

# The Yellow Creek Massacre - Photos and Stories — FamilySearch.org

· 27 May 2013 · 2 Comments

THE YELLOW CREEK MASSACRE Lord Dunmore's War & Logan's Lament originally chronicled by Thomas Jefferson and now told by Clark Larsen 4th great grandson of Ann "Koonay" and John Gibson The American frontier Streams like Yellow Creek and Rivers like the Ohio, flow thru American history, as have tribes of our Lamanite ancestors and nations of our European forbearers. The American Indian tribes living in the Hudson and Mohawk River Valleys and around the finger lakes called themselves Haudenosaunee, which is to say "People of the Longhouse," or more accurately, "We are building a long house." The Dutch first settled New Amsterdam, and their Algonquian Indian neighbor's name for those Iroquois speaking people living further to the west was mingwe, which the Dutch simplified to Mingo. After England drove the Dutch out of North America, they renamed that little village on the banks of the Hudson, New York and the People of the Longhouse, Iroquois, which language group includes the Cayuga, Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Seneca, Tuscarora, and others. Centuries before, the foregoing tribes had come together and formed the Iroquois League of Five Nations (later 6 nations), which also included a few subsidiary tribes such as the Conestoga, Leni Lenape Deleware, Mingo, Mohegan, Piscataway, Shawnee. (Johansen, 2000) Peace in the northern woodlands had been maintained between the European settlers and the Iroquois League for half a century, thanks in no small part to the hard work, friendship, and help of Chief Shikellamy and his sons Tachnechdours "James Logan" named after the Secretary of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania, a man the chief held in high regard, and Tah-Gah-Jute "John Logan." Mindful of all he had done, the Europeans had awarded Shikellamy the King George I Peace Medal. (Moore, 1992) All of this was consistent with the British policy toward the American Indians, which was peaceful co-existence and even eventual assimilation. At the time, it was Chief Shikellamy's plan that there would be no war, but that the Indians would maintain their historic lifestyle. Contrast that to the approach adopted by another Iroquoian people, the Cherokee who lived further to the South, around present day Georgia and the Carolinas, which was also peace, but further to adopt the white man's culture, style, and agrarian ways. At the time of the Yellow Creek Massacre, tensions were high in the area where Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Virginia's borders met, and the Yellow Creek emptied into the Ohio River. The Iroquois League had been deceived into ceding their lands in the Ohio Valley, south of the river, to the British in the 1768 Treaty of Fort Stanwix. This treaty was of lesser concern to the Mohawk, Onondaga, and Tuscarora, but it was of paramount importance to the Shawnee, inasmuch as it was their home that had been given away for pennies on the dollar. (Marshall, 1967) As bad and one sided as the Treaty of Fort Stanwix was, even it didn't protect the Indians from the settler's depredations. "The frontier advanced irrepressibly. The Americans defying every attempt of the English Crown to limit them to territory proscribed in its Indian treaties, trespassed the rich valley of the Clinch and its tributaries and pushed into Kentucky

and along the banks of the upper Ohio. They came to hunt and then to settle in lands which the Shawnee and the Cherokee claimed as their hunting grounds. . . . The Shawnee had good reason to complain. Throughout the summer and fall of 1773 separate groups of surveyors appeared in several regions of the Virginia frontier to lay out tracts for homesteaders already on the ground and for placements for government grants to veterans of the French and Indian War. . . . The Shawnee, hoping that the English government would do them justice, protested the white aggressions to Alexander McKee, deputy of Sir William Johnson, who was the Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Northern Department. The King's orders, they remonstrated, restricted settlement to the Great Kanawha River, but this boundary agreement was being violated and their hunting grounds overrun. . . . In the face of the treaties it had ratified the British government could hardly deny the justice of these arguments. Lord Dunmore, the King's appointed governor of the colony of Virginia, was therefore reprimanded for allowing and even encouraging the aggressions. In his reply to Lord Dartmouth he [wrote], 'the established Authority of any government in America, and the policy of Government at home, are both insufficient to restrain the Americans; and that they do and will remove as their avidity and restlessness incite them . . . they do not conceive that Government has any right to forbid their taking possession of a lands' attracted by the plenty of game they found to employ 'themselves in hunting, in which they interfere much more with the Indians than if they pursued agriculture alone, and the Indian hunters ... already begin to feel the scarcity this has occasioned, which greatly increases (sic) their resentment.' (Caruso, 2002) Lord Dunmore's Proclamation John Murray, 4th Earl of Dunmore was the man most behind destruction of the peace put together so carefully by men like Chief Shikellamy and King George II. He brought an end to the British policy of peaceful co-existence and eventual assimilation His motive? \$\$. I don't know what he did in the decade he served in the British Parliament, to ingratiate himself with King George III, but he got one of the best rewards the crown had to offer. Governor of a colony was no great prize in terms of comfortable living, and crossing the Atlantic was no pleasure cruise, but it could be a real money maker for a shrews politician. All that stood in the way of Dunmore selling vast quantities of land in the West, and getting rich doing it, was the "Red Man." If I seem suspicious that he was the ultimate mover behind the war of 1774, it is for good reason. On 25 April 1774, the Earl issued a proclamation that stated in part, "Whereas, I have Reason to apprehend that the Government of Pennsylvania, in prosecution of the Claim to Pittsburg and its Dependencies, will endeavour (sic) to obstruct his Majesty's Government thereof under my Administration, by illegal and unwarrantable Commitments of the Officers I have appointed for that Purpose, and that that Settlement is in some Danger of Annoyance from the Indians also. . ." (Jacob, 1826, p 58; Bailey, 2000) Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and more than a few others then and since have believed that Dunmore was behind the Indian war, and furthermore, it was his ill-rule that was most often the model for the complaints to King George III, in the Declaration of Independence. Many who have made a study of Lord Dunmore's War have concluded that Dunmore's agent, Lieutenant-Colonel/Doctor John Connolly was at the heart of much of the trouble between Pennsylvania and Virginia as well as bringing on the Indian war, all done with the intention of profiting in land in the confusion and even more so if the Indians could be dispossessed of their legitimate claims in the Ohio valley. ( Burk, 1804, vol iii p 374; Thwaites, 1905, p 42) In William Crawford's letter to Washington he wrote, "We are in great want of some proper person to direct us, who may have command,—Mr. Connolly, who now commands, having incurred the displeasure of the people. He

is unable to take command for two reasons : one is, the contradiction between us and the Pennsylvanians ; and the other that he carries matters too much in a military way, and is not able to go through with it. I have some hopes that we may still have matters settled with the Indians upon a method properly adopted for that purpose." (Crawford, May 8,1774) From Esquire M'Connel's journal comes this assessment "The Earl of Dunmore, with becoming zeal for the honor of the Ancient Dominion, seized this state of things as propitious to his views, and having found Dr. John Conoly, of Pennsylvania, with whom, I think, he could not have had much previous acquaintance, by the art of hocus-pocus — or some other art — converted him into a staunch Virginian, and appointed him Vice-Governor and commandant of Pittsburgh and dependencies; that is to say, of all the Western country. Affairs on that side of the mountain now began to wear a serious aspect." (Jacob, 1826, p 57) Local magistrate Arthur St. Clair believed he was responsible for much of the war between the Indians and colonials and had him arrested; he was subsequently released on orders from Pennsylvania governor John Penn. (Fremont-Barnes, 2007, p 147) Many writers have cited the sale of land by Dunmore to George Washington, not so much because Washington was his only customer, or even his largest one, but rather, because Washington's papers have been preserved by, and are easily accessible from, the Library of Congress. Early in April 1774, Connolly circulated a broadside warning the settlers to arm themselves and beware of the Indians. (Bailey, 2000, vol. 1, pp 249-256) He could hardly have done more to create tension between the two peoples. What we see in the three foregoing paragraphs is a politician who tells the British it's not his fault because the American's are out of control, and yet at the same time is fomenting trouble and egging the "Americans" on. When Steven A. Douglas accused Abraham Lincoln of being two faced, Lincoln replied, "I leave it to the audience, if I had another face do you think I'd be wearing this one?" Might the Earl of Dunmore have said the same? What else we see in those three paragraphs is a criminal conspiracy to murder people and steal their land. And, with the help of men like Michael Cresap, and Daniel Greathouse, it worked. "The Indians had for some time . . . thought themselves intruded upon by the long Knife, as they Called the Virginians at that time, and many of them were for war. However, the[y] called a Council, in which Logan acted a Conspicuous part, he admitted their Ground of complaint, but at the same time reminded them of some aggressions on the part of the Indians, and that by a war, they could but harass and distress the frontier Settlements for a short time, that the long Knife would come like the trees in the woods, and that ultimately, they would be drove from their good land that they now possessed; he therefore strongly recommended peace, to him they all agreed, Grounded the hatchet, everything wore a tranquil appearance . . ." (Jolly, 1836) Cresap's War II Michael Cresap then started the shooting war between the Colony of Virginia and the Mingo and Shawnee Indians. How did it happen? Dunmore's agent Connolly, sent a letter to Cresap dated 21 April 1774, and received O/A 26 April 1774, basically telling him that war with the Indians was inevitable. (Jacob, 1826, pp 64-64) Cresap quickly called together his command, as well as some settlers, and traders, and with a few exceptions, all declared war on the Indians. His minions went forth and before the end of the day were back with a couple of Indian scalps. The next day Cresap and his men attacked a party of Shawnee who were traveling on the Ohio, killing one of them and wounded two others. Had these military actions been for the purpose of protecting the settlers from Indian depredations, they would have targeted the offending Indians, or at the very least their clan. Rather, Cresap's command targeted, unoffending, friendly Indians, who were close at hand, and unsuspectingly going about their

daily business. That's the sort of thing you would expect of men who were dumb, lazy, and cowards, or land thieves. It was then that Cresap took his command and headed up the Ohio with the stated intention of wiping out the Yellow Creek Indian village. They marched about five miles in that direction, but stopped to eat; it was then the men got talking among themselves. Several had been at the village about four weeks previous, and knew it to be peaceful; it was full of men, women, and children, with all their possessions. That it presented no threat to the white settlers was well known to these men and they then mutinied and refused to proceed further. (Clark, 1798) Thomas Jefferson was among the first to write of the white man's war on the Indians on the Ohio River. His Notes on the State of Virginia in Query VI, contained only a couple of paragraphs on the subject, and was privately printed in 1782, was printed in Paris in 1785, and in London in 1787. (Jefferson, 1787) Yet it created such a stir that it caused him to re-investigate the matter between 1797 and 1800 and again published his findings and conclusions in Relative to the murder of Logan's family, printed in Philadelphia. (Jefferson, 1800) This addendum was included as appendix 4 in subsequent printings of Jefferson's Notes on the State of Virginia. With lots more evidence, but only minor revisions he came to basically the same conclusion he had previously reached. Yellow Creek Massacre Yellow Creek was the American Indian's Pearl Harbor. To most Americans, Pearl Harbor is a date, 7 December 1941, rather than a location, 21.3619° north latitude, and 157.9536° west longitude. I'll bet more Americans know more about Iroquois Point, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii than know about what happened to the Iroquois people living on Yellow Creek on 30 April 1774. Most Americans have forgotten the Yellow Creek Massacre, just as I am sure most Japanese would have forgotten Pearl Harbor, had they won WWII. Yellow Creek was not only an unprovoked surprise attack, but it also signaled a significant change from Britain's peaceful co-existence policy, to the make war - steal land policy that followed. The Indian Wars (1774 - 1898) didn't go nearly so well for America's Indians as World War II did for the American people. This is not to suggest that it was all peace and love before 1774; there had been the 1540, Tiquex war - 1622, Jamestown Massacre/Powhatan war - 1636, Pequot war - 1675, King Phillip war - 1680, Pueblo revolt - 1689 to 1760, French & Indian wars - 1763, Pontiac's rebellion. But after 1774, until about 1900, there was hardly a time when American soldiers were not shooting at American Indians, and back at you brother from the Indians. A few of the more famous "incidents" in that 126 year long Indian Wars, were the Trail of Tears, Battle of Tipperanoe (General William Henry Harrison later campaigned with Tyler too), Seminole war (General Andrew Jackson also made sure "the Creek don't rise"), Black Hawk war (Captain Abraham Lincoln), Custer's Last Stand, Sand Creek Massacre, Wounded Knee, and Geronimo. Speaking of presidents and the Indian wars, Theodore Roosevelt called the Yellow Creek Massacre "one of the most brutal and cowardly deeds ever done on the frontier. . . . It was an inhuman and revolting deed, which should consign the names of the perpetrators to eternal infamy," and he called Greathouse, and by implication Dunmore, Connally, & Cresap, "inhuman and cowardly scoundrels." (Roosevelt, 1889) Hermann Groethausen, was a German immigrant. His descendant Daniel Greathouse was a frontier trader, a neighbor of Cresap's, a friend, and a fellow war hawk, and he did heed Cresap's declaration of war. Daniel gathered a group of friends and relatives to the number of roughly 20, who conspired to "kill them some Indians." Among Daniel's confederates were Joshua Baker, John Biggs, George Cox, Jacob & Jonathan Greathouse, Wm Fitzgerald, Wm Grills, Edward King, John & Rafe Mahon, John Martin, Michael Myers, John Sappington, Joseph Smith (a one armed man), Benjamin, Joseph, &

Samuel Tomlinson. (Joshua Baker's wife was a sister of the Tomlinsons) Each of the foregoing participants is known with varying degrees of certainty, and the rest of the 20, thankfully for the sake of their posterity, are lost to history. (Smith, 2006) The Greathouse clan decided to attack the Mingo, not because of anything those particular Indians had done, but because they were close at hand, peaceful, and therefore easy and not too dangerous. Or so Greathouse thought. On 29 April 1774, they reconnoitered the Mingo camp at the mouth of Yellow Creek, located on the Ohio side of the river about halfway between Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and Wheeling, West Virginia. They concluded it would be too risky a target to attack. According to a statement by Michael Myers, given three-quarters-of-a-century after the fact, he killed two Indians during the reconnoiter. (Thwaites, 1905, pp. 9-19) Since no one else ever reported these killings, it's hard to know if Myer's story is true or just some sort of "fish tale" braggadocio. It's pretty likely that more Indians were killed in stories around the camp fire, than ever died in the woods or on the plains; it's likewise likely that more white men died in Indian tales told in those long-houses than ever really perished. Greathouse's scouting party then re-crossed the river to Joshua Baker's trading post and tavern at Baker's Bottom, Augusta County, Virginia (later Ohio County, Virginia, and now Hancock County, West Virginia). The following day, 30 April 1774, a group of between seven and ten Mingo Indians came to Baker's, where the Greathouse gang offered them all the free liquor they could drink, which all but three refused. They then challenged the sober men to a shooting match. They adjourned to the outdoors to shoot at a mark . Once the Indians had discharged their weapons, the men hiding in the backroom rushed out and began a killing spree. Among the dead were the following members of Logan's immediate family: his wife Mellana Alvaretta, of whom Cayuga legend has it - "Her eyes were piercing, her face like the smiling sun, her person comely as a flower and her manners gentle. From wigwam to wigwam she tript like a fairy scattering brightness and joy everywhere and when she glided through the maize-fields she brought golden ears and plenty; when her father Ontonegea took her with him on a journey to Fort Orange where an officer in King George's service on account of her remarkable beauty and gentleness gave her an English name" (Sawel, 1921, p 16-17); his brother Taylanee "John Petty"; his nephew Molnah; his sister Koonay "Ann Gibson." During the massacre, Ann, with her papoose in a cradle board strapped to her back, begged them not to murder her daughter as, "she is your kin" having a white father. Ann was shot in the head, and her two month old daughter was cut from her back and grabbed by the ankles with the intent of dashing her brains out on the rocks. The Greathouse group then proceeded to mutilate the other Indian's bodies, scalping them, hanging the trophies on their belts. An alternative, though less reliable account, states that as Ann tried to escape, far advanced in her pregnancy, she was caught, her wrists were tied and she was hung on a pole. Jacob Greathouse then proceeded to rip open her abdomen, pulled out her unborn son, scalp him, and they there left Ann to die. Two canoes of Indians were seen coming across the river to investigate the ruckus. The Greathouse group fired on them killing all in the first canoe and sending the second skedaddling. The Greathouse gang did not, however, kill Ann's daughter, Diana Gibson, but rather took her as a prisoner of war. She, along with one of the scalps, was reportedly delivered to Cresap. She was in turn turned over to Colonel William Crawford; she was eventually returned to the care of her father, Captain John Gibson. (Jefferson, 1800; Mayer, 1867) John Gibson (May 23, 1740 - April 10, 1822) was born in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. His father ran a trading post and did business with the Conestoga Indians. No doubt John picked up some of their language in the process. We don't

know how much formal education he received but it is regarded that he was well educated for his time. In 1758, at age seventeen, Gibson served as a soldier in the British colonial militia during the French and Indian War. He was a member of General John Forbes expedition that conquered France's Fort Duquesne. They renamed it Fort Pitt, i.e., Pittsburgh else we'd be watching the Duquesneburg Steelers playing the Vert Aboyer Packers in the NFL. It was briefly renamed Fort Dunmore in honor of the British governor of Virginia, but during the American Revolution it reverted to Fort Pitt, which is just as well, since I'm none to crazy about the idea of the Dunmoreburgh Steelers playing in the NFL. He stayed at Fort Pitt following the war, and traded with the Indians along the Allegheny fronteir, but was captured by the Lenape Indians during Pontiac's Rebellion, and was sentenced to be burned at the stake. His life was saved by an old Indian woman who adopted him to replace a son killed in the recent war. It seems likely that although Lenape is an Algonquian language, the fact that he spoke an Iriquois language may have been the factor that made him look attractive as an adoptee, and saved his life. No doubt he also picked up the Algonquin dialect spoken by the Lenape, while there. Later he was freed as a result of the Boquet Expedition. He continued as a trader and held local office in several counties as a judge, clerk, and sheriff. Following the Yellow Creek Massacre, refugees, including some surviving Logan relatives, from the Indian settlement itself, were trying to escape down the Ohio River. They passed on the west side of Wheeling island hoping to escape detection. Cresap's men gave chase. While the Indians fled as best they could, and made a considerable distance down the river, they were encumbered by women, children, and household goods, and the militia soldiers caught up to them, perhaps as far down river as somewhere in the vicinity of Grave Creek Mound and the Little Kanawha, as some accounts suggest. In the ensuing battle, three Indians were killed, with several more wounded; one white man was killed with two more wounded. (Crawford, 7 May 1774; Thwaites, 1905, pp. 17-19) What Cresap failed to do in one fell swoop was accomplished by a pair of actions, i.e., the Yellow Creek Massacre, and the Battle of Grave Creek. These would not be the settler's last such attack. Places like Captina, Capteneer, Fort Pitt, Pipe creek, Short creek, Whetstone creek, Beech Bottom, have also been mentioned, though some may be duplicate or alternate names for the same place. At the time Cresap publicly boasted much of the murders. The story is told that Captain John Gibson went looking for Captain Michael Cresap following the Yellow Creek Massace. When they met, Gibson attempted to arrest (not kill) Crecap, who then skedaddled. Sorry, Eckert (1995), fun but not true. (Gibson affidavit, 1800) Lord Dunmore's War In an American version of the biblical an-eye-for-an-eye, and a-scalp-for-a-scalp, Chief John Logan did something he had never before done. He went on the warpath. Logan the orator was strong and persuasive and together with his father Chief Shikellamy had help keep half a century of peace; Logan the War Chief was a mighty foe. Of martial build, upright bearing, intelligence, and cunning. A contemporary, David McClure, described him thus: "Logan was the most martial figure of an Indian that I have ever seen." (Dexter, 1899; Wellenreuther, 2005) ". . . several inches more than six feet in height." (Mayer, 1867, p 32) John Bartram, a botanist, described Shikellamy's son as tall and commanding. In 1772, Moravian missionary John Heckwelder visited Logan and reported that he was received in the most hospitable and cordial manner by Logan's family. He and his father Chief Shikellamy were held in high esteem by Conrad Weiser, the colonial Indian Agent. The following account was given in 1842, by Judge William Brown Esq.: "Upon putting my head down, [to drink from what is today still named 'Logan's Spring'] I saw reflected in the water on the

opposite side, the shadow of a tall indian (sic). I sprang to my rifle, when the indian gave a yell, whether for peace or war I was not just then sufficiently master of my faculties to determine; but upon seizing my rifle and facing him, he knocked up the pan of my gun, threw out the priming and extended his open palm toward me in token of friendship. After putting down our guns, we again met at the spring and shook hands. This was Logan, the best specimen of humanity I ever met with, either white or red." In summary, the historian, Samuel G. Drake, said of him, "what is agreed to by all authorities, both then and now, is 'that for magnanimity in war and greatness of soul in peace, few, if any, in any nation, ever surpassed him.'" (Drake, 1832) In other words, the conspirators had picked the wrong man to make an enemy. Soon Logan, leading small bands of Shawnee or Mingo was striking settlements all along the frontier. In July, Logan captured a settler named William Robinson on the Monogahela River. He was taken back to the village, tied to a stake, and the Indians intended to torture and kill him, but Logan cut him loose. Three days later he provided Robinson with paper and ink made from water & gunpowder, and dictated the following letter: "To Captain Cresap: What did you kill my people on Yellow Creek for? The White People killed my kin at Conestoga a great while ago and I thought nothing of that; but you killed my kin again on Yellow Creek and took my cousin prisoner. Then I thought I must kill too; and I have been three times to war since; but the Indians are not angry, only myself. July 21, 1774 – Captain John Logan" The Indian strategy was for Chief Cornstalk to lead the Shawnee up the Kenawha into Virginia, and drive the settlers out. Meanwhile Logan would lead the Mingo, who were smaller in number, on raids harassing the settlers in Western Virginia and East Tennessee to draw off militia men from Cornstalk's main attack. On 8 September Logan and his Mingos attacked the settlements on the Main Fork of the Holston, who then evacuated to Royal Oak at Marion. On 13 September Logan's Mingos attacked the militia near Maiden Spring Fort in Tazewell County. On 23 September Logan's band of warriors attacked Fort Blackmore in Scott County. The 24th found them at King's Mill (Kingsport) where they killed the John Roberts family and left the "Cresap letter." On 29 September they went to Moore's Fort in Castlewood where Daniel Boone was in command. It was there John Duncan was killed. On 9 October they simultaneously attacked Fort Blackmore and the Fort at Sapling Grove (Bristol, Tennessee). At that same time Logan was eluding pursuit by a party of militiamen led by a man named McClure. Logan took thirty scalps during the war, a number he estimated as equal to the toll taken on his family and the Mingo Indians in the Grave Creek, Kanaway, Pipe Creek, Fort Pitt, and Yellow Creek massacres. On 10 October 1774, Colonel Andrew Lewis's thousand militia men met Chief Cornstalk's thousand braves at Point Pleasant, where the Great Kanawha River meets the Ohio. A terrible day long pitched battle occurred, devolving at times into hand-to-hand combat. It ended in a draw with losses to the Virginia militia of 215 casualties, while the Indians lost 40 killed.

