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ABSTRACT

Over the past forty years, scholars retold the story of Native Americans and, unlike their predecessors, portrayed them as active participants in their own history. No longer viewed as being the measuring stick of "white" progress or atrocities, historians placed the emphasis on Native Americans, their actions, their culture and their active resistance to acculturation and assimilation through a unique process of accommodation. However, while they accomplished much, few historians attempted to explain how Native Americans influenced the development of America and continued to regard the majority of their activities as methods of cultural resistance.

In an attempt to answer the question of "how Native Americans influenced the development of America," this study examines the impact that Native American urban settlements had on the Anglo-American westward movement and argues that Native Americans "spearheaded" and supported the Euro-American settlement of the west. The focus of this work is on the Native American urban settlement of Logstown and its relationship to the founding and building of Fort Pitt in the Ohio Valley during the mid-eighteenth century. To show the relationship between Logstown and Fort Pitt, this study proposes a model of frontier development that includes Native Americans and their urban settlements in the development of America. The model expands and synthesizes the works of Kenneth Lewis, Richard C. Wade and Francis Jennings and deals primarily with the Eastern Native American groups who migrated west and settled the Ohio Valley, the Shawnee, Lenni-Lenape (Delaware) and Mingo.

By applying this approach, this study discovered three things. First, Native American and Euro-American cultures created similar types of preindustrial societies in regards to institutional development. Second, Native Americans built frontier urban settlements that proved to be the catalyst behind the Euro-American settlement of the west. Lastly, the early settlement of the west by Euro-Americans succeeded as a result of Native American political, physical, military and informational support.
With this study, the author hopes to accomplish two main objectives. First, he wishes to present a study of Native Americans that breaks from the traditional theme that permeates throughout historical scholarship in regards to Native Americans, "barriers and resisters to progress." And second, the author hopes to answer the concerns of critics to new Indian and cultural history by presenting a broader interpretation of Native American history that utilizes an ethnohistorical approach and addresses a more "weighty question" of American history.
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INTRODUCTION

Over the past forty years, scholars retold the story of Native Americans and, unlike their predecessors, portrayed them as active participants in their own history. No longer viewed as being the measuring stick of “white” progress or atrocities, historians placed the emphasis on Native Americans, their actions, their culture and their active resistance to acculturation and assimilation through a unique process of accommodation and away from strictly viewing them as barriers to or victims of the westward advancement of Euro-American and American societies. However while they accomplished much, few historians attempted to explain how Native Americans influenced the development of America.

In an attempt to answer this question of “how Native Americans influenced the development of America,” this study examines the role that Native American urban settlements played in the development of the American frontier. The focus of this work is on the Native American urban settlement of Logstown and its relationship to the founding and building of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania in the Ohio Valley during the mid-eightheenth century. To show the relationship between Logstown and Pittsburgh, this study proposes a model of frontier development that includes Native Americans and their urban settlements in the development of America. The model expands and synthesizes the works of Kenneth Lewis, Richard C. Wade and Francis Jennings and deals primarily with the Eastern Native American groups who migrated west and settled the Ohio Valley. The groups primarily studied are the Shawnee, Lenni-Lenape (Delaware) and Mingo. Although several Native American groups such as the Miami, Wyandot (Huron) and Onieda resided in Logstown, the Shawnee, Delaware and Mingo cultures existed as the three most influential and dominant forces in the community. Additionally, this work deals with two concepts meticulously studied by generations of scholars—the American frontier and the city.
Although this work deals with only one tree in the forest of American history, its contribution to the historical scholarship is twofold. First, it explains the nature, role and importance of Native American urban centers in the development of the United States, a topic previously ignored by scholars, and secondly it presents a hypothesis that shows how Native Americans contributed to the development of American and not merely to the preservation of their own cultures. However to understand the intent and contribution of this work, it must first be placed in a historiographical context.

The Current State of Historical Scholarship on Native Americans

In 1997, the historian Donald F. Fixico edited *Rethinking American Indian History*, a collection of seven essays from two conferences held in 1994 and 1995 that focused on the study of Native Americans. The conferences resulted from concerns of scholars about the enormous complexity of Native American life and the various cultures and languages of the more than five hundred Indian nations that “challenged” their interpretations. This complexity, Fixico explained, caused scholars dealing with the subject to rethink their work, theories and methodologies.¹ From this selection of scholarship that included articles from renowned historians such as James Axtell and Richard White, Fixico deduced that Native American history is currently following a trend that focuses heavily on cultural and ethnographic studies, approaches some historians, such as Eugene Genovese, argue fail to answer the more weighty issues of American history such as the origin of the “American Character.”² While it is not the intention of Genovese and his supporters to convince Native American historians to abandon their cultural and ethnographic research, it is their summation that scholars using these new approaches fail at best and refuse at worst to attempt to answer the more profound questions of history.³ With this concern over the methodological approaches used by Native American historians, scholars find themselves currently asking the questions of where the field of Native American history is at and where it is going?

Where Native American History is At and How it Got There

Fixico’s work provides a good summation of the current field of Native American scholarship. Two of the articles in Fixico’s work, William Hagan’s “The New Indian History” and Glenda Riley’s “The Historiography of American Indian and Other Western Women,” dealt primarily with the scholarship of Native American history, while Fixico’s article, “Methodologies in Reconstructing Native American History,” discussed the various methods scholars use to study Native Americans. Each scholar showed that Native American history evolved from a discipline deeply rooted in narrative scholarship to one that currently utilizes methodologies developed by other disciplines such as ethnohistory, an approach that borrows heavily from anthropological and archeological studies. According to these authors, Native American studies now involve oral, environmental, biographical, women’s, quantitative, agricultural, demographic and narrative histories. While historians such as Genovese wish to de-emphasize these types of studies, cultural and social historians contend that they are necessary to fully understand the history of the United States. So, what has Native American scholarship done to answer the more weighty questions of American history and promote the understanding of the United States?

For all intents and purposes, the field of Native American history began circa 1960 with the emergence of the sub-discipline of ethnohistory. Prior to 1960, works dealing with Native Americans most often portrayed them as either the victims of or barriers to white progress. Written primarily from the perspective of the “conquering” whites, these early works provided a one dimensional view of Native Americans. However beginning in 1960, scholars began presenting the other side of the story. As Robert Hine so eloquently stated, “the Indian should be considered a maker of history, not simply a backdrop against which the European or American narrative is told. The native welcomed the white man, helped him succeed, then blocked his way, and eventually fought him with vigor.” Due to this new awareness, scholars began portraying Native Americans as active participants in American history and not solely as victims or barriers.

4 Ibid., 119.
In 1960, Allen W. Trelease attempted to present an Indian viewpoint in one of the first books of what was termed the new Indian history, *Indian Affairs in Colonial New York*. Trelease departed from his contemporaries by utilizing ethnological material, a method of research used primarily by anthropologists up until that time. Soon afterwards, Robert H. Berdiehofer, Jr., in his 1965 work *Salvation and the Savage*, attempted to show how some Native Americans, though converted to Christianity, resisted complete acculturation by adhering to their own cultural systems despite the overzealous efforts of the missionaries. Early works such as these provided a new topic for scholars of American history, Native Americans.

In 1972, the Newberry Library in Chicago opened the D'Arcy McNickle Center for the History of the American Indian. Through the support of the McNickle Center, a generation of budding scholars furthered the new Indian history. Scholars such as James Axtell, R. David Edmunds, Peter Iverson, Frederick E. Hoxie, Richard White and the "dean of historians associated with the center" Francis Jennings began a legacy of work that portrayed Native Americans as actors/participants and not victims.6

The "dean," Jennings, paved the way for the new wave of historians with his work *The Invasion of America*. Published in 1975, this work revised the history of Native American and white relations in the colonial period by claiming that intercourse between the two divergent peoples established a system of accommodation that fulfilled both groups desires. In short, Jennings portrayed Native Americans as being masters of their own destinies, a complete break from the imperialist school of thought, which essentially relegated Indians to the role of Euro-American pawns.7

Revision of previous histories and the quest for new methodologies of research continued to be the trend of the new Indian historians. In 1983, Richard White established himself as an up and coming dean of the new Indian history with his interdisciplinary work *The Roots of Dependency*. In this prize-winning work, White approached the

---

5 Hine, 2.
7 Francis Jennings, *The Invasion of America*, (Williamsburg, Virginia: W.W. Norton & Company), v-ix.
study of Native Americans by using archeological data, a resource seldom employed by his contemporaries. As a result of this and other works, historians began to seek other interdisciplinary methods to study Native Americans.

Employing these newer methods of research, Jennings and White continued to lead the new field with books of importance. Jennings complemented his earlier work, The Invasion of America, with two studies on the Iroquois covenant chain entitled The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire (1984) and Empire of Fortune (1987). In these works, Jennings presented an, “exploratory and experimental” view of the Iroquois Confederacy by portraying the human characteristics of the relationship. “The Iroquois of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries” Jennings contended, “were human... [and] one finds heroes, villains, fools and quite ordinary persons among their people.” With these new approaches, scholars, for the first time, began to view Native Americans as clever, cunning and sophisticated people who sought to further their own political and economic positions in a world that quickly became overrun by Euro-Americans.

Richard White furtherted Jennings’ argument of an Indian and white relationship founded on accommodation in his 1991 publication The Middle Ground. Looking westward from colonial New York towards the “pays d’en haut,” the Ohio Valley, White studied the relationship between the French, English, Spanish, Iroquois and the autonomous Native American “republican villages” in the Ohio Valley. White convincingly showed that the overlapping cultures of Europeans and Native Americans unintentionally merged together to create a mutually accepted middle ground on which all groups depended for economic, political and cultural survival. Building on previous works, White took the field of Native American one step closer to answering the weighty questions of American history by suggesting that Indians influenced the culture and life of eighteenth century Euro-Americans.

Along with Jennings and White, James Axtell produced several important works on Native American and white relationships. In just eleven years, Axtell completed four significant books, The European and the Indian (1981), The Invasion Within (1985), After Columbus (1988), and Beyond 1492 (1992). In these works, the

---

8 Hagan, 33-34.
educational and acculturative impact of each society upon the others, Native American and white, proved to be the major theme.\textsuperscript{11} Like Jennings and White, Axtell portrayed Native Americans as unique and varying groups of people who were “real determinants of history.”\textsuperscript{12} Consequently, Axtell’s works forced scholars to view Native Americans as unique and formidable contributors to the shaping of American history, a view that a new generation of scholars would take notice of and perpetuate in array of specific and small-scaled cultural studies.

While the McNickle Three, Jennings, White and Axtell, conducted broad studies in the new Indian history by explaining the development, operation and effects of Native American and white relationships in far reaching areas such as the “\textit{pays d’en haut},” a majority of scholars focused their works on cultural studies. While they essentially limited their studies to one person, cultural trait or group, these scholars proved no less ambitious then the McNickle Three. Using ethnohistorical methods, these authors created volumes of work detailing famous leaders such as Pontiac and Tecumseh and groups like the Shawnee and Fox. The work of these scholars addressed several major areas of consideration to include studies on regions, tribes, individuals, economics, contemporary issues, education, the environment, warfare, women and missions.

Like the McNickle Three, scholars writing regional studies looked at Native Americans in large geographic areas such as the Ohio Valley and the South. Daniel H. Usner, originally a student of slavery, studied the relationship between Native Americans, whites and blacks in his 1992 publication Indians, Settlers and Slaves in a Frontier Exchange Economy. The winner of the Jamestown Manuscript Prize in 1990, Usner studied primarily the economic relationships between the various participants of a Louisiana “frontier exchange.” To Usner, the frontier exchange evolved from a network of interaction into a strategy of survival adopted by all the groups involved.\textsuperscript{13} Similar to the McNickle Three, Usner stressed an Indian/white relationship that depended on each other until Euro-Americans gained an upper hand that enabled them to manipulate and control Native Americans.

Other noted regional studies include Gregory E. Dowd's *A Spirited Resistance* (1992), Joel W. Martin's *Sacred Revolt* (1991) and Michael N. McConnell's *A Country Between* (1992). Dowd, studying primarily the prophets and visionaries of the Ohio Valley, traced a Native American religious movement that sought to unify all groups in the region—Shawnee, Delaware, Creek and Mingo—against white territorial and religious expansion. Also studying Native American religious movements, Martin argued that the Muskogee Creek developed their own sacred revolt against white acculturation attempts that eventually led them to war. McConnell, like White and Usner, studied the economic, political and cultural interplay between French, English and Native Americans in the Ohio Valley. McConnell concluded that the Ohio Indians adapted to new situations by selectively adopting traits from outsiders and utilizing them within their already existing cultural framework. The constant theme in these books is Native American resistance through the maintenance of their core culture. No longer viewed as being just barriers to white progress, this newer generation of scholars portrayed Native Americans as active resisters to an intrusive society bent on the acquisition of their land.

Over the last forty years, new Indian scholars attempted to humanize Native Americans, i.e., show them as people and not victims or barriers. To accomplish this, many scholars presented in depth works on individual groups, more commonly known as tribal studies. Recent works on tribal studies include Daniel K. Richter’s study of Iroquois life prior to 1740 *The Ordeal of the Longhouse* and John R. Finger’s work *The Eastern Band of Cherokee*. Richter utilized historic documents, anthropological material and archeological data to present a unique look at European civilization from the Native American perspective. In short, Richter turned the microscope on white civilization by figuratively standing in Native American shoes, and with their eyes, looking at European colonizing efforts. Unlike Richter’s anthropological approach, Finger used a host of oral histories and studied the Cherokee who escaped the American removal efforts and remained in their traditional homes during the nineteenth century. Finger concluded that the Cherokee who remained in their ancestral homes were more successful at preserving their Native

American culture then those who were removed west. While the list of works addressing individual tribes could easily fill twenty pages of text, these two works serve to show the variety and types of material scholars use to study Native Americans. By implementing these new methods, scholars present rich and informative works that essentially rewrite history by portraying Native Americans as people belonging to complex and well developed societies.\textsuperscript{15}

While some historians focus on whole tribes, other scholars attempt to describe a single aspect of Native American culture. One such aspect proved to be the Native American’s use and tie with their environment. In his work *Changes in the Land*, William Cronon produced one of the best environmental studies in recent times. Cronon contended that the change in the ecology of New England from a veritable paradise to an industrialized state was due to the cultural interaction between Native Americans and Europeans. Unlike previous historians, Cronon showed how Native Americans were masters of an entire ecology from their husbandry of wild animals to their superior form of horticulture and fish harvesting.\textsuperscript{16} While early historians portrayed a romantic view of Native Americans and their environment, scholars like Cronon showed that Native Americans used, abused and preserved their environment just like European settlers.

Some new Indian scholars such as James H. Howard combined tribal and environmental studies to produce some very informative works. In his work *Shawnee*, Howard attempted to describe a people who had “been largely ignored by the scholarly world.” Howard effectively described the history of the Shawnee people as well as their entire culture. So thorough is his research, that one can obtain recipes for hominy, blue biscuits and bread from Howard’s work.\textsuperscript{17}

Other types of cultural studies include women’s history. Unlike early histories that reduced Native American women to virtually slaves, new works being produced portrayed them as active and essential members of

\textsuperscript{14} Hagan, 39.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid, 37-38.
their communities. Carol G. Devene, in her 1992 publication Countering Colonization, described how Great Lakes women provided the foundation for their communities resistance to missionary efforts. According to Devene, Great Lakes women asserted their influence by selectively choosing those European traits that strengthened their position, status or culture and rejected all others. Additionally, earlier works such as Ruth Landes’ Ojibwa Women explained the important and active role that Native American women played in their respective communities. Unlike previous works, these books depart from a male oriented and dominated study and show how Native American women, like their white female counterparts, made a significant contribution to theirs as well as Euro-American and American cultures.

The Future of Native American History

The scholarship currently appearing in recent periodicals suggest that the new Indian History is going to continue in its current direction towards cultural histories. J. W. Parmenter’s article “Pontiac’s War: Forging New Links in the Anglo-Iroquois Covenant Chain, 1758-1766,” examines the western Algonquians’ entry into the famed Covenant Chain. Parmenter contends that although the western Algonquians were defeated on the battlefield, they achieved a political victory by obtaining an active status in the Covenant Chain. By entering the chain, the western Algonquians entered into a diplomatic partnership with Great Britain that enabled them to establish their territorial integrity and confirm their independence from the Six Nations.

Similar to Parmenter’s work, J. A. Brandao’s and W. A. Starna’s article, “The Treaties of 1701: A Triumph of Iroquois Diplomacy,” studies the Montreal and Albany treaties of 1701 from the perspective of the Five Nations. According to Brandao and Starna, the Iroquois’ political policy toward New France and her Native American allies proved to be the driving force behind the negotiations and not those of Great Britain and her colonies. While control of the fur trade existed as a topic of discussion, the authors contend that the Iroquois successfully negotiated to secure

---

additional hunting territories and to curtail the belligerence of New France.²⁰ Like the works of the McNickle Three, these articles explain the political ability and contribution of Native Americans. Unfortunately, though these works provide insight into a specific area previously ignored by historians, their arguments, as Genovese rightly pointed out, fail to portray Native Americans in a new or broader light.

Like political studies, Native American religious studies continue to have a cultural focus. M. Ripmeester’s work, “It is scarcely to be believed,” described the Mississauga and their effective method of passive resistance to acculturation. The Mississauga, Ripmeester contended, attempted to maintain familiar lifestyles despite their conversion to the Methodist religion. Using the theme of accommodation, Ripmeester described the Mississauga’s ability to merge new and old lifestyles into one culture.²¹ A. A. Cave’s “The Failure of the Shawnee Prophets Witch-hunt” detailed Tenskwatawa’s failure to turn his people away from their belief in witchcraft. Unlike early writers, Cave contended that the Shawnee Prophet’s failure to instill a genuine fear of witchcraft in his followers led to opposition of his teachings.²² Once again, these works suggest that the current trend of Native American scholarship is focused solely on singular aspects of Indian culture and fail to make a connection to the broader scope of American history, which suggests that, as Richard White put it, “[Native American] history has its own logic and its own physical boundaries.”²³

In addition to the scholarship that addresses newer areas of study, many scholars continue to attempt revisions of old schools of thought. J. Miller’s “Old religion among the Delawares” attempts to revise Anthony F. C. Wallace’s famous thesis on the Garmwing (Big House rite). Utilizing oral histories previously unavailable, Miller reevaluated Wallace’s material and developed his own hypothesis. Unlike Wallace who contended that the

---

Gamwing was a new religion developing in 1805, Miller explained that the rite was part of the Delawares ancient integrative ritual that existed throughout their history.24

In addition to cultural studies, scholars appear to be producing a number of works on social and contact histories. P. T. Strong’s work “Feminist theory and the ‘Invasion of the Hears’ in North America” analyzes the impact of the feminist theory on the ethnohistory of Christian Native American women. In this work, Strong looks at the feminist political economy through the use of personal narratives, biographies and the postmodern and poststructural theories of disciplinary institutions.25 In “The tale of the kettle: Odyssey of an intercultural object,” L. Turgeon provides a unique look at the impact of Native American and European contact. In this article, Turgeon attempts to explain how and why the European-made kettle became immersed in the cultural identity of Native Americans. To accomplish this, Turgeon used travel accounts of New France and museum collections derived from archeological excavations.26 Like the cultural studies, these works tend to look at the impact that Euro-Americans had on Native Americans or study an isolated aspect of Indian society and fail to offer some broader explanation of how the first Americans influenced and impacted on the development of America.

While scholars over the past forty years portrayed Native Americans in a more active light, one theme essentially remained the same, barriers through resistance. Unlike their predecessors who depicted Native American resistance through violence and warfare, the new Indian scholars present a more accurate form of resistance through accommodation and the preservation of cultural institutions such as religion and politics. No longer the pawns of colonial empires, scholars described Native Americans as shrewd politicians who successfully negotiated for the preservation of their culture. Yet, all new Indian scholars must concede the fact that Native Americans lost the struggle for the retention of their traditional ways regardless of how they attempted to resist. Hence, Native American history currently remains the story of an indigenous people’s fight against the onslaught of European and American cultures. However, new Indian scholars can portray another image of Native Americans, one that shows how they

contributed to the development of contemporary America and in so doing address the concerns of their critics such as Genovese.

How to Portray Native Americans in a Broader Historical Light

As is evident by this brief and incomplete historiography, the current trend of new Indian history scholarship fails to address or answer the older more traditional questions asked by earlier historians. Moreover, recent works in the field suggests that cultural and social histories will continue to dominate the scholarship. So how can scholars of the new Indian history continue to explore fresh ideas in Native American cultural and social studies while moving closer towards establishing a middle ground with their critics?

Ironically, new Indian scholars address the same topics as their critics, politics, warfare, economics, as well as a host of other subjects. However, while they successfully humanized the Indian over the past forty years, in the context of “white and red” relationships, new Indian historians continue to primarily describe Native American resistance and fail to expand beyond those peripheries. Native Americans not only resisted white expansion and settlement, they actively and passively facilitated it. Therefore, new Indian scholars can confront their critics by describing the role that Native Americans played in the development of the United States and by using the new methods of research to answer the older more traditional questions concerning history.

The “old dean,” Francis Jennings and his work The Founders of America provides an excellent example of this new approach. Published in 1994, Jennings, at the age of eighty-six, attempted to answer the question, “Do the Americans have a common history?” “To the extent that all the Americas, from their earliest settlement to the present day, have had in occupation the peoples called Indians,” Jennings explained, “the answer is yes.” Native Americans, Jennings argued, provided the link that bound Latin America with Anglo-America. Moreover, Jennings contended that Native American history is, “broken up to be portrayed in a reflection of the part-history of some other people,” and set out to prove three things. First, Native Americans never existed as savages “of either the ignoble or

noble varieties because savagery is the product of imagination forcing facts into perceived molds.” Second, Native Americans “came as pioneers into the Americas and coped with the wilderness they found...transforming it into diverse human habitats;” and moreover, that Europeans “did not conquer wilderness; they conquered Indians. They did not discover America; they invaded it.” And third, the concept culture, not race proved “the product of human ingenuity and tradition, and caste as the product of conquest.”

With this work, Jennings attempted to synthesize Indian history and describe the Native American role in America’s development. The last paragraph of Jennings introduction serves as an excellent call to Native American historians to adopt this approach and explains the thesis of his work. Jennings stated that:

My first response to the idea of a new synthesis of American Indian history was fear of ridicule at the mistakes inevitable upon going so far out of my snug specialty, [because] “like many another academic historian, I have spent most my career working in a narrow specialty,” but curiosity changed my mind. (And I no longer need to worry about tenure or promotion.) The time seemed overdue for a broadened perspective, so I accepted the challenge. Let me stress again that what follows is not the utterance of an oracle, but rather a report of large vistas, many of which are new to me, offered in the hope and expectation of expansion, precision, and correction by other hands. I have tried to take the reader along on that voyage, to share difficulties and excitements, and, if all goes reasonably well, to gain the sense of exultant satisfaction that comes from an enriched mind.

Using Jennings approach as an example, historians can broaden the perspective of new Indian history and “expand with precision” the role that Native Americans played in the development of the United States. This study answers Jennings’ call for a broader approach of new Indian history with a cultural perspective and shows how Native Americans contributed to the settlement and urban development of America in the mid-eighteenth century.

To show how Native Americans contributed to the urban development of America, this work is organized into essentially three parts. Part one consists of the first two chapters and addresses the language used by contemporary historians to describe Native American and Euro-American cultures in the mid-eighteenth century. Once the language is established in chapter one, the second chapter presents a model of Native American frontier development that puts into perspective the role that Native American urban centers played in the development of the

---

28 Ibid, 15-16.
frontier/west. The key variable in this model of frontier development is the presence and function of Native American urban settlements. However since few scholars view them as being urban people, the second part of this work, chapters three through six, dispels this myth and shows how Native Americans dwelled in frontier urban settlements comparable, in regards to social complexity, to their Euro-American counterparts. Lastly, chapter seven makes up the third part of this work and explains the influence Logstown had on the locating and building of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Moreover, it shows how Native Americans propagated and assisted the Euro-American settlement of the American frontier.

To accomplish this task, this work utilizes numerous primary and secondary resources that include the journals of prominent statesmen and traders such as Cadwallader Colden, George Washington and Conrad Weiser as well as the official colonial records of Pennsylvania, Virginia and New York. Unfortunately however, no archeological data from Logstown is used in this work. This is due to the unfortunate fact that the archeological remains of Logstown, as with many Native American sites, rests under the tons of concrete and debris used in creating the many industrial complexes, homes, towns, and businesses of the United States. Therefore, since numerous scholars thoroughly studied their cultures, resource material used in the discussion of the Shawnee, Lenni-Lenape and Mingo peoples comes primarily from the works of C. A. Weslager, Herbert Kraft, William W. Newcomb, Jerry Clark, and James H. Howard as well as from original documents such as the Jesuit Relations, Pennsylvania Colonial Records and the George Mercer Papers to mention a few. With this material, a cultural and physical image is presented of Logstown, which shows how Native Americans created the frontier urban settlements that became the spearheads for the Euro-American settlement of the west.

With this study, the author hopes to accomplish two main objectives. First, he wishes to present a study of Native Americans that breaks from the traditional theme that permeates throughout the new Indian history scholarship, “barriers and resisters to progress.” Second, the author hopes to answer the concerns of critics to new
Indian and cultural history by presenting a broader interpretation of Native American history that utilizes an ethnohistorical approach and addresses a more "weighty question" of American history.
CHAPTER 1

The Language Used In History:
How Contemporary Society Views Native Americans

In his work The Urban Frontier, Richard C. Wade created a bridge between the schools of urban and frontier history by challenging the previously held idea that lone white individuals settled the west by carving homes out of the wilderness. Rather, Wade concluded that cities existed in the west prior to the migration of Euro-American homesteaders and were therefore the spearheads in the development of the frontier.¹ To support this thesis, Wade studied five cities west of the Appalachian Mountains—Pittsburgh, Saint Louis, Cincinnati, Louisville, and Lexington. Although he explained that each town was distinctly unique, Wade showed that cities provided the resources and security homesteaders needed to settle in the west. More importantly, he proved that urban settlements did exist in the west before the mass migration of Euro-American settlers.

Despite its contribution to the field of history, Wade's work neglected to consider the role that Native Americans played in the development of the west. As Wade indicated, the frontier was nothing more than the mere haunt of Indian and animal prior to the introduction of Europeans.² Wade and subsequent generations of scholars who adhere to his thesis are wrong in assuming that the frontier existed as the virgin and unsettled haunt of Native Americans prior to European occupation.

To refute this inaccurate image of the American frontier, Francis Jennings in his book The Invasion of America wrote that:

The American land... was more like a widow than a virgin. Europeans did not find a wilderness here; rather, however involuntarily, they made one. Jamestown, Plymouth, Salem, Boston, Providence, New Amsterdam, Philadelphia—all grew upon sites previously occupied by Indian communities. So did Quebec

² Ibhd., 1.
and Montreal and Detroit and Chicago. The so-called settlement of America was a resettlement, a reoccupation of a land.³

If Jennings is correct in his claim that the settlement of America was a resettlement of Native American communities, then the spearheads of Wade's urban frontier are Native American and not white urban settlements. To justify this claim, three things are needed—a clear definition of what constitutes an urban settlement, a model of frontier development, and examples of Native American settlements influencing the colonization of the west.

Before any discussion concerning the level of urban development Eastern Native American's attained prior to and during the time of the "European Invasion" can be entertained, the language used to describe Native Americans must first be discussed. This discussion of terms is important in order to put Native Americans on the same level in language as their European counterparts. By this, it is meant that a settlement described as a town for Native Americans will possess the same types of social institutions as Euro-American urban centers given the same name. Thus in regards to social development, a town is a town for both Native Americans and Euro-Americans.

Throughout history, white societies traditionally viewed Native American cultures with a jaundiced eye. Since the colonial period, Euro-Americans misunderstood Native Americans and viewed them as an inferior or more primitive race of people. A byproduct of their education and religion, Europeans regarded Native Americans as noble savages. They admired the close "primitive" tie Native Americans had with nature and believed it to be a special and more direct bond with God. “In short, primitivism postulated people dwelling in nature according to nature, existing free of history’s burdens and the social complexity felt by Europeans in the modern period, and offering hope to mankind at the same time that they constituted a powerful counter-example to existing European civilization.”⁴ In other words, Euro-Americans created an image of Native Americans that depicted them as being primitive, backward, socially undeveloped and a people culturally inferior to the “civilized” European who due to their state of existence were closer to God.

---

Yet despite their perceived closeness to God, Euro-Americans attempted to dominate Native Americans by forcing an unfamiliar and often unwanted culture upon them. As a result, Native Americans actively resisted the Euro-American effort to replace their culture with a European religion and accepted way of life. Historians described numerous accounts of Native American uprisings and massacres such as Pontiac’s Rebellion and The Battle of Little Big Horn to illustrate Indian resistance to Euro-American and American cultural and physical intrusion. As a result of these incidents, Euro-Americans and their American successors came to view Native Americans in one of two venues—as either the barriers to or victims of white progress. However, Native Americans actively participated in the development of America and welcomed and engaged in trade and a cultural exchange with Euro-Americans. Unfortunately, the negative image that Euro-Americans and their successors painted of Native Americans still exists today, accounting for the bias in many white descriptions of Indian peoples and cultures. Robert F. Berkofer, Jr., author of The White Man’s Indian, states it best. Berkofer notes:

As with images of other races and minorities, the essence of the White image of the Indian has been the definition of Native Americans in fact and fancy as a separate and single other. Whether evaluated as noble or ignoble, whether seen as exotic or degraded, the Indian as an image was always alien to the White...the Indian was a White invention and still remains largely a White image, if not stereotype...through the continued use of the word Indian, the present-day White still subscribes to the past stereotype.\(^5\)

Therefore, before they can accurately describe them and their cultures, scholars must first view and describe Native Americans with non-biased terms. In order to accomplish that task, scholars must provide meanings for the terms they use to describe Native Americans. To dispel the myth that Eastern Native Americans lived in a state of existence that was inferior to colonial Americans, and to buttress the argument that Eastern Native Americans established the urban settlements that provided Euro-American colonists with the early inroads to the west, the terms most often associated with European expansion and colonization such as urban, settlement, colonize, migrate and inhabitant need defining.

The way in which scholars describe another group of people influences and fashions the way in which their own group perceives that "alien" culture. For centuries, historians explaining certain aspects of American History
used many words. Assuming that they and their audience understood these words, scholars generally failed to define them and in so doing based entire arguments on their implied meanings. For instance, primarily due to the lack of census data, historians never established an accepted numerical or cultural determinant to classify colonial settlements. In other words, historians never established that a settlement with x number of individuals is a hamlet while a settlement with y number of individuals is a town, or a settlement with a local government is a city while a settlement without an established system of laws is a village. Therefore, when scholars use abstract or contemporary terms such as urban or non-urban to describe colonial peoples' states of existence, their descriptions of history are misleading. Hence, the majority of scholars only tell half the story when they use the terms of their culture and society to describe another group's state of existence, or contemporary terms to explain the peoples of the past. For example, it is an accepted fact that many Eastern Native American groups of colonial North America lived in settlements with permanent buildings and houses. Scholars often referred to these settlements as villages, kinship groups, subsistence groups, communities, hamlets, bands or camps. Additionally, the Native Americans who inhabited these settlements established many social institutions in the form of shared sets of laws, customs and traditions. However, scholars seldom consider Eastern Native Americans of colonial North America to be urban dwellers, although they possessed many of the social institutions found in the cities and towns of their Euro-American counterparts. Yet, their Euro-American counterparts lived in similar settlements commonly called towns and cities, words often associated with places of urban settlement. Consequently, scholars often describe European settlements as cities or towns which denotes a state of more civilized or superior existence while labeling Native American settlements as villages, subsistence groups, bands, communities or camps which suggests a state of less civil or inferior living.

The works of Richard Aquila, The Iroquois Restoration, and Carl Bridenbaugh, Cities in the Wilderness, provide examples of biased grammar. In regard to the Five Nations political and social structures, Aquila stated that, “a large Iroquois village consisted of up to 3,000 residents...these tribes, villages, and clans were joined together in the
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Iroquois Confederacy, or the League of the Iroquois.” In contrast, Bridenbaugh explains in his book's preface, “For the complete picture five representative towns have been selected—Boston, Newport, New York, Philadelphia, and Charles Town. These five towns were the largest on the continent at the eve of the American Revolution.” Although some of the towns Bridenbaugh described had populations in excess of twenty thousand people, the population of Newport remained relatively small at only 6,716 inhabitants. Moreover, the period Aquila described is in the mid-seventeen hundreds, while the era Bridenbaugh described is at the turn of the eighteenth century. During the period Aquila described, the towns of Newport and Charleston both possessed populations smaller than 4,000 inhabitants, which equaled that of some Native American urban settlements. Because they are describing two different groups of people, these scholars used two different sets of words to describe similar things, urban settlements. Unfortunately, scholars continue to use different terms to distinguish Native American cultures from Euro-American and American societies and in so doing present a Euro-centric view of American history.

Similar to many words in the English Language, the term urban means different things to different people. To most people, urban refers to those areas of land located within the limits of a city. When scholars use the term urban, people think of an array of things such as large buildings, mass-transit systems, noise, large crowds of bustling urbanites, crime, filth, machine politics as well as a host of other things. In short, people often associate the term urban with the inner city. However, the meanings of words change over time.

In 1900, Henry Gannett, Director of the United States Census established the only criteria to determine if a settlement qualified as an urban area. According to Gannett and the Census Bureau, “the Census generally regards as the urban element that portion of the population living in cities of 8,000 inhabitants or more.” At the time of the first census in 1790, five out of the nearly two thousand settlements regarded as towns in North America contained
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populations of over 8,000 inhabitants. Rather, the majority of colonial towns contained populations of less than two thousand inhabitants. According to John Skinner, Marshal of the North-Carolina District during the 1790 Census, “the marshal...is satisfied that not one town in North-Carolina contains more than 2,000 inhabitants.” Because words mean different things to different people and due to the fact that many contemporary definitions fail to describe colonial Americans accurately, the terms used to describe them must be clearly defined and unbiased. To prevent a more biased interpretation of Native American societies, the remainder of this chapter is dedicated to creating a term that historians can use to accurately describe and compare the myriad of Euro-American and Native American urban settlements that dotted the North American continent during the colonial period.

The Definition of a Frontier Urban Settlement

Though they lacked the terms urban, colonize, settlement and frontier in their vocabulary, Native Americans migrated to unoccupied regions of America, settled and cultivated the land and created permanent and semi-permanent settlements that mirrored culturally, socially and in some cases physically the urban centers of their Euro-American counterparts on the periphery of colonial society that historians have labeled towns. However, Native American urban settlements continue to be referred to by historians as villages, tribes, clans or kin-groups. To correct the disparity between these images, scholars must “rediscover” Berkhofier’s “invented Indian” by defining the terms they use to describe them and their Euro-American counterparts. The intent of the following definitions is not to insult the intelligence of the reader but to explain what is meant by the phrase frontier urban settlement and to illustrate how both Euro-American and Native American cultures fit the proposed meaning. Additionally, the purpose of the following examination is to display the difficulty historians face when they use contemporary terms to describe people and cultures of the past without first establishing the meanings of key words and phrases.

As the word implies, urban means to belong to a city or town. A word often used in conjunction with urban is settlement. According to Webster’s Dictionary, a settlement is land that people settled or colonized and is being
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occupied. The key to understanding the definition of a settlement is to understand the word colonize. Colonizing is a process people engage in when they migrate to a land and settle in as inhabitants. Subsequently, migrate means to remove to a distant place or country, and inhabitants are individuals who permanently reside in an area. Therefore, by these definitions, urban settlements can be summarized as lands belonging to cities or towns, inhabited by permanent residents and colonized by migrants. As these definitions imply, the term urban settlement is an all-encompassing phrase that holds no distinct criteria for classifying or determining colonial settlements. To fully understand the term urban settlement, the words urban and settlement need further defining. To define these words further, the terms city and town need studying.

By definition, a city is a large town or borough. As is evident by this definition, the words town and city are interchangeable. Therefore by definition, a city is a town, and a town is a city. As the definitions imply, no plausible difference exists in the physical characteristics of a city or town, and contemporary scholars offer no criteria to distinguish the differences between them. However, the dictionary presents different definitions for a town and borough. A town is any collection of houses larger than a village, and a borough is a town with a municipal government. Although the dictionary presents separate definitions for the words town and borough, because a city is a town or borough, it is logical to assume that the words city, town and borough are all interchangeable and are areas that consist of municipal governments and are larger than villages. The question is now, what is a village?

As with the term urban, the word village creates an image in most peoples minds of a collection of crude temporary shelters built to sustain a small group of people for a short period of time. Based upon their experience with the use of the term in respects to the historic sense, people most often link the word village with Native Americans lifestyles. However with a further analysis of the English language, it is easy to deduce that the majority of settlements during the colonial period, both Native American and Euro-American, were simple villages in every sense of the vague definition.
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Continuing with this breakdown of the English language, a village is any collection of houses smaller than a town but larger than a hamlet, and a hamlet is a small village. Therefore, during the colonial period, the hierarchy of civil development consisted of cities, towns and boroughs at the upper end of the spectrum followed by villages, hamlets and then individual houses, buildings or dwellings for the habitation or use of man, at the lower end of the scale. As is evident by these definitions, scholars offer no numerical figure or physical criteria to distinguish the difference between cities, towns, boroughs, villages, or hamlets. The terms themselves are ideational and scholars use them freely without consideration of their meanings to describe Euro-American urban areas. In short, scholars failed to establish criteria to determine what constitutes a colonial city or town. Because no numerical variable exists in the English language to determine the varying sizes of colonial urban settlements, simply stated, a collection of houses is an urban area.

