignecto Isthmus.
- **1752:** Lieutenant-Colonel Robert Monckton arrives in Nova Scotia and is posted to the tense frontier at Fort Lawrence.
- **1755 (June 3-16):** Monckton commands the successful siege and capture of Fort Beauséjour.
- **1755 (July 28):** Governor Charles Lawrence and the Nova Scotia Council make the final decision to deport the entire Acadian population.
- **1755 (August-November):** The first wave of the Grand Dérangement begins. Monckton oversees the deportations in the Chignecto region.
- **1755-1763:** The deportation and persecution of the Acadians continue.
- **1758 (September):** Monckton leads the Saint John River Expedition, destroying Acadian and Wolastoqiyik settlements.
- **1759 (September 13):** Monckton serves as second-in-command and is wounded at the Battle of the Plains of Abraham.
- **1762:** Monckton commands the successful British capture of the French island of Martinique.
- **1763:** The Treaty of Paris officially ends the Seven Years' War, cementing British control of North America.

- **1782:** Robert Monckton dies in England, a respected Member of Parliament and celebrated war hero.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

• Archival Collections

- British National Archives, Kew, United Kingdom. (Colonial Office and War Office Papers).
- Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa, Ontario.
- Nova Scotia Archives, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

• Published Documents and Journals

- Monckton, Robert. Correspondence and Military Orders. As found in collections of the Nova Scotia Historical Society and other published archival sources.
- Nova Scotia Council. Minutes of His Majesty's Council at Annapolis Royal, 1736-1749, and Minutes of the Nova Scotia Council, 1749-1755. Halifax: Nova Scotia Archives.
- Treaty of Peace and Friendship between the Eastern Indians and the English, 1725-1726.
- Treaty of Utrecht, 1713.
- United Nations. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. General Assembly Resolution 260A (III), 9 December 1948.
- ———. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. General Assembly Resolution 61/295, 13 September 2007.
- ———. Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. 17 July 1998.
- Winslow, John. "The Journal of Colonel John Winslow." In Collections of the Nova Scotia Historical Society, Vol. 3-4. Halifax, 1883-1886.

Secondary Sources

- Basque, Maurice. *The Acadian Expulsion: An Eighteenth-Century Canadian Genocide*. Fredericton: University of New Brunswick Press, 2012.
- Brumwell, Stephen. *Redcoats: The British Soldier and War in the Americas, 1755-1763*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Faragher, John Mack. *A Great and Noble Scheme: The Tragic Story of the Expulsion of the French Acadians from Their American Homeland*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2005.

- Grenier, John. *The Far Reaches of Empire: War in Nova Scotia, 1710-1760*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008.
- Griffiths, Naomi E. S. *From Migrant to Acadian: A North American Borderland, 1604-1755*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005.
- Johnston, A.J.B. *Sainte-Famille: A Microhistory of the Acadians on Île Saint-Jean (Prince Edward Island), 1751-1758*. Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 2013.
- Lennox, Jeffers. *Homelands and Empires: Indigenous Spaces, Imperial Fictions, and Competition for Territory in Northeastern North America, 1690-1763*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017.
- Pothier, Bernard. "Monckton, Robert." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 4. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003—. Accessed September 25, 2025. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/monckton_robert_4E.html.
- Schabas, William A. *Genocide in International Law: The Crimes of Crimes*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Wicken, William C. *Mi'kmaq Treaties on Trial: History, Land, and Donald Marshall Junior*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- Wolfe, Patrick. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (December 2006): 387-409.

FURTHER READINGS

For readers interested in exploring these topics in greater depth, the following books provide excellent starting points.

- **On the Acadian Deportation:**

- Faragher, John Mack. *A Great and Noble Scheme: The Tragic Story of the Expulsion of the French Acadians from Their American Homeland*. (New York: W.W. Norton, 2005). A comprehensive and highly readable narrative account of the Grand Dérangement.

- **On Acadian Society Before 1755:**

- Griffiths, Naomi E. S. *From Migrant to Acadian: A North American Borderland, 1604-1755*. (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005). The definitive work on the development of the unique Acadian culture and society.

- **On the Military Conflict:**

- Grenier, John. *The Far Reaches of Empire: War in Nova Scotia, 1710-1760*. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2008). A detailed military history that does not shy away from the brutal nature of the warfare against civilians.

- **On Indigenous History and Treaties:**

- Wicken, William C. *Mi'kmaq Treaties on Trial: History, Land, and Donald Marshall Junior*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002). An essential book for understanding the treaty relationship between the Mi'kmaq and the Crown.

- **On the Law of Genocide:**

- Schabas, William A. *Genocide in International Law: The Crimes of Crimes*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009). The leading academic text on the legal definition and application of genocide.

FINAL NOTES

Writing this book was a difficult process. To immerse oneself in the administrative records of atrocity is to risk a certain numbness, a detachment from the profound human suffering encoded in the dispassionate language of military orders and council minutes. It is a necessary risk. The memory of the victims of Robert Monckton—the Acadian families torn apart, the Mi'kmaq hunted for bounty—demands that we do not look away. Their stories are not footnotes to the glorious rise of an empire; they are the central, searing truth of this land's history. My hope is that by naming these crimes with the precision they deserve, we can contribute, in some small way, to the ongoing work of justice.

HERO OF EMPIRE OR ARCHITECT OF GENOCIDE?

For centuries, General Robert Monckton has been celebrated as a hero of the British Empire, a key figure in the conquest of North America. His name is memorialized in the city of Moncton, New Brunswick. But behind the heroic myth lies a story of staggering brutality.

In this groundbreaking and meticulously researched book, Marie-Soleil Seshat Landry dismantles the sanitized history of General Monckton. Using the precise definitions of modern international law as an analytical tool, she reveals his campaigns for what they were: systematic ethnic cleansing and genocide. Drawing on startling primary source documents, this work details Monckton's central role in:

- **The Great Upheaval (Le Grand Dérangement)**, the brutal and methodical deportation of the entire Acadian population.
- The enforcement of scalp proclamations, a government-sanctioned policy offering bounties for the murder of Mi'kmaq men, women, and children.
- The scorched-earth warfare aimed at destroying the homes, communities, and food supplies of Indigenous peoples to clear the land for settlement.

The Genocide of Robert Monckton is a searing indictment of a celebrated historical figure and the colonial system that rewarded him. It is a vital and necessary book for anyone seeking a truthful understanding of North American history and the deep roots of the injustices that Indigenous and Acadian communities continue to face today.
