



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

**The great Easton Treaty of 1758: the 'unknown'
turning point of the French and Indian War**

Item Type	Thesis
Authors	Waugaman, David
Publisher	Wichita State University
Rights	Copyright 2017 by David Waugaman All Rights reserved
Download date	2026-05-15 07:18:07
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/10057/15338

THE GREAT EASTON TREATY OF 1758: THE 'UNKNOWN' TURNING POINT OF THE
FRENCH AND INDIAN WAR

A Thesis by

David Waugaman

Bachelor of Arts, Thiel College, 2015

Submitted to the Department of History
and the faculty of the Graduate School of
Wichita State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

December 2017

©Copyright 2017 by David Waugaman

All Rights reserved

THE GREAT EASTON TREATY OF 1758: THE 'UNKNOWN' TURNING POINT OF THE
FRENCH AND INDIAN WAR

The following faculty members have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content, and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts with a major in History.

Robert Owens, Committee Chair

Robin Henry, Committee Member

Rebeccah Bechtold, Committee Member

ABSTRACT

This thesis attempted to argue that an Anglo-Indian treaty signed at a small Pennsylvanian town called Easton in fall 1758 should be considered a crucial turning point in the French and Indian War. This treaty was one of many events that shifted the tide of the war into British favor. The outcome of the war was the expulsion of the French from colonial North America. This thesis traces the foundations of Easton back to the beginnings of the colony of Pennsylvania and the establishment of relations with Native Americans by the proprietor. From there, it analyzes a shift in policy both at the provincial and parliamentary levels. Then, it examined the effects the early battles of the French and Indian War had on Anglo-Indian relations. Finally, this thesis highlighted the prior failures at Easton, the 1758 conference and treaty document, and the number of legacies that could be derived from Easton's passage.

The approach for this thesis came from an analytical and argumentative approach. Through primary sources such as newspapers, personal journal, state documents, and conference minutes, they helped defend the claim. Additionally, a number of secondary sources were used to supplement the primary sources and to further aid the argument. Overall, through the analysis and examination this thesis provides, it should be clear that the Treaty of Easton 1758 should take its rightful place as a crucial turning point in the French and Indian War. It should no longer be considered as 'unknown.'

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
Chapter 1.	Introduction and Historiography	1
Chapter 2.	British Native American Affairs up to 1754	10
Chapter 3.	The French and Indian War Paves the way for Easton	26
Chapter 4.	Prior Easton Failures and the Great Conference at Easton, October 1758	49
Chapter 5.	Long Term Significances and Conclusions	69
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	87
	APPENDIX	92

Chapter 1: Introduction and Historiography

Throughout the eighteenth century in Colonial America, the British and the French were pinned in numerous wars in the hope of continental expansion and influence. During the middle half of the century, the conflict for expansion launched the continent to a point of no return in, what was called in North America, the French and Indian War (1754-1763); globally this war was known as the Seven Years War (1756-1763). The French and Indian War differed from previous wars on the continent because the global conflict began due to the turmoil in North American. The prior trend had been European conflicts that spilled over into their North American colonies. The primary goal of the French and Indian War was the territorial expansion. The French wanted to seize more lands south from Canada; while the British wanted more control and influence west of the established thirteen colonies along the eastern seaboard. The epicenter of this clash was where modern day Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania resides. The Forks of the Ohio, as it was referred to, was deemed a prize possession because of its vast waterways for trade. Both countries knew who ever controlled that land regulated the majority of the trade that would make its way through the interior of the continent.

As time went on, the two sides battled for control not only of the Forks but for the entirety of the continent, and much of the globe. During the fighting, both sides realized that Native Americans allies would prove crucial. To make this possible each side had to try and woo these tribes through vast conferences and the resulting treaties. At first, the French had all the momentum in gathering the favor of these tribes and the results hurt the British efforts. The British losses at the hands of the French and their Indian allies led the British to boost their negotiation efforts. One of the most important British-Indian conferences took place in a small eastern Pennsylvanian town called Easton. There had been several conferences at this site. But,

in 1758, the British were able to break through with their efforts and create one of the most important turning points of the French and Indian War. This treaty brought those Western Pennsylvanian Indian tribes, who were primarily allied with the French, to the side of the British. Thanks to Treaty of Easton 1758, the British, with the aid of the Native Americans, were able to expel the French from the Forks and eventually ruin their colonial efforts in North America.

To fully understand the context and importance of the Treaty of Easton 1758 one must dig deep into the roots of British, more specifically the Pennsylvanian, and Native American relations. This examination begins with the arrival of the colony's proprietor William Penn. Penn, a devout Quaker, established that fair treatment of the Native American tribes in Pennsylvania was crucial. In the late seventeenth century, Penn presided over a treaty that became the popular image of Native American diplomacy. Further, Penn set the example of what a good Indian agent should be. He interacted with many of the tribes personally, and even, ventured to learn and speak their native languages. Sadly, after the proprietor's departure, all of these fair practices were lost. In 1737, William Penn's sons created one of the most disrespectful and deceitful Native American land purchases, at least until the practices of William Henry Harrison less than a century later. The Walking Purchase of 1737 made the Indians in Pennsylvania feel cheated. Some of these tribes would not trust British Indian agents until Easton two decades later. Seven years later, another important treaty would arise. The Treaty of Lancaster of 1744 was an important document that strengthened the covenant chain between the British and the Native Americans, mainly the Six Nations (or the Iroquois League). This treaty gave the British a consistent Native American ally in the Iroquois League, but suppressed the rights of others in the process. In time, the League proved to be loyal allies; especially when fighting arose throughout the New York region. As relations were going well for the British in

upstate New York with the Iroquois, their agents and traders were still struggling to gain any ground with the Pennsylvania Indians; mainly the Lenape or Delaware. Prior to the 1758 conference, there were two prior conferences that were held at Easton in 1756 and 1757. Both conferences were ultimate failures that led to both sides feeling that nothing had been achieved. Following the 1757 conference failure, key British Native American Agency leaders knew that a great conference would have to be called to fix the unresolved grievances.

Easton was not only a political treaty it was a military treaty that the British had desperately needed. Due to their diplomatic failures, when war broke out in 1754 many of the Native Americans flocked to the French side. The first example of this was the failure of the Braddock expedition in 1755. General Edward Braddock, who shunned aid from Cherokee allies, was charged with leading a large British force to the Forks to expel the French from that region for good. But, thanks to their Indian allies, the smaller French force defeated Braddock in a shocking battle that left the region uncontested for three years. The Western Theatre of the war was not the only region plagued by French victories with the aid of their Native American allies. In upstate New York, the British were bested at Fort William Henry in 1757, a year before Easton. Following the siege and surrender of the fort, French aligned Native Americans went on a rampage that struck terror into the British soldiers. By fall 1758, the outcome of the war looked extremely bleak for the British and their cause.

Along with the important battles, there were a number of important figures who made Easton such an unqualified success. The idea for this conference started with the plans made by Secretary of State William Pitt, the elder. From there his orders went down the chain of command from General John Forbes to several colonial governors, to British Indian Superintendent Sir William Johnson and his Indian agents. Not only were there important British

figures involved. There were a number important Native American chiefs present at Easton; most importantly Delaware Chief Teedyuscung. His boldness led to his people getting the best terms that made the Great Easton Conference so successful.

The conference itself lasted roughly twenty days. Throughout those twenty days, the terms of the eventual treaty were shaped. It was not an easy process. There were many formalities and tensions each side had to face. But, in time the proper concessions were made that produced the influential turning point that was the Treaty of Easton 1758. Following its signing, the effects were almost immediate. The French lost their allies that forced them to abandon their efforts in the Forks without a single British shot. From there the dominos began to fall in Britain's favor. With the Western theater pacified, the victory freed up British supplies that could now go towards their efforts in Canada and upstate New York. Three important campaigns undid the French in North America. With the advantage of the Iroquois League, Sir William Johnson launched a successful siege of Fort Niagara with the Indians aiding heavily in the victory. Second, General James Wolfe seized Quebec in September 1759. Finally, General Jeffery Amherst essentially ended the French chances for victory at the Battle of Montreal in 1760. With their victories, it was clear that the British would now be the only major European power left to control the continent of North America. Many of the Native American tribes, who were loyal to the French, were not happy with this British monopoly of power. This led to a Native American prophet and chief who tried to expel the British through violent war. Pontiac's War, as it was called, was a brutal Native American uprising that struck fear into many of the British colonists. Overall, Easton was a short but extremely significant treaty; without it the British may not have won the French and Indian War. All in all, the Treaty of Easton 1758

should be considered one of the many important turning points that favored the British victory and the expulsion of the French from North America.

As for the literature written on the Treaty of Easton, it is sparse. There is no specific book or journal article written specifically about the treaty. This paper will be the first in depth scholarly examination of this treaty, its importance and its legacies. The document itself was extremely hard to find. There is no public transcription or documentation. The minutes are published in a number of locations but they do not include any reference to the document's physical location. The search for the document was long and frustrating, but after countless hours, the document was found at a small county museum in Easton, Pennsylvania. The senior curator sent me the official translation of the document, most likely the only copy that has come out of the museum.¹ So, the treaty search was one of a kind. Countless authors and historians referred to the treaty and expressed its importance, vaguely. For example, French and Indian War historian Fred Anderson defined, very briefly, the overall significance of the Treaty of Easton 1758. "It had been the most important Indian congress in Pennsylvania's history, its significance was by no means limited to the restoration of peace with the Ohio tribes."² *The Middle Ground, Into the American Woods, Our Savage Neighbors, and Breaking the Backcountry* gave important historiographical background to supplement the understanding of the importance of Native American Affairs during the North American colonial experience and what made Easton 1758 so significant.

A number of works examine Indian-white relations in the Great Lakes/Ohio Valley region, foremost among them Richard White's *The Middle Ground*. When it was published it

¹ At this point, I would like to give special thanks to Ms. Brittany L. Schrum Merriam of the North Hampton County Historical and Genealogical Society for making my search complete!

² Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 278.

became an influential success. His analysis of the *pays d'en haut* was extremely ground breaking and added to the narrative about Native American Affairs in North America. In the introduction section, White presented his thesis and argued that his book examines a 'new Indian history' that places the Indians at the center of his arguments. White is one of the few authors who had tried and succeeded writing from the Indian perspective. Most of the literature, prior to White, on this time period was written from the European/colonial perspective. The information presented in his book help supplement the information presented in chapters two and three of this paper. First, White produced an image of the meeting between the rock and the sea. He argued that there were only two possible outcomes. White concluded that the first speaks of conquest and assimilation; while the second, produced an outcome of "cultural persistence" Throughout this paper, both of White's outcomes arose because of the different practices by the Europeans towards the Native Americans. Next, White examined the region where no true authority could be gained by neither Europeans nor the Indians. He called this region the *pay d'en haut*. He first highlighted the relationship between the French and the Indians, and then later, introduced the British-Indian relations.³ Overall, Richard White's *The Middle Ground* is an authoritative piece that examines the importance aspect of Native American diplomacy and life during the colonial period in North American history. White should be praised for his examination that set the ground work for a better understanding of the *pay d'en haut*.

Peter Silver's *Our Savage Neighbors* focused on the theme of fear throughout the backwoods and countryside, while White's early chapters were more focused on assimilation and interaction. The most interesting part of Silver's monograph was his examination of the role the colonial media played. The information presented throughout supplement the information and

³ Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians Empires, and republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), xi, ix, 11, 16, 31, 50-51, 93.

arguments presented later in the second and third chapters. Silver presented the rapid expansion that took place throughout the Pennsylvanian countryside on the eve of the French and Indian War. This rapid growth put extreme pressure on British/Native American interactions. Different from White, Silver examined the influence of the media in colonial America.⁴ Overall, *Our Savage Neighbors* was another great piece to add to the historiographical narrative dealing with the British experiences with Native American Affairs. It gave many different aspects and arguments that differed from those of White. Most importantly, Silver presented strong points that displayed the powerful influence of the media during the colonial period.

Another book that provides the most directly useful background for Easton 1758 is James Merrell's *Into the American Woods*. White and Silver's monographs focused on the wide realm of Native American Affairs; while Merrell focused only on the Indian relations that took place between the colony of Pennsylvania and the Native American tribes within the colony. It helps the reader better understand what negotiations were like on the Pennsylvania frontier. Merrell made it his goal to take the reader into the woods to examine what the conferences and treaties were actually like for the Indians and colonist of Pennsylvania. He gave some insight into who some of the first negotiators were in the backcountry. This was an important analysis because it displayed the ideal type of Indian negotiator that others hoped to model their behavior after. This vivid description made by Merrell is extremely important to this paper because the model negotiator should be applied to the other Indian agents presented. Additionally, Merrell highlighted the conferences and treaties that arose during the French and Indian War. He explained what some of the treaty conference were like. He highlighted that most of the conference that took place during the 1750s were better compared to carnivals than treaty

⁴ Peter Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2008), xxi, 3, 11, 16, 39, 51, 56, 66, 71, 81, 86, 171, 211, 226.

negotiations.⁵ Overall, *Into the American Woods* gave specific insight to the interactions between the Native Americans and colonist in the Pennsylvanian frontier. It was an extremely important book to establish a background understanding to supplement the information presented throughout this paper. Its specific analysis aided to the arguments presented by both Silver and White.

Finally, Matthew Ward's *Breaking the Backcountry* gave important insight that continued the conversation about British Indian diplomacy during this era. Ward's analysis differs from that of Silver and White. Ward focused on the colonial reactions and decisions towards the Native Americans and French during the 1750s. His work can be more comparable to that of Merrell's. That is because the two focus on the events that took place along the Pennsylvania frontier within the Ohio country. To that end, in his introduction, Ward expressed his reasoning for writing to examine and define the effect the war had on the backcountry inhabitants of Pennsylvania and Virginia. Throughout his later chapters, Ward contrasted the differing styles between the two colonies. He examined that the, Quaker led, Pennsylvanians help out for a peaceful solution. They believed that the Iroquois League would intervene and stop the Ohio Indians from their destructive rampage. The Virginians, on the other hand, took a militaristic approach. They tried to reach out Indian tribes to join them in their attacks against the Native Americans aligned to the French.⁶ Overall, *Breaking the Backcountry* was a good addition to the literature that assisted in explaining the British colonial policies towards the Native Americans.

⁵ James H. Merrell, *Into the American Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvania Frontier* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1999), 101, 127, 156, 186, 246, 252, 256, 276.

⁶ Matthew C. Ward, *Breaking the Backcountry: The Seven Years' War in Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1754-1765* (Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, 2003), 8, 131, 141.

Chapter 2: British Native American Affairs up to 1754

The momentous Treaty of Easton 1758 was not just a random event, and must be contextualized to fully appreciate. This narrative begins long before the start of the French and Indian War. Almost a century before, the ground work for Easton was put in place with the founding of the proprietary colony of Pennsylvania. A proprietary colony was a colony that the crown offered a land charter to a single family or person. For Pennsylvania's case the crown chartered the lands to a man by the name of Sir William Penn. His acquisition and arrival in Pennsylvania was the first step to establishing the chain of British Native American Affairs that culminated with the Treaty of Easton almost a century later.

William Penn was born in London in October of 1644. Young William became enamored by the teachings of a man by the name of George Fox. Fox's religious followers began to call themselves the Society of Friends, more commonly referred to as Quakers. This is when Penn really began to understand the idea of being courteous to one another regardless of religious, race, or creed. He believed that if he called the government to repay the debts owed to his family and his father they would offer him lands in North America. During the early months of 1680, in a petition to the crown, Penn directly asked for the funds owed from the government to his deceased father. His petition began by addressing the king and requested "payments for debts due to his father in Ireland" from the Lord Treasurer. Penn not wanting monetary compensation further requested to the King that, "...[he] will grant him letters in patent for a tract of land in America." The most important part of this petition came at the end where he displayed an understanding that not all of the lands around him were for further settlement. He included the statement that the surrounding his grant was "altogether Indian." This petition was submitted to the Privy Council for review. The final charter was prepared, dated and finalized by the Lord

Chancellor on March 4, 1681 and contained roughly twenty three sections. As early as, October 1681, while Penn was still in London, Sir William wrote to the Lenni Lenape (more commonly referred to as the Delaware Indians) in the hope to establish strong Anglo-Indian Relations. In the letter, Penn wrote to these leaders with great respect. This respect continued throughout his tenure as head of Native American Affairs in Pennsylvania. Included this letter was his expression of peace and mutual respect. “I desire to enjoy it [the lands] with your love and consent, that we may always live together as neighbors and friends.” Penn, in this same letter, made it a point to address the issue of mistreatment and established that Pennsylvania would not follow the trend of unfair practices. “Now I would have you well observe, that I am very sensible of the unkindness and injustice that has been too much exercised towards you by the people of these parts of the world.” Finally, Penn explained to the Lenni Lenape of his genuine intentions to live in harmony. “I desire to win and gain your love and friendship by a kind, just and peaceable life...”⁷ He hoped to establish a system similar to the early *pay d'en haut* that early French settlers had with the Indians along the Great Lakes region.

By summer 1682, Penn and his Indian agents made their first treaty. Not only was this a meeting for lands but it was also an establishment of the good relations between the two sides. The first treaty was signed and dated in July of 1682. This was between the Pennsylvanians and the Delaware Indians. The document explained that, “The said Indians sachemakers [i.e., sachems]...have granted, bargained, sold, and delivered and by theses presents do fully, clearly, and absolutely grant, bargain, sell and deliver unto the said William Penn...all that or those tract or tracts of land lying and being in the province of Pennsylvania aforesaid beginning at a certain

⁷ Joseph J. Kelley, Jr, *Pennsylvania: The Colonial Years* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1980), 3-18; Catherine Owens Peare, *William Penn: A Biography* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1957), 41, 55, 58, 209; Jean R. Soderlund, ed., *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania 1680-1684: A Documentary History* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983), 22-23, 88.

white oak...over against the Falls of Delaware River etc....” The final document created at this peace was a memorandum that defined the good relations between the two sides. The memorandum stated the following important points, “[One] That there be a meeting once every year to read the articles over; the day to be appointed. [Two] That we may pass through any of their lands, as well that which is not purchased as that which is without molestation as they do quietly among us. [Three] That is English or Indian should at any time abuse one the other, complaint might be made to their respective governor, and that satisfaction may be made according to their offense.”⁸ If there were a perfect way to establish good will and friendship with the Native Americans it was to mimic the approaches of William Penn. Sadly, around the year 1684 William Penn departed North America for England, leaving his colony and Native American relations in the care of his sons. This decision changed the tide of British Native American Relations for the next seventy-five years.