Fortunately, common sense dictates that a single house does not make a city. Moreover, due to the growth of America over the last three hundred years, colonial American urban areas regarded by their contemporaries as large cities would, by today's standards, be considered small. For example, in 1790, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania with a population of 376 people existed as one of America's largest frontier cities. In comparison, the United States Census in 1990 shows the village of Lima, Ohio with a population of 37,000 inhabitants as being relatively small. Additionally, each individual defines things differently. Without clear concise definitions, scholars improperly used these words when describing the people, places or things of the past. As is evident by the above example what one individual considered a city, another person regarded as a village two hundred years later. Therefore, the terms urban, city, town, village, and hamlet are abstract ideas that must be defined by scholars before they use them to describe the people of the past. By definition then, a city or town is an indeterminate number of houses with a municipal government. Unfortunately, although further defined, the term urban remains vague without a comprehensive understanding of a municipal government.
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Municipal means belonging to a city, and a government is a ruling body which administers public affairs. Public means that which pertains to a whole community, and a community is a society of people under the same laws or who live in the same circle or sphere of influence, laws are rules of conduct or action established by custom or tradition and enforced by a governing body. Therefore, by these and previous definitions, urban lands are areas which consist of a collection of buildings whose inhabitants are governed by the same laws. Thus by definition, any area to be considered an urban settlement would need only to consist of a collection of buildings whose inhabitants were permanent and adhered to the same set of laws. However, similar to the terms urban, city and town, this definition of an urban settlement can be interpreted in many different ways. For example, two buildings with two residents, one assuming the role of governor and the other of governed, by this definition, constitutes an urban settlement. As is evident, urban settlements are more than buildings with people in them. They are organized groups of people, a society.

As previously defined, a society is a group of people living together under the same laws. However, a society is more complex than its definition suggests. The root word of society is social. In relating to human societies, the term social refers to the interaction of a group and its members based on rank for the welfare of the community. Rank, in this definition, means class division, and a class is people of the same general status or place in society. Therefore for the purpose of this work, urban settlements consist of areas of land inhabited by class-structured people living in permanent dwellings, and conforming to a shared set of laws or practices.

It is important to note that the level of complexity in the construction methods and materials used to build the different groups dwellings is irrelevant. Construction materials and methods are merely techniques to build shelters. It is easy to assume that because one group developed a more efficient means of construction that the other groups settlements are not urban. The most important factor of urban settlement is the existence of a class structured society and not the types of homes, whether longhouse or mansions, that the people occupied. Therefore, this thesis omits
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terms such as city, town and village in order to furnish a bias-free description of America's early development, and to place colonial Native American societies on par with their European counterparts.

Similar to the term urban, the word frontier means different things to different people. As defined by Webster's Dictionary, a frontier is a border of a country or an undeveloped area of a country. According to the historian Frederick Jackson Turner, "the frontier is the outer edge of the wave—the meeting point between savagery and civilization." More specifically, Turner noted that the American frontier is the region that lies at the hither edge of free land, while European frontiers are fortified boundary lines running through dense populations. In most instances, when the term frontier is applied to the American west, Turner's definition of the meeting point between "savagery" and "civilization" is usually the assumed or implied meaning. However, as Jennings indicated, the American landscape was not void of civilization. In reality, Eastern North America consisted of a variety of Native peoples who were as diverse and socially advanced as the nations of Europe. In other words, the outer edge of Turner's frontier was a meeting point between two civilizations, or as the historian Jack D. Forbes more poignantly stated:

A frontier, in the socio-political sense, is a region where two or more ethnic groups or nationalities enter into relations or confront each other...the very essence of a frontier is the interaction of two or more people.

Moreover, Forbes explained that frontiers in colonial America existed between individual political entities that transcended ethnic and racial limits. For example, frontiers, Forbes explained, existed between various groups of European s such as in the case of the Franco-English frontier; between Native Americans groups like the Iroquois-Huron frontier; between Euro-American colonies such as the Virginia-Pennsylvania frontier and between Euro-American and Native American groups such as the Franco-Ohio Indian frontier. In other words, "the concept frontier," Forbes noted, "refers to a meeting point where two forces come up against each other...a contact point."
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where the boundary line “is seldom clear-cut.” In the case of the Ohio Valley in the mid-eighteenth century for example, the “American frontier” consisted of contact points between the French and English, the Colonies of Virginia and Pennsylvania, the Ohio Indians with all these various groups, as well as, a host of other relationships that included a myriad of Euro-American and Native American political entities. Therefore, for the purpose of this work, the term frontier does not refer to an uncivilized or savage region, but to a borderline, the meeting point between two civilizations, Euro-American and Native American.

The purpose of these definitions is twofold, neither of which is to frustrate the reader. They are to establish exactly what the term frontier urban settlement means, and to show that abstract ideas are images created by an individual’s mind and are misinterpreted when used by one society to describe other groups of people. To avoid a misinterpretation, for the purpose of this study, frontier urban settlements consist of areas of land comprised of permanent dwellings inhabited by a class-structured society of people conforming to a shared set of laws or practices that existed on the periphery of Euro-American and American societies and acted as the impetus of contact for the various groups who occupied the land between cultures.
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CHAPTER 2

The “Urban” Indians of the East:
A Model of Frontier Development and the Criteria for Native American and Euro-American Colonial Development

Understanding the terms and concepts used to explain American history is important, however, American history cannot solely be explained or understood through definitions. American history must be studied as a complex entity with many interrelating parts. By this, it is meant that understanding the relationships between the people, places, things and events which comprise American history is more important than comprehending the terminology scholars use to describe them, especially in regards to frontier contact and the development of the west.¹

Unfortunately in most cases, contemporary history consists of the accounts of past happenings which often occurred prior to the birth of the scholars who inscribe them. Because many contemporary scholars do not live in the era they study, or come into contact with people who did, they must rely on the manuscripts and artifacts of individuals long gone and of a time distinctly different from their own.

To better understand the past, some scholars attempt to interpret historic manuscripts and artifacts in their original context and transcend the technological, literary and cultural changes that transpired since the historic authors and craftsmen penned or created their works. In an attempt to accurately understand and describe these historic peoples, scholars develop literary devices to establish criteria for the study of atypical or common objects and events that existed or occurred in history such as the city and the frontier. These devices are often referred to as models. To better understand the role that Native Americans played in the development of the west, this work provides a model
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of frontier development that considers Native American frontier urban settlements as the “spearheads” and initial resource centers of the westward advancement of Euro-American and American societies.

**A Model of Native American Frontier Development**

The model presented in this essay is an extension of Kenneth Lewis’ work, *The American Frontier*. In his work, Lewis claimed that two types of frontier settlement occurred in colonial North America, insular and cosmopolitan. Lewis explained that:

> Insular frontier development is associated with the permanent occupation of regions by agriculturists and is marked by the process of fundamental change, [while] cosmopolitan frontiers arise to accommodate specialized, extractive economic activities in peripheral areas of the world economy.²

Lewis divided cosmopolitan frontiers into six sub-types—trading, ranching, exploitative plantations, transportation, military, and industrial. Surprisingly, Lewis believed that Native American societies contributed little to the development of the American west. In most instances, Lewis reduced Native Americans to insignificant members of the frontier ecology. For example, in the trading frontier, Lewis indicated that in the case of the North American fur trade, traders primarily involved themselves in an interaction with the frontier environment. Lewis noted that, "the goal of trade is the acquisition of items through exchange with aboriginal groups. This form of frontier settlement requires only the presence of the trader and his stock of supplies."³ In the case of his trading settlements for instance, Lewis reduced Native Americans to a mere economic factor that contributed equally with a myriad of other elements to the development of specific type of frontier. By viewing them in this fashion, Lewis disregarded Native Americans as active contributors to the development of the frontier. However despite his exclusion of them, Lewis’ work provides a framework to measure and evaluate the involvement of Native Americans in the development of the frontier.

Lewis included Eastern Native Americans of colonial North America in three of his cosmopolitan frontier models—trading, military, and transportation. According to Lewis, trading frontiers involved forms of settlement
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oriented toward the task of extracting a marketable product from the frontier environment. In most cases, the trader existed as the only agent involved in this type of colonization. Lewis noted that three common elements existed in almost all trading frontiers—the trader and their stock, a transportation system, and a marketable product native to the trade region. In addition to these three traits, trading frontiers expanded over a large region and lasted only as long as the extractable commodity existed. Lewis indicated that:

As the most geographically dispersed and most thinly populated form of colonization, trading frontiers are expected to exhibit a settlement pattern characterized by a small number of settlements thinly distributed along the periphery of the area... These settlements may be located along natural routes of transportation... are likely to be small and consist of buildings necessary to store trading commodities, and may be attached to forts for protection.

As is evident by his explanation, Lewis recognized only the Euro-American elements required to establish cosmopolitan frontiers and failed to consider the agents that propagated and assisted Anglo Americans with the settlement of the west, Native Americans.

Although he neglected them as active contributors in the colonization process, Lewis claimed that, "because trade involves a reciprocal arrangement... resident aboriginal groups... may be included as part of the... trading frontier." In short, Lewis, as previously indicated, discarded Native Americans as participants in the colonization and developmental process of the frontier. Ironically, Lewis suggested that Euro-American colonization influenced Native American settlement. He explained that, "occasionally, villages even grew up adjacent to a trading post as was the case at Fort Prince George, South Carolina where evidence of a large Cherokee settlement was found." However, as will be shown later, Native Americans, in most instances, initiated the Euro-American and American migration to and settlement of the frontier and not the reverse as Lewis suggested.

Unlike Lewis' other models, military and transportation frontiers developed as specialized activity settlements that arose to meet the particular needs of the intrusive society—protection, political control, communication
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and travel. While they were not active participants in the colonization process, military activities and transportation systems supported the expansion efforts of the cosmopolitan frontier they accompanied. Military facilities, placed in locations with strategic value such as trading posts, transportation routes, lakes and the confluence of rivers, Lewis noted, often overlapped other types of cosmopolitan frontier regions. In most instances, Euro-Americans built nonmilitary cosmopolitan and insular settlements adjacent to forts, camps, and other sites of frontier military activity.

More importantly however, Lewis claimed that, "forts established in areas that later became insular frontiers were often the nuclei of civilian settlements that retained the names of their military predecessors." Examples of this relationship between cosmopolitan frontiers and military facilities overwhelm scholarly accounts of the frontier. In the case of Pittsburgh for instance, the erection of Fort Pitt preceded and influenced the development of the urban settlement that would later take its name. The important link in the frontier development to discover is what prompted the development of the military facilities.

While military activities provided cosmopolitan frontiers with protection and political control over the region, transportation frontiers provided the intrusive society with a means of travel and communication. Governments established settlements to facilitate the flow of information, goods, and people into and out of frontier areas they claimed. Usually linear in form, Euro-Americans often situated transportation settlements along roads, rivers, railroads, or other routes of travel. Unlike other forms of frontier settlement, governments or interest groups and not the individual cosmopolitan settler influenced the development of military and transportation settlements. For example, concerning the development of the Ohio Valley, the colonial governments of Pennsylvania, Virginia, Maryland, and New York developed a series of urban settlements that included centers such as Conestoga, Carlisle, and Harris' Ferry to facilitate movement from places such as Philadelphia and Albany to Ft. Pitt and Logstown.
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Like many scholars, Lewis focused on the role that Euro-Americans played in the colonization of the frontier. Virtually ignoring the presence of Native Americans, Lewis explained that the primary actors in the colonization of the frontier involved Euro-Americans i.e., Euro-American traders attempting to exploit the natural resources of the environment; Euro-American governments military and political efforts aimed at controlling a specific region and Euro-American transportation systems developed to augment and facilitate the traders, statesmen, and soldiers operating in frontier regions. However though he provided a sound model for the Euro-American development of frontier urban settlements, Lewis, as do many scholars, failed to answer or pose several questions in regards to frontier settlement, such as, where did the traders go, and why did they go there; who established the routes of travel for the early traders; why did traders and military personal build trading posts, stockades, and forts in certain areas; why were soldiers and forts needed; and where did Euro-American and American settlements emerge? Ironically, the people most often overlooked as colonizers of the frontier provided a destination for traders, a means to efficiently exploit many of the frontier's resources, and initiated Euro-American and American military and civilian frontier settlement. Lewis and other scholars failed to consider that most Native American groups had much to gain with the presence of Euro-American at their doors. Native Americans did not settle merely for beads and bobbles, but traded for significant items that augmented their elaborate gift economies and enabled them to maintain the stratification of their societies. Additionally, Native Americans allied themselves with Euro-Americans to gain political control over a region or to establish a power base. By focusing merely on Euro-American settlement activities, many scholars failed to consider the role that Native Americans played and in so doing only told half the story of development of the American west. By studying these people, Native Americans, a better understanding and more complete picture of the colonization and development of the American west can be formed.

By combining Lewis' frontiers with Wade's and Jennings works, a model of Native American frontier development can be constructed. The model presented in this essay involves six stages of frontier development. However because a complete discussion of the Euro-American and American development of Pittsburgh has been
thoroughly studied by previous scholars, this study focuses on the first two stages of the colonization process to better illustrate how Native Americans assisted with the settlement and development of the west.

Similar to Wade's white spearheads, Native American urban settlements provided migrants, both Euro-American and Native American, with the security and resources necessary to colonize and commercially exploit the frontier. This first stage of frontier development involves Native Americans only, and deals primarily with their creation of frontier urban settlements. Stage two involves the initial efforts of the intrusive society, Euro-Americans, to exploit the frontier region and their dependence on Native Americans to accomplish their various goals. Following the natural waterways and man-made roadways developed by the aboriginal people and improved by the intrusive society, Euro-American traders and governments established cosmopolitan posts in, around, or adjacent to Native American urban settlements.

Next, the governments of Euro-American intrusive societies furnished military facilities such as forts and stockades near or at Native American urban settlements upon the request of Native groups or traders. In some instances, Euro-American governments established military facilities on their own accord without the permission of the Native groups or traders residing in a particular region. In time, Euro-American settlers migrated to the established military facilities and began to colonize and build an insular settlement. Eventually, the Native American population left the region and migrated west, leaving the region to be settled solely by Euro-Americans and their American successors. From these early frontier insular settlements, towns grew and initiated the further development and colonization of the region. Hence, the model of Native American frontier development begins with Native American urban settlements and ends with the emergence of white urban settlements.

Similar to other models of frontier development, the model presented in this essay acknowledges the colonizing efforts of Euro-American traders, statesmen, and settlers. However, unlike other models, the Native American model of frontier development contends that Native American, not Euro-American, settlements provided Anglo Americans with the resources and security necessary to settle the west. To prove this hypothesis, two things
are needed—proof that Native Americans established permanent urban settlements and an example of how these urban settlements influenced Euro-American settlement.

The Criteria to Determine the Level of Native American and Euro-American Frontier Urban Development in the Colonial Period

As previously defined, urban settlements are areas of land inhabited by class-structured people living in permanent dwellings and conforming to a shared set of laws or practices. However, after generations of viewing Native Americans as non-urban peoples, simply claiming that they lived in societies that fit into the definition of an urban settlement presented in this work is not enough. Proof is needed to substantiate this claim.

Throughout the decades, few scholars attempted to establish criteria for urban settlements. In his work dealing with Middle-Eastern cities entitled the Pre-industrial City, anthropologist Gideon Sjoberg provided a framework to categorize urban settlements. With this framework, Sjoberg determined that some Native American groups resided in urban settlements comparable with their Euro-American counterparts. Although he did not study Eastern Native Americans, Sjoberg's treatment of preindustrial societies allows scholars to compare divergent societies. As Sjoberg noted, "preindustrial cities everywhere display strikingly similar social and ecological structures, not necessarily in specific cultural content, but certainly in basic form." 12 Sjoberg argued that, although many forces influenced the development of cities, technology associated with distinctive types of social structures was the key independent variable that determined the complexity of human societies and their creations. 13 He explained that technology consisted of three basic elements—sources of energy, tools and the intelligence necessary to utilize and create resources and instruments. 14 Additionally, Sjoberg classified people into three types of societies—folk, preindustrial or feudal, and industrial. According to Sjoberg, "the technological variable is highly useful for differentiating among folk, feudal, and industrial societies, as well as more specifically between preindustrial and
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industrial cities.” By using Sjoberg’s three levels of societal development as way to measure societies, the complexity of Native American and Euro-American urban development can be determined and an unbiased comparison drawn between the two broad groups through the application of common terms.

To determine the complexity of Native American and Euro-American colonial groups, Sjoberg’s criteria must be further described. Sjoberg explained that folk societies are primarily small homogeneous self-sufficient isolated preliterate groups of people with a low degree of technology who lacked a staple food surplus. In these societies, the people limit themselves primarily to subsistence-oriented activities. As Sjoberg explained, although a modicum of labor specialization existed, work varied little between women and men. Furthermore, the lack of a division of labor inhibited the development of a class system or of substantial technological innovations that denoted more advanced civilizations. Examples of these societies exist today in the remote forests of South America and New Guinea. The Siriono of eastern Bolivia, Sjoberg noted, are excellent examples of folk societies. The men and women are both engaged in the fundamental duties of the society—food collection, cooking and basket-making.

In contrast to folk societies, Sjoberg explained that feudal or preindustrial societies are typically identified by their possession of an agricultural technology that produces sufficient food surpluses for a large non-agricultural population. Sjoberg noted that:

In all instances this technology includes the cultivation of grains. It also embraces (except in ancient Meso-America) animal husbandry, large-scale irrigation works, the plow, metallurgy, the wheel, and other devices that multiply the production and distribution of agricultural surplus. Nevertheless, the feudal society is almost entirely dependent upon animate, i.e., human and animal, sources of energy.

As a result of an advanced agricultural technology, preindustrial societies developed complex social institutions such as class-structured society and consolidated their populations in urban settlements. “The feudal order,” Sjoberg explained, “has a well-defined class structure and a clear-cut division of labor according to age, sex, and
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Additionally, Sjoberg noted that preindustrial urban settlements existed as part of the environment and void of the concept of city-limits.

Unlike preindustrial societies, Sjoberg explained that industrial-urban societies utilize inanimate sources of energy such as electricity, steam, nuclear fission, a complex set of tools, and specialized scientific know-how in the production of goods and services. Moreover, the populations of these societies reside primarily in large well developed urban settlements with a complex infrastructure that possess highly fluid class systems and diffused social power structures. Therefore according to Sjoberg's criteria, eighteenth century societies did not fit into the parameters of industrial societies. Although many societies, particularly those on the European continent, were in a state of transformation from the preindustrial to the industrial level, the societies of Eastern North America, Native American and Euro-American, coexisted as preindustrial urban settlements. Therefore despite all the differences which existed in shape and form, Native American and Euro-American urban settlements were similar in social complexity.

However at first glance, Eastern Native Americans of colonial North America do not fit into the parameters Sjoberg established for preindustrial or industrial societies. Consequently, many scholars may be tempted to view Eastern Native Americans as folk cultures. However, Sjoberg's treatment of ancient Meso-America lends proof that Eastern Native Americans resided in preindustrial societies.

According to Sjoberg, in addition to possessing the three elements of technology, urban settlements needed to contain further prerequisites in order to be considered preindustrial. Sjoberg's prerequisites consisted of a favorable ecological base, advanced forms of technology, and a complex social organization. Sjoberg noted that although Meso-American peoples lacked certain technological advances necessary for the development of preindustrial societies such as large scale irrigation, metallurgy, animal husbandry, the plow and wheeled vehicles, the cultivation
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of a superior crop, maize, provided Meso-American peoples with the time necessary to create the social institutions typified by preindustrial societies. Sjoberg claimed that:

Granted that the plow, the wheel, metallurgy, and pack or draft animals were all missing in early Meso-American civilization, the technology was quite well advanced in one significant respect. For the Indians of the region had a unique and superior kind of plant, maize—one that did not demand large-scale irrigation ventures or metal tools or domesticated animals to pull plows or other devices for its cultivation.22

Consequently due to a superior form of subsistence that required little effort to cultivate, Meso-Americans possessed the time needed and food surplus necessary to gather large populations of people in one location and develop the complex social institutions present in preindustrial societies despite their inferior forms of technology.

Using the same argument for maize producing peoples of North America, Sjoberg’s criteria for Meso-America can be applied to the urban settlements of Eastern Native Americans. Therefore, the key variable required to associate Eastern Native American peoples with preindustrial societies is the existence of complex social organizations and not the utilization of more advanced forms of technology. Thus, Native American urban settlements in order to be considered preindustrial societies need to consist of a collection of fixed dwellings; a permanent population; complex social groups; social institutions; a code of laws or customs; and the existence of a superior form of subsistence such as maize.
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CHAPTER 3

The Emergence of Logstown

Logstown emerged and existed as the most prominent Native American urban settlement in the Ohio Valley from approximately 1730 to 1758. To fully understand how its social institutions developed and functioned, one must first know who exactly settled Logstown. Unlike many Native American settlements during the colonial period, Logstown possessed a multinational population. While many Native American peoples adopted individual captives or integrated foreign groups into their society, the inhabitants of Logstown consisted primarily of three separate groups that came together to form the nucleus of the settlement. These groups consisted of the Shawnee, Delaware and Mingo peoples.

The Shawnee Migration and Establishment of Logstown, 1727-1743

Historians estimate that the Shawnee people from the Hathawikl and Pekowi sub-groups moved from the Wyoming Valley and Susquehanna River in Eastern Pennsylvania and settled Logstown between the years 1730 and 1743.\(^1\) However, the story of the movement of the Hathawikl and Pekowi into the Ohio Valley and the settlement of Logstown began much earlier. The history of the Shawnee peoples' migration began in what scholars believe to be the present-day Winnipeg Lake area in Canada sometime prior to the year 1240.\(^2\) Scholars believe the Shawnee people to be the southernmost members of the central group of Algonkian speaking people that occupied present-day Illinois, Indiana, western Ohio and Missouri. This linguistic group included the Fox, Sauk, Kickapoo, 
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Miami and Shawnee. The Shawnee name translated from the Algonkian language means southerners, which leads historians to believe this explanation for their origin and location in the historic Ohio Valley.3

The Shawnee, who apparently originated from the Winnipeg area, moved south into the Ohio Valley near present day Cincinnati. Currently, a debate exists amongst scholars as to whether the early inhabitants of the Ohio Valley were actually the ancestors of the Shawnee. The strongest argument places the Shawnee ancestors at Fort Ancient, in present day Warren County, Ohio.4 James H. Howard describes this hypothesis, known as the Fort Ancient Aspect, in his book Shawnee. Howard notes that:

The peculiar and distinctive combination of Northeastern, Iroquois like traits with Southeastern (Mississippian) and Midwestern (Oneota) features in Fort Ancient sites fits exactly our picture of historic Shawnee culture.5 Howard continues by stating that, “it would certainly be the most economical explanation in terms of available archeological, linguistic and ethnohistorical data to equate the prehistoric Shawnees with at least part of the Fort Ancient archeological culture.”6 Scholars estimate that the Fort Ancient people thrived in the Ohio Valley eventually expanding their holdings into the areas of present day Cahokia, Illinois and Cumberland, Kentucky.

From the Ohio country, bands of Shawnee began a gradual move southeast seeking trade with various European groups, primarily the Spanish in Florida. This sporadic move took place throughout the entire seventeenth century, and caused the Shawnee to settle in several states to include Florida, Kentucky, Virginia, Alabama, South Carolina, Delaware, Illinois and Tennessee. It is uncertain as to whether the Shawnee moved as a whole group or sub-divided into smaller factions. Several theories exist explaining the Shawnee move. The most sound explanation suggests that a large number of Shawnee remained in the Ohio Valley while smaller groups ventured forth seeking new trade alliances.
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As a result of their separation, the Shawnee appear in a variety of locations in many historical records which lends proof to the theory of their division. Yet, regardless of how they arrived in the southeast, the Shawnee did reside at one time or another in areas ranging from the Ohio and Cumberland Valleys to the Atlantic Ocean. Due to this dispersion, the various Shawnee groups moved and acted on their own accord. Though loosely bound to the larger community, individual Shawnee groups acted autonomously and engaged in both trade and war with whomever they encountered.

Around the turn of seventeenth century, the Shawnee, who had migrated to the southeast, began a slow migration back toward the Ohio Valley. Due to wars with the Iroquois Confederacy and Cherokee Nations and an influx of European migrants, the Shawnee left the colonies of Delaware, South Carolina and Florida and moved northwest into Pennsylvania. Additionally, because of the dismal outcome of the Yamasee War with the English in South Carolina, which was caused by their trade relationship with the Spanish, the Shawnee abandoned their settlements in Florida and South Carolina and moved northwest seeking new trade alliances with the French in Illinois. As the Shawnee moved from the southeast, members of the Iroquois Confederacy, between 1692 and 1673, began to expand their raiding efforts into the Ohio and Cumberland valleys and initiated a series of attacks against the Shawnee located in those regions.7 Due to this increased activity, scholars believe that the Shawnee in the Ohio and Cumberland valleys divided into several groups and moved off to lands in both the east and west.8 By 1683, a number of the Shawnee, who fled the Ohio and Cumberland valleys, moved to the French trading post at Starved Rock, known more commonly as Fort St. Louis, in Illinois and joined their people located there and initiated a sporadic trade relationship with the French that lasted for nearly seventy years.9

Around this same time, the Hathawikil and Pekowi, moving primarily from Delaware and South Carolina, migrated into the eastern portion of Pennsylvania and took up residence in the Wyoming Valley along the Susquehanna River. The Hathawikil and Pekowi entered Pennsylvania from several locations. In 1692, the Munsee,

7 Howard 7.
8 Ibid.
the northernmost group of the Delaware, persuaded a number of the Shawnee residing at Fort St. Louis to cease their trade with the French in the west and move east into Pennsylvania and begin dealing with the English colonies.\textsuperscript{10} Ironically, as Shawnee fleeing Iroquois raids were migrating west towards Fort St. Louis from the Cumberland and Ohio valleys, a group of Shawnee departed the post to seek more advantageous conditions with the English in the east with Pennsylvania. Hence, because groups of the Hathawki and Pekowi were fleeing various Native Americans and Europeans in Illinois, Delaware, South Carolina and the Ohio and Cumberland valleys, the majority of the known Shawnee population resided within the boarders of Pennsylvania by the early eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{11}

The first evidence of Shawnee settlement in Pennsylvania occurred between the years of 1692 and 1698. Approximately seventy Shawnee families along with French trader Martin Charlier from the Fort St. Louis group moved into present day Lancaster County and established the settlement of Pequea along the Susquehanna River.\textsuperscript{12} From the time of their initial settlement to around 1728, the Shawnee expanded their holdings and established several settlements along the Susquehanna River. These settlements covered an area ranging from the Pequea Creek to as far north as the Juniata River near present-day Sunbury in Northumberland County.\textsuperscript{13}

While residing in Eastern Pennsylvania, several incidents occurred that caused the Shawnee migration to the Ohio Valley. In 1700 and 1701, the Shawnee residing in Pequea, under the leadership of sachem Opessa (Wapangtah), entered into a treaty with the colonies of Maryland and Pennsylvania respectively.\textsuperscript{14} The Iroquois Confederacy by right of conquest claimed dominance over the Native Americans that resided in Pennsylvania and rejected the autonomous actions taken by the Shawnee to negotiate the treaties.\textsuperscript{15} Additionally, the Pennsylvania government bestowed upon the Iroquois Confederacy protectorate rights over all the Native Americans residing
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within their colony. Consequently, the Iroquois asserted their position over the Shawnee and in 1711, with the assistance of the Pennsylvania government, forced Opessa to step down as the leader of Pequa.\textsuperscript{16} The Iroquois Confederacy subsequently replaced Opessa as head of the Shawnee settlement with the Oneida chief Carondawana.\textsuperscript{17} With the approval of the Pennsylvania government, members of the Iroquois Confederacy continued to politically assert themselves over the majority of the Pennsylvania Shawnee and other groups of Native Americans throughout the first quarter of the seventeenth century. The Shawnee tolerated the treatment they received at the hands of the Pennsylvania government and Iroquois Confederacy until the pressure of Euro-American settlement in the Susquehanna Valley prompted them to leave.\textsuperscript{18}

The Shawnee began to feel the pressures of Euro-American settlement around 1710 when Swiss Mennonite immigrants intruded upon their settlements along the Susquehanna River. In an attempt to avoid further encounters with the Europeans, the Shawnee moved farther upstream, but it was to no avail. The Europeans continued to trespass on and disturb Shawnee lands.\textsuperscript{19} Hence, due to their adverse relationships with the Iroquois Confederacy and the disturbances caused by migrating Europeans, the Shawnee began to leave their eastern Pennsylvania homes around 1728. By 1731, only twelve hundred Shawnee, located at the headwaters of the Ohio River, along the Juniata and Susquehanna Rivers or in the Wyoming Valley, remained in eastern Pennsylvania.\textsuperscript{20} Between 1732 and 1734, a majority of the residence living in Pequa who remained in eastern Pennsylvania left the settlement and followed the large number of Shawnee who had already migrated from the region.\textsuperscript{21} Although the Pennsylvania government attempted to persuade the migrants to move back east, the Shawnee, who by this time essentially disassociated themselves with the colony and the Iroquois Confederacy, ignored the pleas and remained in their western homes. Eventually, the Shawnee migration spread into western Pennsylvania and the remainder of the
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Ohio Valley, and between 1730 and 1743, the Hathawikil and Pekowi, under the leadership of Kakowatchekey established Logstown.

**Lenni-Lenape (Delaware) Migration to the Ohio Valley, 1727-1748**

Not long after the Shawnee settled Logstown, the Delaware and Mingo groups moved to the settlement. Like the Shawnee, the history of the Delaware migration to the Ohio Valley and Logstown began decades before the actual move occurred. When Europeans first encountered them, the Delaware lived along the Atlantic seaboard in what is today southeastern Pennsylvania, southeastern New York, and the states of Delaware and New Jersey. The Delaware named this area Lenapehoking or Lenape *Ehendawikihit*, which means "where the Lenape dwell".

The origin of the Lenape is a controversial issue amongst scholars. Currently, two contrasting theories exist regarding this issue. The more popular and discussed theory finds its roots in the interpretation of one of the only Native American written records that ever existed, the Walam Olum, and in the works of two Moravian missionaries who lived amongst the Lenape in the eighteenth century, John Heckewelder and David Zeisberger. Translated by Constantine Samuel Rafinesque in 1833, the Walam Olum was a pictographic migration history of the Lenape people recorded on bark tablets and accompanied by chants. Although Rafinesque copied the original tablets, the Walam Olum disappeared soon after the translation. Hence, the interpretation and translation Rafinesque provided is the only one that remains.

The Walam Olum and the histories Zeisberger and Heckewelder derived from the Lenape claim that their pre-historic ancestors originated from an area west of the Mississippi River. According to these sources, the Lenape for unknown reasons decided to migrate east. After several years of traveling, the Lenape met and allied with a group of Native Americans known as the Mengwe, the ancestors of the Iroquois Confederacy, on the western side of the Namaes Sipu, or Mississippi River. The Lenape and Mengwe attempted to cross to the eastern side of the
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Mississippi however, the advance parties of the Lenape encountered the Alligewi, or Talligewi, the ancestors of the Cherokee, who permanently occupied the area immediately east of the Mississippi.26

The Lenape first requested permission to settle the land but were denied by the Alligewi. However, the Alligewi permitted the Lenape to pass through their lands and establish settlements further east. Alarmed at the great numbers of people conducting the crossing, the Alligewi attacked the Lenape. Outraged by the incident, the Lenape and Mengwe declared war on the Alligewi and eventually drove them from the area.

Following the war with the Alligewi, the Lenape and Mengwe divided their newly acquired lands. The Mengwe took the northern portion of the conquered lands around the area of the Great Lakes, while the Lenape claimed the lands directly to the south.27 Eventually, bands of the Lenape began to push further east to occupy these new lands and settled on the four great rivers, the Susquehanna, Potomac, Delaware and Hudson.28 Not all the Lenape crossed the Mississippi, and of those that did, only a small fraction migrated further east. At this point, the Lenape divided into three distinct groups: the two groups that remained on the immediate western and eastern banks of the Mississippi, and the group that migrated east. It is the later group that scholars eventually came to call Lenape, or Delaware. According to the Walam Olum, this last group further divided themselves into three more distinct groups, the Munsee, Unami and Unalachiago.29

The Lenape and Mengwe lived in relative harmony increasing their populations that the war with the Alligewi diminished.30 However, the two groups began to pressure on one another and war eventually ensued. The Mengwe suffered the majority of the losses in the early stages of the conflict. To avoid extermination, the Mengwe
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joined with neighboring groups of Native Americans and formed the famed Iroquois Confederacy. With a balance of power established, a military stalemate occurred until European contact.\(^{31}\)

The second theory, supported by research conducted by archeologists William W. Newcomb, W. A. Ritchie and C. S. Smith, suggests that the historic Lenape culture originated from the Late Pre-historic period cultures of the New York and New Jersey areas that sprung from earlier cultures of the Intermediate period, the interval of time between the Pre-historic and Late Pre-historic periods.\(^{32}\) According to Ritchie, during the Intermediate period, in New York, some native cultures, in successive diffusions over several centuries, migrated from the Great Lakes area, mainly Ohio, via the Allegheny Valley and south shore of Lake Erie into Lenapehoking.\(^{33}\) Although migrations and movement occurred among the various native cultures inhabiting Lenapehoking, scholars suggest that, the Delaware culture developed deep and long standing roots in the immediate vicinity, and while migrations and the diffusion of cultural traits did occur, they failed to occur on the scale suggested by the Walam Olum or the oral traditions of the Lenape.\(^{34}\) According to Newcomb, while the migration account of the Walam Olum developed from their traditional legends, the Lenape altered it during their phase of "revivalistic nativism" to suit the political circumstances of the nineteenth-century.\(^{35}\)

Recent scholars surmise that had the Walam Olum been the true migration history of the Lenape, the descendants of the inscribers would most likely have kept the document instead of using it as payment for medical services rendered by a nineteenth century physician.\(^{36}\) Although Heckewelder and Zeisberger recorded the accounts of eighteenth century Lenape, recent archeological evidence concerning the pre-history of Lenapehoking gives credence to the second theory. The archeological record of Lenapehoking provides no evidence that suggests that a
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large number of people migrated to the area at one particular time as the Walam Olum suggested. In contrast, the evidence suggests that the Lenape evolved from ancestral people who lived in Lenapehoking for thousands of years. Artifacts present in Lenape society during the eighteenth century appear in many of the pre-historic sites of Lenapehoking. Evidence of similar agriculture and shellfish collections along the coast coupled with common pottery, bone and antler artifacts and burial techniques found only at Lenape sites suggests that the Lenape gradually evolved from people who were indigenous to Lenapehoking. In addition to the strong archeological evidence, details concerning the authenticity and accuracy of the Walam Olum’s translation exist that also support theory two. First, the pictographs Rafinesque used in the Walam Olum fail to resemble any of the petroglyph figures or stone carvings found in all of Lenapehoking. Rather, the pictographs resemble the figures found on similar bark records of Midewiwin, Chippewa and other Great Lakes Algonkian cultures. Additionally, contemporary Lenape, in interviews conducted with anthropologist Herbert C. Kraft, state that they never heard their parents or elders mention the Walam Olum. As Kraft himself suggests, “its antiquity is questionable, and the migration story as presented in the Walam Olum appears to have no basis in fact.”

Scholars now believe that the three groups of Lenape who settled Lenapehoking never existed. The terms Munsee, Unami and Unalachtigo, used by Heckewelder and Ziesberger to describe the three migratory groups detailed in the Walam Olum, developed after European contact and represented geographical locations and not individual groups. Current ethnological evidence suggest that, “the Delaware peoples were aboriginally and during most of the seventeenth century unorganized politically and composed of a large number of subdivisions.”

Scholars contend that groups such as the Navisink, Sanhikan (Raritan), Hackinsack, Katskill, Aquackanunk, Tappan, Munsee, and Unami were not cohesive as groups and therefore, the Walam Olum is not an accurate representation of Lenape history.
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Waoraneck, and the Warranawonkong were among the nearly thirty individual groups that resided in Lenapehoking. Due to the decrease in their numbers following European contact, scholars believe these loosely affiliated groups eventually began to merge to form the three sub-divisions of the Lenape that came to be known as the Munsee, Unami and Unalachtigo.

In the Algonkian language, the terms Unami and Unalachtigo mean "people down the river" and "people who live near the ocean" respectively. The Unami and Unalachtigo merged sometime before European contact and formed the core of the Lenape culture. The Munsee, also referred to in historic documents as the Monsee, Mointhey, Munsies and Minisink, occupied an area that encompassed portions of eastern Pennsylvania, along the Lehigh and Susquehanna rivers, New York and New Jersey, near the Blue or Kittatinny Mountains. The name Munsee in the Algonkian language means, "people of the stoney country." The Munsee, while Algonkian speakers, spoke a dialect that differed from their southern relatives, the Unami and Unalachtigo, known as the M-dialect. Scholars believe that the Unami and Unalachtigo made up the actual Delaware, while the Munsee evolved as a loosely related separate group. Regardless of the controversy regarding the origin of the Lenape, the Delaware people did not exist as a recognizable political group until well into the eighteenth century. Concerning the composition of the historic Lenape people, William Newcomb notes that:

The people who were to comprise the Delaware tribe of the eighteenth century were drawn from a large number of small, dispersed, and essentially autonomous groups. At the dawn of historic times they were not a tribe in the political sense, and since they differed somewhat from one another in other aspects of culture, it is perhaps unwise to think of them as a tribe. It was not until these groups had become consolidated in early decades of the eighteenth century that the term Delaware is properly applicable to them. The English name Delaware was given to these people because they were concentrated near the Delaware River in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.46

Many factors contributed to the Lenape migration west. One significant factor proved to be the contrasting views of land ownership between the Lenape and Europeans. The Lenape concept of “land ownership” granted an
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individual the right to plant, hunt and build on the land, but not to permanently possess it.⁴⁹ Among the Delaware, families, and sometimes the entire settlements, controlled separate and distinct areas of land. These territories consisted of wooded areas of various sizes usually bounded by distinguishable landmarks such as streams and rivers. Each individual family “owned” the right to use the land to hunt, fish and trap. All members of the community respected the right of the controlling family and seldom if ever violated them by trespassing on the land. Yet, while they “owned” the right to use the land, the Lenape never believed they actually possessed the land itself.⁵⁰

The Lenape believed that Kishelemukong, the "Great Spirit," created the earth for all people to use.⁵¹ Like the air, water, and sun, the land existed to provide the Lenape with the necessities of life. Simply, the land existed to provide the Lenape and all peoples with the materials necessary to survive. To the Lenape, the land belonged to no one and no single individual or settlement held the right or means to sell or control something that existed for all. Therefore, when they transferred “ownership” of the land, the Lenape gave an individual the right to use the land.