(Accounts and numbers vary) At the conclusion of the battle the Indians withdrew. (Doddridge, 1824; Payton, 1867; Thwaites, 1905; Lewis, 1909; Caruso, 2002) Logan continued on the warpath until he heard of the battle, and then "sat still," refusing to fight any longer. Logan also refused to participate in the peace talks, and the Indians who did characterized him as "being like a mad dog, with his bristles up." John Gibson once again served the crown during Lord Dunmore's War, with conspicuous distinction during the peace treaty. He then served as the crown's Indian agent at Fort Pitt. The British made a big mistake when they pushed him to the colonial side in the American Revolution, but they did the same with oh so many of there American subjects. In the early days of the American Revolution Gibson acted as a negotiator

with the Indians on the western frontier. For example, Chief Netawatwees specifically requested that Gibson be sent to his village as he was a "good man". He then commanded a regiment under George Washington during the battles of White Plains and the Battle of Fort Washington, in New York. He was made a Colonel and given command of Fort Laurens, Ohio where he served during the siege of 1778–1779. After his experience in the American defeats at White Plains and Fort Washington, beating the British at Fort Laurens was probably as satisfying for Gibson as defeating the Hessians at Trenton was for Washington. Under orders from Washington, he was subsequently made commander of Fort Pitt. After the war he was a Judge, a delegate to the state's Constitutional convention, Major General commanding the Allegheny County militia. During the Whiskey Rebellion of 1791-1794 he sided with the United States of America, President George Washington, and the State of Pennsylvania, and as a result was forced from his home and county by the rebels. From 1800 to 1816 he first served as governor of the Indiana territory under appointment by President John Adams, and then as Secretary of the Territory appointed by President Thomas Jefferson, and then acting governor under President James Madison, and secretary again under Monroe. At this point in his life, he may have thought he was thru with war, but it seems war was not thru with him. First came Tecumseh's War of 1811, and then the War of 1812. Gibson County, Indiana is named in his honor. Gibson remained in Indiana as Territorial Secretary until age seventy-six, at which time Indiana became a state, and John and his second wife, also named Anna returned to live with their daughter Jane and son-in-law George Wallace, in Braddock's Field near Pittsburgh. (Woollen, 1883; Gibson, 1922; Hanko, 1955; Gugin, 2006) Logan's Lament Gibson, who was Lord Dunmore's aide/interpreter, Ann "Kooney" Gibson's husband, Chief John Logan's brother-in-law, was tapped on the shoulder by Logan at the peace conference and beckoned out into the woods. Tah-Gah-Jute, to use his Indian name, there sat on a log, under an Elm tree, located six miles south of present day Circleville, Ohio; such a tree is sometimes called a witness tree, and this particular one stood for nearly two more centuries until 1964. It was there Logan poured out his broken heart. "Remembering" is a painting by Andrew Knez, Jr., which depicts Chief John Logan looking at the last vestige of work made by the loving hands of his family, now gone forever at the hateful hands of white men. His prior faith in peace gone in a flash; vengeance now complete, he is alone and empty. It was in these sad circumstances that he dictated to Captain John Gibson the now famous words of "Logan's Lament." "I appeal to any white man to say if ever he entered Logan's cabin hungry, and he gave him not meat; if ever he came cold and naked, and he clothed him not. During the course of the last long and bloody war Logan remained idle in his cabin, an advocate for peace. Such was my love for the whites that my countrymen pointed as they passed and said, 'Logan is the friend of the white men.' I had even thought to have lived with you but for the injuries of one man. Colonel Cresap, the last spring, in cold blood and unprovoked, murdered all the relations of Logan, not even sparing my women and children. There runs not a drop of my blood in the veins of any living creature. This called on me for revenge. I have sought it; I have killed many; I have fully glutted my vengeance. For my country I rejoice at the beams of peace. But do not harbor a thought that mine is the joy of fear; Logan never felt fear. He will not turn on his heel to save his life. Who is there to mourn for Logan? Not one." (Jefferson, 1787, pp 68-69) This little piece of pros went viral, first in the American colonial press, and then on into Europe. It not only grew legs, it grew whiskers. Logan's Lament was included in the McGuffey Reader, and became an oft memorized piece of prose in primary schools across America in the early Nineteenth Century. (Logan,

1788; McGuffey, 1857, pp 324-325) It was more memorized, and more recited in America following the American Revolution, than was even the Gettysburg Address following the American Civil War. This story of the Yellow Creek Massacre and Logan's Lament is told in nearly a hundred books, including an historic novel or two. I will not attempt to list them all, but suffice it to say that President Thomas Jefferson was writing about it in the late 1700's and President Theodore Roosevelt was still writing about it in the late 1800's. Epilog Lord Dunmore returned to Virginia to public acclaim, but within months of his return he was fleeing to England as the American Revolution commenced. While he had successfully deprived the Shawnee, Mingo and the Iroquois Confederacy of their freedom, their rights, and their property, he was not having the same success with the American colonials. The Compt de Buffon of France, father of Buffon's Law of Biogeography propounded the theory that nature in America was inferior to that of Europe and Asia. As evidence he suggested the new world lacked significant plants, large and powerful creatures, and that even the native people here were less virile than were those of Eurasia. He ascribed the "natural inferiority of America" to our "marsh odors and dense forests." Did no one mention to him corn, potatoes, tomatoes, strawberries, pumpkins, moose, bison, elk, puma, grizzly, Squanto, Pocahontas, or Shikellamy? Ah the aristocracy! It's the Dunmores and Buffons who remind us why we've done so well without them. Well, in point of fact, Thomas Jefferson did mention many superlative things American. In 1780, while governor of Virginia, he received numerous questions from Monsieur François Barbé de Marbois, secretary of the French legation to the United States. A good many of these questions related to Buffon's theory. Jefferson compiled his response letters into a book titled Notes on the State of Virginia. He included a discussion of contemporary scientific knowledge, Virginia history, politics, geography, geology, biology, ethnography. Jefferson was assisted by George R. Clark, Thomas Hutchins a geographer, and Thomas Walker. Notes was anonymously published in Paris, in 1785, while Jefferson was America's minister there. To his credit, Buffon did change his opinion on his biogeography theory. It's apparent to me that Lord Dunmore was the gang leader in the "kill the Indians, grab their land" conspiracy. So what of his co-conspirators? Who was John Connolly? John Connolly was born in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, about 1741. He is perhaps best known for Connolly's Plot, a plan concocted with Virginia Governor Lord Dunmore to raise a regiment of Canadians and Indians to be called the Loyalist Foresters and lead them to Virginia to help Dunmore suppress the rebellion. En-route to Detroit he was captured in Hagerstown, Maryland on November 25, 1775, imprisoned, tortured, and executed near the end of the American Revolution. Who was Michael Cresap? He was born in Old Town, Maryland, 29 June 1742. His father was Colonel Thomas Cresap, author of the First Cresap's War. He married Mary Whitehead in Philadelphia in 1764. He had begun to clear land near Wheeling, when he was contacted by settlers heading for Kentucky because he was a veteran. He fought in Cresap's War, Lord Dunmore's War, and returned to Maryland where he raised the first company of Maryland Rifles to participate in the American Revolution. They marched to Boston to raise the British siege there. During the campaign Michael became sick, headed home, but died 18 October 1775, possibly of tuberculosis. His tombstone may be seen today in the trinity Church cemetery, New York City. Who was Daniel Greathouse? He was born in Frederick County, Maryland, 1753, to a family with 11 children. He married Mary Morris, thus answering not the question who will marry merry Mary, but rather, who will marry Mary? They had two children, Gabriel and John. Daniel owned 400 acres (1.6 km<sup>2</sup>) of land at Mingo Bottom, Ohio County, Virginia. In 1771

Daniel Greathouse improved and settled in the Mingo Bottom 1774. (From Augusta County VA, records) By deed dated 13th July, 1775, Daniel sold his freehold to William McMahan, and moved to Yohogania County, Virginia. Some suggest he died in 1775, but the family is insistent that he died of the measles in 1777. Chief John Logan's life from 1774 to 1780. After the poor treatment Logan and his family received from the Virginia colonists, small wonder that he fell in with the British during the American Revolution. The citizens of Virginia paid a high price indeed for Cresap & Greathouse having made such a powerful enemy of this man. While fighting for the British, Logan notched his tomahawk more than 70 times with kills or prisoners taken from among the Virginia militia, scouts, spies, and settlers. At six feet tall, a martial build, bright as a newly minted dime, as illustrated by his eloquent speech, and a natural leader as seen during Lord Dunmore's War, it is small wonder he was such a dangerous man. But then an arrogant condescending British officer, Captain Bawbee, the commissioner of the Indian department, who's contributions to the war were marginal at best, kicked him out of a warehouse, at the British fort in Detroit, where Logan was based, and worse yet Bawbee called Chief Logan a "dog." Logan took it in "high dudgeon," and the next day looked up William McMillan, an old friend from the frontier and just then a prisoner of the British at Detroit. He told him "Bill, I won't fight for the British any more; they have treated me very badly. . . . I would go back to the Big Knives (Virginians), if I thought they would not kill me, & would kill & take as many of the British as I have done of the Big Knives; but I dare not go. Bill, I can kill as many bucks as any Indian on the Scioto river; I will go home, & hunt deer, raccoon & beaver." That was the end of Logan's service to the crown. Once again he "sat still." (Mayer, 1867, Appendix C, pp 181-193; Newton, 1879, pp 74-75) Suddenly the British had a problem. Logan was on strike! What if he lead some or all of his followers on strike? Worse yet, what if he and they changed sides, as he suggested to McMillan he might. Bawbee had created a huge problem for the British, but if Logan were gone – so would their problem be gone. How to use a cover story. When the Confederates assassinated Lincoln, they and those who followed in their footsteps spread all kinds of wild stories, and propounded all kinds of alternate theories to cover their tracks. When the communists assassinated Kennedy, they, their fellow travelers, and a bunch of pseudo intellectuals have since done the same. When one is running from their enemies, they may use the artifice of drawing a red herring across their trail, to throw the blood hounds off the scent. The stories of Chief Logan's death are many and varied. I'm sure his enemies love the ones about a drunken tirade at an Indian Council held in Detroit and Tah-Gah-Jute being killed in consequence. If you don't like that one, then how about he died in a family fight? There's the one that he tried to abduct two Indian women to spread his seed, and was killed by their companions. Or the one of him getting drunk, knocking his new wife silly, and being killed by her nephew. (Mayer, 1851, p 67; Jacob, 1866, p 135) With so many CresapGreathouse apologists out there it's amazing there aren't even more and far worse stories being circulated. Do I have a cc, of the British death warrant for Chief Logan? Of course not, these things are not done on the books or in public view. They are best handled quietly and discreetly, but the British certainly had the best of motives for wanting him dead. While there is no longer any proof that they were behind it, the circumstances certainly suggest it. Like the white man, the Indians also both respected and feared Tah-Gah-Jute. Some of his own tribe may have even requested the elders of the tribe to end him. Be it British or Indian, or both behind it, it matters little at this late date. In any case, the assignment fell to Tod-kah-dohs. He was of the Chief's own clan, and such a choice was S-O-P in such cases as they did not

wish to risk starting a blood feud. It was done with a tomahawk to the back of the head, as Tah-Gah-Jute sat peacefully at his campfire. In 1844, when Tod-kah-dohs was about 100 years of age and living on the Allegheny Seneca Reservation, he told the story to Dah-gan-on-do "Captain Decker," who in turn told it to the Wisconsin Historical Society librarian, Lyman C. Draper, and these were the words that he spoke: "Because he was too great a man to live. . . . He talked so strong that nothing could be carried contrary to his opinions, his eloquence always took all the young men with him. . . . He was very, very great man, and as I killed him, I am to fill his place and inherit all his greatness . . . When I am so great a man as he was [putting his right hand over his heart speaking with emphasis], I am ready to die-- And whomsoever puts me to death will inherit all my greatness, as I do his." (Wallace, 1999, pp 12-13; Galowenski, 2006) In truth, considering the misery Tah-Gah-Jute was in at that point in his life, it was almost more an act of kindness than an act of murder. The Yellow Creek Massacre and Logan's Lament gained a certain amount of fame on their own during and following Lord Dunmore's War, but their next little boost in notoriety came from being included in a couple of obscure paragraphs buried in the middle of Jefferson's scholarly dissertation, Notes on the State of Virginia. Then, the first of the Cresap/Greathouse apologists pushed them center stage and shined spotlights on the whole affair. Luther Martin waited until most of the witnesses and participants had either disappeared or died, then he went on the attack. His letters of accusation were published in the Porcupine's Gazette. Who was Luther Martin? He was a professional attorney who understood that one argues that black is white, or white is black, according to how one is paid; by way of example, he defended Samuel Chase in his impeachment trial, and Aaron Burr in his treason trial; he walked out on the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia; whatever political party Jefferson was in, he chose the other; at the sad end of his life he was an alcoholic, bankrupt, and insane. Not exactly, in my opinion, a founding father in whom we may take a great deal of pride. Luther Martin was also married to Michael Cresap's daughter and saw this as a two for one. He could attack his political foe and also clear his in-laws name. He wrote a series of eight letters for publication in the newspapers, attacking Jefferson's writings and conclusions. What was the Porcupine's Gazette? In 1797, William Cobbett opened the Porcupine's Gazette and Daily Advertiser in Philadelphia. It was a notoriously pro-British, anti-republic newspaper. It was so libelous that in quick succession it first lost \$4000 and then \$5000 more in slander cases. The Porcupine's Gazette closed its doors in 1799. William Cobbett then returned to England. But by then he had already done his damage. He published Luther Martin's eight letters addressed to VP Thomas Jefferson during 1797 and 1798. Jefferson read the first letter, but it was so mendacious and personally insulting that he refused to read any of those that followed. He was simply too astute to get into a \*\*\*\*\* contest with a skunk, especially in a "scurrilous rag" like the Porcupine's Gazette. Luther Martin was the first of the first generation of Cresap/Greathouse apologists. His letter to Jefferson dated 30 March 1797, contains five major points: 1) "But for Jefferson, it soon would have withered and died unnoticed and forgotten had he not preserved it to his collection." 2) He suggested that Logan's Lament was authored by none other than "the ingenious fiction" of Thomas Jefferson's "philosophic brain." 3) "That some of Logan's family were killed . . . I doubt not . . . But in their deaths, Colonel Cresap, or any of his family, had no share." 4) He called Jefferson a coward. 5) He called Logan "an untutored savage" and went on to refer to Logan's Lament as an "it." As to point 1), Notes on the State of Virginia contains only two paragraphs that mentioned the Yellow Creek Massacre & Logan's

Lament. They are tucked into chapter 6 - productions, mineral, vegetable, and animal, query VI - a notice of the mines and other subterranean riches, its trees, plants, fruits, &c. Subsection - sub-sub-heading, The Indians of North America, pp 65-66, and Logan's Lament and related comments were included to prove the point that American Indians could be just as eloquent in speech as their European counterparts. What I'm saying is that while the Yellow Creek Massacre was not exactly a footnote, it was hardly the crux of the book. Anyone who has done much genealogy knows that pretty much every family trees contains at least a few skeletons-in-the-closet, crazy-uncles-in-the-attic, horse thieves, and/or a \*\*\*\*\* or two in the branches. I had an aunt who once tried to fix the last one by making up, and inserting in the record, a wedding date for a pair of our deceased ancestors. Fortunately, few of us have a brazen mass murderer among our progenitors, at least not one whom some famous person of the time called "a man infamous for the many murders he had committed on those much injured people." And if we did have such a relative, would we too behave as the Cresap and Greathouse descendant have? In any case Martin's challenging Jefferson in the media may not have been the wisest thing to do. Jefferson was sensitive to Martin's accusations, so he conducted a thorough three-year investigation of the facts behind the Yellow Creek Massacre & Logan's Lament, and published the results in a 50-page pamphlet titled Relative to the murder of Logan's family. He then made it an appendix in all subsequent printings of his Notes on the State of Virginia. I put it to you; was it Jefferson's two paragraphs on the subject, hidden away inside an obscure book, or Martin's eight letters published in the newspaper which prompted Jefferson's investigation, pamphlet, and appendix in response, that most shined the light of publicity on the Cresap family's dirty little secret? Martin, it seems to me, simply made a bad situation far worse for the family. Sometimes it really is better to "let sleeping dogs lie." Point 2) Who really wrote Logan's Lament? The literal answer to that question is Captain John Gibson, but the more accurate and honest answer is Chief Logan. In his effort to clear his family's name, Martin in his letters, seemed to have no compunction whatsoever about besmirching my ancestor's reputations. (Martin, 1797) He suggested that Logan's Lament must have come from the ingenious brain of Jefferson, because, apparently, it could not have come from the less than ingenious brains of either of my two ancestors who were directly involved, i.e., Gibson & Logan. Subsequently, pretty irrefutable evidence was produced that Logan's Lament was extant at Lord Dunmore's 1774 peace conference, thus proving Martin's theory a null-hypothesis. In point 3) Martin argued that Cresap was not present at Yellow Creek, and was therefore exonerated. Martin's argument begs the question, "Are we not legally and morally responsibility for the consequences of our actions? Jefferson, it seems, understood, as Martin did not, or at least chose not to, the moral and legal concepts of responsibility and culpability. Jefferson, and more than a few others of the founding fathers addressed the Declaration of Independence to King George III. The king was never in America, yet he bears a full share of responsibility for every British and American soldier and civilian killed in the Revolutionary War. Culpability is like the flue, you can pass it on to someone else, and yet still be full of it yourself. One small change Jefferson made after his 1797-1800 investigation was to acknowledge that Cresap was in fact not physically present at Yellow Creek, but he drew essentially the same conclusions as to his culpability in the murder of innocent Indians along the Ohio as he had previously. (Jefferson, 1800) Cresap had the motive, means, and opportunity: At first I was inclined to agree with gr4thgrandfather Gibson that Cresap was exonerated because he was not present at the Yellow Creek Massacre. My research has since led

me to the conclusion that responsibility for these murders lays first with John Murray, 4th Earl of Dunmore, then to Dr. John Connolly, then to Captain Michael Cresap and his vigilantes, then to Daniel Greathouse and his gang. They all have a fair share of blame for the murders, and there is plenty of it to be had. As you read earlier, Cresap was the person most directly responsible for escalating the low level conflict extant that spring into a full blown shooting war between the colonials and the Indians. It was not called Cresap's war by Gibson, and many others then and since, for nothing. And what of Greathouse? It seems he was up to his neck in it all from the very beginning. He was right beside Cresap at Wheeling urging their fellow settlers to go to war with the Indians. In its early stages the War of 1774 was referred to as Cresap's War. Apparently it was in the blood, since Michael's father Thomas Cresap, was behind the 1730's border war between Pennsylvania and Maryland that is now also named Cresap's War. And that too was a land-grab war. Perhaps we should start numbering Cresap's Wars, as we do the World's Wars. What are we to make of the accusation against Cresap contained in both the Captain John Logan letter and in Logan's Lament? We know Gibson tried to correct Logan on this point, as he was dictating Logan's Lament, but he stuck to the accusation. My take on it upon first learning of it was that they were separated by their un-common experience. Logan was born a Seneca, was raised among both Iroquois Indians and British settlers. Iroquois was his native language, English was a second language. In other words he thought first like a Seneca, but pretty much understood the British. Gibson was born a British subject, was raised among both British settlers and Conestoga/Iroquois Indians. English was his native language, Iroquois was a second language. In other words he thought first like a Scotsman, but pretty much understood the Indians. Perhaps Gibson was thinking of nuclear family as the English do, and had in mind his wife, baby girl, and unborn child; two of whom were killed, and one of whom was kidnaped, by Greathouse at Baker's bottom; perhaps Logan was thinking of extended family as the Iroquois do, and had in mind his immediate family killed by Greathouse at Baker's bottom, plus his blood and shirt-tail relatives killed by Cresap at Grave Mound creek and elsewhere along the Ohio. Secondly, Logan probably wanted Cresap's name left in because he understood culpability, i.e Cresap was the big war chief at the time of those first killings, and Greathouse was just his little sergeant; Gibson probably left it in because he too understood legal and moral responsibility, i.e., leading by word and by example. "On our return to Camp (from killing Indians on the Ohio River) a Resolution was formed to march next Day and attack Logan's Camp, on the Ohio, about 30 Miles above Wheeling. We actually marched about five Miles, and halted to take some Refreshment, here the Impropriety of executing the proposed Enterprize was argued, the Conversation was brought forward by Cresap himself." (Clark, 1798) Upon being faced with a mutiny, one of two things happened. Cresap gave it some thought, saw it was the wrong thing to do, and called it off; Cresap saw that these men weren't likely to do what he wanted done, so he marched them off in another direction, and made other arrangements for Yellow Creek. It was his sergeant who lead the attack at Baker's Bottom, and it was his command that finished the job at Grave Mound Creek. William Huston resided at Catfishes camp, in 1774. It was on the main path from Wheeling to Red-stone. (Fort Redstone is now Brownsville, Fayette, Pennsylvania) Cresap and his men, on their way up from the river, "lay some time" at his cabin. While there they made no secret of the killings they had done along the Ohio, rather they boasted of it, and they did it in front of Cresap, so he was well aware of the facts. This was not news to Huston either, since he had already heard of Cresap's having killed some Indians, including

some relatives of Chief Logan. They had with them Big Tarrence on a litter, since he had been wounded in the skirmish. Huston further certified that some of the party, killed some women and others at Baker's bottom, and they had with them Gibson's daughter. (Jefferson, 1800, Houston's certificate) "He [Sappington] met with Cresap (if I recollect right, at Redstone Old Fort); and gave him a scalp, a very large fine one, as He expressed it, and adorned with silver. This scalp, I think He told me, was the scalp of Logan's brother; though as to this I am not absolutely certain." (Jefferson, 1800, McKee affidavit) "But there is not the least doubt in my mind, that the massacre at Yellow Creek was brought on by the two transactions first stated." The two transactions being two of the massacres on the Ohio committed by Cresap, and his men. (Jefferson, 1800, letter from Zane) Cresap may, or may not have issued orders to Greathouse to kill the Indians at Yellow Creek, and it really doesn't much matter if he did or did not. We know he at least led by example, endorsed what Greathouse did, and approved of what he had done since he was already, or was soon made a sergeant in Cresap's company. In British and then American military tradition captain's gave the orders; sergeants carry them out. How do we know Greathouse was Cresap's sergeant? As the program hawkers at the ball game love to shout, "You can't tell the players without a program." Virginia's Colonial Soldiers is just that program. Most of the known Massacre participants can be found in half a dozen companies of Virginia soldiers on the Pittsburgh payroll for the 1774 Indian war. Interestingly, those that were most likely to later blather on about the Massacre, were the ones who murdered and plundered, but apparently never thereafter actually fought in the war that they started, i.e., Michael Myers and John Sappington. (Bockstruck, 1988) Lets say, for the sake of argument, that Yellow Creek occurred before these militia companies were formed. Do you suppose for even a minute that had Greathouse been acting contrary to Cresap's wishes that 30 April 1774 he would then have made Greathouse a sergeant in his command? All today agree, Cresap was not present at the Yellow Creek Massacre. Some seem to think that absolves him of responsibility for those murders. Some of us well understand that present or not, it was he, more than any other single person that was responsible for what took place there that day. Point 4) applies Rule #1 for debating. If the facts are on your side, use them. If the facts don't support your argument, then attack the person. By way of example, see both points 4 which calls Jefferson a coward, & point 5 which calls Logan an untutored savage. On 4 Jan. 1781, British troops led by Brig. Gen. Benedict Arnold landed at Westover in Charles City County and began marching to Richmond, Virginia, Jefferson and the entire state legislature left, and found safe places to hide. Had he stayed he could now be famous for some courageous sound bite like "I only regret that I have but one life to give for my country." But by then that one had already been taken by Nathan Hale whom the British hanged in 1776. Was Jefferson prudent? - yes; was he a coward - I think not! If writing and signing the Declaration of Independence, and sending it off to the king, wasn't a supreme act of courage, I can't possibly imagine what would be. After all, the Americans were sparsely populated agrarian colonies, and England was the world's super power of the day, and it was far from a sure thing that they would win their independence. The founding fathers said as much when they signed the Declaration of Independence. John Hancock said, "We must be unanimous, there must be no pulling different ways; we must all hang together." "Yes." replied Benjamin Franklin, the smartest man on planet earth at the time, "We must, indeed, all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately." (Huang, 1994) There were cowards aplenty amongst those involved in Cresap's War II, but Jefferson was not one of them. It was Theodore Roosevelt, long before I ever said it, who

named the Yellow Creek killers, cowards. There had been both white and Indian depredations along the Ohio, before the war. Jefferson acknowledged as much in his writings when he described a theft and killings. Had either justice or deterrence been Cresap's or Greathouse's motivation they would have gone after the Indians that committed those crimes (or acts of war, if you will); or at least after their clan or tribe. Cresap declared war and went after those who were close at hand, i.e., peaceful, trusting Indians going about their daily business; exactly the kind of target that would appeal most to a real coward. Yellow Creek, in its turn, turned out to be an easy & safe (or so they thought) mark even for men as dumb, lazy, and cowardly as Daniel Greathouse, John Sappington, & Michael Myers. And who paid the price for the cowardice of Cresap & Greathouse? That would be the prior owners of the thirty or more scalps taken by Logan during Lord Dunmore's War, and the seventy plus notches he put in his tomahawk handle during the American Revolution. And finally point 5). This was, perhaps, Martin's most disgusting argument of all, being based as it was on the assumption "How could an ignorant savage speak so logically & eloquently?" Sorry white man but your bias is showing. We see from Martin's argument that the Compt de Buffon, was not the only buffoon of that era. But he, at least, in the end had the good sense to bow to Jefferson's superior argument. Then came John Jeremiah Jacob, who wrote a book published in 1826, intended to exonerate Captain Cresap. Jacob had married Cresap's widow. Oh those Cresap women! They must have held tight the rains on their men. He was not the first one to go to press in an effort to clear the Cresap family name, nor would he be the last. In their efforts to clear their family name, neither Martin in his letters (Martin, 1797), nor his step-father-in-law J. J. Jacob in his book (Jacob, 1826, pp 92-96) seemed to have any compunction whatsoever about besmirching my ancestor's name. Martin's argument that "Logan's Lament must have come from the ingenious brain of Jefferson, because, apparently, it could not have come from the less than ingenious brains of either of my two ancestors" had long since been discredited by pretty irrefutable evidence that it was extant at Lord Dunmore's 1774 peace conference. So Jacob took the fall back position that Gibson was the one who wrote it, threw in an argument that it originally contained no mention of Cresap, (apparently subsequently added by Jefferson, for no discernible reason) and that Logan was never at the peace conference in the first place; all in direct contradiction of Gibson's sworn affidavit which had been published many years before Jacob's scurrilous accusation both in Relative to the murder of Logan's family and in subsequent printings of Notes on the State of Virginia. Thus, Jacob could hardly have been ignorant of the fact that he was calling John Gibson a liar. Logan's Lament is famous, and was cited by Jefferson as an example of "eminence in oratory" equal to anything found in Europe. McGuffey Reader adopted, and millions of American school children memorized it. (McGuffey, 1857, pp 324-325) Even the most obtuse and mendacious CresapGreathouse apologist now admits it came, either from my Gr5uncle Chief Logan or it came from my Gr4grandfather Colonel John Gibson. So you see, for me it's all in the family, thus my only interest is the truth, and to me it's plain as a Bulgarian beauty queen, that the words of the Lament, including the accusations against Col. Cresap , all came from uncle Logan. On what evidence do I base my conclusion? First, on Colonel John Gibson's affidavit to Thomas Jefferson, and here are a few of his own words: ". . . on [my] arrival at the towns, Logan, the Indian, came to where [I] was sitting with the Corn-Stalk, and the other chiefs of the Shawanese (sic) and asked [me] to walk out with him; that [we] went into a copse of wood, where [we] sat down, when Logan, after shedding abundance of tears, delivered to [me] the speech, nearly as related by Mr. Jefferson