With the departure of Sir William Penn from Pennsylvania and North America, so too went the departure of Pennsylvania’s fair dealing with Native Americans. One of the best examples of this is the highly documented and criticized Walking Purchase of 1737. Not even two years after one of the most equitable treaties between colonists and Native Americans, the downhill slide began which led to one of the ‘dirtiest’ Native American land purchases. The narrative began in 1684 when colonists began encroaching on Delaware lands. Delaware chiefs were unhappy with these lands grabs and threatened violence unless fair compensation was granted, this had been the policy under William Penn and his agents. Penn, however, was gone and his sons were in charge. They viewed Indian Affairs through the lenses of paternalism and colonization, rather than through Christian fellowship and equality before God. They threatened

⁸ Soderlund, *the Founding of Pennsylvania*, 157-160.

violence with violence. John and Thomas Penn were more aggressive land and wealth grabbers than their father. For example, in 1730 the proprietors began sending land surveyors into the Lehigh Valley, despite knowing that those lands were off limits by treaty. To fully understand the methods of the Penns' author Watson Dewees offered, "He [Thomas Penn] had departed from the principles and practices of his father and the Society [of Friends] of which he was once a nominal member. He cared little for the rights of Indians, but much for his own personal gain."⁹

The Penns' land grabbing venture was not going to be as easy as they expected. When the Delaware became aware of what was taking place, they rushed to the colonial assembly to protest these actions. They produced a document from 1686 that the lands being surveyed were Delaware lands by treaty agreement. Thomas Penn would not let this document get in his and his fellow surveyors way. Knowing that the League had no interest in these lands, in 1736, Penn sent James Logan to the Iroquois Confederacy in the hope that they would quitclaim the tract belonging to their 'conquered' cousins (the Delaware). Predictably, the Iroquois happily agreed to facilitate a purchase in which they would lose nothing and gain considerably. In August of 1737, both the Delaware and the Penns' produced two documents that were supposedly copies of an original 1686 treaty. It is agreed, today, that the document produced by the Penns' was not legitimate. After much deliberation it was decided that there would be a walking delegation comprised of both Delawares and Pennsylvanians that would walk and where they stopped would be the newly acquired land. The walk took place on September 19, 1737, because the day and night were equal in length. The men chosen for this delegation were a Bucks County sheriff

⁹ Steven C. Harper, "Making History: Documenting the 1737 Walking Purchase," *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies*, Vol. 77, No. 2, (Spring 2010):219-220; Watson W. Dewees, "Thomas Penns Walking Purchase," *Bulletin of Friends' Historical Society of Philadelphia*, Vol. 4, No. 3, (November 1912): 125.

to monitor the fairness, a surveyor who knew the lands, two men sent to protect the Penn's interests, and finally two Indians selected to protect fairness of the deal. After the 'walk', many accounts arose that neither of the Indians saw the finish. This was the culmination of the Penn's misdeeds. Once it was completed, the Walking Purchase of 1737 gained the colony of Pennsylvania roughly 1,110 square miles (or 710,000 acres). This was credited to the 'runners' that were hired and selected by the Penns to carry out this venture. The land was just smaller than the colony of Rhode Island. The outcome of this land grab was the vast amount of profits rose for those who own and sold the land. Historian Francis Jennings concluded, "The Walking Purchase is a classic example not only of deception practiced upon contemporaries, but of obfuscation."¹⁰ It was dealings like the Walking Purchase that led the Delaware to be more favorable to the French during the first crucial, brutal years of the French and Indian War. They would remain so until the Treaty of Easton brought them back to the British.

A number of men proved critical to the Easton Conference. One of the most popular Indian Agents was a man by the name of Conrad Weiser. He immigrated to Pennsylvania in 1710 at the age of thirteen. He arrived, notes Paul Wallace, already "a man deeply rooted in religion, law, and the land- three things on which an ordered society is founded. In everything he did he was intent on achieving for himself and others, peace security and justice..."¹¹ His journey as a life-long Indian agent began in 1712 with his adventures into the wilderness. His journeys permitted him to live among, and even be adopted by, the Mohawks. It is noted that one of his first experiences with the Mohawks was his first winter, which lasted four to five months, where he stayed in a longhouse. It was this exposure to the Mohawks' way of life that brought

¹⁰ Harper, "Making History," 223, Dewees, "Thomas Penn." 228-229;202; Kelley, *P.A. Colonial Years*, 126-127.

¹¹ Paul A. Wallace, "Conrad Weiser and the Delawares," *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid- Atlantic Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (July, 1937): 141.

him early fame in Native American affairs. In 1728, Weiser was a key figure brokering peace between the Iroquois League, of which the Mohawks were founding members, and the colonists of Pennsylvania. If not for his contributions, the League and Pennsylvania might have gone to war.¹² Weiser achieved the foundations of strong relationship that tied the British and League together for decades.

Due to his aid in the 1728 ‘treaty,’ Weiser was offered to be part of Pennsylvania’s new Indian relations program. In 1732, he was appointed to be a provincial servant under the leadership of James Logan. The colony’s new policy centered on long term peace and mutual agreements between the colony and the Six Nations. This proved extremely important, displaying not only the importance of Weiser and his efforts, but demonstrating the colony’s shift away from the Delaware. Not only was he an Indian agent for Pennsylvania, Weiser was also the key interpreter for the League at any conference or meeting. In time, he was given the official title of Provincial Interpreter of the Six Nations.¹³ Twelve years after he began as an Indian agent, Conrad Weiser was an important part of the next piece of British Colonial Indian policy, the Treaty of Lancaster 1744.

The Treaty of Lancaster was the culmination of years of conferences, meeting and treaties between the British colonies and the Iroquois League. The events that caused the gathering were combinations of long-standing grievances and recent clashes that almost pushed the two sides to war. The circumstances were extremely similar to the grievances Weiser had to mend in 1728. The Native Americans were unhappy with unfair trade practices and the influx of squatters on their lands. The Six Nations was specifically upset because they believed the British

¹² Paul A. W. Wallace, *Conrad Weiser: Friend of Colonist and Mohawk* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1971), 17-18; Wallace, “Conrad Weiser,” 142-143.

¹³ Wallace, *Conrad Weiser*, 39, 44-46.

colonists were encroaching on their conquered lands. The British delegation was not just colonists from Pennsylvania, but included representatives from Maryland and Virginia.¹⁴

Prior to Lancaster, relations between the Iroquois and the British were not always hostile. In 1742, the League sided with the colony of Pennsylvania over the Delaware on the legality of the Walking Purchase. This was, yet again, another example of the isolation of the Delaware, by Pennsylvania, making this decision to side with the French easier. But, even after that support, the Six Nations still desired recompense for their grievances. Finally, in the summer of 1744, the three colonies decided to hold a treaty conference in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. The Native Americans were thrilled and arrived on June 15th in large numbers. It is estimated that roughly 245 Native Americans entered Lancaster. The conference began the following day. There were a couple of important aspects of the treaty minutes that expressed the ultimate goal of union. On June 25th, Governor George Thomas of Pennsylvania said, “I am your Brother, and, which is more, I am your true Friend...Receive these your Brethren with open Arms; unite yourselves to them in the Covenant Chain, and be you with them as one Body and one Soul.” Three days later, on the 28th, an Indian chief responded to the call of union and mutual respect. “We are desirous to live with you, our Brethren, according to the old Chain of Friendship, to settle all these Matters fairly and honestly; and as a Pledge of our Sincerity we give you this Belt of Wampum.”¹⁵ The final important speech was delivered on the last day of the conference, July 4th. It was at this time another chief expressly accepted the concept of union between the British colonist and the Six Nations and spoke that, “You had left your House, and were come thus far on Behalf of the whole People of Pennsylvania to see us; to renew your Treaties’ to brighten the

¹⁴ James H. Merrell, ed., *The Lancaster Treaty of 1744, with Related Documents* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2008), 21; Francis Jennings, *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1984), 359.

¹⁵ Merrill, *The Lancaster Treaty of 1744*, 26, 47, 67.

Covenant Chain and to confirm your Friendship with us.” This chief continued on and accepted the desire of peace brought forth by the Pennsylvanians. “We approve this Proposition; we thank you for it.” Not only did this chief accept and embrace the Covenant Chain, he confirmed the legacy of this peace. “Pennsylvania is of old Standing, and has never contracted any Rust; we wish it may always continue bright as it has done hitherto.”¹⁶

After the conference concluded, both sides left feeling satisfied. An additional significant event happened on July 2nd, two days before the final document was produced and signed. Because of the success at Lancaster, the colony of Virginia wanted to create their own treaty with the Six Nations to ensure peace between the colony and the Indians. This treaty stated that, similarly to the treaty made with the Pennsylvanians. The Indians established a “renew[ed] Covenant Chain between the said Colony [Virginia] and the Six Nations...having met at Lancaster.” The Six Nations wanted their treaty with Virginia to be “a foundation for a stricter Amity and peace at this juncture...and Renunciation of all their Claims or pretence of Rights of our Sovereign the King of Great Britain to all the Land in the said Colony of Virginia.”¹⁷

After the treaty, the colonies of Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia all agreed to pay the Six Nations for their encroachment on ‘conquered’ lands. It was estimated that Maryland paid around £200 in Pennsylvanian currency, Virginia around £200 in gold plus £100 in gold as an additional gift, and Pennsylvania paid £300 in currency. As for the Six Nations’ payments received, it is estimated that they had given up roughly 300,000 acres. But, this was a price they were willing to pay. “To the Six Nations the Treaty of Lancaster seemed to be their moment of greatest triumph. Their preeminence over all the northern Indians was formally

¹⁶ Merrill, *The Lancaster Treaty of 1744*, 82.

¹⁷ Virginia Historical Society, publisher, “The Treaty of Lancaster 1744,” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (Oct., 1905): 141-142.

recognized...Their land claims were recognized...” Paul Wallace further offers that the Lancaster Treaty proved “a turning point in our colonial history” and that “the ‘chain of friendship’ there made, extended Pennsylvania’s Indian policy to Maryland and Virginia, was the first great setback to the French in the West.” He argued further and believed that it was the beginning of the French’s downfall in America.¹⁸ To continue this thought, while concluding the Treaty of Lancaster, the final blow to the French in American was signed at Easton fourteen years later. That union had been made between several of the colonies and the Iroquois League. Yet now, perhaps reflecting a growing trend for the consolidation of power, the British government both in England and North America began to take steps to create an umbrella organization that could deal with Native American Affairs on a singular departmental level, not just a colony by colony basis.

Seven years after the Treaty of Lancaster, the uneasy peace in North American started to unravel the British made one final attempt to recondition their Native American agencies. The Indian problem was one of three main issues that arose around the middle of the eighteenth century in colonial British America. In 1754, colonial leaders wanted to meet to discuss pressing issues, “[first] defining the constitutional nature of colonial dependence, [second] defending territorial claims in North America from French encroachments, and [third] subordinating Indian affairs to Britain’s imperial interests.” This was not a new concept. One of the earliest calls for action came in 1751 when a member of the New York assembly called for a confederation of the colonies and a unified Indian policy. This member described that a “Superintendent of Indian Affairs” should be created and appointed to replace localized Indian commissioners and should only answer to the Board of Trade. Under the leadership of Pennsylvanian Benjamin Franklin, a

¹⁸ Jennings, *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire*, 360-362; Wallace, *Conrad Weiser*, 185.

majority of the colonies met in Albany, New York, during the summer of 1754. The Albany Congress had two major parts. First, they wanted to answer the fundamental question of where did British imperial authority end and where did the local colonial authority begin? Second, author Timothy Shannon described the motivation for the Indian conference and the re-hashing of Native American affairs as, "...a recommendation to centralize Indian affairs under the control of the Crown, thereby ending each colony's independent pursuit of Indian Diplomacy and trade. This desire to submit Indian affairs to imperial supervision shared much with the...goals of securing colonial dependence and turning back French encroachments." Before the conference Native American Affairs were in the hands of a few agents representing small and localized interests. This system led to many inter-colonial conflicts over Indian trading and land purchasing. It even forced many colonial assemblies and governors to quarrel over such issues.¹⁹

As previously mentioned, the Congress gathered thanks to the efforts of Benjamin Franklin. But, his call and motivation were more for Union rather than Native American Affairs. The conversation of including Native American Affairs to the Albany Congress caught wind after the New York Assembly member's speech. Two years later, the Board of Trade issued the formal call for the Albany Congress to rectify abuses in the administration of Indian Affairs. In the summer 1754, the call to meet was answered by both the colonial administrator and the Native Americans. It is estimated that roughly 150-200 Indians arrived in Albany for the conference. For such a grand and large scale conference, historians point to the low numbers as an example of the Native American unhappiness with the British colonials; especially the New Yorkers. The main goal of this conference was to once again renew the Covenant Chain, similar

¹⁹ Timothy J. Shannon, *Indians and Colonists at the Crossroads of Empire: The Albany Congress of 1754* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2000), 56,65,72; John R. Alden, "The Albany Congress and the Creation of Indian Superintendencies," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (Sept., 1940): 193, 195-196.

to what had been done at Lancaster between the Iroquois League and several colonies years earlier. But, this conference did not go as smoothly as Lancaster. The Native American leaders were extremely vocal in their displeasure with colonial regulation of Indians Affairs. They even went as far as to say that the French had made better efforts to “seduce” the Indians’ favor. This point made a strong impression on the colonial officials because they believed that war against the French was eminent. Author John Alden concluded expressed, “the impending war [against France] convinced the home government that centralization of authority over Indian affairs was indispensable.”²⁰ As the conference went on, it became clearer that new policies and positions would have to be created to meet the needs of their displeased Indian allies.

To address the problems, colonial officials needed to create an Indian Superintendent. But, they were not exactly sure of the position’s powers and limitations. Furthermore, they were unsure of who to appoint to such a position. In the weeks that followed, the position’s duties came to life. Author Timothy Shannon shed light on the significance and certain duties for the position “eliminated colonial autonomy in Indian affairs and regulated the fur trade for imperial rather than commercial ends.” This new Superintendent “turn[ed] the Indians from independent allies to dependent subjects.” The question now became, to whom would this new position be given? The leaders’ search did not last long. The Iroquois and the Mohawks in particular, called loudly for Sir William Johnson’s appointment. It was clear that, especially in New York, the Indian tribes and leaders would not trust anyone other than Johnson. The Crown heard the nomination and officially appointed Johnson as “Colonel over the Six Nations.” The culmination of the Albany Congress was the Albany Plan of Union, as Benjamin Franklin wanted, but more importantly (especially to the Treaty of Easton) was the creation of new systems towards Native

²⁰ Alden, “The Albany Congress,” 200, 206; Shannon, *Indians and Colonists*, 127, 155.

American British Affairs. This new policy and Superintendent were so successful that they remained in place until the expulsion of the British after the American War for Independence.²¹

Well before Easton, Johnson was an important figure in Native American affairs. His selection was not just because of his military service to the crown but the years of service in regards to Native America affairs. William Johnson was born in Ireland to a well-off family in 1715. Twenty years later, thanks to his uncle, Admiral Peter Warren, he was given the opportunity to venture to New York and helped settle the Mohawk River Valley. Johnson, like many other young men of his time, accepted the venture as a chance to expand his title and name. It proved a wise choice. Once he arrived, Johnson entered the merchant and trade field. Due to his location, his business put him in direct contact with many of the Native American tribes. Unlike his fellow merchant and traders, Johnson developed a great respect for the Indians.²² This was the foundation to a great career in Native American relations culminating in the role of Indian Superintendent.

After years as a private merchant and trader, William Johnson accepted his first political post. He was appointed justice of the peace by Gov. Clinton in New York in 1745. Thanks to this role, Johnson expanded his relationship with the Native Americans. He was extremely successful in his ventures with the Indians; especially those with the Mohawks. Due to his popularity, the Indians granted him his very own Indian name; which was an extremely powerful sign of respect. Sir William Johnson was referred to by the Indians as Warraghiyagey. His name translated to "A Man who undertakes great Things". In the following years, Johnson's political

²¹ Shannon, *Indians and Colonist*, 221-222; Beverly McAnear, "Accounts of the Albany Congress of 1754," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (March, 1953): 740; Alden, "The Albany Congress," 210.

²² James Thomas Flexner, *Mohawk Baronet: Sir William Johnson of New York* (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1959), 7. Milton W. Hamilton, *Sir William Johnson: Colonial American, 1715-1763* (Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press), 6, 23.

post expanded into a military position. There were a variety of examples when Johnson led combined colonial and Indian forces into skirmishes or battles against the French and their Native American allies. An example of this success came after his appointment as Superintendent. The French and some Indian tribes tried to block the return of the tribes from Albany. Johnson banded enough forces together to engage and disperse the French force. Although only one Indian died in the skirmish, it sent a powerful message to both the French and the British about Johnson's influence over the Native Americans. In time, this influence became so strong that the French even put out bounties on Johnson to prohibit his role in swaying the Indians. Finally, when war broke out between England and France in North America, Johnson was appointed to assist General Braddock's 1755 campaign to expel the French from North America. It was documented that Johnson was selected because of his strong relations with the Native Americans not his military experience.²³ Johnson's military campaigns and diplomatic efforts led to the organization of Easton. All in all, Johnson was one of the most important figures to Native American affairs throughout the French and Indian War. But, Sir William Johnson did not achieve all this success by himself.

Johnson had a number of deputies that aided his efforts as Superintendent of Indian Affairs. None were more important than George Croghan. It is believed that Croghan was the successor to Conrad Weiser, who was growing old by the middle of the eighteenth century. There is no known birth date or place for Croghan, but what is known is that he grew up in Dublin, Ireland, and arrived in North America in 1741. Before and after his arrival, he was in favor with many high ranking officials. It is believed that his good standing granted him large tracts of land in Pennsylvania. Croghan established his home on a 1,200 acre plot that began just

²³ Hamilton, *Sir William Johnson*, 44-45, 58, 116; Flexner, *Mohawk Baronet*, 69-70.

five miles west of Harris's Ferry, (modern day Harrisburg) Pennsylvania. In time, Croghan established his homestead as his headquarters for Native American dealings. After being in North America for three years, Croghan was given a license to be an Indian trader, renewed in 1747. It was during this time that Croghan established strong relationships with Indians throughout Pennsylvania; most importantly those tribes in the West who were friendly to the French, such as the Shawnees. These relationships became extremely significant down the road; most especially during the conferences at Easton (1756, 1757, and 1758). Because of his vast popularity, it is estimated that Croghan ran the largest Indian trading enterprise in all of Pennsylvania and even went to court several times over the issue. Another reason why he was so popular among many of the tribes was because he learned and spoke in their languages and was observant to their practices and customs. Author Albert Volwiler noted George Croghan's "deep love for the western wilderness and his outlook towards the west were to have a dynamic influence during the next two decades upon the leaders who lived in the Delaware valley..."²⁴

It was this popularity that caught the eye of Sir William Johnson. Johnson had considerable respect for his fellow Irishman's ability to succeed in British America. In time, Johnson called upon Croghan to meet him at Fort Johnson to discuss his future as an Indian agent. Croghan was already well aware of Johnson and his many successes as an Indian agent. He wished he had the successes in Pennsylvania that Johnson had in New York. Once at Fort Johnson, Johnson appointed Croghan to be his deputy, with a salary of £200 per year. This began a relationship between the two that lasted roughly fifteen years. The first conference Croghan attended with Johnson took place in June 1756. It was at Onondaga that Johnson and Croghan hoped to enlist the final members of the Iroquois League to join the British cause against the

²⁴ Albert T. Volwiler, *George Croghan and the Westward Movement 1741-1782* (New York: AMS Press, 1971), 23-24, 32-33, 35, 44, 54.