In contrast, the European came from a class structured society founded upon a different premise of land ownership. Throughout the centuries, Europeans acquired wealth and position through the acquisition of land. By the time they stumbled onto North America, the Europeans divided and subdivided the majority of their homelands into individually owned plots of land. However when they arrived in North America, the Europeans found vast stretches of “unoccupied” land, an experience unfamiliar to them. To the European, land brought wealth, and real estate became a commodity that individuals bought, sold, inherited, divided, or used as collateral.⁵² In Europe, “every foot [of land] belonged to somebody, and fields and woods beyond the towns and cities were clearly identified as real property and the owners’ rights were protected by law.”⁵³ Moreover, once they gained title to a tract of land, the European believed they retained the right to use it anyway they chose. This included fencing it off and prohibiting
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others from using the land. The common European lived in a world owned by other people and held no rights to land unless granted them by an owner.⁵⁴ Therefore, when they first viewed the vast stretches of “unoccupied” land, the various European nations began their quests to possess it.

The early historian John Heckewelder wrote about an incident concerning the contrast between the Lenape and European concept of land usage. In his account, a Lenape, without permission, allowed his horse to graze overnight in Heckewelder's pasture. When Heckewelder confronted the Lenape over the unauthorized use of his land, the Lenape responded:

My friend, it seems you lay claim to the grass my horse has eaten because you had enclosed it with a fence: now tell me, who caused the grass to grow...the grass which grows out of the earth is common to all; the game in the woods is common to all. Say, did you ever eat venison and bear's meat? "yes, very often," [Heckewelder replied.]—Well, and did you ever hear me or any other [Lenape] complain about that? No; then be not disturbed at my horse having eaten only once of what you call your grass, though the grass my horse did eat, in like manner as meat you eat, was given to the [Lenape] by the Great Spirit. Besides, if you will but consider, you will find that my horse did not eat all your grass.⁵⁵

As is evident by this example, the Lenape, as well as most Native Americans, viewed land ownership and usage differently than their Euro-American neighbors. To the Native American, land belonged to no one and its commodities and resources were bountiful enough to be shared by all people, a concept completely opposite of their Euro-American neighbors.

The contrasting concepts of land ownership eventually led to the Lenape’s dispossessing themselves of their ancestral lands. Once the Europeans established the practice of exchanging lands for goods, the Lenape accepted the method as a standard to do business with the Europeans. While they realized that they granted the Europeans use of their land, the Lenape apparently misunderstood the long-term affect of what they were doing.⁵⁶ When they eventually realized that relinquishing ownership of the land meant forfeiting their own right to use it, the Lenape already dispossessed themselves of a majority of their land.⁵⁷
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The lack of a national or group identity proved to be the other major factor that influenced the Lenape’s westward migration. The Lenape differed from many Eastern Native American groups in that they never formed a nation or confederacy. No single individual or group reigned as the sovereign ruler or “chief” over all the Lenape.

The Lenape’s lack of a unity transcended all facets of their society including the way in which they settled Lenapehoking and governed themselves. The Lenape lived in approximately thirty to forty autonomous settlements throughout Lenapehoking.58 The Lenape governed themselves much like the ancient Greek city-states, each settlement remained independent of one another and attended to its own affairs. Additionally, each settlement established its own headman or set of patriarchs who served as the communities leadership. This autonomy enabled each settlement to negotiate separate land deals with the various European nations competing for control of North America.

Due to their autonomy and misunderstanding of the concept of European land ownership, the Lenape arbitrarily sold their lands to the highest bidder, which eventually forced them to migrate west. The Lenape first began selling their lands in the seventeenth century to the Dutch and English. The most infamous of these sales proved to be the purchase of Manhattan Island for sixty guilders worth of goods to Peter Minuit in 1626.59 Although they initially misunderstood the European concept of land ownership, the Lenape eventually grasped the idea and continued to sell their ancestral lands despite the ramifications. Most often, an entire settlement counseled and ultimately decided whether to sell tracts of their lands, seldom if ever did individuals negotiate the sale of Delaware lands.60

Many of the Lenape’s land sales encompassed large tracts of land. On one occasion, the Lenape traded away the land extending from Cape Henlopen in southern Delaware to Trenton, New Jersey.61 Since they had no
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use for money, the Lenape accepted trade goods as payment for their lands. When they “purchased” the area around present day Burlington, New Jersey, the Dutch paid the Lenape:

Forty six fadome of Duffields, Thirty blankets, one hundred & fifty pound of powder, Thirty guns, Thirty kettles & thirty kettles more instead of Wampam, Thirty axes, Thirty howes, Thirty aules, Thirty needles, Thirty looking glasses, Thirty pair of Stockings, Seaven anchors of Brandy or Rum, Thirty knives, Thirty barnes of lead, Thirty six rings, Thirty Jews harps, Thirty combs, Thirty bracelets, Thirty bells, Thirty tobacco toungs or steeles, Thirty pair of Sisses, Twelve tobacco boxes, Thirty flints, Tenn spoonfulls of red paint, one hundred of fish hooks, one gross of tobacco pipes & thirty shirts to them paid for one of three parcels of land.\textsuperscript{62}

At first, the trade items proved a worthy exchange for their lands. Items such as glass beads, metal tools and firearms revolutionized Lenape technology. However, the Lenape eventually realized that the items they received for their lands were seemingly worthless in comparison. Yet, within a century of meeting the Europeans, the Lenape traded away virtually all their ancestral land along the Atlantic seaboard.

The Lenape migration from Lenapehoking to Logstown is difficult for historians to trace. From the time of European contact until their first known move in 1690, warfare, sickness and White expansionism reduced the population of the Lenape people. This depopulation caused the small independent bands of Lenape, who enjoyed complete autonomy and a uniqueness that set each group apart, to merge to survive the onslaught of Europeans. Though all the Lenape eventually migrated west, the move occurred over a period of several years and affected each group in different ways and at various times.

When the first Europeans settled in Lenapehoking, the Lenape instantly began adjusting and relocating to avoid the pressures of white settlement.\textsuperscript{63} The first recorded Lenape migration west occurred around 1690. A group of Munsee moved to southwestern Canada to join with the Ottawa to trade with the French.\textsuperscript{64} Eventually, by the turn of the seventeenth century, the Lenape adjustment to European contact led to the formation of three distinct groups. The first two groups, made up of the "Jersey" and "Brandywine" Delaware, acted independently of the Unami and Munsee and lived at the forks of the Lehigh (West Branch) and Delaware Rivers and in the Brandywine Valley in
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Pennsylvania respectively. The Unami, or "Schuylkill," accounted for the third group and settled in the upper Schuylkill drainage in Pennsylvania between the South and Blue Mountains.66 The Munsee retained their identity as a separate and independent group and continued to live primarily in Lenapehoking. Though they would eventually merge in the Ohio Valley, the Munsee, Unami, Brandywine and Jersey Lenape acted independently of one another throughout the first half of the eighteenth century.

Around this same time, the Lenape became subjugated to the Iroquois Confederacy. Although many independent settlements and families moved from their ancestral lands to form the Unami, Jersey and Brandywine groups, the Lenape retained "ownership" of parts of their original homeland in Lenapehoking. Like other lands they occupied, the Europeans desired the last few parcels of Lenapehoking remaining in Lenape hands. Over the course of forty years, several events concerning the purchase of this land caused the Lenape to migrate further west into Pennsylvania.

The most infamous of these events was the notorious "Walking Purchase" of 1737. In a 1686 deed between himself and a group of Lenape, William Penn purchased an area of land measured by how far, "a man could walk in a day and a half." After his father's death in 1718, Thomas Penn conspired with James Logan to acquire a majority of the land that belonged to the "Jersey" group and claimed that the Lenape and Penn's father never established the boundaries of the 1686 deed. After convincing the Lenape of the ruse, Penn and Logan trained three runners to make the famed walk and cut a path through the woods.66 Followed by two Lenape observers, the walkers began their trek across Pennsylvania followed by several horses laden with provisions. Though the Lenape intended the walk to be at a normal pace of around twenty-five miles, Penn's walkers succeeded in traveling sixty miles in the time allotted.67 Following the "walk," Logan established a ten square mile reservation for the Lenape at the forks of the Lehigh and Delaware rivers to compensate for their loss. Upset with Penn's and Logan's fraudulent
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scam, the Lenape refused to leave their land. However soon after the walk, Penn opened the area for settlement, and over one-hundred white families immediately moved into the area and pressured the Lenape into moving out.

Over the course of several years, the Lenape sold their lands on the lower Delaware and Schuylkill rivers to avoid confrontations with the Pennsylvania Government and Iroquois Confederacy. As the European colonists stepped up settlement activities in eastern Pennsylvania, a majority of the Lenape conducted a series of moves to and around the Susquehanna region. The Lenape moved to three main urban settlements along the Susquehanna: Wyoming, situated along the North Branch; Shamokin, located at the juncture of the West and North branches; and Paxtang, near the confluence of the Juniata and the Susquehanna. Shamokin, established by a group of Shawnee, existed as the largest and most prominent of these settlements.

As early as 1709, groups of Unami, under the leadership of Olumapies, moved to the settlement of Paxtang near present day Harrisburg. Shortly thereafter in 1718, Olumapies and his people moved again to Shamokin near present day Sunbury. The Lenape movement to and around the Susquehanna continued in this fashion until the mid-eighteenth century when virtually all of them lived in the region. The last reported move to the area occurred in 1742 when Nutimus and his people left the bounds of the "Walking Purchase" and settled in Wyoming. The exodus to the Susquehanna allowed the three groups of Lenape to converge from New Jersey, Delaware, southern New York and southeastern Pennsylvania and settle in a common location for the first time in history. Due to this gathering of peoples, the individual groups of Lenape became diffused into a larger whole and began melding together as one group. Additionally, several groups of Native Americans such as the Shawnee, Conoy, Nanticoke, Mahican, Tutelo and Twightwee (Miami) preceded, accompanied, or followed the Lenape to the Susquehanna. As early as 1694, groups of Lenape and Shawnee, as well as, other Native American peoples allied with one another and lived in
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relative peace. By the mid-eighteenth century, the Susquehanna River Valley became a refuge and veritable melting pot for Eastern Native Americans.

Shortly after their arrival to the Susquehanna, groups of Shawnee began moving across the Allegheny Mountains seeking richer lands free of European and Iroquoian dominance. As early as 1727, adventurous Lenape followed the Shawnee west. Unlike the Shawnee settlers of Logstown who came primarily from one group, the Lenape migrants consisted of members from the Brandywine, Jersey, Unami and Munsee peoples. Within time, the Lenape, Shawnee and other Native American peoples established several prominent urban settlements west of the Allegheny Mountains. These urban settlements consisted of Logstown, Kittanning, Kuskuskie, Shingas' Town, Shannopin's Town, Venango and Loyalhannaing. Unlike the Native American settlements east of the Alleghenies, the "towns" that emerged in the river valleys of western Pennsylvania were not formed from homogeneous cultural units but from a collection of heterogeneous peoples. By 1748, a mixture of one hundred and sixty-five Lenape warriors and their families lived in western Pennsylvania primarily at Logstown, Kittanning and Kuskuskie with the Shawnee and other Native American groups who lived in the Ohio Valley.

The Emergence of the Mingo in the Ohio Valley During the 17th Century

The third major group to settle in Logstown consisted of a conglomeration of Native Americans called Mingos. Though absent from seventeenth century maps, the Mingo, appear in many of the primary documents dealing with the history of the Five Nations and Ohio Valley. Like most Native American peoples, scholars debate over the origin of the Mingo. The majority of scholars claim that the Mingo were refugees of the Five Nations who fled to the Ohio Valley to shed the yoke of Iroquois authority.
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According to historian Francis Jennings, the word Mingo to the English implied a mix of peoples.\textsuperscript{77} Although members of the Iroquois Confederacy made up the majority of the group, the Mingo consisted of members from groups including the Wyandot, Fox, Mahican and Erie peoples.\textsuperscript{78} Additionally, members of the Iroquois Confederacy adopted conquered enemies into their groups. Due to their mixture of Native American groups and adopted persons, scholars contend that many of the Iroquois that made up the Mingo actually came from origins outside of the Iroquois Confederacy.\textsuperscript{79}

George Hunt gives a different explanation of the origin of the Mingo in his work The Wars Of The Iroquois. Citing Augustin Herman, a Bohemian commissioned by Lord Baltimore to map Maryland and Virginia in the seventeenth century, Hunt explains:

On Herman's map of 1670 appears a new tribe in the old land of the Erie on the upper Ohio River, the 'Black Minquas.' These Black Minquas, who later figured in the affairs of the Susquehannah, were undoubtedly the Erie. The name 'Mingo,' evidently a derivative of 'Minqua,' was indiscriminately applied to sub-tribes of the Iroquois at first, and later even to the Five Nations themselves.\textsuperscript{80}

Based on Herman's work, Hunt suggests that the Mingo were survivors of the Erie Nation who in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries lived along the shores of Lake Erie.

William A. Hunter proposed yet another hypothesis for the ancestry of the Mingo. According to Hunter, the Mingo consisted of the refugee bands of Susquehannock who merged with the Seneca at Conestoga and migrated to the west. Hunter even suggested that, despite Conrad Weiser's claim that she was a Seneca, evidence exists that indicates that the famed Queen Aliquippa was in fact a Susquehannock.\textsuperscript{81}

The most likely explanation is that the Mingo were a mixture of people that included all these groups as Jennings suggested. In the mid-seventeenth century, the Iroquois and Erie engaged in a near genocidal war.

Following the war, which virtually wiped out the Erie Nation, many of the members from the Iroquois Confederacy
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war expedition remained in the Ohio Valley too war weary to make the long journey back to their homelands. Eventually, this band of Iroquois, composed primarily of Seneca and Cayugas, adopted the small remnant bands of Erie and merged to form the Mingo.

This original group of Mingo eventually grew by accepting groups of migrating Iroquois and Susquehannocks traveling to the Ohio Valley in pursuit of game and new territory.82 Slowly, the Mingo became more autonomous and disassociated from the Iroquois Confederacy. No longer adhering to the authority of the Confederacy, the Mingo continually ignored the orders of the Five Nations and English to return to their homelands.83 Content in their new homes, the Mingo settled in Logstown as well as several other urban settlements in the Ohio Valley.
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CHAPTER 4

The Key to Becoming a Native American Preindustrial Society:
The “Superior” Subsistence Cycle of Logtown

As described in Chapter 1, one group’s perceptions of another culture are often misleading due to the opinion of the individuals conducting the observation. Descriptions of Logstown from various people prove this fact. For instance, like many English observers in the eighteenth century, Conrad Weiser, on his first trip to the Ohio in 1748, described Logstown as a “town.” Weiser is in good company with this description since individuals such as George Washington, George Croghan, Christopher Gist and Benjamin Franklin also described and regarded Logstown as a town on numerous occasions. In contrast, the Frenchman, Monsieur de Celoron, on his journey to Chiningue (Logstown) in August of 1749, wrote that, “this village consists of fifty cabins, composed of Iroquois, Channanous (Shawnee), Loups (Delaware) and a part of the men of villages I had passed who had come to seek refuge there, and render them stronger.” Ironically, Celoron used the terms “cabins” and “village” in his description of the settlement presenting almost contrasting images of what contemporary Americans perceive as historic Native American life. Seldom do contemporary scholars, and more specifically the people of America, view “Indians” as living in “cabins,” at least not until the Euro-Americans “properly” acculturated them into their society.

Though many Euro-Americans, C. A. Weslager explained, regarded Native American dwellings as crude, primitive and impermanent structures, Celoron’s description sounds like he was almost describing a Puritan Village of colonial New England. What distinguishes folk from pre-industrial societies, Sjoberg explained, is more evident in the social institutions that a people developed then in the material culture or technology they possessed. While it
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appeared to be a "town" to many contemporary observers, Logstown also remained a simple "Indian village" in the eyes of others. Therefore to avoid falling into the old trap of accepting the victor's description of the vanquished, or in this case the literate over the illiterate, contemporary scholars must look on the past with objectivity and look beyond the descriptions of the victors to find the real image of the vanquished. The question is then, what social institutions appear in preindustrial societies that fail to appear or appear differently in folk societies?

As defined in Chapter 2, an urban settlement, Gideon Sjoberg's preindustrial city, is a collection of buildings with a permanent socially organized self-sufficient group of people as a populace adhering to the same set of laws and customs, regardless if they are Native American or Euro-American. Sjoberg noted that several social institutions existed in pre-industrial cities. These institutions included the emergence of a social class; the development of economic, political and religious structures; the practice of marriage; the adherence to family lineage and the development of communication and education systems. Since much is known about the Shawnee, Lenape and Mingo, this work limits itself to the two most critical social institutions that Sjoberg established as the prime determinants of preindustrial societies, politics and economics. It is important to note however, that the focus of this study is to establish the existence of these institutions in Logstown and not to provide an in depth description of their intricacies.

The basis for this work rests on Sjoberg's hypothesis that, though they lacked certain aspects of Euro-American technology such as husbandry and metallurgy, maize compensated for these important elements and enabled Native Americans to develop the complex social institutions that existed in preindustrial societies. The Native Americans' grasp of horticulture led to their abandonment of hunting and gathering and gave rise to their establishment of permanent and semi-permanent urban settlements. The "urbanization" of their culture enabled Native Americans to develop the complex social institutions prevalent in pre-industrial cities.

Maize is paramount to this discussion because it is the key ingredient that allowed Native Americans to develop preindustrial societies. Sjoberg contended that while lack of true metallurgy, the wheel and other items of
technology limited their expansion, maize enabled Native American urban settlements to overcome their technological deficiencies and develop complex social institutions. In short, horticulture enabled Native Americans to concentrate their populations in centralized locations, subsist off their surrounding environment and form permanent or semi-permanent settlements. For instance, in his study of New England, William Cronon found that population sizes differed greatly between nonagricultural and crop-raising Native Americans occupying similar size territories. In Maine, Cronon noted, “nonagricultural Indians...sustained population densities, on average of perhaps 41 persons per hundred square miles, [while] crop-raising Indians...maintained 287 persons on an identical amount of land, a sevenfold difference.” Once in these urban settlements, the daily relations and continued contact between peoples led to the development of social institutions that equaled those of Euro-Americans in complexity.

It is important to note that because no archeological evidence exists for Logstown, reports about its inhabitants’ subsistence, economic and political patterns must be derived from general data concerning the Shawnee, Lenape and Mingo cultures, who for hereafter will be referred to as the Logstonians. While journals of traders such as George Croghan make mention of the Logstonians use of corn and furs, they fail to describe the techniques used to grow and cultivate their crops or hunt and trap their game. Therefore, the majority of this information, though speculative, comes from credible primary sources concerning the individual Shawnee, Lenape and Mingo cultures.

To create the “culture” of Logstown, this study merely hypothesizes that since all the ancestral Logstonians shared common subsistence, economic and political systems, when they merged, they merely continued these practices with little or no disruption to their daily life. Similar to contemporary people who move from one state to another or leave the country altogether, while they must adjust to the local rules of their new society, they carry with them their previously learned practices and traditions. Once in their new surroundings, these migrants merely alter their practices to fit the local society. In other words, while minor adjustments to their individual practices and beliefs probably occurred as in the case with the merging of most peoples, the Logstonians simply brought the basis of their
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cultures with them during their excursions and transplanted them in the Ohio Valley. Moreover, since many of the Logstonians lived with each other in Pennsylvania, new migrants probably needed to make only minor adjustments when they settled in Logstown.

**Maize: The Staple of the Logsonian Subsistence Cycle**

The Logstonians nutritional and economic subsistence practices followed essentially a seasonal pattern. The Logstonians focused on the production of maize or corn and other subsistence crops such as squashes, beans and sunflowers during the spring and summer months, approximately March through September. The women and children usually worked the crops while the men hunted and fished in the immediate vicinity of the settlement. During the winter and fall months, October to February, the Logstonians focused primarily all their attention on hunting, trapping and gathering furs for both food and trade. Henry Harvey wrote about this seasonal pattern while living with the Shawnee:

> In the warm season the Shawnee remained around their villages...Here they raised considerable quantities of corn and beans. The women and children planted and tended it. They watched the ponies off as they had no fences. The men lounged about for the most part but now and then fished or hunted deer...In the fall all prepared for the winter’s hunt. The entire family went on these hunts together with dogs, cats and ponies with as much camp gear as they can conveniently carry. Several brass or copper kettles, some wooden ladles, bowls, large spoons, a tomahawk, and each one a large butcher knife.

As a result of this simple but efficient subsistence cycle, the Logstonians possessed the time and resources necessary to form an urban settlement and to develop the complex social institutions present in preindustrial societies. The institutions that proved to be similar to the social features created by their Euro-American counterparts who developed them as a result of advanced technologies.

The Logstonians relied primarily upon the agricultural practice known as horticulture for the production of their crops. They began preparing for the growing season by clearing their lands of vegetation. They used a
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technique known as slash and burn to clear the lands. This technique enabled the Logstonians to clear large areas of forest surrounding their urban settlement in a controlled, fast and efficient manner.

The slash and burn process began with the removal of the area’s vegetation. To clear the vegetation from the growing area, the Logstonians first removed all the large trees by either chopping them down or by girdling them. Girdling is a technique to kill large trees by removing a strip of bark around the trunk of a tree to create an unprotected band. The exposure of the unprotected band to insects and the elements eventually lead to the death of the tree.

Once the large trees were removed from the area, the Logstonians cleared all the underbrush by chopping it out and piling it up to dry. After drying, the Logstonians burned the underbrush and the fallen trees together. The Logstonians used the wood ash remains of the fire as fertilizer for the soil. This process of fertilization coupled with others used by the Logstonians enabled them to extend the life-span of the soil more effectively than their Euro-American counterparts, which allowed Logstown to flourish for nearly thirty years until destroyed by war. During the clearing of the fields, the Logstonian men usually performed most of the arduous tasks associated with the slash and burn technique. However, once they cleared the fields, the men yielded the responsibilities of producing the crops to the women and children.

Following the clearing of the land, Logstonian women began the planting and cultivating stages of the growing process. The growing and tending of crops acted as both a social and economic function. During this process, women seldom worked their fields alone. Often, the Logstonian women assisted each other to hasten the planting process. However, while the planting became a communal effort, each woman dictated the type of crops
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planted in her fields and held sole right to the land’s yield. Generally, women planted an area of about two acres. Oliver Spencer held captive by the Shawnee described this activity in his journal. Spencer noted that:

The low rich bottom, about three-quarters of a mile in width, was one entire field covered with corn,...the Indian women inhabiting large villages wherever it was practicable cultivated portions of the same field, separated from each other only by spaces of a few feet, and varying in size according to the number and strength of their families.

On average, one women could raise between twenty-five and sixty bushels of corn by working only one or two acres and provide nearly half or more of the annual caloric requirements for a family of five. In a single Logstonian fields of one-hundred acres for instance, the trader James Kenny explained that the women produced anywhere between 2,500 to 6,000 bushels of corn per season, enough to provide for a population of upwards to five-hundred people from one field alone.

Digging sticks proved to be the primary tool women used for planting. When the corn grew to about a foot high, the women planted other crops among the corn such as squashes, beans, sunflowers and pumpkins to maximize the yield of the land and to prevent the growth of weeds. With the planting completed, the women tended the fields by hoeing the corn and weeding the soil to assist in its growth. The women constructed their hoes by using either shells, stones, or shoulder blades from large game animals such as deer, elk and bear and attached them to wooden handles with rawhide. After European contact, the women traded for gardening tools such as mattocks to assist with the cultivation process. In a letter to a prominent merchant named Samuel Blommaert, Isaack de Rasières, chief commercial agent of New Netherlands in 1628, described Lenape horticulture. Rasières observed that:

At the end of March they begin to break up the earth with mattocks...They make heaps like molehills, each about two and a half feet from the others, which they sow or plant in April with maize, in each heap five or six grains; in the middle of May, when the maize is the height of a finger or more, they plant in each heap three or four Turkish beans, which then grow up with and against the maize, which serves for props. It is a
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grain to which much labor must be given, with weeding and earthing-up, or it does not thrive; and to this the women must attend very closely.  

As a result of this effective means of food production, Logstown amassed and supported a large frontier urban population. Subsequently, the congregating of a large population in Logstown caused the populace to create the social institutions present in preindustrial societies such as a complex political structure.

The Logstonians planted a variety of crops. The three primary crops proved to be the “three sisters,” corn, beans and a variety of squash. However corn, as in many Eastern Native American societies, remained their primary crop. In his journal of 1633-1643, David de Vries attested to this by writing, “the food supplies are various. The principal one maize.” Similar to the effect it had on Native Americans in Meso-America, maize enabled the Logstonians and other North American Indians to create urban settlements and to develop the social institutions present in preindustrial societies. While they did not create massive structures such as the stone pyramids like Meso-Americans, the Logstonians and other Northeastern Native Americans built settlements that housed large frontier urban populations, the large populations necessary to create preindustrial social institutions.

The Logstonians planted several types of corn, “white, red, blue, flesh-colored, brown, yellow and spotted ears.” However, like most Native Americans in the Ohio Valley, the Logstonians used primarily four types: flint corn, used to make hominy; a soft white corn, used to make bread; a medium hard grain, used for corn meal; and a small eared corn, used to roast or make succotash. The Logstonians kept the best corn to produce seeds for the following years crops. The Logstonian women coated the kernels with grease or dipped them in water with fish bones to protect the seeds through the winter and to preserve them for planting the following spring. Additionally, the women stored the kernels in ground pits and other storage facilities in Logstown throughout the winter. When
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spring arrived, the Logstonian women simply uncovered their winter stores and planted that year's crops. As is evident by their storage of grains, the Logstonians intended to return to Logstown and replant their crops following their winter hunts, a practice adopted by sedentary preindustrial groups as opposed to nomadic folk societies that continually moved to acquire food.

The women prepared the corn for consumption in a variety of manners. They used corn to make “wes-ku-pi-mi”, a mixture of sun dried corn kernels, peas, salt and grease or boiled meat; “nee peeh-dub-wah”, a corn oatmeal; “tak-wah-ne-pi”, a fermented corn drink made with water; “osah-saw-bo”, also a fermented drink; blue bread or biscuits, made from corn meal and the ashes of burnt pea hulls; corn bread; sour bread; and hominy. The importance of corn is suggested by Colonel James Smith, a Shawnee captive in the eighteenth century. Smith wrote that:

At this time homony plentifully mixed with bears’ oil and sugar, is what they offer to every one who comes in any time of the day, and so they go on until their sugar, bears oil and venison is all gone, and then they have to eat homony by itself, without bread, salt or any thing else.

Simply put, corn existed as the primary staple in the Logstonian diet and enabled a mixture of Native American peoples to come together, establish an urban settlement and build the social institutions present in preindustrial societies.

**Hunting, Trapping and Gathering:**

**The Other Components of the Logstonian Subsistence Cycle**

While farming served as the primary means of subsistence during the summer months, the Logstonians hunted and trapped essentially all year to supplement their diet with meat. Additionally, hunting and trapping provided them with the furs necessary to clothe and shelter themselves. During the summer months, the Logstonians seldom engaged in extensive hunting trips. Often, the Logstonian men hunted within the immediate vicinity of their
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settlements to augment their families' diets with meat. Due to the large crop production, the Logstonians, seldom needed to hunt or trap to ensure their families remained fed. In the summer months, the women assumed the primary role of provider with their production of corn, while during the winter, the men, who augmented the agricultural food stores with their hunting and trapping, provided their families with the majority of their food.

The winter season began with hunting. Like farming, the entire family involved themselves in the hunt. At the beginning of the season, the Logstonians practically abandoned Logstown and traveled to their winter hunting camps that were usually ten to fifteen miles from Logstown, a half-days journey. Being only a half-days journey from the urban settlement, the males could have hunted the same territory from Logstown as was evident by the small population that remained in the urban settlement throughout the winter and hunted from that location. In many cases, the Logstonians moved to their winter camps due to a shortage of wood caused by the construction of their houses and not because of the scarcity of food. On his first journey to Logstown in November of 1750, Christopher Gist observed that, "In the Loggs Town, I found scarce any Body but a Parcel of reprobate Indian Traders, the Chiefs of the Indians being out a hunting." Though many scholars may perceive them as being semi-nomadic, the Logstonians maintained a permanent population in Logstown throughout the year and in the winter occupied hunting camps less than a day's journey from the settlement. Similar to contemporary people such as construction workers who work in their homes in the north during the summer months and move to the south during the winter months to build, the Logstonians managed and maximized the use of their environment by moving to hunting camps in the winter. In other words, the Logstonians perceived Logstown to be their home and maintained a population, small in the winter and large in the summer, in their urban settlement throughout the year. Likewise, Euro-American traders made Logstown their home and remained in the settlement throughout the year.
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Once settled into their hunting camps, the males began collecting game and furs. The Logstonians primarily sought deer, buffalo, elk, bear and turkey on their hunts. 28 Though furs such as beaver and otters brought more European trade goods, the Logsonian hunters sought animals such as deer, elk and bear because they provided meat for subsistence and for a commodity. 29

Scholars continue to debate over the impact of the European trade on Native American subsistence hunting. While hunting proved the primary means to attain prized furs, Richard White, in his book *The Middle Ground*, explains the link between Native American subsistence and economics in the Ohio Valley. White notes that, “in the local economics where trade goods satisfied limited besoins [needs], the fur trade involved relatively little disruption of native subsistence systems. Production for the fur trade came from the hunt not yet separated from the larger subsistence cycle.” 30 White concluded his argument by noting that, “when the distance of beaver from villages and the scarcity of other game in the region did create a conflict, the demands of subsistence took priority.” 31

Anthropologist Herbert Kraft strengthens White’s argument regarding the Native American preference for subsistence game over economic game through the examination of Lenape archeological sites. Kraft noted that while the pelts of beavers, otters, martens and fishers were the desired furs of the French and English traders, the most abundant of animal archeological remains found in the refuse pits of many Eastern Woodland cultures proved to be those of deer, elks, black bears, raccoons, turkeys, geese and turtles. 32 C. C. Trowbridge, a nineteenth century historian who lived among the Shawnee, supports Kraft’s observation in his work *Shawnee Traditions*. Trowbridge observed that in the daily life of the Shawnee:

> They never eat the wolf unless they are in a state of starvation. The reason given is that the meat is very strong & disagreeable. Otters, fishers & minks are not used, for the same reason. 33
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Though deer and bear eventually became trade items when the beaver population began to diminish, especially among the English, the Logstonians need for survival outweighed their need for European trade items. For the Logstonians and other Native Americans, subsistence hunting took precedence over cash hunting.

Once the Logstonians arrived at their winter quarters, the hunters left their camps for several days tracking, killing and stockpiling game. As they killed their game, the hunters hung it up in trees to prevent animals from disturbing the catch. When storing game in this fashion, only buzzards and tree climbing vermin proved to be any sort of problem for the hunters. Other Native Americans seldom if ever disturbed or removed game properly marked by a fellow hunter.

After collecting a modest amount of game, the hunters returned to their camps to supply their families with meat and to rest. Once rested, the males set out and gathered up the remainder of their stored meat and brought it back to camp. Along with being a source of food for the Logstonians, the meat of the game also became a trade item.

As in many preindustrial societies, the Logstonians organized their division of labor according to gender and age. While the men hunted, the women and children prepared the catch. To prepare the meat and furs for trade, the women dried the venison hams by fire and then treated and tanned the hides with the brains of the animals. Once prepared, the Logstonians used both the meat and furs as commodities to trade with both Europeans and other Native Americans. The Logstonian families repeated this cycle of hunting throughout the winter and then returned to their settlements in the early spring near the end of February to begin their planting.

To augment their hunting during the winter months, some Logstonian males trapped. Trapping season began when the frogs started to awake from their hibernation. Frogs proved to be a favorite food source for raccoons,
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which the Logstonians primarily trapped.\textsuperscript{38} Along with raccoon, the Logstonians trapped beaver, muskrat, foxes, wild cats and opossum. The Logstonians used various types of traps to capture their quarry the most effective being snares and deadfalls.\textsuperscript{39} The etiquette of trapping mirrored that of hunting. If a trapper happened upon a sprung trap of another individual, they simply reset it and hung the game in a tree.\textsuperscript{40} As with hunting, trapping proved to be a male dominated activity in which the women and children played a minor role.

Along with hunting, trapping and farming, the Logstonians also gathered a variety of foodstuffs from the environment. The women and children gathered plants in both the spring and fall. In the spring, the gatherers collected fruits such as blackberries and strawberries as well as vegetables like wild onions and cabbages, while in the fall, they gathered a variety of nuts to include hickory nuts, walnuts, acorns and beechnuts.\textsuperscript{41} Amazingly, while gathering was not a major subsistence activity, the Logstonians, as did many of the Native Americans of the Great Lakes area, used 558 different types of plants to include 275 for medicinal purposes, 130 for food and 27 for smoking.\textsuperscript{42} In addition to these wild fruits and vegetables, the Logstonians collected maple sugar and salt. The Logstonians used both sugar and salt to flavor their foods and as a trade commodity.\textsuperscript{43} Due their farming, hunting, trapping and gathering, the Logstonians derived the subsistence necessary to support a population of over two-hundred people and enabled them to build an urban settlement that fostered the creation of complex preindustrial social institutions much like their Native American counterparts in Meso-America.

\textbf{A Brief Look at the "Backcountry" Euro-American in the 18\textsuperscript{th} Century}

In comparison to Logstown, many backcountry Euro-American urban settlements followed a similar subsistence pattern. David McClure a missionary in Pittsburgh viewed the backcountry settlers as, "generally white
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Savages, and subsist by hunting, and live like the Indians." General Thomas Gage, Commander-in-Chief of England's Colonial forces, also saw the backcountry settlers as "white Indians." Gage noted that, "many of these people, were half naked...and they differ little from Indians in their Manner of Life. They have no means to purchase Clothing but by skins, and that induces them to hunt." In short, Euro-American backcountry settlers followed a similar type of seasonal round as the Logstonians and other Native Americans. While the techniques they used to procure and produce their foodstuffs may have differed, their cycle of subsistence remained constant on the frontier for both Euro-American and Native American. In other words, Euro-Americans adopted Native American ways because of the harshness of the frontier environment.

The frontier essentially dictated the type of subsistence necessary for its inhabitants, both Native American and Euro-American to flourish. To survive the frontier, Euro-Americans adopted a successful subsistence pattern already in use by the Native Americans. Both groups relied on a mixture of agriculture, hunting and woodland harvesting to survive. On the frontier, Native Americans and Euro-Americans lived in equal states of development and were on par with one another. Though seaboarding urban settlements such as Boston, with its Harvard College, and Philadelphia and Williamsburg, with their "Old World cultures," developed considerably, the fledgling Euro-American backcountry frontier settlements resembled those of Native Americans. Benjamin Rush perhaps best describes this point. Writing in 1806, Rush noted that:

From a review of three different species of settlers, it appears, that there are certain regular stages which mark the progress from the savage to civilized life. The first settler is nearly related to an Indian in his manners— In the second, the Indian manners are more diluted: It is in the third species of settlers only, that we behold civilization completed.45

Though some eastern seaboard towns evolved into Rush's third stage of societal development, the Euro-Americans on the periphery of these well developed urban settlements existed as preindustrial communities on par with their Native American neighbors and counterparts.

Sjoberg contends that the concentration of people into permanent settlements is the condition necessary for preindustrial societies to develop complex social institutions. In the absence of a superior subsistence pattern or ecologically rich environment, an advanced degree of technology needed to be present for an urban settlement to sustain itself and flourish. In other words, maize, like other forms of advanced technology, enabled people to come together, remain together for long periods of time and develop into socially organized groups. As is evident, the Logstonians possessed the superior form of subsistence needed to bring people together and to develop and maintain a relatively large frontier urban settlement for nearly thirty years. Though they lacked the technology to forge plowshares and construct large scale irrigation, the Logstonians possessed maize, which enabled them to concentrate in one location, socialize and successfully build and maintain an urban settlement. The question is now whether or not the Logstonians developed the complex social institutions necessary to put them on par with their Euro-American counterparts and more importantly influence the Euro-American migration to and settlement of the west.
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CHAPTER 5

The Preindustrial Economy of Logstown

In his model of frontier development, Kenneth Lewis reduced Native Americans to essentially an economic factor in the Euro-American colonial trade economy. Though Native Americans were involved in the economy due to their reciprocal relationship with Euro-Americans, Lewis submitted that only the trader and their stockpile of goods was necessary to develop a trade frontier.¹ To dispel this age old belief and to prove that Native Americans actually were the ones who influenced the establishment of the trading frontiers that facilitated the Euro-American development of the west, the complexity and role of their economic institutions and how they impacted on their communities, regions and world economies must be understood.

The Criteria for Preindustrial Economies

Scholars traditionally view Native American economies as primitive subsistence oriented institutions that focused primarily on the local community. Hence, Lewis’ view. In fact some flatter state that though North America possessed an abundance of natural resources, Native Americans ignored the riches of the continent and choose to live on the land in small homogeneous groups with unsophisticated economies that fulfilled their simple needs. While across the Atlantic Ocean, the “civilized” peoples of Europe developed a rigid form of social organization known as the feudal system, a system that permeated throughout European culture and directly influenced the economic and political institutions of an entire continent. However despite their apparently inferior system, scholars, like economist Willard L. Thorp, do submit that, “the Indians had economic institutions,” that while dissimilar to Euro-Americans, enabled Native Americans to fulfill their simple wants.² Unfortunately, scholars continue to compare Native

¹ Kenneth Lewis, The American Frontier, 277.
American economies with their Euro-American counterparts and fail to look at them as distinct, separate and complex social institutions that existed for centuries before the arrival of the Europeans, social institutions that evolved from the folk to the preindustrial stage of societal development in many Native American societies well before the mid-eighteenth century.