in his Notes on the State of Virginia; that [I] told him that it was not Col. Cresap who had murdered his relations, and that although his son Captain Michael Cresap was with the party who killed a Shawanese chief and other Indians, yet he [Cresap] was not present when his [Logan's] relations were killed at Baker's near the mouth of Yellow Creek on the Ohio; that [I] on [my] return to camp delivered the speech to Lord Dunmore; and that the murders perpetrated as above were considered as ultimately the cause of the war of 1774, commonly called Cresap's war." Second, on Captain John Logan's letter left at the John Roberts home during the war. In that letter Logan likewise accuses Cresap of being the one responsible for the murder of his family on Yellow Creek. Who really wrote Captain John Logan's letter? The literal answer to that question is William Robinson, but the more accurate and honest answer is Chief Logan. The authenticity of that letter is confirmed by William Robinson's affidavit. Finally, Colonel John Gibson's reputation for honor and honesty was so sterling that one of the apologist's favorite witnesses, John Sappington, dropped Gibson's name in an effort to bolster his own credibility, i.e., "I was intimately acquainted with General. Gibson, and served under him during the late war, and I have a discharge from him now lying in the land-office at Richmond, to which I refer any person for my character who might be disposed to scruple my veracity." (Jefferson, 1800) P.S. even a blind pig occasionally finds an acorn. As per George Roger Clark, "What I have related is fact. I was intimate with Cresap. Logan I was better acquainted with, at that time, than with any other Indian in the western country. I was perfectly acquainted with the conduct of both parties. Logan was the author of the speech . . ." (Jacob, 1826, p 158) By 1826, the apologists were denying that it was murder at all. In Jacob's book first surfaced the excuse that the Indians were the aggressors, and Yellow Creek was simply a case of self defense, and he cites Sappington's deposition as his strongest evidence. "The evening before a squaw came over to Baker's house, and by her crying seemed to be in great distress. The cause of her uneasiness being asked, she refused to tell; but getting Baker's wife alone, she told her that the Indians were going to kill her and all her family the next day, that she loved her, did not wish her to be killed, and therefore told her what was intended, that she might save herself. In consequence of this information, Baker got a number of men, to the amount of twenty-one, to come to his house . . ." (Jefferson, 1800; Jacob, 1826, p 111) George Edginton, who was not a resident of the area at the time, was not a participant. He later married the widow of Daniel Greathouse's brother William . . . wrote to Lyman C. Draper from West Liberty, PA in 1845. "On the Town Fork of Yellow creek, where the Indian town was, a small one; and they concluded to move Elsewhere down the river, stopped at Baker's drank. Mrs. Baker told Danl. Greathouse that a squaw told her (in a drunken fit) that the Indians intended to murder Baker's family before leaving. Greathouse went & raised a party of abt. 30 men, George Cox, Edward King & others & went to Baker's; there an Indian was drinking & strutting around in a military coat, some one shot him, & King then stabbed him while in the agonies of death, saying "Many a deer have I served in this way." Then killed another Indian there; & two squaws -- the two latter shot by Danl. Greathouse & John Sappington. One of the squaws had a child, which was saved & sent to Col. Gibson as its father. Twelve Indians were killed in all." YEAH! RIGHT!! That's why they showed up with a couple of women, one advanced in pregnancy with a one year old papoose in a cradle board, why three of them got drunk, why the rest participated in a shooting match. You bet yaw these were dangerous Indians all right, and the Bakers and Greathouse gang were in mortal fear for their lives, for sure. I'm not the only one who sees the absurdity of this excuse. The following came from Judge

Henry Jolly who was 16 and living in the area at the time, "Could any person of common rationality, believe for a moment, that the Indians came to Yellow creek with hostile intention, or that they had any suspicion of the whites, having any hostile intentions against them, would five men have crossed the river, three of them in a Short time dead drunk, the other two discharging their guns, putting themselves entirely at the mercy of the whites, or would they have brought over a squaw, with an infant paupoose, if they had not reposed the utmost Confidence in the friendship of the whites, every person who is acquainted with Indians knows better, and it was the belief of the Inhabitants who were capable of reasoning on the Subject, that all the depredations Committed on the frontiers was by Logan and his party, as a retaliation for the murder of Logan's friends at Yellow creek - I mean all the depredations committed in the year 1774." (Thwaites, 1905, pp 9-14) There is possibly a grain of truth in the squaw warning story, i.e., one of the many versions tells, "The party were concealed in ambuscade, while their commander went over the river, under the mask of friendship, to the Indian camp, to ascertain their number; while there an Indian woman [Ann "Coonay" Shikellamy Gibson] advised him to return home speedily, saying that the Indians were drinking and angry on account of the murder of their people down the river, and might do him some mischief. [she pressed him in a friendly manner, to go home] On his return to his party he reported that the Indians were too strong for an open attack." (Jefferson, 1800, Chambers' deposition; Doddridge, 1824; Drake, 1832, p 161) Her brutal murder the next day at Baker's bottom was how Daniel and the boys repaid Ann's kindness. "Mr. Jefferson calls him Colonel Michael Cresap — which mistake, trifling as it may appear, yet goes to prove the imperfect acquaintance he had with the man and the character he handles so freely. It is true there was a colonel of this name, but everybody knows he was not the man intended." (Jacob, 1826) Can't tell the players without a score card? Here's one. Colonel Thomas Cresap was the father of Michael, was an agent of Lord Baltimore, and was the author of Cresap's War I, the one between Maryland and Pennsylvania. Captain Michael Cresap was the son of Thomas, was the author of Cresap's War II, commanded a Maryland Rifle Company at the beginning of the American Revolution, and according to Find-A-Grave, was made a Colonel in the end. John Gibson was a private, civilian, captain, colonel, and general at one time or another and many authors have used the wrong military title for event in his life. The error is common. For Jacob to make a mountain out of the mole hill of Chief Logan using to title Colonel rather than Captain really is grasping at straws. The next generations of apologists, from say 1850 to the present, then came on the scene. Going into this investigation, let me say, it makes not one iota of difference to me if blame for the Ohio River Massacres falls on Michael Cresap, Daniel Greathouse, or some other person or persons. I knew nothing of either man or either family before I began researching the death of my Gr4thgrandmother Ann "Koonay" Shikellamy Gibson in the Yellow Creek Massacre. I have no ax to grind with any of them. I just want the truth. Jefferson said much the same when he was accused by the Cresaps of somehow having it in for them. To paraphrase him -- That it was murdered has not, I believe, been denied; that it was by one of the Cresaps, Logan affirms. This is a question which concerns the memories of Cresap and Greathouse; to the issue of which I am as indifferent as if I had never heard the name of either. I have begun and shall continue to enquire into the evidence additional to Logan's, on which the fact was founded. I put a great deal of stock in contemporaneous documents prepared by disinterested parties, e.g. the Crawford's letters. Better yet are written statements made by witnesses at or near the time of the incident, but there are few of these. Also reliable are confessions by guilty

parties, these are called statement against interest. By adhering to these standard I am essentially following the federal Rules of Evidence. While trial procedures allow hearsay evidence in only a limited number of circumstances, like confessions, dying declarations, contemporaneous exclamations, official records, etc., they are generally banned because they do not provide an opportunity to confront one's accusers. The apologists, beginning with the attorney Martin, have had a great time making arguments about hearsay, alleged, and other trial standards and procedures. They would love to hold us to the criminal standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt, but no one is trying to send Dunmore, Connolly, Cresap, Greathouse, Sappington, Myers, or anyone else to prison, or to the electric chair. We're simply trying to get at the historic facts. In writing history we have to use such information as we can find if we are to get at the truth, at least to the probable cause level. Caution in so doing is advised, i.e., don't dismiss all hearsay that disagrees with our original premise, while embracing all hearsay that supports our thesis. Furthermore, usually contemporary accounts tend to be most reliable, but not always, because they are sometime filled with self interest and lack the objectivity which time may provide. I place the least stock in exculpatory depositions and statements by the guilty, because they are likely shaded by self interest, e.g., Myers, Sappington, and Tomlinson. Two of the foregoing men's credibility is further diminished, in my eyes, by the fact that they participated in the murders and plundering, yet their names do not appear on the list of soldiers who fought in the war they helped to initiate, i.e., Myers and Sappington. The single least credible statement in this case, in my opinion, is the deposition of Sappington. The man who swore him to it, Samuel McKee, found him so mendacious and disingenuous that he felt obliged to add an addendum to correct at least some of Sappington's omissions and mis-representations. It comes as no great surprise to me based on my experience, 35 years a detective, and I suppose it should come as no great surprise to you, that a person capable of killing two innocent people, as Sappington claimed to have killed, i.e., Logan's brother, and another in one of the canoes, would also be capable of telling a lie. (Sappington, 1789, Tomlinson, 1789) On the other hand even Sappington's deposition should not be dismissed out of hand, as it may contain some enlightening details or information. I tell this story, make my arguments, and do my best to back them with academic research and cogent analysis, to put America's Indian Wars in perspective, and to refute the false accusations made by CresapGreathouse apologists, and a few academic pedants. The fact that so many Martin & Jacobs arguments have been discredited over the years, doesn't seem to deter modern day apologists from recycling them. The first one then, is still often the first one now; Martin argued, "he wasn't there for every battle so it's not his fault" even though he's the one who declared war and started the bloodshed. Since the "he wasn't there" defense is not really available to the Greathouse clan, their fallback has been the old, false self-defense defense; which goes hand in hand with "good riddance the savage." As offensive today, as it was in the day's of Martin, yet is still being offered by a few CresapGreathouse descendants and some pedantic scholars who suggest, nay claim, that Logan was not the author of Logan's Lament because, after all being an Indian he would have been too obtuse and ignorant to produce something so eloquent. The latest argument to come on the scene is the "times were different" and "you had to be there" to understand. He wasn't there: Easy to understand why they keep using this one. As much as his physical presence at the massacre is irrelevant to the issue of his culpability, that denial still works pretty well. e.g., from the Michael Cresap museum websight, "Michael was a bold continental militia volunteer who proved

himself on the western frontier. . . ." e.g., from the book The Hemingses of Monticello, "Thomas Cresap did have the reputation Jefferson charged him with, even though he was not involved in the murder of Logan's family." (Gordon-Reed, 2008, p 534) e.g., from the Horse Thief - Zephyr websight, "The events that were to put Jacob and Daniel Greathouse into history began in 1774. There was a Mingo Indian Chief known as Talgayeeta or Chief Logan. Logan was well educated, spoke English, and had a wide reputation as being a friend to the "white man." Logan provided food and shelter to those in need. He urged other Indians toward moderation and accommodation, rather than war with the settlers. It seems that Jacob and Daniel Greathouse, with a party of approximately 30 men contrived an ambush to kill a small group of friendly Indians. These Indians happened to be Chief Logan's family. Initial reports of the events incorrectly blamed the murders on Michael Cresap. Cresap was in the area and had been with the Greathouses prior to the ambush. Although Cresap may have been responsible for other activities, he was not directly involved in this crime." e.g., from the familypedia websight, "Cresap was blamed for one of the key events that led directly to Dunmore's War, the killing of Chief Logan's family by white settlers. Certainly Logan blamed Cresap for this event. Thomas Jefferson accepted Logan's account, but later in life retracted that position when pressed by Cresap's family. Others have said that Cresap was not present, and have painted him in a more positive light. There are always multiple sides to every story." In trying to pin down Cresap's motive for starting Cresap's War II and targeting Yellow Creek, it at first seemed that it was no deeper than being a land speculator, like his father, and being perhaps a bit cowardly he went after the peaceful, close at hand, and therefore easy targets; but then came the ah-ha! moment while I was researching a whole 'nother generation of the family and stumbled onto the Chief Shikellamy - Colonel Thomas Cresap connection and thus the powerful but hidden motive, i.e., the Six Nations, Pennsylvania, Weiser, Shikellamy, Maryland land sale. There it was, Michael Cresap's motive, means, & opportunity; stronger than ever. Because it is so relevant to this issue here are a few of the details: The Pennsylvania Governor valued the service of Chief Shikellamy, James Logan, and John Logan as peace keepers, representatives, and negotiators. Then the "Logan brothers acted as emissaries for the VA governor to Onondaga (6 nations capital). The Indian delegation was entertained free, and the Penn Governor gave to Shikellamy a present of ten pounds; to Shikellamy's two sons, six pounds . . ." (Sipe, 1927, p 149) The Maryland Governor then engaged them to perform similar duties on behalf of Maryland, and they all met in Lancaster in 1744. "The Maryland commissioners receded from their position. The release for the Maryland lands was signed, on Monday, July 2nd, at George Sanderson's Inn, instead of at the Court House. Conrad Weiser signed in behalf of the absent member of the Iroquois Confederation, (Mohawk), both with his Indian name of Tarach-a-wa-gon, and that of Weiser. By his dexterous management, the lands released were so described as not to give Maryland a title to lands claimed by Pennsylvania, the boundary dispute between Maryland and Pennsylvania being at the time still pending. The release was for all "lands lying two miles above the uppermost forks of Patowmack or Cohongoruton River, near which Thomas Cresap has his hunting or trading cabin, [at Old Town fourteen miles east of Cumberland, Maryland,] by a line north to the bounds of Pennsylvania. But, in case such limits shall not include every settlement or inhabitant of Maryland, then such other lines and courses from the said two miles above the forks to the outermost inhabitants or settlements, as shall include every settlement and inhabitant in Maryland, and from thence by a north line to the bounds of Pennsylvania, shall be the limits. And, further, if any people already have or

shall settle beyond the lands now described and bounded, they shall enjoy the same free from any disturbance of us in any manner whatsoever, and we do and shall accept these people for our Brethren, and as such will always treat them." Thus was the purchase happily effected. "However, Shikellamy refused to sign the deed of the Maryland lands, being determined not to recognize that Maryland had any land claims north of the disputed boundary line between herself and Pennsylvania." (Sipe, 1927, pp 150- 152) Colonel Thomas Cresap was none too happy with the Weiser description as he had designs on far more land than it provided for. One can only imagine his anger with Shikellamy who refused to sign even that title. Cresap's land grab started Cresap's War I, and resulted in the death of one of his son's so we see just how serious he was. The idea that another son might thereafter be bent on revenge is not such a far fetched a notion. Colonel Thomas Cresap thus provided the motive for Yellow Creek; Dunmore and Connally then provided the means and opportunity to Michael Cresap. The foregoing also helps explain Logan's insistence on leaving the Colonel Cresap moniker in Logan's Lament. He was well aware of all that had gone before. The apologists use the mutiny on the Ohio, while Cresap was leading his company up river with the intent of slaughtering all at the Yellow Creek settlement, as evidence that Cresap didn't wish to harm the Indian settlement there. In point of fact it merely prevented Cresap from executing his initial plan, but there's nothing in it to suggest he changed his mind, only his tactics. It was, after all, his men, not him, who questioned the integrity and tactic of slaughtering innocent, friendly Indians, there's nothing to say he didn't simply send a more compliant sergeant and a squad to do the job. But even a few of them refused, and stepped in to save the life of Diana Gibson. To the contrary, the fact that he was leading his command up the river to slaughter the inhabitants of the Yellow Creek village, it seems, is pretty powerful evidence that Captain Michael Cresap had them in his sights all along. Blame the victims: Easy to understand why they keep using this one. It doesn't work all that well, and in using it they exposes their bigotry, but it's all they've got. Logan, and then Jefferson, pointed the finger at Cresap; the first generation of Cresaps then pointed the finger at Greathouse, as though that somehow exonerated their family name from responsibility for these heinous murders, the Greathouse family has ever since been pointing the finger back at Logan and his family, or at Indians in general. After all, "what are the lives of a few meaningless Indians compared to the great life we have now." e.g., the story of Ann warning the Bakers that they were in mortal danger, thus justifying her murder, continues to circulate among the ignorant and mendacious. e.g., from the 1911 Encyclopedia Britannica, "He was on good terms with the whites until April 1774, when, friction having arisen between the Indians and the whites, a band of marauders, led by one Greathouse, attacked and murdered several Indians, including, it appears, Logan's sister and possibly one or more other relatives. Believing that Captain Michael Cresap was responsible for this murder, Logan sent him a declaration of hostilities, the result of which was the bloody conflict known as Lord Dunmore's War." e.g., from the Greathouse Family websight, "He was a rugged frontiersman but he had to be both rugged and ruthless in order to keep his own hair and stay alive at that time in our history." e.g., from the Greathouse Family History websight, "As for me, I have a wholesome respect and admiration for Daniel Greathouse and all of his ilk. These sturdy frontiersmen and pioneers, who suffered untold hardships and lived under almost intolerable conditions, succeeded in overcoming and subduing the Indian tribes and thereby paved the way for the rapid settlement and growth of this great nation of ours. I have no patience with latter-day historians who, from the sanctuary of a land free from internal strife,

so glibly condemn as “murderers” their forefathers, who, by almost superhuman efforts, made it possible for these same, smug historians to live in a land of peace and plenty. All hail to Daniel and his contemporaries! They deserve the respect and reverence of the generations of Americans who have succeeded them, I am thankful that the blood of these men still courses through the veins of many of us. Our Country will be safe and well defended as long as descendants of these men form a preponderance of our population.” This last one sounds an awfully lot like Adolph Hitler’s lebensraum speech. Those silly argument hardly deserves a reply, particularly as they apply to the likes of Chief John Logan, who was about as peaceful as they come, and as good a friend to the white man as ever there was. You had to be there: Not every argument being made by the apologist is old, worn out, and discredited. Here’s a new one, that Martin and Jacobs couldn’t use. Since two hundred and forty years have now passed, the apologists say we can’t understand what happened way back then, in far different times, because “you had to be there.” That is, of course, pretty pure BS, else we would have nothing to learn about right-and-wrong from reading and studying the scriptures, and nothing to learn about life, or human behavior from history lessons. But, for the sake of argument, let’s suppose there really were something to it; let’s take a minute and see what the people living there then had to say on the subject. “. . . but for this eruption, which I believe was as much the white people's fault as the Indians.” (Valentine Crawford letter to Washington, May 6, 1774) George Roger Clark was part of Cresap’s command in those early days of the war, and a company commander in the latter part.

Here’s his assessment: “Logan’s Family was killed, and from the Manner in which it was done, it was viewed as a horrid Murder by the whole Country.” “These facts I think was sufficient to bring on a war with a christian instead of a savage people, and I do declare it was my opinion that the Shawanese did not intend a war this season, let their future intentions be what they might; and I do likewise declare that I am afraid from the proceedings of the chief of the white people in this part of the country that they will bring on a general war, as there is so little pains taken to restrain the common people whose prejudice leads them to greater lengths than ought to be shown by civilized people, and their superiors take too little if any pains, and I do think are much to blame themselves in the whole affair.” (Newton, 1879, p 69) Richard Butler deposition, August 23, 1774. “Col. Cresap, a man infamous for the many murders he had committed on those much injured people.”

(Jefferson, 1787) “I do further certify that, from what I learned from the party themselves, I then formed the opinion, and have not had any reason to change the opinion since, that the killing, on the part of the whites, was what I deem the grossest murder.” (Jefferson, 1800, letter from William Huston) “Devoutly might humanity wish that the record of the causes which led to the destructive war of 1774 might be blotted from the annals of our country; but it is now too late to efface it, the black-lettered list must remain, a dishonorable blot in our national history . . . This horrid massacre [Yellow Creek] was effected by an hypocritical stratagem which reflects the deepest dishonor on the memory of those who were engaged in it.” (Reminiscences of Judge Henry Jolly, 1836) Note: Jolly had no reason to love the Indians, they had killed his wife’s family and scalped her, though she survived. He seems a remarkably insightful man. Jacob Newland served in Captain Cresap’s command during Lord Dunmore’s War, and spoke with him at some length regarding the circumstances of how it began. In the end he concluded, “but never understood that the Indians gave any offence.” (Jefferson, 1800, Newland affidavit) The deponent [James Chambers] further saith, that on the relation of the attack by Cresap on the unoffending Indians, he exclaimed in their hearing, that it was an atrocious

murder; on which Mr. Smith threatened the deponent with the tomahawk; so that he was obliged to be cautious, fearing an injury, as the party appeared to have lost, in a great degree, sentiments of humanity as well as the effects of civilization. (Jefferson, 1880, Chambers' deposition) Joseph Doddridge lived there, then, was a baby at the time of the massacre, but he subsequently married into the Greathouse family, so his story is second hand, but from a pretty reliable source. The Indians "were all killed by Daniel Greathouse and a few of his party. I say a few of his party; for it is but justice to state that not more than five or six of the whole number had any participation in the slaughter at the house. The rest protested against it as an atrocious murder. From their number being by far the majority, they might have prevented the deed; but alas! they did not. . ." (Doddridge, 1824) James Chambers, a neighbor of Baker's but not present during the massacre, declared that the murderers "appeared to have lost, in a great degree, all sentiments of humanity as well as the effects of civilization." (Nelson, 1999, pp 78-81) It looks to me like they were good, honest, Christian people, dragged into Dunmore's war against their will, against their judgment, and perhaps even against their conscience. They certainly don't seem to think stealing land was worth killing innocent Indian men, women, and children, and they don't seem to think well of those who did. Furthermore, these statement by Cresap & Greathouse contemporaries lend credibility to Jefferson's assertion that he was "a man infamous for the many murders he had committed on those much injured people." If those C&G apologists really believe their own point about "you had to be there," then why are they still raising that silly Jefferson was a coward argument? One such excuse maker I read on the internet made me wonder if she was more obtuse or more mendacious, or a whole lot of both. Either way, the "you had to be there" argument doesn't work for them. Grasping at straws: The use of lawyerly waffle words, innuendoes, misdirection etc., isn't a new approach but a few of the terms are. Apologists use words like alleged, supposed, and one even called it the Yellow Creek affair, as though Daniel was there to make love – not war; and please don't be calling it the "so called" Yellow Creek Massacre. It is an established historic fact which no credible authority can or would deny. Let's not be like the radical Muslim or neo-Nazi Holocaust deniers. e.g., from the Stull family websight, "though sadly he [Daniel Greathouse] is portrayed as a villain and scoundrel. He is alleged to have led a massacre of a group of Indians which included the sister and brother of John Logan, reputed to be a chief, and second son of Skikellemus, a celebrated Chief of the Cayuga Nation. . . . We cannot know the actual reasons and justification they felt that brought them to commit this seemingly heinous act. . . . and supposedly made an eloquent speech . . . e.g., from the Greathouse L archivist, "an essay if you will that discussed Daniel and all the hearsay accounts that supposedly linked him to the massacre of Chief Logan's family at . . . [the] so called Yellow Creek Massacre." One could make a pretty good breakfast of all those waffle words. Other straws they grasp at: From the Greathouse Point websight , "John Gibson (1740-1822) was an Indian trader and considered a 'big shot' among the Indians." From the context I believe it is meant in a pejorative manner, and they went on to call him a liar and forger. (Bailey, 2000) But I suppose the fact that he was a captain in Lord Dunmore's War, a Colonel in the American Revolution, fought in the Battle of White Plains and Fort Washington, New York, commanded Fort Laurens and Ft. Pittsburgh, was a Judge in Pennsylvania, Major General of the Allegheny militia, a delegate to the state's constitutional convention, was appointed territorial secretary and acting governor of Indiana by Jefferson, Adams, Madison, Monroe, and Gibson County Indiana is named for him, all sort of did make him a "big shot" among the whites. Why all the confusion these days about

just who John Gibson was? Joseph Ball died wealthy, without issue, and intestate. In other words he willed too his family a century long family fight, to gold diggers and forgers a great target, and to the rest of the family another 100 years or more of work untangling the genealogical web. "Oh what a tangled web we weave, when first we practice to deceive." Anyone with a John Gibson in their line was suddenly a descendant, even though the name was nearly as common as Joseph Smith back then. If you had an Anna Balldridge in your line, that must really be Ann Ball, Joseph's sister. It's a great joke among genealogists to ask each other, "Found any horse thieves yet?" I can't yet say if my relatives were among the victim family or the crooks who swarmed in, but the family tree they left works only if John Gibson had a four year old mother and an eleven year old father. So, perhaps George Washington is not a relative after all. There's even a book on the Ball estate hassle. (Gans, 1900) Conclusion Who you going to believe? The family reunion apologists or contemporaries who wrote about it at the time, historians who have since researched and written about it, including two renowned Presidents of the United States? What they did was terribly wrong. They were condemned by contemporaries, right up to the President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson. A century later they were still being condemned by the first round of historians, right up to the President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt. Another century later and words like atrocious, brutal, cowardly, dishonorable, grossest murder, horror, & hypocritical still apply to Dunmore, Connolly, Cresap, Greathouse, Yellow Creek, and the Ohio in 1774, and waffle words like alleged, reputed, supposed, and affair, don't. The peace loving, generous, kind to all, Shilellamy's family didn't deserve such treatment from men of that ilk. But for Shikellamy and his family the British might well have lost the French and Indian War, been driven from America, and who knows the end result of that calamity? But in this life right does not always prevail. At least a few of those bad men's decedents are still crowing over the land their ancestor's took, and the lives of the innocent they ended. Bibliography: Chris H. Bailey, *The Stulls of "Millsborough," A genealogical history of John Stull, "The Miller" Pioneer of Western Maryland*, Vol. 1, privately published, 2000, pp 249-256 \*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\* Lloyd DeWitt Bockstruck, *Virginia's Colonial Soldiers*, Genealogical Publishing Company, Baltimore, Maryland, 1988, pp. 137-145