French. Although successful in their main goal, there were not enough Delaware or Shawnee present to make a strong enough impression to have them depart their French allies. After this conference, Johnson dispatched Croghan back to Pennsylvania to deal with the bloody conflicts taking place throughout the colony; especially those along the western frontier. Croghan compiled a journal that chronicled Indian Affairs from 1748-1755 and gave it to high ranking British officials.²⁵ It was his hope that giving these leaders a better understanding of the issues, would aid their search for a quick and peaceful solution. Not only was Croghan a “Wilderness Diplomat,” he was an experienced soldier. In 1754 and 1755 he aided the military efforts of George Washington and General Edward Braddock against the French forces stationed at the Forks of the Ohio. With these numerous efforts at Indian Diplomacy, Croghan convened three Indian treaty conferences between the Pennsylvanians and the Indians at Easton, the most important happening in 1758. Without the efforts of George Croghan, the Treaty of Easton might well have failed.

Overall from 1681-1754, there were many conferences and treaties made between the British colonials and a vast amount of Indian tribes. The first traces in Pennsylvania began with the arrival of the proprietor William Penn. His strong Quaker belief in the fair deal and of mutual respect helped fuel the strong early relations between the Pennsylvanians and the Indian tribes. Shortly after his departure, Penn’s children ignored all of their father’s beliefs and practices. The Walking Purchase of 1737 was the prime example of the unfair and land grabbing efforts made by Penn’s sons. It left a sour taste in many of the Western tribes’ mouths that would endure until Easton 1758. Some of the good relations were restored thanks to the efforts of Conrad Weiser and others at the Treaty of Lancaster. Not only were relations restored at Lancaster but the treaty

²⁵ Nicholas B. Wainwright, *George Croghan: Wilderness Diplomat* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1959), 113-114, 117-118, 121.

established a long and strong alliance between the British colonies and the Iroquois League; a relationship that lasted until the end of the American War for Independence. Seven years later, an important multi-colony conference convened in Albany, New York. At this conference, the colonies established a new and improved Indian Agency with a newly appointed Superintendent in Sir William Johnson. William Johnson was the popular choice because his vast exposure and success in the realm of Indian Affairs. To aid his efforts, Johnson selected an extremely successful and popular Indian trader by the name of George Croghan as his deputy. With a strong understanding of the foundations of the British efforts in the field of Native American affairs, it is clearer why Easton 1758 was needed.

Chapter 3: The French and Indian War Paves the way for Easton

The French and Indian War was the culmination of all the colonial wars fought between the British and the French throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Prior conflicts in North America had been ripple effects from conflicts in Europe. Many of these wars left more problems than were solved; especially when it came to the boundaries in the Atlantic World. By the 1750s, more and more land grabbing leaders, on both sides, became tired of the lack of clarity of the borders and began to take matters into their own hands. Examples include the events that took place at the Forks of the Ohio. These events launched the colonial and European forces into warfare.

Before the war began, it was always the French colonial practice to build forts along their territories as a display of their power. The British, on the other hand, very rarely built such military structures and focused more on economic means and efforts. In 1753, the Marquis of Duquesne (commander/ governor of all French forces in Canada and North America) launched another fort building venture. The Marquis had his sights on the Forks of the Ohio in the western region of Pennsylvania. The Forks were crucial for trade because three water ways met at that location. If the French controlled these waterways, they would control the entire inner-continental trade from Canada all the way to New Orleans. Conversely, losing control of a water route in the heart of North America threatened the entire chain of forts and trading posts. The French motivation for this move was because they found British traders in that region to be military threats. By April of 1753, the French arrived at Presque Isle near the shores of Lake Erie in modern-day northwestern Pennsylvania. Once arrived, the French were greeted and aided by many Shawnees and Delaware Indians. This was the beginning of a strong allegiance between these tribes and the French which lasted until Easton five years later. The French believed that

they could march unmolested to the Forks because they expected little resistance from New York or Pennsylvania. But, what they did not account for was the involvement of Virginia.²⁶

Virginia was the colony that took action against the French because they had much invested in the Forks of the Ohio. A group of land surveyors that included (secretly) the Governor created a group known as the Ohio Company. As their name states, the Ohio Company's goal was to survey, sell, and establish trade within the Ohio country; of which the Forks of the Ohio was the center piece. In August of 1753, Governor Robert Dinwiddie of Virginia, after months of writing to the British government, received vague orders from his superiors in London to repel the French advances throughout the northern parts of the Ohio country. Dinwiddie's orders went further when he was given the power to declare war early in October 1753. Dinwiddie was not prepared to ask the House of Burgesses (the governing assembly in Virginia) for funds for a wilderness war with the French. Instead, in an effort to buy more time, Dinwiddie dispatched Major George Washington to meet with the French commander. The twenty-one year old major departed for his mission on October 31, 1753. George Croghan and several Native American chiefs, including a Mingo chief called Half-King, accompanied him. With a pass for safe conduct to the French fort, and the letter from Dinwiddie, Washington reached the Forks for the very first time on November 24th (He would not return again until November of 1758). On December 7th, Washington and his party reached Fort Le Boeuf, but the fort's commandant did not receive him until the 12th. Four days later, Washington departed for his journey back to Williamsburg with the French response. His mission ended when he met with Dinwiddie on January 16, 1754.²⁷

²⁶ David A. Clary, *George Washington's First War: His Early Military Adventure* (New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2011), 46-48, 50,

²⁷ Clary, *George Washington's First War*, 53-54, 56-57, 56-63, 66.

During their meeting, the two examined the French response, which had somehow surprised them. The French would not depart, but would continue their mission to the Forks. In the letter Dinwiddie wrote to the French, he argued that the Forks belonged to the French. “The Lands upon the River Ohio, in the Western Parts of the Colony of Virginia, are so notoriously known to be the Property of the Crown of Great-Britain.” He continued by expressing his surprise “to hear that a Body of French Forces are erecting, Fortresses, and making Settlements upon that River, within, his Majesty’s Dominions.” The French responded in a matter that was extremely displeasing to the governor. He addressed Dinwiddie’s orders to halt their mission and return to Canada. “As to the Summons you send me to retire, I do not think myself obliged to obey it.” The commandant concluded that the only person who could order his withdrawal was “the Orders of my General.”²⁸

After the letter the Virginians knew the French would not be easily swayed. But, not all was lost for Governor Dinwiddie and the Virginians. While Washington marched back to Williamsburg, he noted that there were a number military and building supplies headed north towards the Forks. While Washington was on his mission, Dinwiddie had dispatched a number of troops and supplies towards the Forks to assert Virginian authority there. Two months later, in March, Washington was ordered to gather a relief force to aid the venture at the Forks. Time was a factor because they wanted to beat the larger French force that was moving closer and closer to the Ohio River basin. By May it was too late; the French had dislodged the Virginians without firing a shot and planned to send a peaceful emissary to meet with Washington. The task was given to Ensign Joseph Coulon de Jumonville with the orders that he was to “locate the English

²⁸ “The Journal of Major George Washington: An Account of his First Official Mission, made as Emissary from the Governor of Virginia to the Commandant of French Forces on the Ohio, October 1753- January 1754” (Williamsburg: The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1959), 25, 27.

determine if they had entered French territory, then meet with their commander and summon him to withdraw. The aim was to present an ultimatum, not start a fight.” When Washington got word of this small French force, he was not sure what their intentions were. But, Half-King manipulated the young leader’s mindset and made him believe that their intentions were violent. On May 28th, Washington’s forces found the resting French force. The succeeding events are still unclear and debated among historians today. The French claimed Washington fired first; while Washington wrote that French fired first. Many historians tend to believe the former. What was clear was the result. The outcome was a bloody massacre by Washington and his Native American allies and resulted in the death of Ensign Jumonville. It was only after the skirmish that Washington learned of the French intentions.²⁹ Matters were only going to get worse for the young Virginian.

The fallout after Jumonville’s Glen was rapid. Fingers began pointing and the French wanted revenge. Washington’s men withdrew from the region and, on June 2nd, reached a place called Great Meadows [Fayette County, PA] and constructed a wobbly shack with a palisade in a shallow valley and called it Fort Necessity. By July 1st, the French and their numerous Native American allies had the fort surrounded and to make matters worse heavy rain began to fall and flooded the poorly situated fort. By the morning of July 4th, Washington had no other choice but to ask for terms of surrender. In the signed terms of capitulation, due to a deliberate omission by Washington’s Swiss- born interpreter, the Virginian admitted that he assassinated Ensign Jumonville. Washington’s actions had lit the match that ignited the flame that launched the British and French colonial forces into the French and Indian War in North America and the Seven Years War globally. Fred Anderson described the legacy of Washington’s failure as, “The

²⁹ Clary, *George Washington’s First War*, 69, 74, 82, 84-85.

marquis de Duquesne, delighted...that the Ohio Valley was secure at last,...directed that a subsidized trade be begun to insure that Ohio Indians would not be drawn back into Britain's commercial orbit."³⁰ This was only the beginning of the British failures that made it necessary for the Treaty Conference at Easton in 1758.

With war once again declared between the French and the British, the Native American tribes east of the Mississippi River had to make the decision if they were going to remain neutral, or fight with the British or French. For many of the tribes this was a hard decision, for others it was a forgone conclusion. Two of those tribes were particularly important for the story of Easton. First, the Iroquois League because of their status as long-standing pro-British and even pro-Pennsylvania tribe. Comparatively, their relations with the second tribe, the Delaware Indians, added to the displeasure of many of the Ohio Indian tribes. The Delaware Indians are also important for examination for two major reasons. First, they were originally allied with the French and played a significant role in the outcomes in Western Pennsylvania, and second they were the most important tribe affected by the terms made at Easton in 1758.

By the eighteenth century, the League had already been involved in European colonial affairs for over a century. Due to their unhappiness with the French and unfamiliarity with the British, the Iroquois took a strict stance of neutrality lasting from 1701-1708. For a brief period during Queen Anne's War (1702-1713), 1,500 Iroquois warriors joined the British in an effort to expel the French from North America. During the war, the majority of the warriors that fought alongside the British joined the fight because they did not want to end up on the losing side. Author Richard Aquila explained that the league had other motivations for aiding the British.

³⁰ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 54, 59, 60-64; W.W. Abbot, ed., *The Papers of George Washington: Colonial Series, Vol. 1* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1983), 167.

“Many were angry at the French, who they believed were instigating recent western Indian attacks on Iroquois people.” This made Franco-Iroquois relations even harder. By the end of the Six Nations’ involvement, the joint effort was unsuccessful and many of the tribal leaders asked for French forgiveness to retain their neutrality. After the war, the Six Nations, unhappy with British failures, went back to their neutrality in 1713. This second stint of neutrality lasted until King George’s War (1740-1748), when, with the help of Sir William Johnson, the Mohawks, in 1746, declared war against the French. In time, the rest of the Iroquois declared war on the French but never truly acted on their declaration. This defacto neutrality (excepting the Mohawks) continued until the French began their expansion into the Ohio territory. The League was fully prepared to fight against the French but waited for the British, and their resources, to join the fight.³¹ The League’s experiences with the British were extremely different than those with the French.

Not only were the Iroquois more friendly with the British, they had specific goals to befriend certain colonies; most especially Pennsylvania. From 1701-1718, both the Iroquois League and the government of Pennsylvania made concerted efforts to keep the other happy. The next phase of diplomacy between the two took place from 1719-1727. It was during this phase that the Pennsylvania government formally acknowledged a friendship with the Iroquois. In an effort to strengthen their friendship with the colony of Pennsylvania, the League tried from 1728-1746 gain control of tribal lands across Pennsylvania; including those belonging to the Shawnees and Delaware. In time, the Pennsylvania Assembly gave the Iroquois exactly what they wanted by granting them legal authority over all of the tribes, most importantly control over the Delaware. This was yet again another example of the Pennsylvanians isolating themselves from

³¹ Richard Aquila, *The Iroquois Restoration: Iroquois Diplomacy on the Colonial Frontier, 1701-1754* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1983), 85, 89-95, 97, 104.

the favor of western tribes like the Shawnee and the Delaware. By 1746, though, relations between the two began to sour, because as Aquila put it, “Ironically, the totality of the Iroquois’ success in Pennsylvania contributed to their demise. The Five Nations simply put themselves out of business. Once they had facilitated the transfer of Indian lands over to the Pennsylvanian government and drove out intransigent tribes from Pennsylvania’s borders, the Five Nations had very little else to offer the Pennsylvanians.”³² Overall, the Iroquois’ experiences were a great example for displaying an Indian nation that was very pro-British and pro-Pennsylvanian on the eve of the French and Indian War.

The Delaware Indians were one of the most important tribes present at the Treaty of Easton 1758. The Delaware had been part of Pennsylvania and British Indian policy since the seventeenth century. Pre-contact, the Delaware Indians’ original location was around the Delaware River Valley. Sir Thomas West, governor of Jamestown in 1610, was the first to refer to them as Delaware. Their European name derived from their geographical location, a popular European practice of the time. The Delaware were also referred to as the Lenni Lenape; which in their language meant “common people.” These Indians gathered around the Delaware River not only for the resources, both food and water, but for the protection that a water way could provide. The Delaware’s language was part of the Algonkian language family; which was a popular and common dialect among the tribes in that geographical region. The first European encounters with the Lenape came by the Dutch in the 1620s and the Swedish in the 1650s. During these first contact experiences, it is estimated that the Delaware population numbered around 8,000. The Lenape leaders were fairly easy to manipulate because they did not have a full understanding of European style of land ownership. The Lenape understanding of owning land

³² Aquila, *The Iroquois Restoration*, 158-159, 166, 179, 193.

was vastly different, from that of the western world. “Land ‘ownership’ to the Delawares meant the right to use the land, to plant on it, to build wigwams on it, to hunt the animals that lived on it, but not to possess it permanently in the sense that it belonged to one person in perpetuity.” Decades later, around the 1680s, William Penn and the British settlers arrived and began their own diplomacy with the tribe. During these early dealings with William Penn the Lenape had never received such vast amounts of goods and gifts from the Pennsylvanians. This resulted in a large respect for Penn, so much so, that the Delaware gave him his own name of Miquon (translated to quill or pen). But when Penn departed North America so did the good relations between the colony of Pennsylvania and the Delaware Indians. C. A. Weslager summarized the shift correctly by stating that, “Unfortunately, this was only a brief interlude in the long and tragic history of the Delawares, because an eventual military clash with the Anglo-Americans was inevitable, and ‘Brother Onas’s’ [another name for Penn by the Delaware] kindness merely served to postpone it.”³³

After Penn’s departure, Pennsylvania gave moral and physical authority to the Six Nations over many of the tribes throughout the backcountry; which included the Delaware. By this point, the Delaware and the Iroquois League already had a long and storied history. In the early 1600s, the Delaware were subsumed by the Iroquois Confederacy. Now a part of the League, the Lenape were no longer a ‘masculine’ tribe; this meant that they could not make war without approval from the Iroquois. The Delaware were actually in favor of this ‘woman’ tribal status because it helped them remain neutral in many of the conflicts that arose between the Europeans and Indians. When the union of Pennsylvania and the Iroquois League was made official, it sealed the fate of the Delaware. The union was forged in the hope that the

³³ C.A. Weslager, *The Delaware Indians: A History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1972), 31-32, 34, 37, 40, 41, 162, 164, 170-171.

Pennsylvanians could use the Iroquois to remove the Delaware from desired lands in the eastern half of the colony. Due to this agreement and union many of the Delaware were forced west across the Allegheny Mountains into the Ohio Country. The first of these movements took place around the 1720s. Additionally, while the Delaware moved across the mountains “they took tales of their repeated eviction.” This movement further shifted them into the arms of the French; especially after “William Penn’s humanitarian policy towards the Delaware gave way to [a] new policy strengthening their uncles, the Six Nations.” The event that hastened their violent actions towards the British was the defeat of General Edward Braddock in 1755.³⁴ The Delaware Indians needed a powerful treaty to have them bury the hatchet against the English. Easton was that agreement.

By September of 1754, news of Washington’s defeat reached London. British officials were alarmed by both the colonies inability to stop French advances; as well as, by the French aggressive advance across North America. Two days after receiving the news of Washington’s failure, the Newcastle wrote that, “All North America will be lost if these Practices are tolerated, no War can be worse to This Country, than the Suffering such Insults as These.” To that end, the Duke of Newcastle made it clear to the King and other military advisors that cheap, quick and effective measures must be taken in the Ohio region. It was his hope that if the issue were resolved quickly war would not spill over into Europe. By the end of September 1754, plans were made, and approved for the “Expedition to Virginia.” The man selected to lead this expedition was Major General Edward Braddock of the famous Cold Stream Guards. Braddock was selected because of his close interactions with the Duke but also because of his popularity

³⁴ Richard S. Grimes, “We “Now Have Taken up the Hatchet against Them”: Braddock’s Defeat and the Martial Liberation of the Western Delaware,” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 137, No. 3 (July 2013): 231-232, 237-238; Ward, *Breaking the Backcountry*, 26.

and effectiveness in the field. He had, however, no experience with North American warfare. By February 23, Braddock and his 'military family' arrived in Williamsburg, Virginia and met with Gov. Dinwiddie.³⁵ From September 1754 to March 1755, the British had taken the first steps to try and end the French occupation of the Ohio Valley. It was time for Braddock to reveal his master plan to the colonial officials.

