

“BRITISH IN THOUGHT AND DEED”
HENRY BOUQUET AND THE MAKING OF BRITAIN’S AMERICAN EMPIRE

Erik L. Towne

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green
State University in partial fulfillment of
the requirements of the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

August 2008

Committee:

Peter Way, Advisor

Frank McKenna
Graduate Faculty Representative

Amilcar Challu

Andrew M. Schocket

ABSTRACT

Peter J. Way, Advisor

This work examines how Colonel Henry Bouquet used the British fiscal-military state as a blueprint for military operations in colonial North America during the Seven Years' War (1756-63). Bouquet's military operations marked the peripheral projection of the British fiscal-military state onto American colonists and Native Americans on the imperial periphery. Inside the colonies, military mobilization involved marshalling provincial troops, quartering soldiers, requisitioning provisions, livestock, and farm equipment, and making military infrastructure, all of which led to varying degrees of friction between the army and colonial society. Bouquet sought to impose military power on Native society by controlling diplomacy, regulating trade and gift giving, and reclaiming White captives, with mixed results. Problematically, both colonists and Indians balked at these policies, marking the failure in the colonial world of what had proven to be efficient bureaucratic institutions inside Britain. This work broadens Military Revolution and state formation theories by examining how these process unwound in an imperial setting.

This work identifies variables in British America that did not obtain in the formation of European states. By bridging British imperial, colonial, and Indian historiographies, this work reports that militarization caused tensions between the British state and colonial and native peoples. Historians have not examined the Royal American Army as the catalyst for these tensions, overlooking important variables in empire making. Using path dependence and constitutional theories, this work reports that colonial society developed in ways that made it unable to cope with the fiscal, social, or tactical demands of modern warfare. Ethno-historians have pushed their field to "look east" from Indian Country, overlooking European and military historiographies. By merging Native and British historiographies, this work reports that Bouquet sought to militarize Indian Country in a way that undermined its culture and livelihood, generating a form of violent resistance that European state makers seldom encountered inside their own societies. In both colonial and Indian societies, cooperation with Bouquet led to subjugation. Colonials resisted subjugation through constitutional channels, and political and passive resistance; Native Americans resisted through the Cherokee War and Pontiac's War. Path dependence and violent resistance emerge as the two most important variables that account for Bouquet's inability to integrate North America into the British fiscal-military state during the Seven Years' War.

This work is dedicated to
Lorenzo Maria T. De La Rosa Jr.,
The Carthusian Community,
And all those who “seek and strive after peace.”

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A former student recently pointed out that the most remarkable point about my existence in the world is that “you have spent the past thirty years trying to avoid other people.” True. Even so, one cannot research, write, and edit a dissertation without the assistance of many people and institutions, which is certainly true in the case of this dissertation. To countless people, I owe a great deal of gratitude.

Over the past couple years, the faculty and staffs of the Old Northwest’s historical institutions have provided me with financial and intellectual assistance in this project. I should like to thank the History Department at Bowling Green State University. On behalf of the History Department, Walter E. Grunden awarded me a one-year non-service fellowship. This fellowship facilitated the timely completion of this dissertation in time for several major revisions. Additionally, the History Department has generously funded several conference and research trips that improved the quality of this work. Tina Amos, among many others in the History Department, has shown me great kindness and patience. The William L. Clements Library allowed me the use of their facilities and archival materials. Brian Leigh Dunnigan showed a lively interest in my project and made many insightful suggestions. Likewise, Barbara DeWolfe lent much assistance to my research, and directed me to the Sterling Journal. This journal aided my understanding of trading networks and Indian relations in the Ohio Territory. On a dreary December afternoon, the curators of the Pennsylvania Historical Society directed me to several reels of microfilm that complemented the Papers of Henry Bouquet. I am grateful to Susan Miller of Washington University, Saint Louis, who went to great lengths to retrieve the *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania* for my last minute use. Finally, over the past many years, the archivists and librarians at the Bailey Howe Library, University of Vermont, have allowed me to use their resources and lent much assistance. In a secluded corner of this library, I worked out my ideas on the colonial constitutions and path dependence.

Several North American monasteries have given me silence and solitude over the past year. I am grateful to the Abbot and community of Saint Anselm’s Abbey, in Manchester, New Hampshire. They allowed me to use the Geisel Library at Anselm’s College and a place to complete an early manuscript. Thomas Frerking, OSB generously quartered me at Saint Louis Abbey on several occasions over the past year, where I completed my notes and later edited several chapters. The members of Saint Louis Abbey have taken a lively interest in this project, including J. Linus Dolce, OSB who has been a constant source of friendship, encouragement, and humor. In the final days of completing the dissertation, Maximilian Toczyłowski, OSB unintentionally awakened my interest in the British Marxist tradition, which has always inspired my intellectual work. Additionally, I am indebted to several Cistercian and Carthusian monks, whose lives witness to an ability to resist modernity, warfare, and violence. Accordingly, this work is dedicated to the Carthusian monks in Vermont, who requested a copy for their library.

I wish to acknowledge two former students and two former professors. Brian Gernert read early portions of Chapter II and ensured that I had not violated the dictates of

common sense. More recently, Mr. Gernert has listened patiently as I worked out the relationship between warfare, modernity, and society. Richard A. Murray has used me as a sounding board for several social theories that often dovetailed with my research. Mr. Murray has provided me with many Subway tuna sandwiches, which he distributed to me at little charge and so prevented my starvation. I value the intellectual commitments of both these men, who have ultimately reminded me that I am a teacher. Back when I was an undergraduate, Linda Pitelka listened to me ask questions similar to those that Gernert and Murray now ask of me—often questions that only years of study can answer. Professor Pitelka encouraged me to go to graduate school and has remained a good friend. Donald Poochigian and I share a common interest in political philosophy and social ethics, and he has encouraged me to understand the relationships between war and society. Together, we stood in a North Dakota blizzard protesting the illegal US invasion of Iraq, and thereafter our relationship has remained equally bizarre. My students call me to become as good a teacher as Linda and Donald have been to me.

I am grateful to my parents, who have always supported my academic endeavors.

I own much gratitude to my advisory committee. Andrew Schocket has been a part of my intellectual development since I took his seminar on Early American History, back in my first semester at Bowling Green. Over the past four years, Professor Schocket has taken an interest in my teaching and research, directed me to new historiographies, and made many valuable suggestions. Amilcar Challu graciously agreed to serve on my committee and took an immediate interest in my project. He helped me to understand the state formation literature and conceive it as part of broader imperial processes. Finally, I own much gratitude to my advisor, Peter Way. Professor Way helped me to envision Henry Bouquet as an embodiment of British imperialism in North America. Quite unknowingly, Professor Way directed me to material that ultimately helped resolve questions that have motivated my intellectual inquiries for a decade now. Military history proved to be the missing variable in my own intellectual development that has allowed me to understand better how the world works—or does not work. Professor Way listened to my ideas, tried to improve them, and directed me in creative directions. He read several early manuscripts, a couple more, and ultimately helped me craft this dissertation into a work that will someday be complete. I am grateful to the members of my advisory committee for their dedication to this project, their patience, and insights.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I. HENRY BOUQUET: BRITISH IN THOUGHT AND DEED.....	1
The State, Colonies, and Indians in Historical Thought	1
Henry Bouquet: Enlightened, Calvinist, and Military Entrepreneur.....	4
War and the Rise of the Nation State.....	14
Coming to Terms with Violence and Destruction.....	25
Henry Bouquet and Native American Historiography.....	27
CHAPTER II. THE ROYAL ARMY AND THE BRITISH COLONIES.....	40
There is no Danger that we shall fall in Love with South Carolina.....	40
The Philadelphia Conference.....	43
Battling Constitutions and Governors.....	51
Quartering the Troops.....	57
Requisitioning.....	75
Military Supply and Colonial Contractors.....	97
The Philadelphia Conference's Legacy.....	105
Conclusion.....	112
CHAPTER III. MAKING MILITARY INFRASTRUCUTRE.....	114
This town and all the Forts are in an entirely defenseless Condition.....	114
The Colonial Sea Coast: Forts and Roads.....	118
Forbes' Road vs. the Ohio Company.....	133
Militarization: No other Ennemies to fight than Hunger.....	155
Bouquet's Proclamation Line of 1761.....	164

Conclusion.....	179
CHAPTER IV. ALIGNING AND FIGHTING THE SOUTHERN INDIANS.....	182
You will take every opportunity of ruining the Little Carpenter.....	182
Commanding Indian Affairs: Colonels, Governors, and Superintendents.....	184
The Southern Indians and British Expansion.....	187
Catawbas, Cherokees, and the Forbes Expedition.....	195
The Cherokee War.....	240
They are no more a Nation: The Catawba Legacy.....	251
Conclusion.....	254
CHAPTER V. THE DEVIL UNDER THE SHAPE OF AN INDIAN.....	257
Brokering a Treaty at Easton.....	264
Capturing the Ohio Country.....	278
Making Treaties, Breaking Promises.....	281
Plotting from Iroquoia.....	313
Warring in the Ohio Territory.....	324
I Wish there was not an Indians Settlement within a Thousand Miles.....	334
Conclusion.....	350
CHAPTER VI. EPILOGUE.....	354
I have never seen such a tribe of rebels.....	354
Militarization in Indian Country.....	360
Desertion of the Regulars.....	366
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	379

CHAPTER I

HENRY BOUQUET: BRITISH IN THOUGHT AND DEED

Introduction: The State, Colonies, and Indians in Historical Thought

On November 25, 1758, Colonel Henry Bouquet looked west from the banks of the Monongahela River, over a vast territory that the Forbes Expedition had conquered for the British Empire. Pleased at this conquest, General John Forbes commissioned a goldsmith to strike a medal in commemoration of the British conquest of Fort Duquesne. On one side of the medal was to be a depiction of Forbes Road, winding across the Pennsylvania hills, with the words, “Through so Many Hazards.” The reverse side would depict the British army with Forbes on a litter, approaching the confluence of the Ohio and Monongahela rivers, with Fort Duquesne ablaze. Inscribed on this side would be, “Ohio, British in Thought and Deed.” A dark blue ribbon would connect this medal around the neck of Colonel Henry Bouquet and another select few officers of the Royal Army.¹

The Forbes medal portrayed reason’s triumph over superstition and the “Many Hazards” of an untamed wilderness. Indeed, the British military operations involved countless hazards, but not in the sense that Forbes suggested. The Royal Army placed many burdens on the colonial governments, which assemblymen believed threatened their autonomy. Moreover, the depiction of Forbes on his litter was only half true. Certainly, an intestinal virus had left the General dehydrated and immobile. But, contrary to the medal’s depiction, infirmity prevented Forbes from ever reaching the Monongahela

¹ Grant to Bouquet, Philadelphia, February 20, 1759, *PHB*, II, 137.

River and seeing Fort Duquesne.² In fact, Catawba warriors announced the French departure, upsetting the medal's inscription, "Ohio, British in Thought and Deed." Ironically, however, the British only conquered Acadia and New France; the Ohio Territory was only British in the sense of military jurisdiction. The Royal Army entered a decidedly native society, for Delaware, Shawnee, and many other tribes inhabited this region. By 1763, the Ohio's Indians launched a war against the British presence. The Forbes medal portrayed an Anglocentric worldview, celebrating the civilizing effects of British dominion. To sustain this empire, Bouquet negotiated with oftentimes uncooperative colonial governments, starved Indians of ammunition and rum, and ultimately organized a massacre in 1764. And, herein laid the real meaning of the Forbes medal: by dint of military might the imperial state would expand, bringing Britain's "civilizing" influence to the "savage" wilderness.

This work explores Henry Bouquet's relations with colonial Americans and Native Americans, two peoples subject to expanding British power. Bouquet first brokered military mobilization with colonial leaders, then managed military operations in the Ohio Territory. In the process, he negotiated with colonial governments, crafted Indian alliances, and structured life and society in the Ohio Territory. Bouquet's organizational system constituted the peripheral projection of the British fiscal-military state, a combination of state bureaucracies and military administration that was modern in comparison to the American colonial governments and provincial forces. Even so, Bouquet acted as an instrument of a more efficient, modern, and repressive administration, which first sought to subordinate the American colonies to *de facto*

² Forbes to Bouquet, Stony Creek, October 30, 1758, *PHB*, II, 590; Forbes to Bouquet, November 22, 1758, *PHB*, II, 606.

military rule, and when this failed, sought to transplant military rule to the territories acquired as a result of the French defeat in the Seven Years' War. In 1761, Bouquet implemented a Proclamation Line that demarcated colonial from military jurisdiction. West of this Proclamation Line, Bouquet implemented an administration that sought to regulate many parts of daily life, including Indian diplomacy, movement, trade, and privacy, with mixed results. Just as the colonists had balked at what they perceived as a repressive military regime, so did Native Americans, resulting in the Cherokee Uprising of 1760-61 and Pontiac's War.

Henry Bouquet straddled three very different worlds, the European state, the military, and Native America. Bouquet used the modern European state as a blueprint for British imperialism in North America, though yielding comparatively different results inside the colonies than in the Ohio Territory. Constitutional restraints prevented an overhaul of the colonial governments, but the military had freer rein in the Ohio Territory to implement this blueprint. In the name of fiscal frugality, Bouquet eliminated gift giving in a way that precluded meaningful cultural exchange between British and native societies. Worst still, Bouquet implemented trading regulations that chiseled at native culture. Bouquet had learned nothing from colonials' resistance to military pressure, and predictably, he never anticipated native resistance to even more repressive policies than had ever been attempted in the colonies. Bouquet embodied the British fiscal-military state in its imperial endeavor in North America, and his operations anticipated its collapse.³

³ Whereas P.J. Marshall examined the collapse of Britain's North American empire from the colonial perspective, this work examines the origins of the collapse in the interior. P.J. Marshall, *The Making and Unmaking of Empires: Britain, India, and America c.1750-1783* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 273-352.

Henry Bouquet: Enlightened, Calvinist, and Military Entrepreneur

In August of 1755, King George II authorized Colonel James Prevost to recruit German and Swiss officers to serve in the Royal American army. However, both Parliament and Crown had placed restrictions on who could serve in the Royal Army, signifying that the British state had begun reining in its war machine from mercenary armies. First, Parliament insisted that Prevost could only enlist Protestants to serve as British officers. Second, Parliament only authorized these officers to serve outside England, consigning them to theatres in Africa, India, and North America. Combined, these restrictions reflected a burgeoning consciousness of Britain as a unified and Protestant nation.⁴ King George II added to Parliament's restrictions, forbidding Prevost to hire entire mercenary companies into the Royal Americans, as had typified an earlier and now obsolete practice. This restriction stemmed from the post 1688 emergence of Britain as a nation state. With growing infrequency would the British Crown hire mercenary armies. By the eighteenth century, Europe's burgeoning nation states reined in private armies, forcing them to become more disciplined and professional than had been possible in the mercenary system. George II authorized Prevost to recruit individual men to serve as British officers, not entire mercenary armies. As in the past, these officers functioned much like colonel-proprietors, holding almost absolute control over their regiments. But increasingly, the state itself acted as proprietor of the British war machine, and this marked a major shift in military history. Like Prussia and other modern states, England had begun dispensing with private armies for service inside

⁴ Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), Ch. 1.

Britain and North America. Admittedly, Britain needed manpower to wage the Seven Years' War and hired subsidy armies to fight on the European continent. But, inside its empire, the British nation state was well on the way to instituting a national army, circumscribing reliance on mercenary units.⁵

Restricted by British state, Prevost sailed to the European continent and initiated a search for Protestant mercenaries. Henry Bouquet was among the first mercenaries Prevost contracted into the Royal American Regiments. A native of Berne, a canton in Switzerland, Bouquet met Parliament's requirement for Protestants two times over. That is, Bouquet was not only a Protestant but also more importantly a Protestant of the Calvinist creed. Swiss Calvinism endowed Bouquet with the bureaucratic *spirit* required for managing an early modern army. Little biographical material remains of Henry Bouquet before he entered the Royal Americans. Nonetheless, one can deduce from his rational and scientific mentality that this Swiss colonel carried the spirit of Protestantism and the Enlightenment to the frontiers of North America.⁶

The son of Isaac and Madeleine Rolaz Bouquet, Henry was born in 1719 at Rolle, a village in the western Swiss Alps. The Bouquet Family had long managed a profitable hotel, but contrary to historical myth, there is little reason to suspect that the family hailed from an aristocratic or proprietary elite. Henry's grandfather had worked as a civil servant, suggesting that the Bouquets had long imagined themselves as central to social administration. More recently, several members of the Bouquet clan had enlisted in European armies, where they served as mercenary warriors. Though not aristocratic,

⁵ M.S. Anderson, *War and Society in Europe of the Old Regime 1618-1789* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1998), 167-180; Alan J. Guy, *Oeconomy and Discipline: Officership and Administration in the British Army, 1714-1763* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985).

⁶ For the relationship between Calvinism and bureaucratic organization, see Max Weber, *Essays in Economic Sociology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 52-74.

both the hotel and civil service generated steady flows of revenue and ensured that the Bouquets lived in comfortable security.⁷ In this context, Henry Bouquet would not only perpetuate his family's bourgeois legacy, but he would also export his grandfather's spirit of bureaucratic administration to the New World. Importantly, the worldview that Bouquet would export was not only Protestant, but more importantly, John Calvin's form of Protestantism had conditioned Bouquet to serve as an expert bureaucrat, sensitive to frugality, order, and rationality.

Certainly, the enduring legacy of John Calvin and the Protestant Reformation shaped how the Bouquet Family understood the world and their place in society.⁸ Back in the sixteenth century, religious fervor permeated the University of Paris and shaped such minds as Ignatius of Loyola and John Calvin. After fleeing Catholic Paris, Calvin took refuge in the Swiss Alps, where he refined Martin Luther's religious reform, tightened the doctrine of predestination, and attempted to build a Christian city. Calvin's legacy exerted an enduring influence on Swiss society. Calvin's doctrine of predestination compelled the Christian to experience himself as being among the elect—predestined for eternal life.⁹ As Max Weber demonstrated, Calvinism instilled an ethos of frugality, honesty, industry, punctuality, and rationality above all. In turn, the practice of these virtues convinced the Christian of God's favor, giving him confidence not only

⁷ Mary C. Darlington, *History of Col. Henry Bouquet and the Western Frontiers of Pennsylvania* (Arno Press, Inc, 1971), 89-92.

⁸ The following paragraphs deduce Bouquet's personal character from the society in which he lived. Emile Durkhiem convincingly argued that society shapes the analytic categories, through which one understands the world. Although the deductions made here are broad, Bouquet's mentality can best be understood as the product of Calvinism and the Enlightenment. Emile Durkhiem, *Elemental Forms of Religious Life* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

⁹ John W. O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993). Mary C. Darlington asserted that the Bouquet Family fled to Switzerland to escape religious persecution in France. Her analysis confirms that Henry Bouquet was of the Calvinist creed. See *History of Col. Bouquet and the Western Frontiers*, 89-91.

in eternal life but also leading him to build an earthly paradise. For its practitioners, Calvinism fueled an ethos that favored efficient bureaucracy and capitalist expansion. Calvin's legacy endowed Bouquet with the virtues of a military bureaucrat: acute attention to organization, frugality, industry, punctuality, rationality, and cold logic.¹⁰ In themselves, these virtues lacked any moral meaning, as they primarily served efficiency. But, coupled with Protestantism, these virtues transformed Bouquet into a preeminent candidate for colonel in the Royal American regiments. Early modern colonels worked not so much as warriors or even as tacticians, though the Battle of Bushy Run would prove Bouquet's competence at both. Instead, colonels worked as organizational bureaucrats. Far removed from the chaos of battle, colonels used their intellectual virtues to conscript, finance, ration, regulate, and mobilize resources for warfare.¹¹ James Prevost was quick to perceive that both Bouquet's familial lineage and Calvinist ethos qualified him for a colonelcy in the British army, which Bouquet received in January of 1756.¹²

Like many other young men in his social position, Henry Bouquet discovered military service to be a means toward economic security, amid a European landscape subject to frequent warfare and undergoing rapid change by commercial and territorial realignment. In many ways, European armies facilitated those changes, by protecting sea

¹⁰ Weber, *Essays in Economic Sociology*, 56. Christopher Browning gave a thorough analysis of three bureaucrats who implemented Nazi extermination policies. His work demonstrates that these bureaucrats evidenced no psychological or sociological abnormalities. See Christopher Browning, *The Path to Genocide: Essays in launching the Final Solution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 125-144.

¹¹ Porter, *War and the Rise of the State*, xiv; Charles Tilly, "Food Supply and Public Order in Modern Europe," ed. Charles Tilly, *The Formation of National States in Western Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 380-455.

¹² War Office, August 1755, *PHB*, I, 1; War Office, January 3, 1756, *PHB*, I, 3. For British Protestantism, see Colley, *Britons*; Darlington, *History of Col. Henry Bouquet and the Western Frontier*, 89-91.

routes, by territorial acquisition, and opening up new markets.¹³ At age seventeen, Bouquet enlisted as a cadet in the Dutch army, and by 1738, he became ensign in the regiment of Constant. In the War of Austrian Succession, Bouquet entered the army of the King of Sardinia, serving as first lieutenant and winning military honors. After gaining recognition from the Prince of Orange, Bouquet received the rank of lieutenant colonel in the Swiss Guard. He spent the early years of his adulthood in The Hague, studying military science and mathematics, and keeping company among members of the continental Enlightenment.¹⁴ This experience not only trained Bouquet for service in the Seven Years' War, but one must believe that it also introduced him to the political ideas of the Enlightenment, ideas that he would export to the Ohio Territory. For instance, Bouquet probably discussed Enlightenment philosophies in The Hague's salons, attended theatres, and heard symphonies. More concretely, Bouquet would have derived some notion that the Prussian bureaucratic state had outlasted the Polish Parliamentary system. Put simply, one cannot separate Bouquet's early life as a Dutch warrior from the Dutch culture and society in which he lived. Europe's salons probably exerted as much influence on Bouquet's understanding of society and politics as did the battle field.¹⁵ Colonel James Prevost discovered Henry Bouquet in 1756, now long seasoned in the Enlightenment and military bureaucracy. Prevost contracted the Swiss warrior to head up the First Battalion of Royal American in the Seven Years' War, requiring him to leave The Hague's salons and keep company with men such as Benjamin Franklin, the Willing

¹³ Peter Way, "Rebellion of the Regulars: Working Soldiers and the Mutiny of 1763-1764," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 57, No. 4, (Oct., 2000), 764.

¹⁴ Darlington, *History of Col. Henry Bouquet and the Western Frontier*, 89-91.

¹⁵ For the relationship between the Enlightenment and European expansion, see T.C.W. Blanning, *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), *passim*; Richard Drayton, "Knowledge and Empire," in *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Eighteenth Century*, ed. P.J. Marshall (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 231-251.

Family, and John Bartram, the first American botanist. Bouquet escorted Bartram through the Ohio Territory, on a tour intended to document the region's floral species.¹⁶ To the mind of the twenty first century, Bouquet must seem a funny sort of warrior, for he came to North America equipped with the Enlightenment's world of mathematics, science, and reason.

Colonel Henry Bouquet acted as a conduit between the British state and what Britons perceived as a vast, untamed American wilderness. Bouquet embodied the British war machine, and Britons marshaled this war machine to bring reason and order to their empire's wilderness and its aboriginals. Bouquet, an enlightened warrior, exported rational organization to the Ohio Territory that paralleled the concerts, reading societies, theatres, and indeed the fiscal bureaucracies that flourished back in England, France, and Prussia.¹⁷ In addition to negotiating with governors, conquering territory, and planning massacres, Bouquet requested newspapers, book upon book, dictionaries, transcripts of theatrical plays, mathematical instruments, Madera, and many other

¹⁶ Bouquet to Franklin, Carlisle, August 10, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 600; Franklin to Bouquet, Philadelphia, August 16, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 609-610; Bouquet to Franklin, Fort Loudoun, August 22, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 616-617; Bouquet to Anne Willing, Bedford, September 17, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 115-117. For John Bartram, see St. Clair to Bouquet, Philadelphia, August 21, 1761, *PHB*, V, 705.

¹⁷ In *The Culture of Power and the Power of Culture*, T.C.W. Blanning added yet another book to the canon of Enlightenment historiography as it has developed since Jürgen Habermas wrote the *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* in 1962. Blanning argued that in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries a "public sphere" developed that challenged the existing regimes in Great Britain, France, and the Holy Roman Empire. Unlike Lynn Hunt, Dena Goodman, Sarah Meza, among several others, Blanning argued, "the public sphere was both the creation and extension of the state." Indeed, Blanning buttressed his argument with the insight of John Brewer that states derived power from their ability to command "legitimacy" from the public sphere. Problematically, Blanning seems to ignore John Brewer's more central argument that a fiscal-military bureaucracy enabled the state to command legitimacy. Instead, Blanning analyzed the exchange of goods and information and rational argumentation, but he never acknowledged that the navy facilitated the international exchange of goods and information. Indeed, had Blanning escaped Habermas's shadow, he would have recognized that without Brewer's fiscal-military state, the rationalization of bureaucracy, commerce, colonization, the Seven Years' War, and indeed even the Enlightenment itself would never have unfolded as they did in the eighteenth century. See Blanning, *The Culture of Power*, 8-9, 13.

artifacts of the Enlightenment to be transported to him on the British imperial frontier.¹⁸ The hours Bouquet had spent in The Hague's salons trained him in the continental Enlightenment. Colonel James Prevost contracted Bouquet to organize the military *means* through which Britain exported the Enlightenment's blueprint for statecraft to the New World. This work reports that Bouquet projected his knowledge of the European fiscal-military state first onto the colonial governments and later onto the Ohio Territory. In British America, Bouquet attempted to force his knowledge of efficient fiscal and social management onto the colonial assemblies, which turned out to be jealous guardians of their autonomy. Failing to militarize the colonies, Bouquet later sought to transplant an even more coercive variant of militarism onto the Ohio Indians, which they experienced as neither rational nor enlightened but as violent and destructive.¹⁹

Not only did Bouquet serve Britain as an enlightened warrior, but he also served under an increasingly sophisticated nation state that dictated the terms for honor and profit. M.S. Anderson called the seventeenth century an age of the military entrepreneur. Military entrepreneurs owned small, roving armies. In that era, the military entrepreneur functioned more as a proprietor of his army than as an agent of the state. Professionalism was lacking in these armies, soldiers often received insufficient training, and states exercised limited control over mercenaries. In the mercenary system, officers rented their semi-professional armies to kings, but by the 1750s, men like Bouquet hired themselves out to nation states, and national leaders had reigned in mercenary armies. Vanishing

¹⁸ For artifacts of the Enlightenment that Bouquet requested, see Bouquet to Burd, Philadelphia, April 10, 1763, *PHB*, V, 174-175; J. Dow to Bouquet, Philadelphia, September 24, 1761, *PHB*, V, 774-775; Macdonald to Bouquet, Detroit, September 18, 1761, *PHB*, V, 763-764; St. Clair to Bouquet, Philadelphia, August 21, 1761, *PHB*, V, 705; Ourry to Bouquet, Fort Bedford, May 16, 1761, *PHB*, V, 485; Skiddy to Bouquet, Charlestown, April 29, 1761, *PHB*, V, 449-450; James Sinclair to Bouquet, Carlisle, August 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 553-555.

¹⁹ Drayton, "Knowledge and Empire," 231-251. For the destructive potential of bureaucracies, see Browning, *The Path to Genocide*, 125-144.

were the days when mercenary officers calculated their services with an eye toward profit, which came before national loyalty.²⁰ As with landed proprietors, the state still permitted British officers to sell their regiments, but under restrictions set by the Royal Army. As Britain developed as a nation state, military proprietorship collapsed and a fiscal bureaucracy increasingly financed standing armies. The War Office dictated the terms on which military entrepreneurs could (or could not) sell their regiments.²¹ Thus, the diminishing power of the military entrepreneur paralleled the process of modern state formation. When James Prevost contracted Henry Bouquet into the British army, the Crown and Parliament had defined new parameters for Bouquet's potential profit and curbed the freedoms that seventeenth century military entrepreneurs had enjoyed.

Just as the state defined the terms of entrepreneurialism, so too did the state constrict Bouquet's ultimate freedom to sell his commission or even attain the highest positions in the Royal Army. Bouquet's entrance to the Royal Army paralleled Britain's emergence as one of the most powerful fiscal-military states in Europe. Predictably, the British state had already circumscribed the actual authority a foreign officer could have in the Royal Army. For instance, the War Office forbade foreign officers to sell their regiments, as had been typical of the earlier entrepreneurial system, though British officers retained this privilege. Accordingly, as the Seven Years' War wound down, Bouquet assisted many British officers of lesser rank in selling their military property. General Jeffrey Amherst set the price for old regiments at £1200, while the younger companies went for £1100. But the War Office denied Bouquet the right to sell his

²⁰ Anderson, *War and Society in Europe of the Old Regime*, 33-63.

²¹ Barrington to Calcraft, War Office, January 21, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 436.

military property or even his personal commission.²² Although Britons retained some entrepreneurial rights, the War Office denied Bouquet and other Swiss warriors the right to profit from the British war machine. Bouquet, a Swiss national, had contracted himself to the British state and relinquished the level of ownership and prestige British officers retained from an earlier era.

On two occasions, Bouquet attempted to sell his commission and begin what he perceived as an ideal pastoral life in Maryland or Pennsylvania. Following the Forbes Expedition, Bouquet began contemplating a life as a Maryland or Pennsylvania proprietor, because he could not gain promotion inside the army. As he put it, “I shall quit the service as soon as I can decently.”²³ Bouquet’s friend, Major John Tulleken, framed the problem like this: “I am exceeding sorry at what you tell me concerning yourself Col. Haliman and the rest of the [foreign] gentlemen. Every body must think that you are used extremely ill.”²⁴ Bouquet’s South Carolina overseer, Andrew Fesch, expressed similar horror at Bouquet’s predicament. Fesch wrote, “Mortified to the bottom of my heart to learn of your displeasure and that you have so many disappointments.”²⁵ Yet, Bouquet remained in the Royal Army and oversaw the integration of the Ohio Territory into the British Empire. Then, after the Battle of Bushy Run, Bouquet once again contemplated retiring from the army and becoming a landed proprietor. Bushy Run horrified Bouquet, precisely because the entropic chaos of warfare was antithetical to his real bureaucratic, fiscal, and organizational talents—far removed

²² Milne to Bouquet, York Town, February 24, 1759, *PHB*, II, 148; Bouquet to Amherst, Philadelphia, March 13, 1759, *PHB*, II, 195. For the price of companies, see Tulleken to Bouquet, New York, March 15, 1759, *PHB*, II, 198-199.

²³ Bouquet to Willing [Anne Willing of Philadelphia], Lancaster, February 28, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 472-472.

²⁴ Stanwix, Warrant Appointing Clark, Pittsburgh, March 3, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 482-484.

²⁵ Fesch to Bouquet, Sophy Hall, August 16, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 696-698.

from the bloodbath of war.²⁶ Many British officers expressed astonishment the War Office had again denied Bouquet greater honor after Bushy Run, explicable only by his Swiss origins.²⁷ Despite mortification and ill treatment, Bouquet exported the very state that denied him military advancement to the New World. As the British state centralized and expanded its territorial holdings, it simultaneously reined in military personnel and began to close the gap between state oversight and semi-autonomous military entrepreneurs. As military innovation advanced, European armies increasingly fell under state control, and no military officer would even remember the privileges that Bouquet had sought after the Forbes Expedition and Bushy Run.²⁸

Despite these disappointments, some avenues remained opened for Bouquet to profit inside the First Battalion of Royal Americans. Indeed, the potential for profit was the only justification for Bouquet's decision to leave The Hague and enter the British army. As colonel, Bouquet really held the chief bureaucratic position in the First Battalion of Royal Americans. Like a bureaucratic proprietor, Bouquet enjoyed much control, ranging from discipline, provisioning, to calculating expenditures. Bouquet calculated costs, reduced expenses, and tried to eliminate desertion, all with an eye toward the bottom-line.²⁹ Indeed, the 1763 Royal Stoppage order set in motion a process, which by cutting soldiers pay from 6 pence to 4 pence, not only saved the Treasury money but also could increase Bouquet's wealth by saving money from each soldier's pay. Military frugality, from pay reductions to limiting uniform costs, helped Bouquet save money. In a realm defined by the state, Bouquet profited from his colonelcy but

²⁶ This analysis is derived from Bruce Porter, *War and the Rise of the State*, xiv.

²⁷ Stanwix, Warrant Appointing Clark, Pittsburgh, March 3, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 482-484.

²⁸ Anderson, *War and Society in Europe*, 196-204.

²⁹ For the relationship between Bouquet's battalion and Royal finance, see Bouquet, State of the Southern Department, May 11, 1759, *PHB*, III, 275-276.

military advancement remained problematical until Bouquet proved his inestimable value by pushing the Ohio Indians west of the Muskingum River. Finally, in 1765 and after planning to massacre the Ohio Indians, the War Officer rewarded the horrors Bouquet had exported to the New World with the rank of Brigadier General.³⁰ In the broadest sense, the War Office had never denied Bouquet unlimited maneuverability *only* because he was a Swiss national, though this had always been the stated reason. In fact, the process of state formation had pushed Britain toward greater and greater control of national finance and the military, a process that ultimately eliminated the military entrepreneur from the European war machine. As a Protestant and enlightened bureaucrat, Henry Bouquet embodied the ideals of this modern British state, which depended on a synthesis of bureaucracy, finance, and military muscle.

War and the Rise of the Nation State

Francis Parkman rightly receives credit for being among the first historians to recount the French and Indian War. The overarching thesis of Parkman's scholarship hinged on the triumph of civilization over native savagery. His work rested on the assumption of that Indians were irrational, tied to nature, and doomed by Europe's civilization process. In this view, the Seven Years' War marked a major instance of British Protestantism uprooting the superstitious world of French Catholicism and native savagery.³¹ Parkman's nineteenth century view of history dovetails with a late twentieth century colonial historiography, which too often shifts emphasis away from native

³⁰ Secretary of War to Amherst, London, May 10, 1763, *PHB*, V, 42; Amherst to C. Jenkinson, Secretary of the Treasury, New York, July 23, 1763, *PHB*, V, 61; Sir Jeffery Amherst Papers, Vol. 1: Schedule 1-3, 1760-Oct, 1763, William Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

³¹ José Antônio Brandão, "*Your fyre shall burn no more*" *Iroquois Policy toward New France and Its Native Allies to 1701* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 8-14.

savagery to George Washington. In this sanitized historiography, a young George Washington led an ill fated expedition into the Ohio Territory to warn the French to withdraw from lands claimed by the Ohio Company. By placing Washington at the forefront, colonial historians construct a narrative that allows Washington to learn from his mistakes, emerge as a great man, and sets the colonies on the path toward revolution. Following Parkman's legacy, many current historical models perpetuate Whig mythologies and conceive of the Seven Years' War as setting the stage for American independence.³² This work begins from a different historiography and arrives at different conclusions. Rejecting the "Whig view," this work recasts the Seven Years' War as stemming from national realignments, which began in the sixteenth century. By the eighteenth century, Britain had adopted the fiscal and military innovations that had long been underway on the European continent. Henry Bouquet embodied these innovations, exported them to the New World, and projected them onto colonials and natives, though encountering varying degrees of resistance in both cases. The following paragraphs outline the historiography and relationship between military and political histories, casting them in light of the Seven Years' War.

Following Germany's collapse into Fascist dictatorship in the 1930s, historical sociologists inquired of why dissimilar governments had emerged among ostensibly similar European nations. The question of European state formation in the twentieth

³² This is not to say that Francis Parkman's crass racism survives into the current historiography, but rather the teleological assumptions of British imperialism continue to dominate most historical analysis. These assumptions, as explained below, may take on a Whig, Weberian, or Marxist form. The shift began in the 1950s, by examining the role of the Ohio Company in the coming of the Seven Years' War; see Kenneth P. Bailey, *The Ohio Company of Virginia and the Westward Movement, 1748-1792: A Chapter in the History of the Colonial Frontier* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1939), 30-37. Fred Anderson shifts emphasis again to George Washington, the colonies, and the coming of the American Revolution. See *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 42-107.

century required scholars to look back to the origins of the nation state four hundred years earlier. Their theories took two different directions. On the one hand, Michael Roberts and his students examined European military innovation as the common denominator in European absolutism, which eventually allowed the West to emerge as the dominant center of world power.³³ On the other hand, Barrington Moore founded a school based on comparative analysis, whose descendants argued for agrarian, political, and finally military models as the catalysts for European development. Charles Tilly merged the legacies of Roberts and Moore into a unified explanatory model that began to illuminate the military innovations and political structures that Henry Bouquet exported to North America.³⁴

In a 1956 lecture, Michael Roberts introduced the Military Revolution thesis, which quickly gained a central place in the cannon of early modern history. The tactical innovations introduced by Maurice of Nassau and Gustavus Adolphus precipitated a revolution in European armies. Between 1560 and 1660, European armies underwent a tactical transformation that precipitated other innovations. Infantries adopted linear formations, and gunpowder replaced lance and pike. Cavalries became more aggressive, launching deadly saber attacks. These tactical innovations bore logistical consequences off the battlefield, which are the primary concern of this work. States invested in training and provisioning huge armies. Therefore, states gained ownership in these war machines, replacing military entrepreneurs, and standing armies became the norm, even in peacetime. Roberts summarized his argument concisely: “It was not only that armies

³³ Michael Roberts, “The Military Revolution, 1560-1660,” ed. Clifford J. Rogers, *The Military Revolution Debate: Readings on the Military transformation of Early Modern Europe* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995), 13-29.

³⁴ For the Cold War environment that gave rise to this scholarship, see Lucian, W. Pye, Forward, ed. Tilly, *The Formation of National States*, ix-xi.

were tending to become permanent; it was also that they were rapidly becoming much larger. And this I take to be the result of a revolution in strategy, made possible by a revolution in tactics, and made necessary by the circumstances of the Thirty Years' War."³⁵ In this way, Roberts prepared later social scientists to understand a correlation between military innovation and states' ability to finance national standing armies.

The military revolution that Roberts described came about as an inner European affair, not reaching North America until the Seven Years' War. In Roberts' timeframe, warfare in British America remained comparatively primitive. Colonial armies professed loyalty to respected community leaders, not to states. Guerrilla tactics better halted Indian raids than could tactical innovation.³⁶ For instance, in King Philip's War (1675-1676), Massachusetts regiments repelled Algonquian raiders in a crisis that stemmed from territorial rights, grazing livestock, and religious assimilation.³⁷ Likewise, in 1711, Carolina regiments aligned with Cherokee warriors in a dispute with Yamasee natives over territorial expansion. This Carolina-Cherokee alliance successfully drove the Yamasee Indians from their homeland, forcing them to resettle in Florida.³⁸ Throughout the colonial era, instances abound of colonial armies aligning with native warriors, both for defensive and settlement purposes. British colonial America faced no belligerent that necessitated more than seasonal regiments. In short, colonial wars never required the tactical, logistical, and financial components of modern European warfare. And, therefore, the fiscal capacities of the colonial governments remained quite primitive in

³⁵ Roberts, "The Military Revolution, 1560-1660," 18.

³⁶ Harold E. Selesky, *War and Society in Colonial Connecticut* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 3-32.

³⁷ Virginia DeJohn Anderson, "King Philip's Herds: Indians, Colonists, and the Problem of Livestock in Early New England," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 51 (1994): 602; Jill Lepore, *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York: Knopf, 1998), et al; Richter, *Facing East*, 90-105.

³⁸ Richter, *Facing East*, 162-164.

comparison to Europe's modern fiscal bureaucracies. The *timing* of military competition meant everything in the comparative differences in colonial and British political infrastructures.³⁹

While the Military Revolution theory went unchallenged, Barrington Moore maneuvered between Orthodox Marxist historians and the Whig view in an effort to explain comparative differences in worldwide state formation. In his 1966 book, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, Moore inquired of the “varied political roles played by the landed upper classes and the peasantry in the transformation from agrarian societies...to modern industrial ones.”⁴⁰ Moore inquired of the different outcomes of development in England, France and the United States, Germany and Japan, and Russia and China. Giving the peasantry great importance in social change, Moore explained why these countries took paths of bourgeois revolutions, Fascism, and communism on their way from agrarian to industrial society. For Moore, agrarian variables and internal class conflict explained these different paths, but his intellectual successors identified other determining variables, such as military pressure.⁴¹

Charles Tilly, Brian M. Downing, and Thomas Ertman, among many other scholars refined the model that Moore put forward in *Social Origins*. In 1975, Charles Tilly led a research team, sponsored by the Social Science Research Council, which furthered the inquiry into state formation. In this work, Tilly formulated the argument

³⁹ This analysis anticipates the scholarship of Thomas Ertman, see *The Birth of the Leviathan: Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 26.

⁴⁰ Barrington Moore, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the making of the Modern World* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966), xi.

⁴¹ For a concise analysis of Moore's scholarship and his intellectual descendants, see Theda Skocpol, *Democracy, Revolution, and History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), 1-21; Moore, *Social Origins*, xiv-xvi.

that “War made the state, and the state made war.”⁴² Tilly argued for an interlocked relationship between states’ ability to finance war and the ability of armies to wage war. Beginning in the sixteenth century, the ever expanding power of European armies became dependent on the capacity of civilian governments to finance warfare. The combination of states’ fiscal and martial powers explained why European states developed at a faster pace than non-Western states. More broadly, Tilly’s scholarship gave rise to another debate about the meaning of the modern state.⁴³ On the one hand, many scholars would continue searching for an overarching model of development, along lines defined by Huntington and the modernization school. Conversely, Bruce Porter, among other scholars, would derive from Tilly’s work a pessimistic critique of state formation. These scholars weighed the value of modernity against the social cost of war. In all, Tilly gave teeth to Moore’s comparative analysis, arguing that the relationship between the capacities of civilian governments to finance war better explained different rates of development than could agrarian variables. Now, Geoffrey Parker had the intellectual tools to merge Michael Roberts’ thesis with state formation theories.

In 1976, Parker affirmed the lasting validity of the Military Revolution theory, but he introduced significant changes to it. Parker argued that the introduction of artillery into Western Europe changed warfare in ways that Roberts had not understood. Parker held that the thin walls of medieval forts could not withstand artillery fire. To sustain

⁴² Tilly, “On the History of European State Making,” *The Formation of national States in Western Europe*, ed. Charles Tilly and Gabriel Ardant, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1975), 42; Charles Tilly, *Coercion, Capital, and European States*, 67-95.

⁴³ Charles Tilly, “War and State Power,” *Middle East Report*, No. 171, The Day After. (July-Aug., 1991), 38-40; Charles Tilly, “Major Forms of Collective Action in Western Europe 1500-1975,” *Theory and Society*, Vol. 3, No. 3. (Autumn, 1976), 365-375; *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1990* (Cambridge, Mass: Basil Blackwell, 1990), 67-95.

⁴³ Brian M. Downing, *The Military Revolution and Political Change: Origins of Democracy and Autocracy in Early Modern Europe*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 9.

artillery fire, European states constructed *italienne* or star shaped forts. Engineers designed these forts with lower and thicker walls, allowing soldiers to spy invading armies from all directions. The thick walls of *italienne* forts could withstand artillery fire and sustain sieges. In turn, this new fortification system precipitated siege warfare and forced states to finance and provision huge armies for protracted periods. Parker argued that the combination of artillery fire, *italienne* fortifications, huge armies, and sieges transformed European warfare.⁴⁴ Importantly, these large scale wars bred sophisticated fiscal bureaucracies, wedding the modern fiscal state to warfare.

John Brewer's 1989 book, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State*, gave scholars a systematic analysis of how Britain financed warfare. Spanning 1688-1783, Brewer analyzed Britain's ascendance to modern statehood and its concomitant ability to finance protracted warfare. In this period, the state became the most important participant in the British economy and the single largest employer. Spending rose and the government began financing debt on the Dutch model. Trained in measurements and numbers, a class of bureaucrats evolved that oversaw tax collection and financed state debt. This bureaucracy experimented with three tax models: a land tax, customs tax, and finally an Excise tax—a tax on the producers of the goods of everyday consumption. The land tax met resistance from landed elites. Smuggling doomed the customs tax to failure. By 1714, the state settled on the Excise tax as a suitable method for financing military expenditures. Brewer recast eighteenth century Britain as a fiscal-military state, in which most state spending financed Britain's war machine. At root, the British fiscal military state was built on Excise taxes garnered from

⁴⁴ Geoffrey Parker, *The Military Revolution: Military innovation and the rise of the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), Introduction; Porter, *War and the Rise of the State*, 67.

the producers of beer, soap, candles, wire and other commodities of daily use. In addition to the Excise tax, Treasury bureaucrats developed methods of floating the national debt and other forms of deficit financing. By transferring the burden of debt to the future, the state gained the ability to finance protracted wars.⁴⁵

By the 1990s, the ideas of Barrington Moore and Michael Roberts had so matured under the respective scholarship of Charles Tilly and Geoffrey Parker that a new school of intellectuals has neared a consensus on state formation. Brian M. Downing demonstrated the interrelationship between state formation and the military revolution in his 1992 book, *The Military Revolution and Political Change*. Downing shifted Moore's emphasis from socioeconomics to geopolitics, war, and state bureaucracies. Still, like Moore, Downing's scholarship tried to answer why liberal democracies developed in some states compared to authoritarian regimes in others. Downing compared state formation in six nations, including Brandenburg-Prussia, France, England, Sweden, the Netherlands, and Poland. He saw constitutional arrangements and military pressure as the two most important variables in accounting for political change. Downing put it like this:

Medieval European states had numerous institutions, procedures, and arrangements that, if combined with light amounts of domestic mobilization of human and economic resources for war, provided the basis for democracy in ensuing centuries. Conversely, constitutional countries confronted by a dangerous international situation mandating extensive

⁴⁵ John Brewer's explanation of how Britain's civilian government financed war contrasts with the inability of the British colonial assemblies to raise troops, quarter soldiers, or build infrastructure. Still, we must return to the literature on British state formation to understand the variables that account for this contrast between the British civilian administration and the colonial assemblies. John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1989), Part II.

domestic resource mobilization suffered the destruction of constitutionalism and the rise of military bureaucratic absolutism.⁴⁶

Downing always saw military competition as a critical variable in determining democratic or militaristic state models. He gave a conceptual model that helps explain why dissimilar administrations governed different parts of the British Empire.

Refining Downing's scholarship, Thomas Ertman argued that a dichotomy between European absolutism and constitutionalism neglected multiple other variables that contribute to state formations. The onset of military competition, while important, was not enough to explain the different patterns of early modern state formation. Ertman argued that military competition, combined with timing, and bureaucratic and fiscal variables all influenced European state formation. The sequencing of these variables meant everything to the kind of states that developed, especially as they related to states' ability to finance war. As Ertman explained, "states are often unable, due to the burdens of the past, to respond quickly and efficiently to changes in their environment, and are forced instead to operate within the constraints imposed by sometimes dysfunctional institutional frameworks."⁴⁷ Until the eighteenth century, England's military innovation lagged behind France, Prussia, and the other major European powers, because of its geographical isolation and lack of fiscal innovation. This late start allowed other European states to perfect fiscal and military innovations that England later adopted and implemented with great success. Britain, as a late developer, had a broader inventory of fiscal and military models than did its competitors and used them for imperial gain.

⁴⁶ Downing, *The Military Revolution and Political Change*, 9.

⁴⁷ Ertman, *The Birth of the Leviathan*, 321.

European state formation took many different paths, in turn influencing the course of empire building. Variants in the timing of military competition, constitutional arrangements, and relationships between legislative and bureaucratic entities differentiated the rise of Europe's nations to statehood. These variables have led historians to search for an overarching model that explains disparities in the different courses European nations took in their transformation to statehood. Britain as a late developer, learned from the mistakes made by France, Spain, and other earlier developers, allowing Britain to create one of Europe's most sophisticated fiscal bureaucracies and efficient militaries. By the eighteenth century, Britain ascended to the forefront of European power, and in the Seven Years' War, actually relieved France of its North American empire. Buttressed by a powerful fiscal bureaucracy and standing army, Britain retained a Parliamentary system and many elements of its medieval past, unlike Brandenburg-Prussia. Even so, Britain's Parliamentary system stood next to an increasingly powerful fiscal-military bureaucracy. Britain's accession to power corresponded with its ability to finance debt, unlike France and Spain whose rise to power paralleled their collapse into bankruptcy. That is, early developers often taxed and taxed again landed proprietors and sold noble titles, serving only to perpetuate feudal institutions. In the short term, these schemes generated revenue but over centuries proved unable to sustain empires. By the mid-eighteenth century, the power that France and Spain had once wielded had contracted in comparison to Great Britain's steady rise to imperialism. Unlike early developers, Britain instituted a fiscal bureaucracy that garnered revenue via taxation on commodities, instead of extracting monies from the remnants of a feudal past.⁴⁸ Britain learned from the fiscal and military innovations of its

⁴⁸ William Doyle, *Origins of the French Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999),

continental neighbors, which fueled Britain's military prowess in the Seven Years' War and allowed it to establish an imperial presence in the Ohio Country. Problematically, when the Royal Army tried to impose an Anglocentric model of state craft on Britain's imperial periphery, it encountered constitutional and native variables that had not existed in Europe, and these suggested that the Ohio Territory was British neither in thought nor in deed.

This work follows Henry Bouquet through a sequence of events, variables, and obstacles that led to different levels of militarization east and west of the Allegheny Mountains. During the Seven Years' War, the North American geopolitical landscape became a laboratory for processes that had long been underway inside Europe. This war left British America with two comparatively different geopolitical landscapes, both resistant to military rule but for different reasons. Building on Downing and Ertman's insights, this work posits that the constitutional origins of the colonies hindered their ability to finance and wage modern warfare. But, the same constitutions provided the variable that allowed the colonies to resist military and fiscal innovations, in a way that the Ohio Country could not. The French evacuation of the Ohio country created the illusory impression of a power vacuum in the Ohio Country, which encouraged Bouquet to militarize the Ohio region, for he did not face any of the burdens that haunted the colonies. To his surprise, Bouquet encountered Native Americans, who mounted violent resistance to military rule. Whereas constitutional constraints resisted one variant of militarization, Native Americans used violence to ward off the British militarization of

their homeland. Native American history adds a variable to empire building that complicates the exportation of state formation models to imperial peripheries.⁴⁹

Coming to Terms with Violence and Destruction

Very often, historians erase violence and destruction from the histories of early modern state formation. In the case of the Military Revolution, historians have debated the timing and scope of military innovation but gloss over the bloodbaths that early modern armies created.⁵⁰ Scholars often cast the emergence of the state as nothing more than the logical outcome of the Enlightenment, only rarely following Bruce Porter's lead in connecting modernity with war and repression. Since the nineteenth century, Western scholars have wedded a secularized Messianic idea to the ideologies of the French Revolution, resulting in a teleological myth that few dare to question.⁵¹ Building on Hegel's philosophy, Karl Marx painted a grand historical scheme that brought life and history under human control, through a process of liberation from economic inequality. Whig historians have cast this myth as the triumph of reason over superstition. Max Weber believed history to be a process of increasing efficiency, where people could achieve greater productivity with less effort. Whether Marxian, Whig, or Weberian, the notion of steady human progress has become entrenched in western consciousness. Problematically, teleological myths are unable to account for state planned massacres and genocides, leading scholars to write them off as aberrations in the steady move toward progress. The extermination of entire ethnic groups becomes nothing more than a brief

⁴⁹ Ertman, *The Birth of the Leviathan*, 317-323; Porter, *War and the Rise of the State*, 47-49.

⁵⁰ Way, "Class Warfare," 2.

⁵¹ Gershom Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism: and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*, (New York: Schocken Books, 1995), 10, 37.

resurgence of Hobbesian brutishness that the civilizing process soon corrects. Bruce Porter, Zygmunt Bauman, among other scholars and theologians, dispute the Enlightenment's take on human progress. These scholars argue that the very institutions and structures of modernity lack any internal resistance to genocide and state organized killing. In an analysis of the Nazi war machine, Bauman explained, "We know already that the institutions responsible for the Holocaust were in no legitimate sociological sense pathological or abnormal."⁵² Looking back to the 1760s, few historians have questioned the legitimacy of Britain's fiscal bureaucracies or the organizational structure of the Royal Army. Yet, arguably, in those very institutions resided the logic of brutality and massacre. Henry Bouquet harnessed the mentality of John Calvin and the Enlightenment to organize military operations in North America, which resulted in varying degrees of violence and destruction.

Although Brian M. Downing and Geoffrey Parker give overarching models that illuminate imperial processes, their scholarship remains ahistorical in that it erases the human suffering that resulted from these processes. Peter Way has urged historians to move beyond the abstractions that are inherent in state formation and military theory. Rejecting a purely theoretical analysis, Way has insisted the Royal Army's construction of a British North American empire "occurred at the expense of soldiers, colonists and indigenous peoples."⁵³ Building on Way's insight, this work grounds Henry Bouquet's

⁵² Zygmunt Bauman, "Sociology of the Holocaust," *The Journal of British Sociology*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Dec., 1988), 486. Several theologians have associated development policies with warfare, violence, and ecological destruction. They have called for a complete end to the modernization process, see Lenardo Boff, *Cry of the Earth, Cry of the Poor* (New York: Orbis Books, 1997), *passim*; Gustavo Gutierrez, *Liberation Theology* (New York: Orbis Books, 1980), *passim*. For a discussion about the relationship between the Enlightenment and warfare, see Louis J. Lekai, *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality* (Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 1977, 153-178.

⁵³ Way, "Class Warfare: Military Revolution, Common Soldiers, Empire-Building and the Prehistory of the Global Worker," (Unpublished articles), 2.

operations in colonial and indigenous society. Bouquet, like models of state formation, preferred to stay aloof from colonial and indigenous society. However, Bouquet himself recounted endless woes in dealing with colonials and natives. Arguably, seventeenth century constitutional engagements constrained Bouquet's fiscal and military agility inside colonial society. But, trained in the Enlightenment's ideas of government, he managed to institute a comparatively efficient and rational administration over the Ohio Territory. This administration allowed military personnel to control indigenous and colonial migrant populations. Bouquet exported the processes that Downing and Parker described to the New World. Expanding the analysis of both Bruce Porter and Zygmunt Bauman of modernity, this work argues that Native Americans did not experience Bouquet as heralding steady human progress or a Messianic ideal, but violence and destruction instead.⁵⁴

Henry Bouquet and Native American Historiography

Henry Bouquet encountered several groups of Native Americans. In the southern colonies, Bouquet crossed paths with the Cherokee Indians. As shown in chapter II, Bouquet oversaw the construction of a fortification system that both defended the southern frontier and facilitated trade with native society. Later, Bouquet brokered an alliance with Little Carpenter, a Cherokee headman, who summoned Cherokee warriors to assist Bouquet in the Forbes Expedition. But the collapse of this alliance became a

⁵⁴ Zygmunt Bauman, "Modernity and the Holocaust," in *Genocide: An Anthropological Reader* ed. Alexander Laban Hinton (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), 110-132; Porter, *War and the Rise of the State*, *passim*. For an excellent analysis of how indigenous cultures experience modernity and international developments, see John H. Bodley, "Victims of Progress," in *Genocide: An Anthropological Reader*, ed. Alexander Laban Hinton (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 2002), 137-160. Bodley concluded that depopulation often results from international development, despite broad based insistence to the contrary.

pretext for the Royal Highlanders to extend the British state over Cherokee Country. Next, Bouquet encountered the Ohio Indians, an Indian grouping comprised of Delaware, Shawnee, and many other bands. The Easton Conference committed Bouquet to preserving natives' territorial integrity, even against the counter claims of the Ohio Company. However, Bouquet proved equally committed to the policies of Amherst, which shattered the good terms of the Easton Conference and collapsed into Pontiac's War. Now, Bouquet waged a campaign to drive the Ohio Indians west of the Muskingum River with the same vehemence that he had earlier used against the Ohio Company. Finally, predicated upon the Covenant Chain, a loose alliance between the Iroquois and neighboring or client tribes, the Iroquois Confederation claimed hegemony over both the Cherokee and Ohio tribes. For this reason, Iroquois brokers appeared in Cherokee diplomacy, at the Easton Conference, and later buffered Bouquet's expedition against the Ohio Indians. In these instances, the Iroquois Confederacy harnessed British military muscle to reassert ancient claims over neighboring Indian populations. This work grounds geopolitical theories in the lived experiences of Iroquois, Cherokee, and Ohio, peoples.

Writing in the mid-nineteenth century, Francis Parkman painted the Iroquois people as warlike and savage. Parkman saw Iroquois raids on New France and the neighboring Huron Indians as economically motivated, aimed at gaining control of the Beaver trade. Thus began the Beaver War theory, which survived even into Daniel Richter's early scholarship. Parkman attributed Iroquois raids against the Erie and Susquehannock Indians to irrational savagery. Parkman's view of the Iroquois Condeferacy grew out of the Whig view of history. Parkman and his contemporaries

believed that only the advancement of European civilization could redeem the Iroquois from their savage state. Parkman's theory of Iroquois history dovetailed with Bernard Bailyn's idea of Early American history as the embodiment of British liberties. Thus, through the Cold War, no one dared to mount a serious challenge to Parkman and the Whig view of Iroquois History.⁵⁵

In the 1980s, James Axtell, Francis Jennings, Daniel Richter, and several other historians sought to reverse the Whig view of Native American history, by marshalling ethnography to the service of historical analysis. Richter's book, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse*, marked one of the early fruits of the new ethnohistory. He used this work to redefine the parameters of Iroquois historiography. Richter argued that the Iroquois entered into cultural, economic, and diplomatic relationships with both their European and Indian neighbors. But as the Iroquoian population declined and dependency grew, the Europeans colonized the Iroquois Confederacy. According to Richter, the process of colonization moved through four ordeals: demographic decline, dependence on external trade, diplomatic crisis within European imperialism, and finally the loss of Iroquois sovereignty. By 1720, Richter argued that Iroquois sovereignty had passed to British colonizers.⁵⁶ Richter's analysis set the stage for Theda Perdue to study the legacy of Iroquois hegemony and the Confederacy's efforts to regain power, even after 1720.

A probing analysis of gender in Cherokee history stands as Theda Perdue's major contribution to Native American studies. Beside *Cherokee Women* stands her insightful analysis of Iroquois claims to hegemony over Cherokee Country indicates the pervasive

⁵⁵ For an analysis of Francis Parkman, see Brandão, "Your fyre shall burn no more", 5-10.

⁵⁶ Daniel Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse* (Charlestown, University of North Carolina Press); Francis Jennings, *Empire of Fortune: Crowns, Colonies, and tribes in the Seven Years War in America* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1988).

influence of this Confederacy over vast stretches of eastern America. Perdue takes on the idea that the British used the Covenant Chain to create peace among Indians and bound them to the Crown. Instead, Perdue argues that many divisions existed in both Cherokee and Iroquois society, making it impossible for either group to agree upon a unified diplomatic policy. Both Cherokee and Iroquois warriors resisted British peace overtures, demanding instead to revenge “crying blood.” However, sachems in both tribes brokered peace deals in the context of the Covenant Chain, which complemented British imperial policy. Even so, Covenant Chain alliances reflected only a small minority within Cherokee and Iroquois societies, for warriors usually rejected the peace overtures of tribal sachems.⁵⁷ Neither the Cherokee nor Iroquois peoples ever settled on unified tribal policies, which befuddled Henry Bouquet and frustrated British efforts to gain hegemony over native population.

Perdue’s analysis gives two important insights for this dissertation. First, she adds to an analytic framework that tries to understand Indian history from the native perspective, in this case by examining a division between sachems and warriors in the diplomatic process. Second, Perdue identified the willingness of British agents to harness Iroquois claims to sovereignty in order to gain a unified Indian policy. Building on these insights, this dissertation argues that the Royal Army harnessed Iroquois cultural hegemony to manage the Ohio Indians after 1763. For their part, the Iroquois Confederacy harnessed British military superiority as a means to regaining sovereignty over the Ohio tribes. In this sense, British and Iroquois goals in the Ohio Territory dovetailed, stripping the Ohio Indians of both territorial and cultural sovereignty.

⁵⁷ Theda Perdue, “Cherokee Relations with the Iroquois in the Eighteenth Century,” in *Beyond the Covenant Chain: The Iroquois and their neighbors in Indian North America, 1600-1800*, ed. Daniel K. Richter and James H. Merrell (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press), 135-149.

Building on Perdue's insights, this dissertation suggests that Gregory Evans Dowd did not draw adequate attention to the importance of the Iroquois Confederacy in the evolution of British Indian policy after Pontiac's War.⁵⁸ Arguably, the Royal Army and Iroquois Confederacy exploited each other's weaknesses in a plot to subordinate the Ohio Indians. British and Iroquois cooperation led to a greater violence and destruction in the Ohio Territory than either Michael McConnell or Richard White have recognized.

Beginning with the solid scholarship of David Corkran, the historiography of the Cherokee people has focused on colonial-Cherokee relations. Problematically, this approach neglects the effort of the British army to extend the British Empire over the Cherokee peoples. Corkran set the parameter for historians' understanding of the Cherokee War in his 1966 book, *Cherokee Frontier*. Corkran argued that colonial expansion and South Carolina's failure to honor trading agreements collapsed into warfare. Corkran gave a balanced analysis of Cherokee War (1759-61), never casting ultimate blame for the crisis on either the colonies or the natives. Even so, his analysis looked much like a tribal history, though lacking ethnographic insight. These shortcomings linked Corkran's scholarship with Parkman and the Whig view, showing ultimately that colonial civilization tamed the savagery of the Cherokee frontier. In 1995, Tom Hatley revised Corkran's analysis, recasting colonial Cherokee history in light of ethnohistory and borderland studies. In *The Dividing Paths*, Hatley examined Cherokee-Anglo relations from first contact in 1760 to 1785, when the Cherokees brokered their first treaty with the United States. This broad approach revealed a more dynamic and changing relationship between Cherokee and Anglo society than Corkran's focus on the Cherokee War permitted. In the seventeenth century, Cherokee and colonial society

⁵⁸ Dowd, *War Under Heaven*, 153-162.

came together in trading and geopolitical agreements. By 1759, colonial expansion had strangled former good relations, collapsing into the Cherokee War. Fighting broke out again in the American Revolution, as Cherokees fought to protect their territorial integrity. Hatley's book concludes with the 1785 Hopewell Treaty, symbolizing the separate paths the two societies had taken. Most importantly, Hatley examined a broader swath of history in light of ethnography. This allowed for a balanced understanding of Cherokee-Anglo relations. Problematically, neither Corkran nor Hatley placed Cherokee history in the context of British imperial expansion, which arguably had a greater impact on Cherokee history than colonial armies.

John Oliphant's 2001 book, *Peace and War on the Cherokee Frontier, 1756-63*, recast the Cherokee War in the context of the Seven Years' War. Oliphant's approach effectively overcame the colonial lens through which both Corkran and Hatley had viewed Cherokee history. Lieutenant Colonel James Grant emerges as the central figure in Oliphant's analysis. Grant led the Royal Highlanders into Cherokee Country to bring order to a crisis that Governor William Lyttelton had allowed to rage out of control. Despite a rampage of death and destruction, Oliphant insists that Grant acted as a mediator between colonials and natives. Oliphant painted South Carolina's Governor Lyttelton as Grant's antithesis. In this view, Lyttelton launched two expeditions into Cherokee Country that sought to extend colonial jurisdiction and gain control of trade but only resulted in bloodletting. Grant's Highlanders finally intervened and forced a resolution. Grant headed up the Royal Highlanders, who destroyed the middle Cherokee towns in 1761. Soon thereafter, Grant negotiated a peace settlement that denied Carolinians' demands for land and executions of the Cherokee ringleaders.

Oliphant's analysis allows historians to conceive of the Cherokee War in an imperial context. Problematically, Oliphant gave too much importance to Governor Lyttelton. Arguably, British intervention in what became the Cherokee War had actually begun in 1758, when Little Carpenter aggravated Henry Bouquet, one year before Lyttelton's first expedition and a full three years before Grant marched the Highlanders into the middle settlements. Indeed, Bouquet and the Royal Army began plotting to rein the Cherokees into the empire long before Lyttelton marched into Cherokee Country. Whereas Oliphant made Lieutenant Grant the agent of imperial expansion, this work cast Henry Bouquet as the first British officer to imagine Royal control over Cherokee Country.

This work views the Cherokee War through Henry Bouquet's efforts to extend the British Empire over the American interior, over Cherokee Country. Bouquet never had direct dealings with the Cherokee villages. However, he brokered an important alliance with Little Carpenter that brought many Cherokee warriors into the British army during the Forbes Expedition. Bouquet mistakenly believed that Little Carpenter spoke for all Cherokee peoples, when in reality he only represented a small faction.⁵⁹ Only days before the British took Fort Duquesne, Little Carpenter withdrew from the campaign and returned to Cherokee Country. Little Carpenter believed border disputes demanded his attention more than the Forbes Expedition, a sentiment that neither Bouquet nor John Forbes understood. Feeling betrayed by Little Carpenter, Bouquet and Forbes set out to yoke the Cherokee people into the British Empire. Meanwhile, the Cherokee War erupted, which began as a border conflict between the Cherokee people and colonial settlers and traders. Historians have neglected the extent to which this border war

⁵⁹ Theda Perdue, "Cherokee Relations with the Iroquois in the Eighteenth Century," in *Beyond the Covenant Chain: The Iroquois and their neighbors in Indian North America, 1600-1800*, ed. Daniel K. Richter and James H. Merrell (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press), 135-149.

dovetailed with Bouquet's disappointment at Little Carpenter's withdrawal from the Forbes Expedition. As Oliphant argued, the border crisis opened a window for the Royal Army to force a resolution and extend imperial control over the Appalachian region. But long before Grant marched the Royal Highlanders into Cherokee Country, Bouquet and Forbes had tried to extend the process of state formation over the Cherokees. The Royal Highlanders effectively ended Governor Lyttelton's border war, and realized Bouquet's plans for imperial control over Cherokee Country. The Royal Proclamation Line confirmed what Bouquet had wanted since Little Carpenter had abandoned the Forbes Expedition.

Bouquet first encountered the Ohio Indians at the Easton Conference. Comprised of Delaware, Shawnee, and other disparate Indian bands, historians have traced their histories from their seventeenth century exodus from Pennsylvania, to their life in the Ohio Country, concluding with Pontiac's War or beyond. Richard White's 1991 book, *The Middle Ground*, dealt a death blow to Francis Parkman and his descendants. White's history of the Great Lakes' tribes demonstrated that natives and Europeans came together in complex trading and diplomatic relationship, creating a so-called middle ground. In White's analysis, the middle ground reached its apogee in the French alliance but progressively disintegrated under British and United States control. Following the British conquest of the Ohio Territory, White argued that Pontiac's War put in place the conditions for a new middle ground under British control. As White stated the case, "Pontiac's Rebellion was not the beginning of a racially foreordained Indian demise; it was the beginning of the restoration of the middle ground."⁶⁰ Subsequent scholars have accepted White's interpretation with little revision. For instance, writing in 1992,

⁶⁰ White, *The Middle Ground*, 270.

Michael McConnell interpreted Pontiac's War as a stalemate, which put in place conditions for accommodation between the Ohio Indians and the British. For both White and McConnell, American settlement severed the possibility of accommodation and forced the natives from their Ohio lands.⁶¹

More recently, ethnographic analysis has done to the Great Lakes Indian society what Tom Hatley did for Cherokee society. Daniel Richter and Gregory Evans Dowd have revisited the Ohio accommodation theory and have challenged its very foundation. Both Richter and Dowd argue that British racism rendered impossible accommodation after the Seven Years' War, and they marshal Pontiac's War to prove this point. Writing in 2001, Richter juxtaposed Pontiac's War with the Paxton Boys. Both groups came together in a racially charged battle that never found resolution. In this interpretation, the British imperial government emerged as a third party that quelled the rebellion and erected the Proclamation Line of 1763 to keep the two groups forever apart. In Richter's analysis, the Paxton Boys anticipated policies of ethnic cleansing that the United States would soon unleash against North America's native peoples.⁶² In a similar vein, Gregory Evans Dowd cast Pontiac's War as a pan-Indian spiritual struggle against British territorial encroachments, following the expulsion of the French King from the Ohio region. Placing preeminence on spiritual and racial tropes, Dowd understood Pontiac's War to signify the collapse of accommodation, not the precondition for a new middle ground. He argued that the war came to an "indecisive conclusion," leaving legacies of racism, intertribal organization, and mysticism. But Dowd pointedly blamed the British,

⁶¹ Michael N. McConnell, *A Country Between: The Upper Ohio Valley and Its Peoples, 1724-1774* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 281.

⁶² Daniel Richter, *Facing East From Indian Country: A Native History of Early America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 208.

whereas Richter faulted the Americans.⁶³ Both Richter and Dowd give an analytic framework to cast Bouquet as an agent of empire building. Far from wanting to rebuild a middle ground, Bouquet gave far greater importance to British hegemony over the Ohio Territory, subduing natives, and seizing all captives. Bouquet's relations with Ohio natives corroborate Dowd and Richter's insistence that racial divisions followed the Seven Years' War, instead of a renewed middle ground. Indeed, the Proclamation Line symbolized these divisions, and Bouquet saw this line as a literal barrier between colonial society and the militarily controlled Ohio Territory.

Before all else, Henry Bouquet saw himself as a agent of the British state and enforcer of imperial policy, leading him to both accommodate and then kill natives. John Forbes had brokered the Easton Treaty, which brought the Delaware natives into the British alliance, and Bouquet insisted that this treaty superseded the narrow claims of the Ohio Company. Bouquet devised a proto-Proclamation Line in 1761, primarily to halt colonial usurpation of Indians' lands. But just as Bouquet had enforced Forbes's Indian treaties, so too did he enforced Jeffrey Amherst comparatively repressive Indian policy. Obedient to Amherst, Bouquet imposed prohibitions on munitions and rum sales, thereby creating conditions ripe for starvation. Not surprisingly, the Ohio Indians rebelled against these policies, laid siege to many Ohio forts, and threatened forts Detroit and Pitt. Bouquet acted to halt Pontiac's War with the same determination that he had earlier used to halt the claims of the Ohio Company—perceiving both as challenges to the British Empire. As an agent of the British state, Bouquet's foremost goal was to end Pontiac's War and bring the Ohio Indians under British imperial control, much as Grant had

⁶³ Gregory Evans Dowd, *War Under Heaven: Pontiac, the Indian Nations & the British Empire* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2002), 266-275.

accomplished in Cherokee Country. Initially, Bouquet doubted the Royal Army could subdue Pontiac's warriors, and he advised Pennsylvania's governor to declare martial law. In the end, Bouquet tried to push the "Indians Settlement within a Thousand Miles of our Country."⁶⁴ In this sense, Bouquet anticipated the racially divided world that both Dowd and Richter saw as the core legacy of Pontiac's War. But months before this rebellion, Amherst had disbanded several regiments, making an actual ethnic cleansing impossible.⁶⁵ Thus, Bouquet settled for something like a stalemate, though a stalemate conditioned on the return of captives. Bouquet implemented the very different policies of Forbes and Amherst, frustrating any effort to pigeonhole the Swiss Colonel into a tidy historiographical model. Further complicating these paradoxical Indian policies, Bouquet *accommodated* Iroquois designs for cultural hegemony over the Ohio natives as a means to lessen the extent of a British *stalemate* in Pontiac's War.

On November 25, 1758, Colonel Henry Bouquet looked west from the Monongahela River, across vast stretches of land that he claimed for the British Empire. Looking toward the setting sun, Bouquet penned letters to friends back east in New York City and Philadelphia, announcing the dawn of a British territorial empire. The Royal Army had routed the French from Fort Duquesne. Bouquet attributed the British victory to the tactical genius of General John Forbes, erasing any claim colonials, natives, or soldiers had to this conquest or in the trans-Allegheny imperial system. The British war machine had won empire and would now rule it.⁶⁶ The following chapters argue that

⁶⁴ Jeffery Amherst to Bouquet, New York, August 7, 1763, *BHB*, V, 350-352.

⁶⁵ Ellis, Abstract of Royal Orders to Reduce the Army, London, May 18, 1763, *PHB*, V, 186-189.

⁶⁶ Bouquet to Nancy Anne Willing, Fort Duquesne, November 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 608; Bouquet to Stanwix, Fort Duquesne, November 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 609; Bouquet to Tulleken, Fort Duquesne,

Bouquet bridged two imperial systems, bridged colonial and native societies, but he also erected jurisdictional and racial barriers between these worlds. The Proclamation Line of 1761 signified these barriers.⁶⁷ East of the Proclamation Line, the British colonial system perpetuated a constitutional system, rooted in assemblies that found the fiscal and material demands of modern warfare difficult to bear. West of these colonies, Bouquet implemented a comparatively modern, bureaucratic administration, capable of regulating finance, trade, and development. A second, deeper layer of analysis examines the social consequences that Bouquet's operations brought to North America. Instead of political and social integration, Henry Bouquet heralded disintegration and entropy. The British victories of the Seven Years' War were limited to the imaginings of the military elite, for war brings only violence and destruction.⁶⁸ Cherokee and Ohio natives understood this reality far better than did the British colonists.

The following chapters trace the movement of Henry Bouquet's army, from Philadelphia, down to Charlestown, back north and across Pennsylvania's hills, and finally to the Ohio Territory. Bouquet's path introduced him to many peoples, including colonial elites and ordinary farmers, Native headmen and Indian children. In all these encounters, Bouquet's goal remained steadfast, to remake Britain's North American Empire, and he used Europe's most modern, fiscal, bureaucratic states as a blueprint for this project. Any deviations, any paradoxes, in Bouquet's project were peripheral to his mission and are best explained by changes in military command, not uncertainty in the Colonel's mission. Bouquet discovered colonial governments that were not prepared for

November 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 609; Bouquet to William Allen, Fort Duquesne, November 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 610-612.

⁶⁷ This analysis is derived from Richter, *Facing East From Indian Country*, 1-10.

⁶⁸ This argument is derived from Bruce Porter, *War and the Rive of the State*, xii-22.

war, so he dealt with them as the British constitution and military orders required.

Chapter I shall examine Bouquet's operations in South Carolina and Pennsylvania, where he interacted with societies and political infrastructures that were completely unprepared for the demands of modern warfare and military innovation. Chapter II shall examine how Bouquet made the physical infrastructure of war, forts, roads, and more forts. Part II of this dissertation follows Bouquet across the Appalachian and Allegheny Mountains, where he entered upon a vast and seemingly ungoverned territory. In Chapter III, Little Carpenter and the Cherokee War emerge as catalysts for Bouquet to extend British imperial authority into Cherokee Country. Chapter IV shall examine Bouquet as an agent of an imperial policy that sought to subordinate Ohio's natives to a repressive military bureaucracy. Bouquet made and remade the Ohio region according to Forbes and later Amherst's orders, ultimately collapsing into Pontiac's War. By 1764, the Ohio region bore the indelible mark of Henry Bouquet's organization and military prowess. Bouquet incorporated the Ohio Territory into the British Empire, an empire designed on the model of Europe's most modern nation states; and he endeavored to remake it with the demands of modern warfare in mind, plunging Native Americans into a reign of violence and destruction.

CHAPTER II

THE ROYAL ARMY AND THE BRITISH COLONIES

Introduction: “There is no Danger that we shall fall in Love with South Carolina”

During the Forbes Expedition, Bouquet wrote, “One is not through with one difficulty before falling into another.”⁶⁹ Difficulties were endemic to Bouquet’s military experience and he did not conserve any ink in writing about them. The following pages unravel three major difficulties that Bouquet encountered in his relationship with the colonial governments. First, in 1757, the governors of the southern colonies met at what became known as the Philadelphia Conference. There, they agreed to raise soldiers to complete Bouquet’s Second Battalion of Royal Americans. Yet, only the arrival of a battalion of Royal Highlanders offset the manpower shortage occasioned by the governors’ utter failure to fulfill their commitments. Second, tension appeared between the Royal Army and colonial governments. The Pennsylvania and South Carolina governments refused to cooperate with Bouquet’s demand that they quarter hundreds of soldiers. Third, tension emerged between military personnel and colonial citizens, especially in the cases of requisitioning wagons. The army absolutely needed wagons to move westward, but colonists experienced this demand to be a real hardship that lacked any constitutional foundation. Arguably, the colonial governments were backward in comparison to the administrative bureaucracies that were the governments of England and the Netherlands. Indeed, Europe’s most modern administrative bureaucracies provided a prototype for the Royal Army itself, and arguably, for the administrative system Bouquet would later set up in the Ohio Territory. The major problem that this

⁶⁹ Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, June 7, 1758, *PHB*, II, 42-46.

chapter grapples with is a triangular tension that arose between the governors, colonial assemblies, and Bouquet's comparatively modern fiscal and military apparatus. While in the colonies, Bouquet operated within participatory governments that historian Brian M. Downing identified as antiquated, backward, and inefficient compared to the bureaucratic structure of the Royal Army.⁷⁰ Bouquet must have believed that these governments were hostile to fiscal and military bureaucratization, though in fact no military pressure had ever spurred them to develop a more efficient political infrastructure.⁷¹

A few historiographical concepts help to illuminate the tensions between Bouquet and the colonies. The tensions stemmed from the difficulties of operating a fiscal-military state in the colonial American context. John Brewer, among many other scholars of early modern state formation, has developed the idea of the fiscal-military state. Brewer pointed out that eighteenth-century England underwent a period of protracted warfare that gave rise to a large state apparatus. The state became the single most important participant in the domestic economy and the single largest employer. The state vastly increased military expenditure, creating huge debts. A civilian administration evolved that financed this debt on the Dutch model. By 1714, the Excise Tax became the principal means of financing English military expenditures, plunging England into the forefront of what Jeffery Parker among other historians identify as the peak of a military revolution. The rise of the English fiscal-military state vastly increased the size and efficiency of the Royal Army and navy, which in turn fueled imperial expansion.

⁷⁰ For Brian M. Downing's take on medieval constitutionalism, see *The Military Revolution and Political Change: Origins of Democracy and Autocracy in Early Modern Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 18-55.

⁷¹ This analysis deals with timing, military pressure, and the subsequent need for modern political infrastructure. This analysis is derived from the scholarship of Thomas Ertam, *The Birth of Leviathan: Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 5-6.

Problematically, the colonial governments had existed long before Brewer's fiscal-military state came into being, and they were largely unable to cope with the fiscal demands of Bouquet's large army, supply needs, and social pressures. In other words, the colonial legislators labored under the constraints of what political historians call path dependence, meaning they simply lacked a bureaucratic infrastructure to finance protracted military commitments and huge armies. Here began the tensions between Bouquet and the colonies, both of whom had set out on very different paths.⁷²

Douglass North, among many others writing from the perspective of historical institutionalism, have developed the idea *path dependence*. Put simply, path dependence asserts that once institutions are in place, they often determine the outcome of subsequent events. For example, the colonial governments were modeled after comparatively ancient European participatory assemblies. So, the Royal Army found itself dependent on institutions, whose original architects had never intended them to cope with huge armies. Bouquet never toppled a single colonial institution, for these were linked to British political and national identity. Instead, Bouquet maneuvered through colonial backwardness and inefficiency, only creating more efficient and repressive institutions in the trans-Allegheny west—the topic of subsequent chapters.⁷³ Second, Jack P. Greene

⁷² For the fiscal-military state, see John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1989), Part II; Downing, *The Military Revolution and Political Change*, 3-17; Etram, *The Birth of Leviathan*, 26-28. The literature on the Military Revolution is vast. For example, see Michael Roberts, "The Military Revolution, 1560-1660," in Clifford J. Rogers, *The Military Revolution Debate: Readings in the Military transformation of Early Modern Europe* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995), 13-29; Geoffrey Parker, *The Military Revolution: Military innovation and the rise of the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 2; Jeremy Black, *A Military Revolution? Military Change and European Society 1550-1800* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1990), *passim*.

⁷³ Douglass C. North, *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), *passim*; Douglass C. North, "A Transaction Cost Theory of Politics," *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*, vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 335-67; Douglass C. North, "In Anticipation of the Marriage of Political and Economic Theory," in James E. Alt, Margaret Levi, and Elinor Ostrom, eds. *Competition and Cooperation: Conversations with Nobelists about Economics and*

has illuminated the origin and nature of the colonial constitutions and governments. As explained below, Greene understood customary law and practice as central to the British constitution. Accordingly, the American colonists believed customary law and practice to be sacrosanct. Not surprisingly, Bouquet's forward looking, administrative bureaucracy clashed with seemingly ancient customary law and practice. Combined, path dependence and constitutional theories illuminate tensions between the Royal Army and the colonial governments, and suggest why Bouquet would attempt to set up a comparatively modern, bureaucratic administration in the trans-Allegheny west.

The Philadelphia Conference

John Campbell, the fourth Earl of Loudoun, a professional officer and a Scot, first gained military experience in 1745, suppressing the Highland Rebellion. In 1756, Loudoun succeeded Governor William Shirley of Massachusetts as commander in chief of His Majesty's forces in North America. A proficient administrator, Loudoun attempted to unify the disparate North American provincial armies. Moreover, he believed that each colony should make an appropriate financial contribution to the Seven Years' War. Unlike his predecessors, he did not promise the colonial assemblies that the London Treasury would reimburse their wartime expenditures. Loudoun confronted a political landscape that was characterized by an utter lack of bureaucratic and military cohesion. He faced provincial minded assemblies, and disparate armies that were provincial in every possible sense. For just as regional needs blinded these assemblies to the imperial goals that Loudoun represented, so too did provincial soldiers enlist because

Political Science (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1999), 314-17; Paul Pierson, *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 1-53.

they felt personal affinity and respect for their provincial officers. When Loudoun arrived in North America, he discovered that the provincial armies lagged far behind the level of European military innovation. Instead, he found disparate provincial armies that were more equipped to fight Indian raids than build empire. He discovered obstinate assemblies, and he found no bureaucratic mechanism that would facilitate the large scale war that he planned to wage in North America. In short, Loudoun faced a geopolitical landscape that lacked the fiscal and military innovations needed to cope with modern warfare.⁷⁴

Loudoun explained that these provincial armies' inability to work toward unified strategic objectives stemmed from their constitutional origins. Although so-called Divine Right had long ago authorized James I and his successors to allocate America's lands, God had not given a blueprint for unity or cooperation among what became very different colonies. Loudoun fittingly called the conglomerate of Englishmen who had settled those lands "adventurers." British monarchs had sent governors to manage the settlements that those "adventurers" had founded; and the governors, in turn, had authorized defensive armies. Local goals had always brought those regiments together, namely to ward off hostile Indians. Here began a tradition of small, local, and certainly *provincial*, armies setting out to defend their settlements and villages from Indian raids. But, as these colonies expanded, "our enemies grew jealous of them, which obliged our Government at

⁷⁴ Clifford J. Rogers argues that the Military Revolution was evolutionary and occurred in different stages. His theory begins to explain why America remained behind in this evolutionary process. See Rogers, "The Military Revolutions of the Hundred Years' War," in Clifford J. Rogers, *The Military Revolution Debate*, 55-77. For a similar argument, see Fred Anderson, *A People's Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years' War* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 12-13.

home to send Fleets to protect them.”⁷⁵ Then, in 1753, the French imperial army had encroached on the frontiers of Pennsylvania and Virginia and threatened territory claimed by the Ohio and Susquehanna land companies and similar entities. Loudoun believed that the provincial regiments stood little chance against French military prowess. But instead of submitting to Loudoun’s command, the colonists insisted that their governors command their troops, for it had always been this way. The governors claimed that no commission, not even Loudoun’s, superseded their command in the colonies, unless it was “under the Great Seal [of George II].”⁷⁶ In many cases, Loudoun perceived, that these constitutional claims had “Rendered [the provincial regiments] almost totally useless.”⁷⁷ Hoping to unify the provincial regiments, Loudoun summoned a conference to meet at Philadelphia.

Consistent with his commitment to military cohesion, Loudoun called the southern governors to meet at Philadelphia to organize the 1757 campaign. Attending the conference were the governors of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina, and a representative of Georgia. Beginning on March 15, 1757, Loudoun unveiled his plan to deploy most of the British regulars to the northern front. Intelligence suggested that the French would attack South Carolina, either from sea, via Santa Domingo, or from Fort Toulouse in the region that would become Alabama, an important Creek trading post. The participants agreed that the southern frontier needed a large

⁷⁵ Loudoun’s analysis lacked the nuances that historical precision requires. For example, the state sent Regular troops into Virginia to quell Bacon’s Rebellion, and earlier conflicts with the French and Spanish had led to larger colonial mobilizations. Loudon to Hardy, Albany, November 21, 1756, *PHB*, I, 26-27; Harold E. Selesky, *War and Society in Colonial Connecticut* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 3-32.

⁷⁶ For a thorough analysis of the problems involved with recruitment in the colonies, see Alan Rogers, *Empire and Liberty: American Resistance to British Authority 1755-1763* (Berkeley: University Of California Press, 1974), 37-74; Loudon to Hardy, Albany, November 21, 1756, *PHB*, I, 26-27.

⁷⁷ Loudoun to Hardy, Albany, November 21, 1756, *PHB*, I, 26-27.

number of troops to defend it. But the troop commitments that Loudoun requested would prove to be far too ambitious: Pennsylvania 1400 troops, Maryland 500, and Virginia 1,000; combined, the Carolinas were to produce 900 troops. Of these, Pennsylvania would send only 200 to South Carolina, Virginia 400, and North Carolina 200, while South Carolina would commit 500.⁷⁸ Henry Bouquet's British regulars would defend Charlestown, South Carolina, for, as Loudoun explained, it was "of the greatest consequence."⁷⁹ Following the Philadelphia Conference, the Board of Trade urged the southern governors to request their assemblies and councils to allot money for the number of troops that their governors had committed to the southern theatre. Problematically, the Board of Trade did not account for the very real constraints faced by the colonial assemblies, namely that they lacked a bureaucratic infrastructure that could raise and finance standing armies. Loudoun and the Board of Trade had made a request that was doomed to failure.⁸⁰

Together, the southern governors committed their colonies to raise nearly 1,000 troops, far less than Loudoun had requested but still a substantial number. Loudoun decided to split the First Battalion of the Royal Americans between General John Stanwix at Carlisle, Pennsylvania and Bouquet at Charlestown. Stanwix would take command of several posts on the Pennsylvania frontier and would command the Maryland and Virginia troops. Suspecting a French offensive against the southern frontier, Bouquet's trek to Charlestown was a defensive measure. From Philadelphia, Bouquet and five

⁷⁸ Loudoun, Minutes of a Meeting with the Southern Governors, March 15, 1757, *PHB*, I, 91-93; Minutes taken at a meeting of the Governors, in *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, VII, (Harrisburg, 1851), 468-472.

⁷⁹ Loudoun to Lyttelton, New York, April 24, 1757, *PHB*, I, 94-95.

⁸⁰ Loudoun wrote only that a principle secretary of the king had made with request; it is assumed here that the directive came from the BTP. Loudoun to the Governors of the Southern Provinces, New York, May 5, 1757, *PHB*, I, 107. This analysis is derived from theories of political path dependence, see Ertam, *The Birth of Leviathan*, 26-28.

companies of the First Battalion sailed to Charlestown. He anticipated the speedy arrival of 200 Pennsylvania troops, 400 Virginians, and 200 more from North Carolina.