\*\*\*\*\* John Daly Burk, *History of Virginia, from its first settlement to the present day*, Dickson & Prescue printers, Petersburg, Virginia, 1804 Percy B. Calley, "The Life adventures of Lieutenant-Colonel John Connally: the story of a Tory," *Western Pennsylvania Historic Magazine* 11, April 1928, pp 101-106 John Anthony Caruso, *The Appalachian Frontier: America's First Surge Westward*, University of Tennessee Press, 2002, pp 120-142

\*\*\*\*\* George Roger Clark letter, 1798 G. L. Cranmer, *History of the Upper Ohio Valley*,: Brant, Fuller & Co., Madison, Wisconsin 1891 Cresap's War \*\*\*\*\*'s\_War 1730's William M. Darlington, Christopher Gist's Journals, with historical, geographical, and ethnological notes and biographies of his contemporaries, J.R. Weldin & Co., Pittsburgh, 1893

\*\*\*\*\* Franklin B. Dexter, ed., *Diary of David McClure*, Knickerbocker Press, New York, NY, 1899 Joseph Doddridge, *Notes on the settlement and Indian wars of the western parts of Virginia and Pennsylvania, from 1763 to 1783, inclusive: together with a view of the state of society, and manners of the first settlers of the western country*, first published in 1824; J. Munsell, Albany,

New York, 1876, pp 229-239 \*\*\*\*\* Doddridge & Doddridge, 1912 p 312  
 Samuel Gardner Drake, Indian Biography, containing the lives of more than two hundred Indian Chiefs, J. Drake, Boston, Massachusetts, 1832 Lord Dunmore's War \*\*\*\*\*'s\_War 1774 \*\*\*\*\*'s\_War,\_1774 Allan W. Eckert, That Dark and Bloody River: Chronicles of the Ohio River Valley, Bantam Books, New York, 1995. p. 55-59, 665-666 (this is an historic novel, based on things that actually occurred, but a novel none-the-less) \*\*\*\*\* Lawrence J. Fleenor, Jr.. The History of Yellow Creek, Big Stone Gap, Virginia, February 2004 \*\*\*\*\* Gregory Fremont-Barnes, ed., Encyclopedia of the age of political revolutions and new ideologies 1760-1815, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, 2007, Volume 1: A-L, Emmett William Gans, A Pennsylvania Pioneer: biographical sketch with report of the executive committee of the Ball estate association, R. J. Kuhl, printer, Mansfield, Ohio, 1900

\*\*\*\*\* John B. Gibson, "General John Gibson", The Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine, Vol 5, issues 2-4, Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania, price 75¢, April 1922, pp 298-310  
 James L. Golden and Allan L. Golden, Thomas Jefferson and the Rhetoric of Virtue, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Lanhan, Maryland, 2002, pp 357-372 \*\*\*\*\* ... Dave Golowenski, "The Roots of Tragedy," Ohio Magazine, October 2006 \*\*\*\*\* Annette Gordon-Reed, The Hemingses of Monticello, an American family, W. W. Norton & Co., New York, 2008 Linda C. Gugin & James E. St. Clair, ed., The Governors of Indiana, Indiana Historical Society Press, Indianapolis, Indiana, 2006 Charles William Hanko, The life of John Gibson, soldier, patriot, statesman, College Publishing Company, Dayton Beach, Florida, 1955 Nian-Sheng Huang, Benjamin Franklin in American Thought and Culture (1790-1990), American Philosophy Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1994, p 52 John Jeremiah Jacob, A Biographical Sketch of the Life of the Late Capt. Michael Cresap, Printed for the Author by J. M. Buchanan, Cumberland, Maryland, 1826, reprinted 1866 listing George Roger Clark as co-author, digitized 2008

---



---

Thomas Jefferson, "in Query Vi: A notice of the mines and other subterraneous riches; its trees, plants, fruits, &c.," Notes on the State of Virginia, published privately in Paris, 1782; published anonymously in Paris where Jefferson was trade representative, 1785; published John Stockdale, London, 1787 \*\*\*\*\* Thomas Jefferson, Relative to the murder of

Logan's family, (a pamphlet of abt 50 pages), Samuel H. Smith, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1800

\*\*\*\*\* The Papers of Thomas Jefferson, Princeton University, volume 31: 1 February 1799 to 31 May 1800 \*\*\*\*\* Bruce Elliot Johansen & Barbara Alice Mann, Encyclopedia of the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois Confederacy), Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, 2000

\*\*\*\*\* Henry

Jolly's Journal - 1774, Reminiscences of Judge Henry Jolly, 1836, reprinted in History of Dunmore's War, edited by Reuben Gold Thwaites and Louise Phelps Kellogg, Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison, Wisconsin 1905, pp. 9-14 \*\*\*\*\* Virgil Anson Lewis, History of the Battle of Point Pleasant Fought Between White Men and Indians, The Tribune Printing Company, Charleston, West Virginia, 1909 John Logan, "Fine Specimen of Indian Eloquence", Universal Magazine, LXXXIII, 1788, p 181, reprinted Logan's Lament and a synopsis of his story Peter Marshall, "Sir William Johnson and the Treaty of Fort Stanwix," Journal of American Studies, Cambridge University Press, Great Britain, Vol. 1 No. 2, October 1967, pp 149-179

\*\*\*\*\* Luther Martin, letters to Jefferson, Porcupine's Gazette, William Cobbett, ed., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 17 July 1797; 11 December 1797; 13 January 1798; 20 January 1798; 3 February 1798; 3 March 1798 found in the Library of Congress Martin's first letter to Jefferson, dated 3 April 1797, may be found in William Cobbett, Porcupine's Works, Vol V, printed by Cobbett and Morgan, at the Crown and Mitre, Pall Mall, London, 1801, pp 211-217

\*\*\*\*\* Brantz Mayer, Discourse to the Maryland Historical Society on the occasion of their sixth anniversary, 9 May 1851, p 67

\*\*\*\*\* Brantz Mayer, Tah-Gah-Jute; or Logan and Cresap, Joel Munsell printer, Albany, New York, 1867 \*\*\*\*\* Wm. H.

McGuffey, McGuffey's New Fifth Eclectic Reader, selected and original exercised for school, Wilson, Hinkle & Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, 1857, Lesson XCV, pp 324-325 Chester A. Moore, "Medal given place among chief relics," Reading Eagle, April 5, 1992, p A11

\*\*\*\*\* Larry L. Nelson, A Man of Distinction Among Them, Alexander McKee and the Ohio Country Frontier, Kent State University Press, Kent, Ohio, 1999 J. H. Newton, G. G. Nichols, and A. G. Sprinkle, History of The Pan-Handle; being historic collections of the counties of Ohio, Brooke, Marshall, and Hancock , West Virginia, published by J. A. Caldwell, Wheeling, West Virginia, 1879, pp. 24-26\*\*\*\*\* John Lewis Payton, The Adventures of My Grandfather, John Wilson, Publisher, London, 1867, pp 131-148 \*\*\*\*\*

Theodore Roosevelt, The Winning of the West, Volume 1: from the Alleghenies to the Mississippi, 1769 - 1776, G. P. Putnam's Sons, the Knickerbocker Press, New York, New York, 1889, pp 194-243, 347-352 Franklin B. Sawel, Ph.D., Logan the Mingo, The Gorham Press, Boston, Massachusetts, 1921 \*\*\*\*\* C. Hale Sipe, The Indian Chiefs of Pennsylvania, A Story of the Part Played by the American Indian in the History of Pennsylvania, Based Primarily on the Pennsylvania Archives and Colonial Records, and Built Around the Outstanding Chiefs, The Ziegler Printing Co., Inc., Butler, Pennsylvania, 1927, pp 122-164

\*\*\*\*\* Eric Drummond Smith, "Appalachian Greens: Wheeling, WV Early History," Hillbilly Savants, Wheeling, West Virginia, 2006 \*\*\*\*\* Reuben Gold Thwaites and Louise Phelps Kellogg, ed., Documentary History of Dunmore's War, Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison, 1905

\*\*\*\*\* Anthony F. C. Wallace, Jefferson and the Indians: The tragic fate of the first Americans, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1999 \*\*\*\*\* H[enry] A[ugustine] Washington, ed.,: The Writings of Thomas Jefferson: Being his Autobiography, Correspondence, Reports, Messages, Addresses, and Other Writings, Official and Private, Vol II, Appendix 5, Taylor & Maury publishers, Washington, D.C. 1853 Hermann Wellenreuther and Carola Wessel, ed., The Moravian Mission Diaries of David Zeisberger 1772 - 1781, Pennsylvania University State Press, University Park, Pennsylvania, 2005

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\* Alexander Scott Withers, Chronicles of Border Warfare, Robert Clarke printer, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1895, Reprint, McClain, 1994 William Wesley Woollen, Biographical and Historical Sketches of Early Indiana, Hammond & Company, Indianapolis, Indiana, 1883 DOCUMENTATION Because the relevant books are so obscure, and you won't find them at the corner library; because web sights are notoriously unreliable, here today - gone tomorrow; I am including bits and pieces of the actual text for your review. John or James Logan? Chief Shikellamy's firstborn son was Tachnechdours, born about 1720; his second was born around 1725 and was named Tah-Gah-Jute. Most historians who have studied this family know that Shikellamy named his son James Logan in honor of his good friend, Secretary of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania. There is considerable confusion as to which one is Logan. The answer seems to be, both. Here you are getting my best educated guess, and a couple of documents on which I base my conclusions. A land warrant in the Bureau of Land Records, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, places Tachnechdours "James Logan" to the east of his brother at the time. It was issued on September 17, 1773, for George Ballard, and describes his tract of 300 acres in these words: ". . . situate on the East side of the North East Branch of Susquehanna about 3 or 4 Miles back of where James Logan was living in the vicinity of his father Shikellamy's old home near Shamokin (now Sunbury, Pennsylvania)." ("Logan the Mingo; A problem in Identification," Repr., Pennsylvania Archeologist Bulletin XXXII, December 1962, p 92); (Ronald R. Wenning, "Chief Logan: Friend, Foe, or Fiction?" The Journal of the Lycoming County Historical Society, Volume XXXVII, Number 1, Fall, 1997) It is traditional in many societies that the eldest son steps into his father's shoes. All that's consistent with Tachnechdours being given the name James Logan, and remaining at the helm of his father's realm. Logan's Lament, and his Captain John Logan letter, 1774, fixes Tah-Gah-Jute "John Logan" as living along the Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Ohio border. (Jefferson, 1787, pp 68-69) (Jefferson, 1800, see Robinson declaration) Letters from Valentine Crawford May 6&7, 1774 to Washington Jacob's Creek, May 6, 1774. Dear Colonel:— I am sorry to inform you that the disturbance between the white people and the Indians has prevented my going down the river; as all the gentlemen who went down are returned, and most of them have lost their baggage, as I wrote more particular in my other letter. I will refer you to my brother's letter for the news. I got my canoes and all my provisions ready, and should have set off in two or three days but for this eruption, which I believe was as much the white people's fault as the Indians. It has almost ruined all the settlers over the Monongahela, as they run as bad as they did in the year 1756 and 1757, down in Frederick county. There were more than one thousand people crossed the Monongahela in one day. I thought it, therefore, dangerous to go down with so much of your property, and so came to a resolution to send my son down to you to know what I must do with your servants and goods, and how I must act with your

hirelings. As to the goods, I have stored them; and I went to Mr. Simpson as soon as I came up, and offered him some of the carpenters and all the servants; but he refused taking them—the latter, for fear they would run away; he has, however, now agreed to take some of both : the carpenters to do the framing for the mill, and the servants to dig the race. Stephens has agreed to quit, provided the Indians make peace, and you will employ him again. He has all his tools here, and it would be out of his power to get them back again, as he has no means of conveyance. I am afraid I shall be obliged to build a fort until this eruption is over, which I am in hopes will not last long. I trust you will write me full instructions as to what I must do. Mr. Simpson, yesterday, seemed very much scared ; but I cheered him up all I could. He and his laborers seemed to conclude to build a fort, if times grew any worse. I am building a kind of blockhouse myself, and have employed some of your carpenters to help me, which I will settle with you for. I have run you to as little cost as possible for provisions, as our journey is stopped ; but if peace should be made soon, I shall provide more, as I have my canoes ready, unless you order me to the contrary when my son returns. . As you are largely bail for me, and kindly went my security to the sheriff, I have sent you a bill of sale of my land I live on for fear of accidents in war; as you are the last man in the world I should choose to be loser by me. In case I can not go down the river for you, if you should choose to sell the servants, my brother, William Crawford, wants two of them ; but if there is the least chance of going, I am ready and willing to serve you to the best of my ability. I am, etc. Valentine Crawford to Washington. Jacob's Creek, May 7, 1774. Dear Sir:— I am sorry to inform you the Indians have stopped all the gentlemen from going down the river. In the first place, they killed one Murphy, a trader, and wounded another; then robbed their canoes. This alarmed the gentlemen very much; and Major Cresap took a party of men and waylaid some Indians in their canoes, that were going down the river, and shot two of them and scalped them. He also raised a party, took canoes and followed some Indians from Wheeling down to the Little Kanawha; when, coming up with them, he killed three and wounded several. The Indians wounded three of his men, only one of whom is dead; he was shot through, while the other two were but slightly wounded. On Saturday last, about 12 o'clock, one Greathouse, and about twenty men, fell on a party of Indians at the mouth of Yellow creek, and killed ten of them. They brought away one child a prisoner, which is now at my brother William Crawford's. These circumstances have put it out of my power to execute your business. I, therefore, came to a resolution to send my son down to you to let you know of this disagreeable disappointment, and to learn what I must do with your carpenters, servants, and goods. This alarm has caused the people to move from over the Monongahela, off Chartier's and Raccoon [creeks], as fast as ever you saw them in the year 1756 or 1757, down in Frederick county, Virginia. There were more than one thousand people crossed the Monongahela in one day at three ferries that are not one mile apart. Mr. Simpson seems much frightened at this alarm; but I went to him the day after I got home to Jacob's creek, and offered him all the servants and some of the carpenters. As we were obliged to make our own canoes, some of the carpenters I had to retain to work on them. Just as I had got all our canoes and our provisions and everything ready to start, we were stopped by the alarms as above. I have stored all your goods and tools safely; and if the Indians should come to a pause, I am ready to start at the shortest warning. Your servants are all in very good health, and if you should incline selling them, I believe I could sell them for cash out here to different people. My brother, William Crawford, wants two of them, and I would take two myself; or, if this disturbance should be settled, I could push down the river immediately,

and could do a great deal this fall. In the meantime, your men might build some houses at your Bottom or at the Great Meadows; or, as I mentioned, the carpenters would be willing to be discharged, if you would be willing to employ them again as soon as this difficulty is over. Pray give me full particulars how to act in this troublesome affair. I am, etc. Valentine Crawford Letters from William Crawford May 8, 1774 To Washington. May 8, 1774. Sir:— Inclosed you have the drafts of the Round Bottom and your Chartier's land, finished agreeable to Mr. Lewis's direction. I should have sent them from Stanton, but Mr. Lewis had set out for Cheat river before I got there, and I wanted him to see the returns before I sent them to you. I was still disappointed, as before I could return back again Mr. Lewis started for home, and I understand he will be in "Williamsburgh soon. If the returns do not answer, you can have them changed. If you should not choose to enter those names in the return now made for the Round Bottom, I have sent you a blank to fill up, which you may do yourself. I suppose by this time various reports have reached you. I have given myself some trouble to acquaint myself with the truth of matters; but there are some doubts remaining as to certain facts; however, I will give you the best account I can. The surveyors that went down the Kanawha as report goes, were stopped by the Shawanese Indians, upon which some of the white people attacked some Indians and killed several, took thirty horse-loads of skins near the mouth of Scioto; on which news, and expecting an Indian war, Mr. Cresap and some other people fell on some other Indians at the mouth of Pipe creek, killed three, and scalped them. Daniel Greathouse and some others fell on some at the mouth of Yellow creek and killed and scalped ten, and took one child about two months old, which is now at my house. I have taken the child from a woman that it had been given to. Our inhabitants are much alarmed, many hundreds having gone over the mountain, and the whole country evacuated as far as the Monongahela; and many on this side of the river are gone over the mountain. In short, a war is every moment expected. We have a council now with the Indians. What will be the event I do not know. I am now setting out for Fort Pitt at the head of one hundred men. Many others are to meet me there and at Wheeling, where we shall wait the motions of the Indians, and shall act accordingly. [8] We are in great want of some proper person to direct us, who may have command,—Mr. Connolly, who now commands, having incurred the displeasure of the people. He is unable to take command for two reasons : one is, the contradiction between us and the Pennsylvanians ; and the other that he carries matters too much in a military way, and is not able to go through with it. I have some hopes that we may still have matters settled with the Indians upon a method properly adopted for that purpose. It seems that they say they have not been paid anything for their land—I mean the Shawanese and Delawares. The Six Nations say they have no right to any of the money, the land not being their property. I do not mean to say anything against Mr. Connolly's conduct, only he can not carry things on as he could wish, as he is not well acquainted with the nature of the people he has to deal with. Fair means would do better, and he could get anything he wanted more readily. In case of a war, much dependence from this place lies on you, Sir, as being well acquainted with our circumstances. Should matters be settled with the Indians soon, I suppose you will proceed on with the improvement of your lands; if not, you will discharge your people, and of course your servants will be sold. In that case, I should be glad to take two of them, if you are willing. In a few days you will be better advised, and then you will be more able to determine on matters. I am, &c. William Crawford Richard Butler deposition August 1774 Richard Butler, in a deposition sworn before Arthur St. Clair about the several killings of Indians by white men, including those at Yellow Creek, Aug.

23, 1774 "These facts I think was sufficient to bring on a war with a christian instead of a savage people, and I do declare it was my opinion that the Shawanese did not intend a war this season, let their future intentions be what they might; and I do likewise declare that I am afraid from the proceedings of the chief of the white people in this part of the country that they will bring on a general war, as there is so little pains taken to restrain the common people whose prejudice leads them to greater lengths than ought to be shown by civilized people, and their superiors take too little if any pains, and I do think are much to blame themselves in the whole affair." (Newton, 1879, p 69) Virginia's Colonial Soldiers Captain Michael Cresap Sr's roll, p 142 Captain Michael Cresap Jr's roll, p 142 Daniel Greathouse, Sergeant Captain George Roger Clarke's roll, p 146 George Cox, Sargent Captain John Wilson's roll, p 145 Benjamin Tomlinson, Lieutenant John Mahon, spy Joshua Baker, private Jacob Greathouse, private Joseph Tomlinson, private Samuel Tomlinson, private Captain George McCullough's roll, p 147 John Biggs, private Major John Connolly's roll, p 148 William Grills, private Lieutenant John Hinkston's roll, p John Martin, private Lieutenant Sigismund Stribling's roll, p 141 Joseph Smith, private Colonel George Washington's 1757 roll, p 113 William or Wm Fitzgerald 5 who plundered the Indians but took no part in the war they started: Jonathan Greathouse Edward King Rafe Mahon Michael Myers John Sappington Thomas Jefferson's Notes on the State of Virginia, 1785 in Query Vi, excerpt on Native Americans The Indian of North America being more within our reach, I can speak of him somewhat from my own knowledge, but more from the information of others better acquainted with him, and on whose truth and judgment I can rely. From these sources I am able to say, in contradiction to this representation, that he is neither more defective in ardor, nor more impotent with his female, than the white reduced to the same diet and exercise: that he is brave, when an enterprize depends on bravery; education with him making the point of honor consist in the destruction of an enemy by stratagem, and in the preservation of his own person free from injury; or perhaps this is nature; while it is education which teaches us to honor force more than finesse: that he will defend himself against an host of enemies, always chusing to be killed, rather than to surrender, though it be to the whites, who he knows will treat him well: that in other situations also he meets death with more deliberation, and endures tortures with a firmness unknown almost to religious enthusiasm with us; that he is affectionate to his children, careful of them, and indulgent in the extreme: that his affections comprehend his other connections, weakening, as with us, from circle to circle, as they recede from the center: that his friendships are strong and faithful to the uttermost extremity: that his sensibility is keen, even the warriors weeping most bitterly on the loss of their children, though in general they endeavour to appear superior to human events; that his vivacity and activity of mind is equal to ours in the same situation; hence his eagerness for hunting, and for games of chance. The women are submitted to unjust drudgery. This I believe is the case with every barbarous people. With such, force is law. The stronger \*\*\* therefore imposes on the weaker. It is civilization alone which replaces women in the enjoyment of their natural equality. That first teaches us to subdue the selfish passions, and to respect those rights in others which we value in ourselves. Were we in equal barbarism, our females would be equal drudges. The man with them is less strong than with us, but their woman stronger than ours; and both for the same obvious reason; because our man and their woman is habituated to labour, and formed by it. With both races the \*\*\* which is indulged with ease is least athletic. An Indian man is small in the hand and wrist for the same reason for which a sailor is large and strong in the arms and shoulders, and a porter in the legs and thighs.