During a couple days in mid-April, 1755, General Braddock met with five colonial governors at The Alexandria Congress. The first day of the conference was to deal with the failure when it came to Indian Diplomacy. Author David Preston argued that this was a continuation of the Albany Congress almost a year earlier. During, this portion of the Congress, Braddock affirmed and appointed Sir William Johnson as head Indian Superintendent. The following day, Braddock revealed the "Secret Instructions" for his military campaign against the French. It was detailed that Braddock was to dislodge the French from the Forks of the Ohio, with the understanding that Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia's forces would fortify and maintain British interests there. While Braddock's army was massed at Fort Cumberland, the general met with the Native Americans on several occasions to gain their favor. Braddock assured many of the Indians that he and the British had come to restore their lands, a statement that was not entirely true. When it came time for the Native Americans to pledge their allegiance to the expedition, the result was not what the general had hoped. This was due to "Braddock's attitude" that "alienated his potential Indian allies." And the low turnout was determined to be "a reflection of British imperial weakness in early 1755." Braddock hoped the Indians would join the British cause after his expedition. In actuality, his expedition had the opposite effect on the Indians of the Ohio Country. On July 9th, the army was less than twelve miles from the fort and

³⁵ David L. Preston, *Braddock's Defeat: The Battle of the Monongahela and the Road to Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 29-30, 36-37, 52, 58, 67, 69-70.

Braddock began planning for the siege, which he hoped to begin the next day.³⁶ In those final two hours, the army and the entire expedition, and the future of Pennsylvania changed forever.

As mentioned earlier, the British marched almost the entirety of their expedition unmolested by the French and their Native American allies. So the question is, what were the French doing during Braddock's march? The French were well aware of Braddock's slowly approaching force. It was the goal of the commandant to surrender and hope for favorable terms, such as Washington had received almost a year earlier. Going into July, this was still the French plan, until the second in command Captain Daniel Hyacinth-Marie Lienard de Beaujeu suggested that he be given orders to attack the army during its crossing of the Monongahela River. After debating back and forth, the commandant gave Beaujeu the order and use of the regular troops in his mission. He also gave him permission to use the Native American allies, if he could convince them to join. By July 8th, Beaujeu's efforts were met with little success, until he made one final attempt that night. Author Thomas Crocker referred to that night's speech as 'Captain Beaujeu's prayer'. The French began his 'prayer' by urging that the Indians not let the French fight the British alone. "I am determined to meet the English. What! Will you let your fathers go alone?" Later, he confirmed that all who joined him would taste victory and that those loyal to the French had an obligation to join him. "...the English are going to throw themselves into the lion's mouth. They are weak sheep pretend to be ravenous wolves. Those who love their father, follow me... The victory is ours!"³⁷ The Native Americans present were moved by his speech, when the captain left the fort, he was accompanied by roughly 700 Native American allies. Many of

³⁶ Preston, *Braddock's Defeat*, 77-78, 87-88, 91, 108, 111, 118, 165, 175, 191, 195, 200, 226; Ward, *Breaking the Backcountry*, 41.

³⁷ Thomas E. Crocker, *Braddock's March: How the Man Sent to Seize a Continent Changed American History* (Yardley, P.A.: Westholme, 2009), 202-205.

the warriors that rallied to the captain were from western Delaware tribes. In the battle to come, the Indian allies gave the French an advantage that turned the tide.

The battle began when Captain Beaujeu's marines and militia engaged the British advance force under the command of Thomas Gage. Gage's forces pushed back the French advance, but they were still left with a large and hidden force of Native Americans. When word reached Braddock of an engagement, he gave orders to deploy the army to aid the advance guard. This would be the first of many detrimental mistakes made by Braddock. By 3:00 pm, Braddock's army now fully engaged, was at its breaking point. The British ranks fired into the wilderness not hitting the Native Americans or the French marksmen who were hiding within the thick forest. Less than an hour later, Braddock's army was leaderless and mass confusion broke out. By the end of the day, 400 British and colonial soldiers laid dead on the field. Not only did Braddock lose men, he lost his entire artillery train. By 9:30 am on the 10th of July, Braddock's defeated forces arrived to Dunbar's rear encampment.³⁸ The French had pulled off an unthinkable victory. Without the aid of the Native Americans, the French were days from surrendering the Forks over to the British.

Two days later, the mortally wounded general gave his final order; the army was to retreat back to Fort Cumberland, almost 250 miles away. During the retreat, the losses started to become clearer. It is estimated that, "Of the approximately 85 commissioned officers engaged there, 60 were killed or wounded... The 44th Regiment lost not only its regimental commander but 6 additional officers engaged... the 48th Regiment lost 6... Halkett's regiment had numbered 858 officers and men on June 8... down to 668 by July 25th. Dunbar's regiment fell from its initial strength of 773... to a total of 605 on July 30th." Loss of life was not the only legacy that

³⁸ Crocker, *Braddock's March*, 206; Preston, *Braddock's Defeat*, 232-233, 241, 251, 262-263, 269.

came from Braddock's shocking defeat. One of the most important legacies from this battle was that with Braddock defeated, it left the Pennsylvania frontier exposed. This exposure unleashed a terror that came in the form of vast Native American attacks led by the western Delaware. It was believed by a Pennsylvanian commission that Braddock's defeat only strengthened the Delaware motives and position to aid the French. This support for the French began with the defeat of Washington in 1754. After his surrender, "warriors of the Wolf phratry of Delawares, residing in the upper Allegheny Valley, moved to Venango in support of the French." Later in July, Gov. Robert Morris of Pennsylvania highlighted the terrible legacy of this defeat. He spoke, and his words later published, that, "This unfortunate and unexpected change in our Affairs will deeply effect everyone of his Majesty's Colonies... which having no Militia, is thereby left exposed to cruel Incursions of the French and their barbarous Indians, who delight in shedding human Blood..." As Gov. Morris previewed, with English regulars out of the picture, the Delaware Indians went on the war path. "On October 1755, Delawares at Kittanning, encouraged by the Retreat of the [British] Forces, gravitated to the French whom they saw as a more power and safer bet as an ally." This unleashed a reign of terror that resulted in the burning of farmhouses and barns, the loss of livestock and many prisoners being taken. In time the Delaware formally declared war against the English. Their declaration stated that, "We, the Delawares of Ohio, do proclaim War against the English We have been their Friends many years, but now have taken up the Hatchet against them & we will make it up with them whilst there is an English man alive."³⁹ It was clear that the British needed to restore good relations with the Delaware. This anger from the Delaware was a culmination of neglect that had begun in 1737 and continued until Easton 1758. This was not the only battle during the early years of the war that the Native

³⁹ Preston, *Braddock's Defeat*, 271, 276-277; Grimes, "We "Now Have Taken Up the Hatchet Against Them"," 228-230, 245, 249, 251-254; "The Speech of Honourable Robert Hunter Morris," *The Pennsylvania Gazette*. Philadelphia, July 31, 1755, Accessed from America's Historical Newspapers.

Americans aided in a French victory. Two years later, in New York, the British soldiers and colonists faced defeat at the hands of the French and their Indian allies.

Roughly a year after Braddock's blunder, the Duke of Newcastle's plan of a short and quick campaign in North America failed and brought with it a global war against France. The result of this was the start of the Seven Years' War. The British were now under the command of John Campbell, the Earl of Loudon and the French under General Louis-Joseph de Montcalm-Gozon. General Montcalm brought many early successes to the French effort. One example was at the battle of Fort William Henry, in upstate New York, in the summer of 1757. The battle was another French victory, but the aftermath highlighted the fear that the pro-French Native Americans could strike on the British and their colonists. In New York, the British stronghold of Fort William Henry was in great shape physically but strategically was at a loss. This was credited to the influence of the French aligned Indians of which Anderson highlighted their effectiveness before the coming battle, "So effectively did the Indians and Canadian irregulars confine the rangers to the vicinity of the British forts that General Daniel Webb and his senior officers were deprived of virtually all intelligence concerning French preparations for the coming campaigns." For example, the British had little knowledge that the French had amassed a force at Fort Carillon that numbered in 2,000 Indians and 6,000 French troops. The British at the fort under the command of Colonel Monro numbered around 2,300.⁴⁰

On August 3rd, the British scouts noticed the arrival of 250 French transportation vessels and 150 Native American canoes. By three in the afternoon, Montcalm and his artillery began the formal siege on the fort. It took a day for Monro to realize that his fort was doomed. The best he could do was to hold out for honorable terms. On August 7th, Montcalm called a cease fire

⁴⁰ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 185-187.

and wished to meet with Monro. During the meeting under a flag of truce, Montcalm informed Monro that his Indian scouts intercepted a letter from Webb that stated no reinforcement were coming and Monro should seek terms of capitulation. Monro declined because the fort and his men were still holding strong defenses. Two days later, after heavy bombardment, Monro's forces became physically and mentally exhausted. Monro understood that he could not hold out any longer and asked for terms from Montcalm. Due to his honorable defense of Fort William Henry, Montcalm gave the British favorable and respectable terms. The British were permitted to leave with colors and honor to Fort Edward under the promise they would not fight the French for eighteen months.⁴¹

Even though the terms were extremely favorable, the British forces were not completely safe. Many of the Native American chiefs, under Montcalm, were not satisfied with the terms agreed upon. By this point, many of the Native Americans were expecting war medals that came from looting the enemy or even scalps from the heads of the enemy. The first sign of Indian displeasure came after the British left the fort. The Indians rushed in and pillaged the supplies and attacked the British hospital and those left behind. This was only the beginning of terrors to come for the retreating British. Author Ian Steele noted that the British did not trust the Indians, "It was one thing to trust French honor, but it was quite another to assume that all the Indians were aware of the terms..." After the victory, French officers noticed that two-thirds of the Indian forces were not at camp. The Native Americans reached the retreating British and reigned terror upon the rear militia and camp followers. Many of those in the rear fought off the raiding Indians; while others were taken, killed or scalped. When the British force reached Fort Edward, many of them ran to the gates with no jackets or personal belongings. Once they arrived the

⁴¹ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 188, 190-194.

forces at Fort Edward tried to figure out what exactly happened. A private documented in his diary what he gathered from the retreating army. His description from survivors noted that “the Savage Indians Came upon the and Stript them of their Packs and Cloths and the most of their Arms.” This narrative continued and highlighted the losses that the retreated British faced. “then they fell to killing our men At A most Dredfull manner they Raveshd the women and then Put them to the Slaughter young Children.”⁴²

Once Colonel Monro reached Fort Edward, it took him ten days until he could get a rough count of the number of men he had lost both during the battle and at the hands of the Indians during the retreat. During this count, he estimated that, “Of the 971 regulars, 20 were killed in the siege and 27 were wounded...The regulars captured and killed in the incident included 11 percent of Monro’s own regiment, 13 percent of the regular independent companies and rangers and 31 percent of the Royal Americans- 129 soldiers in all.”⁴³ The Battle for Fort William Henry was fought between gentlemen in the European style. The terms were reached with respect and honor. But, the retreat was met with terror and death at the hands of the pro-French Indians. It is important to note that these Indians acted on their own and were not ordered by Montcalm. But, that does not take away from the effectiveness of having Native American allies during the war in North America. The Six Nations, up to this point, had shown little effort and support in the British cause. By the end of 1757, the Pennsylvanian frontier was up in flames thanks to the Western Delaware; while New York and most of New England was struck with terror thanks to those northern tribes loyal to the French. After two years of fighting in North

⁴² Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 195; Ian K. Steele, *Betrayals: Fort William Henry and the “Massacre”* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 111-113, 117, 122-123.

⁴³ Steele, *Betrayals*, 133-134.

America, the British cause became desperate, changes had to be made. 1758 began the changes that shifted the tide of the war to the British's favor.

The winds of change for the British in North American arrived with the ascension of William Pitt. The changes the British needed both for the war efforts and Native America diplomacy had to start from the top down. Pitt was born in Westminster, England on November 15, 1708. He had come from a prominent family thanks to the successes of his grandfather's ventures in India. During his early years in the House of Commons, Pitt and his followers in the opposition attacked the practices of the Hanoverian leadership. Through his oratorical prowess and popularity, based largely on his reputation as being uncorrupt able, Pitt ascended to the position of Secretary of State of the Southern Department on December 4, 1756.⁴⁴ Once appointed, Pitt went right to work. The in North American war looked bleak and he knew he had to change the tide.

Within two months of his appointment, Pitt made the war in North America a priority, not a sideshow. He first wrote to Lord Loudon pressing for action taken against the French in Canada. Also, Pitt wrote letters to many of the governors across the thirteen colonies calling for troops and action to aid the British war efforts. Even after a vast escalation of force in North America, the war was still not going in the British's favor. In 1758, Pitt had to take more drastic measures. He first recalled Lord Loudon for failures in 1756-1757 and appointed General James Abercromby as his replacement. In May 1758, Abercromby informed Pitt of an important issue that could further advance British favor in the war, Native American diplomacy. Due to Pitt's change in focus, the Native Americans took notice. In a letter from Abercromby to Pitt, the

⁴⁴ Jeremy Black, *Pitt the Elder: The Great Commoner* (Gloucestershire, U.K.: Sutton Publishing, 1999), 2, 29, 34-35, 42, 64-65, 96, 110.

general noted that, “From whence you will see, that Teedyuscung, the Chief of the Delawares, & several of those Tribes of Indians, who had made Incursions on the Frontiers of Pennsylvania and Maryland, were turning fast on our side...” He continued by stating the need for a treaty conference, “...and that they were all desirous of joining His Majesty’s Army against the French...”⁴⁵ In the months that followed, the Delaware and other western backcountry tribes got their conference and the treaty that changed the tide of the war for the British in North America.

Pitt generated plans for the war in North America, including Brigadier-General John Forbes’ leading an expedition against Fort Duquesne. This was the first time since Braddock’s expedition that a military force would be sent back into the Ohio country. When Forbes arrived, he needed to meet with several Indian leaders, as did Braddock during this campaign. Forbes was at least more successful than Braddock, and obtained the loyalty of some Cherokee from South Carolina. It is estimated this force number around 700 at the start, but due to the boredom Forbes exposed them to, most departed. By July, there were less than 200 left.⁴⁶

The general began his campaign with his arrival into Philadelphia in April of 1758. Brigadier General John Forbes was forty-six years old. He was born in Scotland in the early eighteenth century. Before his military career, young Forbes was set on the study of medicine until the age of twenty-five when his military journey began during the War of the Austrian Succession. A year before his appointment to this campaign, Forbes as commissioned a colonel in 1757 and was sent to North America. During the December 1757 planning, Pitt promoted, Forbes to Brigadier General and ordered him to expel the French from Fort Duquesne. On May 7th, he decided to cut a new road from Carlisle to Bedford (or Raystown), Pennsylvania. His

⁴⁵ Black, *Pitt the Elder*, 149, 155, 157; Gertrude Selwyn Kimball, ed., *Correspondence of William Pitt, when Secretary of State, with Colonial Governors and Military and Naval Commissioners in America* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1906), 3-4, 88, 258-259.

⁴⁶ C. Hale Sipe, *Fort Ligonier and Its Times* (New York, Arno Press, 1971), 19, 25.

army began the long and dangerous journey towards the French fort. Forbes trailed behind the advance force, he reached Carlisle in June and was in Bedford by September. It was not his intentions to be so far and slow behind, but during his travels, Forbes became ill and could not even ride on the back of his horse. Around the time that Forbes arrived at Bedford, his advance forces arrived at and created their advance camp and called it the Camp at Loyal Hannon; later to be named Fort Ligonier.⁴⁷

From Ligonier, the British forces wanted to gauge the strength of the French at the fort and dispatched Major Grant and his Highlanders to gather intelligence. By September 13th, Grant's men were roughly 13 miles from the fort facing no opposition from the French or Native Americans. The next day, Grant ordered that the army play their drums and their bagpipes. Grant believed that his force was capable of taking the fort that day. The sounds alerted the French and the Indians, this was their first acknowledgement of a British force. The outcome of this short battle was the total destruction of Grant's force. The French and the Native American allies surrounded and defeated Grant in a manner similar to Braddock. The surviving Highlanders were slaughtered with little mercy from the Indians. The only positive to take from Grant's failure was that some of the Native Americans that took part were satisfied and departed for the time being.⁴⁸ This was a major blow for the French who heavily relied upon their Indian allies in that region. Thanks to Easton, roughly a month later, French Indian affairs worsened.

Of the Indians that stayed, along with the confident French, believed could defeat Forbes and the British. The French made a bold move and attacked the British at Fort Ligonier on October 12, 1758. The British, with the aid of their heavy artillery, fought back the advance by

⁴⁷ Sipe, *Fort Ligonier and Its Times*, 34-108; Charles Mores Stotz, *Outposts of the War for Empire: The French and the English in Western Pennsylvania: Their Armies, Their Forts, Their People, 1749-1764* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2005), 43-44.

⁴⁸ Sipe, *Fort Ligonier and Its Times*, 41, 46-49, 53, 67.

the French and Indians. The man who led the British forces was a man by the name of Colonel James Burd. Col. Burd described the battle and stated that, “This day, at 11 A.M., the enemy fired 12 guns to the southwest of us, upon instantly the firing increased, upon which I sent out a larger party of 500 men. They were forced to the camp, and immediately a regular attack ensued, which lasted a long time; I think about two hours. But we had the pleasure to do that honour to his Majesty’s arms, to keep his camp at Loyal Hannon.”⁴⁹ Days before the attack, an important Indian conference began at Easton. In August, General Forbes expressed the importance of this coming Indian Treaty in a letter. “Hambies & Teedyuscungs son goes down to Easttown to persuade their friends to come and join me...” He continued on writing that if positive treaty would not be concluded at Easton that it would be “a monstrous reflection upon them if they do, and they never after wither look for, or expect the favour or protection of Great Britain.”⁵⁰ It was Forbes’ understanding that if the Indians did not join now, the British may never gain their favor.

There are a number of additional figures pertaining to Easton 1758 to briefly introduce starting with Gov. William Denny. Denny who had come from a military breed was selected as governor after the Penn family submitted requests for a new governor to the Duke of Cumberland. The Penn’s request because their current governor, Robert Morris, had created a deadlock between he and the Quaker-led colonial Assembly. When the Penn’s agreed to Denny’s appointment, the Duke of Cumberland gave him startup funds of 5,000 pounds. Denny’s main goal, passed down by Cumberland, was to ease relations between the proprietors, his position, and the Assembly. This was not going to be an easy task; especially for a described unmotivated and lazy man. When Denny arrived, though, he was well received by the colonists of

⁴⁹ Sipe, *Fort Ligonier*, 67-68.

⁵⁰ John Forbes, “Letters of Gen. John Forbes, 1758,” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (1909): 89-90

Pennsylvania. During his appointment ceremony, on August 20, 1756, it was noted that there was an enormous crowd present. After his official appointment, Denny went to the Assembly to ask for £60,000 for the defense of the colony. After much debate and turmoil, the sides agree upon a £30,000 payment. This event displayed Denny the extent of the struggles he was going to face while governor. Not only did Denny have to raise funds to defend his new colony, but had to preside over Indian Affairs. In November 1756, the Assembly asked him to travel to Easton to attend a treaty conference with “hostile Delaware”. Denny was not pleased with this aspect of the job and it showed through his lack of effort. Even at Easton in 1758, Denny did more harm than good throughout.⁵¹ But, the one positive for him was he had good Indian agents that tried to make something out of nothing. One example of those agents was Christian Fredrick Post.