Loudoun urged the southern governors to keep their militias on alert and prepared to defend the porous frontiers. Loudoun organized the 1757 campaign in dialogue with the colonial governors at Philadelphia, as he understood the war to be a cooperative effort.⁸¹

From the beginning, the colonies fulfilled the obligations of the Philadelphia Conference with varying degrees of success. On May 23, Bouquet's Royal Americans sailed into the James River and docked at Williamsburg. Upon arriving, Bouquet tried his luck at recruiting but soon discovered that the Virginians were hesitant to embark on a defensive mission in another colony. Only half of the 400 Virginian soldiers that Governor Dinwiddie had promised were prepared to sail, for the others had not yet been recruited. Bouquet had not received any word about the Carolina soldiers, but he hoped optimistically that they had already arrived at Savannah, Georgia.⁸² On May 30, Governor Dobbs reported that the North Carolina Assembly had appropriated £5,300 to raise two provincial companies for service in South Carolina. Moreover, Dobbs was prepared to march a company to protect the Georgia frontier if Governor William Henry Lyttelton requested it.⁸³ Unlike all the other southern governors, Governor Lyttelton did not receive notice of the Philadelphia Conference until three days before Bouquet arrived at Charlestown. This discrepancy occurred because Lyttelton had not yet arrived at his post when the Philadelphia Conference took place. Nonetheless, Bouquet felt certain that Lyttelton's assembly would allocate money for the recruitment of 500 soldiers or more.⁸⁴

⁸¹ Loudoun to the Governors of the Southern Provinces, New York, May 5, 1757, *PHB*, I, 107.

⁸² Bouquet to Loudoun, Williamsburg, May 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 110.

⁸³ Dobbs to Loudoun, New Bern, May 30, 1757, *PHB*, I, 111-112.

⁸⁴ Bouquet to Stanwix, Charlestown, June 23, 1757, *PHB*, I, 121.

On June 15, 1757, the Colonel arrived at Charlestown on what he called “a very tedious passage.”⁸⁵ He reported troop strength of 5 regular companies, 200 Virginians, 200 Pennsylvanians, and 200 North Carolinians. Mounting intelligence indicated that the French were planning an attack by sea from Haiti, but the southern colonies still lagged behind the number of soldiers the Philadelphia Conference required them to commit.⁸⁶ As Bouquet explained, “You see Monsieur, that the 2000 men whom My Lord had destined for the security of the three southern provinces, are reduced for the present to the 600 men whom I have brought, and to the three independent companies.”⁸⁷

Over the summer of 1757, the southern colonies underwent a transition from confidence in their ability to raise troops to default on the Philadelphia Conference’s quotas. In June, Bouquet believed that the South Carolina Assembly was preparing a bill for raising troops.⁸⁸ But when this assembly finally allocated funds for raising troops, it disbanded the province’s existing 200 soldiers, leaving it with no provincial soldiers. In early July, Governor Lyttelton requested the Georgia Assembly to raise 700 troops, 200 more than the Philadelphia Conference had requested.⁸⁹ But by mid-August, Bouquet had sent 100 Virginian troops to Georgia to compensate for the scarcity of the Georgian troops. At the beginning of August, neither Pennsylvania nor Virginia had met their troop quotas. By the end of August, Governor Dobbs had finally raised his troop quota, but then the North Carolina Assembly withheld money to transport them to Charlestown.

⁸⁵ Bouquet to Hunter, Charlestown, June 23, 1757, *PHB*, I, 116.

⁸⁶ Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, June 1757, *PHB*, I, 116; Bouquet to Hunter, Charlestown, June 23, 1757, *PHB*, I, 116.

⁸⁷ Bouquet to Webb, Charlestown, June 23, 1757, *PHB*, I, 118.

⁸⁸ Bouquet to Dobbs, Charlestown June 30, 1757, *PHB*, I, 133. Only after the London Treasury granted Virginia and the Carolinas £50,000 did South Carolina begin to raise a sizeable number of troops. Bouquet to Dobbs, Charlestown, September 15, 1757, *PHB*, I, 198.

⁸⁹ Bouquet to Napier, Charlestown, July 13, 1757, *PHB*, I, 139.

This situation left the southern frontier exposed and forts undermanned.⁹⁰ Without modern fiscal bureaucracies, the colonial governments simply could not fulfill the quotas imposed by the Philadelphia Conference. The colonial assemblies, safeguarding their power of the purse, lacked the fiscal know-how to garner monies for troops that would defend neighboring colonies. Antiquated political infrastructures, not personal obstinacy, explained the inability of the southern colonies to provide for their mutual defense.⁹¹

By August of 1757, Bouquet recognized that the southern governors would default on quotas set at the Philadelphia Conference. Few of the promised troops had arrived, and South Carolina had enlisted only twelve new soldiers.⁹² As Indian raids increased on the Pennsylvania and Virginia frontiers, Bouquet understood that those colonies would retain their provincial troops for frontier defense.⁹³ But, lacking provincial troops, Bouquet's battalion would remain incomplete and the southern frontier would remain vulnerable to Indian raids.

Whereas Loudoun had earlier given a constitutional explanation for the colonies' lack of cooperation, Bouquet devised a solution that involved both constitutional and practical components. As Bouquet pondered why the Philadelphia Conference had failed, he began to suspect that the colonial governors wielded significantly less coercive power than wartime mobilization required. Thus, he proposed to Loudoun that Parliament should centralize provincial recruitment by extending something like the Militia Act to North America. Although Parliament never implemented a policy along

⁹⁰ Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 172; Bouquet to Napier, Charlestown, July 13, 1757, *PHB*, I, 139; Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, August 29, 1757, *PHB*, I, 179; Bouquet to Dobbs, Charlestown, August 6, 1757, *PHB*, I, 157; Bouquet to Webb, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 168-169.

⁹¹ For the origins of the assemblies' power of the purse, see Theodore Draper, *A Struggle for Power: The American Revolution* (New York: Times Books, 1996), 36-37.

⁹² Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 172-176.

⁹³ Bouquet to Dobbs, Charlestown, August 7, 1757, *PHB*, I, 160-162.

these lines, Bouquet began to develop a social theory that subordinated citizens, legislators, and property to the centralized control of the military, something like what Brian M. Drowning called military-bureaucratic absolutism.⁹⁴ Put another way, Bouquet wanted to end the legacy of disparate colonial governments and bring the American colonies into the orbit of the British fiscal-military state. Over the course of his operations in North America, Bouquet would flesh out this constitutional arrangement, which took on its fullest meaning west of the 1761 Proclamation Line—the state did not confirm this line until 1763. Meanwhile, Bouquet sent out regular recruiters into the colonies as a practical solution to the shortage of soldiers. On August 6, he sent recruiting officers Rudolph Bentinck and Ralph Phillips from Charlestown to North Carolina with orders to raise the troops that Governor Dobbs had not mustered.⁹⁵ Likewise, Bouquet sent lieutenants William Hay and Edward Jenkins on a recruiting mission in South Carolina.⁹⁶ For months, Bouquet had waited for the southern governors to fulfill the obligations of the Philadelphia Conference. Now, military necessity required Bouquet to complete those obligations or at least try.

On September 8, Loudoun reported that a long awaited battalion of Royal Highlanders under the command of Archibald Montgomery had arrived in North America. He pointed out that many “low country men” were mingled among the Highlanders. With the combined consent of Montgomery and the Scottish soldiers, Loudoun instructed Bouquet to employ the “low country men” to complete the ranks of the First Battalion. The so-called “Real Highlanders,” however, were to remain in the

⁹⁴ Drowning, *The Military Revolution and Political Change*, 10. Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 172-176.

⁹⁵ Bouquet, Recruiting Instructions to Bentinck & [Ralph] Phillips, Charlestown, August 6, 1757, *PHB*, I, 158-159.

⁹⁶ Bouquet, Directions to the Magistrates of South Carolina, August 6, 1757, *PHB*, I, 160.

same corps, presumably due to cultural considerations. The arrival of the Highlanders had temporarily resolved the problem of provincial recruitment. With this body of regulars, Bouquet had no immediate need for provincial troops.

The arrival of the Highlanders diminished the importance of the Philadelphia Conference. Bouquet relieved Governor Dobbs of his troop obligations, notifying him that the Highlanders would complete the First Battalion's ranks.⁹⁷ Loudoun instructed Bouquet to recall the Virginia provincials from Savannah, Georgia, and replace them with regulars. Accordingly, Bouquet reported to Virginia's governor Dinwiddie that the Royal Army had no further use for his troops in Savannah and ordered him to finance their transport back to Virginia.⁹⁸ Likewise, Loudoun instructed Bouquet to send the Pennsylvania provincials back home to defend their frontiers.⁹⁹ Loudoun called the inability of the governors to marshal troops "a Lucky disappointment," because Bouquet would have had to send them all back to their respective colonies.¹⁰⁰ But what seemed lucky in the short term proved in the long haul to be a systemic tension between American colonists and the Royal Army, which would soon reappear in quartering disputes and later in a requisitioning crisis.

Battling Constitutions and Governors

Historian Jack P. Greene has argued that the relationship between the British state and the American colonies is one of the major problems in Early American political history. For Greene, the major constitutional problem that the first British Empire faced

⁹⁷ Bouquet to Dobbs, Charlestown, September 10, 1757, *PHB*, I, 195.

⁹⁸ Bouquet to Dinwiddie, Charlestown, December 9, 1757, *PHB*, I, 251-252.

⁹⁹ Loudoun to Bouquet, New York, September 8, 1757, *PHB*, I, 185-188.

¹⁰⁰ Loudoun to Bouquet, New York, October 12, 1757, *PHB*, I, 205-207. For a broader analysis of the problems of colonial union, see Rogers, *Empire and Liberty*, 10-21.

was how to reconcile the power of the British state with the liberties of the colonies. The problem began in 1607 and only increased after 1707, when the Act of Union brought Scotland and Wales into a constitutional system whose peripheral members did not share economic equality with the center. Throughout the American colonial era, the problem remained constant: a strong central state was useful in unifying the vast, disconnected, and infinitely diverse empire; yet in unifying this empire, it seemed to threaten the autonomy and security of the American colonies.¹⁰¹

The English Civil War infinitely complicated this problem, because it muddled the relationship between the colonies and the central state. Whereas the king had chartered the American colonies, Parliament gained power equal to that held by the king after the Civil War. Meanwhile, royal authority over the colonies decreased, while Parliament allowed benign neglect to become customary or gain the status of constitutional law. Put simply, after 1688, neither king nor Parliament intervened significantly in colonial affairs. Combined, these factors had given the Americans virtual autonomy within the British imperial system by 1750. As Green explains it:

[S]overeignty resided not in an all-powerful Parliament but in the crown, the power of which had been considerably reduced over the previous century by specific ‘gains made over the years in the direction of self-determination’ by each representative body within the empire.¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ Jack P. Greene, *Peripheries and Center: Constitutional Development in the Extended Politics of the British Empire and the United States, 1607-1788* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1986), 3.

¹⁰² Greene, *Peripheries and Center*, 141; Thomas C. Grey, “Origins of the Unwritten Constitution: Fundamental Law in American Revolutionary Thought,” *Stanford Law Review* 39: 5 (May 1978), 843-850.

Bouquet's operations in North America illuminate this problem. Bouquet came to Charlestown, Philadelphia, and crossed the Monongahela River, armed with Parliamentary prerogative and the assumption that colonial governments willingly accepted subordination to the British Parliament. Thus, frictions erupted when Bouquet crossed paths with colonial governments and citizens. His relationships with these entities suggested ignorance or even apathy to what Greene has called customary practice, for he assumed the existence of Parliamentary power, where none had ever before been asserted.

The muddled location of sovereignty extended beyond the relationship between imperial center and colonial periphery to the internal dynamics of the colonial governments themselves. Historian Theodore Draper has explained the evolution of the relationship between royally appointed governors and the legislators over the course of the colonial period. What began as a system in which governors held preeminent authority underwent a transition that increased the legislators' authority. In a certain sense, this transition paralleled the broader transformation of British sovereignty in the wake of the English Civil War.¹⁰³ Indeed, the power of South Carolina's Commons House increased throughout the Seven Years' War period.¹⁰⁴ A protracted struggle for power between the Penn Family and Quakers characterized Pennsylvania's early political history. In the realm of military legislation, the Quaker faction, like South Carolina's Commons House, exerted significant power.¹⁰⁵ From Georgia to Pennsylvania, Bouquet did not favor either political faction or branch of government. Instead, he insisted that

¹⁰³ Draper, *A Struggle for Power*, 26-48.

¹⁰⁴ George Edward Frakes, *Laboratory for Liberty: The South Carolina Legislative Committee System, 1719-1776* (Lexington: The University of Kentucky Press, 1970), 83-87.

¹⁰⁵ Alan Tully, *Forming American Politics: Ideas, Interests, and Institutions in Colonial New York and Pennsylvania* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 257.

colonial governments existed only to further the state's goals for empire building. As for any notion of customary practice, Bouquet wrote of the necessity of "dispensing with ordinary forms...when one is forced to do it in order to save the state."¹⁰⁶

Governor Henry Ellis kept a tight rein on the Georgia Assembly, and this won Bouquet's immediate praise. The Colonel observed that Ellis showed more concern for imperial goals than the Assembly's rights and frontier expansion, which became the basis for friendship between these two royalists. Ellis proved his worth to Bouquet by inflexible management of legislators, providing for defense, and appropriately controlling colonists.

Henry Ellis arrived in Georgia to find that his predecessor, Governor Little, had allowed the Assembly too much authority and had not reined it into the empire. Almost as he docked, Ellis confronted an Assembly that he described as "foolish" and shortsighted. This initial clash was over the quartering of troops. The Assembly opposed Ellis's request for royal regiments to defend the colony, only because it did not want to quarter them. But Ellis was determined to augment Georgia's provincial regiments. As he put it in a letter to Bouquet:

I am much pleased with, & not less so with the intelligence you give me of more [Highlanders] being expected from Europe, & I cannot help flattering my self, that if the French really intend disturbing us, we shall be in a situation to disappoint them.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶ Bouquet, *Proposals Regarding Loudon's Instructions*, March 1757 *PHB*, I, 72-73.

¹⁰⁷ Henry Ellis to Wm. H. Lyttelton, Savannah, June 23, 1757, Lyttelton Papers, William Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Ellis believed that security superseded any customary privileges that Governor Little had afforded the Assembly. Ellis restructured what many historians regard as an antiquated or inefficient political arrangement and put himself at the head of government.¹⁰⁸

Henry Ellis arrived in Georgia to find the colony had only 500 standing soldiers and almost no defensive infrastructure. Bouquet augmented Ellis's provincials by ordering 100 Virginians to Georgia. To maintain these soldiers, Ellis prepared an Act for the quartering and ferrying of troops. Bouquet tried to secure royal financial backing for Ellis to increase the number of Georgia's rangers. Ellis worked to improve the colony's infrastructure by rebuilding its four stockade forts (see Chapter III). In the urban realm, Ellis observed that merchants inflated the prices of soldiers' provisions. To end wartime price hikes, he set the price that soldiers paid for provisions; only much later would the military adopt similar measures in the Indian trade. On the frontier, Ellis regulated settlement patterns, hoping to prevent Indian wars and hostage taking. In all, the policies that Ellis implemented paralleled the state's objectives for empire, so Bouquet pledged his "utmost" support to Georgia's governor.¹⁰⁹

Bouquet perceived that Governor Lyttelton managed the South Carolina government with much less authority than did his counterpart in Georgia. Although the South Carolina government paid ostensible loyalty to the British state, Bouquet found little evidence of it in its defensive posture. Lyttelton reported to the South Carolina

¹⁰⁸ For the so-called ancient origins of these institutions, see Downing, *The Military Revolution and Political Change*, 18-55.

¹⁰⁹ Ellis to Bouquet, Savannah, June 24, 1757, *PHB*, I, 130; Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, July 14, 1757, *PHB*, I, 141-142; Bouquet to Dobbs, Charlestown, August 6, 1757, *PHB*, I, 157; Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 172-176; Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 172-176; Ellis to Bouquet, Savannah, June 24, 1757, *PHB*, I, 130; Bouquet to Webb, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 168-169; Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 172-176; Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, July 14, 1757, *PHB*, I, 141-142; Edmond Atkin to Wm. H. Lyttelton, Winchester, Aug. 13, 1757, Lyttelton Papers; Henry Ellis to Wm. H. Lyttelton, Savannah, June 22, 1757, Lyttelton Papers.

Commons House that Loudoun had granted its petitions for defensive aide against the French threat. The governor begged the legislators to “convince the World that you are worthy Subject of a great & good Prince, who extends his royal Care to you in so conspicuous a Manner.” Lyttelton informed the Commons House that the Philadelphia Conference required South Carolina to raise a contingent of troops, and he asked the House to “exert all the Means which Providence has put into your Heads” to forward the good of the service.¹¹⁰ But Lyttelton proved unable to translate this rhetoric into actual military preparedness. On all fronts, Bouquet began to believe that the South Carolina government had failed in its imperial obligations, and this because Lyttelton did not exercise proper coercion over the legislative branch.

The Commons House controlled the colony’s purse strings. It held authority to originate revenue bills and more importantly, not to originate them. This authority in practice limited Lyttelton’s control over the Commons, regardless of however much he may have backed the empire. The Commons had blatantly demonstrated this authority in an earlier struggle with the royalist Governor James Glen. Glen had opposed the man the Commons nominated as a London agent, but the Commons eventually won by refusing to originate a bill to quarter the governor.¹¹¹ Apparently, the Commons found rendering royal officials homeless brought speedy compliance, for in 1757, the Commons again withdrew appropriations that had financed lodgings for Bouquet’s officers, fired their housekeeper, and threw Bouquet and his officers into the street.¹¹² As described below, this incident followed from a protracted struggle between Bouquet and the Commons

¹¹⁰ Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, 1755-1757, in Terry W. Lipscomb, ed. *The Colonial Records of South Carolina* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989), 470-471.

¹¹¹ Franks, *Laboratory of Liberty*, 92.

¹¹² Representation of the Field Officers Regarding Troops, Charlestown, December 2, 1757, *PHB*, I, 248-250.

House. Lyttelton, a royalist to the core, tried to mediate between the Commons and the Royal Army. But Bouquet interpreted Lyttelton's mediation to be lackadaisical at best, for the Commons had whipped him on the quartering question, had not implemented price controls, and had refused appropriations to raise troops.¹¹³ Therefore, Bouquet characterized Lyttelton as weak and irrational, for unlike Ellis, Lyttelton could not dictate to the legislative branch of his government. Bouquet's relationship with Pennsylvania's government approximated his dealings with the South Carolina Commons House.

Quartering the Troops

The quartering controversy illuminates two historiographical problems. First, from the perspective of military historians, the quartering controversy serves as a case study of one problem that arose from the ever-increasing size of European armies. Quartering troops was certainly inefficient and perhaps even chaotic, especially as it occurred in North America. Bouquet expressed the problem in a letter to his friend, Governor Ellis: "I shall always prefer to make two Campaigns, than to settle the Quarters in any of our American Towns."¹¹⁴ Indeed, the quartering of troops did itself resemble a social campaign to bring the colonies into line with the demands of early modern warfare, larger and larger armies being one characteristic of the military at this time. Second, colonists and their governments often articulated this social campaign in a constitutional framework. The quartering controversy illuminates the constitutional problems that emerged during the Seven Years' War. In the quartering debacle, Bouquet challenged

¹¹³ Bouquet to Dinwiddie, Charlestown, June 23, 1757, *PHB*, I, 123; Bouquet to Napier, Charlestown, July 13, 1757, *PHB*, I, 137; Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, October 16, 1757, *PHB*, I, 212-219.

¹¹⁴ Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, September 17, 1757, *PHB*, I, 200; Roberts, "The Military Revolution;" Parker, *The Military Revolution*.

colonial autonomy as military necessity required. Conversely, colonials harnessed the custom of benign neglect to dispute quartering. In the end, the quartering dispute was one element in a broader imperial campaign that undermined colonial autonomy for the sake of imperial expansion.

On countless occasions, Bouquet referred the South Carolina government to the Act of Parliament that “Specifys that the Soldiers shall receive gratis in their Quarters,” along with five pints of beer per-day, candles, vinegar, wood, and all necessary utensils “to dress and eat their Victuals.”¹¹⁵ Colonials insisted that this Act of Parliament contradicted their belief in royal sovereignty and Parliamentary neglect. If George II was sovereign, then the Act of Parliament did not obtain, at least not in Charlestown and Philadelphia—or so colonial legislators wanted to believe.¹¹⁶ In this context, the quartering controversy illuminates early constitutional tensions between periphery and center on the one hand, and the struggle for power between military personnel and colonial policymakers on the other.

On November 21, Loudoun reported that the 1756 campaign had ended, and he handed responsibility for quartering the troops to the governors of the Jerseys, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, and Pennsylvania. Additionally, he planned to winter three regiments in Nova Scotia.¹¹⁷ No sooner had Loudoun issued this order than the New York Assembly voiced its reluctance to quarter even 400 soldiers. Loudoun responded with wonder at how New Yorkers would cope when he would eventually thrust a completed battalion of 1,000 soldiers on them. He insisted that New York provide quarters, even in private homes if necessary. Did New Yorkers want to be exempt from

¹¹⁵ Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, March 1758, *PHB*, I, 326.

¹¹⁶ Greene, *Peripheries and Center*, 141.

¹¹⁷ Loudon to Hardy, Albany, November 21, 1756, *PHB*, I, 27.

this obligation? Even the people of “the first Fashion, in England, have not been exempted” from quartering troops in time of war, Loudoun explained.¹¹⁸

In autumn of 1756, Bouquet arrived at New York City from England. From New York, he traveled to Pennsylvania to execute his first assignment, quartering troops. News that Loudoun had given quartering orders reached Philadelphia only days before the Royal Army arrived. Bouquet was startled when Philadelphians greeted him with protest. One farmer attacked Bouquet as he entered Philadelphia. In Bouquet’s words:

[W]hile entering the city on horseback at the head of the battalion, a farmer rogue mounted on a nag lashed at me with his whip, which missed me, fortunately for him. He was at once beaten up and taken to prison where he still is, and I expect to get satisfaction for this attack on the complaints I made about it to the mayor. That is the third incident of this kind to occur. The outcome has not been pleasant for these scoundrels, and I hope that we shall succeed in inspiring them with fear of the red coats.¹¹⁹

Couched in this story of the nag riding rogue are three major implications of Bouquet’s efforts to quarter troops in Philadelphia. First, the “farmer rogue” symbolized many Philadelphians who on the one hand wanted military assistance but were totally unprepared to accept quartering and other social implications. Second, Bouquet indicated his willingness, albeit reluctant, to respect constitutional prerogatives, and allow colonial governments to handle civilian matters, in this case chastising insubordinate farmers. Finally, despite the second point, the long-term consequence of British military intervention was to increase British imperial authority, through “fear of the red coats.”

Captain Tulliken had already been in Philadelphia four days when Bouquet arrived on December 2, 1756. The winter was already cold, but Tulleken had made no headway in securing lodgings for the 1,000 troops. Finally, on December 8, the

¹¹⁸ Loudoun to Hardy, Albany, November 21, 1756, *PHB*, I, 29.

¹¹⁹ Bouquet to Young, Philadelphia, December 15, 1756, *PHB*, I, 37.

Pennsylvania Assembly passed a law that compelled Philadelphia's tavern owners to lodge 500 soldiers. The law was inadequate, because the Redcoats far outnumbered Philadelphia's taverns. But given the winter's severity, Bouquet made the best of what the assembly had granted and "put twenty men in taverns which do not have three beds." Instead of lodging officers in homes suited to their rank, the assembly relegated them to the same taverns intended for soldiers. To make matters worse, many tavern keepers lowered their signs and closed their doors for the winter, exempting themselves from quartering obligations. Although smallpox had claimed three soldiers and others were infected, the assembly refused to grant a military hospital. Bouquet murmured, "In such weather it is cruel to encounter such poor hosts."¹²⁰

Through December, Bouquet took practical measures to secure quarters for his soldiers. Finally, on December 15, he demanded that Governor Denny provide quarters for one battalion of the Royal Americans, including 3 field officers, 7 captains, and 1,000 soldiers. He ordered the governor to provide a hospital for his soldiers, whom smallpox increasingly threatened. Finally, he demanded quarters for General Webb and his *aide de camp*.¹²¹ In response, Philadelphia's sheriff and magistrates visited the soldiers' quarters, and their conclusions corroborated Bouquet's complaints. This committee found that 94 soldiers lay on straw and 73 others did not even have straw or covering. The houses used for quartering were too small for the number of soldiers being billeted. Additionally, there were no quarters suit for officers and insufficient quarters for new recruits.¹²²

¹²⁰ Bouquet to Young, Philadelphia, December 10, 1756, *PHB*, I, 32-33.

¹²¹ Bouquet, Demand for Quarters, Philadelphia, December 15, 1756, *PHB*, I, 38.

¹²² Ourry to Bouquet, Philadelphia, December 26, 1756, *PHB*, I, 42.

Benjamin Franklin read this committee's report and assured Bouquet that the colonial government would meet every demand that he had made on December 15.¹²³

Having received Franklin's reassurances, Bouquet penned an even more ambitious request. Foremost, Bouquet requested a larger hospital with treatment facilities. He wanted the colony to provide all the soldiers with beds stuffed with hay, straw, or chaff and covered with blankets. He requested pewter spoons, copper kettles, and many candles. The army required 50 chamber pots. In all, Bouquet's list of necessary items demonstrated that the Royal Army wanted the colonies to provide not only quarters and hospital care but also the ordinary necessities of daily life.¹²⁴

The Philadelphia quartering débâcle revealed Bouquet's ability to strike a delicate balance between what he perceived to be Pennsylvania's weak colonial government and military necessity. Consistent with English custom, Bouquet assumed authority to lodge soldiers "willy nilly (*sic*) in private homes." He speculated that to commandeer all Philadelphia's homes and taverns would avert what seemed to be an impending crisis. But commandeering civilian property required the governor's consent, which circumscribed any willy-nilly military coercion.¹²⁵ Bouquet explained this dilemma:

Everything most abominable that nature has produced, and everything most detestable that corruption can add to it, such are the honest inhabitants of this province [Pennsylvania]. A weak government puts the capstone on their insolence, and if order is not established there, the authority of the King and his Parliament will soon be no longer recognized.

¹²³ Franklin to Bouquet, Philadelphia, December 26, 1756, *PHB*, I, 43.

¹²⁴ Bouquet, Memorandum, Philadelphia, December 26, 1756, *PHB*, I, 44-45.

¹²⁵ Bouquet to Young, Philadelphia, December 10, 1756, *PHB*, I, 32-33; Bouquet to Young, December 15, 1756, Philadelphia, *PHB*, I, 37.

Thus, instead of a crass militarization of society, Bouquet took the practical step of maneuvering through constitutional muddles in order to secure shelters, then hospitals, and finally chamber pots for 1,000 soldiers. Eventually, he hoped to bring Pennsylvania under “the authority of the King and his Parliament,” but he won the quartering crisis.¹²⁶ Next, Bouquet would implement in South Carolina what he had learned in Philadelphia.

Spring arrived and royalist missions obliged both Bouquet and Franklin to depart from Philadelphia. Loudoun directed Bouquet to use the Philadelphia quartering model as a prototype for dealing with the South Carolina government. Bouquet was to demand quarters and a hospital, both equipped to handle 1,000 soldiers. Although he should always act with civility and prudence, Bouquet held final authority in military affairs and operated under the Acts of Parliament.¹²⁷ Whereas Bouquet took with him an imperialist quartering model, Franklin’s was a lobbying mission to bring Pennsylvania under royal, instead of proprietary control. Franklin wrote Bouquet:

How happy are the Folks in Heaven, who, tis said, have nothing to do, but to talk with one another except now and then a little Singing & Drinking of Aqua Vitae. We are going different ways, & perhaps may never meet, till we meet there. I pity you for the hot summer you must first undergo in Charlestown.

Indeed, they never met again, and Bouquet hated the Carolina summer. But, whereas Bouquet would succeed in imposing an imperialist-quartering model on South Carolina, Franklin would not succeed in ending proprietary control of Pennsylvania.¹²⁸

At the Philadelphia Conference, Loudoun had won a commitment from the southern governors to quarter all the royal troops sent to their provinces.¹²⁹ In April,

¹²⁶ Bouquet to Young, Philadelphia, December 15, 1756, *PHB*, I, 37.

¹²⁷ Loudoun, Instructions to Bouquet, March 1757, *PHB*, I, 65-66; Loudon, Orders to Bouquet, New York, April 24, *PHB*, I, 1757, 89.

¹²⁸ Edmund S. Morgan, *Benjamin Franklin*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 104-144.

Loudoun requested Governor Lyttelton to make good on this commitment by quartering the regulars in Charlestown. Believing South Carolina to be a wealthy colony, Loudoun expected Lyttelton to maintain Bouquet's soldiers at the colony's expense.¹³⁰

Bouquet and the regulars arrived at Charlestown on June 23, 1757. He had left two soldiers behind, due to a smallpox infection, but two others acquired the disease while at sea. Upon their arrival, fear of a smallpox outbreak so unraveled the Charlestown inhabitants that they forbade Bouquet's five companies to enter the city. Bouquet did not dispute this, for he found the countryside to be cooler and healthier. Even so, Bouquet reported that Charlestown, like Philadelphia, lacked any preparedness for his arrival, lacked quarters, and had not even begun constructing barracks. As in Philadelphia, he lacked straw beds and similar necessities. But, initially, Bouquet believed that the South Carolinians were more willing than the Philadelphians had been to accommodate the regulars. Indeed, upon Bouquet's arrival, Governor Lyttelton called his legislators into session to begin military appropriations.¹³¹ Soon, however, Bouquet would recall the Philadelphians with fondness compared to Lyttelton's government.

Bouquet spent most of the 1757 summer complaining about humidity and rebuilding South Carolina's fortification system (see Chapter III). Until the South Carolina Commons House scaled down Bouquet's barrack design, quartering had been a peripheral concern. Nonetheless, Bouquet had requested the construction of barracks upon his arrival in Charlestown. Barracks would not only remedy the inconvenience of billeting soldiers in homes and taverns but they would also increase officers' oversight.

¹²⁹ Loudoun, Minutes of a Meeting with the Southern Governors, March 15, 1757, *PHB*, I, 91-93.

¹³⁰ Loudon to Lyttelton, New York, April 24, 1757, *PHB*, I, 95.

¹³¹ Bouquet to Stanwix, Charlestown, June 23, 1757, *PHB*, I, 121-122; Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, June 23, 1757, *PHB*, I, 124.

On June 27, the Commons House denied a bill to defray the cost of raising and clothing 500 regulars, plus 200 provincials for the defense of the Carolinas.¹³² On July 6, the Commons voted £4,000 to construct plain and simple single-story barracks, instead of two-story structures.¹³³ These plans called for wooden floors and ceilings, all of which Bouquet found to be detestable. New York had constructed two-story brick barracks “with very good rooms, with chimneys and window,” and included beds, tables, benches, and cooking utensils. Even Philadelphia had provided the soldiers blankets, pillows, beer, candles, and salt. Now, Bouquet insisted that South Carolina make available amenities equal to those provided by Philadelphia and New York. The Commons did not understand the “incontestable right of the King’s troops for lodgings,” but Bouquet wished they would soon learn about it. More practically, Bouquet suggested that the colony use the already appropriated £4,000 to begin constructing barracks, along the lines he had already specified. He threatened to quarter the remaining troops elsewhere—perhaps in private homes.¹³⁴

Bouquets tolerated his camp on the outskirts of Charlestown, but only while he anticipated the completion of two-story barracks. Initially, wrangling between Bouquet and the Commons had delayed the construction of barracks. Then, instead of building barracks for 1,000 men, the legislators had appropriated £4,000 to construct the style of barracks Bouquet wanted but only for 600 soldiers. As matters worsened, the dreaded rainy season came before any barracks were completed, forcing Bouquet to billet the

¹³² Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, June 27, 1757, 477.

¹³³ Debate on appropriations, Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, July 6, 1757, 493.

¹³⁴ It is notable that the very amenities that Bouquet demanded for the troops—beer, candles, and salt, were the very things on which the state levied the Excise Tax. And, the state financed war from the profit it garnered from the Excise tax. Thus, by demanding these amenities, Bouquet was, in a very small part, compelling the colonies to finance the war effort. Bouquet, Memorandum on Construction of the Barracks at Charlestown, Charlestown, July 21, 1757, *PHB*, I, 150-151; Brewer, *The Sinews of Power*, 30-134.

regulars in Charlestown. In short, this quarrel between Bouquet and the Commons delayed the transition from camp to barrack life, resulting in soldiers being “very badly housed.” Still, Bouquet anticipated the completion of the barracks by November 1.¹³⁵

This quarrel over barracks illuminates a broader fight between the Commons House and Royal Army for hegemony. Both Bouquet’s correspondence and the *Commons House Journal* indicate that this fight originated from the legislators’ power of the purse, which subordinated Bouquet’s demands to review. Bouquet had petitioned for entirely new barracks for all the troops. But on July 6, the Commons had appropriated only £4000. Instead of relying on paper currency or taxation, the Commons decided to borrow the money “from any Fund in the Public Treasury” to finance the barracks, indicating that this project warranted no special expenditure. Unlike New York’s brick barracks, the Commons decided to construct these from “Pine Timber and Boards.” The Commons wanted this structure to house the existing soldiers and those still anticipated.¹³⁶ But Bouquet insisted that the proposed structure would accommodate only 500 soldiers, so the Commons proposed lodging 200 soldiers in preexisting barracks. Bouquet complained that the South Carolinians saw no distinction between the Royal Army and their slaves. As he put it, “[T]hey’re extremely pleased to have soldiers to protect their Plantations, but will feel no inconveniences from them making no great difference between a soldier & a Negro.” This situation suggested that Lyttelton needed to bring the Commons House into line with imperial goals.¹³⁷

¹³⁵ Bouquet to Webb, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 169; Bouquet to Stanwix, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 170.

¹³⁶ Debate on building barracks, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly*, July 6, 1757, 493.

¹³⁷ For Bouquet’s criticism of the South Carolina governments, see Bouquet to Stanwix, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 170; Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 172. T.H. Breen has argued that the colonies displays of elaborate wealth were overstated. Nonetheless, those displays led British military officials to believe that the colonist were far wealthier than they really

As Bouquet's relations with the South Carolina legislators deteriorated, Georgia seemed more malleable to military demands. With a looming French threat, Governor Ellis requested Bouquet to dispatch 100 soldiers to the Georgia coast. Bouquet committed the troops on condition that the colony would provide their shelter and subsistence. But if Georgia could not meet this expense, then Bouquet made the unprecedented offer to finance this expedition with royal monies.¹³⁸ Remarkably, Governor Ellis compelled the Georgia Assembly to muster appropriations to accommodate the 100 Virginia soldiers that Bouquet sent to defend Georgia. Ellis reported that he had prepared an act for the ferrying and quartering of soldiers. Knowing that Georgia traders had artificially inflated the price of goods, Ellis fixed the price of military supplies.¹³⁹ In late August, Bouquet dispatched 100 Virginia provincials under the command of Lieutenant Walter Steuart for Ellis to deploy as necessary. Whereas Lyttelton's legislators had drawn the purse strings closed on the Royal Army, Ellis subordinated the Georgia legislators to military necessity, regulated the economy, and secured quarters before the Virginians arrived. Thus, Bouquet gave Ellis considerable control over the Virginian soldiers and promised him future military assistance.¹⁴⁰

No sooner had Bouquet dispatched the Virginians to Georgia, than he received word that Loudoun had destined a battalion of Highlanders to Charlestown. Not only would the Highlanders nullify the Philadelphia Conference, but also this large army

were. The South Carolinians seem to have convinced Bouquet that they had fiscal resources to construct barracks, which led Bouquet to demand far greater appropriations than the colonists were willing to pay. See *The Marketplace of Revolution: How Consumer Politics Shaped American Independence*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), chapter 1.

¹³⁸ Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, July 14, 1757, *PHB*, I, 141-142.

¹³⁹ Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 172-176; Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, August 26, 1757, *PHB*, I, 177.

¹⁴⁰ Bouquet to Dobbs, Charlestown, August 6, 1757, *PHB*, I, 157; Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, August 26, 1757, *PHB*, I, 177.

would increase tensions with the South Carolina government. As the Highlanders neared, Bouquet became increasingly concerned about the quartering crisis. If the Commons could not quarter Bouquet's troops, then how would they cope with 1,000 Highlanders? As Bouquet put the problem, "We expect them daily & shall have a great deal of Trouble to quarter them conveniently."¹⁴¹ Early September, Loudoun intervened in South Carolina affairs and instructed Lyttelton to have quarters prepared for the Highlanders upon their arrival. Loudoun insisted that the Highlanders "will find this [quarters] an essential Article." If the colony did not care for those "raw men," who were arriving from a cold climate, then Loudoun feared that many might die.¹⁴² The influx of a massive army on so small a government illuminates two important aspects about quartering: disease outbreak and prevention of desertion.

Early in September, the Highlanders arrived at Charlestown, and without proper quarters, soldiers became more vulnerable to disease.¹⁴³ No sooner had they docked than a disease that had beset the Carolinas left many of the once healthy Highlanders debilitated. Despite Loudoun's orders, Bouquet reported that the colony had not quartered the Highlanders and this compounded the problem of disease.¹⁴⁴ When Bouquet inquired about the government's obligations to the Highlanders, Loudoun insisted that the colony remained obliged to quarter them. Moreover, the mere construction of barracks did not fulfill the quartering obligation, because barracks were

¹⁴¹ Bouquet to Webb, Charlestown, August 29, 1757, *PHB*, I, 180.

¹⁴² Loudoun to Bouquet, New York, September 8, 1757, *PHB*, I, 185-188.

¹⁴³ Bouquet to Webb, Charlestown, September 10, 1757, *PHB*, I, 196.

¹⁴⁴ For the quartering crisis, see Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, September 17, 1757, *PHB*, I, 200. For the problem of disease, see Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, September 10, 1757, *PHB*, I, 196.

useless without bedding, furniture, utensils, candles, and a firing range.¹⁴⁵ Bouquet understood the linkage between amenities and hospitals to preserving soldiers' health.

Irregular amenities and barracks not only increased instances of disease but also increased desertion. Early on, Bouquet had requested the Carolina legislators to construct two-story barracks, along the lines of New York's. This design allowed each officer to quarter all the soldiers under his command on a single floor, maximizing the officer's supervision and limiting construction costs. As Bouquet put it, two-story barracks "give the officers better facilities for maintaining correct discipline."¹⁴⁶ Still, the legislators had not only rejected this blueprint but also refused to shelter hundreds of soldiers. Bouquet lamented that quartering crisis had already led to increased desertions.¹⁴⁷

Bouquet pressed both Lyttelton and the Commons House to resolve the quartering crisis, but to "no other Effect yet than to put Sometimes People out of humor." Eventually, Lyttelton made the quartering crisis the legislature's highest priority, but the colony lacked materials to complete construction. Meanwhile, soldiers were scattered about Charlestown. Bouquet complained that Charlestown's taverns were foul and scarce. As he put it, "[I]f the men had been divided among the Inhabitants till other Quarters could have been provided...No body would have Suffered much...and we Should naturally have Saved [some] of the men lost by death, or desertion." Bouquet had divided the regulars between taverns and barracks, but this was the only group not billeted in private homes. Indeed, he had quartered hundreds of Highlanders in homes

¹⁴⁵ Loudoun to Bouquet, New York, October 12, 1757, *PHB*, I, 205-207.

¹⁴⁶ Bouquet, Memorandum on Construction of the Barracks at Charlestown, Charlestown, July 21, 1757, *PHB*, I, 150.

¹⁴⁷ In correspondence with Hunter, Bouquet linked increased desertion to lack of proper barracks. See Bouquet to Hunter, Charlestown, October 16, 1757, *PHB*, I, 209-210. Bouquet noted that desertion had become an increased problem. See Bouquet to Dobbs, September 29, 1757, *PHB*, I, 202-203.

and store houses and 500 others in barracks. It is doubtful that ordinary citizens perceived any difference between an unwelcome Highlander and English soldiers—both appeared to be British intruders. Barracks were often unfurnished and unsanitary. For instance, the barracked Highlanders had retrieved beds from their ship, only to discover those beds to be filthy, rotten, and ridden with vermin.¹⁴⁸ These conditions bred disease and desertion. Bouquet lamented, “Our men are not yet quarter’d, I have had more trouble about it here, than we had at Philadelphia...I am heartily tired of these eternal Disputes, which makes the Service so disagreeable in America.”¹⁴⁹

Predictably, the quartering crisis led to increasingly high instances of death and desertion. The Highlanders had lost so many soldiers to death and desertion that Montgomery began drafting supernumeraries from his own battalion to replenish the ranks.¹⁵⁰ Early in October, Loudoun ordered Bouquet to draft all of the Highlanders’ surplus soldiers into the regulars to compensate for deserters. He promised to give these recruits arms and uniforms. But Bouquet could not recruit these soldiers, because Montgomery had already drafted them all.¹⁵¹ Lacking proper barracks, fresh provisions and rum became Bouquet’s primary weapons against death and desertion.¹⁵²

A fight over furniture moved Bouquet’s dealings with the South Carolina government beyond redemption. On October 21, the Commons House authorized the governor to construct barracks for 1,000 men. Additionally, it authorized repairs to an old house that Virginian soldiers had occupied, which would now become officers’

¹⁴⁸ Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, October 16, 1757, *PHB*, I, 212-219.

¹⁴⁹ Bouquet to Stanwix, Charlestown, October 18, 1757, *PHB*, I, 222; Field Officers, Representation of the Field Officers Regarding Troops, Charlestown, December 2, 1757, *PHB*, I, 248.

¹⁵⁰ Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, October 16, 1757, *PHB*, I, 212-219.

¹⁵¹ Bouquet to Stanwix, Charlestown, October 18, 1757, *PHB*, I, 221-222.

¹⁵² Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, October 16, 1757, *PHB*, I, 212-219.

quarters. Problematically, the Commons did not appropriate funds for furniture, delaying this until a future meeting. Bouquet believed barracks were useless without furniture. Already, some soldiers were sleeping on the “Ground in a Church half build [built],” and Bouquet refused to replicate this model in the new barracks. In that light, Bouquet forbade the legislators to recess until they had given an answer on furniture. Under military pressure, the legislators’ response was predictable, and they refused furniture and other amenities. Finally, Bouquet requested blankets for infirmed Highlanders, as even the Carolinians were “obliged to give Blankets to their Slaves.” Still, no blankets were forthcoming. Lyttelton assured that the Commons would soon grant these demands, but Bouquet’s relationship with this government had now ruptured.¹⁵³ Bouquet was prepared to leave South Carolina’s defense to anyone but himself. The Swiss Colonel wrote to Stanwix, his counterpart in Pennsylvania:

There is no Danger that we shall fall in Love with South Carolina, if we had any Inclination that Way, their genteel Proceedings with us would soon cure us of it. You may therefore depend upon our Readiness & Willingness to join you at any Time.¹⁵⁴

The Commons House met again on December 1 and took up Bouquet’s request for necessary items. Contrary to Lyttelton’s assurances, the Commons refused a hospital for the regulars. As for firewood, it ordered two cords per-week for every 100 soldiers; this was not enough for eight soldiers. If the colony’s commissioners provided additional firewood, then they would also incur the bill. It allotted approximately one blanket for

¹⁵³ Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, October 21, 1757, *PHB*, I, 223-224.

¹⁵⁴ Bouquet to Stanwix, Charlestown, October 27, 1757, *PHB*, I, 230.

every two men.¹⁵⁵ Worst still, these legislators ousted the field officers from the quarters it had allotted them on October 21. It fired the officers' housekeepers and ordered them to tell the officers to abandon their quarters. In response, Bouquet and his officers resolved that the Commons House must provide an entire forest, from which the soldiers could glean wood. They resolved that Lyttelton must order the legislators to provide one blanket per soldier, instead of obliging two soldiers to cuddle in a single blanket. Defying the legislators, Bouquet and his officers refused to abandon their quarters. Bouquet's disgust increased, as he explained, "I am heartily tired of America & if I can once get rid of it, no Consideration in the World, would make me come again."¹⁵⁶

Lyttelton believed that Bouquet had hijacked his effort to bring the Commons House into compliance with the army's demands. The Governor had implored the legislators to grant *all* Bouquet's requests, and he had felt confident that it would comply. But before they had reconvened, Bouquet had met with their speaker and reduced his demands to only quarters and a single blanket for every soldier. Moreover, Bouquet gave a threefold ultimatum: If the colony could not afford the Royal Army, then it should ask Loudoun to recall it; or second, request financial aid from the Crown; or finally, should make temporary provisions until Loudoun could resolve this crisis. Lyttelton asserted that Bouquet had given this ultimatum as a backhanded measure to have the Highlanders recalled, consolidate his command, and ultimately to gain military control over the

¹⁵⁵ Doyley to Bouquet, Charlestown, December 2, 1757, *PHB*, I, 246; Field Officers, Representation of the Field Officers Regarding Troops, Charlestown, December 2, 1757, *PHB*, I, 249. It is noteworthy that the soldiers believed this order to be ridiculous. As soon as they received their allotted portion of firewood, they burned all of it. See Commissioners to Lyttelton, Complaint Regarding Troops, Charlestown, December 22, 1757, *PHB*, I, 261-262.

¹⁵⁶ Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, December 10, 1757, *PHB*, I, 253. For Bouquet's refusal to surrender the officers' quarters, see Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, December 10, 1757, *PHB*, I, 259.

colony.¹⁵⁷ Absolutely no evidence corroborates Lyttelton's accusation, but the point is clear: No constitutional precedent defined the boundaries between a British military commander and a governor. Amid this muddle, Bouquet and Lyttelton fought to control legislative appropriations, a fight that did not account for the colony's actual fiscal limitations.¹⁵⁸ Although Bouquet did not want to militarize South Carolina, he would militarize the Ohio Territory and suggest a similar policy for Pennsylvania (Chapter III).

Loudoun advised Bouquet to proceed with a twofold strategy to bring the Commons House into line with military necessity. On the one hand, he advised Bouquet to act with conciliation. "I woul'd have you act very Tenderly in it, and must beg that on all occasions you will take care as far as Possible, to keep up that good Correspondence between You and Governor Lyttelton."¹⁵⁹ On the other hand, if conciliation collapsed, then Loudoun permitted Bouquet to quarter the troops forcibly. As Loudoun put it,

Therefore, tis my Orders, that in Case the Assembly have continued obstinate in not furnishing the Barracks with every Requisite of Barracks, that you directly demand Quarters in Town, for as many of the Troops as you find necessary, either for the Safety of the Place or for the general Service in Carrying on the War.

Thus, to the extent that conciliation succeeded, Loudoun allowed the colonial government to retain some legislative power, but military necessity allowed Bouquet to

¹⁵⁷ Lyttelton to Loudoun, Charlestown, December 10, 1757, *PHB*, I, 254-256. In his correspondence with Loudoun, Bouquet actually complemented Lyttelton's efforts to steer the Assembly toward accepting his demand. Bouquet and Lyttelton represented their relationship in very different terms, and it is not clear how to resolve this contradiction. For Bouquet's quite positive representation of Lyttelton, see Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, December 10, 1757, *PHB*, I, 259.

¹⁵⁸ Bouquet to Lyttelton, Charlestown, February 28, 1758, *PHB*, I, 313; Greene, *Peripheries and Center*, 141; Grey, "Origins of the Unwritten Constitution," 843-850.

¹⁵⁹ Loudoun to Bouquet, New York, December 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 265.

override this customary chain of command.¹⁶⁰ Loudoun recalled that the Royal Army had experienced similar quartering difficulties in both New York and Philadelphia. In both cities, the king's ministers had approved the army's quartering policy, and Loudoun believed that such would be the case in South Carolina as well.¹⁶¹ Even so, Bouquet's threats failed to motivate the colony to complete new quarters by the spring of 1757. Instead, the Commons House transformed Bouquet's demand for quarters into a display of legislative power of the purse.¹⁶²

Both Bouquet and Loudoun asked why, if the American colonists had requested British military assistance, then had they been completely unprepared to deal with a massive military influx. Loudoun framed the problem like this:

Tis very extraordinary, that after the people of that province were sensible of the Danger they were in from their Neighbors, and did apply for Troops for their Defence, that as soon as they arrive, there shoud (*sic*) Deny them the Common Necessaries of Life, which they are by Law bound to furnish them, and wou'd leave them to perish for the Winter, and not only occasion the Death of so many of their fellow Subjects.¹⁶³

This question raised a more central problem: how could the limited fiscal resources of small, colonial governments sustain a massive army? Military personnel insisted that Parliament had always required provincial governments to quarter troops, making the question almost unwarranted. But for the South Carolina government, the question awakened a broader constitutional problem that had fiscal overtones. On the one hand,

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, 268.

¹⁶¹ Ibid, 266-269.

¹⁶² Franks, *Laboratory for Liberty*, 92.

¹⁶³ Loudoun to Bouquet, New York, December 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 268.

the legislators wanted to retain autonomy and power of the purse, which ensured them some control over armies and governors. On the other hand, the Commons exercised its fiscal powers by limiting appropriations and paper money, consequently putting a stranglehold on military expenditures.¹⁶⁴ Concretely, the South Carolina treasury had less money than Bouquet's barrack project required. The crux of the quartering crisis laid in the Commons House's vulnerable autonomy, conservative fiscal policy, and perhaps lack of revenue. To transcend these problems, Bouquet asserted military authority in places customarily reserved to the Commons House, creating tension between the army and colony.¹⁶⁵

Bouquet departed from South Carolina in March 1758. He left behind a memorandum that ordered the colonial government to bend to military demand, really highlighting all the tensions that had emerged over the past year. For instance, Bouquet ordered the colonial government to provide quarters and a hospital, provision soldiers, place provincial soldiers on the same pay scale as royal troops, and finally to better regulate commercial and transport activity.¹⁶⁶ On this note, the Colonel departed from South Carolina, but he would later implement many of these regulations in the trans-Allegheny zone. Meanwhile, Bouquet sailed back to New York City, where he arrived on April 19, 1758. Four companies of royal soldiers sailed with him, the fifth arriving a few days later. Bouquet felt happy to return to New York City and welcomed the

¹⁶⁴ Draper, *Struggle for Power*, 36-41.

¹⁶⁵ Brewer, *Sinews of Power*; Franks, *Laboratory for Liberty*.

¹⁶⁶ Bouquet, Memorandum, Charlestown, March 1758, *PHB*, I, 327-330.

opportunity to serve as ground commander in the Forbes Campaign. As he put it, “No assignment could have been more agreeable to me.”¹⁶⁷

Requisitioning

Bouquet served as General John Forbes’s field commander in the 1758 Forbes Expedition. In Pennsylvania, Bouquet’s operations differed significantly from his stint in South Carolina, where he had dealt primarily with the colonial government. Now, Bouquet would organize the military arm that forged territorial acquisition, which heavily relied on wagons, horses, and other local resources. Just as in South Carolina, Bouquet would harness Parliamentary statute to justify requisitioning these resources.¹⁶⁸ But, now Bouquet would find himself in direct confrontation with colonial society. Now, unlike in South Carolina, the Pennsylvania government stood in the background of Bouquet’s often tumultuous relationship with backcountry constables and farmers. The South Carolina Commons House had always remained in one place, but now Pennsylvania farmers could evade Bouquet’s demands by concealing their coveted resources. Military historians such as Geoffrey Parker have pointed out that early modern armies often exploited local resources in the usual course of warfare, but these armies rarely faced constitutional constraints.¹⁶⁹ What follows explores the constitutional débâcle that arose when Bouquet requisitioned Pennsylvanians’ wagons to haul artillery, hay, and provisions from Berks, Lancaster, and York counties to military posts in western Pennsylvania.

¹⁶⁷ Bouquet to Forbes, New York, April 23, 1758, *PHB*, I, 332-333. For Bouquet’s service in the Forbes Expedition, see Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 268-269.

¹⁶⁸ P. J. Marshall, *The Making and Unmaking of Empires: Britain, India, and America c.1750-1783* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 115-118; Rogers, *Empire and Liberty*, 51-58.

¹⁶⁹ Parker, *The Military Revolution*, 125.

British military personnel claimed that Parliamentary statute sanctioned the requisitioning of wagons and other resources, because warfare was impossible without these.¹⁷⁰ However, Pennsylvanians believed that military coercion violated what historian Jack P. Greene has identified as a customary law that formed an emerging British imperial constitution. As Greene explained this constitution:

[S]overeignty resided not in an all-powerful Parliament but in the crown, the power of which had been considerably reduced over the previous century by specific 'gains made over the years in the direction of self-determination' by each representative body within the empire.¹⁷¹

Herein lays the crux of this muddled legal situation: the constitutional justification that backcountry farmers offered for not supplying the military clashed against an increasingly assertive Parliament and Royal Army. Although the colonial government did not challenge Parliamentary authority outright, the actual legal situation pointed in the direction of a constitutional showdown. In the short term, Edward Shippen and other brokers settled delicate and often muddled resolutions to these conflicts. Even so, these inefficiencies convinced Bouquet that Europe's burgeoning administrative bureaucracies were preferable to participatory governance, especially when dealing with Native Americans.

Back in 1757, York County, Pennsylvania, the Royal Army requisitioned a horse that soon died. Often called impressment, requisitioning was a legal procedure that

¹⁷⁰ For Bouquet's reliance on Parliamentary statute, see, for example, Bouquet, *Proposals Regarding Loudon's Instructions*, March 1757, *PHB*, I, 72-76; Alan Rogers, *Empire and Liberty: American Resistance to British Authority, 1755-1763* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974).

¹⁷¹ Greene, *Peripheries and Center*, 141; Grey, "Origins of the Unwritten Constitution," 843-850.

compelled a citizen to contract a beast, wagon, or some other material to the army. Impressed beasts often died. But this particular death was unusual for two reasons. First, the army failed to reimburse the owner as required by the requisitioning contract, causing local resentment. And second, this particular case drew public attention and brought the military into disrepute. Thus, Bouquet began requisitioning horses and wagons for the Forbes Expedition, amid the social outcry caused by this dead horse. The Colonel tried to placate the populace by reimbursing the owner of the dead horse.¹⁷²

Combined, York County farmers owned almost 500 wagons. But given the dead horse incident, few farmers were willing to contract horses and wagons for military service. Therefore, Bouquet followed a trusted American military tradition and chose “a man of Publick Spirit, and Zealous for the Good of the Service, and the Prosperity of his Country” to rally his fellow citizens to the army’s project. In other words, the army looked for outstanding citizens to broker between itself and their local communities. In the Forbes Expedition, Edward Shippen was the primary person who fulfilled this role. Meanwhile, Colonel Armstrong recommended George Stevenson to resolve the dead horse incident, because the local community respected him. Hopefully, Stevenson could convince his fellow citizens to cooperate with the army, support its strategy, and secure Pennsylvania from French and Indian raids. More specifically, “I hope that for a Dead Horse, the People of York County, will not Distress the Service in such urging Circumstances, and Load themselves with the Consequences of such undutiful Behaviour

¹⁷² Bouquet to Stevenson, June 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 27-29.

towards their King and Country.” To that end, Bouquet commissioned Stevenson to contract 60 wagons from York County.¹⁷³

The Forbes Expedition began in the spring of 1758 and culminated in the French withdraw from Fort Duquesne that autumn. Over these months, Bouquet coordinated an enterprise that contracted wagons to haul the artillery, provisions, and tools required for a protracted mission into the Allegheny Mountains. Contractors received certificates that promised payment for the term of use and complete reimbursement for destroyed wagons. The burden of maintaining the contracts and tracking the wagons resided in the army, not in the contractor.¹⁷⁴ Pennsylvanian farmers were essential to this enterprise, for the army needed their wagons to haul materiel, such as provisions, tents, tools, and Indian goods. Bouquet enlisted constables and magistrates to broker between the Royal Army and local farmers. Just as Little Carpenter brokered Indian alliances, so too did Bouquet enlist Edward Shippen and among others to mediate between colonists and the army.¹⁷⁵ Decades before the Revolutionary War, these brokers stood in an ever-widening gulf between customary practice and the increasing weight of Parliamentary authority.

Bouquet’s first experience of requisitioning came at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, in late May 1758. For some days, he had attempted to persuade farmers to voluntarily contract wagons to the army. Failing that, he had ordered local magistrates to implement

¹⁷³ Bouquet to Stevenson, Carlisle, June 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 27-29. For the relationship between provincial officers and soldiers, see Fred Anderson, *A Peoples’ Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years’ War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 26-60; Selesky, *War and Society*, 3-32.

¹⁷⁴ For the use of wagons see, Bouquet to Forbes, Letter to the General, September 4, 1758, Donald H. Kent, Louis M. Waddell, Autumn L. Leonard, Louis M. Waddell, John L. Tottenham, eds., *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, II, hereafter: *PHB* II (Harrisburg, PA: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum, 1976), 471.

¹⁷⁵ Fred Anderson is chiefly concerned with Forbes’s alliance with Native Americans. *The Crucible of War: The Seven Years’ War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 268-269. This work examines the construction of the Forbes Expedition from the perspective of the field commander, Henry Bouquet.

Governor Denny's impressment order, but they refused. Indicative of things to come, Bouquet summarized the situation in a letter to Loudoun:

The civil authority is so completely annihilated in this county—that after all the gestures that I made over four days, at the moment, I have only been able to obtain eight chariots (wagons). The farmers are making fun of the orders of the sheriff and the constables. Yesterday evening I wrote my request to the Magistrates, requesting to have the Press Warrants. You will find their response enclosed.

I summoned them [the magistrates], and insisted that they give the good warrants that conform to the last act of the assembly, instead of prayers and of exhortation. They requested time for deliberation, and after having thought it over, they told me that they would send the press warrants to the Constables, of which these peasants have refused to obey.¹⁷⁶

Writing in his native tongue, Bouquet revealed his true impression of American “peasants” and their magistrates. Indeed, he believed that Pennsylvania’s entire governing authority had collapsed, and this opened the way for military intervention.

In June 1758, Forbes directed Bouquet to secure sixty wagons from Berks, Lancaster, and York counties respectively. Forbes directed Bouquet to enlist wagons through military contracts but Governor Denny had authorized the army to use impressment—the forcible impounding of wagons—as a last resort.¹⁷⁷ As these contracts got underway, Berks County farmers initiated measures that not only gave them increased control over their property but also expanded their opportunity to profit. These farmers petitioned Bouquet to hire Jacob Weaver as wagon master for their county. The

¹⁷⁶ Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, May 29-30, 1758, *PHB*, I, 386-390.

¹⁷⁷ Denny, Press Warrant, Philadelphia, May 31, 1758, *PHB*, II, 405; Forbes, Memoranda, June 1, 1758, *PHB*, II, 1-2.

farmers knew Weaver to be “an Active, careful, and honest Man, that he hath a perfect knowledge in loading and driving Waggon (sic), and great Skill in Horses & Carriages.” The petitioners were inclined to pay Weaver well above the army’s set rate, because he offered more security for the wagons than did military personnel.¹⁷⁸ The Berks County farmers seized requisitioning as an entrepreneurial opportunity, controlled the terms of the contracts, and requested a trustworthy wagon driver. Lancaster and York counties proved to be less enterprising and less cooperative.

Lancaster County farmers refused to contract wagons to the army, forcing Bouquet to delay the march from Carlisle to Bedford. As Bouquet put it:

Every thing is ready for us to march & take Post at Reas Town [Bedford], but by want of a Sufficient number of Carriages, I am obliged to Stay here, and to loose a precious time, that I could employ in Securing our frontiers; This is very hard for me, and I do not know how your people will answer for the Consequences.

Privately, Bouquet promised the Lancaster magistrates and sheriff that he could finance any contract and demanded eighteen wagons immediately.¹⁷⁹ Edward Shippen, likewise, enlisted the assistance of Lancaster magistrates to contract the needed wagons.¹⁸⁰

Bouquet found the farmers of York County to be even more obstinate, perhaps because they had experience of how military contracts worked. As reported above, in 1757, the army had contracted wagons and horses, but one horse had drowned. Many farmers in York County seized on this incident as a justification to resist current

¹⁷⁸ Petition for Waggoners, June 1, 1758, *PHB*, II, 4.

¹⁷⁹ Bouquet to Edward Shippen, June 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 26.

¹⁸⁰ Shippen to Bouquet, June 9, 1758, *PHB*, II, 63.

requisitioning demands, not least because military personnel had not reimbursed the owner. Bouquet lamented the possibility that one dead horse could hamper an entire county's loyalty to the Royal Army. But such was the case, for out of the some five-hundred wagons in York County, the farmers had not contracted even one.¹⁸¹

Eventually, Bouquet requested Forbes to forward George Stevenson money, with which to reimburse these farmers for "that cursed horse which was drowned last year."¹⁸² By mid-June, Stevenson had enlisted twenty-seven of the sixty wagons that Bouquet demanded from York County.

As the season progressed, the Royal Army failed to fulfill the terms of its certificates, contracts went unpaid, and farmers' willingness to cooperate dwindled.¹⁸³ Thus, Bouquet redoubled his efforts to enlist wagons and introduced increasing levels of coercion. He ordered three-hundred fresh wagons "to be Either hired or Impressed." Put another way, military contracts had lost legitimacy, and Bouquet resorted to requisitioning, what he called a "coup d'Etat to get Waggon."¹⁸⁴

In August, Bouquet readied the army to march toward Loyalhanna and then to siege Fort Duquesne.¹⁸⁵ His goal was to surround the fort before the French received reinforcements from Canada. This strategy called for the swift westward movement of British forces, even without waiting for reinforcements. But to succeed, the army needed wagons for the immediate movement of artillery and provisions. Thus, Bouquet ordered Colonel William Burd and others to re-route wagons to Bedford.¹⁸⁶ More ominously, he

¹⁸¹ Bouquet to Stevenson, June 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 27-29.

¹⁸² Bouquet to Forbes, June 7, 1758, *PHB*, II, 45.

¹⁸³ Bouquet to Forbes, August 20, 1758, *PHB*, II, 399.

¹⁸⁴ Bouquet to Forbes, August 31, 1758, *PHB*, II, 450-451.

¹⁸⁵ Bouquet to Burd, August 29, 1758, *PHB*, II, 444-445.

¹⁸⁶ Bouquet to Burd, September 1, 1758, *PHB*, II, 458.

requested Forbes to empower him either to contract or impress three-hundred additional wagons to haul materiel to Bedford and Loyalhanna.¹⁸⁷ Initially, Forbes denied the request to impress wagons. Pennsylvania magistrates had convinced Forbes of the many difficulties involved in requisitioning farmers' wagons. As Forbes explained:

The Magistrates in their different districkts (*sic*) all agree in the great difficulty of getting (*sic*) fresh Waggons or Horses, saying, the Farmers complain their Horses were starved from want of forage, so I am afraid we must make the best of what we have.¹⁸⁸

The army's precedent of starving farmers' horses led those same farmers to starve Bouquet of supplies. For the time being, Forbes postponed Bouquet's alleged coup but only long enough to compel the Pennsylvania Assembly to comply with it.

Bouquet hated for intransigent farmers to stall the expedition, and he believed that military success depended on the army's ability to requisition wagons. "Everything depends on having wagons," Bouquet wrote Forbes. By commanding posts and entrenchments, the Royal Army could survive "in the very teeth of the enemy," even if the enemy "attack you with all possible advantage." But they could not survive without wagons. In this light, Bouquet proposed three tactics that would allow the army to procure wagons. First, he requested permission to re-open negotiations with Pennsylvania magistrates. Perhaps, by promising payment, eliminating the starvation of horses, and appointing suitable wagon masters, the farmers would willingly hand over

¹⁸⁷ Bouquet to Forbes, August 31, 1758, *PHB*, II, 449-451.

¹⁸⁸ Forbes to Bouquet, September 2, 1758, *PHB*, II, 462.

their wagons. If the first tactic failed, then Bouquet proposed to return to the army's earlier method of impressing wagons. As Bouquet put it:

The second way would be to give Sir John [St. Clair] the troops beyond the Susquehanna, in order to levy in all the rebellious quarters, and where force alone can obtain wagons; to reduce them to brigades, make them out their harness in good condition at their own expense, and furnish them with forage.

Third, Bouquet suggested that Forbes order the Pennsylvania Assembly to pass legislation that would require every Pennsylvania wagon-owner to contract one wagon to the army at a set rate. Anyone who disobeyed the law would incur a fine of £30, which would extend to any constable or magistrate who resisted implementation. If the Assembly refused to pass the requisitioning law and the Redcoats met defeat, then the Assembly would be the army's scapegoat.¹⁸⁹

Bouquet understood the fundamental problem in the army's North American requisitioning program. On the one hand, ordering Quarter Master John St. Clair to confiscate the needed wagons was the most efficient method of expediting the campaign. Indeed, Geoffrey Parker reported that European warfare hinged on this tactic.¹⁹⁰ On the other hand, American warfare differed from European theatres, because Americans claimed the constitutional rights of Britons. Embedded in that claim were assemblies' rights, constitutional custom, representation, and the rule of law. And indeed, the third tactic illuminated this central constitutional problem: preservation of the imperial

¹⁸⁹ Bouquet to Forbes, September 4, 1758, *PHB*, II, 472.

¹⁹⁰ Parker, *The Military Revolution*, 64-75.

constitution implied that the army should seek legislative backing for its operations, even if that meant delaying the campaign. Therefore, Forbes agreed to implement the third tactic, although permitting recourse to the second.¹⁹¹

Forbes ordered St. Clair to present the second ultimatum to the Pennsylvania Assembly. Accordingly, St. Clair petitioned the Assembly to enact legislation that would commission all Pennsylvania constables and magistrates to commandeer wagons, arguing that the fate of the campaign was at stake. He threatened that if provincial constables, legislators, and magistrates inhibited the enlistment of wagons, then Forbes intended to empower military officials to execute “Violent Measure[s]” to secure this needed materiel.¹⁹² St. Clair’s negotiations with the Pennsylvania Assembly were an early manifestation of what the British Parliament was beginning to understand as the proper constitutional relations between the periphery and center. Although Assemblies’ rights and British liberties informed Forbes’s decision-making, the noble world of customary practice did not lend itself to territorial conquest. At the end of the day, Forbes did not bypass the Pennsylvania Assembly, but the Assembly itself signified an emerging political and social problem that the state faced in administering an expanded empire.

The Pennsylvania Assembly acted on St Clair’s orders and farmers began contracting wagons to the army. On September 13, James Sinclair sent from Bedford a brigade of 22 wagons, carrying pork, Indian corn, and flour. Additionally, he sent 80 packhorses loaded with flour.¹⁹³ On the following day, Hugh Mercer notified Bouquet

¹⁹¹ The idea of an imperial constitution is derived from, Greene, *Peripheries and Center*, 141. A similar idea is found in Ned C. Landsman, *From Colonials to Provincials: American Thought and Culture, 1768-1760* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997), 167-175.

¹⁹² Forbes to Denny, September 9, 1758, *PHB*, II, 484.

¹⁹³ James Sinclair to Bouquet, September 13, 1758, *PHB*, II, 497-498.

that hundreds of wagons had departed from Bedford to Loyalhanna.¹⁹⁴ Sinclair used a combination of brokerage and impressment to secure over one-hundred wagons from Lancaster farmers.¹⁹⁵ But for Bouquet, these wagons arrived too late and his correspondence reveals that he had already modified his strategic plans. That is, the Colonel had come to believe that poor roads and injured packhorses, combined with insufficient provisions and wagons, required that the Redcoats delay their siege of Fort Duquesne.¹⁹⁶ Although the Pennsylvania Assembly had cooperated, this cooperation came too late. Forbes reflected, “I hope [the Pennsylvanians] will be damn’d for their treatment of us with the Waggon, and every other thing where they could profit by us from their impositions.”¹⁹⁷ This paved the way for impressment.

By spring 1759, the Royal Army began consolidating the Ohio Territory into the British Empire. Once more, the army demanded wagons, and once more, Pennsylvanians resisted. The first sign that military personnel had not fulfilled the terms of the 1758 wagon contracts appeared in a York County Petition, dated February 25, 1759. The petitioners complained that the army had not paid the 1758 wagon contracts and had unethically demanded that the farmers prove that those contracts had ever existed. Instead of the original brokers paying the contracts, the army now required the farmers to divine the wagon master’s identity, the intended destination of the wagon, and the wagon’s fate. Then, the army requested the farmers to apply to the wagon master for payment—often a nameless officer but not a Jacob Weaver, whom Berks County farmers had appointed to be their wagon master. Problematically, sparing mystical illumination,

¹⁹⁴ Hugh Mercer to Bouquet, September 14, 1758, *PHB*, II, 505-506.

¹⁹⁵ James Sinclair to Bouquet, October 13, 1758, *PHB*, II, 557.

¹⁹⁶ Bouquet to Forbes, September 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 492

¹⁹⁷ Forbes to Bouquet, September 17, 1758, *PHB*, II, 523.

the farmers could not garner any of this information. In many cases, the army had wrecked or destroyed the wagons. For example, no sooner had wagons left Shippensburg than several were lodged in mud.¹⁹⁸ In short, this petition marked the army's *de-facto* inability to fulfill the terms of its contracts, probably because the army had not retained records of to whom the wagons belonged. Initially, Bouquet attempted to suppress this petition.¹⁹⁹ Then, as discontent mounted, he recognized that the rule of law would not allow the army to default on the 1758 contracts, at least not without repercussions. Considering this, Bouquet actually bypassed Stanwix and notified General Jeffrey Amherst that all of the army's accounts remained unsettled. As he put it,

[All] Waggon and Pack Horse requires chiefly to be paid as soon as possible, and any further delay would be attended with a general dissatisfaction in the People. [A]nd be of bad Consequences for the Service of the next Campaign.

Bouquet warned that default on the contracts could result in the Pennsylvania Assembly taking action with the governor "to postpone their Proceeding's on the King's service."²⁰⁰

With the 1758 contracts in arrears, Stanwix issued an advertisement for wagons to serve in a campaign against Fort Venango and other Ohio strongholds. In early May 1759, Stanwix appointed appraisers and brokers to contract in every Pennsylvania county. Ominously, this advertisement threatened that if any county failed to provide a predetermined quota, then military personnel would resort to impressment "and all other

¹⁹⁸ Bouquet to Forbes, June 7, 1758, *PHB*, II, 42-46.

¹⁹⁹ Stevenson to Bouquet, February 25, 1759, *PHB*, III, 149.

²⁰⁰ Bouquet to Amherst, March 1, 1759, *PHB*, III, 161.

severe Methods.” Here, Stanwix had crossed a constitutional boundary that Forbes had not dared and threatened to requisition wagons without seeking the Assembly’s approbation—a threat he eventually made good.²⁰¹

On May 25, Bouquet requested Edward Shippen to publicize this advertisement for wagons in York, Cumberland, Berks, and Reading counties.²⁰² However, the military’s default on the 1758 accounts proved to be an immediate impediment. Stanwix ordered the farmers of Lancaster County to contract two hundred wagons for the 1759 campaign, more than any other county’s quota.²⁰³ Once again, Edward Shippen tried to enlist the magistrates’ patronage in this endeavor. But the farmers of Bedford, Carlisle, and Lancaster counties were sluggish in fulfilling these demands.²⁰⁴ For example, contractors procured only a couple wagons, because the previous year’s contracts were in arrears, leaving many farmers almost destitute. The farmers pledged their backing for the Ohio campaign, but they could not give material assistance.²⁰⁵ Lieutenant Lewis Ourry found the inhabitants of Dunker’s Town even more intransigent than the Lancaster farmers. As he put it, “[They were] in general backward, & seem’d to doubt our fair promises, having been disappointed last Year.”²⁰⁶ The army’s default on the 1758 contacts now prohibited Pennsylvanians’ financial and material capacity to enter new contracts.

²⁰¹ Stanwix, Advertisement, May 4, 1759, *PHB*, III, 269-271.

²⁰² Ourry to Bouquet, May 24, 1759, *PHB*, III, 312-314; Bouquet to Burd, Philadelphia, May 25, 1759, *PHB*, III, 320-321.

²⁰³ Stanwix, Advertisement, May 4, 1759, *PHB*, III, 269-271.

²⁰⁴ Burd to Bouquet, Lancaster, May 28, 1759, *PHB*, III, 337-338.

²⁰⁵ Shippen experienced many difficulties in procuring wagons at Lancaster. Shippen to Bouquet, May 22, 1759, *PHB*, III, 301; Shippen to Bouquet, May 30, 1759, *PHB*, III, 340-343; Burd to Bouquet, Lancaster, May 30, 1759, *PHB*, III, 343.

²⁰⁶ Weiser to Bouquet, Reading, May 30, 1759, *PHB*, III, 345; Ourry to Bouquet, Lancaster, May 24, 1759, *PHB*, III, 312.

To remedy lack of confidence in military contracts, Bouquet tried to ensure that wagon contractors had money-in-hand when they approached farmers. By paying up front, Bouquet hoped that farmers might become more willing to cooperate. Jacob Weiser commissioned constables to contract wagons in Reading, Pennsylvania. Problematically, the constables demanded payment upfront. Accepting the legitimacy of this request, Weiser petitioned Bouquet to pay the constables immediately.²⁰⁷ In a similar case, Captain John Byers had the task of contracting wagons in Carlisle County. In the beginning, Byers had to travel to Philadelphia to draw credit for Carlisle wagon contracts. Not only did this increase an already difficult task, but it also weakened the farmers' confidence that they would ever receive payment. To overcome this problem, Bouquet entrusted wagon contractors with the money, allowing them to make a down payment on the contracts. For instance, Bouquet entrusted Jacob Weiser with £1,000, allowing him to contract 30 wagons almost immediately. Likewise, Amherst permitted Bouquet to pay constables for their labors.²⁰⁸ Accordingly, Bouquet received assurances that Carlisle would indeed provide a wagon convoy by early June.²⁰⁹

In addition to defaulted contracts, the Royal Army confronted two additional hurdles in its campaign to requisition wagons. First, James Wolfe's seemingly endless siege of Quebec dampened Pennsylvanians' excitement about participating in what appeared to be a faltering war effort. For instance, Hoops feared that the news of northern defeats had sullied Carlisle farmers' willingness to lend wagons to a defeated cause. Notably, this marked a rare time when military personnel admitted that public

²⁰⁷ Weiser to Bouquet, Reading, May 28, 1759, *PHB*, III, 338-339.

²⁰⁸ Armstrong to Bouquet, Carlisle, May 28, 1759, *PHB*, III, 333-335. For Bouquet's agreement to entrust the contractors with money, Bouquet to Weiser, Philadelphia, May 31, 1759, *PHB*, III, 346.

²⁰⁹ Ouury to Bouquet, Carlisle, May 28, 1759, *PHB*, III, 336-337.

opinion affected their ability to operate.²¹⁰ Second, farmers often attempted to retain their wagons until the end of a harvest, as they needed wagons to haul in crops. Because contractors understood local concerns, some evidence indicates that they willingly delayed contracting wagons so that farmers could bring in harvests.²¹¹ Even so, farmers' wavering confidence in contracts and victory and concern for their harvests all conspired to deprive the Royal Army of the wagons it needed to mount the Ohio Campaign.

In late May, Bouquet reported that his inability to procure sufficient wagons was the only hindrance to moving into the Ohio Territory. He needed wagons to haul supplies to the frontier magazines before the troops arrived.²¹² Understanding this, Amherst sent a twofold petition to the Pennsylvania Assembly. First, he requested the Assembly to appropriate £100,000 for the army to reimburse Pennsylvania farmers for their lost or damaged wagons. This would close the 1758 contracts, a first step in winning back the farmers' confidence. Second, he petitioned the Assembly to re-enact the 1758 law that had authorized the army to requisition wagons. But, Amherst made this request with a caveat: if the Assembly did not authorize requisitioning, then Amherst would. "If that was refused," as Bouquet explained it, "we should fall upon proper Methods to compel the unwilling to do their Duty, beginning by those who are most inclined to obstruct the Service."²¹³ In this context, Bouquet advised his contractors, Armstrong, Burd, Shippen, and Weiser that if the farmers refused to volunteer their wagons, then the army would

²¹⁰ Hoops to Bouquet, Carlisle, May 28, 1759, *PHB*, III, 331; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 344-345.

²¹¹ Stephen to Bouquet, Lancaster, July 26, 1759, *PHB*, III, 455 – 456.

²¹² This was not to suggest that the army had contracted only a few wagons, for Bouquet reported that over 100 wagons were moving supplies to forts Bedford and Ligonier. Bouquet to Mercer, Philadelphia, May 26, 1759, *PHB*, III, 326-327; Bouquet to Stephen, Philadelphia, May 31, 1759, *PHB*, III, 347.

²¹³ Bouquet to Weiser, Philadelphia, May 31, 1759, *PHB*, III, 346; Bouquet to Shippen, Philadelphia, June 2, 1759, *PHB*, III, 361-362.

soon have the means to compel compliance.²¹⁴ Not only did the Assembly refuse to renew the impressment policy, but it also refused to finance the army's defaulted 1758 contracts.²¹⁵ Therefore, Amherst overrode the Assembly's authority and authorized requisitioning. To compensate for the Assembly's apparent poverty, Stanwix petitioned the King to provide "a Chest of Gold and Silver" for the army to fulfill its wagon contracts.²¹⁶ Whereas South Carolina's monetary weakness had opened a gap for military intervention, now the Pennsylvania Assembly's obstinacy occasioned Amherst's crass assertion of military supremacy. Still, the Assembly remained intact.

Stephen Brumwell argues that the Royal Army's relationship with the American colonists became almost benign after 1757. He argues that Americans grew increasingly willing to support the war effort. Brumwell attributes some of this to the successful Forbes Expedition.²¹⁷ But neither the behavior of Pennsylvania farmers nor their Assembly confirms this thesis. On June 1, Bouquet threatened that if farmers did not contract wagons, then he would implement Amherst's requisitioning order. To maintain a facade of colonial autonomy, Governor Denny authorized impressment and Amherst confirmed it. And, in hopes that the King would finance the 1758 contracts, Bouquet reported that the army would now pay for all the materiel it impressed.²¹⁸ Even so, farmers continued to resist contracting their wagons to the Royal Army.

Three factors explain why Pennsylvania farmers withheld compliance with requisitioning orders: poverty, recalcitrance, and weak civil bureaucracies. First, Edward

²¹⁴ Bouquet to Burd, Philadelphia, May 31, 1759, *PHB*, III, 348.

²¹⁵ Bouquet to Burd, Philadelphia, June 2, 1759, *PHB*, III, 360.

²¹⁶ Bouquet, "Advertisement for Wagons," May 17, 1759, *PHB*, III, 291.

²¹⁷ Stephen Brumwell, *Redcoats: The British Soldier and War in the Americas, 1755-1763* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 11-53.

²¹⁸ Bouquet to Armstrong, Philadelphia, June 1, 1759, *PHB*, III, 356; Bouquet to Shippen, Philadelphia, June 2, 1759, *PHB*, III, 361-362; Weiser to Denny, Reading, June 25, 1759, *PHB*, III, 379-380.

Shippen discovered that poverty prevented otherwise cooperative farmers from lending material support. As Shippen entered each village, he made clear the number of wagons that the army required. Underlying this so-called “Assessment” was the threat that the army would resort to impressment to obtain the predetermined number of wagons.

Shippen oiled the gears of compliance with assurances that the King would finance the 1758 contracts, a tactic that bore some fruit. Nonetheless, Shippen quickly realized that poorer farmers could not spare wagons, especially if they had received no payment on the previous year’s contracts. As Shippen put it, “disappointment has had an effect on the poorer sort...it has really incapacitated most of them from doing what they now have an inclination for.”²¹⁹

Lancaster County’s resistance to Bouquet’s efforts to implement Amherst’s requisitioning order marked the second form of resistance. It was at Lancaster that Isaac Richardson, a judge, reported that many Lancaster inhabitants had not contributed any wagons in 1758 and had held out again in 1759. Bouquet was outraged and ordered Shippen to identify all such people. If those recalcitrant persons still refused to do their part for the service, then Bouquet would authorize the magistrates to requisition their wagons. Bouquet lamented that many Lancaster farmers had offered only lip service, but he vowed to conspire with Shippen to bring compliance. Meanwhile, Bouquet ordered Shippen to impress these recalcitrant farmers’ wagons until the army had the requisite number.²²⁰ Only four days later, Bouquet sent soldiers to Lancaster County to assist the constables in impressing the required wagons, along with horses, gears, and even drivers.

²¹⁹ Shippen to Bouquet, Lancaster, June 11, 1759, *PHB*, III, 373.

²²⁰ Bouquet to Shippen, Philadelphia, June 4, 1759, *PHB*, III, 364-366.

He directed the soldiers to guard the impressed wagons, suggesting that the farmers might attempt to repossess their impounded property.²²¹

Finally, in Chester County, Bouquet confronted the problem of civil bureaucrats who simply refused to enforce press warrants. Bouquet ordinarily relied on local bureaucrats to enforce requisitioning orders, but this assumed the compliance of constables and magistrates. For example, Bouquet reported that the Chester Country magistrates had issued a press warrant in June and a second on July 9, authorizing Roger Hunt to requisition wagons. Even so, the magistrates refused to enforce the very warrants that they had issued or to cooperate with requisitioning procedures. Instead, they watched as farmers secretly transported their wagons out of the county. Then, the magistrates refused to impose what Bouquet regarded as the small fine for resisting impressment.²²² The Chester farmers had put up the same façade as had the recalcitrants that Richardson reported. Only in this case, stubborn constables and magistrates actually hijacked Bouquet's ability to acquire the predetermined quota of wagons. As a result, the western forts remained under-manned and vulnerable to French raids.²²³ Thus, a combination of poverty, recalcitrance, and conspiracy limited the number of wagons that the army contracted; the Assembly only exacerbated these difficulties.

While Bouquet resorted to coercion, farmers increasingly questioned the authority of the very men who brokered between local communities and the army, which further whittled at the requisitioning system. Whereas Edward Shippen had succeeded as a broker in 1758, Pennsylvanians questioned the authority of Conrad Weiser in 1759. For example, Reading farmers resisted Weiser's efforts to contract their wagons, claiming

²²¹ Bouquet to Burd, Philadelphia, June 8, 1759, *PHB*, III, 367-368.

²²² Bouquet to Denny, Shippensburg, July 12, 1759, *PHB*, III, 401-402.

²²³ Tulleken to Stanwix, Fort Bedford, July 12, 1759, *PHB*, III, 402.

that he had no right to act as an agent for the Royal Army. The farmers inquired, “[A]re you an officer in the Army?” Weiser responded that he derived his authority from the Pennsylvania Statute of April 21, 1758 and the governor’s 1759 impressment warrant. Only after Weiser explained that he had money to fulfill the 1758 contracts did the farmers concede to contract 39 wagons. Payment, or lack of it, often determined farmers’ ability and willingness to enter new military contracts.²²⁴

In a similar instance, Bouquet complained of the “bad disposition of the People” in Lancaster County, which made the job of the requisitioning officers almost impossible. As he put it, “I think that no man alone is equal to the Task.” In that light, Bouquet suggested that Shippen align himself with a man of high standing in Lancaster County and entrust him with much of the actual work of requisitioning. The Colonel relieved Shippen from riding across the county, negotiating with farmers, and bargaining. Instead, Burd would not assign a loyal assistant to that footwork, and leave Shippen to organize contracts, pay farmers, and oversee the requisitioning process. Bouquet understood that Shippen stood in a difficult position, as he was acting as a broker between “all his Neighbors” and the army. But throughout the colonial period, this had served as the principal method of waging war. Now, pressure from the Royal Army had whittled at the authority that local notables wielded, for farmers began to assert autonomy not only from the army but even from their social betters.²²⁵

By mid-July, the resistance that many farmers had mounted to the requisitioning program had succeeded in preventing Bouquet from acquiring the number of wagons that the army had “Assessed” it required. However, two factors combined to give the army a

²²⁴ Weiser to Denny, Reading, June 25, 1759, *PHB*, III, 379-380.

²²⁵ Bouquet to Burd, Carlisle, June 27, 1759, *PHB*, III, 383-384; Selesky, *War and Society*, 3-32.

sufficient number of wagons to supply the western posts. First, military brokers had contracted wagons from other counties, many of which had already returned from the western posts. Both Sinclair and Tulleken confirmed this steady movement of hundreds of wagons to and from the western posts. Now, Bouquet sent the wagons he had already acquired on multiple trips to compensate for not having enough.²²⁶ Second, as farmers brought in their summer harvests, they became more willing to surrender their wagons. For example, Stephen reported that all the wagons promised by Lancaster County shall be delivered, because “our harvest will be compleatly (*sic*) finished in two or three days, except the Oats, which will be ripe in about ten days.” Sinclair corroborated the correlation between the end of the harvest and the increased availability of wagons.²²⁷ From this, one suspects that the Lancaster farmers had actually hurried their wagons out of the county only to bring them back in time for the harvest. In any event, the army had bypassed the Assembly and acted directly on colonists to procure wagons.

By the Seven Years’ War, Britain’s now well developed administrative bureaucracy could marshal both fiscal and military resources to answer colonial nabobs’ pleas for assistance against the French. However, these colonists were completely unprepared to accept the constitutional, fiscal, and social consequences of this military project. Pennsylvania farmers wanted to believe that their constitution was more than a body of positive laws and certainly more than orders handed down from Amherst, Bouquet, and Stanwix. Instead, they and their legislators became increasingly articulate of what Thomas C. Grey has defined as “noninterpretive” law and what the British legal

²²⁶ Grant to Bouquet, Fort George, July 18, 1759, *PHB*, III, 422; Tulleken to Bouquet, Fort Bedford, July 21, 1759, *PHB*, III, 433; Tulleken to Bouquet, Fort Bedford, July 22, 1759, *PHB*, III, 438; Sinclair to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 28, 1759, *PHB*, III, 458-459.

²²⁷ Stephen to Bouquet, Lancaster, July 26, 1759, *PHB*, III, 455-456; Sinclair to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 28, 1759, *PHB*, III, 458-459.

tradition called “customary law.” This body of legal custom, though not positive, remained binding, even on Parliament and military personnel.²²⁸ Any analysis of supplying the American theater must consider that resource requisitioning occurred within the bounds of a British constitution. Backed by a fiscal-military state, this emerging constitution had more endurance than did English “customs and commons” that were simultaneously threatened by industrialization. Impounded wagons made bringing in a harvest difficult but not a constitutional crisis. When considered, however, in the wider context of quartering disputes, ordering officers to disobey the South Carolina Assembly, and the burgeoning Indian crisis, it becomes more evident that the British state struggled to balance the war for empire with the customary rights of colonial governments that had never developed the fiscal tools required by modern warfare.²²⁹

The Pennsylvania wagon controversy illuminates the threefold constitutional, military, and social implications of supplying the Royal Army in the Seven Years’ War. First, although, military personnel never impressed one wagon without the backing of Parliamentary statute wider, constitutional questions surfaced, assemblies felt threatened, and farmers felt vulnerable. Second, the Pennsylvania wagon controversy sheds light on the unprecedented challenge that early modern governments faced in supplying increasingly large armies. Bouquet’s goal was territorial conquest, not idolization of customary practice.²³⁰ Third, Edward Shippen, among countless other constables and

²²⁸ Grey, “Origins of the Unwritten Constitution,” 843-850.

²²⁹ For the South Carolina quartering controversy, see Bouquet, Representation of the Field Officers Regarding Troops, December 2, 1757, *PHB*, I, 248-250. For the Pontiac’s War, see David Dixon, *Never Come to Peace Again* (Norman, University of Oklahoma Press, 2005), 244-257; Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 223-365. Douglass North’s concept of path dependence illuminates the conflict between the state and the colonies, *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic*, Introduction.

