BRITISH TROOPS, COLONISTS, INDIANS, AND SLAVES IN SOUTHEASTERN NORTH AMERICA, 1756-1763

A Dissertation

by

HYUN WU LEE

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Chair of Committee,	April Hatfield
Committee Members,	Cynthia Bouton
	Angela Hudson
	Jonathan Smith
Head of Department,	David Vaught

May 2014

Major Subject: History

ABSTRACT

This work recasts the world of the North American Southeast during the Seven Years' War by examining the intersecting stories of British soldiers, colonists, Indians, and enslaved and free Africans. Populated with diverse Indians, Europeans, and enslaved and free Africans, the Southeast remained a vibrant and fiercely contested space that can be viewed as a slice of the Atlantic world in which the larger, external forces of imperialism and market capitalism collided throughout the eighteenth century.

It also argues that the political, social, and intercultural dimensions of the Seven Years' War relations between British soldiers and colonists cannot be fully understood without examining the experiences of Indians and enslaved Africans—especially in the Southeast. While British soldiers often judged the inhabitants of the Southeast based on their notions of race, class, and gender to maintain their identity as King's Troops, these differences did not preclude them from pursuing economic interests with the local planters or share social, physical spaces together with the Indians and enslaved Africans.

DEDICATION

To my parents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Hatfield, and my committee members, Dr. Hudson, Dr. Bouton, and Dr. Smith, for their guidance and support throughout the course of this research. I also thank my former advisers Peter Field at the University of Canterbury and Dan Thorp at Virginia Tech for their moral support.

Thanks also go to my friends and colleagues and the department faculty and staff for making my time at Texas A&M University a great experience. I want to extend my gratitude to the Merlbern G. Glasscock Center and Carol and Boe W. Martin for their generous funding which allowed me to travel to numerous archives in the United States and the United Kingdom. I wish to give special thanks to William L. Clements Library and the David Library of the American Revolution for granting me fellowships to access their archives on site.

Finally, thanks to my parents for their encouragement, patience, and love during all those years I spent in graduate schools.

NOMENCLATURE

Add. MS.	Additional Manuscripts
CO	Colonial Office
GD	Gift and Deposits
LO	Loudoun Papers
SCDAH	South Carolina Department of Archives and History
SCHS	South Carolina Historical Society
WO	War Office

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER I

BRITISH TROOPS AND SOUTHEASTERN NORTH AMERICA IN THE SEVEN YEARS' WAR

> "There is no Danger that we shall fall in Love wth. South Carolina, if we had any Inclination that Way, their genteel Proceeding with us would soon cure us of it."[1]

— Henry Bouquet to John Stanwix, 1757

No British officer castigated South Carolina more than Colonel Henry Bouquet. His bitter disputes with the colonists over the quartering of his troops have led scholars to characterize relations between the British army and South Carolina's Anglo-American civilian populations as confrontational and antagonistic. This is a grossly incomplete picture, however. British troops daily engaged in various exchanges with the diverse inhabitants of the Southeast—colonists, Indians, as well as both free and enslaved Africans—and collaborated with them to pursue common economic interests despite some frictions. Such interactions provide us a unique window to examine how British troops understood indigenous and creolized inhabitants of the British Colonial Southeast and to see in new ways how these various local populations dealt with one another in a wartime context and in the presence of British troops.

The emergence of Atlantic World studies has stressed the importance of peoples' mobility over the oceans and the resulting connections that enmeshed of peoples from

---

[1] Henry Bouquet to John Stanwix, October 27, 1757. *The Papers of Henry Bouquet Vol. 1*, S.K. Stevens, Donald H, Kent, and Autumn L. Leonard, (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1972), p.231

the Americas, Africa, and Europe. While most of the works dealing with intercultural relations consider how colonists or European creoles interacted with Indians and enslaved Africans, the European subjects of those studies tend to be traders or elites in government. Some of these colonists acted as soldiers in wartime, but unlike Britain, France, or Spain North American colonies had no professional soldiers. Although soldiers receive mention when intercultural relations are concerned, they are rarely seen as the role of intercultural agents. Rather, they appear as tools of war, bent on slaughtering slaves in arms and exterminating Indians. While such violence and cruelty frequently occurred wherever colonial or British troops were present, it does not provide the entire picture of actions on the ground when these soldiers shared colonial space with its varied occupants.

Scholars have not offered analysis of the socio-cultural experiences of British troops in the Southeast despite narrating the chain of events leading to war and the complex peace treaty negotiation processes in detail. They have customarily included the Anglo-Cherokee Wars of 1760-61 in their works about the Seven Years' War but not many have assessed it from the perspective of everyday informal and formal exchanges between the British troops and the Indian warriors and enslaved Africans who played vital roles. From Lawrence Henry Gipson to Fred Anderson to Daniel Baugh, the

conflict in the southern theater served as a brief episodic diversion to the main drama and battles unfolding in the Ohio Country and Canada or in the Indian subcontinent.[2]

Historians of the British empire have studied British troops' involvement in the Seven Years' War within the frame of the empire's projection of power to its overseas possessions and the war's impact on "making and unmaking" of empires, invariably casting their gaze toward the War of American Independence. For instance, Peter Marshall asserts that the Seven Years' War "did much to bring about close integration between Britain and its Atlantic colonies," citing as evidence the expansion of trade, surging interests in land grants and public office positions in the colonies, and an influx of new migrants who were often ex-soldiers.[3] Marshall might be correct in his holistic observation of the effect of the Seven Years' War on the British empire, but he conflates British troops' experience in the Atlantic colonies with the war efforts in New England, New York, and Pennsylvania to draw his conclusions. Moreover, Marshall and other British imperial historians frame the British army's relations with the American colonists primarily as a tension between military power and civil power, emphasizing disagreements over financing military logistics such as raising men, quartering troops, procuring provisions, and maintaining forts in frontiers. Such a frame focuses exclusively on the imperial-colonial relations through the lens of the British army's high command and elite colonial officials while overlooking British troops' daily social

---

[2] Lawrence H. Gipson, *The Triumphant Empire: New Responsibilities within the Enlarged Empire, 1763-1766* (New York: Knopf, 1968); Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War*, (New York: Vintage Books, 2000); Daniel Baugh, *The Global Seven Years War, 1754-1763* (New York: Longman, 2011)

[3] Peter Marshall, *The Making and Unmaking of Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p.117

engagements with ethnically diverse colonists, American Indians and people of African descent.[4]

As a result, these grand syntheses have chosen to describe the war in terms of skirmishes, body counts, destruction wrought on the Cherokees by the British army, and the negotiation of the peace treaty. The emergence of social history of the British army and British colonies in wartime since the 1970s brought out the aspects of military

---

[4] Notable academic works covering the British troops' activities in the Southeast during the Seven Years' War are: Lawrence H. Gipson, *The Triumphant Empire: New Responsibilities within the Enlarged Empire, 1763-1766* (New York: Knopf, 1968) J.R. Alden, *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier* (New York: Gordian Press, 1966), David Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier: Conflict and Survival, 1740-62* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962), Stanley Pargellis, *Lord Loudoun in North America* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1968; first print, 1933) Francis Jennings, *Empire of Fortune: Crowns, Colonies, and Tribes in the Seven Years War in America* (New York: Norton, 1988) Tom Hatley, *The Dividing Paths: Cherokees and South Carolinians through the Era of Revolution* (New York : Oxford University Press, 1993), Ian K. Steele, *Warpaths: Invasions of North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), Robin Fabel, *Colonial Challenges : Britons, Native Americans, and Caribs, 1759-1775* (Gainesville : University Press of Florida, 2000), Stephen Brumwell, *Redcoats* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War*, (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), D.E. Leach, *Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America 1607-1763* (New York: MacMillan, 1973), Paul David Nelson, *General James Grant: Scottish Soldier and Governor of East Florida*. (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1993), Walter Stitt Robinson, *The Southern Colonial Frontier 1607-1763* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1979), Steve Bruce, "The Cherokee Wars 1759 to 1761," *Miniature War Games* 140 and 141 (1995), Michael James Foret, "On the Marchlands of Empire: Trade, Diplomacy, and War on the Southeastern Frontier, 1733-1763" (Ph.D. diss., College of William and Mary, 1990) For contemporary accounts of the Cherokee expedition, see Christopher Gadsden [Pseudonym: Philopatrios], *Some Observations of the Two Campaigns against the Cherokee Indians.* (Charles-Town [S.C.]: Printed and sold by Peter Timothy, MDCCLXII. 1762) Evans Digital Edition, Early American Imprints, Series I: Evans, 1639-1800, #9242, #9243, George Milligen Johnston, *A Short Description of the Province of South-Carolina*. (London: Printed for John Hinton, 1770) Huntington Library, Sabin Collection, Unit 283: Range 53,859-53,860, James Adair, *History of the American Indians*. (London: 1775) ed. Kathryn E. Holland Braund (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, c2005), William De Brahm, *De Brahm's Report of the General Survey in the Southern District of North America*, ed. Louis De Vorsey, Jr. (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina, 1971) On colonial South Carolina during the Seven Years' War, see Jack Greene and J.R. Pole, *Colonial British America: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1984), Michael Morris, "The High Price of Trade: Anglo-Indian Trade Mistakes and the Fort Loudoun Disaster," *Journal of Cherokee Studies* 17 (1996). For latest collections of essays on the Seven Years' War, see Matt Schumann and Karl Schweizer, *The Seven Years War: A transatlantic history* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

history outside the battlefield and logistics.[5] Although many social histories of the British army and soldiers unearthed previously neglected aspects of the history in terms of their experiences in the Americas and exchanges with the inhabitants, the focal point of relations were limited to those between British troops and colonial troops and colonial civilians.[6]

Although "New Indian" historians recently have done a better job in complicating the picture, their discussions of interactions between British soldiers and American Indians still tend to focus on military operations (understandably due to the nature of sources) with exceptions in the rare cases of Indian captives sprinkled over the larger narratives of the war. The neglect of the Southeast among scholars of white-Indian relations in North America is particularly noticeable. Richard White's paradigm-shifting *Middle Grounds* recast the scholarship on white-Indian relations; Collin Calloway's prolific works examining the social and cultural exchanges between Indians and Euro-

---

[5] On social histories of the British army and recent scholarship on "War and Society," see John Shy, *A People Numerous and Armed: Reflections on the Military Struggle for American independence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), Fred Anderson, *A People's Army: Massachusetts soldiers and society in the Seven Years' War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), Sylvia Frey, *The British Soldier in America: A Social History of Military Life in the Revolutionary Period* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), Glenn Steppler, *The Common Soldier in the Reign of George III, 1760-1793* (PhD. disst.: University of Oxford, 1984), Michael McConnell, *Army and Empire: British soldiers on the American frontier, 1758-1775* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004). Daniel Krebs, *A Generous and Merciful Enemy: Life for German Prisoners of War during the American Revolution* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2013) On the impact of the Seven Years' War on Britain, see Stephen Conway, *War, State, and Society in mid-eighteenth-century Britain and Ireland* (Oxford; New York : Oxford University Press, 2006)

[6] Several historians have highlighted the frictions between British and American soldiers during the Seven Years' War. See, Alan Rogers, *Empire and Liberty: American Resistance to British Authority, 1755-1763*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), Leach, *Roots of Conflict,* chaps. 5-6. British imperial historians reject this interpretation. See Stephen Conway, "From Fellow-Nationals to Foreigners: British Perceptions of the Americans, circa 1739-1783," *William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, Vol. 41, No. 2* (Apr., 1984), pp. 80-81. "The ill-effects should be not be exaggerated, however; much of the frictions was based on perceived military disparities."