By using Europeans to understand Native Americans, scholars fall into the same old trap of using one society's culture to explain a distinctly different group of people. While it is easy to compare the social institutions of an indigenous people to their colonizing counterparts and weigh the impact of the latter on the former, the aboriginal societies developed economic institutions long before the intrusive societies appeared. To effectively understand and compare the two groups therefore, scholars must view Native American and Euro-American economies in the purest sense of the word “economy.”

In its’ purest sense, an economy is the careful or thrifty management of resources, as income, materials and labor, or as a system for the management and development of resources by a people to acquire the necessities of life. The Logstonians economic system invariably depended on their subsistence pattern, the mechanism responsible for providing them with their “necessities of life.” However, the Logstonian economy, like in most Native American societies, involved more than merely surviving off the land, it required attaining necessities.

Marshall Sahlins indicated two ways people become “rich” or fulfill their necessities, accumulation of capital and the satisfaction of wants. Wants, Sahlins explained, can be satisfied through producing much or desiring little. While the acquisition of capital and land remained the primary focus of Euro-Americans, the wants of the Logstonians, i.e. those things they essentially desired most, consisted of food, clothing, shelter and prestige. To prove that the Logstonians developed a preindustrial economy complex enough to fulfill their various necessities of food, clothing, shelter and prestige, four questions must be answered. What constitutes a preindustrial economy? What

---

3 Webster's 2: New Riverside University Dictionary, s.v. “economy.”
5 For details on prestige and the other wants of Native Americans or indigenous peoples, see Sahlins, Stone Age Economics.
role did it play in their society? How did it affect its community, region and world? And, did Logstown’s economy fulfil the wants and necessities of its population?

Gideon Sjoberg established only three economic determinants to distinguish folk societies from preindustrial societies. According to Sjoberg, typical folk economies included a “small self-sufficient preliterate group, an absence of any real division of labor or class system and a high degree of homogeneity.” In contrast, preindustrial economies contained an agricultural technology able to support a non-agricultural population; a clear division of labor; and an economy dependant on animate labor such as human or animal. As is evident by these descriptions, Sjoberg determined that the existence of an advanced agricultural technology and an established division of labor were the only factors that economically separated folk from preindustrial societies.

In regards to the advanced agricultural technology, chapter four addressed the presence of this feature in Logstown in the form of maize horticulture. In addition to proving that Logstown supported a population of no less than two-hundred people for over thirty years, historic records also prove that the agricultural technology of the settlement provided enough surplus foodstuffs to support a non-agricultural population of European traders, shamans, wampum makers and artisans and to produce commodities for trade. Thus, Logstown meets the first of Sjoberg’s criteria for a pre-industrial economy.

Like most societies of the eighteenth century, the Logstonians divided their labor according to age and gender, and therefore contained the second determinant of Sjoberg’s preindustrial economies. In the simplest of descriptions, men hunted, women planted, children assisted their mothers in the tending of crops and grandmothers provided wisdom, insight and leadership to their families and community as well as performing less physical tasks
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7 Ibid., 11.
8 For the estimated size of Logstown’s population see Celoron’s Journal in Expedition of Celoron to the Ohio Country in 1749, ed. C. B. Gallweath, 28. In the journal Celoron noted that approximately forty warriors greeted him when he arrived. Also for population estimate see Conrad Weiser’s Journal in Reuben Gold Thwaites’ Early Western Travels, 31. In his journal of 1748, Weiser received an accounting of the warrior population from the Ohio Indians that totaled 789 individuals. Using Gregory E. Dowd’s rational that, “men of fighting age constitute a fourth or a fifth of the entire population,” in A Spirited Resistance, 79, then the minimum number of inhabitants in Logstown is two-hundred. Also using William Cronin’s estimate of five individuals per cabin in Changes in the Land, 44. Father Bonnecamp’s description of eighty cabins in Logstown in 1749 coupled
such as sewing and educating the young. In short, the Logstonians possessed a clear and well defined system of labor dependant on human work.\(^9\) All individuals knew their responsibilities and performed them according to societal norms. Therefore, Logstown, having met both of Sjoberg’s criteria, developed a preindustrial economy.

Despite the apparent existence of a preindustrial economy in Logstown, Sjoberg’s broad criteria leave much to the scholar’s interpretation, and therefore, much to debate. A major flaw of Sjoberg’s argument is that he never explained or put forth criteria to determine distinctions in the divisions of labor that separated folk from preindustrial economies. At first glance, one could easily argue that hunters and gatherers developed a clear division of labor based upon gender and age. Using this simple argument, scholars could claim that the Logstonians of the eighteenth century and the archaic hunters and gatherers of the Late Woodland period both developed similar preindustrial economies. By using Sjoberg’s simple criteria, it is easy to reduce agrarian Native Americans to folk economies or promote hunters and gatherers to preindustrial economies.

To fully understand the complexity of an economic institution in a community, scholars must look at the role it played and the impact it had on the society as a whole. Since an economy requires organization and management by the people who are involved in the system, it is therefore dependant on social relations. In other words, an economy is a social institution dependant on social relations.\(^{10}\) To prove that Logstown developed a preindustrial economy, the role it played in and the impact it had on their society must be known.

The Structure and Role of the Logstonian Economy

While he failed to elaborate on the degree of the division of labor needed to distinguish between folk and preindustrial societies, Sjoberg explained that preindustrial economies influenced the structuring of their society into classes, something folk economies failed to or lacked the means to do. Subsequently, the feature that separates folk from preindustrial economies is the existence of a caste society, such as the European feudal system. Thus, for
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agrarian Native Americans to be considered preindustrial societies, they must include a class system. However, many Native American peoples lacked the caste structure existing in eighteenth century European and North American colonial societies, a system of hierarchy that included kings, governors, nobles, merchants, labors, servants and slaves. Yet, while the Logstonians and other agrarian Native Americans lacked a European caste system, they did develop a ranked and stratified society based upon merit and prestige derived from an elaborate gift economy. This Native American stratification of society, while different from Euro-Americans, proved as complex and structured as their Euro-American counterparts.

A social class is a division of people by quality, grade or rank; quality is an inherent or distinguishing character trait that fosters a sense of superiority that leads to the attainment of high social standing. Rank is a relative position in society and, a class is a social separation of a people. To determine whether or not the Logstonians created a “class” structured society, two things must be proven. First, did Logstown have a social division among its people; and second, if they did, what was the inherent character trait that enabled one group to attain a level of superiority in the community?

Individuals in any society gain prestige, prominence or an influential status through success, renown, the ability of being widely honored or wealth. By attaining prestige, an individual generally command’s the admiration of their group or people. Consequently, each group establishes formal and informal ways to achieve prestige. For instance in America today, the majority of the people generally idolize and esteem professional athletes. Americans generally view athletes in a positive light, regardless of their backgrounds or behavior. At the mere mention of some athletes names such as Michael Jordan, the famed basketball player, people almost instantly put forth some positive comment, despite his reported gambling problems. In short, prestige allows individuals to attain a special status in their communities. In Logstown, the Logstonians gained status in their community by gaining prestige.12
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11 Webster’s 2: New Riverside University Dictionary, s.v. “class,” “quality” and “rank.”
Prior to European contact, the ancestral people of the Logstonians followed formalized and well-established kinship lines. In the case of the Shawnee, Lenape and Mingo, each group followed essentially matrilineal lines of descent. Meaning, the prestigious head-men or sachems, those individuals the Euro-Americans would mistakenly label kings and half-kings, came essentially from the same lineage. As dealings between Native Americans and Euro-Americans intensified, and the Euro-American traders and statesmen chose to deal solely with the “kings,” the prestige of these individuals rose accordingly. In dealing with the Lenape, William Penn wrote:

Their Government is by Kings, which they call Sachems, and those by Succession, but always of the Mothers side...Every King hath his council, and that consists of all the Old and Wise men of his Nation...nothing of Moment is undertake, be it War, Peace, Selling of Land, or Traffick, without advising with them... Tis admirable to consider, how Powerful the Kings are, and yet how they move by the Breath of their People.13

While he mistakenly believed the sachems to be all powerful kings, Penn correctly assessed that these leaders, “moved by the breath of their people.” Unlike European society, the ancestral Logstonian leaders acted in accordance with the consensus of the people and not by the will of a few select individuals.

The sachems continued to hold the most prestigious positions in their societies, which enabled them to assert the most influence. However, as the ancestral people of the Logstonians disintegrated into the refugee settlements of the Ohio Valley such as Logstown, the traditional kinship lines essentially disappeared. The absence of clear kinship lines coupled with the multi-ethnicity of the urban settlements opened up the public forum to all individuals desiring to attain prestige and influence within their community. In a society where majority ruled, the individual prestige of a person directly affected their influence over their peers. The more prestige, an individual could amass, the more influence they had within their settlement, and thus, the more esteemed and important position they held. In Logstonian society, prestige proved to be the inherent character trait that created social division, i.e., the class system required in preindustrial societies.14
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14 Malinowski, 16.
Shingas, a noted and successful warrior among the Lenape, provides an example of an individual who was not from the traditional kinship line and clan associated with Lenape leadership but attained an important position in Logstown nevertheless. According to tradition, the leaders of the three Lenape groups came from the Turtle Clan. However, Shingas came from the Turkey Clan. In 1747, the representative of the Lenape, Olunapies, died without appointing a successor. Desiring to continue their newly established trade with the Ohio Indians, the Pennsylvania government requested the Lenape appoint a leader in Olunapies’ place who, according to George Croghan, “so chosen by [the Lenape] shall be looked upon by us as your King, with whom Publick Business shall be transacted.”

At the Virginia treaty at Logstown in 1752, the Mingo leader Tanacharison, also a resident of Logstown, fulfilled the request of the Pennsylvania government and on behalf of the Logstonians bestowed upon Shingas the title of “King of the Delaware.” Speaking to the Delaware, Tanacharison exclaimed,

> Nephews you received a speech last year from your brother, the Governor of Pennsylvania...desiring you to choose one of the wisest councillors, and present him to us for a King. As you have not done it, we let you know it is our right to give you a King, and we think proper to give you Shingas for your King, whom you must look upon as your head chief, and with whom all public business must be transacted between you and your brethren, the English.

A man of prestige and power, the leaders and people of Logstown appointed Shingas to the important position of “king.”

While prestige and position could be gained through a variety of ways, the Logstonians, like most Native Americans, economically gained prestige primarily by fulfilling the needs of their neighbors, family and friends through the selfless presentation of gifts. Gifts, sociologist Aafke E. Komter suggested, “are not exclusively friendly acts, springing from sympathy or love; they may also be conscious or unconscious maneuvers ‘in order to gain security and to fortify one’s self against risks incurred through alliances and rivalry’...[in short,] a gift may be a vehicle...
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17 George Croghan, “Proceedings of George Croghan, Esquire, and Mr. Andrew Montour at Ohio, May 18th-28th,” in Reuben Gold Thwaites, Early Western Travels, 1748-1846, vol. 1 (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1904), 64.
for exercising power.”  

Gift giving enabled the Logstonians to create obligation and establish status between themselves and others inside and outside the community. William Penn described the “liberality” of the Lenape gift giving. Penn wrote:

In Liberality they excell, nothing is too good for their friend; give them a fine Gun, Coat, or other thing, it may pass twenty hands, before it sticks; light of Heart, strong Affections, but soon spent; the most merry Creatures that live, Feast and Dance perpetually; they never have much, or want much: Wealth circulateth like the Blood, all parts partake; and though none shall want what another hath, yet exact Observers of Property. Some Kings have sold, others presented me with several parcels of Land; the Pay or Presents I made them, were not hoarded by the particular Owners... We sweat and toil to live; their pleasure feeds them, I mean their Hunting, Fishing and Fowling.

While gift giving may be perceived as a social act rather than an economical one, sociologist Claude Levi-Strauss noted that while individuals accumulate riches in order to rise in the social hierarchy, “even when pigs are exchanged for pigs, and food for food, the transactions do not lose all economic significance for they encourage work and stimulate a need for cooperation.” As a result, in Logstown and other Native American urban settlements, gift giving remained both an economic and social act.

The Logsonian economy essentially involved three different types of economies, subsistence, gift and moral. While the subsistence economy fulfilled the Logstonians necessity for survival, the gift and moral economies fulfilled their need for prestige, power and position. The Logsonian gift economy proved to be a system of action that relied on the principal of redundancy, the giving to others beyond the levels required by immediate necessity to construct effective social cooperation in moral economies.

The gift proved to be the prime component in the gift economy. The Logstonians, as did other Native Americans, presented gifts at births, deaths, marriages, peace treaties and a host of other events to strengthen or
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improve their status in their community or to obtain a specific action from a person or group. Being a redundant transaction, the receiver either immediately gave the presenter an equivalent gift, or accepted the present with the pre-conceived understanding that on a subsequent occasion, they would give a gift that exceeded that of the first. Furthermore, the receiver understood that their counter present would bring about in turn a right to receive or refuse later a new gift that would surpass those previously given. An activity that permeated throughout all their social institutions, the exchange of gifts proved to be not only a means to transfer goods and receive an economic advantage or profit, but also as a way to attain prestige in a society. Because in some societies, Levi-Strauss noted:

There is something else in what we call a ‘commodity’ than that which renders it commodious to its owner or its merchant. Goods are not only economic commodities but vehicles and instruments for realities of another order: influence, power, sympathy, status, emotion; and the skilful game of exchange consists of a complex totality of maneuvers, conscious or unconscious, in order to gain security and to fortify one’s self against risks incurred through alliances and rivalry.24

In Logstown, the exchange of items such as European trade goods in the form of gifts enabled individuals to attain prestige and status in their community.

The Logstonians and other Native Americans exchanged gifts amongst themselves and Euro-Americans on numerous occasions to secure alliances and to fortify themselves against “risk.” Understanding the complexity and protocol of the Native American gift economy, George Croghan, on his trip to Logstown in 1751, delivered, “the Provisional Present from the Province of Pennsylvania” to secure the alliance of the Logstonians. During his visit, the Logstonians held a council with the French traders informing them that, “You desire we may turn our Brothers the English away, and not suffer them to come and trade with us again; I now tell you...they shall live amongst us as long as there is one of us alive...Our Brothers are the People we will trade with and not you.”25 In the competitive world of the Ohio Valley in the eighteenth century, the French and English competed for the Logstonian trade and used the Logstonian gift economy to improve their standing in the community and to monopolize the trade coming out of Logstown.25 Although this example is of a Euro-American using the gift economy to further his and his

24 Levi-Strauss, 18-19.
25 Croghan, George Croghan, “Proceedings of George Croghan, Esquire, and Mr. Andrew Montour at Ohio, May 18th-28th,” 58-60.
government’s aims, the purpose of the gift and protocol used in the presentation of the gift worked the same for the Logstonians and other Native Americans.

As indicated, the gift economy is the key element in a moral economy, a system of socially desirable transactions that enable an individual to maintain, improve and balance their social ties in a community. Consequently, the redistribution of resources to others in the form of gifts is an economically rational act when it is essential to build, improve, maintain or restore social relations or a preferred balance in the quality of life between members of a community.26 In the ranked society of Logstown, individuals gained prestige by improving their relations with community members through the presentation of gifts. As a result, prestige, gained through an elaborate gift economy, existed as the inherent character trait in the community that enabled an individual to rise above another in Logstonian society.

The Impact of the Logstonian Economy on the Ohio Valley

Having answered the first two questions, what constitutes a preindustrial economy and what role did it play in Logstown, this study now turns to the third question, how did the Logstonian economy affect its community, region and world? As mentioned earlier, one element in the Logstonian economic system proved to be the presence of a moral economy that relied on a gift economy. According to David Cheal, moral economies exist in conjunction with political economies, and thus, make up only a “part-society.” Therefore, the desire for gifts influenced not only the development and function of the moral economy, but the political economy as well.

A political economy, social scientist Neal Wood described, is an economic system that arises when a political state or leader, “sought to acquire goods to provide for the prosperity of their members.” Analyzing the works of Sir Thomas Smith and Jean Bodin, Wood surmised that when political leadership managed the public economy for the welfare of their people, a political economy existed.27 In response to Wood’s hypothesis, social scientist Karl Polanyi noted:

26 Levi-Strauss, 91.
Man’s economy, as a rule, is submerged in his social relationships. He does not act so as to safeguard his individual interest in the possession of material goods; he acts so as to safeguard his social standing, his social claims, his social assets. He values material goods only insofar as they serve this end. Neither the process of production nor that of distribution is linked to specific economic interests attached to the possession of goods; but every single step in that process is geared to a number of social interests which eventually ensure that the required step be taken. These interests will be very different in a small hunting or fishing community from those in a vast despotic society, but in either case the economic system will be run on noneconomic motives.28

In Logstown, the moral economy’s influence on the political economy shaped the political and economic relationship between the Logstonians and their Euro-American counterparts. Consequently, the way that the Logstonian economy impacted on its local, regional and world environment proved to be through its ability to influence the political aims and direction of the Euro-American and European governments to fulfill the political and economic wants of the Logstonians.29

Nowhere is the noneconomic motives of the Native American, Euro-American and European political economies more evident than in the North American fur trade. During the colonial period, the nations of Europe and their colonies developed a mercantile economy, an economic system founded and dependant on trade. The predominant goal of the government in this economic system is to strengthen a nation economically in order to expand its trade network to increase its revenue.30 To ensure the trade expansion proceeded without incident, the government used the yield from the trade to prepare its defenses in the event of war. Each country competed with each other for the trade, which resulted in wars, which led to the increased pursuit for preparedness. Since many European countries lacked the natural resources to provide themselves with the revenue necessary to secure the trade such as gold, they relied on the trade to produce it. For example England’s American colonies, economist Rendigs Fels notes, “were expected to provide raw materials which the mother country manufactured and exported for gold. A colony could not develop manufactures of its own, nor should it trade with any but the mother country.” To acquire and to maintain the sources of these desired materials, the countries of Europe involved themselves in

29 Cheal, 91.
numerous wars to secure trading empires. The French and Indian War, King William’s War and Queen Anne’s War provide excellent examples of confrontations resulting from France’s and England’s desire to control the North American trade.\footnote{Ibid.}

On the North American continent, the European powers vied for control of the Native American trade to increase and expand the revenues and sizes of their empires. With their goods actively being sought by colonial traders, Native Americans expanded the peripheries of their pre-existing trade networks to include the newly arrived Europeans. When they began trading with Europeans, Native Americans unintentionally involved themselves in a regional and worldwide mercantile economy, a type of economy designed to strengthen the political and military might of a nation and to facilitate its imperialistic aims. Subsequently, the local, regional and world economies of the Native Americans essentially became mercantile in nature, i.e., dependant on trade, like their European and colonial counterparts, which involved them in the European imperialist struggle for the North American continent.

Logstown emerged during the peak years of the Ohio Valley fur trade long after Europeans and Native Americans first met on the shores of the Atlantic Coast. However, unlike the majority of North America from the Atlantic Coast to the Mississippi River, the portion of the Ohio Valley that encompassed western Pennsylvania and northeastern Ohio, where Logstown was located, remained virtually free of Europeans until the mid-eighteenth century. Prior to that time, New France stretched from Canada down the Mississippi River to the Louisiana Territory, while, the independent English colonies extended from the Atlantic Coast to the Allegheny Mountains. Long before trade came to Logstown, Native Americans and Europeans developed an accepted and established system of trade, one that many Logstonians participated in before they settled in the Ohio Valley. By explaining this elaborate trade network, scholars can understand the impact of Logstown’s economy on its community, region and world.

Richard White dubbed this elaborate system of trade relations as “the middle ground, a place in between cultures, peoples, empires and the nonstate world of villages.” According to White, the middle ground emerged from the dynamics of human relations between Native Americans and Europeans living and operating in the “\textit{pays d’en}
“heart,” the Ohio Valley. The middle ground arose from the participants’ needs to find a non-forceful way to solicit the cooperation and consent of foreigners to assist in attaining their various necessities. Formed from “mutual accommodation,” Native Americans and Europeans adjusted their differences, “through a creative, and often expedient, process of misunderstandings,” thus resulting in the middle ground.32

Three elements provided the foundation for the middle ground, economics, politics and Native American urban settlements. For now however, the role that the Logstonian economy is the focal point of this discussion and the impact of Logstown and its political system will be addressed in subsequent chapters.

Economics is technically the science that deals with the production, distribution and consumption of commodities, and a commodity is something useful or capable of yielding anything advantageous.33 To understand the economic relationship between the Logstonians and other groups of Native Americans and Euro-Americans, the items used in the trade, their values and impact on all the people involved must first be understood. In other words, what items became necessities and why?

A variety of goods exchanged hands between the Logstonians and other traders. The primary goods provided by the Logstonians in the trade consisted of furs and food commodities such as meat and, more significantly, corn. Backcountry settlers and more specifically frontier forts and trading houses needed the subsistence support of the Logstonians and other Native Americans to survive.34 Thomas Gist, an ensign in General Forbes expedition against Fort Du Quesne in September of 1758, described the support relationship between Euro-Americans and Native Americans. Gist, who the Native Americans captured, arrived at Logstown and resupplied themselves with corn, pumpkins and watermelons for their journey down the Ohio. Moreover, some Anglo-Americans explained that the majority of Native Americans believed that the Euro-American survival depended on their assistance. According to French trader Nicholas Perrot, the Native Americans held the “arrogant notion that the

32 White, The Middle Ground. For exact quotes see, ibid, x and 52.
33 Webster’s 2. New Riverside University Dictionary. s.v. “economic.”
34 Cronon, 36.

George Croghan, who established a trading house at Logstown, explained the types of goods exchanged between Euro-Americans and Native Americans. Croghan explained that the traders brought:

Rum; guns; gunpowder, lead, flints, tomahawks and vermillion; strouts, especially those of deep blue or livery red, blanketing, matchcoating, linen and calicoes of the brightest and flourishing collours; wampum; lace, thread, gartering, ribbons; women’s stocking, traps, axes, hoes, bras wire, files, awls, needles, buttons, and combs; jewsharps, bells, whistles, looking glasses, rings and silver jewelry of all kinds.\footnote{Albert Volwiler, *George Croghan And The Westward Movement, 1741-1782,* (Cleveland, Ohio: Arthur H. Clark Company, 1926), 30.}

For these various items, Croghan noted that the traders received, “deer, elk, buffalo, and bear skins; beaver, raccoon, fox, cat, muskrat, mink, fisher, and other furs; food supplies and sometimes personal services.” Croghan estimated that the annual value of this trade was forty thousand pounds per year.\footnote{Ibid, 30. For estimate of trade see *Pennsylvania Gazette*, September 26 and April 25, 1754.} The question is, why did Native American and Euro-American commodities become desirable to each other.

Europeans initially came to America to exploit the land and its’ resources. Contrary to the popular belief that America’s first colonists desired to rid themselves of the yoke of tyranny, the original colonial charters of England’s and France’s colonies identified commerce as the primary and often the sole purpose of the “colonizing” endeavors. Europeans founded Jamestown, New Amsterdam and Quebec to attain what Richard Hakluyt termed “mercantile commodities” – fish, furs, timber, sassafras and a host of other items.\footnote{Cronon, 20.} The colonists sought these goods because they were items in great demand but in relatively short supply in European markets. William Cronon perhaps best explained the European motives behind their colonizing efforts. Cronon noted, “what was a merchantable commodity in America was what was scarce in Europe. Only if this was true would it make sense to pay the cost of transporting it across the ocean. Beaver, cod, and sassafras all satisfied this economic requirement and
so were often the chief goals of an exploring expedition." Therefore, the economies of the Euro-Americans revolved around the acquisition of their necessities, merchantable commodities and the land that bore them.

Before and after European contact, Native Americans managed their resources, i.e. the environment, through their subsistence cycle. The careful management of the environment yielded a superior form of subsistence, the “three sisters” and hunting; clothing, in the form of refined furs; shelter, in the form of semi-permanent and permanent dwellings and a vibrant trade with fellow Native Americans and, after contact, Europeans. Their subsistence cycle provided them with usable commodities which in turn furnished them with their necessities of life. Since it is an accepted fact that Native Americans subsisted and drew all their needs from the environment, the focus here is on the vibrant trade network of the Logstonians.

Europeans did not introduce trade to the indigenous people of North America, rather, Native Americans exposed Euro-Americans to a trade system that existed for centuries. Long before European contact, prehistoric Native Americans, such as the Hopewell, Adena and Mississippian cultures, created a trade system that stretched from Ontario to the Gulf of Mexico and from the Atlantic Coast to the Rocky Mountains. At various pre-historic sites such as Fort Ancient, Ohio, archeologists found artifacts that included Black Hills obsidian; Great Lakes copper; Atlantic and Gulf Coast shells; mica and crystal from the Appalachians; gold and silver from Canada; conch shells and alligator teeth from the Gulf of Mexico and salt and lead from southern and northern Illinois. While the majority of these cultures “disappeared” prior to European contact, many scholars, as mentioned in Chapter 3, believe these people to be the ancestors of the Shawnee and other groups of Native Americans. These groups did not simply “disappear;” they dissolved into smaller groups. They reorganized. However, regardless of their ancestry or how and why they “reorganized,” it is important to note that Native Americans actively and continuously traded long before their exposure to Europeans.

Although the elaborate trade network of the Hopewell, Adena and Mississippian cultures essentially ceased to function, Native Americans continued to trade traditional commodities with each other up to and after European contact. Many agrarian Native Americans traded surplus corn, beans and squash to their neighbors and migrating bands of hunters and gathers for meat, furs and hides. When Euro-American traders arrived in Northern America desiring to exchange well crafted goods for their traditional commodities, Native Americans simply included and accepted Europeans into their pre-existing trade network. “We were very fortunate,” George Croghan wrote on his first trip to the Ohio country, “in finding a good road all the way and particularly thro the Allegheny Hills Considering how Mountainous this Country is.” European traders did not blaze trails through the wilderness, rather, they followed those already established by Native Americans.

Before and after European contact, the majority of Native Americans continued to seek the same commodities that fulfilled their necessities of life. Items such as food and furs, which enabled Native Americans to cloth, feed and gain prestige for themselves, remained the primary focus of their commercial activities. However, while their subsistence cycle continued to provide them with food, shelter and clothing, after European contact, Native Americans sought to fulfill some of these same necessities, primarily that of prestige, through the acquisition of foreign trade goods.

Among the refugee Native American populations of the Ohio Valley, trade transcended economic boundaries and became a social conduit between peoples of varying groups. The Logstonians, as well as many Native Americans, exchanged trade goods as gifts to solidify relations between members of the same or differing urban settlements. By exchanging gifts, individual Native Americans gained prestige, honor and influence in and outside their urban settlements. European trade goods became an important part of the Logstonians and other Native
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Americans gift economies augmenting traditional commodities such as furs. Consequently, Native Americans initially desired European trade goods more for the prestige they brought then for the technological advantage they offered. 45 Thus, the Logstonians acceptance of the European mercantile system of trade, one that brought the rare goods essential for the operation of their gift economy, enabled them to influence the events and actions of the persons and governments in their community, region and world.

Did the Logstonians influence the political aims and designs of the Native Americans and Euro-Americans in the Ohio Valley through the solicitation of their trade? The answer is yes. While an entire book can be dedicated to this subject, the next two chapters deal primarily with the political influence Logstown had on the development and settlement of the Ohio Valley, and thus, this direct subject is deferred until later. Yet, some examples of the Logstonians influence on the political setting of colonial America due to their involvement in a worldwide mercantile economy is evident in their ability to regulate and dictate the placement of frontier outposts.

Contrary to popular belief, the Euro-American colonial governments did not necessarily want to establish a military presence in the Ohio Valley. The original plan of both the French and English entailed Native Americans trucking their goods to the nearest Euro-American trading post such as Albany or Montreal and exchanging their goods for European items. While French voyagers, coureurs de bois and English traders journeyed to the Ohio Valley to solicit business, the plan remained to draw Native Americans to the Euro-American posts. However, once they essentially trapped out the lands in the outlying regions of the Euro-American outposts, the Native Americans pushed further west and seldom journeyed to the east to trade with Euro-Americans. Though some Native American groups such as the Huron acted as middlemen in the trade, the French and English colonial governments sought to bring the various native groups into alliance with their particular governments in order to perpetuate the trade by venturing forth into the Ohio Valley and establishing frontier outposts. Thus, Euro-American mercantilism

45 White, The Middle Ground, 100.

In their quest for control over the region, the Euro-Americans sought to gain the allegiance of the various Native American groups inhabiting the Ohio Valley either through submission or negotiation. While they participated and played a key role in the imperialistic and mercantilist designs of the competing European countries, the Logstonians, as well as the remainder of the Native Americans residing in the Ohio valley, sought to further their own ends.\footnote{James Axtell, The Invasion Within (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 3.} In a recent article, historian W. J. Eccles explained this important and often overlooked point by noting that, “[the] Indian nations fought alongside the French purely to serve their own ends. They were allies, not mercenaries. In fact, they regarded the French as little more than an auxiliary force aiding them in their struggle to preserve their hunting grounds.”\footnote{“For exact quote see ibid., 360. For first hand account of the Logstonians’ political designs see Charles Thomson, Enquiry Into The Causes (London, 1759), 108-114.} In the quest to further their own economic aims, the Logstonians created an influenced the political conditions and affairs of their community, region and world.

The French undertook a policy to essentially cut off English expansion west of the Appalachian Mountains. The French reasoned that if England’s colonies were able to expand beyond the Appalachian Mountains their wealth and power would increase beyond that of themselves due to their acquisition of the economically rich Ohio Valley.\footnote{Eccles, 344.} Subsequently, the French viewed this potential disruption to the balance of power as a barrier to the expansion of their empire. To avoid this catastrophic blow to their imperialistic goals, France began to construct a string of forts along the Allegheny River. In the course of one year, France built three forts, Venango, Le Boeuf and Presqu’Isle with a fourth planned at Logstown.\footnote{“Letter to Pennsylvania Governor James Hamilton from Virginia Governor Robert Dinwiddie,” Colonial Records of Pennsylvania, vol. 5, 687. For detailed account of Ohio Valley forts see Charles M. Slocz, Outposts Of The War Of Empire (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1985).} Though they successfully constructed the first three forts, poor weather conditions halted the French advance and delayed their plans for the construction of the fourth outpost. Seeing an opportunity to
establish a military presence in the valley to counter that of the French, the Pennsylvania government petitioned the
Logstonian counsel to build a fort in the vicinity of the settlement. Aware of their precarious situation, the
Logstonians refused the Pennsylvania request in order to retain possession of their lands and to avoid a direct
confrontation with the French. However, the Logstonians used the incident to secure more provisions and arms from
the English that totaled, "100 Small Arms, Powder, Shot and some Clothing."52

Both France and England, as did their colonies, understood that the key to controlling the Ohio Valley rested
in the hands of the Native Americans. Aware of the fact that they were looking out for their own interests by playing
the two imperialistic powers against one another, England and France actively sought to forge lasting alliances with
the Native Americans to obtain a "favorite nation" trading position.53 Without the Native Americans, both France
and England realized that a complete control over the fur trade could not be obtained.54

Though this is a brief and incomplete description of the Native American role in the fur trade, it gives insight
into the fact that the Logstonian and other Native American economies influenced the world around their urban
settlements through their participation in the Euro-American and European mercantile system of trade. Because the
fur trade, historians Jacqueline Peterson and John Anfinson explained, "was an "Indian trade," a process of human
interaction, in which the economic exchange of raw commodities for manufactured goods figured as vehicle and
symbol for a much wider set of contacts between Indian and White."55 The Logstonians proved to be active
members in the worldwide mercantile system of trade and not merely one of a multitude of economic factors as
Lewis and other scholars contend. In other words, the Logstonians, through their active pursuit and desire for their
necessities of life, used political maneuvers to further their economic interests, thus becoming influential and active
contributors in the political and economic development of the Ohio Valley.
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This leads to the final question, did the Logstonian economy support and fulfill the necessities of its people? Once again, the answer is yes. While many historians focus on the Native Americans’ growing dependence on European trade goods or their increased harvesting of pelts to the near extinction of the animals in some cases, the Logstonian economy enabled its people to fulfill their necessities. In short, the Logstown’s economy enabled the Logstonians to acquire food, clothing, shelter and prestige.

Many scholars contend that the ruin of the “noble savage” was the introduction of European trade goods. These goods offered Native Americans such an overwhelming technological advantage or caused them to become so intoxicated with rum that within time, they became totally reliant on European products and abandoned or forgot their traditional ways of subsisting. For example, in his study of the Shawnee, Jerry Clark noted that:

a major aspect of this trade dependency related to the survival of the Shawnee or any other tribe...with the introduction of more efficient weapons and the adoption of European methods of warfare...the various tribes were dependent upon Europeans to supply these instruments, for without them the survival of the group was in serious jeopardy.\textsuperscript{56}

Ironically, while an estimated 20,000 Native Americans resided in the Ohio Valley’s major urban centers, at the dawn of the eighteenth century, the Europeans only traded or gave away approximately 1,300 firearms, meaning a mere 7% of the known population possessed guns.\textsuperscript{57} With so few firearms in the hands of the Ohio Valley Native Americans, Clark’s estimate of a “serious” situation seems overstated. Unfortunately, overstatements like Clark’s tend to be the norm rather than the exception when dealing with the impact of European trade on Native American society.

While Native Americans eventually became more reliant on manufactured goods following the eighteenth century, the majority of Native Americans continued to engage in the same economic practices that yielded them their necessities of life prior to European contact. If not, than the countless journals kept by European trappers, traders and colonists commenting on the traditional ways Native Americans efficiently utilized their environment are nothing
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more than mere fabrications of vivid imaginations. Richard White gives three reasons why Native American technology continued after European contact. White observed that:

There are three major problems with assuming that European goods rapidly and nearly completely replaced native manufactures in the pays d’en haut. First, according to the archaeological record, native technology persisted for a considerable time. Second, given the carrying capacity of...canoes and the limited number that departed annually for the West, there was simply no way to transport all the goods that would have been necessary to supply the native population. Third, when read carefully contemporary accounts make it clear the European goods remained relatively scare over much of the pays d’en haut well into the eighteenth century.\(^{38}\)

In other words, though they came to desire European made goods, the Logstonian economy continued to rely heavily on the traditional commodities that Logstown’s inhabitants extracted from the environment.

It is unimportant whether or not the Logstonian economy possessed all of the characteristics found in Sjöberg’s or other scholars’ economic models of “civilized” societies. As Sjöberg himself indicated with the treatment of Meso-American agriculture, exceptions can be made to every model. What is significant is that Native Americans, like the Logstonians, created complex economic institutions similar to their Euro-American counterparts designed to fulfill more than just their need for subsistence as previously believed, and that these economic institutions created the social hierarchy that influenced and controlled the activities of its communities social and political affairs. Hence, while dissimilar in design and sometimes function to their Euro-American counterparts, the Logstonians and other Native American urban settlements possessed the economic institutions capable enough to facilitate the westward expansion of both Native American and Euro-American settlers.

\(^{38}\)Ibid, 133-4.
CHAPTER 6

"WE THE PEOPLE:"
THE LOGSTONIAN POLITICAL SYSTEM

The definition established in this work for an urban settlement stipulates that a society must include some form of governmental apparatus to manage the affairs of a community based on an established value system or code of conduct. To determine if the Logstonians created a political system, one question must be answered, "What is a preindustrial government?" By addressing this question, the intricacies of Logstonian society can be objectively analyzed and conclusions drawn about the way the people in the community governed themselves and managed their affairs. Once objectively analyzed, the Logstonian political structure can be compared, contrasted and categorized with other forms of government giving insight into the complexity of Logstonian society.

The Criteria for Preindustrial Political Systems

To address the simple question, "What is a preindustrial government," this work once again turns to Sjoberg's hierarchical criteria for societies. According to Sjoberg, the political systems of preindustrial societies generally consist of a power structure dominated by a small group of social elite who established an autocratic form of government.1 The elite group occupied most of the key positions in the society and tended to come from essentially the same small familial or kinship group. In many preindustrial societies, the sovereign or "king," ministers and advisors enjoy overwhelming temporal and spiritual authority and worked to maintain their economic and political positions through bureaucratic and or coercive military means.2

In contrast, Sjoberg explained that industrial societies develop more liberal and loosely defined power structures. While individual leaders and key personnel exist in an industrial society, social power generally rests with
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the consent of the governed. In most cases, industrial communities select key individuals to hold positions of authority with certain prescribed responsibilities and privileges. Additionally, the governmental bureaucracy bases its decisions more on an accepted set of formalized rules than on the decision of a single person in a position of power and or authority to determine governmental actions. Due to this selection process, the leader possess such limited power and control over the community that it enables the society to create and maintain a less rigid hierarchical system of government.³

Folk societies lack any real governmental system and develop a limited division of labor or class system due to their high degree of homogeneity.⁴ In most instances, individuals of the community share equal statuses based on their sex. Similar to industrial societies, folk societies lack a privileged stratum that exercise legitimate authority and control over the general populace, but unlike the more advanced industrial groups, they fail to create a stratified society with a social elite occupying the upper echelons of a hierarchical system.⁵ Though certain charismatic and skilled individuals are consulted for their advice, these individuals hold no authority over their nomadic communities and are essentially equal to their neighbors in regards to real authority. While they may acquire more wealth and possessions due to their abilities or charisma, these individuals possess no special rank or privilege in their community due to a specific position or status they hold.

Tools to Analyze Governments

To determine where a certain group may fit into Sjoberg’s political hierarchy of societies, criteria need to be established to analyze the level of governmental control in the culture being studied. As is evident by Sjoberg’s criteria, preindustrial governments exercise almost an unrestrained control over the general populace, while folk and industrial societies create political systems with limited or, in the case of folk groups, no authority and control over the society. To determine the type of government the Logstonians established, this work uses certain terms associated
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with political systems such as power, authority and control to establish the criteria to measure communities. The definitions for these terms come from anthropologist Timothy Earle’s work *How Chiefs Come to Power*. Though his work deals primarily with chiefdoms, Earle’s definitions and use of these terms provides an effective means to analyze and compare various types of political systems.