Christian Fredrick Post was another key figure that made Easton possible. He was born in East Prussia in 1710 and immigrated to North America in 1742. He was chosen by Gov. Denny and Gen. Forbes to send and receive messages from many of the Indian tribes across the Pennsylvania frontier. Author Walter Champion defined Post’s significance as, “His major contribution was his much discussed role as a diplomat in the withdrawal of the western Indians from the French interest in 1758.” Along with that, author C. Hale Sipe analyzed Post in a similar manner. It was his “...missions that contributed very largely to the success of the Forbes campaign...” Throughout the 1750s, Post was sent on a number of peaceful missions to the eastern and western Indians in Pennsylvania. It was his goal not only to declare peace, but to gauge the interest of the tribes; especially when it came to joining arms against the French. In June 1758, General Forbes dispatched Post to the western Pennsylvanian Indian tribes. Post’s goal was to get these tribes to be neutral while Forbes’ armies march towards Fort Duquesne. After

⁵¹ Nicholas B. Wainwright, “Governor William Denny in Pennsylvania,” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 81, No. 2 (April, 1957): 171-175.

his journey, he was sent to meet with eastern Indian chiefs, mainly Teedyuscung. These chiefs informed Post that the time was ripe for the British to court the western tribes for neutrality or even alliance. This dangerous mission began in July 1758. When Post was almost to the gate of Fort Duquesne, the French, aware of Post's intentions, threatened to capture him. Some French even put a bounty on him to prohibit further advances and meetings. The threats worked and Post withdrew from the region, with little effectiveness. The Indians he met with chose to continue their support with the French.⁵² It would take more than Post's words to lead these tribes away from the French. In time, Post returned with news that conference and treaty had been made between the British and the western tribes that sealed the French's fate at the Forks of the Ohio.

Overall, the French and Indian War began with the failures of George Washington in 1754. Once again, the British and the French were pinned up against one another for colonial control of North America. With war returned to the continent, the Native Americans needed to choose a side. The British had courted the support and allegiance of the primary members that made up the Iroquois League; while the Pennsylvanians, through poor policy and practices, had neglected the Delaware Indians. With nowhere else to go, the Delaware, especially in the west, befriended the French in the Ohio country. Their friendship proved extremely significant when they aided the French in the Battle of the Monongahela that led to the defeat of a stronger British force under the command of Edward Braddock. Following the defeat, these Delaware Indians reigned terror across the Pennsylvania backcountry. Two years later, the French and Indian allies again bested the British at the Siege of Fort William Henry. Due to the Indians' effectiveness, the British unable to prepare for the coming siege and surrendered shortly after it began. After the siege, the British were allowed to leave peacefully, but were terrorized by the French's Indian

⁵² Walter T. Champion, Jr., "Christian Fredrick Post and the Winning of the West," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 104, No. 3 (July, 1980): 308-309, 315, 319; Sipe, *Fort Ligonier*, 81, 84, 88, 90.

allies. After two years of defeat, the British government made changes to their war efforts. It started with the appointment of William Pitt as Secretary of State of the Southern Department. Once appointed, Pitt made changes and plans to change the tide of the war going into 1758. One example of these changes was the creation of the Forbes' expedition against the French at Fort Duquesne. While Forbes was executing his expedition, the government of Pennsylvania was planning to create peace with the western tribes. Through the actions of newly appointed Governor William Denny and Indian agent Christian Fredrick Post they tried to make Forbes' journey unmolested from Indian attack or raids. The scene was set. Easton was going to happen. It was time for the western tribes to meet with the British officials to discuss the prospect of leaving the French.

Chapter 4: Prior Easton Failures and the Great Conference at Easton, October 1758

The information presented in this chapter examines the prior Easton Conferences, 1756 and 1757, the Great Easton Conference of 1758, and the treaty document. After Braddock's defeat, the colony of Pennsylvania went up in flames. Indians were running rampant, and many lives and goods were lost. The French had strong control of the Forks of the Ohio and the Native Americans in the western frontier. The French, thanks to their early victories, felt confident in their position and believed victory was possible. The French government changed their focus from North America back to Europe. This all happened around the same that the British, under William Pitt, switched their focus from Europe to North America. Not only did this shift bring more regular troops to North America, it brought its powerful navy to the seas and Great Lakes. In Pennsylvania, to combat these raids and aggressive acts, the colony declared war on the Delaware Indians, but the lack of a standing army made it hard for any military success. The only options the Pennsylvanians could make were through diplomatic means. The first diplomatic measures began in the summer of 1756 but would not 'bear good fruits' until matters concluded in October 1758 with the Great Treaty at Easton 1758.

During the late spring/early summer 1756, the Susquehanna Delaware reached out to the Indian agents and stated that they were willing to meet at a treaty conference. It is important to note, that the Susquehanna Delaware were the eastern Delaware who were less aggressive towards the Pennsylvanians than their western cousins. The Pennsylvanian government agreed to meet and halt hostilities for six weeks. The conference began on July 28, 1756 with Governor Robert Morris presiding. The conference opened with delivered remarks from the governor and the "King" of the Delaware Teedyuscung. During this speech, Governor Morris asked the Indians present to renew the friendship with the Pennsylvanians as they did under William Penn.

Morris stated, “Being now Convinced out of my mouth the Sincerity of my Profession made to you by Capt. Newcastle and of the Dispositions of the People of this Province to renew the Ancient friendship that subsisted between William Penn and the Indians...” On July 31st, the conference closed with a believed peace between the Indians and colony of Pennsylvania.⁵³ This assumed peace did not last long. Months later, the Indians and Teedyuscung were recalled to Easton to discuss their relationship.

By fall of 1756, a number of changes took place since the short conference in July. First, Governor Morris was replaced by Governor Denny and the fighting between Indian raiders and colonists continued. Relations got so bad that experts informed Denny that if he did not meet with the Native Americans they might lose more tribes to the French during the winter months. Denny called a meeting between Teedyuscung, other Indian tribes, and colonial Indian Agents in November. This conference lasted from November 8-17, almost a full week longer than the July meeting. On November 9th, Teedyuscung confirmed to those assembled of the peace that had been made months earlier. Three days later, Gov. Denny asked the Indians and their leaders to speak plainly and explain why they were unhappy with and attacked the Pennsylvanians. Denny said, “Have we, the Governor, or People, of Pennsylvania, done you any Kind of Injury? If you think we have, you should be honest, and tell us your Hearts: You should have made Complaints, before you struck us, for so it was agreed, in our ancient League:” The following day, Teedyuscung responded to the questions asked by Denny and explained that many Indians flocked to the French because they feared the British would further encroach on Indian lands. Conrad Weiser agreed with the Delaware chief during his interpretation of the Treaty. He wrote

⁵³ Kelley, Jr., *P.A.: The Colonial Years*, 351; Alden T. Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents: Treaties and Laws, 1609-1789*, Vol. III Pennsylvania Treaties, 1756-1775 (Bethesda, M.D.: University of Publications of America, 2004), 110-112, 114, 120.

that, "...after the France had Such great advantage over the English it was an Easy Matter for that false hearted French King to prevail on our foolish young men to join them, and take up the hatchit against our Brethren the English the French making use of arts and presents." On the final day of the conference, Denny addressed all present with this closing remarks. He spoke of peace between the two sides. He stated that, "If any of our Indians shall incline to come into the Province and live among their Brethren the English, I do now assure you, that they shall be kindly received and supported..." The conference concluded with an uneasy peace and general uncertainty of the future. On November 24th, Sir William Johnson ordered George Croghan to "promise an immediate adjustment in the interest of peace, and also to attempt to bring the Ohio Indians into the British orbit, or at least, to neutralize them throughout a peace conference."⁵⁴ Even though during the 1756 calendar year there were two conferences with the Indians at Easton, more work was needed before a true and stable peace could be reached. It was the hope of Johnson, Denny, and Croghan that this stable peace would come in 1757.

The final figure pertinent to Indian diplomacy and the conferences at Easton, including 1758, was Teedyuscung, the King of the Delawares. It is believed that he was born around the year 1700 around Trenton, New Jersey. He was the son of Captain Harris who was a noted man among the Indians. For the first thirty years of his life, Teedyuscung lived as a poor Delaware Indian among the wealthy whites in New Jersey. He could speak English, as well as, several Indian languages, but was illiterate. To survive in New Jersey, the young Teedyuscung picked up the trade of basket and broom making to generate income. Due to his many years of isolation from the primary location of the Delaware Indians, he learned little to nothing of the ancient ceremonial forms and observations of his nation. In 1730, his family moved from their home in

⁵⁴ Kelley, Jr., *P.A.: The Colonial Years*, 358, 361; Alden, *Early American Indian Documents*, 140, 142-143, 146, 148, 160, 164.

New Jersey to live closer to their people in Pennsylvania. During their time in Pennsylvania, it is believed that Teedyuscung's father was one of the first to denounce the legality of the Walking Purchase. Later in life, Teedyuscung moved to Gnadenhutten to live amongst the whites again. During his time in Gnadenhutten, he was baptized by Moravians on March 12, 1750 and was given the Christian name Gideon. Biographer Anthony Wallace believed that, "This conversion seems to have represented to Teedyuscung an effort at identification with the whites, who appeared to him to be the most secure, powerful, and prosperous of mankind." After his time at Gnadenhutten, Teedyuscung moved for the Wyoming village along the Susquehanna River where he began his climb to chief ton.⁵⁵

Teedyuscung's first exposure to Native American diplomatic affairs was during the Albany Congress in 1754. It is noted that he made no important contribution, but it is believed that when he spoke up he was drunk and his words were ill timed. By April 1755, he was awarded the title of "a Sachem of the Delawares" and could speak for the tribe at conferences. During the winter of 1755-1756, Teedyuscung switched from neutral (with British leanings) to the war path against the British. It is not exactly clear what specific events happened that launched Teedyuscung to take up the hatchet against the British. The results were, under the leadership of Teedyuscung, a number of bloody and successful winter Indian raids on many of the colonist in Pennsylvania. After January 3rd, 1756, Teedyuscung never went out with another war party again, due to his war party's success he did not any further victories or treasures. Once he was appeased, and on the eve of the 1756 Easton conference in July, Teedyuscung was

⁵⁵ Anthony F. C. Wallace, *King of the Delawares: Teedyuscung 1700-1763* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949), 18-19, 28, 39, 44, 47.

prepared to bury his hatchet against the British. He and his Indians were happy to rejoin the British favor. It is important to note but he that he did not speak for the western Delaware.⁵⁶

In January 1757, Sir William Johnson ordered George Croghan to send messages to the Ohio Indians. The message had been delivered to the Delaware chief Custaloga. He informed the British delegation that they would consult the anti-British Senecas under Garistagee. The Seneca chief advised the Delaware chief to not respond. Custaloga took the advice and did not respond. Not all hope was lost with this lack of response. It was noted that on May 12 the Delaware warriors were interested in the possible peace the delegates from Philadelphia offered. Based on that information, it should have been clear to the British and Pennsylvanian officials that the peace with the Ohio Indian was not going to come in 1757. But, they continued on their track for a conference anyway. The only tribal leader that arrived was, again, Teedyuscung. The conference proved doomed even before it started. This was because two differing factions arrived in Easton in July. The first was comprised of Gov. Denny and his officials, while the second represented the Quakers that wished to undermine Denny's efforts. Biographer Anthony Wallace described the confusion that many of the Native Americans faced throughout the conference, "In these confused circumstances the proprietary party (Denny's faction) could not prevent the Quakers from carrying on what amounted to a separate treaty with the Delawares." It was because of these differing factions that Teedyuscung left this conference very unhappy. He was unsure towards which faction to aim his efforts.⁵⁷

The conference opened on July 21st, with Gov. Denny presiding. The Indian delegation, numbering 159, was headed by 'King' Teedyuscung. Teedyuscung began the conference with a

⁵⁶ Wallace, *King of the Delawares*, 57, 66, 80, 84, 95.

⁵⁷ William A. Hunter, "Provincial Negotiations with the Western Indians, 1754-1758," *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (July, 1951): 216; Wallace, *King of the Delawares*, 156, 159-160.

speech. It is important to note that due to prior conferences and the establishment of peace with the Pennsylvanians, he took a different approach. He first asked for a clerk be appointed to him. This was something that had never been done before and became a highly contested issue. After long deliberation and the fear backlashes, Gov. Denny granted the chiefs wish. A day later, Gov. Denny delivered his opening remarks. During these remarks, the governor stressed that Indian Affairs were now in the hands of the few. A practice many of the Indian leaders had asked for in the past. On July 25th, Denny spoke to the Indian delegation and informed them of the conference's purpose. "We are met together to finish, by the Assistance of the Almighty, the great Works of Peace, and to make a new Chain of Friendship so bright that it shall never rust, and so strong that it shall never be in the Power of wicked Spirits to break it..." Two days later, Denny affirmed the purpose through the reassertion of the agreements made at Easton. He hoped that the two would return to the old relations and spoke "Though our Forefathers and yours might make some mistakes...they were open and upright in their Intentions; they lived together in Perfect Peace, and the mutual Exchange of good Offices."⁵⁸

After Denny's July 27th speech, Teedyuscung delved into his second unorthodox mission during Easton 1757. Since he had already made numerous peace offerings with the Pennsylvanian government, he hoped that he could address more specific concerns. His largest concern dealt with the unfair practices by 'Indian agents' that resulted in 'unlawful' land grabs and treaties; most importantly the Walking Purchase of 1737. It was the 'King's' hope that he might reverse some of these unfair treaties, and, in the process, protect his people's land from further encroachments. Governor Denny replied "The Proprietaries have never granted away any Lands, though within the Limits of this Province, without first purchasing them of the Indians..."

⁵⁸ Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents*, 244-249, 257-258, 264.

Teedyuscung requested, to Denny, that the treaty documents be produced and presented to him. Days later, the documents from all prior colonial Native American Affairs, including the Walking Purchase of 1737, were delivered from Philadelphia and presented to the Indian ‘King.’ The treaty conference closed on August 7th with speeches from Gov. Denny and Teedyuscung. Their speeches contained words of mutual respect and peace.⁵⁹

The conference may have closed with good will speeches from both parties, but that does not mean that the treaty was successful. As a whole, the conference failed. First, the intended audience, the Ohio Indians, declined the invitation, leaving the less militant tribes. Second, the multi-factioned Pennsylvanians brought confusion to many of the Native Americans present. Author Nicholas Wainwright assessed the impact of such factionalization as a key to the conference's failure. He believed that one of the factions “stirred up the natives to such a heat that a massacre of the officials hung in the balance.” described that the factions led to the outcomes that deemed Easton 1757 as a failure. Third, Teedyuscung’s aggressive agenda took a step back from the peace and good will established prior with the Pennsylvanians. George Croghan predicted that the Treaty of Easton 1757 was not going to last, as it was a “truce not a peace.” He believed the only thing the treaty did was lower the Anglo-American prestige. With the Pennsylvanians divided, it made them look unattractive to the Ohio Indians and made it hard from them to leave the French.⁶⁰ Though the All the conferences at Easton in 1756 and 1757 failed, Pennsylvania had no choice another conference. The Ohio Indians were still aligned with the French and terror reigned throughout the backcountry. The British made a third and final attempt in the fall of 1758 at Easton. With the change in circumstances, it was believed that it was time for the Ohio Indians to bury their hatchets against the British.

⁵⁹ Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents*, 273, 276, 294-295.

⁶⁰ Wainwright, “Governor William Denny, 185; Wainwright, *George Croghan; Wilderness Diplomat*, 134.

The foundations for the Conference at Easton began during the summer of 1758. First, due to the British Navy's successes, the French in Canada, hurt from famine in 1756 and 1757, were unable to resupply their colonist. This was credited to the escalation of the Royal Navy's involvement in the western hemisphere. For any French merchant ship to arrive safely in Canada it would have to "run a gauntlet of Royal Navy vessels." In June 1758, during a journey to the Ohio Indians, Christian Fredrick Post noted in a journey entry the situation of the Franco-Indian alliance there. He documented his conversation with a chief and wrote that the chief informed him that the French soldiers were "starved with hunger." Additionally, thanks to the blockade increased involvement in North America, the "Provisions they got from the Mississippi, which was but very little."⁶¹ This meant that if the French were not receiving enough goods to sustain themselves, then they would not have enough to give to their Indian allies. These circumstances made the time right for the Indians to join the British, who had an abundance of goods and gifts.

The second foundation was in a letter by Sir William Johnson to the Delaware Indians dated July 21, 1758. Johnson asked the Delaware, on the Ohio, to depart from that region and return east near the Susquehanna River. He warned them that if they stayed they might be in grave danger. "The Times are troublesome, and I see black Clouds gathering over the Ohio, I therefore send this Belt for the last Time...to advise you to get out of the Way, and come with all your Families, and live with the Rest of your Brethren." He concluded this letter by inviting their chiefs to the Easton Conference. "Your Uncles the Six Nations and your Brethren living on the Sasquenhannah River are invited to a great Meeting by the governor of Pennsylvania. I would have your chief Men go thither, and they will hear Things for their good, and I hope it will open their Eyes to see what is their true Interest." The same day, Johnson wrote a letter to Governor

⁶¹ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 237; Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents*, 396.

Denny regarding the coming conference. Johnson informed Denny of one of the goals he hoped would be achieved at Easton. He hoped that, "...by a solemn public Treaty to agree upon clear & fixed Boundaries between our Settlements & their Hunting Grounds..." Towards the end of his letter, Sir William described the possible significance of a treaty with the Indians at Easton. "...I am apt to believe, such a System of Conduct...would dislodge the French from their alarming Encroachments..." Finally, Johnson firmly believed that it would be impossible to bring the Indians to their side without a treaty made between the colony of New Jersey and the Minisink tribe. He wanted that because he believed that "those [the Minisinks] are the Indians chiefly concerned in the Irruptions upon his Province."⁶² So, the orders had been passed down by Johnson and were twofold: First, to make peace with the Ohio Indians through good practices; secondly, to ensure peace between the colony of New Jersey and the Minisinks. If both were achieved at Easton, the British would strike a devastating blow to the French cause.