Americans or Britons; Daniel Richter's examination of European colonization from the perspective of Indians; Peter Silver's study of how Indian wars shaped American colonists' psyche and identity; and Eric Hinderaker's portrayal of Indians occupying the space on the edge of the British empire and later the United States are only a small sample of the literature that largely ignores the Southeast from their studies.[7]

Several historians have written about southeastern Indians and their relations with colonists, but these works have often lacked the Atlantic perspective of white-Indian relations in the Southeast. For instance, James Axtell's *The Indians' New South*, James Merrell's *The Indians' New World*, and John Juricek's *Colonial Georgia and the Creeks* more or less tell their stories from regional perspectives without the context of the British Atlantic World where people constantly traversed across the Atlantic Ocean carrying news and information to the British metropole and other peripheries of the empire.[8] British troops represented an ideal example of transient actors in the Atlantic World who constantly moved wherever they needed to in wartime. After the Seven Years' War, some of them settled permanently in the British colonies while others went

---

[7] Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Collin Calloway, *New Worlds for All: Indians, Europeans, and the Remaking of Early America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), Daniel K. Richter, *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 2001), Peter Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2007), Eric Hinderaker, *Elusive Empires: Constructing Colonialism in the Ohio Valley, 1673-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), Eric Hinderaker and Peter Mancall, *At the Edge of Empire: The Backcountry in British North America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003)

[8] James Axtell, *The Indians' New South: Cultural Change in the Colonial Southeast* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1997), James Merrell, *The Indians' New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbors from European Contact through the Era of Removal* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), John Juricek, *Colonial Georgia and the Creeks* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2010)

home and then returned to America once again to fight colonists who turned into rebels. While British imperial historians have examined the British imaginings of America due to the increasing accessibility of the printing press and Britons' growing interest in its overseas colonies, studying British troops' direct encounters and exchanges with the inhabitants of the Southeast shows us a different picture compared to Britons' popular imaginations based on secondary accounts in the British Isles.[9]

This study will examine British troops' verbal and ritual exchanges with American Indians and diverse colonial occupants of the Southeast in the woods, forts, and colonial towns where their paths frequently converged.[10] If colonial or creole

---

[9] On American Indians in a transatlantic cultural context, see Troy Bickham, *Savages within the Empire: Representations of American Indians in eighteenth-century Britain* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), Tim Fulford and Kevin Hutchings, *Native Americans and Anglo-American Culture, 1750-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) Tim Fulford, *Romantic Indians: Native Americans, British Literature, and Transatlantic Culture, 1756-1830* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006). Alden Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters: American Indians in Britain, 1500-1776*. For a contemporary work, see Henry Timberlake, *The Memoirs of Lt. Henry Timberlake: the Story of a Soldier, Adventurer, and Emissary to the Cherokees, 1756-1765* (Original print, London: 1765), ed. Duane H. King, (Cherokee, N.C.: Museum of the Cherokee Indian Press, 2007)

[10] Douglas Leach, *Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America 1607-1763* (New York: MacMillan, 1973), John Shy, *Toward Lexington: The Role of the British Army in the Coming of the American Revolution* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965), Colin Calloway, *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006); British imperial historians have produced works on British soldiers in North America than Early Americanists but they tend to focus on the questions on the identity of "British-ness" and "Britons" and "Americans" emerged as the British subjects across the Atlantic experienced the Seven Years' War and the War of American Independence by looking at the British officers in North America. These works, however, pay less attention to the actual interactions between the British troops and the inhabitants of America on the ground than focusing on Britons' emerging perception of "Americans" by consuming mass print materials at home. In addition, scholars have paid more attention to the American War of Independence than the Seven Years' War as they wanted answer question on the British empire's tenacity in the American colonies in the aftermaths of revolutionary era. See Stephen Conway, "From Fellow-Nationals to Foreigners: British Perceptions of the Americans, circa 1739-1783," *William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, Vol. 41, No. 2* (Apr., 1984), pp. 265-276; "British Army Officers and the American War for Independence," *William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, Vol. 41, No. 2* (Apr., 1984): 265-276; Ed. Julie Flavell and Stephen Conway, *Britain and America go to War: the Impact of War and Warfare in Anglo-America, 1754-1815* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2004), Peter Marshall, *The Making and Unmaking of Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), Eliga H. Gould, *The Persistence of Empire: British Political Culture in the Age of American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, N.C.:

soldiers had infamous reputations for committing horrendous violence and cruelty (which they certainly did) resulting from the seizure of Indian land, sexual assaults, or drunken killings, they also daily interacted with Indians in more mundane ways—hunting, participating in rituals together, conversing, or simply sharing physical spaces. Such proximity could elicit unspoken responses and observations that later surfaced in writing or speech. Despite the rich sources, British troops—officers and rank-and-file—have received relatively little attention from Early American scholars other than military historians investigating the British army in the Seven Years' War and the Revolutionary War.

Previous studies on British troops in the Southeast have focused on two key events: Henry Bouquet's quartering in Charles Town in 1757 and the Cherokee expeditions of 1760-61. As for Bouquet's short-lived stay in South Carolina, scholars have exclusively written about financial and constitutional disputes involving Bouquet and the Commons House of South Carolina.[11] Stanley Pargellis and Jack Greene agree that Bouquet's quartering dispute exposed the problem of legal authority of the British commander-in-chief in North America over exercising the Mutiny Acts that included clauses on quartering troops. These clauses neither clarified specifics on how to proceed

---

University of North Carolina Press, c2000), Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992); On works on the British army that extensively covers the Seven Years' Wars, see J.A. Houlding, *Fit for Service: the Training of the British Army, 1715-1795* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981); Stephen Brumwelll *Redcoats* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), Linda Colley, *Captives: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1600-1850* (New York : Pantheon Books, 2002)

[11] Stanley Pargellis, *Lord Loudoun in North America*; Jack P. Greene, "The South Carolina Quartering Dispute, 1757-1758," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 60 (1959): 193-204

with procuring quarters nor who should bear its expenses in the American colonies.[12] Consequently, Bouquet's quartering dispute set a precedent for future controversy over the Quartering Act of 1765 when the South Carolina's assembly defied Bouquet's request to quarter the troops at the private homes of inhabitants. In other words, the incident served as yet another example of the growing rift between the British imperial authorities and the colonial assemblies in North America as the Seven Years' War exacted a staggering financial burden. These narratives that focus on the conflict have failed to see that the stories involving British troops quartered at various locations of Charles Town often described their everyday social interactions with the town's inhabitants and have a great deal to tell us about how race, class, gender, and ethnicity operated.[13]

Surprisingly, scholars of Cherokee history also have not examined the Anglo-Cherokee War in depth, as they tend to take a long-term view of the Cherokee-British relations or examine the cultural changes within the Cherokee society from the eighteenth to the nineteenth centuries. Consequently, the conflict is interpreted as the continuation of white-Indian relations fraught with violence, lies, and greed.[14] John

---

[12] Marshall, *The Making and Unmaking of Empire*, p.103

[13] On the quartering disputes in Anglo-America before revolutionary era, see Allen Rogers, "Colonial Opposition to the Quartering of Troops During the French and Indian War," *Military Affairs 34* (1970): 7-11, Douglas Leach, *Roots of Conflict: British Armed Forces and Colonial Americans, 1677-1763* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), John Shy. *Toward Lexington*, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965)

[14] David Corkran's *The Cherokee Frontier* provided a comprehensive overview of the conflict based on long-term relations between the South Carolinians and the Cherokees from the first encounter of the British and the Cherokees and the political factions within the Cherokee Nation. For Hatley, the Anglo-Cherokee wars reflected one of the many themes among the Cherokee-Carolinian relations forged in the common interests of trade that did not last long but diverged, resulting in the contraction of Cherokee power in the region.

Oliphant's latest work on the Cherokee-British conflict more or less follows the tradition of his predecessors with a heavy emphasis on the shrewd or poor statesmanship of the prominent actors involved in the conflict.[15] It is essentially a political and diplomatic history on the origins and resolutions of the Cherokee-British conflict showing the problems of British Indian policies and their actual applications and bending the rules for practical reasons on the ground by the key individuals.

This study examines the social and military affairs in South Carolina during the Seven Years' War as a part of larger spatial unit ("Southeastern North America") within the Atlantic world. Populated with diverse Indians, Europeans, and enslaved and free men and women of African descent, the southeast remained a vibrant and fiercely contested space that can be viewed as a miniature of the Atlantic world in which the larger, external forces of imperialism and market capitalism collided throughout the eighteenth century. I hope to demonstrate that the concept of "occupied space"—in which interactions occurred between occupying soldiers and occupied civilians—serves as a useful interpretive framework to reevaluate the impact of British troops on colonial frontiers and cities where their everyday interactions with Euro-Americans, Indians, and enslaved and free Africans shaped their daily lives. The crux of my research interest lies with investigating these moments of encounter along the lines of race, ethnicity, gender, and class, to demonstrate that daily interactions played a crucial role in carving out so-

[15] John Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier, 1756-63* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001)

called "zone of exchanges" within the Atlantic world.[16] The sources generated by the presence of British troops permit us to see into these interactions and can show us what happened when the troops' occupation destabilized the social relations that preceded the army's arrival.

Envisioning the colonial southeast as an integral building block of the Atlantic world, I examine British officers and rank-and-file soldiers as conduits of information who, as they sailed across the oceans and coasts in an effort to expand and defend the interests of British empire, linked the different regions of the Atlantic world. These British soldiers—of diverse ethnic backgrounds including Scots, Swiss, Irish, and German—did not merely fight against enemies in skirmishes. They spent a significant portion of their time in the New World engaging in local affairs with colonial and indigenous inhabitants. They also travelled great distances, especially in wartime. My

---

[16] This dissertation is heavily influenced by Gary Nash's seminal work interweaving the experiences of three peoples of Native Americans, Europeans, and Africans in North America. British Colonial Southeast is an ideal zone of the Atlantic World to study interactions between the three peoples. See Gary Nash, *Red, White, and Black: The Peoples of Early America*, 6th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1982) For examples of scholarship adopting Nash's approach, see Daniel Usner, Jr., *American Indians in the lower Mississippi Valley* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), Robert Paulett, *An Empire of Small Places: Mapping the Southeastern Anglo-Indian trade, 1732-1795* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012), Angela Pulley Hudson, *Creek Paths and Federal Roads: Indians, Settlers, and Slaves and the Making of the American South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010). For scholarship on the American Revolution and its implication for the three peoples, see Jim Piecuch, Three peoples, *One King: Loyalists, Indians, and Slaves in the Revolutionary South, 1775-1782* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2008) or Woody Holton, *Forced Founders* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999) Placing the British Colonial Southeast in the framework of the Atlantic World is one of the objectives of this study. For major works on Atlantic World studies, see Nicholas Canny, "Writing Atlantic History; or, Reconfiguring the History of Colonial British America," *The Journal of American History 86* (1999): 1093-1114, Bernard Bailyn, *Atlantic History: Concepts and Contours* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005), Jack Greene and Philip Morgan, *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), David Armitage and Michael Braddick, *The British Atlantic World*, 2nd ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), John Elliott, *Empires of the Atlantic World* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2006). On Colonial Southeast and the Atlantic World, see James Carson, *Making an Atlantic World: Circles, Paths, and Stories from the Colonial South* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2007)

dissertation demonstrates that relations between British soldiers and colonists cannot be fully understood without examining British troops' perceptions of and interactions with Indians and enslaved Africans—especially in the southeast where their dominating presence permeated the fabric of colonial society that British troops temporarily occupied. I argue that the British troops' daily social interactions with Indians and enslaved Africans shaped the British officers' attitudes toward the Southeast's colonists, the existing relations between British subjects across the Atlantic, and the direction of British imperial policies in the Southeast.

Contrary to the image of British troops isolating themselves away in forts and barracks from the colonial populations, they actually engaged in numerous exchanges with peoples of all sorts as they shared space and lived together with the diverse inhabitants of the Southeast during the Seven Years War. Although temporary in nature, the sudden influx of a sizeable number of British troops disrupted a peculiar colonial society founded on plantation economy and racial slavery; in turn, the British troops quickly adapted to colonial practices and norms in their dealings with colonists, Indians, and enslaved and free Africans. Some even assimilated into the society.

To understand the world that British troops encountered, Chapter Two outlines a brief history of colonial South Carolina as the heart of the British "southern frontier" in North America, its geopolitical status in the Atlantic World, and the British strategy in the region from the first half of the eighteenth century to the commencement of the Seven Years' War. In the early eighteenth century, South Carolinians repeatedly petitioned the Board of Trade and Plantations and King George I that the mother country

take care of George's subjects of the "southern province." The call for protection of South Carolina (and subsequently Georgia) stemmed from the traumatic experience of the Yamassee War in 1715, prompting colonists to demand immediate attention from the British government that had left matters of defense largely up to local militia. Not only did colonists fear the Spanish and French and their Indian allies, but they also demanded direct royal intervention to rescind the charter from the proprietorship and bolster the colony's defense. In 1719, the colonists succeeded in toppling the Proprietors. Consequently, the transition from the proprietorship to a crown colony signaled the reshaping of southeastern North America into a hotly contested borderland, as British imperialists and colonists alike pursued an expansionist strategy to check French Louisiana and Spanish Florida. Hence, when the Seven Years' War began in earnest in North America in 1755 with Edward Braddock's disastrous defeat by the French at Monongahela, it did not take long for the British troops to be deployed to the "southern frontier."[17]

Chapter Three explores how the arrival of ethnically heterogeneous British troops—composed mainly of German-speaking Royal Americans (mostly recruited from the Dutch Pennsylvania region under the command of Swiss officers) and Scottish Highlanders—propelled all sorts of political, social, and economic exchanges, both informal and formal, with local inhabitants. Looking at the writings and activities of British soldiers in Charles Town reveals that the traditional understanding of the

---

[17] Vernon Crane, *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732* (Durham, N.C., Duke University Press, 1928; reprint, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956) Vernon Crane popularized the concept of "southern frontier" but scholars have rejected his concept since then.

quartering dispute as primarily a legal and fiscal battle misses how race and ethnicity worked the behind the scene. The inhabitants of Charles Town resented the presence of predominately German-speaking Royal Americans who vandalized public properties, swore and (sexually) assaulted residents; in contrast, they appear to have turned a blind eye to the Highlanders and even voluntarily provided quarters to them at their private homes. In addition, Bouquet's private purchase of a plantation and "negro" slaves earned the ire of South Carolinian elites, further aggravating the ongoing quartering dispute. Beneath these publicized frictions, however, British troops contributed significantly to the local economy, as the demand for provisions and quarters meant that landlords, tavernkeepers, and artisans found an expanded market for their goods and services.