According to Earle, *authority* is a group sanctioned right and responsibility for an individual to lead based upon their capabilities or social position. Bestowed on the individual by the consent of the general populace, the leader sets the standards for others to follow and leads by example and not by coercion. Moreover, though some individuals are destined to lead due to their capabilities or an established genealogical structure, the individuals of a society work out the social realities of their daily lives through a political process and not through the decisions of a single individual. However, Earle noted that certain individuals in a community might compete for positions of authority to attain power.6

*Power*, Earle contends, exists as a measured source of control that an individual possesses over other members of their community. Power creates an environment that fosters an unequal relationship between members of the same society and enables individuals with control over the societal resources to essentially act autonomously without the consent or compliance of the general populace. Furthermore, the existence of a hierarchical system that places power in the hands of a few select leaders in a society motivates individuals to seek those resources that allow them to secure positions of control within their community. As individuals seize power, the political process of a community becomes one that involves interplay between members with power and excludes those citizens with limited or no access to positions of control from influencing the affairs of their society.7 Unlike authority, power enables leaders to directly coerce members in their community to perform certain tasks or act in certain ways.

5 Ibid., 109.
7 Ibid.
Earle defined *control* as the ability of an individual to restrain others from accessing sources of power. According to Earle, four sources of power exist in society—social, economic, military and ideological. Social power depends on an individual's relationship with their particular kinship group or community. To exercise political control, individuals use social relationships (social power) to manipulate the society's power structure by engaging in activities such as strategic marriages, adoptions and godfathering. Likewise, individuals seize economic, military and ideological power by controlling the modes of commercial production, the loyalty of the “warrior” class and the ability to direct the authority structure through the manipulation of the code of social order. By restricting others from accessing various sources of power, an individual establishes and maintains their own position of authority or power.\(^8\)

Anthropologist Morton H. Fried in his work, *The Evolution of Political Society*, perhaps best explains the relationship between power, control and authority in a political society. To Fried, authority exists as “the ability to channel the behavior of others in the absence of the threat or use of sanctions,” the rewards or punishments that channels the behavior of an individual, while power is “the ability to channel the behavior of others by threat or use of sanctions.”\(^9\) In other words, authority is the ability to control the actions of others without the use of power.

Using Earle’s definitions and Fried’s conceptualization of the interplay between them as guidelines to evaluate the political structure of Logstown and compare it with the criteria for preindustrial and industrial urban settlements, the degree of authority, power and control in the Logsonian governmental system can be estimated and a conclusion drawn as to their level of social complexity. Additionally from this analysis, the type of government the Logstonians developed, be it a republic, chiefdom, oligarchy or other form of political system can also be surmised.

**The Traditional Governments of the Logsonian**

To fully understand and appreciate the uniqueness of the Logsonian political system, its roots must first be discovered in the traditional governments of the Shawnee, Delaware and Mingo. Similar to most features in
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Logstown, the Logstonians adopted various elements of their former groups to develop the political structure of their settlement. Despite the fact that the Shawnee, Delaware and Mingo each came from societies with distinctly different governments, their former political structures shared many of the same features. Drawing on these similar features, the Logstonians developed a new form of government that, up to that time, was unique to the urban settlements of the Ohio Valley.

The Shawnee developed a system of governmental and societal organization known as a chiefdom, a political organization characterized by kin-based societies. In a chiefdom, an individual’s social standing and political status depends on their position within their particular kinship group.\textsuperscript{10} The Shawnee organized themselves into five distinct groups whose members inherited their affiliation patrilineally.\textsuperscript{11} These five primary groups consisted of sub-groups or name groups that signified an individual’s particular kin-group and social standing. An individual’s name, for example, directly correlated to their particular name group. The Shawnee Prophet, Tenskwatavaw, explained to C.C. Trowbridge that, “[the Shawnee] generally bestow a name descriptive of some act of the animal totem...a child from the Panther tribe is sometimes called the scratcher, or the leaper.”\textsuperscript{12} Though at one time these name groups represented over thirty distinct single family units, the historic Shawnee reduced these kin-groups to twelve distinct units and assigned them specific animal names such as the Turtle, Rabbit, Wolf and Bear.\textsuperscript{13}

The name groups provided the foundation for the relationships between individuals and various families in a community. Membership in a particular group placed certain responsibilities on its family members. For instance, the Turtle group normally had the responsibility of carrying the sacred bundle, a bag of ritual items, in each Shawnee community. Additionally, certain pairs of familial units buried each others dead and were taught to feel a special
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affinity with individuals from their own and specified groups. Thus, the name groups influenced Shawnee social organization more so than any other feature in an individual community.

While the name groups provided family units with the medium for individual community members to express social relations, the five primary groups, the Chalaakaatha, Mekoche, Thawikila (Hathawikila), Pekowi and Kishpoko, created the organizational structure of the Shawnee. Each division held a designated responsibility for some military, religious, social or political activity. The Shawnee Thomas Wildcat Alford described the various duties of the groups explaining that:

Originally there were five clans composing the Shawnee tribe, including the two principal clans, Tha-we-gi-la and Cha-lah-kaw-tha, from one of which came the national or principal chief. The remaining three Pec-u-we, the Kis-pu-go, and the May-ku-jay, each had its own chief who was subordinate to the principal chief in national matters, but independent in matters pertaining to the duties of his clan. Each clan had a certain duty to perform for the whole tribe. For instance the Pec-u-we clan, or its chief, had charge of the maintenance of order and looked after the celebration of things pertaining to religion or faith; the Kis-pu-go clan had charge of matters pertaining to war and the preparation and training of warriors; the May-ku-jay clan had charge of things relating to health and medicine and food for the whole tribe. But the two powerful clans, the Tha-we-gi-la and the Cha-lah-kaw-tha, had charge of political affairs and all matters that affected the tribe as a whole. Indeed, the tribal government may be likened to the government of the United States, in which each state (clan), with its governor (chief), is sovereign in local matters, but subordinate to the president of the United States (principal chief) in national matters.15

Though they may have operated as a more cohesive and hierarchical society during the pre-historic period, the five Shawnee groups acted essentially independently of one another during the historic period. Each group designated and created their chiefs and subcultures. In many instances, the subcultures created by the Shawnee more closely resembled other Native American cultures than that of their fellow Shawnee brethren. For example, the Mekoche shared many of the same ceremonies as the Creek, and in the case of Logstown, the Pekowi and Hathawikila adopted many of the practices of the Lenape and Mingo. Although at times they joined forces and acted as collective units, each group essentially attended to their own political, military and religious affairs.16
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The Shawnee created two types of leadership positions in their society, peace chiefs and war chiefs. The peace or settlement chief attained their position through hereditary descent. Though hereditary, the eldest son of a deceased leader held no rightful claim to their father's former position. A collection of the community's chiefs and elders selected the most capable son of the deceased leader to assume their father's position as chief. Simply put, the son who displayed the most skill and leadership potential attained the prestigious position of chief. Heredity merely supplied the minimum set of standards. The son needed to possess certain leadership skills to attain the office of chief. In most instances, however, the leadership seldom selected an individual under the age of thirty to become chief. If the deceased leader left no capable heir, the remaining chiefs and principle men in the community selected a skilled person to assume the vacant position.\textsuperscript{17}

Unlike the peace chiefs, the war chiefs attained their position through deed. To become a war chief, an individual needed to lead a minimum of four successful military excursions without suffering a friendly casualty and take one or more enemy scalps from each engagement. If an individual accomplished these tasks, they assumed the right to demand their acceptance as a war chief. Once the individual made the request, the chiefs and elders of the community nearly always approved and acknowledged the person's right at a public feast.\textsuperscript{18}

In addition to the male leaders, the Shawnee appointed female chiefs. Similar to the male chiefs, the Shawnee divided the duties of the female leaders into activities of war and peace. Usually, the female chiefs came from the same name or kinship group as the male chiefs and were a close relative or immediate family member of the paternal leader. Though somewhat of a woman's auxiliary, the power of the female chiefs equaled that of their male counterparts. In most decisions on war and peace, the female chiefs influenced the actions of the male leaders.\textsuperscript{19}

The duties of the chiefs encompassed both international and domestic responsibilities. In all matters of the community, both the peace and war chiefs gave their input into the decision making process of the leadership. Yet
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depending on the issue of discussion, the peace or war chiefs held the responsibility of making the final decision. For instance, in the case of land cessions, the peace chiefs took the input of the war chiefs, "but in the councils [the war chiefs] never preceded the village chiefs either in their speeches or propositions for the adoption of any measure."

Likewise, in the declaration of war, the war chief listened to the opinions and concerns of the settlement chiefs, but made the final decision. 20 Consequently, the Shawnee political structure limited the chief's ability to exercise power or control over the community and to make decisions without the solicitation of the group's collective leadership. 21

The rank of chief existed as a prestigious position of authority more so than one of power. The individual gained their position and right to rule from the community. Though hereditary in nature, the people could remove a chief from office for abusive, poor or inappropriate behavior. 22 Once they established the hierarchy of chiefs, the community willingly allowed the leadership to exercise control over the domestic and international affairs of their settlement and usually accepted their decisions on public matters. 23

To assist the chiefs with their administration of the community, the Shawnee created an informal council made up of significant members from all the name groups. Though these individuals possessed no formal power, the chiefs seldom made decisions without their consent and approval. "In important councils," Tenskwatawa explained to C.C. Trowbridge that, "the aged men of the nation are invited...[and] sit behind the Chiefs...and explain the proceedings at any previous council...and generally afford their advice & assistance in the proceedings." 24

According to Alford, the council consisted of individuals who, "were intelligent and staunch, fully able to advise about the affairs that affected the tribe." Additionally, Alford claimed that the councilors assumed the responsibility of
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governing the community. In most instances, chiefs chose prestigious and able councilors to become their subordinate chiefs.

From hunting rights to punitive measures for crimes such as murder, the Shawnee developed a formalized system of rules. The Shawnee based their system of law on morality and custom. In domestic matters, the chiefs and councils based their decisions on this accepted code of behavior. For instance, the Shawnee regarded murder as an individual crime against a family or name group and not as a crime against the community. In regards to the punishment for such a crime, Tenskwatowa explained to C.C. Trowbridge that:

In the case of murder, if the guilty person be a man of power & respectability in the nation the chiefs assemble immediately and take measures to procure a large supply of wampum to compensate the friends of the deceased for their loss.

Once collected, the chiefs visited the relatives of the murdered person and informed them of their intention to procure the appropriate payment for the crime, usually sixty fathoms for males and one hundred and fifty for females. However, the injured family could lessen or refuse the payment. If they chose to refuse the compensatory payment, the family had the right to take the murderer’s life without fearing any reciprocation from the individual’s name group or the community. In the case of a person of lowering standing, the murderer negotiated with the victim’s family on their own behalf. In all instances, the murderer accompanied the chiefs to the victim’s family in a formalized ceremony and compensated them with the appropriate payment of wampum or forfeited their life.

The Shawnee developed laws and forms of punishment for a myriad of crimes to include theft, adultery, incest, rape and public drunkenness. For each offense, the punishment varied from banishment, flogging and death to a public reprimand or a simple loss of prestige with no formalized type of reparation. However in all instances, the
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chiefs, councilors and community relied on their code of formalized and accepted behavior to determine the appropriate type and level of community and individual action.29

The traditional system of Shawnee government possessed features of both preindustrial and industrial societies. While their system of government had positions of authority occupied by the prestigious “elite” from a common lineage similar to preindustrial groups, the community limited the power of the individuals holding these various posts, thus restricting the ability of Shawnee leaders to control the actions of the people much like more advanced industrial societies. As seen through the parameters of power, authority and control, the traditional system of Shawnee consists of elements of both preindustrial and industrial societies suggesting that they were in a state of political transition, or that they developed a governmental structure distinctly their own.

The Lenape

The social organization of the Lenape affected the development of their political system. Unlike the early Shawnee who organized into five distinct groups and established themselves as a collective unit, the Lenape developed a society oriented on individual urban settlements and not on a well developed clan system. According to historian Paul Wallace, the Lenape created, “an atomistic society...one in which local communities were completely independent, each being subject to its own laws.”30 This lack of a group identity or organization caused the Lenape to develop autonomous political units oriented on their individual urban settlements.31 These individual communities acted as the focal point of Lenape society and provided the basis for their political, economic and social structure.32

The Lenape urban settlements consisted of a conglomeration of individual family units who possessed distinct geographical subsistence territories. Usually, each community consisted of one or more related groups who cultivated and hunted the lands immediately adjacent to their settlement.33 Though these communities lacked a sense
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of a larger whole and were essentially autonomous and somewhat endogamous, the Lenape shared a similar culture and appeared to have been loosely aligned as members of neighboring groups intermarried and expanded familial relationships.\textsuperscript{34} Furthermore, each family unit belonged to one of three phratries—the Turtle, Turkey and Wolf.\textsuperscript{35} In most cases, members from all three groups lived in a single village, and for this reason, the phratries served to identify members belonging to the same kin-group regardless of where they lived. Similar to the Shawnee name-groups, members of these various phratries had names associated with their particular kin animal and usually wore or adorned themselves with a mark signifying this relationship similar to a European’s coat-of-arms.\textsuperscript{36}

A matriarchal society, the eldest Lenape female family member existed as the central and most influential figure of the family units. Regarded as “chiefmakers,” the Lenape matriarchs possessed the ability to appoint and dismiss the male leadership of their family units, more commonly known as sachems or sakimas.\textsuperscript{37} Though they chose the male leadership, elder females shared responsibilities with them in regards to administering the affairs of the family. In most instances, the sakimas attended to running the political affairs of the community in regards to treaties, warfare and land cessions, while the matriarchs ensured that their families performed and completed the domestic duties of the settlement such as the planting and harvesting.\textsuperscript{38}

The position of sakima followed a hereditary descent along the matriarchal side to the family.\textsuperscript{39} Unlike the Shawnee, the Lenape leadership generally passed from brother to brother as opposed to father to son.\textsuperscript{40} A seventeenth century writer described the Lenape descent explaining that:
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When the king dies it is not his children who succeed him, but his brother by the same mother, or his sister’s, or her daughter’s male children, for no female can succeed to the government.41

Once selected as a sakima, the male leader had the responsibility of representing his group in the community council. The responsibilities of the sakhems encompassed both political and ceremonial duties. Yet unlike the European kings they would eventually become compared to by White colonists and travelers, the sakhems participated in the rudimentary economic activities of the community and possessed no more wealth or power than any other male member in the Lenape society.42

The actual governmental apparatus used by the Lenape to manage the affairs of their community proved to be a council made up of the male sakhems. “Nothing of importance,” Thomas Holm wrote, “such as war peace, the sale of land, or the like, is undertaken, without having been first discussed in council, to which are not only called the counsellors, but the common people.”43 Once the council began, the sakima designated the order of the speakers from first to last. While an individual spoke, the entire gathering remained silent until they clearly announced an end to their discussion. When all had spoken on an issue, the sakhems concluded the meeting by announcing their decision on the matter. “The Council having all declared their opinion, Daniel Denton explained in 1670, “the King after some pause gives the definitive sentence, which is commonly seconed with a shout from the people, every one seeming to applaud & manifest their assent to what is determined.”44

To assist in governing of their daily lives, the Lenape developed an unwritten moral code of behavior to control the general behavior and actions of the populace. The nineteenth century historian E. M. Ruttenber perhaps best summarizes the historical literature and documentation regarding the Lenape code of behavior. Ruttenber noted that:
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Law and justice, as civilized nations understand those terms, were to them unknown, yet both they had in a degree suited to their necessities. Assaults, murders, and other acts regarded as criminal offenses by all nations, were regarded by them, but the execution of punishment was vested in the injured family, who were constituted judges as well as executioners, and who could grant pardons or accept atonements. The rights of property they understood and respected; and half their wars were retaliatory for the taking of their territory without making just compensation. There was not a man among them that did not know the bounds of his own land as accurately as though defined by a surveyor’s chain. Their customs were their unwritten laws, more effective than those which fill the tomes of civilized governments, because taught to the people from infancy and woven into every condition and necessity of their being.45

Though dissimilar to Euro-American justice systems, the Lenape created a code of societal conduct that established the bounds by which members of the group behaved towards one another, a feature present in preindustrial societies but absent in folk societies.

The position of sakima gave the male leaders authority and responsibility in the community, but afforded them no real sense of autocratic power. Power and control rested in the hands of the counsel and community in the form of a general consensus. For the most part, the sakima carried out the will of the people directly through the council and indirectly through informal pressures and controls.46 To maintain their prestigious and authoritative position in the community, the sakima had to be, “gracious, hospitable, communicative, affable, and their house...open to every Indian.”47 If they performed their duties poorly or proved to be an individual of questionable character, the community had the power to remove the sakima from position. “In the government of the Lenape,” Ruttenber concluded in 1872, “the perfect liberty of the people was the fundamental law, and absolute unanimity the only recognized expression of the popular will. A more perfect system of checks and balances the wisdom of civilized nations has not devised.”48 Ruttenber continued by noting that, “a more perfect democracy will never exist
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among the nations of the earth and in this respect it was distinguished from the government of the Iroquois, the later
more nearly resembling a republic.  

The "Refugee" Mingo

The political organization of the Mingo group is a difficult thing to firmly identify. Being a mixture of
several different refugee peoples to include Seneca, Wyandot (Huron), Erie and Susquehannock, the Mingo political
system presumably consisted of elements from each of these groups. Since a complete study of their culture has
never been done, this exists as perhaps one of the few, if not the only, works that attempts to put together the
patchwork of material pertaining to the Mingo.

Of the four aforementioned groups, an abundance of primary and secondary resource material exists for the
Huron and Seneca, while relatively little exists for the Susquehannock and Erie. Fortunately, historian and
anthropologist Frederick W. Hodge concluded that the Erie political and social organization closely resembled that of
the Huron, and several sources indicate that the Susquehannock culture virtually mirrored that of their Seneca
neighbors. For these reasons, the majority of material regarding the Mingo will be derived from sources pertaining
primarily to the Huron and Seneca. Unfortunately though it is perhaps not the best method of coming to understand
the Mingo, for the purpose and scope of this work, it is the most practical.

Like the Delaware, the Mingo traced their lineage along a matrilineal line of descent and organized
themselves into genes. The genes consisted of a, "female ancestor and her children, together with the children of her
female descendants." Both the Seneca and Huron organized the genes into eight distinguishable clans or gentes.
Six of the groups shared similar names—wolf, bear, turtle, beaver, deer and hawk, while two of the groups differed.

49 Ibid., 48.
50 Frederick W. Hodge, ed., Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico (Washington, 1912). Citation found in Harry Forrest Lupold, The
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In the case of the Seneca, these two groups had the names of the snipe and the heron, while the Huron used the names of the sturgeon (or loon) and fox.  

The gentes formed the foundation for the social and governmental institutions in the society and provided the basis for individual relationships. For instance, members of the same gentes had certain rights privileges and obligations due to their membership in a particular group. Being a member of a certain gente allowed an individual to elect or depose the group's sachem; prohibited them to marry members of their group; gave them rights of inheritance to property of deceased kin; bound them to a reciprocal obligation to defend and redress injuries of fellow members; enabled them to bestow names on members; gave them access to a common burial place and allowed them to be part of the gente's council. 

Gente membership had no territorial or group limitations. Members of all gentes lived in various communities among their own people as well as in neighboring group's settlements. "Huron, Neutral and Iroquois who belonged to gentes named after the same animal regarded themselves as bound by many of the same ties of affinity as were members of a single gente within their home community." Outsiders entering a community for the first time often sought out individuals with similar gente affiliations for shelter, food and most of all protection. Gente membership transcended tribal affiliation indicating that members of the Mingo group associated with one another before they merged in the Ohio Valley, lending proof to the hypothesis that individuals of the various nations—Seneca, Wyandot (Huron), Erie and Susquehannocks, came together to form the Ohio Mingos. 

The various Native American groups who made up the Mingo each developed essentially the same type of hierarchical government. The successive order of the hierarchy consisted of gentes (clans), phratries, tribes and confederacies. For instance, several matrilineal related families (genes) made up the Wolf gente; the Wolf gente belonged to a phratry that included the Bear, Beaver and Turtle gentes; this phratry existed as one of two phratries that

---
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made up the Seneca tribe; and the Seneca tribe belonged to the famed Iroquois Confederacy. Each level of this governmental apparatus consisted of a council of sachems that looked after community, tribal (national) and confederacy affairs except for the phratry which acted more as a social than political organization.

In this hierarchical system, the gentes formed the basis of the governmental apparatus and saw to the management of the domestic and national affairs of their particular settlements and group. Each gente had a council made up of the chosen heads of the individual family genes. In regards to community affairs, the gentes usually met daily to address and resolve issues concerning their particular community. When dealing with affairs of the entire nation, the community councils converged at a pre-determined urban settlement and resolved matters that concerned the whole group. These matters included issues such as land seizures and sales and the election and removal of sachems.

The individual community councils designated individuals to spoke for the group when meeting to resolve national or international affairs. These select individuals usually inherited this position from a brother or uncle. As a result, each urban settlement possessed a council made up of the sachems from each of the gentes, and depending on the number of settlements a group established, there could be several sachems for each particular gente attending a council meeting. Moreover, the head speakers of the various councils could very well be from the same related gente.

The governmental mechanism of the Huron and Iroquois Confederacies consisted of the same elements as the gente political apparatus. A composite of sachems chosen from the gentes leadership made up the confederacies councils. Similar to national affairs of the individual tribes, the various confederacy councils met only to resolve issues confronting the entire alliance. In a letter to Henry Schoolcraft in October of 1845, Mr. L. Morgan explained the composition of the Iroquois’ great council. Morgan wrote:
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We learn that at the establishment of the confederacy, fifty sachems were founded... There were also fifty sub-sachems, or aids; that is, to every sachem was given a sub-sachem to stand behind him—in a word to do his bidding... They are unequally divided among the Five Nations, the Onondagas having as many as fourteen. The eight original... families [gentes] still hold to be correct,... but each [gente] did not have a sachem. In some of the [gentes] were two or three, in others none... The fifty sachems were the only official characters known at the councils of the confederacy... and unanimity was always necessary. Over this council, the ta-do-da-ho-ho, or great sachem of the confederacy, presided... always taken from the Onondagas... The object of this council was to "raise up sachems" in the place of those who had died. It would require more room than twenty letters would furnish to explain what we saw and heard—the mode of election and deposition—the lament for the dead—the wampum—the two sides of the council fire, and the other ceremonies connect with raising.58

The sachems, which held either peace or war seats, existed as perhaps the most important and influential figures in Mingo society. Like the Shawnee and Lenape, the Mingo sachems possessed a position of authority and held no real power or control over the community, nation or confederacy. In addition to being chosen from a hereditary line of descendants by the matriarchs of the individual gentes, the gente, tribal and confederacy councils validated the selection of both war and peace leaders. Appointed to these fragile positions of prestige, the sachems needed to conduct themselves in an appropriate manner or suffer the consequences of removal from office. In 1727, Cadwallader Colden explained that:

Each Nation is an absolute Republack by its self, govern'd in all Publick Affairs of War and Peace by the Sachems or Old Men, whose Authority and Power is gain'd by and consists wholly in the Opinion the rest of the Nation have of their Wisdom and Integrity. They never execute their Resolutions by Compulsion or Force upon any of their People. Honour and Esteem are their Principal Rewards, as Shame & being Despised are their Punishments... Their Generals and Captains obtain their Authority likewise by the general Opinion of their Courage and Conduct, and loose it by a Failure in those Vertues. Their Great Men are generally poorer than the common People, for they affect to give away and distribute all the Presents or Plunder they get in their Treaties or War, so as to leave nothing to themselves. If they should once be suspected of Selfishness, they would grow mean in the opinion of their Country-men, and would consequently lose their Authority.59

---
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At all levels of government, the council of sachems existed as the mechanism by which the Mingo governed themselves. The sachems derived their authority from their gentes and made up each settlement and national council and represented their individual nations at the confederacy councils.\textsuperscript{60} In most instances, the gente, national and confederacy councils consisted of and were led by the same individuals. Whether it was the declaration of war, the negotiation of peace or to determine reparations for an individual’s violation of community law, the Mingo addressed their domestic, national and international affairs through their councils. Held in the presence of the governed and opened up to all who wished to express their views on a particular subject, including women, the council existed as a representative government where unanimity was the fundamental law of its decision making process.\textsuperscript{61}

To assist with their decision making, the council relied on an ancient and accepted code of behavior. The Mingo system of law prohibited the general society or individual sachems from punishing an individual for a violation of the behavioral code. In most cases, individuals literally paid for their crimes, even in the instance of murder. When dealing with an individual who habitually got themselves into trouble, the council or the individual gentes imposed restrictions or sanctions on that person’s actions. On occasion however, individual gentes killed members of their group who they deemed socially dangerous. Thus through their legal system, the Mingo sought to improve a persons behavior and “awaken a sense of responsibility” in them and not to merely punish an individual for poor judgment or inappropriate actions.\textsuperscript{62}

Similar to their Shawnee and Lenape neighbors, the Mingo communities vested authority in the hands of a few proven individuals, but prevented any control or abuse of power by any one person or group due to their elective style of government through a common line of hereditary descent. Bound loosely together by kinship ties, the individual urban settlements served as the foci of the Mingos’ daily lives. Though they acknowledged the jurisdiction
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of the Seneca nation over the Ohio Valley in the eighteenth century, the community council proved the most influential and important element in the management of the Mingos’ daily affairs.\textsuperscript{63} Hence though they recognized a higher authority, the Mingo style of government enabled them to act autonomously in governing the domestic and international affairs of their individual communities.

\textbf{The Logstonian Government}

The Logstonians created a governmental apparatus to manage their unique and diversified settlement. Though the basic elements of their system differed little from that of their former groups, the Logstonians adjusted their old institutions to accommodate the fragility of their fledgling multiethnic community. The basic components of this political system consisted of military and secular leaders, a community council of sachems and an accepted code of behavior, the minimum elements required to meet the criteria for a governmental mechanism established for an urban settlement.

Contrary to the belief of some scholars that they, “were a potentially volatile mix of the discontented . . . who lived together as much from fear as from friendship,” the Logstonians shared a similar kinship system that formed the basis for their social relationships.\textsuperscript{64} In other words, members of the Turkey gente continued to associate and share a reciprocal bond with other individuals from the same gente despite their affiliation with a particular tribal or national organization like the Seneca, Lenape or Shawnee. Thus, Logstonians associated along kinship lines more so than along national or tribal lines creating a significant degree of homogeneity and cooperativeness in the community. In fact, the kinship system of many Native American groups continues to exist today in one form or another still providing the basis for social relationships between members of the certain gentes.\textsuperscript{65} It is unreasonable to assume then, that because the Logstonians of the eighteenth century departed from their ancestral groups, they ceased to use their pre-established gente systems to continue to associate with one another. As it was in the days prior to

\textsuperscript{63} Rutter, p. 257.
\textsuperscript{64} Richard White, The Middle Ground, p. 186.
\textsuperscript{65} Howard, Shawnee, p. 86 and Weslager, The Delaware Indians, p. 3-30.
Logstown's emergence, members of similar gentes, but from different communities and nations, identified with members from the same totemic group and maintained a reciprocal relationship of rights and responsibilities with related individuals.66

The position of sachem remained a post of authority with its rights and responsibilities outlined by the community and gente. Like their former groups, some gentes continued to select a male leader to represent them as their sachem or to simply confirm a sachem's selection of a successor. While the position of sachem usually followed a matriarchal or patriarchal line of descent, by the mid-eighteenth century, the gentes and community began selecting individuals outside the traditional lines as was in the case of Shingas, previously mentioned in chapter five.67

The sachems' roles in their community changed little, encompassing both domestic and international affairs. Though the power of decision making generally rested in the hands of the gente or community, the sachems began to enjoy more power and control in making international decisions. Usually, the sachem acted independently when dealing with matters of international trade, war, regional defense and political alliances. The increase in power and control over international affairs occurred primarily because of two reasons. First, due to the frequency and increasingly exclusive nature of their meetings with outsiders such as the English and French, the sachems lacked the ability to consult with the general public on every decision with more meetings being held outside the community. And secondly, the practice of Euro-Americans to deal solely with the leaders of a particular group increased the need for sachems to act more independently in order to make timely decisions with the various outside groups.68 Yet despite their increased responsibilities, the sachems continued to consult their communities when possible. For instance when approached by the government of Pennsylvania to forge an alliance, Scarouady, a Mingo leader of
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Logstown and its surrounding area, responded, “we will take the Belt home to Ohio where there is a greater and wiser Council than Us, and consider it and return you a full Answer.”

Tanacharison provides an excellent example of the Ohio Valley sachems. Born of Catawba mother and Seneca father, Tanacharison established himself as one of the most influential men in the Ohio Valley. Though some scholars arguably contend that he was the “viceroy,” “regent,” or representative of the Iroquois Confederacy sent to watch over the Ohio Indians, the Half-King, a name that Tanacharison later earned, gained his position by becoming a mediator between Ohio Indians and colonists. “Building upon a base of kin and personal allies,” Michael N. McConnell notes, “his authority enhanced by British generosity, Tanacharison eventually became the preeminent Iroquois in the Ohio Country.”

The wiser community council Scarouady alluded to consisted of the peace and war sachems from the individual gentes. Within Logstown, three known gentes existed that happened to coincide with the three major phraties in some groups of the Iroquois Confederacy, the Wolf, Turkey and Turtle. Just like their former groups, the entire council deliberated over most of the domestic and international affairs and entertained the queries, ideas, problems and solutions of their community members. Yet unlike their former groups, the Logstonian council consisted of members from all nations, Shawnee, Mingo and Delaware, which created situations where decisions were made solely according to gente or tribal identity.

In his journal of 1753 for example, Captain William Trent noted that on one occasion he and the Half-King sent for Shingas regarding a matter concerning the Logstonian Delaware. Trent wrote that, “the Half King and myself sent for him [Shingas], and told him that it was not right for him to be out of the way when the Canaywages came, for it was with their Nation that their chief Business was.” Due to the diverse nature of the Logstonian
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community, the council and sachems acted in accord and independent of one another depending on how a particular situation would affect their gente, tribal group or community. Thus unlike the hierarchy of their former groups that consisted of genties, nations and confederacies, the components of the Logstonian political system consisted of genties, comprised of members from all nations, tribal groups, which included only individuals of a particular nation and the community, which accounted for the entire settlement's population.

The most prominent sachems of the Logstonian Council consisted of Kakowatcheky, the Shawnee leader of the Wolf gente, Shingas and his brother King Beaver (Tamaque), Delaware leaders of the Turkey gente who resided in and around Logstown at various times, and the Mingo leaders Tanacharison and Scarouady of the Seneca and Onieda respectively. While these were the more prominent sachems, the council consisted of several more gente leaders unofficially augmented with the support and participation of the community elders. In all, it could be conjectured that the Logstonian council consisted of members of the Shawnee, Lenape, Mingo, Wyandot, Erie, "Iroquois from the Sault St. Louis, from the Lake of the Two Mountains, and Indians from the Nepisinkies and the Abanakis, with Ontarios and other nations" based purely off of documentation regarding the composition of the settlement's population and knowledge of the gene and gente roles in the community.

The sachems and council relied on the code of behavior used by their former groups. Designed more to mend relationships and rehabilitate offenders as opposed to punishing wrong doers, the code encompassed a myriad of crimes to include murder, incest, theft and excessive drunkenness. For many of the crimes, a victim's family or gente usually accepted payment in the form of wampum, skins or other valuable items to compensate for the loss. In the new multiethnic settlements like Logstown, families, to avoid blood feuds or a rift in the community, seldom
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sought to repair damages with the death of the offender regardless of the crime. In crimes that affected the entire community, the Logstonian council often intervened to rectify a situation. At the Carlisle Conference in October of 1753 for instance, Scarouady attempted to mend the practice of rum traders in the Ohio Valley by appealing to the Pennsylvania Commissioners. Concerned with the adverse affect the liquor had on his people, Scarouady complained that:

Your [Pennsylvania’s] traders now bring scarce any thing but Rum and Flour...the Rum ruins Us. We beg you would prevent its coming in such Quantities by regulating the Traders. We never understood the Trade was to be for Whiskey and Flour. WE desire it may be forbidden, and none sold in the Indian country; but that if the Indians will have any they may go among the Inhabitants and deal with them for it...In short, if this Practice be continued We must be inevitably ruined. We most earnestly therefore beseech You to remedy it.74

Though history proved that the rum trade continued, the Pennsylvania government agreed to curtail the traffic of liquor by adopting a plan proposed by Scarouady to limit the goods to essentially three locations under the watchful eye of the Native Americans.75 Thus regardless of the offenders group affiliation, the Logstonian council sought to appease victims by forcing the accused to make the appropriate accommodations.

As is evident by this brief description of Logstonian, Delaware, Shawnee and Mingo political systems, Logstown possessed a well-developed government that efficiently managed the affairs of the settlement’s population. Unfortunately, the Logstonian government fails to meet Sjoberg’s criteria for preindustrial governments. Unlike preindustrial societies, Logstown lacked a political system dominated by a small group of social elite who occupied most of the key positions in the society. While many of the Logstonian leaders came from the same gentes, the sachems never held complete autocratic power and control over the society. Furthermore, the sachems and their advisors never enjoyed overwhelming temporal and spiritual authority or directly controlled the economic and political institutions through bureaucratic and or coercive military means. Therefore, Logstown’s government cannot be classified as a preindustrial political system. Additionally, Logstown fails to meet all of Sjoberg’s requirements for
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the governments of folk societies due to its clear division of labor, prestige-based social stratification and the existence of discernible leadership positions in the community. The question is then, "what level of sophistication did the Logstonians attain in their political development?"

Though the Logstonians clearly did not achieve an industrial status economically and socially, they did possess some of the political features present in industrial societies such as an elected body of representatives and an accepted code of laws and or customs. Therefore based upon the previous text, it would be inaccurate to label the Logsonian government as either folk, preindustrial or industrial. Because the position of sachem usually followed a hereditary line of descent and consisted of the more prestigious members of the community, Logstown’s leadership closely resembled the leadership of preindustrial societies. Yet unlike preindustrial societies, the sachems merely occupied positions of authority with certain rights and responsibilities given to them by the community through a process of gene and gente hereditary selection. Ultimate power and control rested in the hands of the governed due to the elaborate council system and code of behavior the sachems appealed to and relied on when making decisions resembling more closely the features present in industrial societies. The best description of the Logsonian government would be to say then that, the political apparatus of Logstown existed as a system in transition from the preindustrial to the industrial.

Assigning a contemporary term to explain the Logsonian proves just as difficult as determining its level of social sophistication. The four most likely terms to associate the Logsonian government with are chiefdom, democracy, republic or oligarchy. While some scholars might argue that they created a system of government that resembled a chiefdom, the Logstonians lacked the population and territorial density to qualify for this type of government thus ruling out this possibility.76 Likewise, Logstown could not be classified as an oligarchy seeing that

76 Timothy Earle, “The Evolution of Chiefdoms,” in Chiefdoms: Power, Economy and Ideology, ed. By Timothy Earle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 1. In this anthology, Earle defines chiefdoms as, “a polity that organizes centrally a regional population in the thousands ... (with) some degree of heritable and social ranking and economic stratification.” As is evident, Logstown existed as an urban settlement that attended to its own affairs while often times working in conjunction with other Native Americans.
the leadership consisted of a large body of members who possessed relatively little power in the way of societal
control. With the choices now limited, this means that Logstown existed as either a republic or democracy.

Arguing that "republics destroyed hierarchy, order and authority," Richard White suggests that Logstown
existed as one of the many "republican villages" of the Ohio Valley. Yet, a republic consists of a government
composed of a representative government chosen by a body of persons who empower certain individuals to
represent them and therefore remove themselves from the decision making process. Furthermore, an elected
individual usually heads a republic and not a monarch or chief. Though they selected a body of representatives to
represent their genes, gentes and community, the Logstonians never relinquished their right to participate in the
decision making process. Rather, the community retained all power and control in governing the majority of the
domestic and international affairs of their settlement through their participation in the councils and their familial hold
on the sachems. Thus, Logstown falls outside the parameters of a republic.

Of all the choices presented, democracy seems to describe the Logsonian system of government the best.
A term originally used by the Greeks to describe the Athenian practice of laws being passed by a majority vote of all
freeborn male citizens, democracy means, "the making of law and policy by a majority of all." Like all terms
however, the meaning of democracy changed over time to include concepts such as unrestricted access to public
office. However if taken in the purest sense of the word, the Logsonian political system developed into a democratic
government where the community through its representative council of sachems determined public policy and
actions.

What is important is not whether the Logstonians developed a republic or democracy, but to determine if
their political system was sophisticated enough to influence the development of the area adjacent to their community.

Achieving a level of sophistication that advanced it beyond a preindustrial state, the Logstonian government ably
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guided the sachems, council and people of Logstown to negotiate political alliances with Native American and Euro-American groups, diffuse potentially volatile domestic tensions, negotiate trade agreements with foreign governments and guide military actions against enemies. The Logstonian government proved to be a sophisticated political system and possessed all the features necessary to influence the international and domestic affairs in and around its settlement's boarders.
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CHAPTER 7

The Spawning of A Spearhead:
The Native American Factor in the Development of Pittsburgh,
1744-1764

In this work, it is argued that Native American urban settlements provided the motivation and support necessary for Euro-Americans to settle the Ohio Valley. In the four preceding chapters, this work established that Logstown existed as a preindustrial frontier urban settlement with complex social institutions. With the essential element of the Native American model of frontier development established, Logstown as an urban settlement, this study now shifts its focus to explain how Native Americans influenced and supported Euro-American efforts to settle the Ohio Valley. To accomplish this, three questions must be answered. Why did the Euro-Americans come to the site of present day Pittsburgh? How did the initial cosmopolitan settlement of Pittsburgh, Fort Prince George, become established, and, what impact did Native American support have on the establishment of Fort Pitt?