²³⁰ Parker, *The Military Revolution*, 45-81.

magistrates, stood in a precarious social position between disaffected Pennsylvania farmers and the coercive power of the Royal Army. As both Pennsylvania citizens and agents of the British state, the job of brokers plunged them into the middle of an increasingly heated controversy. In all, Bouquet's frantic drive to procure wagons suggested that he had assumed greater authoritarian and bureaucratic prerogatives than Pennsylvania colonists were prepared to accept. Even so, military personnel respected colonial political institutions and never threatened their existence.

Perhaps heavy handedly, British military personnel negotiated with the Pennsylvania Assembly. Never did Bouquet or any other military official contemplate disbanding the Assembly, despite its inefficiency. Indeed, the legislative branch of colonial government was entrenched in British political identity. David Dixon likes to speculate that the American Revolution originated on the Pennsylvania frontier. Indeed, one might be tempted to posit that Bouquet precipitated one of the earliest crucibles of resistance, but he did not.²³¹ Instead, Douglass North's concept of path dependence better illuminates the army's negotiations with the long established Pennsylvania Assembly than does speculation about the origin of the American Revolution.²³² Once an institution is established, then its existence, however inefficient, sets the stage for the future. While in Pennsylvania, Bouquet bore with participatory government, not least because he could not destroy the political identity of fellow Britons.

²³¹ North, *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic*, Introduction.

²³² North, *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic*, Introduction.

Military Supply and Colonial Contractors

Establishing an administrative bureaucracy in what came to be a territorial empire was one result of ousting the French from Fort Duquesne. Now in possession of western Pennsylvania, British military personnel faced what seemed to be the almost insurmountable problem of supplying this region. Like requisitioning, supply chain management not only required precise bureaucratic organization but also the cooperation of colonial governments, local producers, and contractors. The Forbes Expedition marked the largest supply movement that Bouquet had yet overseen in North America. As Charles Tilly has demonstrated, an army's maneuverability depends on the efficient and rational distribution of food supplies.²³³ During the Forbes Expedition, Bouquet spent most of his energies worrying about procuring wagons, building roads, halting raids, and conquering Fort Duquesne. Yet, his ability to do all this depended foremost on distribution of foodstuffs, without which soldiers would die. More than wagons, lack of flour threatened the army's survival. Indeed, the Royal Army retained Fort Duquesne, only because James Sinclair brokered contracts with colonial suppliers, who then hurried flour and other provisions to the fort. Thereafter, Sinclair brokered cooperative relationships between colonial suppliers and the army that stood in stark contrast to the requisitioning débâcle. Thus, unlike the requisitioning ordeals, supply chain management

²³³ The literature on bureaucracy and the rise of the modern state is vast. Max Weber first identified the correlation between bureaucracy and statehood, see H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds., *From Max Weber* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), 214-215; Charles Tilly, "On the History of European State Making," in *The Formation of national States in Western Europe*, ed. Tilly, Charles; Ardant, Gabriel (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1975), 42; Charles Tilly, *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1990* (Cambridge, Mass: Basil Blackwell, 1990), 118-120. For the disastrous effects of rational bureaucracies, operating without reference to moral judgment, see Zygmunt Bauman, "Sociology after the Holocaust," *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 39, No. 4, (Dec., 1988), see 477-485.

marked a high level of coordination and cooperation between colonial producers, suppliers, and the Royal Army.

Holding on to conquered territory depended on the capacity of military personnel to coordinate the efficient and speedy distribution of food. Military personnel developed complex supply networks that stretched from the eastern seaboard into the Ohio Territory. The quartermaster general oversaw the acquisition and distribution of food supplies, a job that required scrupulous attention to detail, and good relations with suppliers. John St. Clair and James Sinclair, respectively quartermaster and assistant quartermaster, performed an important part in coordinating these networks and relationships. Likewise, both exhibited strong personalities and quick tempers. Bouquet forgave their tempers, only to the extent that they proved competent quartermasters. St. Clair's arrogance combined with an inability to move supplies made him as worthless to the army as were Lancaster farmers who withheld their wagons. Conversely, Sinclair's efficient distribution management recommended Bouquet excuse his quick temper. In the end, Sinclair brokered trading partnerships between the Royal Army and colonial suppliers that both prevented famine at Pittsburgh and proved lucrative to the suppliers. Whereas requisitioning proved a constitutional and economic crisis for both the army and colonial farmers, territorial conquest opened up trading opportunities for colonial suppliers that strengthened the bond of peace between the army and colonists.

Sir John St. Clair had served as deputy quartermaster general in Braddock's Campaign. In that position, he won infamy for his inability to procure wagons and horses in both Maryland and Virginia. In that instance, Benjamin Franklin intervened and

acquired 150 wagons from Pennsylvania.²³⁴ Later St. Clair served as quartermaster general in the Forbes Expedition, where he displayed an arrogance that only his lack of organizational skill surpassed. St. Clair's incompetence added to the delays of the Forbes Expedition and paralleled Bouquet's difficulty in requisitioning wagons. Franklin had earlier compensated for St. Clair's failures, but now a less illustrious James Sinclair supplanted St. Clair and averted a supply crisis.

Forbes appointed St. Clair to serve as deputy quartermaster general in the 1758 expedition. Early in this campaign, St. Clair proved unable to procure adequate forage and flour, paralleling the army's inability to procure wagons. When Bouquet ordered Washington to march from Cumberland, Washington retorted that lack of flour would slow his progression.²³⁵ As the army began to proceed westward, Bouquet increasingly relied on Sinclair, the assistant quartermaster, to distribute supplies. Sinclair compensated for St. Clair's failures and ultimately prevented a military famine. As the Forbes Expedition progressed, Sinclair demonstrated an extraordinary ability to acquire and rationalize the distribution of what little supplies were available.²³⁶ For example, Bouquet requested Sinclair to procure 200 beeves, flour, salt, forage, Indian corn, and liquor to allow the campaign to proceed from Loyal Hannon.²³⁷ Obediently, Sinclair sent Bouquet a brigade of 22 wagons: 14 loaded with pork, 4 with Indian corn, 3 with oats, and one with whiskey. Most importantly, he sent 80 pack horses loaded with flour. He sent an additional 36 packhorses to Fort Cumberland, carrying flour. Moreover, in order to prevent waste, Sinclair ordered drivers to weigh all flour bags and not to transport any

²³⁴ Anderson, *The Crucible of War*, 92.

²³⁵ Bouquet to Forbes, September 4, 1758, *PHB*, II, 471-474.

²³⁶ Sinclair to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 16, 1758, *PHB*, II, 221.

²³⁷ Bouquet to James Sinclair, Loyal Hannon, September 9, 1758, *PHB*, II, 482-483.

that weighed less than 150 pounds.²³⁸ Throughout autumn 1758, Sinclair kept up a steady movement of flour from Bedford to the western posts.²³⁹ By December, many believed a French offensive to be imminent, and Sinclair rushed 100,000 lbs of flour to Fort Ligonier and Pittsburg, enough to last 800 men for four-months.²⁴⁰ Yet, Sinclair's efforts amounted to only a catch-up game. The army still did not have enough provisions, because St. Clair had not contracted colonial suppliers. By December, Bouquet reported that Pittsburgh lacked sufficient flour and the men were restless.²⁴¹

St. Clair's incompetence infuriated Forbes. The General grumbled that he did not know St. Clair's whereabouts, but if Forbes ever located the quartermaster, then he would scold him. Put simply, St. Clair had failed to procure adequate provisions for the winter quarters, a situation that ripened soldiers' disposition to mutiny.²⁴² In response, St. Clair posted an advertisement for flour, but in the dead of winter, scarce flour remained on the market.²⁴³ Amid snow and hostile Indians, St. Clair asked farmers to haul flour to Pittsburgh. In return, the army would grant certificates or promissory notes, much like the notes issued for wagons. Bouquet complained that the army had no money to back the certificates, and without payment, the farmers would soon refuse to supply the army. As he put it, "Without cash money these men will no longer come."²⁴⁴ In May 1759, Bouquet received the position of Quartermaster General; he promised to manage a more

²³⁸ Sinclair to Bouquet, Bedford, September 13, 1758, *PHB*, II, 497-498; James Sinclair to Bouquet, Bedford, September 14, 1758, *PHB*, II, 506-507.

²³⁹ James Sinclair to Bouquet, Bedford, September 23, 1758, *PHB*, II, 539; James Sinclair to Bouquet, Bedford, October 13, 1758, *PHB*, II, 557.

²⁴⁰ Bouquet to Hugh Mercer, Fort Ligonier, December 26, 1758, *PHB*, II, 642-644.

²⁴¹ Bouquet to Burd, Pittsburgh, December 1, 1758, *PHB*, II, 617.

²⁴² Halkett to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, January 4, 1758, *PHB*, III, 12-13.

²⁴³ St. Clair, Letter Book: Calculation, Advertisement, and Circular Letter, January 5, 1759, *PHB*, III, 14-16.

²⁴⁴ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, January 15, 1759, *PHB*, III, 52-54.

efficient business than had St. Clair.²⁴⁵ Foremost, Bouquet asked Sinclair to rationalize St. Clair's flour program and broker trustworthy contracts with colonial suppliers.

Sinclair transformed St. Clair's garbled flour program into a prototype of bureaucratic efficiency, benefiting both the army and colonial suppliers. First, Sinclair distributed the advertisement for flour to a broader population than had his predecessor. He posted the advertisement at the South Branch of the Potomac River, Winchester, and Frederick County in Maryland, York, and Lancaster counties. Sinclair acknowledged that the wagon requisitioning program had indebted the army to the colonists, so he struggled to revive confidence in military promissory notes. Moreover, he studied receipts, garnering what materials distinct counties had already contributed. In that light, he targeted counties for goods that the army had not already requested of them. For example, Frederick County, Maryland had not yet contributed many horses, so Sinclair targeted that region for horses. Most importantly, he recognized that the South Branch of the Potomac had not yet contributed flour, which they held in large quantities. This insight eventually saved Pittsburgh from starvation.²⁴⁶ Coherent organization and forethought were the principal differences that Sinclair brought to St. Clair's flour program, which ultimately proved lucrative to colonial suppliers. As Bouquet expressed it, "I was astonished by the wisdom of his plan and the breadth of his views...he was very capable and could be depended on." This "young man" had already proven to be an expert bureaucrat in contrast to St. Clair.²⁴⁷

But no sooner had Sinclair restructured the flour program than a rumor spread that Bouquet had accused him of disobeying orders. Gossip had it that Sinclair had ordered

²⁴⁵ Bouquet to Stevenson, Lancaster, May 15, 1759, *PHB*, III, 282-284.

²⁴⁶ Sinclair to Bouquet, Carlisle, January 9, 1759, *PHB*, III, 35-37.

²⁴⁷ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, January 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 42-45.

troops to march from Bedford into the perilous Pennsylvania winter. Indeed, the rumor had already reached Forbes. Sinclair took this accusation as an insult to his accomplishments, and scribbled a terse explanation to Bouquet. He disavowed being “the Author of the march of the troops from Fort Bedford.” He demanded either that Bouquet withdraw the accusation or reveal who had uttered it.²⁴⁸ Bouquet retorted,

When you know how to write, and to whom you write, I may answer your peremptory (*sic*) Summons: Till then I must refer you, your Letter, and your Justification, to the general, with whom at least, it may be expected that you will observe the decency of your Station.²⁴⁹

But, Bouquet recognized that Sinclair’s “Station” had actually prevented famine, and his organizational capability was beyond doubt. Bouquet could not deny that Sinclair’s bureaucratic skills outweighed protocol. Unlike St. Clair’s handling of the Stephen ordeal, Bouquet could not allow this incident to delay progress. After all, Colonel Armstrong had blundered the troop movement, not Sinclair.²⁵⁰

Sinclair explained that he had not intended to offend the Colonel’s authority, and he explained that St. Clair had actually ordered Colonel Armstrong to move the soldiers from Bedford. Sinclair explained away the débâcle as a miscommunication and apologized for his part in it. As Sinclair put it,

²⁴⁸ Sinclair to Bouquet, Carlisle, January 17, 1759, *PHB*, III, 57-58.

²⁴⁹ Bouquet to Sinclair, Bedford, January 21, 1759, *PHB*, III, 63.

²⁵⁰ For Bouquet’s abiding confidence in Sinclair, see Bouquet, Notes of Letter to Forbes, January 23, 1759, *PHB*, III, 70-71. For the origin of the blunder, see Halkett to Bouquet, Camp east of the Alleghany Ridge, December 29, 1758, *PHB*, II, 648-649.

I imagined he was misinformed by some Malicious Person who had a mind to hurt me in your Opinion, at such a one my Letter was pointed; this in a heat led me to write, what upon cooler Reflection it was impossible to recall.²⁵¹

Bouquet's aversion to St. Clair disposed him to accept Sinclair's explanation.²⁵² In a letter to Forbes, Bouquet chalked the incident up to a lack of communication, a mere misunderstanding. Bouquet had wrongly associated Sinclair with the former Quartermaster, St Clair. Now, Sinclair had proven his ability, and "I saw that he was very capable and could be depended on." Bouquet continued, "[A]bundance will soon take the place of the continual scarcity which has afflicted us as long as we depended on the foresight of these gentlemen [St. Clair]."²⁵³ Sinclair's organizational competence counterbalanced his breach of protocol. St. Clair, conversely, had no excuse or counterweight for his incompetence.

By early February, Sinclair's ability to broker contracts with colonial suppliers were evident throughout western Pennsylvania. Ourry reported that a great number of horses and Indian meal were moving up Braddock's Road for Pittsburgh. In one week, 80 packhorses had passed by Fort Cumberland. Ourry invited the farmers who had brought provisions or liquor to Bedford to haul their goods all the way to Pittsburgh. But, if they did not want to go so far, then Ourry purchased their provisions at Fort Bedford and hauled them westward. To preserve the army's credit, Ourry had "been put to all Sorts of shifts," whereby he overcome the credit problems incurred by St. Clair and the requisitioning programs. The South Branch farmers moved their goods through deep

²⁵¹ Sinclair to Forbes, Carlisle, February 18, 1759, *PHB*, III, 131-133.

²⁵² MacLeane to Bouquet, Carlisle, January 28, 1759, *PHB*, III, 89.

²⁵³ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, January 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 42-45.

snows and howling winds, all for the sake of personal profit and preventing starvation at Fort Ligonier and Pittsburgh. Ourry scribbled a note to Forbes assuring him that these farmers had “earned their bread very dearly.”²⁵⁴ Hugh Mercer, Pittsburgh’s commander, reported a steady arrival of cattle, grain, and liquor, most of it coming from the South Branch.²⁵⁵ By mid-February, Sinclair’s flour program had averted the possibility of famine at the western posts, a remarkable accomplishment in the middle of winter.²⁵⁶

In contrast to St. Clair’s inability to move the Virginia soldiers to Pennsylvania in the summer of 1758, Sinclair organized a supply network from the South Branch of the Potomac to Pittsburgh, and then into the Ohio Territory. The journals kept at Fort Lyttelton reveal a steady movement of packhorses from the South Branch to Pittsburgh. For example, on March 2, William Chestnut passed Lyttelton with 10 packhorses bound for Pittsburgh. Later that month, Andrew Byerley’s wife transported supplies to Pittsburgh.²⁵⁷ Having proved his organizational capacities in the flour program, Bouquet entrusted Sinclair with similarly important tasks in the summer of 1759. For instance, Bouquet gave Sinclair a central role in organizing the requisitioning and distribution of wagons, which later won him Amherst’s approbation. In late summer, Bouquet ordered Sinclair to organize the army’s efforts to procure forage, hay, and oats.²⁵⁸ As in the flour program, Sinclair strategically posted advertisements for hay and oats, and he ostensibly

²⁵⁴ Ourry to Forbes, Bedford, February 3, 1759, *PHB*, III, 100.

²⁵⁵ Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, February 7, 1759, *PHB*, III, 107-109.

²⁵⁶ Lloyd to Bouquet, Ligonier, February 19, 1759, *PHB*, III, 133-134; Ourry to Bouquet, Bedford, February 26, 1759, *PHB*, III, 151.

²⁵⁷ Graydon, Journal Kept at Fort Lyttelton, March 1-April 1, 1759, *PHB*, III, 222-227.

²⁵⁸ For wagons see, Bouquet, Instructions for Hambright, Bedford, August 1, 1759, *PHB*, III, 474-475; Sinclair to Bouquet, Carlisle, August 4, 1759, *PHB*, III, 489-491. For the collection of foodstuffs, see Bouquet to Sinclair, Bedford, August 8, 1759, *PHB*, III, 514-517; Bouquet to Stephen, Bedford, August 1, 1759, *PHB*, III, 472-473.

offered farmers the market value.²⁵⁹ But secretly, Sinclair had set the price at £2 for a predetermined quantity, only later would he offer a more competitive price.²⁶⁰ Five days after the French withdrew from the Ohio Territory, Sinclair reported that he had collected sufficient forage for the army to proceed into the trans-Allegheny region.²⁶¹

Sinclair worked in the shadow of St. Clair, and he consistently proved himself to be a more efficient organizer than his elder. Beneath Sinclair's hot temper, Bouquet sensed managerial skills that rescued the army on many occasions and improved relations with colonial suppliers. Unlike the wagon requisitioning program, Sinclair brokered contracts with colonial suppliers that proved lucrative, prevented requisitioning, and benefited the army. Sinclair organized the efficient movement of supplies along the lines of what present-day writers call supply-chain management. Sinclair first won Bouquet's approbation by offsetting the conditions ripe for famine and mutiny at Pittsburgh. Later, he organized complex supply networks that not only facilitated cooperation between the army and colonial suppliers but also moved supplies across vast stretches of territory. In the long term, Sinclair established supply routes that private traders, such as George Croghan and John Porteous, would later follow.²⁶²

The Philadelphia Conference's Legacy

Back in March 1757, the Philadelphia Conference failed to unify the southern colonies in the war effort. This failure, like the earlier collapse of the Albany Congress, demonstrated that the colonies lacked cohesion and none of them perceived a necessity in

²⁵⁹ Sinclair to Bouquet, Carlisle, August 4, 1759, *PHB*, III, 489-491.

²⁶⁰ Bouquet to Sinclair, Bedford, August 8, 1759, *PHB*, III, 514-517.

²⁶¹ Sinclair to Bouquet, Carlisle, August 25, 1759, *PHB*, III, 617-618.

²⁶² Bruce Porter, *War and the Rise of the State: The Military Foundations of Modern Politics* (New York: the Free Press, 1994), 149-193.

sending their provincial soldiers to fight in another's war. As historians Anderson, Selesky, and Titus have demonstrated, colonial officers marshaled local soldiers to wage local wars for local interests—usually against raiding bands of Indians, as in King Philip's War.²⁶³ After Bouquet's recruiters failed to enlist sufficient numbers of provincial soldiers, the Royal Highlanders had intervened to offset the manpower deficit. Now, in 1763, raiding bands of Indians nearly cleared all the inhabitants from western Pennsylvania and Virginia in what historians call Pontiac's War.²⁶⁴ In this conflict, the Pennsylvania Assembly agreed to raise additional troops but few men enlisted, despite a growing frontier crisis. Unorganized bands of Virginia militiamen filled the Pennsylvania personnel vacuum, halted Indian raids, and facilitated the return of captives. Later, in 1764, the Pennsylvania Assembly unexpectedly appropriated funds to pay these Virginian soldiers. On the surface, this appropriation appeared as benevolence. However, it did little more than veil the legacy of the Philadelphia Conference. The Pennsylvania government still had not mastered mass mobilization. For its part, the Virginia government still lacked the fiscal ability to mount Gregory Evans Dowd, *War Under Heaven*: a protracted war. In all, neither the Pennsylvania nor Virginia governments had adopted the tactical innovations of modern European styled wars; neither understood the art of financing huge standing armies. Until the Seven Years' War, no European power had yet exported the military and fiscal innovations that historians call the military revolution to North America.

²⁶³ Anderson, *A Peoples' Army*, 26-60; Selesky, *War and Society in Colonial*, 3-32; James Titus, *The Old Dominion at War: Society, Politics, and Warfare in Late Colonial Virginia* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), 126-141.

²⁶⁴ For the clearing of the frontier, see Matthew Ward, *Breaking the Backcountry: The Seven Years' War in Virginia and Pennsylvania* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press). For Pontiac's War, see Gregory Evans Dowd, *War Under Heaven: Pontiac, the Indians Nations, & the British Empire* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press), 114-147.

Through the spring and summer of 1763, raiding parties of Indians had brought chaos to the Pennsylvania and Virginia frontiers. These parties engaged the army in guerilla warfare, and for a time, Bouquet doubted the army's ability to repulse the attacks. Then, occasioned by the Treasury's order to reduce soldiers' pay, rampant mutiny had depleted the Regulars' ranks. Thus, the army had to replenish its numbers before it could launch what became known as the Western Offensive, which would confirm British territorial control and take so-called captives into British custody.²⁶⁵ By autumn, several colonial militias had sprung up and, driven by a racist logic, they were prepared to drive the Ohio Indians far from colonial settlements.²⁶⁶ Colonel John Armstrong marshaled a private raiding party of nearly 600 men to defend the settlements on the Susquehanna River. Another private party of soldiers set out to rid the region north of Fort Augusta of all Indians. Private raiding parties signaled the willingness of frontier inhabitants to defend their settlements.²⁶⁷ Bouquet could not dismiss Armstrong's raiders, especially given an increased desertion rate among the regulars and the unwillingness of the Pennsylvania Assembly to raise 1,000 provincials.²⁶⁸ Problematically, Armstrong's and similar private raiding parties did not operate under state supervision; consequently, they could unintentionally destabilize Indian-state diplomacy and disrupt British military strategy. This situation recommended that Bouquet try to bring private raiding parties under his control, channel their anger toward imperial goals, and regularize their pay.

²⁶⁵ Jeffrey Amherst to Bouquet, New York, August 7, 1763, *PHB*, V, 350-352.

²⁶⁶ Dowd, *War Under Heaven*, 174-185.

²⁶⁷ Plumsted to Bouquet, Carlisle, October 2, 1763, *PHB*, V, 424-426.

²⁶⁸ Bouquet to Gage, Philadelphia, May 20, 1764, *PHB*, V, 542-454.

In early October 1763, Colonel Stephen reported that Virginian volunteers were gathering at Winchester in preparation to join Bouquet's regulars at Pittsburgh. As he put it, "I had Spirited up about a thousand men to embark in an interprize (*sic*) of So great important to the Colony." From Pittsburgh, they would execute the campaign against the Western Indians. But Bouquet encountered two problems with the Virginians. First, it was not clear how to finance these soldiers. Neither the Crown nor the Virginia government had called them into being; so, Bouquet did not anticipate that either entity would readily provide money to pay them. Second, the precise relationship between the Virginia volunteers and Bouquet's regulars lacked definition, for Governor Fauquier had not incorporated these soldiers into the Virginian provincials. Then, as autumn turned to winter, the Virginia Assembly persisted in its refusal to finance the militias without executive consent. And, Fauquier being in England, the Assembly stalled, until finally Amherst had to abort the 1763 Western Offensive.²⁶⁹ When General Gage took command of the army, he bypassed Fauquier's prerogative and gave Bouquet permission to recruit the Virginians into the Royal Americans. In a promise that amounted to little more than speculation, Gage ensured that the Crown would pay the Virginians, effectively removing the Armstrong and Stephen militias from colonial control.²⁷⁰

April 1764, the Virginia Assembly again refused to appropriate funds to raise provincial regiments. Meanwhile, soldiers continued to desert from the regulars and the 42nd regiment remained incomplete. This rendered it impossible for Bouquet to wage the Western Offensive. Despairing of the Virginia Assembly, Bouquet turned to the

²⁶⁹ Stephen to Bouquet, Winchester, October 10, 1763, *PHB*, V, 427-428; Stephen to Bouquet, Winchester, November 7, 1763, *PHB*, V, 451-452.

²⁷⁰ Gage to Bouquet, New York, November 18, 1763, *PHB*, V, 460-461; Bouquet, Outline of Letter to Gage, December 27, 1763, *PHB*, V, 488.

Pennsylvania Assembly, urging it to raise 1,000 troops. On July 4, Bouquet met with Governor Hamilton and the Pennsylvania Commissioners. They agreed to his requests and placed provincial troops under Royal command. Immediately, Hamilton would send 300 provincials to defend the Pennsylvania frontier, which had again come under raids. Additionally, he would meet Bouquet's request for 950 soldiers and 50 Light Horsemen. Perhaps most importantly, "They have at my recommendation agreed to send to Great Britain for 50 Couples of Blood Hounds to be made use of, with Rangers on Horseback, against the Enemy's Scalping Parties, which will I hope deter more effectually the Savages."²⁷¹ Likewise, the Pennsylvania government placed a bounty on Indian scalps, encouraging frontiersmen to murder their racial adversaries. Still, Pennsylvanians were lackluster in their response.²⁷²

Despite Hamilton's cooperation, the Pennsylvanians did not enlist as quickly as Bouquet had anticipated, requiring that the Colonel again delay the Western Offensive.²⁷³ He complained that the few men who had enlisted did so as packhorse and wagon drivers. Bouquet found the Paxton Boys to be lawless cowards, and he criticized their killing of imprisoned Indians. "Will not People Say that they found it easier to kill Indians in Gaol, than to fight them fairly in the Woods," Bouquet asked? Long frustrated by the unwillingness of the colonists to supply wagons, their unwillingness to defend their own frontier left Bouquet equally amazed. He summarized the situation:

²⁷¹ Bouquet to Gage, Philadelphia, June 7, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 562-564. For recent raids on the Pennsylvania frontier, see Bouquet to Livingston, Philadelphia, June 11, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 568-569.

²⁷² John Penn, A Proclamation, July 7, 1764, *Colonial Records*, IX, 191-192.

²⁷³ This strategy is dealt with in Chapter IV. Bouquet to Gage, Philadelphia, June 21, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 571-578; Bouquet to Gage, Philadelphia, July 12, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 589.

I am So much disgusted at the Backwardness of the Frontier People in assisting us in taking Revenge of the Savages who murder them daily with Impunity, that I hope this will be the Last Time I shall Venture my Reputation and Life for their Sake.²⁷⁴

Whereas the Pennsylvania government had agreed to raise troops but few enlisted, many Virginians wanted to enlist but the Virginia Assembly lacked the financial ability to form them into regiments.²⁷⁵ Indians had renewed raids on the Virginian frontier, and now many men from the Cumberland region wanted to serve in the regulars. Field, a Virginia officer, asked if he should send these men to Bedford to join the service, or if they should proceed up Braddock's Road to Pittsburgh.²⁷⁶ Because the Virginia Assembly could no longer cope with the fiscal side of warfare, Gage gave Bouquet permission to recruit the Virginians into the Royal Americans without obtaining permission from Governor Fauquier. His justification for transgressing Fauquier's power was twofold.²⁷⁷ First, he had come to understand that Bouquet may not be able to marshal sufficient troops from Pennsylvania, and by enlisting willing Virginians, Bouquet had a better chance of filling his ranks. Second, and more importantly, Gage felt utterly frustrated with the Virginia Assembly's financial woes and unwillingness to form new provincial regiments. He believed that the Assembly had deliberately tried to thwart the army's efforts to end the Indian raids on the Virginia frontier. Thus, if the Assembly refused to cooperate, then Gage would not bother to consult the Virginia government about recruiting willing soldiers. As Gage put it,

²⁷⁴ Bouquet to Harris, Philadelphia, July 19, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 594-595.

²⁷⁵ Titus, *The Old Dominion at War*, 132-133.

²⁷⁶ Field to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, June 23, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 584.

²⁷⁷ Gage to Bouquet, New York, April 4, 1764, *PHB*, V, 506-508.

[I]t appears to me, that the Gov^{rs} can do nothing without Advice of Council, and that The Councils will do nothing, but thwart, the good Intentions of the Gov^{rs} to grant us any Help. We have no occasion to ask Leave to get Volunteers, and we Shall not be the better for doing it.²⁷⁸

Put simply, British military personnel all concluded that the colonial governments were not prepared to wage war, at least not according to European norms of state financing and mass mobilization. Therefore, Gage simply bypassed the ordinary chains of colonial command for the sake of military expedience.

In early September 1764, 210 Virginia Volunteers marched from Winchester, Virginia to Pittsburgh. Weeks later another 110 Virginia Volunteers set out for Pittsburgh under the command of Major John Field, and Colonel John McNeil trailed with 250 another Volunteers.²⁷⁹ These Virginians wanted only to end Indian raids that had made the Allegheny frontier uninhabitable. They came willing to serve in the RAR, so long as they could form their own companies and choose their own officers.²⁸⁰ Not least, the Virginia volunteers succeeded in their mission, for Bouquet entrusted them with the responsibility of returning captives to their families in Pennsylvania and Virginia.²⁸¹ Bouquet acknowledged what he perceived to be the invaluable service provided by the Virginian volunteers and recommended some of their officers for promotion.²⁸² Problematically, even after Gage had authorized recruitment, Bouquet had not settled on formula to pay these Virginian soldiers. Quite unexpectedly, the Pennsylvania Assembly rerouted monies appropriated for Pennsylvania soldiers to these Virginians. In this case,

²⁷⁸ Gage to Bouquet, New York, July 18, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 592-593.

²⁷⁹ Bouquet to Gage, Pittsburgh, September 26, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 646-648.

²⁸⁰ Bouquet, Advertisement for Volunteers, Carlisle, August 11, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 602-603.

²⁸¹ Bouquet to Hay, Forks of the Muskingum River, November 15, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 708-709.

²⁸² Bouquet to Gage, Forks of the Muskingum River, November 15, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 703-706.

the Pennsylvania Assembly had better mastered the fiscal art of warfare than had the Virginian soldiers' own government.²⁸³ Indeed, the willingness of these Virginians to enlist in the Royal Army illuminated the inability of their colonial government to cope even with small scale warfare, much less to master the fiscal demands of the early modern warfare. Whereas Pennsylvania lacked the ability to mobilize citizens to defend their own frontiers, Virginia lacked an administrative bureaucracy to pay soldiers who self-mobilized.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined several points of friction between Henry Bouquet and the colonial governments. The chapter has harnessed Thomas Ertman's interpretation of political path dependence to explain why the colonial governments were unable to cope with the demands of the Royal Army. Almost untouched by military pressure, British military personnel discovered that medieval notions of customary practice and popular participation had survived in the colonial political infrastructures. Instead of state bureaucrats, representative assemblies controlled taxation, which often meant that they evaded it. Once these governments had begun down this path, the costs of reversal became extremely high. Thus, by the Seven Years' War, no fiscal bureaucracy existed to finance a protracted war nor was it possible to create such a bureaucracy, not without the fiscal innovations historians associate with the military revolution argument.²⁸⁴

Bouquet used the British fiscal-military state as a blueprint for his expectations of the colonial governments, and he tried to project that model onto those comparatively

²⁸³ Bouquet to Gage, Fort Loudoun, August 31, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 622.

²⁸⁴ Ertman, *The Birth of Leviathan*, 5-6; Pierson, *Politics in Time*, 20-21.

inefficient modes of governance. Even as a colonel, Bouquet managed a more sophisticated military administration than did any of the colonial governments with which he interacted. Bouquet had no choice but to endure these hopelessly inefficient colonial governments. It was precisely this inefficiency that caused three layers of friction between the colonial governments and the Royal army. First, Bouquet encountered friction when the colonial governments failed to enlist soldiers according to the agreements of the Philadelphia Conference. Second, Bouquet encountered friction when the Pennsylvania and South Carolina governments hampered the speedy quartering of soldiers. Third, Pennsylvania colonists mounted resistance to requisitioning demands, especially as pertained to wagons. At these three junctures, Bouquet operated amid the constrictions placed on him by the colonial governments, which lacked the fiscal and mobilization abilities to deal with early modern warfare. Lacking scientific bureaucracies, cold logic, and impersonal administrations, Bouquet believed these colonial governments to be hopelessly intransigent, and he perceived a better way to organize political institutions and society.²⁸⁵ As the following chapters argue, Bouquet implemented a comparatively modern bureaucratic system in the trans-Allegheny zone that was more efficient and equipped to bend its subjects to the will of the Royal Army.

²⁸⁵ This and the analysis of the following chapter is derived from the literature on state formation. See for example, Brewer, *The Sinews of Power*; Etram, *The Birth of Leviathan*, see especially 19-34.

CHAPTER III

MAKING MILITARY INFRASTRUCTURE

Introduction: “This town and all the Forts are in an entirely defenseless Condition”

Restructuring the physical infrastructure of South Carolina to meet the requirements of Early Modern warfare ranked among the important missions that Lord Loudoun assigned to Bouquet in 1757. Over the following years, Bouquet continued the army’s mission of clearing forests, cutting roads, building and repairing fortifications, and even building bateaux. Bouquet’s was not a solitary mission but one that operated best by forging cohesion and cooperation between the Royal Army and the colonial governing authorities.¹ Unlike the quartering controversy described in Chapter II, colonial governments offered considerably more compliance with the army’s demands in constructing military infrastructure, in part because these projects more concretely benefited their colonies. As Bouquet put it, “everybody appears well disposed for the common Defence of the Country, (as long as it does not interfere with private Interest or Conveniences.)”² Even so, colonial cooperation with the Royal Army led to subordination.³ The following chapter argues that colonial compliance in the

¹ Some policy analysts have argued that joint ventures along these lines result in successful rural infrastructure building. See, for example, Elinor Ostrom, Larry Schroeder, Susan Wynne, “Analyzing the Performance of Alternative Institutional Arrangements for Sustaining Rural Infrastructure in Developing Countries,” *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Jan., 1993), 11-45. Most often, however, the Royal Army undertook infrastructure construction without reference to the colonial governments, especially in the trans-Allegheny zone. Other researchers indicate that such military projects actually promote economic growth, because they eliminate unfair economic practices. See, for example, Robert E. Looney, “The Economic Impact of Rent Seeking and Military Expenditures: A Comparison of Third World Military and Civilian Regimes,” *American Journal of Economic Sociology*, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Jan., 1989), 11-29.

² Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 172-176.

³ Bouquet, Proposals Regarding Loudon’s Instructions, March 1757, *PHB*, I, 72-76.

construction of physical infrastructure proved invaluable for defensive warfare, which ultimately brought security to the Pennsylvania and Virginia frontiers. On the other hand, the Royal Army controlled the physical entities it constructed, especially those west of Allegheny and Appalachian mountains, such as forts LeBoeuf, Niagara, Pitt, Presque Isle, among many others. The colonial governments lost jurisdiction over these regions. Whereas chapter two examined the colonies as politically autonomous, the following pages examine Bouquet as an agent of territorial acquisition and militarization. Bouquet's Proclamation of 1761 confirmed this division between colonial and military jurisdiction, restricted Anglo settlement, and challenged the very existence of the Ohio Company. Compared to the colonial governments, Bouquet's was a coercive regime that regulated many aspects of daily life and anticipated army's postwar Indian policy.

For historians, the physical infrastructure that the British army made raises many questions about the relationships between warfare, infrastructure, and state finance. Although Jeffery Parker never disclaimed Michael Roberts' Military Revolution theory, he introduced significant changes to it. For instance, Parker posited that the introduction of artillery into Western Europe fundamentally changed warfare in ways that Roberts had not understood. Parker pointed out that the thin walls of medieval forts could not withstand artillery fire. This occasioned the construction of the *Italienne*—star shaped—fort, which had lower and thicker walls and allowed soldiers to see all directions from it. Most importantly, architects designed the *Italienne* fort to withstand artillery fire and to sustain protracted sieges. Sustained sieges required massive armies, large quantities of provisions, and cost tremendous amounts. Combined, artillery fire, the *Italienne* fort,

large armies, and sustained sieges brought a revolutionary change to European warfare.⁴ Italiane fortifications held an essential place in the Military Revolution, because their construction required massive state expenditures and often resulted in military victory. In this way, the Italiane fortifications went hand in hand with the fiscal military state.

Building on Parker's critique, Bruce Porter explained that the Military Revolution increased the importance of engineers in military service, because they best understood the art of fort construction.⁵ Given the decrepit state of Georgia and South Carolina's fortifications, Bouquet enlisted the expertise of several engineers, confessing that he had very little knowledge of engineering. As he put this dilemma, "Tho' I am not a very great Engineer, I shall do my utmost to put this town first, then Forts in a tolerable State of Defence." Bouquet requested that the army send three engineers to the southern colonies to oversee construction projects. He believed that the entire fortification system required a new design that would both prevent decay and reduce long-term expenditures.⁶ Even so, this massive construction project came at an equally massive cost that only the British fiscal military state could bear, not the small colonial governments.

In 1750, the Pennsylvania government initiated the construction of small fortifications along its frontier. But by Braddock's defeat, those fortifications remained incomplete and insufficient to halt violence on the frontier. The construction of modern fortifications and roads required far greater expenditures than the colonial governments could finance. Only wealthy states could afford to construct a fortification system, such

⁴ Geoffrey Parker, *The Military Revolution: Military innovation and the rise of the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988). Bruce Porter, *War and the Rise of the State: The Military Foundations of Modern Politics* (New York: the Free Press, 1994), 67.

⁵ Porter, *War and the Rise of the State*, 66.

⁶ Bouquet to Napier, Charlestown, July 13, 1757, *PHB*, I, 139.

as could endure a protracted siege.⁷ So, from Georgia to Presque Isle, Britain's administrative bureaucracy financed repairs to existing forts, roads, and storehouses, and oversaw the construction of much new infrastructure. Heretofore, the colonial governments had only constructed ten-foot high, triangle forts—not surprising, given their limited fiscal abilities and defensive strategies. Overhauling the colonial fortification system required far greater expenditures than the colonies had ever incurred before. This expense alone recommended British fiscal intervention, implicitly linking American territory to the British Treasury.⁸ By 1761, the colonial governments and land companies had forfeited to the Royal Army jurisdiction over many fortifications and roads. Throughout this process, Bouquet encountered only muddled colonial opposition compared to the quartering and requisitioning crises, because modernized infrastructure secured the frontier, created economic opportunities, and facilitated westward expansion—all under military control. Often, for the colonial governments and traders, these payoffs outweighed the costs of controlling a frontier that Indian affairs had destabilized.

Patricia Seed has argued that Spanish, French, and British explorers established territorial claims by implanting symbols of power in North America. However, Daniel Richter demonstrated that Native Americans usually found unintelligible the symbols that Seed described and therefore without meaning or coercive power. But, by the Seven Years' War, the symbols of power that the British state exported to America had power to actualize the reality they represented: British territorial hegemony. Examples of these

⁷ William A. Hunter, *Forts on the Pennsylvania Frontier, 1753-1758* (Harrisburg, Pa: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1960), 168-193.

⁸ By September of 1757, the London Treasury had poured £50,000 into the southern colonies for reparations of infrastructure. Bouquet to Dobbs, Charlestown, September 15, 1757, *PHB*, I, 198.

symbols included artillery, fortifications, massive armies, and roads. Like his predecessors, Bouquet planted symbols of British territorial claims on the North American frontiers, only Bouquet's symbols contained more coercive power than those Seed described.⁹ More than symbolic, Bouquet's management of colonial infrastructure was an actual making of territorial empire. In the trans-Allegheny zone, Bouquet militarized political and social spheres that earlier would have been the sole concern of colonial governments. Put another way, where the Royal Army controlled infrastructure, military personnel eventually gained tenuous control over political and social life.

The Colonial Sea Coast: Forts and Roads

Long before Bouquet arrived at Charlestown, the Carolinians had already constructed a line of forts along their western frontier, much like their colonial neighbors in Pennsylvania and Virginia. The Carolina forts facilitated trade with the Cherokee peoples and supposedly offered some defense against hostile Indians. Problematically, the colonial governments never anticipated these forts to withstand a protracted siege and certainly not a French military assault. However, in 1757, all intelligence indicated that the French intended to launch a major offensive against the southern colonies.¹⁰ And though the much anticipated a French offensive never materialized, Cherokee warriors would indeed lay a protracted siege on Fort Loudoun and threatened many other outposts. For this reason, British military planners embarked on a robust plan to secure the

⁹ Patricia Seed, "Taking Possession and Reading Texts: Establishing the Authority of Overseas Empires," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 49, No. 2 (Apr. 1992): 183-209. Michael N. McConnell wrote of this fortification system as having symbolic meaning that the Ohio Indians attacked in Pontiac's War. *A Country Between: The Upper Ohio Valley and Its Peoples, 1724-1774* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 187.

¹⁰ Loudoun, Minutes of a Meeting with the Southern Governors, March 15, 1757, *PHB*, I, 91-93.

southern frontier. British engineers doubted the southern forts could withstand even a tussle, as they amounted to little more than trading posts.¹¹ In April of 1757, Loudoun ordered 100 Virginia troops to construct a series of new forts in Cherokee Country to ensure the colony's security. He ordered South Carolina troops to reinforce the fort at Chota, an important post in Cherokee Country. Notably, this order marked one of the first instances of the Royal Army's intervention in Cherokee Country, command of provincial soldiers, and frontier reinforcement.¹² As these constructions got underway, Loudoun appointed Colonel Bouquet to oversee their progress and integration into the empire.

In spring of 1757, Bouquet arrived at Charlestown, South Carolina from New York. An aura of melancholy greeted the Colonel, because most Carolinians knew that their colony lacked adequate fortifications to sustain what intelligence reported to be an imminent French attack. Intelligence revealed that French forces were encamped at Cape Francois and stretched along in their settlements along the Gulf of Mexico. Additionally, rumor told that the French were held up in Alabama and Mississippi, from where they could launch a landed attack. Worst still, as Bouquet soon recognized, the southern colonies lacked adequate fortifications to withstand either a land or sea strike. All this made repairs to the fortification system seem even more urgent. Immediately upon arriving in Charlestown, Bouquet requested that the governors of Georgia, North and South Carolina, and Virginia report on their respective colonies' preparedness for war.¹³

Before the southern governors reported their preparedness for war, Bouquet realized what Charlestown's citizens and government already knew: the city's

¹¹ Hunter, *Forts on the Pennsylvania Frontier*, 39.

¹² Loudon to Lyttelton, New York, April 24, 1757, *PHB*, I, 94.

¹³ Bouquet to Napier, Charlestown, July 13, 1757, *PHB*, I, 137.

fortifications could not withstand a French naval attack. A line of fortifications flanked Charlestown's eastern front. Problematically, Bouquet found these barriers to be in poor condition and unable to withstand a naval assault. As for artillery, Bouquet reported that cannons lacked carriages and gunners. Worst still, the colony had so neglected some artillery that it now lay under sand. On the westward side, Bouquet found Charlestown to be even more vulnerable to an inland attack. No inland fortifications guarded the city, making it incredibly vulnerable compared to contemporary European cities. What little fortifications did exist on Charlestown's western front Bouquet found to be in poor repair.¹⁴ South Carolina's interior fortifications were in even worse condition.

Neither were the fortifications that lined the South Carolina coast adequate to defend against a French naval assault. Shaped as a triangle, Fort Johnson held only forty men, and its battery and ramparts were in ruins. Fort Frederick guarded Port Royale, but Bouquet found this fort to be in ruins. Some of its walls had collapsed and the barracks were "intirely gone to decay, affording neither Shelter from Wind nor Rain." The fort had only five usable cannons and the others lay on the shores rusting. The cannons had been stripped from their carriages, and the carriages were decrepit. Despite the strategic importance of this fort, Bouquet reported that it had little defensive value and could not safeguard British territorial claims. Moreover, Bouquet perceived that South Carolina needed additional coastal fortifications, namely at Port Royale, the colony's largest harbor. As he put it, "everything [was] in Ruins." Although the colony had a sizeable amount of artillery, it lacked the basic infrastructure to make it useful.¹⁵

¹⁴ Bouquet to Webb, Charlestown, June 23, 1757, *PHB*, I, 119-120.

¹⁵ Bouquet to Stanwix, Charlestown, June 23, 1757, *PHB*, I, 121; Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, June 23, 1757, *PHB*, I, 124-126.

Inland, the South Carolina government had constructed a series of fortifications to shore up control of the Indian trade. However, Bouquet found those same forts to be completely inadequate to defend British territorial claims. Fort Moore guarded Hamburg, South Carolina, but no longer served any defensive purpose. “The Works some part fallen, and other parts expected to fall every day, the whole in a ruinous Condition.” With the help of Cherokee labor, Governor Glen had constructed Fort Prince George at the Keowee River, intending it to facilitate trading relations with the Cherokees. But from the beginning, rains had damaged its earthen bastions, and its green timbers had rotted quickly. By Bouquet’s arrival, Fort Prince George was on the verge of collapse. The powder magazine, intended to protect gunpowder from moisture, was only “a small Log building incapable of resisting the least Shower of Rain.” Instead of being a commercial center, this fort had become a playground for Indian children. As Bouquet explained, “The Ramparts daily falling, the Ditch capable of being leap’d over, even by the Indian Children, who with ease also climb the Rampart at any part.” Not yet completed, Fort Loudoun stood on the banks of the Tanassee River, and it would later fall under Cherokee siege. Despite the strategic importance of these fortifications, Bouquet insisted that they were wholly inadequate for military purposes and could not sustain British territorial claims. They needed to be redesigned and rebuilt.¹⁶

Upon completing his survey of South Carolinas’ fortification system, Bouquet concluded, “This town [Charlestown] and all the Forts in these Parts are in an entire defenceless (*sic*) Condition.”¹⁷ The defenseless condition of these forts invited state intervention. Unlike the quartering crisis, both South Carolina’s citizens and Commons

¹⁶ Bouquet to Napier, Charlestown, July 13, 1757, *PHB*, I, 137; David H. Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier: Conflict and Survival 1740-1762* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962), 47-49.

¹⁷ Bouquet to Barrington, Charlestown, July 13, 1757, *PHB*, I, 141.

House cooperated with Bouquet's efforts to strengthen South Carolina's physical infrastructure.

Bouquet's mission to bring colonial fortifications up to speed with the demands of Early Modern warfare paralleled a popular petition that the colonial government finance this project. On June 27, 1757, the people of Charlestown and some "Country Gentlemen" presented a petition to the Commons House, requesting the house to appropriate funds to reinforce the colony's fortifications. "[T]he naked defenseless situation of this Town & Harbor at a Time we are engaged in a War with the most potent, political & active Power in Europe fills their Minds with dreadful Apprehension when they consider how many Allurements this province affords to tempt that Nations to make a vigorous Push for it." The petitioners feared that the French Navy was planning to attack the South Carolina coast and could overrun it in ten days. In that light, they committed to "Chearfully pay their Proportion of the Expence be it what it will," for they feared that if the French Navy gained Charlestown, then the entire colony would quickly fall to the Enemy.¹⁸

The Commons House conceded to both its petitioners and agreed to cooperate with Colonel Bouquet. First, the Commons voted to increase the garrisons at Port Royal, Fort Loudoun, and Fort Johnson only one day after Bouquet made his initial report. The Commons voted appropriations for the colony to raise, clothe, and maintain five companies of 100 soldiers for one-year.¹⁹ Days later, the Commons made appropriations for the repair of the colony's fortifications. As Bouquet explained it, "[A]s this Province hath granted ten Thousand Pounds Sterling to be apply'd in Fortifications, I shall do my

¹⁸ Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, 1755-1757, in Terry W. Lipscomb, ed. *The Colonial Records of South Carolina* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989), 477-478.

¹⁹ Journal of the Commons House, 475-477.

utmost to put those places in a State of Defence.”²⁰ The willingness of the Commons House to finance 500 soldiers and fortification repairs was one of the only hopeful signs that Bouquet detected.²¹ The appropriations the Commons House voted in the summer of 1757 were a double-edged sword. In a certain sense, the legislators’ cooperation won Bouquet’s approval and allowed the colonial government to remain relevant. In a broader sense, however, the Commons House had made the appropriations at the bequest of the Royal Army. In turn, Bouquet, instead of the Commons House, would largely determine how to invest this money and utilize the soldiers. And, this later sense pointed to a long-term trend: colonial governments gained favor with British military officials only to the extent that they conceded to imperial demands. The Quartering controversy proved the rule true that cooperation led to subordination.²²

Fort Johnson guarded the Charlestown seacoast, which had fallen into a decrepit condition like the other Carolina forts. Bouquet’s reconstructing plans began by reinforcing Charlestown’s Atlantic or eastern front. First, Bouquet ordered soldier-laborers to remove all the underbrush within 1,200 feet of Fort Johnson to ensure the cannons a clear firing range. Anticipating a siege, he instructed the soldiers to re-dig the fort’s wells to ensure they could hydrate 150 soldiers. He ordered the construction of a new battery of 12 cannons that would overlook the Atlantic. Later he requested Governor Ellis to send the 18-pound cannons that General Oglethorpe had left at Fort Frederica to be mounted on Fort Johnson. A parapet for musketry would replace the existing battery. Bouquet ordered the soldier-laborers to enlarge Fort Johnson, so that it

²⁰ Bouquet to Barrington, Charlestown, July 13, 1757, *PHB*, I, 141.

²¹ Bouquet to Webb, Charlestown, June 23, 1757, *PHB*, I, 119-120; Bouquet to Stanwix, Charlestown, June 23, 1757, *PHB*, I, 121; Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, June 23, 1757, *PHB*, I, 124-126; Bouquet to Napier, Charlestown, July 13, 1757, *PHB*, I, 137.

²² Porter, *War and the Rise of the State*, 69.

could hold 150 soldiers. Finally, assuming the role of engineer, Bouquet designed a plan to block a large channel that left the fort vulnerable to the sea. Accordingly, he gave tortuous instructions for the construction of a large cable (or what he called a boom) which would block access to the fort.²³ These propositions set Fort Johnson on the road to becoming an adequate defense against a seaborne attack.

Lyttelton forwarded Bouquet's instructions for the reconstruction of Fort Johnson to the South Carolina Commons House. The colonial commissioners promised to consider Bouquet's recommendations and speedily appropriate monies for these projects. The Commons approved Bouquet's plan for the enlargement of Fort Johnson and his other recommendations. Accordingly, the Commons voted £7,000 to repair the colony's artillery and fortifications. Engineers believed the boom too costly and despaired of "putting such a design in Execution." Yet, the Commons House cooperated with Bouquet's other requests for internal improvements. Appropriations for military infrastructure increased the colonists' sense of security, and allowed the Royal Army to gain the upper hand in colonial defense.²⁴ With Charlestown fortified, Bouquet turned his attention to repairing South Carolina's interior fortification system.

By August of 1757, Bouquet had gathered sufficient information to begin reconstructing the southern fortification system. Bouquet began with Fort Prince George. Located in the Lower Cherokee County, this fort served as the point of contact between Charlestown and Fort Loudoun, in present-day eastern Tennessee.²⁵ Bouquet ordered Lieutenant Lachlan Shaw of the South Carolina Independents to march with two

²³ Bouquet to Lyttelton, Charlestown, July 20, 1757, *PHB*, I, 147-148. For the 18-pound cannons Bouquet requested from Georgia, see Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, August 26, 1757, *PHB*, I, 177.

²⁴ Commissioners: Report to Lyttelton, Charlestown, July 28, 1757, *PHB*, I, 153.

²⁵ Bouquet to Webb, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 168-169.

sergeants, one corporal, and twenty-nine privates to Fort Prince George. There he would relieve Ensign Boggs. Bouquet ordered Shaw to take command of the fort, its ammunition, and artillery.²⁶ Upon arrival, Bouquet instructed Shaw to inspect the fortification, to order his soldiers to make repairs, and to enclose the edifice with a stockade. Most importantly, Bouquet withdrew Fort Prince George from the control of the South Carolina governing authority. No longer did the South Carolina government determine the fort's use, structure, or future, as now the Royal Army would oversee the administration and use of Fort Prince George. As Bouquet explained,

[H]is Excellency the Earl of Loudoun General & Commander in chief in North America has been pleas'd to appoint me to take the Command of all the Troops rais'd in Georgia[,] South and North Carolina[.] You are to receive no orders or Directions in military Matters except from me, or other [of] your Superior Officers under my Command.²⁷

Effectively, the Royal Army transformed Fort Prince George from a colonial trading post into an outpost of the British Empire. Now, this one time decaying fort took on imperial importance.²⁸

The South Carolina Commons House demonstrated a willingness to cooperate with Royal military personnel in matters of internal improvements and security. In late August, the Commons House appropriated £10,000 for reconstruction of the colony's

²⁶ Bouquet to Boggs, Charlestown, July 15, 1757, *PHB*, I, 142. Bouquet to Shaw, Charlestown, July 15, 1757, *PHB*, I, 143.

²⁷ Bouquet to Shaw, Charlestown, July 15, 1757, *PHB*, I, 145.

²⁸ For state centralization, see Charles Tilly, "On the History of European State Making," in *The Formation of national States in Western Europe*, ed. Ardant, Gabriel; Tilly, Charles (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1975), 42.

infrastructure. Likewise, in matters of security, Bouquet and the southern governors developed cordial relationships, which only later, the quartering crisis damaged. For example, Bouquet and Governor William Henry Lyttelton together visited Port Royale and agreed on a plan to fortify its harbor. Many regarded this as the colony's most important harbor, because its size permitted large cannon-bearing vessels to dock. At Lyttelton's request, the Commons House allotted £1,500 of its initial £10,000 for construction of this fortification. Meanwhile, the Commons House appropriated another £3,500 for the eventual construction of a fort at George Town. But already Bouquet suspected that the Common House's cooperation was finite, not least because these appropriations bettered the colony, not military interests as such. Bouquet complained that most colonists seemed willing to defend their colony but not at the expense of personal or financial interests.²⁹ In South Carolina, the Commons House primarily approved appropriations that bettered the colony; it proved less willing to appropriate funds for extraneous entities, such as for army hospitals, firewood, and barracks.

The reconstruction of South Carolina's infrastructure occurred in tandem with the revamping of Georgia's. Arguably, however, Governor Ellis of Georgia compelled his legislators to bend to Royal demands to a far greater degree than was possible in South Carolina. In June 1757, Bouquet requested Governor Ellis to report on the state of Georgia's artillery, arms, ammunition, fortifications, "and what forces you could rise in case of an Invasion."³⁰ From the outset, Bouquet perceived that Georgia's southern

²⁹ Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 172-176.

³⁰ Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, June 1757, *PHB*, I, 116; Bouquet to Dobbs, Charlestown, June 30, 1757, *PHB*, I, 133.

frontier was more vulnerable to an invasion than were any of the other southern colonies. Even so, he could not fully imagine the decrepit state of Georgia's fortifications.³¹

Back in England, the decision to appoint Governor Ellis stemmed from the necessity of protecting this fledgling colonial outpost from an enemy attack. Unlike other colonial governors, George II had handpicked Ellis to ensure Georgia's international and political security during the Seven Years' War. Accordingly, Ellis' errand to Georgia was Royalists through and through. But, Ellis's mission to Georgia was fraught with crisis from the beginning. Before his ship left the English Channel, French privateers stole him away to France, tormented him, and held him hostage. After this ordeal, Ellis wasted no time fulfilling his mission and took control of the Georgian government. He began repairing the colony's infrastructure even before Bouquet inspected it. Not surprisingly, Bouquet found Ellis a suitable companion, as both men shared similar missions.³²

Ellis had prepared his response to Bouquet's inquiry about Georgia's military preparedness months before Bouquet had ever articulated the question. Ellis reported that Georgia had only 500 members of a standing army. His colony owned 40 barrels of powder for use by the militia. In other words, "We are entirely destitute of Military Stores." Ellis insisted that Georgia had no fortifications, though some people liked to believe that Frederica, Saint Simon, Fort William, and Fort Augusta qualified as bastions. As he explained it, those so-called forts "are capable of no Defence, being altogether in Ruins."³³

³¹ Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, June 1757, *PHB*, I, 116.

³² Lyttelton Papers, William Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

³³ Ellis to Bouquet, Savannah, June 24, 1757, *PHB*, I, 130.

Ellis described Georgia's forts as lacking artillery and being in structural collapse. For example, Fort Frederica was the only bastion constructed of stone, but dirt now filled its moats. Although over 50 cannons were scattered about Frederica, only four were mounted and fit for use. The barracks were in good shape, and presently garrisoned by a detachment of about thirty men from South Carolina's independent companies. Frederica was in better shape than the other three forts, but an internal report cast doubt on its ability to withstand a siege. A hurricane accounted for Fort William's decrepit condition, leaving it with damaged ramparts and only two guns. Fort Saint Simon began as a little, square, wooden fort. But it had fallen into utter decay, following what Ellis believed had been an attack led by General Oglethorpe and the Spaniards. What artillery remained, nature had swept into the sea. "There were nine "tolerable Guns... that lie buried in the Sand: & the few men posted there, are rather marks of our Right than of our Strength." The commanding officer at Fort Augusta reported that it too had collapsed into disrepair; although the store house held some grenades, 20 swivel guns, 20 small carriage guns, but all these were honeycombed by rust and without carriages. Ellis understood that Britain could not defend a territorial empire with artillery and fortifications in this condition.³⁴

Ellis set out to update Georgia's fortifications to the requirements of the British state and early modern warfare. Although not permanent, log forts would offer temporary protection and establish British hegemony on the frontier. To this end, Ellis requested the Georgia assembly to make appropriations to construct a series of log fortifications. These log forts would compensate for the decrepit condition of Fort Frederica and the others. However, Georgia was a poor colony, with a low population,

³⁴ Ellis to Bouquet, Savannah, June 24, 1757, *PHB*, I, 131; Taylor to Ellis, August 13, 1757, Frederica, *PHB*, I, 163-165.

and few enlisted men. So, Ellis sought Royal intervention, and he looked to Bouquet as a conduit between Georgia and the Royal Treasury. Intentionally or not, Royal fiscal intervention would inevitably increase the army's influence over colony affairs, especially in determining the use of its fortifications. Doubtless, Ellis was prepared to accept these consequences. As he put it,

You see by it that we are greatly expos'd, incapable of resisting even the Slightest Attack, having yet neither Forts nor Magazines, nor funds of any kind. The whole people of the province do not amount to Five Thousand Whites, & two Thousand negroes; & those of the former fit to bear arms do not exceed Seven hundred & fifty, which are rather better than Militia usually are, as many of them have been Soldiers, but are so dispers'd, that they could afford but very little help to each other upon any Sudden Emergency.³⁵

Put differently, Georgia's defensive posture, or lack of it, required Royal intervention.

Ellis offered a threefold justification for Royal financial and military assistance. First, Georgia's frontier was vulnerable to a French attack. Second, both the Spanish and Creek Indians bordered Georgia, and either group aligned with the French could mount a formidable attack. Finally, without a strong military infrastructure, the colonial government could command no respect; it was a nullity. To meet warfare's demands, Ellis vowed to exploit Georgia's fiscal and human resource, but only imperial intervention could complete this task.³⁶ Neither Bouquet nor his superiors turned down

³⁵ Ellis to Bouquet, Savannah, June 24, 1757, *PHB*, I, 131.

³⁶ Ellis to Bouquet, Savannah, June 24, 1757, *PHB*, I, 131.

this request. Governor Ellis had aligned Georgia with Britain's fiscal-military state and undauntedly invited military intervention in the colony.³⁷

Bouquet probably received Ellis' report on Georgia's fortifications sometime after initial repairs had already begun on the colony's infrastructure. Bouquet acknowledged that Georgia's fortifications were in a worst state of defensive preparedness than were South Carolina's. He lamented that the Royal Army could not act more swiftly to rebuild Georgia's infrastructure but vowed to lend all possible support when more soldiers arrived. Meanwhile, Bouquet concurred that Georgia's forts "are in such decay that it would perhaps be a greater Expence to repair them than to build new ones." In that light, he approved Ellis' efforts to construct temporary log forts, as they "will be serviceable for Retreats...I think that they shou'd be Spacious enough to contain all the People about them, & be provided with Wells or cisterns, & Store houses for Provisions, and Ammunition [and] Wood &c." As for the cannons scattered about forts Simon and William, Bouquet recommended that these be unearthed, cleaned, painted, and remounted on carriages. The colony should salvage artillery, ammunition, grenades, and shells and prepare them for use. Munitions repairs would cost the colony little, while Bouquet attempted to enlist funds to construct log forts.³⁸ By mid-September, Ellis had made good progress in making Georgia's fortifications meet military requirements.³⁹

The contrast between Ellis's command of the Georgia government and the Commons House's influence in South Carolina was unmistakable. Fiscal appropriations and decisions were made very differently in each colony. In South Carolina, a popular

³⁷ Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, July 14, 1757, *PHB*, I, 141-142; Bouquet to Dobbs, Charlestown, September 15, 1757, *PHB*, I, 198.

³⁸ Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, July 14, 1757, *PHB*, I, 141-142.

³⁹ Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, September 17, 1757, *PHB*, I, 200.

petition had partially accounted for why the Commons House voted appropriations to strengthen the colony's fortifications. Carolinians were more likely to tie the purse strings on their governor, than to bend to his dictates. Governor Ellis, by contrast, almost dictated the process of financing and building almost identical infrastructure in Georgia. Similarly, Ellis begged Bouquet to reinforce his colony with Virginian soldiers, as promised by the Philadelphia Conference. Then, Ellis put before his Assembly an Act for the ferrying and quartering of these soldiers, long before Bouquet could even confirm their departure. In South Carolina, conversely, Governor Lyttelton had not prepared for the regulars' arrival, leaving them to camp on a racetrack. Long after his arrival, Bouquet petitioned the Commons House for quarters, resulting in chaos. The British government assigned Ellis to Georgia precisely because he could bring the colony into line with military policies. In turn, Ellis aligned his government with the Royal Army far more compared to any other southern government. Bouquet quickly became appreciative of Ellis' Royalist tendencies, as he reported: "The Governor who takes all possible means to forward the Service, has prevail'd on the Assembly to raise 700 Provincials, & to grant ten thousand pound Sterling for Reparations of the old Works, and building of new Ones."⁴⁰ South Carolina's constitutional system limited the Royal Army's influence, but the case is unambiguous in Georgia: military decisions originated and received implementation from the top-down.⁴¹ As Bouquet put it, Governor Ellis "take[s] all possible means to raise the people of Georgia, from the wretched condition they were

⁴⁰ Bouquet to Napier, Charlestown, July 13, 1757, *PHB*, I, 137.

⁴¹ Porter, *War and the Rise of the State*, xix, 47-50, 79-83.

in.”⁴² Yet, in both colonies, the coercive hand of the Royal Army planted the material signs of British territorial control.

The South Carolina Commons House pretended that it had brokered with military personnel to secure the colony. But, this was naive. Bouquet never hid that he had exploited the colony’s finances to advance imperial territorial control. As he explained,

I have been as Saving as possible for the Government having made no Scruple to charge the Province with what I could of public Expences, Such as...Expresses Sent to the Forts, Reparation of Artillery &c and if I could Succeed, they Should even pay for the Carriages that might be wanted for the Service in the Province: I have acted So upon the conviction that they are able to bear these Expences and the more So, when I Saw how averse they were to Spend their money in providing Quarters.⁴³

Whereas Bouquet duped the Common House, Georgia’s poverty made it vulnerable to state intervention from the outset. Governor Ellis and Bouquet cooperated to undermine Georgia’s autonomy and bring it under imperial hegemony. Bouquet reported:

Georgia is in a quite different Situation, and tho’ extremely poor, they have done a good deal, influenced by their Governor, who is Still indefatigable in providing for their Safety and welfare. As they are a Frontier...in N. America, and utterly unable by themselves to repair their decayed Forts, I take the Liberty to Submit to your Lops Consideration, if it Should not be necessary to have the Said Forts repaired, and the Garrisons Supplied with Provisions and Utensils, at the Government’s Expence?⁴⁴

⁴² Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 175.

⁴³ Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, October 16, 1757, *PHB*, I, 214-215.

⁴⁴ Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, October 16, 1757, *PHB*, I, 215. For additional instances of Bouquet’s willingness to give Georgia fiscal and military assistance, see Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, December 9, 1757, *PHB*, I, 252-253. Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, December 10, 1757, *PHB*, I, 257.

Loudoun conceded to some of Bouquet's pleas for fiscal assistance to Georgia, but neither South Carolina nor Georgia had sufficient wealth to stave off the weight of empire. The cost of modern fortifications exceeded even the budget of wealthy colonies. By mid-September, Whitehall had appropriated £50,000 for the army to fortify the Carolina and Virginian frontier. This appropriation increased the state's hegemony over the colonies, and it placed the frontier fortifications under military control. Just as Bouquet forbade Shaw to allow colonial interference at Fort Prince George, so now the colony would have no meaningful access to any fort that benefited from Whitehall's appropriations.⁴⁵ The construction of military infrastructure was part of the process of territorial consolidation. Yet, Bouquet's 1757 operations were only a dress rehearsal for the construction of Forbes' Road and Fort Pitt. Infuriated by the quartering crisis, Bouquet departed from Charlestown, leaving the completion of the southern fortification system to other hands. Still, the Colonel had initiated the bureaucratic process that would construct the material symbols of empire in the southern colonies.

Forbes' Road vs. the Ohio Company

In February 1758, Loudoun transferred Bouquet and his five Royal American companies from South Carolina to New York City. Loudoun ordered Bouquet's soldiers to take the ship that had transported the Highlanders from the British Isles to Charlestown, South Carolina. The voyage promised to be unpleasant, because earlier Bouquet had ordered the Highlanders to remove all the beds from this ship in lieu of

⁴⁵ Bouquet to Shaw, Charlestown, July 15, 1757, *PHB*, I, 145.

proper barracks. Archibald Montgomery would remain in South Carolina and oversee the completion of the infrastructure projects that Bouquet had begun.⁴⁶

Bouquet and the regulars sailed into New York harbor in late April. No sooner had they docked, than Bouquet sent the regulars down to Philadelphia, while he remained at New York City to complete his accounts and procure artillery, equipment, and supplies for the 1758 expedition, which would construct a trans-Pennsylvania road. The purpose of this road would be to facilitate British acquisition of Fort Duquesne and of the Ohio Territory. But Bouquet did not *lag* behind the regulars; in no sense was he delayed. Instead, the rear is the proper location for a colonel in any army, because it is from the rear that warfare is methodically planned, and efficiently organized. Bouquet held the task of acquiring supplies and sending them to the front lines, including blankets, provisions, tools, and tents among many other things. Likewise, he organized the location of disparate provincial regiments across the Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia countryside. Bouquet remained in New York City, because his position was bureaucratic, organizational, tactical, and properly far behind the comparatively chaotic lines of battle. Working as field commander under General John Forbes, Bouquet organized the physical extension of British territorial control from Philadelphia, across the Allegheny range, and into the Ohio Territory.⁴⁷ Yet, even the best bureaucratic tactician cannot transcend the contingencies of human activity and disagreements between Bouquet, provincial officers, and colonials actually undermined the army's tight

⁴⁶ Forbes to Bouquet, New York, February 14, 1758, *PHB*, I, 301-302.

⁴⁷ Fred Anderson, *The Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 272-274.

organization.⁴⁸ The Ohio Company of Virginia would become a formidable obstacle to Bouquet's ability to organize an efficient and timely movement across the Allegheny Mountains.

In many ways, Bouquet's struggles with the Ohio Company mirrored the quartering and requisitioning ordeals. For decades, the Iroquois Confederacy had sold land out from under neighboring or client tribes to the Pennsylvania and Virginia governments. In 1737, the Confederacy ceded a large tract of land to the Penn Family in a fraud known as the Walking Purchase. Again, in 1744, the Confederacy brokered a fraudulent land deal with the Virginia government. Soon thereafter, the Crown authorized the Virginia Council to cede this territory to corporations, such as the Greenbrier, Wood's River, and the Loyal companies. In 1747, a group of wealthy gentlemen, including George Washington and John St. Clair, from Virginia's North Neck petitioned Governor Gooch for a 200,000 acre grant. Even then, Gooch suspected that such a grant would jeopardize Britain's peace negotiations with France, as King George's War was wrapping up. Gooch referred the petition to the Crown. The petitioners then requested 500,000 acres, with the caveat, that if the Crown granted 200,000 acres immediately, then the shareholders would build a fort and facilitate settlement. Apprehensive of the company's expansive goals, the Crown authorized the Virginia Council to cede 500,000 of land to the newly incorporated Ohio Company, but only to create buffer between British and French possessions. The Crown wanted the Ohio Company to provide a buffer against French aggression and to preempt an alliance between the French and Ohio Indians. In this respect, the Ohio Company anticipated

⁴⁸ Porter, *War and the Rise of the State*, xiii-xiv; Bouquet to Forbes, New York, April 23, 1758, *PHB*, I, 332-333; Bouquet to Forbes, New York, May 4, 1758, *PHB*, I, 336-337.

Henry Bouquet's Proclamation Line of 1761 and the Royal Proclamation Line two years later. But before then, Bouquet would lead the Royal Army into the zone claimed by Ohio Company shareholders.⁴⁹

One month after Bouquet departed from New York City, Forbes ordered him to organize the movement of the army toward Fort Duquesne. To begin, Bouquet would have to repair or build magazines across the Pennsylvania frontier. Forbes ordered him to contract 120 wagons at Philadelphia to haul supplies to Carlisle and then on to Bedford. Forbes advised Bouquet to hire engineers, because the army would need to construct a series of forts along the way to Fort Duquesne, which would not only consolidate the state's hegemony but also serve the practical purpose of providing shelter, storage, and security. As for troops, Bouquet would march Colonel John Armstrong's First Battalion of the Pennsylvania Regiments to Fort Loudoun; James Burd's Second Battalion of the Pennsylvania Regiments would proceed to Bedford; Sir Allan McLean would march three companies of Royal Highlanders to Carlisle. Under Little Carpenter's tutelage, Cherokee warriors would secure the area between the mountains and the west branch of the Susquehanna River. Forbes trusted that Bouquet's precise organizational skills would culminate in both the provincial regiments and their supplies arriving at Lancaster, Pennsylvania. From there, the army would proceed toward Bedford, cutting roads and building forts and storehouses along the way. After reinforcing Fort Cumberland, then General George Washington's First Virginia Regiment would join Bouquet in central Pennsylvania. In all, building this trans-Pennsylvania road to Fort Duquesne required a high level of bureaucratic organization, quite unlike the

⁴⁹James Titus, *The Old Dominion at War: Society, Politics, and Warfare in Late Colonial Virginia* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), 8-14.

comparatively primitive level of organization found in constitutional customs and legislative bodies. Here, Bouquet orchestrated territorial acquisition, marshaling all the insights of modern state building to this project.⁵⁰

Following Forbes' instructions, Bouquet ordered soldiers to construct a series of frontier magazines to prepare the way for a much larger influx of soldiers. By late May, Bouquet had fully supplied the Pennsylvania magazines. Soldiers constructed a stockade fort at the Juniata and a similar fort at Bedford. The later fort included storehouses and entrenchments for troops. Bouquet requested a master carpenter and blacksmith to oversee the soldiers' labor, a request that Forbes obliged. Still, Bouquet anticipated the arrival of Washington's Virginians, now delayed into early June. John St. Clair, Forbes' Quarter Master General and Bouquet's nemesis, promised to send Lieutenant Thomas Bassett of the RAR to Shippensburg with equipment for road construction. Meanwhile, St. Clair was outfitting Virginia's Colonel William Byrd III with blankets, kettles, tents, and not least axes, all to facilitate road construction. In all, St. Clair had ordered Bassett, Byrd, and Washington to oversee the construction of Forbes' Road.⁵¹ Almost prophetically, St. Clair warned,

I am not anxious about the cutting the Road to Rays Town [Bedford] from Fort Cumberland, it may be done in 4 days, or in 2, if the tow Ends are gone upon at

⁵⁰ Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, May 20, 1758, *PHB*, I, 347-348; Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, May 23, 1758, *PHB*, I, 353-354. For Early Modern state building, see Brian M. Downing, *The Military Revolution and Political Change: Origins of Democracy and Autocracy in Early Modern Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 3-17; Thomas Ertam, *The Birth of Leviathan: Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 26-28. For a description of the Pennsylvania forts, see Hunter, *Forts on the Pennsylvania Frontier*, 544-547.

⁵¹ Bouquet to Forbes, Lancaster, May 22, 1758, *PHB*, I, 350-352; Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, May 25, 1758, *PHB*, I, 354-356; St. Clair to Bouquet, Winchester, May 28, 1758, *PHB*, I, 376-377.

the same time; but I am afraid you will have a deal of work, from Fort Loudoun, to Rays Town, which I am afraid will be troublesome.

In fact, the stake of St. Clair, Washington, and many other Virginians in the development of an alternative road would prove almost more troublesome than the terrain through which Bouquet was consolidating Britain's territorial empire.⁵²

St. Clair and the Virginian regiments had exhausted Bouquet's patience before they ever met the Swiss Colonel. Bouquet complained to Forbes that St. Clair had dallied in preparing John Armstrong's First Battalion and Burd's Second Battalion. As he put it, "Everything is still in a great confusion, and nothing can be expected of an army that is always separated, and most of whose officers have no notion of service."⁵³ Forbes had already given Bouquet permission to dispatch Washington's provincials as necessity required.⁵⁴ In an effort to gain some benefit from Washington's regiment, Bouquet begged St. Clair to divert the Virginian soldiers away from Shippensburg and back to Fort Cumberland. With no confidence in Washington, Bouquet assigned some of his soldiers to garrison Fort Cumberland, a task ordinarily assigned to the injured, lame, or decrepit. The remainder of Washington's regiment would begin "cutting the road from Cumberland to Ray's Town [Bedford] on their march."⁵⁵

Anticipating the arrival of more provincial soldiers, Forbes advised Bouquet on how best to exploit their labor. First, many provincial troops would repair the road between Lancaster and Carlisle. Second, because the road between Carlisle and

⁵² St. Clair to Bouquet, Winchester, May 28, 1758, *PHB*, I, 376.

⁵³ Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, May 29-May 30, 1758, *PHB*, I, 386-390.

⁵⁴ Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, May 30, 1758, *PHB*, I, 393-394.

⁵⁵ Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, May 30, 1758, *PHB*, I, 393-394. For a description of Fort Cumberland, see Hunter, *Forts on the Pennsylvania Frontier*, 365-480.

Shippensburg served as the primary communication artery between Pennsylvania and Virginia, Bouquet should disperse provincial troops at posts every six miles along this road.⁵⁶ The implementation of Forbes' orders began in early June when Lieutenant Colonel Adam Stephen arrived at Fort Loudoun with 600 Virginians; among these were five of Washington's companies. These Virginians immediately began repairs on the roads toward Fort Lyttelton and Shippensburg.⁵⁷ Meanwhile, Hugh Mercer, a Scottish trained physician and member of the Pennsylvania Provincials, arrived at Fort Loudoun only to discover that Captain Robert Callender had sent six companies of soldiers on to Bedford. This required Mercer to recall two companies to complete the troops at Fort Loudoun. Mercer's provincials joined Stephen's in repairing the road from Loudoun to Shippensburg.⁵⁸ Even so, when Bouquet inspected these roads, he found them to be almost impassable. Rains had reduced the road to rock and stone, and as a result, "Our wagons are breaking down; our horses are losing their shoes. It is a wretched state of affairs." This situation recommended that Bouquet map an entirely new road, because if the army continued at its present pace, then the troops would move as slow as "tortoises."⁵⁹

Three factors accounted for the slow pace of the campaign. First, in May, Forbes allotted Bouquet 271 tents. He cautioned the Colonel to distribute them "with a parcimonious (*sic*) hand," because he was still waiting for additional tents to arrive from England. When the first 200 arrived, Bouquet ordered his subordinates to send as many

⁵⁶ Forbes "Memoranda," Philadelphia, June 1, 1758, *PHB*, II, 1-2. Hunter, *Forts on the Pennsylvania Frontier*, 472.

⁵⁷ Stephen to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, June 6, 1758, *PHB*, II, 41. Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, June 7, 1758, *PHB*, II, 47. Hunter, *Forts on the Pennsylvania Frontier*, 472, 477.

⁵⁸ Hugh Mercer to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, June 5, 1758, *PHB*, II, 34.

⁵⁹ Bouquet to Forbes, Fort Loudoun, June 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 73.

to Washington as he required. But Washington demanded more and more. So, Bouquet requested additional tents from New York and moaned that none of the officers or soldiers at Carlisle had any. This parsimonious distribution of tents eventually stalled the movement of Washington's Virginians. St. Clair blamed Bouquet for the lack of tents and requested that he send 114 immediately. Bouquet obliged this request, but warned that he had few additional tents to distribute. Washington delayed movement of the Virginians for weeks while awaiting tents. Finally, Bouquet ordered only part of Washington's regiments to Fort Cumberland, where they lived in Indian-styled bark shelters.⁶⁰ Tent shortages also delayed Captain David Hunter's progression. His soldiers did not have "ten Firelocks, they have no Ammunitions, Canteens, Knapsacks, Blankets or *Tents* [emphasis added]." ⁶¹ In all, the tent shortage stretched only over a few weeks. In that context, it demonstrated the ability of Bouquet and Forbes to organize the transport of tents from England to disparate regions of the American frontier quite quickly. Looked at from another perspective, Washington's obstinate refusal to move the Virginians until Bouquet secured tents spiraled into many unnecessary delays. What began as a "parsimonious" distribution, Washington turned into a delayed campaign.⁶²

Transporting vast quantities of provisions across equally vast terrains had challenged military personnel since armies had grown in size back in the sixteenth century. Provisioning proved no less challenging for Bouquet and became the second hindrance to expediting this campaign. No sooner had Bouquet transported

⁶⁰ For the tent escalating tension in the tent débâcle, see Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, May 20, 1758, *PHB*, I, 347-348; Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, May 23, 1758, *PHB*, I, 353-354; Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, June 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 10-15; Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, May 25, 1758, *PHB*, I, 361-365; Stanwix to Bouquet, New York, May 25, 1758, *PHB*, I, 370; Stephen to Bouquet, Winchester, May 26, 1758, *PHB*, I, 372; St. Clair to Bouquet, Winchester, May 27, 1758, *PHB*, I, 374-375; Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, May 30, 1758, *PHB*, I, 393-394.

⁶¹ Stevenson to Bouquet, New York, May 31, 1758, *PHB*, I, 399-400.

⁶² Bouquet to St. Clair, Carlisle, June 3, 1758, *PHB*, I, 22-24.

Washington's five regiments to Cumberland, than he began to fear that they would starve. Bouquet believed it a "miracle" that the Pennsylvania Assembly finally intervened and provided provisions. When Bouquet ordered the Virginia regiments to Cumberland, St. Clair shipped them to Fort Loudoun instead. Bouquet excused this in light of Cumberland's sparse provisions, yet it delayed road repairs.⁶³

After the Cumberland incident, Bouquet slowed the westward progression to ensure that the army could supply itself and not depend on the dubious cooperation of the Pennsylvania Assembly. Therefore, Bouquet halted St. Clair's road construction, until the army had built and supplied the advance posts. As Bouquet put it, "I carry one hundred Waggon loaded with Provisions, Ammunition and Tools, besides a Good drove of Cattle to enable us to wait without danger of being Starved the next Transport."⁶⁴ However, provisioning the army remained a major difficulty, because supplies traveled slowly across the frontiers. Indeed, Washington would marshal the threat of starvation as a principal reason for following Braddock's Road, an alternate route to Pittsburgh that passed through the Ohio Company's real estate. The first winter at Fort Pitt nearly proved Washington's prediction true, as Bouquet pleaded for Philadelphia to send provisions to the western posts.⁶⁵ Competent organization prevented starvation, which

⁶³ In this instance, the Pennsylvania Assembly made itself relevant by supporting the Royal Army. Regardless of its origins, the necessity of war fundamentally changed the orientation of the Assembly as this case demonstrates. For Downing, instances such as this demonstrate the continuity of Parliamentary systems. See, for example, Downing, *The Military Revolution and Political Change*, 157-186. Porter concedes this point, though he emphasized how warfare changed the state and circumscribed liberties usually associated with legislative government. For Porter's take on Downing, see *War and the Rise of the State*, Chapter 3, Note 42, page 83. Bouquet to St. Clair, Carlisle, June 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 22; Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, June 7, 1758, *PHB*, II, 47-51.

⁶⁴ Bouquet to Burd, Pittsburgh, December 1, 1758, *PHB*, II, 617; Bouquet to St. Clair, Carlisle, June 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 22-24.

⁶⁵ For Washington's comments, see Washington to Bouquet, November 6, 1758, *PHB*, II, 597-598. For Bouquet's impatience with what he perceived to be a cabal between Armstrong and Washington, see Bouquet to Forbes, Loyal Hannon, October 28, 1758, *PHB*, II, 588-589. For the lack of supplies, see Bouquet to the Duke of Portland, Fort Duquesne, December 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 620-621.

explained Bouquet's rage when the Virginian army failed to supply a new fort on the Monongahela River. Bouquet ranted:

Your Letter of the 25th received last night surprised & vexes me beyond Expression; after giving such Strict Charge to L^t Col. Mercer to Subsist you, & repeated orders to the Commanding officer at Cumberland to forward Provisions with the utmost diligence, Could I imagine that they would let you Starve? It is hard to have nobody to depend upon.⁶⁶

Bouquet insisted that his subordinates organize efficient supply lines, originating at Fort Cumberland and extending beyond the Allegheny Mountains. Bouquet understood that diligent organization of supply lines offered the best remedy to the never-ending threat of starvation.

Bouquet's inability to procure wagons was a third cause of delay in the Forbes' Expedition. Unlike supplying soldiers, either tents or provisions, procuring wagons required a direct intersection between the army and civilians. Forbes described the difficulty in obtaining wagons from the civilian population as the greatest "plague" of his life.⁶⁷ The unique constitutional and social consequence of the army's effort to procure wagons was taken up in the previous chapter. Here, suffice it to say, that delays in the procurement of wagons slowed the movement of supplies to the western posts, setting back road construction and delaying the campaign.

Delays in obtaining tents, provisions, and wagons angered St. Clair and Washington—both men lacking familiarity with the complexities of European styled

⁶⁶ Bouquet to Burd, Bedford, September 30, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 167.

⁶⁷ Forbes to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 14, 1758, *PHB*, II, 207-210.

bureaucratic organization. Accordingly, St Clair demanded a face-to-face meeting between Bouquet, Governor Horatio Sharpe of Maryland, and himself.⁶⁸ As St. Clair put it:

From our different Situations, I can easily perceive that we cannot carry on the Service unless we have a meeting, if I send the troops all to Fort Cumberland on Monday I must propose having an Interview with you...I shall get Governor Sharpe [of Maryland] to meet us on Tuesday where we shall be able to settle every thing of our future Motions.⁶⁹

From St. Clair's perspective, the problem hinged on the movement of troops from Fort Cumberland to Pennsylvania. Couched in his letter was the assumption that a meeting with Governor Sharpe would whip Bouquet into shape. But, Bouquet could not attend the meeting, which settled little more than a decision to garrison Fort Cumberland.⁷⁰

Colonial governors did not scare Bouquet, if his previous relations with Governor Lyttelton offered any precedent. By arranging a meeting between Bouquet and Sharpe, St. Clair had set in motion a more startling chain of events than he could have imagined possible. Like Governor Ellis, Governor Sharpe was a Royalist, backing the British state through and through. Instead of expediting the shipment of tents and provisions, Bouquet and Sharpe jointly decided to construct an entirely new highway, linking Frederick and Cumberland. Later, the plan to open this so-called Maryland road ballooned into

⁶⁸ Bouquet to St. Clair, Carlisle, June 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 22-24.

⁶⁹ St. Clair to Bouquet, Winchester, June 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 29.

⁷⁰ Bouquet regretted missing this meeting. Bouquet to St Clair, Carlisle, June 5, 1758, *PHB*, II, 32. St. Clair would not reveal the particulars of what he wanted to discuss beforehand. St. Clair to Bouquet, Winchester, June 5, 1758, *PHB*, II, 35-36; Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, June 7, 1758, *PHB*, II, 50. For the meeting between Sharpe and St. Clair, see Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, June 10, 1758, *PHB*, II, 65. For Sharpe and fort construction, see Hunter, *Forts on the Pennsylvania Frontier*, 365.

Bouquet's ambitious decision to construct a trans-Allegheny road. Imperialist to the core, this trans-Allegheny road would bypass Braddock's Road and the possessions of the Ohio Company, against the hopes of St. Clair and the other Virginia shareholders.⁷¹

Contrary to St. Clair's intent, Governor Sharpe had actually requested the army's assistance in opening the road between forts Cumberland and Frederick. This route would allow the troops to bypass the oftentimes-flooded Potomac River. And it shaved 20 miles from the existing passages, allowing for speedy wagon transports between Maryland and Pennsylvania. The existing roads between forts Cumberland and Frederick were already in good condition, but one 30-mile stretch remained to be carved out of Maryland's forests. Sharpe immediately sent men out to survey the new route, and Bouquet promised the labor of the new recruits at Carlisle. On their way from Carlisle to Maryland, these new recruits could pick up tools from Fort Loudoun. With the labor of six-hundred men, the army could complete this section of road in just 3 weeks. Not only did Bouquet ask Forbes to approve the project, but he also praised Sharpe's support of the Royal army. As he put it:

Governor Sharpe has busied himself very eagerly to accelerate the service and remove many difficulties. We are under great obligation to him, and if you approve the communication he has proposed, I hope that he will be willing to take care of managing it, at your request.⁷²

⁷¹ Bouquet, Memoranda: Articles Agreed Upon at the Conegogee, Conegogee, June 12, 1758, *PHB*, II, 79; Bouquet to Sharpe, Conegogee, June 13, 1757, *PHB*, II, 82; Kenneth P. Bailey, *Christopher Gist: Colonial Frontiersman, Explorer, and Indian Agent* (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1976), 145.

⁷² Bouquet to Forbes, Fort Loudoun, June 14, 1758, *PHB*, II, 87-88.

With Forbes approbation for the Maryland Road, the army had set in motion an impetus for the complete overhaul of the region's transportation system.⁷³

Meanwhile, Bouquet returned to Pennsylvania to inspect the road repairs between Fort Loudoun and Bedford. Put simply, Bouquet found Pennsylvania's road system to be inefficient and almost beyond redemption. He blamed ordinary Pennsylvanians for this inefficiency. Instead of progressing westward, the existing roads passed through towns and villages, Carlisle and Shippensburg for example. Logical from Pennsylvanians' perspective, Bouquet insisted, "[T]hey have chosen the worst" possible routes. To compensate for delays and to expedite the expedition, Bouquet set out to reconnoiter a new road, a road suited for a modern military and speedy transport. Local inhabitants suggested four alternative passes for Bouquet's consideration. But upon inspection, he found none of these routes to head directly west because all were tied to local interests. Thus, Bouquet proposed the construction of an entirely new route.⁷⁴ What became known as Forbes' Road would bypass Cumberland, cut across a steep pass in the Allegheny Mountains, cross Fort Bedford, and proceed directly to Fort Duquesne. Immediately perceiving that this proposed route not only bypassed colonial villages but also the Ohio Company's real estate interests, the Virginians mounted a fight. St Clair insisted that time did not permit the army to reconnoiter a road across the Allegheny Mountains, and it would give the French and Indians another opportunity to attack British

⁷³ Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, June 19, 1758, *PHB*, II, 112-113. The Board of trade granted the Ohio Company's charter in order to shore up Britain's hegemony in the region. The Ohio Company, conversely, saw its grant as geared towards profits from the Indian trade and land speculation. In 1758, these goals became incompatible and the Army undermined the Ohio Company's claims. Titus, *The Old Dominion at War*, 14.