They raise fewer children than we do. The causes of this are to be found, not in a difference of nature, but of circumstance. The women very frequently attending the men in their parties of war and of hunting, child-bearing becomes extremely inconvenient to them. It is said, therefore, that they have learnt the practice of procuring abortion by the use of some vegetable; and that it even extends to prevent conception for a considerable time after. During these parties they are exposed to numerous hazards, to excessive exertions, to the greatest extremities of hunger. Even at their homes the nation depends for food, through a certain part of every year, on the gleanings of the forest: that is, they experience a famine once in every year. With all animals, if the female be badly fed, or not fed at all, her young perish: and if both male and female be reduced to like want, generation becomes less active, less productive. To the obstacles then of want and hazard, which nature has opposed to the multiplication of wild animals, for the purpose of restraining their numbers within certain bounds, those of labour and of voluntary abortion are added with the Indian. No wonder, then, if they multiply less than we do. Where food is regularly supplied, a single farm will shew more of cattle, than a whole country of forests can of buffaloes. The same Indian women, when married to white traders, who feed them and their children plentifully and regularly, who exempt them from excessive 40 drudgery, who keep them stationary and unexposed to accident, produce and raise as many children as the white women. Instances are known, under these circumstances, of their rearing a dozen children. An inhuman practice once prevailed in this country of making slaves of the Indians. It is a fact well known with us, that the Indian women so enslaved produced and raised as numerous families as either the whites or blacks among whom they lived. It has been said, that Indians have less hair than the whites, except on the head. But this is a fact of which fair proof can scarcely be had. With them it is disgraceful to be hairy on the body. They say it likens them to hogs. They therefore pluck the hair as fast as it appears. But the traders who marry their women, and prevail on them to discontinue this practice, say, that nature is the same with them as with the whites. Nor, if the fact be true, is the consequence necessary which has been drawn from it. Negroes have notoriously less hair than the whites; yet they are more ardent. But if cold and moisture be the agents of nature for diminishing the races of animals, how comes she all at once to suspend their operation as to the physical man of the new world, whom the Count acknowledges to be and to let loose their influence on his moral faculties? How has this combination of the elements and other physical causes, so contrary to the enlargement of animal nature in this new world, these obstacles to the development and formation of great germs been arrested and suspended, so as to permit the human body to acquire its just dimensions, and by what inconceivable process has their action been directed on his mind alone? To judge of the truth of this, to form a just estimate of their genius and mental powers, more facts are wanting, and great allowance to be made for those circumstances of their situation which call for a display of particular talents only. This done, we shall probably find that they are formed in mind as well as body, on the same module with the '*Homo sapiens Europæus*.' The principles of their society forbidding all compulsion, they are to be led to duty and to enterprise by personal influence and persuasion. Hence eloquence in council, bravery and address in war, become the foundations of all consequence with them. To these acquirements all their faculties are directed. Of their bravery and address in war we have multiplied proofs, because we have been the subjects on which they were exercised. Of their eminence in oratory we have fewer examples, because it is displayed chiefly in their own councils. Some, however, we have, of very superior lustre. I may

challenge the whole orations of Demosthenes and Cicero, and of any more eminent orator, if Europe has furnished any more eminent, to produce a single passage, superior to the speech of Logan, a Mingo chief, to Lord Dunmore, when governor of this state. And as a testimony of their talents in this line, I beg leave to introduce it, first stating the incidents necessary for understanding it. In the spring of the year 1774, a robbery and murder were committed on an inhabitant of the frontier of Virginia, by two Indians of the Shawanee tribe. The neighbouring (sic) whites, according to their custom, undertook to punish this outrage in a summary way. Col. Cresap, a man infamous for the many murders he had committed on those much injured people, collected a party and proceeded down the Kanhaway in quest of vengeance. Unfortunately a canoe of women and children, with one man only, was seen coming from the opposite shore unarmed, and unsuspecting an hostile attack from the whites. Cresap and his party concealed themselves on the bank of the river, and the moment the canoe reached the shore, singled out their objects, and at one fire, killed every person in it. This happened to be the family of Logan, who had long been distinguished as a friend of the whites. This unworthy return provoked his vengeance. He accordingly signalized himself in the war which ensued. In the autumn of the same year a decisive battle was fought at the mouth of the Great Kanhaway, between the collected forces of the Shawanese, Mingoes and Delawares, and a detachment of the Virginia militia. The Indians were defeated and sued for peace. Logan, however, disdained to be seen among the suppliants. But lest the sincerity of a treaty should be distrusted, from which so distinguished a chief absented himself, he sent, by a messenger, the following speech, to be delivered to Lord Dunmore. "I appeal to any white man to say, if ever he entered Logan's cabin hungry, and he gave him not meat; if ever he came cold and naked, and he cloathed him not. During the course of the last long and bloody war Logan remained idle in his cabin an advocate for peace. Such was my love for the whites, that my countrymen pointed as they passed, and said, 'Logan is the friend of white men.' I had even thought to have lived with you, but for the injuries of one man. Colonel Cresap, the last spring, in cold blood, and unprovoked, murdered all the relations of Logan, not sparing even my women and children. There runs not a drop of my blood in the veins of any living creature. This called on me for revenge. I have sought it: I have killed many: I have fully glutted my vengeance: for my country I rejoice at the beams of peace. But do not harbour a thought that mine is the joy of fear. Logan never felt fear. He will not turn on his heel to save his life. Who is there to mourn for Logan?—Not one." Before we condemn the Indians of this continent as wanting genius, we must consider that letters have not yet been introduced among them. Were we to compare them in their present state with the Europeans North of the Alps, when the Roman arms and arts first crossed those mountains, the comparison would be unequal, because, at that time, those parts of Europe were swarming with numbers; because numbers produce emulation and multiply the chances of improvement, and one improvement begets another. Yet I may safely ask, how many good poets, how many able mathematicians, how many great inventors in arts or sciences, had Europe, North of the Alps, then produced? And it was sixteen centuries after this before a Newton could be formed. I do not mean to deny that there are varieties in the race of man, distinguished by their powers both of body and mind. I believe there are, as I see to be the case in the races of other animals. I only mean to suggest a doubt, whether the bulk and faculties of animals depend on the side of the Atlantic on which their food happens to grow, or which furnishes the elements of which they are compounded? Whether nature has enlisted herself as a Cis- or Trans-Atlantic partisan? I am

induced to suspect there has been more eloquence than sound reasoning displayed in support of this theory; that it is one of those cases where the judgment has been seduced by a glowing pen; and whilst I render every tribute of honor and esteem to the celebrated Zoologist, who has added, and is still adding, so many precious things to the treasures of science, I must doubt whether in this instance he has not cherished error also by lending her for a moment his vivid imagination and bewitching language. So far the Count de Buffon has carried this new theory of the tendency of nature to belittle her productions on this side the Atlantic. Luther Martin's letters to Mr. Fennel, the orator, and to the Porcupine's Gazette newspaper, 1797 To the editor of Porcupine's Gazette Baltimore-Town, March 30th, 1797 Sir, The enclosed copy of a letter be so good as to insert in your paper: though addressed and sent to Mr. Fennel, the propriety of inserting it in the Gazette will be evident, I doubt not, to every reader. Your humble servant, Luther Martin (Copy) Mr. Fennel, By the late Philadelphia papers I observe, Sir, that in your "readings and recitations, moral, critical, and entertaining," among your other selections you have introduced "The Story of Logan the Mingo Chief." In doing this, I am satisfied you were not actuated by a desire to wound the feelings of a respectable family in the United States, or by a wish to give a greater publicity to a groundless calumny. You found the story and speech in Jefferson's Notes on Virginia; you found it related with such an air of authenticity, that is connot be surprising that you should not suspect it to be a fiction. But, Sir, philosophers are pretty much the same, from old Shandy, who in support of a system sacrificed his aunt Dinah, to De Warville and Condorcet, who for the same purpose would have sacrificed a world. Mr. Jefferson is a philosopher; – he too had his hypothesis to establish, or, what is much the same thing, he had the hypothesis of Buffon to overthrow. When we see him employed in weighing the rats and the mice of the two worlds, to prove that those of the new are not exceeded by those of the old – when, to establish tha the body of the American savage is not inferior in form or in vigour to the body of an European, we find him examining minutely every part of their frame, and hear him declare that, though the wrist and the hand of the former are smaller, that those parts of the latter, yet "ses organes de la generation ne font plus foibles ou plus \*\*\*\*\* – and that he hath not only as many hairs on his body, but that the same parts which are productive of hair in the one, if left to themselves, are equally productive of hair in the other: – when we see him so zealous to establish an ewuality in such trifles, and to prove the body of his savage to be formed on the same modula with the "Homo Sapiens Europeaus," how much more solicitous may we suppose him to have been to prove that the midn of his savage was also formde on the same modula? Than the man whom he has calumniated, he could scarcely have selected a finer example to establish the position that the human race in the western world are not belittled in body or mind; but that unfortunately that man was not born in America. For the want of better materials he was obligated to make use of such as came to his hands; and we may reasonably conclude, whatever story or speech he could pick up calculated to destroy to destroy the hypothesis of Buffon, or to establish his own, especially in so important a point, instead of being scrutinized minutely, would be welcomed with avidity. – And great and respectable as the authority of Mr. Jefferson may be thought, or may be in reality, I have no hesitation to declare, that from an examination of the subject, I am convinced the charges exhibited by him against Colonel Cresap is not founded in truth; and also, that no such specimen of Indian oratory was ever exhibited. That some of Logan's family were killed by the Americans I doubt not; whether they fell the victims of justice, or mistake, or of cruelty, rests with those by whom they fell. But in their death Colonel Cresap, or

any of his family, had no share. And in support of this assertion I am ready to enter the lists with the author of the Notes on Virginia. No man, who really knew the late Colonel Cresap, could have believed the tale. He was too brave to be perfidious or cruel. He was a man of undaunted resolution; a man of whom it ight be said,with us much propriety as I believe was ever said of man, "that he knew not fear." Courage, hospitality, candour (sic), and sincerity were the prominent features of his character. These also are the leading traits in his descendants. Immediately after the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle he established himself at Old Town, on the north branch of the Potomac, only fifteen miles this side of Fort Cumberland, and one hundred and forty miles to the sestward of Baltimore-Town. What must have been the situation of himself and his family on so distant a frontier, during the war which terminated in the year seventeen huynred and sixty-three, and during the troubles which preceded that war, may be easily conceived by those who have any knowledge whatever at that time of the settlements of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. After the defeat of General Braddock, a company saised and commanded by his eldest son, Thomas Cresap, and in a great measure supplied with arms and other necessaries by the Colonel himself, attacked the invading savages, and drove them over the mountains; but this victory was embittered by the loss of their gallant leader; he and one of the Indian Chiefs fell by wounds mutually inflicted, and expired together. Soon after this event, colonel Cresap, and his then eldest son, raised another company, at their own expense,crossed the mountains, and defeated the Indians with considerable slaughter. After the inhabitants of that part of the country where he resided had generally fled from their houses, and retired to the neighborhood of Conococheaque, he remained with his family at his house near Old Town, which he had surrounded with a stockade for twenty months or upwards. When at last he was induced to withdraw from so dangerous a situation, removed with his books and appers, accompanied by a few of the former inhabitants, who had been in his neighborhood collecting their cattle, and were dirving them down the country, he was attacked by the Indians who lay in ambush for him, and four of his party were killed on the spot; the Indians were, however, repulsed with considerable loss, and he had the good fortune to escape unhurt. That Colonel Cresap and his family were frequently and actively engaged in the conflicts which took place between us and the Indians, is well known. That some of the Indians have fallen by their hands, is not denied; but those were not in the number of our friends. To the Indians who were attached to our cause his doors were ever open. At his house was their frequent rendezvous; there often they met messengers from then governors of Virginia and Maryland; there they were often furnished with arms, with ammunition, and with provisions, and not unfrequently out of his own stores, and at his own expense. It was to those savages, who were employed by the French nation (before it became our very good friend and ally) to revenge their frontiers and butcher the peaceful inhabitant, that he and his family were terrible. And to those they were terrible, though not "as the fires of heaven." But, perhaps, it was from the facts which I have here stated that Mr. Jefferson considers himself authorized to say "Colonel Cresap was infamous for the many murders he had committed on the much-injured Indians." – And left some future philosopher, in some future Notes on Virginia, might be tempted to call him also "infamous for his many murders of the much-injured" Britons, may, perhaps, have been his motive for flying with such precipitation from the seat of his government, not many years since, when the British army invaded that State. As to Logan; – lightly would I tread over the grave even of the untutored savage; but justice obliges me to say, I am well assured that the Logan of the wilderness – the real Logan of nature – had but

little, if any more likeness to the fictitious Logan of Jefferson's Notes, than the brutified Caffree of Africa to the enlightened philosopher of Monticello. In that wilderness Mr. Jefferson culled this fair flower of aboriginal eloquence; whether he has preserved it in the same state in which he found it, or, by transplanting it into a more genial soil, and exposing it to a kinder sun, he has given it the embellishments of cultivation, I know not. There are many philosophers so very fond of representing savage nature in the soft amiable and most exalted point of view, that we feel ourselves less surprised when we see them become savages themselves. To some one of this class of philosophers, I doubt not it woes its existence. Yet, but for Jefferson, "it would have breathed its poisons in the desert air." — Whatever was the soil in which it first sprung up, it soon would have withered and died unnoticed or forgotten, had not he preserved it in his collection. From thence the authors of the Annual Register have given their readers a drawing as large as nature. The Rev. Mr. Morse in his Geography, and Mr. Lendrum in his History of the American Revolution, have followed their example; and you, Sir, are now increasing its celebrity, with all its colouring (sic) retouched and heightened by the flowing pencil of a master. Do you ask me how I am interested in this subject? I answer, the daughter of Michael Cresap was the mother of my children. I am influenced also by another motive not less powerful. My much lamented and worthy relation, who died on the expedition against the western insurgents, bequeathed to me as a sacred trust, that, had he lived, he intended to have performed himself, to rescue his family from this unmerited opprobrium. Do you ask me, why have I so long neglected this duty? I answer, because for a long time past every feeling of my mind has been too much engrossed by the solicitude, though an unavailing solicitude, of preserving the valuable life of one of that family, to attend to any objects which could bear a postponement. The shock is now past. I begin to recall my scattered thought to other subjects; and finding the story of Logan in the catalogue of your readings, it instantly brought me to the recollection of a duty, which I have hastened thus far to fulfil. And now, Sir, to conclude: I arrogate to myself no authority of prohibiting the story and speech of Logan from being continued in your readings and recitations; this I submit to your sentiments of propriety and justice; but from those sentiments I certainly have a right to expect, that, on its conclusion, you will inform your hearers, it is at best but the ingenious fiction of some philosophic brain; and when hereafter you oblige an audience with that story and speech, with the poison you will dispense the antiodote, and by reading to them this letter, also oblige your very humble servant, Luther Martin. March 29, 1797 To Mr. James Fennel Thomas Jefferson, Relative to the murder of Logan's family , 1800 Thomas Jefferson, An Appendix to the Notes on Virginia relative to the murder of Logan's family, (a pamphlet of abt 50 pages), Samuel H. Smith, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1800

\*\*\*\*\* This pamphlet was included as appendix4 in subsequent printings of Notes on the State of Virginia. It begins with a letter addressed to Governor Henry of Maryland dated, "Philadelphia, December 31st, 1797." Jefferson presents the evidence on which he charged Captain Cresap and his party with the murder in 1774 of peaceable Indians, including many women and children. H[enry] A[ugustine] WASHINGTON, ed.,: The Writings of Thomas Jefferson: Being his Autobiography, Correspondence, Reports, Messages, Addresses, and Other Writings, Official and Private, Vol II, Appendix 5, Taylor & Maury publishers, Washington, D.C. 1853 \*\*\*\*\* from the Electronic Text Center, University of Virginia Library. \*\*\*\*\* to Governor Henry of Maryland Philadelphia, Dec.

31st, 1797. Dear Sir, — Mr. Tazewell has communicated to me the enquiries you have been so kind as to make relative to a passage in the Notes on Virginia, which has lately excited some newspaper publications. I feel, with great sensibility, the interest you take in this business, and with pleasure, go into explanations with one whose objects I know to be truth and justice alone. Had Mr. Martin thought proper to suggest to me that doubts might be entertained of the transaction respecting Logan, as stated in the Notes on Virginia, and to enquire on what grounds the statement was founded, I should have felt myself obliged by the enquiry to have informed him candidly of the grounds, and cordially have co-operated in every means of investigating the fact, and correcting whatsoever in it should be found to have been erroneous. But he chose to step at once into the newspapers, and in his publications there, and the letters he wrote to me, adopted a style which forbade the respect of an answer. Sensible, however, that no act of his could absolve me from the justice due to others, as soon as I found that the story of Logan could be doubted, I determined to enquire into it as accurately as the testimony remaining, after a lapse of twenty odd years, would permit; and that the result should be made known, either in the first new edition which should be printed of the Notes on Virginia, or by publishing an Appendix. I thought that so far as that work had contributed to impeach the memory of Cresap, by handing on an erroneous charge, it was proper it should be made the vehicle of retribution. Not that I was at all the author of the injury. I had only concurred with thousands and thousands of others in believing a transaction on authority which merited respect. For the story of Logan is only repeated in the Notes on Virginia, precisely as it had been current for more than a dozen years before they were published. When Lord Dunmore returned from the expedition against the Indians, in 1774, he and his officers brought the speech of Logan, and related the circumstances connected with it. These were so affecting, and the speech itself so fine a morsel of eloquence, that it became the theme of every conversation, in Williamsburg particularly, and generally, indeed, wheresoever any of the officers resided or resorted. I learned it in Williamsburg; I believe at Lord Dunmore's; and I find in my pocketbook of that year (1774) an entry of the narrative, as taken from the mouth of some person, whose name, however, is not noted nor recollects, precisely in the words stated in the Notes on Virginia. The speech was published in the Virginia Gazette of that time (I have it myself in the volume of Gazettes of that year) and though in a style by no means elegant, yet it was so admired, that it flew through all the public papers of the continent, and through the magazines and other periodical publications of Great Britain; and those who were boys at that day will now attest, that the speech of Logan used to be given them as a school exercise for repetition. It was not till about thirteen or fourteen years after the newspaper publications, that the Notes on Virginia were published in America. Combatting in these the contumelious theory of certain European writers, whose celebrity gave currency and weight to their opinions, that our country, from the combined effects of soil and climate, degenerated animal nature, in the general, and particularly the moral faculties of man, I considered the speech of Logan as an apt proof of the contrary, and used it as such; and I copied, verbatim, the narrative I had taken down in 1774, and the speech as it had been given us in a better translation by Lord Dunmore. I knew nothing of the Cresaps, and could not possibly have a motive to do them an injury with design. I repeated what thousands had done before, on as good authority as we have for most of the facts we learn through life, and such as, to this moment, I have seen no reason to doubt. That any body questioned it, was never suspected by me, till I saw the letter of Mr. Martin in the Baltimore paper. I endeavored then to recollect who among

my contemporaries, of the same circle of society, and consequently of the same recollections might still be alive. Three and twenty years of death and dispersion had left very few. I remembered, however, that Gen. Gibson was still living, and knew that he had been the translator of the speech. I wrote to him immediately. He, in answer, declares to me, that he was the very person sent by Lord Dunmore to the Indian town; that, after he had delivered his message there, Logan took him out to a neighboring wood; sat down with him, and rehearsing, with tears, the catastrophe of his family, gave him that speech for Lord Dunmore; that he carried it to Lord Dunmore; translated it for him; has turned to it in the Encyclopedia, as taken from the Notes on Virginia, and finds that it was his translation I had used, with only two or three verbal variations of no importance. These, I suppose, had arisen in the course of successive copies. I cite Gen. Gibson's letter by memory, not having it with me; but I am sure I cite it substantially right. It establishes unquestionably, that the speech of Logan is genuine; and that being established, it is Logan himself who is author of all the important facts. "Col. Cresap," says he, "in cold blood and unprovoked, murdered all the relations of Logan, not sparing even my women and children. There runs not a drop of my blood in the veins of any living creature." The person and the fact, in all its material circumstances, are here given by Logan himself. General Gibson, indeed, says, that the title was mistaken; that Cresap was a captain, and not a colonel. This was Logan's mistake. He also observes, that it was on the Ohio, and not on the Kanhaway itself, that his family was killed. This is an error which has crept into the traditional account; but surely of little moment in the moral view of the subject. The material question is : was Logan's family murdered, and by whom? That it was murdered has not, I believe, been denied; that it was by one of the Cresaps, Logan affirms. This is a question which concerns the memories of Logan and Cresap; to the issue of which I am as indifferent as if I had never heard the name of either. I have begun and shall continue to enquire into the evidence additional to Logan's, on which the fact was founded. Little, indeed, can now be heard of, and that little dispersed and distant. If it shall appear on enquiry, that Logan has been wrong in charging Cresap with the murder of his family, I will do justice to the memory of Cresap, as far as I have contributed to the injury, by believing and repeating what others had believed and repeated before me. If, on the other hand, I find that Logan was right, in his charge, I will vindicate, as far as my suffrage may go, the truth of a Chief, whose talents and misfortunes have attached to him the respect and commiseration of the world. I have gone, my dear Sir, into this lengthy detail to satisfy a mind, in the candor and rectitude of which I have the highest confidence. So far as you may incline to use the communication for rectifying the judgments of those who are willing to see things truly as they are, you are free to use it. But I pray that no confidence which you may repose in any one, may induce you to let it go out of your hands, so as to get into a newspaper. Against a contest in that field I am entirely decided. I feel extraordinary gratification, indeed, in addressing this letter to you, with whom shades of difference in political sentiment have not prevented the interchange of good opinion, nor cut off the friendly offices of society and good correspondence. This political tolerance is the more valued by me, who considers social harmony as the first of human felicities, and the happiest moments, those which are given to the effusions of the heart. Accept them sincerely, I pray you, from one who has the honor to be, with sentiments of high respect and attachment, Dear Sir, Your most obedient And most humble servant, THOMAS JEFFERSON. \_\_\_\_\_ Introduction to appendix The Notes on Virginia were written, in Virginia, in the years 1781 and 1782, in answer to certain queries proposed to me by Monsieur de Marbois, then secretary of the French legation in the

United States; and a manuscript copy was delivered to him. A few copies, with some additions, were afterwards, in 1784, printed in Paris, and given to particular friends. In speaking of the animals of America, the theory of M. de Buffon, the AbbÈ Raynal, and others presented itself to consideration. They have supposed there is something in the soil, climate, and other circumstances of America, which occasions animal nature to degenerate, not excepting even the man, native or adoptive, physical or moral. This theory, so unfounded and degrading to one-third of the globe, was called to the bar of fact and reason. Among other proofs adduced in contradiction of this hypothesis, the speech of Logan, an Indian chief, delivered to Lord Dunmore in 1774, was produced, as a specimen of the talents of the aborigines of this country, and particularly of their eloquence; and it was believed that Europe had never produced anything superior to this morsel of eloquence. In order to make it intelligible to the reader, the transaction, on which it was founded, was stated, as it had been generally related in America at the time, and as I had heard it myself, in the circle of Lord Dunmore, and the officers who accompanied him; and the speech itself was given as it had, ten years before the printing of that book, circulated in the newspapers through all the then colonies, through the magazines of Great Britain, and periodical publications of Europe. For three and twenty years it passed uncontradicted; nor was it ever suspected that it even admitted contradiction. In 1797, however, for the first time, not only the whole transaction respecting Logan was affirmed in the public papers to be false, but the speech itself suggested to be a forgery, and even a forgery of mine, to aid me in proving that the man of America was equal in body and in mind, to the man of Europe. But wherefore the forgery; whether Logan's or mine, it would still have been American. I should indeed consult my own fame if the suggestion, that this speech is mine, were suffered to be believed. He would have just right to be proud who could with truth claim that composition. But it is none of mine; and I yield it to whom it is due. On seeing then that this transaction was brought into question, I thought it my duty to make particular inquiry into its foundation. It was the more my duty, as it was alleged that, by ascribing to an individual therein named, a participation in the murder of Logan's family, I had done an injury to his character, which it had not deserved. I had no knowledge personally of that individual. I had no reason to aim an injury at him. I only repeated what I had heard from others, and what thousands had heard and believed as well as myself; and which no one indeed, till then, had been known to question.

Twenty-three years had now elapsed, since the transaction took place. Many of those acquainted with it were dead, and the living dispersed to very distant parts of the earth. Few of them were even known to me. To those however of whom I knew, I made application by letter; and some others, moved by a regard for truth and justice, were kind enough to come forward, of themselves, with their testimony. These fragments of evidence, the small remains of a mighty mass which time has consumed, are here presented to the public, in the form of letters, certificates, or affidavits, as they came to me. I have rejected none of these forms, nor required other solemnities from those whose motives and characters were pledges of their truth. Historical transactions are deemed to be well vouched by the simple declarations of those who have borne a part in them; and especially of persons having no interest to falsify or disfigure them. The world will now see whether they, or I, have injured Cresap, by believing Logan's charge against him; and they will decide between Logan and Cresap, whether Cresap was innocent, and Logan a calumniator? In order that the reader may have a clear conception of the transactions, to which the different parts of the following declarations refer, he must take notice that they establish four different murders. 1. Of two Indians, a little above Wheeling. 2. Of

others at Grave Creek, among whom were some of Logan's relations. 3. The massacre at Baker's bottom, on the Ohio, opposite the mouth of Yellow Creek, where were other relations of Logan. 4. Of those killed at the same place, coming in canoes to the relief of their friends. I place the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, against certain paragraphs of the evidence, to indicate the particular murder to which the paragraph relates, and present also a small sketch or map of the principal scenes of these butcheries, for their more ready comprehension.