The British army also exchanged intelligence and forged military alliances with the Indian nations of the Southeast during the Seven Years' War in order to fight against their common enemies. Although the Fort Duquesne expedition took place outside the geographical boundaries of the Southeast, Chapter Four examines how British officers dealt with Cherokees and Catawbas in the context of the mission. Miscommunication, misunderstanding, and cultural incompatibility over the meanings of gift giving and alliance troubled the Cherokee-British relations from beginning to end. As Gregory Dowd has shown, British officers John Forbes and Henry Bouquet regarded the Cherokee allies as no more than mercenaries who owed valuable military services to the British in exchange for their pay.[18] In contrast, the Cherokee warriors who agreed to join

[18] Gregory Dowd, "Gift Giving and the Cherokee-British Alliance," in *Contact Points* ed. Andrew R.L. Cayton and Fredrika J. Teute (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998)

the expedition wanted relations on an equal footing with the British and viewed the terms of the agreement as negotiable over time. By examining how the British officers perceived the words and actions of the Cherokee warriors, this chapter suggests how simple but misinterpreted communications led to a series of unfounded suspicions and frustrations on both sides and ultimately a failed alliance.

Chapter Five examines James Grant's expedition against the Cherokees in 1761, paying special attention to the first three months the British troops' stay in Charles Town. From January to March of 1761, soldiers and officers occupied various public spaces of Charles Town as a de facto garrison force and interacted extensively with white and black townspeople and Indian visitors. They involved themselves in the town's market economy, recruited African pioneers, robbed Creek Indian visitors, attended Sunday services at local churches, and participated in a massive public ceremony to hail the ascension of George III, ate and drank in taverns, and formed liaison with local women. Thus, the occupied space of Charles Town facilitated the extensive everyday informal and formal exchanges between British troops and Charles Town's free and enslaved women and men and the Indians.

Chapter Six follows up everyday interactions but shifts the focus deep into Cherokee country. Instead of investigating the details of military operations and logistics and the settlement of peace terms between the Cherokee and British leaders, this chapter focuses on various incidents involving British troops, allied Indian warriors (mostly Senecas, Catawbas, and Chickasaws), and Cherokee prisoners. In the early phase of the expedition, Indian warriors acted independently rather than working together with

British troops, as hunting accidents and a violent murder involving the Seneca revealed. British officers also viewed the accompanying Indian warriors in a scornful manner. By the end of four months of campaigning, however, they might have become more integrated as a fighting unit and appreciated each other. These vigorous informal and formal exchanges defined the British troops' experiences in Charles Town and in the colonial Southeast as much as did the warfare against the French and the Indians, heretofore emphasized in scholarship on the era.

These interactions sometimes brought tensions to colonial politics and social order as both the British officers and rank-and-file soldiers pursued their own interests in the Southeast, which often conflicted with the colonists. As much as the presence of British troops might have temporarily changed the colonial Southeast, the powerful economic force of rice and indigo plantations run by slave labor also drew in some British officers who possessed the social and economic means to take advantage of economic opportunities they saw in South Carolina. Although Henry Bouquet and James Grant complained constantly of the colonists' shortcomings and insolence, they quickly invested their capital in plantations and slaves, hoping to increase their wealth while they continued to carry out military duties elsewhere.

After the Seven Years' War effectively terminated in the Southeast with the signing of the peace treaty between the Cherokees and the South Carolinians in 1761, Bouquet and Grant maintained their social ties and networks with the elites of South Carolina. James Grant, who later became East Florida Governor, undertook the task of transforming Florida into a plantation economy modeled after South Carolina as he

collaborated with South Carolinian merchants and planters to expand the British empire before he returned to Scotland.[19] Similarly, Henry Bouquet also invested in plantations and slaves in South Carolina before his incompetent manager accumulated debts that forced him to liquidate the property while Bouquet fought in the Ohio country and at Fort Pitt.[20]

The study of British troops in the Southeast benefits from the fortuitous preservation of British officers' papers preserved in private and public archives. In addition to official records and correspondence housed in the National Archives at Kew, James Grant's Papers (also known as *Ballindalloch Muniments*) and the papers of Henry Bouquet (a compilation from the larger portfolio of the *Frederick Haldimand Papers*), in particular, constitute invaluable sources that provide British perspectives on the societies they encountered in southeastern North America. Fascinating court martial records preserved in *War Office 71* (housed in the National Archives at Kew) and officers' orderly books also provide a glimpse of how the British rank-and-file interacted with various South Carolina inhabitants. Colonial sources written by colonial officers, newspaper editors, planters, merchants, missionaries, travellers, and colonial women reveal that the British troops visiting the Southeast were never isolated from the local

---

[19] For James Grant's career as the Governor of East Florida, see Paul David Nelson, *General James Grant: Scottish Soldier and Governor of East Florida*. (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1993)

[20] As one historian of the British army noted, British officers' involvement in colonial affairs might have been extensive but British rank-and-files also attempted to make sense of the New World as they interacted with colonists, Indians, and enslaved Africans. William A. Foote, "The Army in the Eighteenth Century" in *A Guide to the Sources of British Military History* ed., Robin Higham, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971), p.131, "There was almost certainly a parallel Plantations Commission Register, now lost or strayed, which possibly may slumber peacefully unrecognized in some collection. This ledger, if found, will shed significant light on the participation of army officers in local colonial affairs. While no such ledger has been found, my work shows that other extant sources allow us to explore such issues.

population but constantly engaged in exchanges with the peoples around them, mediated by their race, class, and gender.

In the Southeast, Indian affairs proved a divisive subject between British troops and colonists, fracturing the imperial-colonial relations as demonstrated in the Fort Duquesne expedition and the Anglo-Cherokee War. Although certain British officers exhibited strong anti-Indian sentiment against the Cherokees in the Fort Duquesne episode, the Anglo-Cherokee War demonstrated British troops' extensive everyday interactions with Indian warriors and accompanying the Cherokee expedition brought them closer together. On the other hand, British officers denigrated the South Carolinians for causing an unnecessary conflict that drained the resources of the British army to such a degree that some questioned the necessity of fighting against the Cherokees.

These differences, however, tended to dissipate submerge while British troops were quartered in Charles Town. Despite a vocal dispute between Bouquet and the Commons House of South Carolina and the townspeople's ethnic animosity toward the Royal Americans in 1757, British troops and Charles Town's inhabitants came closer together as they engaged in daily social, economic exchanges. While British soldiers often judged the inhabitants of the Southeast based on their notions of race, class, and gender, and with an eye to maintaining their identity as the King's Troops, these differences did not preclude their pursuit of personal economic interests within the local plantation economy or the sharing of social and physical spaces with Indian warriors and people of African descent. Thus, unlike in the northern colonies where the British

subjects' shared war effort and euphoria of victory against the common foes united them, everyday social and economic exchanges bridged differences between British troops and the diverse inhabitants of the Southern provinces over the course of the Seven Years' War.

CHAPTER II

THE SOUTHEAST AND SOLDIERS

As this study demonstrates, we still do not know a lot about British troops' experience in North America, especially their informal and formal exchanges with the inhabitants.[21] Southeastern North America deserves a separate study of British troops' experience and exchanges with its peoples despite Fred Anderson's magisterial synthesis of the Seven Years' War and John Shy's *longue durée* approach to British troops in British North America.[22] Although the Seven Years' War and British troops in North America have received plenty of attention, we still know little about what social and cultural roles British troops assumed in the region. Frequently told narratives of British soldiers engaging in unconventional warfare with Indians, garrisoning forts in frontiers, and cooped up in the barracks of colonial cities conjure an image of soldiers isolated from other inhabitants of North America. Although historians have written extensively about British officers' disdain and condescension toward the colonial militia or

---

[21] By "British troops," I mean rank-and-file and officers recruited from either in Britain or Europe belonging to Regiments of Foot with numeric numbers (from 1st to 115th) and nicknames assigned to them such as 17th Forbes, 21st Royal North British Fusileers, and 77th Montgomery's Highlanders. By "colonial troops," I mean locally raised troops in the English colonies of North America known as Provincial regiment (Virginian regiment, Pennsylvania regiment, South Carolina regiment, etc.) and Independent Companies of South Carolina and New York. See, J.A. Houlding, *Fit for Service: The Training of the British Army, 1715-1795* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981)

[22] Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War*, (New York: Vintage Books, 2000); John Shy, *Toward Lexington: The Role of the British Army in the Coming of the American Revolution* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965)

authorities, social interactions and intercultural relations between the British troops and the peoples of America have been overlooked.[23]

British Colonial Southeast as a Historical and Geographical Unit

For the purpose of this study, I use the term "Southeast" in relation to the center of the North American continent. Neither the colonists nor the Britons used the term to describe their geographical position; they simply used terms such as "southern frontier" or "southern provinces" to designate South Carolina and Georgia. For Native Americans, such European spatial conceptualizations were irrelevant. As Indians became enmeshed in the networks of trade with French and English, however, they increasingly understood their place relative to European trading partners.[24]

The topographical features as well as the geopolitical circumstances in the Southeast resulted in a variety of settings that encouraged informal and formal

---

[23] See Alan Rogers, *Empire and Liberty: American Resistance to British Authority, 1755-1763*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), Leach, *Roots of Conflict,* chaps. 5-6

[24] On the discussion of the transformation of southeastern Indian culture through European contact, see Nancy Shoemaker, *A Strange Likeness: Becoming Red and White in Eighteenth-century North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), Robert Paulett *An Empire of Small Places* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012). Robbie Ethridge and Charles Hudson, Charles. *The Transformation of the Southeastern Indians, 1540-1760.* (Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 2002) Robbie Ethridge, *Creek Country: The Creek Indians and Their World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), pp.22-32. John Juricek, *Colonial Georgia and the Creeks* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2010). James Merrell, *The Indians' New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbors from European Contact through the Era of Removal* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989). Tom Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993). Gregory A. Waselkov and Peter H. Wood and M. Thomas Hatley. *Powhatan's Mantle: Indians in the Colonial Southeast, Revised and Expanded Edition.* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2006) See also D.W. Meinig , *The Shaping of America*: *Atlantic America, 1492-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004). Meinig clusters "Carolina and the Carolinas" separate from French Louisiana and Spanish Florida to highlight the different settlement types, domain, and development. But, in this study, I include Louisiana and Florida to show how British colonists frequently referenced their rival European settlements in the discussion of defense.

exchanges between British troops, European colonists, Indians, and enslaved or free Africans. For example, informal bartering of goods and services between British troops and local inhabitants occurred at European forts, towns, military encampments, waterways, roads, and plantations, where colonial authority exerted limited control.[25] South Carolina's extensive networks of creeks, streams, and rivers running over swampy lands in the low country and the western interior's hilly terrain allowed the movement of Indians and colonial traders. In the larger geo-political framework of the Atlantic World, the Southeast was connected to Spanish Florida, the Caribbean, the Gulf of Mexico, and French Louisiana via rivers and coastal lines. These geographical features and the imperial boundaries of the Southeast resulted in diverse political, social, demographic, economic, and cultural patterns that rendered the experience of British troops in the Southeast fundamentally different from those in the Middle Colonies or New England. In short, paying special attention to geographical perspectives of the Southeast has the potential to recast the narrative and analysis of the Seven Years' War along the southern frontiers.