⁷⁴ Bouquet to Forbes, Fort Loudoun, June 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 72-76.

soldiers and frontier settlements.⁷⁵ But Bouquet disagreed, for nothing could take longer than maneuvering through colonials' jumbled mud pits and waiting for the provincials to repair them. Upon learning of Bouquet's plan to reconnoiter a "road on the other side of the Allegany [M]ountains," Forbes again gave his approval.⁷⁶

While Bouquet planned the trans-Allegheny road, the army continued to construct new highways, giving rise to a series of new forts. Bouquet opened a fort at the Juniata on 23 June, which became a critical fort connecting Lancaster to Bedford.⁷⁷ On June 28, he arrived at Bedford and decided on a location to construct another fort.⁷⁸ St. Clair ordered 100 Highlanders to Fort Lyttelton and more were on the way to repair infrastructure. Royal regulars were marching toward Fort Loudoun to rebuild the roads in that region. Meanwhile, Washington's Virginians had begun repairing roads from Cumberland west to Bedford and east to Frederick. Bouquet wrote Washington to encourage his oversight of those repairs.⁷⁹ Yet, while Bouquet trekked through the Allegheny Mountains, the Virginian officers who worked under his command were mounting an opposition movement to this trans-Allegheny pass.

Two engineers, known only as Dudgeon and Hesse, accompanied Bouquet on his Allegheny surveying tour. Together, they surveyed vast stretches of western Pennsylvania territory, searching out the most efficient route for a new road.⁸⁰

⁷⁵ St Clair to Bouquet, Winchester, June 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 76-78. The best description of the Ohio Company and its relationship with the Royal Army is P. James, *The Ohio Company: Its Inner History* (Pittsburgh, 1959), *passim*.

⁷⁶ Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, June 16, 1758, *PHB*, II, 103. Other reports indicated that constructing an entirely new road would take less time than repairing existing routes. Bullitt to Bouquet, Carlisle, June 17, 1758, *PHB*, II, 105.

⁷⁷ Bouquet to Forbes, Juniata, June 22, 1758, *PHB*, II, 126-127.

⁷⁸ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, June 28, 1758, *PHB*, II, 142-144.

⁷⁹ St Clair to Bouquet, Carlisle, June 22, 1758, *PHB*, II, 130-131. Bouquet to Washington, Bedford, June 27 1758, *PHB*, II, 134.

⁸⁰ Bouquet to Forbes, Juniata Camp, June 21, 1758, *PHB*, II, 122.

Meanwhile, back in Virginia, opposition to all the new highways mounted, as evidenced in the correspondence of John Armstrong and George Washington. Armstrong wrote Bouquet and warned that the opening of new roads would only delay the expedition and “Divide our people.”⁸¹ The warning was dubious. Earlier, the Virginians had attributed delays to shortfalls in tents, provisions, and wagons. Now, the only social divisions that the new roadways created were between the Royal Army and the Ohio Company’s shareholders, such as St. Clair, George Mercer, and Washington.⁸² To divert attention from the Forbes Road, Bouquet ordered 300 of Washington’s Virginians to work on the Maryland Road, hinting at Forbes’s commitment to overall infrastructure improvements.⁸³

In late June, St. Clair penned two letters that disparaged the possibility of finding the trans-Allegheny pass that would expedite the campaign. St. Clair hoped that his letter would discourage the Swiss Colonel from future reconnoitering in the Pennsylvania woods.⁸⁴ Days later, St. Clair reported to Forbes that Bouquet would never discover a passable route from Bedford across the Allegheny Mountains. Moreover, he insisted that the new road that Washington’s Virginians had forged from Cumberland to Bedford was too far for the army to travel. Therefore, the Virginian concluded that geography dictated that the army must repair Braddock’s Road and use it. Forbes speculated that “passion” directed St. Clair’s decision-making. But neither passion nor geography told the whole story. In fact, Braddock’s Road was the main artery through the Ohio Company’s lands.

⁸¹ John Armstrong to Bouquet, Carlisle, June 28, 1758, *PHB*, II, 145.

⁸² For a partial analysis of George Washington’s interests in the Ohio Company, see *The Crucible of War: The Seven Years’ War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 106. For a complete list of the Ohio Company shareholders, see Bailey, *Christopher Gist*, 26.

⁸³ Bouquet to St. Clair, Bedford, June 30, 1758, *PHB*, II, 148-150; Bouquet to Washington, Bedford, July 1, 1758, *PHB*, II, 156.

⁸⁴ St. Clair to Bouquet, Carlisle, June 30, 1758, *PHB*, II, 153.

If the Royal army completed a second, more efficient road, then the Ohio Company's shares would surely fall. But the Royal army did not have shares in the Ohio Company, and Bouquet doubted that it was even a legal entity. Accordingly, Forbes ordered Bouquet to reconnoiter the entire Allegheny region, especially Laurel Ridge, until he discovered a direct and efficient route to siege Fort Duquesne.⁸⁵

Bouquet persisted in the search for a direct rout to Fort Duquesne. By early July, he had decided a new road to be preferable to Braddock's, and he believed that with proper engineering, the army could traverse the treacherous Laurel Ridge. Still, the Virginians mounted violent opposition to this new road. As Bouquet explained:

This is a matter of politics between one province and another, in which we have no part; and I have always avoided saying a word on this subject, as I am certain that we shall find a passage, and that—in that case—we should for many reasons prefer this route, if not for the whole army, at least for a large detachment... I do not understand on what grounds Sir John is convinced that no road can be found beyond this place without dropping down to Braddock's.⁸⁶

As with the Maryland Road, Forbes approved Bouquet's plans for the trans-Allegheny route. Like Bouquet, Forbes experienced as troublesome the opposition of "foolish people" to the army's efforts to control the frontier, and he intended to address the matter to the colonial governors.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Forbes to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 6, 1758, *PHB*, II, 163-165. Kenneth P. Bailey, *The Ohio Company of Virginia and the Westward Movement, 1748-1792: A Chapter in the History of the Colonial Frontier* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1939), 30-37; Titus, *The Old Dominion at War*, 11-14.

⁸⁶ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, July 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 179-182.

⁸⁷ Forbes to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 14, 1758, *PHB*, II, 207.

On July 15, Bouquet gave orders to reconnoiter Braddock's Road, but this amounted to nothing more than a tactic to deceive the French. Meanwhile, the Colonel continued to open storehouses along the Pennsylvania frontier. He stationed detachments of 30 soldiers throughout the region to guard against roving bands of enemy Indians.⁸⁸ Then, on July 21, Bouquet received a conclusive report on the prospects for traversing Laurel Hill. According to this report, stones covered the summit of the hill and even more lined its western side. Soldiers' muscle could remove stones, making the ridge passable even for farm wagons. The region had sufficient forage and water to sustain hundreds of men and beasts. Anticipating Forbes' approval of the route, Bouquet ordered the construction of a storehouse at the foot of Laurel Hill and dispatched 600 soldiers to the region.⁸⁹

Forbes compared both the Virginians and Bouquet's proposed routes. The route the Virginians favored meant traveling 34 miles from Bedford to Fort Cumberland. Then, Braddock's road meandered another 125 miles from Fort Cumberland to Fort Duquesne, totaling 160 miles. But eight miles of the Virginians routed remained uncut, crossed many rivers and streams, and lacked bridges. The route Bouquet proposed, on the other hand, stretched 46 miles from Bedford to the top of Laurel Hill. Then, the proposed pass from Laurel Hill to Fort Duquesne amounted to another 40 or 50 miles, making it a 90 mile stretch in all. With few streams and no rivers, Laurel Hill was the only obstacle. "If...those two roads are compared," Forbes concluded, "I don't see that I am to hesitate one moment which to take unless I take a [political] party likewise, which I hope never to do in Army matters." Distance, not Ohio Company shareholders,

⁸⁸ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, July 15, 1758, *PHB*, II, 215-217.

⁸⁹ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, July 21, 1758, *PHB*, II, 252. For additional geographic description, see George Armstrong to Bouquet, Edmund's Swamp, July 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 271-272.

determined Forbes' decision to construct a new road across the Allegheny Mountains.⁹⁰

Braddock's Road was now irrelevant in the British territorial empire.

In August 1758, Forbes' medical condition worsened. Having endured the so-called "flux" for months, letter writing and ordinary correspondence had now become almost impossible. Forbes went "out in his Chariot every evening which does him great good." Even so, the General increasingly relied on his field commanders to carry out the service.⁹¹ Accordingly, Bouquet pushed ahead with the trans-Allegheny road and fought against the resistance Ohio Company shareholders mounted. George Washington emerged as the preeminent spokesman for the interests of the Ohio Company's shareholders, and due to Forbes' frailty, Bouquet became responsible for mediating between the Virginian and the British state.

On July 25, Washington declared to Bouquet, "[I] shall never have a Will of my own where a point of duty is required."⁹² Yet, many Virginians had an entrenched interest or "Will" in the development of Braddock's Road. For his part, Washington could not accept that Forbes had chosen a more direct route. He explained that Braddock's Road had begun as an Indian route that the Ohio Company had appropriated in 1753. Washington's regiment had repaired the road to Grist's Plantation. In 1755, Braddock's soldiers had widened the road and extended it within six miles of Fort Duquesne. Washington concluded, "A Road that has been so long opened—so well repaired—and so often, must be much firmer and better than a new one, allowing the ground to be originally, equally as good." Whereas Washington denied Braddock's Road

⁹⁰ Forbes to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 23, 1758, *PHB*, II, 265. Bouquet did not receive Forbes' approval until August 3, and Forbes' infirmity required that his secretary correspond with Bouquet. Halkett to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 31, 1758, *PHB*, II, 294-295.

⁹¹ Halkett to Bouquet, Carlisle, August 7, 1758, *PHB*, II, 322.

⁹² Washington to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, July 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 273-275.

entailed any disadvantages, he provided a meticulous explanation of why a trans-Alleghany road would destroy the campaign. Washington believed that the time, expense, and manpower required to forge the new road would completely exhaust the resources of the middle and southern colonies. He warned that by the time the army completed the road, all the provincial troops would have disbanded for winter, draining the army of manpower to siege Fort Duquesne. Finally, Washington warned that the delays occasioned by the construction of a new road would weigh on the Indians' patience and perhaps sever their loyalty, leaving the army without espionage agents. Washington believed that further delays would cause the Indians to look "upon us in a despicable light," and perhaps damage the alliances brokered at the Easton Conference. Washington warned that if any one of these points happened, then colonial support for the war would dissipate and the British cause would end in utter defeat.⁹³

Washington's warning of calamity annoyed Bouquet. At first, the Swiss Colonel responded to the Virginian's letters with detached decency: "Nothing can be greater than your generous disposition for the Service, and the candid Exposition of your Sentiments."⁹⁴ Indeed, Bouquet's tolerance probably encouraged Washington to prolong his bargaining on behalf of the Ohio Company's interests. Through August, Washington persisted, "If unfortunately I am right; my Conduct will acquit me."⁹⁵ Then, more sarcastically, "I wish with all my Soul you may continue to find little difficulty in opening your Road. I am certain if you find much, you will not have time for any other Service this Campaign."⁹⁶ Finally, this "candid Exposition" drove Bouquet beyond

⁹³ Washington to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, August 2, 1758, *PHB*, II, 298-303.

⁹⁴ Bouquet to Washington, Bedford, July 27, 1758, *PHB*, II, 281-282.

⁹⁵ Washington to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, August 6, 1758, *PHB*, II, 318-319.

⁹⁶ Washington to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, August 13, 1758, *PHB*, II, 364-365.

endurance, and he reported an imperial *fait accompli*—construction had already begun. Bouquet chalked up the decision to forge the trans-Allegheny road to Forbes' orders: "[T]here was no room left to hesitate." He assured Washington that Rohr had discovered a "gap," over which the road would pass. And except for the weakening Cherokee alliance, this "gap" solved the first two fatalities that Washington had predicted.⁹⁷ But whereas this geographic gap resolved one problem, it paralleled a larger social gap that was emerging between colonial and military hegemony on the frontier; that is, the army's power increased as it moved west and the colonial governments lost influence.

Once the trans-Allegheny route was a *fait accompli*, Forbes continued to consolidate military power in western Pennsylvania. First, he recommended that the army begin to move small detachments up Braddock's Road. If enemy intelligence knew the British were constructing a new road, then movement up Braddock's Road would confuse what little intelligence they had obtained. From a practical standpoint, Forbes wanted to construct a route between the two roads, which would hasten communications and troop movements. Bouquet assigned this detail to Washington's Virginians, both placating Washington and integrating the Virginians into an imperialist project.⁹⁸ Meanwhile, the process of constructing depots and magazines continued. Bouquet dispatched Rohr and other surveyors to identify a location for a post at Loyal Hanna. Once the army built this post, Bouquet lamented that Royal officers would have to man it, because provincial officers "serve only as obstacles" to the goals of the state.⁹⁹ A process was underway on the Pennsylvania frontier, whereby Royal power increased as

⁹⁷ Bouquet to Washington, Bedford, July 27, 1758, *PHB*, II, 281-282; Bouquet to Washington, Bedford, August 10, 1758, *PHB*, II, 350-351.

⁹⁸ Forbes to Bouquet, Shippensburg, August 15, 1758, *PHB*, II, 366-368; Bouquet to Washington, Bedford, August 17, 1758, *PHB*, II, 374-375.

⁹⁹ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, August 18, 1758, *PHB*, II, 379-382.

colonial power proportionally decreased. Military infrastructure was the gauge of this process.

Historical hindsight reads wisdom into the length of the Forbes' Expedition. Fred Anderson argued that Forbes used a logic opposite to Braddock's failed expedition to take the Forks. As Anderson put it:

Whereas Braddock had hoped to expel the French quickly and therefore carried a minimum of provisions with his column, Forbes knew that he would need to hold the Forks once he had driven out the French, and that meant transporting vast quantities of food, clothing, ammunition, arms, and trade goods overland from the coast.¹⁰⁰

Washington had been first to argue against this tactic, proposing that colonial resources and provincial troops could not sustain an extended campaign. Although Bouquet had silenced Washington in August, he replicated the Virginian's arguments in September. First, Bouquet warned that the colonists would grow impatient with the campaign's length. After surrendering forage and wagons, the colonists rightly wanted to see results. Second, he did not accept that the French held superior strength, for even French aligned "Savages" scattered at the sound of British gunfire. Couched in both arguments was Bouquet's confidence in British infrastructure and military superiority. Now, Bouquet believed that autumn was the time to siege Fort Duquesne. However, in the midst of warfare, neither Bouquet nor Washington could have known that these ostensible setbacks were actually setting the stage for Forbes' success. That is, during Forbes' extended campaign, other processes were at work, which would ultimately reverse

¹⁰⁰ Bouquet to Forbes, September 4, 1758, *PHB*, II, 472; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 258.

Braddock's defeat. For example, Fort Frontenac on Lake Ontario had fallen to the British. The Delaware chief, Teedyuscung, had brokered an alliance between all the Ohio Indians and the British, stripping Fort Duquesne of its Indian allies. Forbes' slow campaign paralleled the gradual whittling away of French military and diplomatic superiority, resulting in British material and military superiority.¹⁰¹

In early September of 1758, Bouquet had crossed Loyal Hanna and ordered additional repairs to what he perceived to be a "worthless" road.¹⁰² Two months later, General Forbes passed Loyal Hanna, and like Bouquet, found the road to be an inadequate piece of military infrastructure. He ordered additional repairs. As Forbes explained:

I had no reason either to expect that the road was better, or better open'd than what I had come, which was so monstrously and Carelessly done that I lost all manner of patience, and was obliged to employ the artillery guard to make Bridges & Openings to let them pass.¹⁰³

The Loyal Hanna repairs were among the last that Forbes commissioned. He guided the army to the Forks, but the flux killed him.

Late November 1758, Bouquet's soldiers marched toward what was supposed to be a siege to oust the French from Fort Duquesne. But hours before the planned November assault, the army's Catawba spies reported that a cloud of thick smoke hovered above the Ohio River. "[A] few hours after they [Indians] sent word that the

¹⁰¹ Anderson, *ibid.*

¹⁰² Bouquet to Forbes, Loyal Hannon, September 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 492-494.

¹⁰³ Forbes to Bouquet, November 22, 1758, *PHB*, II, 606.

Enemies had abandoned their Fort after having burned everything.”¹⁰⁴ The Catawbas reported that the French had bombed Fort Duquesne, burnt the surrounding structures, and had destroyed their fields and magazines. In a certain exaggeration, the Catawbas speculated that the French had fled eight hundred miles west, into the Illinois Country. In the aftermath of that bloodless victory, Washington returned his provincial soldiers to Virginia, taking, ironically, the Forbes’ Road. Bouquet ordered Royal Regulars to guard the smoldering Fort Duquesne. The soldiers stood guard “half naked,” awaiting blankets, provisions, and tents to catch up with their lead.¹⁰⁵ With forts, roads, and storehouses, stretching across Pennsylvania, British military personnel now imagined that they could militarize the trans-Allegheny zone, organize Indian and trading policy, and regulate daily life. Seemingly, despite the requisitioning and quartering ordeals, Bouquet never learned that human agency often resisted military dictates. Now, after the French evacuation, he acted as though providence had given free reign to military rule. Thus, began Bouquet’s campaign to militarize the Ohio Territory.

Militarization: “No other Ennemies to fight than Hunger”

The military revolution bred tendencies toward militarism that were manifestly unequal across Europe’s political landscapes. The sequencing of many variables allowed a high level of militarization to emerge in Prussia, while constitutionalism remained in England. The Seven Years’ War exported the process of militarization to North America, but the American social landscape posed challenge that did not exist in Europe. Different social and political variables on either side of the Allegheny Mountains allowed Bouquet

¹⁰⁴ Bouquet to William Allen, Fort Duquesne, November 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 610.

¹⁰⁵ Bouquet to Stanwix, Fort Duquesne, November 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 609.

to realize unequal degrees of militarization, but never to the extent to which he hoped. East of the Allegheny Mountains, constitutional frameworks constrained Bouquet's ability to dictate military policies. These constitutional constraints coupled with human resistance made quartering and requisitioning very difficult. After crossing the Allegheny Mountains, Bouquet did not face the constraints imposed by constitutional custom, and he wanted to avoid replicating the inefficiencies of the colonial assemblies. The French evacuation from the Ohio Territory created the illusion of a power vacuum that Bouquet tried to fill with military rule. But, Bouquet never fully realized the level of militarization that he had wanted, precisely because the Ohio Indians posed the same obstacles that colonists had posed east of the Allegheny Mountains. In this sense, Bouquet's story was that of Jeffery Amherst and Thomas Gage inside the colonies—all attempts to militarize North America after the Seven Years' War collapsed, and the Royal Army was unable to control the colonists, the frontier, or the natives, precisely because these groups resisted military rule.¹⁰⁶

The following pages argue that Bouquet tried to establish a variant of military rule over the Ohio Territory. He initiated this process by securing a military stronghold at the forks of the Monongahela and Ohio rivers. Soon thereafter, Bouquet tried to implement policies that regulated daily life for soldiers, traders, and other inhabitants at Fort Pitt. He coupled these policies with broader regulations on settlement, trade, and travel throughout the Ohio Territory. Then, Bouquet declared military control over the lands claimed by the Ohio Company, as evidenced by the 1761 Proclamation Line. Colonial

¹⁰⁶ Thomas Ertman argued that the sequencing of events such as the timing of war and political path dependence affected the kind of political institutions that war bred. See *The Birth of the Leviathan: Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 5-6.

protests softened Bouquet's attack on the Ohio Company but did not dampen his efforts to militarize trans-Allegheny society. Lack of social resistance encouraged Royal officials to persist at a level of hyper-militarization that no constitutional restraints made possible. Finally, Amherst's ban on the munitions and rum trade marked a level of militarization that endangered native culture and livelihood. These restrictions overlooked the legacy of French and Indian intercultural exchange and created a variant of military control that distinguished the Ohio Territory from the seaboard colonies.¹⁰⁷ Bouquet's effort to impose frugality, honesty, industry, punctuality, and rationality on the Ohio Indians, all under the façade of civilization, bred violent native resistance to British imperialism.¹⁰⁸

Upon claiming the Ohio Territory, General John Forbes assured the people of Pennsylvania that "our Back Settlements, instead of being frightful Fields of Blood, will once more smile with Peace and Plenty." The General described a fertile land with riches far greater than those to be found in all the mines of Mexico.¹⁰⁹ But never did Forbes contemplate opening the region to agriculturalists, much less squatters. Instead, immediately after ousting the French, the army began transforming the Ohio Country into a militarized zone. By mid-December 1758, Hugh Mercer had overseen the construction of a rudimentary fort at the forks of the Monongahela and Ohio rivers, the first symbol of

¹⁰⁷ Bouquet's operations counters Richard White's argument that the British became participants in the Middle Ground, following Pontiac's War. Bouquet's operations only broke the possibility of future inner-cultural exchange. For White's interpretation of this time period, see *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 256-268.

¹⁰⁸ For the devastating impact of war, see Porter, *War and the State*, 1-22.

¹⁰⁹ Forbes, Letter from General Forbes' Army, Pennsylvania Gazette, December 14, 1758, *PHB*, II, 613.

British territorial control, but a symbol that had real coercive power.¹¹⁰ Soon, a steady stream of flour, hogs, and other supplies began to flow across the newly completed trans-Allegheny pass to Fort Pitt.¹¹¹ Thus, the 1759 campaign extended westward the process that had already consolidated Pittsburgh into the British territorial empire.

In July 1759, George Croghan, an eccentric Irishman turned Indian trader, sent Indian spies to reconnoiter the former French centers of power at Niagara, Presque Isle, and Venango.¹¹² Intelligence indicated that a detachment of 700 French and Indian warriors had returned to Presque Isle from Detroit. Other intelligence indicated French detachments had retaken forts Le Boeuf and Venango. If these detachments united, then the French could mount a formidable campaign to retake Pittsburgh. But by mid-August, the Royal army had driven the French from Crown Point, Niagara, and Ticonderoga, ensuring that the French would never again control this region. General John Prideaux had led a successful siege on Fort Niagara, severing Detroit's supply line and forcing the French to retreat into the Illinois Country. The French razed their forts at Presque Isle and Venango, triggering Bouquet's boast, "The Ennemies (*sic*)...Saved us the Trouble of an Expedition against their Forts."¹¹³

In mid-August, General Stanwix ordered Hugh Mercer to take possession of Fort Niagara but environmental factors impeded immediate territorial consolidation. Low

¹¹⁰ Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, December 19, 1758, *PHB*, II, 635-636; Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, December 23, 1758, *PHB*, II, 639-641.

¹¹¹ Ourry to Bouquet, Bedford, January 1, 1759, *PHB*, III, 2; Forbes to Bouquet, Carlisle, January 8, 1759, *PHB*, III, 20-22.

¹¹² Bouquet to Croghan, Lancaster, July 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 408-409. There are two important books about George Croghan. Albert T. Volwiler, *George Croghan and the Westward Movement, 1741-1782* (Cleveland: 1926), 35. Nicholas Wainwright, *George Croghan, Wilderness Diplomat* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959), 5-37.

¹¹³ Tulleken to Stanwix, Fort Bedford, July 12, 1759 *PHB*, III, 402; Tulleken to Stanwix, Fort Bedford, July 14, 1759, *PHB*, III, 416; Shippen to Bouquet, Lancaster, August 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 552; Croghan to Stanwix, Pittsburgh, August 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 558; Bouquet to Mercer, Bedford, August 16, 1759, *PHB*, III, 570-571; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 298-311, 330-339.

rivers made water transport through the region impractical. Mercer sent Indians to inquire of William Johnson about the quickest land route from Pittsburgh to Niagara, but drunkenness aborted the Indians' mission. Soon Mercer reported that he could not march a body of men from Presque Isle to Niagara, because a great swamp covered the lands south of Lake Erie. By autumn 1759, Tulleken had abolished plans to transport troops from Pittsburgh to Niagara, because swamps covered the region and the army lacked bateaux to navigate the rivers. Swamps proved to be a greater obstacle to territorial consolidation than any constitution, legislative body, or rocky ridge ever had.¹¹⁴

The army commissioned two teams of scouts to explore the region from Niagara to Pittsburgh as a first step to gaining control of local centers of power, such as former French strongholds and Indian villages. Three major points emerge from the scouts' journals. First, the scouts reported the distances between the former French forts. For example, they measured 21 miles between Fort LeBoeuf and Presque Isle, but only 17 miles of road existed between the two forts. They described a region of fertile soil suited for agrarian production and many navigable rivers. "Land very Rich and Level...The Land good but Stoney in Some places... well Timbered three Miles to Custologoes (*sic*) Town." Second, Indians led the scouts through forested and swampy lands, and gave them provisions, shelter, and directions. Already, Indians were themselves co-participants in British territorial consolidation. Finally, the scouts discovered Native American towns and villages. There, they discovered White Indians, setting in motion a campaign to redeem those so-called "captives." "This Town...has 20 Houses in it, 40

¹¹⁴ Bouquet to Mercer, Bedford, August 16, 1759, *PHB*, III, 570-571; Mercer to Stanwix, Pittsburgh, August 15, 1759, *PHB*, III, 568; Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, August 20, 1759, *PHB*, III, 591-592; Mercer to Stanwix, Pittsburgh, August 20, 1759, *PHB*, III, 593-594; Tulleken to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, September 15, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 104-105.

fighting men, 50 Women and Children and 30 White Prisoners.” In the broadest sense, these British scouts drew a blueprint of an ecological and cultural landscape that the Royal military personnel intended to bring under British control.¹¹⁵

These journals provided a roadmap for the army’s 1760 campaign to take possession of forts Venango, Presque Isle, and finally LeBoeuf. In July 1760, General Robert Monckton ordered Bouquet to march his troops to Presque Isle. With reports that this fort lay in ruins, Lieutenant Thomas Bassett, an engineer of the RAR, marched with Bouquet, taking with him carpenters and a proportional number of tools. Bassett would oversee reconstruction. Croghan, deputy agent for Indian Affairs, attended Bouquet on the journey. He went with orders to rebuild the Middle Ground, and ensure the Indians “our Intentions are not to Molest, but to Protect them, & their Familys.” A colonel, an engineer, and an Indian agent negotiated their way through an unfamiliar territory, all to make the infrastructure of Britain’s territorial empire.¹¹⁶

The French fort, Machault, stood at the junction of the Allegheny River and French Creek. Bouquet’s party arrived at this place on July 13 and renamed the location Venango. When Bouquet’s party approached Venango, they found only the charred remains of a former French stronghold, one swivel, and broken gun barrels. What the French had not destroyed, the Indians had burned, making the regions’ “tolerable good

¹¹⁵ Lee, *Journal of His Trip From Niagara to Pittsburgh*, October 1759, *PHB*, IV, 184-187. All quotes taken from Patterson and Hutchins, *Journal of March from Pittsburgh to Presque Isle*, October 26, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 258-261. Bruce Porter has argued that “development” rarely improves social systems, but instead resulted in bureaucratic states that suppressed traditional cultures. Porter, *War and the Rise of the State*, xv. E.P. Thompson described this same process as the ‘Curse of Adam.’ E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (Harmondworth, England, Penguin, 1968), Part II, especially 233-58.

¹¹⁶ Bouquet to Willing, Pittsburgh, July 4, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 618-619; Monckton to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, July 6, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 620-622. For Bouquet description of this journey, see *Journal of March from Fort Pitt to Presque Isle*, July 17, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 640-643.

Land” its sole recommendation.¹¹⁷ Bouquet ordered soldiers to rebuild the fort, storehouses, and a sawmill, integrating the place into the supply line. Over the next months, bullocks, flour, sheep, and tools passed through Venango from Pittsburgh to Presque Isle.¹¹⁸

From Venango the party traveled north to Presque Isle, where they arrived in late July. Bouquet perceived his possession of this fort to be a stepping-stone in the British movement to capture Fort Detroit. Upon arrival, Bassett procured construction materials from Niagara and began building a new fort and a slaughterhouse. Soldiers began to fence meadows for gardening. Creating a supply chain may have been the most important task, but it proved to be the most difficult.¹¹⁹ Establishing supply chains and organizing construction took longer than Bouquet had anticipated. Feeling isolated in the British frontier, the Colonel requested eight kegs, one of Madeira, and the others of port. He also requested a treatise on carpentry.¹²⁰ Still months would pass before the French abandoned Fort Detroit, meaning that warfare continued even as the British were familiarizing themselves with the imperial periphery.

Geography not hostile Indians proved to be the major challenge to Presque Isle’s integration into the empire. The often rocky and swampy terrain between Pittsburgh and Presque Isle left many pack horses injured or killed and rarely were the rivers navigable. Swampy terrain precluded Venango from serving as a year round depot. On July 18,

¹¹⁷ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 283, 335-336; Patterson and Hutchins, Journal of March from Pittsburgh to Presque Isle, October 26, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 259; Bouquet to Monckton, Camp at Beaver Creek, July 9, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 626-627.

¹¹⁸ Bouquet to Monckton, Venango, July 13, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 634-635; McKenzie to Bouquet, Venango, August 8, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 683; Bouquet to Walters, Presque Isle, August 11, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 687-689.

¹¹⁹ Bouquet, Return of Provisions at Presque Isle, July 18, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 646; Bouquet to Monckton, Presque Isle, July 19, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 649-650. For supply shortages, see Bouquet to Walters, Presque Isle, July 20, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 653.

¹²⁰ Bouquet to Bentinck, Presque Isle, July 29, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 665.

Mercer arrived at Presque Isle with 6 beeves, 6 sheep, 11 bags of flour, and 7 kegs of rum, barely enough to feed 400 men for 6 weeks. Geography recommended that Presque Isle receive provisions and supplies from Niagara, a relatively short distance by whaleboat. And as supplies depleted, Bouquet increasingly relied on Walters, the commanding officer at Niagara, to supply Presque Isle. From Niagara, Bouquet requested ammunition, axes, forage, pork, spades, and shovels, and still more forage. Initially Walters resisted Bouquet's requests, for like Presque Isle, Niagara was not located in proximity to an obvious supply source. But Monckton soon ordered Walters to supply Presque Isle, and Amherst confirmed this order. Thereafter, with crass indifference to Niagara's own supply difficulties, Bouquet began ordering Walters to sacrifice Niagara's wellbeing for the sake of supplying Presque Isle. Yet, supply lines remained unstable, which led to rationing, and rationing to labor stoppages, and then desertion. These troubles persisted until the army better integrated the Lake Erie region into the empire.¹²¹

Presque Isle served as a launch pad for the British possession of Fort LeBoeuf. The French had torched LeBoeuf in the autumn of 1759, leaving the place a desolate ruin.¹²² But soon after repairs began, the British discovered a new road that the French had completed between LeBoeuf and Presque Isle. This discovery expedited the movement of supplies across the southern shore of Lake Erie. Additionally, the British

¹²¹ Bouquet, Return of Provisions at Presque Isle, July 18, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 646; Bouquet to Monckton, Presque Isle, July 19, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 649-650. For supply shortages, see Bouquet to Monckton, Presque Isle, July 18, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 644-645; Bouquet to Walters, Presque Isle, July 20, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 653; Monckton to Bouquet, near Pittsburgh, July 28, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 658-660; Bouquet to Monckton, Presque Isle, August 6, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 678-679. For the reduction of rations, see Monckton to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, July 28, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 658-660. For Amherst's order, see Walters to Bouquet, Niagara, August 6, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 680; Bouquet to Monckton, Presque Isle, August 11, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 685-687.

¹²² Patterson and Hutchins, Journal of March from Pittsburgh to Presque Isle, October 26, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 258-261.

discovered 27 French bateaux and 3,000 wooden planks hidden in the woods. Combined, the preexisting bateaux, road, and timber quickened the flow of supplies and accelerated the construction of a new fort. Put another way, the British grafted physical infrastructure that had been on the periphery of the French Empire to the periphery of their own empire.¹²³

On July 19, Croghan received intelligence that a party of Ottawa and Wyandot Indians were lurking about Presque Isle, where Bouquet was still stationed. Croghan determined these Indians were agents for the commanding officers at Fort Detroit. Bouquet reacted to the incident with alarm and forbade his soldiers to leave camp. But three days later, an estimated 20 French and Indians fired upon a British reconnoitering party. Bouquet sent out a detachment that discovered a wounded sergeant and two soldiers, both scalped and killed. The Enemy Indian party had taken two other soldiers captive. This incident itself was an anomaly, for although Detroit and Michilimackinac remained under French hegemony, they had few Indian allies and no clear supply routes. In fact, the cause for alarm was in the French camp, because the British were quickly pilfering their once formidable heritage. British possession of Venango, Presque Isle, and LeBoeuf were part of a process, now long underway, that would land Detroit in British possession at the Peace of Paris.¹²⁴

¹²³ Mercer to Bouquet, LeBoeuf, July 18, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 649; Bouquet to Monkton, Presque Isle, August 11, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 685-687; Smallman to Bouquet, LeBoeuf, September 29, 1760, *PHB*, V, 54-55; Smallman to Bouquet, LeBoeuf, September 29, 1760, *PHB*, V, 54-55.

¹²⁴ Bouquet to Monkton, Presque Isle, July 19, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 649-650; Bouquet to Monkton, Presque Isle, July 29, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 665-667; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 338-339.

Bouquet's Proclamation Line of 1761

Having integrated the former French strongholds into British control, Bouquet set out to break the legal claims of the Ohio Company to the lands south of LeBoeuf, Presque Isle, and Venango. Back in 1747, the Board of Trade had granted those lands to the Ohio Company, oblivious to the Native Americans who lived and hunted there. Then, in April of 1760, Royal military personnel had concerned themselves with continuing the process of brokering alliances with the Ohio Indians, a process that John Forbes had begun at the 1758 Easton Conference. But, Forbes had never fully conceptualized how the British would construct Native alliances after hostilities ended. Now, Jeffery Amherst, who had no love for Natives, found himself with the errand of defining British-Indian diplomacy. His task turned on balancing the competing claims of the Ohio Indians and the Ohio Company to the same trans-Allegheny lands. Amherst penned a speech to the Ohio Indians promising that the Royal Army would not sequester their lands, except to build fortifications, reversing an earlier British commitment to evacuate the region upon the French defeat. Amherst committed British military muscle to defend natives' land rights against colonial encroachment. Implicitly, Amherst meant that the Royal Army would occupy the Ohio Territory, build forts, but inhibit colonial expansion beyond the Alleghenies. As he put it, "I mean not neither to take any of Your Lands, except in such cases where the necessity of His Maj: service, obliges...where I must and will build Forts."¹²⁵ Perhaps unknowingly, Amherst had jeopardized the title of the Ohio Company shareholders to their trans-Allegheny holdings, but he did not suggest a resolution to this problem. Instead, Henry Bouquet, acting as field commander, would

¹²⁵ Amherst and Post, *Speeches to the Western Indians*, April 24, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 533; White, *The Middle Ground*, 256-268.

have to sort out these disputed claims to the land. Bouquet did not breakup the Ohio Company, but he dealt it a paralyzing blow.¹²⁶

Enlightened by George Washington, Bouquet first learned about the Ohio Company in 1758, and he associated it with Braddock's Road and stubborn Virginians.¹²⁷ Since its inception, the Company's shareholders had clashed with the Crown over the actual purpose of the original 500,000 acre grant. The shareholders wanted to sale land, promote settlement, and trade with Indians. The Crown, conversely, wanted the Ohio Company only to provide a buffer between British and French territorial possessions. In 1761, Bouquet took the Crown's reasoning to its logical conclusion and militarized the buffer zone between the colonies and the Ohio Territory, abrogating the need for the Ohio Company to fulfill this role. The Company's grant was now immaterial, and frontier security superseded it. Put another way, the Royal Army could now perfect what the Crown had permitted the Ohio Company to do imperfectly.¹²⁸

In July 1760, Virginian Colonel Thomas Cresap and several other members of the Ohio Company had solicited Bouquet to buy shares of the Company's 500,000 acre grant. Each member owned a 25,000 acre share, which cost £500.¹²⁹ Land speculation was not foreign to Bouquet, though his American ventures had not yet turned a profit, only trouble instead. For instance, Bouquet owned shares in a handful of South Carolina

¹²⁶ For the Ohio Company during the Seven Years' War, see Bailey, *The Ohio Company of Virginia*, 105-106; Bailey, *Christopher Gist*, 25-32; James, *The Ohio Company*; Titus, *The Old Dominion at War*, 11-16.

¹²⁷ Washington to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, August 2, 1758, *PHB*, II, 298-303.

¹²⁸ Titus, *The Old Dominion at War*, 11-13.

¹²⁹ Bouquet to Cresap, Presque Isle, September 12, 1760, *PHB*, V, 32-33; Mercer to Bouquet, Philadelphia, December 27, 1760, *PHB*, V, 214-215; Bailey, *The Ohio Company of Virginia*, 105-106; Bailey, *Christopher Gist*, 25-32; Jack M. Sosin, *Whitehall and the Wilderness: The Middle West in British Colonial Policy, 1760-1775* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961), 42-43.

plantations, including Walnut Hill and Pickpocket.¹³⁰ None of these South Carolina ventures yielded profit, debt nearly landed one shareholder in jail, and Bouquet eventually sold his shares.¹³¹ As the Carolina plantations faltered, Bouquet attempted to procure a section of Thomas Penn's land known as the Lick. Penn welcomed Bouquet's inquiry, but would not "consent to sell an Inch of it." He explained that "of old a fixed determination" from the founding of the colony reserved that land for the Penn Family.¹³² Thus, Bouquet was disposed to purchase land when Cresap and the Ohio Company invited him to join their venture. The startling thing was Bouquet's vehement refusal.

Throughout 1760, Bouquet's real-estate agent scoured the Maryland and Pennsylvania countryside, searching for a plantation that would suit the somewhat fussy Swiss Colonel. Meanwhile, Bouquet refused to give Cresap a direct answer about the Ohio Company's offer. Certainly, Bouquet was not ignorant of the potential profit he was sidestepping. He reflected, "I could indeed procure a number of German and Swiss Families to settle upon those Lands, If the Conditions could realy (*sic*) be made advantageous to them." Three points explain Bouquet's opposition to the continued existence of the Ohio Company. Foremost, he noted that the Easton Treaty precluded further Anglo settlement beyond the Allegheny range, and having participated in the Easton Conference (See Chapter IV), Bouquet was not prepared to allow a land company to steal territory from Iroquois sovereignty. Although the Maryland and Virginia governments had not yet signed the Easton Treaty, Bouquet believed that it bound them nonetheless. Second, given this Treaty, Bouquet believed that only the British state could sanction Anglo settlement in the Ohio River Valley. Finally, if the state opened those

¹³⁰ Austin, Laurens and Appleby to Bouquet, Charlestown, September 7, 1761, *PHB*, V, 734-735.

¹³¹ A. Fesch to Bouquet, Charlestown, September 7, 1761, *PHB*, V, 743-744.

¹³² Peters to Bouquet, Philadelphia, February 22, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 462-463.

lands to colonial settlements, then Bouquet would consider purchasing them. Couched in Bouquet's refusal to buy into the Ohio Company was a latent belief that the Easton Treaty had actually abrogated the Company's 1747 grant, subjugating the region to some unspecified combination of Iroquois hegemony and military absolutism.¹³³ To make things worse, Cresap mistakenly reported to his fellow shareholders that Bouquet intended to purchase Ohio Company lands, and George Mercer mistakenly invited Bouquet to sign a deed.¹³⁴

Instead of partaking in the Ohio Company's venture, Bouquet worked to freeze colonial settlement in the trans-Allegheny west. He believed the Easton Treaty required Royal military personnel to take this position. From 1760 onward, Bouquet fought off colonial adventurers, who scouted the region dressed as hunters but who probably had homesteading in mind. He described the problem:

I mentioned to you in the beginning of the last Campaign that several Idle People from Virg^a & Maryland made it a Practice to hunt along the Monongahela, which gives umbrage to the Indians. Their Scheme Seems to be to reconnoiter the Land, & I am told that several of those pretended Hunters intend to settle above & below Redstone Creek. I have refused Several applications made to me for leave to settle, But it can not be prevented, without a Proclamation in the three Provinces to forbid hunting or settling beyond the Allegheny.¹³⁵

¹³³ Bouquet to Cresap, Presque Isle, September 12, 1760, *PHB*, V, 32-33. For Bouquet's loyalty to the Easton Treaty, see McConnell, *A Country Between*, 150-151. For the claims of the Ohio Company, see James, *The Ohio Company*, 17, 128-129. In another instance, Bouquet again attempted to secure proprietary land and failed, see Armstrong to Bouquet, Carlisle, June 24, 1761, *PHB*, V, 574-575.

¹³⁴ Mercer to Bouquet, Philadelphia, December 27, 1760, *PHB*, V, 214-215. For the terms of the Easton Conference, see Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 396-404; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 277-279; Nicholas B. Wainwright, *George Croghan, Wilderness Diplomat* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959), 145-151.

¹³⁵ Bouquet to Monckton, Pittsburgh, March 20, 1761, *PHB*, V, 352-356.

Bouquet suspected, probably correctly, that these ostensible hunters had larger plans in mind than venison for supper. Thus, what began as a prohibition on trans-Allegheny hunting evolved into the Proclamation Line of 1763.¹³⁶

One month after Bouquet made this first complaint, Monckton received a report that an unusual Anglo settlement had sprung up on the Monongahela River, only a short distance from Pittsburgh. Located in present-day West Virginia, the details of this settlement are obscure but fascinating nonetheless. What was probably a lepers' colony arose at a reputed therapeutic spring in the Appalachian Mountains. An officer explained that the lower sort had erected 40 miserable huts without forethought or design. Indeed, he found the best hut to be "hardly tolerable." "[C]hiefly loathsome Ulcers" disfigured all the women and "rendered them nacreous to themselves & all mankind."¹³⁷ The army came to know about the ulcerated women and similar settlements, because Indians complained that Anglo intruders were depleting the fragile deer population.¹³⁸ For example, Shawnee Indians shot Nathaniel Thomlinson and Jacob Aron, who had set up an illegal hunting hamlet near Fort Burd.¹³⁹ Perhaps even more provocative, the army received reports that squatters had claimed the region of proprietary lands called the Lick, the very land that Bouquet had earlier tried to purchase. Worst still, other groups of squatters were "Quarrelling [among] each other and planning the Mischief."¹⁴⁰ The army responded swiftly to these complaints. First, Monckton demanded that trans-Allegheny

¹³⁶ For a discussion of illegal settlement, see McConnell, *A Country Between*, 168-169. In his recent book, Colin G. Calloway did not connect the Proclamation Line of 1763 with the Bouquet's operations in the Ohio Territory, the claims of the Ohio Company, or the Easton treaty. *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 47-46.

¹³⁷ Boyd to Bouquet, The Warm Springs, October 28, 1762, *PHB*, V, 125-126.

¹³⁸ McDonald to Bouquet, Fort Burd, October 25, 1761, *PHB*, V, 840.

¹³⁹ A. McDonald to Bouquet, Fort Burd, April 8, 1762, *PHB*, V, 74-75; A. McDonald to Bouquet, Fort Burd, April 15, 1762, *PHB*, V, 78-79.

¹⁴⁰ Armstrong to Bouquet, Carlisle, June 24, 1761, *PHB*, V, 574-575.

settlements violated the Easton Treaty, and he ordered the army to drive squatters from their illegal habitations.¹⁴¹ Accordingly, Bouquet ordered Sergeant McDonald to dispel squatters from all the lands reserved for the Delawares.¹⁴² Meanwhile, Bouquet issued a Proclamation that forbade trans-Allegheny hunting or settlement. He vowed to court martial any colonist arrested for hunting or settling without certificates from governors Denny, Fauquier, or General Monckton. Whereas the rule of law regulated colonial society, military law and brutal discipline organized Ohio society during the British occupation.¹⁴³

What Bouquet understood to be a necessary prohibition on all Anglo settlement in the trans-Allegheny region, the members of the Virginia Assembly interpreted as a plot to sever Virginia's vast territorial claims that extended to the Pacific Ocean. Thus, before the Virginia Assembly ratified the Proclamation Line, it petitioned Governor Fauquier to clarify its meaning. Fauquier pointed out to Bouquet that many Virginians had abandoned farms and settlements on the Monongahela and Ohio rivers during the 1756 Indian raids. Now, those displaced farmers wanted to return to their lands, so Fauquier begged Bouquet to spell out the purpose of government issued certificates. Were the certificates to ensure land owners could return to their property? Or, did the certificates have a more sinister implication, as to prohibit all settlement? If the former, then the Assembly would ratify the Proclamation Line. By returning the land to its rightful owners, the army might prevent an upheaval like the one in the Green Mountains. On the

¹⁴¹ Monckton to Bouquet, April 5, 1761, *PHB*, V, 391-393.

¹⁴² Bouquet to Monckton, Pittsburgh, April 22, 1761, *PHB*, V, 435-439.

¹⁴³ Bouquet intended this line to be an absolute prohibition on trans-Allegheny settlement. Bouquet, Proclamation Against Settlers, Pittsburgh, October 28, 1761, *PHB*, V, 844; Calloway, *The Scratch of a Pen*.

other hand, the Assembly suspected that Bouquet actually intended to nullify land grants, an offense against constitutional government.¹⁴⁴

Both Amherst and Bouquet replied to Fauquier with conciliation, assuring him that the army did not intend to violate property rights. Bouquet maintained that he had never intended to invalidate pre-existing property claims or to prevent displaced persons from returning to their farms, if they first obtained certification. The Colonel explained that he had enacted this policy to halt illegal hunting, squatting, and other transgressions against the Easton Treaty. As he put it, “I issued the Said orders to prevent in the best manner I could those incroachments (*sic*).” Even so, Bouquet did not apologize for his determination to prosecute colonial intruders by court martial under the Articles of War, as only the military held jurisdiction in the trans-Allegheny territory.¹⁴⁵ Amherst upheld Bouquet’s stance. He assured Fauquier that the Proclamation protected the land titles of rightful landowners and prevented encroachment. Amherst insisted that Bouquet only wanted to prevent illegal Anglo settlement and had never intended to incite a conflict between displaced persons and the military.¹⁴⁶ In that light, the Virginia Assembly ratified the 1761 Proclamation Line. Fauquier began issuing certificates of ownership to displaced farmers and some evidence indicates that Bouquet ratified them.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴ Fauquier to Bouquet, Williamsburgh, January 17, 1762, *PHB*, V, 39-40. For land as a means of productions, David P. Szatmary, *Shays’ Rebellion: The Making of an Agricultural Insurrection* (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1980). For the disturbance in the Green Mountains, see Michael A. Bellesiles, *Revolutionary Outlaws: Ethan Allen and the Struggle for Independence on the Early American Frontier*, (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1993).

¹⁴⁵ Bouquet to Fauquier, Pittsburgh, February 8, 1762, *PHB*, V, 44-45.

¹⁴⁶ Amherst to Bouquet, New York, February 28, 1762, *PHB*, V, 47-48.

¹⁴⁷ Although a few farmers returned to their homesteads, renewed Indian raids compelled most to flee back eastward. Fauquier to Bouquet, Williamsburg, March 12, 1762, *PHB*, V, 64; Blane to Bouquet, Ligonier, June 14, 1762, *PHB*, V, 94-95.

Privately, however, both Amherst and Bouquet wanted to halt all colonial expansion into the trans-Allegheny region, but until the army could alter state policy, Amherst advised, “I would avoid doing anything that can give the colonials the least room to Complain of the Military power.”¹⁴⁸ Bouquet believed that the army had an obligation to finish off the Ohio Company for two reasons. First, the Colonel believed that the Easton Treaty amounted to a *de facto* abrogation of the Company’s charter, and following Pontiac’s War, he would urge the Crown to annul the Company’s charter.¹⁴⁹ Second, Bouquet believed that the Company’s shares were overvalued, and the army had an obligation to protect unsuspecting Marylanders and Virginians from its intrigues. As he explained, “I foresaw that those poor People would be ruined by that bubble.”¹⁵⁰ Therefore, Bouquet ordered Pittsburgh’s commanding officer “Not [to] permit on any Account any Lands to be settled to the Westward of the Allegheny without orders from the General.”¹⁵¹

Although the army opposed trans-Allegheny settlement, it actually facilitated a tightly regulated commerce that resembled the fiscal-military state’s management of economies. Tight regulation occurred, because the army used this trade as its principal means of solidifying the British alliance with Native Americans. From 1759, Indians had looked to British markets to replace French trading networks. General Monckton fixed the price of goods, set trade routes, and numerous other regulations. Still, the army wanted to extend Atlantic trading networks into the Ohio Territory. As Bouquet explained:

¹⁴⁸ Amherst to Bouquet, New York, February 28, 1762, *PHB*, V, 47-48.

¹⁴⁹ Bouquet to Gage, Philadelphia, May 20, 1764, *PHB*, V, 542-454.

¹⁵⁰ Bouquet to Amherst, Pittsburgh, April 1, 1762, *PHB*, V, 71-73.

¹⁵¹ Bouquet, Instruction for Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, November 19, 1762, *PHB*, V, 131.

Besides the Profits that can be expected from a well regulated Trade upon the Ohio: it seems to be the most Effectual way of fixing these wavering Tribes in Our Interest, and prevent leaving them any reason to regret (*sic*) the French, who used to Supply them largely.¹⁵²

Although the Easton Treaty hampered Anglo settlement, it actually influenced the conditions and terms on which the army facilitated the trans-Allegheny Indian trade. Whereas the army discouraged Anglo settlement, it encouraged what became a tightly regulated Indian trade.

Military personnel regulated trade by demanding that tavern owners and traders receive military certification to conduct their business. Under the terms of this certification process, many tavern keepers petitioned Bouquet to confirm their ownership of taverns and surrounding property. Two examples are pertinent. First, T. Hay reported that he operated a tavern and begged Bouquet not to dispossess him. Even so, Hay acknowledged that his continued possession of the tavern depended solely on Bouquet's favor.¹⁵³ Second, George Croghan had requested Bouquet's approbation for a trading post on the on Yioghiogheny River. Indians had earlier granted Croghan the land, and he believed it would facilitate trade and travel. Bouquet requested Monckton's consent for Hay and Croghan to proceed with these endeavors.¹⁵⁴ Bouquet was sympathetic to both petitioners and recommended Monckton to "permit People to build them [taverns] at proper distances, allowing them use of some Lands about their Houses to raise hay & Corn." He believed that such taverns would serve trading interests and would "give no

¹⁵² Bouquet to Fauquier, Bedford, August 25, 1759, *PHB*, III, 614-615.

¹⁵³ T. Hay to Bouquet, Shawnee Cabins [eight miles west of Bedford], April 9, 1761, *PHB*, V, 401.

¹⁵⁴ Bouquet to Monckton, Pittsburgh, April 22, 1761, *PHB*, V, 435-439

Ombrage to the Indians.”¹⁵⁵ Monckton agreed and ordered, “There can be no Objection to People Setting up Taverns on the Road between Bedford & Pittsburgh.”¹⁵⁶ Similarly, Indian Councils consented to tavern keepers planting small gardens.¹⁵⁷

However, Bouquet’s recommendation of Hay proved ill founded, for Hay did not live as a polite or commercial Briton. Instead, Hay and his wife “were laying the foundation of what we call en bon François, un Bordel & un coupe Gorge.” A military investigation determined that the tavern facilitated frequent riots and other chaos that endangered Hay’s neighbors and irritated the Indians. Instead of keeping a house for travelers, it appeared that Hay had no beds or forage and exploited lodgers. Far from being a tavern, Hay’s establishment amounted to a “publick nuisance.” Because Hay failed to serve the public good, the army stripped him of his license and forbade him ever to open another establishment.¹⁵⁸

As the trans-Allegheny region stabilized, colonials sought not only to open taverns but also to enter the lucrative Indian trade.¹⁵⁹ For instance, a fellow called Mr. Boyle applied to Bouquet for a tavern license, but Ourry knew him to be a rogue. He recommended that Bouquet grant the license to an upright man instead.¹⁶⁰ In a similar case, Hoops recommended Pr. Plumsted to Bouquet, who wanted to open a shoe and saddle making business at Pittsburgh. He requested that Bouquet assist him in that endeavor, as it would benefit the common good.¹⁶¹ In other cases, business owners gave

¹⁵⁵ Bouquet to Monckton, Pittsburgh, April 22, 1761, *PHB*, V, 435-439.

¹⁵⁶ Monckton to Bouquet, New York, June 28, 1761, *PHB*, V, 586-587.

¹⁵⁷ Pauli to Bouquet, Sandusky, May 24, 1762, *PHB*, V, 87-88.

¹⁵⁸ Ourry to Bouquet, Bedford, May 25, 1761, *PHB*, V, 506-507.

¹⁵⁹ Croghan to Gates, Pittsburgh, May 20, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 566-568.

¹⁶⁰ Ourry to Bouquet, Bedford, May 22, 1761, *PHB*, V, 497-499.

¹⁶¹ Hoops to Bouquet, Carlisle, April 21, 1761, *PHB*, V, 434.

traders credit based on military recommendation.¹⁶² Finally, Mr. Ross, an established trader reported that he had entered into the Indian trade and entrusted the management of his business to Thomas Hart. Ross begged Bouquet to give Hart his blessing and protection. Ross assured Bouquet that Hart would cause no complaint, no trouble.¹⁶³ Promise of rational cooperation with the army's commercial policies won licenses; profit kept a man in business. As trade expanded, the army had increasing difficulty keeping track of licensed traders; nonetheless, it looked to reputable traders to implement commercial policies.¹⁶⁴

The army's interpretation of the common good led to a host of trading regulations that Bouquet implemented. For soldiers, shoes were always in scarce supply. When traders inflated the cost of shoes, Bouquet intervened and lowered the cost of shoes sold at Pittsburgh to a universal just price.¹⁶⁵ Likewise, William Johnson took measures to establish a fair trade between colonial traders and the Indians by price setting.¹⁶⁶ To prevent fights with Indians, Bouquet ordered that traders only sell goods at military posts and implemented Johnson's price scale.¹⁶⁷ Later, Bouquet found himself in the difficult position of implementing Jeffery Amherst's trading regulations, which Amherst derived from the dubious assumption that he could transform the Ohio Indians into sober Calvinists. In an effort to bring social harmony, Bouquet tried to implement an almost total prohibition on the sale of ammunition to Native Americans, but this prohibition only

¹⁶² Petition of Stone's Creditors, Pittsburgh, January 19, 1761, *PHB*, V, 257.

¹⁶³ Ross to Bouquet, Lancaster, April 6, 1761, *PHB*, V, 395-396.

¹⁶⁴ Monckton to Bouquet, April 5, 1761, *PHB*, V, 391-393.

¹⁶⁵ Blane to Bouquet, Ligonier, April 1, 1761, *PHB*, V, 382-383.

¹⁶⁶ Johnson to Bouquet, Detroit, September 18, 1761, *PHB*, V, 761; Bouquet, Indian Trade Regulations, Fort Pitt, September 18, 1761, *PHB*, V, 762-763.

¹⁶⁷ Bouquet to Monckton, Pittsburgh, March 23, 1761, *PHB*, V, 366-367.

resulted in obstructing natives' hunting culture. By prohibiting spirits, military personnel imagined they could actually reshape native society. Amherst put the case like this:

The Total prohibition of Rum, will, I am hopefull (*sic*)...will be More Beneficial to themselves and Familys; and I am Sure it will prevent their being guilty of Many Crimes, Which in their Liquor, they were too apt to Committ (*sic*).¹⁶⁸

Bouquet implemented these trading prohibitions in the larger context of the British effort to militarize the Ohio Country, and he acted with the same zeal that he had exerted against the Ohio Company. Yet, Bouquet never fully eliminated traffic in ammunition and rum, just as he never fully realized the complete militarization of the region.

Bouquet found himself buried in troubles when he tried to enforce Amherst's partial prohibition on the liquor trade. When profit was at stake, traders always managed to smuggle liquor to Indians. Early on, Bouquet concluded that unless the army completely banned the trans-Allegheny liquor trade, then he would have no means to regulate it.¹⁶⁹ Eventually, Bouquet resurrected a solution that he had first invented in South Carolina to prevent a French naval invasion on Charlestown: a boom. Bouquet proposed that army engineers construct a similar fixture across the Monongahela River, to prevent the nightly smuggling of liquor. "If a good Fence was carried across the Neck from River to River at the foot of the nearest Hill, with one or two Barriers, and a Small

¹⁶⁸ Amherst to Bouquet, New York, May 2, 1762, *PHB*, V, 81-83.

¹⁶⁹ Bouquet to Monckton, Pittsburgh, March 28, 1761, *PHB*, V, 375-376; Bouquet to Monckton, Pittsburgh, March 20, 1761, *PHB*, V, 352-356.

guard to report the Passengers...”¹⁷⁰ Utterly impractical, these boom proposals revealed more about life in a garrisoned city and the mind of a military man than common sense.

Pittsburgh was not a colony, nor was it in proximity to one, culturally or politically. Instead, Royal military personnel regulated it as a garrisoned village, which several examples illustrate. Bouquet forbade Pittsburgh inhabitants use of the army’s boats, tools, wagons, and wheelbarrows. No trade could occur after the evening gun shot. Additionally, Bouquet imposed a heavy fine and banishment on anyone convicted of stealing or damaging timber, planks, rails, stones, bricks, lime, coal, or firewood. Military bureaucrats regulated the payment of debts. Any inhabitant who had a guest was required to register his or her name with the army. The army allowed no inhabitant to exit the fort without an official pass from the commanding officer. Similarly, no inhabitant could build, demolish, or exchange houses without permission. No one could rent out his house or sell it, because the army granted the inhabitants only the *use* of their houses but not ownership. If an angry inhabitant demolished his house, then he “must expect to be punished Severely.” Perhaps most importantly, Bouquet forbade Pittsburgh’s inhabitants to sell rum or liquor to Indians, under pain of loosing their trading licenses, destruction of their houses and stores, and banishment. Bouquet forbade the inhabitants from purchasing horses, saddles, bridles, hobbles, or bells from Indians, probably because the Indians had first stolen these items from the British Army.¹⁷¹ The logic of the fiscal-military state built roads and forts, regulated trade and even society. Pittsburgh was a garrisoned village, regulated by a military bureaucracy that Bouquet orchestrated. Whereas Pittsburgh’s few inhabitants tolerated garrison life, a far off

¹⁷⁰ Bouquet to Monckton, Pittsburgh, April 22, 1761, *PHB*, V, 435-439.

¹⁷¹ Bouquet, Orders Concerning Pittsburgh Inhabitants, May 9, 1761, *PHB*, V, 470-471.

Ottawa rebel rouser began enlisting the region's native population in a pan-Indian alliance to counter the British militarization of their country.

In 1763, tensions between the Royal Army and the Ohio Indians spilled over into western Pennsylvania in what historians call Pontiac's War. Warring Indians renewed frontier raids and scalping, razed fields and houses, and took captives. Terrified settlers fled to the fortifications that the British Army had constructed back in 1758. Ordinary social and political life came to a halt, as panic left a power vacuum in Western Pennsylvania.¹⁷² Jeffery Amherst doubted that the army could restore peace, unless "there was not an Indians Settlement within a Thousand Miles of our Country."¹⁷³ Back in 1758, the French evacuation left a power vacuum that created favorable conditions for the British to militarize the Ohio region. Bouquet organized Pittsburgh as a garrisoned village. Then, in 1763, renewed warfare created similarly favorable conditions for the militarization of western Pennsylvania and Virginia. Confiding to Governor Hamilton, Bouquet proposed pushing this garrison model eastward to fill the power vacuum created by renewed warfare. This meant suspending colonial governance, abolishing property rights, regulating food supplies, and curtailing movement.

It is impossible to save the whole of this extensive Country; several Parts must be abandoned...I would, therefore, propose that a Law should be enacted, to remain in Force during this Indian War, obliging the Inhabitants to Stockade [reside in] seven or eight Places in this Country, each capable of holding about 300 Men, exclusive of Women & Children:

¹⁷² For the crisis on the Pennsylvania frontier, see David Dixon, *Never Come to Peace Again: Pontiac's Uprising and the Fate of the British Empire in North America* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005); Matthew C. Ward, *Breaking the Back Country: The Seven Years' War in Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1754-1765* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2003); White, *The Middle Ground*, 269-314.

¹⁷³ Amherst to Bouquet, New York, August 7, 1763, *PHB*, V, 350-352.

Those Places to be fixed by the Law... and taking in as many Mills as possible, for the Advantage of Bread and Water.¹⁷⁴

Surely, Hamilton realized that cooperation in such matters always led to subjugation, as had occurred when the Royal Army repaired and then took possession of the southern fortification system. Despite the severity of Pontiac's War—to be covered more fully below, governors Hamilton and Fauquier resisted Bouquet's efforts to militarize the colonial frontiers; they refused to allow military rule a backdoor entrance into their colonies.¹⁷⁵

By autumn of 1764, the British army had halted Indian raids and restored some level of military rule in pockets of the Ohio Territory, an imperial periphery. Virginian soldiers facilitated the return of captives to colonial society, as part of a peace settlement that stripped Indians of an important leverage against British policy. Still, native resistance had dealt a serious blow to any realization of absolute military rule. The garrison model persisted inside British forts, and perhaps on the roadways leading to them. Bouquet's efforts to domineer Indian relations allowed him to imagine that his army had subjugated the Ohio Indians. In a letter to Thomas Gage, Bouquet wrote:

The Dread of English Power, in my opinion, the Sole motive capable of making a Solid Impression upon their Minds, and they must be convinced

¹⁷⁴ Bouquet to Hamilton, Carlisle, July 1, 1763, *PHB*, V, 279-282.

¹⁷⁵ An earlier historiography conceived of the Pennsylvania frontier as a place of burgeoning democracy. See Brooke Hindle, "The March of the Paxton Boys," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 4 (Oct., 1946), pp. 461-486. More recently, historians have discussed the relationship between frontier raids and the transformation of racism from latency into actual violence. See Krista Camenzind, "Violence, Race, and the Paxton Boys," in *Friends and Enemies in Penn's Woods: Indians, Colonists, and the Racial Construction of Pennsylvania*, ed William A. Pencak and Daniel K. Richter (University Park, Pa: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004), 201-220; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 190-191.

by their own Eyes, that it is not out of necessity, but out of regard for them, that we offer them our Alliance: and I doubt whether we Shall ever root out the French Interest in that County, till we make our appearance in it with a Force Sufficient to make ourselves respectable, and awe both the French and the Savages: The Notion of our Power well impressed, will facilitate ever after any Negotiation with them; and we might then with Safety reduce our Garrisons, and send them Messages, and even orders by a Single Messenger, but not before.¹⁷⁶

Couched in Bouquet's rhetoric was an admission that the British had not succeed in either cooperation or cultural exchange with the Ohio Indians. In place of a middle ground, the British had tried to dictate Indian relations and realize military rule but neither had fully succeeded. For instance, the chief of the Turtle People gave Bouquet "great reason to be dissatisfied with his Conduct." Bouquet disposed the chief from office but natives did not recognize this dispossession. The British army circumscribed the Ohio Indians' ability to determine their social and political lives, but native resistance to British policy impeded Bouquet from ever realizing complete militarization of the Ohio Territory.¹⁷⁷

Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has argued that Henry Bouquet organized the construction of a physical infrastructure that facilitated British territorial expansion, via the military. Bouquet funneled money through the army to reconstruct fortifications, in turn allowing him to declare military jurisdiction over entire fortified regions. Beginning in the southern colonies, Bouquet oversaw repairs to the fortification system that lined the

¹⁷⁶ This incident marked one of the only times Bouquet meddled in internal Indian affairs. However, given the context in which it occurred, this incident pointed to Bouquet's willingness to extend military power far beyond its previous limits. Minutes: Conference with Delaware Chiefs, November 11, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 692-693; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 203.

¹⁷⁷ McConnell, *A Country Between*, 203.

Appalachian Mountains. In the long term, this process allowed the British army to sever colonial jurisdiction over these lands and provided an impetus for subjugating the Cherokee Indians in 1760. Next, in 1758, Bouquet planned a fortification and road system that connected eastern Pennsylvania to the trans-Allegheny zone. The colonial governments generally supported Bouquet's blueprint for military infrastructure, because forts and roads facilitated development and encouraged trade. West of the Allegheny Mountains, Bouquet continued the process of building and repairing infrastructure. For example, he organized the reconstruction of Fort Pitt, integrated former French forts into British jurisdiction, and established new roadways. In the short term, Bouquet implemented military rule over these fortified zones, regulating many aspects of daily life and trade. The Proclamation Line of 1763 ensured that colonial jurisdiction would never extend west of the Alleghenies and challenged the territorial holdings of the Ohio Company. But, in the long term, Native Americans resisted militarization in the same way that colonists had earlier resisted quartering and requisitioning demands. The French evacuation of the Ohio Territory created the largely illusory impression of a power vacuum, which seemed to favor militarization of the region. But Bouquet efforts to extend military rule from the fortified zones to Native relations ended in disaster. The Ohio Indians resented trading restrictions, and they mounted a successful war that actually challenged the British hold on the region's infrastructure. Making military infrastructure usually meant extending military jurisdiction and subjugating a surrounding population. Even so, as the following chapters examine more closely, Native American relations added a variable to empire building that European state

makers had never encountered, and this Indian variable presented a challenge to empire building that Britain's imperial architects had never anticipated.

CHAPTER IV

ALIGNING AND FIGHTING THE SOUTHERN INDIANS

Introduction: “You will take every opportunity of ruining the Little Carpenter”

Compared to the Iroquois and Ohio Indians, the Royal Army’s relationship with Catawba and Cherokee natives commands less attention from historians. For example, in his sweeping history of the Seven Years’ War, Fred Anderson paid rather little attention to the Royal Army’s alliance with Catawba natives. Like his predecessors, Anderson conceived of the Cherokee War as an almost entirely colonial affair. And, maybe it was, except that it occurred under the gaze of Henry Bouquet and his Royal counterparts. While the Ohio Company claimed Ohio lands, South Carolina expansion, illegal hunting, and unfair trading practices had begun to encroach on Cherokee Country. The Seven Year’s War exacerbated the processes that endangered both Catawba and Cherokee land rights and autonomy, by compelling natives to compete for these rights in an imperial sphere. The war strained already tense intertribal alliances and animosities, especially between the Catawbans, the Cherokees, and the Shawnee Indians. The realignments of the Seven Years’ War compelled natives to negotiate intertribal, trading, and territorial relationships inside a vastly expanded empire; these themes unfold through the following pages. Certainly, the process of British colonization had forced the Southern Indians to cope with territorial threats and integrate the materials of European trade into their ever changing cultures. Likewise, colonization had compelled disparate Indian groups to form intertribal alliances and to war against each other. The following pages argue that the

Seven Years' War exacerbated these changes, despite British efforts to unify Indian policy, halt westward expansion, and regulate trade.

The chapter unfolds in two parts, tracing first the alliances that Bouquet brokered with the Catawba and Cherokee during the Forbes Expedition. Second, the chapter examines how Bouquet and Forbes severed alliances with former native allies, precipitating the Cherokee War and militarization of Cherokee Country. This chapter traces Bouquet's ever changing relationship with Little Carpenter. Little Carpenter was a dynamic Cherokee broker, who sought to conciliate between the Cherokee natives, colonials, and the Royal Army. Little Carpenter emerges as a tragic figure. Despite a legacy of successful alliances between these groups, he ultimately lost the support of his people and became a marionette of the Royal Army.

In preparation for the 1758 Forbes Expedition, Bouquet and Little Carpenter brokered an alliance system between the Royal Army and the Catawba and Cherokee Indians. Later, tensions between Cherokee Country and colonial society beckoned Little Carpenter to return home before fulfilling his obligations to the Forbes Expedition, only days before the siege of Fort Duquesne. Failing to understand Little Carpenter's perspective, Bouquet severed the army's friendship with the Cherokee Indians. Bouquet and Forbes encouraged colonial governors to think of the Cherokees as an enemy people, worthy only of scorn and contempt. Unwittingly, Bouquet actually exacerbated the tensions between the Cherokees and colonials that Little Carpenter wanted to resolve, thereby legitimizing Governor Lyttelton's incursions into Cherokee Country. David Corkran and Tom Hatley, among many other historians, recognize that colonial expansion and unfair trading practices precipitated the Cherokee War. Still, historians

have separated the Cherokee War from the Cherokees' ruptured alliance with Bouquet at the height of the Forbes Expedition. The British army did not encourage colonial expansion and unfair trading practices, though these had a long legacy of their own. Arguably, however, Bouquet helped to transform what had earlier existed as local crises and border conflicts into the Cherokee War, creating inter-tribal tensions, realignments, and most importantly bringing Royal militarization of Cherokee Country. Bouquet used military power to broker, solidify, and sever the alliances of the Forbes Expedition. After the French evacuated Fort Duquesne, Royal personnel refused to use military power to protect the livelihood of their Catawba allies. Meanwhile, Bouquet began a process that militarized the trans-Allegheny and Appalachians zones, and the Cherokee War erupted from this process. And, though the Catawbas found themselves squeezed from their lands, the Royal Army militarized Cherokee Country, severed it from the colonies, burned houses, and manipulated Cherokees to a peace treaty by creating conditions ripe for starvation.

Commanding Indian Affairs: Colonels, Governors, and Superintendents

In 1753, the Privy Council initiated a process that brought North American Indian affairs under imperial jurisdiction. Following Mohawk outrage at an illegal New York land deal, Lord Halifax took measures to limit the colonial governments' ability to alienate Native tribes. He hoped these policies would solidify Natives loyalty to the British Army, for many Ohio Indians were quickly slipping into the French alliance. Importantly, Halifax and the Privy Council recognized the territorial rights of Native Americans, and they wanted to prevent settlers, land companies, and even colonial

governments jeopardizing those rights. By limiting threats from these entities, Halifax hoped to solidify Britain's Native American allies on the eve of renewed warfare. In 1754, Halifax brought Native American affairs under the jurisdiction of the Royal commander-in-chief of North America, divesting colonial governors of heretofore assumed powers. One year later, the Board of Trade divided North America into northern and southern jurisdictions of Indian affairs. The Board appointed a civilian superintendent to oversee each jurisdiction. This arrangement resolved the problem of each colony defining a distinct Indian policy, while ostensibly recognizing that Indian nations had authentic sovereign and territorial rights. Through the Seven Years' War, Royally appointed Indian superintendents would supersede colonial governors and petty military personnel in Native American affairs. The creation of North American Indian superintendents paralleled the process that consolidated the southern fortification system under military jurisdiction.¹

In 1757, General John Loudoun reported that Whitehall had appointed Edmund Atkin to serve as Indian superintendent for the southern colonies; Sir William Johnson now held the same position over the Iroquois Confederation and northern Indians. In contrast to Atkin, Loudoun gave Bouquet no more than a consultative role in Indian affairs. But Bouquet did not accept his subordination to Atkin without question. Upon receiving this directive, Bouquet requested Loudoun to clarify the extent to which he could meddle in Native American affairs. Specifically, he requested authority over Indians that equaled that of the colonial governors. But Loudoun insisted that the Board of Trade gave Atkin sole control over Indian diplomacy, leaving Bouquet with only an

¹ John Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier, 1756-63* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001), 24-26.

advisory position. Indian affairs remained the concern of the Indian superintendent. Even in Atkin's absence, Loudoun insisted, "the Indians, must be referred to a Conference with him."² Reluctantly, Bouquet accepted this chain of command. So, after the British army asserted jurisdiction over the southern fortification system, Bouquet instructed the commanders of those forts to give Atkin and Governor Lyttelton primacy in Indian affairs. As he put it, "As to Indian Affairs[,] you are to observe & follow such Directions as you shall receive from time to time from the Governor of this Province without any further orders from me."³ In fact, Atkin's primary duties pertained to the relationship between Natives and colonial governments, land rights, and trade. In the military realm, Bouquet retained significant authority. In the Forbes Expedition, he brokered alliances with the Cherokee Little Carpenter and the Catawba King Hagler. Arguably, Bouquet brokered an alliance system with the Southern Indians that paralleled the Easton Treaty that Forbes concluded with the Ohio Delawares. From the native perspective, however, Bouquet was a thorn in Indian society. Whereas Little Carpenter and King Hagler searched for middle grounds, Bouquet was foremost a military man and pushed the imperial will even on the unwilling. Thus, after the Catawbas completed their service to the Forbes Expedition, Bouquet declared them an extinct people and dismissed them without gifts. From a position of military power, Bouquet encouraged the southern governors to snub Little Carpenter. This directive exacerbated a crisis between the

² Loudon, Instructions to Bouquet, March 1757, *PHB*, I, 65-66; Bouquet, Queries Relating to Instructions, March 1757, *PHB*, I, 68; Bouquet, Proposals Regarding Loudon's Instructions, March 1757, *PHB*, I, 72-73; Loudon, Orders to Bouquet, New York, April 24, 1757, *PHB*, I, 90. For the role of Indian superintendent, see Fred Anderson, *The Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 130; Michael N. McConnell, *A Country Between: The Upper Ohio Valley and Its Peoples, 1724-1774* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 126; Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 25.

³ Bouquet to Shaw, Charlestown, July 15, 1757, *PHB*, I, 143.

colonial governments and Cherokee society, allowing the Royal Army to intervene and militarize Cherokee Country.⁴

The Southern Indians and British Expansion

Long before Britons arrived in North America, the Catawba Indians lived and hunted on lands along the Atlantic seaboard, which would later become North Carolina. Throughout colonial history, the Catawbas worked to develop close alliance with the North Carolina government. Catawba natives took the Seven Years' War as an opportunity to fight against common enemies they shared with the colony. In the spring of 1757, for example, Catawba warriors killed many enemy Indians and procured a couple of scalps. Catawba scouts routed Delaware Indians who had unleashed terror on the Pennsylvania and Virginian frontiers. Along with colonial militias, they defended Virginia's frontier settlements from future Enemy attack. Even so, neither the governments nor military personnel were forthcoming with gifts, problematic because gifts not only solidified military alliances but also sustained Catawba livelihood. The Catawbas believed their colonial alliances reached beyond the North Carolina government to neighboring colonies and Indian tribes. For instance, Catawba headmen sent deerskins to Governor Lyttelton, symbolizing loyalty to their South Carolina neighbors and desire for reciprocity. Inside Indian Country, an historic friendship united the Catawba and Cherokee peoples. Moreover, Catawba brokers worked to bring the Chickasaw and Creek Indians into the British alliance. Most importantly, beyond trans-

⁴ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 458. In fact, Atkin held primacy over Lyttelton in Indian Affairs, and the governor would come to accept this chain of command, though perhaps only after Bouquet had departed from South Carolina. See David H. Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier: Conflict and Survival 1740-1762* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962), 144.

colonial and inter-tribal alliances, the Catawbas believed themselves to be part of a broader imperial world. This belief motivated Catawba warriors to wage war on behalf of George II. As a sign of their loyalty, Catawba headmen sent King George two scalps that they had procured in their spring 1757 expedition to the Pennsylvania and Virginia frontiers. Next year, the Catawbas dispatched warriors to assist Bouquet in the Forbes Expedition.⁵ Ironically, the Catawbas' professions of loyalty to the empire paralleled the American colonists' inability to fulfill the terms of the Philadelphia Conference—their own obligations to the empire.⁶

Only reluctantly did military personnel and colonial officials recognize the Catawbas' diplomatic and military contributions in the Seven Years' War. For example, Catawba headmen brokered an alliance between the Georgia government and the Creek Indians, who had formerly allied themselves with the French. After Catawba brokers had secured the Creek alliance, Governor Ellis agreed to meet Creek headmen and confirm their friendship with Georgia. Despite their centrality in these negotiations, Ellis did not invite the Catawbas to his conference with the Creeks or acknowledge their diplomatic contributions. Instead, Ellis hijacked Catawba diplomatic activities, garnering fruit where he had not planted. Similarly, British military personnel favored traders' reports about the burgeoning Creek alliance, instead of the Catawba diplomats who had actually brokered it. Not surprisingly, Bouquet attributed the British-Creek alliance to Governor Ellis' diplomatic cleverness. He believed that the Georgia-Creek alliance would increase

⁵ Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, May 29-30, 1758, *PHB*, I, 386-390. For Catawba diplomacy, see James H. Merrell, *The Indians New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbors from European Contact through the Era of Removal* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 135-143.

⁶ King Hagler and other Catawba headmen to William H. Lyttelton, June 16, 1757, Lyttelton Papers, Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Edmond Atkin to Wm. H. Lyttelton, Winchester, August 13, 1757, Lyttelton Papers.

trade and security but never acknowledged Catawba centrality in the affair. Underlining this blindness to Catawba diplomacy lay a latent and more sinister distrust of Indians in general. That is, Ellis believed that only the complete removal of the French from Louisiana would guarantee the loyalty of the Catawba, Creek, and Chickasaw peoples. With the French gone, the British would then gain more freedom to march military units into Creek and Chickasaw country, not having to worry about French retaliation, something Catawba diplomats could not guarantee.⁷

As for the Chickasaw Indians, the British perceived them to be a very poor and “pathetic” people. The Chickasaw complained that the Cherokees had killed several of their people last winter, “and they request that our good offices may be employed with those people to postpone the fate of a dying Nation.” The Chickasaws begged the British to honor their alliances and promised to pour out their blood in the “service of their faithful friends the English.” However, the army cared little more for the starving Chickasaw than it did for the Catawbas’ diplomatic achievements. Instead, military personnel worked to solidify its alliance with the Cherokees, a more formidable people and more critical in the war effort.⁸ Unlike the Catawba, Creek, and Chickasaw tribes, however, the Cherokees would eventually turn their superiority against the British Army itself. Put another way, the British disdained Catawba, Creek, and Chickasaw loyalty, instead funneling their energies into a shaky alliance with Little Carpenter, whom they mistakenly believed represented all the disparate Cherokee towns.⁹

⁷ Henry Ellis to Wm. H. Lyttelton, Savannah, June 22, 1757, Lyttelton Papers. For the Creek Treaty, see Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, December 9, 1757, *PHB*, I, 252-253; Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, December 10, 1757, *PHB*, I, 257. For a broader analysis of Catawba diplomacy, see Merrell, *The Indians’ New World*, 150-155.

⁸ Bouquet to Ellis, Charlestown, December 9, 1757, *PHB*, I, 252-253; Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, December 10, 1757, *PHB*, I, 257.

⁹ For the fractured nature of Cherokee society, see Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 2-8.

All alliances bring both cost and payoffs. For decades, Catawba headmen had conceded land to the South Carolina government in exchange for trade and promises of friendship. Nameless Catawba men and women bore the cost of these concessions that whittled away at Native culture and livelihood. As King Hagler put it,

we are desirous of living as brothers with the white people and to shew our sincerity we gave ye government of South Carolina all our lands for ye use of our father the great King George to settle his people upon except thirty miles round our towns to plant upon ourselves and furnish us with deer without which we cannot purchase ye necessaries of life.¹⁰

Although loosing many acres, the Catawba Indians did not immediately resent this grant to the South Carolina government. After all, the South Carolinians had historically respected treaty terms with their Indian neighbors. Even so, the North Carolina government was far less scrupulous about its territorial bounds and allowed colonial settlements to choke Catawba villages. North Carolina settlers closed in on Catawba villages, usurped their ancient hunting grounds, and strangled their livelihood. King Hagler explained, “We daily complain to them but we are not heard.” Territorial concessions to the colonies diminished the Catawbas hunting grounds, leaving only a vestige of their former viability. Hunting had served as the Catawbas primary subsistence, without which they began to lose their cultural identity and even their lives. Territorial and economic contraction disrupted traditional Catawba customs and tribal hierarchies. Amid this crisis, young Catawba warriors resisted colonial encroachments

¹⁰ From King Hagler and other Catawba headmen to Wm. H. Lyttelton, June 16, 1757, Lyttelton Papers.

and wanted to use violence to halt this process. King Hagler resisted those tendencies, but he foresaw a time when the young warriors would prevail.

We now apply to you as our Elder and well beloved Brother to lay our grievance before our father who we are sure is Ignorant of his children's oppression otherwise he would order them relief before now by ordering their lands to be measured out for them. Our young people who are already greatly incensed perhaps may not be prevailed upon from Doing some great mischief.¹¹

But the crisis was more desperate than King Hagler admitted, because the Catawbias were experiencing rapid population decline. Sadly, Britons bore the fruit of Catawba diplomacy but never had to acknowledge their contribution to the southern Indian alliance. Instead, Bouquet put all his bets on Little Carpenter, the Cherokees, and mused on the potential usefulness of Mohawk warriors, all of whom were both militarily and numerically more powerful than the dying Catawba allies. Bouquet did not appreciate that King Hagler's people were more loyal to British interests than were most other tribes.¹²

King Hagler's plea was an ominous foreshadowing of a multilayered cycle that forced Native Americans' to abandon their territorial claims, hunting patterns, cultures, and finally threatening their very existence. First, Natives conceded land to British colonials, as had the Catawbias in the Carolinas and the Delawares in Pennsylvania.

¹¹ From King Hagler and other Catawba headmen to Wm. H. Lyttelton, June 16, 1757, Lyttelton Papers. Merrell gives a full discussion on Catawba territorial issues, see *Indians' New World*, 167-191.

¹² Bouquet represented the Catawbias as almost bothersome and expressed more interest in a Mohawk alliance than he showed to Catawbias waiting for his orders. See Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, May 29-May 30, 1758, *PHB*, I, 386-390.

Next, territorial concessions and British agrarian expansion compromised Indians' hunting patterns, making their livelihood almost impossible. This, in turn, created conditions ripe for starvation, altered gender roles, and compromised cultural identity. Finally, as British expansion increased, young warriors incited war to reverse their peoples' territorial losses. And this in turn compromised traditional social hierarchies, the position of headmen, and even of King Hagler himself. King Hagler attempted to halt the North Carolina government's territorial expansion, but he utterly failed. Now, his efforts to preserve his tribes' territorial integrity, via an alliance with Bouquet, were proving fruitless, not least because Bouquet himself declared the Catawbas a dead people.¹³

The violence that King Hagler feared would further sever the Catawbas from the British came in the early summer of 1757. Colonists continued to migrate north from the southern colonies into North Carolina and Virginia; moreover, North Carolinians felt at liberty to cross Catawba hunting grounds, kill deer, squat, and make mischief. These migrant trespassers showed disdain for Catawba land rights, which alone weakened the Indians' territorial rights in the mind of the colonial governments. Put simply, these colonial squatters, trespassers, and even their governors, denied that the Catawba natives had any legitimate claim to ancient hunting grounds, not least because the land remained uncultivated and unfenced. Not surprisingly, the Catawbas saw things differently and grew increasingly unsettled over colonial squatters and trespassers. As trespassing increased, young warriors grew discouraged with the diplomatic efforts of their elders and perceived violence to be a necessary last resort. Accordingly, Catawba warriors shot

¹³ For the Catawba land concessions and the manifold consequences, see Merrell, *The Indians New World, passim*. For this process among the Pennsylvania Delawares, see McConnell, *A Country Between*, 5-20.

at wagon trains, killed cattle and horses, and plundered migrants' belongings. Still, Governor Dobbs of North Carolina refused to halt illegal settlements, squatters, and trespassers on Catawba lands. He attributed the violence to Catawba brutality, not to squatters' greed and disdain for Indians' lands. Dobbs demanded that the South Carolina government subdue the Catawba warriors.¹⁴ Soon, the Catawbas lost their lands to the colonial governments. Unlike the Catawbas, the Cherokee mounted stronger resistance against the colonials and delayed the forfeiture of their lands until the Jacksonian Era.¹⁵

Once the Carolina governors had confiscated Catawba lands, they quickly extended the rule of law and British governing institutions into what had only years before been ancient hunting grounds. The Carolina government intended these institutions to confirm colonial jurisdiction in the region and property rights; ironically, the governors now became quite willing to halt the very same squatters and trespassers who had so threatened Catawba livelihood. For example, so called legitimate settlers on the South Carolina frontier reported crimes, such as horse and cow stealing. Worst still, many of the settlers broke the Sabbath and blasphemed against the Almighty. Before frontier posses arrested these rogues, they often escaped into the backwoods. God-fearing settlers petitioned the South Carolina government to send constables and justices of the peace to establish civilization on the frontier.¹⁶ Such chaos on the frontiers was not unique to South Carolina, as a similar land crisis had erupted in the Green Mountains. Governor Lyttelton had ignored King Hagler's pleas on behalf of the Catawbas' land claims, instead turning all his efforts to protecting his colony's territory from Georgia

¹⁴ Arthur Dobbs to William H. Lyttelton, New Bern, July 19, 1757, Lyttelton Papers.

¹⁵ Merrell, *Indians New World*, 181-187, 198-209.

¹⁶ Christopher Guin, et al, DS to William H. Lyttelton, Carven County, S.C. June 16, 1757, Lyttelton Papers; Merrell, *Indians' New World*, 189-191.

squatters. Governor Ellis of Georgia assured Lyttelton, “I will use the best means necessary to deter them.” Whereas colonial governments were willing to remove squatters from lands claimed under colonial jurisdiction, they were unwilling to protect Indians’ land claims and hunting grounds.¹⁷

In summary, King Hagler worked tirelessly to reverse the tide of colonial expansion. In his day, colonial hunters and squatters had closed in on the Catawba Nation, almost choking the Indians from their own land. By 1758, small pox and population decline had so decimated the Catawba Nation that it had become too weak to wage a successful war against colonials. Instead, King Hagler attempted self-preservation by aligning with the very forces that were whittling away at Catawba existence, namely the colonial governments, the British Army, and even King George II. Although the colonial governments ignored King Hagler, Bouquet did not. Instead, as the following pages demonstrate, Bouquet welcomed Catawba overtures to the Royal Army, enlisted Catawba warriors into the Forbes Expedition, and even adopted a Catawba chief. Indeed, the alliance Bouquet and King Hagler brokered paralleled the alliance that Israel Pemberton was simultaneously brokering with the Ohio Delawares. Together, Bouquet and Pemberton enlisted a formidable native army to the Forbes Expedition. But unlike Pemberton, Bouquet was no Quaker pacifist. Nor was the Swiss Colonel sympathetic to the Catawbas’ territorial crisis. Besides, he had no authority to preserve Catawba territorial integrity in exchange for military service. Instead, Bouquet enlisted Catawba warriors for the sole purpose of espionage missions and capturing Fort

¹⁷ Henry Ellis to William H. Lyttelton, Savannah, June 22, 1757, Lyttelton Papers.