Extract of a letter from the Honorable Judge Innes to Thomas Jefferson... Extract of a letter from the Honorable Judge Innes, of Frankfort in Kentucky, to Thomas Jefferson, dated Kentucky, near Frankfort, March 24, 1799. I recollect to have seen Logan's speech in 1775, in one of the public prints. That Logan conceived Cresap to be the author of the murder at Yellow Creek, it is in my power to give, perhaps, a more particular information, than any other person you can apply to. In 1774 I lived in Fincastle county, now divided into Washington, Montgomery and part of Wythe. Being intimate in Col. Preston's family, I happened in July to be at his house, when an express was sent to him as County Lieut. requesting a guard of the militia to be ordered out for the protection of the inhabitants residing low down on the north fork of Holston river. The express brought with him a War Club, and a note which was left tied to it at the house of one Robertson, whose family were cut off by the Indians, and gave rise for the application to Col. Preston, of which the following is a copy, then taken by me in my memorandum book.  
"Captain Cresap, What did you kill my people on Yellow Creek for? The white people killed my kin at Conestoga, a great while ago; and I thought nothing of that. But you killed my kin again, on Yellow Creek and took my Cousin Prisoner. Then I thought I must kill too; and I have been three times to war since; but the Indians are not angry; only myself. July 21st, 1774, CAPTAIN JOHN LOGAN. With great respect, I am, Dear Sir, your most obedient servant, HARRY INNES Jefferson letter to John Gibson Presented by Gen. Gifson's daughter to WM. Robinson. (Darlington, 1893, p 206) Philadelphia, Dec. 31, 1797. Sir: I took the liberty the last summer of writing to you from hence, making some enquiries on the ubject of Logan's Speech, and the murder of his family, and you were kind enough in your answer among other things, to correct the title of Cresap who is said to have headed the party, by observing that he was a Capt and not a Col. I trouble you with a second letter asking if you could explain to me how Logan came to call him Col. If you have favored me with an answer to this it has [206] miscarried, I therefore trouble you again on the subject, and as the transaction must have been familiar to you, I will ask the favor of you to give me the names and residence, of any persons now living who you think were of Cresap's party, or who can prove his participation in this transaction either by direct evidence or from circumstances, or who can otherwise throw light on the fact. A Mr. Martin (Luther Martin, Attorney-General of Maryland, married a daughter Captain Cresap.) of Baltimore has questioned the whole transaction, suggesting Logan's Speech to be not genuine, and denying that either Col or Capt Cresap had any hand in the murder of his family. I do not intend to enter into any newspaper contest with Mr Martin; but in the first republication of the notes on Virginia to correct the Statement where it is wrong and support it where it is right. My distance from the place where witnesses of the transactions reside is so great, that it will be a lengthy and imperfect operation in my hands. Any aid you can give me in it will be most thankfully received. I avail myself with great pleasure of every occasion of recalling myself to your recollection, and of assuring you of the sentiments of esteem and attachment with which I am dear Sir, your most obedt and humble Servt TH. JEFFERSON. Affidavit of John Gibson ALLEGHANY COUNTY, SS. STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA. Before me, the subscriber, a

justice of the peace in and for said county, personally appeared John Gibson, Esquire, an associate Judge of same county, who being duly sworn, deposeth and saith that he traded with the Shawanese and other tribes of Indians then settled on the Siota in the year 1773, and in the beginning of the year 1774, and that in the month of April of the same year, he left the same Indian towns, and came to this place, in order to procure some goods and provisions, that he remained here only a few days, and then set out in company with a certain Alexander Blaine and M. Elliot by water to return to the towns on the Siota, and that one evening as they were drifting in their canoes near the Long Reach on the Ohio, they were hailed by a number of white men on the South West shore, who requested them to put ashore, as they had disagreeable news to inform them of; that we then landed on shore; and found amongst the party, a Major Angus M'Donald from West Chester, a Doctor Woods from same place, and a party as they said of one hundred and fifty men. We then asked the news. They informed us that some of the party who had been: taken up, and improving lands near the Big Kanawha river, had seen another party of white men, who informed them that they and some others had fell in with a party of Shawanese, who had been hunting on the South West side of the Ohio, that they had killed the whole of the Indian party; and that the others had gone across the country to Cheat river with the horses and plunder, the consequence of which they apprehended would be an Indian war, and that they were flying away. On making inquiry of them when this murder should have happened, we found that it must have been some considerable time before we left the Indian towns, and that there was not the smallest foundation for the report, as there was not a single man of the Shawanese, but what returned from hunting long before this should have happened. We then informed them that if they would agree to remain at the place we then were, one of us would go to Hock Hocking river with some of their party, where we should find some of our people making canoes, and that if we did not find them there, we might conclude that everything was not right. Doctor Wood and another person then proposed going with me; the rest of the party seemed to agree, but said they would send and consult Captain Cresap who was about two miles from that place. They sent off for him, and during the greatest part of the night they behaved in the most disorderly manner, threatening to kill us, and saying the damned traders were worse than the Indians and ought to be killed. In the morning Captain Michael Cresap came to the camp. I then gave him the information as above related. They then met in council, and after an hour or more Captain Cresap returned to me, and informed that he could not prevail on them to adopt the proposal I had made to them, that as he had a great regard for Captain R. Callender, a brother-in-law of mine, with whom I was connected in trade, he advised me by no means to think of proceeding any further, as he was convinced the present party would fall on and kill every Indian they met on the river, that for his part he should not continue with them, but go right across the country to Red-Stone to avoid the consequences. That we then proceeded to Hocking and went up the same to the canoe place where we found our people at work, and after some days we proceeded to the towns on Siota by land. On our arrival there, we heard of the different murders committed by the party on their way up the Ohio. This Deponent further saith that in the year 1774, he accompanied Lord Dunmore on the expedition against the Shawanese and other Indians on the Siota, that on their arrival within fifteen miles of the towns, they were met by a flag, and a white man of the name of Elliot, who informed Lord Dunmore that the Chiefs of the Shawanese had sent to request his Lordship to halt his army and send in some person, who understood their language; that this Deponent, at the request of Lord Dunmore and the whole of the

officers with him, went in; that on his arrival at the towns, Logan, the Indian, came to where the deponent was sitting with the Corn-Stalk, and the other chiefs of the Shawanese and asked him to walk out with him; that they went into a copse of wood, where they sat down, when Logan, after shedding abundance of tears, delivered to him the speech, nearly as related by Mr. Jefferson in his Notes on the State of Virginia; that he the deponent told him that it was not Col. Cresap who had murdered his relations, and that although his son Captain Michael Cresap was with the party who killed a Shawanese chief and other Indians, yet he was not present when his relations were killed at Baker's near the mouth of Yellow Creek on the Ohio; that this Deponent on his return to camp delivered the speech to Lord Dunmore; and that the murders perpetrated as above were considered as ultimately the cause of the war of 1774, commonly called Cresap's war. JOHN GIBSON Sworn and subscribed the 4th April, 1800, at Pittsburg, before me, JER. BARKER. Extract of a letter from Col. Ebenezer Zane Extract of a letter from Col. Ebenezer Zane, to the honorable John Brown, one of the Senators in Congress from Kentucky; dated Wheeling, Feb. 4th, 1800. I was myself, with many others, in the practice of making improvements on lands upon the Ohio, for the purpose of acquiring rights to the same. Being on the Ohio at the mouth of Sandy Creek, in company with many others news circulated that the Indians had robbed some of the Land jobbers. This news induced the people generally 1 to ascend the Ohio. I was among the number. On our arrival at the Wheeling, being informed that there were two Indians with some traders near and above Wheeling, a proposition was made by the then Captain Michael Cresap to waylay and kill the Indians upon the river. This measure I opposed with much violence, alleging that the killing of those Indians might involve the country in a war. But the opposite party prevailed, and proceeded up the Ohio with Captain Cresap at their head. In a short time the party returned, and also the traders, in a canoe; but there were no Indians in the company. I inquired what had become of the Indians and was informed by the traders and Cresap's party that they had fallen overboard. I examined the canoe, and saw much fresh blood and some bullet holes in the canoe. This fully convinced me that the party had killed the two Indians, and thrown them into the river. On the afternoon of the day this action happened, a report prevailed 2 that there was a camp, or party of Indians on the Ohio below and near the Wheeling. In consequence of this information, Captain Cresap with his party, joined by a number of recruits, proceeded immediately down the Ohio for the purpose, as was then generally understood, of destroying the Indians above mentioned. On the succeeding day, Captain Cresap and his party returned to Wheeling, and it was generally reported by the party that they had killed a number of Indians. Of the truth of this report I had no doubt, as one of Cresap's party was badly wounded, and the party had a fresh scalp, and a quantity of property, which they called Indian plunder. At the time of the last-mentioned transaction, it was generally reported that the party of Indians down the Ohio were Logan and his family; but I have reason to believe that this report was unfounded. Within a few days after the transaction above mentioned, a party of Indians were killed at Yellow Creek. But I must do the memory 3 of Captain Cresap the justice to say that I do not believe that he was present at the killing of the Indians at Yellow Creek. But there is not the least doubt in my mind, that the massacre at Yellow Creek was brought on by the two transactions first stated. All the transactions, which I have related happened in the latter end of April 1774; and there can scarcely be a doubt that they were the cause of the war which immediately followed, commonly called Dunmore's War. I am with much esteem, yours, &c., EBENEZER ZANE. Certificate Of William Huston The certificate of William Huston of Washington county, in

the State of Pennsylvania, communicated by David Riddick, Esquire, Prothonotary of Washington county, Pennsylvania; who in the letter enclosing it says "Mr. William Huston is a man of established reputation in point of integrity." I William Huston of Washington county, in the State of Pennsylvania, do hereby certify to whom it may concern, that in the year 1774, I resided at Catfishes camp, on the main path from Wheeling to Red-stone; that Michael Cresap, who resided on or near the Potomac river, on his way up from the river Ohio, at the head of a party of armed men, lay some time at my cabin. I had previously heard the report of Mr. Cresap having killed some Indians, said to be the relations of " Logan" an Indian Chief. In a variety of conversations with several of Cresap's party, they boasted of the deed; and that in the presence of their chief. They acknowledged they had fired first on the Indians. They had with them one man on a litter, who was in the skirmish. I do further certify that, from what I learned from the party themselves, I then formed the opinion, and have not had any reason to change the opinion since, that the killing, on the part of the whites, was what I deem the grossest murder. I further certify that some of 3 the party, who afterwards killed some women and other Indians at baker's bottom, also lay at my cabin, on their march to the interior part of the country; they had with them, a little girl, whose life had been spared by the interference of some more humane than the rest. If necessary I will make affidavit to the above to be true. Certified at Washington, this 18th day of April, Anno Domini, 1798. WILLIAM HUSTON. Certificate of Jacob Newland The certificate of Jacob Newland, of Shelby County, Kentucky, communicated by the Honorable Judge Innes, of Kentucky. In the year 1774, I lived on the waters of Short Creek, a branch of the Ohio, twelve miles above Wheeling. Some time in June or in July of that year, Capt. Michael Cresap raised a party of men, and came out under Col. M'Daniel, of Hampshire County, Virginia, who commanded a detachment against the Wappotomm aka towns on the Muskingum. I met with Capt. Cresap, at Redstone fort, and entered his company. Being very well acquainted with him, we conversed freely; and he, among other conversations, informed me several times of falling in 2 with some Indians on the Ohio some distance below the mouth of yellow Creek, and killed two or three of them; and that this murder 3 was before that of the Indians by Great-house and others, at Yellow Creek. I do not recollect the reason which Capt. Cresap assigned for committing the act. but never understood that the Indians gave any offence. Certified under my hand this 15th day of November, 1799, being an inhabitant of Shelby county, and State of Kentucky. JACOB NEWLAND. Certificate of John Anderson The Certificate of John Anderson, a merchant in Fredericksburg, Virginia; communicated by Mann Page, Esquire, of Mansfield, near Fredericksburg who in the letter accompanying it, says, "Mr. John Anderson has for many years past been settled in Fredericksburg, in the mercantile line. I have known him in prosperous and adverse situations. He has always shown the greatest degree of Equanimity, his honesty and veracity are unimpeachable. These things can be attested by all the respectable part of the town and neighborhood of Fredericksburg." Mr. John Anderson, a merchant in Fredericksburg, says, that in the year 1774, being a trader in the Indian country, he was at Pittsburg to which place he had a cargo brought up the river in a boat navigated by a Delaware Indian and a white man. That on their return down the river, with a cargo belonging to Messrs. Butler, Michael 1 Cresap fired on the boat, and killed the Indian, after which two men of the name of Gatewood, and others of the name of Tumblestone, I who lived on the opposite side of the river from the Indians, 3 with whom they were on the most friendly terms, invited a party of them to come over and drink with him; and that, when the Indians were drunk, they murdered them to the number of six, among whom was Logan's mother.

That five other Indians uneasy at the absence 4 of their friends, came over the river to inquire after them; when they were fired upon, and two were killed, and the others wounded. This was the origin of the war. I certify the above to be true to the best of my recollection . Attest DAVID BLAIR, 30th June, 1798. JOHN ANDERSON. Deposition of James Chambers The Deposition of James Chambers, communicated by David Riddick, Esquire, Prothonotary of Washington county Pennsylvania, who, in the letter enclosing it, shows that he entertains the most perfect confidence in the truth of Mr. Chambers. WASHINGTON COUNTY, SS. Personally came before me Samuel Shannon, Esquire, one of the Commonwealth Justices for the County of Washington in the State of Pennsylvania, James Chambers, who, being sworn according to law, deposeth and saith that in the spring of the year 1774, he resided on the frontier near Baker's bottom on the Ohio; that he had an intimate companion, with whom he sometimes lived, named Edward King; that a report reached them that Michael Cresap had killed some 2 Indians near Grave Creek, friends to an Indian, known by the name 3 of " Logan;" that other of his friends, following down the river, having received intelligence, and fearing to proceed, lest Cresap might fall in with them, encamped near the mouth of Yellow Creek opposite Baker's bottom; that Daniel Great-house had determined to kill them; had made the secret known to the deponent's companion, King; that the deponent was earnestly solicited to be of the party, and, as an inducement, was told that they would get a great deal of plunder; and further, that the Indians would be made drunk by Baker, and that little danger would follow the expedition. The deponent refused having any hand in killing unoffending people. His companion, King, went with Great-house with divers others, some of whom had been collected at a considerable distance under an idea that Joshua Baker's family was in danger from the Indians, as war had been commenced between Cresap and them already; that Edward King, as well as others of the party, did not conceal from the deponent the most minute circumstances of this affair; they informed him that Great-house, concealing his people, went over to the Indian encampments and counted their number, and found that they were too large a party to attack with his strength; that he then requested Joshua Baker when any of them came to his house, (which they had been in the habit of,) to give them what rum they could drink, and to let him know when they were in a proper train, and that he would then fall on them; that accordingly they found several men and women at Baker's house; that one of these women had cautioned Great-house, when over in the Indian camp that he had better return home, as the Indian men were drinking, and that having heard of Cresap's attack on their relations down the river, they were angry, and, in a friendly manner, told him to go home. Great-house, with his party, fell on them, and killed 3 all except a little girl, which the deponent saw with the party after the slaughter; that the Indians in the camp hearing the firing, manned two canoes, supposing their friends at Baker's to be attacked, as was supposed; the party under Great-house prevented their landing by a well-directed fire, which did execution 4 in the canoes; that Edward King showed the deponent one of the scalps. The deponent further saith, that the settlements near the river broke up, and he the deponent immediately repaired to Catfish's camp, and lived some time with Mr. William Huston; that not long after his arrival, Cresap, with his party, returning from the Ohio, came to Mr. Huston's and tarried 2 some time; that in various conversations with the party, and in particular with a Mr. Smith who had one arm only, he was told that the Indians were acknowledged and known to be Logan's friends which they had killed, and that he heard the party say, that Logan would probably avenge their deaths. They acknowledged that the Indians passed Cresap's encampment on the bank of the river in a peaceable manner,

and encamped below him; that they went down and fired on the Indians and killed several; that the survivors fled to their arms and fired on Cresap, and 2 wounded one man, whom the deponent saw carried on a litter by 3 of the party; that the Indians killed by Cresap were not only Logan's relations, but of the women killed at Baker's one was said and generally believed to be Logan's sister. The deponent further saith, that on the relation of the attack by Cresap on the unoffending Indians, he exclaimed in their hearing, that it was an atrocious murder; on which Mr. Smith threatened the deponent with the tomahawk; so that he was obliged to be cautious, fearing an injury, as the party appeared to have lost, in a great degree, sentiments of humanity as well as the effects of civilization. Sworn and subscribed at Washington, the 20th day of April, Anno Domini 1798. Before SAMUEL SHANNON. JAMES CHAMBERS. Certificate of David Reddick WASHINGTON COUNTY, SS. I, David Reddick, prothonotary of the court of common pleas, SEAL. for the county of Washington in the State of Pennsylvania, do certify that Samuel Shannon, Esq., before whom the within affidavit was made, was, at the time thereof, and still is, a justice of the peace in and for the county of Washington aforesaid; and that full credit is due to all his judicial acts as such as well in courts of justice as thereout. In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of my office at Washington, the 26th day of April, Anno Dom. 1798. DAVID REDDICK. Certificate of Charles Polke The certificate of Charles Polke; of Shelby County, in Kentucky, communicated by the Hon. Judge Innes, of Kentucky, who in the letter enclosing it, together with Newland's certificate, and his own declaration of the information given him by Baker, says, "I am well acquainted with John Newland, he is a man of integrity. Charles Polke and Joshua Baker both support respectable characters." About the latter end of April or beginning of May, 1774, I lived on the waters of Cross creek, about sixteen miles from Joshua Baker, who lived on the Ohio, opposite the mouth of Yellow Creek. A number of persons collected at my house, and proceeded to the said Baker's and murdered several Indians, among whom was a woman said to be the sister of the Indian chief, Logan. The principal leader of the party was Daniel Great-house. To the best of my recollection the cause which gave rise to the murder was a general idea that the Indians were meditating an attack on the frontiers. Capt. Michael Cresap was not of the party; but I recollect that some time before the perpetration of the above fact it was currently reported that Capt. Cresap had murdered some Indians on the Ohio, one or two, some distance below Wheeling. Certified by me, an inhabitant of Shelby county and State of Kentucky, this 15th day of November, 1799. CHARLES POLKE Declaration of the Hon. Judge Innes The Declaration of the Hon. Judge Innes, of Frankfort, in Kentucky. On the 14th of November, 1799. I accidentally met upon the road Joshua Baker, the person referred to in the certificate signed by 3 Polke, who informed me that the murder of the Indians in 1774, opposite the mouth of Yellow Creek, was perpetrated at his house by thirty-two men, led on by Daniel Great-house; that twelve were killed and six or eight wounded; among the slain was a sister and other relations of the Indian chief, Logan. Baker says, Captain Michael Cresap was not of the party; that some days preceding the murder 1 at his house two Indians left him and were on their way home; that they fell in with Capt. Cresap and a party of land improvers on the Ohio, and were murdered, if not by Cresap himself; with his approbation; he being the leader of the party, and that he had this information from Cresap. HARRY INNES. Declaration of William Robinson The Declaration of William Robinson. William Robinson of Clarksburg, in the county of Harrison, and State of Virginia, subscriber to these presents, declares that he was, in the year 1774, a resident on the west fork of Monongahela river, in the county then called West Augusta,

and being in his field on the 12th of July, with two other men, they were surprised by a party of eight Indians, who shot down one of the others and made himself and the remaining one prisoners; this subscriber' s wife and four children having been previously conveyed by him for safety to a fort about twenty-four miles off; that the principal Indian of the party which took them was Captain Logan; that Logan spoke English well, and very soon manifested a friendly disposition to this subscriber, and told him to be of good heart, that he would not be killed, but must go with him to his town, where he would probably be adopted in some of their families; but above all things, that he must not attempt to run away; that in the course of the journey to the Indian town he generally endeavored to keep close to Logan, who had a great deal of conversation with him, always encouraging him to be cheerful and without fear; for that he would not be killed, but should become one of them; and constantly impressing on him not to attempt to run away; that in these conversations he always charged Capt. Michael Cresap with the murder of his family; that on his arrival in the town, which was on the 18th of July, he was tied to a stake and a great debate arose whether he should not be burnt; Logan insisted on having him adopted, while others contended to burn him; that at length Logan prevailed, tied a belt of wampum round him as the mark of adoption, loosed him from the post and carried him to the cabin of an old squaw, where Logan pointed out a person who he said was this subscriber' s cousin; and he afterwards understood that the old woman was his aunt, and two others his brothers, and that he now stood in the place of a warrior of the family who had been killed at Yellow Creek; that about three days after this Logan brought him a piece of paper, and told him he must write a letter for him, which he meant to carry and leave in some house where he should kill somebody; that he made ink with gun powder, and the subscriber proceeded to write the letter by his direction, addressing Captain Michael Cresap in it, and that the purport of it was, to ask "why he had killed his people? That some time before they had killed his people at some place, (the name of which the subscriber forgets,) which he had forgiven; but since that he had killed his people again at Yellow Creek, and taken his cousin, a little girl, prisoner; that therefore he must war against the whites; but that he would exchange the subscriber for his cousin." And signed it with Logan's name, which letter Logan took and set out again to war; and the contents of this letter, as recited by the subscriber, calling to mind that stated by Judge Innes to have been left, tied to a war club, in a house where a family was murdered, and that being read to the subscriber, he recognizes it, and declares he verily believes it to have been the identical letter which he wrote, and supposes he was mistaken in stating as he has done before from memory, that the offer of exchange was proposed in the letter; that it is probable that it was only promised him by Logan, but not put in the letter; while he was with the old woman, she repeatedly endeavored to make him sensible that she had been of the party at Yellow Creek, and, by signs, showed him how they decoyed her friends over the river to drink, and when they were reeling and tumbling about, tomahawked them all, and that whenever she entered on this subject she was thrown into the most violent agitations, and that he afterwards understood that, amongst the Indians killed at Yellow Creek, was a sister of Logan, very big with child, whom they ripped open, and stuck on a pole; that he continued with the Indians till the month of November, when he was released in consequence of the peace made by them with Lord Dunmore; that while he remained with them, the Indians in general were very kind to him; and especially those who were his adopted relations; but above all, the old woman and family in which he lived, who served him with everything in their power, and never asked, or even suffered him to do any labor, seeming in truth to

consider and respect him as the friend they had lost. All which several matters and things, so far as they are stated to be of his own knowledge, this subscriber solemnly declares to be true, and so far as they are stated on information from others, he believes them to be true. Given and declared under his hand at Philadelphia, this 28th day of February, 1800. WILLIAM ROBINSON Deposition of Colonel William M'Kee The deposition of Colonel William M'Kee, of Lincoln County, Kentucky, communicated by the Hon. John Brown, one of the Senators in Congress from Kentucky. Colonel William M'Kee of Lincoln county declareth, that in autumn, 1774, He commanded as a captain in the Botetourt Regiment under Colonel Andrew Lewis, afterwards General Lewis; and fought in the battle at the mouth of Kanawha, on the 10th of October in that year. That after the battle, Colonel Lewis marched the militia across the Ohio, and proceeded towards the Shawnee towns on Sciota; but before they reached the towns, Lord Dunmore, who was Commander-in-Chief of the army, and had, with a large part thereof, been up the Ohio about Hockhocking, when the battle was fought, overtook the militia, and informed them of his having since the battle concluded a treaty with the Indians; upon which the whole army returned. And the said William declareth that, on the evening of that day on which the junction of the troops took place, He was in company with Lord Dunmore and several of his officers, and also conversed with several who had been with Lord Dunmore at the treaty; said William, on that evening, heard repeated conversations concerning an extraordinary speech at the treaty, or sent there by a chieftain of the Indians named Logan, and heard several attempts at a rehearsal of it. The speech as rehearsed excited the particular attention of said William, and the most striking members of it were impressed on his memory. And He declares that when Thomas Jefferson's "Notes on Virginia" were published, and He came to peruse the same, He was struck with the speech of Logan as there set forth, as being substantially the same. and accordant with the speech He heard rehearsed in the camp as aforesaid. Signed, WILLIAM M'KEE. Certificate of James Speed Jr., and J. H. Dewes DANVILLE, December 18th, 1799. We certify that Colonel William M'Kee this day signed the original certificate, of which the foregoing is a true copy, in our presence. JAMES SPEED, Junior. J. H. DEWEES. Certificate of the Honorable Stevens Thompson Mason The Certificate of the Honorable Stevens Thompson Mason, one of the Senators in Congress from the State of Virginia. "Logan's Speech, delivered at the Treaty, after the battle in which Colonel Lewis was killed in 1774. "[Here follows a copy of the speech agreeing verbatim with that printed in Dixon and Hunter's Virginia Gazette of February 4, 1775, under the Williamsburg head. At the foot is this certificate.] "The foregoing is a copy taken by me, when a boy, at school, in the year 1775, or at farthest in 1776, and lately found in an old pocketbook, containing papers and manuscripts of that period. "January 20th, 1798. STEVENS THOMPSON MASON." Statement of Andrew Rogers Statement of Andrew Rogers in regard to the speech of Logan to Lord Dunmore. A copy of Logan's speech, given by the Late General Mercer, who fell in the battle of Trenton, January 1776, to Lewis Willis, Esquire, of Fredericksburg, in Virginia, upwards of twenty years ago, (from the date of February 1798,) communicated through Mann Page, Esquire. "The speech of Logan, a Shawanese chief, to Lord Dunmore." [Here follows a copy of the speech, agreeing verbatim with that in the Notes on Virginia.] A copy of Logan's speech from the Notes on Virginia having been sent to Captain Andrew Rodgers, of Kentucky, He subjoined the following certificate: In the year 1774 I was out with the Virginia Volunteers, and was in the battle at the mouth of Canhawee, and afterwards proceeded over the Ohio to the Indian towns. I did not hear Logan make the above speech; but from the unanimous accounts of those in