To answer these questions, Logstonian support is broken down into four categories—political, military, informational and physical. Native American political support consists of two elements, policy and diplomacy. Policy refers to the Native American domestic plans and efforts to use Euro-Americans to buttress their own political and economic position in the Ohio Valley. These plans and efforts include the negotiation of treaties, alliances and agreements with Euro-Americans to strengthen their own position in the Ohio Valley. Though the intention of Native American domestic policy was not to assist Euro-Americans but to accomplish their own aims, some Logstonian plans, such as the one to become politically independent of the Iroquois Confederacy, required that they adopt certain measures that assisted white settlers like the opening up the Ohio Valley to English traders and diplomats. Thus though they sought to fulfill their own political objectives, the Logstonians adopted domestic policies that led to the creation of inroads and destinations for English traders who ventured into the Ohio Valley. The inroads that settlers would later use to establish Pittsburgh.
Political diplomacy refers to the Native American non-domestic actions to support an English presence in the Ohio Valley. While they used their domestic policy to secure their own objectives, the Logstonians employed diplomacy to assist the English with their efforts to establish a trading frontier and cosmopolitan settlement in the Ohio Valley. Thus in regards to political diplomacy, Logsonian support pertains to the diplomatic actions taken by the Native Americans to assist the English against the French. While their policies opened up the Ohio Valley to English traders, the Logstonians’ diplomatic efforts supported the British objective to plant a permanent settlement in the region.

Unlike political support, military, physical and informational support pertains to the Native American assistance given to the Euro-Americans once the English and French established Forts Duquesne and Pitt at present-day Pittsburgh. Military support consisted of the armed assistance that Native Americans provided Euro-Americans during the Seven Years War. Depending on whose fort was in place at the time, Native Americans provided armed support to both the French and English occupants of the two posts. Physical support included Native American efforts to provide the inhabitants of the two posts with the major necessity of life, food. Once the English firmly established Fort Pitt, physical support encompassed the Native American efforts to procure the commodities of trade essential to the physical survival of the post, meat and corn. Informational support consisted of Native American efforts to keep the post informed of potential danger from Euro-Americans and other Ohio Indians. Additionally, informational support included services Native Americans performed for the post such as scouting and interpreting. Though the post changed hands three times, the French and English both relied on Native American support before, during and after the Seven Years War. Moreover, Native American support proved so vital that a lack of it caused the downfall of Fort Duquesne. Thus by looking at Native American support, this study will show how the Logstonians and their Ohio Indian neighbors provided the Euro-Americans with a reason to come to the Ohio Valley and the support necessary to establish a permanent cosmopolitan settlement in the Ohio Valley. The settlement that eventually became Pittsburgh.
To show how the Logstonians and other Ohio Indians acted as the catalyst for the Euro-American settlement of the Ohio Valley, this chapter examines Pittsburgh's evolution over four distinct time periods. The first period discussed is from 1744 to 1751 and explains how the Logstonians opened up the Ohio Valley to English trade and offers answers to the first question proposed in this chapter—why did Euro-Americans come to Pittsburgh circa Logstown? The second period examined is from 1752 to 1754 and involves Logstonian diplomatic efforts to assist the English with the construction of Fort Prince George, the first post established at present-day Pittsburgh. Unlike the first section, which explains the Native American drive to further their own aims, this period looks at the Logstonian political efforts to support the British objectives in the Ohio Valley and presents answers to the second question proposed in this chapter—how did the first settlement at present-day Pittsburgh, Fort Prince George, become established? The last two periods studied, 1754 to 1758 and 1758 to 1762, explains how Native Americans assisted Forts Duquesne and Pitt and provides answers to the third question proposed in this chapter—what impact did Native American support have on the establishment of Euro-American cosmopolitan settlements. Through the examination of these four periods, the role that the Logstonians played as the catalyst for the settlement and initial development of Fort Pitt will be realized. In short, it will be shown that Native American urban settlements proved to be the spearheads of the Euro-American settlement of the frontier.

The Tumultuous Twenty Years in the Ohio Valley, 1744-1764

The political turmoil rocking the Ohio Valley in the middle part of the eighteenth century is central to understanding the role that the Logstonians played in the establishment of Pittsburgh. The parties responsible for this turmoil consisted of a “skewed triangle” of powers that included England and her colonies of New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Maryland, France and her agents in Canada and Louisiana and the autonomous “Ohio Valley Indians” based out of Logstown. While each group had its own reasons for attempting to control the rich Ohio Valley, the struggle resulted from the Ohio Indians’ antagonism of the tumultuous relationship between the English and the French.
In the decades that made up the later part of the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries, England and France engaged in a series of military and economic conflicts that would eventually lead to the last of their wars for control over the North American continent and its lucrative fur trade, the Seven Years War. To achieve their political goals in this conflict, the two European powers sought the aid of their colonies as well as the various Native American groups that occupied the strategic Ohio Valley. With the assistance of their Native American allies, France intended to block the westward expansion of the English colonies, which directly threatened their monopoly on the Ohio Indian trade. Similarly, the English sought Native American support to expand their colonial holdings and to increase their activity in the Indian trade. Like an intricate chess game between two masters, England, France and their respective colonies maneuvered to ally with Native Americans to legitimize their claims to the Ohio Valley trade.

The claims for the valley included not only contentions between England and France, but also between the English colonies. Of these disputes, the most significant conflict existed between Pennsylvania and Virginia and concerned the boundaries of the two colonies in regards to the Ohio Valley. In short, both Pennsylvania and Virginia claimed that the Ohio Valley belonged within the borders of their respective colonies. Almost like the contest between England and France, the two colonies attempted to make inroads into the Ohio Valley and strengthen their claims by purchasing tracts of land from and making treaties with the Ohio Indians. Understanding their unique, opportunistic and fragile position of being members of a "country between" the various European and colonial factions, the Native Americans actively sought to increase their own control over the region and made a concerted effort through their "council fire" and Logstown to use the Euro-Americans to accomplish their political objectives. Thus, in their quest for the political and economic control of the Ohio Valley, the Ohio Indians made political decisions that pitted the English against the French, and in so doing, antagonized the relationship between the two powers that drew them into a war for the possession of the region and for the affection of the Native American

1 James Axtell, The Invasion Within. 3.
hunters so vital to Indian trade. As a result, the Ohio Indians acted as more than just mere observers or pawns in the imperial quest for control over the Ohio Valley but "shaped the events that unfolded in their land."  

PART I
How the Logstonians Opened Up the Ohio Valley to Euro-American Settlement, 1744-1752

While turmoil existed between France and England before the Seven Years War, the Ohio Valley remained virtually free of Euro-American settlements between the area of the Allegheny Mountains and Mississippi River for essentially two reasons. First, the Euro-Americans lacked the logistical assets and resources required to support remotely situated outposts, and second, based on their negative experience with them, the Ohio Indians did not want Euro-American urban settlements next to their homes. Consequently, the Europeans and their colonies chose to forgo settlement and attempted to control the Ohio Valley trade "indirectly through Indian proxies" based out of Native American urban settlements such as Logstown. However, the Ohio Indians desire to become the dominant political force in the Ohio Valley led the Logstonians and their Native American neighbors to seek a Euro-American trading partner that would fulfill their economic needs and recognize their autonomy from the Iroquois Confederacy.

To the Ohio Indians, the colony of Pennsylvania proved to be the type of trading partner they desired, one that would recognize their autonomy and provide them with the prestigious trade goods important in their economic system. Thus, the Logstonians and their Native American neighbors forged a political relationship with Pennsylvania through the negotiation and implementation of two successive treaties that subsequently opened up the Ohio Valley to Euro-American trade and settlement—the Philadelphia Treaty of 1747 and the Lancaster Treaty of 1748. With

---

these two treaties, the Logstonians sought to accomplish two objectives. First, the Logstonians wanted to establish their political autonomy from the Iroquois Confederacy, and secondly, they sought to forge a permanent economic and political relationship with Pennsylvania that strengthened their control over the Ohio Valley. Consequently, the Logstonian desire to improve their own political and economic position in the region caused them to adopt a domestic policy that opened up the Ohio Valley to English traders and trade goods, threatened the French hold on the fur trade and motivated Euro-Americans to come to Logstown. In other words, the Ohio Indians adopted a domestic policy to satisfy their own ambitions that opened up the Ohio Valley to English traders and provided them with a reason to come to the Ohio Valley.

The Ohio Indians initiated the Philadelphia Conference of 1747 as a result of a series of events that began in 1744 with the signing of a treaty between the Iroquois Confederacy at Onondaga and the English colonies of New York, Pennsylvania and Maryland. With the 1744 Treaty of Lancaster, the Iroquois council at Onondaga ceded to Pennsylvania, Virginia and Maryland the land that now makes up present-day Kentucky, West Virginia and western Pennsylvania, an area that encompassed Logstown and its surrounding region. Though only a small number of English traders came to the Ohio Valley as a result of it, the treaty excluded Native Americans from claiming “ownership” of the ceded territory and gave the English colonies the right to intrude on lands that Ohio Indians occupied. Subsequently, the Ohio Indians sought to broker a deal with the English that guaranteed them “ownership” of the territory and prevented the Onondaga council from impeding on their right to occupy the land.

Though the newly introduced English trade existed as a minor threat to their monopoly, the French viewed it as an aggressive first attempt to occupy the territory by their European rival and began to expand their efforts into the Ohio Valley. To undermine the English traders and to gain allies for their armed conflict with England, King George’s War, which began in 1744, the French colonial government began to negotiate with independent and neutral bands

---

of Ohio Indians to prevent them from embracing the British trade.\(^7\) In an attempt to bring the Shawnee into the their fold in 1745, the French convinced the métis trader Peter Chartier, who lived amongst them as one of their own, to make a clean break from the British and support French political and economic claims to the region. Though a majority of the Shawnee—including those at Logstown—continued to back the British, Chartier led his band in several raids against English traders before removing them closer to the French outposts in the western portion of the Ohio Valley.\(^8\) However despite Chartier’s break, the French enjoyed few successes and began to lose their hold on the Ohio Indians.

To reestablish their economic and political footing in the region, the French government sought to win the Ohio Indians over with their trade and sent an increased number of voyagers, coureurs de bois and diplomats into the region near Logstown, the area of the Ohio Valley they perceived to be the most threatened by the English advances. However, a sharp decline in fur prices, the high cost of their trade goods and an English plea to “take up the hatchet” against their European enemies pushed the Ohio Indians further away from French interests and led them to initiate small-scale raids on Canadian and Louisiana traders.\(^9\) Unfortunately for the French, the success of these raids motivated the Logstonians to send a diplomatic envoy to Philadelphia that intended to use Pennsylvania as the means to attain their political autonomy and to strengthen their position in the Ohio Valley.

Aware that their hostilities toward the French would draw reprisals, the Logstonians sent a delegation to Philadelphia in November of 1747 to solicit logistical and economic support from the English colonies in their war with the French, to restrict the traffic of liquor and to gain recognition of their political autonomy from the Iroquois Confederacy’s Onondaga council.\(^10\) Conrad Weiser, the individual Pennsylvania selected to meet with the delegation, recognized the opportunity to make the “Indians around the Lakes their…warm friends,” and suggested


to the Pennsylvania government that they grant the Logstonians’ requests. The council’s president, Anthony Palmer, heeded the advice of the experienced Indian diplomat and authorized a gift worth £200 that included weapons, powder, flints and lead to express the friendly intentions of the Pennsylvania government. Weiser volunteered to take the present to Logstown the following Spring to acknowledge the autonomy of the Ohio Indians and to assess their military strength. Additionally, the council elected to prohibit the sale of all “Rum, Brandy, or other Strong Liquors” to the Ohio country in a formal proclamation.

The results of the Philadelphia Conference proved beneficial for both the Logstonians and the English. For the English, the conference gained Native American support for their trade in the Ohio Valley, which subsequently opened up the area to an influx of traders that gravitated to the primary Native American center of trade in the Ohio Valley, Logstown. By 1748, over twenty English and five French traders lived in Logstown and established trading houses in the urban settlement. Additionally, the Logstonians guaranteed the protection of the English traders against French aggression. Due to the influx of the English traders, the Native American preference for their goods and the protection promised them by the Ohio Indians, the Logstonians caused the French and English to compete for their trade which eventually resulted in the Seven Years War.

For the Logstonians, the conference enabled the Ohio Indians to gain their political autonomy from the Iroquois Confederacy. Prior to this conference, the English conducted all business with the Ohio Indians through the Onondaga council, which consequently made the Logstonians and their neighbors privy to the decisions of a group of people who were not fully concerned with the impact of their arrangements on the Native Americans who lived in the Ohio Valley. To correct this situation, the Logstonians maneuvered the English into a position with this conference that made them dependant on the Ohio Indians for their economic success in the Ohio Valley. Without

---

11 Ibid. In the text of the conference, Logstown is not mentioned. However, one of the Indian delegates states that, “[t]he Indians on the Ohio had concluded to kindle a fire in their town, and had invited all the Indians to a considerable distance round about them to come to their Fire in the Spring, and that they had consented to it.” However in his journal of 1748, Weiser noted that, “the ensuing Council must be held at Logstown, they had order’d so last Spring.” With this entry, it is confirmed that the delegation consisted of at least some influential members of the Logstonian council.


the support of the people who lived in the region, the English traders could not successfully engage in the lucrative fur trade of the area. As a result, beginning in 1747, the Ohio Indians gained the ability to directly influence the Native American and Euro-American affairs in the Ohio Valley. Additionally, the Ohio Indians succeeded in acquiring the military supplies necessary to mount a formidable defense against French aggression and reduced the flow of liquor into their country. With their political objectives met, the Ohio Indians concluded the Philadelphia Conference within four days and returned to the Ohio Valley as the political masters of their region.

Eager to gain the friendship of the Ohio Indians while maintaining their relations with the Iroquois, the Pennsylvania government elected to keep Weiser in Philadelphia for a conference with the Six Nations and to send George Croghan to Logstown in his stead. With Croghan’s visit, the Pennsylvania government hoped to accomplish three major goals. First, they wanted to lay the foundation for future economic and political relations with the Ohio Indians with the presentation of a small gift to the Ohio Indians that signified their autonomy from the Iroquois Confederacy. Second, they wanted to show that they supported the Ohio Indians request for the reduction of the liquor traffic. Lastly, the Pennsylvania government sought to inform the Logstonians of the reason behind Weiser’s delay.14 Croghan’s trip to Logstown unofficially affirmed the Ohio Indians autonomy and set the precedence for future dealings with the Native Americans in the Ohio Valley. No longer would the colonies consult and deal with the Onondaga council in regards to the Ohio Valley, but the English would begin to seek the approval and assistance of the Ohio Indians in virtually all matters of trade and settlement west of the Allegheny Mountains.15

When he arrived at Logstown in April of 1748, Croghan met with the Ohio Indians, explained the pertinent items on his agenda, and delivered the Pennsylvanian’s gift.16 After Croghan concluded his business, the Logstonians informed Croghan that the Twightwee Indians (Miami) at Pickawillany, present-day Piqua, Ohio, sought to break from the French and petitioned them and their Shawnee neighbors to “open up a Council Road to the

15 Downes, 74.
16 Ibid., 287-289.
English Governments on their behalf. More importantly however, Croghan learned that Old Briton, the leader of the Twilightee at Pickawillany, intended to send a delegation east, headed by his son Assapausa, to meet with the English colonies at the invitation of the Logstonians. Pleased with this news, Croghan departed Logstown with a letter from the Logstanian leaders Scarouady, Tanacharison and Kakowatchekey to the Pennsylvania government that explained their intentions to visit Lancaster in the summer with the Twilightee delegation.

In their willingness to accept the Twilightee into their chain of friendship and to act as mediators with the English on their behalf, the Logstonians directly threatened French trade in the region. In previous decades, the French enjoyed an uncontested monopoly on the Twilightee trade. Too far from the English colonies, the French felt that the Twilightee would remain in their interest and restrict their trade to either Canada or Louisiana. However, with them willing to become middlemen in the western trade, the Logstonians created a competitive market that favored them and their English allies and threatened the French. Determined not to lose their monopoly, the French began to organize for military excursions into the Ohio Valley to resolve this unfavorable economic situation.

Delayed by inclement weather, the Ohio delegation reached Lancaster in July of 1748. Though the delegation began as a small party of only eighteen persons, by the time it reached Lancaster, the party ballooned to fifty-five individuals and included Mingos, Shawnee, Delaware, Twilightee and Nanticoke. Led by the Logstonian leader Scarouady, the delegation came to petition the Pennsylvania government to admit the Twilightee people into their "chain of friendship" and to act as intercessors for the members of Chartier’s band that desired to return to the English interest. After only four days of deliberation, the Pennsylvania government established the Logstonians as mediators for the Ohio Indians, forged an alliance with the Twilightee that directly threatened French claims to the

---

18. Id., 299.
19. Ibid., The Indian Chiefs of Pennsylvania, 106.
valley and repaired relations with the renegade Shawnees now under the leadership of Logstown’s newest sachem, Neuchecoomeh.²²

Shortly after the conference concluded, Weiser journeyed to Logstown to give Pennsylvania’s gift to the Ohio Indians.²³ Weiser’s journey marked the first official English delegation to the Ohio country and formally established a separate council fire for the Ohio Indians at Logstown. However, The Ohio Indians had their own agenda and sought to bring the Wyandot and their ally the colony of Virginia into the chain of friendship to increase their military and political strength as well as to increase their economic opportunities. The conference proved successful for both the Ohio Indians and the English. The Ohio Indians under the leadership of Scarouady and Tanacharison brought the Wyandot and their allies the Virginians into the newly forged chain of friendship with Pennsylvania and established Logstown as the primary council fire in the Ohio Valley.²⁴ Weiser learned that the warrior strength and population of the Ohio Indians numbered 789 and approximately 4,000 individuals respectively and confirmed their allegiance to the English colonies despite the tentative Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle signed April 19, 1748 that ceased the overt hostilities of King George’s War.²⁵

Though France and England signed the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, Canada, Pennsylvania and Virginia continued to jockey for control over the Ohio Indian trade. As a direct result of Weiser’s visit and the Twilightee exodus, Canada’s governor the Marquis de la Galissonnière made the first move to control the trade by sending Monsieur de Celoron and two-hundred and forty-five officers, Canadians and Indians into the Ohio Valley to assert France’s claim to the territory with a show of force.²⁶ On July 8, 1749, Celoron arrived at Logstown, known to the French as Chiningue, and discovered ten English traders in the town and learned that the Logstonians planned to attack his unit. Alarmed by the Logstonians boldness, Celoron stepped up his guard, ordered the English flag Weiser

²⁴ McConnell, 75-77.
²⁶ Celoron, 13.
raised in 1748 torn down and met with the head of the English traders to warn him and his compatriots off the land.\textsuperscript{27} Additionally, Celoron met with the Logstonians and informed them that he came "only to do good", to rid the territory of English traders, and not to attack the Ohio Indians.\textsuperscript{28} Unnerved by the presence of armed troops, the Logstonians agreed to renew relations with the French but petitioned Celoron to cease his aggression against the English traders.\textsuperscript{29} With this expedition, Galissonière intended to drive the English from the territory and to "make those return who had gone astray."\textsuperscript{30} However, Celoron's mission failed to have the impact Galissonière hoped and only worked against the French by strengthening the bond between the Ohio Indians and the English.\textsuperscript{31}

Several months after Celoron left Logstown, Canadian traders and Indian diplomats began to deal with the Logstonians and their Native American neighbors. In response, the Pennsylvania government sent George Croghan and Andrew Montour to counter the activities of the principle French trader and Indian diplomat in the Ohio country, Chabert de Joncaire, Jr., with the offer of a large present to the Ohio Indians in the Spring of 1751.\textsuperscript{32} When they arrived in Logstown on December 15, 1750, Croghan and Montour learned that Joncaire planned to build a fort at an Indian town located one hundred and fifty miles up the Ohio River with the consent of the residents. Additionally, Croghan and Montour discovered that Joncaire petitioned the Logstonians to "meet him and clear the Road for him," but to no avail. The Logstonians remained steadfast in their support of the English and suggested that they build a fort on the Ohio to secure the trade.\textsuperscript{33} However concerned that the construction of a fort on the Ohio would renew the hostilities between the English and French colonies, the Pennsylvania government chose to shelve the proposal.

\textsuperscript{28} Celoron, 32.
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 35-36.
\textsuperscript{30} For quote see "Conference of Marquis de la Joncaire with the Cayugas, May 15, 1750," in Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, vol. X, 208. For Joncaire's plans of Celoron's expedition see Ibid., 243-244.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 242-243.
\textsuperscript{32} "Extract of a letter from Colonel Johnson to Governor Clinton, August 18, 1750," in Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, vol. VI, 289. See also Twitas, Early Western Travels, 1748-1846, vol. I, 53ff.
\textsuperscript{33} "Letter from George Croghan to the Governor of Pennsylvania, Logstown, 16 December 1750," in Pennsylvania Colonial Records, vol. 5, 496-498.
despite the Logstonians apparent desire to "remove closer to their Brethren the English, with a view, no doubt, of receiving Protection."34

The Philadelphia and Lancaster conferences not only motivated the French to act, but the conferences spurred colonies with conflicting claims to the Ohio Valley into action. Following the 1748 conference at Logstown, the Virginia government authorized the creation of the Ohio Company to purchase lands in the Ohio Valley. The King George III of England approved the petition and granted the company 500,000 acres with 200,000 acres to be settled immediately and held free of rents and taxes for ten year on the condition that the company settled one hundred families on the land and built a fort.35 Shortly after it formed, the company sent Christopher Gist to the region to survey the land and to gather an "exact Account of the Soil, Quality, & Product of the Land."36 Though this expedition accomplished little save the collection of topographical data, the creation of the company marked Virginia’s intent to claim the lands it purchased from the Six Nations at the Lancaster Treaty of 1744. Moreover, the move pitted Virginia, who planned to build settlements in the area, against Pennsylvania, who intended to create strong political and economic ties with the Native Americans by keeping Anglo settlers out of the region.

In an attempt to maintain their advantage with the Ohio Indians, Pennsylvania dispatched Croghan and Montour back to Logstown with the present they had promised on their visit in 1750.37 Two days after Croghan and Montour arrived, Joncaire brought forty warriors to Logstown and attempted to sway the Ohio Indians away from the English trade. Yet like Celoron before him, Joncaire failed to turn the Logstonians away from the English.

Rather, the Logstonian sachems informed Joncaire that:

"We ourselves brought them [, the English,] here to trade with us, and they shall live amongst us as long as there is one of us alive... Our Brothers are the People we will trade with, and not you."38

34 Ibid., 498.
As a result of their bold stance, the Logstonians and their neighbors realized that they had alienated the French and brought themselves closer to war. To avert possible French hostilities, the Logstonians turned their recommendation for an English post on the Ohio River to a formalized request. In a speech to the Pennsylvania government, the Lenape Sachem Beaver, the brother of Shingas, and several Mingo leaders explained that:

Now, Brothers, we have been considering what the French mean by their Behaviour, and believe they want to cheat us out of our Country, but we will stop them, and Brother You must help us. We expect that you our Brother will build a strong House on the River Ohio that if we should be obliged to engage in a War that we should have a Place to secure our Wives and Children likewise to secure our Brothers that come to trade with us...Now, Brothers, we will take two Months to consider and choose out a Place fit for that Purpose, and then we will send You word.39

However, the Pennsylvania government elected to ignore the Ohio Indians’ request due to the belief that a post on the Ohio would draw them into a war with the French.

While Croghan and Montour worked to secure Pennsylvania’s relationship with the Ohio Indians, Virginia’s governor, Robert Dinwiddie, planned to send a diplomatic expedition to Logstown in May of 1752 to “treat with the said Indians in order to confirm what was agreed upon at the Treaty of Lancaster [in 1744], and to secure that Nation to the Interest of His Majesty and this Colony.”40 For this purpose, Dinwiddie selected Gist to take a present and the Ohio Company Commissioners selected to negotiate with the Ohio Indians, Joshua Fry, Lunsford Lomax and James Patton, to Logstown.41 In addition to Dinwiddie’s instructions, Gist received directions from the Ohio Company committee to proceed to the Ohio country prior to the official expedition to invite as many of the Ohio Indians to the conference as was possible and to secretly “[take] Notice of any Quantity of good Land...[on] the River Ohio...convenient for...building Store Houses & other Houses for the better carrying on a Trade and Correspondence.”42 With instructions in hand, Gist set out for the Ohio country on November 4, 1751.

39 For quote see Ibid., 538. For role of King Beaver see Sipe, The Indian Chiefs of Pennsylvania, 305 and Darlington, Christopher Gist’s Journals, 163.
41 “Instructions Given to Christopher Gist, April 28, 1752,” in Green-Mercer Papers, ed. Lois Mulkearn, 52-54.
42 “Instructions Given to Mr. Christopher Gist by the Committee of the Ohio Company, July 16, 1751,” in Christopher Gist’s Journals, ed. William M. Darlington, 67-68.
With the Philadelphia and Lancaster conferences of 1747 and 1748 respectively, the Logstonians provided the Euro-Americans with a reason to come to the eastern half of the Ohio Valley. Prior to the Philadelphia Conference, the French enjoyed a monopolistic hold on the Ohio Valley trade. With no threat to their economic activities in the area, the French government remained content with the Ohio Valley trade being generated by independent and company traders who operated out of Native American urban settlements in the region. Though they primarily focused their efforts in the western half of the Ohio Valley, the French had a limited number of traders in the east at Logstown and maintained loose economic ties with the Ohio Indians in that region of the valley.⁴³

The English, though they realized the unlimited potential of the region, lacked the resources to support a large scale trade in the region and opted to maintain and nurture their lucrative trade with the Iroquois Confederacy. As a result, few English traders ventured into the French controlled Ohio Valley and therefore had a limited trade with the Logstonians and their neighbors. However with their initiation of the Philadelphia Conference, the Ohio Indians provided the English with a reason to go to the Ohio Valley and a means to exploit its resources.

To exploit this situation, the English agreed to recognize the political autonomy of the Ohio Indians and subsequently established a council fire at Logstown that served to manage the political and economic affairs of the Logstonians and their neighbors. To start the operation of this newly forged economic and political relationship, which the Logstonians sought to establish with their initiation of the Philadelphia Conference, the English and Ohio Indians met in a series of conferences at Logstown and Lancaster between 1748 and 1751. These various meetings resulted in the Logstonian request for a Euro-American settlement on the Ohio River and increased the membership of the chain of friendship to include the Twilightee, Wyandot and Virginians. As a result of the increased English activity in the Ohio Valley, the French began to assert themselves in the region with the use of military force.

Consequently, the Logstonians found themselves as members of a country between the two groups, chose to support English efforts to claim the Ohio trade, and made a second request for the establishment of a post to accomplish theirs as well as British aims. Though the English elected not to establish the post that the Native Americans wanted

⁴³ White, The Middle Ground, 188.
constructed, the conferences, initiated as the result of the Ohio Indian political designs to gain their autonomy, caused the French and English to attempt to actively control the region with their presence as opposed to with Native American proxies. Thus, the Ohio Indians, through their political activity, opened up the region to English traders and French military aggression and provided the Euro-Americans with the motivation to come to the Ohio Valley and permanently establish their trade.

PART II
The Logstown Conference of 1752:
How the Ohio Indians Generated the Construction of Fort Prince George

The Logstonians influenced the establishment of Fort Prince George with the negotiation and implementation of the Logstown Treaty of 1752 with the colony of Virginia. Though the Ohio Valley was opened up to them with the Philadelphia and Lancaster conferences, the Pennsylvanians refused the Logsonian request for a post in the Ohio Valley. However, the Logsonian leaders continued to push for a military settlement on the Monongahela River that would serve to protect their interests as well as their families from French aggression. Undeterred by Pennsylvania’s reluctance, the Logstonians saw a chance to establish a Euro-American post on the Monongahela River with the inclusion of the colony of Virginia into their skewed triangle. Once they were included into the chain of friendship, the Logstonians negotiated with the Virginians to build the post on the Monongahela River that became Fort Prince George and later Fort Pitt. In other words, the Virginians established Fort Prince George because of a Logsonian political push for a military post on the Monongahela River, a post that served both the Virginians and the Logstonians’ political and economic objectives.

After he took Dinwiddie’s invitation to the Ohio Indians, Gist led the Ohio Company commissioners to Logstown in May of 1752 to ratify the Lancaster Treaty of 1744. With this conference, the Virginians hoped to accomplish two things. First, the Virginians sought the Ohio Indians approval of the Lancaster Treaty of 1744. In the original treaty, the Iroquois Confederacy agreed to cede “all the Lands that are or shall be, by his Majesty’s
Appointment in the Colony of Virginia, for the mere sum of £200 worth of presents. If successful in doing this, the Virginians would, by right of "his Majesty's Appointment," be able to settle the 500,000 acres King George III granted the Ohio Company in their charter. Also, the Virginians sought the approval of the Ohio Indians to build a post and urban settlement on the banks of the Ohio River.

The conference started off poorly for the Virginians. After being introduced by Croghan, Gist and the commissioners elected not to give the Logstonians the present they brought from the governor of Virginia due to the absence of some key individuals such as Tanacharison. Disgusted at the Virginians' reluctance to distribute the gift, a sign of good faith and intentions in Native American treaty negotiations, two Shawnee leaders decided to leave the conference. However, soon after they made this decision, Tanacharison and the other key individuals arrived and convinced them to stay. With all the key persons present, Gist and the commissioners distributed the gift and the conference commenced with the Virginians immediately addressing the issue of the treaty ratification. Yet, tensions remained high due to the commissioner's stipulation that the Ohio Indians ratified the Lancaster Treaty of 1744 when they accepted Weiser's gift from Pennsylvania in 1748. Believing their land claims resolved, the Virginians continued to address the various points on their agenda and requested permission of the Ohio Indians to build a settlement on the Ohio River. In an attempt to make the proposition sound better to the Logstonians, the commissioners noted that:

> From such a settlement greater advantages will arise to you than you can at present conceive, our people will be able to supply you with goods much cheaper than can at this time be afforded, will be ready help in case, you should be attacked and some good men among them appointed with authority to punish and restrain the many injuries and abuses...by disorderly white people.46

After the Virginians made their requests, the Ohio Indians transacted some business amongst themselves to end Shawnee and Lenape hostilities against the southern Indians (Cherokee) and to acknowledge the admittance of

---

46 "Extracts from the Treaty with the Indians at Loggs Town in the year 1752," in George Mercer Papers, ed. Lois Mulkern, 57.
George Croghan as a permanent member of their council fire. With these actions completed, the conference ended the first day without the major concerns of Virginia being addressed by the Ohio Indians.\footnote{Ibid., 54-61.}

Unlike the first day, which the Virginians dominated with their requests, the Ohio Indians guided the actions on the subsequent days of the conference. The Logstonians addressed some personal business, appointed Shingas as the head sachem for the Lenape over the next few days of the conference, and elected to shelve the requests of the Virginians until the later days of the conference. Once they concluded their personal business, the Ohio Indians addressed the Virginians’ requests.

In regards to the Lancaster Treaty, the Ohio Indians acknowledged the land cessions up to the “hill on the other side of the Allegheny hill,” meaning the western side of the Allegheny Mountains. The second point, concerned the establishment of a fort and urban settlement worked somewhat into the hands of the Ohio Indians. Though Pennsylvania ignored their requests for a “strong house,” the Ohio Indians saw a perfect opportunity to have the Virginians establish a post. However, the Ohio Indians disliked the idea of having an urban settlement adjacent to their lands. Thus, the Ohio Indians informed the Virginians that:

\begin{quote}
Our brothers of Virginia may build a strong house at the fork of Monaugahela to keep such goods, powder, lead, and necessaries as shall be wanting, and as soon as you please. . . In regard to your request, to build a strong house at the Monaugahela, you told us it would require a settlement to support it with provisions and necessaries; it is true, but we will take care that there shall be no scarcity of that kind.\footnote{A Journal of Christopher Gist’s Journey,” in George Mercer Papers, ed. Lois Mulkey, 135.}
\end{quote}

However despite their immediate rejection of an urban settlement being constructed adjacent to the post, the Ohio Indians informed the Virginias that they would consult the council at Onondaga for advice on the situation and rethink the issue at a later date.\footnote{Ibid., 136.} Lastly, the Logstonians requested that the Virginians prove their support of the Twilightee and personally deliver a portion of the present to them. With this gesture, the Logstonians believed the Twilightee would remain in the chain of friendship and prevent them from going back over to the French. The Virginians ended the conference with one final request and offer. They asked the Ohio Indians to either consider
sending their children to an Indian school in Virginia or to entertain the possibility of sending white teachers to their towns. With kind words, the Ohio Indians refused the offer and the conference ended.⁵⁰

The Logstown conference of 1752 is important for four reasons. First, the Ohio Indians and Virginians gained the fort they both wanted in the Ohio Valley near Logstown at present-day Pittsburgh. With this conference, the Logstonians chose the location for Pittsburgh in 1752 and influenced its establishment with the Treaty of Logstown. Thus, the Native Americans selected the place and time of Fort Prince George’s establishment. Secondly, Virginia replaced Pennsylvania as the dominant English colony in the Ohio Valley due in part to their willingness to build a post for the Ohio Indians, which subsequently shifted the general English policy from one concerned with trade to one concerned primarily with settlement. Consequently, the Ohio Indians opened up their region to both English traders and their cosmopolitan settlements and created an even greater chasm between themselves and France. Thirdly, the conference established the bounds of the Lancaster Treaty of 1744 and limited the unchecked advance of white insular settlement. Moreover, the treaty ratification reaffirmed the Ohio Indians’ autonomy with the colony of Virginia. Following this conference, Virginia and Pennsylvania dealt directly with the Ohio Indians in regards to the westward advancement of their colonies. Lastly, the conference established the Ohio Indians’ resolve to support English as opposed to French claims to the Ohio Valley. These conditions combined forced France to adopt a military strategy to recapture the Ohio Valley trade. Hence due to Native American political efforts, the militarily weak English gained the permission and support of the Logstonians to establish a cosmopolitan settlement in a region hotly contested by colonial and European powers. However though the Logstonians invited the English to build a post in the area, the task remained uncompleted until tensions between the French and British colonies heightened in the spring of 1754. Tensions that the Logstonians helped create with their political diplomacy.

**The Impact of the Logstown Conference and the Construction of forts Prince George and Duquesne, 1752-1754**

Concerned with the bold move of the English colonies to build forts along the Ohio River, the French began to feel that the King of England orchestrated the actions of Virginia and Pennsylvania himself. In a letter to Jean

⁵⁰ Ibid, 137-138.
Baptiste Machault, France’s Comptroller-General of the finances, Canada’s newly appointed governor Marquis
Duquesne wrote that:

It is not possible that the King of Great Britain has not consented to and even ordered all the movements
which the English are making on this Continent.\(^{51}\)

Though many of the French officials wanted to assert themselves more forcefully in the Ohio Valley, some, such as
interim governor of Canada Baron de Longueuil, wanted “to leave the Belle Rivière, [the Ohio River,] at peace,
having a special respect and consideration for the Iroquois who dwell there.”\(^{52}\) More poignantly however, Longueuil
contended that:

the English were trading there before us; that it was no just to chase them out; that at most the river belonged
to the Iroquois; and that we had only to supply their needs, As the English were doing, for these last to
withdraw of their own accord, when they saw they could not earn a living there.\(^{53}\)

However when he arrived in Canada in 1752, the Marquis Duquesne had orders in hand directing him to “drive the
English from our territory, and to prevent them coming there to trade.”\(^{54}\)

Duquesne wasted no time in dispatching his orders and organized an expedition of 2,200 troops to establish
a string of four forts descending from Fort Niagara southward into the Ohio Valley. By the end of 1753, the French
established three of the four posts, Fort Presqu’Isle (Erie, Pa.), Fort Le Bocuf (Waterford, Pa.) and Fort Venango
(Venango, Pa.).\(^{55}\) Due to poor weather and a lack of supplies, the French failed to build a fort at Logstown, the site
selected for the fourth post. Though displeased with their progress, the French commander, Claude de Contrecoeur,
enjoyed few human obstacles in the form of the Ohio Indians or their English friends. Throughout their advance,

---

\(^{51}\) “Extract of a letter from M. Duquesne to M. de Machault, October 28, 1754,” in Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New

\(^{52}\) “Extract of a letter from Francois Bigot to the Minister, October 26, 1752,” in Wilderness Chronicles of Northwestern Pennsylvania, ed. S.K.
Stevens and Donald H. Kent (Harrisburg, PA: Historical Commission, 1941), 40, found in Donald H. Hunt, The French Invasion of Western

\(^{53}\) Ibid.

\(^{54}\) “Minute of Instructions to be given to M. Duquesne, April 1752,” in Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York, vol X,
242-245.

neither Contrecœur nor his command came under any hostile attack. On the surface, it appeared to the French that their plan to repossess the Ohio Valley trade had all but succeeded in the winter of 1753.\textsuperscript{56}

When the French landed at Presqu’Isle and began to erect a fort, the Ohio Indians sent a delegation to Virginia to ask for military aid.\textsuperscript{57} Dinwiddie responded immediately and dispatched Captain William Trent to Logstown “with a Present of Powder, Lead, [and] Guns.”\textsuperscript{58} When he arrived at Logstown, Trent met with Tanacharison and discovered that the Logstonians sent a reconnaissance party to scout out the French activities at Presqu’Isle. After the party returned, Trent held a formal council with the Logstonian leaders where the “chain of friendship” determined their next move.\textsuperscript{59} After fourteen days of deliberation, the Logstonians and Trent agreed on two actions. The Logstonians decided to send a delegation to the French to warn them off their lands and another to meet with Governor Dinwiddie to discuss the affairs of 1753 in depth, while Trent agreed that Virginia would honor its commitment to the Ohio Indians and build the fort it promised as soon as possible. Additionally, Trent agreed to send an emissary to the French to also request their departure from the region.\textsuperscript{60} With these actions determined, Trent set out for Virginia.