Duquesne. Catawba territorial claims would be no more secure after King Hagler's pact with Bouquet than before.¹⁸

Catawbas, Cherokees, and the Forbes Expedition

Whereas the Catawbas lived in proximity to the British colonists, the Cherokee Indians inhabited the Appalachian Mountains west of the southern colonial settlements. The Cherokees were a loose confederation of peoples, who inhabited three distinct zones of the Appalachians. Slightly different cultures, dialects, and attitudes toward the British colonizers distinguished the inhabitants of these zones. Yet, they all shared a common lineage that traced back to the Iroquois Confederacy, which through the Covenant Chain, continued claiming the Cherokees as their nephews. By the eighteenth century, trading networks loosely connected Cherokee Country to South Carolina and Virginia, yet the Cherokees remained autonomous from colonial society in comparison to the Catawbas. In 1712, Cherokee warriors joined with the South Carolina provincial regiments in the Tuscarora War, marking the first colonial-Cherokee military alliance. Over the following decades, the Cherokees and southern colonies developed friendly trading relations. However, by the mid-eighteenth century, colonial expansion and trading disputes had whittled away at the century old friendship between these two peoples, leading them to take what historian Tom Hatley called a dividing path. Because their population remained much larger than the Catawbas' population, the Cherokees proved more willing to fight against colonial encroachments, whereas the Catawbas aligned with the British in

¹⁸ Bouquet to Forbes, Fort Loudoun, June 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 72-76; Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, June 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 10-15. For Israel Pemberton and the Delawares, see Bouquet to William Allen, Fort Duquesne, November 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 610-612; Francis Jennings, *Empire of Fortune: Crowns, Colonies, and Tribes in the Seven Years War in America* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1988), 410-411.

hopes of preserving their civilization. The Cherokee War confirmed the dividing path, and arguably brought Cherokee Country under British military control.¹⁹

While colonial rogues squatted on Catawba and Cherokee lands, Bouquet brokered a shaky alliance with Little Carpenter. Little Carpenter was a Cherokee headman, who had worked not only to resolve tensions between the Cherokee natives and colonials but also had negotiated alliances between the British Army and Cherokee warriors. From Bouquet's perspective, Little Carpenter, being a Cherokee himself, spoke for all Cherokee Indians. Viewed more realistically, that is, from the Cherokee perspective, Little Carpenter represented the lower and middle Cherokee Towns, as opposed to the northern Tellico towns. Yet, even where he commanded respect, Little Carpenter did not speak for all the Indians who inhabited the southern Appalachian Mountains. Misguided by his perception of Little Carpenter's actual influence, Bouquet harnessed this headman's very real diplomatic acumen, enlisted his support for the Forbes Expedition, but ultimately expected him to deliver too much. Bouquet expected Little Carpenter to bring all the Cherokee People into an alliance with the British Army for the Forbes Expedition. Problematically, not all Cherokee Peoples saw the world through Forbes's eyes, not even through Little Carpenter's. Despite Little Carpenter's best diplomatic efforts, he would never convince all Cherokees to accede to the British worldview. Like his Catawba counterparts, Little Carpenter hoped that a tight alliance with the British Army would limit territorial conquest inside Cherokee Country. But many other Cherokees disagreed and resisted any move toward accommodation and military alliance. Indeed, the Tellico Peoples never felt any affinity toward Little

¹⁹ Tom Hatley, *The Dividing Paths: The Cherokees and South Carolina Through the Era of Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Theda Perdue, *Cherokee Women: Gender and Culture Change 1700-1835* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998).

Carpenter. They resisted colonial accommodation with the Royal Army.²⁰ Moreover, by 1759, the Tellico Peoples would mount strong resistance against colonial expansion, and unfair trading practices, and Lyttelton's provincial army. Bouquet's correspondence reveals his willingness to broker Cherokee alliances, but he ultimately did not understand the social dynamics of Cherokee Country. Bouquet had unrealistic expectations, thus conditioning himself to be disappointed when Little Carpenter abandoned the Forbes Expedition to resolve "the differences between the English & my People," back in Cherokee Country.²¹

In 1757, Bouquet and the southern governors initiated a diplomatic process to enlist Cherokee support in the British effort to oust the French from the Ohio Territory. Like Catawba natives, Cherokee warriors had already proven their willingness to fight with colonial soldiers against frontier raids. In preparation for the Forbes Expedition, Bouquet commissioned Cherokee espionage detachments to garner intelligence from French forts and to route enemy Indians from the southern frontier.²² Similarly, Virginia's governor Dinwiddie enlisted Cherokee war parties to join with Virginia volunteers to route enemy Indians from the Virginia frontier. Cherokee warriors willingly supported the Virginians' efforts to stabilize their frontiers, but they expected some recompense for their efforts. Even so, after repelling enemy Indians, Governor Dinwiddie refused to hold a conference with the Cherokee warriors, refused to thank them, and refused to bestow the customary gifts. Instead, Dinwiddie requested Atkin, the Southern Indian Superintendent, to disband the Cherokee warriors and send them back to Cherokee Country. Dinwiddie refused to fulfill appropriate diplomatic protocols, which

²⁰ Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, Ch. 1; Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 44-45.

²¹ Attakullakulla to Wm. Henry Lyttelton, Lyttelton Papers.

²² Bouquet to Demere, Charlestown, July 28, 1757, *PHB*, I, 155.

would have not only ensured future Cherokee cooperation but also provided the Indians with much needed material goods. Ultimately, this and subsequent diplomatic failures alienated the Cherokee People from the Virginian government, severed their alliance with the British Army, and moved them closer to outright warfare.²³

Back in Cherokee Country, Little Carpenter complained that the Cherokee people lacked basic hunting necessities, namely ammunition and guns, but other goods as well. This situation could not be surprising, given that these Indians had foregone their ordinary way of livelihood to defend the Virginia frontier, for which they had received neither gratitude nor payment. Near the lower Cherokee towns, the British had built forts Loudoun and Prince George, but agents had not supplied these forts with even the most basic Indian goods. Lacking ammunition and guns, Cherokee men could not complete the autumn hunts, creating conditions for starvation. Moreover, the Cherokees required a blacksmith to repair their broken guns, but despite their promises, the British military personnel never sent a blacksmith to Cherokee Country. Little Carpenter pointed out that the colonial governments had constructed forts Loudoun and Prince George as a sign of friendship and reciprocity. Yet, by allowing these forts to collapse into disrepair, both the colonial governments and British authorities had failed to live up to their trading promises. Little Carpenter took the abandoned forts to be a sign that the British did not care for their Indian brothers.²⁴ Bouquet substantiated this point: “It [a frontier fort] is

²³ Robert Dinwiddie to William H. Lyttelton, July 22, 1757, Lyttelton Papers. For a broader analysis of Dinwiddie’s relationship with Native Americans, see James Titus, *The Old Dominion at War: Society, Politics, and Warfare in Late Colonial Virginia* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991), 95-98

²⁴ Paul Demerè to William H. Lyttelton, Fort Loudoun, August 31, 1757, Lyttelton Papers. The utter collapse of the frontier fortification system is detailed in chapter III; see for example Taylor to Ellis, August 13, 1757, Frederica, *PHB*, I, 163-165.

worth nothing in itself, having been constructed only for pleasing those Indians.”²⁵ Then, in what could have been reciprocity, the Virginia Assembly passed an act for trading with Indians in August 1757. But the Assembly did not care if the Cherokees received goods or not, if they prospered or starved. Instead, the Assembly’s only goal was to undersell French traders, not to create trading reciprocity with their Cherokee neighbors. Governor Dinwiddie insisted that Virginia would undersell French traders, even if this meant creating a trade deficit. If trade prevented starvation, then that was an unintended consequent.²⁶ More broadly, Virginia’s refusal to supply Cherokee Country was a precursor to Amherst’s later refusal to supply ammunition and rum in Ohio Country.

Bouquet imagined that Little Carpenter commanded a level of influence that paralleled the influence and power wielded by a colonial governor, like Ellis of Georgia. But few parallels actually existed between Indian headmen and colonial governors, and this misconception blinded Bouquet to broader tensions inside Cherokee Country. For example, in August 1757, Bouquet gave a positive report about the army’s relations with the Cherokee People, “The situation of our Indian Affairs is very good. The Cherokees Seem to be our Sincere friends, [and] have made the Path to the French bloody.” Indeed, Little Carpenter had discovered a newly constructed French fort near present-day Paducah, Kentucky on the Ohio River. At Paducah, Cherokee warriors had scalped a French officer and delivered the trophy to Bouquet.²⁷ Thus, Bouquet projected this single instance of Cherokee support onto all Cherokee natives, vastly overestimating Cherokee friendship. Yet, even in the context of friendship, Bouquet subjugated Native

²⁵ Bouquet to Webb, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 168-169.

²⁶ Robert Dinwiddie to William H. Lyttelton, Williamsburg, August 27, 1757, Lyttelton Papers. Titus pointed out that the Virginia-Cherokee alliance never really satisfied the Virginians, *The Old Dominion*, 102.

²⁷ Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, August 25, 1757, *PHB*, I, 172-176.

Americans to British military rule. Just as he withdrew Fort Prince George from colonial jurisdiction, so now Bouquet forbade Lachlan Shaw to give credence to Cherokee laws or customary practices, “We are to be their friends, and not their Slaves; Let it be your utmost Rule to entertain Peace & Friendship with them, but don’t allow them to give us Laws.”²⁸ Similar to colonial governments, Bouquet was willing to broker with Cherokee headmen but always with the intention of bringing them under the imperial umbrella. The Swiss Colonel never really understood the internal dynamics of the Cherokee towns, just as he never appreciated the customary practices of colonial society.

Bouquet’s dealings with the so-called Tellico Cherokee were one important example of his incomprehension of Native American society. The Tellico Cherokee lived on the northern periphery of Cherokee Country, distant from the British forts and outside Little Carpenter’s sphere of influence. Members of the provincial regiments did not feel safe traveling through the Tellico and feared for their own scalps.²⁹ Bouquet acknowledged that the Tellico natives resisted colonial jurisdiction and were hostile to military personnel. Still, he imagined that a good show of British strength would settle Tellico unrest. Until then, he believed the army should nurse its alliance with Little Carpenter. In turn, Bouquet calculated that Little Carpenter would win the goodwill of the Tellico natives. He anticipated that Little Carpenter would summon hundreds of warriors to the Pennsylvania frontier.³⁰ But Bouquet was imagining, and by autumn of 1757, colonial expansion had already strained the British-Cherokee alliance. Governor Dinwiddie penned, “Our back Country at present is pretty quiet Only at Sometimes the Enemy & Indians Surprise some of our Out Settlers murdering the poor people &

²⁸ Bouquet to Shaw, Charlestown, September 17, 1757, *PHB*, I, 199.

²⁹ Bogges to Lyttelton, Fort Prince George, August 29, 1757, *PHB*, I, 181.

³⁰ Bouquet to Demere, Charlestown, September 10, 1757, *PHB*, I, 194.

destroying their Corn & Cattle.”³¹ Here began Tellico resistance to illegal hunting, squatting, and trespassing. Over the next months, the pillage and murders that the Tellico Cherokees had begun would spread to other regions of Cherokee Country, eventually severing Little Carpenter from Bouquet’s grip.

Meanwhile, south of Tellico, Bouquet brought forts Loudoun and Prince George under military jurisdiction. This transition facilitated trade and supplied natives with ammunition, rum, and other goods, which the colonial governments had inhibited. Bouquet ordered repairs to Fort Prince George, making it both a defensive structure and central to the Indian trade. Structural repairs and the resumption of trade “produced a good Effect” among the Southern Cherokees. As Bouquet described their disposition, “They are now become mild and humble, and they ask as favours the Presents that they used to extort as tribute.” Even as tension brewed in Tellico Country, trading reciprocity brought economic stability to the lower towns and brought neighboring tribes into British trading networks. As Bouquet put it,

I hear that the numerous Nation of the Choctaws begin to buy goods from our Indian traders, and Seem disposed to give up the French Interest, Which I believe Signifies nothing more than the unableness (sic) of the French to Supply them.³²

True, trade had wielded a friendship between many southern Indians and the British army. True, in 1757, not even the Tellico Cherokees were plotting a fully fledged war. Indeed, Bouquet’s description was true but overly optimistic. A dreamy impression of

³¹ Dinwiddie to Bouquet, November 24, 1757, *PHB*, I, 244.

³² Bouquet to Loudoun, Charlestown, December 10, 1757, *PHB*, I, 257.

Cherokee loyalty blinded Bouquet to the fact that colonial hunters and squatters could easily transform all these deceptively loyal natives into replicas of the Tellico Cherokees.

Bouquet must have imagined that Little Carpenter served as a conduit between the contentment at Fort Prince George and Tellico Country. But even the Colonel's military subordinates were alarmed by the tensions between the Tellico Cherokees and colonial intruders. Now, military personnel feared that Tellico anger could spill over onto the Royal army itself. Tellico warriors were positioned to attack the western fortification system, and the possibility of a siege of Fort Loudoun became real. Despite repairs to Fort Prince George, Fort Loudoun stood in the heart of Tellico Country and remained in decrepit condition. Narrow passes, limited communications, and distance from other forts made provisioning Fort Loudoun difficult. Tulleken complained that Fort Loudon lacked defensive capabilities and doubted its ability to sustain a siege. He explained the crisis succinctly: "[T]he Indians may be masters of it at any time."³³ Yet, despite Tulleken's warning, Little Carpenter stayed at the heart of Bouquet's Cherokee diplomacy. Fort Loudoun was five hundred miles west of Charlestown and even farther from Bouquet; the prospect that Tellico warriors could siege it did not worry the Colonel.

In February of 1758, Little Carpenter, several Cherokee headmen, and even more young warriors arrived at Fort Loudoun to pay a peaceful visit to Captain Paul Demere, the fort's commander. Upon their arrival, the warriors surrendered several Miami prisoners to Demere. They gave him even more Miami scalps, and Demere forked over a handsome reward. Seeing the warriors' happiness, Demere joked that they may murder and scalp British prisoners for additional ransom payments. Demere lavished gifts on his Cherokee guests, showed them all the kindnesses of friendship, and even fired the fort's

³³ Tulleken to Loudoun, Lancaster, January 29, 1758, *PHB*, I, 282-284.

cannons in their honor. He gorged the Cherokee visitors and welcomed the headmen to lodge in the officers' barracks. But beneath this diplomatic fanfare were smoldering hostilities that not even Little Carpenter would be able to contain for long. The documents reveal that Little Carpenter knew he could not stave off a Cherokee rebellion. Ominously, he warned Demere that Fort Loudoun could not withstand an Indian attack. Even so, Little Carpenter ensured Demere that he had encouraged wavering Indians to align with the British and to take up the hatchet against the French. Next morning, the band departed for Cherokee Country. Demere, much like Bouquet, was deceived by the apparent innocence of Little Carpenter and the warriors. Deluded by fanfare, Demere allowed himself to believe that all Cherokee peoples were kindly disposed toward the British. Thus, Demere described the Tellico Indians as "entirely Reformed, and behave Extremely well." In all, Demere could not see past jovial warriors parading with Miami scalps, so he failed to heed Little Carpenter's warning that Fort Loudoun could not withstand what really was an imminent Indian attack.³⁴

As complacency about the Tellico Indians swelled, Bouquet enlisted Cherokees from the southern towns for service in the Forbes Expedition. This required the Cherokees to depart from their small mountain communities, proceed north through Virginia, and report to military posts in Pennsylvania. In May 1758, the army delivered scores of armaments, liquor, and uniforms to Pennsylvania's frontier forts to clad Cherokee warriors. In June, Colonel William Byrd had reached Winchester, Virginia, where Little Carpenter had gathered 60 Cherokee warriors. Byrd anticipated the arrival of another 200 Cherokee fighters. A handful of warriors had already encamped at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and Forbes hoped that Little Carpenter could confirm them in the

³⁴ Demere to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, February 21, 1758, *PHB*, I, 306-308.

British alliance.³⁵ By July, Forbes reported that almost 130 Catawba, Tuscarawas, and Nottoway Indians had gathered at Winchester, Virginia. Forbes ordered these Indians to proceed to Fort Cumberland, where Bouquet should send additional supplies.

Meanwhile, some military personnel speculated that Little Carpenter had marshaled additional Indians to the British alliance, who were proceeding northward from Augusta County, Virginia.³⁶ Bouquet began appropriating supplies and munitions for all these aligned Indians, though he believed that the Highlanders' "bad pistols" would be good enough for natives.³⁷ But Forbes showed more confidence in Indians' martial abilities and ordered the Cherokees to be supplied with light fuses and hundreds of heavy firelocks.³⁸ Thus, as Little Carpenter, Cherokee warriors, and other southern Indians journeyed north to join the Forbes Expedition, Bouquet never recalled that many Indians remained discontent back in Cherokee Country.

Indian alliances were difficult to broker, and without proper attention, they were even more difficult to maintain. This was certainly the case in the Forbes Expedition. No sooner had Bouquet enlisted Little Carpenter's warriors than these approximate 300 Indian fighters grew bored and wanted to return to Cherokee Country. Long before Bouquet had settled supply routes and constructed outposts, the Cherokee warriors threatened to abandon the army for more exciting ventures. As Forbes put it, "The Cherokees are Impatient and want to go home, but I hope they will with prudent manadgment (*sic*) be persuaded to Stay."³⁹ Nowhere were the Cherokees more prone to

³⁵ Ward, Cherokee Account, Fort Littleton, May 14, 1758, *PHB*, I, 341; Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, May 29, 1758, *PHB*, I, 379-381; Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, June 19, 1758, *PHB*, I, 112-113; Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 143-145.

³⁶ Forbes to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 6, 1758, *PHB*, I, 163-165.

³⁷ Bouquet to Forbes, Lancaster, May 22, 1758, *PHB*, I, 350-352.

³⁸ Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, May 25, 1758, *PHB*, I, 354-356.

³⁹ Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, May 23, 1758, *PHB*, I, 353-354.

mutiny than at Winchester, Virginia. Quartermaster John St. Clair reported that 60 Cherokee warriors wanted to depart from Winchester for Cherokee Country, and those who remained threatened to pillage the community. Despite lavish gifts, St Clair did not believe the army could retain their allegiance. Therefore, he requested Forbes to dispatch Atkin or another Indian agent to Winchester to shore up the fledgling Cherokee alliance.⁴⁰ By the end of May, several Cherokees had departed from Winchester. As Adam Stephen explained it,

Several Small parties of Indians are returned home, & If Judge right, we are in danger of losing more, unless that are employd (*sic*) one way or Other. Sir John Saint Clair takes all possible pains to keep them in good Temper.⁴¹

By the end of May, the Cherokee warriors at Winchester numbered around 280, but Little Carpenter promised to bring about 200 more.⁴²

The British enacted a twofold strategy to retain its wavering Cherokee allies: presents and espionage engagements. Presents sealed Indians' commitment to European states, and the Cherokees expected lavish gifts for their military exploits. As the 1758 expedition unfolded, Forbes sent a large quantity of Indian gifts to Lancaster, Pennsylvania. Forbes instructed Bouquet to keep the gifts safe until the Indians had

⁴⁰ Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, May 25, 1758, *PHB*, I, 354-356. For the conduct of the Cherokee in Winchester, see Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, May 30, 1758, *PHB*, I, 393-394.

⁴¹ Stephen to Bouquet, Winchester, May 26, 1758, *PHB*, I, 372.

⁴² St. Clair to Bouquet, Winchester, May 28, 1758, *PHB*, I, 376-377; Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, May 29, 1758, *PHB*, I, 379-381.

fulfilled their duties to the expedition.⁴³ Even so, the army deliberately displayed these gifts before the Indians, not only to entice their fancy but also to compel them to remain through the entire campaign. Time is a cruel cure for boredom, and promised gifts only meant more waiting. Espionage made these Cherokee warriors feel useful and also provided an essential military service. Thus, as French aligned Indians mounted raids on the Pennsylvania frontier and threatened British security, Bouquet commissioned Cherokee detachments to reconnoiter enemy camps, collect intelligence, and harvest scalps.⁴⁴ Combined, promised presents and espionage engagements gave the Cherokee warriors reason to remain in the British military alliance, despite its boredom and slow progress.

It was late May 1758 when Bouquet began preparations for the first Indian conference of the Forbes Expedition; at this conference, British brokers would convince the Cherokees to accept the above mentioned twofold strategy. Early on, Bosomworth and Bouquet expected to hold this conference at Shippensburg, but supply failures soon recommended that they divert it to Fort Loudoun. Once the army settled the location, Bouquet identified three points to be resolved. First, he wanted the army's brokers to convince the Cherokees to remain loyal to the British, until the army had completed building bridges, roads, posts, and supply chains. Second, he wanted the Indians to wait until the end of the expedition to receive their gifts, ostensibly because heavy gifts would only bog down the warriors but actually to ensure they would not make an early departure. Finally, while waiting to siege Fort Duquesne, Bouquet wanted to engage the Cherokee warriors in espionage activities. As he put it,

⁴³ Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, May 25, 1758, *PHB*, I, 354-356; Bosomworth to Bouquet, Shippensburg, May 30, 1758, *PHB*, I, 397.

⁴⁴ Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, May 25, 1758, *PHB*, I, 361-365.

Finally, to cooperate with us in the necessary arrangements for the safety of our communications by apportioning their men to the posts that we designate, and continually sending out parties to get news of the enemy, and to try to take prisoners.⁴⁵

Even before Bouquet had identified these three major points of the conference, the Indians had turned point one up-side-down. That is, the Cherokee warriors who had already arrived at Shippensburg had torn open the army storehouses, stealing the very presents that Bouquet did not want them to receive until the expedition's end.⁴⁶

Meanwhile, supply problems at Shippensburg recommended that Bouquet transfer the entire conference to Fort Loudoun.⁴⁷ Bouquet's organizational acumen could not keep pace with the Cherokees' boredom, which would ultimately topple both Bouquet and Little Carpenter's effort to maintain the Cherokee alliance.

From the outset, Bosomworth advised Bouquet to exercise caution in transferring the conference from Shippensburg to Fort Loudoun. He warned Bouquet not to reroute the Cherokee warriors before they all arrived at Shippensburg, fearing that many straggling native detachments would be lost in western Virginia. Even so, Bosomworth cajoled the Cherokees gathered at Winchester to proceed directly to Fort Loudoun. Once the straggling warriors had gathered at Shippensburg, then Bouquet, Bosomworth, and Forbes agreed that all the Indians should proceed to Fort Loudoun.⁴⁸ By late May, the first stream of Cherokees approached Fort Loudoun. But upon their approach, Captain William Trent mistook these aligned Cherokees for the very Indians who were

⁴⁵ Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, May 29-30, 1758, *PHB*, I, 386-390.

⁴⁶ Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, May 25, 1758, *PHB*, I, 361-365.

⁴⁷ Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, May 29-30, 1758, *PHB*, I, 386-390.

⁴⁸ Bosomworth to Bouquet, Shippensburg, May 30, 1758, *PHB*, I, 397; Bouquet to St. Clair, Carlisle, May 31, 1758, *PHB*, I, 400-402.

concurrently raiding the Pennsylvania and Virginia frontiers. Suspecting a raid, Trent ordered his soldiers to unleash cannon and gun fire on the approaching Cherokee warriors. Fear, not crass racism, spurred this attack, which ironically dispersed the very Indians who had come to counter the frontier raids. As a result, St. Clair wrote, “I dread we shall not have one Indian of the Cherokees left.”⁴⁹ As soldiers fired on the Cherokees at Fort Loudoun, the army welcomed Cherokee and Iroquois brokers to a conference at Philadelphia.

On June 1, 1758, Governor Denny of Pennsylvania and General Forbes opened a conference with Seneca George and twelve representatives of the Cherokee people in Philadelphia. Seneca George represented the historic surety that the Iroquois Nation claimed over Cherokee Country, and though waning, those claims retained diplomatic power. Forbes saw the Cherokee-Iroquois relationship through the lens presented to him by Seneca George, not as it actually existed—or did not exist—in Cherokee Country. Isolated in Philadelphia, Seneca George harnessed the strength of the British Army to shore up the Iroquois’ historic claims over the Cherokee people. Accordingly, Seneca George assured Forbes that the Cherokee people were united with the Iroquois against the French. He promised that the Cherokees would make a steady migration northward to Mohawk Country. Then, united with the Mohawks and the British army, the Cherokee warriors would wage war against the French. As he put it, “[W]henver they see a Frenchman they will knock his brains out.” Seneca George begged Forbes to provide the Cherokee warriors with clothing, but no amount of clothing could counterweight Iroquois deception, colonial hunters and squatters, and most recently Captain William Trent’s orders. In all, this Philadelphia Cherokee Conference revealed more about Iroquois

⁴⁹ St. Clair to Bouquet, Winchester, May 31, 1758, *PHB*, I, 402-404.

sovereignty claims than about the multiple Cherokee dispositions toward the British, for the Tellico Cherokees were hostile to the Virginians and Little Carpenter's warriors were slipping out of Bouquet's hands.⁵⁰

Two days after Seneca George pledged Cherokee loyalty, a band of Cherokee warriors barged into Fort Loudoun and held a conference. An Indian from Carlisle escorted them, suggesting that Bouquet had commissioned an envoy to lure the frightened Indians back to Fort Loudoun. Envoy or not, the Cherokees decided to sever their alliance with the British Army and demanded a large present. Captain Trent promised that Bouquet would soon arrive to hold a conference and tried to delay their departure. Unconvinced, the Cherokee warriors threatened to join the Creek Indians in an alliance with the French. If Trent refused a large present, then the warriors threatened to pillage the Virginia frontier on their return to Cherokee Country. Trent took this threat lightly, and persisted in his effort to retain the Cherokee alliance.⁵¹ Upon receiving Trent's letter, Bouquet despaired of retaining these Cherokee warriors in the British alliances, writing, "The Cherokee are behaving so very badly...and are ready to leave us."⁵² Reassured by Seneca George, Forbes cautioned Bouquet against pessimism and

⁵⁰ Forbes, Memoranda, Philadelphia, June 1, 1758, *PHB*, II, 1-2; *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, VIII (hereafter *Colonial Records Memorial*) (Harrisburg, 1851), 124-125. For the Cherokees relationship with the Iroquois Confederation, see Richard Aquila, *The Iroquois Restoration: Iroquois Diplomacy on the Colonial Frontier, 1701-1754* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1983), 205-232; Theda Perdue, "Cherokee Relations with the Iroquois in the Eighteenth Century," in *Beyond the Covenant Chain: The Iroquois and their neighbors in Indian North America, 1600-1800*, ed. Daniel K. Richter and James H. Merrell (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press), 135-149.

⁵¹ Trent to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, June 5, 1758, *PHB*, II, 36.

⁵² Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, June 7, 1758, *PHB*, II, 47-51; Corkran reported that Cherokee warriors rarely remained in any expedition for more than three months, explaining why they had already begun abandoning the British alliance in June, see *The Cherokee Frontier*, 152.

urged him to expend all diplomatic means to preserve the Cherokee alliance. “I am sorry to find you are of opinion that nothing will keep them,” Forbes wrote.⁵³

Thus reprimanded, Bouquet dispatched a Cherokee envoy from Carlisle to detain the Cherokee warriors at Fort Loudoun. For the moment, Bouquet seemed to regain hope for the Cherokee alliance. As he put it, “If they wish to come to Loudoun, all could be reconciled; if they refuse, we can no longer count on them.” The Colonel calculated that if the Cherokees abandoned the British, then the French would probably meet equal difficulties with their Indians allies. And, if both the British and French lost their Indian allies, then the European powers would wage a traditional European styled war.⁵⁴ Over the next days, the Cherokee threats proved empty, Trent gave trivial gifts, and more Cherokee warriors arrived.⁵⁵ For example, Bosomworth persisted in his efforts to marshal warriors from Cherokee Country to conference at Fort Loudoun. Meanwhile, small bands of Cherokees arrived at Fort Loudoun, having completed espionage missions at forts LeBoeuf, Presque Isle, and Venango. Indeed, these were probably the Indians whom Seneca George had referred to as the Iroquois’ subjects.⁵⁶ Thus, Bouquet’s twofold strategy of placating the Cherokees with small gifts and espionage missions had yielded handsome returns in the short term.

On June 3, Bouquet ordered Bosomworth to return to Winchester to persuade the wavering Cherokee warriors to return to the British alliance. If the natives feared cannon and gun fire at Fort Loudoun, then Bouquet hoped that they would proceed to Bedford,

⁵³ Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, June 10, 1758, *PHB*, II, 64-66.

⁵⁴ Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, June 7, 1758, *PHB*, II, 47-51.

⁵⁵ Consistent with claims made by Seneca George, many of these newly arrived Cherokee came from the northern warfront—Presque Isle, LeBoeuf, and Venango. Stephen to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, June 7, 1758, *PHB*, II, 52-53; Trent to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, June 8, 1758, *PHB*, II, 54.

⁵⁶ Stephen to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, June 7, 1758, *PHB*, II, 52-53; Trent to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, June 8, 1758, *PHB*, II, 54; Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 153.

Pennsylvania. Although St. Clair despaired of retaining any Cherokee allies, Bouquet believed that Little Carpenter would bring a large detachment of his people, which “will certainly produce a revolution in their attitude.”⁵⁷ Predictably, the friendly fire incident had instilled a lingering fear of Fort Loudoun in these Cherokees. Even so, they agreed to meet Bouquet at Carlisle, Pennsylvania. They arrived at Carlisle in mid-June, the same day Bouquet sent his Cherokee warriors off to Fort Loudoun. The arrival of the southern Cherokees perplexed Bouquet, because they had already resisted Fort Loudoun and small pox had broken out at Carlisle. Nonetheless, he lavished these warriors with kindness and secured them to the British interests. Bouquet convinced them that Trent was mistaken in ordering cannon and gun fire, because the Colonel seems to have escorted these Cherokees back to Fort Loudoun for a conference. Unlike the Cherokees, the Catawbas’ loyalty to the British Army had never wavered, but unlike the Cherokees, the Catawbas’ small numbers did not allow them much bargaining power.⁵⁸

By June 17, the majority of the British aligned Cherokees had arrived at Fort Loudoun for the long anticipated conference. Those promised by Seneca George had arrived from the trans-Allegheny frontier. Bosomworth had convinced many of the Indians held out at Winchester to proceed to Fort Loudoun. Bouquet had escorted several Cherokees from Carlisle down to the conference, but now he despaired of others who had been dispersed by the friendly fire incident. Bosomworth represented the army’s interests at the conference. He reported, “The Indians are all to receive their several Proportions of Goods for the Service of the Campaign.” The army would store these presents until the Indians had fulfilled their obligations. By framing it this way,

⁵⁷ Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, June 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 10-15.

⁵⁸ Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, June 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 10-15; Bouquet to Forbes, Fort Loudoun, June 14, 1758, *PHB*, II, 87-89.

Bosomworth believed that the promised gifts would ensure good service and loyalty from the Indians. Withholding their gifts at Fort Loudoun was “the most effectual means of securing them inviolable to our Interest.” Although “tedious and troublesome” for military personnel, this method seemed to be agreeable to the Indian’s “Temper.”⁵⁹

Once Bosomworth had gathered the Catawba and Cherokee natives, Bouquet proceeded from Carlisle to Fort Loudoun to oversee the conference. The conference lasted for two days, involved public councils, and backroom brokering. Bouquet secured 27 Catawbas and 99 Cherokees to the British alliance, who vowed “to conquer or perish with us.” He convinced the Indians to follow the British Army into battle and to wait out the entire expedition before receiving their gifts. The army would equip the Indians for battle, giving each warrior stroud mantles, leggings, two knives, a shirt, and a breech cloth.⁶⁰ The Indians agreed to this arrangement. The conference diminished Bouquet’s initial pessimism about Indian diplomacy. As he explained it, “I was astonished to find so much spirit, imagination, strength, and dignity in savages.” Bouquet had adopted the Catawba warrior, Captain Johnny, as his son. Adoption was a Native custom that entail reciprocal obligations.⁶¹ In this case, adoption consummated the Catawbas loyalty to the army. As Bouquet put it, “This last tribe [Catawba] will not leave us.”⁶²

Bouquet’s newfound confidence in natives allies served primarily as an auxiliary to his burgeoning irritation with George Washington, the Virginians, and Braddock’s Road. Before arriving at Fort Loudoun, Bouquet had been trekking through the

⁵⁹ Bosomworth to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, June 16, 1758, *PHB*, II, 92-93.

⁶⁰ Bosomworth, Calculation of the Expense for Indian Warriors, Bedford, July 23, 1758, *PHB*, II, 260.

⁶¹ Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, June 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 10-15.

⁶² “Bouquet to Forbes”, Fort Loudoun, June 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 72-76. For an analysis of adoption, see Daniel Richter, “War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 40, no. 4 (October 1983): 529.

Pennsylvania backwoods, inspecting road construction and growing increasingly convinced that the army needed to cut a trans-Allegheny route.⁶³ In this context, Bouquet was thrilled when a Cherokee warrior interrupted his speech and announced that his people knew the trans-Allegheny terrain well. This Indian asked a fellow warrior, recently returned from Fort Duquesne, “to sketch his march.” Unsheathing his knife, the warrior sketched onto the table a path from Winchester to Fort Duquesne. The sketch included all the rivers and paths, down to minute geographic details. The warrior explained that the Allegheny Mountains dominated the geography, but he assured the Colonel that the range was passable. Low lands lined the Monongahela River, making it easily traversable. Then, land rose to great heights on both sides of the river. As for Fort Duquesne, the warrior described it as a mere stockade polygon, less formidable than the Alleghenies. Etched onto the table, this map answered the questions that Bouquet had hoped to discover on his earlier treks across the Allegheny Mountains. Just as importantly, it convinced him that what came to be called Forbes Road was not only possible but also preferable to Braddock’s. For the time being, this new found Indian alliance corroborated imperial goals far better than did the Virginians’ provincial interests.⁶⁴ Whereas Seneca George worked to tie the Cherokees to Iroquoian surety, so now Bouquet found it expedient to bind the Cherokees to British territorial expansion.

As the conflict between Bouquet and Washington heated, the Swiss Colonel suggested his Cherokee allies could actually fulfill the role of provincial regiments. Accordingly, he petitioned Forbes to consider giving the Cherokees the status of a

⁶³ Bouquet to Forbes, Fort Loudoun, June 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 72-76.

⁶⁴ Bouquet to Forbes, Fort Loudoun, June 16, 1758, *PHB*, II, 95-97. The literature on George Washington’s opposition to Forbes Road is vast. For a summary, see Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 272.

provincial regiment. Couched in Bouquet's description of this arrangement was his inability to comprehend Native cultural identity.

One other thing, that is to make the Indians provincial soldiers. They are very willing, the expense is nothing, and I believe the advantage is very real. It would be only necessary for them to remove their coats and breeches...cut off their hair and daub them with [White] paint.⁶⁵

Quite literally, Bouquet wanted not only to strip the Indians of Native attire but also to Anglicize their pigment. While on good terms with the Cherokees, this mindset allowed Bouquet to integrate Cherokee warriors into the British Army. But, once Pontiac turned the table, this same mindset would serve to massacre a people who not only dressed differently but whose pigment was a different shade than Europeans.⁶⁶

James Byrd III had promised to bring some 500 Indians into the British alliance, and the Fort Loudoun conference ensured the army an additional 200 native allies. Bouquet believed that even a few hundred loyal Indians "certainly would be preferable to 500 rogues who do nothing but filch our presents without rendering any service."⁶⁷ Already, the Cherokees had rendered Bouquet important services. For example, he had commissioned a detachment of seven Cherokees to reconnoiter Fort Duquesne, marking one of the first espionage missions of the Forbes Expedition. Cherokee warriors provided

⁶⁵ Bouquet to Forbes, Juniata, June 21, 1758, *PHB*, II, 120-124.

⁶⁶ Peter S. Onuf, "We Shall all be Americans: Thomas Jefferson and the Indians," *Indiana Magazine of History*, XCV (June 1999), 103-136.

⁶⁷ Bouquet to Forbes, Fort Loudoun, June 16, 1758, *PHB*, II, 95-97; Gipson, *The Great War for the Empire*, VI, 255.

flanking parties for the soldiers who cut roads leading toward Bedford.⁶⁸ Following the Loudoun Conference, the Cherokeees began what turned out to be their most important task in the expedition: collecting intelligence and capturing French prisoners. Forbes knew that Fort Duquesne had not received supplies from Canada, but he did not know their exact level of desperation. Forbes ordered Bouquet to commission Catawba and Cherokee spies to garner this intelligence about Fort Duquesne's strength.⁶⁹ Accordingly, on June 28 Bouquet ordered Captain Johnny and Catawba warriors to reconnoiter enemy camps along the Ohio River and attempt to capture a prisoner. Meanwhile, Cherokee scouts killed a French hunter and returned his scalp to Bouquet.⁷⁰ Throughout the summer of 1758, the Cherokee allies performed as Bouquet had anticipated, especially by encouraging the construction of Forbes Road. Bouquet did not withhold his approbation,

I do not know if our Cherokeees will always be so disposed, but today they have done what I have never heard of any Indians doing before. That is working for us, and carrying a quantity of bark to roof our storehouses.

Bouquet's approval of the Cherokee alliance was linked to his increasing frustration over Braddock's Road, Washington, and the Virginians.⁷¹

⁶⁸ Bouquet to Forbes, Fort Loudoun, June 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 72-76; Bouquet to Forbes, Fort Loudoun, June 14, 1758, *PHB*, II, 87-89.

⁶⁹ Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, June 16, 1758, *PHB*, II, 103.

⁷⁰ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, June 28, 1758, *PHB*, II, 142-144.

⁷¹ Bouquet to St. Clair, Bedford, June 30, 1758, *PHB*, II, 148-150; Gipson, *The Great War for the Empire*, VI, 257; Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 154.

In early July, Forbes reported the arrival of 129 Catawba natives at Winchester and Little Carpenter trailed with a large Cherokee detachment. Forbes instructed Bouquet either to send these Indians to Fort Cumberland or to join him in Pennsylvania. Intelligence had it that Little Carpenter's detachment of Cherokee warriors had arrived at Augusta County, Virginia and were now progressing toward Bedford, Pennsylvania. Forbes understood that Little Carpenter's detachment had come only to assist the army in taking possession of Fort Duquesne. The Cherokees were not possessed of infinite patience, and without combat activities, they might soon return to their Appalachian homeland. Forbes turned this disposition to the army's advantage, arguing that time no longer permitted wrangling over Braddock's Road. With Little Carpenter's arrival, the army had to expedite the construction of the new trans-Allegheny road. As Forbes put it, "with the addition of those Indians now at Winchester & the little Carpenter...there is no time to be lost."⁷²

No sooner had Little Carpenter arrived than Cherokee warriors attempted to sever Bouquet's alliance with the Catawba Indians. This represented a deviation in the historic friendship between the Catawba and Cherokee peoples. Cherokee natives became even more frustrated with British Indian policy when the Virginia government struck an alliance with the Shawnee Indians, enemies of the Cherokee nation. Then, Catawba Indians, always loyal to Virginia, joined in the Shawnee alliance, thereby alienating themselves from their former Cherokee allies. Historian David H. Corkran described the ruptured Catawba-Cherokee friendship like this:

⁷² Forbes to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 6, 1758, *PHB*, II, 163-165.

[The Cherokee Nation] expressed its disillusionment with the Virginians by making peace with the Shawnee allies of the French against whom the Cherokees had fought to protect the Virginia frontier. The move led to further Cherokee isolation. Before the year was out it ruptured Catawba-Cherokee friendship.

Here began the division between the Catawba and Cherokee natives that lasted through the Cherokee War. Meanwhile, Britain's few remaining Cherokee allies would be content to irritate Bouquet and his Catawba warriors.⁷³

On June 28, Bouquet ordered Captain Johnny and a Catawba detachment to reconnoiter the Ohio River and capture a prisoner. On July 11, Captain Johnny returned with only a scalp, and no prisoner from whom Bouquet could garner intelligence.

Bouquet's Cherokee warriors examined this scalp and claimed it was old, inauthentic, a fraud. This infuriated Bouquet, and he treated his adopted son with scorn and contempt. Finally, Captain Johnny led his Catawba warriors back to Virginia. Bouquet referred the incident to Washington, requesting him to report it to the Governor Fauquier.

Washington was sorry to learn that "the Catawbias have so egregiously misbehaved themselves" and promised to report the matter to the governor.⁷⁴ But Captain Johnny's loyalty was as indubitable as was Cherokee hatred for the Shawnee Indians. In fact, the contingencies of wilderness warfare had probably prevented the Catawbias from procuring a live captive, so they shot and scalped a Frenchman instead. The Cherokees, motivated by Catawba support for the Shawnee-Virginia alliance, transformed Bouquet's initial upset about no prisoner into blazing anger, by suggesting that the Catawba warriors

⁷³ Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 160.

⁷⁴ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, June 28, 1758, *PHB*, II, 142-144; Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, July 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 179-182; Gipson, *The Great War for the Empire*, VI, 257.

had presented a fraudulent scalp. Bouquet's anger wounded Captain Johnny and he returned to Virginia, exactly as the Cherokees wanted. As Bouquet put it, "We must no longer count on any but ourselves."⁷⁵ Intertribal resentment among the southern Indians weakened Bouquet's ability to broker an alliances among these Indians in the Forbes Expedition, ironic given Forbes concomitant successful mediation between factious Pennsylvanian interests and the Ohio Indians. Even so, the Catawbias had not abandoned the British alliance, for this incident anticipated the day when Catawba warriors would march with Major Grant against the Cherokee Nation.⁷⁶

The Cherokees themselves proved to be less malleable to military goals than Bouquet had anticipated. For example, Bouquet ordered Washington and Byrd to oversee construction of a road from Fort Cumberland to Bedford. Problematically, Byrd commanded a sizeable detachment of Cherokees, who refused to travel by unknown roads. Byrd's Indians not only refused to flank road builders but also refused to travel the route that Bouquet had ordered the provincial regiments to cut.⁷⁷ Often Indians refused to travel roads that gave bad omens, but the British had no analytic framework to comprehend this intuition. Bouquet, Forbes, and other military personnel defined military goals with a precision that was too narrow to account for internal tribal tensions, omens, and other intangible realities, however real those realities seemed to Indians.⁷⁸

While Captain Johnny hurried the Catawba back to Virginia, the army lost sight of Little Carpenter. For several days, Bouquet anticipated Little Carpenter's arrival at

⁷⁵ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, July 15, 1758, *PHB*, II, 215-217.

⁷⁶ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 40, 158-159. Later reports had it that Little Carpenter was not on good terms with the Virginian government, confirming this interpretation.

⁷⁷ Bouquet to Washington, Bedford, June 27 1758, *PHB*, II, 134; Bouquet to Washington, Bedford, July 1, 1758, *PHB*, II, 156; Washington to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, July 7, 1758, *PHB*, II, 167-168.

⁷⁸ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, July 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 179-182; Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, August 18, 1758, *PHB*, II, 379-382.

Fort Bedford. Finally, on July 13, Captain Pearis escorted 16 Cherokee warriors to Bouquet's camp.⁷⁹ But no sooner had these warriors arrived and received gifts than they departed. As Bouquet explained it,

Our new comers Cherokee, are gone away after having Stolen our goods. It is a great humiliation for us to be obliged to Suffer the repeated Insolence of Such Rascals; I think it would be easier to make Indians of our White men, than to coax that damned Tanny Race.⁸⁰

Bouquet reported to Forbes that neither the Catawbas nor the Cherokees had lived up to the terms of the Fort Loudoun Conference. Now, he believed that the army could no longer rely on Indian allies.⁸¹ As July turned to August, the army's Indian allies had dwindled to only 200.⁸²

On July 21, Colonel Byrd sent ten Cherokee warriors from Virginia up to Bedford, Pennsylvania. Upon their arrival, animosity arose between Bouquet and his natives allies. The warriors requested gifts that far exceeded those agreed to at the Loudoun Conference, including much wampum, silver arm plates, wrist bands, several strouds, and countless other articles. Bouquet complained, "They seem a little like spoiled children[.]" Two days later, Bouquet complained to Forbes that Byrd's Cherokees "are giving us a great deal of trouble." They had rejected the presents that Bouquet gave them and made additional demands. Worst still, they had attempted to lure

⁷⁹ Bosomworth to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, July 14, 1758, *PHB*, II, 204-205; Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, July 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 179-182; Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, July 13, 1758, *PHB*, II, 200.

⁸⁰ Bouquet to Washington, Bedford, July 14, 1758, *PHB*, II, 205-206.

⁸¹ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, July 15, 1758, *PHB*, II, 215-217; Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 126-128.

⁸² Extract of Letter from Officer on Duquesne Expedition, Fort Loudoun, July 17, 1758, *PHB*, II, 226-227.

the army's few good warriors back to Cherokee Country.⁸³ Perceiving Bouquet's difficulties, Forbes made no efforts to enlist 60 additional Cherokee warriors, whom Byrd had gathered at Fort Cumberland. As Forbes put it, "he [Byrd] little knows me, if he imagines that Sixty Scoundrels are to direct me in my measures."⁸⁴ Soon after Forbes refused to broker an alliance with these Indians, 46 returned to Cherokee Country.⁸⁵ By the beginning of August, all the Indians Byrd had brought up from the Appalachian Mountains had now abandoned the British alliance, returned to Cherokee Country, and ravaged the Virginia frontier on the way. Little Carpenter's Cherokee subordinates had begun defecting, united with Tellico sentiments, and now launched counterattacks against colonial expansion, squatters, and trespassers.⁸⁶

While Bouquet struggled to retain some Cherokee allies, the French aligned Indians unleashed raids on the Pennsylvania and Virginian frontiers, targeting not only settlers but also soldiers. On the morning of July 13, hostile Indians murdered two Virginian soldiers and captured a third. Two Cherokees led a detachment of 50 soldiers to retaliate for the murders, but they only discovered the tracks of six enemy Indians.⁸⁷ The following day this same enemy party fired on the express carrying a letter from Bouquet to Washington. The carrier abandoned his horse and fled to Washington's tent. Washington responded quickly, sending three detachments to hunt down the hostile Indians. Notably, to this point in the war, this was the largest detachment led by Officer

⁸³ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, July 21, 1758, *PHB*, II, 251-255. For the gifts that these Cherokee demanded, see Bouquet to Washington, Bedford, July 23, 1758, *PHB*, II, 263-264; Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, July 23, 1758, *PHB*, II, 261-262. On July 31, 30 of Bouquet's Cherokee considered departing but decided to remain until Forbes arrived. See Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, July 31, 1758, *PHB*, II, 290-293.

⁸⁴ Forbes to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 23, 1758, *PHB*, II, 264-266.

⁸⁵ Washington to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, July 28, 1758, *PHB*, II, 284.

⁸⁶ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, August 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 312-314.

⁸⁷ Washington to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, July 13, 1758, *PHB*, II, 203-204.

Richard Pearis and eighteen Cherokees.⁸⁸ On July 21, a party of Cherokees returned from the Ohio Country to Bedford, delivering Bouquet a fresh scalp and a French gun. Because the party met no reprisal, Bouquet speculated that the French were perhaps growing weaker.⁸⁹ In a parallel case, three Indians attacked Michael Scully, a British Regular, who was hunting stray horses four miles from camp on the Cumberland Road. Heavy rains that day had dampened the Indians' guns, obstructing their discharge. Detecting the Indians, Scully returned fire and downed a native. But what began as a gun fight turned into a brawl. As Bouquet reported it,

Before he could reload, the other two attacked him with their knives and tomahawks. He knocked one down with the butt of his rifle and, collaring the other, threw him to the ground and would have beaten him to death if other Indians had not come to his rescue with loud cries. He fled and, running very rapidly, he escaped with slight wounds.⁹⁰

These attacks were not isolated incidents but had become almost daily occurrences by early August. Indeed, soldiers constructed roads under threat of tomahawk, capture, or enemy gunfire. Bouquet lacked intelligence about French strength, but unrelenting attacks recommended the army increase its espionage campaign.⁹¹

By late July, only 70 Cherokees remained loyal to the British army. Of those remaining, Bouquet appointed seven to conduct an espionage operation at Fort Duquesne. Over a seven day stretch, these Cherokee spies determined that only around 100 Ohio

⁸⁸ Washington to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, July 16, 1758, *PHB*, II, 221-223.

⁸⁹ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, July 21, 1758, *PHB*, II, 251-255.

⁹⁰ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, July 31, 1758, *PHB*, II, 290-293.

⁹¹ Forbes to Bouquet, Carlisle, August 2, 1758, *PHB*, II, 303. For additional Indian attacks, see Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, August 8, 1758, *PHB*, II, 335-339.

Indians remained at Fort Duquesne, few compared to the once powerful French-Indian alliance. The Cherokees' interest reached a crescendo when they spied a nude Indian woman, bathing in the Monongahela River. Her proximity to the fort recommended that they not kill her, so they gazed upon her instead. They saw no tents, no soldiers, and no signs of the once powerful French army. Whereas espionage gathers intelligence, voyeurism observes nudity. In this case, Bouquet's Cherokee spies conflated espionage and voyeurism, concluding that the French were now quite impotent, militarily that is.⁹²

Back in mid-July, Bouquet had contemplated an attack on the Indians who lived along the Ohio River, on lands probably claimed by the Virginian owned Ohio Company. Bouquet calculated that such an attack would compel these Ohio Indians to abandon the French alliance. He sounded out Washington's thoughts on this plan, perhaps hoping that the Virginian would lead the attack. As Bouquet explained it, "If their houses and families were in danger, I would think it a great inducement for them to provide for their immediate defence and leave the french (*sic*) their own quarrels to fight."⁹³ But contrary to Bouquet's hopes, Washington advised against this large scale attack for two major reasons. First, he believed that such a formidable assault would require equally formidable manpower, which would have been difficult to provision at that juncture. Second, the French had parties that watched the British relentlessly. French intelligence operations would surely detect such a formidable enterprise, and a French counterattack would quickly terminate Bouquet's best efforts. Worst still, an enemy attack might destroy the entire British war party. With these considerations, Washington advised

⁹² Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, August 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 312-314. For a similar account of this mission, see Bosomworth, *Indian Intelligence*, Bedford, August 4, 1758, *PHB*, II, 315. For the ongoing failure of Cherokee espionage missions, see Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 147, 149.

⁹³ Bouquet to Washington, Bedford, July 14, 1758, *PHB*, II, 205-206.

Bouquet to delay any strike against the Ohio Indians, until the British had gained unquestioned possession of the Ohio Territory.⁹⁴ Bouquet perceived that Washington was no more willing to cooperate in this preemptive raid than he had been willing to support the Forbes Road project. Bouquet turned his sights elsewhere.⁹⁵

Raids persisted through the summer months, and by mid-August, Washington became willing to conspire with Bouquet. He inquired of the Colonel, “[I]f you approve of it, I woud (*sic*) send 50 Men...I think it the most Eligible method of getting a Prisoner for Intelligence.”⁹⁶ But now, Bouquet did not need Washington’s assistance, for Ensign John Allen and Lieutenant William Patterson had already embarked with a party of 80 soldiers to rescue captives and garner intelligence. The party arrived near Fort Duquesne on the evening of July 29. Night covered the fort, but the party heard rifle and cannon fire, mingled with the voices of French and Indian warriors. This indicated that the two groups held joint military drills. That night, the party fell asleep to the sounds of Indians singing and dancing. As dawn broke, the party mounted a high ridge overlooking Fort Duquesne. Smoke from smoldering camp fires mixed with an early morning fog, blurring a clear view of the compound. Even so, Allen perceived a more formidable French army than earlier intelligence indicated. He detected no new structures, no entrenchments along the rivers, but a nine-foot high wooden and clay wall surrounded the fort. Allen induced that the Indians camped on the western side of the fort, because he saw no tents from his vantage point. Chanting echoed through the valley, suggesting hundreds of Indians remained aligned with the French. Additionally, Allen suspected

⁹⁴ Washington to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, July 16, 1758, *PHB*, II, 221-223. Washington’s opposition to Bouquet’s endeavors usually occurred in the shadow of Braddock’s Road. See Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 148-149.

⁹⁵ Washington to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, July 19, 1758, *PHB*, II, 230.

⁹⁶ Washington to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, August 6, 1758, *PHB*, II, 318-319.

that 400 French soldiers still garrisoned the fort. This intelligence not only explained that the French could continue to raid the British frontier but also countered the early report given by the seven Cherokee spies. Allen garnered a rudimentary map of Fort Duquesne, which would fuel future British military activities at the site.⁹⁷

Back in July, Bouquet had cajoled the Cherokee not to abandon the British alliance, despite mounting pressure from detractors within Cherokee County itself. After all, Bouquet continued to rely on the Cherokees' cartographical skills, espionage, and the security they provided. But after Forbes Road traversed Laurel Hill, Bouquet's dependence on the Cherokee alliance began evaporating. In mid-August, he glibly allowed 48 to abandon the British alliance and head back to Cherokee Country. On second thought, Bouquet sent an envoy to detain the Cherokee at Fort Loudoun, awaiting Forbes's decision on how to distribute their presents. Despite Bosomworth's opposition, Bouquet preferred to give the Indians gifts than to deal with what rumor told would be the consequences of angry Cherokee warriors roving across western Virginia. Rumor, not benevolence, compelled Bouquet to detain the Cherokee at Fort Loudoun, for he believed these "bugbears" would certainly plunder the Virginian frontier if they returned to Cherokee Country without presents.⁹⁸ Forbes took seriously the threat of Cherokee reprisals, and understood that Fort Loudoun could not withstand a sustained attack. As Lieutenant Lewis Ourry, the fort's commander put it, "I dread the arrival of those fifty Indians, in the wretched situation I am in now." Upon receiving Bouquet's report, Forbes

⁹⁷ Allen, Report on Fort Duquesne, August 1758, *PHB*, II, 324-326.

⁹⁸ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, August 8, 1758, *PHB*, II, 335-339. In a letter to Washington, Bouquet explained that he had allowed the Cherokee to abandon the British alliance because the army would soon have traversed the Allegheny Mountains. See Bouquet to Washington, Bedford, August 10, 1758, *PHB*, II, 350-351. For tensions caused by Cherokee warriors passing through Virginia, see Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 458; Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 142-162.

ordered Major Grant to march two companies of Royal Highlanders to Fort Loudoun. Defense of British fortifications, not gift giving, motivated Forbes's decision making.⁹⁹ Meanwhile, he asked Bouquet to oil the gears of the Catawba alliance so that the army could retain the facade of its once formidable Indian alliances.¹⁰⁰

As it turned out, the Cherokees arrived at Fort Loudoun before the Highlanders. Whereas rumor represented the Cherokees as plunderers, Lewis Ourry found that they "behaved themselves with great Mildness." Even so, Ourry refused to give them presents until "our Chief Warrior [Forbes]" ordered it. The Indians "began to murmur a little on the hardship of being deprived the use of their own things." Moreover, given the earlier friendly fire incident, these Cherokee warriors understandably feared the arrival of the Royal Highlanders. But Ourry recast the approaching Highlanders as an envoy of benevolence and convinced the Cherokees to wait for their arrival.¹⁰¹ Before dispatching the Highlanders, Forbes had ordered Major Grant to persuade the Cherokees to return from Fort Loudoun to Bedford. Failing that, Grant should convince them to remain at Loudoun until Forbes arrived. Given his recent successes with Delaware diplomacy at the Easton Conference, Forbes felt confident that he could restore the Cherokees to the British alliance. But if diplomacy failed, then Forbes instructed Grant to allow the Indians to return to Cherokee Country with their presents.¹⁰²

As the Cherokees awaited their presents, Bouquet remained at Bedford awaiting both Little Carpenter and Captain Johnny. Since the fraudulent scalping incident back in

⁹⁹ Halkett to Bouquet, Carlisle, August 10, 1758, *PHB*, II, 346; Ourry to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, August 10, 1758, *PHB*, II, 347-348.

¹⁰⁰ Forbes to Bouquet, Shippensburg, August 15, 1758, *PHB*, II, 366-368; Bouquet to Washington, Bedford, August 17, 1758, *PHB*, II, 374-375.

¹⁰¹ Ourry to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, August 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 358-359.

¹⁰² Forbes to Bouquet, Shippensburg, August 15, 1758, *PHB*, II, 366-368; Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 154-155.

June, the Catawbas had stayed afar off and Little Carpenter had busied himself with internal Cherokee affairs. By mid-July, Bosomworth anticipated both Little Carpenter and Captain Johnny would return to Winchester, Virginia.¹⁰³ One month later, Bouquet learned that Captain Johnny, along with 31 Catawbas and 27 Tuscarawas, had departed from Winchester for Cumberland. To cover Captain Johnny's hurt feelings, Bouquet ordered a shipment of vermilion to Fort Cumberland; Forbes hoped this would restore the Catawba alliance.¹⁰⁴ As August became September, Captain Johnny never appeared, and his whereabouts were unaccountable.¹⁰⁵ Finally, 30 Catawba Indians arrived at Fort Cumberland, but an Indian woman reported Captain Johnny was scalped and dead.¹⁰⁶ As Washington put it:

When the Convoy got within 6 Miles of this place 3 Cuttawba men and 2 squaws contrary to the Advice of the Officers, set on before the Convoy for this Garrison, and soon after were fired upon by about 10 or 12 of the Enemy who Killd (*sic*) Captain Bullen and Captain French, & wounded one of the Squaws. The loss we sustain by the death of these two Indian Warriors is at this Juncture very considerable as they were very remarkable for their bravery, and attachment to Our Interests—particularly poor Bullen, whom /and the other/ we buried with Military Honours.¹⁰⁷

“[T]he Enemy” killed Captain Johnny, just as potentially enemy Cherokee warriors had earlier accused him of presenting his adopted father a fraudulent scalp. Was this enemy a Cherokee? Probably, though the documents are not precise. More certainly, the death of

¹⁰³ Bosomworth to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, July 14, 1758, *PHB*, II, 204-205.

¹⁰⁴ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, August 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 355-356; Forbes to Bouquet, Shippensburg, August 15, 1758, *PHB*, II, 366-368.

¹⁰⁵ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, August 18, 1758, *PHB*, II, 379-382.

¹⁰⁶ Washington to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, August 21, 1758, *PHB*, II, 405; Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, August 26, 1758, *PHB*, II, 423-425.

¹⁰⁷ Washington to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, August 24, 1758, *PHB*, II, 416-417.

Captain Johnny resurrected the Catawba-British alliance, and prepared the Catawba warriors to wage war against the Cherokees, side-by-side with British soldiers.¹⁰⁸

But more was to happen before then. Bouquet's search for a French prisoner continued. The Swiss Colonel ordered Major Armstrong to reconnoiter the trans-Allegheny and to "aim at a Prisoner if there is White People But for Indians let them all be knocked (*sic*) on the head."¹⁰⁹ He commissioned several Indian detachments to the same task but they returned without prisoners. Frustrated, Bouquet wrote, "Our Indians are rascals who are worth neither the trouble nor the expense they have cost."¹¹⁰ Meanwhile, French aligned Indians carried out a successful raid on Shippensburg, killing one man, taking a woman hostage, and making a light horseman prisoner.¹¹¹ Despite continued ambushes, intelligence suggested that French strength was growing ever weaker at Fort Duquesne.¹¹² Still, Forbes pleaded with Bouquet not to push ahead, not to compromise the broader war strategy. He warned Bouquet that Indian ambushes would probably increase, as new intelligence indicated that more Western Indians had reached Fort Duquesne.¹¹³

However, Bouquet objected to this strategy. Based on Ensign John Allen's report, the French had few Indians at Fort Duquesne, and Bouquet speculated that the French had consigned the Indians to the west of the fort to conserve provisions. In that light, the British could only gain by advancing quickly on Fort Duquesne for two

¹⁰⁸ Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 160.

¹⁰⁹ Bouquet to Burd, Bedford, August 26, 1758, *PHB*, II, 419.

¹¹⁰ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, August 26, 1758, *PHB*, II, 425.

¹¹¹ Halkett to Bouquet, Shippensburg, August 26, 1758, *PHB*, II, 428-429. Forbes ordered the Highlanders to retaliate this attack, and though they did not locate the enemy, they protected Shippensburg from complete destruction. See Forbes to Bouquet, Shippensburg, September 4, 1758, *PHB*, II, 477-478.

¹¹² Bouquet to Burd, Bedford, September 1, 1758, *PHB*, II, 458-459.

¹¹³ Forbes to Bouquet, Shippensburg, September 2, 1758, *PHB*, II, 460-462; Stephen to Bouquet, September 1, 1758, *PHB*, II, 512.

strategic reasons. First, in light of the lack of wagons and the uncertainty of provisions, the British needed to move quickly before they depleted their provisions. And second, an early attack on Fort Duquesne would impede the French's ability to call in their Indian-allies from "the rear," that is, from the Ohio Territory. Given available intelligence, Bouquet believed that the French had few native allies at Fort Duquesne. In short, whereas the small French force at Fort Duquesne held food and drink in steady supply, the large British force was eager to attack its weaker enemy, before it exhausted its comparatively limited food supply. Bouquet wanted quick action.¹¹⁴

Both Bouquet and Forbes agreed that Major Grant of the Highlanders was "inferior to few."¹¹⁵ Informed by John Allen's report and calculating behind Forbes's back, Bouquet sent Major Grant on a reconnaissance mission to Fort Duquesne with instructions to capture French aligned Indians and to garner intelligence. The detachment was itself of extraordinary size, being comprised of 100 Royal American, 200 Highlanders, 100 Pennsylvanians and Virginians respectively, and almost 150 Indians. But on the night of September 14, Major Lewis blundered Grant's instructions, leading the soldiers into a quagmire of thorns, mud, and a barricade. This mistake made Grant so angry with Lewis that he "could not speak to him with common patience." To counteract this crisis, Grant ordered the soldiers to unleash fire on Fort Duquesne, not to reload, but attack with their bayonets. Yet, even before Grant gave this order, the French aligned Indians had detected the British soldiers. As British soldiers approached the fort, the Ohio Indians repelled their advance, shot them down, and left them to wander aimlessly. Next day, as Grant retreated, a band of French and Indian warriors attacked 250 British

¹¹⁴ Bouquet to Forbes, September 4, 1758, *PHB*, II, 471-474.

¹¹⁵ Forbes to Bouquet, Shippensburg, August 28, 1758, *PHB*, II, 439.

soldiers on their left flank, killing Captain McDonald and Lieutenant Campbell. Almost immediately, 100 Pennsylvanians deserted and fled into the woods without firing a shot. Soon, the French broke the British formation, surrounded the soldiers, and launched fire from all directions. Fear seized Grant's troops and "Orders were to no purpose." By noon, every soldier had disbanded and fled down "the Road he likes best." Ohio Indians took Grant prisoner, along with nine other captives.¹¹⁶

From a prison cell inside Fort Duquesne, Grant penned Forbes a lame justification for the clandestine mission: Bouquet had kept the affair secret for fear French spies would learn of it. Why had Bouquet commissioned such a mission, especially given Forbes's orders to the contrary? Put simply, Bouquet wanted revenge for the murder of Captain Johnny and for the Shippensburg raids.¹¹⁷ Bouquet had put too much faith in John Allen's obsolete report and too little faith in Forbes' warning not to advance. Understandably, Forbes was angered beyond endurance, for he feared that this setback would compromise the Indian alliance. Forbes spoke of his "fears of alienating and altering the disposition of the Indians, at this critical time, who (tho fickle and wavering) yet were seemingly well disposed to embrace our alliance and protection."¹¹⁸ As it turned out, Forbes' insistence that the army conclude the Easton Conference and proceed slowly worked to the army's advantage. Days after Grant's defeat, Colonel John

¹¹⁶ Grant to Forbes, September 14, 1758, *PHB*, II, 499-504; Bouquet to Forbes, Loyal Hannon, September 17, 1758, *PHB*, II, 517-521; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 272-273; Gipson, *The Great War for the Empire*, VII, 268-270.

¹¹⁷ Grant to Forbes, September 14, 1758, *PHB*, II, 499-504.

¹¹⁸ Forbes to Bouquet, Bedford, September 23, 1758, *PHB*, II, 535-538; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 273-274.

Bradstreet seized Fort Frontenac, effectively severing the supply chain between Montreal and Fort Duquesne.¹¹⁹

On October 8, Littler Carpenter and King Hagler, apparently not influenced by the emerging division among their tribes, departed from Winchester and were headed to join the British army at Bedford. Combined, the Cherokee and Catawba headmen commanded 62 warriors. Forbes planned to proceed against Fort Duquesne when this joint Catawba-Cherokee force arrived. As Forbes put it, “[I]f those will Join as heartily and perswade (*sic*) the others to return I shall take my measures so as to march the whole as soon as possible and with very few halting days move on directly so you see there is no time to be lost.” Forbes timed the siege of Fort Duquesne with the arrival of the Catawba and Cherokee warriors, making cooperation between these Indian tribes central to military planning and territorial conquest.¹²⁰ Then, on October 15, Little Carpenter arrived at Fort Bedford. Forbes graciously greeted this Cherokee headman and his 30 warriors and hoped that he could win the release of Major Grant from Fort Duquesne.¹²¹ Now, with the arrival of Little Carpenter, the Indians impatient to wage war, and winter fast approaching, Forbes finally decided that the time was right to siege Fort Duquesne.

I have therefore ordered the whole to march upon [M]onday next, with a design to make very few resting days, untill (*sic*) that we see the Enemy, besides having engaged the Little Carpenter with upwards of Eighty of the very best of the Indians to accompany us to whose Capricious disposition delays might prove dangerous.¹²²

¹¹⁹ Hess to Bouquet, Lancaster, September 20, 1758, *PHB*, II, 530-531; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 259-266.

¹²⁰ Forbes to Bouquet, Bedford, October 10, 1758, *PHB*, II, 550.

¹²¹ Forbes to Bouquet, Bedford, October 15, 1758, *PHB*, II, 561-563; Bouquet to Burd, Stoney Creek, October 16, 1758, *PHB*, II, 565-566.

¹²² Forbes to Bouquet, Bedford, October 21, 1758, *PHB*, II, 582-583.

Most important, Forbes timed the siege of Fort Duquesne to the arrival of Little Carpenter, whose alliance he so valued that he entrusted 80 warriors to his supervision.

Despite strong opposition, Forbes had successfully brokered the Easton Treaty and had begun preparing to capture Fort Duquesne. Consistent with the many ironies of this war, the successes that Forbes made were synchronized with an emerging crisis down in Cherokee Country. For a decade, tension had grown between the southern colonies and the Cherokee Indians, namely over trade and territorial expansion. Back in 1730, the Cherokee people had reached a trading agreement with the South Carolina government. Governor James Glen and Little Carpenter brokered a second trading agreement at Saluda in 1755.¹²³ Problematically, South Carolina never lived up to its own treaties and Virginian hunters and squatters violated Cherokee territorial rights. Not surprisingly, rumors brewed in the southern colonies that the Tellico towns were seeking an alliance with Chickasaw and Creek natives. For instance, Georgians suspected the Cherokees had sent envoys to Georgia to enlist the Chickasaw and Creek Indians in a pan-Indian confederacy. By early autumn, 1758, one might easily have believed that the Cherokees were plotting war against the Virginians. Reports that were more fantastic alleged that Tellico natives had aligned with the Ohio Indians to raid Bedford County, Pennsylvania. For their part, the Cherokees suspected that British agents were trying to enlist Creek Indians in an alliance against the Cherokee People. In fact, the only alliance that actually existed in autumn 1758 was between King Hagler (Catawba) and Little Carpenter (Cherokee), and they were aligned with the Royal Regulars. Forbes praised this alliance, but tensions between the southern colonies and the Cherokee Nation had reached a

¹²³ Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 13, 59-61.

breaking point. The Forbes Expedition only aggravated the trading and territorial crises between these factions, leading to war on the Cherokee frontier.¹²⁴

On October 25, Forbes received word that tensions between the Cherokee people and the Virginians had escalated. Reports had it that Cherokee and Virginian raiding parties had already clashed. For instance, near Chota, the Tellico capital, Virginians had attacked a Cherokee hunting party by the Beaver River, killing four men. In another case, Cherokee warriors had killed and scalped a Virginia man and his wife.¹²⁵ In early November, Little Carpenter received word that hostilities had erupted back in Cherokee Country, indicating that his own people needed his diplomatic acumen. Meanwhile, report after report told Little Carpenter that the French intended to abandon Fort Duquesne, eliminating Bouquet's need for a large detachment of Cherokee allies. Combined, fighting in Cherokee Country and the imminent French withdrawal from the Ohio Country compelled Little Carpenter to withdraw from the Forbes Expedition and return to Cherokee Country to mediate a looming crisis.¹²⁶

But Bouquet and Forbes believed that Little Carpenter had abandoned the Royal army at a critical juncture and interpreted his departure as a betrayal, a mutiny. Instead of running after Little Carpenter, they took steps to tarnish his character and strip him of any meaningful ability to act as a broker between colonial and Indian societies. Foremost, Bouquet and Forbes penned directives to the southern governors, instructing them to ostracize Little Carpenter. For example, Forbes wrote Governor Lyttelton:

¹²⁴ Edmond Atkin to Lyttelton, Augusta, November 4, 1758, Lyttelton Papers; Henry Ellis to Lyttelton, Savannah, November 5, 1758, Lyttelton Papers; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 457-458; Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 85-101, 115-129.

¹²⁵ Paul Demere to Lyttelton, Fort Loudoun, November 6, 1758, Lyttelton Papers, Lyttelton Papers.

¹²⁶ Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 161.

[Y]ou will take every opportunity of not only ruining the Little Carpenter in the eyes of his own nation, but of treating him with the utmost infamy and Contempt if he presumes to go into South Carolina[. H]is desertion of us two day before our Succefs (*sic*), and all his Endeavours used to make the rest of his nation do the same, were indication too strong for me of the badnefs (*sic*) of his heart.¹²⁷

Upon receiving this directive, Lyttelton refused future meetings with Little Carpenter.

Forbes's instructions to Lyttelton paralleled those he gave to the other southern governors. In mid-December, he instructed Governor Fauquier of Virginia to be on the lookout for Little Carpenter, explaining that he had betrayed the Royal army.¹²⁸

Moreover, military personnel worked to sever the friendship between the Catawbas and the Cherokees. For example, Lachlan McIntosh reported "the Shameful behaviour" of Little Carpenter to Catawba headmen gathered at Fort Prince George. Months earlier, Forbes had speculated that Little Carpenter might withdraw from the expedition to calm tensions in Cherokee Country. Nonetheless, both Forbes and Bouquet now accused Little Carpenter of mutiny and disparaged his ability to conciliate among warring factions. Indeed, Forbes and Bouquet so tarnished Little Carpenter's integrity that he could not mediate a resolution to escalating borderland tensions. Indeed, some Cherokees feared for the life of their once powerful broker.¹²⁹

Unlike Bouquet and Forbes, Little Carpenter did not perceive his departure from the British alliance as a sign of disloyalty and certainly not of mutiny. Instead, Little Carpenter explained that he had departed from Pennsylvania to Virginia only to resolve

¹²⁷ John Forbes to Lyttelton, Fort Pitt, November 26, 1758, Lyttelton Papers.

¹²⁸ Francis Fauquier to Lyttelton, Williamsburg, December 14, 1758, Lyttelton Papers.

¹²⁹ Lachlean McIntosh to Lyttelton, Fort Prince George, March 4, 1759, Lyttelton Papers; Forbes to Washington, November 20, 1758, *PHB*, III, 603-604; Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 164-165.

“the differences between the English & my People.” Then, learning of the conflicts that were afoot between the Carolinians and the Cherokees, Little Carpenter felt compelled to broker a resolution to this emerging crisis as well. In this light, Little Carpenter remained steadfast in his decision to leave Pennsylvania. As he explained it,

[M]y sudden return to my Nation would be of more Service than my going to Warr, for I was apprehensive by what I heard before I left my Nation that my People might be guilty of doing some mischief on the Frontiers of the White People.

As a sign of his goodwill, Little Carpenter begged the Six Nations to remain loyal to the British army and not to assist the French.¹³⁰

Military reports corroborated Little Carpenter’s worries that border tensions had strained Cherokee society. As one British official explained it:

The Indians in General, of Late, Seem to be altered and Disaffected more than I ever See them in my Life and through Rum Drinking the Young fellows in their Liquor telling the Warriors they Stand up for [to?] the white people and will not goe and get Revenge for their Relations that was killed in Virginia which has made a Great alteration amongst them.¹³¹

As would occur later in Pontiac’s War, colonial expansion and warfare had strained internal tribal dynamics. Whereas headmen had ordinarily commanded great respect in

¹³⁰ Lachlan McIntosh to William H. Lyttelton, Fort Prince George, March 21, 1759, Inclosing Cherokees, Attakullakulla to Lyttelton, 20 March 1759, Lyttelton Papers.

¹³¹ Beaner James to William H. Lyttelton, Estatoe, February 25, 1759, Lyttelton Papers.

Cherokee society, now young warriors challenged their elders' wisdom. These young warriors would soon unleash their pent up anger against colonial intruders, their new found Catawba nemesis, and finally against the British fortification system.¹³²

Back in 1757, John Loudoun had commissioned colonial Indian agents, such as Edmund Atkin and Sir William Johnson, to broker between British authorities and Native peoples. Little Carpenter had held an important position in this dynamic. Now, however, Bouquet had implemented military rule over the southern fortification system and in the trans-Allegheny zone. Instead of relying on Atkin or Little Carpenter, military personnel tried to rebuild the Cherokee alliance in what one might call garrison diplomacy. At Fort Prince George, Lachlan McIntosh held a conference that briefly stabilized the crisis between the Cherokees and the Virginians. As one Cherokee headman explained the renewed alliance, "[I]f any Mischief is done them by the White People they are to apply to your Excellency for Satisfaction." If the Indians harmed the White settlers, then the Indians in turn would give whatever satisfaction the governor demanded. McIntosh wanted to secure a lasting peace, and the Indians believed that their path was "Clearer and Brighter than Ever it was [before]."¹³³ Meanwhile, at Fort Loudoun, Captain Raymond Demeré secured a promise from Old Hop that Cherokee warriors would repel a French attack against British regional interests.¹³⁴ Yet, nativism permeated Old Hop's people, who endured extreme poverty and lacked clothing, surely reducing their tolerance for British lordship.¹³⁵ Forbes's accusation that Cherokee warriors had forsaken the British Army legitimized unending colonial land grabs and illegal hunting. And Demeré

¹³² For the role of young warriors, see Richard White, *The Middle Ground*, 269-314.

¹³³ Lachlan McIntosh to William H. Lyttelton, Fort Prince George, December 21, 1758; McIntosh to Lyttelton, Fort Prince George, January 10, 1759, Lyttelton Papers.

¹³⁴ James Glen to Cherokee Old Hop, Fort Cumberland, 1758, Lyttelton Papers.

¹³⁵ Demere to Lyttelton, Fort Loudoun, January 26, 1759, Lyttelton Papers.

and McIntosh's diplomatic strategies only disguised a brewing hatred between colonists and natives. In winter, 1759, a series of murders and reprisals ripped apart this fragile borderland society, beginning the Cherokee War. Governor Glenn promised Old Hop presents and inquiries, but promises rang hollow as Virginia war parties emptied entire Cherokee villages. From the Cherokee perspective, garrison diplomacy lacked the legitimacy that Edmund Atkin had brought to the Appalachian borderland.¹³⁶

By January of 1759, British colonial and military authorities lost control over violence in Cherokee Country. In January 1759, two Cherokee men were returning from seasonal hunting tours. On the Carolina frontier, two White hunters invited the Cherokee hunters into their tent, on seemingly friendly terms. Once intoxicated, the two Indians fell fast asleep. The hunters tomahawked their native guest, leaving them for dead. Then, the two White hunters ran to the nearest village and declared that they had killed two hostile Cherokee raiders, who had represented themselves as friendly hunters. The White hunters actually turned the truth up-side-down, accusing their Cherokee victims of the very crime they had committed. This lie confirmed rumors that Indians were hostile, disloyal, and a grave threat. Moreover, to colonial ears, this lie echoed Little Carpenter's betrayal to the British army.¹³⁷ One month later, the servant of a colonial trader killed an Indian child. James Beaner had worked as a trader in Cherokee Country for many years. Then, as tensions between colonials and Indians mounted, a "mad frenzy" took possession of Beaner's servant. The servant stabbed a 12 year-old Indian boy in Sugar Town. Despite medical care, the child died of a wound to his throat. As always, the child's mother demanded warriors cover the death of her child. Cherokee headmen

¹³⁶ James Glen to Cherokee Old Hop, Fort Cumberland, 1758, Lyttelton Papers.

¹³⁷ Samuel Wyly to Lyttelton, January 14, 1759, Lyttelton Papers.

“Agreed that two men Should goe (*sic*) and kill the white man.” Little Carpenter tried to halt this mourning ritual, explaining that madness had possessed the servant, but the Cherokees demanded the servant’s blood.¹³⁸ What was most haunting about both stories is that the innocent, sleeping hunters and a child, became the victims of a lethal terror that seemingly no authority could control.

Soon, the Cherokee violence spilled over into intertribal relations and hardened the burgeoning hatred between the Catawba and the Cherokee nations. Unlike the Cherokees, Catawbas warriors had remained steadfast to Bouquet and Forbes all the way to the Monongahela River. Accordingly, the Catawbas fell into line with the Easton Treaty and accepted the British alliance with the Delaware and Shawnee natives, both being Cherokee enemies. By March 1759, reports of the Catawba-Shawnee friendship had reached Cherokee Country, severing the historic goodwill between the Catawbas and the Cherokees. In this context, Lachlan McIntosh reported to Governor Lyttleton a “Shocking affair that Happened in Keowee.” On the night of March 3, 1759, Cherokee men and women had gathered in a British trader’s house. Amid plentiful rum and spirits, the natives celebrated and danced late into the night. Then, a Catawba woman innocuously joined the Cherokee festivities. Perhaps unknowingly, this Catawba woman had exposed herself to Cherokee hostility toward the Catawba-Shawnee friendship. Soon, Cherokee warriors seized the woman, hauling her away from the party. Once outside the party, the Cherokee warriors tomahawked, murdered, and scalped their Catawba captive. Next, the Cherokee assailants tore the woman’s scalp into five pieces and threw the corpse into a river. Two days later, the Cherokees removed the cadaver

¹³⁸ Beaner James to William H. Lyttelton, Estatoe, February 25, 1759, Lyttelton Papers.

from the waters, “put a Rope about her Neck and trailed her about till the Wolfs and Dogs Devoured her.”¹³⁹

Cherokee-on-Catawba violence finally reached the ears of Lachlan McIntosh, consigning its resolution to garrison diplomacy. McIntosh investigated the murder of the Catawba woman. He discovered a cycle of violence, the Catawba dancer being only the latest victim. The cycle had begun some months earlier with the killing of a Cherokee woman in Catawba Country. Now, the Cherokees feared Catawba retaliation, and they wanted the British to halt incursions of Catawbas into the Appalachian region. Accordingly, McIntosh recommended that Governor Lyttelton convince Catawba and Cherokee headmen to sever all relations, political and social. This recommendation amounted to a candid admission that the earlier friendship between Little Carpenter and King Hagler had utterly collapsed. In effect, McIntosh had actually concocted the same divide-and-rule strategy that Sir William Johnson would later implement to preclude an alliance between the Cherokee, Iroquois, and Ohio tribes. By subordinating natives under military rule, McIntosh calculated that the army could control intertribal kidnappings, murders, and uprisings. Meanwhile, by weakening tribal alliances, the army could protect colonial society.¹⁴⁰ Even so, intertribal violence increased over the spring and summer of 1759. As one Cherokee put it, “they begun [murdering] first and laid our People in heaps.”¹⁴¹

¹³⁹ Lachlean McIntosh to William H. Lyttelton, Fort Prince George, March 4, 1759, Lyttelton Papers.

¹⁴⁰ Lachlean McIntosh to Lyttelton, Fort Prince George, March 4, 1759, Lyttelton Papers. For Johnson’s divide and rule strategy, see McConnell, *A Country Between*, 265-266.

¹⁴¹ Lachlean McIntosh to William H. Lyttelton, Fort Prince George, March 4, 1759, Lyttelton Papers; Cherokees, Tistoe of Keowee Cherokee, The Wolf to William H. Lyttelton, Fort Prince George, March 5, 1759, Lyttelton Papers.

Except for Demere and McIntosh, the eruption of the Cherokee War caught British military personnel off guard, as they were caught up in euphoria from the Fort Frontenac and Duquesne triumphs. Before the British could implement a divide-and-rule strategy, Cherokee warriors executed their earlier threats to broker alliances with French aligned Indians. Resentful of Bouquet and Forbes, Cherokee brokers sought to enlist Delaware and Shawnee natives (still in the French alliance) in a partnership against the British and Catawbas. As Croghan described it,

Two Shawnesse arrived here from the Meguck, who inform me that the Cherokees have sent two Messengers to their Nation to acquaint them that the English had a design to cutting (*sic*) of all the Indians Nations, that they expected soon to be at War with the English, and desired the Shawnesse (*sic*) to assist them.¹⁴²

Moreover, Onondaga Iroquois held several Catawba Indians prisoner, generating suspicions of renewed Iroquois lordship over Cherokee Country.¹⁴³ Other intelligence indicated that Iroquois Mingo warriors (of Ohio) had planned to raid Catawba towns in Virginia.¹⁴⁴ Early on, Bouquet ignored these reports, as intelligence predicted many horrors that never happened. By December 1759, he admitted that something was amiss in Cherokee Country and warned military personnel to guard against Cherokee ambushes. But, Bouquet did not acknowledge that the Cherokee War was long underway, not until

¹⁴² Croghan to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, July 31, 1759, *PHB*, III, 470.

¹⁴³ Mercer to Stanwix, Pittsburgh, July 21, 1759, *PHB*, III, 435-436; Theda Perdue, "Cherokee Relations with the Iroquois in the Eighteenth Century," in *Beyond the Covenant Chain: The Iroquois and their neighbors in Indian North America, 1600-1800*, ed. Daniel K. Richter and James H. Merrell (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press), 135-149; White, *The Middle Ground*, 250-251.

¹⁴⁴ Mercer, Indian Intelligence, Pittsburgh, March 17, 1759, *PHB*, III, 204-207.

Cherokee warriors controlled the very fortification system that he had integrated into the empire.¹⁴⁵

The Cherokee War

By the time Bouquet admitted a Cherokee War actually existed, Governor Lyttelton of South Carolina had already led his first of three crusades into Cherokee Country. Then, after stirring up the Cherokee crisis, Lyttelton accepted transfer from the governorship of South Carolina to the more prestigious governor's post in Jamaica. In a certain sense, Lyttelton's crusades stemmed from his belief that forts Loudoun and Prince George remained under colonial jurisdiction, though Bouquet insisted that these forts were off limits to colonial governments.¹⁴⁶ Before that, Demeré and McIntosh had tried mediating between the colonial governments and the Cherokee People, but they could not replicate William Johnson or Little Carpenter. By summer 1759, the Lower and Middle Cherokee towns had joined with the northern Tellico peoples and launched unrelenting raids against the southern backcountry. Virginia hunters and squatters were a major source of Cherokee distress, but South Carolina's failure to honor trading agreements equally piqued Cherokee unrest. Then, after Lyttelton launched his first crusade into Cherokee Country, he ensured that Cherokee warriors would direct their rage against the Carolinians in what historian Tom Hatley called a border war.¹⁴⁷

As the Cherokee crisis escalated, Bouquet cast all his energies to integrating the Ohio Country into the British Empire, primarily to breaking the grip of the Ohio

¹⁴⁵ Bouquet to Stanwix, Winchester, December 20, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 372-374.

¹⁴⁶ For Gipson's treatment of the Cherokee War, see Gipson, *The British Empire Before the American Revolution*, IX, 75-79; Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 111-112.

¹⁴⁷ Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 191-206; Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 120-133; Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 72.

Company to lands in the trans-Allegheny zone. When Bouquet departed from South Carolina, now almost one year previous, the Cherokee natives had not yet displayed contempt for British military personnel. But in the intervening months, Bouquet and Forbes had tarnished Little Carpenter's ability to resolve conflicts, even as the squatting and trading crises simmered. Bouquet could never admit that his letters had ruined Little Carpenter's ability to broker, so instead he blamed this crisis on his old adversary, Governor Lyttelton. Bouquet believed that Lyttelton had overstepped the bounds of a colonial governor by marching troops into territory that the Royal Army controlled. Bouquet sarcastically described Lyttelton's blundered incursion into Cherokee Country like this,

It is reported that after that fine Expedition, The Cherokee have murdered all the Traders in their Country, which if true will oblige the General [Amherst] to Send Troops to that Province. I hope we Shall not be of the number.¹⁴⁸

Like Bouquet, British military personnel resented what they perceived to be Lyttelton's arrogant campaign into Cherokee Country. The British army regarded Cherokee Country, much like the Ohio and Green Mountain lands, to come under imperial jurisdiction. In this sense, Lyttelton's incursions into Cherokee Country paralleled the disruptive activities of the Ohio Company and the Green Mountain Boys, as all three groups challenge militarization of their lands and necessitated Royal

¹⁴⁸ Bouquet to Stanwix, Lancaster, February 25, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 467-468.

intervention.¹⁴⁹ In 1759, Lyttelton declared a premature victory over the Cherokeees that ended about the same time Lyttelton received the governorship of Jamaica. As Lyttelton departed the colony, Cherokee warriors launched a massive retaliatory raid on the South Carolina frontier, scalping 40 settlers. Now, having stirred up a crisis, Lyttelton requested the Royal Army to send a force to South Carolina to resolve it, which would in turn solidify imperial jurisdiction over Cherokee Country.¹⁵⁰ Here began the second phase of the Cherokee War. Accordingly, General Amherst ordered Archibald Montgomery to march 1,200 Highlanders into Cherokee Country, and Catawba scouts escorted this expedition.¹⁵¹ Bouquet gave Colonel William Byrd permission to “send as many Men as coud (*sic*) possibly be spared to the South West Frontier, where the Cherokeees continue to make horrid Devastations.”¹⁵² In April 1760, George Croghan recruited Shawnee natives to raid Cherokee Country, having the twofold advantage of strengthening Shawnee loyalty to the empire and stopping their young men from stealing military horses from Fort Pitt. As Croghan explained the operation drew “y^e Cherokees (*sic*) from thire (*sic*) Cruel Merders on y^e frontiers of y^e Southern provinces, & att y^e Same Time Imploying those young Dogs w^h has pleag^d us Stealing horses.”¹⁵³ Combined, the Highlanders, Byrd’s Virginian regiment, and 100 Shawnee warriors marched into Cherokee Country on a mission that would not only halt frontier raids and

¹⁴⁹ For the crisis in the Green Mountains, see Michael A. Bellesiles, *Revolutionary Outlaws: Ethan Allen and the Struggle for Independence on the Early American Frontier* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1993), chapters 1-4; Sung Bok Kim, “A New Look at the Great Landlords of Eighteenth-Century New York,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 27: 4 (Oct. 1970), 583.

¹⁵⁰ Stanwix, Warrant Appointing Clark, Pittsburgh, March 3, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 482-484. For frontier raids, see Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 202.

¹⁵¹ Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 207-215; Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 120-133.

¹⁵² Byrd to Bouquet, Winchester, May 10, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 554-555.

¹⁵³ Croghan to [Gates], Pittsburgh, May 1, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 547-548; Croghan to Gates, Pittsburgh, May 20, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 566-568; Nicholas B. Wainwright, *George Croghan: Wilderness Diplomat*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959), 169-171.

secure British fortification but would more importantly bring Cherokee Country under definitive imperial control. What followed became the most significant military operation that the Southern colonies saw during the Seven Years' War.

Lyttelton's first crusade into Cherokee Country violated Royal jurisdiction. Worst still, the crisis that followed came just when Jeffery Amherst had concentrated military efforts on taking Montreal. Not surprisingly, Lyttelton's request of February 23 for Royal intervention angered Amherst, who ordered Archibald Montgomery to march Royal regiments to the Carolinas for what Amherst hoped would be a speedy and retaliatory operation. Accordingly, two Royal regiments, including Montgomery's own Highlanders, launched the second expedition into Cherokee Country, bringing early British successes but not ending the crisis as Amherst had wanted. Ironically, only decades earlier, British Royal forces had marched into Scotland and colonized the very Highlanders who were now subjugating Cherokee Country under British imperial rule.¹⁵⁴

Now, holding the rank of lieutenant colonel, James Grant received appointment as Montgomery's second-in-command of the British operation and quickly became the guiding force behind the operations. Grant disliked the South Carolina government and resented Lyttelton's crusade into Cherokee Country, which he believed had precluded the possibility of a quick resolution to the crisis.¹⁵⁵ Montgomery and Grant arrived at South Carolina on April 1, 1760 and directed all their efforts to moving the Royal Highlanders from the seaboard into Cherokee Country. Soon, however, they discovered that Lyttelton had made no arrangements for wagons or supply networks, again proving the colony's

¹⁵⁴ Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 113.