camp, I have reason to think that said speech was delivered to Dunmore. I remember to have heard the very things contained in the above speech, related by some of our people in camp at that time. ANDREW RODGERS. Declaration of John Heckewelder The declaration of Mr. John Heckewelder, for several years a missionary from the society of Moravians, among the western Indians. In the spring of the year 1774, at a time when the interior part of the Indian country all seemed peace and tranquil, the villagers on the Muskingum were suddenly alarmed by two runners (Indians), who reported "that the Big Knife (Virginians) had attacked the Mingo settlement, on the Ohio, and butchered even the women with their children in their arms, and that Logan's family were among the slain." A day or two after this several Mingoes made their appearance; among whom were one or two wounded, who had in this manner effected their escape. Exasperated to a high degree, after relating the particulars of this transaction, (which for humanity's sake I forbear to mention,) after resting some time on the treachery of the Big Knives, of their barbarity to those who are their friends, they gave a figurative description of the perpetrators; named Cresap as having been at the head of this murderous act. They made mention of nine being killed, and two wounded; and were prone to take revenge on any person of a white color; for which reason the missionaries had to shut themselves up during their stay. From this time terror daily increased. The exasperated friends and relations of these murdered women and children, with the nations to whom they belonged, passed and repassed through the villages of the quiet Delaware towns, in search of white people, making use of the most abusive language to these (the Delawares), since they would not join in taking revenge. Traders had either to hide themselves, or try to get out of the country the best way they could. And even at this time, they yet found such true friends among the Indians, who, at the risk of their own lives, conducted them, with the best part of their property, to Pittsburg; although, (shameful to relate!) these benefactors were, on their return from this mission waylaid, and fired upon by whites, while crossing Big Beaver in a canoe, and had one man a Shawanese, named Silverheels, (a man of note in his nation,) wounded in the body. This exasperated the Shawanese so much, that they, or at least a great part of them, immediately took an active part in the cause; and the Mingoes, (nearest connected with the former.) became unbounded in their rage. A Mr. Jones, son to a respectable family Of this neighborhood (Bethlehem), who was then on his passage up Muskingum, with two other men, was fortunately espied by a friendly Indian woman, at the falls of Muskingum; who through motives of humanity alone, informed Jones of the nature of the times, and that He was running right in the hands of the enraged; and put him on the way, where He might perhaps escape the vengeance of the strolling parties. One of Jones's men, fatigued by travelling in the woods, declared He would rather die than remain longer in this situation; and hitting accidentally on a path, He determined to follow the same. A few hundred yards decided his fate. He was met by a party of about fifteen Mingoes, (and as it happened, almost within sight of White Eyes town,) murdered, and cut to pieces; and his limbs and flesh stuck up on the bushes. White Eyes, on hearing the scalp halloo, ran immediately out with his men, to see what the matter was; and finding the mangled body in this condition gathered the whole and buried it. But next day when some of the above party found on their return the body interred, they instantly tore up the ground, and endeavored to destroy or scatter about, the parts at a greater distance. White Eyes, with the Delawares, watching their motions, gathered and interred the same a second time. The war party finding this out ran furiously into the Delaware village, exclaiming against the conduct of these people, setting forth the cruelty of Cresap towards women and children, and

declaring at the same time, that they would, in consequence of this cruelty, serve every white man they should meet with in the same manner. Times grew worse and worse, war parties went out and took scalps and prisoners, and the latter, in hopes it might be of service in saving their lives, exclaimed against the barbarous act which gave rise to these troubles and against the perpetrators. The name of Great-house was mentioned as having been accomplice to Cresap. So detestable became the latter name among the Indians, that I have frequently heard them apply it to the worst of things' also in quieting or stilling their children, I have heard them say, hush! Cresap will fetch you; whereas otherwise, they name the Owl. The warriors having afterwards bent their course more toward the Ohio and down the same, peace seemed with us already on the return; and this became the case soon after the decided battle fought on the Kanawha. Traders, returning now into the Indian country again, related the story of the above-mentioned massacre, after the same manner, and with the same words, we have heard it related hitherto. So the report, remained, and was believed by all who resided in the Indian country So it was represented numbers of times, in the peaceable Delaware towns, by the enemy. So the Christian Indians were continually told they would one day be served. With this impression, a petty chief hurried all the way from Wabash in 1779, to take his relations (who were living with the peaceable Delawares near Coshachking) out of the reach of the Big Knives, in whose friendship He never more would place any confidence. And when this man found that his numerous relations would not break friendship with the Americans, nor be removed, He took two of his relations (women) off by force, saying, "The whole crop should not be destroyed; I will have seed out of it for a new crop;" alluding to, and repeatedly reminding those of the family of Logan, who He said had been real friends to the whites, and yet were cruelly murdered by them. In Detroit, where I arrived the same Spring, the report respecting the murder of the Indians on the Ohio (amongst whom was Logan's family) was the same as related above; and. on my return to the United States in the fall of 1786, and from that time, whenever and wherever in my presence; this subject was the topic of conversation, I found the report still the same; viz. that a person, bearing the name of Cresap, was the author, or perpetrator of this deed. Logan was the second son of Shikellemus, a celebrated chief of the Cayuga nation. This chief, on account of his attachment to the English government was of great service to the country, having the confidence of all the Six Nations as well as that of the English, He was very useful in settling disputes, &c., &c. He was highly esteemed by Conrad Weisser Esq., (an officer for government in the Indian department), with whom He acted conjunctly, and was faithful unto his death. His residence was at Shamokin, where He took great delight in acts of hospitality to such of the white people whose business led them that way. (The preceding account of Shikellemus, -Logan's father,- was copied from manuscripts of the Rev. C. Pyrloeus, written between the years 1741 and 1748. His name and fame were so high on record, that Count Zinzendorf, when in this country in 1742, became desirous of seeing him, and actually visited him at his house in Shamokin.(See G. H. Hoskiel's history of the Mission of the United Brethren, &c. Part II. Chap. 11, page 31.) About the year 1772, Logan was introduced to me by an Indian friend, as son to the late reputable chief Shikellemus and as a friend to the white people. In the course of conversation I thought him a man of superior talents than Indians generally were. The subject turning on vice and immorality, He confessed his too great share of this, especially his fondness for liquor. He exclaimed against the white people for imposing liquors upon the Indians; He otherwise admired their ingenuity' spoke of gentlemen, but observed the Indians unfortunately had but few of these as their neighbors, &c. He spoke of

his friendship to the white people, wished always to be a neighbor to them, intended to settle on the Ohio, below Big Beaver; was (to the best of my recollection ) then encamped at the mouth of this river, (Beaver,) urged me to pay him a visit, &c. Note. I was then living at the Moravian town on this river, in the neighborhood of Cuskuskee. In April 1773, while on my passage down the Ohio for Muskingum, I called at Logan's settlement; where I received every civility I could expect from such of the family as were at home. Indian reports concerning Logan, after the death of his family, ran to this; that He exerted himself during the Shawanese war, (then so called,) to take all the revenge He could, declaring He had lost all confidence in the white people. At the time of negotiation, He declared his reluctance in laying down the hatchet, not having (in his opinion) yet taken ample satisfaction; yet, for the sake of the nation, He would do it. His expressions, from time to time, denoted a deep melancholy. Life (said He) had become a torment to him: He knew no more what pleasure was: He thought it had been better if He had never existed, &c., &c. Report further states, that He became in some measure delirious, declared He would kill himself, went to Detroit, drank very freely, and did not seem to care what He did, and what became of himself. In this condition He left Detroit, and on his way between that place and Miami was murdered. In October, 1781, (while as prisoner on my way to Detroit,) I was shown the spot where this should have happened. Having had an opportunity since last June of seeing the Rev. David Zeisberger, senior, missionary to the Delaware nation of Indians, who had resided among the same on Muskingum, at the time when the murder was committed on the family of Logan, I put the following questions to him: first who He had understood it was that had committed the murder on Logan's family? and secondly, whether He had any knowledge of a speech sent to Lord Dunmore by Logan, in consequence of this affair, &c. To which Mr. Zeisberger's answer was: That He had, from that time when this murder was committed to the present day, firmly believed the common report (which He had never heard contradicted) viz., that one Cresap was the author of the massacre; or that it was committed by his orders; and that He had known Logan as a boy, had frequently seen him from that time, and doubted not in the least, that Logan had sent such a speech to Lord Dunmore on this occasion, as He understood from me had been published; that expressions of that kind from Indians were familiar to him; that Logan in particular was a man of quick comprehension, good judgment and talents. Mr. Zeisberger has been a missionary upwards of fifty years; his age is about eighty; speaks both the language of the Onondagoes and the Delawares; resides at present on the Muskingum, with his Indian congregation; and is beloved and respected by all who are acquainted with him. JOHN HECKEWELDER. Historical statement From this testimony the following historical statement results: In April or May, 1774 a number of people being engaged in looking out for settlements on the Ohio, information was spread among them, that the Indians had robbed some of the land-jobbers, as those adventurers were called. Alarmed for their safety, they collected together at Wheeling Creek.(1) Hearing there that there were two Indians and some traders a little above Wheeling Captain Michael Cresap, one of the party, proposed to waylay and kill them. The proposition, though opposed, was adopted. A party went up the river, with Cresap at their head, and killed the two Indians. (2)The same afternoon it was reported that there was a party of Indians on the Ohio a little below Wheeling. Cresap and his party immediately proceeded down the river, and encamped on the bank. The Indians passed him peaceably, and encamped at the mouth of Grave Creek, a little below. Cresap and his party attacked them, and killed several. The Indians returned the fire, and wounded one of Cresap's party. Among the slain of the Indians were some of

Logan's family. Colonel Zane indeed expresses a doubt of it; but it is affirmed by Huston and Chambers. Smith, one of the murderers, said they were known and acknowledged to be Logan's friends, and the party themselves generally said so; boasted of it in presence of Cresap; pretended no provocation; and expressed their expectations that Logan would probably avenge their deaths. Pursuing these examples.

(3) Daniel Great-house, and one Tomlinson, (1) First murder of the two Indians by Cresap. (2) Second murder on Grave Creek. (3) Massacre at Baker's Bottom, opposite Yellow Creek, by Greathouse, who lived on the opposite side of the river, from the Indians, and were in habits of friendship with them, collected, at the house of Polke, on Cross Creek, about 16 miles from Baker's Bottom, a party of 32 men. Their object was to attack a hunting encampment of Indians, consisting of men, women, and children, at the mouth of Yellow Creek some distance above Wheeling. They proceeded, and when arrived near Baker's Bottom, they concealed themselves, and Great-house crossed the river to the Indian camp. Being among them as a friend He counted them, and found them too strong for an open attack with his force. While here, He was cautioned by one of the women not to stay, for that the Indian men were drinking, and having heard of Cresap's murder of their relations at Grave Creek, were angry, and she pressed him in a friendly manner, to go home; whereupon, after inviting them to come over and drink, He returned to Baker's, which was a tavern, and desired that when any of them should come to his house He would give them as much rum as they would drink. When his plot was ripe, and a sufficient number of them were collected at Baker's, and intoxicated, He and his party fell on them and massacred the whole, except a little girl, whom they preserved as a prisoner. Among these was the very woman who had saved his life, by pressing him to retire from the drunken wrath of her friends, when He was spying their camp at Yellow Creek. Either she herself, or some other of the murdered women, was the sister of Logan, very big with child, and inhumanly and indecently butchered; and there were others of his relations who fell here. The party on the other side of the river, (1) alarmed for their friends at Baker's, on hearing the report of the guns, manned two canoes and sent them over. They were received, as they approached the shore, by a well-directed fire from Great-house's party, which killed some, wounded others, and obliged the rest to put back. Baker tells us there were twelve killed, and six or eight wounded. This commenced the war, of which Logan's war-club and note left in the house of a murdered family, was the notification. In the course of it, during the ensuing summer, a great number of innocent men, women, and children, fell victims to the tomahawk and scalping knife of the Indians, till it was arrested in the autumn following by the battle at Point Pleasant, and the pacification with Lord Dunmore, at which the speech of Logan was delivered. Of the genuineness of that speech nothing need be said. It was known to the camp where it was delivered; it was given out by Lord Dunmore and his officers; it ran through the public papers of these (1) Fourth murder, by Great-house. States; was rehearsed as an exercise at schools; published in the papers and periodical works of Europe; and all this, a dozen years before it was copied into the Notes on Virginia. In fine, General Gibson concludes the question for ever, by declaring that He received it from Logan's hand, delivered it to Lord Dunmore, translated it for him, and that the copy in the Notes on Virginia is a faithful copy. The popular account of these transactions, as stated in the Notes on Virginia, appears, on collecting exact information, imperfect and erroneous in its details. It was the belief of the day; but how far its errors were to the prejudice of Cresap, the reader will now judge. That He, and those under him, murdered two Indians above Wheeling; that they murdered a large number at Grave Creek, among whom were a part of the

family and relations of Logan, cannot be questioned; and as little that this led to the massacre of the rest of the family at Yellow Creek. Logan imputed the whole to Cresap, in his war-note and peace speech: the Indians generally imputed it to Cresap: Lord Dunmore and his officers imputed it to Cresap: the country, with one accord, imputed it to him: and whether He were innocent, let the universal verdict now declare.

Declaration of John Sappington The declaration of John Sappington, received after the publication of the preceding Appendix, but included in later editions. I, JOHN SAPPINGTON, declare myself to be intimately acquainted with all the circumstances respecting the destruction of Logan's family, and do give in the following narrative, a true statement of that affair: "Logan's family (if it was his family) was not killed by Cresap, nor with his knowledge; nor by his consent, but by the Great-houses and their associates. They were killed 30 miles above Wheeling, near the mouth of Yellow Creek. Logan's camp was on one side of the river Ohio, and the house, where the murder was committed, opposite to it on the other side. They had encamped there only four or five days, and during that time had lived peaceably and neighborly with the whites on the opposite side, until the very day the affair happened. A little before the period alluded to, letters had been received by the inhabitants from a man of great influence in that country, and who was then, I believe, at Capteener, informing them that war was at hand, and desiring them to be on their guard. In consequence of those letters and other rumors of the same import, almost all the inhabitants fled for safety into the settlements. It was at the house of one Baker the murder was committed.. Baker was a man who sold rum and the Indians had made frequent visits at his house, induced, probably by their fondness for that liquor. He had been particularly desired by Cresap to remove and take away his rum, and He was actually preparing to move at the time of the murder. The evening before, a squaw came over to Baker's house, and by her crying seemed to be in great distress. The cause of her uneasiness being asked, she refused to tell; but getting Baker's wife alone, she told her that the Indians were going to kill her and all her family the next day, that she loved her, did not. wish her to be killed, and therefore told her what was intended, that she might save herself. In consequence of this information, Baker got a number of men, to the amount of twenty-one, to come to his house, and they were all there before morning. A council was held and it was determined that the men should lie concealed in the back apartment; that if the Indians did come, and behaved themselves peaceably, they should not be molested; but if not, the men were to show themselves, and act accordingly. Early in the morning, seven Indians four men and three squaws, came over. Logan's brother was one of them. They immediately got rum, and all, except Logan's brother, became very much intoxicated. At this time all the men were concealed, except the man of the house, Baker, and two others who staid out with him. Those Indians came unarmed. After some time Logan's brother took down a coat and hat, belonging to Baker's brother-in-law, who lived with him, and put them on, and setting his arms a-kimbo, began to strut about, till at length coming up to one of the men, he attempted to strike him, saying, " White man, son of a \*\*\*\*\*." The white man, whom he treated thus kept out of his way for some time; but growing irritated, he jumped to his gun, and shot the Indian as he was making to the door with the coat and hat on him. The men who lay concealed then rushed out, and killed the whole of them excepting one child, which I believe is alive yet. But before this happened,' one with two the other with five Indians, all naked, painted, and armed completely for war, were discovered to start from the shore on which Logan's camp was. Had it not been for this circumstance, the white men would not have acted as they did; but this confirmed what the squaw had told before. The white men; having

killed, as aforesaid, the Indians in the house, ranged themselves along the banks of the river to receive the canoes. The canoe with the two Indians came near, being the foremost. Our men fired upon them and killed them both. The other canoe then went back. After this, two other canoes started, the one containing eleven, the other seven, Indians, painted and armed as the first. They attempted to land below our men, but were fired upon; had one killed, and retreated, at the same time firing back. To the best of my recollection there were three of the Great-houses engaged in this business. This is a true representation of the affair from beginning to end. I was intimately acquainted with Cresap, and know He had no hand in that transaction . He told me himself afterwards, at Redstone Old Fort, that the day before Logan's people were killed, He, with a small party, had an engagement with a party of Indians on Capteener, about forty-four miles lower down. Logan's people were killed at the mouth of Yellow Creek, on the 24th of May, 1774; and the 23d, the day before, Cresap was engaged as already stated. I know, likewise; that He was generally blamed far it, and believed by all who were not acquainted with the circumstances to have been the perpetrator of it. I know that He despised and hated the Great-houses ever afterwards on account of it. I was intimately acquainted with General Gibson, and served under him during the late war, and I have a discharge from him now lying in the land-office at Richmond, to which I refer any person for my character who might be disposed to scruple my veracity. I was likewise at the treaty held by Lord Dunmore with the Indians, at Chelicothe. As for the speech said to have been delivered by Logan on that occasion, it might have been, or might not, for anything I know, as I never heard of it till long afterwards. I do not believe that Logan had any relations killed, except his brother. Neither of the squaws who were killed was his wife. Two of them were old women, and the third, with her child, which was saved, I have the best reason in the world to believe was the wife and child of General Gibson. I know He educated the child, and took care of it, as if it had been his own. Whether Logan had a wife or not, I can't say; but it is probable that as He was a chief, He considered them all as his people. All this I am ready to be qualified to at any time. Attest, SAMUEL M'KEE, Junr. JOHN SAPPINGTON. Addendum by McKee, Jr. Certificate of Samuel M'Kee, Jr. MADISON COUNTY, Feb. 13th, 1800. I do certify further, that the above-named John Sappington told me, at the same time and place at which He gave me the above narrative, that He himself was the man who shot the brother of Logan in the house, as above related, and that He likewise killed one of the Indians in one of the canoes, which came over from the opposite shore. He likewise told me, that Cresap never said an angry word to him about the matter, although He was frequently in company with Cresap, and indeed had been, and continued to be, in habits of intimacy with that gentleman, and was always befriended by him on every occasion. He further told me, that after they had perpetrated the murder, and were flying into the settlement, He met with Cresap (if I recollect right, at Redstone Old Fort); and gave him a scalp, a very large fine one, as He expressed it, and adorned with silver. This scalp, I think He told me, was the scalp of Logan's brother; though as to this I am not absolutely certain. Certified by SAMUEL M'KEE, Junr. Tomlinson testimony On Apr. 17, 1797 Benjamin Tomlinson gave the following interrogatory at Cumberland, MD: "The first witness we introduce is Benjamin Tomlinson, Esq., who is still living - a man universally respected, and whose testimony no man dare to call in question. It is given by way of interrogatory. Question 1st. What number of Indians were killed at Yellow Creek? Answer. Logan's mother, younger brother, and sister, who was called Gibson's squaw; this woman had a child half white, which was not killed. Ques. 2d. Do you recollect the time and circumstances of the affair at Yellow Creek. Ans.

Yes; the time was the third or fourth day of May, 1774, and the circumstances were that two or three days before these Indians were killed at Yellow Creek by the whites, two men were killed and one wounded in a canoe belonging to a Mr. Butler, of Pittsburg, as they were descending the Ohio river near the mouth of Little Beaver, and this canoe was plundered of all the property; and moreover, about this time the Indians were threatening the inhabitants about the river Ohio, and I was also informed they had committed some depredations on the property of Michael Cresap. I assisted in the burial of the white men killed in Butler's canoe. Ques. 3rd. Who commanded the party that killed the Indians at Yellow Creek, and who killed those Indians. Do you know? Ans. The party had no commander. I believe Logan's brother was killed by a man named Sappington; who killed the others I do not know, although I was present. But this I well know - that neither Captain Michael Cresap nor any other person of that name was there, nor do I believe within many miles of the place. Ques. 4th. Where was Logan's residence, and what was his character? Ans. I believe his residence was on Muskingum. His character was no ways particular; he was only a common man among the Indians - no chief, no captain. Ques. 5th. Where and when did Logan die? Ans. To this question I answer, that I do not know when or where Logan died, but was informed by Esquire Barkley, of Bedford, that he became very vile; that he killed his own wife, and was killed by her brother. I am, however, certain he did not die until after Dunmore's treaty on the Scioto. Ques. 6th. Was Logan at the treaty held by Dunmore with the Indians at Camp Charlotte, on the Scioto? Did he make a speech? And if not, who made a speech for him? Ans. To this question I answer: Logan was not at the treaty; perhaps Cornstalk, the chief of the Shawnee nation, mentioned among other grievances the Indians killed on Yellow Creek; but I believe neither Cresap nor any other persons were named as the perpetrators. I perfectly recollect that I was that day officer of the guard, and stood near Dunmore's person, and consequently I saw and heard all that passed; that also two or three days before the treaty, when I was on the out-guard, Simon Girty, who was passing by, stopped with me and conversed; he said he was going after Logan, but he did not like his business, for he was a surly fellow; he, however, proceeded on, and I saw him return on the day of the treaty, and Logan was not with him. At this time a circle was formed and the treaty begun. I saw John Gibson, on Girty's arrival, get up and go out of the circle and talk with Girty; after which he (Gibson) went into a tent, and soon after returning into the circle, drew out of his pocket a piece of clean, new paper, on which was written, in his own hand-writing, a speech for and in the name of Logan. This I heard read three times - once by Gibson, and twice by Dunmore - the purpose of which was, that he (Logan) was the white man's friend' that on a journey to Pittsburg to brighten this friendship, or on his return from then, all his friends were killed at Yellow Creek; that now, when he died, who should bury him? - for the blood of Logan was running in no creature's veins; but neither was the name of Cresap or the name of any other person mentioned in this speech. But I recollect having seen Dunmore put this speech among the other treaty papers. Ques. 7th. If Logan was not at the treaty, and made no speech, pray from whence it came and who was the author of that famous speech? Ans. In addition to what is stated above, I say there is no doubt in my mind that it originated altogether with and was framed and produced by Colonel John Gibson. Ques. 8th. Do you recollect the names of any gentlemen who were present at the treaty? Ans. Yes; I recollect the following persons, and believe they are still alive and live at the following places, to-wit: General Daniel Morgan, Berkley county, Virginia; Colonel James Wood, now Governor of Virginia; Captain David Scott, Monongahela; Captain John Wilson, Kentucky; Lieutenant Gabriel Cox,

Kentucky; Captain Johnson, Youghiogheny; Captain James Parsons, Moorfield; General George R. Clark, Captain William Harrod, Colonel L. Barret, Lieutenant Joseph Cresap and Captain Wm. Henshaw, Berkley. Ques. 9th. Was the question as to the origin of the war discussed at the treaty? Ans. Yes; the Indians gave as a reason, the Indians killed at Yellow Creek, Whetstone creek, Beech Bottom and elsewhere. But the Indians were in fact the first aggressors, and committed the first hostilities. Ques. 10th. Were not some white men killed by the Indians in the year 1773? Ans. Yes; John Martin and two of his men were killed on Hockhocking, about one year before Dunmore's army went out, and his canoe was plundered of above £200 worth of goods. I lived on the river Ohio, and near the mouth of Yellow Creek, from the year 1770 until the Indians were killed at Yellow Creek, and several years after; I was present when the Indians were killed, and also present at the treaty in September or October, 1774, near Chillicothe, on the Scioto; and certify the foregoing statement of facts are true, to the best of my recollection. BENJAMIN TOMLINSON Cumberland, Apr. 17, 1797 letter from George Rogers Clark to Samuel Brown, Esq June 17th, 1798 Sir Your letter was handed to me by Mr Thruston, the Matter therein contained was new to me; I find myself hurt that Mr Jefferson should have been attacked with so much Virulence on a Subject which I know he was not the Author of, but except a few Mistakes of Names of Persons & Places, the Story is substantially true; I was of the first and last of the active Officers who bore the Weight of that War, and on perusing some old Papers of that Date I find some Memoirs, but independent of them I have a perfect Recollection of every Transaction relative to Logan's Story. The Conduct of Cresap I am perfectly acquainted with, he was not the Author of that Murder, but a family of the Name of Greathouse. – But some Transactions that happened under the Conduct of Captn Cresap a few Days previous to the Murder of Logan's Family gave him sufficient Ground to suppose it was Cresap who had done him the Injury; But to enable you fully to understand the subject of your Enquiry, I shall relate the Incidents that gave rise to Logan's Suspicions, and will enable Mr Jefferson to do Justice to himself and the Cresap Family by being made fully acquainted with the Facts. Kentucky was explored in 1773; A Resolution was formed to make Settlements in the Spring following & the Mouth of the little Kenhawa was appointed the Place of general Rendevouz – in order to descend the River thence in a Body; Early in the Spring the Indians had done some Mischief. Reports from their Towns were alarming, which caused many to decline Meeting, and only eighty or ninety Men assembled at the Place of Rendevouz, where we lay some Days; a Small Party of Hunters which lay about ten Miles below us were fired on by the Indians whom the Hunters beat off and returned to our Camp; This and many other Circumstances led us to believe that the Indians were determined to make War; the whole of our Party was exasperated, and resolved not to be disappointed in their Project of forming a Settlement in Kentucky, as we had every necessary Store that could be thought of. An Indian Town called Horse-Head Bottom on the Sioho and nearest its mouth lay most in our way, we resolved to cross the Country & Surprise it; who was to Command was the question; there were but few among us who had experience in Indian Warfare, and they were such as we did not chuse (sic) to be commanded by. We knew of Capt Cresap being on the River about 15 Miles above us with some Hands settling a new Plantation and intending to follow us to Kentucky as soon as he had fixed his People, we also knew that he had had Experience in a former War. It was proposed & unanimously agreed on to send for him to Command the Party; A Messenger was dispatched and in half an Hour returned with Cresap; he had heard of our Resolution by some of his Hunters who had fallen in with those from our Camp, and had set out to come to us;