The South Carolinians themselves clearly understood the placement of South Carolina in the realm of the Atlantic World in connection with the Caribbean Islands, French Louisiana, Africa, and Europe. An anonymous report (presumably written sometime in the 1740s) boasted Port Royal in Charles Town as "the most commodious for the Rendezvous of the King's Ships" in "all places in British America" where "they

---

[25] Helen Hornbeck Tanner, "The Land and Water Communication Systems of the Southeastern Indians," in Gregory A. Waselkov and Peter H. Wood and M. Thomas Hatley. *Powhatan's Mantle: Indians in the Colonial Southeast,* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2006), pp.27-42

can have frequent and almost constant advices from all the Governm[ts] on the Continent," including Jamaica, Havana, and Providence all within ten days. In addition, the author asserted that the ships stationed in Port Royal, "can sooner relieve any of the Windward Islands than from Jamaica, and be vastly more convenient to protect our own and annoy the Enemies Colonies in America than at any other place in the British Dominions."[26] Similarly, when the Cherokee War raged in South Carolina in 1760, Lieutenant Governor William Bull described South Carolina's geographic location to the Board of Trade as having, "an easy communication with old France, and their West Indies, adjacent to Louisiana, and accommodated with good Harbours on the Atlantic Ocean." These remarks indicated that contemporaries understood their place in the Atlantic World as a strategic North Caribbean commercial outpost.[27]

The Colonial Southeast was a borderland where three European powers competed for hegemony as they expanded their territory and trading posts into the Indian countries. Hence, Spanish Florida, British South Carolina, and French Louisiana created a complex web of competition for trade and alliances with various Indian nations to balance the power in the region.[28] Unlike the Spanish or French, the British colonists aggressively contested boundaries with Indians nearby by purchasing land, condoning

---

[26] *Miscellaneous Papers relating to America; 1739-1772, "Reasons humbly offer'd for fortifying Port Royal harbor in So Carolina & for erecting an Hospital & store houses there"* Add. Ms. 22680, f.12 , [unknown date; presumably in the 1740s) (London; British Library)

[27] *Records of the Colonial Office, America and West Indies, CO 5/376*, William Bull to Board of Trade, July 12, 1760 (London: National Archives at Kew)

[28] William S. Coker, and Thomas D. Watson, *Indian Traders of the Southeastern Spanish Borderlands* (Gainesville, FL : University Presses of Florida ; Pensacola : University of West Florida Press, c1986), David Weber, *The Spanish Frontier in North America* (New Haven : Yale University Press, c1992)

illegal encroachments, and seizing territory either by war or peace treaty. European presence in the Southeast (particularly the French and British) gradually expanded after initial phases of starvation, unsustainable economy, or near the annihilation by Indian attack. But the Creeks and the Cherokees also expanded their power (after surviving smallpox epidemics) as they struck lucrative trade agreements and military alliances with the Europeans to weaken or annihilate their traditional enemies.[29]

Southeastern Indians' growing dependence on European trade accelerated the existing intertribal warfare as Indians competed to gain the favor of their European trade partners.[30] Indians frequently launched raids on remote European settlements on behalf of the British, French, or Spanish in order to receive presents and negotiate favorable trade terms with them. Deerskins, bounty scalps and enslaved Indians made up the commodities of trade. Indians frequently dictated terms of war and trade, refusing to acquiesce to the demands of European neighbors. In addition, longstanding rivalries or spontaneous killings based on revenge and blood law sparked conflict between southeastern Indians could embroil their European allies as well.

Although southeastern Indians suffered from the Old World diseases, frequent wars, and rapid cultural change after European contact, they continued to make their presence known in the region. Their populations regenerated as they incorporated European tools and weapons to their advantage. Rivalries between the French and English in North America also gave Indians geopolitical leverage vis-à-vis Europeans

---

[29] See James Axtell, *The Indians' New South: Cultural Change in the Colonial Southeast*, John Juricek, *Colonial Georgia and the Creeks*, Tom Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*

[30] James Merrell, *The Indians' New World*; Kathryn Braund, *Deerskins and Duffels* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008)

until the conclusion of the Seven Years' War. However, Spanish Florida gave the Southeast a crucial distinction compared to the Northeast or the Great Lakes region. Although the Spanish presidio of St. Augustine failed to exert much influence over southeastern Indians through trade, it added another variable to the geopolitics of the region, creating a web of Spanish-French-Anglo relations and their respective relations with numerous southeastern Indians.[31]

By the commencement of the Seven Years' War, the major powers of southeastern Indians either allied or maintained relationships with British traders who offered quality goods at competitive rates. The British openly boasted of their supremacy in trade with Indians and how they commanded the Indians under their influence by making them dependent on trade with the British.[32] Catawbas and Cherokees in particular enjoyed even better prices when Virginia and South Carolina traders competed against each other. While the relationship based on trade lasted, from the Indian perspective, deerskin trade with European colonists allowed the Cherokees, Creeks, and Catawbas to expand their power and provided less powerful nations a means of survival in the eighteenth-century Southeast.

---

[31] On Spanish Florida, see Amy Bushnell, *The King's Coffer: Proprietors of the Spanish Florida Treasury, 1565-1702* (Gainesville: University Presses of Florida, 1981); Jane Landers, *Black Society in Spanish Florida* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999). On French Louisiana, Shannon Lee Dawdy, *Building the Devil's Empire: French Colonial New Orleans* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), Ed. Bradley G. Bond, French Colonial Louisiana and the Atlantic World, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 2005), See also, Daniel Usner, *American Indians in the lower Mississippi Valley: social and economic histories* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998)

[32] For instance, see Kathryn Braund and James Merrell. Scholars of colonial southeast seem to agree on one thing: the English thoroughly dominated Indian trade with their cunning, with Scottish traders' marriages into Indian societies, and with cheaper prices and superior quality European manufactured goods, and the abundance of rum provided by the English, which gradually made the southeastern Indians addicted and dependent on trade with the English.

South Carolina and Charles Town

South Carolina began humbly as "a colony of a colony," with Barbadians immigrating to a small, narrow peninsula that became Charles Town in 1660. After the early phase of a subsistence economy based on domestic consumption of food and goods by immigrants, South Carolina's export trade relied on "shipping provisions and timber products to Barbados for slaves, sugar, bills of exchange, and European goods."[33] In the early eighteenth century, the deer skin trade with Indians provided a significant source of income for Carolinians. As McCusker and Menard note, the colonists exported deerskins to London valuing £35,000 in the late 1740s and £55,000 around 1770.[34] Indian slave trade also constituted a major component of the economy in South Carolina until the declining Indian population, the waning demand for Indian slaves from neighboring colonists, and the Yamasee War killed the trade around 1720.[35]

Charles Town expanded rapidly after 1730 and increasingly assumed its role as the center of a region encompassing North Carolina founded 1691 and eventually Georgia founded 1733.[36] As a seasonal home to planter-merchant elites as well as an urban town with "middling sorts," half of the population consisted of enslaved Africans

---

[33] Peter Wood, *Black Majority*; John McCusker and Russell Menards, *The Economy of British America* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina, 1985), p.171

[34] John McCusker and Russell Menard, *The Economy of British America* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina, 1985), p.173

[35] On Indian slave trade, see Alan Gallay, *The Indian Slave Trade: the Rise of the English Empire in the American South, 1670-1717* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002); Robbie Ethridge, ed. *Mapping the Mississippian Shatter Zone: the Colonial Indian Slave Trade and Regional Instability in the American South* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009) See also Christina Snyder, *Slavery in Indian Country* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010)

[36] Emma Hart, *Building Charleston* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2010), p.2

who predominated in public spaces such as markets and shops.[37] But, as Emma Hart argues, Charles Town remained quintessentially "a British Atlantic town" in the British Atlantic World connected through its port.[38] Merchants residing in Charles Town waited for traders to bring in deerskins so that they could export to the Atlantic trade networks within the British Empire.

In the Southeast, Charles Town quickly assumed its role within the British Atlantic as a shipping center for exporting deerskin, rice, and indigo to supply trade within the British Empire. Initially exporting deerskins, Carolinians experimented with several crops to find suitable agricultural exports to the market economy of the British Atlantic World. Subsequently, rice and indigo proved the most suitable crops for South Carolina's climate and soil.[39] Thus, the population growth of whites and their insatiable demand for land and labor fueled the import of African slaves and established brutal racial slavery, firmly entrenched by the 1750s.[40] Despite a massive slave insurrection at Stono in 1739, white colonists continued to import African slaves while imposing more stringent slave codes. The number of blacks surpassed whites in South Carolina in the first half of eighteenth century, creating a "black majority." Also, Indian delegations regularly visited Charles Town to negotiate, protest, and forge diplomatic relations with

---

[37] Ibid., p.2

[38] Ibid., p.6

[39] For development colonial plantation economy and African slavery in Carolinas, see S. Max Edelson, *Plantation Enterprise in Colonial South Carolina* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006); Philip D. Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint: Black Culture in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake and Lowcountry* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998); Judith Carney, *Black Rice* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001); Peter Wood, *Black Majority* (1974, reprint New York: W. W. Norton, 1996)

[40] For a development of South Carolina's economy, "Chapter 8: The Lower South" in John McCusker and Russell Menards, *The Economy of British America* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina, 1985), pp.169-188

colonists.[41] Thus, Charles Town took its place among the British colonial towns where enslaved and free Africans, Indian visitors, and white colonists shared public spaces.

Forts and Garrison Forces

Before the arrival of over one thousand British troops in the Southeast in 1757, forts represented a predominate site of social and economic exchanges between a mix of British and colonial soldiers and Indians in the eighteenth century. In the course of the Seven Years' War, these outposts far removed from major colonial towns on the eastern coastlines continued to be focal points of British troops' interactions with others in North America. The Cherokee expeditions led by Archibald Montgomery and James Grant in 1760-61 encamped near Fort Prince George and Fort Ninety Six (also known as Fort Keowee) before they retreated to Charles Town. British troops later occupied these small structures erected in the middle of Indian country and interacted with them.

No manmade structures on land better expressed European colonial ambition and expansionist impulse than forts. Among the numerous English-built forts in South Carolina and Georgia, Fort Ninety Six, Fort Prince George, Fort Loudoun, Fort Moore, and Fort Augusta acted as both trade and military outposts.[42] (See Figure 3) Bartering of deerskins, scalps, Indian or African slaves, and European goods (gun and gunpowder in particular) frequently occurred. Cultural and social exchanges also took places at these

---

[41] Vernon W. Crane, *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1929), p.108 "Charles Town in the eighteenth century was the one port-town of the South…For Charles Town was also the metropolis of the whole southern Indian country, and it was there that traders from the mountains and the Gulf plains paid their annual visits to civilization."

[42] See Larry E. Ivers, *Colonial Forts of South Carolina, 1670-1775* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1970)

forts: Indians and colonists held diplomatic meetings, colonial traders and Indian women met and married one another, travelers lodged and quizzed Indians for ethnographic information, and visiting missionaries proselytized.[43]

The origins of British forts in the Southeast go back as early as the 1700s as colonial authorities pursued permanent trade and military posts which could replace traders' huts within Indian countries. The plans for building forts and garrisoning Carolina in 1720 reveal that the English colonists conceptualized "the Southwest Frontier" as a buffer zone separating them from French Louisiana. The looming French presence—for instance, Fort Toulouse on Alabama River—and the possibility of the French-Indian alliance presented a worst-case scenario for the Carolinians. "It is well known the English have Extirpated or driven Natives back into the Land and are scattered along the Sea Coast of North America," one memorandum warned, "Now the French Incorporates themselves with the Indians by Intermarraiges [sic] and placing Popish Missionarys among them who endeavour to breed in them an incurable aversion to the English." The specter of coordinated French-Indian attacks from "the SouthWest Frontier," the author argued, warranted making a monetary investment immediately: "a

---

[43] Vernon W. Crane, *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1929), p.187 "Some sort of traders' blockhouse had from early days overlooked the focus of the western trails at Savannah Town, and very early, indeed, there was an 'Oldfort' on the right bank near where Auguta later rose. It was apparently some such traders' strong-house that was garrisoned by the Cherokees-Creek expedition in the winter of 1715-1716. Soon, however, a new fort was constructed, appropriately named Fort Moore. This served both as garrison and trading-post for the supply of the inland tribes, and in 1717 was placed under the inspection of the Indian commissioners." For missionary activities in Fort Loudoun, see William Richardson, "An Account of the Presbyterian Mission to the Cherokees 1757-1759," *Tennessee Historical Magazine,* 2nd. Ser.,vol.1 (1931): 125-38. See also *Society for Propagation and Gospel Letterbooks* (Charleston, SC: South Carolina Historical Society)

peny now layd out may Save pounds hereafter and enable us in Times of war even to dispossess the French."[44]

These European-made structures represented a symbol of European expansion and an indication of future permanent settlement. An anonymous memorandum titled *Land set aside crops next to fort* proposed that "the Land adjacent thereto be appropriated for the Use of the Garrison, both in respect to the Officers & Soldiers" so that they could use for "a Garden and Orchard Plat" and raise "Horses Sheep and Hogs" as well as "Indian corn" and "Wheat, Rice, Pease, Oats &c^{a}." It also suggested that this policy would make soldiers' "Familes with which and their Pay they may live comfortably and pleasantly, and may be a great Encouragem^{t} for them to live there and defend the Place." The author also encouraged "both for Traders & Planters" to settle around fort "to assi[s]t in Defending the Fort when it shall be attack" and to "bring People to settle there and their own Interest as well as the publicks will oblige them to perform the several conditions."[45] In reality, however, garrison soldiers at these forts could only survive because of food provided by Indian women or supplies brought from Charles-Town. If Indians cut off food and supply routes from Charles Town, those residing inside forts would die from starvation. In fact, the Cherokees held Fort Loudoun under siege until its starving soldiers surrendered in 1760.

---

[44] *An Aid of Proper plans for Garrisons in Carolina & the absolute Necessity of doing it Speedily, 1720* (South Carolina Historical Society)

[45] *Board of Commissioners Collection, William R. Coe Papers, 11/569/30, Land set aside crops next to fort…* (Charleston, S.C.: South Carolina Historical Society) [Date unknown. Most likely the 1720s or 1730s]

These forts also served as a means to gather intelligence concerning both Indians and the French. In 1756, South Carolina Governor James Glen reported to the Board of Trade "the necessity of a Fort in the Upper Cherokee Country" in order to exclude "the French and their Indians whom I found ever busy and insinuating in that Nation."[46] In short, English colonists erected forts to check the expansion of French and Spanish traders to the Indians neighboring the English settlements, despite the enormous of expense of construction and maintenance. Inadequately garrisoned and poorly fortified to withstand full-scale assault, these forts nonetheless served to delineate the English borders of influence as the Spanish, French, and English vied for dominance and sought opportunities to undermine each other's footholds in the region.