By October 1758, there had been many changes across the Pennsylvania frontier, and in North America. First, a British force marched across Pennsylvania numbering around 5,000 under the leadership of Forbes. The French garrison at Fort Duquesne was lowered significantly to support the defenses of Canada from approaching British advances and was running low on supplies. The Ohio Indians took notice of these changes and believed that the time had come to meet with the British officials to protect their lands and interests. Both sides decided to meet again at Easton. Members of the British and Indian delegations arrived around the end of September. The conference formally opened on October 7th, 1758.

⁶² James Sullivan, *The Papers of Sir William Johnson*, Vol. II (Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1922), 875-880.

The conference was presided over by Gov. Denny of Pennsylvania. During the first day, October 7th, Teedyuscung delivered the only speech. During the speech, he welcomed Governor Denny and the British delegation to Easton. Along with that, Teedyuscung credited his voice as the reason that the other tribes have joined the conference. He stated that, “I have spoke loud and raised my Voice, and all the Indians have heard me, as far as the Twightwees, and have regarded it, and are now come to this Place.” The following day, the minutes documented the number of and the various Indian tribes present. It estimated that there were roughly 507 Indians present, counting women and children. Also, it documented that the following tribes were present: the Mohocks, Oneidoes, Onodagoes, Cayugas, Senecas, Tuscaroras, Nanticokes and Conys, Kandt, Chugnuts, Chehohckers, Minisinks, Mohickons, and the Wapings. The size of the Indian delegation displayed promise that this conference was going to be different than any prior at Easton. For example, in 1757, the Indian delegation numbered between 100-200; now it was over 500. Additionally, on the 8th, Governor Denny delivered his welcome speech to those gathered. He requested that the Indians not be afraid to speak freely, in the hope that the most good could be achieved. He said that, “With this String[of wampum] I take all Bitterness out of your Breast, as well as everything disagreeable that may have gathered there, in order that you may speak perfectly free and open to us.” After Denny’s speech, a Seneca chief by the name of Tagashata addressed the assembled. The most important part of his speech dealt with his rationale for his tribe’s absence from the Easton 1757 conference. The Seneca chief explained that their absence from the prior conference was because “we were then so much alarmed by the French, who were near us, that we could not then leave our Country.” He continued that as soon as his tribe received word of this conference they “immediately arose, and came as soon as we could to your Council Fire.”⁶³

⁶³ Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents*, 428-430.

The following day (October 9th), Governor Bernard of New Jersey arrived. Due to private Native American meetings, Governor Bernard did not address the entire conference until October 11th. After Bernard's introduction, Teedyuscung rose to address all present; especially those of the Indian delegation. He explained that, "I sit by only to hear and see what you {have} to say to one another, for I have said what I have to say to the Governor of Pennsylvania..." This, again, was because the Delaware 'King' had made his peace with the Pennsylvanians previously. On October 12, the conference continued with a powerful speech from Tagashata. His speech opened with a tone of reconciliation; especially from the British towards the Delaware. He explained that the Delaware actions were "struck into them [the British] by our Couzins, the Delawares; it was a french Hatchet that they unfortunately made use of by, the Instigation of the French." He petitioned that the British forgive the Delaware for their actions and pledged that the Delaware would "take it [the Hatchet] out of your Heads and bury it under ground, where it shall always rest and never be taken up again." Conjointly, Tagashata described that many other tribes wanted peace with the British. "Our Nephews, the Minisink Indians, and there other different Tribes of that Nation, have...laid down the Hatchet they had taken up against their Brethren the English...[and that] they would forever cultivate in a good Friendshop with you..."⁶⁴

After Tagashata spoke, Cayuga Chief Tokkaaio arose and addressed all present. During his speech, Takkaaio made a point that many of those warriors who joined the fight against the British were stolen and manipulated by the French. He assured the British that these warriors "shall do so no more" and asked for their forgiveness. On October 13th, Gov. Denny opened the proceedings with a speech that explained the Pennsylvanians had lost their way and hoped to

⁶⁴ Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents*, 430-433.

return to the favorable practices of William Penn. “I must first put you in mind, that perfect Peace and Friendship subsisted between you and your Brethren, the English in this Province from our first Settlement among you...they [differences between colonist and Indians] were amicable settled and adjusted by our wise Men at our Council Fires, according to an agreement made by our Proprietary William Penn, and your fathers.” Denny continued on by promising to return to those old practices. “Had this wise Agreement been carefully observed, as it always ought to have been, our late unhappy Differences had never arose. But what is passed cannot be recalled, and shall be forgotten. Let us both resolve never to be guilty of the like Error in the future.” After those words of reconciliation and hope, the Pennsylvanian Governor highlighted the events that had taken place between the Indians and the colony of Pennsylvania over the past three years. He hoped to inform all present of the many misunderstandings and attempts at reconciliation displayed the tough road both had taken the hope for a permanent peace.⁶⁵

The official minutes noted on October 14th that the Native Americans declined to meet. The succeeding days brought up an interesting shift in the affairs of the conference. Up until this point, the theme had been of peace and recovery between the Indians and the British. But, on October 15th, some of the chiefs present held a private meeting with Governors Denny and Bernard. Nichas, the Mohawk chief spoke first and explained why they requested the private meeting. “We thought proper to meet you here to have some private discourse about our Nephew, Teedyuscung.... Now I, on behalf of the Mohocks, 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...” Following Nichas, Tagashata, Assarandonquas (Onondagoes), and Thomas King all spoke out against Teedyuscung and his claimed title. During Thomas King’s speech, he questioned the ‘King’s’ authority. “We

⁶⁵ Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents*, 434-437.

for, our parts, intirely disown that he has any Authority over us, and desire to know from whence he derives his Authority.” The next day, Governor Denny had the minutes from this private meeting read to all present at the conference. He then rose and addressed all the questions and concerns raised by the Indian chiefs regarding Teedyuscung. He responded that Delaware ‘King’ “Came [for a treaty conference] and told us that he represented Ten Nations, amongst which the United Nations were included; that he acted as Chief Man for the Delawares, but only as a Messenger...” To salvage the good relations established during the previous days, Denny continued to appease these chiefs concerns and explained that “I...do assure you that I never made Teedyuscung this great Man, nor ever pretended to give him any Authority over you...”. Denny said that on various occasions the Delaware referred to these tribes as his “Uncles and Superiors.”⁶⁶ Denny believed that his speech calmed the Indian delegation from further displeasures and saved conference from an affair that may have put the treaty in jeopardy.

The day after Denny’s speech, October 17th, the Indians were in councils all day and declined to meet. On October 18th, Thomas King spoke to the British delegation and explained why many of the tribes left the British for the French. He first described the ill will done towards the Shawnee by the British. King stated that, “But if you Look a little about you, you Will find that you gave the first Offence; For in Time of Profound Peace, some of the Shawanese passing through South Carolina to go to War with the Enemies, were taken up and put in Prison; The English knew they were going to War, and that they used to do it every Year...” He continued by highlighting the specific event brought the Shawnees to French favor. “This first raised ill will in the minds of the Shawnaese, and as the French came a little after this happened to settle on the Ohio, the Shawanese complained of it to them, and they made an artful use of it, set them against

⁶⁶ Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents*, 439-441.

the English and gave them the Hatchet.” Then, King explained why many of the Senecas were unhappy with the British. He detailed an event when Seneca Warriors were returning from war passing throughout Virginia. During, there journey home they were encountered by roughly one-hundred and fifty solders. These soldiers kindly welcomed them to a house, at which time; they took the warriors arms and proceeded to attack them. The outcome was “two of them were killed on the Spot, and one young Boy, was taken Prisoner.”⁶⁷

The Mingo chief continued detailing the rationales for why the Ohio Indians came in communion with the French. “The French however came and became our Neighbours, and you neither coming yourselves, nor assisting us with Warlike Stores, our People, of necessity, were obliged to Trade with them for what we Wanted, as your Traders had left the Country. The Governor of Virginia took care to settle on our Lands for his own Benefit; but when we wanted his assistance against the French he disregarded us.” King closed his speech by addressing two additional issues. First, he confirmed that the Indian delegation would comply with the British request to return all Prisoners. This was an issue that had been briefly discussed earlier in the conference. Second, King addressed the Governor of New Jersey on behalf of the Minisinks and explained that there was a purchase made between the tribe and the colony and the tribe had not been paid for all of the lands yet. Along with that, he asked for the same actions be taken by the Governor of Pennsylvania.⁶⁸

After the grievances were presented, both delegations met in private throughout most of the day on the 19th. That evening, there was a private conference between the Indians and the Governor of New Jersey. During this meeting, Gov. Bernard discussed the proposition of paying

⁶⁷ Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents*, 443-445.

⁶⁸ Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents*, 446-447.

for the lands unpaid. The Indians present said they would recommend to the Minisinks to consider it. The next day, the full conference met and began with a speech from Gov. Denny. His speech was aimed at addressing all of the concerns raised by King's speech given on the 18th. First, Denny promised to take the advice of the Indians and "to prevent the like Evils for the time to come." Then, he addressed the issue of the Seneca boy taken by the Virginians. "I promise you that I will immediately send to the Governor of Virginia to enquire after the Seneca Boy...who you say was left a Prisoner in his country and promised that the Indians "may depend on his being returned to you."⁶⁹ Once again, Denny's response avoided certain calamity that would have endangered the prospect of peace.

The next part of the minutes included a letter from Gov. Denny to the Ohio Indians that was delivered by Post. An important part of the message included a paragraph requesting that these tribes leave the French before Forbes' Army reaches Fort Duquesne. "...And will likewise give orders that your People may be kept at a Distance from Fort Duquesne, that they may not be hurt by our Warriors, who are sent by our King to Chastise the French, and not to hurt you; Consider the Commanding Officer of that Army treads heavy, and would be very sorry to hurt any of his Indian Brethren." The minutes continued with another private meeting between the Indians and the Governor of New Jersey on October 21st. It was described that Gov. Bernard, at the approval of his commissioners, offered the Minisinks eight hundred Spanish Dollars for their land claims in New Jersey. After advising with their 'Uncles', the Minisinks accepted the governor's offer. Egohohwen expressed the happiness of the tribe following the agreement. "We

⁶⁹ Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents*, 448-450.

are now thoroughly satisfied, and we will still retain a Friendship for our Brethren, the English...”⁷⁰

On October 22nd, the Indians declined to meet with the Governors and their agents. Instead a number of the chiefs met with Christian Fredrick Post. During their meeting, Post informed the Indians of their Cousins’ defeat with the French by Forbes’ forces at Fort Ligonier. He also explained that the Indians had taken heavy losses during the battle. The next morning there were no meetings because a Seneca chief died and the Indians were given time to mourn. The conference continued in the afternoon of the 23rd with a final speech from Governor Denny. He opened his speech by addressing the renewed friendship created at Easton. He went on by saying, “Now we have healed your Wounds, we, by this Belt, renew all our Treaties; we brighten our Chain of Friendship; we return to our first Affection; we confirm our Ancient Union...” Towards the end of his speech, the Governor explained the importance of this peace treaty. “This Treaty will convince all our Enemies that we are now united in the firmest Band of Amity, and whilst join our Strength together, it will not be in their Power to hurt either you or us.” After his speech, the minutes included a detail inscription of the goods and gifts given to the Indian tribes present. Most of the items given included clothing or personal use items. Finally, Gov. Denny informed those present that he must depart back to Philadelphia for business. He closed with the final words “Brethren, It gives me great Pleasure that the Business of this Treaty has been carried on with so much Satisfaction.” Before he departed Easton, Gov. Denny dispatched Christian Fredrick Post to the west to inform the tribes there of the agreements made. The following day, on his way to Philadelphia, Gov. Denny wrote to Sir William Johnson informing him of the completion of the conference. He wrote, “Sir, I have the pleasure of informing you, that the

⁷⁰ Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents*, 453-455

Treaty of this place is happily concluded, tho we met with many difficulties thro' the whole course of the Conferences.”⁷¹

On October 24th, the Indians held a private conference with several Pennsylvanian Indian agents, whom were entrusted the authority of Gov. Denny in his absence. During this meeting, the agreement between the colony of Pennsylvania and the Indians was finalized. The next day, there was no meeting between the British and the Indians. It was noted that the Indians took this day to divide up the gifts.⁷² October 26th was the final day of the conference at Easton and it began with a speech from members of the Pennsylvania Council. The speech could be better categorized as the Pennsylvanians' closing remarks. In it the members stated:

Brethren,

As we have settled all Difficulties, and Confirmed the Antient Leagu{e} of Amity, and brightened the Chain of Friendship, we now clean the Blood off your Council Seats, and put them in order, that when you hold Councils at Home, you may sit as you formerly used to do in your Seats, with the same Peace and Tranquility.

We disperse the dark Clouds that have hung over our Heads during these Troubles, that we may see the Sun Clear, and Look on each other with the Chearfulness our Forefathers did.⁷³

After the Pennsylvanians' speech, Mr. Weiser produced the Confirmation Deed, which confirmed peace between those tribes present and the Pennsylvanians. The deed was signed and agreed upon by all the Chiefs present. Once the Pennsylvanians settled their business with the Indians, Gov. Bernard spoke and produced his own document dealing with the land agreement with the Minisinks. It was his hope that this document would ease the tensions between the two; thus, making peace between the British and the Indians complete. The final speech of the

⁷¹ Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents*, 457-461; Sullivan, *The Papers of Sir William Johnson*, Vol. III, 10.

⁷² Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents*, 462-463.

⁷³ Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents*, 463.

conference was delivered by Tomas King. He spoke that he and the other Indian chiefs were pleased with the events during the Easton Conference. He stated, “that the Nations were vastly pleased that all the Antient Treaties made there at Albany, and elsewhere, were renewed, as well as that the Old Council Fire at Philadelphia was kindled again...these in Particular, as well as every other matter transacted at these Conferences, we will make known to our own Nations, and to every other in Friendship and Alliance with us; and we are sure they will be very well received.” After Thomas King’s closing speech the official business was concluded. The official conference minutes closed with the following statement, “Some Wine and Punch was then ordered in, and the Conferences were concluded with great Joy and mutual Satisfaction.”⁷⁴

The treaty document contained the important agreement made between the colony of New Jersey and the Minisinks. This agreement was a goal stressed by Sir William Johnson in his letter to Gov. Denny months before Easton. Johnson understood for the Indians to be completely satisfied with the British they must see efforts from both the Pennsylvanians and New Jersians. The document opened in the following manner, “This Indenture made At Easton in the Province of Pensilvania on Monday the Twenty Third day of October...” After listing the all of the leaders, translators, and all present, the document explained the agreement made between the Indians and New Jersey. It stated:

Inhabitants of the said Northern parts of the said Province [New Jersey] have arisen, to put an End to which, the Mingoes or united Nations, have permitted their Nephews the said Minisink or Munsie and the said Oping or pompton Indians to Settle on their Lands on the Branches of the Susquehanah and else where, to which they have for their best convenience removed. And Whereas to prevent disputes for the Future it has been agreed by the Parties to these presents, with the Interposition and approbation of the said...Minisink or Munsie, and the said Oping or pompton, and all other Indians having claims upon the said Northern parts of New Jersey aforesaid, Should for the Consideration hereafter

⁷⁴ Vaughan, *Early American Indian Documents*, 463-466.

mentioned Grant, Release and Confirm unto his Excellency the Governor, and Commissioners aforesaid, all the said Northern parts of New Jersey...⁷⁵

Additional information in the document included, the terms of new territory lines, and listed those involved. The left side of the document featured important signatures; George Croghan, Deputy Indian Agent, Conrad Weiser, was listed as the Provincial interpreter for Pennsylvania, Thomas King, Tagashata, and Egohohoun, who was listed in the minutes as the primary chief of the Minisinks, Along with his 'signature,' Egohohoun placed his seal on the document. The Native Americans seal was pressing their thumb print down on the red wax on the paper. The image of such stamps is included in the Appendix section of this paper. The last important part of this document came on the back left corner where it listed the payment. It stated that the payment was "Received October 23d. 1758 the Sum of Three hundred and Seventy five pounds in full of the Consideration."⁷⁶ With the documents signed and the treat conference concluded it was time for the Native Americans to return to their tribes and inform them of the new peace with the British.

Overall, between the years of 1756-1758, the British made great strides to make peace with many of the tribes they had neglected over the years. The first effort took place at Easton in 1756. Due to the poor attempts made by Governor Morris of Pennsylvania little to nothing was achieved. If anything more violence broke out. The summer's failures caused the need for a second Easton conference took place in the fall of 1756. This meeting was called in the hope to hold on to what relations the Pennsylvanians had with the Native Americans. Once again, little to no ground was gained. The following year, 1757, Denny called another Indian conference to be held at Easton. Out of all the conferences, this conference gained the least. As mentioned above,

⁷⁵ *1758 Indian Treaty*, Northampton County Historical & Genealogical Society, Easton, Pennsylvania.

⁷⁶ *1758 Indian Treaty*.

George Croghan believed that Easton 1757 gained nothing and weakened the position of the British. Over time and thanks to the efforts of Post and Johnson, the Indian tribes were prepared to meet for a great conference at Easton in October of 1758. The Native Americans came in large numbers roughly 500 in total. After nineteen days of speeches, private councils and meetings, peace was made between the colonies of Pennsylvania and New Jersey and those nations present. The conversation now shifts from the document to the legacies that it produced for the Anglo-Indian relations due to the French and Indian War.

Chapter 5: Long Term Significance and Conclusions

Easton was the key domino to fall that led to the expulsion of the French from North America. Exactly a month after the Treaty of Easton, the British took control of the Forks of the Ohio, after a five year contest for control. After the fall of Fort Duquesne, the other prongs from Secretary of State William Pitt's offensive plans took shape. General Wolfe began his attack on the key city of Quebec; while General Amherst planned his attack on Montreal. Additionally, Sir William Johnson got significant Indian aid which helped the Canadian offensives with his victory at the French stronghold of Fort Niagara. With victory achieved, the two sides met in Paris to discuss terms. The outcome was the Treaty of Paris 1763. With 'All of Canada in the Hands of the British' Native American affairs did not improve. The Indians could no longer play one nation off of the other. Along with that, countless times after 1758 the British returned to their old practices and treated the Indians poorly. The King of England even tried to ease the tension through the Proclamation of 1763 which delegated Indian lands west of the Appalachian Mountains. The British paid little attention to the proclamation and settled there anyway. An example of this would be the new settlement of Pittsburgh, named for William Pitt. These offenses angered many of the Indians, and, one specifically, decided to put a stop to it. An Ottawa chief named Pontiac led one of the most infamous Indian 'uprisings' against the British from 1763-1764. All in all, Easton was signed in October of 1758 but its legacies lasted all the way up to 1764 and possibly beyond.