¹⁵⁵ Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 114-115.

inability to cope with the demands of European armies.¹⁵⁶ On June 25, the Highlanders advanced to Etchoe in the middle settlements, where they confronted a formidable force of Indians from the lower and upper towns, along with Choctaw and Creek allies. Fighting began with a native ambush on the Royal infantry and rangers, hand to hand battle broke out. Finally, Grant succeeded in luring the native warriors into the middle of the British formation, where the natives suffered heavy losses and retreated. This was the first battle of Etchoe.¹⁵⁷

In late June, the British turned their attention to relieving Fort Loudoun, which Cherokee warriors had surrounded in a European styled siege. Ultimately, Demeré could not withstand this siege and surrendered Fort Loudoun to Cherokee warriors on July 8, 1760. Lewis Ourry recounted the surrender:

[T]he Cherokees having engaged, in the Capitulation, to conduct the Garrison of Fort Loudoun Safe to F^t Prince George behaved very well the first Day's march but at Night, under various Pretences left them. And the next morning, when the poor half Starved Victims were preparing to march, they found themselves surrounded by a large body of Indians who fired upon them.¹⁵⁸

The Cherokee warriors killed 25 soldiers, and rumor told that they had reduced the remaining 200 soldiers to slavery. They executed all of the officers, except Captain Stewart. Little Carpenter had purchased Stewart from his Indian captors. Demeré had

¹⁵⁶ Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 114-115.

¹⁵⁷ Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 129-131.

¹⁵⁸ Ourry to Bouquet, Fort Bedford, September 29, 1760, *PHB*, V, 52-53. For Corkran's treatment of the siege of Fort Loudoun, see *Cherokee Frontier*, 218-221.

been “inhumanly butcher’d.”¹⁵⁹ By late August, Montgomery and Grant withdrew from the region and ordered the Highlanders to repair roads for the third phase of this war. As Corkran explained the crisis, “With the repulse of Montgomery’s expedition and the taking of Fort Loudoun, the Indians had gone a long way toward achieving their war aim of eliminating the English garrisons from their nation.”¹⁶⁰ Problematically, the massacre at Fort Loudoun hindered Grant’s bargaining power on behalf of the Cherokee people, compelling Jeffery Amherst to order another round of attacks against the natives.¹⁶¹

In autumn of 1760, up in the Ohio Country, British military personnel made strident efforts to broker a pan-Indian alliance against the Cherokee Nation. Croghan called the Wyandotte, Ottawa, and Pottawatomie peoples to council. He asked them to bury the hatchet against the British and take up the war hatchet against the rebellious Cherokee.¹⁶² Meanwhile, Robert Rogers ordered Lieutenant Butler to Fort Miami in order to thwart the Twitway, a band of the Miami tribe, from making an alliance with the Cherokees. Butler’s mission was important because the French had already encouraged the Twitway’s to join with the Cherokees against the British.¹⁶³ Bouquet welcomed the Indian allies that both Croghan and Rogers brought into the alliance against the Cherokee rebels. In preparation for the third campaign against the Cherokees, Bouquet requested Monkton to supply these new allies with ammunition and other necessities from

¹⁵⁹ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 120-133; Ourry to Bouquet, Fort Bedford, September 29, 1760, *PHB*, V, 52-53; Gipson, *The British Empire Before the American Revolution*, IX, 75-79; Walker to Bouquet, Virginia, June 2, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 580-581; Ourry to Bouquet, Fort Bedford, July 11, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 632-633.

¹⁶⁰ Walker to Bouquet, Virginia, August 23, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 703; Corkran, *Cherokee Frontier*, 221-222.

¹⁶¹ Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 134-139.

¹⁶² Croghan, Indian Conference at Detroit, December 5, 1760, *PHB*, V, 150-152.

¹⁶³ Rogers to Bouquet, Detroit, December 7, 1760, *PHB*, V, 162-163; Rogers, Orders to Butler, December 7, 1760, *PHB*, V, 163-164.

Pittsburgh.¹⁶⁴ Supportive of Croghan, Rogers, and the Indian allies, Monckton ordered Bouquet to give ammunition to any aligned Indian who requested it.¹⁶⁵

Through the early months of 1761, James Grant fulfilled Jeffery Amherst's orders to organize provincial armies, Ohio warriors, and the southern governments for a massive campaign into Cherokee Country. Amherst augmented Grant's two Highland battalions with four companies of light infantry and two British independent companies.¹⁶⁶ In early February, Lieutenant Lewis Ourry announced that Colonel William Byrd would lead Virginia regiments into what became the final expedition against the Cherokees. This time, Byrd marshaled even more troops and prepared to mount a more robust campaign than he had in 1760.¹⁶⁷ Again, Croghan enlisted the Ohio Indians in a British alliance against the Cherokee, explaining, "We go to Conquer Countrys & Subdue Nations." In other words, Croghan meant that the British army would squash the Cherokee rebels or any other challenge to its territorial empire.¹⁶⁸ Then, in March, British aligned Indians discovered a Cherokee tomahawk, lying on the road leading to Fort Burd. The Indians "Seem[ed] Very uneasy About it", for they correctly perceived the tomahawk to signal the third phase of the Cherokee War.¹⁶⁹ Likewise, Campbell harnessed many other Ohio Indians to the war against the Cherokees, promising them ammunition and other supplies.¹⁷⁰ As spring approached, the Virginia Assembly voted to maintain the Virginia Regiment until December 1, 1761. The Assembly requested Amherst to provide massive

¹⁶⁴ Bouquet to Monckton, Pittsburgh, January 25, 1761, *PHB*, V, 265-266.

¹⁶⁵ Monckton to Bouquet, New York, February 12, 1761, *PHB*, V, 292-293.

¹⁶⁶ Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 141.

¹⁶⁷ Ourry to Bouquet, Philadelphia, February 11, 1761, *PHB*, V, 288-289.

¹⁶⁸ Croghan, Indian Conference at Fort Pitt, Pittsburgh, March 1-3, 1761, *PHB*, V, 325-326.

¹⁶⁹ Read to Bouquet, Fort Burd, March 19, 1761, *PHB*, V, 352. Bouquet forwarded this report to Monckton. See Bouquet to Monckton, Pittsburgh, March 20, 1761 *PHB*, V, 352-356.

¹⁷⁰ Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, June 1, 1761, *PHB*, V, 516-518.

reinforcements to wage the war against the Cherokees.¹⁷¹ For his part, Bouquet had a personal interest in ending the Cherokee War. His South Carolina plantation had not turned a profit since its purchase. Now, Bouquet wanted the rebellion to end so that he could sell this property. As the overseer put it, “That once settled, we will not fail to sell it.”¹⁷² In all, Royal military personnel were now prepared to expend all necessary forces to end the rebellion that Governor Lyttelton had precipitated by his ill-advised march into Cherokee Country.¹⁷³

It would be too much to assume that the Ohio Indians were immediate friends of the British Empire, for quite the contrary was the case. The Ohio Indians’ distrusted both the Iroquois Confederacy and their Cherokee neighbors; Croghan tapped this distrust to advance British military strategy. From the Shawnee perspective, aligning with the British against the Cherokees amounted to little more than effort to gain equal or brotherly partnership in Anglo-Iroquois Covenant Chain and to avenge their southern rivals. Heretofore, the Iroquois had imagined the Ohio Indians (and Cherokees) as nephews in the Covenant Chain, but certainly not brothers. Upon learning about that the British had brokered a brotherly alliance with the Shawnee, the Iroquois dispatched agents to shore up their claim to be uncles over the Ohio tribes and to preempt a Shawnee invasion of Cherokee Country. Here began a process that transformed the Covenant Chain alliance into an anti-British pan-Indian alliance for Seneca and Mongo Iroquois.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷¹ Stephen to Bouquet, Winchester, April 1, 1761, *PHB*, V, 386-387.

¹⁷² S. Fesch to Bouquet, Walnut Hill, April 15, 1761, *PHB*, V, 425-427.

¹⁷³ Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 236-254.

¹⁷⁴ For the Shawnee-British alliance, see Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 205-205; Jon William Parmenter, “Pontiac’s War: Forging Links in the Anglo-Iroquois Covenant Chain, 1758-1766,” *Ethnohistory*, Vol. 44, No. 4, (Autumn, 1997), pp. 622-629.

By mid-June, intelligence reports convinced British military personnel that an Iroquois faction was plotting to unite the Ohio Indians in a pan-Indian alliance. The goals of that alliance were twofold: first, to oust the British from Pittsburgh and, second, to restore Iroquois hegemony over the Ohio Territory, thereby precluding a Shawnee invasion of Cherokee Country.¹⁷⁵ In this context, the Cherokee and Iroquois delegates traveled to Detroit for a conference with the Wyandotte Indians in early July. The Iroquois pleaded with these Detroit Indians not to join the British Army in its war against the Cherokees. Presenting red wampum belts and a war hatchet, the Cherokee and Iroquois delegation promised that if the Delaware and Wyandotte would oust the British from Pittsburgh, then the Iroquois would eliminate them from Pittsburgh. As explained by the conference transcripts:

When the English took possession of Detroit they willingly permitted your young men to go to War against their ancient Enemies the Cherokees, but we now desire and request that they may not go to War against them, but remain at home for some time.

The Wyandotte headmen did not accept this proposal, perceiving the British Empire to be preferable to the Iroquois and their Walking Purchase claims. Soon thereafter, the Wyandotte headmen surrendered the war belt to the British and pledged their brother allegiance to the British campaign against the Cherokee.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁵ Hambach to Bouquet, Detroit, June 27, 1761, *PHB*, V, 585; Bouquet, Orders to Crawford, Pittsburgh, June 29, 1761, *PHB*, V, 593; Bouquet to Campbell, Pittsburgh, June 30, 1761, *PHB*, V, 596-597.

¹⁷⁶ Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, July 7, 1761, *PHB*, V, 618-620. For the quote, see the attached transcript of Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, July 22, 1761, *PHB*, V, 647-650. For an analysis of this so-

The 1761 Campaign began early. In May, the Ohio Indians, whom Croghan had brought into the British alliance, spotted 200 Cherokee encamped within a quarter mile from Winchester. Under cover of night, Croghan's Indians launched an attack on the Cherokee, killing six and wounding many others.¹⁷⁷ Other evidence indicates that Cherokee warriors attacked Ohio Indians who passed through Cherokee Country.¹⁷⁸ James Grant led the most important expedition into Cherokee Country of 1761. His was a joint operation of the Highlanders and the Carolina regiment, totaling a contingent of 1,600 soldiers. Historian John Oliphant painted Grant as sympathetic to the Cherokee Indians in comparison to Governor Lyttelton and the Carolinians. As such, Grant probably intended only to burn the Cherokees middle towns, allowing the natives to escape into the mountains. This interpretation holds that Grant intended to cause sufficient damage to meet Amherst's demands for retaliation but with minimal loss of life. Bringing the Cherokees to peace talks was foremost on Grant's mind.¹⁷⁹

In early June, Little Carpenter had tried to convince the Cherokee war part to broker a peace settlement with Grant and to release captives. Little Carpenter's efforts bore no fruit and over 600 young warriors set out to repulse Grant's army, which had begun marching into Cherokee Country. On June 10, Grant marched his army through a narrow valley, along a river. Cherokee warriors hid in the mountains and awaited a favorable time to launch an attack on the British pack train and food supply. Surely, the warriors hoped to avoid a repeat of the frontal assault that had cost them the battle at Etchoe, and now hoped to force Grant into retreat by destroying his food supply.

called Iroquois Plot, see Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 536-537; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 450-453; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 171-175; White, *The Middle Ground*, 286-287.

¹⁷⁷ Stephen to Bouquet, Winchester, May 12, 1761, *PHB*, V, 476.

¹⁷⁸ Myer to Bouquet, Lake Sandusky, September 30, 1761, *PHB*, V, 788.

¹⁷⁹ Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 157-158.

Following trivial attacks on the pack animals, Grant dispatched his infantry and rangers to clear the mountains of native warriors. Meanwhile, he hurried the Redcoats through the Valley, but coming into a ravine, the Cherokees launched a full scale assault on the pack train, killing 11 soldiers and wounding 52. About 50 horses were killed and the food supply damaged. Provincial forces repelled this attack, and the Cherokee warriors had depleted their ammunition by noon.¹⁸⁰ Though in retreat, the Cherokees were not defeated.

Following the Cherokee ambush, Grant knew that if the Cherokees escaped into the mountains, then he could not bring the war to a decisive end, as Jeffery Amherst had instructed. Unable to attack his native assailants, Grant led the Highlanders on a 33 day rampage through the middle settlements, destroying houses, fields of corn, and destroying all signs of civilization. The Highlanders entered Etchoe and destroyed every building and field. Similar attacks followed on Tasse, Neowi, Canuga, and countless other Cherokee villages. In all, the rampage took the Highlanders on a 150 mile trek through Cherokee Country. By the first days of July, Grant withdrew his army from Cherokee Country, marking the last chapter of the Cherokee War. Grant's goal had not been to kill natives, so much as to force them to either starve or come to the peace table. And, indeed, he achieved the latter, though Grant's was a peace table anchored in British military rule.¹⁸¹

While Grant's Redcoats decimated the Cherokee middle towns, Little Carpenter led a peace initiative. Though his standing among the British remained compromised, Major Grant preferred negotiating with the Little Carpenter to any other broker. More

¹⁸⁰ Hoops to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 20, 1761, *PHB*, V, 641; Corkran, *The Cherokee War*, 243-254, see especially 250; Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 158-161.

¹⁸¹ Corkran, *The Cherokee War*, 243-254, see especially 250; Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 161-164.

importantly, Grant negotiated from the perspective of bringing stability instead of retribution, as the Carolinians demanded. Still, Grant demanded that the Cherokees hang four headmen, one from each district of Cherokee Country. Next, he requested that the Cherokees sever all French alliances, though making no mention of the Iroquois. Finally, Grant demanded that the Cherokees recognize the authority of British courts in Cherokee Country, both signifying a reassertion of British military jurisdiction and the absence of colonial control in this region. The Royal Army confirmed this peace arrangement by designating Little Carpenter Emperor of the Cherokee. Built on Bouquet and Forbes' earlier dismantling of Little Carpenter's good reputation, this measure only confirmed that British military officials now perceived him to be a marionette of the empire. Even so, Little Carpenter used his newfound emperorship to save the lives of the four Cherokees, whose execution Grant had sought. Otherwise, the once powerful headman now symbolized the Royal Army's willingness to meddle in tribal affairs, pointing simultaneously to the elimination of future colonial interference in Cherokee Country. Put simply, the British had now extended military jurisdiction over Cherokee Country in a manner that paralleled the 1761 Proclamation Line. Major Grant had ended the ability of the Carolinians to interfere in Cherokee affairs in the same way that Bouquet had broken the ability of the Ohio Company to settle lands claimed by the Ohio Indians.¹⁸²

“They are no more a Nation”: The Catawba Legacy

Whereas the Forbes Expedition put in place conditions that precipitated the Cherokee War, what became of the Catawbans? What was their reward for unwavering

¹⁸² Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 258-259; Gipson, *The British Empire Before the American Revolution*, IX, 75-79; Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 138-140; Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 140-168.

loyalty to the British alliance, for following the Royal army all the way to Fort Duquesne, unlike Little Carpenter? How did British officials reward Catawba scouts for escorting Grant's army into Cherokee Country? Arguably, from the British perspective, the Catawbas had served as nothing more than expendable warriors for the Royal army. Following their service, Bouquet neither lavished Catawba warriors with promised gifts nor worked to reverse colonial acquisition of Catawba territory. Instead, Bouquet accepted the demise of the entire Catawba nation as an inevitable consequence of history and dismissed them as a defeated people, a dead nation.¹⁸³

Compared to the cantankerous Cherokees, territorial loss had weakened the Catawbas bargaining power by the 1750s. Less bargaining power may explain the Catawbas' comparatively good disposition toward Bouquet and the colonial governments during the Seven Years' War. For their part, British military personnel rarely doubted the Catawbas' loyalty during the Forbes Expedition. In the early days of this expedition, Bouquet expressed more confidence in the Catawba alliance than in their Cherokee counterparts. Comparing the Cherokees to the Catawbas, Bouquet wrote, "This last tribe will not leave us."¹⁸⁴ In another letter, Bouquet spoke of friendship with the Catawbas: "The Catawbas being our friends at all times."¹⁸⁵ Not surprisingly, the Catawbas fulfilled the terms of their alliance with the Royal army all the way to Fort Duquesne, despite the death of King Hagler. Indeed, Forbes described their disposition as happy.¹⁸⁶ During the Forbes Expedition, Catawba warriors were well disposed toward Little Carpenter and his warriors, despite growing tensions between these two groups back in the Appalachian

¹⁸³ Bouquet to Amherst, Lancaster, June 25, 1763, *PHB*, V, 255-256.

¹⁸⁴ Bouquet to Forbes, Fort Loudoun, June 11, 1758, *PHB*, II, 72-76.

¹⁸⁵ Bouquet to Forbes, Fort Loudoun, June 16, 1758, *PHB*, II, 95-97.

¹⁸⁶ Forbes to Bouquet, Bedford, October 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 584-586.

Mountains.¹⁸⁷ Following the conquest of Fort Duquesne, Bouquet and Forbes reversed their favorable disposition toward the Cherokee warriors, and compelled their Catawba allies to sever their friendship with the Cherokees as well.¹⁸⁸

Nearly one year following the siege of Fort Duquesne, 62 British-aligned Catawba warriors remained encamped on the outskirts of what the Royal Army called Fort Pitt. Reports had it that these Catawba warriors had not yet received their promised gifts, lacked adequate shelter and necessary items, and were almost naked. Moreover, Bouquet had not yet commissioned these warriors to road construction or to battle against their former friends and fellow warriors, the Cherokees.¹⁸⁹ By late August, Bouquet sent orders for the Catawba warriors to depart from Pittsburgh for Winchester, Virginia. There, Bouquet instructed Hugh Mercer to placate the warriors with few and inexpensive gifts. Once satisfied, Bouquet wanted the Catawbas to return to their country, because “their Services [are] not wanted.”¹⁹⁰ Obedient to Bouquet, frugality determined the gifts Mercer gave to the Catawba warriors. He gave them a few presents, but no ammunition or guns. Soon, Mercer ordered them to depart from Winchester and never to return. Bouquet, Stanwix, and the reigning military personnel agreed that Mercer had acted correctly in disowning so troublesome a people as the Catawbas.¹⁹¹

In 1758, Bouquet had prized the Catawba warriors as friends and marveled that they would not abandon the British alliance. Following the Forbes Expedition, Bouquet’s attitude underwent a diametrical transition. Now, he no longer required the services of

¹⁸⁷ Burd to Denny, Carlisle, May 30, 1758, *PHB*, I, 395-396.

¹⁸⁸ Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 208.

¹⁸⁹ Mercer to Stanwix, Winchester, August 12, 1759, *PHB*, III, 543-545; Bouquet to Mercer, Fort Bedford, August 15, 1759, *PHB*, III, 561-562.

¹⁹⁰ Bouquet to Mercer, Fort Bedford, September 1, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 11-12; Mercer to Bouquet, August 30, 1759, *PHB*, III, 614-61.

¹⁹¹ Mercer to Bouquet, Winchester, September 8, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 54-57; Stanwix to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, September 8, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 57-59.

his once valued friends, who had become nothing more than an expense to the British state. Thus, he ordered Hugh Mercer to send them away from Winchester, far out of sight, never to return. In this way, Bouquet rendered the Catawbas unimportant. Problematically, by conceiving of an entire people as being unimportant, one steps onto a slippery slope that quickly allows one to believe that they are non-existent. And, by 1763, Bouquet had come to that conclusion. As he put it:

I Should be sorry we Should ever appear to be under the least obligation to the perfidious Cherokees, and as to the Catawbas they are no more a Nation: I would rather chuse (*sic*) the liberty to kill any Savage that may come our Way, than to be perpetually doubtful whether they are Friends or Foes.¹⁹²

For Bouquet, the tragedy of war made it easier to deny former alliances and friendships with the Catawbas than to negotiate their position in the British territorial empire. Indeed, a racist logic made it easier for Bouquet to contemplate the murder of all Native Americans than to regard them as even human.

Conclusion

The Seven Years' War marked the first time the British state organized a war for territorial acquisition, an unintended consequence of which was to exacerbate brewing tensions in Indian Country and the southern colonies. In the Forbes Expedition, Bouquet's operations hinged on his ability to organize a unified military system, whereby the army could move vast quantities of provisions and soldiers into isolated regions of

¹⁹² Bouquet to Amherst, Lancaster, June 25, 1763, *PHB*, V, 255-256.

North America. He marshaled a cold and dull logic to make the process of territorial acquisition wholly efficient. Paradoxically, this logic estranged the Royal army from the very colonial and Indian societies on which it depended to satisfy its respective material and diplomatic requirements. As previous chapters have demonstrated, Bouquet required wagons to haul materiel to Pennsylvania's western posts. But, he could not conceive of this quite legitimate military necessity from the perspective of the wagon owners, who absolutely needed their wagons to harvest crops. This same problem haunted Bouquet's Indian diplomacy. He did not understand that Little Carpenter and King Hagler acted from social interest, on behalf of tribal welfare. Like farmers' necessity to haul in crops, Native headmen acted to preserve their peoples' territorial integrity, end unfair hunting and trading practices, and to live in the British Empire. Intertribal tensions and border wars informed Little Carpenter's decision to abandon the British alliance in the autumn of 1758, a reality for which Bouquet's narrow military logic could not account. So too, Catawba warriors followed the Royal army to Fort Duquesne and then requested gifts, not to exploit the British state but to secure livelihood and assistance against territorial loss. However, Bouquet dismissed Little Carpenter as a traitor and the Catawbas as a defeated nation. From his position inside the Royal Army, Bouquet dismantled Little Carpenter's ability to broker between the Cherokee people and the southern government. Worst still, instead of negotiating a settlement between the colonies and the Cherokee people, Bouquet buttressed military incursions into Cherokee Country that left scores of colonists, soldiers, and natives dead. Since the seventeenth century, colonization had precipitated border conflict between aboriginals and Europeans. Bouquet and his military counterparts showed little willingness to mediate these conflicts. More often, the Royal

Army confirmed divisions between colonials and natives and militarized native society. Major James Grant's operations in the Cherokee War evidenced the Royal Army's preference for coercion over conciliation.

Resulting from the Forbes Expedition, Little Carpenter lost his position as broker between British and Cherokee societies. So too, border tensions between the Tellico Cherokees, Carolina traders, and Virginian squatters escalated into a war of greater magnitude, involving not only Tellico but all Cherokee towns, involving not only frontier settlers but their governments as well, involving not only militias but provincial and Royal armies. The Cherokee War became a favorable occasion for the Royal Army to militarize Cherokee Country, barricade it from colonial jurisdiction, and erect a social barrier between colonial and Cherokee peoples. Despite their faithful alliance to the British, the Catawba Nation became a casualty of imperial expansion. When combined, the mindset that regarded the Catawba Nation as dead and the Cherokee People as worthy of military incursions created conditions ripe for increased militarization in the Ohio Country. As the following chapter will demonstrate, Bouquet *did* combine these two mindsets and unleashed the frightful result on the Ohio Indians.

CHAPTER V

THE DEVIL UNDER THE SHAPE OF AN INDIAN

The Forbes' Expedition convinced Henry Bouquet that Little Carpenter was untrustworthy and indeed the entire Cherokee population seemed to challenge British power. But Bouquet's distrust of the Cherokees did not extend to all tribes, for he would never disparage Iroquois diplomacy. In 1757, Bouquet still anticipated brokering an alliance with the Ohio Indians, and he mused, perhaps naively, on "the Friendship of the Indians in that Country."¹ In this context, Bouquet implemented the terms of the Easton Treaty and halted colonial expansion past the Allegheny Mountains, as signified by the 1761 Proclamation Line. However, General Jeffrey Amherst transformed the good terms of the Easton Conference into a comparatively repressive military occupation of the Ohio Territory. And, with predictable loyalty, Bouquet implemented Amherst's repressive policies with the same vigor that he had earlier implemented Forbes's conciliatory measures. As things turned out, the Delaware, Ottawa, Shawnee, and many other Ohio tribes declared war against the British military occupation of the Ohio Country. By 1763, Bouquet asked, "Shall we not Soon obtain an adequate Vengeance of those Infernal Wretches?"² The following pages shall inquire of what transformed friendship with the Ohio Indians into casting them as "Infernal Wretches."

Jeffrey Amherst gave directives that transformed the Ohio Territory from a world of cultural exchange into a place where Europeans denied Indians the basic necessities of life, such as ammunition for subsistence hunting. A charismatic Ottawa headman called

¹ Bouquet, Memorandum, February 25, 1757, *PHB*, I.

² Bouquet to Amherst, Pittsburgh, September 30, 1763, *PHB*, V, 403-405.

Pontiac exploited this crisis to form a pan-Indian alliance that mounted a formidable war against the Royal Army. Henry Bouquet never encountered Pontiac, and for this reason, Pontiac rarely appeared in Bouquet's correspondence. Nonetheless, any understanding of Bouquet's operations in the Ohio Territory requires an analysis of the war that bears Pontiac's name. For Bouquet and Royal military personnel, Pontiac was a little known Ottawa chief, living far west of British military control, but his influence eventually extended through much of British North America. The loose amalgam of people known to historians as the Ohio Indians experienced a rough transition from French to British sovereignty. These Indians resented Amherst's refusal to provide armaments, ammunition, and gifts, and they feared colonial expansion. Neolin, an Ottawa prophet, harnessed this resentment to build a pan-Indian spiritual movement. This movement derived its force from a doctrine of separate creations, a belief that the Master of Life had created Indians and Europeans separately. Historian Gregory Evans Dowd took this doctrine to be a sign of burgeoning racism. From the idea of separate creations followed the imperative that the Ohio Indians should abandon European trade and renounce alcohol. Neolin preached a nativist spiritual revival, uniting the Ohio Indians in a shared hatred of Europeans and their culture.³

In the spring of 1763, Pontiac transformed Neolin's religious movement into a military alliance against British imperialism. Pontiac enlisted Indians from the Susquehanna to Mississippi rivers, and from northern Michigan to the Ohio River valley, calling them to rebel against the British occupation of the Ohio Territory. Pontiac's Indian alliance captured forts Sandusky, Saint Joseph, Miami, Ouiatenon, and

³ Gregory Evans Dowd, *War Under Heaven: Pontiac, the Indians Nations, & the British Empire* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press), *passim*.

Michilimackinac. Additionally, forts Detroit, Niagara, and Pitt sustained a protracted siege but the warring natives never captured them. Spiritual conviction, a belief in an imminent French return, and Pontiac's magnetism sustained the Western Indians' ability to wage what many historians interpret as a bridge between the Seven Years' War and the American Revolution. By autumn of 1763, the British army had liberated the Ohio forts and halted frontier raids, but Amherst conditioned a peace settlement on the return of all captives. For this reason, Henry Bouquet planned a 1764 Expedition into the Ohio Territory, aiming to rescue captives and push the Ohio Natives beyond the Muskingum River. By autumn of 1764, with Iroquois assistance, Bouquet finalized a peace settlement with Delaware and Shawnee headmen.

Pontiac's War has attracted the attention of many historians who study the relationship between Native Americans and British imperialism. Richard White denied Francis Parkman's thesis that Pontiac's War was a racial struggle between Native savagery and British civilization. White argued that Pontiac's War resulted from the failure of the British to replace the French as "fathers"; the failure of the Indians to prevent the British occupation of the Ohio Territory; and the failure of the French to return to their former Indian allies. From these failures, Pontiac's War precipitated the restoration of the middle ground, now under British control.⁴ In contrast to White, both Daniel Richter and Gregory Evans Dowd drew attention to the racial dynamics of Pontiac's War. Richter reported that Pontiac's War marked the beginning of a racially divided frontier and the end of intercultural diplomacy. Colonists and natives would no

⁴ Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 269-271.

longer live “parallel lives,” as Richter explained it.⁵ Whereas Richter retained White’s causal analysis of Pontiac’s War, Dowd really changed White’s interpretation entirely. Dowd argued that Pontiac’s War was fought over “how Indian peoples and an expansive colonial power related, politically and socially.”⁶ Like Richter, Dowd held that war did not resolve these questions. In all, White saw Pontiac’s War as an aberration that resulted in rebuilding a world of cooperation and intercultural exchange. Richter whittled away at the level of resolution that White believed had followed from the war. Dowd reversed White’s argument entirely, arguing that Pontiac’s War originated from a struggle for political and social recognition, which neither group ever gained.⁷

This work parallels Dowd’s take on Pontiac’s War with some important qualifications. By tracing the transition from the Easton Conference to Amherst’s repressive policies, this work accepts Richard White’s causal analysis of Pontiac’s War. More broadly, however, this work frames Amherst’s failures in the broader context of the Ohio Indians’ struggle for political and social power. The Ohio Indians first utilized the Covenant Chain at Easton in an effort to gain equal partnership in the Anglo-Iroquois alliance, and only after that failed did they rebel. Consistent with both Dowd and Richter, this work reports that Pontiac’s War did not rebuild a middle ground. The following pages build on Dowd’s analysis of a racial barrier between the British army and the Ohio natives. Bouquet’s effort to push the Ohio Indians westward marked the beginning of a process that Daniel Richter called ethnic cleansing that gained full

⁵ Daniel Richter, *Facing East From Indian Country: A Native History of Early America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 187-188. Building on Richter’s scholarship, Krista Camenzind argued that the Paxton Boys embodied this burgeoning racial division between British and natives worlds. See Krista Camenzind, “Violence, Race, and the Paxton Boys,” in *Friends and Enemies in Penn’s Woods: Indians, Colonists, and the Racial Construction of Pennsylvania*, ed William A. Pencak and Daniel K. Richter (University Park, Pa: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004), 201-220.

⁶ Dowd, *War Under Heaven*, 2.

⁷ Dowd, *War Under Heaven*, 22-89.

momentum in the Early Republic. Yet, racial reductionism fails to explain the complexity of British-Iroquois relations, which in some ways restored Iroquois sovereignty over the Ohio tribes. Whereas Dowd downplayed the role of Iroquois diplomacy, consistent with his emphasis on a racial divide between Britons and natives, this work reports that the British army deployed the Iroquois Confederacy as a means to regain control of the warring Ohio tribes. By focusing the 1763 Indian crisis through Bouquet, this work narrows in on the Iroquois Confederacy, in difference to most other scholarship. Instead of giving Pontiac central importance, the following analysis reports that the Ohio Indians, the British army, and the Iroquois Confederacy were fighting for social and political control in the Ohio Territory. Arguably, both the British army and the Iroquois Confederacy harnessed the others' respective military and diplomatic strength to conquer the Ohio tribes.

Whereas Henry Bouquet looked west towards Britain's imperial future, the Iroquois Confederacy looked back to a time when it had exerted greater influence over neighboring tribes under an alliance called the Covenant Chain. Through diplomatic rituals, the Covenant Chain secured Cherokee and Algonquian Indians under Iroquois patronage by conceptualizing these client peoples as nephews. These same rituals formed the basis for an alliance between the Iroquois Confederacy and the British, wherein both parties acted as brothers. In practice, the Covenant Chain gave the Iroquois uncles sizeable control over their nephews, as evidenced by the 1737 Walking Purchase. In this fraudulent land deal, Iroquois headmen and the Penn Family conspired to dispossess Delaware Indians, an Iroquois client people, from their lands in eastern Pennsylvania. Sanctioned by the Covenant Chain, Iroquois warriors drove their Delaware nephews

westward into the Ohio River Valley, where they developed a loose alliance with the French. Then, in 1758, John Forbes negotiated the Easton Treaty, which upset the Walking Purchase, severed the Delaware-French alliance, and resettled the Delawares in the Wyoming Valley. This new British-Delaware alliance so weakened the French that they torched Fort Duquesne and evacuated the Ohio Territory. Thereafter, the Iroquois Confederacy maneuvered to reverse the Easton Treaty, not by restoring the Walking Purchase, but by extending the Covenant Chain alliance over the Ohio Indians. Jon Parmenter has argued that after 1758 the Ohio Indians entered the British-Iroquois Covenant Chain to gain equal partnership with the Iroquois, now acting as brothers. This work argues that the Iroquois Confederacy claimed hegemony over the Delaware, Shawnee, and other Ohio Indians under the Covenant Chain alliance system, thereby lessening the bite of the Easton Treaty. Whereas the Ohio Indians had wanted an equal partnership with Iroquois brothers, the Iroquois harnessed Royal military muscle to reduce the Ohio Indians to nephews.⁸ In this way, Thomas Gage, William Johnson, and Henry Bouquet utilized the British-Iroquois alliance to secure captives and broker a peace deal with the Delaware and Shawnee tribes at the banks of the Muskingum River.

This chapter begins with an analysis of Bouquet and Forbes' diplomatic successes at the Easton conference. But the good spirit of Easton did not last. As demonstrated in chapters 2 and 3, Bouquet's 1761 Proclamation Line brought a political reorientation to the Ohio region, placing it under military rule and restricting colonial expansion. Under Amherst's orders, Bouquet implemented trading restrictions and political and social

⁸ Fred Anderson, *The Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 205-207; Jon William Parmenter, "Pontiac's War: Forging Links in the Anglo-Iroquois Covenant Chain, 1758-1766," *Ethnohistory*, Vol. 44, No. 4, (Autumn, 1997), pp. 617-654.

repressions that undermined the successes of the Easton conference. In response, Pontiac organized a war that captured British forts and terrorized frontiers. Instead of protecting Indians' land, now the British government confirmed the Proclamation Line (1763), transforming it into a buffer between colonial and Indian worlds. Soon thereafter, Bouquet organized the so called Western Offensive (1764), which aimed to reclaim all captives and push the Ohio Indians beyond the Muskingum River. Warfare did not improve social and political relationships in the Ohio Territory. War, instead, became a catalyst for British political and social repressions and for the Iroquois Confederacy to reassert sovereignty over the Ohio Indians. Both weakened, the Royal Army and the Iroquois buttressed each other in a struggle to reclaim the Ohio Territory and its peoples. Both won a vulnerable victory.

Brokering a Treaty at Easton

In 1758, while Bouquet was wrangling with the Cherokees, John Forbes was negotiating for the Royal Army with the Susquehanna or Western Delaware Indians. Back in 1720s, the Penn Family together with the Iroquois Confederacy had conspired to oust these Delawares from their homeland in Pennsylvania's Wyoming Valley. As refugees, they resettled along the Ohio River, entered French trading networks, and nursed hostility against the British.⁹ Forbes worried that this legacy could impede the

⁹ Anderson, *The Crucible of War*, 164-166; Richard Aquila, *The Iroquois Restoration: Iroquois Diplomacy on the Colonial Frontier, 1701-1754* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1983), 166-193. Francis Jennings, *Empire of Fortune: Crowns, Colonies, and tribes in the Seven Years War in America* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1988), 25-28; Michael N. McConnell, *A Country Between: The Upper Ohio Valley and Its Peoples, 1724-1774* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992), 5-46. Paul Moyer, "'Real' Indians, 'White' Indians, and the Contest for the Wyoming Valley," in *Friends and Enemies in Penn's Woods: Indians, Colonists, and the Racial Construction of Pennsylvania*, ed William A. Pencak and Daniel K. Richter (University Park, Pa: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004), 221-227.

Royal Army's campaign to take possession of Fort Duquesne and the Ohio Territory. Accordingly, Forbes initiated negotiations that culminated in the Easton Conference, which arranged the return of the Delaware refugees from the Ohio region back to the Wyoming Valley. This transfer not only restored the Delawares to lands that colonial expansion had compelled them to abandon, but also it weakened the ability of the Ohio Indians to launch raids on the Pennsylvania and Virginian frontiers. Instead of diplomacy, Bouquet had proposed a preemptive attack on the Delawares, scaring them into obedience and subjugation. Forbes rejected this tactic and instead took a diplomatic approach that restored the Susquehanna Delawares to the Wyoming Valley and confirmed their loyalty to the British.¹⁰ In June 1758, Forbes began preparations for the Delaware Indians to make the eastward trek, through the Allegheny Mountains. He ordered military personnel to prepare a path and way stations for the refugees.¹¹ Knowing that Cherokee warriors patrolled this region, Forbes instructed Bouquet to restrain these scouting parties from attacking the friendly Delawares. Although, these scouts preempted frontier raids, Forbes insisted that they stay west of "our friendly Delawares."¹² Already in late June, the joint efforts of Forbes and a Quaker faction in the Pennsylvania government had negotiated the resettlement of several Delaware families in the Wyoming Valley. The Easton Conference ensured that more would soon follow.¹³

¹⁰ Bouquet, Notes on Garrisons for Posts & Offensive Operations on the Ohio, March 18, 1757, *PHB*, I, 60.

¹¹ Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, June 6, 1758, *PHB*, I, 39-40.

¹² Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, June 16, 1758, *PHB*, I, 103.

¹³ Forbes to Bouquet, Philadelphia, June 27, 1758, *PHB*, I, 135. For the Easton Conference, see Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 396-404.

In July of 1758, Forbes began preparations for the Easton Conference, by bringing together members of the Royal Army, the Pennsylvania government, and the Delaware refugees. He enlisted Christian Frederick Post to be the army's principal broker in negotiating the Delawares' return to the Wyoming Valley. Twice married to Delaware women, this Prussian cabinet builder was the perfect conduit between the army and the Delaware Indians. In 1757, Governor Denny of Pennsylvania had first commissioned Post to negotiate the return of some Delaware families to eastern Pennsylvania. This experience gave Post the trust of Delaware men, women, and children. Then, Forbes enlisted Post's assistance in this more ambitious campaign to completely sever the Delaware-French alliance and resettle the Delawares in eastern Pennsylvania. Post's first act as the army's chief negotiator was to enlist Teedyuscung to act as the Delaware's chief broker. Teedyuscung was a Delaware headman, who both understood imperial diplomacy but always gave his people foremost importance. Consistent with Post's intent, Teedyuscung brought his people to the Easton Conference and brokered their return to the Wyoming Valley.¹⁴ By early summer, the Pennsylvanian Quakers, the Royal Army, and the Delaware refugees had begun three-party brokering that could potentially reverse the Penn Family's colonization of the Wyoming Valley—at least it was antithetical to the Appalachian border war.

In July, Post arranged an initial conference between Forbes and Teedyuscung's faction at Philadelphia. Anticipating the conference to be held at Easton, Pennsylvania in

¹⁴ Conference held at Philadelphia, June 1, 1758, *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, (hereafter *Colonial Records Memorial*) (Harrisburg, 1851), 142-144; Indian Conference, July 11, 1758, *PHB*, I, 187; Bouquet, Philadelphia, July 12, 1758, *PHB*, I, 194; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 275. For Jennings's take on Christian Frederick Post and Teedyuscung, see *Empire of Fortune*, 384-389. For a thorough analysis of Teedyuscung's dealings with the Iroquois Confederacy and the Pennsylvania government, see Anthony F.C. Wallace, *King of the Delawares: Teedyuscung 1700-1763* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1949), 176-207. For George Croghan's role in the Easton Conference, see Nicholas B. Waintwright, *George Croghan: Wilderness Diplomat* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959), 128-134.

October 1758, this meeting confirmed intention to negotiate between the Delaware and the Royal Army. Teedyuscung reported that the Delaware refugees had promised, “To turn the Edge of the Hatchet which the French had given to the Indians against the French themselves, that they might feel its sharp edge.”¹⁵ Even so, the Western Delawares remained alienated from the Pennsylvania government and loosely aligned with the French. Contrary to the Quaker’s efforts, the Penn Family had initiated a campaign that opposed the resettlement of the Delawares in the Wyoming Valley. Nonetheless, this July meeting gave Forbes the rudiments of a three-party alliance. Now, conscious of the Penn Family’s proprietary intransigence, Forbes began chiseling at colonial and proprietary control over Indian affairs, a process that eventually gave military personnel, even Bouquet, increased control over Indian diplomacy. Much negotiating remained before the autumn Easton Conference. Meanwhile, Forbes cautioned Bouquet to show utmost respect to any Indians wandering through the Allegheny Mountains, because they might be Delaware refugees.¹⁶

On July 20, 1758, Forbes commissioned emissaries to travel into the Ohio Territory and summon the Western Delawares to the Easton Conference.¹⁷ Only days later, reports began circulating among military personnel that small bands of Delawares and Shawnees were already trekking across the Pennsylvania backcountry for the Easton Conference—ironic, given that Cherokee warriors were simultaneously abandoning the British alliance.¹⁸ Yet, as Forbes brought the Delawares under the army’s auspices, the

¹⁵ Peters to [Forbes], Philadelphia, July 12, 1758, *PHB*, I, 197-199.

¹⁶ *Colonial Records*, VII, 142-144; Indian Conference, July 11, 1758, *PHB*, I, 187; Forbes to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 17, 1758, *PHB*, I, 224; Bouquet, Memorial, Philadelphia, July 12, 1758, *PHB*, I, 194; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 275.

¹⁷ Forbes to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 20, 1758, *PHB*, I, 232.

¹⁸ Washington to Bouquet, Fort Cumberland, July 28, 1758, *PHB*, I, 284.

Seneca, one of five members of the Iroquois Confederation, resented these maneuvers and tried to halt them. From the Seneca perspective, Forbes' negotiations seemed to undermine the 1737 Walking Purchase and Iroquois claims to hegemony over the Delaware People. In early August, a Seneca delegation traveled to Philadelphia, where they met with Governor Denny. This delegation accepted that an earlier Easton Conference (1757) had lessened their grip over the Delawares. Now, the Senecas feared that the anticipated October conference would hasten a process that seemed to be reversing the Walking Purchase and unraveling their regional sovereignty. In a desperate bid to revive the Confederacy, one Seneca delegate insisted, "The Six Nations are the Heads of all the Nations here." But another delegate expressed the situation more realistically: "Teedyuscung put the Five Nations behind him." For his part, Teedyuscung tried to reassure the Seneca delegation that the Delawares remained united to their Iroquois uncles, a claim the Delawares would assert repeatedly in the upcoming months. But that claim rang hollow, because Teedyuscung continued to rally the Delawares to the Easton Conference, and Bouquet backed these efforts with gifts. Forbes had initiated a process that neither the Seneca nor even the Penn Family could reverse, because the Royal Army had surpassed these entities as the regional strongman.¹⁹

By autumn, Bouquet, the Cherokee allies, and George Washington all agreed that Forbes had unnecessarily delayed the 1758 campaign. Given these delays, both Bouquet and Washington feared that the Royal Army risked failing in its bid to siege Fort

¹⁹ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, August 18, 1758, *PHB*, I, 379-382; At a conference with the Indians in the Council Chamber at Philadelphia, August 5, 1758, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 151-153, 158. For Iroquois-Delaware diplomacy in the eighteenth century, see Aquila, *The Iroquois Restoration*, 178-193. It is incorrect to think that *all* Ohio Indians returned to Pennsylvania, because many Ohio wanted autonomy from both the British and French governments. See McConnell, *A Country Between*, 128-130. For the crisis that erupted among colonial interests who did not support Forbes, see Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 390-391.

Duquesne. The Cherokee warriors had grown bored, and conflicts down in Cherokee Country beckoned their attention. But Forbes, now desperately ill, had acted with diligent caution for three reasons. First, he refused to move the army forward until he could confirm all the Indian alliances, a task made impossible during the middle of the Indian hunting season. Second, Forbes believed that continued British victories in the northern theatre would diminish French manpower and supplies. In this way, he believed that time would force the French to divert Fort Duquesne's manpower and supplies to the northern theatre, making the planned siege all the easier for the British. Specifically, Forbes speculated that if Captain James Bradstreet took Frontenac, a French fort at the mouth of the Saint Lawrence River, then the French would have to recall many of their regulars to strengthen the northern theatre. Because the Marquis Louis Joseph de Montcalm could spare no forces from Fort Ticonderoga, the French necessarily would demand that the French divert soldiers from Fort Duquesne to reinforce the Canadian front. Finally, one-hundred Delaware refugees had already arrived for the Easton Conference, and Forbes expected their chiefs to arrive soon. Not surprisingly, Forbes believed that the long anticipated Easton Conference was of more imminent importance than a siege on Fort Duquesne. Combined, the Indians' hunting season, continued British victories, and the emerging British-Delaware alliance all served to weaken the French defenses at Fort Duquesne, recommending that Forbes delay the siege until autumn.²⁰

Bouquet did not accept the wisdom of Forbes' strategy. Even so, he penned Forbes a letter of ostensible compliance, stating his enduring loyalty. Accordingly, Bouquet ordered his subordinates to delay outright attacks on Western Indians until the

²⁰ Forbes to Bouquet, Shippensburg, September 2, 1758, *PHB*, I, 460-462; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 259-285.

Easton Conference clarified exactly what tribes were aligned with the British.²¹ But under the surface, Bouquet had already begun planning another strategy. Bouquet convinced Major Grant to launch a night raid on Fort Duquesne, with the goals of capturing a soldier and garnering intelligence. Grant commanded a detachment of one hundred regulars, provincial soldiers, and Catawba Indians.²² As more than 500 Indians gathered at Easton, Pennsylvania, Grant led this secret detachment into a quagmire at Fort Duquesne that ended in British defeat and embarrassment. Amid preparations for the Easton Conference, Forbes learned of Grant's defeat and the capture of several key British officers. His response was uninhibited: Grant "by his thirst of fame brought on his own Perdition, and run a great risqué of ours."²³ Now, the French had scored a major victory against Forbes' army, and Bouquet's grip on the Cherokee alliance was weakening. Still, Forbes delayed the siege on Fort Duquesne and completed the Easton Conference.

As the Easton Conference neared, Pennsylvania's political factions began wrangling over Forbes' plan to resettle the Delaware Indians in the Wyoming Valley. Governor Denny operated in the colonial government as a Royal appointee, and he was obliged to promote Forbes and the Royal interests. But very often, the fiscal prerogatives of colonial assemblies allowed them to hogtie their governors and defeat royal policies. Like Governor Ellis, Denny showed a willingness to command colonial politics, though perhaps only because Pennsylvania politics were so factious. No doubt, Pennsylvania politics were contentious, and Quaker and Penn factions prepared for a showdown at the Easton Conference. In this case, Denny scored a winning alignment with the Quaker

²¹ Bouquet to Forbes, Loyal Hannon, September 11, 1758, *PHB*, I, 492-494.

²² Bouquet to Forbes, Loyal Hannon, September 17, 1758, *PHB*, I, 517-521.

²³ Forbes to Bouquet, Bedford, September 23, 1758, *PHB*, I, 535-538.

faction against the Penn or proprietary faction. Derived from humanitarian sentiments, this Quaker faction found the Walking Purchase too morally reprehensible and wanted to reverse its legacy. They supported Forbes' plan to restore the Delawares to the Wyoming Valley. Perhaps less noble, Denny supported this resettlement proposal because he represented Royal interests inside the colonial government. Accordingly, Denny mounted his case before the Pennsylvania Assembly:

I have the pleasure to acquaint you that from the present face of things Indians Affairs seem to have a very favourable appearance [.]. I have been particularly attentive to improve every Opportunity that has Offered to reclaim such of them as have joined our Enemies, and of Conciliating the affections of the Indians in General [.]. I have lately received Intelligence that many are already arrived on our Frontiers and great Numbers are Assembling together and may be daily expected there.

To ensure a lasting peace with the Delawares, Denny invited the governors from Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and even Virginia to the Easton Conference.²⁴ The Pennsylvania Commissioners agreed to finance Denny's participation in the conference, but Governor James DeLancy of New York did not bother attending, because his Assembly refused to finance presents. Besides, DeLancy had no confidence in Indian diplomacy.²⁵

²⁴ At a conference held at Philadelphia, September 12, 1758, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 166-168. For the colonial governors, see Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 389-390. Wainwright asserted that Denny attempted to keep the Quakers from attending the conference. Wainwright did not like the Quaker's anti-imperialist attitude, friendship with the Indians, and opposition to military operations. See Wainwright, *George Croghan*, 129-129.

²⁵ James Delancy, Letter explaining he will not attend Easton Conference, September 4, 1758, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 165.

Conversely, the Penn Family and the proprietary party resisted Forbes' effort to surrender Pennsylvania's lands to the Ohio Delawares, for this seemed to reverse the colonization process. Moreover, it would take land from Pennsylvania, which was their principal source of capital. The Iroquois Confederacy and its colonial representatives, William Johnson and George Croghan, aligned with the proprietary faction. The Iroquois Confederacy feared that this resettlement plan would diminish its sovereignty over their Delaware nephews in the Ohio region. Or, viewed from the proprietary perspective, the claims of the Walking Purchase made a good smokescreen to hide the Penn Family's economic interests. Either way, the Penn Family and the Iroquois Confederacy planned to curb the success of the Easton Conference. By early September 1758, Pennsylvania's two political factions had lined up a showdown at Easton.²⁶

On October 7, Denny arrived at Easton, along with several aides and many members of Pennsylvania's Quaker faction. Denny and his New Jersey counterpart, Francis Bernard, would preside over the conference. Teedyuscung greeted the governors, gave wampum, and told them that many other delegates would soon assemble for the conference. He was correct. The Delaware and Tuteloos, among other Ohio Indians, gathered for the conference, making thirteen Indian tribes in all. Additionally, representatives of the Iroquois Confederation gathered at Easton, including Mohawks, Onondagas, and Senecas, among other Iroquois delegates. These headmen imagined themselves to be the uncles of the Ohio Indians. Headmen, warriors, women, and children filled the streets of Easton, Pennsylvania. Each Indian group arrived believing

²⁶ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 275. Notably, the Five Nations never had any real claim to sovereignty over the Ohio Indians. This claim amounted to little more than a smokescreen, intended to prop up the fledgling power. See, Aquila, *The Iroquois Restoration*, 193-204; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 390-391.

Forbes and the colonial representatives would give their respective interests a fair hearing. But under the surface lurked William Johnson's opposition to any resettlement policy that compromised the Iroquois' regional hegemony. Johnson's obstructionist attitude dovetailed nicely with proprietary opposition to resettlement. Thus, Forbes, the Quakers, and the Ohio Delawares entered the conference with formidable opponents.²⁷

Intoxicated, Teedyuscung opened the Easton Conference on the morning of October 8. Backed by the Pennsylvania Quakers, Teedyuscung introduced his intention to break the Penn Family's fraudulent land deals and to end the legacy of the Walking Purchase. In this way, he wanted to bring back the Delaware refugees from their settlements on the Ohio River, giving them permanent possession of the Wyoming Valley. Problematically, Teedyuscung's belligerence and drunkenness blunted his diplomatic acumen, and probably even embarrassed his Quaker supporters. This allowed the Iroquois delegation to gain control over the proceedings. Croghan, Johnson, and the Iroquois brokers gave a muted response to Teedyuscung claims, hoping Teedyuscung's drunkenness and profanity would compromise the integrity of the entire Ohio delegation. Still, the Iroquois delegation knew that the Quakers and Teedyuscung had strong arguments, and even stronger military backing.²⁸

One-week into the conference, the Iroquois delegation arranged a private meeting with Denny and the other colonial governors. This delegation challenged Teedyuscung's authority and argued that the Iroquois were the legitimate overlords of the Ohio Indians. As a Mohawk headman expressed it:

²⁷ At a Conference held at Easton, October 7, 1758, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 174; Jennings, *Empire and Fortune*, 391, 396-397; Wallace, *King of the Delawares*, 194-202.

²⁸ Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 396-398; Wallace, *King of the Delawares*, 194-196.

You all know that he [Teedyuscung] gives out that he is a great Man, and Chief of Ten Nations—this is his Constant Discourse. Now I, on behalf of the Mohawks, say we do not know he is such a great Man. If he is such a great Man we desire to know who made him so. Perhaps you have, and if this be case tell us so. It may be the French have made him so.²⁹

Manipulative to the core, the Mohawk headman wanted to accomplish two goals, one dealing with Iroquois sovereignty over the Delaware Indians and another dealing with Teedyuscung and the French. First, the Mohawk wanted to strip Teedyuscung of any ability to speak for the Delaware Indians, claiming that right for the Iroquois instead. More ominously, the Mohawk suggested that Teedyuscung neither spoke with Iroquois sanction nor spoke on behalf of the Delaware Indians. Knowing that the British had not crowned Teedyuscung, the Mohawk insinuate that Teedyuscung derived his royal pretensions from the French. Was Teedyuscung a French agent, hell bent on infiltrating the Royal Army and colonial government? If so, then must not Forbes and the governors remove him from the conference? After all, Forbes and the governors wanted to sever the Delaware-French alliance. If Teedyuscung was a French agent, then he was antithetical to the goals of the Easton Conference. The records indicate that the governors did not take the Mohawk's manipulation seriously. As Denny put it, Teedyuscung had said only "that he acted as a Chief Man for the Delawares, but only as a Messenger for the United Nations [Iroquois], who were his Uncles and Superiors."³⁰ Still, the Mohawks wanted absolute hegemony over the Delawares and Teedyuscung to

²⁹ At a Conference held at Easton (private session with Indians), October 15, 1758, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 190-191; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 398; Wallace, *King of the Delawares*, 203-204.

³⁰ At a Conference held at Easton, October 16, 1758, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 192-193; Wallace, *King of the Delawares*, 203-204.

be removed from the Easton Conference. Conversely, Forbes, Denny, and the Quakers continued to seek permanent Delaware title to the Wyoming Valley.

Once more, however, Teedyuscung's drunkenness interfered in ordinary diplomacy, allowing the Iroquois brokers to gain what they had hoped to achieve in private conference. On October 18, Teedyuscung claimed that King George II had granted the Delaware Indians territory, stretching "as far as the Heads of the Delaware [River]." Teedyuscung had turned the Walking Purchase up-side-down, now himself claiming lands that belonged to the Iroquois Confederation. This claim was little less ridiculous than Teedyuscung's earlier claim to sovereignty over the Iroquois Confederacy. Next day, Teedyuscung recanted this territorial claim, saying "the Delawares did not Claim Lands high up on the Delaware River; those belonged to their Uncles." Now, Teedyuscung had made two bogus claims against Iroquois sovereignty, unintentionally strengthening the bargaining power of his adversaries.³¹

Harkening back to the 1737 Walking Purchase, the Iroquois brokers wanted the British army to reestablish Iroquois sovereignty over the Ohio Indians. But, the need to tame Teedyuscung's belligerence was one of the only selling points to the otherwise bogus claims for Iroquois sovereignty. Weeks into the Conference, Teedyuscung recovered his diplomatic skills and exposed the true depravity of Iroquois claims. Indeed, he insisted that contention between the Delaware Indians and the Iroquois Confederacy was derived from the Walking Purchase. Teedyuscung's candor cleared the air and allowed the Conference to achieve its original goal. Since 1737, the Delawares had sold many of their ancient lands, which Teedyuscung did not expect to regain. But,

³¹ At a Conference held at Easton (private session with Indians), October 19, 1758, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 201-202; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 398-400; Wallace, *King of the Delawares*, 204-205.

he refused to surrender more territory to the English, and now he begged his Iroquois uncles to halt future sales of Delaware territory. As it turned out, the Iroquois delegation admitted that the Walking Purchase was a fraudulent land deal, and from now on, the Covenant Chain became the Iroquois justification for hegemony over neighboring tribes. Indeed, they broke with the Penn Family on this central point. One Iroquois headman blamed this land fraud on the English. As he put it, “The English first began the Mischief; we told them so.” As it turned out, both Delaware and Iroquois delegations agreed to soften the territorial implications of the Walking Purchase. The Confederacy would stop selling lands it claimed under the Walking Purchase and allow the Delawares to resettle in the Wyoming Valley, but now as nephews or clients to the Confederacy. In exchange, the Delawares promised to accept Iroquois sovereignty, though not least because the Iroquois had no strength to enforce this claim. Having dismantled the Walking Purchase, the Iroquois Confederacy would now claim that the Covenant Chain reached across the Ohio Territory and into Cherokee Country. Teedyuscung gained the Wyoming Valley for his people, while the façade of Iroquois sovereignty now was linked to the Covenant Chain.³²

Although the Easton Conference softened Pennsylvania land frauds, it breathed new life into the Covenant Chain and established the Iroquois as uncles over the Delawares. Teedyuscung begged his uncles to protect the Delawares’ territorial integrity:

I sit here as a Bird on a Bow: I look about and do not know where to go;
let me therefore come down upon the Ground, and make that my own by a

³² At a Conference held at Easton (private session with Indians), October 19, 1758, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 212; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 399-400; Parmenter, “Anglo-Iroquois Covenant Chain,” 619-622.

good Deed, and I shall then have a Home for Ever; for if you my Uncles, or I die, our Brethren, the English, will say they have bought it from you, and so wrong my Posterity out of it.³³

And so it was. Teedyuscung had surrendered his people to Iroquois hegemony in exchange for land. For their part, the Iroquois had buttressed their weak political and social position with British military muscle. The Oneida brokers took pity on Teedyuscung and allowed him to share Iroquois lands, but never did the Iroquois grant actual title or ownership to the Delawares. Instead, “you may make use of those Lands in Conjunction with our People.” The Iroquois retained their claim to be Uncles, but the Royal Army increasingly sustained that claim. To compensate for other colonial land frauds, the New Jersey government gave monetary compensation to Minisink and Wappinger Indians. Still, these Indians remained landless, much like the Catawbias.³⁴

The major success of the Easton Conference was that Forbes allowed both colonial and native brokers to retain a façade of power, while agreeing to resettle the Delawares on lands that both groups claimed. In this way, Forbes denied the French important Indian allies. Governor Denny stated that he had yielded colonial lands to advance Forbes’ objective of severing the Delaware-French alliance. As he put it, “we desire they will go from among the French to their own Towns, and no Longer help the French.”³⁵ Bouquet agreed that the Easton Conference had succeeded, because it

³³ At a Conference held at Easton, October 20, 1758, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 203; Teedyuscung’s so-called “Bird on a Bow” speech is often cited. See for example, Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 400; Wallace, *King of the Delawares*, 206.

³⁴ At a Conference held at Easton, October 26, 1758, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 221; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 400-401; Wallace, *King of the Delawares*, 194-207.

³⁵ Loudoun, Minutes of a Meeting with the Southern Governors, March 15, 1757, *PHB*, I, 91-93; Minutes taken at a meeting of the Governors, February 14, 1759, Philadelphia, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 468-472; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 400-404.

deprived the French of “their chief strength [the Delaware Indians].”³⁶ Bouquet would uphold the terms of the Easton Treaty against colonial detractors, such as the Ohio Company.³⁷ Forbes had begun orchestrating the Delawares’ relocation, without consulting Johnson, the Iroquois faction, or the Penn Family. So, in a certain sense, Forbes compelled his detractors to accede to a *fait accompli*. They did. As the Easton brokers returned to their respective homelands, each disparate faction felt that in someway they had received a fair hearing.

Beneath this aura of success, however, the Easton Conference chiseled away even more power from the Iroquois Confederacy than it did from the Penn Family and colonial interests. On October 20, Denny sent a message to the Ohio Indians by the hand of Frederick Post, inviting them to return to eastern Pennsylvania. It read, “[B]y this Belt I make a Road for you, and invite you to come to Philadelphia to your first Old Council Fire...which fire we will kindle up a gain and remove all disputes, and renew the Old and first treaties of Friendship.” What Denny did not say was more important. That is, he invited the Ohio Indians, Delawares and Shawnees alike, to come to a council fire at Philadelphia, not in Iroquoia. Although the Iroquois Confederacy retained some power as uncles, the Easton Conference had placed these Indians under the *de facto* jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania governor. Denny’s summons indicated that the Easton Conference had stripped the Iroquois Confederacy of actual sovereignty over Delawares. Now, the Delaware Indians would broker for themselves with the Pennsylvania government, rendering Iroquois claims to be uncles, emperors, or even proprietors only a memory of their former strength. Just as the Easton Treaty weakened the French-Delaware alliance,

³⁶ Bouquet to Nancy Anne Willing, Fort Duquesne, November 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 608.

³⁷ Bouquet to Cresap, Presque Isle, September 12, 1760, *PHB*, V, 32-33. For Bouquet’s loyalty to the Easton Treaty, see McConnell, *A Country Between*, 150-151.

so too did it weaken Iroquois sovereignty claims.³⁸ After the Royal Army took possession of the Ohio Territory, the Iroquois Confederacy would try again to regain sovereignty over the Indians who remained in that region, for its control of the Delawares had passed to the Pennsylvania government.

Capturing the Ohio Country

Only a short time before the Easton Conference, Bouquet had doubted Forbes' wisdom in delaying the siege of Fort Duquesne. Then, the French abandoned their fort on the Monongahela River, really without a fight. Now, Bouquet attributed the successful siege to the exact justifications Forbes had earlier offered for delaying the campaign. As Bouquet explained it, the Easton Treaty kept "the 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 of the French from the Ohio."³⁹ But self congratulation could only go so far before the Royal Army had to get down to the difficult task of integrating the Ohio Territory into the British imperial system. As demonstrated in chapter 3, this task involved the construction of entirely new supply chains, new fortification systems, and the expansion of trade

³⁸ Governor Denny, Governor Denny's answer to the message from the Ohio Indians at a meeting held at Philadelphia brought by Frederick Post, October 20, 1758, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 207. Aquila indicated that Iroquois claims over the Ohio Indians had begun as recently as the 1751 Logstown Conference, *The Iroquois Restoration*, 201-204; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 402-403. For the gradual loss of Iroquois power, see Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse*; José Antônio Brandão, "Your fyre shall burn no more" *Iroquois Policy toward New France and Its Native Allies to 1701* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 117-131. For the movement of the Delaware from the Ohio Territory back to eastern Pennsylvania, see "Extract of Letter from Pittsburgh (Lately Fort Duquesne)," November 26, 1758, *Pennsylvania Gazette*, reprinted in *PHB*, II, 612-613. In the winter of 1759, Hugh Mercer reported that the Iroquois were jealous of the Ohio Indians and warned that they would soon broker an alliance with the French. See Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, January 8, 1759, *PHB*, III, 23-24.

³⁹ Bouquet to Nancy Anne Willing, Fort Duquesne, November 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 608; Bouquet to Stanwix, Fort Duquesne, November 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 609; Bouquet to William Allen, Fort Duquesne, November 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 610-612; Bouquet to the Duke of Portland, Fort Duquesne, December 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 620-621; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 409-411.

networks. And as military personnel built this infrastructure, Bouquet brokered, severed, and brokered anew alliances with the Ohio Indians. All told, Bouquet's alliances with the Ohio Indians were more fragile than those Forbes had brokered, perhaps because Little Carpenter's betrayal of the Royal Army now colored the colonel's approach to Indian diplomacy. Contrary to historical teleology, Bouquet reversed the comparatively good relations that Forbes had brokered with the Ohio Indians. Under Jeffery Amherst's regime, the Royal Army would fail to replicate French-Indian alliances, fail to sustain trading net-works, and justify these changes under a guise of racial difference. By implementing Amherst's policies, Bouquet militarized the Ohio Territory, restricted ammunition and rum sales, and curbed the social and political autonomy of the region's indigenous population.⁴⁰ What follows traces the collapse of British-Indian diplomacy following the Easton Treaty, through the Amherst era, and ending in Pontiac's War.

With winter fast approaching in 1758, Forbes prepared for an autumn siege on Fort Duquesne. The Easton Treaty had paved the way for the Delaware Indians to return to the Wyoming Valley, and the Catawba and Cherokee alliances seemed to be holding. And, with reports that Colonel John Bradstreet had captured Fort Frontenac, Forbes calculated that the time had approached to siege Fort Duquesne. Unexpectedly, Little Carpenter withdrew from the British alliance, but even without Cherokee allies, Bouquet pushed the Royal Army across the Allegheny Mountains into the Monongahela valley. Only hours before the planned November assault, the British Indian spies reported that a cloud of thick smoke hovered above the Ohio River. "[A] few hours after they [Indians]

⁴⁰ Dowd, *War Under Heaven*, 2; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 441-442; White, *The Middle Ground*, 256-258.

sent word that the Enemies had abandoned their Fort after having burned everything.”⁴¹ Native Americans reported that the French had bombed their fort, burnt the surrounding structures, destroyed their fields and magazines, and fled eight-hundred miles west, into the so-called Middle Ground. This left the Royal Army in firm possession of the smoldering remains of Fort Duquesne and the nearby territory, creating a presumption of sovereignty over the region’s Native inhabitants.

Now possessing the charred remains of Fort Duquesne, the British spent the winter months fighting off starvation, brokering native alliances, and fearing French retaliation. On November 25, 1758, Bouquet reported to Stanwix that his regiments were greatly distressed and lacked necessities such as tents, blankets, shoes, and were half naked. He implored Stanwix to hurry supplies to Fort Duquesne, no simple request, because this was the westernmost point of the British Empire. Despite their physical condition, Bouquet believed his soldiers remained in good spirits.⁴² Compared to his soldiers, Bouquet perceived that the Ohio Indians were in a more desperate situation, facing cold, hunger, and a vastly different imperial system. He begged colonial officials to hurry supplies to the frontiers for Native Americans, fearing that otherwise they would either starve or return to the French alliance. Accordingly, Israel Pemberton, a leading Quaker and broker at Easton, rushed trade goods to Pittsburgh. George Croghan quickly followed Pemberton’s lead.⁴³ From 1759 to 1761, military personnel would conduct a series of Indian conferences at Pittsburgh that would attempt to incorporate the Western

⁴¹ Bouquet to William Allen, Fort Duquesne, November 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 610; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 259-266; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 407-409.

⁴² Bouquet to Stanwix, Fort Duquesne, November 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 609; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 411-413.

⁴³ Bouquet to William Allen, Fort Duquesne, November 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 610-612; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 410-411; Wainright, *George Croghan*, 156-157.

Indians into the British Empire by facilitating territorial acquisition, trade, and the redemption of captives.

Making Treaties, Breaking Promises

Having led the Royal Army into the Ohio Territory, Bouquet now extended the diplomatic spirit of the Easton Treaty to the Ohio Indians. In early December, Bouquet invited the Western Delaware to a Conference at Pittsburgh, where he communicated three important points that would define British-Indian relations for several years. First, Bouquet assured these Indians that the Royal Army had not come to take possession of their lands but only to extend trading networks into the Ohio region. He asked the Indians to drive the remaining French from the Ohio Territory and to torch their forts, something the French would ultimately accomplish on their own. Consistent with the Easton Treaty, Bouquet invited the Ohio Indians to travel to Philadelphia, meet Denny, and re-settle in the Susquehanna Valley. Second, and most important for the Ohio Indians, Bouquet promised that the army would facilitate trade and supply goods, especially ammunition. For the Indians, ammunition was more than a matter of sport—their lives depended on it. Finally, the redemption of captives was foremost on Bouquet's mind. Expecting the Indians to surrender *all* captives in a matter of weeks, Bouquet thanked the Delawares for their compliance on this point. For their part, the Indians promised to propagate the Easton Treaty, expel the French, and welcomed new trading alliances. As for captives, they would surrender them soon, maybe next season, at some later date, sometime. The Delawares' ambivalence about surrendering captives would eventually reverse Bouquet's willingness to bring the western tribes into the

British alliance. As for traders, the headmen warned that the region remained dangerous, the British were newcomers, and both Redcoats and traders should watch out lest they loose their scalps.⁴⁴ What became the First Pittsburgh Conference identified land, trade, and captive redemption as the fabric of British-Indian relations, and these became the catalysts of future conflict.

In the short term, the Ohio Indians gave the terms set by the First Pittsburgh Conference a fair chance, trusting in Bouquet's promises. Stripped of their French suppliers, the Ohio Indians looked to British traders to supply their wants. As Bouquet had promised trade, the Indians now came to Fort Duquesne, seeking ammunition, flour, rum, and other necessities. However, as December grew colder, Hugh Mercer turned these Indians away, for despite Bouquet's promises, the fort had no flour to give the Indians, because St. Clair had failed to manage properly the flour supply. Mercer begged Bouquet to hurry Indian goods to Fort Duquesne, for he believed that the Indians were eager to trade furs and skins for ammunition, flour, and rum. Bouquet assured Mercer that the army would loose no time in shipping Indian goods to Fort Duquesne.⁴⁵ The first record of supplies sent to the Ohio Indians included 25 guns, additional pistols, scalping knives, and tomahawks—all eventually to be turned against the Royal occupiers. Less harmful were thread, wire, shirts, flannel hats, breech cloths, and white wampum—a sign

⁴⁴ Bouquet, Conference with the Delaware Indians, December 3, 1758, *PHB*, II, 621-626. Richard White confirmed that the British never set out to take Indian lands. As he explained it, "General Amherst promised not to take Indian land, but he would not withdraw from it." Instead, Amherst wanted to end all gift giving. See *The Middle Ground*, 256.

⁴⁵ Hugh Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, December 19, 1758, *PHB*, II, 635-636. The Indians had taken all the corn from the fields that surrounded Fort Duquesne. See Hugh Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, December 23, 1758, *PHB*, II, 639-641. For Bouquet's reply, see Bouquet to Hugh Mercer, Fort Ligonier, December 26, 1758, *PHB*, II, 642-644; Armstrong to Bouquet, Bedford, January 1, 1759, *PHB*, III, 3.

of peace.⁴⁶ Consistent with the spirit of the Easton Conference, the Pennsylvania Commissioners sent Mercer £800 of Indian presents, requesting him to use these to broker alliances with leading headmen.⁴⁷

Despite the Western Indians initial acceptance of British rule, external forces were already plotting to hijack the legacy of John Forbes and the Easton Conference. The Penn Family, its proprietary faction in Pennsylvania, and the Iroquois Confederacy together mounted the first and, heretofore, the most formidable opposition to the Easton Treaty. Like the Iroquois, the Penn Family had no interest in surrendering its lands to the Delaware Indians, even if imperial peace was the consequence. But following the First Pittsburgh Conference, Thomas Penn began to bridge divisions between the proprietary faction and the Royal Army. Penn believed that the conquest of Fort Duquesne would bring security to the Pennsylvania frontier, and his sentiments paralleled the three main points of the Pittsburgh Conference. First, Penn believed that the Easton and similar treaties had greatly reduced the French influence over the Western Indians, which in turn would lead to the redemption of captives. Second, Penn hoped that Pennsylvanian merchants would now be able to establish a fair trade with the newly aligned Indians. He proposed that Jeffrey Amherst and Governor Denny should facilitate this trade. Finally, and most importantly, Penn agreed that the Royal Army should disguise the reality of its territorial ambitions and instead convince the Indians that it was their benevolent benefactor. As he put it, “I entirely agree with you that we ought to take every Method to convince the Indians that we do no intend to settle their Lands, or it will not be possible

⁴⁶ Account of Indian Goods, Bedford, January 1, 1759, *PHB*, III, 4-5; Armstrong to Bouquet, Bedford, January 6, 1758, *PHB*, III, 16-17.

⁴⁷ Forbes to Bouquet, Carlisle, January 8, 1759, *PHB*, III, 20-22.

to preserve Peace with them.”⁴⁸ All Britons, even Thomas Penn, could agree on land, trade, and redemption of captives; however, they could not conceive of Indians and Britons making the kind of compromises on which the French Middle Ground thrived.⁴⁹

In addition to Penn’s territorial ambitions, the Iroquois Confederacy initiated a campaign to fracture an emerging Ohioan pan-Indian alliance and regain hegemony over western lands. Early in January 1759, delegates from Iroquoia traveled to Pittsburgh and warned Hugh Mercer that the Delaware Indians were not to be trusted. This delegation predicted that the Delaware and Shawnee Indians would resurrect the old French alliance and take up the hatchet against the Royal Army. Worst still, they might repudiate all ties to the Iroquois Confederacy and form a pan-Indian alliance among the Western Indians.⁵⁰ Still resentful of Little Carpenter, Bouquet believed that these predictions were true. Indeed, Bouquet convinced himself that the Delawares and Shawnees were already agents of the French, because they had provided imprecise intelligence.⁵¹ As winter turned to spring and the French never attacked Pittsburgh, Bouquet’s apprehensions and fears abated. But many Delawares never resettled in the Wyoming Valley, and military personnel suspected these Indians wanted to sever ties with both French and English. As Mercer put it, “For their old thinking People would gladly give over fighting, and have seen too much of both English & French to be very fond of a near connection with either.”⁵² For its part, the Iroquois Confederacy aligned itself with the Royal Army and

⁴⁸ [Thomas] Penn to Bouquet, London, April 4, 1759, *PHB*, III, 243-244.

⁴⁹ White, *The Middle Ground*, 256.

⁵⁰ Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, January 8, 1759, *PHB*, III, 23-24; Mercer to Forbes, Pittsburgh, January 8, 1759, *PHB*, III, 25-26. Anderson indicates that the Iroquois’ apprehensions were probably well founded, and this is the first time the confederacy would “Harness British military power to serve Iroquois ends.” See *Crucible of War*, 330-333; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 113-117.

⁵¹ Bouquet to Forbes, Bedford, January 15, 1759, *PHB*, III, 52-54.

⁵² Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, March 1, 1759, *PHB*, III, 164-165.

participated in the campaign against Fort Niagara, all of which set in motion an alliance that persisted through Pontiac's War.⁵³

Despite abiding apprehension of an Enemy attack, renewed trade had brought calm to the forks of the Monongahela River, now called Fort Pitt.⁵⁴ What began as Sinclair's invitation for colonials to sell flour at Pittsburgh had grown into a full scale Indian trade. Peddlers, suttlers, and traders brought every imaginable commodity to Pittsburgh. Hugh Mercer complained that the army was the only entity that failed to send Indian gifts and supplies to the fort, forcing him to procure gifts from colonial merchants. Shingas, a Delaware chief, reported his people's desire to maintain trade and a strong alliance with the British. "Shingas," assured Mercer, "that All the Indians in alliance with the Delawares are determined to burry the French Hatchet, as they have done." In addition to the Delawares, Mercer reported that many Chippewa and other Indian tribes had traveled to Pittsburgh to trade with the British.⁵⁵ Trade oiled the gears of peace, making it incumbent upon the military personnel to maintain a steady supply of goods to Pittsburgh. Perceiving this necessity and the army's own limitations, Bouquet instructed Mercer to purchase Indian goods from Israel Pemberton, a Philadelphia merchant and leading broker at the Easton Conference. Meanwhile, Bouquet attempted to extend eastern trading networks into the trans-Allegheny zone, setting a precedent for the army's close regulation of western traders.⁵⁶

⁵³ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 330-339; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 114-117.

⁵⁴ Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, March 21, 1759, *PHB*, III, 212-214.

⁵⁵ Colonel Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, March 18, 1759, *PHB*, III, 210-211. The Indian Commissioners assumed some responsibility for the transport of Indian goods to Pittsburgh. Indian Commissioners to Bouquet, Philadelphia, April 2, 1759, *PHB*, III, 231.

⁵⁶ Bouquet to Mercer, Philadelphia, April 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 240-241; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 148-149. For George Croghan's role in facilitating trade, see Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 412-413; Wainright, *George Croghan*, 160-163.

As trading networks developed at Pittsburgh, the army anticipated the time when it would absorb Fort Detroit into the British Empire. Not until July 1759 did Royal military personnel commission spies to reconnoiter the former French posts in the Ohio Territory. These spies reported that the French had only a weak alliance with the Ottawa and Wyandotte Indians at Fort Detroit.⁵⁷ But months before British espionage missions, captives had escaped from Detroit, made their way back to Pittsburgh, and reported the weakening French position. In early spring, 1759, two men from Greenbrier, Virginia had escaped from their Wyandot captors at Detroit. These men provided the British with important intelligence about the architecture of Fort Detroit, its dissipating Indian allies, and scanty supplies. More importantly, these escaped captives were physical proof that the Ohio Indians held many, many more Britons prisoner in the western reaches of North America. Already, Bouquet was growing impatient for the Indians to surrender these hostages. But so long as the French remained in that region, the British had little hope of convincing the Western Indians to lay down the hatchet and surrender their captives. As one Briton put it, “The Indians are generally disposed to make peace, but are kept back by the Insinuation of the French, that we come to rob them of their Lands and cut their Throats.”⁵⁸ While waiting, Bouquet recommended that military personnel use “patience, Art, and dissimulation.”⁵⁹

By spring 1759, signs emerged that the Western Indians were not eager to embrace the terms of the Easton Treaty, the first Pittsburgh conference, or British territorial hegemony. For example, intelligence had it that many young Delaware

⁵⁷ Bouquet to Croghan, Lancaster, July 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 408-409.

⁵⁸ Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, April 4, 1759, *PHB*, III, 232-233; Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, April 24, 1759, *PHB*, III, 251-252. For the persistence of French power, see Wainright, *George Croghan*, 158-159.

⁵⁹ Bouquet to Mercer, Philadelphia, April 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 241.

warriors had rejected a friendly alliance with the British and were instead clinging to the French alliance. Mercer commissioned Kilbuck, a Delaware headman, to propagate the terms of the Easton Treaty to his brothers at Kuskuskies. “Brothers”, Kilbuck addressed the headmen, “Call all your foolish Young men from the French...the French lead them to Destruction.” Looking towards 1764, Kilbuck warned, “[I]f they will fight against me, they must Die.” Some intelligence hinted that these young warriors had contemplated an alliance with the Iroquois Confederacy, perplexing because the Iroquois feared an emerging Delaware-French alliance.⁶⁰ Given a spate of recent captivities, murders, and scalpings between Ligonier and Pittsburgh, equalizing the Western Indians’ hostility to British possession of the trans-Allegheny zone took on even greater importance.⁶¹

As spring turned to summer, the Ohio Indians launched a series of attacks against Fort Pitt. Heretofore, only the Penn Family and the Iroquois Confederacy had attempted to hijack the Easton and Pittsburgh conferences, but this internal defection was what ultimately soiled the good terms of the first Pittsburgh conference. On May 25, supposedly French aligned Indians took two Virginians captive, killed one Pennsylvanian soldier at Pittsburgh, and left another soldier dead at Stoney Creek. In light of these attacks, Mercer demanded that the army dispatch soldiers to guard the road between Ligonier and Pittsburgh, lest hostile Indians should sever British supply lines.⁶² Back at Bedford, George Croghan had already halted the movement of supplies westward,

⁶⁰ Mercer, Indian Intelligence, Pittsburgh, April 25, 1759, *PHB*, III, 278-280; Mercer to Burd, Pittsburgh, May 23, 1759, *PHB*, III, 308-309; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 332-333.

⁶¹ Report of the Horse Drivers Captured by Indians, Pittsburgh, April 24, 1759, *PHB*, III, 253-254; Bouquet to Stanwix, York Town, April 26, 1759, *PHB*, III, 256-257; Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, May 12, 1759, *PHB*, III, 277. French aligned Indians attacked Captain Thomas Bullitt’s supply train in late May. See Lloyd to Stanwix, Fort Ligonier, May 23, 1759, *PHB*, III, 309-311; Lloyd to Stanwix, Fort Ligonier, May 25, 1759, *PHB*, III, 315-317.

⁶² Stephen to Stanwix, Bedford, May 25, 1759, *PHB*, III, 318-319; Stephen to Bouquet, Bedford, May 27, 1759, *PHB*, III, 328-329.

because “almost every party of ours that travels the Road is attacked, and beat by the Enemy.”⁶³ Bouquet assured Mercer that the “Wavering disposition” of the Indians would end as soon as they saw the massive strength of the Redcoats, a strength that he believed was incomparable to the French army.⁶⁴ Meanwhile, Bouquet forbade the soldiers at Fort Ligonier to depart without a sufficient force on hand to repel enemy attacks. Bouquet suspected that the French aligned Indians wanted these attacks to lure British soldiers onto the frontiers, only to seize the forts themselves. Additionally, he ordered strong escorts to guard all convoys.⁶⁵ Finally, on July 5, what Bouquet most dreaded actually happened: French aligned Indians launched a successful attack on Fort Oswego. Consequently, military personnel began a crackdown on Indians lurking through frontier forests. They suspected that almost any Indian posed a threat to the fledging frontier forts. This crackdown dovetailed with Bouquet’s increasingly prejudicial description of Native Americans, marking a transition from the conciliatory atmosphere of the Easton Conference towards a never fully realized militarization of the Ohio Country.⁶⁶

As raids increased, trade declined. In late May, Mercer sent Indians away from Fort Pitt, because raids had halted convoys and the fort had no trade goods. As news of Indian attacks spread through Pennsylvania, farmers grew increasingly unwilling to contract wagons to the army and merchants declined shipments of Indian goods to the frontier.⁶⁷ To complicate matters, both Mercer and George Croghan had garnered intelligence that the French had marshaled 500 soldiers at Fort Detroit and were now

⁶³ Croghan to Gates, Bedford, May 25, 1759, *PHB*, III, 319-320.

⁶⁴ Bouquet to Mercer, Philadelphia, May 26, 1759, *PHB*, III, 326-327.

⁶⁵ Bouquet to Stephen, Philadelphia, May 31, 1759, *PHB*, III, 347.

⁶⁶ Haldimand, Orders to Several Posts, Oswego, July 5, 1759, *PHB*, III, 392; Haldimand, Note to Several Posts, Oswego, July 11, 1759, *PHB*, III, 400-401.

⁶⁷ Bouquet to Burd, Philadelphia, May 31, 1759, *PHB*, III, 348; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 325-329.

preparing to proceed with one cannon to Fort Venango.⁶⁸ Despite this, many Ohio Indians continued to bring abundant quantities of furs to Pittsburgh.⁶⁹ Seeing Indians' willingness to trade, Bouquet did not yet dream of severing the Delaware alliance. Instead, he asked Croghan and Mercer to purchase Indians' furs and store them at Pittsburgh. Meanwhile, Bouquet prepared the army to launch an attack on Fort Venango, anticipating that the French had already reinforced it.⁷⁰

Raids, ongoing captivities, and the collapse of trade cast a shadow of gloom over the good spirit of the Easton conference. As is often the case when one experiences loss, these setbacks caused military personnel to cling to what seemed certain. In this case, they clung to the Easton Treaty as though it was the dying embers of a once great accomplishment. From July 4 to 11, 1759, Croghan and Mercer held a second Indian conference at Pittsburgh, hoping to renew and extend the Easton and first Pittsburgh conferences. This time the British invited representatives of the Western Delawares, Shawnees, and Wyandots, totaling five hundred Indians in all. Croghan opened the conference with a speech that recalled the good terms of the Easton conference, the return of Delawares' lands, and the subjugation of the Iroquois Confederation. For their part, the Indians explained that they were hesitant to confirm any new treaties, until the Europeans had concluded a peace among themselves. Still, the Western Delawares surrendered a couple of captives and a few more Indians entered the British fold. The army grabbed any Indian it could as a sign that it could still broker alliances. Meanwhile,

⁶⁸ Croghan to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, July 11, 1759, *PHB*, III, 397; Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, July 11, 1759, *PHB*, III, 399-400.

⁶⁹ These furs included 9 beaver skins, 11 wolves, 7 raccoons, 5 otters, 2 cats, 2 elk skins, 65 summer and short haired skins, and 423 autumn skins. See Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, May 23, 1759, *PHB*, III, 304-307.

⁷⁰ Bouquet to Mercer, Philadelphia, June 1, 1759, *PHB*, III, 357-358; Bouquet to Burd, Carlisle, June 26, 1759, *PHB*, III, 382-383.

captivity remained an intractable problem and Indians, still loyal to the French, resumed raids against their British occupiers.⁷¹

In July 1759, Major John Tulleken reported that the Enemy had almost surrounded Fort Bedford. As he put it, “The enemy is now all around me.” Indeed, in the spring of 1759, the French and their Indian allies had penetrated the Pennsylvania backwoods. Just as the British and their Indian allies had penetrated those forests in 1758, so now, the French repeated that penetration, and with the same intention: to capture the fort at the Monongahela and Ohio rivers. Forts Bedford and Ligonier were to the British advance on Fort Duquesne in 1758 what forts Detroit, Niagara, and Venango were to the French advance on Pittsburgh in 1759. Whereas in 1758, British operations in the Pennsylvania backwoods had aimed at capturing Fort Duquesne, in 1759, French operations in that same region strove to recapture this same location, now called Pittsburgh. Although the tables were turned, the same dynamics unfolded on the Pennsylvania frontier in 1759 as had unfolded in 1758. However, there was one important difference: the comparatively large size of the British Army permitted Tulleken to ask for a massive reinforcement of 500 soldiers. And, it was precisely the size and strength of the Redcoats that repulsed French espionage missions from Pennsylvania and ultimately pushed the British army into the *pays d’ en haut*.⁷² Fearing an emerging crisis, Bouquet ordered several additional regiments to the frontier, even before receiving

⁷¹ A meeting held at Philadelphia, July 4, 1759, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 382-391; Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, July 11, 1759, *PHB*, III, 399-400; Wainright, *George Croghan*, 163-164.

⁷² Tulleken to Stanwix, Fort Bedford, July 12, 1759, *PHB*, III, 402. For additional attacks, see Tulleken to Bouquet, Fort Bedford, July 18, 1759, *PHB*, III, 425-426; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 322-324.

Tulleken's request. Additionally, Croghan encouraged British aligned Indians to take up the hatchet against their adversaries.⁷³

Despite the army's efforts to construct Indian-on-Indian warfare, Indian attacks continued to whittle away at what remained of the Easton conference and Delaware alliance. The instance of Edward Morton, a wagon master, was a poignant example. In mid-July, Morton's wagon train came under Indian fire between Bedford and the Juniata. Morton escaped unharmed and led the convoy back to Fort Bedford. In response, Tulleken sent out a detachment of over 50 soldiers to reconnoiter the area, but within a few days, Indians had scalped and killed one of the soldiers.⁷⁴ As the army investigated this attack, Captain Samuel Price discovered that Delawares, not French aligned Indians, had attacked Morton's wagon train and scalped the soldier. This was not the work of an Enemy, but of Delaware allies.⁷⁵

What was fracturing the British-Delaware alliance? The Western Delawares were not simply stepping in line with their Western counterparts. Instead, persistent Indian raids on the Pennsylvania backcountry had slowed the movement of provisions and trade goods to Pittsburgh. For months, Mercer had sent Indians away from Fort Pitt, unable to meet their subsistence needs. Then, George Croghan inflated the price of Indian goods far above what the army allowed.⁷⁶ Most recently, Mercer sent away King Beaver, a Delaware headman, without nourishment or presents.⁷⁷ In this context, Kikyuskung,

⁷³ Bouquet to Tulleken, Lancaster, July 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 411; Bouquet to Tulleken, Carlisle, July 16, 1759, *PHB*, III, 419 – 420; Bouquet to Croghan, Lancaster, July 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 408-409; Bouquet to Mercer, Lancaster, July 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 409-410; Wainright, *George Croghan*, 165.

⁷⁴ Tulleken to Stanwix, Fort Bedford, July 12, 1759, *PHB*, III, 402.

⁷⁵ Tulleken to Bouquet, Fort Bedford, July 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 412-413.

⁷⁶ Bouquet to Burd, Carlisle, June 26, 1759, *PHB*, III, 382-383; Bouquet to Croghan, Lancaster, July 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 408-409; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 412-413; Wainright, *George Croghan*, 162-163.

⁷⁷ Bouquet to Mercer, Lancaster, July 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 409-410.

headman of a small group of Delaware Indians, traveled from Pittsburgh to Fort Bedford and greatly desired to meet with General Stanwix. Kikyuskung believed that all the Indians would soon leave Pittsburgh because Mercer refused them subsistence. As Tulleken put it, “He is extremely (*sic*) impatient to see you but does not care to go farther to meet you.” Tulleken begged Kikyuskung to await Stanwix’s arrival at Bedford, but the headman gave him only two days. Although Kikyuskung turned out to speak for rather few Indians, the tone of Tulleken’s letter revealed that he perceived an impending crisis: “If you cant be here so soon as two days yourself, for God sake my dear Sir let Colonel Bouquet come, for I am quite at a loss how to act with those Indian gentlemen.”⁷⁸ Meanwhile, Sinclair hurried Indian goods to Pittsburgh, just as he had earlier prevented the same garrison from starving.⁷⁹

Back at Pittsburgh, Croghan and Mercer tried to solidify the British alliance with the Ohio Indians by developing trading networks and provisioning them. Both Croghan and Mercer complained that the Indians’ demands exceeded what they could supply. As French hegemony waned, the Ohio Indians naturally turned to Pittsburgh for their supply needs—not least because the British had promised trade. Early on, military personnel calculated that the benefit of severing the French-Indian alliance and procuring intelligence would outweigh the cost of the gifts and nourishment. As wagons pulled into Pittsburgh, Mercer requested ever greater quantities of gifts, flour, and other goods. Croghan, likewise, ordered his eastern factors to send increasingly large quantities of trade goods. Problematically, Croghan outraged both Indians and Pennsylvania Quakers

⁷⁸ Tulleken to Stanwix, Fort Bedford, July 26, 1759, *PHB*, III, 454-455; Tulleken to Bouquet, Fort Bedford, July 28, 1759, *PHB*, III, 459-460.