British forts in the Southeast spread out across the region. Among these forts, Fort Prince George, built in 1753, and located right across the Cherokee village of Keowee, gained prominence for its bustling commercial activity. (See Figure 4) A mile above Keowee stood Cunnasagee or "Sugar Town," which acted as a gateway to the larger Upper, Middle, and Lower Cherokee settlements along the Blue Ridge Mountains; Fort Congaree was located at an intersection of dividing paths to the Catawbas and the Cherokees via Ninety-Six; Fort Moore and Fort Augusta, on each side of the Savannah

---

[46] British Public Record Office, South Carolina, Board of Trade, *Vol. 18, K.133*, James Glen to the Lords Commissioners for Trade, April 14, 1756; Theda Perdue, *Cherokee Women*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1998), p.96 "The purpose of Fort Loudoun ostensibly had been to offer protection to civilians while warriords raided the enemy in the Ohio valley, but colonial officials also intended to use it to keep an eye on these remote Cherokee towns, which had always been a bit too tolerant of French traders and ambassadors for British tastes." For instance, King Hagler of the Catawbas insisted a fort to be built in the Catawba Country in 1757 and Fort Prince George was a product of the agreement between South Carolina governor James Glen and the Cherokees in 1753. Virginians also paid a considerable sum in building Fort Loudoun in 1756 as the Warrior's Path traversed through Virginia connecting the Upper Cherokees to the Ohio country and New York.

River, guarded the inland passage to Georgia and Florida. Small garrisons of fewer than 30 men each occupied these forts after their construction in the early eighteenth century.[47]

Indian nations willing to trade with the French or British allowed the Europeans to build forts near or inside their boundaries despite their apprehension of armed soldiers occupying these structures.[48] The Cherokees only allowed the construction of a fort in the Overhill Country after the assurance from Raymond Demere, the commander of Fort Loudoun, that the soldiers would not molest the Cherokee people. While the Cherokees acted with a suspicion and alarm over the arrival of colonial troops, they clearly saw economic opportunity and the advantage of having a nearby station where they could trade scalps and deerskins for guns, gunpowder, and other items. Some Indian nations requested that a fort to be built near them, believing that the presence of colonial soldiers in their territory would deter enemy invasions. For instance, the Catawbas pleaded with the governors North Carolina and South Carolina to build a fort in their land and continued to support the British war effort during the Seven Years' War.

As was the case with many European forts built in North America, supposedly defensive military structures served primarily as trading centers and storehouses. Most of these structures were poorly built and could barely sustain themselves under hot and inclement seasonal weather without constant repairs and landscaping efforts. A report of the conditions of military defense of South Carolina described forts in South Carolina as

---

[47] Vernon W. Crane, *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1929), pp.187-189

[48] Tom Hatley, *The Dividing Paths* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp.95-96

"few in number, and some of them gone decay."[49] Dismal conditions at these structures continued throughout the Seven Years' War as the commanders of Fort Loudoun and Fort Prince George constantly requested new materials to repair the forts' rotting wood and falling fences. Henry Bouquet, a Swiss Colonel who stayed in Charles Town from 1757 to 1758, drew a bleak picture of Fort Prince George: "The Ramprts daily falling, the Ditch capable of being leap'd over, even by the Indian Children, who with ease also climb the Rampart at any part."[50]

As much as colonial forts served as structural nexuses binding Indians and colonists in exchanges of goods, food, deerskins, slaves, and scalps, these sites also became fraught with violence. Cherokees responded to such events in two ways: they swiftly avenged these deaths by killing the murderers and they petitioned fort commanders to relay their remonstrance to the governor in Charles Town. If the colonists ignored their grievances, Indians attacked the fort as it became easy target situated in their own countries. For instance, in 1758, the Lower and Middle Cherokees threatened to attack and destroy Fort Prince George when Virginians indiscriminately killed Cherokee warriors travelling through Bedford County to assist the Fort Duquesne expedition. Likewise, the Overhill Cherokees attacked Fort Loudoun in 1760 signaling the beginning of the Anglo-Cherokee Wars.

---

[49] *British Public Record Office, South Carolina, Board of Trade, Vol.28, P.175*, Dunk Halifax, T. Oswald, Andrew Stone, and W.G. Hamilton to William Pitt, Whitehall, December 24, 1756

[50] *Bouquet Papers*, Bouquet to Napeir, July 13, 1757; White Outbridge to Loudoun, June 13, 1756, LO 1220 (San Marino: Huntington Library) Similarly, at Fort Moore, a commanding officer reported that some parts of the fort "to fall every Day" in "a very ruinous Condition."

If garrison soldiers aggravated Indians through their violent acts, traders fared no better in maintaining good relations with Indians.[51] Colonial traders' greed and dishonesty constantly garnered complaints from Indians. Typical fraudulent dealings involved using false scales in measuring weights and selling rum illegally. These exchanges based on suspicion and distrust soured white-Indian relations and provoked violent incidents that escalated into a full-scale war with the Yamasees in 1715 and with the Cherokees in 1760. Despite the colonial authorities' attempts to regulate trade in the wake of the Yamasee War, these iniquities continued to plague white-Indian relations in the southeast. In 1757, Paul Demere at Fort Loudoun noted of one trader John Elliott that "I am most sure he don't use the Indians very well, they complain to me very much about him, when he Sells them Rum it is half water, and his Goods very Dear."[52]

Though everyday interactions occurred at these forts in the Southeast, and aside from a few individuals married to Indian women, such as Lachlan McIntosh and James Beamer, the relations between garrison soldiers, colonial traders, and Indians remained volatile. Years of daily exchanges did not necessarily bring resident colonists at forts and Indians closer and suspicions against each other escalated as the Seven Years' War commenced. Garrison soldiers frequently interrogated the Cherokees to see if the French had contacted them to attack the forts and resident colonists; traders continued to swindle Cherokees through dishonest transactions. These mounting tensions at the forts

---

[51] John Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier, 1756-63* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press : a Great Britain: Palgrave, 2001), pp. 35-38

[52] *Lyttelton Papers*, Paul Demeré to Lyttelton, Fort Loudoun, Feb. 20, 1759 (Clements Library: University of Michigan, Ann Arbor)

burst into violence that eventually led British troops to intervene in the Anglo-Cherokee Wars.

The Emergence of British Defense Strategy of the Southeast

Prior to the arrival of the British Royal Americans from Philadelphia and the Scottish Highlanders from Cork, Ireland, in 1757, the southern British colonies relied on locally raised militias to defend themselves. James Oglethorpe's expedition to Georgia created a sizeable number of troops paid for by the British Crown and known as Independent Companies. Like New York, South suffered defensively because their colonial land policies granted large blocks of lands to entice immigrants and because colonial assemblies hesitated to impose military service on the settlers for fear that they might migrate to Pennsylvania where no military law existed.[53] Hence, South Carolina experienced a chronic shortage of manpower and defensive capacities because of "the poverty and the sparseness of population" that precluded "the development of an effective militia."[54]

The large black majority population could have served as a main source of military manpower for Carolina. In fact, in the Yamasee War of 1715, black slaves fought alongside their white masters. But the Stono Rebellion of 1739 rattled the confidence of the masters and led the colony to outlaw the arming of slaves and instead

---

[53] John Shy, *Toward Lexington: The Role of the British Army in the Coming of the American Revolution* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965), p.12

[54] Ibid., p.11

focus on mandating white slave patrols.[55] In addition, slaves who fled from Carolina to Spanish Florida embarrassed Carolina slave owners.[56] Naturally, the colonists frequently disparaged St. Augustine as "a wretched garrison town defended by negroes." Even Indians seemed to have been aware of the Carolinians' apprehension over the Spanish using runaway slaves against them. In 1757, Georgia Lieutenant Governor Charles reported that the Creek Indians offered him that they would attack the Spanish fort of St. Illy nearby St. Augustine "garrisoned by Negroes whom they hope to bring away, in order that they may dispose of them to the English as Slaves."[57]

From the viewpoint of strategic value, however, the southern provinces remained outside the attention of London until the Yamasee War jolted the Carolinians, prompting them to demand immediate attention from the British government.[58] After the end of the Yamassee War, planters and merchants of South Carolina revolted against the Lord Proprietors of Carolina in 1715, accusing them of willful negligence. The Commons House of South Carolina, in alliance with the assembly's new agents Joseph Boone and Richard Berresford, waged a series of campaigns for half a decade to petition the royal government to better defend the colony. After a couple of bumbling attempts from Sir

---

[55] Ibid., p.12 Also, see Sally Hadden, *Slave Patrols: Law and Violence in Virginia and the Carolinas*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001)

[56] See Jane Landers, *Black Society in Spanish Florida* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999)

[57] *Bouquet Papers*, Charles Taylor to Bouquet, August 13, 1757

[58] On the South Carolina Revolution of 1719, see Robert M. Weir, *Colonial South Carolina: A History* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1997), Vernon W. Crane, *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1929), pp.206-234. On the latest studies on this topic that disagrees with the conclusions of Weir and Crane that the fear of Spanish-Indian invasion acted as a catalyst, see Hanno T. Scheerer's "The Proprietors Can't Undertake for What They Will Do," in *Carolina Lowcountry and the Atlantic World: Creating and Contesting Carolina: Proprietary Era Histories* ed. Michelle LeMaster and Bradford Wood (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2013)

Robert Montgomery of Skelmorly to publicize the dire situation of South Carolina, the colonists toppled the Proprietors in 1719.[59]

In that momentous year when the Crown took direct control over South Carolina, John Barnwell, the assertive South Carolina planter, answered a series of queries from the Board to highlight the issues of defense in the southern colony to the Board of Trade and Plantation. He portrayed South Carolina as "the frontier" endangered by the Spanish and French and their Indian allies.[60] Barnwell also revealed the population of Charles Town and South Carolina in the early eighteenth century and their militias answering that among 9000 white inhabitants, 2000 men could serve as militiamen. He then proceeded to compare South Carolina's population with that of French Louisiana, Spanish Florida, and major Indian Nations in the Southeast to make an impression that potential enemies surrounded the southern British colony.

On the Indian neighbors, Barnwell's response revealed his belief that the French continuously undermined the British position in the region by making relentless overtures to the Indian Nations on the Southeast. First, Barnwell described the Catawbas

---

[59] Vernon W. Crane, *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1929), p.208 As Crane wrote, "the strategy of the dominant anti-proprietary party in the province was to exploit to the utmost the perils of their frontier situation and the inefficiency of the Proprietary regime. No doubt they colored their reports of the Indian revolt and of the French peril; on the other hand the Proprietors and their servants constantly minimized these events." On the latest studies on the Yamasee and its significance, see Steven J. Oatis, *South Carolina's frontiers in the era of the Yamasee War, 1680-1730* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. 2004); William L. Ramsey. *The Yamasee War: A Study of Culture, Economy, and Conflict in the Colonial South.* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2008) Allan Gallay, *Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English empire in the American South, 1670-1717,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), pp.1.19, 315-57

[60] *Board of Commissioners Collection, William R. Coe Papers*, (Typescript: Charleston, S.C.: South Carolina Historical Society) "SOUTH CAROLINA is scituated in a most pleasant & agreable Climate & productive of whatever is necessary for the life of Man, Yet it is but thinly Inhabited in proportion to the rest of the his Majties. Colonies on the main Land of America. By reason it is the frontier of the British Empire on the said Main to the South & West & exposed to the Incursions of the French and Spaniards & barbarous Indian Savages."

as "intirely in the English Interests and by their Situation will be so long as Carolina is a Barrier between them and the Incroachments of the French." As for the Cherokees, however, Barnwell reported, "at present [they] are intirely in the English Interest" but the French constantly schemed to bring the Cherokees on their side. To counter the French initiative toward the Cherokees, the Carolinians had to spend a large sum of money "in making presents to their chiefs" and warned that "this Colony will be reduced to the last Extremety" if the French finally succeed in persuading the Cherokees to ally with them. Similarly, the French have "intirely bought over" the Choctaws and "Secured their Interest among them by building forts & placing Garrisons and carry on their Trade." Although the Choctaws remained at peace with South Carolina, Barnwell predicted that the French-Choctaw alliance would "make an Intire Conquest of this province." The only factor that deterred the Choctaws from immediately doing so was the ongoing war between them and the Cherokees.[61]

The growing presence of French settlements in Louisiana and Alabama along the Mississippi River and Gulf Coast also posed "the southwestern" problem for the English colonists. The French fort built at Mobile in 1700 unnerved Carolinians as they accused the French of inciting "the Albama Indians to murder our Traders" and set up a new settlement named New Toulouse. The Carolinians also resented the French incursion because they lost the trade relations with "Chickesaws, Albamas, Taliboose and Abicaws and other nations" with whom they had traded "for above thirty yeares." Those Indians'

---

[61] *Board of Commissioners Collection, William R. Coe Papers*, (Typescript: Charleston, S.C.: South Carolina Historical Society) In the copy dated August 8, 1720, the same query is answered with the following variation about the troops that they are "little inferior to disciplined troops."