We now thought our little Army (as we called it) compleat, and the Destruction of the Indian Town inevitable; A Council was call'd, and to our Astonishment our intended General was the Person who dissuaded us from the Enterprize, alledging that appearances were suspicious, but that there was no Certainty of a War, that if we made the Attempt proposed he had no doubt of Success, but that a War at any Rate would be the Result, that we should be blamed for it and perhaps justly; but that if we were determined to execute the Plan, he would lay aside all considerations, send for his People and Share our Fortunes; he was then asked what Measure he would recommend to us, his Answer was that we should return to Wheeling, a convenient Post to obtain Intelligence of what was going forward, that a few Weeks would determine the Matter, and as it was early in the Spring, if we should find that the Indians were not hostilely disposed we should have full Time to prosecute our intended Settlements in Kentucky; This Measure was adopted, in two Hours the whole Party was under way; As we ascended the River we met Killbuck an Indian Chief (Delaware) with a small Party; We had a long Conference but obtained very little satisfaction from him. – It was observed that Cresap did not attend this Conference but kept on the Opposite side of the River, he Said that he was afraid to trust himself with the Indians; that Killbuck had frequently attempted to waylay & kill his Father, & that he was Doubtful that he should be tempted to put Killbuck to Death. – On our arrival at Wheeling, the whole Country being pretty well settled thereabouts, the Inhabitants appeared to be much alarmed, and fled to our Camp from every Direction. – We offered to Cover their Neighbourhood with Scouts, until we could obtain further Information, if they would return to their Plantations; but Nothing we could say would prevail; By this Time we got to be a formidable Party as all the Hunters & Men without Families &c in that quarter joined us. Our Arrival at Wheeling was known at Pittsburgh, the whole of that Country at that time being under the Jurisdiction of Virginia. Dr. Connelly had been appointed by Dunmore Capt Commandant of the District then Called West Augusta; He Connelly hearing of us sent a Message addressed to the Party, informing us that a War was to be apprehended, and requesting that we would keep our Position for a few Days, that Messengers had been sent to the Indian Towns whose return he daily expected, and the Doubt respecting a War with the Indians would then be cleared up. – The Answer we returned was that we had no Inclination to decamp for some Time, and during our stay we should be Careful that the Enemy should not harass the Neighbourhood. – But before this Answer could reach Pittsburgh he had sent a second Express addressed to Capt Cresap as the most influential Man amongst us informing him that the Messengers had returned from the Indian Towns and that a War was inevitable, and begg'd him to use his Influence with the Party to get them to Cover the Country until the Inhabitants could fortify themselves. – The Time of the Reception of this Letter was the Epoch of open Hostilities with the Indians. The War Post was planted, a Council Called and the Letter read and the Ceremonies used by the Indians on so important an Occasion acted, and War was formally declared. – The same evening two scalps were brought into Camp. – The following Day some Canoes of Indians were discovered descending the River, taking advantage of an Island to cover themselves from our View. They were chased by our Men 15 Miles down the River, they were forced ashore and a Battle ensued, a few were wounded on both sides and we got one scalp only; On examining their Canoes we found a considerable quantity of ammunition and other Warlike Stores. On our return to Camp a Resolution was formed to march next Day and attack Logan's Camp, on the Ohio, about 30 Miles above Wheeling. We actually marched about five Miles, and halted to take some Refreshment, here the Impropriety of

executing the proposed Enterprize was argued, the Conversation was brought forward by Cresap himself; it was generally agreed that those Indians had no hostile Intentions, as it was a hunting Camp composed of Men Women and Children with all their Stuff with them. This we knew as I myself and others then present had been at their Camp about four weeks before that time on our way down from Pittsburgh; In short every Person present particularly Cresap (upon Reflection) was opposed to the projected Measure. We returned & on the same evening Decamped and took the Road to Red-Stone. – It was two Days after this that Logan's Family was killed, and from the Manner in which it was done, it was viewed as a horrid Murder by the whole Country. From Logan's hearing that Cresap was at the Head of the Party at Wheeling it was no wonder that he considered Cresap as the Author of his Family's Destruction. Since the Receipt of your Letter I have procured the Notes on Virginia, they are now before me; the Action was more barbarous than therein related by Mr Jefferson; those Indians used to visit & receive Visits from the neighbouring (sic) Whites on the Opposite Shore, they were on a Visit at Greathouses's at the Time they were massacre'd (sic) by those People and their associates. The War now raged with all its Savage Fury until the following fall, when a Treaty of Peace was held at Dunmore's Camp within five Miles of Chillicothe, the Indian Capital on the Siothos. – Logan did not appear – I was acquainted with him & wished to be informed of the Reason of his absence by one of the Interpreters. The Answer he gave to my Enquiry was "that he was like a Mad Dog, that his Bristles had been up and were not yet quite fallen – but that the good Talks now going forward might allay them." – Logan's Speech to Dunmore now came forward as related by Mr Jefferson, and was generally believed & indeed not doubted to have been genuine and dictated by Logan. – The Army knew it was wrong so far as it respected Cresap and afforded an Opportunity of rallying that Gentleman on the subject. – I discovered that Cresap was displeased and told him that he must be a very great Man, that the Indians shouldered him with every Thing that had happened – he smiled & said he had a great mind to tomahawk Greathouse about the matter. – What is here related is Fact, I was intimate with Cresap, and better acquainted with Logan at that Time than with any other Indian in the Western Country, and had a Knowledge of the Conduct of both Parties. Logan is the Author of the Speech as related by Mr Jefferson, and Cresap's Conduct was such as I have related. I have gone through a Relation of Every Circumstance that had any Connection with the Information you desire & hope it will be satisfactory to yourself & Mr Jefferson. I am your mo. obt servt G[eorge] R[oger] Clark recollections of Michael Myers Recollections of Capt. Michael Myers, Newburgh, Ohio, given to Dr. Draper February 25 and 26, 1850. (In other words, nearly three quarters of a century after the fact.) Two men came there, who wished to cross the Ohio to Yellow Creek, & desired a pilot, & engaged Mr. Myers to go over with them. They swam over their horse beside the canoe, & went two or 3 miles up on the western side or bank of Yellow Creek. Their object was to examine land. It was near night, & concluded to stop, spanceled out the horse, & prepared to camp. The horse feeding, rambled over a rise of ground about 300 yards distant; & soon after, hearing the bell on the horse rattling rather violently, Myers and the men picked up their guns & went to see what it meant: and when within 40 yards, Myers discovered an Indian in the act of unspanselling the horse, who was rather restive (running round towards the camp of his white masters) not seeming to like his new visitor. The Indian's gun was lying on the ground near by. Myers drew up & shot the Indian who fell over, as if dead. It was now near sun-down. Presently in a few minutes Myers discovered another Indian approach with a gun in his hand, who had been attracted thither

by the report of Myers' shot; & when about 30 yards from Myers, looking down the hill at the dead fallen or wounded Indian, as if in astonishment, Myers having reloaded immediately after his former shot, now fired, & this second Indian also fell, whether dead or not, Myers did not wait to see. The Indian camp was only about a hundred yards off, with a large number of deer & bear skins presented to view. By this time the two white men had got their horse & ran off; & when Myers reached the river, the men were partly over in the boat with their horse swimming beside, & would not consent to return. Myers hurried up the river to a spot where he could ford it, & thus got over. Next morning an Indian came to inquire who shot the two Indians the day before; and some of the party stationed there (about 30, Mr. Myers thinks) killed this Indian. Myers, however, did not participate in this murder. The same day, or the next, as Myers thinks, a large "dug-out" came over a few rods below the mouth of Yellow Creek. Greathouse's party, and Myers with the rest, some 30 or 40, were posted along the Southern bank of the river behind trees & bushes, & logs, & as the Indian canoe came within 5 or 6 rods (Myers says he thinks nearer) of shore, they fired upon the Indians as directed by their Captain (Greathouse). the Indians had guns with them, [he] thinks all of them were shot (& erroneously supposes there were some 30 of them.) The remainder of this Indian party, who did not attempt to come over, went down the river to Wheeling & there got attacked. Sappington lived a little below Greathouse's; Geo. Cox was a large man and well known to Myers. Mr. Myers was not out with McDonald, Dunmore nor Lewis in 1774. (Thwaites, 1905, pp. 17-19) Later authors McGuffey's Fifth Reader Lesson XCV.

SPEECH OF LOGAN, CHIEF OF THE MINGOES. R E M A R K . — Let every pupil notice, as each one reads, when the final consonant of any word is joined to the vowel of the next word. Articulate distinctly. Do not say who lof for whole of; an dindeed, for and indeed; eminen torators, for eminent orators; talen tsin, for talents in; celebraty din pea san duar, for celebrated in peace and war. 1. I MAY +challenge the whole of the orations of Demosthenes and Cicero, and indeed, of any more emi- nent oi'ators, if Europe or the world, has furnished more eminent, to produce a single passage superior to the speech of Logan, a Mingo chief, delivered to Lord Dunmore, when governor of Virginia. As a +testimony of Indian talents in this line, I beg leave to introduce it, by first stating the +incidents necessary for under- standing it. 2. In the spring of the year 1774, a robbery was com- mitted by some Indians, upon certain land adventurers on the Ohio river. The whites in that quarter, accord- ing to their custom, undertook to punish this outrage in a summary way. Captain Michael Cresap and one Daniel Greathouse, leading on these parties, surprised, at different times, traveling and hunting parties of the Indians, who had their women and children with them, and murdered many. Among these, were +unfortun- ately the family of Logan, a chief celebrated in peace and war, and long ""distinguished as the friend of the whites. 3. This unworthy return provoked his +vengeance. He accordingly signalized himself in the war which ensued. In the autumn of the same year, a +decisive battle was fought at the mouth of the Great Kanawha, between the collected forces of the Shawnees, the Min- goes, and the Dclawares, and a detachment of the Vir- ginia militia. The Indians were defeated, and sued for peace. Logan, however, +disdained to be seen among the +suppliants: but, lest the +sincerity of a treaty, from which so distinguished a chief absented himself, should be distrusted, he sent, by a messenger, the following speech to be delivered to Lord Dunmore. 4. "I appeal to any white man to say, if ever he entered Logan's cabin hungry, and he gave him not meat ; if ever he came cold and naked, and he clothed him not. During the course of the last long and bloody war, Logan remained idle in his cabin, an +advocate for peace. Such was my love for

the whites, that my coun- trymen pointed as they passed, and said, 'Logan is the friend of the white men.' I had even thought to live with 3'ou, but for the injuries of one man. 5. "Colonel Cresap, last spring, in cold blood, and +unprovoked, murdered all the +relatives of Logan, not sparing even my women and children. There runs not a drop of my blood in the veins of any living creature. This called on me for revenge. I have sought it. I have killed many. I have fully +glutted my +venge- ance. For my country, I rejoice at the beams of peace: but do not +harbor a thought that mine is the joy of fear. Logan never felt fear. He will not turn on his heel to save his life. Who is there to mourn for Logan? Not one." EXERCISES.— Who was Demosthenes? Cicero? Who undertook to punish the Indians? Whose family were killed? Where was a decisive battle fought? Where does the Kanawha rise? Why did not Logan appear among the suppliants? In the sentence, "Logan never felt fear," which is the subject? Which the attribute? See Pinneo's Analytical Grammar. (McGuffey, 1857, pp 324-325) Reminiscences from journal of Judge Henry Jolly. First published in Silliman's journal in 1836; from, Reuben Gold Thwaites and Louise Phelps Kellogg, Documentary History of Dunmore's War, Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison, 1905, pp. 9-14 In the Spring of the year 1774 a party of Indians encamped on the Northwest of the Ohio, near the mouth of Yellow Creek, a party of whites called Greathouse's party, lay on the opposite side of the river, the Indians came over to the white party - I think five men, one woman and an infant babe, the whites Gave them rum, which three of them drank, and in a short time became very drunk. The other two men and the woman refused, the Sober Indians were challenged to shoot at a mark, to which they agreed, and as soon as the(y) emptied their Guns, the whites shot them down, the woman Attempted to escape by flight, but was also shot down. She lived long enough however to beg mercy for her babe, telling them it was a kin to themselves, they had a man in the Cabin, prepared with a tomahawk for the purposes of killing the three drunk Indians, which was immediately done. The party of men, women &c moved off for the Interior Settlements, and came to Catfis(h) camp on the evening of the next day, where the tarried until the next day. I very well recollect my mother, feeding and dressing the Babe, Chirping to the little innocent, and it smiling, however they took it away and talked of sending it to its supposed father, Col Gen. (John) Gibson of Carlisle (Pa.) who was then (and) had been for several years a trader amongst the Indians. The remainder of the party, at the mouth of Yellow Creek, finding that their friends on the opposite side of the river was Massacred, the(y) attempted to escape by descending the Ohio, and in order to avoid being discovered by the whites, passed on the west side of Wheeling Island, and landed at pipe creek, a small stream that empties into the ohio a few miles below Graves creek, where they were overtaken by Cresap with a party of men from Wheeling, the(y) took one Indian scalp, and had one white man badly wounded, (Big Tarrence) they I believe carried him in a litter from Wheeling to Redstone I saw the party of them return from their victorious campaign. The Indians had for some time before this event thought themselves intruded upon by the long Knife, as they Called the Virginians at that time, and many of them were for war however the(y) called a Council, in which Logan acted a Conspicuous part, he admitted their Ground of complaint, but at the same time reminded them of some aggressions on the part of the Indians, and that by a war, they could but harass and distress the frontier Settlements for a short time, that the long Knife would come like the trees in the woods, and that ultimately, they would be drove from their good land that they now possessed; he therefore strongly recommended peace, to him they all agreed, Grounded the hatchet, everything wore a tranquil appearance, when behold, in came the

fugitives from Yellow creek; Logan's father, brother and sister murdered; what is to be done now; Logan has lost three of the nearest and dearest relations, the consequence is that this same Logan, who a few days before was so pacific, raises the hatchet, with a declaration, that he will not Ground it, until he has taken ten for one, which I believe he completely fulfilled, by taking thirty scalps and prisoners in the summer of '74, the above has often been told to me by sundry persons who was at the Indian town, at the time of the Council alluded to, and also when the remains of the party came in from Yellow creek; Thomas Nicholson has told me the above and much more, another person (whose name I cannot recollect) told me that he was at the towns when the Yellow Creek Indians came in, that there was a very Great lamentation by all the Indians of that places, some friendly Indian advised him to leave the Indians Settlement, which he did. Could any person of common rationality, believe for a moment, that the Indians came to Yellow creek with hostile intention, or that they had any suspicion of the whites, having any hostile intentions against them, would five men have crossed the river, three of them in a Short time dead drunk, the other two discharging their guns, putting themselves entirely at the mercy of the whites, or would they have brought over a squaw, with an infant paupoose, if they had not reposed the utmost Confidence in the friendship of the whites, every person who is acquainted with Indians knows better, and it was the belief of the Inhabitants who were capable of reasoning on the Subject, that all the depredations Committed on the frontiers was by Logan and his party, as a retaliation for the murder of Logan's friends at Yellow creek - I mean all the depredations committed in the year 1774. It was well known that Michael Cresap had no hand in the Massacre at Yellow Creek. West Virginia Division of Culture and History - West Virginia Archives & History © 2005 [Information given to Dr. Draper by Michael Cresap, Jr., in the autumn of 1845. 2SS, book 5, pp. 33-35.] Jos. Tomlinson said, that one of the Squaws was in the habit of crossing to Bakers to get milk, & Mrs. Baker was kind in giving her some for her 2 children, this squaw was Logan's sister, & the father of her children was John Gibson. One day she said that the Indians were angry & wd be over next day by a certain hour, & advised Mrs. Baker to move to Cat Fish's camp : the next day several Indians came at the appointed time with their faces painted black ; the men at the time were not in [the] house ; the Indians went into Bakers, & without permission took liquor & drank, & also took what rifles there were there, & one put on Nathaniel Tomlinson's military coat. After a little, Daniel Greathouse, Danl. (?) Sappinton, & Nathl. Tomlinson, George Cox, & one other came in. Tomlinson wanted his regimental coat, which the Indian did not feel disposed to yield to its owner; & Tomlinson declared he would kill him, if he did not, & the probability is the Indians were indulged with more liquor. Cox was opposed to this summary course, said it would breed an Indian war, & that he would have no hand in it; & had not gone far in the woods [when he] heard firing at the house. Greathouse, Tomlinson & Sappington were all that were concerned in the affair. Baker had no hand in it, nor was he probably present. (Thwaites, 1905, pp 9-19) From "A Man of Distinction Among Them, Alexander McKee and the Ohio Country Frontier" by Larry L. Nelson, pp. 78-81. The violence unleashed by Creasap's men spread unabated across the region, culminating in an incident that, even by frontier standards, was distinguished by its cold-blooded brutality. in 1773, a Mingo headman named Johnny Logan and a small band of followers had established a village thirty miles north of Wheeling, near the mouth of Yellow Creek (close to present-day Wellsville, Ohio). Logan was the oldest son of Johnny Shikellamy, and both father and son were well known along the western border for their steadfast loyalty to the British. During the Seven Years War, Shikellamy and his family had

sought refuge at Thomas McKee's trading post. There can be little doubt that Logan and Alexander McKee knew one another well, but the extent of their contact during the spring of 1774 is unknown. Logan's home lay opposite the site of Joshua Baker's Virginia homestead and trading post. Baker and the Mingos had lived peacefully ever since Logan's arrival. But in early May, a group of Virginians, led by Daniel Greathouse, methodically lured ten members of the Mingo village to Baker's trading post where, over the course of the afternoon, they were murdered. Among the dead were several members of Logan's immediate family, including his mother and brother. Greathouse and his companions also killed Logan's sister as she carried her newborn infant on her back. The incident began on May 1, when two men asked Capt. Michael Myers of Washington County, Pennsylvania, to guide them over to the west side of the Ohio River where they wished to travel up Yellow Creek and examine some land a few miles from the stream's confluence with the Ohio. Myers's party did not have permission to be in Indian territory and crossed the Ohio at dusk to avoid detection. Camping for the night a short distance from their destination, Myers and the two men were wakened later that evening by the loud rattling of a bell attached to one of their horses. Investigating, they discovered an Indian apparently in the act of stealing the animal. Myers shot and killed the Indian. A short while later, a second Indian, drawn to the site by the report of Myers's rifle, also was executed. Frightened, Myers and his two companions fled back to Virginia and Baker's trading post. Worried that their actions would prompt a retaliatory raid from the Yellow Creek Indians, Myers sent word to Greathouse and other neighbors within the vicinity to assemble at Baker's and prepare an ambush. Although Baker was not present, by dawn, thirty-two men were lying in wait. The following morning, unaware that the perpetrators of the previous evening's violence awaited them, eight members of Logan's band crossed the river to Baker's. Among the group were four men and three women, including Logan's brother, mother, and sister who carried her two-month-old infant on her back. Logan's band had frequently visited Baker's post and usually spent their time buying liquor, milk, and other small items. Today, Nathaniel Tomlinson, Baker's brother-in-law, was more generous than usual with his liquor and eventually invited the Indians to take part in a shooting match. As the contest began, one of the Indians, John Petty, who was somewhat intoxicated, wandered through the trading post. Coming upon Tomlinson's regimental coat and hat, he put them on and swaggered through the house claiming, "I am a White Man." The action insulted Tomlinson, and when the Indians discharged their weapons at a target, he grabbed his rifle and shot Petty as he stood in the doorway. The shot was a signal for Greathouse and the others to come out of hiding and attacked the remainder of the Mingos. The attack was swift and brutal. John Sappington, one of the Virginians, shot and killed Logan's brother and then scalped him. For years after, Sappington took particular delight in boasting of the feat and described the trophy, which still was adorned with trade silver, as a "very fine one." Logan's sister was panic stricken; she ran across the courtyard in front of the trading post and stopped six feet in front of one of Greathouse's men. In the split second that their eyes met, he put a bullet into her forehead. Grabbing the infant from her cradleboard, he took hold of its ankles and was about to dash its brains out when one of his companions intervened to save the child's life. The remaining Indians also were shot or tomahawked. Within seconds, all the Mingos were dead. The savagery of the attack was astounding, and even James Chambers, a neighbor of Baker's who was not present, declared that the murderers "appeared to have lost, in a great degree, all sentiments of humanity as well as the effects of civilization." Alarmed by the gunfire from across the river, seven other

members of Logan's camp started across the Ohio in two canoes to investigate. Greathouse and his men spread out in the underbrush on the eastern shore and fired on the Mingos as they neared land, killing two and sending the others back in retreat. A second group of Mingos attempted another landing, but like the first, was turned away by Greathouse and his companions. McKee learned of the Yellow Creek murders on May 3, and he immediately called Connolly, Kayashuta, a deputation from the Six Nations, and members of the local militia together for a meeting at Croghan's home, where he informed them of the Mingos' deaths. McKee assured his guests that the incident was the act of "a few rash and inconsiderate White People, and not by the intention or Knowledge of any of our Wise People"; he promised them that Dunmore, after he learned of the murders, would surely take every step to rectify the situation. In the meantime, McKee urged all parties to remain calm and to keep the peace. Two days later, on May 5, McKee met again with many of the same representatives. He performed the condolence ceremony, "covering the Bones of their deceas'd Friends with some Goods suitable to the Occasion and agreeable to their Custom," and he dispatched several messages to the western tribes "to convince those People to whom they were to be delivered, of our Sincerity, And That We did not countenance these Misdemeanors." McKee had responded appropriately and energetically to the dangerous situation. But the viciousness of the murders that had precipitated the crisis, when combined with the long-standing grievances of the western tribes, meant that a peaceful resolution would be difficult to obtain. Word of the murders raced through the western border settlements and with it the fear of Indian retaliation. Many fled, abandoning their homes and their possessions. "The panic becoming universal, claimed Connolly, "nothing but confusion, Distress and Flight was conspicuous." The frightened settlers were more than warranted in their apprehension. The Shawnees and Mingos had often disagreed over policy in the Ohio Country, yet Michael Creasap's adventuring and the Yellow Creek murders had been enough to bring the two tribes together for a council along the Scioto River. The two nations listened to the message sent from McKee on May 5. While dismissing McKee's words as lies, the Shawnees refused for the moment to go to war with the Virginians. But fifteen to twenty Mingos under Logan set off for the Ohio Valley to seek retribution for the loss of their family and friends." By late May, only Logan's Mingos were at war. McKee, with Croghan's assistance, had fashioned a fragile peace that greatly restricted the scope of open warfare along the Ohio frontier. As the month drew to a close, Connolly, who had seemed to support McKee's efforts up to that time, began to take a much harder diplomatic stance, possibly at Dunmore's instruction. He called out the local militia, ordered needed repairs to Fort Dunmore, and sent a party of soldiers to patrol the Ohio River below Pittsburgh, hoping to engage and defeat one of the hostile bands that roamed the area. Clearly, Virginia sought to widen the conflict, hoping that a victory over the western tribes would legitimize Virginia's claims to the region. On June 10, realizing that the local situation was well beyond his ability to influence, McKee wrote to Johnson and advised the superintendent that only the reimposition of imperial or Pennsylvanian control could halt the violence. It was impossible to predict, wrote McKee, whether the worsening situation around Pittsburgh would result in a general Indian war. But despite the violence perpetrated by natives and whites alike, there seemed to be a temporary lull in the hostilities. Now was the time that "some wise interposition of Government is truly necessary, and would undoubtedly restore peace," claimed the agent. "Without it it is impossible, and thousands of the inhabitants must be involved in misery and distress." Speaking of the Indians living in the Ohio Country, McKee wrote that

"they have given great proofs of their pacific disposition, and have acted with more moderation than those who ought to have been more rational." A war to chastise them ,would be ineffective and would inevitably lead to the "destruction of this country."