The first legacy of the Treaty of Easton was the completion Forbes' expedition against the French at Fort Duquesne. The expedition of his journey paused after the victory at Fort Ligonier on October 12th. By November 1st, General Forbes arrived with the main force at Fort Ligonier. Once arrived, the General had to make an important decision. Would the army stay at

Fort Ligonier for the winter or would they push on to Fort Duquesne? This was a significant decision because if he had waited the fort might have been reinforced by spring 1759. Forbes held a Council of War on November 11th with many of his top officers including George Washington and Henry Bouquet. During that meeting Forbes declared, “The risks being so obviously greater than the advantages, there is no doubt as to the sole course that prudence dictates.” This meant that the army was going to make winter camp at Ligonier and the campaign would resume in the spring. The next day, a French raiding party was sighted and Forbes dispatched to regiments of Virginians, one led by George Washington. The events that followed nearly cost Washington his life and changed the course of the Forbes campaign. On November 30, 1758, the *Pennsylvania Gazette* published the best account of Washington’s ‘skirmish’ with the enemy. “On the 12, Col. Washington being out with a scouting party, fell in with a number of enemy about 3 miles from our camp [Fort Ligonier], whom he attacked, killed one, took 3 prisoners...” Thanks to the intelligence of one of the prisoners after Washington’s friendly fire incident, the British learned that the fort was undermanned and most of the Native Americans had departed the French ranks. The Indian departure was a combination of the warriors returning home for the winter and, also, many left after the word of the completion of the Treaty of Easton. Forbes held another emergency Council of War where the decision was made to march towards Fort Duquesne immediately.⁷⁷

On November 13th, Colonel Henry Bouquet, Forbes’ second in command, departed with an advance force of 1,000 men. Finally on November 17th Forbes depart Fort Ligonier with the main body consisting of roughly 4,300. While Forbes’ army marched towards the Forks, the French commandant Captain Francois-Marie Le Marchand de Lignery made one last attempt to

⁷⁷ Sipe, *Fort Ligonier and Its Times*, 75-78; Stotz, *Outposts for Empire*, 42.

gather a war party of Native Americans to attack the coming British force. His plea for aid came on November 20th. But, thanks to the Treaty of Easton his efforts were futile. Even Lignery knew of the treaty conference at Easton and what this treaty meant for his efforts of defending the Forks. Historian Fred Anderson summarizes Lignery's final attempt. Lignery sent a messenger to deliver a war belt to the Delaware in the hopes that they would join the French in defense of the fort. But, "the Delawares refused to accept the belt and instead kicked it about as if were a snake." Additionally, the Indians gave a response to the French commandant. "Give it [back] to the French captain... We have often ventured our lives for him; and hardly loaf of bread [in return]...; now he thinks we should jump to serve him." When the messenger returned it was noted that he was "pale as death" and "endured their [the Native Americans] ridicule until midnight." It was clear to Lignery that he was to have no support from the Indians. This event highlighted that the French had failed as 'fathers' and the Delaware were prepared to embrace the British, mainly thanks to Easton and gifts presented there.⁷⁸

While Forbes marched and Lignery pleaded, Christian Fredrick Post was out spreading word of the new Treaty of Easton. The most important part of his travels came on November 25th during a meeting with chief Shingas' band. After the meeting, Shingas agreed to carry the message of peace with the English to the Ohio country. But, one of the Indian councilors gave Post a warning for the coming English. Post noted that the chief, "...begged us very much to tell the Governor, General, and all other people not to settle there. And if the English would draw back over the mountain, they would get all the other nations into their interest." On November 25th, 1758, the British Army under command of General John Forbes claimed the burnt remains of Fort Duquesne. The fort was in ruins because the French departed and burned the fort. It was

⁷⁸ Sipe, *Fort Ligonier and Its Times*, 119-120; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 282-283.

estimated, by Indians in the region, that the French only had 400-500 men. After securing the fort, Forbes wrote a letter to Governor Denny informing him of their acquisition. He informed the governor of the attitude of the Indians along the Forks, "...being abandoned or at least not seconded by their Friends the Indians who we had previously engaged to act a neutral part and who now seem all willing and ready to embrace His Majesty's most gracious protection." A month later, Forbes' victory became public in a *New York Mercury* article from December 1758. The article (from the future Pittsburg) was written by a member of General Forbes' army. The author informed the readers that Forbes had "...reconciled the several Nations of Indians at War with us, and with one-another, regained our lost Interest among them...instead of being frightful Fields of Blood, will once more smile with Peace and Plenty."⁷⁹ Overall, the Treaty of Easton had a powerful and significant effect on the outcome of the Forbes expedition, as Fort Duquesne was practically indefensible without Indian allies.

A second significant legacy of the Treaty of Easton was the successful British siege of Fort Niagara during the summer of 1759. Historian Fred Anderson expressed the importance of this battle by titling it "The Six Nations Join the Fight." With Easton signed and the western tribes appeased, the Six Nations were emboldened to take up arms against the French. Before 1759, the Iroquois League, as a whole, remained neutral. Only warriors from certain tribes, and in small numbers, joined on British's expeditions. It was after the British victory at the Forks of the Ohio that the Iroquois reached out to Johnson. They hoped to join the coming expedition against the French in Canada. Johnson believed that the whole confederacy was prepared to take up arms with him. On June 30th, 1759, the combined British and Indian forces moved towards

⁷⁹ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 280-281; Sipe, *Fort Ligonier and Its Times*, 120-121; Forbes, "Letters of Gen. John Forbes," 97; "Pittsburg,(Formerly Fort Duquesne) November 28, 1758," *New York Mercury*, New York, December 23, 1758, Accessed from America's Historical Newspapers, 1-2.

the heavily fortified French Fort Niagara. Johnson's forces arrived outside of the fort around the 6th of July. On the same day, the French learned of the British attack when a working party was attacked by a war party of Iroquois warriors. Four days later, the British began the formal siege of the fort. The French commandant hoped he could get his allied Seneca chiefs and warriors to convince the Iroquois fighting with the British to return home. Shortly after the siege began, the two sides held a temporary truce, during which, the Iroquois chiefs met. In the meetings, the pro-British chiefs informed the Seneca chief, "that continued support for the French was no longer tenable." While all of this was happening, the French relief force under Lignery (the same former commandant of Fort Duquesne) marched from Fort Machault (located in north western Pennsylvania) towards the British lines. During their march, the British Indians spoke with the Indians marching with the French and informed them that they should depart to avoid heavy losses and further bloodshed. These Indians wisely took the advice and abandoned Lignery. After the battle, the British Indians pursued and either killed or captured the retreating French. The losses for Lignery's defeat are unsure but the minimum number of casualties was around 344. This event can be compared to the retreat of Braddock's forces after the Battle of the Monongahela when the French had the Indian advantage. With the relief force defeated, the French were forced to surrender on July 25th. The British and Sir William Johnson got their victory with the aid of the Iroquois. An important legacy of the battle was that, "No western [French] commandant would persuade any of the Indians of the pays d'en haut to send warriors to Canada's aid. For the first time in history, New France would face its enemies alone."⁸⁰ The Treaty of Easton 1758 was one of the factors that created this dismal situation for the French.

⁸⁰ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 330-331, 333, 335, 337, 339.

After the victories at Duquesne and Niagara, both important legacies of the Treaty of Easton, the British felt confident going into their 1759 campaigns. The most important offensive was General James Wolfe's attack on Quebec in September. This battle was an example where the French-aligned Native Americans were unable to influence the outcome. In battles previous to Easton 1758, the Franco-Indian forces defeated the British time and time again. Thanks Easton, the British did not let the Native Americans dictate a French victory. William Pitt, in the fall of 1758, had heard of Wolfe's victory at the battle of Louisbourg, which opened up the waterways to Canada's interior- and further blocked French efforts to resupply Canada- began planning the next steps to eliminate the French from North America. His first orders were for General James Wolfe to take the city of Quebec. Wolfe was born into a military Welsh family in January 1727. He began serving his country as a commissioned officer in 1742. From there Wolfe rose through the ranks. In North America he was designated Major-General, but was only ranked as high as Colonel in England. From June until early September Wolfe examined his position and began his battle plans for the invasion of the city. With Fort Niagara in the hands of the British and the British navy blocking supplies from entering North America, the French knew that an invasion of Canada was soon to come. The outcome of the battle was a decisive British victory. But, the battle cost both general their lives. Wolfe was shot three times and Montcalm killed at the beginning of the battle. The British took the city and occupied it.⁸¹ Overall, the Battle of Quebec was the second of three deathly blows to the French in North America. The outcome of the battle showed the ineffective use, by the French, of the Native Americans. The British and their Native American allies were too strong for the French and their few allies. Thus Wolfe's victory was the third ripple generated after Easton.

⁸¹ Reilly, *Wolfe of Quebec* (London: Cassell & Co., 2001), 3, 17, 215, 291, 293, 309, 311-312; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 344, 365.

The final legacy that displayed the impact of the Treaty of Easton 1758, during the French and Indian War, was General Amherst's victory at Montreal in 1760. After Niagara and Quebec, Montreal was the last French stronghold in all of Canada. General Amherst was determined to take the city and bring an end to the French and Indian War. A major challenge he faced was Indian diplomacy. Amherst had little interest in such affairs, so he put the task in the hands of Sir William Johnson. Johnson achieved goals that were extremely well-pleasing to the general. He gained enough support that Indian scouts had informed the British that the French forces were massing at Montreal. Another success was when the British advanced on the city, they face no opposition from the Canadian militia or any pro-French Indians. Finally, it is believed that Johnson's efforts undid the French at Montreal. This was because, "the very Indian villages that had always furnished New France with its most loyal auxiliaries actually expedited the British advance."⁸² As Anderson previously analyzed, the French were truly alone.

The campaign began with the advance guard's march towards Montreal on August 31, 1760. By September 2nd, the advance guard and the main body join together for the final part of the journey. On September 5th, one of Amherst's commanders was approached by Indians representing the Huron and several Iroquois tribes. It was believed that they wanted to meet to make peace with the British. The commander could not make peace at that time but gave them a pass for safe conduct in the region and promised that peace would come after the campaign. After the British arrived outside of Montreal, the Governor of Canada asked for a temporary peace to ascertain knowledge of the war completion in Europe. Amherst declined this offer because he claimed he had come to take Canada. On September 7th, the Governor submitted

⁸² Douglas R. Cubbison, *All Canada in the Hands of the British: General Jeffery Amherst and the 1760 Campaign to Conquer New France* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2014), 188-189, 191; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 402, 405.

terms for surrender of the city and all of French Canada. Many of the terms were agreed upon, even though they were extremely favorable to the French. With very little bloodshed, Amherst had got what he had wanted, Montreal. The best way to sum up the campaign against Montreal would be to cite the closing remarks of author Douglas Cubbison. “In 1760, General Jeffery Amherst’s objective had been the total subjugation of Canada. He planned for nothing less, and he would accept nothing less. Within four weeks of initiation his movements aimed at Canada’s heart of Montreal, all of Canada was in the hands of the British.”⁸³ With Amherst’s victory, the war was all but over in North America. But, the war did not formally end until peace was reached in 1763. Just because the war ended did not mean that the significance or legacy of the Treaty of Easton was completed. It played a crucial role in the ‘peace’ and life that came after the conflict.

With the war in North America completed, those in Canada and the thirteen colonies waited for affairs to be completed in Europe. A little over two years after Amherst’s victory at Montreal, peace talks began in Europe. Many of those in England believed that they should dictate terms to the French. The preliminary terms were signed on November 3, 1762. During the formal negotiations, future statesman Edmund Burke believed the British would be better off if they left the French in North America. He feared that removing the French from that corner of the world it would leave the thirteen colonies unchecked. In less than twenty years his fear became a reality. In the end, the British convinced the French to hand over all of their land claims in North America to the British. Native American historian Colin Calloway delivered a summary of the treaty which was signed on February 10, 1763. “At the Peace of Paris 1763, France handed over to Great Britain all its North American territories east of the Mississippi. It

⁸³ Cubbison, *All of Canada in the Hands of the British*, 191, 192-197, 202, 208, 217; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 406-407.

transferred Louisiana to Spain, and Spain transferred Florida to Britain.” With the British now in dominant control of North America, they decided to take new approaches to their governance. One change came in the realm of Indian diplomacy. “They believed for a time that they could dispense with the protocols of doing business in Indian country and could dictate to the Indians from a position of strength.”⁸⁴ An example of that would be the complete ignorance to the terms agreed upon at Easton in 1758.

As for the document, there were three important articles worth noting. First, Article III dealt with prisoners of war and explained, “All the prisoners made, on all sides, as well as by land as by sea, and the hostages carried away or given during the war, and to this day shall be restored without ransom...” Many of the British subjects in North America expected their loved ones returned from not only the French but the Native Americans. This was a concept that the Indians would likely despise and resist. It was their practice of taking captives in the hope of ransoming them, or in some cases keeping them as adopted members of the tribe. Many such captives themselves resisted repatriation/separation from their Indian families. Second, Article IV officially ceded French claims in North America to Great Britain. “...Moreover, his Most Christian Majesty [King of France] cedes and guaranties to his said Britannick Majesty in full right Canada, with all its dependences...every thing that depends on the said countries lands, islands, and coasts, with sovereignty, property, possession, and all rights acquired by treaty, or otherwise...” The most important word used in this Article was dependences. To those in Europe and North America (British and French), this certainly meant the Native Americans. Whether these tribes wanted it or not, they were now under the direct control of the British government and their colonies. Which shortly after the treaty’s ratification, the Indians disputed this claim

⁸⁴ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 503, 505; 165, Colin G. Calloway *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America* (Oxford: University Press, 2006), 165,168-169.

through force. The final article of importance was Article XXI. In this article, it explained that all French troops must leave North American immediately. It read “The French troops shall evacuate all the territories, lands, towns, and places, and castles... without any reserve...”⁸⁵ The tribes that remained loyal to the French were not prepared to lose their military presence, for a possibly more aggressive British military force. Britain was the biggest winner of the treaty, but it was the Native Americans, not France, who would emerge as the biggest loser. Despite Indians’ efforts, treaties, and bloodshed, got them no favorable terms. In the coming months, the British made matters worse and Indians made their unhappiness known.

The legacy of the Treaty of Easton continued after the war. At the end of Forbes’ expedition, Indian chiefs reminded Forbes and his officers of the terms of Easton that forbade the British from settling west of the Allegheny Mountains. Three days after the fall of Fort Duquesne, Delaware Chief Beaver approached Forbes and requested the British, “to go back over the mountains and stay there.” Shortly after Beaver’s request, another Indian chief said if the British settled near the Forks that, “all the nations would be against them [and there would] be a great war, and never come to peace again.” Forbes, who was favorable to the Indians, even requested to General Amherst that it was important for peace in the west to maintain good relations with the Indians there. The British response was the construction of a new fort at the Forks called Fort Pitt. The Indians saw this fort as “an imposing symbol of imperial presence and a threat to Indian independence.” Thanks to the continued encroachment in the west, the Indians became disenchanted with their Anglo brethren. A Delaware prophet by the name of Neolin arose. Neolin preached that the Great Spirit spoke to him and promised that the Indians would defeat all Europeans and return to the old times. Many heard the prophet’s words and believed

⁸⁵ *Treaty of Paris 1763*, Treaty Document Digital Transcription, The Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy, New Haven: Yale University, 2, 3, 7.

them. One Ottawa chief, by the name of Pontiac, took Neolin's words as a call for action, though he tweaked the message into a specifically anti-British one. The British were not totally unaware of what was to come in the spring of 1763. It is believed that many leaders of British outposts began hearing warnings regarding approaching Indian attacks. These officers reported their concerns to the commander-in-chief General Jeffery Amherst. Amherst's response underestimated the organization and power of the Indians. He wrote that, "I cannot think the Indians have it in their power to execute anything serious against us while we continue to be on our guard." On April 27, 1763, Pontiac with roughly 400 Indian warriors raised a war belt at Detroit, hoping to expel the British from North America.⁸⁶ This action launched British North America into a yearlong conflict called Pontiac's War.

There were a number of major reasons why the Indians were unhappy. Richard White credited this to a series of failures. These were "the failure of the Indians to create a confederacy that would prevent British occupation of that region, the failure of the British to act as either fathers or brothers, and the failure of Onontio [the French] to return." Additionally, the Indians fear that the British had "grown too powerful & seemed as if they would be too Strong for God himself." And because of this new believed power, "The English were less sociable and did less fraternizing with the Indians than did the French; that the English wanted to make settlements, whereas the French were content with trading..." Another reason, in the Ohio region, was the obvious British neglect of the terms made at Easton five years prior. The first attacks began in May with Pontiac's siege on Fort Detroit. Although it was unsuccessful it sent a message of fear across the western frontier. From May 16-June 2, the Indians had taken at least four forts. With

⁸⁶ Calloway, *The Scratch of a Pen*, 55-56; William R. Nester, "*Haughty Conquerors*": *Amherst and the Great Indian Uprising of 1763* (Westport, Conn: Praeger, 2000), 36-37, 59, 63, 65.

the war clouds heavy over the far western reaches of the new British territories, the next targeted forts were along Forbes' Road.⁸⁷

The attacks across the Ohio region were swift. Around the same time Pontiac was taking western forts, Ohio Indians were destroying forts in Pennsylvania. Many of the Ohio Indians went on the war path against the British because they declined to honor the agreements made at Easton. On May 28, 1763, around six people were killed in an Indian raid on the outskirts of Fort Pitt. In reaction to this raid, the British officials at Fort Pitt ordered all settlers to enter the fort for protection. From June until late July 1763, the Indians attacked and raided all of the settlements surrounding Fort Pitt. On July 26, the Indians met with the British leaders. No terms were reached and an Indian siege of the fort commenced.⁸⁸ To aid and support the forts along Forbes' Road, General Amherst dispatched Col. Henry Bouquet and a relief force of Scottish Highlanders. Col. Bouquet departed Carlisle on July 18th with a force of roughly 460. They arrived at Fort Bedford on July 25th and arrived at Fort Ligonier on August 2nd, lifting the sieges at both locations. On August 4th, he departed for Fort Pitt. On the afternoon of the fifth, the force was about half a mile from Bushy Run, the British came under heavy fire from the Indians. The Battle of Bushy Run lasted all night. For support, the British used flour bags as protection. The British took heavy casualties during the first night but did not give up. The morning of August 6th, Col. Bouquet's men pushed back the Indians who retreated. This was the first time an Indian attack was repelled by the British.⁸⁹ Bouquet's force reached Fort Pitt and ended the siege. All in all, if the British treated the Indians with more respect, especially in regard to treaty terms,

⁸⁷ White, *The Middle Ground*, 271,278; Sipe, *Fort Ligonier and Its Times*, 141-142; Gregory Evans Dowd, *War Under Heaven: Pontiac, the Indian Nations, & the British Empire* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 117, 121, 125-126.