shift to French trade deprived South Carolina of income from tributes, commissions, and trade amounting to £6000. In 1719, the French also took Pensacola from the Spanish and founded New Orleans with 4,000 settlers. As a result, the French built another fort at "the mouth of Catahoochee River," allowing the Ochesee Nation to withdraw "their Dependance upon [from] the English."[62]

Although Barnwell made his points to the Board of Trade and Plantations, the plan to bolster the defense in the Southeast never materialized. In 1721, only one fledgling company of British regulars arrived in the southern colony, and it consisted largely of "invalids"—pensioners discharged from active duty because of age or infirmity. The colonists did not take these soldiers seriously and consequently they had a dismal experience in the colony because of disease, spoiled provisions, and neglect.[63] Thus, the southern colonies continued to rely on locally raised troops under the title of Independent Companies. Although a plan of sending British regulars to the southern colonies resurfaced prior to James Oglethorpe's expedition to Georgia in 1737, it never materialized and no additional British reinforcement arrived in South Carolina until Henry Bouquet's Royal Americans and Archibald Montgomery's Scottish Highlanders arrived in Charles Town in 1757.[64]

---

[62] *Board of Commissioners Collection, William R. Coe Papers, Address to the Lords commissioners for Trade and the Assembly's answer to their Lordships' Queries*, January 29, 1719 (Typescript: Charleston, S.C.: South Carolina Historical Society) More recent historians believe that the South Carolinians overstated French influence. See Joshua Piker, *Okfuskee* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004) and Steven Hahn, *Invention of Creek Nation* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004)

[63] John Shy, *Toward Lexington*, p.30

[64] Ibid., p.32 Quoted from *Diary of the First Earl of Egmont.* Oglethorpe proposed to the Robert Walpole's ministry arguing that "if that the defense were left to a militia it would cost dear, because they

In Georgia, the Anglo-Spanish dispute over British colonization of Savannah in 1733 and the ensuing War of Jenkins' Ear led to James Oglethorpe raising a mixed force of British regulars, colonial militia, and Indian warriors to launch a preemptive attack on Florida in 1740. Although Oglethorpe's siege of St. Augustine failed, his army successfully defended Georgia against Spanish invasion in 1742. With the end of the War of Jenkins' Ear, the army was disbanded, once again leaving the Colonial Southeast without the protection of British troops, except for a handful of soldiers in the outpost forts.

Spanish Florida proved a lesser threat than French Louisiana but remained a great annoyance to the Carolinians because the Spanish provided a safe haven for runaway slaves and encouraged the Indians of the Savannah region to attack English settlements.[65] The Carolinians' hatred toward Spanish Florida was reflected in Barnwell's disparagement of St. Augustine as "a Garrison containing 300. sory Soldiers being mostly Banditti and undisciplined" who subsisted by making "some pitch & Tarr with the help of the negro Slaves plundered by their Indians from our Frontier Settlements." He also claimed that the English colonists near the Spanish border "are now always murdered & eaten by the Savages living on the Coasts of that Country" and

---

must be paid when in service of for the neglect of their own affairs, and therefore it were more eligible and safe to have regular troops.

[65] On the discussion of African descents in Spanish Florida, see Peter Wood, *Black Majority Black Majority* (New York: Norton, 1974) and Jane Landers, *Black Society in Spanish Florida* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999) Also, see the Seven Years' War from the Spanish perspective and outside the context of the Southeast, Paul W. Mapp, *The Elusive West and the Contest for Empire, 1713-1763* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press; Williamsburg, Va.: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 2011)

that "the Spaniards" also harbored "Re[b]ells ffelons Debtors Servants & Slaves that escape thither from this Settlement."[66]

Barnwell's proposed solution to the Spanish problem was simple, if unrealistic. He recommended that the British seize St. Augustine and add to its empire, describing Florida as "a pleasant Country and Capable if in English hands of very great Improvements."[67] After boasting how Colonel James Moore sacked the Indian settlements around St. Augustine in 1702, Barnwell argued "It would be of great advantage not only to this province but to the rest of the English empire in America to have St. Augustine taken from ye Spaniards for it would make a notable barrier to his Maj[es]ties Dominions upon the main."[68] While Whitehall ignored Barnwell's overly aggressive proposals in 1719, James Oglethorpe's colonization of Georgia in 1735 and his subsequent failed preemptive invasion to St. Augustine in War of the Jenkins' Ear demonstrated the colonists' insecurity over their Spanish neighbor.[69] With the Treaty of Madrid, Spain recognized Britain's dominion over Georgia. The Anglo-Spanish tension, however, continued throughout the Seven Years' War though Spain remained neutral in the conflict.[70]

---

[66] *Board of Commissioners Collection, William R. Coe Papers*, (Typescript: Charleston, S.C.: South Carolina Historical Society)

[67] Ibid.

[68] Ibid.

[69] In 1736, the colonists again raised fears of a Spanish invasion as they alleged that the Spaniards demanded "all Georgia and South Carolina" and "have sent over a Man who himself confesses that he is to guide them in the Invasion of these Provinces," adding that "The Safety of several Thousand of British Subjects there, and of 30,000 Slaves will depend upon the Spanish Pleasure, for if there is no Forces there, they at Will destroy the one, and take the other." *Board of Commissioners Collection, William R. Coe Papers*, *11/569/19,* September 21, 1736

[70] *Lyttelton Papers* (Ann Arbor: William L. Clements Library), Henry Ellis to Lyttelton, Savannah, October 6, 1757. For instance, the murder of Spanish settlers by the Creeks in 1757 caused a diplomatic

In addition to these longstanding fears against the foreign and domestic threats, the arrival of deported French Acadians to Charles Town in 1756 created a new anxiety among the South Carolinians. Governor James Glen reported "many People apprehend" the Acadians "may watch opportunitys and join with the Negroes" and "set fire to it in several places at once" to burn down Charles Town.[71] The presence of 1,200 French Acadians--"400 of whom are men, and many more daily expected from Georgia, and one hundred French Prisoners"—put Glen and the inhabitants under new pressure over their security which extended beyond the city limits of Charles Town. Glen worried the colonists not only had to remain constantly vigilant toward the French Acadian "whose principles and inclination prompt them to do us all the mischief in their power" as well as keep a watchful eye on "4000 negroes…in weak settled Countrys."[72]

***

From the perspective of the colonists, the British Southeast (South Carolina and Georgia) needed the protection of King's Troops because of geopolitical position in relation to French Louisiana and Spanish Florida. Uprisings like the Stono Rebellion and the Yamasee War had made the South Carolinians live with constant paranoia and fear. With the commencement of the Seven Years' War in North America, seemingly

---

entanglement between the British Southeast and Spanish Florida. For works on the Anglo-Spanish relations before the Seven Years' War, see Timothy Paul Grady, *Anglo-Spanish Rivalry in Colonial Southeast America, 1650-1725* (Brookfield, VT : Pickering & Chatto, 2010)

[71] British Public Record Office, South Carolina, Board of Trade, *Vol. 18, K.133*, James Glen to the Lords Commissioners for Trade, April 14, 1756

[72] *British Public Record Office, South Carolina. Board of Trade, Vol. 18, K.133*, James Glen to the Lords Commissioners for Trade, April 14, 1756. On the French Acadians and their diaspora in the British Southeast, see Chris Hodson, *The Acadian Diaspora*, pp. 47-63 and John Mack Farragher, *A Great and Noble Scheme*, pp.365-392

suspicious Cherokees activities implicating the French also increased tensions at the remote forts in Indian country. Lastly, troublesome French Acadians dumped in Charles Town against the wishes of South Carolinians provided further reason to welcome and support the arrival of British troops.[73] Once Bouquet arrived in Charles Town with the Royal American troops in 1757, however, he encountered colonists who would not support the King's Troops and, shockingly, treated them, to his mind, worse than their "negro slaves."

[73] John Shy, *Toward Lexington*, p.39 As Shy notes, "Regulars were in South Carolina and the West Indies largely because these colonies were willing to support them" because they were "becoming more frightened of slave insurrection every year."

CHAPTER III

ROYAL AMERICANS AND SCOTTISH HIGHLANDERS IN CHARLES TOWN, 1757-1758

In 1757, Colonel Henry Bouquet sent a long letter to his superior Lord Loudon in New York after having quartered in Charles Town for three months. The letter contained numerous details about South Carolina's defensive capabilities against the potential French coastal attacks and how the town's inhabitants treated his British troops. Among Bouquet's laborious list of reports, he singled out the colonists' disrespect toward the King's Troops: "they're extremely pleased to have soldiers to protect their Plantations, but will feel no inconveniences from making no great difference between a soldier & a Negro."[74] His flummoxed comment reveals that race and class added an important dimension to the quartering dispute.

Bouquet emphatically declared that "settling the Quarters in Town" amounted to "the eternal Struggle in America," blaming the South Carolinians for "the Men lost by Death or Desertion."[75] Historians have argued that Bouquet's disregard for proper procedures in dealing with the Commons House of Assembly, along with arrogance and

---

[74] Bouquet to Loudoun, August 25, 1757. *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, *Vol.1* ed. S.K. Stevens, Donald H, Kent, and Autumn L. Leonard, (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1972), p.172

[75] Bouquet also reported that he had "to hold a General Court Martial, & as there is actually no Opportunity here for England, I take the Liberty to inclose the Proceedings here," presumably to deal with desertion cases as well as other demeanors soldiers committed. Bouquet to Stanwix, October 18, 1757, *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, p.119 To his fellow Col. John Stanwix, Bouquet used more frank and direct language to express his displeasure in South Carolina: "There is no Danger that we shall fall in Love wth. South Carolina, if we had any Inclination that Way, their genteel Proceeding with us would soon cure us of it."

splenetic temper, only provoked the colonial legislature to refuse defiantly to quarter the soldiers. In short, the liberty loving colonists, unapologetic in their defense of the rights of Englishmen, scored a victory against the overbearing, arrogant British officer.[76] Moreover, scholars have studied the case in Charles Town in anticipation of the Quartering Acts of 1765 and 1774.[77]

This telelogical approach of looking at the Seven Years' War as a prelude of the American Revolutionary War has been dismissed by some more recent historians, but they have still highlighted the event in the frame of civilian-soldier frictions and overlooked vibrant, mundane everyday interactions that took place between the British soldiers and the denizens of quartered in colonial towns. Charles Town, in particular, rarely received attention compared to Philadelphia, New York City, or Boston, partly because of the relatively small number of troops making temporary quarter, as opposed to those colonial cities where a large number and more permanent presence of British soldiers provide easier cases for historians to study. But the British army's stays in Charles Town in 1757 and 1761 provide us with an instructive counterpoint to the northern examples.

---

[76] For instance, see volume preface of *The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly*, ed. Terry W. Lipscomb South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1996), CD-ROM, p. *xiii-xv*; Stanley Pargellis, *Lord Loudoun in North America* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1968; first print, 1933); *Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America 1607-1763* (New York: MacMillan, 1973); Jack P. Greene, "The South Carolina Quartering Dispute, 1757-1758," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 60 (1959): 193-204

[77] Douglas Edward Leach is probably the foremost proponent of this thesis of *Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America 1607-1763* (New York: MacMillan, 1973); Fred Anderson calls for more nuanced approach than Leach. See *Crucible of War*, (New York: Vintage Books, 2000)

By the virtue of Charles Town being a southern colony built on a plantation economy and slavery, it put the British soldiers in a different setting than the northern colonial towns.[78] In addition, the composition of the "British" troops in Charles Town in 1757 was mostly Dutch Pennsylvanians and Scottish Highlanders, added ethnic dimensions to the quartering dispute.[79] What transpired in Charles Town between the British troops and colonial inhabitants – social, economic, and cultural exchanges– reveals enriching stories apart from the constitutional contest over imperial authority. In short, we need to look beyond the verbal exchanges between the British commanders—Lord Loudoun (the commander-in-chief of the British army in North America) and Bouquet—and the Commons House of Assembly to understand the daily experiences of British troops in Charles Town. The everyday interactions between Royal Americans, Highlanders, Virginians, Dutch Pennsylvanians, and the town's free and enslaved inhabitants show that the economic interests and cultural connections between British, Scottish, and Virginian soldiers and the inhabitants of Charles Town both bound them together and tore them apart from each other.