⁷⁹ Sinclair to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 28, 1759, *PHB*, III, 458-459. Sinclair sent four wagons filled with Indian gifts to Pittsburgh, see Sinclair to Bouquet, Carlisle, July 30, 1759, *PHB*, III, 464-465.

when he inflated prices far above set levels.⁸⁰ For his part, Mercer lamented that even when Indian men departed to escort convoys, “their Squaws &c [children] must be fed here.”⁸¹ Frugality always regulated Indian expenditures, and frontier raids further limited the quantity of supplies that reached Pittsburgh. As Croghan put it, we try to “be as frugal as the good of the Service would permit, without running into an ill timed parsimony.” Both Croghan and Mercer insisted that Indian demand far exceeded the army’s budgetary constraints. However, Mercer’s receipts indicated that the army appropriated fewer provisions to Indians than to soldiers, despite statements to the contrary. Although Croghan and Mercer’s complaints were hyperbolic, Amherst would later interpret this language of frugality as empirical truth, from which he developed supply policy. Until then, Stanwix developed a liberal trade policy, hoping to bring *all* Ohio Indians into the British alliance.⁸²

By early August 1759, Sir William Johnson had brokered an agreement with the Seneca Iroquois to drive the French out of Fort Niagara. Scarcity of French trading goods had angered the Seneca people. Moreover, they feared the growing strength and numbers of the Western Indians, over whom they retained little control. Accordingly, the Senecas harnessed the British Army to drive their former French allies from Fort Niagara. After that, both British and Seneca brokers believed that the Ohio Indians would perceive

⁸⁰ Croghan to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, July 31, 1759, *PHB*, III, 468-469. Bouquet complained that the army could not proceed more quickly, because it had to provision new Indian allies. See Bouquet to Gordon, Bedford, August 2, 1759, *PHB*, III, 482-483; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 412-413; Wainright, *George Croghan*, 162-163.

⁸¹ Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, August 1, 1759, *PHB*, III, 478-480.

⁸² Croghan to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, July 31, 1759, *PHB*, III, 468-469. Richard White pointed out that Amherst invented scarcity as a way to force Indians to become farmers. See *The Middle Ground*, 265-266. Jennings indicated that the Ohio Indians understood “gifts” to be only rent payments, which the British owed the Indians in exchange for forts. See *Empire of Fortune*, 441-442. In an earlier historiography, Wainright did not question the British notion that Indians ungratefully consumed all that the British army and traders lavished on them. See *George Croghan*, 166-167.

no alternative than to accept Iroquois hegemony and the British alliance.⁸³ Even before he knew Niagara had fallen, Stanwix shipped a tremendous supply of Indian goods to Pittsburgh. Unlike many others, Stanwix was prepared to expend any quantity of goods in order to consummate alliances with the Ohio Indians. Stanwix believed that if the army could broker stable alliances, no matter what the cost, then imperial “Success Seems infallible.”⁸⁴ Meanwhile, William Johnson publicized his intention to march with a detachment of Iroquois into the Ohio Territory, seize Fort Detroit, and occupy the surrounding settlements. Johnson warned all the women and children to flee to Scioto, a French stronghold. By mid August, French forces had fled west of the Mississippi River. As one Delaware spy put it, “the French are in the utmost confusion.” This confusion severed the French-Indian alliance forever, forcing one-time British adversaries to return to the forks on the Monongahela River for basic supplies. Brokers of the Cuscutee and Twigtwee tribes embarked for Pittsburgh, and many other Indians followed. They came “to know in what manner the Peace was settled between us and the Western Indians that they might know how to Act.” Only days later, Shawnee spies arrived at Pittsburgh from Fort Niagara, reporting that trench warfare had erupted at Niagara. The British had the upper hand.⁸⁵

For months, British military personnel had sifted through intelligence about the French strength at forts Presque Isle, Le Boeuf, and Venango. This intelligence had never brought certainty, was often contradictory, and sometimes called into question the

⁸³ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 330-339; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 414-417. For the Iroquois loss of control over the Ohio Indians, see White, *The Middle Ground*, 245.

⁸⁴ Stanwix to Bouquet, Fort Bedford, August 2, 1759, *PHB*, III, 484-486.

⁸⁵ Indian Intelligence, Pittsburgh, August 4, 1759, *PHB*, III, 493-494. Reports that the British had conquered Fort Niagara began to circulate in eastern Pennsylvania on August 5, see Delancy to Denny, New York, August 5, 1759, *PHB*, III, 495-496.

loyalty of the Indians who had provided it. But as the collapse of the French fortification system became certain, the army again enlisted Indian allies to garner intelligence and fight against the French. One officer wrote to Christopher Gist, a Virginia shareholder in the Ohio Company and Indian agent:

Do Dear Gist Incite the Indians by all the influence you have over them to evert (*sic*) themselves to drive the Barbourous Inhumane Enemy out of their Lurking Places[.] Tell them that they lately took one Captain Jacobs [possibly the son of the Delaware Chief] an Indian who had His Majestys Comission (*sic*) and whipt him for three Days & at last tore out His Bowels[.] He was a Worthy Sober Brave & gallant Soldier.⁸⁶

By using inflammatory language, military personnel hoped to solidify the Indians' loyalty to the British state and sever their alliance with the French. This marked one of the last occasions when Bouquet imagined the Indians as participants in the British war effort. That is, even as Redcoats and Senecas warred against the French, Croghan had summoned Chippewa, Cuscukskees, Ottawa, Twigtwees, and Wyandot headmen to Pittsburgh for another conference. Unlike earlier conferences, military personnel no longer imagined the Indians as necessary military allies or trading partners but instead as a conquered people, inhabiting lands now controlled by the British Empire.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ Leake to Gist, Albany, August 5, 1759, *PHB*, III, 497-498.

⁸⁷ Croghan to Stanwix, Pittsburgh, August 6, 1759, *PHB*, III, 502-503; Mercer to Stanwix, Pittsburgh, August 6, 1759, *PHB*, III, 503-504. For the role of Christopher Gist in the Forbes Campaign, see Kenneth P. Bailey, *Christopher Gist: Colonial Frontiersman, Explorer, and Indian Agent* (Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1976), 146-149. Gregory Evans Dowd maintained that British military officials denied Indians any meaningful location in the British Empire, thought of them as a racial other instead. In this system, Dowd maintained, Indians stood at the lowest level of the hierarchically structured British Army. Indians became the victims of domineering military officers. See Dowd, *War Under Heaven: Pontiac, The Indian Nations & the British Empire* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2002), 63-70.

Upon ousting the French from the Ohio Territory, an subtle transition began in the relationship between British military personnel and the region's Native population. For example, Hugh Mercer increasingly framed natives as a conquered people and an expense to the state, instead of relating to them as military allies. Only latent in earlier correspondence, now Mercer stated explicitly that Indians had become an expense to the empire, instead of a military asset. In the weeks before a conference with the Western Indians, Mercer wrote to Governor Denny:

We hear a Number of the Distant Tribes being at Hand, upon their first Visit, so that there is no appearance of our being able to avoid a vast expence of Provisions; this lays the General under Great difficulties in supplying us, and throwing in a sufficient stock for the Support of his Arms.⁸⁸

Unlike the Easton Conference, the army no longer understood an alliance with the Western Nations as imperative to broader military strategies. As for Thomas Penn, Indian diplomacy had become a mere protocol, perhaps necessary for stabilizing the region but burdensome still. Soon, Bouquet would perceive that such protocols did not yield benefits that outweighed their expense, and he would redefine Indians as “Idle People.”⁸⁹

At Pittsburgh, on August 7, 1759, George Croghan and William Johnson met in conference with representatives of several Great Lakes tribes, including Chippewa, Delaware, Ottawa, Pottawatomie, Shawnee, Wyandot, among several lesser known

⁸⁸ A Council held at Philadelphia, March 29, 1759, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 302.

⁸⁹ Bouquet to Croghan, Fort Bedford, August 10, 1759, *PHB*, III, 531.

bands. The attendants represented the so-called Western Nations, who had remained aligned with the French far longer than had the Delawares. Moreover, many of these Indians identified themselves as “warriors,” an eerie indication that young warriors had already upset the traditional diplomatic position of tribal elders, like Little Carpenter and Teedyuscung. Whereas the first two Pittsburgh conferences had sought to extend the terms of the Easton Treaty, Croghan framed this third Pittsburgh conference around the idea that the Western Nations were unwilling to accept the terms of the earlier treaties. Instead, they had remained in the French alliance, taken up the hatchet against the British, and terrorized the Pennsylvania frontier. Laying down wampum, Croghan hoped that these nations would never again take up the hatchet against the British, a point he drove home with more wampum. Croghan accused these nations of violating the Easton Treaty by warring against the British and then gave more wampum.⁹⁰ Through the night, next morning, and into the afternoon, the Western delegates held council together. One speculates that the delegates suspected the British were insincere, but because they were nearing starvation, they decided to see what the British were willing to offer. At 3 p.m., these delegates requested Croghan to open a second council meeting.⁹¹

Croghan opened the second day’s council, stating he was glad that so many warriors had gathered to “strengthen the Chain of Friendship between them and us,” and giving a string of wampum. King Beaver, a Delaware headman, reminded the Western delegates that they had earlier asked him to broker a peace between the British and the Iroquois Confederacy. Holding up a wampum belt, King Beaver announced that both groups were now willing to extend the Chain of Friendship to the Western Indians. Next,

⁹⁰ Minutes of a Conference Held by Croghan, August 7, 1759, *PHB*, III, 507-511.

⁹¹ Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, August 15, 1759, *PHB*, III, 565-566.

a Delaware warrior accused the Delaware and Shawnee Indians of taking up the hatchet against the British and raiding the colonial frontiers. But he added they had received the hatchet from the Western Nations. At the Easton conference, however, his people had buried the hatchet beneath a tall pine tree, because “the Wise Men of all Nations have made Peace with our Brethren the English.” Now, both the Delaware and Shawnee delegates begged the Western Nations to bury the hatchet and make peace with the British. Again, the British promised the Western Indians freedom to hunt and abundant trade. As one put it,

I desire that you and the Warriors of your nation may...go a hunting, and travel this Road of Peace and visit your Brethren the English, and exchange your skins, and furs, for Good to cloth your Women and Children.

King Beaver corroborated this promise, for he hoped that the “clouds of war” had passed. Importantly, the Delaware and Shawnee headmen had called the Western Nations to peace, still perpetuating the legacy of the Easton Treaty. Although the Western Nations agreed to lay down the hatchet, they understood peace to be tentative at best. For now, they would take the message of peace back to their people, who lived in the western most reaches of the British territorial empire. Most certainly, any future peace depended on freedom to hunt and plenteous trade.⁹²

From the beginning, ambiguity marked what had been one of the largest Indian Councils since Easton. Bouquet believed that the Western Nations would ultimately

⁹² Minutes of a Conference Held by Croghan, August 7, 1759, *PHB*, III, 507-511; Croghan to Stanwix, Pittsburgh, August 11, 1759, *PHB*, III, 539-540; Wainright, *George Croghan*, 165.

choose their alliances based on whether or not the French retained Niagara. He called it “the signal upon which the Indians will join again.” True, perhaps in the short term, but access to ammunition, provisions, and trade would ultimately decide the loyalty of the Western Nations. And, soon after this conference, other military personnel acknowledged Mercer’s earlier complaint that Indian diplomacy cost too much money. Days after the conference, Bouquet bemoaned the “great number of Indians sitting idly at fort Duquesne,” who consumed provisions more rapidly than the army could supply the fort. Bouquet complained that provisions were “consumed by that Idle People...Therefore The General desires that You [Croghan] put an End to that useless Consumption, which is Our Evident ruin.” Later Bouquet added, “We must be Brothers & friends, but not Slaves.” And finally, “use all your Endeavours (*sic*) to diminish their Number.”⁹³ As for a territorial empire, the Western Nations believed that the Royal Army would abandon Pittsburgh once they had ended the French threat. This expectation befuddled Bouquet, “We certainly never intended to abandon Pittsburgh.”⁹⁴ Whereas the Easton conference had secured an alliance that complemented British military strategy, the August 1759 conference set the stage for the army to bring military coercion to bear against the Western Nations.

Through the remainder of August, Bouquet repeated his demands that Mercer reduce the number of Western Indians at Pittsburgh, because they consumed too much food, cost too much money, and caused supply shortages. But the Indians were slow to depart, because warfare had ravaged their cornfields and they were nearing starvation.

⁹³ Bouquet to Croghan, Fort Bedford, August 10, 1759, *PHB*, III, 531; Wainright, *George Croghan*, 166-167.

⁹⁴ Bouquet to [Peters], Fort Bedford, August 8, 1759, *PHB*, III, 512-514; White, *The Middle Ground*, 261.

Meanwhile, Delaware Indians were probably the culprits of increased instances of horse theft at Pittsburgh.⁹⁵ As for trade, Croghan reported Pittsburgh lacked both merchants and trading goods, except for some laced coats, hats, and similar elitist ornaments. The paucity of trade goods disappointed the Indians. Bouquet told Philadelphia's merchants that scores of Indians were anxious to trade skins at Pittsburgh, and he encouraged the merchants to enter this new market.⁹⁶ In late August, the army received word that the French had abandoned forts LeBoeuf, Presque Isle, and Venango. Even so, Mercer warned his military counterparts not to take possession of this fortification system, until they had established a stable supply chain to Pittsburgh. Moreover, the Western Indians continued to deplete Pittsburgh's food supply, and Mercer wanted to force their departure.⁹⁷ On September 1, an estimated 500 Indians remained at Pittsburgh, and Bouquet lamented that the army could not take possession of the frontier forts until those Indians departed. If more Indians arrived, then Mercer would have to send them away without gifts. Bouquet feared that if the army did not put an end to gift giving, then it would never end, for an endless stream of Indians would come seeking presents. Bouquet instructed Mercer to act with "the greatest Oeconomy." Then, on September 8, Mercer issued an initial order for Indians to depart from Pittsburgh, instructing them to return home and not to attempt making war with their "old Knives."⁹⁸

⁹⁵ Bouquet to Mercer, Fort Bedford, August 10, 1759, *PHB*, III, 532-533; Bouquet to Morton, Fort Bedford, August 10, 1759, *PHB*, III, 533-534; Croghan to Stanwix, Pittsburgh, August 13, 1759, *PHB*, III, 558; Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, August 15, 1759, *PHB*, III, 565-566. Mercer reported that he would purchase additional horses from Virginia because so many were stolen. See Bouquet to Mercer, Fort Bedford, August 16, 1759, *PHB*, III, 570-571.

⁹⁶ Croghan to Stanwix, Pittsburgh, August 11, 1759, *PHB*, III, 539-540; Bouquet to Willing, Fort Bedford, August 10, 1759, *PHB*, III, 535-536.

⁹⁷ Mercer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, August 16, 1759, *PHB*, III, 573.

⁹⁸ For Bouquet's orders to act with economy, see Bouquet to Mercer, Fort Bedford, September 1, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 11-12. For all other material, see Bouquet to Pemberton, Fort Bedford, September 1, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 7-8; Mercer to Bouquet, Winchester, September 8, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 54-57. Returns indicated that

Meanwhile, Bouquet took measures to stimulate trade with the Ohio Indians. Accordingly, he wrote Governor Fauquier and invited him to facilitate trade between Virginian merchants and the Ohio Indians. Bouquet assured Fauquier that the army would fix the prices of goods to ensure its profitability.⁹⁹ Soon, two young merchants departed from Winchester to Pittsburgh, carrying £500 worth of Indian goods, and other traders would follow. Eventually, they commissioned James Cunningham as a permanent “Factor” at Pittsburgh to oversee the Indian trade.¹⁰⁰ Back in Pennsylvania, Stanwix requested the Assembly to encourage merchants to trade with the Ohio Indians. Governor Denny told the Assembly that this would extend the Indian trade, protect the well being of frontier settlers, and solidify the recent military gains against the French.¹⁰¹ Accordingly, by mid-September, wagon loads of Indian goods began pouring into Pittsburgh. And Mercer encouraged merchants to enter the Indian trade, something they found difficult because it had lain stagnant for so long.¹⁰²

By autumn of 1759, relations between the army and Native Americans began deteriorating rapidly, primarily because the expense of creating a new middle ground was too much for the British to bear. Scores of Ohio Indians remained camped at Fort Pitt, and they refused to leave. Following months of negotiations, Bouquet ordered the Indians to depart from Fort Pitt. He ended the provisioning program, declaring that he

the Indians continued to consume nearly 2,000 rations per day. See Stanwix to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, September 8, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 57-59. For the implementation of Amherst’s Indian policies, see White, *The Middle Ground*, 256-261.

⁹⁹ Bouquet to Mercer, Fort Bedford, August 26, 1759, *PHB*, III, 618-619. For price setting, see Mercer to Bouquet, Winchester, August 30, 1759, *PHB*, III, 636-639.

¹⁰⁰ Mercer to Bouquet, Winchester, August 28, 1759, *PHB*, III, 631; Mercer to Stanwix, Winchester, September 19, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 124-125.

¹⁰¹ Stanwix, A letter from General Stanwix to Governor Denny (information repeated in a circular letter), Bedford, August 13, 1759, *Colonial Records* VIII, 376-380; Denny to the Assembly, Philadelphia, August 30, 1759, *PHB*, III, 639.

¹⁰² Dow to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, September 7, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 47; Mercer to Bouquet, Winchester, September 8, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 54-57.

refused to feed “The Devil under the Shape of an Indian.”¹⁰³ Meanwhile, the Piqua Shawnee, Twightwee, and Wea people tried to broker an alliance with the British. To prove their loyalty, they set about murdering several Frenchmen. But the army did not wish to invest in an alliance with these Indians, because the expense was too high. As one report explained, “[T]he Government feared it would draw on an Additional Expence in Presents, for which reason these Indians were neglected.”¹⁰⁴ This marked a major transition in British diplomacy. Whereas Forbes had sought conciliation between Britons and Native Americans, Bouquet increasingly erected a prejudicial barrier between British and native societies, which justified eliminating the expense of Indian diplomacy.¹⁰⁵

While trade was sluggish, the Ohio Indians proved even more reluctant to return captives. Originally, Indians used captivity to restore declining populations, perpetuate social identity, and replace deceased tribal members.¹⁰⁶ Through requickening ceremonies, Indians adopted captives into their tribes, by infusing characteristics of the deceased into the newly adopted tribal member. This form of captivity survived into eighteenth century, and having seen former British colonist transformed into White Indians, Bouquet remarked, “I have seen some of our prisoners not worth redeem[ing] they are more Stupid & more Indians than their Masters.”¹⁰⁷ But by the Seven Years’ War, captivity resembled hostage taking more than adoption. For example, following

¹⁰³ Bouquet to Gates, Fort Bedford, September 11, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 69-70; Wainright, *George Croghan*, 165-166.

¹⁰⁴ Description of Western Indians, 1759, *PHB*, IV, 405-408. George Croghan brokered a loose agreement with these Indians, but it lacked military backing. See Wainright, *George Croghan*, 167-168.

¹⁰⁵ For a more complete analysis of racial logic, see Linda Colley, *Captives* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2002), 161. Richard White attributed this arrogant attitude and policy shift to Jeffrey Amherst and the implementation of his policy reforms. See *The Middle Ground*, 258-259.

¹⁰⁶ Daniel Richter, “War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience,” *The William and Mary Quarterly* 40, no. 4 (October 1983), 529.

¹⁰⁷ Richter, “War and Culture,” 531-35; Return of Provisions at Presque Isle, July 18, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 646.

Grant's defeat at Fort Duquesne, the French and their Indians allies took many British prisoners. Much evidence suggests that the French released these British prisoners into Indian custody, when the Forbes Expedition conquered Fort Duquesne.¹⁰⁸ The Ohio natives were reluctant to surrender people they perceived to be family members to agents of the British state, captives from the first group. However, they placated the British by returning military prisoners, such as Lieutenant Alexander McDonald of the 77th Regiment, taken captive at Grant's defeat in 1758.¹⁰⁹

Since the Easton Treaty, clauses promising the return of captives had littered British-Indian diplomacy. Even so, the Indians had returned only a few captives and military brokers did not press the issue, fearing it would drive the Indians back into French hands. This mindset changed after the French evacuated the Ohio Territory. On October 24, 1760, General Stanwix held another Indian conference at Pittsburgh. Securing the return of British captives was its major goal. As Stanwix expressed it, "No nations could ever charge the English with a Breach of Treatys." But he accused that the Indians had failed to fulfill a central component of their treaty obligations: "that is, restoring our Prisoners, which I insist on." Over the next days, natives pleaded with the British brokers to provide their people a fair and equitable trade. For their part, the Indians perceived this conference as an opportunity to beg the British to mitigate the causes of poverty in Indian Country. Only on the last day of the conference did the Indians acknowledge the British request for the return of captives. The Indians claimed to empathize with the British request. Still, they lamented, "[I]t is impossible for us to set

¹⁰⁸ Bouquet to Forbes, Camp at Loyal Hannon, September 17, 1758, *PHB*, II, 517-521; Inventory: Effects of Officers and Troops, *PHB*, II, 531-532; Extract of Letter from Pittsburgh [*Pennsylvania Gazette*, December 14, 1758,] November 26, 1758, *PHB*, II, 612-613.

¹⁰⁹ Tulleken to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, January 13, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 420-422.

the time.”¹¹⁰ Put another way, these captives remained the only real bargaining tool the Indians retained, and they were too savvy to surrender their diplomatic centerpiece. The debate over captives, even more than provisions or trade, was the catalyst that broke down the good terms of the Easton Conference.¹¹¹ Jeffery Amherst brought British-Indian relations to the breaking point.

Born in 1717, Amherst served as an aide-de-camp to Sir John Ligonier in the War of Austrian Succession. On March 17, 1758, Amherst sailed for North America, where he orchestrated the siege on Louisbourg. One year later, he assisted in planning the two pronged attack against Canada, moving one army down the St. Lawrence River and another up from Fort Ticonderoga to siege Montreal. The French army surrendered Montreal and Canada to Amherst on September 8, 1760. Amherst's operation in Canada dovetailed with the Forbes Expedition, which together turned the tide of the Seven Years' War in the British favor. In 1760, the War Office appointed Amherst commander-in-chief of His Majesty's forces in North America, requiring him to organize expeditions against Dominica and Martinique. In 1762, Amherst participated in planning the operations against Havana and Cuba, and the expedition restored Newfoundland to the British Empire. Yet, while Jeffery Amherst shored up British territorial victories, his contempt for Native Americans and efforts to eliminate expenses further destabilized the Ohio Territory.¹¹²

¹¹⁰ Stanwix, A meeting held at Pittsburgh, October 24, 1759, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 430, 433-435; Colley, *Captives*, 161. White explains that the British had earlier allowed the Indians to believe that they could retain captives, see *The Middle Ground*, 262.

¹¹¹ White, *The Middle Ground*, 256-268; Richter, *Facing East From Indian Country*, 181-182.

¹¹² Jeffery Amherst, *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, May 9, 2008
<<http://www.biographi.ca/EN/ShowBioPrintable.asp?BioID+35890>>

General Amherst reshaped British-Indian relations through a series of economizing policies that eliminated expenses and encouraged Indians to become self sufficient. William Johnson and George Croghan found Amherst's policies suspect from the beginning, but Henry Bouquet economized with the same vigor that he had earlier enforced the Easton Treaty. First, Amherst tried to eliminate presents from Indian diplomacy. Although the middle ground had centered on gift giving, Amherst believed that presents bred dependence and lethargy. By eliminating presents, Amherst believed Indians would become self sufficient hunters. Second, Amherst encouraged renewed trade with Native Americans. However, he forbade the sale of ammunition, gun powder, and rum to natives, which became a catalyst for future problems. Third, Amherst demanded that the Ohio Indians surrender all their captives to British authorities, a request that no British broker believed workable. The Ohio Indians received these policies just as they became aware that the British did not intend to evacuate the Ohio Territory as earlier promised. Not surprisingly, Amherst's policies confirmed the fears of Ohio's indigenous population that the British intended to enslave them.¹¹³ To complicate matters, Amherst's Indian policies paralleled orders from London to implement a Stoppage Order, a reduction in soldiers' pay from 6 pence to 4 pence. Pay reductions tipped off a continental wide mutiny among the regulars, effectively emptying the army of the necessary manpower to maintain even a façade of military rule in the Ohio Country. All told, from 1760 to 1763, Amherst would implement a series of policies that precluded a renewed middle ground and generated distrust inside the Royal Army. The following paragraphs trace how Bouquet reorganized the Ohio Territory under Amherst's regime.

¹¹³ White, *The Middle Ground*, 256-261.

In April of 1760, Amherst penned a speech that defined his postwar Indian policy. Amherst threatened retaliation in case of misconduct; he asserted the army's unlimited authority to construct countless forts; and he advised that the state held power to sequester Indian lands. Upon reading this speech, Bouquet recognized a transition from Forbes' conciliatory policies to Amherst's authoritarian stance, but he acquiesced to the new policies.¹¹⁴ Meanwhile, George Croghan, among many lesser known brokers, continued trying to forge a new middle ground. In early April of 1760, Tulleken reported that over 300 Shawnee Indians had arrived at Pittsburgh and demanded a conference with George Croghan. The Shawnees ignored Tulleken's many requests that they depart, until Croghan finally obliged their request for a conference.¹¹⁵ Versed in Native American diplomacy, Croghan sealed an alliance with the Shawnee Indians, even as Amherst and Bouquet were debating the state's ability to sequester their lands. Croghan reported, that this Shawnee Conference had put things "on So good a footing that they have offered to go to Warr Against the Southern Indians." Indeed, Croghan had used this conference to enlist young Indian horse thieves in a military detachment that eventually marched against the rebellious Cherokee People. Instead of imagining Indians as savages, Croghan diverted their energies to military goals. This began an Indian alliance that culminated with bands of Ohio Indians raiding Cherokee Country.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ Bouquet to Stanwix, Philadelphia, April 24, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 530; Post, Proposed Alterations to Amherst's Speech, April 24, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 531-532. For a top-down analysis of British policy in the Ohio Territory, see Jack M. Sosin, *Whitehall and the Wilderness: The Middle West in British Colonial Policy, 1760-1775* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961), 27-78. For tensions Amherst generated inside the Royal Army, see Peter Way "Rebellion of the Regulars: Working Soldiers and the Mutiny of 1763-1764", *William & Mary Quarterly* 57: 4 (Oct., 2000), pp. 761-792.

¹¹⁵ Tulleken to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, April 2, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 506-507.

¹¹⁶ Croghan to Gates, Pittsburgh, May 1, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 547-548; Croghan to Gates, Pittsburgh, May 20, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 566-568; Wainright, *George Croghan*, 169.

Having diverted some unsettled warriors off to Cherokee Country, Croghan tried to foster good relations with the Indians on the trans-Allegheny frontier. One example points to how the middle ground dynamic worked. In late May 1760, hostile Indians scalped and killed a Virginia soldier near Bushy Run. Croghan

sent an Indian and a white man; immediately (*sic*) to the place if Possible to track the Party that done the Murder, who returned & reported to me that they could not find any signs of a Party nor do the[y] believe there was above one man so that I am of opinion it must be some Indians who has been Abused here in his Liquor by the Soldiers.¹¹⁷

Croghan believed that the Indian had taken “private Revenge.” Still, Croghan hoped that the Indian headmen would identify the murder and hand him over to British officials. Croghan understood the incompatibility of Native Americans’ sense of private revenge and the British sense of the rule of law and courts of justice. In this case, Croghan tried to broker a Middle Ground between two contradictory justice systems by enlisting the cooperation of headmen. He respected Native American social structures, and worked within those structures to satisfy the British sense of justice. Croghan required the British to relax their demand for immediate trial, but he, likewise, required the headmen to surrender this murderer.¹¹⁸ For the meantime, Bouquet advised, “trying what Croghan could do by way of Negotiations as we have not yet sufficient Forces.”¹¹⁹ Ominously,

¹¹⁷ Croghan to Gates, Pittsburgh, May 23, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 572-573.

¹¹⁸ Croghan to Gates, Pittsburgh, May 23, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 572-573; White, *The Middle Ground*, 585.

¹¹⁹ Bouquet to Monckton, Fort Littleton, June 7, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 585-586.

Bouquet saw this compromise as only a temporary measure that coercion would soon render pointless.

Through the summer of 1760, the Ohio Indians launched a series of attacks against the Royal Army at the Lake Erie forts. For example, Croghan had received intelligence that a party of Ottawas and Wyandots, about 20 men in all, were lurking about Presque Isle. Five days later, Indians attacked British regulars at the fort, killing two soldiers, scalping another, and taking a fourth captive.¹²⁰ Days later, on July 21, Bouquet sent a party to reconnoiter the peninsula and determine if the French had departed. Around 3 PM, two soldiers reported an estimated 20 French and Indians fired upon their reconnoitering party. In response, Bouquet ordered a party of 100 soldiers to investigate the peninsula. This party discovered a sergeant wounded by seven buck shot, and two soldiers scalped and killed. Enemy Indians had taken captive two other British soldiers.¹²¹ By mid-August, not one British aligned Indian remained at Presque Isle because the army had refused them provisions. Increased attacks and loss of allies signaled the weakness of the British-Indian alliance.¹²²

Back at Pittsburgh, military personnel began implementing Amherst's trade restrictions in the autumn of 1760. First, military personnel forbade traders to sell rum to the Indians in exchange for skins. One-month later, Bouquet prohibited the sale of gunpowder in exchange for meat.¹²³ Bouquet never succeeded in halting the sale of alcohol to Native Americans, though he never tired of trying. Bouquet lamented that the

¹²⁰ Mercer to Bouquet, Presque Isle, July 24, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 657; Bouquet to Monkton, Presque Isle, July 19, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 649-650.

¹²¹ Bouquet to Monkton, Presque Isle, July 29, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 665-667.

¹²² Bouquet to Monkton, Presque Isle, August 11, 1760, *PHB*, IV, 685-687; Miles to Bouquet, Presque Isle, November 23, 1760, *PHB*, V, 118-119.

¹²³ Burd, General Orders, Pittsburgh, October 8, 1760, *PHB*, V, 62; Bouquet, Memorandum for Campbell, November 1, 1760, *PHB*, V, 92. Bouquet was only implementing Amherst's orders. See White, *The Middle Ground*, 256-257.

Pittsburgh traders “take all possible methods to evade the orders given for the proper Regulation of the Trade, & that an Example appears necessary to convince them of their dependency.”¹²⁴ These restrictions pointed to the militarization of the Ohio Territory, as Bouquet tried to regulate both colonial traders and native consumption.

In October 1760, General Robert Monckton gave instructions to Robert Rogers for capturing Fort Detroit. Foremost among Monckton’s goals was the rescue of British captives. Next, the army would integrate the French inhabitants into the British Empire by promising them free-trade with all nations.¹²⁵ Immediately upon seizing Fort Detroit, the army found a handful of captives and sent them to Presque Isle for refuge. Surprisingly, the French inhabitants proved quite willing to take an oath of allegiance to the British state and surrendered their armaments.¹²⁶ On December 5, 1760, Croghan announced to a conference of Ottawa, Pottawatomie, and Wyandotte Indians, “Your Fathers are become British Subjects.” Croghan promised the Indians free trade, demanded the release of all captives, and requested them to renew the Chain of Friendship with all the Ohio Indians and with the Six Nations. Next day, the Indians confessed their desire to renew the Chain of Friendship. However, they refused to surrender the captives, whom they had adopted. As one headman put it, “we do not choose to Force them that has a Mind to live with us.” Croghan concluded the conference, renewed the Chain of Friendship, but never pushed the Indians to surrender

¹²⁴ Bouquet to Monckton, Pittsburgh, March 28, 1761, *PHB*, V, 375-376; Bouquet to Monckton, Pittsburgh, March 18, 1761, *PHB*, V, 348-349; Bouquet, Orders Concerning Pittsburgh Inhabitants, May 9, 1761, *PHB*, V, 470-471. For a partial analysis of how Amherst’s cost reductions affected Croghan, see Wainright, *George Croghan*, 177.

¹²⁵ Monckton to Rogers, 1760, *PHB*, V, 78. At the Detroit conferences, Richard White has pointed out that the British misled the Ohio Indians about the return of captives. Similarly, the British never made good on their promises about trade. See White, *The Middle Ground*, 260-267. For Robert Rogers, see Wainright, *George Croghan*, 173-175.

¹²⁶ Rogers to Bouquet, Detroit, December 1, 1760, *PHB*, V, 138; White, *The Middle Ground*, 260.

all captives. This concession indicates that Croghan did not believe the Indians would ever surrender all their captives, and he probably thought that the army would eventually modify this demand.¹²⁷

Soon after Croghan concluded the Detroit peace treaty, the contrast between the French Middle Ground and the British manner of dealing with Indians became increasingly clear. Campbell expressed the contrast like this: “The French had a different manner of treating them from us. The four Nations that live in the Environs of Detroit, are as much under the Commandant, as the Inhabitants, and come for every Thing they want”¹²⁸ But within a few months, Campbell found this dynamic to be conducive to military goals, because “they pay more respect to the Governour here than is done in any other of our Colonies.” He explained that the Indians had provided the fort with venison through the winter, and the local inhabitants had provided flour and Indian corn. He found all the former French colonists to be quite happy under the British government. Documentary evidence indicates that the French inhabitants stayed up into the late hours of the night playing cards with the British soldiers. And with one exception, the soldiers had all been content at the Detroit post. As Campbell explained, “I have had but one Complaint of our Soldiers Since we have been here, I attribute that, to the want of Rum.” Perhaps most importantly, “The Women Surpasses our expectations.”¹²⁹

The Indians at Detroit were in desperate material want, for they did not even have ammunition for hunting.¹³⁰ Therefore, Bouquet granted two initial trading permits.

¹²⁷ Croghan, Indian Conference at Detroit, December 5, 1760, *PHB*, V, 150-156; Wainright, *George Croghan*, 175.

¹²⁸ Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, December 11, 1760, *PHB*, V, 170-172.

¹²⁹ Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, March 10, 1761, *PHB*, V, 340-341; McDonald to Bouquet, Fort Detroit, March 10, 1761, *PHB*, V, 342.

¹³⁰ Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, December 23, 1760, *PHB*, V, 196.

These permits allowed for the trade of dried goods but forbade the sell of liquor to Indians. The traders were to sell the goods at rates fixed by George Croghan.¹³¹ Soon thereafter, other traders petitioned Bouquet to enter the Detroit trade.¹³² Few companies organized a more sophisticated trade than did John Porteous. Porteous immigrated to North America from Scotland in 1762. Soon after his arrival, he entered the Albany fur-trade, developing a trans-Atlantic market that stretched from Fort Detroit to London. John Sterling worked as Porteous's principal factor at Detroit, and his *Letter Book* reveals the dynamics of the Indian trade in the first years under British control. Sterling brokered dynamic trading relationships with Native Americans that relied on Indian hunters and anticipated European demand. Some evidence indicates that Sterling smuggled alcohol into the Ohio Territory despite Amherst's prohibitions. Even so, Sterling's good trading relationship with Native Americans could not withstand Amherst's trading restrictions and ultimately harmed Porteous's company.¹³³

Not long after the Royal Army had integrated Fort Detroit into the empire, relations with Native Americans underwent a transition from what Campbell described. Through the Seven Years' War, the army had provisioned its Native allies. But following the war, Amherst redefined the army's obligations to natives, halted provisioning, and demanded they abandon camps near British fortifications. Now, Amherst imagined, natives would survive by agriculture and the trade, much like the British colonists. Thus, Monckton implemented Amherst's policies, as he explained,

¹³¹ Bouquet to Hill and Colhoon, Trading Permit, December 23, 1760, *PHB*, V, 195.

¹³² Hambach to Bouquet, Lancaster, January 1, 1761, *PHB*, V, 229; Ross to Bouquet, Lancaster, April 6, 1761, *PHB*, V, 395-396.

¹³³ John Sterling, *Letter Book*, Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

The Indian Expence is Immense, I have Upwards of three Thousand Pounds to Pay for Roger's Expedition to Detroit; It is time now that the Indians should live by their Hunting, & not think that they are always to be receiving Presents.¹³⁴

This order grew out of the same regulatory policies that had earlier produced the 1761 Proclamation Line, which curtailed the Ohio Company by forbidding colonial expansion beyond the Allegheny Range. And, it anticipated the Stoppage Order, which cut soldiers' pay and ultimately led to a continental wide mutiny. The decision to halt gift giving came as part of the army's effort to reshape Ohio society. Put simply, the state would henceforth discourage Indian dependency, in the same way that it discouraged trans-Allegheny settlement. In practice, however, Campbell understood that the British could not radically change the dynamics of the French Middle Ground without incurring "fatal Consequences." Detroit remained a prototype of intercultural harmony.¹³⁵

Just as military personnel tightened trading policies, colonial cries for the army to expedite the return of captives became louder and louder. Three major Pittsburgh conferences, a Detroit conference, and years of diplomacy had not resolved the problem of captivity. In May 1761, the Pennsylvania Orphan's Court ordered the army to return one child to his parents, in order that he might receive a proper education.¹³⁶ Next month, James McCullough petitioned the army to rescue his two sons, James and John, whom the Indians had taken captive in August of 1756. Despite McCullough's "low Circumstances," he was willing to give any reward for the return of his two sons, whom

¹³⁴ Monckton to Bouquet, April 5, 1761, *PHB*, V, 391-393; White, *The Middle Ground*, 257.

¹³⁵ Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, June 1, 1761, *PHB*, V, 516-518; Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, June 8, 1761, *PHB*, V, 533-534.

¹³⁶ Ourry to Bouquet, Fort Bedford, May 25, 1761, *PHB*, V, 506-507.

the Delaware had taken captive in a raid near Fort Loudoun. As he explained it, “The loss of the above Boys make their unhappy Parents truly wretched.”¹³⁷ Bouquet would invoke these and similar petitions to justify the transition from the Easton diplomacy to a more coercive strategy to secure the return of captives.¹³⁸ In all, the Indians had not ended captivity as required by the many conferences, and the British had failed to fulfill their trading promises. Combined, these broken promises allowed external pressures to further fracture the trans-Allegheny Indian alliance.

Plotting from Iroquoia

Since the Easton Conference, the Covenant Chain alliance had given the Iroquois Confederacy a sense of sovereignty over its western neighbors. Historically, the Walking Purchase and similar frauds had lodged the Delaware and other Ohio tribes under Iroquois tutelage. And however bogus they were, these measures continued to shape Iroquois diplomatic strategy, but now with the added weight of the Covenant Chain that Teedyuscung had renewed at Easton. For instance, in the Niagara campaign, the Seneca Iroquois proved their ability to harness the British army to achieve nativist goals. Now, sensing an emerging crisis in the Ohio Territory, Seneca headmen tried to exacerbate this crisis and posit themselves as the solution to it. That is, if the Senecas could whip up a rebellion, then they could punish their rebellious nephews, quell the rebellion, and

¹³⁷ Petition of McCullough, June 2, 1761, *PHB*, V, 525-526.

¹³⁸ Cochrane to Bouquet, Presque Isle, June 2, 1761, *PHB*, V, 522-523; White, *The Middle Ground*, 262. For the changed attitude since the Easton Treaty, see McConnell, *A Country Between*, 176.

thereby strengthen the Covenant Chain. Such became the Iroquois Plot and set the basis for the Iroquois diplomatic strategy that lasted through Pontiac's War.¹³⁹

In early June 1761, a Genesee Seneca delegation summoned numerous Western and even Cherokee headmen to a secret conference at a Wyandot village, not far from Fort Detroit. Once assembled, the Seneca brokers framed the conference in terms of ending the British occupation of the Ohio Territory. Accordingly, the Senecas wanted to precipitate a pan-Indian rebellion against the British occupiers.¹⁴⁰ But more immediately, they wanted to reverse George Croghan's effort to enlist Ohio Indians in the war against the Cherokees, whom they regarded as nephews. One delegate put it like this:

When the English took possession of Detroit they willingly permitted your young men to go to War against their ancient Enemies the Cherokees, but we now desire and request that they may not go to War against them, but remain at home for some time.¹⁴¹

Then, a Cherokee delegate presented a large belt of red wampum and gave it and a war hatchet to the Delawares, Shawnee, and Wyandot headmen, begging them to unite as one people. Later, a Seneca put forward that the Ohio Indians forcibly expel the British from the Ohio Country, for they had come to do the Indians ill. The Iroquois delegation

¹³⁹ For the Logstown Conference and the Walking Purchase, see Aquila, *Iroquois Restoration*, 200-204. Almost all analyses of Pontiac's War include references to the Iroquois. See Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 536-537; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 450-453; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 171-175; White, *The Middle Ground*, 286-287.

¹⁴⁰ Parmenter, "Anglo-Iroquois Covenant Chain," 619-622.

¹⁴¹ Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, July 22, 1761, *PHB*, V, 646-647; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 537. For Croghan's effort to enlist Ohio warriors against the Cherokees, see McConnell, *A Country Between*, 153; Wainright, *George Croghan*, 177. For the role of the Iroquois Confederacy in Cherokee Country, see Theda Perdue, "Cherokee Relations with the Iroquois in the Eighteenth Century," in *Beyond the Covenant Chain: The Iroquois and their Neighbors in Indian North America, 1600-1800*, ed. Daniel Richter and James H. Merrell (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press), 135-149.

promised that if the Wyandots and other Indians would cut off the British from Detroit, then Iroquois warriors would sever their hold on forts Niagara and Pitt.¹⁴²

By mid June of 1761, loyal Wyandot Indians had reported this secret conference and rumors of defection among the Western Indians to Campbell. Since the British had taken possession of Detroit, Campbell had been on good terms with the fort's inhabitants, where the British had most successfully replicated the French middle ground. That spring, however, Campbell became aware that a spirit of discontent had gripped these once loyal Indians. Reports hinted that Tahiadoris, a Seneca headman, had held a conference at Sandusky with Wyandots [Hurons], Ottawas, Pottawatomies, and Chippewas. Tahiadoris had discounted the sincerity of the Easton and Pittsburgh conferences and now summoned these natives to "take up the Hatchet against the English."¹⁴³ Tahiadoris attempted to form a pan-Indian alliance, making "all of the same accord and of the same voice."¹⁴⁴

Mounting intelligence authenticated the Seneca plot, and Campbell rushed a frantic letter to Bouquet:

I am more Anxious (*sic*) that you should be informed of this affair, as one part of their scheme is to endeavour to surprize Fort Pitt, this is to be Attempted by a Part of the Six Nations the Delawars, & Shawnies, whilst the remainder of the Six Nations were to Assemble at the head of French Creek & attempt something against Niagara with the Assistance of the

¹⁴² Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, July 7, 1761, *PHB*, V, 618-620; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 172-173.

¹⁴³ Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, June 16, 1761, *PHB*, V, 555-556; Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, June 17, 1761, *PHB*, V, 559-560; Campbell to Walters, Detroit, June 17, 1761, *PHB*, V, 560-561.

¹⁴⁴ Report of Indian Council, Detroit, June 18, 1761, *PHB*, V, 563-564. For a complete discussion of the Senecas, see McConnell, *A Country Between*, 171-175,

Northern Indians, whom that have been endeavouring to bring into their Scheme.¹⁴⁵

Military personnel accepted this alarmist report only hesitantly. As rumors of impending disaster spread, Captain Callender scurried off to Pittsburgh to assure Bouquet “it was a false alarm.”¹⁴⁶ False alarm or not, Bouquet used the threat of an Indian rebellion to increase military power.¹⁴⁷ For the security of Pittsburgh, Bouquet ordered the formation of a two-company militia. Now, every male inhabitant would enroll in the militia and take up arms. Bouquet ordered all artificers, laborers, suttlers, traders, indeed any non-enlisted man capable of carrying arms, to enlist in the Pittsburgh militia. They were to give their names to either Hugh Crawford or Robert Pearis, the captains of this militia. Bouquet ordered any man who resisted enlistment to depart from Pittsburgh within two days. Rumors that Tahiadoris had held a secret conference at Sandusky led quickly to the militarization of Pittsburgh.¹⁴⁸

The Iroquois Plot quickly unraveled, not because of military coercion but because the Ohio Indians resisted it. Put simply, the Ohio Indians had not yet developed the oppositional consciousness on which Tahiadoris relied for a meaningful pan-Indian movement.¹⁴⁹ That would not come for a couple years. To Ohio Indians’ ears, the Iroquois Plot echoed the Walking Purchase and Iroquois’ desire to act as uncles instead of copartners in the Covenant Chain. Thus, some time after the secret conference,

¹⁴⁵ Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, June 21, 1761, *PHB*, V, 569-571. Cochrane hurried this report to Bouquet, Cochrane to Bouquet, Presque Isle, June 24, 1761, *PHB*, V, 577-578.

¹⁴⁶ Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, June 27, 1761, *PHB*, V, 582-583.

¹⁴⁷ Later Bouquet admitted that he believed Campbell’s warnings, despite messages to the contrary. Bouquet to Campbell, Pittsburgh, June 30, 1761, *PHB*, V, 596-597.

¹⁴⁸ Bouquet, Proclamation Enrolling Militia, Pittsburgh, June 29, 1761, *PHB*, V, 593-594.

¹⁴⁹ McConnell discussed a lack of “ethnic unity.” McConnell, *A Country Between*, 173.

Wyandot elders took the other Ohio headmen and even the Iroquois brokers to Campbell's house. The Wyandot headmen surrendered to Campbell the war hatchet and a red wampum war belt, as a testimony to the good relations the two groups had brokered at Detroit. An Iroquois broker confessed that the Wyandot Indians had given his people a new heart and he would take the message of peace back to the Iroquois. Still, the Iroquois remained opposed to British operations in Cherokee Country and wished that the Ohio Indians would not join in that war.¹⁵⁰ To British ears, this surrender only confirmed that the Iroquois Plot was real, that the Iroquois retained sovereignty over Cherokee Country, and they wanted to strengthen those claims over the Ohio Indians. More immediately, the conference revealed that the Ohio Indians could potentially mount a formidable campaign against the British occupation.¹⁵¹ As Ourry put it, "[T]here Certainly is no trusting them at any time."¹⁵² Thus, although the Wyandots revealed the Iroquois Plot, the very fact that they had participated in a secret conference already tainted relations between the Royal Army and the Western Indians.

As the dust settled from the Iroquois Plot, Royal military personnel launched a vigorous campaign to reclaim all captives. Meanwhile, the army made further reductions in gift giving and provisioning. As Monckton put it, "Should the Delawares & Shawnee Comply with their Engagements, in bringing in the Prisoners, Some small Presents must of Necessity be given them, but in that, I must beg that it may be with the Greatest frugality."¹⁵³ Bouquet reported that the Delawares and the Shawnees could not even

¹⁵⁰ Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, July 7, 1761, *PHB*, V, 618-620; Cochrane, "Uneasiness of the Iroquois," Pittsburgh, July 27, 1761, *PHB*, V, 664-665.

¹⁵¹ Bouquet to Campbell, Pittsburgh, July 9, 1761, *PHB*, V, 621-623; Cochrane to Bouquet, Presque Isle, July 9, 1761, *PHB*, V, 623-624; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 174-175; Perdue, "Cherokee Relations with the Iroquois," 143-145.

¹⁵² Ourry to Bouquet, Fort Bedford, July 10, 1761, *PHB*, V, 628-629.

¹⁵³ Monckton to Bouquet, Philadelphia, July 13, 1761, *PHB*, V, 632.

agree among themselves how best to return captives. Thus, Bouquet revoked trading licenses to several Indian villages, until those Indians surrendered captives and stopped stealing British horses.¹⁵⁴ Campbell opposed the coercive tactics that Amherst, Bouquet, and Monckton were adopting. As he stated in a letter to Bouquet:

[Y]oull see how well disposed the Indians in this quarter are at present, and I think its our own fault we dont keep them in their present disposition & by keeping them in our interests, we secure all the Northern Nations who are entirely influenced by the Nations here.¹⁵⁵

But few other military personnel shared Campbell's position. Monckton approved the trade restrictions that Bouquet had imposed, arguing that the Indians would not surrender captives or halt horse theft until necessity compelled them.¹⁵⁶ More dangerously, Amherst discredited the Iroquois Plot, believing that Indians were too weak and too stupid to organize an attack against the Redcoats. In that light, he encouraged the army to adopt even more coercive tactics to bring the Ohio Indians into compliance with imperial goals. "[B]y all Means," Amherst urged, "keep them Scarce of Powder."¹⁵⁷

Through the autumn of 1761, Ohio natives uttered a litany of complaints against the British imperial system. They complained that colonial traders did not abide by the army's trading regulations, and they felt themselves to be the victims of extortion. This complaint compelled William Johnson to restate British trading policy. Despite

¹⁵⁴ Bouquet to Monckton, Pittsburgh, July 24, 1761, *PHB*, V, 654-655.

¹⁵⁵ Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, July 30, 1761, *PHB*, V, 672-673.

¹⁵⁶ Monckton to Bouquet, New York, August 24, 1761, *PHB*, V, 715-716; Bouquet to Monckton, Pittsburgh, September 10, 1761, *PHB*, V, 746-748.

¹⁵⁷ Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, September 17, 1761, *PHB*, V, 757-758.

Johnson's efforts to create a more equitable trade, Amherst's orders to withhold gun powder began to have a visible effect in early October, the beginning of the hunting season.¹⁵⁸ By mid-October, the effects of this powder shortage had reached Detroit. Campbell warned, "I am certain if the Indians knew General Amherst's Sentiments about keeping them Short of Powder it would be impossible to keep them in temper." Late in November, Campbell begged Amherst to allow the sale of gun powder to natives so they could complete their hunts.¹⁵⁹ As autumn progressed, the Ohio Indians grew increasingly restless, not least because colonial hunters had depleted the region's deer population. So unstable was the situation that Bouquet did not feel that he could safely leave Pittsburgh to tend to his plantations in South Carolina.¹⁶⁰ To abate native discontent, Bouquet issued the Proclamation Line, which halted colonial expansion and hunting in the trans-Allegheny west. Yet, without ammunition, the Indians still could not carry out their ordinary hunting rituals.¹⁶¹ Unfair trading practices, an artificial powder shortage, and territorial encroachments not only violated British treaty promises but now threatened Native Americans' means of subsistence.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁸ For material relating to Johnson, see Johnson to Bouquet, Detroit, September 18, 1761, *PHB*, V, 761; Indian Trade Regulations, Fort Pitt, September 18, 1761, *PHB*, V, 762-763. For additional complaints against traders, see Croghan to Hutchins, Pittsburgh, October 25, 1761, *PHB*, V, 841-842. For Amherst's policies, see Blane to Bouquet, Ligonier, October 4, 1761, *PHB*, V, 795; Ourry to Bouquet, Fort Bedford, October 4, 1761, *PHB*, V, 795-796.

¹⁵⁹ Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, October 12, 1761, *PHB*, V, 815-816. For more on the dearth of gunpowder, see Croghan to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, December 10, 1762 *PHB*, V, 137-138; Croghan to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, January 8, 1763, *PHB*, V, 139-140; Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, November 8, 1761, *PHB*, VI, 26; Campbell to Amherst, Detroit, November 8, 1761, *PHB*, VI, 28-29; Campbell to Bouquet, Detroit, November 28, 1761, *PHB*, VI, 32.

¹⁶⁰ Bouquet to Gually, Pittsburgh, October 18, 1761, *PHB*, V, 827-828.

¹⁶¹ McDonald to Bouquet, Fort Burd, October 25, 1761, *PHB*, V, 840; Bouquet, Proclamation Against Settlers, Pittsburgh, October 28, 1761, *PHB*, V, 844; Bouquet to Livingston, Pittsburgh, February 6, 1762, *PHB*, VI, 44. Colin G. Calloway, *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 48-56.

¹⁶² Bouquet understood that the Indians' complaints were derived from promises made by the state at the Easton Conference, and what action he took to abate discontent was derived from a sense of obligation imposed by the Easton Treaty. Bouquet to Fauquier, Pittsburgh, February 8, 1762, *PHB*, V, 44-45. For an analysis of Amherst's trading policies, see White, *The Middle Ground*, 265-267.

By March of 1762, the Ohio natives had returned to their villages from a hunting season made dismal by lack of ammunition. To silence their more boisterous expressions of discontent, Bouquet forbade the sale of alcohol to Native Americans in the Ohio Territory and began removing unlicensed traders from the region.¹⁶³ Days later, Amherst reasserted his belief that Indians did not threaten British territorial holdings and ordered a vast reduction of soldiers stationed at Presque Isle and Venango. As he put it, “[T]here being Nothing to fear from the Indians in our present Circumstances.”¹⁶⁴ This very false belief allowed Amherst to reduce Indian expenditures and complain that Croghan had wasted money on gift giving. Croghan refuted this charge,

I have examined the Copy of my last Years Accounts and find that not one third of the Expencc accrued here and that chiefly in Presents to such Indians as delivered up Prisoners, and for Indians Services Escorting Provisions to the other posts and passing Indian Expresses, the rest of my Account Accrued at D’troit in Provisions for the Conference by Sir William Johnson[’]s Order.¹⁶⁵

Indeed, Croghan calculated that already Ohio Indians had returned 411 English prisoners to Pittsburgh and 31 to neighboring towns and villages.¹⁶⁶ As Amherst whittled away at the Easton Treaty, Indians increasingly felt compelled to protect their hunting grounds from colonial intruders. In April 1762, Indians burned hunting cabins that colonists had

¹⁶³ Bouquet, Copy of General Order, Pittsburgh, March 1, 1762, *PHB*, V, 49-50; Blane to Bouquet, Ligonier, March 6, 1762, *PHB*, V, 51-52; Bouquet to Amherst, Pittsburgh, March 7, 1762, *PHB*, V, 52-53; Blane to Bouquet, Ligonier, April 21, 1762 *PHB*, V, 80-81. The ban on alcohol originated in the mind of Amherst; Bouquet only implemented the policy, see White, *The Middle Ground*, 265-266.

¹⁶⁴ Amherst to Bouquet, New York, March 2, 1762, *PHB*, V, 50-51.

¹⁶⁵ Croghan to Bouquet, near Pittsburgh, March 27, 1762, *PHB*, VI, 68-70.

¹⁶⁶ Croghan, Return of Prisoners, October 9, 1762, *PHB*, VI, 121. Wainwright gave a thorough analysis of the problems Amherst’s trading policies caused Croghan. See *George Croghan*, 184-200.

built illegally in the trans-Allegheny zone. If the army refused to enforce the Proclamation Line, then Native Americans would.¹⁶⁷

Amherst did not interpret these attacks on hunting cabins for what they were: the resumption of the frontier raids that had earlier ravaged western Pennsylvania and Virginia. Instead, Amherst reiterated his prohibition on alcohol and powder sales.

I would Deal it [ammunition] very Sparingly to the Indians so long as the War Continues, & that they can have any Excuse of being Set on by Our Enemies.—The Total prohibition of Rum, will, I am hopefull (*sic*), have Such an Effect on the Indians, as to make them Turn their thoughts on purchasing of the Traders, What will be More Beneficial to themselves and Familys; and I am Sure it will prevent their being guilty of Many Crimes, Which in their Liquor, they were too apt to Committ.¹⁶⁸

Building on Amherst's insights, Bouquet quickly halted gift giving until the Ohio Indians returned all captives.¹⁶⁹ By August 1762 and winter fast approaching, Bouquet faced an unprecedented problem in provisioning the western forts. This dearth of provisions became a justification to cut off all supplies to Native Americans. As Bouquet explained it, "[T]hey will not Dare to Offer any Violence now that we can so easily retaliate upon them."¹⁷⁰

Through autumn 1762, the army sent Indians away from its fortifications, without food or basic supplies. Whereas the Ohio Indians had not developed an oppositional

¹⁶⁷ A. McDonald to Bouquet, Fort Burd, April 8, 1762, *PHB*, VI, 74-75; A. McDonald to Bouquet, Fort Burd, April 15, 1762, *PHB*, VI, 78-79.

¹⁶⁸ Amherst to Bouquet, New York, May 2, 1762, *PHB*, VI, 81-83. Amherst reiterated this directive even more forcibly in January 1763. See Queries From Bouquet with Amherst's Answers, January 10-11, 1763, *PHB*, V, 143-148.

¹⁶⁹ Bouquet to Amherst, Pittsburgh, July 11, 1762, *PHB*, VI, 99-100. For the effects of this policy on Native society, see Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 537-538; White, *The Middle Ground*, 266-268.

¹⁷⁰ Bouquet to F. Gordon, Pittsburgh, August 24, 1762, *PHB*, VI, 109-110.

consciousness at the time of the Iroquois Plot, now they threatened to burn Fort Venango and other British strongholds. Officer Gordon reported that he had sent 36 Mingo warriors away from Venango, because he had no provisions to spare. The warriors called him a liar, ravaged his cornfields, stole corn, and threatened to do more violence.¹⁷¹ Croghan explained that the Indians were disappointed in not receiving the same amount of presents that they had grown accustomed to receiving from the French and English in the past.¹⁷² But neither Amherst nor Bouquet cared. Soon, the army received intelligence that the Iroquois Plot had never completely evaporated. Now, rumor that the French government had surrendered the Ohio Territory to the British precipitated the Ohio Indians to resurrect Tahiadoris' call for a pan-Indian alliance. Thus began what historians call Pontiac's War.¹⁷³

In late November 1762, Bouquet received intelligence that the Ohio Indians had restructured the Iroquois Plot into a more narrowly defined alliance between Delaware, Mingo, and Shawnee Indians. The report read:

There haveing (*sic*) been a private Council held last Spring by the Mingo (*sic*) and the Chiefs of the Delawares it was then agreed between them to Strike the English now liveing (*sic*) in their Country, and in order to get all the other Nations to join them in this undertaking, they had Secretly Sent a large Belt with a bloody Hatchet over the Lakes which had now pass'd through the Several nations Residing that way, and was lastly delivered to their Nation by some of the Principal Men of the Shawnese (*sic*). But that no Nation had take hold of it but the Mongoes (*sic*), Delawares, and Shawnese (*sic*).¹⁷⁴

¹⁷¹ F. Gordon to Bouquet, Venango, September 19, 1762, *PHB*, VI, 112-113.

¹⁷² Croghan to Bouquet, November 25, 1762, *PHB*, V, 136-137. This led to Croghan's resignation as William Johnson's assistant. See Wainwright, *George Croghan*, 201-202.

¹⁷³ McConnell, *A Country Between*, 181.

¹⁷⁴ McKee to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, November 22, 1762, *PHB*, V, 133.

Just as Amherst had dismissed the Iroquois Plot, so now Bouquet dismissed the possibility that the Ohio Indians could mount a campaign against the British fortification system. As he put it, “The whole will vanish into Smoke & will only Serve as a Warning for us to be very vigilant as we see so plainly that there is no dependence upon the faith of treaties with these Savages.”¹⁷⁵ Croghan explained that the Indians “Never Intended to make Warr on y^e English Butt Say its full time for them to prepair to Defend themselves & thire (*sic*) Coutry (*sic*) from us who...Designe (*sic*) make Warr on them.”¹⁷⁶ Although the British never intended to wage war against Ohio Indians, Amherst’s trading policies had created almost unbearable conditions that made basic subsistence difficult. Through the early months of 1763, the Royal Army persistently refused to supply Native Americans with gun powder, inhibiting their ability to hunt for subsistence.¹⁷⁷

Bouquet’s correspondence of spring 1763 is littered with admissions that the Native Americans were not comfortable with the transition from French to British rule. “It was natural,” Bouquet mused, “to expect that the Indians would express Some uneasiness at the Cessions made in their Country by France.”¹⁷⁸ Military personnel complied with Amherst’s directives to reduce gifts and not to reward Indians for fulfilling minimal obligations, such as returning captives. Thus, Ecuyer refused to give Indians gifts when they returned 10 horses to Pittsburgh, for he assumed that they were only returning stolen property. Instead, he allowed them to pick some corn and then sent them

¹⁷⁵ Bouquet to Ecuyer, Bedford, November 25, 1762, *PHB*, V, 135.

¹⁷⁶ Croghan to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, December 10, 1762, *PHB*, V, 137-138.

¹⁷⁷ McKee, Indian Conference Minutes, Pittsburgh, April 16, 1763, *PHB*, V, 182-186. Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 535. Richard White noted that denial of the rum trade angered Indians. See *The Middle Ground*, 264-267.

¹⁷⁸ Bouquet to Amherst, Philadelphia, May 19, 1763, *PHB*, V, 190-191; Bouquet to Sharpe, Philadelphia, May 21, 1763, *PHB*, V, 191.

away. Upon their departure, the Indians stole £300 worth of pelts, stole three horses and rum, and assaulted a passerby.¹⁷⁹ Next day, at a Pittsburgh sawmill, Indians murdered and scalped two men and then fled away with stolen horses. Ominously, they left a tomahawk behind—a sign of war. Now Ecuyer reported, “I think the uprising is general; I tremble for our posts. I think according to reports that I am surrounded by Indians... and I believe we shall be attacked tomorrow morning.”¹⁸⁰ This was Bouquet’s first confirmation that what he once called “Some uneasiness” had actually taken on a material and violent form.

Warring in the Ohio Territory

Going back to the days of Francis Parkman, most historians have placed Pontiac at the center of the Indian war that erupted in 1763. Though not wholly unwarranted, this method portrays Pontiac as a great man, while not taking into account the varied reasons individual Indian bands waged war and sought peace.¹⁸¹ Moreover, most British military officials had never heard of Pontiac until the war reached its final stages. Only the most intuitive British brokers imagined that the postwar trading policies had upset the position of tribal elders, allowing Pontiac to organize young warriors into a pan-Indian alliance. Few men understood that Amherst’s coercive policies were at the root of the Indians’ discontent. So, it cannot be surprising that British brokers tried desperately to resurrect the Chain of Friendship with the Indian chiefs, despite their increasing lack of tribal

¹⁷⁹ Ecuyer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, May 29, 1763, *PHB*, V, 193.

¹⁸⁰ Ecuyer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, May 30, 1763, *PHB*, V, 195-196.

¹⁸¹ For the historiographical legacy of Francis Parkman, see Francis Jennings, “Francis Parkman: A Brahmin among Untouchables,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 42 (July 1985), 305-328. Building on Jennings critique of Parkman, see Brandão, “*Your fyre shall burn no more*”, 5-18. Despite efforts to repudiate Parkman, Pontiac’s legacy as a great war hero persists in the scholarship of Gregory Dowd. See *War Under Heaven*, 5-9.

power. As Pontiac's War expanded, Bouquet grew increasingly pessimistic that anything less than military coercion could restore British sovereignty.¹⁸²

In early June 1763, a false rumor began circulating that Chippewa and Ottawa Indians had killed all the British at forts Detroit and Sandusky. This rumor was only believable because just days before Indians had indeed slaughtered Colonel William Clapham, along with most of his soldiers, in proximity to Pittsburgh. Fear gripped Pennsylvania's frontier settlers, and over 250 men, along with women and children, fled to Fort Pitt for refuge and protection. Captain Simeon Ecuyer feared that small bands of Indians were within only one-mile of Pittsburgh, which had very little flour. Bouquet insisted that Indians would never attempt an open attack on Fort Pitt, such as he had allowed Grant to attempt in 1758. Even so, Bouquet warned that a surprise attack could unfold. The same situation occurred at Fort Ligonier, where Indians had shot at the fort and then hurried into the woods. Bouquet could not estimate how many Indians were actually in rebellion. For the meantime, he halted all personnel and supply movement, fearing that both might perish from Enemy attacks.¹⁸³

Upon learning of what he called "the insurrection," Amherst lamented what he saw as the army's responsibility for it. As he explained, "We Ourselves Supply them with Powder & Lead." Immediately, Amherst gave instructions for how to end the insurrection: "[T]he only true Method of treating those Savages, is to keep them in proper subjection, & punish, without Exception, the Transgressors." Amherst's interpretation

¹⁸² Ecuyer, Speech to the Indians, Pittsburgh, May 29, 1763, *PHB*, V, 196-197; Dowd, *War Under Heaven*, 211-212. The following analysis takes Francis Jennings approach for dealing with Pontiac, placing him in a larger social context. See *Empire of Fortune*, 442-444.

¹⁸³ Ecuyer, Speech to the Indians, Pittsburgh, May 29, 1763, *PHB*, V, 196-197; Colhoon, Indian Intelligence from Tuscarawas, Pittsburgh, June 1, 1763, *PHB*, V, 197-199; Bouquet to Ecuyer, Philadelphia, June 5, 1763, *PHB*, V, 208; Ecuyer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, June 2, 1763, *PHB*, V, 202-203; Blane to Bouquet, Ligonier, June 4, 1763, *PHB*, V, 206-207; Bouquet to Amherst, Philadelphia, June 4, 1763, *PHB*, V, 205-206; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 540-541.

and solution for the war were unfortunate, because they only exacerbated the causes of the conflict. More perplexing, Amherst denied that the Ohio Indians were in rebellion. Instead, he insisted that the Senecas had launched isolated attacks, in fulfillment of the Iroquois Plot. All this was imaginary.¹⁸⁴

As Amherst mused on the Senecas' misdeeds, Croghan reported that almost all the Delaware Indians were now in rebellion. In fact, the Delawares were merely enforcing the terms of the Easton Treaty by forcing illegal Connecticut squatters from their land in the Wyoming Valley. Governor Hamilton had already ordered these squatters to depart from the region; now, the Indians enforced that order.¹⁸⁵ Bouquet blamed the Quakers for the Delawares' operation, for they had advanced the Delaware cause at the Easton conference. As Bouquet put it,

The Quakers are very busy here in poisoning People's Minds wth the notion that your Settlements at the Yioghiogheny & Allegheny are the true Causes of the War, but I have demonstrated So clearly the falsity of that opinion, that none but their adherents will give it any Credit.¹⁸⁶

But the Quakers had not incited the Indian war. Like Amherst, Bouquet could not imagine that the Ohio Indians actually had mounted a campaign against the Royal Army. Now that such a campaign had begun, Bouquet invented the fiction that Quaker agitators were culpable for the war, not Native Americans. Effectively, this reversed the alliance

¹⁸⁴ Amherst to Bouquet, New York, June 6, 1763, *PHB*, V, 209-210; Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 441.

¹⁸⁵ Croghan to Bouquet, Carlisle, June 8, 1763, *PHB*, V, 210.

¹⁸⁶ Bouquet to Croghan, Philadelphia, June 14, 1763, *PHB*, V, 223-224.

that Forbes had formed with the Quakers at Easton and prepared the way for a new alliance with the Iroquois Confederation.¹⁸⁷

Bouquet's Quaker conspiracy was one of the first causalities in Pontiac's War, and military personnel gradually admitted the gravity of Pontiac's threat. Some early evidence indicated that French agitators had conspired with the Ohio Indians to attack the British posts. By mid-June, Amherst admitted that the war was broader than he had first admitted, but he still denied that Indians could siege Fort Detroit. To counter the Indian war, Amherst ordered Major Campbell to complete the 42nd and the 77th regiments.¹⁸⁸ As things worsened, Amherst admitted that the natives had ingeniously combined European siege tactics with raids and guerilla warfare, thereby mounting a formidable threat to the Royal army. To counter this, Amherst instructed Bouquet to use unrestrained force to repulse the Indians from the Pennsylvania and Virginia settlements. As he explained it,

I hope to see you soon [at] the head of some regiments, for if small parties are sent out one after another as before, and if they are cut off, this careless kind of war will cost us an endless number of men. That is why they must be driven back by one single stroke and exterminated.¹⁸⁹

Couched in this directive was the increasingly prevalent assumption that Native Americans could not live in proximity to Britons. To Amherst and Bouquet,

¹⁸⁷ For efforts to blame the war on Croghan, the Quakers, or some other non Indian entity, see Wainright, *George Croghan*, 199. The details of this alliance have not received systematic treatment, but the Iroquois appear between the lines of almost every document of this period. For the effects of the alliance William Johnson brokered between the Iroquois Confederation and the Royal Army, see Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 451-452; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 261-262.

¹⁸⁸ Croghan to Bouquet, Shippensburg, June 11, 1763, *PHB*, V, 218-219; Amherst to Bouquet, New York, June 12, 1763, *PHB*, V, 220-221; Amherst to Hamilton, New York, June 19, 1763, *PHB*, V, 242; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 541.

¹⁸⁹ Amherst, Report of Monro and Barr, New York, June 16, 1763, *PHB*, V, 231-233.

extermination seemed more preferable than the two groups replicating the French *pays d'en haut* and living in a world of cultural compromise and exchange. Here began the logic of the Early Republic's removal policy.¹⁹⁰

By mid-June, the capacity of Native Americans to mount a formidable war against the British occupation was beyond doubt. Report after report confirmed that Indians had destroyed colonists' fields and villages, and settlers had evacuated the Pennsylvania frontier, just as in 1756 and 1757. Once more, Indians began taking children captive.¹⁹¹ Reports had it that orphans and women filled the streets of Carlisle, creating "a Scene of Horror painful to Humanity, & impossible to describe."¹⁹² On 22 June, Indians attacked homesteads, farmers, fences, and livestock that surrounded Fort Pitt. Then, Indians surrounded the fort, unleashed fire at its bastions, and killed one soldier. Other soldiers returned fire and killed one Indian.¹⁹³ But gunfire for gunfire does not win wars. By early July, Bouquet slowly realized that the pan-Indian alliance held the upper hand against the Royal Army. Indeed, guerilla tactics had now cost the British forts LeBoeuf, Presque Isle, and Venango.¹⁹⁴ Fearing the worst, Bouquet advised Governor Hamilton to suspend participatory government, implement marshal law, and relocate Pennsylvanians to specified garrisoned towns, much like Fort Pitt. Hamilton presented Bouquet's recommendations to the Pennsylvania Assembly, but due to fiscal and time constraints, the Assembly's principal response was to allocate money for the

¹⁹⁰ Dowd, *War Under Heaven*, 196-199.

¹⁹¹ Ourry to Bouquet, Fort Bedford, June 20, 1763, *PHB*, V, 243-244; Bouquet to Amherst, Philadelphia, June 22, 1763, *PHB*, V, 245.

¹⁹² Bouquet to Hamilton, Carlisle, July 13, 1763, *PHB*, V, 307-308.

¹⁹³ Ecuyer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, June 26, 1763, *PHB*, V, 259-260.

¹⁹⁴ Bouquet to Ecuyer, Carlisle, July 4, 1763, *PHB*, V, 293-295.

raising of 700 provincial troops.¹⁹⁵ Pontiac's War actually threatened the colonial constitutional system far more than any requisitioning orders ever had.

The Seven Years' War marked the first time the British state organized territorial expansion, which introduced forms of land usages that were antithetical to native hunting practices. For the British, fences were the most visible symbols of territorial ownership. For example, upon taking possession of Fort Pitt, settlers divided the surrounding lands by putting up fences.¹⁹⁶ Now, in this war against British occupation, Native Americans launched a systematic attack on Europeans' fences. At Ligonier, farmers locked their cattle in barns, fearing that Indians would disembowel them. Still, Indians pillaged Ligonier homesteads, tearing down almost every fence in the area and destroying livestock. So too at Bedford, Indians set about destroying fences and upsetting farmers' herds. As Blane put it, "[I]n the evening the Indians drove off all our Cows, entirely owing to the destruction of the Fences."¹⁹⁷ By autumn, fence destruction had become so prevalent that Amherst ordered the military to slaughter and salt all cattle, in order to preempt Natives from tearing down fences and disemboweling livestock. Acts of fence

¹⁹⁵ Bouquet gave these recommendations in response to a request from Governor Hamilton. See Bouquet to Hamilton, Carlisle, July 3, 1763, *PHB*, V, 290-291. For Hamilton's response, see Hamilton to Bouquet, Philadelphia, July 12, 1763, *PHB*, V, 305-307; Hamilton to Bouquet, Philadelphia, July 6, 1763, *PHB*, V, 298-299. Bouquet's suggestion that Hamilton suspend ordinary constitutional governance was not an overblown effort to install a garrison state. Rather, most frontier inhabitants had already fled for refuge and protection in military forts. Thus, Bouquet's suggestions amounted to a practical means of governance, given the large number of people who had fled to more garrisons than the state could reasonably supply. Bouquet wanted the inhabitants to remain in one place (a garrison) and out of harm's way. As he put it, "The Behaviour of the Inhabitants in so rashly throwing themselves into the Power of the Indians, without the least Intention & Resolution to defend themselves, is indeed very unaccountable, & attended with bad Consequences, as it encourages the Savages to repeat their Attempts." See, Bouquet to Ourry, Carlisle, July 4, 1763, *PHB*, V, 297.

¹⁹⁶ Ecuyer to Bouquet, Pittsburgh, March 11, 1763, *PHB*, V, 167-168. For an thorough analysis of land usage, see William Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983), 127-156; Timothy Silver, *A New Face on the Countryside: Indians, colonists, and slaves in South Atlantic forests, 1500-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 130-132.

¹⁹⁷ D. Campbell to Bouquet, Ligonier, July 17, 1763, *PHB*, V, 318; Blane to Bouquet, Ligonier, August 18, 1763, *PHB*, V, 365-366; A. Campbell to Bouquet, Fort Bedford, September 4, 1763, *PHB*, V, 381-382; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 541.

destruction pointed to a larger dichotomy between European and native cultures.

Whereas Europeans associated fences with civility, Native Americans perceived fences as barriers, threatening to hunting practices, and challenging to communal agriculture.¹⁹⁸

As Indians captured British forts, felled fences, disemboweled livestock, and raided colonial settlements, Royal military officials began describing these acts with prejudicial language that reinforced a barrier between the two groups. This language legitimized military efforts to push Native inhabitants west, away from colonial settlements, or kill them. First, Bouquet increasingly regretted earlier alliances with the Cherokee and Catawba Indians.¹⁹⁹ Then, after an Indian detachment killed Lieutenant Robertson, Amherst instructed his subordinates not to keep any Indian prisoners but rather to kill them.²⁰⁰ Soon Bouquet extended this logic to military tactics. That is, Bouquet reasoned that Native warriors had not abided by the rules of warfare, namely Eurocentric rules. Therefore, the Colonel felt justified in adopting so called extraordinary tactics. In this context, Bouquet petitioned the Maryland and Virginia governments raise regiments of backwoods hunters and woodsmen. These regiments would hunt down Indians, as though they were wild animals.²⁰¹ Later, Bouquet conjectured that English bloodhounds would work even better than hunters and woodsmen. Bouquet fantasized that “a few Instances of Indians Seized and worried by Dogs, would, I presume, deter them more effectually from a War with us, than all the Troops we could raise.”²⁰²

¹⁹⁸ Amherst to Bouquet, New York, September 25, 1763, *PHB*, V, 397-398; Silver, *A New Face on the Countryside*, 1130-132.

¹⁹⁹ Bouquet to Amherst, Lancaster, June 25, 1763, *PHB*, V, 255-256.

²⁰⁰ Amherst to Bouquet, New York, June 29, 1763, *PHB*, V, 277. In reference to these events, Richard White wrote, “It was a war of great brutality and small kindness.” See, White, *The Middle Ground*, 288.

²⁰¹ Bouquet to Hamilton, Carlisle, July 1, 1763, *PHB*, V, 279-282.

²⁰² Hughes to Bouquet, Lancaster, July 11, 1763, *PHB*, V, 304-305; Bouquet to Penn and the Provincial Commissioners, Philadelphia, June 4, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 554-555.

Amherst did not embrace the canine idea. Instead, Amherst advised Bouquet to use a primitive form of germ warfare against hostile Indians. Amherst explained the inoculation like this:

You will Do well to try to Innoculate (*sic*) the Indians, by means of Blankets, as well as to Try Every other Method, that can Serve to Extirpate this Execrable Race.—I should be very glad your Scheme for Hunting them down by Dogs could take Effect; but England is at too great a Distance to think of that at present.²⁰³

Days later Amherst repeated his request that Bouquet find a vector, through which to infect Native populations with smallpox. Bouquet ordered Simeon Ecuyer, Pittsburgh's commanding officer, to distribute smallpox laden blankets to Delaware chiefs, which eventually precipitated a limited smallpox outbreak.²⁰⁴ Awaiting these blankets to bear their poisonous fruit, Amherst instructed Bouquet to organize a campaign that would drive Native Americans from the Ohio Territory. Importantly, Amherst understood massacre as preferable to removal, though he reserved both options. Bouquet spent the following weeks organizing a Western Offensive, designed to "make them Suffer."²⁰⁵

The Battle of Bushy Run occurred only one week after Amherst had ordered Bouquet to infect Native Americans with smallpox. Early in August, Bouquet marched a Royal detachment from Carlisle toward Pittsburgh, intending to lift the siege on Fort Pitt.

²⁰³ Amherst, Memorandum, July 16, 1763, *PHB*, V, 315.

²⁰⁴ Amherst to Bouquet, New York, July 7, 1763, *PHB*, V, 299-300. A smallpox outbreak had weakened the Delaware Indians, and historians usually attribute it to the infected blankets. See Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 447-448; White, *The Middle Ground*, 288.

²⁰⁵ Lieutenant Colonel J. Robertson to Bouquet, Philadelphia, July 19, 1763 *PHB*, V, 322-323; Bouquet to Ecuyer, Bedford, July 26, 1763, *PHB*, V, 327-328; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 197.

On the afternoon of 5 August, a band of Indians attacked Bouquet's advance guard at Bushy Run. Immediately, members of the 42nd Regiment drove these attackers out from ambush but failed to follow their tracks. Later Indians resumed the assault, and Bouquet ordered his whole force to make a general charge that drove the Indians "from the Heights." Still, the Redcoats did not gain an advantage. As soldiers routed Indians from one hiding place, they reappeared again at another, until finally Indians surrounded Bouquet's soldiers. Having surrounded the Redcoats, the Indians then attacked the supply convoy in the rear, forcing their adversaries into retreat. As dusk descended, a battle erupted and both Indians and Redcoats unleashed an unrelenting attack. The Redcoats eventually repulsed the Indians but not without great loss to both the 42nd and 77th regiments. In all, Bouquet lost over sixty men, including rangers and drivers, thus ending the first day's battle.²⁰⁶

The Redcoats camped on a hill, dressed the wounded with flour bags, and awaited the next Indian attack. Before dawn, the Indians launched another attack on the British camp. Still exhausted and dehydrated, the Redcoats thwarted this attack but did not gain the upper hand. By now, the Indians had encircled the British troops, and with many horses already dead, the Light Infantry could not break through enemy lines. To maneuver out of this predicament, Bouquet ordered his troops into a formation that resembled a retreat, drawing the Indians into firing range. Meanwhile, Major Campbell and two companies withdrew behind a hill, out of the Indians' sight. Believing the British to be in retreat, the Indians ran toward the Redcoats. Unknowingly, the Indians ran into a British encircling maneuver, and Bouquet ordered Campbell's detachments to charge their flank. Later, Captain Bassett and his companies charged the Indians, forcing

²⁰⁶ Bouquet to Amherst, 26 miles from Pittsburgh, August 5, 1763, *PHB*, V, 338-339.

them to flee past the British front and exposing them to rounds of grapeshot. Unwilling to sacrifice their warriors, the Indians fled into the forest. Bouquet heralded the Indians' retreat as a British victory, and it may have been, but only to the extent that it cleared the way for the Redcoats to lift the siege on Fort Pitt. Still, Bouquet did not pursue his attackers or halt their ability to wage similar attacks on colonials, livestock, and fences. Repulsed at touching the bodies of dead savages, the Redcoats refused to take scalps. Bouquet had little more than self congratulations to show for his victory.²⁰⁷

Fearing British retaliation, Delawares and Shawnee headmen sent a delegation to Fort Pitt to sue for peace. These delegates explained that they had come to renew the ancient Chain of Friendship. One Indian explained that his people had waged war against the British to halt territorial expansion. As he put it,

Brothers you have Town's & places of your own; you know this is our Country; & that you having Possession of it must be offensive to all Nations therefore it would be proper, that you were in your own Country where our Friendship might always remain Undisturbed.²⁰⁸

The Delaware headmen explained that they had tried to halt the war, but the Western Indians had resisted the Chain of Friendship. For his part, Ecuyer repeated the Army's claim that territorial expansion was only to protect Native Americans and to facilitate trade. As for the accusation that the state had seized Indians' lands, Ecuyer explained,

²⁰⁷ Bouquet to Amherst, Bushy Run, August 6, 1763, *PHB*, V, 342-344. Following Bouquet's description, Francis Parkman and his disciples touted this as a great British victory. More recently, historians have interpreted this as just another Indian raid, this scoring a victory against the Redcoats. To claim British victory is only to assert that Bouquet made it to Pittsburgh, albeit with heavy losses. Even so, Bouquet attained his objective and relieved the fort. See Jennings, *Empire of Fortune*, 448-449; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 193-194.

²⁰⁸ Indian Speeches at Fort Pitt, Pittsburgh, July 26, 1763, *PHB*, V, 333-335.

“This is our Home, You have attacked us without reason or provocation, you have Murdered & plundered our Warriors and traders.”²⁰⁹ Whereas the Easton Conference had brought conciliation, now military policies had made it impossible for both Britons and Native Americans to coexist in the Ohio Territory. The Delaware and Shawnee envoys failed to initiate peace negotiations, because Bouquet could no longer make the compromises that were central to the middle ground.²¹⁰

“I Wish there was not an Indians Settlement within a Thousand Miles”

The Battle of Bushy Run sharpened Bouquet’s distrust of Native Americans, lending support to the underlying idea of the Western Offensive that Indians could no longer reside in proximity to colonists. Amherst defined two goals for the Western Offensive, which Bouquet would implement with an unwavering passion. First, the operation would shore up Britain’s territorial claims in the Ohio region. To that end, Amherst calculated that Bouquet should remove Natives west of the Muskingum River, preferably beyond the Ohio Territory. As he put it, “I Wish there was not an Indians Settlement within a Thousand Miles of our Country; for they are only fit to Live with the Inhabitants of the Woods, being more nearly Allied to the Brute than the Human Creation.” Second, Amherst demanded that Bouquet secure the release of all captives.²¹¹ Richard White argued that Pontiac’s War initiated the process of rebuilding British-Indian relations. As he put it, “Pontiac’s Rebellion was not the beginning of a racially

²⁰⁹ Ecuyer, Reply to Indians, Pittsburgh, August 2, 1763, *PHB*, V, 336-337.

²¹⁰ Bouquet to Amherst, Pittsburgh, August 11, 1763, *PHB*, V, 361-362. This interpretation differs significantly from that put forward by Richard White, who held that Pontiac’s War was a catalyst for the British and Native to rebuild the middle ground. In the broad sense that White intends, his interpretation may be true. However, in Bouquet’s mind, conciliation was no longer possible and extermination became the preferable means for dealing with the Ohio Indians. See White, *The Middle Ground*, 270.

²¹¹ Amherst to Bouquet, New York, August 7, 1763, *PHB*, V, 350-352.

foreordained Indian Demise; it was the beginning of the restoration of the middle ground.”²¹² However, neither Amherst nor Bouquet embarked on a mission to restore the world of intercultural exchange and compromise, precisely because the Royal Army would not obtain its “ends through force.”²¹³ Following Bushy Run, Bouquet’s correspondence grew increasingly acidic toward Native Americans, excluding him from a future middle ground. Indeed, Bouquet eventually grew hostile toward British military personnel, John Bradstreet, and others, who sought to broker an end to the Ohio War.

Amherst organized the Western Offensive, and Thomas Gage implemented it with minimal alterations. Amherst ordered Bouquet to lead a force from Pittsburgh to the Muskingum and Scioto rivers, which would obliterate Delaware, Mingo, and Shawnee villages. Colonel Stephen would complement Bouquet’s operation, by attacking the Shawnee Towns and Scioto.²¹⁴ Colonel Bradstreet would sail from Niagara to Detroit, from where his soldiers would liberate Green Bay and Michilimackinac.²¹⁵ William Johnson enlisted the aide of the Canadian Indians against the Ohio warriors, stirring up Amherst’s ire. As he explained, “I never will put the least Trust in any of the Indian Race.” Nevertheless, Amherst insisted that only Johnson would dictate peace terms, no one else.²¹⁶ As preparations for offensive operations began, George Croghan reported that that the Western Indians had ceased hostilities and had returned to peace. In this context, Croghan threatened to resign from the Indian Department, complaining that the

²¹² White, *The Middle Ground*, 270.

²¹³ For White, the middle ground hinged on the inability of Native Americans and Europeans to obtain what they wanted through coercion, thereby necessitating cultural exchange and compromise. See, *The Middle Ground*, 50-60, especially 52.

²¹⁴ Bouquet to Amherst, Pittsburgh, September 30, 1763, *PHB*, V, 403-405; Stephen to Bouquet, Winchester, October 10, 1763, *PHB*, V, 427-428.

²¹⁵ Bouquet to Amherst, Pittsburgh, September 30, 1763, *PHB*, V, 403-405; Stephen to Bouquet, Winchester, October 10, 1763, *PHB*, V, 427-428; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 618-619; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 197.

²¹⁶ Amherst to Bouquet, New York, September 25, 1763, *PHB*, V, 397-398.

army had ignored his opinions, intelligence, and the Indians' quest for peace.²¹⁷

However, Amherst, Bouquet, and Gage launched the Western Offensive not from military necessity but for the "Chastisement and Removal of that perverse Nation."²¹⁸

In mid-October of 1763, Pontiac led a delegation to Fort Detroit to sue for peace, marking the most direct contact Amherst and Bouquet ever had with this infamous instigator of the Ohio Indian War. Pontiac reported:

The word which my Father sent me to make peace, I have accepted; all my young men have buried their hatchets: I think that you will forget all the evil things which have occurred for some time past. Likewise, I shall forget what you have done to me, in order to think nothing but good.²¹⁹

Officer Gladwin listened but lacked authorization to finalize a peace settlement. He sent the Indians away, telling them that only Amherst could finalize a peace settlement. Then, writing Bouquet, Gladwin recommended that the army restore peace soon, lest war bankrupt the peltry trade. As he put it, "[T]he Expence of Such a War, which if it continued, the intire (*sic*) ruin of our Peltry trade must follow, and the loss of a prodigious Consumption of out Merchandises." Cynically, Gladwin recommended that Amherst could utterly destroy Natives, by simply allowing a free trade in rum. Like Smallpox, rum guaranteed to destroy the Indians, and Gladwin wished that traders could

²¹⁷ Croghan to Bouquet, Carlisle, October 11, 1763, *PHB*, V, 430-431; Wainwright, *George Croghan*, 201-202, 209-210.

²¹⁸ Bouquet to Stephen, Pittsburgh, October 23, 1763, *PHB*, V, 434-436.