En route to Virginia, Trent sent a letter to Governor Hamilton of Pennsylvania and informed him that, “The Indians are in such confusion that there is no knowing who to Trust. I expect they will all join the French except the Delawares, as they expect no assistance from the English.”\textsuperscript{61} Additionally, when he returned to Virginia, Trent made Governor Dinwiddie privy to the same information. In response to this information, Dinwiddie sent a young George

\textsuperscript{56} Donald H. Kent, The French Invasion of Western Pennsylvania, 1753, 43.
\textsuperscript{58} “Letter to the Honorable Robert Dinwiddie from William Trent, 17 November 1753,” in History of Colonel Henry Bouquet and the Western Frontiers of Pennsylvania, 1747-1764, ed. Mary Carson Darlington (Privately Published, 1920), 17.
\textsuperscript{59} The Logstonian leaders consisted of Tanacharison and Scatourdy, the Mingoes, Shingas and King Beaver, the Delaware sachems, Neuchiconen, the Shawnee sachem, The Tunk, the Twiicopey sachem and the Wyandot Chief, the Wyandot sachem, Extract from William Trent’s Journal, in Ibid., 27.
\textsuperscript{60} “Account of William Trent’s meeting with the Ohio Indians, December 7 to December 24, 1753,” in Ibid., 27-40.
\textsuperscript{61} Downes, Council Fires on the Upper Ohio, 62.
Washington to the French at Ft. Le Boeuf with a warning to "require...[their] peaceable Departure." However before Washington arrived, Tancharison met with the French and informed them that:

This is our land, and not yours. . . . If you had come in a peaceable Manner, like our Brothers the English, we should not have been against your trading with us, as they do, but to come, Fathers, and build great houses upon our Land, and to take it by Force, is what we cannot submit to. . . . I desire you to withdraw, as I have done our Brothers the English. . . . I lay this down as a Trial to both, to see which will have the greatest Regard to it, and that Side we will stand by, and make equal Shares with us. . . . for, I am not afraid to discharge you off this Land.  

Yet despite Tancharison proposal of a "trial" to determine the Ohio Indian position, the French remained committed to their plan to take back the Ohio Valley trade by a show of force. In his response to Tancharison's speech, the commander at Le Boeuf, Le Gardeur de St. Pierre, affirmed the French position when he informed the Mingo sachem that:

You need not put yourself to the Trouble of Speaking; for I will not hear you: I am not afraid of Flies, or Musquitoes, for Indians are such as these, I tell you, down that River I will go, and will build upon it. . . . I have Forces sufficient to burst it open, and tread under my Feet all that stand in Opposition, together with their Alliances. . . . It is my Land, and I will have it.  

As a result of his failed attempt, Tancharison accompanied Washington on his journey to officially return the wampum given the Ohio Indians by the French in early years that affirmed their friendship towards one another. By doing this, the Ohio Indians openly intended to cast their lot with the English against the French. However despite his attempt to return the wampum, St. Pierre refused to except the Ohio Indians rejection of French friendship and promised Tancharison that "he wanted to live in Peace, and trade amicably with them, as Proof of which, he would send some Goods immediately down to the Loggs-Town for them." Yet while they promised amicable trade, the Ohio Indians remained leery of the French and chose to support the English efforts to erect a fort on the Ohio River.

In January of 1754, Governor Dinwiddie authorized Trent and Washington to each raise one hundred men and John Carlyle to acquire enough supplies for five hundred men for a military excursion into the Ohio Valley.

---
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After he conferred with the Ohio Indian delegation in 1753, Dinwiddie ordered Trent to erect the promised fort at the confluence of the Allegheny, Ohio and Monongahela Rivers, the site dictated by the Logstonians. Meanwhile, Washington and Carlyle received orders from Dinwiddie that directed them to assemble their respective troop and supplies and meet with Trent. With these plans set in motion, the British colonies set out on a collision course with the French that met at Logstown and initiated the events that began the Seven Years War.

While Virginia planned for its armed expedition into the valley, Pennsylvania sent Croghan and Montour to Logstown to assess the situation, deliver a present and to appraise the losses the colony would suffer if the French continued with their plans. When they arrived at Logstown, Croghan discovered that the Twilightee returned to the French interest due to the English inability to carry on an effective trade with or provide military assistance to them. Up to this point, English trade virtually stopped due to the French military presence in the Ohio Valley. Unable to protect their own traders, the Ohio Indians began to rethink the strength and capabilities of the English. Thus, English doddering over a period of three years threatened their favorable position with the Ohio Indians.

While Croghan and Montour met with the Ohio Indians at the site of their Ohio council fire, a vanguard of French soldiers arrived at Logstown and made camp adjacent to the settlement. After an episode with the commander of the French unit, Tanacharison met with Croghan and Montour and confirmed the Ohio Indians support of the English and voiced the Native American desire to have a second fort built on the Ohio River. Additionally, despite the French efforts to convince the Ohio Indians that they “were coming here to visit,” the Logstonians made an all out commitment to support the English efforts to build a cosmopolitan settlement in the Ohio Valley. Tanacharison made a request for English troops to be sent into the area to man the posts. In a speech to Croghan, Tanacharison stated that:

[Footnotes]
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We now request that our Brother the Governor of Virginia may build a Strong House at the Forks of the Mobongialo, and send some of our young Brethren, their Warriors, to live on it; and we expect our Brother of Pennsylvania will build another House somewhere on the River where he shall think proper... as our Enemies are just at hand, and we do not know what Day they may come upon us. 69

Thus by the close of 1753, the Ohio Indians made an all out military and economic commitment to the English after this conference despite their wavering support and in effect cast their lot against the French. Moreover, the Logstonians pushed even harder for the establishment of not only one, but two posts in the Ohio Valley. For the first time, the Ohio Indians regarded the French as their "enemies," and to prove this, requested the presence of English troops and forts "on their land." Thus despite the presence of over two thousand Frenchmen in their lands, the Ohio Indians chose to remain in the English interests and set the conditions for the establishment of Fort Prince George.

When they heard Trent received orders to raise a company of men to erect a fort at the confluence of the three rivers, the Logstonian sachem Tanacharison and Scarouady sent a letter that urged the Captain to "come immediately and build a Fort at the Forks of the Monongahela." To accommodate the Logstonians' request, Trent hastened his departure before he gathered his compliment of one hundred troops and arrived at the confluence on February 1, 1754 with only thirty-three men. 70 To assist Trent, Tanacharison brought a company of men to help erect the fort and personally laid the first log of Fort Prince George. However while things began to appear more favorably to the Ohio Indians with the establishment of the post at the site of present-day Pittsburgh in full swing, Trent and half his troops left the uncompleted post to quicken the delivery of Carlyle's supplies. 71 After Trent departed, a French force of 1,100 men attacked the hastily constructed and weakly defended Fort Prince George and forced Ensign Ward, the commander, to surrender without a shot being fired. To many Ohio Indians, the weak display of force proved that the English lacked the ability to support Native American interests in the Ohio Valley. Displeased with the English colonies' lack of support, a small number of Ohio Indians became neutral or returned to the French interests. However, the strong support of Tanacharison, Scarouady and Shingas kept a majority of the

70 For quote and explanation of Captain Trent’s actions see: E. Ward’s Deposition, 13 June 1756, in History of Colonel Henry Bouquet, ed. Mary C. Darlington, 42.
Ohio Indians in the English interests. Yet, the English post that the Logstonians desired to have at the confluence of the three rivers became the French post of Fort Duquesne.

Through their political support of the English, the Logstonians paved the way for the construction of a post at the site of present-day Pittsburgh. Without Native American political involvement, the English could not have gained a position so formidable in the Ohio Valley that it threatened French interests and perpetuated their military actions. Moreover, without their direct request, the militarily weak English could not have established a cosmopolitan settlement in the Ohio Valley. Hence, the establishment of forts Prince George and Duquesne required more than just a mere trader and his stock of supplies as Kenneth Lewis suggests. The establishment of a Euro-American cosmopolitan frontier settlement in the Ohio Valley in the mid-eighteenth century required the approval and support of Native American peoples. The political support that the Logstonians gave to the English.

1754 And the End of Logstonian Political Power

Shortly after they took Fort Prince George, the French used the poorly constructed post as the foundation for Fort Duquesne. With Duquesne situated in such a strategic location, the French elected not to build a post at Logstown. Rather, they elected to conduct military operations from Duquesne. Ironically, had it not been for the poor weather conditions in the Fall and Winter of 1753, the French may have erected their fourth fort at Logstown and prevented the construction of fort Prince George and Duquesne and subsequently delayed the establishment and emergence of Pittsburgh. Thus with Duquesne established, the French completed the string of forts that they believed would keep the English traders out of the Ohio Valley and motivate the Ohio Indians to return their interests.

However, the establishment of Duquesne only led to overt Indian hostilities.

In May of 1754, Tanacharison and a group of Indians accompanied Washington and his command up the Ohio River beyond Duquesne to erect a second fort. Enroute, Tanacharison and Washington came upon a French detachment under the command of Ensign Joseph Coulon Jumonville. Tanacharison, Scarouady and Washington

71 Ibid., 44.
believed the detachment came to reconnoiter their forces and agreed to attack the unit. In just a few short minutes, the English and their Indian allies killed ten, wounded one and captured twenty-one. More importantly however, Jumonville, a prominent member of French society, died at the hands of Tanacharison.  

Elated at their first joint victory and complete route of the enemy, Tanacharison “declared to send these Frenchmen’s Scalls with a Hatchet to all the Nations of Indian’s in union with them,” to prove the abilities of their English allies. Unlike their previous diplomatic activities, the attack on Jumonville marked the first military action the Ohio Indians took against the French and firmly established their alliance with the English.

However, the success the chain of friendship enjoyed in May proved short lived and stood as the highpoint in a series of English and French engagements that ended in defeat for the former. Only two months after his victory over Jumonville, Washington suffered a defeat at his hastily constructed post, Fort Necessity. Ironically, Jumonville’s brother handed Washington his defeat and made him sign a document of capitulation that claimed he assassinated the officers younger brother. Spurred by these events, the English sent General Braddock to capture Fort Duquesne. However, Braddock suffered an embarrassing defeat at the Battle of Monongahela. These successive defeats coupled with the English inability to support their economic, military and political needs caused the Ohio Indians to divide into two camps. A pro-English camp led by Tanacharison and Scourouady and made up primarily of Mingo people, and a pro-French sect led by Shingas and comprised mostly of Delaware and Shawnee. More importantly however, Scourouady burned Logstown, the site of the Ohio Indians council fire. Two settlements, Aughwick and Kuskuski, became the location for the pro-English and pro-French sects respectively and served as the locations for Euro-American and Indian conferences.

Once divided, the two sects assumed secondary roles in the political and military affairs of the Ohio Valley. In a conference held at Aughwick in 1754, the English informed the Mingo that the Six Nations sold them a large tract of land that encompassed their current settlement and a large portion of the Ohio Valley. When the Mingo

objected to this, the English delegate, Conrad Weiser, informed them that they may “look upon the [Ohio] lands as lost to them” due to these transactions and the French occupation.\footnote{Frank W. Brecher, Losing a Continent: France’s North American Policy, 1753-1763 (Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1998), 47-64.} In addition to this issue, the Ohio Indians raised a number of points that concerned their military involvement against the French. When they questioned Weiser about their role, the Englishman instructed them to “Make yourselves quiet and easy and mind nothing but Council affairs till you see Us first stir.” Weiser continued his speech and explained to the Ohio Indians to visit their kin on the Ohio to gather “News of our Friends... and also the Proceedings of the French.”\footnote{“Journal of Conrad Weiser at Auquick, August and September 1754,” in Pennsylvania Colonial Records, vol. 6, 158.} To compound matters, the Mingo lost their most prolific political and military leader shortly after the conference with the death of Tanacharison. Though Scarouady remained, Tanacharison’s loss proved a great blow to the Mingo/English alliance and caused many Ohio Indians to join Shingas and his brother the Beaver at Kuskuski in their support of the French.\footnote{Ibid., 154.}

This conference marked a turning point in Ohio Indian political affairs. For the first time since 1744, the English negotiated directly with the Six Nations in regards to Ohio politics without consulting the Ohio Indians. Also, no longer viewed as a significant military force, the English decided to use their Ohio Indian allies to gather information as opposed to conducting independent raids or other offensive maneuvers against the French. Consequently after 1754, the Ohio Indians existed as a marginal political and military force in the Ohio Valley for the English and no longer initiated and controlled their negotiations with Euro-Americans but had policies virtually directed to them by their Anglo allies. However, the Logstonians such as Shingas who joined the French retained their autonomy and remained at Kuskuski and reoccupied Logstown, where the French built thirty cabins complete with fireplaces for the former inhabitants.\footnote{“A Council held at Carlisle, 16 January 1756,” in Ibid., vol. 7, 5.} Moreover, Logstown remained the major trading center in the Ohio Valley and became a lifeline of military and physical support for Fort Duquesne.\footnote{Charles Frederick Post, “Two journals of Western Tours: October 25, 1758-January 10, 1759,” in Early Western Travels, vol. 1, ed. Gold Thwaites, 281. See also Pennsylvania Colonial Records, vol. 8, 469-491 and Charles A. Hanna, The Wilderness Trail: The Ventures and Adventures of the Pennsylvania Traders on the Allegheny Path, vol. 1 (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1911, 377.} Thus, from Logstown and
Kuskuski, the Ohio Indians shifted their support from the English to the French and began to assist the later in the
defense and establishment of Fort Duquesne.

PART III
Logstonian Support of Fort Duquesne, 1754-1758

Though they defeated the weakly defended Fort Prince George, the French required the assistance of the
Ohio Indians to ensure the security of their newly constructed post, Fort Duquesne. During its existence, the French
garrison of Fort Duquesne required Native American military, physical and informational support to continue to
endure throughout the entirety of its existence. Once the Ohio Indians ended their support of the post, the French
abandoned Fort Duquesne and subsequently lost their bid for the control of the Ohio Valley. Hence, Native
American support proved vital to the existence of Fort Duquesne and when stopped, caused the downfall of the post.

To the French, Fort Duquesne existed as the keystone of its defense for the Ohio Valley. Though they built
a string of posts that descended from Fort Niagara into the Ohio Valley, Fort Duquesne stood as the first line of
defense against Pennsylvania and Virginia, the two most aggressive English colonies with objectives directly
opposed to the French aims. Writing in 1757, the Marquis de Vaudreuil, the Governor General of New France,
explained the importance of Fort Duquesne to his superiors. Vaudreuil wrote:

But for the Preservation of the Beautiful river,[the Ohio River], on which depends the security of all the posts
of the Upper countries, [Canada], ‘is indispensable that we fortify Fort Duquesne in such a manner as to
enable it to sustain a siege.’

However, the French sought to hold Duquesne and the other frontier forts with Native American assistance. The
Reverend Claude Godfroy Cocquard, a Canadian priest, explained the French faith in their Native American allies.
In a letter to his brother, Cocquard wrote that despite the likelihood of an English attack:

M. Dumas, Commandant of Fort Duquesne... is awaiting without fear; that his fort is well fortified, and that
2,000 Indians in cabins around that fort, were a strong defense which the English would not readily
approach.

82 “Reverend Claude Godfroy Cocquard to his Brother, March 1757,” in Ibid., 528.
Thus, French administrators elected to rely on Native American support to buttress their position in the Ohio Valley in lieu of the construction of a formidable, but costly, post.

Despite Fort Duquesne's strategic importance, the post stood in a miserable state of disrepair. Several French administrators and officers to include Fort Duquesne's commander, Captain Dumas, noted that "no foresight had been employed to supply that fort with provisions," and that the post "[had] never been completed...[and could not] resist an attack with artillery." Additionally, Vaudreuil stressed the inadequacies of the post's defense to his superiors. Vaudreuil explained that:

Fort Duquesne, in its present condition, could not offer any resistance to the enemy; 'tis too small to lodge the garrison necessary on such an occasion. A single shell would be sufficient to get it so on fire, that it would be impossible to extinguish it because the houses are too close...Besides, 'tis so near the confluence...that it is always exposed to be entirely submerged by the overflowing of the rivers.

Moreover, Fort Duquesne's distance from Canada made provisioning the post near impossible. Duquesne himself explained to Vaudreuil that "too much time was consumed in going in one trip from the fort on River au Boeuf to Fort Duquesne, to the loss of a great quantity of provisions which have been spoiled by bad weather." Hence due to their unfavorable conditions, the French garrison at Fort Duquesne turned to their Native American allies for assistance.

From the time they first arrived at the confluence of the three rivers until they burned the post, the garrison of Fort Duquesne relied on the Ohio Indians to provide them with enough resources to augment their insufficient amount of provisions. Charles de Raymond, a Captain in the French colonial regular troops in Canada, the Troupes de la Marine, wrote that, "the soldiers of the...Belle Rivière...require...if one wanted to...feed them...the same food that all the voyageurs live on, that is Indian corn, venison, and other meat that the Indians kill." With the Native American's assistance, Duquesne believed that the post would be self-sufficient in two years. In the first year

---
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of its existence, the garrison, in conjunction with the Ohio Indians, produced “seven hundred minots of Indian corn” and planted a secondary crop of peas. The soil in the area proved so rich that the garrison’s corn field extended up both the Allegheny and Monongahela rivers for a quarter of a mile.98 Moreover, a number of Ohio Indians moved to the post and grew crops conjointly with the garrison. With the increased manpower and favorable weather conditions, Duquesne calculated “that if the harvest were good, at least 2,000 minots could be saved” per year and easily provide for the garrison’s subsistence needs.99

However, poor harvests prevented the French post from producing the intended supplies and forced them to rely heavily on subsistence trade with the Ohio Indians. In a letter from Logstown, Mary de La Chauvignerie, a Canadian officer, expressed the French reliance on Native American subsistence support. Chauvignerie wrote, “we are on the verge of going without food. The great quantity of Brandy...poured out...Prevents the Indians from hunting, and as a result we are at the point of lacking everything.”90 Similarly, the French trader at Logstown, Joncaire, noted that “the...Residents...increase the price of their Corn in the hope of selling it very expensively...the high price of Corn obliges me to get rid of all my animals due to the bad forage...this winter.”91 Thus, the French sought and relied on Native American support to provide for their subsistence needs. However despite Native American support, poor harvests coupled with the ravages of war caused the post to be insufficiently supplied throughout the entirety of its existence.92

The Ohio Indians repeatedly offered military assistance to Fort Duquesne. In fact, the military support the Ohio Indians gave the post enabled it to survive. Only one year after the French erected the post, General Braddock

marched on Fort Duquesne with a force of 3,000 English regulars and colonial militia. Outnumbered four to one, the commander of the beleaguered French post rallied his Native American allies to provide for the fort’s defense.93

In an effort to spoil the English offensive against his uncompleted and poorly defendable post, the Marquis de Contrecoeur, Fort Duquesne’s commander, sent eight hundred troops comprised of six hundred Ohio Indians and two hundred Frenchmen and Canadians to ambush Braddock’s force. However, the French commander reacted too slowly and his forces met Braddock’s troops in an open and frontal engagement. Initially halted by the British artillery, the French commander, Captain Dumas, centered the French and Canadian troops on the English front and directed the Indian forces to attack the enemy flanks. Unaware of the Native American envelopment, George Washington estimated the enemy strength at only three hundred French and Indians.94 However, “the order was executed so promptly,” Dumas recollected that, “the enemy, who were already shouting their ‘Long Live the King,’ thought now only to defend themselves.”95

As the fight lingered, the French gained the upper hand and routed the English from the field. Though the acting English commander, George Washington, attempted to rally his troops, Dumas recounted that “the whoop of the Indians, which echoed through the forest, struck terror into the hearts of the entire enemy” and prevented the British reorganization.96 By the battle’s end, the Ohio Indians and their French allies killed or wounded 1,200 of the 1,459 English troops they encountered.97 As a result of the English defeat, Braddock’s second in command Colonel Thomas Dunbar, though he still outnumbered and outgunned the French, retreated to Fort Cumberland. With this retreat, the English military threat to Fort Duquesne ended and would not be renewed until 1758. Thus, Native
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American military support proved to be the difference in the English defeat and helped to ensure Fort Duquesne’s existence, or as the historian Thomas A. Lewis more poignantly put it, “without them [Contrecoeur] was lost.”

Though they checked the English advance, the garrison of Fort Duquesne relied on their Native American allies to keep the British at bay. Concerned with Fort Duquesne’s poor defenses, the newly appointed commander, Captain Dumas, believed that he needed to assume an offensive posture to prevent the English from attempting a second attack on his post. To accomplish this, Dumas employed hundreds of Native American allies to conduct raids on military and civilian settlements throughout the colonies of Pennsylvania, Virginia, Maryland and South Carolina. In 1756 and 1757, the Ohio Indians decimated the English colonies and inflicted over one thousand civilian and military casualties, captured several hundred prisoners, burned several small posts, severed or severely limited the British colonies communication with their frontier posts and sacked hundreds of goods and livestock.

The success of these raids paralyzed the English frontier and enabled Fort Duquesne to escape defeat for three years. In a letter to Marquis de Machault, the Canadian Minister of Marine and Controller-General, Vaudreuil explained the impact of the Ohio Indian’s successes. Vaudreuil wrote that, “our continual incursions have placed it out of the power of Virginia to undertake anything...even to construct [a] fort to protect herself...on account of our Indians, who are always in the field...the entire frontier of the three Provinces is in the like condition...The English are in daily dread of being attacked.” Thus when threatened with the likelihood of an attack on Fort Duquesne in 1756, Vaudreuil brushed the notion aside when he claimed that, “if the enemy was really marching against...[Dumas]...he could...have raised the Indians of the Beautiful river...by means of whom he would...prevent the former making any progress.” As is evident, Ohio Indian military support proved essential to the existence of Fort Duquesne. Without the Ohio Indian preemptive military raids and their augmentation to the French force, Braddock’s advance on Fort Duquesne would have succeeded in its mission to take the fort in 1755.
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However due to the military efforts of the Ohio Indians, Fort Duquesne lasted as a keystone in the French defense of the Ohio Valley and New France for nearly four years.

Strangers in a strange world, the French relied on the Ohio Indians for informational support. Informational support consisted of knowledge about activities beyond the control and influence of Fort Duquesne and the French. From the outset of their tenure at Fort Duquesne, the French relied on Native American informational support to keep them abreast of the activities of the English and their Indian allies. Vaudreuil described the informational support Fort Duquesne received from the Ohio Indians. In reference to Braddock’s attack, Vaudreuil explained that:

We had confirmation of this intelligence from some reliable Indians belonging to different villages, who had given us pretty strong assurances of it, not admitting of a doubt. They have also added, as a very sure thing, that 4,000 men were going to Choueguiau; that the 5 Nations would form the wings of this army; that the English were desirous of seeing Niagara and Fort Frontenac, and that 600 bateaux had . . . been built and Orange . . . that 5,000 men were encamped outside Orange, covering two leagues of country. 102

As a result of this information, Vaudreuil sent four hundred troops to Fort Duquesne to buttress the post’s defenses and kept the four hundred troops at Fort Presqu’Isle that he planned to move to Niagara in place. 103 Ironically, the four-hundred reinforcements prompted Contrecoeur to send out the force that routed Braddock’s column. 104 Without the reinforcements, Contrecoeur doubted that his force could withstand the attack of such a formidable and well organized column and made preparations to abandon the post. 105 Thus, Native American informational support directly influenced the affairs of what was perhaps the pivotal point in Fort Duquesne’s early period. Though this is only one instance of Native American informational support, the literature is literally filled with accounts of the French using the Ohio Indians to gather information. So many in fact, that it would require several chapters to touch on each affair. 106
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Despite the Native American support, Fort Duquesne seemed almost predestined to fail. Though the French enjoyed great successes with their Native American allies, the lack of provisions coupled with the poor location and construction placed the post in an unfavorable condition before the hostilities of the Seven Years War heightened. Moreover, the offensive approach of Fort Duquesne’s commanders and the limited number of garrisoned troops left little time and people for the post’s physical improvements. In the four years that it existed, the French only constructed one building of any significance and failed to improve on the post’s defensibility. To compound matters, an unpopular commander with the Ohio Indians, the Marquis de Ligneris, replaced the effective and popular Domas and Contrecoeur in a time when the French could not supply the Native Americans with trade goods. Furthermore due to their offensive raids into the English colonies, the Ohio Indians neglected their harvests and left their corn to rot in the fields. Thus, when the garrison at Fort Duquesne relied on them to defeat a second English attempt on the fort in November of 1758, the Ohio Indians abandoned the post in the face of a large British force and returned to their settlements to hunt. To the French, the Native American withdrawal signified the end for their most important post in the Ohio Valley. The Marquis de Bougainville, the aide-de-camp of General Montcalm, expressed the inevitability of Fort Duquesne’s fall after the Native American exodus. Bougainville wrote that, “the Indians...have quitted Fort Duquesne, to return to their villages...it was found impossible to retain them; yet, the Beautiful river is almost certain of being attacked...its success is more than probable.” Hence without Native American support, the French burned the post and left the Ohio Valley never to return.

Native American support played a vital role in the establishment and development of Fort Duquesne. Restricted by wartime activities, the Ohio Indians and French focused their efforts on the protection and survival of
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Fort Duquesne. Continually overmatched by their English opponent and underfed, the French relied on the Ohio Indians to ensure the stability of the post. In their Native American allies, the French possessed a force that successfully defended Fort Duquesne on two separate occasions from an English attacker twice the size of the Native American contingent and the garrison’s troops. Likewise, the Native Americans proved to be the only offensive weapon employed by the French to prevent an English advance. When informed of the loss of the Ohio Indians, General Montcalm, the commander of French forces in New France, plainly stated that it “tis to be feared.” Yet, the importance of Native American support to Fort Duquesne is perhaps best summarized in a comment made by Colonel Henry Bouquet, an English officer involved with the post’s capture. After the English concluded a peace with the Ohio Indians, Bouquet responded by saying, “the treaty struck the blow which has knocked the French in the head.” George Washington likewise pointed to the French loss of Native American support as being a major cause of Fort Duquesne’s demise. In a letter to Virginia’s Lieutenant Governor Francis Fauquier, Washington wrote that, “the possession of this fort has been a matter of great surprise to the whole army, and we cannot attribute it to more probable causes than those of weakness, want of provisions and the desertion of their Indians.” Ironically, all the items mentioned by Washington as reasons for the downfall of Fort Duquesne proved to be factors directly related to and dependent on Native American support. Thus, Native American support provided Fort Duquesne with the military, physical and informational support necessary to sustain itself in the initial stages of its establishment, and when stopped, proved to be the factor that perpetuated the downfall of the post.

PART IV
Logstonian Support of Fort Pitt, 1758-1762

Unlike the sad saga of Fort Duquesne, the story of Fort Pitt and the emergence of Pittsburgh stands as a monument to the “white conquest of the frontier.” Historians such as Frank C. Harper poetically claim that “the history of Pittsburgh...had a world significance...and determined that ours should be an Anglo-
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Saxon...civilization."115 Few historians view Native Americans as being instrumental in Pittsburgh's, or for that matter, any urban settlement's emergence and development. Historians such as Walter O'Meara view the Native Americans at Fort Pitt as being passive victims who “faced [the] loss of their hunting lands...[and] their total extinction as a people,” with the establishment of the post.116 However, without the initial support of the Ohio Indians, Fort Pitt may have gone the way of its predecessor Fort Duquesne. Native American support enabled Fort Pitt to become secure enough to perpetuate the establishment of an insular frontier settlement. Consequently, Native American support proved to be the spearhead for the establishment of Fort Pitt, which in turn became the forerunner and catalyst for the development of Pittsburgh.

Native Americans provided essentially four types of support to Fort Pitt, political, military, physical and informational. Of these, Native American political support proved to be the most important in the early establishment of Fort Pitt. Even before Fort Duquesne fell, the English solicited the political support of the Ohio Indians to ensure the success of their expedition against the post, a plan that caused the French abandonment of the garrison.

In an effort to weaken the military strength of Fort Duquesne, General Forbes, the English commander who led the actual attack on the post, sought the neutrality of the Ohio Indians with their ratification of the Treaty of Easton.117 "If no Indians were to Join the Garrison," Forbes and many Englishmen believed that “Fort Du Quese could easily be carried."118 To accomplish this, Forbes petitioned the former Logstonian leaders Shingas and his brother the Beaver to “establish as sure as the Mountains between the English Nation and all the Indians...an everlasting Peace.”119 To Forbes, Bouquet and many others, the Ohio Indians proved to be the key to Fort
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Duquesne’s defense, and the Beaver and his brother Shingas, who led some of the largest and most lethal attacks on Pennsylvania’s frontier, existed as the two most capable Native American leaders to broker an English peace.  

Shingas and the Beaver embraced the opportunity to support the English due to the inability of the French to carry on a prosperous trade with the Ohio Indians and to defend themselves without the assistance of the Logstonians and their neighbors.  

So displeased and unconfident were they in the French alliance, that the Logstonians removed their women and children to Kuskuski with Forbes’ advance. Hence when approached with Forbes’ proposal, Shingas and the Beaver jumped at the opportunity to reinvigorate their economy and agreed to secure a peace between the English and the Ohio Indians. Consequently, due to the Native American political support of Shingas and the Beaver, Forbes forced the French to abandon Fort Duquesne and occupied the ground without a shot being fired. Bouquet eluded to the role that the Ohio Indian’s neutrality played in the downfall of Fort Duquense. In a letter to a female friend, Bouquet noted that:

The glory of our success must after God be allowed to our General, who from the beginning took those wise measures which deprived the French of their chief strength. . .[and] kept such a number of Indians idle during the whole campaign, and procured a peace with those inveterate enemies, more necessary and beneficial to the safety and welfare of the Provinces than the driving the French from the Ohio.

Though Forbes successfully seized the ground that Fort Duquesne occupied with the aid of Native American neutrality, the English position at the confluence remained tentative. Bouquet explained the English position as:

A sad state of affairs, camping 300 miles from Philadelphia, with neither tents nor baggage, and in need of clothing, with the weather bitter cold (the thermometer at 16°), and getting supplies only with the greatest of difficulty.
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Additionally, George Croghan warned the English commanders that “although the military conquered the French, they ‘had nothing to boast from the War with the natives’ who must be conciliated.”

In poor health and unable to sustain a large force at the newly named Pittsburgh, Forbes left a detachment of two hundred and eighty men under the command of Colonel Henry Bouquet with the orders to secure the peace with the Ohio Indian. To Forbes and Bouquet, the security of their detachment and the future designs of the English to control the Ohio Valley rested on the goodwill and support of the Ohio Indians. Bouquet in a letter to General Jeffery Amherst, the overall Commander of English troops in North America, expressed this belief when he wrote that “the visible disaffection of the Ohio Indians gives me more uneasiness than the exaggerated Preparations of the Enemy, as it is their Power to cut off the Supplys of our advanced Post.”

Likewise in a series of letters with Amherst, Forbes reinforced Bouquet’s belief and explained that:

The Governors...ought to attend...to...for the safety, and welfare of these Provinces, Peace with the Indians...the State of the Indians all along the Ohio...is I'm afraid not understood...I beg you will not think triflingly of the Indians or their friendship; when I venture to assure you that twenty Indians are capable of laying half this province to waste.

Moreover, Colonel Hugh Mercer, who succeeded Bouquet as commander at Fort Pitt and had orders to abandon the post in the face of an assault, received information from his Native American allies that the French proposed to attack Pittsburgh with the winter thaw. Thus, at the instance of key individuals and in the face of such potential danger
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from an enemy who still forcefully occupied the greater portion of the Ohio Valley, Bouquet and Mercer arranged to meet with the leaders of the Ohio Indians to turn their newly forged neutrality into a lasting peace.\textsuperscript{133}

Throughout the entirety of Fort Pitt's formative period, Logstonian and Ohio Indian political support created a peaceful environment essential for the post's prosperity. From the commencement of Mercer's command in November of 1758 until July of 1760, George Croghan met with the Ohio Indians in a series of conferences to reestablish their economic and military alliance with the Native Americans.\textsuperscript{134} To Bouquet and Mercer, Croghan's success proved imperative to the security of Pittsburgh. In a letter to Mercer, Bouquet informed him that "Mr. Croghan with your assistance will I hope be able to support our Interest with the Indians, till we can raise the Troops, and Inforce your arguments by the weight of an Army."\textsuperscript{135} In the initial stages of their negotiations, Croghan and the Beaver worked to pacify the Ohio Indians to provide Mercer and his command with the time and resources necessary to construct a formidable defense at Pittsburgh.\textsuperscript{136}

Many of the Ohio Indians believed that the English force came and remained at Pittsburgh to possess the Native Americans' land.\textsuperscript{137} Pesquitomen, a Mingo sachem, explained to Christian Frederick Post, a missionary selected to meet with the Ohio Indians that, "We are always jealous...[that]...the English will take the land from us."\textsuperscript{138} To thwart this perceived English attempt at occupation, many of the Ohio Indians gathered at Kuskuski with their still French allies to plan an attack on Pittsburgh.\textsuperscript{139} To prevent this attack, the Beaver, on three separate occasions, suggested to Croghan and the English that they withdraw "back over the mountains...till the other nations have joined the peace, and then...come and build a trading house."\textsuperscript{139} Likewise in a conference with Post, Ketiusshund, a Mingo sachem, told the missionary that:
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All the nations had jointly agreed to defend their hunting place...and suffer nobody to settle there...and if the English would draw back over the mountain, they would get all the other nations into their interest; but if they staid and settled there, all the nations would be against them; and he was afraid it would be a great war, and never come to a peace again.  

However, Croghan and his commanders remained insistent that a post be erected as soon as possible to prevent the French reoccupation of Pittsburgh.  

In concert with the Mingo leaders on the Ohio, the Beaver and Shingas set out to secure the peace that Croghan and his commanders desired. In July of 1759, the Beaver and his compatriots gathered nearly five hundred Native Americans that represented nine different nations to meet with Croghan at Fort Pitt to secure an English/Indian peace. At the conference, Croghan ensured the Ohio Indians that the English came to rid the country of the French and to “secure...[the]...Trade” with the Native Americans. For this purpose, Croghan petitioned for their “Sensible” understanding of the situation and explained the English intention “to build a trading house” for the purpose of securing the trade. Additionally, Croghan requested that the Ohio Indians show their intentions for peace “by restoring...all our People who yet remain Prisoners amongst you.” In support of Croghan’s request, the Beaver expressed to the Ohio Indians that:  

I desire you would sit and smoke your Pipes till I give you a call; I assure you the English have no intention of Injuring you, and I must insist on your...immediately quitting the French.  

Furthermore, the Beaver delivered two English prisoners who he considered his “Mother...[and]...sister” to Croghan as an “example by him” to the Ohio Indians of his British support.  

Through the efforts of the Beaver and Croghan, the Ohio Indians at Kuskuski, who remained in the French interest, elected to make a peace with the English. Only the brother and nephew of the Lenape sachems Teedyuschen and Cuffinger opposed the reconciliation and expressed their intentions to assist the French with their...
expulsion of the English who would “pull asleep the Indians...[and]...Cut their Throats.” Within one month, the Beaver’s efforts at the conference came to fruition and were realized when sachems from the Delaware, Shawnee, Wyandot, Ottawa, Ojibwa, Kaskaskia, Miami, and Potawatomi journeyed to Fort Pitt to secure a peace with the English. In a ceremony of peace, the Lenape war sachem White Eyes buried the French war hatchet with a “Belt of Wampum” and petitioned the Ohio Indians to “go hunting and travel this Road of Peace...and exchange your skins and furs, for Goods to clothe your Women and Children.” Mercer gleefully relayed to Bouquet the impact of the Beaver and Croghan’s efforts. Mercer informed Bouquet that “A happy opportunity offers itself...of clearing the Ohio entirely of French Men, Their Indians are wavering to a Man, & many drop off from them daily, & will be fixed in the British Interest.” The favorable results of these conferences coupled with the French expulsion from and abandonment of forts Niagara and Venango gave Mercer and his command the security they needed to erect Fort Pitt. In a letter to Pennsylvania’s Governor Denny, Mercer noted that:

We can now talk to our new Allies in a proper Stile...the Consistency of our Plan in bringing them entirely over to the British Interest, ought to be preserved by treating them with a great kindness, but suffering none of their insults.

One month later, General John Stanwix, Forbes’ replacement, began the construction of Fort Pitt. However though secure from an immediate attack, the English needed the Beaver and the other key sachems to ensure that the peace would last while they constructed Fort Pitt.

To ensure the preservation of peace, Croghan once again solicited the Beaver and his supporters to gather the Ohio Indians to Pittsburgh for a series of conferences. Between October of 1759 and August of 1760, the Beaver and Croghan orchestrated no less than three large conferences. The Beaver’s efforts culminated with a conference in August of 1760 that attracted nine hundred and nineteen Native American men, women and children to
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Pittsburgh. At this conference, the Ohio Indians agreed to consider, with the Onondaga Council, an English proposal to build forts in the Ohio Valley. Additionally, the Ohio Indians resolved to quit any and all violence towards the English and “to return to [their] former Employment of Hunting,” while the British settled to trade at the cheaper prices posted in Philadelphia. Thus, the political support and efforts of the Beaver and other key sachems prevented a Native American attack on the weakly fortified Pittsburgh and enabled the English to lay the foundation for Fort Pitt and subsequently the urban settlement that followed.

Though the Beaver and Croghan checked the potential for a large and unified Ohio Indian military action against Fort Pitt through their diplomatic efforts, the Native Americans who remained aligned with the French continued to harass English convoys and small parties that operated on the periphery of the post. This Ohio Indian harassment, coupled with the inadequate amount of supplies that Fort Pitt received due to transportation and reacquisition problems, kept the English garrison at an intolerably low number of troops. However with English lines thinly stretched and an enemy force poised at Quebec and the French forts of Niagara and Venango, Bouquet coldly informed Mercer that “this is a Critical time for you but we confide entirely in your Prudence, and Industrious to extricate yourself from the difficulties that surround you.” Unable to build a sufficient force to simultaneously defend and construct Fort Pitt, Mercer solicited Native American military support to amend the egregious situation that confronted Fort Pitt’s exterior region.