---

[78] On colonial South Carolina, Robert M. Weir, *Colonial South Carolina: A History* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1997), Jack Greene, *The Quest for Power; the Lower Houses of Assembly in the Southern Royal Colonies, 1689-1776* (1963; reprint New York: W.W. Norton, 1972), Robert Olwell, *Masters, Slaves, & Subjects* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998)

[79] For a table of European ethnic demography in South Carolina in c.1750, see D.W. Meinig, *The Shaping of America*: *Atlantic America, 1492-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), pp. 216-217. South Carolina had English (Anglican and Puritan), Scots (Lowland and Highland), Irish, Welsh, French, Germans, and Jews. For a contemporary account, see William De Brahms's *Report of the General Survey in the Southern District of North America* Louis De Vorsey, Jr., ed., *Report of the General Survey in the Southern District of North America*, *1772* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1971), p.90. "The City is inhabited by above 12,000 Souls, more than half are Negroes and Mulattoes; the City is divided in two Parishes, has two Churches, Saint Michael's and Saint Philip's, and six Meeting Houses, vide, an Independent; a Presbyterian, a French, a German and two Baptists; there is also an assembly for Quakers, and another for Jews, all which are composed of several Nations, altho' differing in Religious Principles…"

Insecurity and Fear

As discussed in the previous chapter, Bouquet's Royal Americans arrived in a time of heightened fear among the colonists of Charles Town. In addition to existing fears of external invasions and domestic slave insurrections, the arrival of deported French Acadians in Charles Town in 1756 had propelled the anxiety of Carolinians to a new level.[80] Suspicious of the French origins and possible subversive plots, the white residents of Charles Town feared that the Acadians "may watch opportunitys and join with the Negroes" and "set fire to it in several places at once," burning many wooden buildings of the town.[81] James Glen worriedly reported to the Board of Trade and Plantation that "we have upward of 1200 French Acadians in this little Town, 400 of whom are men…and one hundred French Prisoners whose principles and inclination prompt them to do us all the mischief in their power," in addition to "4000 negroes who must always be looked upon" vigilantly in the remote settlements.[82] Given that the white colonists of Charles Town numbered only about 4,000 people, they had good reason to fear the latest situation and clamor for troop protection.

The fear of slave uprising was all too real in the minds of white South Carolinians. George Milligen's short essay on South Carolina published in 1763 described the enslaved Africans as necessary "in this Climate" but also as "very

---

[80] For the French Acadians in Charles Town from 1756, see Chris Hodson, *The Acadian Diaspora* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012) and John Mack Farragher, *A Great and Noble Scheme* (New York : W.W Norton & Company, 2005)

[81] *British Public Record Office, South Carolina, Board of Trade*, *Vol. 18, K.133*, James Glen to the Lords Commissioners for Trade, April 14, 1756 (microfilm accessed from the David Library of American Revolution)

[82] Ibid.

dangerous Domestics" because "their Number so much exceeding the Whites." He conjectured that Indians and Africans have "a natural Dislike and Antipathy" to each other that proved "a very lucky Circumstance" for whites. The colonists should use the natural animosity between the two peoples to their advantage, Milligen argued, and thus it would be unwise to either "extirpate" the Indian neighbors or "force them [away] from their Lands" because "runaway *Negroes*" might overtake the Indian land and "quickly become more formidable Enemies than *Indians* can ever be, as they speak our Language, and would never be a Loss for intelligence."[83]

Given the neurotic state of mind among the colonists, Loudoun's decision to move British troops to Charles Town took the black majority in South Carolina into account. When Governor Lyttelton informed Loudoun that raising additional provincial men and sending them to the frontier would prove difficult because "the Number of Negroes in this Province which greatly overbalances that of the Whites" who "might prove an Intestine Enemy," Loudoun wasted no time in replying to the newly appointed governor that he understood the danger of "the great Number of Blacks" in the province as well as the colonists' apprehensions of slave uprising if South Carolina's colonial troops moved out and left Charles Town unguarded. Loudoun swiftly assured Lyttelton that, with the expected arrival of the Royal Americans under Col. Bouquet's command, "that objection is now removed, as the additional Force sent is sufficient to keep them in

[83] George Milligen, *A Short Description of the Province of South Carolina*, (London, 1763; Accessed through *Sabin Americana*)

awe."[84] However, by sending Bouquet to South Carolina, Loudoun also intended the troops to defend "the most exposed" colony of Georgia.[85] Thus, Fred Anderson's description of Bouquet's mission in Charles Town "in effect, to deter slave insurrection" is not entirely accurate.[86] Loudoun deployed the Royal Americans to Charles Town primarily to raise more provincial troops and deter French-Indian attacks but, since the South Carolinians shirked his order to raise more men because the fear of slave insurrections, the British troops were sent to "remove" the colonists' excuse.

Henry Bouquet in Charles Town

Colonel Henry Bouquet, better known for his illustrious military career in western Pennsylvania and the Ohio Country and his victory at Bushy Run, had enduring ties to Charles Town till his death in 1764. Born in Rolle, Switzerland, in 1719, young Bouquet enlisted in a Swiss professional regiment, following Swiss and family traditions of becoming a mercenary soldier. Before entering the British army, he had served in the Dutch Republic and later for the King of Sardina. He rose to the rank of a lieutenant colonel in his own Swiss Guards at the Hague. When he arrived in Philadelphia in the summer of 1756, Bouquet found the city very much to his liking because of its scientific community.[87] "I am far from being Indifferent to what happens in your Province,"

---

[84] Loudoun to Lyttelton, April 24, 1757. *Lyttelton Papers* (Ann Arbor: Clements Library)

[85] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, Bouquet to Ellis, June 15, 1757, p.116; Lyttelton to Loudoun, November 15, 1756, LO 2162 (San Marino: Huntington Library); Loudoun to Lyttelton, New York, April 24, 1757, (San Marino: Huntington Library) LO 3448

[86] Fred Anderson, *The Crucible of War*, p.204

[87] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, *Vol.1* ed. S.K. Stevens, Donald H, Kent, and Autumn L. Leonard, (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1972), p. *xxiv-xxvi*

Bouquet confided to a friend while quartered in Charles Town, "I look upon it as my mother Country in America, and feel myself Still prejudiced in its favour."[88] His affinity for Pennsylvania, however, influenced his negative perception of South Carolina as he constantly compared his experiences in Philadelphia to the vexing affairs in Charles Town.

In the British army, Bouquet served alongside another prominent Swiss officer named Frederick Haldimand. These mercenary officers' contributions to the British army proved immensely valuable for their expertise in military engineering and fortifications. The British North American commander-in-chief of John Campbell, Lord Loudoun, possessed so few cultural sensibilities that he called Bouquet "bucket," Loudoun trusted Bouquet's skill set and ability to carry out critical missions for the British army.[89] Bouquet had already spent nearly two years in North America in New York and Philadelphia. His earliest correspondence through 1755 and the first half of 1757 shows that he had already experienced some frustration with quartering men and questioned the discipline of provincial soldiers. However, he did not resort to strong criticism of colonists' refusal to provide quarters until his nine-month stint in Charles Town from 1757 and 1758.

In April of 1757, Loudoun ordered Bouquet to take "the Five Companies of the First Battalion of the Royal American Regiment" and sail to Charles Town in order to

---

[88] Bouquet to Richard Peters, October 22, 1757, [H.S.P., Peters Papers, Vol.4, 115 A.L.S.], Ed. S.K. Stevens, Donald H, Kent, and Autumn L. Leonard, *The Papers of Henry Bouquet Vol. 1* (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1972), pp.225-226

[89] *Huntington Manuscript 1717*, *Loudoun's Notebook, Vol.8, Book 1,* (San Marino: Huntington Library)

assume the command of military men in the southeast. His primary mission was to raise more provincial troops to bolster defense of the southern colonies. In a meeting with the governors of the southern provinces—Virginia, Maryland, North Carolina, and Georgia—at Philadelphia, Loudoun reacted to rumors of potential attacks on South Carolina by sea from Santo Domingo or by land from the Creek Indians' "Albama" Fort, "on the Head of the Mobile."[90] Thus, Loudon thought it proper that two thousand men should be sent to protect "that Valuable Province of South Carolina" in addition to Georgia. His plan required that a total of two thousand men were to be raised eventually in addition to the troops sent it from Virginia and Bouquet's Five Companies of the "Royal American Regiment."[91]

Bouquet's mission to Charles Town faced problems from the start. First, he could not recruit 200 men from Pennsylvania as Loudoun had instructed. In the end, he arrived in Charles Town with 600 men—5 Companies of the Royal American Regiment and the Companies of Provincial Troops of Virginia. After an outbreak of small pox on board the ship, Bouquet's troops landed in Charles Town on June 15, 1757, without a welcoming party as the town's inhabitants feared the spread of small pox amongst them.[92] The lack of a warm reception from the inhabitants of Charles Town marked a troubled beginning for Bouquet and his Royal American soldiers.

---

[90] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, Loudoun to Bouquet, April 24, 1757, p.88
[91] Ibid.
[92] Bouquet to Loudoun, June 23, 1757, *LO 3871* (San Marino: Huntington Library)

Quartering Dispute: Bouquet's Prejudice and Paranoia

It took less than two months for Bouquet to complain about the inhabitants of South Carolina and their ungrateful attitudes towards the King's Troops. Quartering troops and paying for their expenses, indeed, proved a main point of dispute between Bouquet and the Commons House of South Carolina. This storyline common in scholarly account, however, misses other developments that unfolded in Charles Town as a mix of Bouquet's Royal Americans and Montgomery's Scottish Highlanders spent more than six months among the inhabitants.

The essence of the quartering dispute between Bouquet and South Carolina's lower legislature was simple; the surrounding social, economic, and cultural contexts related to the quartering dispute, however, were far more complex than the narratives found in earlier scholarship.[93] Bouquet primarily fought over securing quarters, various provisions, and money to cover the expenses. Unfortunately, Charles Town had no proper barracks ready to quarter the troops and Bouquet had no choice but to accept the adverse circumstance; on the other hand, he expected that the colonists would bear the expenses of quartering, such as providing utensils and firewood. In their correspondence, Loudoun and Bouquet both stressed that "the rich, flourishing, Province of South Carolina," to whom troops had ben sent on the colonists' "own Sollicitation for their Defence" should willingly supply provisions for the troops. Whether they truly perceived the southern colony as a bountiful land or came up with a pretext to extract

---

[93] Stanley Pargellis, *Lord Loudoun in America*, Jack Greene, "The South Carolina Quartering Dispute, 1757-1758," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 60 (1959): 193-204

support from the colony is uncertain.[94] Regardless, South Carolina's lower house assembly's inaction and delay over approving the money for quartering frustrated Bouquet. He constantly applied pressure on the lower house to take swift action by referring to the King's authority and Loudoun's power as the commander-in-chief in North America. Loudoun also pressed Governor Lyttelton for his failure to convince the colonial legislature of "the Right…the King and the Mother country have to Quarters, with proper Conveniences for their Troops, at all Times, and more particularly for those now sent for the Defence of His Majesty's colony"[95]

This bitter standoff between Bouquet and the Commons House of South Carolina, however, was not as one-dimensional as it has been depicted. Initially, the members of the Commons House welcomed His Majesty's Troops, as their presence provided much needed security from "the Neighbouring Indians" and the French who "devote themselves to the Ruin & Destruction of all Interior Parts of the Province."[96] The message from the Commons House suggests that South Carolina elites fundamentally desired British troops primarily to protect Indian traders who provided an

---

[94] Henry Bouquet to Loudoun, June 23, 1757, *LO 3871* (San Marino: Huntington Library) "I receive from Gov[r]. L all possible assistance, his constant endeavours to forward the Service, and his great influence in this Province, give me great hopes to bright things in a better condition," Bouquet wrote, "I am very happy to have found a Man of such Activity, application and Ability, in the distressed condition matters are in these parts." Bouquet's letters to his friends reveal he had the same difficulty of procuring quarters in Philadelphia. Bouquet repeatedly pointed toward the model examples in Philadelphia and New York, and pressured Charles Town to follow the suit. Initially, Bouquet remained optimistic of the quartering prospect because of Lyttelton's commitment to support for the King's interests.