²¹⁹ Pontiac to Gladwin and the Reply, Detroit, November 1, 1763, *PHB*, V, 449.

sell Indians an unlimited supply of it.²²⁰ The Ohio Indians were no longer capable of waging war and wanted a middle ground. Even so, Amherst, Bouquet, and Gladwin continued enlisting soldiers and organizing an operation to reclaim captives and force Indians west of the Muskingum and Scioto rivers.²²¹

By autumn of 1763, Bouquet admitted that he lacked sufficient manpower to wage the Western Offensive. Foremost, a mutiny among the regulars had depleted the Redcoats, leaving too few soldiers to launch the offensive.²²² Second, both the Pennsylvania and Virginia assemblies had refused to finance provincial regiments. After the Indians sued for peace, the assemblies saw no need to finance further warfare. After all, the Royal army was conducting operations on western lands, lands even removed from the Ohio Company's speculations. Thus, as winter set in, Bouquet decided to delay the Western Offensive until spring, but he refused to give it up completely. He explained the dilemma to Gage, "It was too late in the Year to think of any further operations this Way, but if you don't think proper to grant Peace to the Indians, The Same Plan may be pursued with your approbation next Spring." Meanwhile, the Colonel continued to hope that the assemblies would finance future military exploits, however purposeless they were. Bouquet wrote, "[I]n my humble opinion, the only certainty we can have of a lasting Peace with Savages, is not to grant it [peace] to them, but at the Head of Such Forces as must convince them of our ability to chastise them if they break it."²²³ Now,

²²⁰ Gladwin to Bouquet, Detroit, November 1, 1763, *PHB*, V, 445-446. For prohibitions on the rum trade, see White, *The Middle Ground*, 259.

²²¹ Bouquet to Amherst, received by Gage, Pittsburgh, December 1, 1763, *PHB*, V, 472; Gage to Bouquet, New York, December 22, 1763, *PHB*, V, 481-482.

²²² Peter Way "Rebellion of the Regulars: Working Soldiers and the Mutiny of 1763-1764," *William & Mary Quarterly* 57: 4 (Oct., 2000), pp. 761-792.

²²³ Bouquet to Gage, Pittsburgh, December 27, 1763, *PHB*, V, 486-487. Bouquet demanded that his subordinates not accept Indians' please for peace or re-open the Indian trade. See, for example

retribution, far more than strategic necessity, explained Bouquet's inability to give up plans for the Western Offensive, which he perceived to be the only certain means to end captivity and establish a barrier between colonial and native worlds.

In winter of 1764, Gage remained committed to waging the Western Offensive, and he forbade any peace settlements. To these ends, Gage initiated a diplomatic strategy that engaged the Iroquois as uncles to their warring Ohio nephews, undermining the spirit of the Easton conference but harkening back to the Covenant Chain. Gage conspired with William Johnson to enlist the Iroquois Confederacy in the Western Offensive. Provided the Confederation reigned in dissident Senecas, Johnson would allow them to participate in military operations that would restore their hegemonic claims over the Ohio Indians. As Gage explained it, "I am endeavouring if possible to draw some of our Friendly Savages into the Quarrell, by falling upon the Shawnese and Delawares—which they promise to do, and I hope, will bring in some of their Scalps."²²⁴ Bouquet endorsed this, mostly because it would quiet the rebellious Seneca faction.²²⁵ By spring, Gage confirmed that the Iroquois Confederacy would send between 150 and 200 warriors to assist Bouquet in the Western Offensive. Now, Gage had put Royal muscle behind the Iroquois Confederacy's imagined status as uncles over the Delaware and Shawnee

Bouquet, Instruction to W. Grant, January 19, 1764, *PHB*, V, 491-492; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 618-619.

²²⁴ Gage to Bouquet, New York, January 26, 1764, *PHB*, V, 493. Richard White pointed out that William Johnson already preferred accommodation instead of further war, and Gage accepted some of Johnson's arguments, *The Middle Ground*, 290.

²²⁵ Bouquet to Gage, Bedford, February 4, 1764, *PHB*, V, 494-495. Johnson brought the Seneca into the British alliance and secured a large land grant in the Niagara region. Gage to Bouquet, New York, April 19, 1764, *PHB*, V, 517-519.

people. With Johnson's help, the Iroquois had finally gained the upper hand against the Easton Treaty and restored the Covenant Chain.²²⁶

By spring of 1764, the Delaware, Shawnee, and many other Western Indians suspected that the British would indeed sponsor an Iroquois ploy to regain sovereignty over the Ohio natives. Now, threatened by starvation, the Ohio Indians wore animal skins and had little ammunition, because their French suppliers had dried up. To make matters worse, they had been unable to determine a new diplomatic course, following the army's rejection of their peace initiatives.²²⁷ Having ratified the Iroquois alliance, Gage instructed colonels Bouquet and Bradstreet to begin preparations for the Western Offensive. Bouquet would launch an attack on Muskingum and Scioto villages. Bradstreet would prepare the Connecticut and Jersey regiments to move against Sandusky. Gage hoped that Bouquet and Bradstreet would break the Western Indians' strength, force a surrender of their captives, and then push them west of the Mississippi River. After routing the Ohio tribes, Iroquois claims to sovereignty over them would become meaningless, giving the Royal army control in the region.²²⁸ In all, Gage had transformed the goal of confirming Britain's territorial claims to a more chilling effort of building "a Barrier impenetrable to savages."²²⁹

²²⁶ Gage to Bouquet, New York, April 4, 1764, *PHB*, V, 506-508; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 235-238.

²²⁷ Deposition of Gershom Hicks, Pittsburgh, April 14, 1764, *PHB*, V, 514-516. Bouquet acknowledged the Seneca alliance. See Bouquet to Gage, Carlisle, May 2, 1764, *PHB*, V, 532-534; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 626.

²²⁸ Gage to Bouquet, New York, April 19, 1764, *PHB*, V, 517-519; Bouquet to Gage, Carlisle, May 2, 1764, *PHB*, V, 532-534; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 197-200; White, *The Middle Ground*, 290-291.

²²⁹ Bouquet to Gage, Philadelphia, May 20, 1764, *PHB*, V, 543. Later Bouquet stated that the goal was to destroy Native American villages. Bouquet to Johnson, Philadelphia, May 31, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 551-553.

Over the next weeks, however, Sir William Johnson guided Indian diplomacy along a slightly less coercive path than Gage anticipated. In early July, Johnson and several Iroquois headmen arrived at Fort Niagara. There Johnson confirmed a peace settlement with Ottawa, Huron, Caughnawaga, Chippewa, and Sac and Fox nations. Johnson reported that he had brokered a peace with the “greater part of the Western Indians.” The arrangement gave the Iroquois Confederacy ostensible control over these Indians, by resurrecting Iroquois status as uncles in the Covenant Chain. Gage acknowledged that the Iroquois resented the Easton Treaty and the autonomy it gave the Delaware and Shawnee tribes.²³⁰ Now, the Iroquois harnessed Johnson’s diplomatic skills to restore their hegemony, which the Quakers had chiseled away five years earlier.

On August 12, a band of Delaware, Shawnee, Munsee, Ohio Seneca, and Wyandot chiefs approached Colonel John Bradstreet’s camp at Presque Isle. Together, they represented the tribes from Sandusky, Muskingum, and the Scioto plains. These chiefs had come to sue for peace. Bradstreet flaunted the army’s ability to “revenge the Insults and injuries done to the English.” Lacking ammunition, Delaware and Shawnee headmen had already recalled their warriors and halted frontier raids. Bradstreet harnessed the chiefs’ unwillingness to continue fighting to increase his personal power in Great Lakes region. Shrewdly, Bradstreet offered a three pronged peace deal. First, he required the signatory tribes to surrender all captives, even those adopted. As he put it, “[A]nd should there be any unwilling to leave you they must be oblig’d to come [back to the English].” Second, he demanded that the Indians liberate British fortifications,

²³⁰ John Penn, A council held at Philadelphia, July 6, 1764, *Colonial Records*, IX, 189-190; Johnson to Bouquet, German Flats, June 18, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 572-573; Johnson to Bouquet, Johnson Hall, September 1, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 625. For the Iroquois’ jealousy, see Gage to Bouquet, New York, October 1, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 651; White, *The Middle Ground*, 291.

namely LeBoeuf, Presque Isle, and Venango. In the future, the Ohio Indians would relinquish lands for British fortifications and infrastructure. Finally, Bradstreet required the Indians to accept military jurisdiction, ostensibly meaning they would live under Bradstreet's personal lordship. More concretely, if any Indian should kill an Englishman or plunder his property, then the army would prosecute the accused at Pittsburgh in a military court. Bradstreet compelled the Indians to leave six hostages, while the chiefs returned to present these conditions to their people. Bradstreet's treaty paralleled a similar treaty that William Johnson had recently concluded at Niagara on July 11. Problematically, Bradstreet lacked authorization to broker treaties, and in so doing, he had actually granted himself a position in the Great Lakes region that paralleled Johnson's position in Iroquoia. This was too much for Bouquet, Gage, and Johnson, and they quickly repudiated the Presque Isle treaty.²³¹

Consistent with the goals of the Pittsburgh conferences, Bradstreet had established a mechanism to end captivity, and the Indians had nodded to British military rule. Even so, Bradstreet had forfeited the goals of the Western Offensive and bypassed William Johnson's authority, all for the sake of personal lordship over the Great Lakes. Bouquet expressed shock and horror at Bradstreet's ambitions. As he put it,

The Terms he gives them are such as fill me with Astonishment. After the massacres of our Officers and garrisons, and of our Traders & Inhabitants, in Time of a profound Peace: After the Immense Expence (*sic*) of the

²³¹ Bradstreet, Indian Treaty, Lake Erie, August 12, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 603-607. For an analysis of Bradstreet's personal ambitions, see Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 620-625; Dowd, *War Under Heaven*, 153-162; Michael McConnell pointed out that Bradstreet had acted contrary to William Johnson's diplomatic strategy, in addition to upsetting Bouquet and Gage's military plans. See *A Country Between*, 200; White, *The Middle Ground*, 291- 292.

Crown, and some of the Provinces to punish those infamous Murders, not the least Satisfaction is obtained.

Bouquet charged that Bradstreet lacked experience in Indian diplomacy. Experiences, such as Little Carpenter's desertion, would have hardened Bradstreet's heart against what Bouquet believed to be only lies and manipulations. Bouquet rejected Bradstreet's treaty and moved forward with plans to attack Delaware and Shawnee villages. "I can not reconcile my self to the thought of seeing those Vilains (*sic*) go unpunished."

Implementing the Pittsburgh conferences and ending captivity were no longer Bouquet's principal objectives. Now, retribution motivated Bouquet's strategy, and he professed a willingness to massacre entire villages and to drive the living into the Mississippi River.²³² Thomas Penn encouraged Bouquet to disregard Bradstreet's peace settlement and stay the course of retribution, unless Gage called off the Western Offensive. Now, even the Easton alliance system was broken, for Royal military personnel had sided with Johnson, the Iroquois Confederation, and the Pennsylvanians. Bouquet and Gage had forgotten Forbes' alliance with the Quakers.²³³

On September 2, Gage ordered Bradstreet to renounce the Presque Isle treaty and attack the Delaware and Shawnee Indians living on the Scioto plains. As he put it, "I annul and disavow the Peace you have made, and you will attack as Ordered, unless you get the Promoters of the War into your Hands, to be put to Death." Like Bouquet, Gage found the treaty to fall short of obtaining "Satisfaction for all the Crueltys (*sic*) those

²³² Bouquet to Gage, Fort Loudoun, August 27, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 621; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 623.

²³³ Penn to Bouquet, Philadelphia, August 31, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 624. Soon, Bouquet reported back to Penn that Gage had annulled Bradstreet's treaty. See Bouquet to Penn, Ligonier, September 12, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 638-639.

Barbarians have been guilty of [committing].” Gage ordered Bradstreet to act in conjunction with Bouquet in attacking the Delaware and Shawnee villages. But the possibility of capitulation obliged Gage to qualify this directive: if the Indians surrendered “the Promoters of the War” for execution, then the army would confirm a peace settlement.²³⁴ Until then, he ordered Bouquet to continue preparation for the Western Offensive and “listen to no Terms of Peace, till they deliver the Promoters of the War into your Hands to be put to Death.”²³⁵ Days later, Bouquet received intelligence that Indians had raided a school house in western Pennsylvania, killing several children and the teacher, Enoch Brown. Bouquet discovered Brown’s head mounted on a pole. The Colonel took this incident to be proof that the Western Indians had deceived Bradstreet. Instead of peace, the Indians had bought time to scurry their captives farther westward and delay military action. Now, Bouquet accelerated preparations for the Western Offensive.²³⁶ He ordered Bradstreet to end negotiations, until they obtained satisfaction for the “murders of our officers & Soldiers, traders and Inhabitants.”²³⁷

By September 26, the time of Bouquet’s long awaited Western Offensive had almost arrived. Gage had ordered Bouquet and Bradstreet to launch the operation from Pittsburgh. Problematically, neither Bouquet nor Gage had successfully determined Bradstreet’s whereabouts. Other regiments lagged behind, leaving Bouquet with fewer troops than he had anticipated. Despite Johnson’s promises, no Iroquois warriors had yet arrived from Iroquoia. The Colonel did not regret the absence of the Iroquois warriors,

²³⁴ Gage to Bradstreet, New York, September 2, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 637-638.

²³⁵ Gage to Bouquet, New York, September 2, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 626-627; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 200; White, *The Middle Ground*, 292-293.

²³⁶ Bouquet to Penn, Ligonier, September 12, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 638-639; Bouquet to Gage, Bushy Run, September 16, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 640.

²³⁷ Bouquet to Bradstreet, Bedford, September 5, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 629-630; Bouquet to Gage, Bedford, September 5, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 631-632; Bouquet to Bradstreet, Ligonier, September 12, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 635-636; Gage to Bradstreet, New York, September 2, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 637-638.

because without them, he would have one less debt to pay. Put another way, Bouquet could assert British territorial control without reference to William Johnson, Iroquoia, the Covenant Chain, or any other Indian claim. Even if the Delaware and Shawnee surrendered Pontiac, Bouquet believed “it [to be] of great Consequence to the Stability of Peace, to march this Army to their town.”²³⁸ Bouquet was determined to launch the Western Offensive, regardless of troop numbers, the Iroquois alliance, or even Pontiac’s surrender.

In early October, Iroquois brokers and a band of warriors finally arrived at Pittsburgh. Without a translator, Bouquet and the Iroquois spoke past each other, but both parties understood two points. First, Bouquet intended to launch the Western Offensive. Second, William Johnson had authorized the Iroquois to advance a peace between Bouquet and the Delaware and Shawnee Indians. Resuscitating the Covenant Chain, the Iroquois delegates claimed to speak as uncles for their Ohio nephews. They assured Bouquet that the Western Indians were now gathering all their captives and would surrender them at Sandusky in five days. Seemingly, Johnson and the Iroquois had transformed Bradstreet’s unauthorized treaty into British policy, using it as a catalyst for negotiations with the Delaware and Shawnee chiefs. But should the Ohio Indians refuse to end captivity, then the Confederacy would support massive retaliation. Either way, backed by Johnson, the Confederacy had positioned itself to regain power over their Ohio nephews. As Michael N. McConnell put it, “[T]he Ohio Country would continue as an extension of Iroquoia, its people still identified as “dependents” of the

²³⁸ McDougall to Bouquet, Sandusky, September 24, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 644-645; Bouquet to Gage, Pittsburgh, September 26, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 646-648.

Confederacy.”²³⁹ Days later, Bouquet marched a hodgepodge of Redcoats, Virginians, and Iroquois warriors across the Ohio River, towards the Muskingum and Scioto villages. This was the long awaited Western Offensive, but now tamed by Johnson and the Iroquois, it amounted to little more than a puffed up mission to seize captives.²⁴⁰ Bouquet warned that if hostile Indians repeated Bushy Run, then “they must never expect Peace between them & us.”²⁴¹

On October 15, 1764, Bouquet and his army reached Tuscarawas (present day south central Ohio), the farthest west he would ever travel in the British Empire. Upon arriving, he penned a letter to the Delawares, demanding the immediate surrender of their captives.²⁴² Two days later, Keyashuta, an Ohio Seneca headman, spoke on behalf of the Delaware and Shawnee tribes. Keyashuta pleaded that neither the tribal elders nor the British bore responsibility for past hostilities. Instead, armed with French munitions, young Indian warriors had launched frontier raids and captured British forts. “It’s owing to the Western Nations & our foolish young Men that this War happened between us.” Keyashuta assured Bouquet that the Western Indians would surrender not only to the Royal army but also to the Iroquois Confederacy, restoring the Covenant Chain. “[T]he Chiefs of the Delawares, Shawnese...are related to the Six Nations.” Most importantly, the Indians agreed to surrender *all* their captives to British military personnel. Then, Delaware and Shawnee chiefs offered Bouquet bundles of sticks,

²³⁹ Onondaga and Oneida Indians, Speech to Bouquet: Speech of Two Six Nations Indians to Colonel Bouquet, [probably Pittsburgh], October 2, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 653-654; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 235-236.

²⁴⁰ Bouquet to Gage, Pittsburgh, October 2, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 657-658.

²⁴¹ Bouquet, Reply to Onondaga and Oneida Indians, Pittsburgh, October 2, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 655-657; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 625.

²⁴² Bouquet to the Delawares, Tuscarawas, October 15, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 661-662. For the Delawares’ efforts to conclude a peace settlement, see McConnell, *A Country Between*, 202-203.

symbolizing the captives their respective tribes held.²⁴³ Relinquishing war leaders, restoring the Chain of Friendship, and ending captivity—these were the concession the Western Indians made to Bouquet. The Colonel responded, “You must be Sensible that you deserve the Severest Chastisement, but, the English are a mercyfull (*sic*) & generous People, averse to shedding (*sic*) the Blood, even of their most cruel Enemies.”²⁴⁴

Bouquet enumerated the Indians’ many offenses against the British Empire. He rejected their claims that young warriors bore responsibility for the war, a point historians have refuted. In the end, surrendering White captives remained the point of departure for concluding a peace settlement. Bouquet insisted, “You promised at every former Treaty, as you do now, that you would deliver up all your Prisoners, and have received every Time on that Account considerable presents, but you never complied with that nor any of your Engagements.” Now, Bouquet warned that Pennsylvanians and Virginians wanted to “Revenge the Bloody Murderers of their Friends.” Self righteously, Bouquet flaunted the army’s benevolence in restraining the Paxton Boys and similar frontier rogues. Now, time was up and Bouquet demanded the surrender of captives within twelve days.

Bouquet ordered the Ohio tribes to surrender:

all the Prisoners in your Possession, without any Exceptions, Englishmen, Frenchmen, Women, & Children, whether adopted in your Tribes, married, or under any other Denomination whatever, and all Negroes, and to furnish all the Said Prisoners with Cloathing (*sic*), Provisions, & Stores to carry them to Fort Pitt.²⁴⁵

²⁴³ Speeches of Seneca and Delaware Chiefs, October 17, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 669-670.

²⁴⁴ Bouquet, Speech to Delawares, Shawnees, and Ohio Senecas, October 17, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 671-674; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 624-625.

²⁴⁵ Bouquet, Speech to Delawares, Shawnees, and Ohio Senecas, October 17, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 671-674. Bouquet reported the results of this conference to Gage and Johnson. He never accepted the role of young warriors in the war. Bouquet to Gage, Tuscarawas, October 21, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 675-677; Bouquet to Johnson, Tuscarawas, October 21, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 679. For Richard White’s analysis of William

Gage advised Bouquet to relax his retributive demands, spoiling the possibility for dramatic executions. Military coercion, mounted against native defeat, compelled the Ohio Indians to surrender their captives into the hands of backwoods Virginia militiamen. Yet, even without executions, Bouquet's peace deal forced the Ohio Indians to surrender their only remaining bargaining power into British possession, an act that must challenge historians' claims that Pontiac's War ended in a stalemate.²⁴⁶

Aside from the bargaining weight captivity entailed, ethnohistorians have demonstrated that familial relationships sometimes developed between captives and their adopted families. Not surprisingly, Indians refused to surrender their "White" loved ones to British military personnel until no other option remained.²⁴⁷ Days after the Tuscarawas Conference, Delaware natives surrendered 32 hostages at Pittsburgh. Bouquet responded, "I hope your chiefs will follow your Example, & deliver every drop of White blood in your Nation." By November 5, Bouquet certified that the Delawares had fulfilled the British requirements.²⁴⁸ Fearing retribution at Pittsburgh, Shawnee natives took longer in the surrender process. On November 12, the Shawnees had

Johnson's role in the peace settlement, see *The Middle Ground*, 305-307. For the Paxton Boys and the emergence of racism on the Pennsylvania frontier, see Krista Camenzind, "Violence, Race, and the Paxton Boys," in *Friends and Enemies in Penn's Woods: Indians, Colonists, and the Racial Construction of Pennsylvania*, ed. William A. Pencak and Daniel K. Richter (University Park, Pa: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004), 201-220; James Axtell, "The White Indians of Colonial America," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 32: 1 (Jan., 1975): 55-88.

²⁴⁶ Gage to Bouquet, New York, October 21, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 680. For the stalemate theory, see McConnell, *A Country Between*, 206; White, *The Middle Ground*, 305.

²⁴⁷ Colin G. Calloway, "An Uncertain Destiny: Indian Captivities on the Upper Connecticut," *Journal of American Studies* 17, no. 2 (1983): 190-91; Daniel Richter, "War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 40, no. 4 (October 1983): 529.

²⁴⁸ Bouquet to Big Wolfe, Camp at the Forks of Muskingum, October 31, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 681-682. At a later conference, Bouquet reported that 32 Indians had already been delivered. Minutes: Bouquet's Conference with Chiefs Custaloga and Keyashuta, November 1, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 682-683; Bouquet to Stanwix, Camp on Muskingum River, November 5, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 684-685.

surrendered 36 captives and requested to complete the process in the spring of 1765.²⁴⁹ Bouquet uttered disgust at this request and threatened military reprisals. Bradstreet restrained Bouquet's impulse, but the threat remained. Bouquet inhibited a peace treaty with the Shawnee Indians until they surrendered approximately 100 remaining captives. Finally, a Shawnee broker assured Bouquet that his people had already gathered the remaining captives, and they would soon transport them to Pittsburgh. With this promise, Bouquet ended the British war against the Shawnees and all the Western Indians. As he expressed it,

I came here determined to strike you with a Tomahawk in my hand, but since you have submitted, it shall not fall upon your heads, I will let it drop and it shall no more be seen. I bury the bones of all the people who have fallen [in] this War, and cover the place with leaves, so that the place shall no more be perceived.²⁵⁰

Headmen found the surrender process difficult to bear. The captives and their Native families experienced it as tormenting.²⁵¹

Bouquet's experience with Little Carpenter's betrayal and then Bushy Run led him to think prejudicially about Native Americans and to act in ways that built barriers between colonial and native worlds. This prejudicial way of thinking permitted Bouquet to organize a perfectly logical and efficient surrender process, which ironically "White

²⁴⁹ Red Hawk to Bouquet, Waghatawmaka, November 8, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 687; Minutes: Conference with the Shawnees, November 12, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 694-696; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 202-205.

²⁵⁰ Bouquet, Orders, November 13, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 697-698; Bouquet, Speech to the Shawnees, Forks of Muskingum, November 13, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 698-697; Minutes: Conference with the Shawnees, Muskingum, November 14, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 700-703.

²⁵¹ Speeches of Seneca and Delaware Chiefs, October 17, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 669-670.

Indians” experienced as completely irrational. Military personnel treated captives not as fellow Britons but as war criminals. As Indians surrendered captives, Virginia soldiers shackled them and confined them to a prison at Fort Pitt. Suspecting they would attempt escape, Bouquet ordered military personnel to keep these prisoners under constant surveillance. Among the first group of surrendered captives, Pennsylvania families claimed 14. Accordingly, Bouquet sent 14 soldiers from a Pennsylvania regiment to escort these men, women, and children on a forced march back to Pennsylvania. Bouquet ordered Captain Hay to guard and escort another band of prisoners back to Virginia. He ordered military personnel to return child prisoners to their parents. In return, Bouquet required the parents to sign exchange receipts, certifying that they had received their children.²⁵² Often women and children identified themselves as Native, not White, and resisted this forced march back into colonial society. As Bouquet described it, “[S]everal of them have remained so many Years with them [the Indians] that they are become Savages, and they are obliged to tie them to bring them to us.”²⁵³ The army ritualized the transition from Native to Anglo identity. Shackling, imprisonment, and forced marches reversed the adoption process, by stripping captives of their Native identity and compelling their re-socialization into colonial society. What Bouquet saw as a completely rational process, captives must have experienced as completely irrational.²⁵⁴

Bouquet conceptualized White Indians as being sexually impure, dirty, and tainted by their adoption into native society. He orchestrated regulations intended to purge prisoners, before returning them to the colonies. For instance, Bouquet ordered:

²⁵² Bouquet to Lewis, Camp on Muskingum River, November 4, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 683-684.

²⁵³ Bouquet to Gage, Camp on Muskingum River, November 15, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 703-706; McConnell, *A Country Between*, 204-205.

²⁵⁴ Richter, “War and Culture,” 529.

Men are to [be] lodged Separately from the Women and Children, and most of them, particularly those who have been a long time among the Indians will take the first Opportunity to run away, they are to be closely watched and well Secured.

Later he reiterated, “It is unnecessary to mention to you to prevent any Intercourse between the young females and you[r] Young Males.” Couched in Bouquet’s instructions were two curious assumptions. First, he regarded the captives as actual prisoners, prisoners in the sense that they were culpable of nativism. Second, Bouquet believed that nativism sometimes manifest itself in sexual promiscuity. Worse than the possibility that prisoners might escape, Bouquet feared that they might engage in promiscuous, sexual activities. Military raids could bring back escaped prisoners; however, Bouquet could not reverse fornication, a grave sin. Thus, shackling, imprisonment, and the forced march became tools of purgation, which cleansed the prisoner of nativism and prepared her for re-entry into colonial society. Understandably, many White Indians resisted purgation and fled from their British captors. And Bouquet demanded that Delaware and Shawnee headmen surrender any prisoners, who escaped back into Indian Country, or face renewed warfare.²⁵⁵

Conclusion

This chapter has traced the good spirit of the Easton Conference through its tragic collapse in the 1764 Western Offensive. Back in 1753, working closely with Quakers, John Forbes organized the Easton Conference around the assumption that Delaware headmen, Iroquois delegates, and the Pennsylvania government could together agree that

²⁵⁵ Bouquet to D. Hay, Camp on Muskingum River, November 9, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 688.

the British would benefit by resettling the Delaware Indians in the Wyoming Valley. In the short term, these different factions conceded to Forbes's proposal and some Delaware Indians severed their alliance with the French and returned to their Pennsylvania homeland. But, the seeds of discontent were already present at Easton. Forbes had dealt the Walking Purchase a serious blow, exposing Sir William Johnson and the Iroquois' illegitimate claims to sovereignty over the Delaware, Shawnee, and other Ohio Indians. Instead of accepting this blow, both Johnson and the Iroquois looked for ways to restore the status quo, which usually meant wheeling out the Covenant Chain. Neither did Thomas Penn embrace the idea of Ohio Indians settling on lands he claimed. Despite all this, the Easton Treaty stripped the French of critical Indian allies, weakened the French aligned Indians, and cleared the way for the Forbes Expedition to siege the Ohio Territory.

Bouquet, always loyal to military policy, accepted the terms of the Easton Treaty and felt it his duty to propagate the terms Forbes had brokered. Through three Indian conferences, Bouquet promised the Ohio Indians trade and requested the return of British captives. Yet, neither the Indians nor the army fulfilled their respective obligations. Perceiving captives as their only lever against the British occupation, the Ohio Indians refused to surrender their human collateral to Bouquet's agents. Jeffrey Amherst's administration effectively transformed the conciliatory spirit of the Easton Conference into a spirit of subjugation. Amherst opposed gift giving and devised trading policies that denied Indians ammunition and rum. As tension between the Royal Army and Natives intensified, young warriors renewed raids on the Pennsylvania and Virginia frontiers and attacked British strongholds. By 1761, Bouquet received rumors that a Genesee Seneca

delegation had plotted to stir up a rebellion among the Ohio Indians. Then, the Senecas manipulated the Royal Army to regain sovereignty over the rebellious Ohio natives, reversing the spirit of Easton and awakening the Covenant Chain alliance. By 1763, Pontiac had created a pan-Indians alliance that declared war against the British occupation and ignored Iroquois pretensions to hegemony.

The irony of the bloodbath that historians call Pontiac's War was that the three major parties involved were fighting from positions of weakness. First, the Iroquois Confederation used Pontiac's War as a catalyst to regain power over the Delaware and Shawnee tribes, only they were too weak to achieve this hegemony on their own. Second, Whitehall had concluded the Paris Peace treaty that ended Seven Years' War. Many regiments were already disbanded and war spending was slashed. Worst still, a mutiny had depleted the remaining ranks of the Royal Americans, meaning the regiment had insufficient soldiers to liberate the Ohio forts and secure the frontier. Third, the Ohio Indians' ability to wage war depended on their volatile French alliance and ammunition supply. Once the French bolted, the Ohio Indians had no choice but to sue for peace, although a peace requiring they surrender captives. The war itself was a bloodbath, marked by frontier raids and relentless Indian killing. Bushy Run ultimately transformed Bouquet's sense of disciplined organization into an expedition to drive the Ohio Indians far west of the Proclamation Line. In autumn of 1764, Bouquet led his ragtag army against the even more exhausted Delaware and Shawnee Indians, still trying to end captivity and now intent on driving these natives west of the Muskingum River. Finally, due to military weakness, Bouquet put aside his hopes for retribution in exchange for

captives, which he finally secured by two separate treaties with Delaware and Shawnee brokers.

Weakened by nearly a decade of war, Bouquet lacked sufficient fiscal and military resources to end Pontiac's War without Iroquois assistance. The Iroquois Confederacy was always the specter behind British military operations. Too weak to sustain sovereignty over the Great Lakes, the Confederacy drew from British military muscle to score a political victory over the Ohio tribes. On the banks of the Muskingum, Iroquois warriors declared the Ohio Indians to be their nephews, reversing the spirit of Easton. For his part, Thomas Gage siphoned the diplomatic powers of Sir William Johnson and the Confederacy to subdue the Ohio Indians. By 1765, the British army could pretend that it controlled the Ohio Territory, and the Iroquois could delight in some resuscitated version of the Covenant Chain. Yet, neither the British army nor the Confederacy cared to enforce their respective claims without the other's backing. For their part, the Ohio Indians had succumbed to external coercion. Bouquet wrenched captives from what had often become familiar surroundings, purged them of nativism, and marched them back to colonial society. Beginning with Amherst's policies, Bouquet and the Iroquois Confederacy had whittled away at the conciliatory spirit Forbes had set at the Easton Conference.²⁵⁶ Now, Bouquet consigned the Ohio Territory to political and social instability, until the Treaty of Fort Stanwix effectively removed the native population.

²⁵⁶ For the gains made by the Iroquois Confederacy, see McConnell, *A Country Between*, 242-254; White, *The Middle Ground*, 305-314, 351-354.

EPILOGUE

“I have never seen such a tribe of rebels”

Colonel Henry Bouquet embodied the British fiscal-military state. His operations in the Seven Years' War illuminated the continuity between state and empire building, the problems of multiple constitutional arrangements existing in a single imperial entity, and the relationship between human agency and military coercion. The ability of the British army to defeat France, the most powerful nation in Europe, while planting the seeds of rebellion in its own American colonies is an irony that puzzles historians. Perhaps Britain's ability to colonize Scotland, Ireland, and India, while losing the American colonies, heightens this irony. But here lay the clue to this puzzle: British authorities mistakenly imagined the North American colonies to be almost identical to their own political arrangements and therefore receptive to British fiscal-military policy. In this framework, Britain's loss of the American colonies began in the Seven Years' War. The colonies operated under a much older constitutional system that had not witnessed first-hand eighteenth century European military and fiscal innovations. The colonies clung to their participatory assemblies and resisted the Royal Army's attempts to realize military rule in North America.²⁵⁷ This fundamental incompatibility between the British fiscal-military state and colonial constitutional arrangements inhibited the emergence of what Jack P. Greene believed was an imperial constitution.²⁵⁸

Furthermore, west of the Allegheny Mountains, the Royal Army's increasing military

²⁵⁷ This analysis is derived from Perry Miller, “Errand into the Wilderness,” *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 10: 1 (Jan., 1953), 4-32.

²⁵⁸ Jack P. Greene, *Peripheries and Center: Constitutional Development in the Extended Politics of the British Empire and the United States, 1607-1788* (Athens, GA and London: University of Georgia Press, 1986).

pressure encountered growing resistance from Native Americans. Instead of a British middle ground, Pontiac organized a pan-Indian alliance that warred against the British occupation of the Ohio Territory. The military projection of the British fiscal military state onto North American society created a crisis of imperial proportions.

The operations of British military officials in North America suggested that they believed the colonies to be almost identical to the British nation state. This belief led them to adopt many policies that reflected Britain's level of fiscal and military innovation, which were incompatible with the constitutional and social realities of colonial America. For example, Bouquet confronted persistent political and social resistance in mobilizing colonists and their governments for warfare. By imagining the colonies to be similar to contemporary Britain, military officials' formulated broad policies that did not respect local contingencies, especially in matters of recruitment, quartering, and requisitioning. Consequently, Bouquet received directives that were inconsistent with the complexities that he encountered, causing his operations to reflect frustrated compromise more than the British blueprint he wanted to project.²⁵⁹ Put simply, Bouquet's problems stemmed from imagining the colonies to be far more compatible with the British fiscal-military state than they actually were. This work demonstrated that the basic conditions for militarization did not obtain in colonial America, making the colonies unable to receive the fiscal and military policies that Bouquet projected onto them. The reason for this is located in the constitutional and military histories of the colonies, not in their loyalty to the ideals of British liberty.

²⁵⁹ The South Carolina quartering crisis began when a river swept away Lord Loudoun's instructions on the matter, leaving Bouquet to negotiate the burgeoning crisis without proper directives. Bouquet to Webb, Charlestown, August 29, 1757, *PHB*, I, 180.

State formation theory has illuminated the internal dynamics of European state building but has not accounted for problems armies encountered when projecting the state model onto colonial peripheries. Barrington Moore identified agricultural development and internal class relations as key variables in state formation. Later, Brian Downing argued that the onset of external military pressure determined the emergence of absolutist or democratic statehood. Then, Thomas Ertman emphasized timing of military pressure as critical to state formation. Problematically, these studies ignore the overflow of European warfare into the New World; they have not recognized empire making as an outgrowth of European warfare and state formation. Arguably, in the colonies, the British army generated the kind of military pressure that would have precipitated political change inside European states, but in this case destabilized the British imperial system.²⁶⁰ This work has interrogated the onset of military pressure inside the colonies, in relation to the colonial constitutions and the British fiscal military state. Arguably, the timing of militarization in the colonies exposed variables that scholars have not identified in European state formation, such as constitutional persistence and human agency. Henry Bouquet discovered those variables by accident in trying to project the fiscal-military state onto disparate colonial societies.

Inside European nation states, military pressure and domestic spending almost always led to some degree of absolutism. As Ertman pointed out, the timing of military pressure in relation to constitutional arrangements determined the efficiency of national

²⁶⁰ For Early Modern state building, see Brian M. Downing, *The Military Revolution and Political Change: Origins of Democracy and Autocracy in Early Modern Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 3-17; Barrington Moore, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the making of the Modern World* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966); Thomas Ertman, *The Birth of Leviathan: Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 26-28.

fiscal bureaucracies. Early developers, such as France and Spain, developed inefficient fiscal bureaucracies that tapped into the residues of feudalism to finance modern warfare. Having embarked on an inefficient model, path dependence explains that the early developers could not change course. Britain, conversely, developed comparatively late and avoided the mistakes of the early developers. In this way, Britain developed a highly successful fiscal bureaucracy that enacted an Excise Tax, adopted deficit spending, and embraced the concept of a national debt.²⁶¹ The colonies remained pre-modern by comparison. As this work demonstrated, the Seven Years' War exposed elements of early and late development inside the British Empire. This work highlighted the incongruity between colonial realities and the expectations of military officials, leading to an explanation for why the making of the British Empire entailed the logic of its undoing.

This work relied on the insights of Jack P. Greene to illuminate colonial constitutional arrangements, which ultimately proved incompatible with the demands of early modern warfare. Greene argued that three constitutional systems were operative in the eighteenth century British Empire: the colonies' constitutional arrangements that derived from their charters; the post-1689 English constitution, which shaped internal state dynamics; and finally an emerging imperial constitution that held the British Empire together. Building on Ertman's insights, this work identified an instability in Greene's three-tiered constitutional system. That is, the 1689 Glorious Revolution set England on a military path that forced it to modernize its constitutional system, develop a fiscal bureaucracy, and a standing army. By comparison, the colonies never faced sizeable military pressure, so they never questioned the viability of their older constitutional

²⁶¹ John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1989), Part II.

arrangements. Paradoxically, Greene's burgeoning imperial constitution held together two constitutional systems that the Seven Years' War revealed to be incompatible. Not surprisingly, when the Royal Army projected the British fiscal-military state onto the colonial constitutions, few people missed the obvious contradictions. The colonies were unable to cope with recruitment, quartering, requisitioning, and the other demands of military innovation. Although Bouquet tried to realize military rule, the colonists' resisted and English customary law justified their intransigence. The conflicts that Bouquet encountered were the logical outcome of imposing a late developmental model onto pre-modern constitutional arrangements, an ironic situation in that both models existed inside the British Empire.²⁶²

The British colonies had never confronted the kind of military pressure that precipitated military innovation inside European states. As Brian Downing explained, nations that either resisted the military revolution or did not mobilize domestic resources for war usually preserved constitutional arrangements.²⁶³ Although King Phillip's War threatened New England society, and Bacon's Rebellion occasioned the arrival of Regular troops to stabilize Virginia, these were internal wars, unlike those waged between European nation states, and did not precipitate constitution change. No external threat necessitated colonial military innovation, and the colonists relied on local, seasonal armies instead. Predictably, Henry Bouquet discovered colonial governors bewildered by the prospect of raising large provincial armies and quartering large numbers of regular soldiers. British Regulars and Royal Highlanders offset persistent recruitment problems but precipitated quartering crises. Persistent problems in recruiting, quartering, and

²⁶² Greene, *Peripheries and Center*.

²⁶³ Downing, *The Military Revolution and Political Change*, 3-17; Geoffrey Parker, *The Military Revolution: Military innovation and the rise of the West* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

provisioning large armies constituted another element that distinguished colonial America from comparatively modern European states. Colonists exacerbated these problems by evading requisitioning orders. For instance, farmers secreted wagons to neighboring counties and refused to surrender horses to requisitioning agents. The pre-1689 colonial constitutions established weak governments that could not manage modern warfare, cooperate with Bouquet, and certainly could not mobilize society on mass for war.

The operations of Henry Bouquet inside the British colonies add three variables to state formation that scholars have not identified inside European states. First, state formation theory has overly emphasized the process of European state formation at the expense of empire building. Downing, Ertman, and Charles Tilly have illuminated the relationship between war and the state; problematically, they ignore that European states often exported their wars to the New World. By studying the Seven Years' War, this work understands state formation to be a trans-Atlantic process, which becomes more complicated in a colonial setting. Second, state formation literature has not accounted for the possibility that different constitutional arrangements might exist inside a single national entity, such as the British Empire. In this case, internal military pressure exposed the British colonies as really undeveloped, unable to cope with military innovation, and very different from the post-1689 British fiscal-military state. Thus, instead of Greene's emerging British imperial constitution, this work demonstrated that two incompatible constitutional systems existed inside the British Empire, one constituted before 1689 and another based on fiscal-military innovation. Bouquet exposed the incompatibility between these arrangements and the American Revolution

resolved it. Chapters two and three of this work demonstrated that colonists themselves formed a variable that state formation theorists often ignore. That is, colonists resisted the projection of the fiscal-military state onto colonial society, especially by resisting quartering and requisitioning policies. The determinism that underlies state formation theory has failed to account for human agency as a central component to political processes, which became even more startling when Henry Bouquet tried to militarize the even less developed Ohio Country. Chapters four and five of this work explored the relationship between native society and the fiscal-military state.

Militarization in Indian Country

The Forbes Expedition took Henry Bouquet across the Allegheny Mountains, where he discovered a land devoid of anything he recognized as a ruling authority. What seemed to his Eurocentric mind to be a power vacuum was exacerbated by the presence of Native Americans, who demanded gifts, trade, and the eventual withdraw of the Royal Army. Not surprisingly, Bouquet wanted to avoid the problems he had encountered in the colonies, and perceiving a power vacuum, he set out to realize military rule over the Ohio region. He realized military rule at the frontier forts and in the surrounding territory. Then, in an attempt to assure the Ohio Indians of British goodwill, he drafted the 1761 Proclamation Line, which curbed colonial westward expansion and limited the claims of the Ohio Company to western lands. Yet British control of Indian Country began to unravel before the Royal Army had ousted the French from Fort Detroit. Governor Lyttelton's invasion of Cherokee Country challenged the Royal Army's jurisdiction, necessitating the influx of Royal Highlanders to shore up imperial control.

Soon thereafter, Jeffery Amherst eliminated gift giving and precluded the possibility of a renewed middle ground. Pontiac's War quickly followed. This work has inquired of Bouquet's relationship with Cherokee society and the Ohio Indians and found a gradual movement away from compromise and conciliation to subjugation and warfare.

Arguably, Native social and political arrangements were even less receptive to militarization than were the colonies. Indeed, precisely because Bouquet and Jeffery Amherst did not fully understand native society, they tried to militarize the Ohio Country, and this created a crisis that not even the Royal Army could resolve without Iroquois assistance. As a result, the British army, the Cherokee and Ohio Indians, and the Iroquois Confederacy gained a weaker position than they desired from the projection of the British fiscal-military state onto Indian Country.

Almost by accident, Henry Bouquet subsumed Cherokee Country into imperial jurisdiction and checked colonial expansion. Unlike the Ohio Indians, the Cherokee Indians never demanded trading alliances or a middle ground from the Royal Army. Instead, Bouquet oversaw the reconstruction of the southern fortification system, allowing him to establish imperial jurisdiction over lands that colonial authorities had before controlled. By accident of making infrastructure, Bouquet brought Cherokee Country under what seemed to be benign, military control, but squatters and traders crossed the line of military jurisdiction, exacerbating tensions between colonial and Cherokee society. In 1758, Little Carpenter abandoned the British army, compelling John Forbes and Bouquet to diminish his capacity to broker between Anglo and Cherokee worlds. In 1759, Governor William Henry Lyttelton of South Carolina used this incident as a justification for marching provincial troops into Cherokee Country, despite

Bouquet's earlier severance of the Appalachian region from colonial jurisdiction. David Corkran and Tom Hatley, among many other historians, have contented themselves that Lyttelton's invasion of Cherokee Country was a provincial dispute over settlement and trade. Problematically, this interpretation overlooked the imperial dimension of the Cherokee War. Royal officials interpreted Lyttelton's invasion of Cherokee Country as an illegal breach of British territorial sovereignty. Then, after Lyttelton stirred up a crisis that he could not resolve, Royal Highlanders displaced provincial regiments, invaded Cherokee Country, leveled native villages, and restored the entire Appalachian region to imperial control. Unlike earlier Indian wars, this work has argued that the Cherokee War unfolded as the Royal Army established territorial jurisdictions, reined in colonial authorities, and gained control over Indian relations.

While crisis brewed in Cherokee Country, John Forbes negotiated the Easton Treaty with the Ohio Delawares. Forbes and Quaker allies brokered the resettlement of the Delawares in Pennsylvania's Wyoming Valley, despite formidable opposition from the Penn Family and the Iroquois Confederacy. This resettlement policy robbed the French of important allies and eased Forbes' conquest of Fort Duquesne. Historians understand the remarkable successes of Forbes and the Easton Conference, but they have not connected those successes with Bouquet's early operations in the Ohio Territory. Bouquet entered the Ohio Territory as Forbes' field commander, and projected the conciliatory spirit that Forbes had brokered at Easton onto the trans-Allegheny tribes. He extended the terms of the Easton Treaty to the Ohio Indians by holding numerous conferences at Fort Pitt, promising the Indians' territorial integrity, trade, and requesting an end to captivity. Conciliation underlined the Proclamation Line of 1761, which

Bouquet perceived as a necessary step in establishing Royal jurisdiction over the Ohio Territory, halting colonial expansion, and protecting natives' lands.

Richard White established the framework in which historians have interpreted British, French, and American relations with the Algonquian Indians. For White, these imperial powers brokered a middle ground with the Ohio tribes through a process of compromise and inner cultural exchange. In White's analysis, Pontiac's War established the terms of compromise that allowed a middle ground to emerge between the British and Ohio Indians. Recently, however, Gregory Evan Dowd and Daniel Richter have modified White's interpretation, by recasting the British occupation of the Ohio Territory as the beginning of ethnic division. Dowd understood Pontiac's War as entirely the fault of the British, not as the basis for a middle ground. This dissertation identified a transition in Bouquet's behavior that is attributable to changes in military command and trading policy. Under Forbes' leadership, Bouquet extended the conciliatory spirit of the Easton Conference into the Ohio Country. But under Amherst's regime, Bouquet's actions grew increasingly coercive and unmindful of native perspectives. Thus, elements of cultural compromise emerged in Bouquet's early dealings with the Ohio Indians, but Amherst's orders to end gift giving diminished the possibility of a renewed middle ground. Later, under Thomas Gage's leadership, Bouquet pushed ahead plans to erect an impenetrable barrier between the colonial frontiers and Indian Country. In all, Bouquet represented a middle ground that might have been, would Jeffery Amherst not have destroyed the possibility of rebuilding it.

In recent decades, ethnohistorians have tried to reverse the nineteenth century legacy of Francis Parkman with the effect of almost erasing the Iroquois Confederacy

from eighteenth century history. Parkman painted the Iroquois as a savage people and hell bent on destroying neighboring tribes. He argued that Christian civilization would ultimately trample native savagery, leaving the Iroquois noble but conquered savages. To counter the noble savage mythology, Daniel Richter and José Antônio Brandão posited that the Iroquois had become essentially powerless by the eighteenth century. Indeed, this historiography rendered the Iroquois Confederacy almost a diplomatic and military nullity by 1701.²⁶⁴ Building on this analysis, Gregory Evans Dowd denied that the Iroquois influenced British policy in Pontiac's War. But here the anti-Parkman band wagon went too far, precisely because the Iroquois Confederacy remained a viable diplomatic force into the 1760s. In private sessions, John Forbes contended with Iroquois claims to sovereignty during the Easton Conference. After Amherst's trading policies drove the Ohio tribes into rebellion, Iroquois brokers and Sir William Johnson resurrected the Covenant Chain as a partial solution to the Ohio crisis. In this way, Iroquois diplomats escorted Henry Bouquet to the Muskingum River, where they assisted in brokering a treaty with Delaware and Shawnee headmen. Far from being unimportant as Dowd represented, the Iroquois brokers proved to be critical collaborators with Bouquet, Gage, and Johnson during Pontiac's War. And they offered their diplomatic strength to fill the void that the 1763 mutiny left in the British army.

In 1762, the British Crown concluded the Paris Peace Treaty ending the Seven Years' War. Ironically, this European peace settlement put in place military policies that created more tensions in the Ohio Country than had ever existed in wartime. The reason for this was simple: under the Amherst regime, the Royal Army did not evacuate native

²⁶⁴José Antônio Brandão, "Your fyre shall burn no more" Iroquois Policy toward New France and Its Native Allies to 1701 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997).

lands as earlier promised, continued to occupy frontier forts, and ended gifts giving, which in turn threatened Indians' livelihood. The reassertion of civil power in the form of the Treasury made a weak foundation for a renewed middle ground. Under the Amherst regime, what had existed as military conciliation became the crass projection of the fiscal-military state, similar to what Bouquet had imposed on the colonial governments. But, the colonial constitutions, customary practice, and the governing authorities had constrained Bouquet. Not recognizing similar constraints in Indian Country, allowed Bouquet impose military rule in a way that was unimaginable inside the British colonies. Whereas Bouquet had demanded the colonist produce quarters, wagons, and horses, now he insisted that the Ohio Indians surrender all captives—and survive without gifts, ammunition, and rum. Whereas the Forbes regime had emphasized gifts and territorial integrity, now captivity emerged as the central diplomatic stake. Under Amherst directives, Bouquet projected military rule onto a native population that could not possibly receive it. Pontiac's War erupted because the Ohio Indians could not live within the constraints of British military rule and future compromise had become impossible.

Pontiac's War revealed the limitations of British military rule and by extension, the limitations of state formation theories. The Ohio Indians evidenced a level of resistance that colonial society had not yet dared to experiment with. Unlike the colonists, the Ohio Indians warred from a position of material weakness, as Amherst's policies had pushed some tribes toward starvation. The colonists had marshaled comparatively benign arguments against quartering and requisitioning, though some individual farmers showed more creativity. Too often, political theorists have pretended

that states exist as entities without populations, and they strip the formation process of human agency, creativity, and resistance. Pontiac's War proved that aboriginal populations could resist the imposition of a military form that did not fit. More interesting is that native warriors, who were less equipped for war than were the already pre-modern colonial societies, mounted such formidable resistance as to not only destabilize the Royal Army but even colonial society. A similar rebellious consciousness would take over a decade to happen among the colonists, who never saw themselves in opposition to Britishness.²⁶⁵ This study reveals that perceptibly weak and primitive aboriginal societies mounted unexpected and formidable resistance to military rule, precisely because they held an immediate consciousness of an idealized past.

Desertion of the Regulars

In 1762, the London Treasury ended wartime appropriations. Inside England, the fiscal bureaucracy devised means to finance the wartime deficit, Excise Taxes continued, and Britons enjoyed a greatly expanded empire. In part, the Treasury would hold the British colonists responsible for financing the regiments that remained in America, just as Bouquet had held them responsible for quartering, requisitioning, and recruitment. The Treasury imposed the Stamp, Sugar, and other acts that eventually precipitated the War for Independence. Through the Stamp and similar acts, London bureaucrats siphoned monies from the British colonists and rerouted them to finance the deficit and ongoing

²⁶⁵ E. P. Thompson offered an explanation for why social consciousness developed at different rates among different social groups. See Michael D. Bess, "E. P. Thompson: The Historian as Activist," *The American Historical Review* 98: 1 (Feb., 1993), 21-24.

military expenditures.²⁶⁶ Despite these measures, postwar fiscal reductions were inevitable. The Treasury reduced military appropriations, which in turn slashed monies to be invested in Indian relations. Jeffery Amherst imposed a series of policies that ended giving gifts to the Ohio Indians and triggered Pontiac's War.²⁶⁷ Finally, this fiscal logic pierced the Royal Army itself and precipitated an internal rebellion, the Mutiny of 1763. Herein laid the fatal flaw of the first British Empire: neither colonial society, Native America, nor even the British Regulars were receptive to British fiscal innovation. The Mutiny of 1763 attested to the fact that the internal structure of the Royal Army was vulnerable to the same contradictions that triggered the crises that fiscal-military logic had already occasioned outside the army. Both inside and outside the army, human agency and creativity burst through Britain's fiscal-military policies, adding a critical variable in state formation that scholars have too often overlooked.

Having concluded the Treaty of Paris, the Lords of the Treasury believed that Britain's wartime obligations to soldiers had ended and frugality required a pay reduction. On May 10, 1763, the Secretary of War penned Jeffery Amherst a letter that ordered him to reduce the Royal Regulars' pay from 6*d.* to 4*d.*, first in Nova Scotia and then across the North American continent. Precisely, the directive ordered the "Stoppages from the Pay of the Troops that may be Stationed at places where they are supplied (*sic*) with Provisions at the Expence of the Publick, agreeable to what was

²⁶⁶ Edmund S. Morgan, *The Birth of the Republic, 1763-1789* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); P. D. G. Thomas, "Charles Townshend and American taxation in 1767," *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 83, No. 326 (Jan., 1968), 33-51.

²⁶⁷ Jon William Parmenter, "Pontiac's War: Forging New Links in the Anglo-Iroquois Covenant Chain, 1758-1766," *Ethnohistory*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (Autumn, 1997), 617-654.

practised (*sic*) during the last peace.”²⁶⁸ The Stoppage Order applied everywhere in America, without exception. The letter indicated that Treasury officials anticipated soldiers would either receive food at colonial expense or grow it themselves. Already, the colonial governments had demonstrated their inability to quarter soldiers, now it seemed an improbable scenario that they could provision entire armies. Surrounding some British forts were extensive gardens that supplemented soldiers’ diets. But the Treasury’s suggestion that soldiers should grow even larger quantities of food seemed a ludicrous proposition, even to Amherst.²⁶⁹ What military officials called the Stoppage Order sparked a continental wide mutiny of Regular soldiers, ranging from protests and work stoppages to desertion. Arguably, Henry Bouquet endured one of the most troubling consequences of this internal rebellion. Desertions had depleted his regiments, leaving his army too weak to combat the concomitant Ohio Indian war. As a result, Pontiac’s warriors seized major sections of the Ohio fortification system, terrorized the Pennsylvania frontier, and reversed the tide of British military rule.²⁷⁰ Fearful of losing his entire regiment, one officer lamented of his troops, “I have served for over 22 years, but I have never seen such a tribe of rebels, bandits and hamstrings.”²⁷¹

Historians have examined the rebellion of 1763 in a couple different ways, usually focusing on mutiny as a collective act of resistance instead of the more serious crime of fleeing from the ranks. Paul E. Kopperman explained a linear relationship between the Stoppage Order and the mutiny of 1763. While forthright, Kopperman’s

²⁶⁸ Secretary of War to Amherst, London, May 10 1763, 42, Sir Jeffery Amherst Papers, Vol. 1: Schedule 1-3, 1760-Oct, 1763, William Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Amherst to C. Jenkinson, Secretary of the Treasury, New York, July 23, 1763, Amherst Papers.

²⁶⁹ Amherst to C. Jenkinson, New York, July 23, 1763, 61, Amherst Papers. For soldiers and gardening, see Bouquet to Forbes, Lancaster, May 22, 1758, *PHB*, II, 350-352; Bouquet to William Allen, Fort Duquesne, November 25, 1758, *PHB*, II, 610-612.

²⁷⁰ Bouquet to Monckton, Pittsburgh, July 10, 1761, *PHB*, V, 626-627.

²⁷¹ Ecuyer to Bouquet, Bedford, November 13, 1763, *PHB*, V, 459-460.

characterization resulted in a kind of economic reductionism, because it removed the mutineers from their broader social world.²⁷² Peter Way overcame the limitations of Kopperman's work by recasting the mutiny in the context of the broader social and economic changes that were happening in eighteenth century England. Way argued that British soldiers came from laboring classes, such as tailors and cobblers, and understood the primitive phases of industrialization. British soldiers drew from their experience as industrial laborers to mount collective resistance to the Stoppage Order.²⁷³ Building on Way's insights, the following paragraphs conceive of the Stoppage Order as an outgrowth of the fiscal-military state, which paralleled earlier reductions in gift giving to the Ohio Indians. In this sense, the Stoppage Order was a projection of the British fiscal-military state onto the soldiers and the internal workings of the Royal Army itself. For Peter Way, mutiny occurred as soldiers acting to restore what they saw as a just balance between their labor and the frugality of the British Treasury. In Way's analysis, soldiers drew from their experience as wage laborers to resist pay reductions. But neither Kopperman nor Way accounted for different conditions in the Ohio Territory that made it easier for soldiers to desert than to mount collective resistance. Arguably, in the west, pay reductions became the catalyst for soldiers simply to desert the Royal Army, paralyzing Royal war machine. Depletion of the Regulars impeded Henry Bouquet's ability to mount his 1764 war of retribution against the warring Ohio Indians, compelling him to rely on colonials and Iroquois to buttress his rebellious army.

²⁷² Paul E. Kopperman, "The Stoppages Mutiny of 1763," *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine*, 69 (1986), 241-254. Kopperman's avoidance of broader social and economic stakes persisted in "The Cheapest Pay": Alcohol Abuse in the Eighteenth-Century British Army," *The Journal of Military History*, Vol 60, No. 3, (July, 1996), 445-470.

²⁷³ Peter Way, "Rebellion of the Regulars: Working Soldiers and the Mutiny of 1763-1764," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 57, No. 4, (Oct., 2000), 763.

Historians often envisage Jeffery Amherst as a calculating soul, and perhaps he was. In this case, however, Amherst acted primarily as a conduit between the Treasury and the Royal Americans. In July of 1763, Amherst advised the Royal commanders throughout North America that the Treasury would soon reduce soldiers pay. For instance, he penned a letter to the officers at Cape Breton and Newfoundland that they would soon “make a Stoppage of Four pence Sterling for every portion of Provisions that may be Issued.”²⁷⁴ Meanwhile, Amherst begged the Treasury to reconsider the Stoppage Order, because the price of goods outweighed soldiers’ pay in North America. As he put it, “I really think the Stoppage rather too great, considering the high price the Soldiers are obliged to Pay for their Necessarys &ca in this Country.”²⁷⁵ Amherst believed that the Royal Army was obliged to ensure soldiers’ sufficient pay to procure foodstuffs, otherwise something worse than a food riot might result. He forestalled implementing the Stoppage Order until August of 1763. Meanwhile, to create the appearance of frugality, Amherst ordered Bouquet to evacuate all women and children from the frontier forts, “The Women, Children, & those who are really Useless Hands, cannot be Sent away too Soon.”²⁷⁶ By turning away non-enlisted persons, Amherst could reduce expenses and hope for the Treasury to rescind the Stoppage Order. Even so, Amherst was a military man, always loyal to the British state, and he vowed to implement the Order when conditions seemed favorable.²⁷⁷

²⁷⁴ Amherst to C. Jenkinson, Secretary of the Treasury, New York, July 23, 1763, Amherst Papers. Peter Way has demonstrated that mutinies were most server in the Maritime region. “Rebellion of the Regulars,” 781.

²⁷⁵ Amherst to C. Jenkinson, Secretary of the Treasury, New York, July 23, 1763, Amherst Papers.

²⁷⁶ Amherst to Bouquet, New York, July 16, 1763, *PHB*, V, 313-314.

²⁷⁷ Amherst to C. Jenkinson, Secretary of the Treasury, New York, July 23, 1763, Amherst Papers.

In August of 1763, Pontiac's War erupted and demanded the redeployment of the Redcoats. Pontiac's Indians upset the Treasury's assumption that peace had resumed, and Amherst deployed several regiments back across the Alleghenies. Warring natives had seized several British forts and had renewed raids on the Pennsylvania and Virginian frontiers.²⁷⁸ The Lords of the Treasury demanded that Amherst implement the Stoppage Order but the timing could not have been worse. Amherst found himself in the paradoxical situation of having to convince soldiers to enlist but now on reduced pay. He penned Bouquet a letter, instructing him to begin recruitment, fill the 42nd regiment, and prepare for an offensive campaign against the Ohio Indians. Additionally, Amherst ordered Bouquet to reduce the Redcoats pay from 6 pence to 4 pence. Since 1757, Bouquet had encountered difficulties recruiting soldiers, and now recruiting on reduced pay seemed a fanciful proposition. To solve this dilemma, Amherst instructed Bouquet to shrink the 77th regiment and recruit its most talented soldiers into the 42nd.²⁷⁹ But Amherst's apprehensions proved true: Bouquet could not fill the ranks of the 42nd regiment and simultaneously reduce soldiers' pay. No sooner had Bouquet recruited soldiers than others deserted. The Stoppage Order created a maddening cycle of recruitment followed by desertion.²⁸⁰

On September 22, 1763, Henry Bouquet lowered the Redcoat's pay from 6*d.* to 4*d.*, but soldiers greeted this reduction with the very protests that Amherst had tried to dodge.²⁸¹ Within one-week of lowering the Regulars pay, Bouquet reported that three

²⁷⁸ Gregory Evan Dowd, *War Under Heaven: Pontiac, The Indian Nations & the British Empire* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2002), 90-147.

²⁷⁹ Amherst to Bouquet, New York, August 7, 1763, *PHB*, V, 346-349.

²⁸⁰ Amherst to Bouquet, New York, July 16, 1763, *PHB*, V, 313-314; Bouquet to Gage, Philadelphia, May 20, 1764, *PHB*, V, 542-454.

²⁸¹ Amherst: Order for Stoppages, New York, September 22, 1763 *PHB*, V, 399-400.

soldiers deserted.²⁸² But that was only the beginning of what escalated into uncontrollable acts of desertion. Captain Ecuyer reported that on a march from Pittsburgh to Ligonier, eight soldiers deserted. Ecuyer found his regiment to be in a mutinous disposition, slow to follow orders, and he anticipated more desertions.²⁸³

By mid-November, the Stoppage Order had transformed the regulars into what Captain Ecuyer called “a tribe of Rebels.” He explained it like this:

I have been obliged, after all imaginable patience, to have two of them horsewhipped on the spot and without a court-martial. One wanted to kill the sergeant and the other wanted to kill me. I was on the point of blowing his brains out, but fear of killing or wounding several of those around us stopped me. What a disagreeable thing! In the name of God let me retire into the country. It is in your power, Sir, to let me go, and I shall have eternal gratitude.²⁸⁴

Ecuyer’s rant illuminated turmoil inside the army that the Stoppage Order occasioned. For several years, Bouquet had tried to realize military rule, at least inside British forts, and soldiers had not mounted systematic resistance. Now, the Stoppage Order strengthened both the processes of military coercion and brought subaltern resistance. Peter Way has argued that many soldiers who entered the Royal Army brought with them laboring and craft experiences. Soldiers retained from those experiences notions of customary rights and just wages. Not surprisingly, Regular soldiers from England’s artisan and laboring ranks mounted resistance to the Stoppage Order, based on their

²⁸² State of the First Battalion, Royal Americans, September 30, 1763, *PHB*, V, 415.

²⁸³ Ecuyer to Bouquet, Bedford, November 8, 1763, *PHB*, V, 453.

²⁸⁴ Ecuyer to Bouquet, Bedford, November 13, 1763, *PHB*, V, 459-460.

understanding of customary rights in the English labor system.²⁸⁵ But, to the extent that Bouquet realized military rule, he had already displaced many notions of customary right and stripped away many residues of paternalism. This transition allowed Ecuyer to evade the many customary obligations that laborers and soldiers ascribed to their superiors and instead resorted to horsewhipping recalcitrants. Initially, Bouquet and other Royal officials did not always respond to mutiny as English town officials responded to food riots but hoped coercion would bring a speedy end to the rebellion. Yet, the mutiny persisted and British officials increasingly resorted to conciliatory measures.²⁸⁶

Alarmed by the level of mutiny in the 45th regiment, Amherst attempted to conciliate between the Treasury's demands and the regulars in Florida, New York, Ohio, and across the continent. Amherst altered the Stoppage Order from a 4*d.* reduction to only two and one-half pence in both Florida and New York.²⁸⁷ Although this alteration violated the Treasury's orders, Amherst feared that another 4 pence reduction could extend the rebellion. As he put it,

On consideration that the Stoppages of Four Pence ordered to be made from the Pay of the Troops, was rather more than the Solders could Bear in this Country...I have taken upon me, without waiting for an answer from Home, to Reduce the Stoppage to Two Pence Half Penny: I enclose you a Copy of the Publick Order which I have given for Lowering the Stoppage as above mentioned, that you may make the same known to the Troops under your Command.²⁸⁸

²⁸⁵ Way, "Rebellion of the Regulars," 767.

²⁸⁶ Way, "Rebellion of the Regulars," 765-766, 787-788.

²⁸⁷ Way, "Rebellion of the Regulars," 787-788.

²⁸⁸ Amherst to The Officer Commanding the Troops in Florida and its Dependencies, stationed at Pensacola, New York, October 14, 1763, 82; Amherst to Lieutenant Colonel Robertson, New York, October 14, 1763, Amherst Papers.

Yet, Amherst alteration to the Treasury's order did not prevent desertion and mutiny in Florida. There, Royal officers tried deserters in military courts, in a crisis that strangely paralleled the one in Ohio. Perceiving that courts martial did not dissuade potential deserters, Amherst revoked their decisions and experimented with a pardon. Even so, a pardon did not lessen the bite of the Stoppage Order itself and Amherst failed to broker a resolution.²⁸⁹

Back in Ohio, desertions continued into the winter of 1764, causing a major labor shortage in the Royal Army. For example, Captain John J. Schlösser reported that desertion increased daily, and he attributed it to Amherst's Stoppage Order. As he explained the problem, "I can ascribe the Reason to nothing but the Stoppage for Provision." At the bottom of Schlosser's letter, Bouquet scribbled a worried calculation, indicating that his six companies lacked adequate manpower.²⁹⁰ By May of 1764, Bouquet still had not filled the ranks of the 42nd regiment, as the desertion rate outpaced enlistment. Meanwhile, Pontiac's War tore at the fabric of frontier society, and Bouquet requested that the Pennsylvania Assembly raise 1,000 provincial soldiers. The Assembly refused.²⁹¹ Still, the Treasury was not prepared to rescind the Stoppage Order and desertion continued.

As desertion depleted the Redcoats' ranks, Amherst implemented a couple measures intended to abate the crisis. First, he denied soldiers' requests for discharges, compelling them to serve longer than specified by their contracts. As might have been

²⁸⁹ Amherst to The Officer Commanding the Troops in Florida, October 14, 1763.

²⁹⁰ Schlosser to Bouquet, Philadelphia, March 4, 1764, *PHB*, V, 497-498.

²⁹¹ Bouquet to Gage, Philadelphia, May 20, 1764, *PHB*, V, 542-454.

expected, these soldiers espied an underhanded impressment in this policy and began deserting at even more rapid rates. As Bouquet explained,

The orders I had from Sir Jeffery Amherst forbidding me to discharge as usual the men whose times of Service were expired, added to Seven Years of a most disagreeable (*sic*) Service in the Woods have occasioned this unprecedented Desertion. The encouragement generally given in this Country to Deserters, Skreened almost by every Inhabitant will in times ruin (*sic*) the Army, unless the Laws against Harbourers are better inforced, by the American Governments.

As colonists became increasingly willing to harbor deserters, more and more soldiers joined the mutiny. By mid-May, the three regular regiments stationed at Lancaster lost 38 soldiers, shrinking their combined numbers to only 55 soldiers.²⁹²

As Pontiac's War lingered, mutiny continued to plague the army and depleted the ranks of the 42nd regiment. West of the Proclamation Line, Bouquet realized a variant of military rule, which officers had sustained inside the forts. But now, sympathetic colonists offered defecting Redcoats an alternative to military rule, and many soldiers braved the trek across the Alleghenies and took shelter in the colonies. Coercion had proven a futile remedy to mutiny. Just as Pennsylvanians had resisted requisitioning, now they slighted militarization by funneling soldiers back into colonial society. Lancaster farmers who had earlier secreted wagons away from requisitioners now harbored deserters. Unable to halt this exodus back into Pennsylvania, Bouquet renounced the logic of militarization and sought to reintegrate deserters into the ranks.

²⁹² Bouquet to Gage, Philadelphia, May 20, 1764, *PHB*, V, 542-454.

After all, he needed manpower to launch the long awaited 1764 offensive. In this context, Bouquet requested General Thomas Gage to grant deserters a general pardon, hoping this would encourage seasoned soldiers to return to the Royal Army and replenish the ranks.²⁹³ Gage accepted this proposal and agreed that old soldiers brought more training and experience than did provincial recruits. He hoped that such this pardon would have “a good effect” in completing the 42nd regiment.²⁹⁴ Accordingly, the Royal Army posted advertisements throughout Pennsylvania and Virginia for deserters from the First Battalion of regulars to re-enlist under the terms of the military’s general pardon.²⁹⁵

Few soldiers embraced Gage’s pardon, and desertion persisted though the summer of 1764. Soon, Gage rescinded the general pardon and reinstituted military justice. Bouquet reported that he had imprisoned two captured deserters from the 42nd and three from the 60th, along with several from the Pennsylvania regiments. Gage responded with orders for Bouquet to execute the captured deserters.²⁹⁶ This order paralleled Gage’s instructions to execute Pontiac and his collaborators.²⁹⁷ Likewise, Bouquet threatened to execute any colonist convicted of selling munitions to hostile Indians. Though perfectly consistent with British treason codes, Bouquet’s threats exceeded colonial statutory law.²⁹⁸ In all, British military men met desertion with discipline and execution, punishments more severe than what colonists were prepared to accept. Still, desertion persisted.

²⁹³ Bouquet to Gage, Philadelphia, May 27, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 547-548.

²⁹⁴ Gage to Bouquet, New York, June 5, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 556-558; Gage, Amnesty Proclamation, New York, June 11, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 570.

²⁹⁵ Schlosser to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, June 30, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 584-585.

²⁹⁶ Bouquet to Gage, Carlisle, August 10, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 601-602.

²⁹⁷ Gage to Bouquet, New York, September 2, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 626-627.

²⁹⁸ Bouquet to Forster, Carlisle, June 29, 1763, *PHB*, V, 274;

By autumn 1764, desertion had depleted the First and Second Royal battalions to only 750 soldiers in all. This short fall could not have come at a worst time, for Bouquet worried that so sparse a battalion could not halt frontier raids and end Pontiac's War. Indeed, Bouquet was convinced that only military might could end this Indian war:

For in my humble opinion, the only certainty we can have of a lasting Peace with Savages, is not to grant it to them, but at the Head of Such Forces as must convince them of our ability to chastise them if they break it.²⁹⁹

Problematically, the desertions of 1763-64 left Bouquet with insufficient strength to carryout an authentic offensive to subjugate the natives. With Bouquet's regiments almost paralyzed by desertions, William Johnson invoked the Covenant Chain alliance and sent an Iroquois delegation to negotiate with their warring Ohio nephews.³⁰⁰ Meanwhile, Bouquet appealed to the Pennsylvania government for financial and military assistance. Now, with Pontiac's War spilling onto the Pennsylvania frontier, the Pennsylvania government finally agreed to defray the cost of recruiting, not least because the only practical alternative was to militarize western Pennsylvania. Pennsylvanians had always resisted reforming their government along the lines of Britain's military-fiscal bureaucracy, but now they agreed to lend financial assistance to what had become Bouquet's ragtag army.³⁰¹ The mutiny of 1763-64 challenged the internal workings of

²⁹⁹ Bouquet to Gage, Pittsburgh, December 27, 1763, *PHB*, V, 486-487.

³⁰⁰ For the role of the Iroquois, see Michael N. McConnell, *A Country Between: The Upper Ohio Valley and Its Peoples, 1724-1774* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992); Parmenter, "Pontiac's War".

³⁰¹ Bouquet to Gage, Fort Loudoun, August 31, 1764, *PHB*, VI, 622.

Bouquet's war machine, forcing him to rely on Iroquois natives and a legislative process to salvage his operations at the banks of the Muskingum River.

On November 15, 1764, the First Battalion of Royal Americans arrived at the Muskingum River. For almost a decade, Colonel Henry Bouquet's military machine had projected the British fiscal-military state onto colonial governments, frontier settlers, and into Indian society, always with mediocre results at best. The more energy Bouquet expended to realize military rule in North America, the more creative were the strategies that colonial assemblies, farmers, natives, and finally soldiers used to resist military coercion. Now, ironically, the very peoples who Bouquet had failed to transform into marionettes of the Royal Army were actually buttressing his demand that the Ohio Indians surrender their captives, all captives. Whereas Bouquet had hoped to execute Pontiac and drive the Ohio Indians across the Mississippi River, his war machine had deserted, almost utterly collapsed. This rebellion weakened Bouquet's war making powers and cleared the way for colonials and Iroquois to reverse earlier losses. Bouquet secured the release of captives, but he never fully realized the militarization of the British imperial periphery. Instead, he left a legacy of barriers and hostilities between the Royal Army, British colonists, and Native Americans. A westward moving line that Bouquet first drew over the Allegheny Mountains in 1761 symbolized those legacies; by 1764, he had moved this line to the Muskingum River; and one day it would extend across North America.³⁰²

³⁰² This analysis is derived from Gregory Evan Dowd's analysis of an ethnic barrier between colonial and native societies. *War Under Heaven*, 177-179.

Bibliography

Manuscript sources

William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

William Henry Lyttelton Papers

Sir Jeffery Amherst Papers

John Sterling Letter Book

Published Documents

The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, 1755-1757, in Terry W. Lipscomb, editor. *The Colonial Records of South Carolina*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989.

The Ohio Company Papers, 1753-1817, Being Primarily Papers of the "Suffering Traders" of Pennsylvania. Bailey, Kenneth P., editor. Arcata, CA, 1947.

The Papers of Henry Bouquet, volumes 1-VI. Edited by S. K. Stevens. Donald H. Kent, Autumn L. Leonard. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical Museum Commission. 1951.

The Papers of Sir William Johnson. Prepared for Publication by the Division of Archives and History. Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1921-1965.

The Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania from 1682 to 1801. Mitchell, James T., Flanders, Henry, editors. Harrisburg, PA: The State Printer of Pennsylvania, 1896.

Books

Anderson, Fred. *A People's Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years' War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.

- . *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of the Empire in British North America, 1754-1766*. New York: Vintage Books, 2000.
- Anderson, M.S. *War and Society in Europe of the Old Regime 1618-1789*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1998.
- Aquila, Richard. *The Iroquois Restoration: Iroquois Diplomacy on the Colonial Frontier, 1701-1754*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1983.
- Axtell, James. *After Columbus: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Bailey, Kenneth P. *The Ohio Company of Virginia and the Westward Movement, 1748-1792: A Chapter in the History of the Colonial Frontier*. Glendale, CA: Arthur H. Clark, 1939.
- . *Christopher Gist: Colonial Frontiersman, Explorer, and Indian Agent*. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1976.
- Black, Jeremy. *A Military Revolution? Military Change and European Society 1550-1800*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International, 1991.
- Borneman, Walter R. *The French and Indian War: Deciding the Fate of North America*. New York: harper Collins, 2006.
- Brandão, José António. *"Your fyre shall burn no more" Iroquois Policy Toward New France and Its Native Allies to 1701*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.
- Brewer, John. *The Sinews of Power: War, Money and the English State, 1688-1783*. New York: Alfred Knopf. 1989.
- Bruce, A. P. C. *The Purchase System in the British Army, 1660-1871*. London: Royal Historical Society, 1980.
- Calloway, Colin G. *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- . *Crown and Calumet: British Indian Relations, 1783-1815*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987.
- Cronon, William. *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1983.
- Crouse, Maurice A. *The Public Treasury of Colonial South Carolina*. Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 1977.

- Darlington, Mary C., ed. *History of Col. Henry Bouquet and the Western Frontiers of Pennsylvania 1747-1764*. New York: Arno Press, 1971.
- Dixon, David. *Never Come to Peace Again: Pontiac's Uprising and the Fate of the British Empire in North America*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2005.
- Dowd, Gregory Evans. *War Under Heaven: Pontiac, the Indians Nations, & the British Empire*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2002.
- Downing, Brian M. *The Military Revolution and Political Change: Origins of Democracy and Autocracy in Early Modern Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Draper, Theodore. *Struggle for Power: The American Revolution*. New York: Times Books, 1996.
- Duby, Georges. *Rurual Economy and Country Life in the Medieval West*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998.
- Duffy, Christopher. *Siege Warfare: The Fortress in the Early Modern World 1494-1660*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Duffy, Michael. *The Military Revolution and the State, 1500-1800*. Exeter: University of Exeter, 1980.
- Flexner, James Thomas. *Lord of the Mohawks: A Biography of Sir William Johnson*. Boston: Little Brown, 1979.
- Frakes, George Edward. *Laboratory for Liberty: The South Carolina Legislative Committee System, 1719-1776*. Lexington: The University of Kentucky Press, 1970.
- Greene, Jack P. *Peripheries and Center: Constitutional Development in the Extended Politics of the British Empire and the United States, 1607-1788*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1986.
- _____. *The Quest for Power: The Lower House of Assembly in the Southern Royal Colonies 1169-1776*. New York: Norton & Company, Inc., 1972.
- Guy, Alan J. *Oeconomy and Discipline: Officership and Administration in the British Army, 1714-63*. Manchester, UK: Dover, N.H.: Manchester University Press, 1985.
- _____. *The Army of the Georges 1714-1783*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

- Hill, Christopher. *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Press, 1975.
- _____. *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.
- _____. *The Century of Revolution, 1603-1714*. New York: Norton & Company, Inc., 1961.
- Hinderaker, Eric. *Elusive Empires: Constructing Colonialism in the Ohio Valley, 1673-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Hunter, William A. *Forts on the Pennsylvania Frontier, 1753-1758*. Harrisburg, PA: The Pennsylvania Historical Commission and Museum Commission, 1960.
- James, Alfred Procter, *Drums in the Forest; Decision at the Forks*. Pittsburgh: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1958.
- _____. *The Ohio Company, Its Inner History*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1959.
- Jennings, Francis. *Empire of Fortune: Crowns, Colonies, and Tribes in the Seven Years War*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1988.
- Kopperman, Paul E. *Braddock at the Monongahela*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1977.
- Landsman, Ned C. *From Colonials to Provincials: American Thought and Culture, 1768-1760*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Lepore, Jill. *The Name of War: King Philip's War and the Origins of American Identity*. New York: Knopf, 1998.
- Linebaugh, Peter and Rediker, Marcus. *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2000.
- Littlefield, Daniel F. *Africans and Creeks: From the Colonial Period to the Civil War*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1979.
- _____. *The Chickasaw Freedmen: A People Without a Country*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1980.
- _____. *Rice and Slaves: Ethnicity and the Slave Trade in Colonial South Carolina*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981.

- Marchand, Philip. *Ghost Empire: How the French Almost Conquered North America*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers, 2007.
- Marshall, P.J., editor. *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Eighteenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- . *The Making and Unmaking of Empires: Britain, India, and America c. 1750-1783*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- McConnell, Michael N. *A Country Between: The Upper Ohio Valley and Its Peoples, 1724-1774*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992.
- Merrell, James H. *The Indians New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbors from European Contact through the Era of Removal*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989.
- Middleton, Richard. *The Bells of Victory: The Pitt-Newcastle Ministry and the Conduct of the Seven Years' War*. Cambridge; London: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Nash, Gary B. *The urban Crucible: The Northern Seaports and the Origins of the American Revolution*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Nolan, James Bennett. *General Benjamin Franklin: The Military Career of a Philosopher*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Oliphant, John. *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier, 1756-63*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University State, 2001.
- O'Toole, Fintan. *White Savage: William Johnson and the Invention of America*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.
- Parker, Geoffrey. *The Military Revolution: Military Innovation and the Rise of the West, 1500-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- . "The 'Military Revolution, 1560-1660'—A Myth?" Rogers, Clifford J., ed. *The Military Revolution Debate: Readings on the Military Transformation of Early Modern Europe*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995.
- Perdue, Theda. "Cherokee Relations wit the Iroquois in the Eighteenth Century," in Daniel K. Richter and James H, Merrell, eds. *Beyond the Covenant Chain: The Iroquois and Their Neighbors in Indians North America 1600-1800*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1987.

- _____. *Cherokee Women: Gender and Culture Change 1700-1835*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Piers, Mackesy. *The War for America, 1775–1783*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Porter, Bruce. *War and the Rise of the State: The Military Foundations of Modern Politics*. New York: The Free Press, 1994.
- Ralston, David B. *Importing the European Army: The Introduction of European Military Techniques and Institutions into the Extra-European World, 1600-1914*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1990.
- Rediker, Marcus. *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea: Merchant Seamen, Pirates, and the Anglo-American Maritime World, 1700-1750*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- _____. *The Slave Ship: A Human History*. New York: Viking Press, 2007.
- Richter, Daniel K. *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- _____. *Facing East From Indian Country: A Native History of Early America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- _____. *Beyond the Covenant Chain: The Iroquois and Their Neighbors in Indian North America, 1600-1800*. Daniel Richter and James Merrell, editors. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1987.
- Roberts, Michael. "The Military Revolution, 1560-1660." In Rogers, Clifford J., ed. *The Military Revolution Debate: Readings on the Military Transformation of Early Modern Europe*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995.
- Rogers, Alan, *Empire and Liberty: American Resistance to British Authority 1755-1763*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.
- Scholem, Gershom G. *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*. New York: Schocken Books, 1941.
- _____. *The Messianic Idea in Judaism And Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*. New York: Schocken Books, 1995.
- Silver, Timothy. *A New Face on the Countryside: Indians, colonists, and slaves in South Atlantic forests, 1500-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

- Sirmans, Eugene M. *Colonial South Carolina: A Political History, 1663-1763*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966.
- Sosin, Jack M. *Whitehall and the Wilderness: The Middle West in British Colonial Policy, 1760-1775*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.
- Tilly, Charles, ed. *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.
- . *Coercion, Capital, and European States, A.D. 990-1990*. Oxford and Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- Thompson, E.P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Press, 1972.
- Titus, James. *The Old Dominion at War: Society, Politics, and Warfare in Late Colonial Virginia*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1991.
- Tully, Alan, *Forming American Politics: Ideas, Interests, and Institutions in Colonial New York and Pennsylvania*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.
- Usner, Daniel H. *Indians, Settlers & Slaves in a Frontier Exchange Economy: The Lower Mississippi Valley Before 1783*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- Volwiler, Albert T. *George Croghan and the Westward Movement 1741-1782*. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1926.
- Wainwright, Nicholas B. *George Croghan: Wilderness Diplomat*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959.
- Wallace, Anthony F.C. *King of the Delawares: Teedyuscung 1700-1763*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1949.
- Wallace, Paul A. *Conrad Weiser: Friend of Colonist and Mohawk, 1696-1760*. New York: Russell & Russell. 1971.
- Ward, Matthew C. *Breaking the Backcountry: The Seven Years' War in Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1754-1765*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2003.
- Way, Peter. *Common Labor: Workers and the Digging of North American Canals 1780-1860*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Weber, Max, *From Max Weber*. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, editors. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970.

- Weir, Robert M. *Colonial South Carolina: A History*. Millwood, N.Y.: KTO Press, 1983.
- Wheeler, James Scott. *The Making of a World Power: War and the Military Revolution in Seventeenth-Century England*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1999.
- White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and republics in the great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Wood, Peter H. *Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 Through the Stono Rebellion*. New York: Knopf, 1974.

Articles

- Axtell, James. "Ethnohistory: An Historian's Viewpoint." *Ethnohistory* 26: 1 (Winter, 1979): 1-13.
- . "Some Thoughts on the Ethnohistory of Missions." *Ethnohistory* 29: 1 (Winter, 1982): 35-41.
- . "The White Indians of Colonial America." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 32: 1 (Jan. 1975): 55-88.
- . "The Ethnohistory of Early America: A Review Essay." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 35: 1 (Jan. 1978): 110-144.
- Bean, Richard. "War and the Birth of the Nation State." *Journal of Economic History* 33 (1975): 203-201.
- Bauman, Zygmunt, "Sociology after the Holocaust," *The British Journal of Sociology* 39: 4 (Dec. 1988): 477-485.
- Black, Jeremy. "Britain's Foreign Alliance in the Eighteenth Century." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 20: 4 (Winter, 1988): 573-602.
- . " "George II and All That Stuff": On the Value of the Neglected." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 36: 4 (Winter, 2004): 581-607.
- . "British Foreign Policy in the Eighteenth Century: A Survey." *The Journal of British Studies* 26: 1 (Jan. 1987): 26-53.
- . "Military Organisations and Military Change in Historical Perspectives." *The Journal of Military History* 62: 4 (Oct. 1998): 871-892.

- _____. "War and the World, 1450-2000." *The Journal of Military History* 63: 3 (Jul. 1999): 669-681.
- _____. "Britain as a Military Power, 1688-1815." *The Journal of Military History* 64: 1 (Jul. 2000): 157-177.
- _____. "Determinism and Other Issues." *The Journal of Military History* 68: 4 (Oct. 2004): 1217-1232.
- Calloway, Colin G. "An Uncertain Destiny: Indian Captivities on the Upper Connecticut," *Journal of American Studies* 17: 2 (1983): 190-91.
- Dunn, Walter S. *Frontier Profit and Loss: The British Army and the Fur Trade, 1760-1764*. Westport, Connecticut; London: Greenwood Press, 1998.
- Green, Jack P. "The South Carolina Quartering Dispute 1757-1758." *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 60 (1959): 193-203.
- _____. "Martin Bladen's Blueprint for a Colonial Union." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 17: 4 (Oct. 1960): 516-530.
- _____. "The Role of the Lower House of Assembly in Eighteenth-Century Politics." *The Journal of Southern History* 27: 4 (Nov. 1961): 451-474.
- Grey, Thomas C. "Origins of the Unwritten Constitution: Fundamental Law in American Revolutionary Thought." *Stanford Law Review* 39: 5 (May 1978): 843-850.
- Jespersen, Knud J. V. "Social Change and Military Revolution in Early Modern Europe: Some Danish Evidence." *The Historical Journal* 26: 1 (Mar. 1983): 1-13.
- John, A.H. "War and the English Economy, 1700-1763." *Economic History Review* 7:3 (1955): 329-344.
- Kingra, Mahinder S. "The Trace Italienne and the Military Revolution During the Eighty Years' War, 1567-1648." *The Journal of Military History* 57: 3 (Jul. 1993): 431-446.
- Kopperman, Paul E. "The Stoppages Mutiny of 1763." *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine*, 69 (1986): 241-254.
- _____. "'The Cheapest Pay': Alcohol Abuse in the Eighteenth-Century British Army." *The Journal of Military History* 60: 3 (Jul. 1996): 445-470.
- Lynn, John A. "Tactical Evolution in the French army, 1560-1660." *French Historical Studies* 14: 2 (Autumn, 1985): 176-191.

- Neal, Larry. "Interpreting Power and Profit in Economic History: A Case Study of the Seven Years' War." *The Journal of Economic History* 37: 1 (March, 1977): 20-35.
- Onuf, Peter S. "We Shall all be Americans: Thomas Jefferson and the Indians." *Indiana Magazine of History*, XCV (June 1999): 103-136.
- Paul, Michael C. "The Military Revolution in Russia, 1550-1682." *The Journal of Military History* 68: 1 (Jan. 2004): 9-45.
- Parker, Geoffrey. "The "Military Revolution," 1560-1660—a Myth?" *The Journal of Modern History* 48: 2 (June 1976): 196-214.
- Parmenter, Jon William. "Pontiac's War" Forging New Links in the Anglo-Iroquois Covenant Chain, 1758-1766." *Ethnohistory* 44: 4 (Autumn, 1997): 617-654.
- . "Mutiny and Discontent in the Spanish Army of Flanders 1572-1607." *Past and Present* 58 (Feb. 1973): 38-52.
- Richter, Daniel. "War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience," *The William and Mary Quarterly*. Vol. 40, no. 4 (Oct. 1983): 529.
- . "Whose Indian History?" *The William and Mary Quarterly* 50: 2 (Apr. 1993): 379-393.
- Rogers, Clifford. "The Military Revolution of the Hundred Years' War." *The Journal of Military History* 57: 2 (Apr. 1993): 241-278.
- Way, Peter. "Rebellion of the Regulars: Working Soldiers and the Mutiny of 1763-1764." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 57: 4 (Oct., 2000).
- . "Soldiers of Misfortune: New England Regulars and the Fall of Oswego, 1755-1756." *Massachusetts Historical Review* 3 (2001).
<<http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/mhr/3/way.html>>
- Weiss, Roger W. "The Issue of Paper Money in the American Colonies, 1720-1774", *The Journal of Economic History*, 30 (Dec. 1970), pp. 770-784.
- Wicker, Elmus. "Colonial Monetary Standards Contrasted: Evidence from the Seven Years' War", *The Journal of Economic History*. Vol. 45: 7 (Dec. 1985): Pp. 869-884.