

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

The Great Peace of Montreal of 1701: French-Native Diplomacy in the Seventeenth Century.
By Gilles Havard.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9qv2612f>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 26(1)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Calloway, Colin G.

Publication Date

2002

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

American nationalism. Perhaps Silko has best succeeded in utilizing one byproduct of the discourse of domination, the captivity narrative, for her own subversive purposes in redirecting Euro-Americans back to their own spiritual roots in European paganism. Her novel thus provides a fitting final note on the ramifications of “going Native.”

Sandra Baringer

University of California, Riverside

The Great Peace of Montreal of 1701: French-Native Diplomacy in the Seventeenth Century. By Gilles Havard. Translated by Phyllis Aronoff and Howard Scott. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 2001. 308 pages. \$70.00 cloth; \$24.95 paper.

Gilles Havard, a historian living in Paris, provides a detailed study of the Great Peace of Montreal and the events leading up to it. First published in French in 1992, his work has been revised, updated, translated, and published in English on the three-hundredth anniversary of this major international peace accord.

The seventeenth century was punctuated by increasing warfare between the Five Nations of the Iroquois Confederacy on the one hand, and the French and their predominantly Algonquian allies on the other. By mid century, multiethnic villages on the western shores of the Great Lakes were crowded with displaced peoples seeking refuge from Iroquois attacks. By the 1680s French agents were helping forge these peoples into an anti-Iroquois coalition. By the end of the century, Ojibwas and other western tribes were inflicting defeats on the Iroquois, while the Iroquois were getting dragged into escalating Anglo-French colonial conflict. Their numbers thinned by war and disease, the Iroquois looked to chart a new course, while the French hoped to neutralize them as England's most formidable Native ally. The Great Peace at Montreal established peace between the Iroquois and the Great Lakes nations, and provided for Iroquois neutrality in the event of renewed war between England and France.

By any standards, the Great Peace was a major diplomatic feat. Many ethnohistorians—William Eccles, Francis Jennings, Daniel Richter, William Starna, and Jose Brandão—have written about it, but Havard has given it the book-length treatment it deserves. Part one surveys the political and diplomatic arena, identifies the agendas and strategies of the different nations, describes the workings of forest diplomacy, and traces wars and peace in the seventeenth century. Part two reconstructs the long round of negotiations that began in the winter of 1697 and culminated at Montreal in the summer of 1701. Part three concentrates on the conference itself, when 1,300 representatives from thirty-eight or thirty-nine Indian nations and one European nation met at Montreal. After almost three weeks of negotiation and ceremony, marred by outbreaks of disease, headmen from the various nations put their marks on an agreement and brought an end to the wars most of them

had known their whole lives. Appendices contain a discussion of the Indian pictographs on the treaty document, biographical sketches of the “cast of characters,” and an English translation of the treaty they signed.

The new strategy of formal neutrality allowed the Iroquois to play off French and British rivals during the potentially devastating imperial contests of the eighteenth century, and is often cited as evidence of Iroquois statesmanship. Havard and others see it as a triumph of French diplomacy but, whatever its origins, the Iroquois quickly recognized the advantages of neutrality and pursued it. The Grand Settlement of 1701 required negotiations between the Iroquois and the English in Albany, to clarify the terms of the Covenant Chain in light of the developments at Montreal. Unable to prevent the Iroquois from making peace under the aegis of the French, New York had little choice but to accept their neutrality. For the Iroquois, the treaty secured peace east and west; for the western nations it secured peace in the east—their Sioux enemies and neighbors to the west were not included.

The Peace was the work of individuals more than nations. Havard identifies the major players in the negotiations leading up to the Montreal conference and in forging the treaty itself: the Huron-Petun chief Kondiaronk, who died during the conference; the Onondaga Teganissorens, a key figure in Iroquois diplomacy for forty years and a leading advocate of the strategy of neutrality; the Miami chief Chichicatalo; governor-general Louis Hector de Callière; governor of Montreal (and future governor-general) Philippe De Rigaud De Vaudreuil; and many others. The Wabanaki or Abenaki confederacy features as an important player, but, rather confusingly, Abenakis do not appear in the list of constituent tribes and are treated as separate from the Penobscots, Passamaquoddies, Mi'kmaqs, and Maliseets.