The major security problem that preoccupied Mercer and Bouquet proved to be the protection of the long and indefensible supply line between Fort Pitt and the English colonies. “Beginning in June,” one trader noted that:

The Indians began to infest the Communication by several Parties constantly kept upon the Roads from Pittsburgh to Fort Loudon, & Attacked our convoys by which the Horses provided...were near all lost being either kill’d or taken by the Enemy, or destroy’d by forced Marches for want of time to feed; and that
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in the beginning of July out of Eight Hundred... purchased, I found only about One Hundred and Twenty fit for Service.\textsuperscript{154}

Additionally, though Bouquet contracted for provisions, Mercer’s responsibility to outfit and support Fort Ligonier with supplies, poor weather, inept traders and inadequate amounts of packaging and shipping resources compounded the affects of the hostile Ohio Indian raids.\textsuperscript{155} Colonel James Burd, the commander of Ligonier, described the impoverished situation of the frontier forts when he wrote Mercer that:

I must begg that this Garrison and at the Crossing may be immediately & constantly supplied with Provisions; The want ever since I came here has been very severe upon the Troops, and the Arrears due them considerable & for the want of Provisions the Service has been much impeded which I hope will no more be the Case.\textsuperscript{156}

Likewise, James Kenny, the keeper of the King’s stores in Pittsburgh, expressed the depravity of the garrisons’ situation. In his journal of 1759, Kenny wrote that “being almost out of provisions, there was some hints that we must soon eat horses & dog, if relief did not come soon.”\textsuperscript{157} In an offer to expedite and secure the convoys, Colonel Robert Monckton, the English officer in command of Pennsylvania affairs, offered to reinforce Mercer and Burd with an additional One hundred men. However, Bouquet opted to “dissemble till... better provided at Pittsburgh... trying what Croghan could do by way of Negotiations... as we have not yet sufficient Forces to afford Escorts to all the Convoys.”\textsuperscript{158} Thus to relieve his embattled supply lines and to provision his haggard posts, Mercer turned to his Native American allies.

Faced with two tasks construction and protection, Mercer immediately began to employ Native American escorts to protect the supply trains. Despite its potential costs, Mercer informed Bouquet that “we are under a
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Necessity of employing Indians for most of our Expresses. You will no doubt be of Opinion that the expence arising from thence is not to be mentioned at so critical a juncture.\footnote{159}{Letter from Bouquet to Monckton, Fort Littleton, 7 June 1760," in Bouquet, The Papers of Henry Bouquet, vol. 4, 585. For Monckton's offer see Ibid., 578.} For the success of this plan, Mercer and Bouquet turned to Croghan to "use all...[his]...Influence & Address to persuade...a Number of Young Warriors to take The Hatchet...to clear The Communication & Secure our Convoys."\footnote{160}{Letter from Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, 11 July 1759," in Ibid., 400. See also McConnell, 153-157.} Though costly as Mercer predicted, Native Americans relieved the supply lines and, provisions, though still of low quantities, began to flow with little difficulty. Mercer, overjoyed with the success of his plan, wrote Bouquet that:

> We are al along in good spirits, preparing for a resolute defence; you may judge how happily circumstanced for the Enemy, with Not an Ounce of Flour, or Beef, but a few Milch Cows of the Sutlers, and Horses enough. The Convoy with supplies will be in tomorrow, and every week must now add to our Force & accommodation. The Delawares & Other Indians have showd great zeal & fidelity on this Occasion; but for them our Circumstances could scarcely have been made known to you, or supplies so readily obtained.\footnote{161}{Letter from Bouquet to Croghan, Lancaster, 13 July 1759," in Ibid., 409.} Thus, Native American military support provided Fort Pitt with the security and provisions needed to concentrate on the construction of the post and become firmly entrenched in the region.

Three elements existed as the key factors for the establishment of Fort Pitt—the control of the ground, the speed of construction and the quality of materials used in the post’s erection. In the initial stages of Fort Pitt’s establishment, the English needed to defend the ground from a French incursion while, they hastily erected a post to hold Pittsburgh. For without the ground and a defensible position to guard from, the English had no need for construction materials. Yet, the manpower needed to undertake the completion of these two tasks depended not on the mere availability of troops but on the quantity of provisions gathered to sustain a garrison sizeable enough to simultaneously secure the ground and build a formidable post. “The King’s orders,” Bouquet pointed out, “are to build a Fort...which cannot be Effect without a large body of Men, and it is not possible to Send them as long as all the Provisions...are consumed.”\footnote{162}{Letter from Bouquet to Croghan, Fort Bedford, 10 August 1759," in Ibid., vol. 3, 531.} In other words, food dictated the amount of men that could be housed and
employed for the construction and defense of Fort Pitt. Stanwix alluded to this fact when he informed Governor
Denny that work progressed “unequal” to his wishes being only able to employ “as many troops as [he] could feed
for the Works.”

Thus, under the continuous and ominous threat of a French attack, the English needed to man
Pittsburgh with a force large enough to establish the post and withstand an enemy assault. However, Forbes and
Bouquet left Pittsburgh and its commander, Mercer, in a miserable “state of affairs” from which they had to “extricate
themselves.” Thus, with few resources and options at hand, Mercer turned to his Native American allies to augment
Pittsburgh’s stores and provide them with the provisions necessary to maintain the force required to accomplish the
objectives of his command.

The lack of provisions plagued the English construction of Fort Pitt from the outset. Due to a shortage of
supplies, Forbes, who had triumphantly marched into Fort Duquesne at the head of nearly 10,000 men, left a force of
only two-hundred and eighty soldiers at Pittsburgh to face an enemy garrison forty miles away at Fort Venango that
numbered approximately 1,000 troops. Moreover, of these two hundred and eighty men, twenty percent
consisted of poorly trained and unreliable provisional soldiers who, according to Mercer were, “the most worthless
individuals of the Pennsylvania troops.” In short, Mercer held at best a tenable position with troops who had
relatively little food, no shoes, tents or baggage and faced an enemy four times its size. Bouquet summated that “the
regulars are not suitable on their present footing, and the provincials are not good for much.”

In the face of this adversity, Bouquet ordered Mercer to make a peace with the Ohio Indians, send spies to Venango, place Pittsburgh’s
garrison on half rations and solicit Native American subsistence support. These physical obstacles, which had to
be overcome to secure the ground, occupied a majority of the garrison’s manpower and severely hindered the post’s
construction. Stanwix explained to Bouquet that:
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164 For garrison size see Forbes, Writings of General John Forbes, ed. James, 265 and “Letter from Forbes to Governor Denny,” Pennsylvania
Colonial Records, vol. 8, 232. Fleming, 413-415 and Harper, 86. For garrison size due to supply problems see Bouquet, The Papers of Henry Bouquet,
vol. 2, 610. For French threat see ibid., 292 and Donohoo, 244.
166 “Letter from Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, 15 January 1759,” in ibid., 50 and 53.
We break ground for our Fort only the 3rd Instant [nearly one year after the occupation of Pittsburgh]... [we] have so many call's for other services in the woods Escorts & Covering party's that for want of hands we advance as yet but slowly.  

Thus, Mercer sought Native American physical support to assist with the establishment of Fort Pitt.

Mercer relied heavily on Native American subsistence support to augment the post's beleaguered provisions in the first four years of Pittsburgh's existence. Mother nature, enemy attacks and Ohio Indian visits made provisioning Fort Pitt a constant battle for the English commanders. The effects of nature proved to be the most difficult factor for the garrison to overcome. Though Bouquet contracted for numerous supplies to be delivered to the post, poor harvests, heavy rains and the seasonal availability of certain supplies prevented the garrison from acquiring a level of provisions necessary to station a large numbers of troops at Pittsburgh.

To compound the problem, frequent raids on convoys prevented an ample amount of provisions from being brought to the post. Consequently, the post continually lacked the supplies necessary to sustain a large force. On several occasions, Mercer dispersed troops to other frontier posts such as Fort Ligonier to alleviate the food shortages. Thus to stop these raids and increase provisions, Mercer employed large numbers of Native Americans to protect the supply lines. However, Native American protection proved to be a double-edged sword.

Preoccupied with defending English convoys, the Native American guards ceased their traditional subsistence activities and required foodstuffs like the remainder of the garrison. However because of Pittsburgh's precarious situation with the Ohio Indians, Mercer, for fear of losing their support, supplied the Native American guards with twice the normal allowance of rations. "All the Indians upon the Communication cannot be more hurtfull to us," Bouquet expressed to Croghan, "than our pretended friends are in destroying our Provisions at Pittsburgh, the Consequences are the same, as it is Equal if the Convoys are destroyed upon the Road, or devoured by...
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them at Pittsburgh. As a result, the Native Americans placed an unexpected strain on the very provisions they protected against attack, which subsequently prevented the English commanders from increasing the garrisons' strength. Moreover, the large numbers of Native Americans brought in to make the necessary treaties to establish a secure environment served to further exhaust the post's provisions and prevent the increase or its troop size. Thus due to the strains of nature, war and unexpected population expansions, the poorly provisioned garrison appealed to their Native American allies for subsistence support.

Despite the negative effects of nature, enemy attacks and Ohio Indian visits, Native American subsistence support proved to be an essential factor in the establishment of Fort Pitt. The Native Americans supplied Fort Pitt with essentially two kinds of provisions, meat and corn. The various types of meats supplied by the Native Americans consisted of turkey, bear, buffalo, raccoons and venison, which proved to be the most provisioned food source. The Native American meat trade proved so vital to the survival of Fort Pitt that approximately fifty-one percent of daily rations consumed came from venison sold to the post stores by Ohio Indians for trade goods, powder, lead, black wampum and for the first time British sterling.

Though the meat trade made up the bulk of Native American subsistence support, the Ohio Indians Continually supplied Fort Pitt with corn to feed the garrison as well as the livestock and pack animals. In regards to provisioning the post to augment the lack of "forage," Mercer made it his first order of business to harvest the "Corn field left Standing opposite Loggs Town" and to purchase corn from the Ohio Indians. Though the garrison attempted to plant crops of their own, floods, insects and poor weather conditions often reduced the yield. Of four hundred cabbages planted at Fort Pitt in 1762 for instance, James Kenny noted that there were "only forty left but

172 "Letter from Bouquet to Coghan, Fort Bedford, 10 August 1759," in Ibid., vol. 3, 531.
173 "Letter from Bouquet to Pemberlon, Fort Bedford, 1 September 1759," in Ibid., vol. 4, 7. See also "Letter from Tulleken to Bouquet, Fort Pitt, 2 April, 1760," in Ibid., 506.
what ye Grasshoppers has Eaten."  Consequently, the Native American corn trade became a needed and dependable food source for the post. So dependable was it, that despite inconveniences such as poor weather or infrequent visits that delayed "Indians from bringing...Canoes or Indian Corn," Mercer informed Bouquet that "I...expect some." One officer at Pittsburgh best described the importance of the Native American food trade to the garrison. Lieutenant Elias Meyer plainly stated that:

In our present unfortunate position...we [have] need of [the neighboring Indians] both for the hunt and for Indian corn. Thus, Native American subsistence support relieved the post from the restrictive and undependable flow of military provisions and freed the garrison to attend to the tasks of protection and construction as opposed to being consumed with foraging for survival.

Though, due to food shortages, Pittsburgh's garrison never reached the 1,000 men Bouquet desired, Native American subsistence support provided enough provisions to the post's stores that it enabled the English to double their troop size at Fort Pitt within the first six month's of their occupation. Several months after he transferred one hundred men to other posts due to inadequate supplies, Mercer noted that Native American support enabled him to retain a force of three hundred and fifty men. Moreover, Mercer informed Bouquet that "the Indians...gave [the Garrison] the advantage" of relieving two hundred men to "carry on some publick work...[and to] check any...Indian [attacks]." Consequently, the increased security and much improved provisioning of the post enabled the English commanders to double the number and increase the types of skilled artisans charged with the fort's construction. By October of 1760, the post's compliment of skilled workers ballooned from fifty to one

hundred and twenty-eight workers and consisted of bricklayers, wheelwrights, blacksmiths, carpenters, limeburners, sawyers, brickmakers, masons and a master smith.\footnote{Slotz, 131. The workers increased from 55 to 128 and consisted of which 58 were house carpenters, 23 were bricklayers and 10 were masons.} With this increased supply of manpower, one observer wrote that the army is "now...employed in erecting a most formidable fortification; such a one as will...secure the British empire on the Ohio...[and] be a lasting monument."\footnote{"Extract of a Letter from Pittsburgh, September 24, 1759," in The Olden Times, ed. Craig, 197-198. See also New American Magazine, November, 1759.} Consequently, the increased quantity and improved quality of manpower enabled General Stanwix, the officer in charge of Fort Pitt's construction, to complete the outer walls and the barracks by 1760 and lay the groundwork for Bouquet's completion of the post in 1761.\footnote{Slotz, 131. See also Harper, 88, O'Meara, 227 and Lois Mulsarn & Edwin V. Pugh, The Traveler's Guide To Historic Western Pennsylvania (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1954).} As is evident, the increase and security of provisions supplied by Native American physical and military support resulted in increased manpower, which subsequently hastened and improved the construction time and materials needed and used in the erection of Fort Pitt. "The presence of...General [Stanwix]...[and] the friendship and alliance of the Indians," one observer wrote, "has been of the utmost consequence...for continuing the fortifications and supplying the troops here and on the communications [of Fort Pitt]."\footnote{"Fort at Pittsburgh, March 21, 1761," in The Olden Times, 198.} Thus, in the face of virtual starvation, Native American subsistence support enabled Fort Pitt to maintain a garrison sizeable enough to protect the post from French aggression and provide the bulk of manpower needed to construct and establish a permanent Euro-American settlement in the Ohio Valley at Pittsburgh.

Due to their defensive posture, limited number of troops and their lack of knowledge concerning the backwoods of western Pennsylvania, Fort Pitt's garrison required Native American informational support to keep them abreast of activities outside their area. Native Americans provided Fort Pitt with essentially two types of intelligence, military and political. Military intelligence pertained to enemy troop movements and fortifications, while political intelligence consisted of information that concerned Ohio Indian intentions to support French or English interests. Additionally, Native American couriers served as the primary means of communication between Fort Pitt
and the colonies. Through the use of Native American couriers, Fort Pitt remained updated on the latest and most important activities of English forces. Hence in their remote environment, Mercer and his garrison relied on Native American informational support to provide them with reliable and timely intelligence in land where a numerically superior and offensively minded enemy was only six days away by land and three by water. In short, Native Americans became the eyes, ears and lifeblood of communications for the remotely situated and weakly garrisoned outpost.

In conjunction with provisioning the post, Bouquet and Mercer made the gathering of enemy intelligence a primary concern of Fort Pitt. Threatened with an eminent enemy attack, Bouquet ordered Mercer “to keep constant Spies about Venango, Presqu’ Isle, and down ye River to discover the forces of the Ennemies.” Moreover, Bouquet instructed Mercer that “no Surprise can happen where you command...and...as the Ennemies could perhaps attempt this Post...your Scouting Indians must keep a Look out.” Information of the enemy situation proved so vital to the security of Fort Pitt that, Bouquet authorized Mercer to “pay the exorbitant demands” of Native American spies “to gather the intelligence.” With orders in hand, Mercer turned to his only available resource to gather the information critical to the survival of his post, Native Americans.186

Native Americans continually provided Mercer and Fort Pitt with the latest and most detailed information about enemy troop movements. The account of Captain Thomas Bull, a Lenape employed by Mercer to spy on the French in 1759, serves as a perfect example of the type of detailed intelligence Native Americans provided Fort Pitt. Bull journeyed to the French forts Presqu’Isle, Venango and Le Boeuf and informed Mercer that:

Prisque Isle the Garrison consisted of...One Hundred and three soldiers...The Fort is a square, with four Bastions, Square Log Work...The Wall only Single Logs; no Bank within or Ditch without...La Beef...is of the same shape but very Small, The Bastions, Stockades, and joined by Houses for the Curtains, the Logs mostly rotten; Platforms are erected in the Bastions, and Loop holes properly Cut. One Gun is Mounted on One of the Bastions and Points down the River. Only One Gate, and that fronting this Way on the Side Opposite the Creek. The Magazine is on the Right of the Gate going in, part of it Sunk in the Ground, and

above is some Casks of Powder to Serve the Indians. Here are... One Hundred and Fifty Soldiers... He found at Venango Forty Men... but gives the description of the Fort as I received formerly.\textsuperscript{187}

Never satisfied with only one report, Mercer usually employed several Native Americans at one time to gather information. Based on this report, Mercer dispatched a second spy, the Lenape sachem Killbuck, to meet the Ohio Indians at Kuskuski to “draw them off from the French” in an attempt to further weaken their enemy’s position and to confirm Bull’s intelligence. As a result of this second mission, Killbuck succeeded in getting the Delaware and Mingo to agree not to fight for the French in the event of a conflict and discovered that “500 soldiers besides Indians” planned to reinforce Venango.\textsuperscript{188}

With this newfound information, Mercer sought to capitalize on the weakened state of Venango and petitioned Stanwix to authorize an attack. Stanwix responded favorably to Mercer’s request and instructed him to “Seize the opportunity...to burn Venango.” To accomplish this mission, Stanwix suggested that Mercer “engage” the help of “three hundred... Warriors.” Moreover, Stanwix informed Mercer that, since his “Chief dependence [was on] the 300 Indians,” he was “not to move from Pittsburgh” without their assistance.\textsuperscript{189} However before Mercer could launch his plans, the English captured Fort Niagara and the French abandoned Venango.\textsuperscript{190} Though this plan never came to fruition, Mercer and his commanders used Native American information to make strategic moves to counter the French in the Ohio Valley. With the vital information gathered by Native Americans, the English remained secured from enemy attacks and succeeded in their efforts to construct Fort Pitt. Thus, Native American informational support provided Fort Pitt with the intelligence necessary to protect itself from French and Ohio Indian aggression.

Always dependent on and uncertain of the Ohio Indian political position, the English relied on Native American information to warn them of potential swings in their loyalties. By being forewarned of potential breaks in

\textsuperscript{187} Intelligence received the 17\textsuperscript{th} of March, 1759, at Pittsburgh,” in Pennsylvania Colonial Records, vol. 8, 311-313. See also “Mercer: Indian Intelligence, 17 March, at Pittsburgh, 1759,” in Bouquet, The Papers of Henry Bouquet, vol. 3, 204 and Hunter, 95.
their newly forged “chain of friendship,” the English, through Native American proxies, prevented shifts in loyalty that could have exposed Fort Pitt to French and Indian attacks that would have proved detrimental to the establishment of the post.

A myriad of examples exist of Native American informational support in the primary literature concerning Pittsburgh’s early years. In June of 1759 for instance, Croghan received information from two Native Americans that a French officer at Venango desired eighty Ohio Indians to “go on the Road, and annoy the English Convoys.” In response to this request, the Native Americans informed Croghan that “the Indians agreed too” attack the English convoys. To preempt these strikes, Croghan sent word that warned Stanwix and the convoys of these potential attacks and dispatched the two Native Americans back to Venango for more information. Additionally, Croghan sent Native American envoys to dissuade these eighty Ohio Indians from an attack on Fort Pitt’s already embattled supply line and to inform them of the intended peace conference at Pittsburgh in July. ¹⁹¹ To Croghan’s joy, the Native American spies and envoys returned with news that:

The Indians with the French told them that they heard that the Heads of all the Indian Nations were to meet me [Croghan] here to settle a Peace, & that as soon as they heard the Peace was settled they would to a Man abandon the French. ¹⁹²

Hence, the intelligence that Native Americans provided Fort Pitt enabled Croghan and his Ohio Indian envoys, such as the Beaver, to prevent attacks on the post’s fragile supply lines and to keep the vital provisions needed to generate the manpower behind the fort’s construction flowing.

In addition to keeping the English abreast of Ohio Indian and French political and military activities, the Native Americans helped keep Fort Pitt’s line of communication with the colonies open and operating. Used as guides, interpreters, porters and couriers, Native Americans provided the garrison with a knowledge of the woods and the people that few Euro-Americans mastered. Whether employed to haul goods at a dollar a day, charged with the delivery of a message or required to interpret, the Euro-Americans relied on Native American support to augment

¹⁹⁰ “Intelligence received from Pittsburgh, 16 August 1759,” in Pennsylvania Colonial Records, vol. 8, 38. Donchho, 244.
their limited number of troops. Croghan explained Fort Pitt's reliance on Native American support to fulfill their basic needs in his journal of 1759. Croghan wrote that:

This day I sent...five...Indians to Ligoneir with Letters, & to pilot a small Escort through the Woods here, with Provisions as we were quite out of Flour, and the Enemy watching the Road & neither of the Garrisons having a Sufficient number of Men to bring up an Escort in the face of the Enemy. Due again to the small number of troops who were preoccupied with defense and construction of Fort Pitt, the garrison relied on Native American support to establish their Euro-American cosmopolitan post.

From 1758 to 1762, Native American support provided Euro-Americans with the security and resources necessary to establish a cosmopolitan and insular urban settlement in the Ohio Valley. In only four years, Pittsburgh rose from a poorly provisioned garrison of two hundred and eighty men huddled in the snow on a baron point of ground for security, to an urban settlement with a civilian population of 332 people and a military garrison of 400 men that lived in 162 houses and huts as well as the barracks of Fort Pitt. In addition to the homes, Pittsburgh's population built a hospital, a sawmill, brick kilns outdoor ovens and forges, a blacksmith shop, a boat building yard, a seine, private trading houses, gardens, corn fields, apple orchards and a company store that regulated the major industry of the urban settlement, the fur trade. Yet, the most impressive feature of Pittsburgh remained the post.

The largest and costliest post ever built by the British in North America, the perimeter of Fort Pitt's main works stretched almost a mile long and took an estimated 66,000 cubic yards of dirt and a projected £60,000 to £100,000 to construct. Additionally, Fort Pitt spanned eighteen acres and possessed a moat that completely surrounded the post. To put its size into perspective, Fort Duquesne, complete with bastions, could have fit into the perimeter of Fort Pitt's interior parade field "with room to spare." Thus with the emergence of Fort Pitt and Pittsburgh, the

192 Ibid., 320.
196 Stutz, 127-136.
197 O'Meara, 213-222. Also see Stutz, 127.
198 Harper, 88.
199 O'Meara, 218-219.
Euro-Americans established their cosmopolitan and insular urban settlements in the Ohio Valley and subsequently became a spearhead for the early west’s development.

Left by Forbes in a “sad state,” Bouquet and Mercer looked to their Native American friends to provide them with the resources and security necessary to build Fort Pitt. Before they could attempt to establish themselves permanently in the area, the Euro-Americans needed to calm the tumultuous political environment of the Ohio Valley. To accomplish this, the Euro-Americans turned to Native American leaders such as the Beaver, Shingas, Delaware George, Killbuck and White Eyes to broker a peace between the Ohio Indians and the English. Without this peace, the French held an advantageous position in the Ohio Valley that threatened to dislodge the English from their weak and virtually untenable position at Pittsburgh. However with the support of Ohio Indian diplomats, the English forged a friendship that not only lessened the likelihood of a French attack on Pittsburgh, but gave the British access to the Native American resources necessary for the post’s survival. Thus, Native American sachems, through their successful diplomatic support, established an Ohio Indian/English peace that fulfilled the British need for security.

Though they needed a peace to ensure their security, the English required provisions and manpower to build Fort Pitt. For the beleaguered English, provisions and manpower came in the form of Native American physical and military support. Though Bouquet and his commanders ordered and paid for the shipment of supplies to Fort Pitt, weather, enemy raids and the influx in a Native American population intentionally drawn to the post by Mercer and Croghan to ensure its security stressed the limited number of supplies sent and received by the fort. In short, the post faced starvation daily and feared it as much if not more than the French military poised only forty miles away at Venango.

To overcome this deadly obstacle to the post’s survival, the English turned once again to their Ohio Indian friends to augment their inadequate quantity of supplies with their native food sources. For the Ohio Indians, the English need proved to be an economic opportunity, which they fully exploited. With almost daily deliveries of meat
and corn, the Ohio Indians accounted for nearly fifty-one percent of the daily rations consumed by the post’s inhabitants. Moreover, Mercer and the garrison came to rely so heavily on the Native American food sources that shortages of the commodities forced the English to delay, reduce and slow the construction of the fort. However when maintained, the provisions supplied to the post enabled the English to increase their number of garrisoned troops and skilled workers as well as increase the speed and quality of their work. Likewise, the English paid “exorbitant prices” to Native American guards to protect their vital and indefensible supply lines from constant enemy attacks that destroyed the resources necessary to transport the critical supplies as well as the provisions themselves. Combined Native American physical and military support enabled Pittsburgh to grow from a garrison of only two-hundred and eighty men with no shoes, shelter and supplies to a cosmopolitan settlement of seven-hundred and seventy-two soldiers and civilians that lived in one-hundred and sixty-two houses and a post larger than any other built by the English on the North American continent in the eighteenth century in only four short years. Thus, Native American physical and military support helped provide and protect the supplies required to augment the English provisions, enlarge the size of their garrison to ensure its security, increase the quality and quantity of workers employed to construct the fort and hasten the project along to its speedy and thorough completion. Thus, Native American physical and military support provided the English with the resources that enabled them to increase the manpower and consequently the security essential to complete the construction of Fort Pitt in the face of a hostile enemy.

Finally, Native American informational support provided the English with the intelligence required to make the strategic political and military moves necessary to ensure the survival of their post. Likewise, Ohio Indians provided the English with services that a majority of Euro-Americans could not perform on the Pennsylvania frontier such as scouting and interpreting. Through the informational services the Ohio Indians provided them, the English made military moves to prevent an attack on Pittsburgh from a superior enemy force; conducted political negotiations necessary to maintain their alliance with the Native Americans so vital to the post’s security and kept the critical lines
of communication open between the remote frontier outposts and the colonies. Thus, Native Americans became the eyes and ears for the English who were unprepared and ill-equipped to survive in the region. In other words, Native American informational support provided Fort Pitt with the intelligence necessary to stay abreast of and counter the French and hostile Native American military and political maneuvers that would have proved lethal to the survival of Fort Pitt.

In the tumultuous world of the Ohio Valley in the mid-eighteenth century, the Logstonians and their Ohio Indian neighbors provided the Euro-Americans with a reason to come to the region, the political means to establish a cosmopolitan settlement in the area and the resources necessary for a weak and dependent post to survive, grow and eventually mature into the insular settlement of Pittsburgh. Thus, the Native American settlement of Logstown and its inhabitants provided the resources and security necessary for Fort Pitt to survive and grow into the insular settlement of Pittsburgh.
CONCLUSION

“We Have Brought Them Here”

Did Native Americans influence the settlement of the west, the settlement that so many scholars claim they resisted and put up barriers to throughout the entirety of their autonomous political existence? The answer is yes. Though they eventually resisted the advancement of Anglo society, Native Americans first invited Euro-Americans into their homes, welcomed them when they came and supported them in their efforts to establish cosmopolitan settlements, the settlements that became the nuclei and “spearheads” for America’s urban insular development. Consequently, the tip of Richard C. Wade’s Euro-American “spearhead” proved to be the Native American urban settlements that in many instances initiated and supported the establishment of Anglo cosmopolitan settlements such as Fort Pitt. In other words, the catalyst for the initial stages of the west’s urban cosmopolitan development proved to be Native American frontier urban settlements.

Since no criteria existed for differentiating between cities, towns and villages or to determine and compare the level of Native American and Euro-American colonial “urbanization”, this work dismissed the use of these ideational terms and created physical criteria to distinguish urban from non-urban areas. Urban settlements consisted of areas of land occupied by people who established permanent dwellings, created complex social institutions, developed a ranked society, and conformed to a shared set of cultural customs that shaped the premise of community relations. Consequently, Frontier urban settlements existed as urban settlements in peripheral contact areas where two or more societies came into contact with one another. However after years of living with Berkhofer’s “invented Indian,” Native Americans needed to be perceived as more than just “urban Indians;” they needed to be viewed as a culture advanced enough to influence the
settlement of the west. In other words, one question needed to be answered, “How could the ‘inferior non-
urban Indians’ impact the urban development of the ‘technologically and culturally superior’ Euro-Americans?”

Gideon Sjoberg’s work The Preindustrial City provided a tool to compare Native Americans with
Euro-American societies in regards to societal advancement. Sjoberg established a hierarchy of societal
development with three levels—folk, preindustrial or industrial. Simply put, folk societies lived in the most
underdeveloped state, industrial societies developed the highest state of societal advancement and preindustrial
societies proved to be in a state of transition from the folk to the industrial level of advancement. In Sjoberg’s
hierarchy, preindustrial societies most closely matched the definition established in this work for a frontier urban
settlement with one exception. Sjoberg stipulated that preindustrial societies possessed advanced forms of
technology such as metallurgy or employed a superior form of subsistence that enabled large populations of
people to congregate in one area and develop complex social institutions such as a political systems. To
Sjoberg, the concentration of people into permanent settlements proved to be the primary condition necessary
for a group to develop the complex social institutions present in more advanced preindustrial and industrial
societies. Advanced forms of technology or superior subsistence activity enabled urban settlements to amass
the large populations needed to create the dynamics for the development of complex social institutions. In the
evolutionary process of societal development, urban areas existed as the impetus for growth and change.
Subsequently, Sjoberg’s preindustrial societies proved to be urban settlements with advanced forms of
technology or a superior form of subsistence.

In the quest to determine the complexity of Logstonian social institutions, this work discovered that
Logstown possessed all the features required to be a preindustrial frontier urban society. Unlike nomadic folk
societies, the Logstonians developed a highly effective subsistence economy that revolved around maize
production. As a result, an estimated three to five hundred individuals resided in Logstown and used the
settlement as the center of their economic and political activity in the Ohio Valley for nearly thirty years.
Moreover, the Logstonians built fifty to eighty permanent “cabins,” developed a gift economy that created rank in their society, followed a unique and liberal code of behavior that influenced community relationships, established a division of labor based on age and gender and possessed a political apparatus that achieved a level of sophistication that advanced it beyond a preindustrial state and enabled the government to manage the domestic and external affairs of the community. Though they lacked the technology to forge plowshares and construct large scale irrigation ditches like their Euro-American counterparts, the Logstonians possessed maize, which enabled them to concentrate in one location, interact socially, create complex social institutions similar to their Anglo counterparts and build an urban settlement. Though different in physical appearance, developmentally, Logstown existed as a preindustrial urban settlement, a state of existence that was similar, not “inferior,” to many of the Euro-American “towns” that dotted the colonial landscape.

The mechanism employed to determine the role that Native Americans played in the development of the west was an extended model of frontier development proposed in Kenneth Lewis’ work The American Frontier. Though he ignored Native Americans as being active contributors to the development of the west, Lewis’ framework and categorization of frontier urban settlements proved to be a good foundation to create the Native American model of frontier development.

The Native American model of frontier development provided in this work consisted of six evolutionary stages. The first evolutionary stage of frontier development began with the Native Americans establishment of urban settlements. Once a frontier situation arose, the second stage of evolution began. In this second stage, Native American urban settlements provided migrants, both Euro-American and Native American, with the security and resources necessary to colonize and commercially exploit the frontier. Due to this Native American support, Euro-American traders and governments established cosmopolitan posts in, around, or adjacent to Native American urban settlements. As a result of the construction of these settlements, Euro-American settlers migrated to the established cosmopolitan posts and built insular settlements, which
marked the beginning of the third stage of development. Eventually, Euro-American pressure forced the Native American groups out of a region, leaving the region to be settled solely by Euro-Americans and their American successors and subsequently created the conditions for the fourth stage of evolution. From these early frontier insular settlements, towns grew and initiated the further development and colonization of the region, thus completing the urban development of the "frontier." Hence, the model of Native American frontier development begins with Native American urban settlements and ends with the emergence of white urban settlements.

Similar to other models of frontier development, the model presented in this essay acknowledged the efforts of Euro-American traders, statesmen, and settlers to develop the west. However, unlike other models, the Native American model of frontier development contends that Native American, not Euro-American, settlements provided Anglo Americans with the resources and security necessary to settle the west. Because previous scholars thoroughly studied the Euro-Americans and their development of the west, this study elected to concentrate solely on the first two stages of frontier evolution.

With the Native American model of frontier development shaped, this study looked at Logstown's relationship to Fort Pitt in regards to the six stages of development. In the process, the study discovered two things. First, Logstonians initiated and created the conditions for the establishment of the first Euro-American cosmopolitan settlement in the Ohio Valley and, second, they provided the critical support necessary for Fort Pitt to survive during its fledgling years. As a result, Native American efforts enabled Euro-Americans to establish the cosmopolitan settlements that became the catalyst for insular development, the fourth stage of the Native American model of frontier development and Lewis' second stage. Consequently, Native Americans transformed the "wilderness" into pockets of urban development long before the Euro-American settlers arrived to the "backcountry." The pockets that Euro-American cosmopolitan settlers journeyed to, settled in and transformed into frontier contact regions.
Through their political support of the English, the Logstownians paved the way for the construction of a post at the site of present-day Pittsburgh. In 1747, the Logstonians initiated relations with Pennsylvania that created an Ohio Indian council fire and set of a world-wind of events that caused the tensions for the Seven Years War and led to establishment of Forts Prince George, Duquesne and Pitt. Due to Native American political involvement, the English gained a position so formidable in the Ohio Valley that it threatened French interests and perpetuated their military actions. Moreover the Logstonian request for “strong houses,” enabled the militarily weak English to establish a cosmopolitan settlement in the Ohio Valley, an area previously dominated by French traders. Hence, the establishment of Euro-American cosmopolitan settlements in the Ohio Valley required more than just a mere trader and his stock of supplies as Kenneth Lewis suggested. The establishment of Euro-American cosmopolitan frontier settlements required in many instances the approval and support of Native American peoples. The political support that the Logstownians possessed due to their societal advancement and provided to the English. In short, the Logstonians initiated and created the conditions for the cosmopolitan settlement of the Ohio Valley and propagated, desired and approved the establishment of an English “strong house.”

However though the English gained Logstonian approval for the establishment of a cosmopolitan settlement, the actual task of constructing the post proved more arduous than the English bargained for and required the support of the Ohio Indians to see the project through. After the fall of Fort Duquesne, Bouquet and Mercer required and depended on the political, physical, military and informational support of the Ohio Indians to complete the construction of Fort Pitt. Before they could attempt to establish themselves permanently in the area, the Euro-Americans needed to calm the tumultuous political environment of the Ohio Valley and looked to Native American leaders such as the Beaver and his brother Shingas to broker a peace between the Ohio Indians and the English. Without this peace, the French held an advantageous position in the Ohio Valley that threatened to dislodge the English from their weak and virtually untenable position at Pittsburgh. However with
the support of Ohio Indian diplomats, the English forged a friendship that not only lessened the likelihood of a French attack on Pittsburgh, but gave the British access to the Native American resources necessary for the post's survival.

However, peace proved to be only one essential item required by the English to establish Fort Pitt. The English required provisions and manpower to build Fort Pitt. For the beleaguered English, provisions and manpower came in the form of Native American physical and military support. Though the English commanders ordered supplies for Fort Pitt, weather, enemy raids and the constant influx of Pittsburgh's Native American population stressed the limited resources of the post and subsequently threatened the garrison's existence. In short, the post faced starvation daily and feared it as much if not more than the French military poised only forty miles away at Venango. To overcome this deadly obstacle to the post's survival, the English looked to the Ohio Indian to augment their inadequate quantity of supplies with their "superior" native food sources. With daily deliveries of meat and corn, the Ohio Indians accounted for nearly fifty-one percent of the daily rations consumed by the post's inhabitants. Moreover, Mercer and the garrison came to rely so heavily on the Native American food sources that shortages of the commodities forced the English to delay, reduce and slow the construction of the fort. However when maintained, the provisions supplied to the post enabled the English to increase their number of garrisoned troops and skilled workers as well as increase the speed and quality of their work. Additionally Native American guards protected the vital and indefensible English supply lines from constant enemy attacks that destroyed the resources necessary to transport the critical supplies as well as the provisions themselves. Combined Native American physical and military support enabled Pittsburgh to grow from a garrison of only two-hundred and eighty poorly provisioned men to the largest and strongest cosmopolitan settlement built by the English on the North American continent in the eighteenth century in only four short years. In short, Native American physical and military support provided the English with the
resources necessary to increase the manpower and security required to complete the construction of Fort Pitt in the face of a hostile enemy.

Finally, Native American informational support provided the English with the intelligence to make strategic political and military moves necessary for the post's survival and performed a myriad of services that a majority of Euro-Americans could not perform on the Pennsylvania frontier such as scouting and interpreting. Ohio Indian informational services informed the English of French and Indian military moves, prevented attacks on Pittsburgh, maintained alliances with the Native Americans and kept the critical lines of communication open between the remote frontier outposts and the colonies. Subsequently, Native Americans became the eyes and ears for the English who were unprepared and ill-equipped to survive in a region that was foreign to them by providing Fort Pitt with the intelligence necessary to counter French and Indian military and political maneuvers aimed at destroying the post.

In the tumultuous world of the Ohio Valley in the mid-eighteenth century, the Logstownians and their Ohio Indian neighbors provided the Euro-Americans with a reason to come to the region, the political means to establish a cosmopolitan settlement in the area and the resources necessary for a weak and dependant post to survive, grow and eventually mature into the insular settlement of Pittsburgh. Thus, the Native American settlement of Logstown and its inhabitants existed as the catalyst and mechanism responsible for the establishment of Fort Pitt.

Tanacharison's speech to the French trader Joncaire perhaps best describes the relationship between Native American urbanites and the Euro-American cosmopolitan settler. Tanacharison simply informed Joncaire that "We ourselves brought them here to trade with us, and they shall live amongst us as long as there is one of us alive." In their desire to procure their own wants, achieve their own political aims and establish themselves as the preeminent power in the Ohio Valley in the mid-eighteenth century, the Logstonians initiated and supported Euro-American cosmopolitan development. Development they believed would assist them in
achieving their own political and economic objectives in the Ohio Valley in the mid-eighteenth. Hence, the initial “point” of the Euro-American settlement spear proved to be the preindustrial frontier urban settlements of the Native Americans and not Anglo-American cosmopolitan settlements.
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