⁸⁸ An Indian siege is much different than a European siege. Indian sieges do not include heavy artillery. They are established by the Indians in the outlying woods prohibiting anyone in or out of the fort.

⁸⁹ Sipe, *Fort Ligonier and Its Times*, 161-163, 166, 168, 174, 176-177, 181, 184, 187, 196-200.

Pontiac's War may not have happened in the capacity that it did on Forbes' Road. In the end, the Indian uprising failed the British established dominion over them. But, the bloodshed of the first year caused many in London to take action over their colonies in North America.

After the horrors that took place across British North America during 1763, the British government in London tried to resolve the problem by enacting stricter regulations on Indian Affairs. This was the first time in almost ten years, since the completion of the Albany Congress in 1754, that the imperial government tried to regulate the colonies' interactions with the Native Americans. Many officials believed a defensive proclamation was necessary. This was because they based many of the measures included on the experiences that took place during the French and Indian War. Also, these leaders hoped that this document would return the Native American agents to the good practices preached and practiced by Sir William Johnson. King George III issued a proclamation on October 7, 1763 and three days later it began its journey across the Atlantic to his subjects in North America. The Proclamation was a direct legacy of the Treaty of Easton 1758, the peace with France, and the events that took place during Pontiac's War. The important terms were threefold. First, it hoped to better regulate the trade with the Indians and, second, it forbade the unauthorized purchase of Indian lands not verified by the Crown or the Indian Superintendents. Finally, it stated that all settlers on reserved Indian lands must depart immediately. Historian Gregory Dowd expressed another importance of the proclamation. "Unlike the former French subjects in the newly conquered regions, Indians would be treated as separate peoples, not as newly minted subjects of the king. The famous borderline protecting Indians from expansion unsanctioned by the Crown also sets them apart from His Majesty's people." This defined that the proclamation was favored the practice of completely isolating their colonist from any interaction with the Native Americans. This was not good because many of the

tribes relied upon the trading and interactions with the Anglo-Americans. Sir William Johnson hoped that the British in North America would treat the Indians not as one tribe or race or just as other British subjects, but to treat them as separate individual nations. The document finally arrived on the North American continent in December 1763 with little change in the succeeding months.⁹⁰ Again, if the terms made at Easton were observed the crown might not have needed to deliver this proclamation.

There were important components that the London officials hoped to include in the Proclamation of 1763. First, the government established that lands not legally purchased nor ceded belong to the Native Americans. “And whereas it is just and reasonable, and essential to our Interest, and the Security of our Colonies, that the several Nations or Tribes of Indians...who live under our Protection, should not be molested or disturbed in the Possession of such Parts of Our Dominions and Territories as, not having been ceded to or purchased by Us, are reserved to them...as their Hunting Grounds.” Second, the Whitehall officials hoped to stop the unlawful and unauthorized purchases of Indian lands. “And We do hereby strictly forbid...all our loving Subjects from making any Purchases or Settlements whatever, or taking Possession of any of the Lands above reserved without our especial leave and Licence for that Purpose first obtained.” Finally, the document included the clause that ordered all settlers living on the “Indian Hunting Grounds” to depart back east. If enforced and followed, it was believed, it would ease the tensions between the Anglo-Americans and the Indians. It stated that, “And. We do further strictly enjoin and require all Persons whatever who have either willfully or inadvertently seated themselves upon any Lands within the Countries above described...are still reserved to the said

⁹⁰ Jack M. Sosin, *Whitehall and the Wilderness: The Middle West in British Colonial Policy, 1760-1775* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1980), 27, 39; Dowd, *War Under Heaven*, 177-179.

Indians as aforesaid, forthwith to remove themselves from such Settlements.”⁹¹ Overall, the Proclamation of 1763 was another legacy of the Treaty of Easton of 1758.

As it has been presented, there have been both positive and negative legacies of the Treaty of Easton. The final legacy of the treaty was the foundation of the city of Pittsburgh. After Forbes’ victory in 1758, the British army was the ruling authority at the Forks for the next fifteen years. After Forbes’ departure and death in 1759, Colonel Bouquet took temporary command of Pittsburgh. He made it a priority to address the Indian concerns that arose when the army did not leave after the fall of Fort Duquesne. He reached out to the Indians and explained that the British presence at the Forks was to ensure the practice of fair and good trade. The Indians were fairly helpful to those stationed at Pittsburgh during the first winter. Due to French raids, the British supply lines to Pittsburgh were hurt and little supplies actually arrived. With that in mind, the army relied on the Indians who, on occasion, provided them with deer meat and other supplies. But, these efforts were scattered and led to the death of twenty-one and left over 100 ill. That spring, the Assembly created the “Act for Preventing Abuses in Indian Trade.” The act was created in the hope that, “by providing oversight for the Indian trade at Pittsburgh, the Pennsylvania Assembly would gain a measure of jurisdictional authority over the Ohio Forks, an important step toward formal incorporation of the region into a colony.” Along with the Pennsylvanians, George Croghan saw a golden opportunity at Pittsburgh. He hoped to open trade with the Indians to expand the venture and possible land surveying. Croghan was more interested in personal profit than control or authority.⁹²

⁹¹ *The Royal Proclamation- October 7, 1763*, Document Digital Transcription. The Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy, New Haven: Yale University, 3.

⁹² Daniel P. Barr, *A Colony Sprung from Hell: Pittsburgh and the Struggle for Authority on the Western Pennsylvanian Frontier, 1744-1794* (Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 2014), 81, 83-85, 88.

The British understood with affairs with the French completed, Pennsylvania and Virginia would continue their competition for control. Historian Daniel Barr explained by stating, “Defense of the backcountry from marauding Indian war parties may have briefly united Pennsylvania and Virginia under the imperial banner during the war, but the colonies’ rivalry over the Ohio forks had never completely disappeared....with the British army in control of the region, the legislatures still sought to manipulate events to their advantage.” In reaction to the possible competition, Amherst ordered that a fort be built at Pittsburgh to enforce the military’s authority. The creation of Fort Pitt hurt both the chance for provincial control and relations with the Indians. With the French defeated, the Indians believed that there was no need for a permanent military structure. In October 1761, Bouquet tried to not only enforce Easton but the idea that the British military should be the only presences at Pittsburgh. It was documented that he arrested squatters along both Forbes’ and Braddock’s roads. In Pittsburgh, the fort was the only planned building. The rest of the region sprung up around the fort. In 1760, there were 146 houses, 36 huts, and 19 unfinished buildings and had a population of 149. A year later, the population had risen to 332 and only grew from there. Bouquet’s efforts were a lost cause. Nothing was going to stop from the settlement of Pittsburgh. The final legacy of Easton and the creation of Fort Pitt and Pittsburgh was, “What had been a fragile peace concluded between equals in 1758 [at Easton] now evolved into an uneven relationship, with the British assuming the unwarranted role of conqueror and the upper Ohio Indians being diplomatically treated as a vanquished foe.” The legacy continued later by stating, “The British were creating a new world in which the Indians clearly had no place...”⁹³ Overall, the Native Americans were once again at a loss. This time it cost them vast amounts of land. The Treaty of Easton may have been a huge

⁹³ Barr, *A Colony Sprung from Hell*, 92-93, 95, 98-99.

success for the British, during the war, but with the establishment of Fort Pitt and Pittsburgh it was an ultimate defeat for the Native Americans.

In closing, the Treaty of Easton 1758 should be recognized as one of the crucial turning points during the French and Indian War. The treaty took the western Ohio Indians away from the French and began the tide of change for the British. The foundation of the treaty did not start in 1758. It began with the founding of Pennsylvania. With the arrival of the proprietor, William Penn, the goal of the colony's officials was to treat Indian Affairs with the upmost importance. William Penn was at the head of Pennsylvania's Native American diplomacy and brought its golden years of Anglo-Indian interactions. After his departure, his children lost their father's values and mistreated the Indians. The climax of this mistreatment was the Walking Purchase of 1737. Seven years later, the colonies of Pennsylvania and Virginia neglected many of the lesser tribes through the eastern and western parts of their territories, most importantly the Delaware. The Treaty of Lancaster 1744 made a stable alliance between the British and the Iroquois Confederacy and gave them dominion over all of the tribes in two colonies. The final important diplomatic measure that shaped the 'early' Indian Diplomacy was the Albany Conference in 1754. It created the regulatory system from which Easton was created.

When the French arrived at the Forks of the Ohio, the Delaware welcomed them with open arms and aid. All of these early diplomatic measures were not achieved without the help of several important figures; many of which were important at the Treaty of Easton. They were Conrad Weiser, Sir William Johnson, and George Croghan. Without their efforts, British Native American diplomacy might have had a different result. Around the time of the Albany Congress, a young Virginian major was starting another colonial war between the French and British. George Washington's defeat at Fort Necessity launched North America into another conflict for

expansion. The defeat was a culmination of poor diplomatic and military discipline by Washington and colony of Virginia. A year later, the British took measures to ensure wilderness defense against the aggressive French. They dispatched General Edward Braddock and British regulars to dislodge the French from British lands. During their march, a combined French and Indian force shocked and defeated Braddock's army. Without strong Indian alliances, the wilderness in the Ohio country went up in flames.

In 1757, with war declared, matters only got worse for the British. After a defeat at Fort William Henry, the pro-French Indians attacked a retreating British force and struck further fear across the British colonies. There were several other additional figures that arose starting with Secretary of State William Pitt, Pennsylvanian Governor William Denny, General John Forbes and Christian Fredrick Post. All helped create and spread word of both the treaty conference and the outcome at Easton in 1758. The conference at Easton in 1758 was extremely important but it was not the only one there during the war. Both in 1756 and 1757 the Indians and British officials met to try and resolve their differences. Easton 1756 was comprised of two meetings. One took place in the summer; while the other took place in the fall. At both, very little was achieved. In the summer of 1757, Governor Denny met with the Indians again. By the end of this conference, even less was achieved than the two previous. In October of the following year, both sides made a final attempt to make peace and settle the decades' long differences. The conference last from October 7-26, 1758 and ended with peace being made between the western Indians and the colonies of Pennsylvania and New Jersey. On October 26, 1758, the tide changed in favor of the British.

After Easton, the dominos began to fall for the British, which marked the end of the colonial experiment for the French. It started with Forbes' victory over the French at Fort

Duquesne, without single shot being fired. With a British victory, the Iroquois League was motivated to fight on the side of the British. Sir William Johnson used the league to defeat the French at Fort Niagara opening the door for the British invasion of Canada. Over the next two years, the British took two of the largest cities in French Canada. First was the fall of Quebec under the leadership of General Wolfe. The second was the fall of the capital at Montreal by General Jeffery Amherst. The French and Indian War ended with the Treaty of Paris 1763. The French were gone and that left the Indians with only the British. After the war, the British treated the Indians like a defeated foe. An example was the creation of the settlement, Pittsburgh; which was a direct violation of the Treaty of Easton. Other violations and bad practices left many of the Native Americans unhappy. Under the leadership of Pontiac, the Native Americans attacked and conquered many of the British outposts across the Western frontier. The Proclamation of 1763 established all lands west of the mountains as Indian 'hunting grounds', in the hope to avoid further conflicts with Native Americans. All in all, the Treaty of Easton was a culmination of the British colonial Indian policy and was its shining moment during the French and Indian War. Easton should no longer be called the 'unknown turning point'. It should now take its place as one of the factors why the British achieved victory that gave them control across North America.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

- 1758 Indian Treaty*. Northampton County Historical & Genealogical Society, Easton, Pennsylvania.
- “Pittsburg,(Formerly Fort Duquesne) November 28, 1758.” *New York Mercury*. New York, December 23, 1758. Accessed from America’s Historical Newspapers.
- “The Journal of Major George Washington: An Account of his First Official Mission, made as Emissary from the Governor of Virginia to the Commandant of French Forces on the Ohio, October 1753- January 1754.” Williamsburg: The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1959.
- “The Speech of Honourable Robert Hunter Morris.” *The Pennsylvania Gazette*. Philadelphia, July 31, 1755. Accessed from America’s Historical Newspapers.
- Abbot, W.W., ed. *The Papers of George Washington: Colonial Series, Vol. 1*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1983.
- Alden, John R. “The Albany Congress and the Creation of Indian Superintendencies.” *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 27, No. 2 (Sept. 1940): 193-210.
- Anderson, Fred. *Crucible of War: The Seven Years’ War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766*. New York: Vintage Books, 2000.
- Barr, Daniel P. *A Colony Sprung from Hell: Pittsburgh and the Struggle for Authority on the Western Pennsylvania Frontier, 1744-1794*. Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 2014.
- Black, Jeremy. *Pitt the Elder: The Great Commoner*. Gloucestershire, U.K.: Sutton Publishing, 1999.
- Brandão, José Antônio, “Your fyre shall burn no more”: *Iroquois Policy Towards New France and Its Native Allies to 1701*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.
- Calloway, Colin G. *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America*. Oxford: University Press, 2006.
- Champion, Jr., Walter T. “Christian Fredrick Post and the Winning of the West.” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 104, No. 3 (July, 1980): 308-325.
- Clary, David, A. *George Washington’s First War: His Military Adventures*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2011.
- Crocker, Thomas E. *Braddock’s March: How the Man Sent to Seize a Continent Changed American History*. Yardley, P.A.: Westholme, 2009.
- Cubbison, Douglas, R. *All Canada in the Hands of the British: General Jeffery Amherst and the 1760 Campaign to Conquer New France*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2014.
- Dean R. Snow. *The Iroquois*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.


- Deweese, Watson, W. "Thomas Penn's Walking Purchase." *Bulletin of Friend's Historical Society of Philadelphia*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (November, 1912): 124-132.
- Dowd, Gregory Evans. *War under Heaven: Pontiac, the Indian Nations, & the British Empire*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.
- Flexner, James Thomas. *Mohawk Baronet: Sir William Johnson of New York*. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1959.
- Forbes, John. "Letters of Gen. John Forbes, 1758." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (1909): 86-98.
- Grimes, Richard, S. "We "Now Have Taken up the Hatchet against Them": Braddock's Defeat and the Martial Liberation of the Western Delawares." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 137, No. 3 (July, 2013), 227-259.
- Hamliton, Milton W. *Sir William Johnson: Colonial American, 1715-1763*. London: Kennikat Press, 1976.
- Harper, Steven C. "Making History: Documenting the 1737 Walking Purchase." *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies*, Vol. 77, No. 2 (Spring 2010): 217-233.
- Hunter, William A. "Provincial Negotiations with the Western Indians, 1754-1758." *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (July, 1951): 213-219.
- Jennings, Francis. *Empire of Fortune: Crowns, colonists and tribes in the Seven Years War in America*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1988.
- . *The Abiguous Iroquois Empire*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1984.
- Kelley, Jr., Joseph. *Pennsylvania: The Colonial Years 1681-1776*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1980.
- Kimball, Gertrude Selwyn, ed. *Correspondence of William Pitt, When Secretary of State, with Colonial Governors and Military Commissioners in America*, Vol. 1. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1906.
- McAneer, Beverly. "Accounts of the Albany Congress of 1754." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (March, 1953): 727-746.
- Merrel, James H. *Into the America Woods: Negotiators on the Pennsylvanian Frontier*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2000.
- Merrel, James H., ed. *The Lancaster Treaty of 1744, with Related Documents*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2008.
- Nester, William R. "*Haughty Conquerors*": *Amherst and the Great Indian Uprising of 1763*. Westport, Conn: Praeger, 2000.

- Pear, Catherine Owens. *William Penn: A Biography*. Philadelphia, J.B. Lippincott Company, 1957.
- Preston, David. L. *Braddock's Defeat: The Battle of the Monongahela and the Road to Revolution*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Reilly, Robin. *Wolfe of Quebec*, London: Cassell & Co., 2001.
- Richard, Aquila. *The Iroquois Restoration: Iroquois Diplomacy on the Colonial Frontier, 1701-1754*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1983.
- 1758 Indian Treaty*. Northampton County Historical & Genealogical Society, Easton, Pennsylvania.
- Shannon, Timothy J. *Indians and Colonists at the Crossroads of Empire: The Albany Congress of 1754*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2000.
- Silver, Peter. *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2008.
- Sipe, C. Hale, *Fort Ligonier and Its Times*. New York: Arno Press, 1971.
- Soderlund, Jear R., ed. *William Penn and the Founding of Pennsylvania 1680-1684: A Documentary History*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.
- Sosin, Jack M. *Whitehall and the Wilderness: The Middle East in British Colonial Policy, 1760-1775*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1980.
- Steele, Ian K. *Betrayals: Fort William Henry and the "Massacre"*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Stotz, Charles Morse. *Outposts of War for Empire: The French and English in Western Pennsylvania: Their Armies, Their Forts, Their People, 1749-1764*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2005.
- Sullivan, James. *The Papers of Sir William Johnson*, Vol. II-III. Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1922.
- The Royal Proclamation- October 7, 1763*. Document Digital Transcription. The Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy, New Haven: Yale University.
- Treaty of Paris 1763*. Treaty Document Digital Transcription. The Avalon Project: Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy, New Haven: Yale University.
- Vaughan, Alden T., ed. *Early American Indian Documents: Treaties and Laws 1607-1789*, Vol. III Pennsylvania Treaties 1756-1775. Bethesda, M.D.: University Publications of America, 2004.
- Virginia Historical Society, publisher. "The Treaty of Lancaster, 1744." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (Oct., 1905): 141-142.


- Volwiler, Albert, T. *George Croghan and the Westward Movement 1741-1782*. New York: AMS Press, 1971.
- Wainwright, Nicholas B. "Governor William Denny in Pennsylvania." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. 81, No. 2 (April, 1957): 170-198.
- . *George Croghan: Wilderness Diplomat*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1959.
- Wallace, Anthony F.C. *King of the Delawares: Teedyuscung 1700-1763*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949.
- Wallace, Paul A. W. *Conrad Weiser: Friend of Colonist and Mohawk*. New York: Russell & Russell, 1971.
- . "Conrad Weiser and the Delawares." *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (July, 1937): 139-152.
- Ward, Matthew, C. *Breaking the Backcountry: The Seven Years' War in Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1754-1765*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2003.
- Weslager, C. A. *The Delaware Indians: A History*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1972.
- White, Richard. *The middle ground: Indians, empires, and republics in the Great Lakes region, 1650-1815*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

APPENDIX


Appendix: Treaty of Easton Images




Treaty of Easton 1758, Sigal Museum. Personal photograph by author. June 17, 2017.



Treaty of Easton 1758, Sigal Museum. Personal photograph by author. June 17, 2017.



Treaty of Easton 1758, Sigal Museum. Personal photograph by author. June 17, 2017.



Treaty of Easton 1758, Sigal Museum. Personal photograph by author. June 17, 2017.