The complexities and intricacies of the international and interethnic negotiations that culminated in the Great Peace allow for divergent interpretations of the settlement, especially around the question of whether it represented victory or defeat for the Iroquois. Canadian historian William Eccles saw it as Iroquois capitulation and a step in their long decline; Brandão and Starna have argued that it was a triumph of Iroquois diplomacy. Havard takes issue with both positions: the peace was imposed by the French but the Iroquois derived advantages from it and were much better off after the summer of 1701 than they had been in 1697. Challenging Brandão and Starna's concentration on territorial boundaries, Havard emphasizes that the peace rested on exchange of prisoners and shared access to hunting territories, which allowed Great Lakes nations and the Iroquois henceforth to eat from the same bowl, rather than clash in contested grounds and spark off a new round of wars.

Working from rich French sources, Havard may exaggerate French agency and influence. In a world where multinational Indian alliances were common and Native rituals of diplomacy so pervasive that the French themselves adopted many of them, at Montreal as elsewhere, there is a danger of conveying an impression that Indians needed Frenchmen to show them how to forge alliances or to end war. The Tree of Peace may have “been planted in Montreal, not in Onondaga” (p. 166), but it was the Iroquois, not the French,

who had established their league on a vision of peace. In light of French wars of genocide against the Fox, one might dispute the rather passive characterization of the French role in these wars (p. 175). Indians certainly recognized the power of print, but it is surely an overstatement to assert that they “were amazed by writing, which they saw as truly magical” (pp. 188–189). Finally—an error that presumably survived from the French edition—Tulsa’s Gilcrease Museum is in Oklahoma, not Arizona (p. 101).

Scholars will no doubt continue to debate the motivations and contributions of the many players in this multinational summit. There is room for further examination of the Great Peace as an Indian-Indian event in an context of longstanding and ongoing Native alliances, a perspective that might reduce the French to the role of supporting actors. Nevertheless, the *Great Peace of Montreal* effectively reconstructs the multiethnic character of North American diplomacy and clearly demonstrates the significance of the Great Peace in the French colonial project.

Colin G. Calloway
Dartmouth College

Indian Orphanages. By Marilyn Irvin Holt. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2001. 336 pages. \$34.95 cloth.

“They knew they were orphans but they didn’t know what an orphan was,” says Alfred Half Moon, a Shawnee recalling his own Oklahoma childhood in the early 1900s (p. 18). This is the dilemma that author Marilyn Holt confronts in this sturdy history of the growth of the Indian orphanage, an institution that had no counterpart in tribal society until a certain level of chaos made caring for children a burden beyond the ability of distressed and dislocated families. Holt addresses the social conditions that preceded this particular development across several Indian nations, time periods, and regions. Although she focuses at length on the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Creek, and Chickasaw (they had the most institutions and records), her work also spends time with the Seneca, Ojibwa, and Sioux, among others. Sometimes this no-frills historical account actually becomes fascinating, particularly as Holt reconstructs the history of the Cherokee’s exceptional management of their orphaned or destitute children. After their brutal removal from their homelands in Georgia, the Cherokee confronted a new problem; how best to care for the number of destitute and orphaned children that had survived the removal. Since these children were thought of as a best chance for a future Cherokee Nation, the matter was considered a priority. Although devoted to Western education and Westernization in general even before relocation, the Cherokee did not immediately adopt institutionalization as a substitute for family. Their own social experiment with orphanages began in 1871 with the Cherokee Orphan Asylum established with \$4,000 in tribal funds. Completely independent of the federal boarding school system and located in Tahlequah, the governmental and educational capital of the Cherokee Nation, this institution