[95] *Lyttelton Papers,* Loudoun to Lyttelton, New York, December 6, 1757 (Ann Arbor: Clements Library)

[96] *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly*, *The Records of Colonial South Carolina Series*, ed. Terry W. Lipscomb (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1989), June 24, 1757, p.483 "A Guard was kept every Night in Charles-Town by such of the Soldiers belonging to His Majesty's Independent Companies as were quarter'd at the Barracks, before so many of them were sent to the Cherokees."

important source of income. Although the colonists made no explicit mention of slave patrol, they intended to make use of Bouquet's British troops to replace provincial soldiers sent off to the Cherokee Country. Lyttelton also provided assistants to the British commanders as he pressured the Commons House, delivering a message that "your own property & that of every Individual you represent is rendered more valuable by the Security derived to it from such a Body of Troops being posted in this Province."[97] Indeed, the Royal American officers had expertise in fortification work that proved extremely valuable for the defense of Charles Town. Even before Bouquet and his Royal American officers arrived, a German engineer in his forces already worked in the fortification of Fort Johnson at Charles Town.[98] Not surprisingly, the Commons House swiftly approved Bouquet's plan to repair and fortify Fort Johnson and encouraged Lieutenant Hesse of the Royal Americans, who supervised the fortification, to stay in the town by approving a handsome salary.[99]

---

[97] *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly*, October 12, 1757

[98] *British Public Record Office, South Carolina, Board of Trade, Vol.18, K.147* "Now for all these Forts and fortifications, they have but one Engineer, and be not on the King's Establishment, but a German Protestant who by chance came to settle there, and who they have employed about the works of Charles Town." See also *British Public Record Office, America and West Indies, Vol. 75, Circular Letter*, White Hall, March 13, 1756 In a circular letter, "It having been represented that a considerable number of the Foreign settlers in America, might be more willing to enter into the King's Service, if they were Commanded by Officers of their own Country. An Act of Parliament has been passed, of which I send you enclosed a Printed Copy enabling His Majesty to grant Commissions to a certain number of German Officers or Engineers; and as they have already engaged, they will embark with all Expedition, in order to assist in raising and commanding such of the Foreign Protestants, in North America; as shall be able and willing to serve with the rest of the Forces upon this occasion." Bouquet also gave detailed instructions on how to repair Charles Town's Fort Johnson. Bouquet to Lyttelton, July 20, 1757, *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, pp.38-39

[99] *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly*, *The Records of Colonial South Carolina Series October 6, 1757-January 24, 1761*, ed. Terry W. Lipscomb (South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1996), CD-ROM, March 18, 1758, p.139 "the Sum of thirty Pounds Current money per Week to be paid out of the Fortification Fund during the time he has been Actually Employed as an Engineer in the Service of this Government including his Quarters as a Lieutenant in the Royal American Battalion. And

Private correspondence and local newspaper reports also reveal a quite different picture from the narrative of friction between British troops and local civilians or colonial troops. A local Scottish merchant John Murray wrote to his family member in Scotland that the Royal Americans contributed putting Charles Town in "a better State than might have been Expected."[100] George Mercer, a colonial officer leading the Virginian companies that accompanied Bouquet's Royal Americans, reported to George Washington that he himself had good relations "a Set of very genteel pretty Officers here of the Royals" and "Harmony & Unanimity prevail greatly among Us…"[101] Bouquet also believed that the inhabitants welcomed the British troops, reporting to Loudoun that the colonists were "well disposed for the common Defence of the Country..." Bouquet, however, added a caveat by underlining and putting parenthesis on the phrase: "(as far as it does not interfere with their private Interest or Conveniences.)"[102]

These initial words appreciation from both sides, however, quickly dissipated as Bouquet became impatient with the progress of quartering. Bouquet invoked Loudoun's authority and pressed Lyttelton, arguing that he could not allow his soldiers to "camp out

---

as an Encouragement to him to Continue here, as well for Carrying on the new Works as for any other Services wherein it may be requisite to Employe him as an Engineer, we have Resleved that he be allowed out of the same Fund the Further sum of Twenty One pounds Current Money per week, during Such Time only, as he Shall hereafter be Actually Employed in our Service, not Exceeding twelve Months."; See also Hesse to [Haldimand] in Bouquet Papers, Ed. S.K. Stevens, Donald H, Kent, and Autumn L. Leonard, The Papers of Henry Bouquet Vol. 1 (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1972), pp.234-236 [Translated] "

[100] *GD 219/290*, *Letter book of John Murray, merchant, Charleston, South Carolina, 1756-58*, John Murray to James Irving, August 20, 1757 (Edinburgh: National Records of Scotland)

[101] George Mercer to George Washington, August 17, 1757, *The Papers of George Washington*, *Colonial Series 4*, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1984), p.372

[102] Bouquet to Loudoun, August 25, 1757. *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, p.174

in the rainy seasons" and insisted that they needed "suitable quarters."[103] His prodding, however, failed to expedite the process as the Commons House postponed the vote on bills related to quartering for another month. Consequently, Bouquet's attitude toward the South Carolinians decisively turned both sour and paranoid. He lashed out against the gentry and commoners of Charles Town alike: "The Lawyers, Justices of the Peace, & in general the whole people are eternally against us…"[104] In December of 1757, the Commons House continued to offend Bouquet when they refused to provide quarters and provisions for subaltern officers (ranks lower than captain). He protested the decision and demanded that subaltern officers be quartered in private homes, arguing that all the officers had "an equal Right to their Quarters" and rejected "the Distinction that the Assembly was pleased to make…"[105] A month later, when Bouquet learned that the Commons House had decided to impose duties on provisions which British troops consumed, he exploded and submitted a petition to the Assembly demanding that they rescind the duties.[106] Two months later, Bouquet had had enough of what he perceived to be colonists' insults. When Bouquet heard of that Commons House had finally approved the construction of new barracks for British troops which would be ready in a months' time, he withheld gratitude, writing to a fellow British officer that the colonists' decision

---

[103] *Bouquet's Memorandum regarding the backs to be built at Charles Town*, July 21, 1757, *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, p.151

[104] Bouquet to Stanwix, August 25, 1757, *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, p.170

[105] Bouquet to Loudoun, December 10, 1757, *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, p. 259

[106] *Bouquet's Remonstrance to the Assembly*, January 19, 1758, *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, pp.278-279 "That the said Troops being Sent hither for no other Purpose but the defence of this Province, & being maintained at a very great Expence, & the Crown of Great Brittain having never been Known to pay any duties: your Remonstrant conceives that the Said duties ought to be remitted."

"has been done with such Symptoms of Disaffection for the Troops, that we think ourselves very Little obliged to them."[107]

The acrimony Bouquet expressed to his fellow British officers, to Loudoun, and to Governor Lyttelton regarding the members of the Commons House of South Carolina, however, reveals only a partial picture. Various activities of British officers (including Bouquet himself) and rank-and-file soldiers that took place in Charles Town among the British troops and its inhabitants behind the scenes influenced the course of the quartering dispute. The lower house's opposition to Bouquet stemmed from ethnic animosity toward the Royal Americans and Bouquet's purchase of a plantation. Similarly, Bouquet's scathing criticisms of the denizens and the environment of South Carolina contradicted his apparent social and economic activities in Charles Town.

The Impact on Local Economy and Labor

The arrival of Bouquet's Royal Americans in Charles Town had an unforeseen effect on local artisans relying on the labor of indentured servants. Only nine days after Bouquet and the British troops arrived in Charles Town, the Commons House received a petition from an urban resident of "Charles-Town Neck" regarding runaway indentured servants enlisting with Bouquet's Royal Americans. William Lawrence complained that his "two German Servants, one named Matthias Streinweyer, the other John Peter Fry had run away," which cost him a total of £162.10. Lawrence then applied for financial compensation from the Commons House for his loss of income and labor. He allegedly

---

[107] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, Bouquet to John Hunter, February 16, 1758, pp. 303-304

asked "the Commanding Officer" to return his servants, but he was denied this request. Lawrence appealed to the Commons House that he had "no other Way to support himself, his Wife, & two Children, but by making of Hay" and expressed concern that "the inlisting the Servants of the Inhabitants of this Province to serve as Soldiers" constituted "a Matter of general Concern."[108] This petition suggests that the presence of Bouquet's Royal Americans had a disruptive impact on the local labor market. No doubt other young white males of German background seized the unusual opportunity to escape their servitude to join the German-speaking soldiers of Bouquet's Royal Americans.

One of the biggest economic transactions involving the British troops was lodging. Charles Town's inhabitants applied for public credit to the Commons House for lodging the British troops. These bills reveal some of the economic and social dimensions of quartering soldiers in the urban spaces of Charles Town. For example, Isabella Robertson asked £33:3:8 for "Rent of Rooms for the Highland Battalion" and Elizabeth Richardson charged a hefty sum of £216:5 for "the Lodging of several of the officers of the Royal American Regiment."[109] Lodging British troops sometimes damaged landlords' properties which prompted them to request compensation from the Commons House.[110] The Committee usually rejected these claims. For instance, Jonathan Scotts rented his house to "the Highland Soldiers from the first of September to

---

[108] *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly*, *The Records of Colonial South Carolina Series*, ed. Terry W. Lipscomb (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1989), June 24, 1757, p.474

[109] Ibid., January 18, 1758, p.57

[110] Ibid., January 27, 1758, p.67. Sarah Nightingale submitted a bill of £150 to the Commons House for "Damages Sustained by the encampment of the Royal Americans."

the first of this Month March amounting to £120" but was disallowed for "a Charge of £45 Damages" and only received "the Remainder £75."[111] Some officers could afford an extra room for private quarters from the house owners. An overwhelming number of the bills submitted to the House confirm that most of the officers quartered in private or public homes in Charles Town were Highlanders, suggesting connections between residents with the Scottish background and the soldiers.

A sudden spike in Charles Town's population thanks to Bouquet's Royal Americans and Montgomery's Highlanders, however, presented an enormous opportunity, particularly to local merchants and manufacturers. The soldiers also brought dependents, including women and children, therefore increasing the number of people needing to purchase food and other items. The scope of economic exchanges in Charles Town mostly involved supplying or selling provisions and items soldiers consumed such as utensils, fuel, and bedding.[112] Inhabitants not only rented rooms and houses to soldiers but they also charged for storing soldiers' baggage and renting furniture to them. Daniel Bourgett requested £48 for "House Rent, being for Lodging and Baggage for the Highland Soldiers."[113] Hugh Anderson charged £72 for "Bed Steads

---

[111] Ibid., March 8, 1758, p.120

[112] Ibid., pp.40-41. "Two Cords of Fire wood per Week for each Company of 100 Effective Men Actually in Charles Town from this Time, to the 1st day of April next, & two Cord per Month from that day to the 1st of October. One Pound of Candles per Week, to every Room of Mess of Eight Men, including the several Guard Rooms. ½ Gallon Vinegar, ½ Bushel Salt, ½ lb. Pepper per Week to Each Company of 100 Men. 2 Iron Candle Sticks, 2 horn or Tin Lanthorns, 1 Pine Table & 2 Forms. To Each Guard Room including Johnsons Fort as One. 1 Iron Pot about 8 Gallons, 1 wooden Ladle, 1 Pine Table & 2 Forms, 2 Platters, 2 Bowles & 12 Trenchers of Wood, 1 Iron Candle Stick, a Rack & Pegs, 1 Straw Broom, 1 Wooden Pail, 1 Wooden Piggen, 2 Tin Mugs of a Quart each, 1 Axe. For Each Room containing 8 Men. 1 Crocus bed filled with Straw, 1 Bolster, 2 Duffel Blankett[s], to serve two men."

[113] Ibid., p.69

& Tables for the Highland Officers."[114] For the inhabitants employed producing or selling necessary items for troops, the contracts with the British army meant a lucrative business. James Henderson, probably the sole supplier of candles for the troops because only his name shows up in the bills, charged a hefty sum of £900.[115] Most inhabitants made more modest sums doing business with the quartered troops supplying hay, bedding, and spices.[116]

These requests for public credit often reveal the locations of the private homes in which officers lodged. Many officers lodged in well-furnished homes, rather than in miserable barracks with the rank-and-file. Despite his vitriol towards the people of Charles Town, Bouquet himself lodged at Thomas Walker's house for £206:15, for which the Committee recommended "50/ per Week to be allowed to the 30th November which Amounts to £55."[117] Sarah Clifford lodged "an Highland officer and the Chaplain to the regiment at 50/ per Week £25," the same rate as for Col. Bouquet. Susannah Walker (presumably the wife of Thomas Walker) lodged "Mr. Rae, Doctors mate, & Lieutenant Sutherland at 50/ per Week £40." Major Tulliken, Bouquet's subordinate officer, paid the lavish rate of £5 per week to Ann Watson for the total of £95, as he stayed for 19 weeks.[118] These officers presumably took quarters in "some very good

---

[114] Ibid., January 26, 1758, p.70
[115] Ibid., February 1, 1758, p.82
[116] Ibid., February 8, 1758, pp.92-93 Mary Frost supplied "Hay for the Troops"; Ruth Hartman made "Beds, Bolsters & Sheets for the Troops" for £20:19:4; John Parnham supplied "Black Pepper for the Troops" for £36.
[117] Ibid., March 8, 1758, p.121
[118] Ibid.

Houses" as a Virginian Provincial officer George Mercer described.[119] The 187 Highlander officers found quarters in relatively comfortable private homes of the inhabitants who may have shared Scottish background.[120] The rest of the Highlanders sought spaces "in a half finished Church without windows, in damp Store houses upon the Quay, and in empty houses, where most of the Men were obliged to ly upon the Ground without Straw or any sort of covering."[121] Some stayed in an unfinished barracks where they shared space with the French Acadian prisoners.

Some house owners and innkeepers failed to get a full reimbursement because of the time limit imposed by the House to permit credit for quartering British soldiers. For instance, Henry Kennan lodged "Lieutn. Monro, a Highland Officer" for whom he charged the House of Commons £36:8:6 for "4 weeks & 3 days" which the Committee found "beyond the Time Limitted by a Resolution of the House." On the other hand, Kennan only received a partial amount of £25:7:1 for the effective days. In these

---

[119] George Mercer to George Washington, August 17, 1757, *The Papers of George Washington*, *Colonial Series 4*, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1984), p.370 Even in Mercer's disparaging description of Charles Town's buildings, he admitted few good houses existed. "The Town in the first Place is little larger than WmsBurg no Buildings in it compare with our Public Ones there, far inferior to Philadelphia N. York, Boston or even New Port itself. The rest of the Town is built on a Point of Land between two Rivers on the Bay there are some very good Houses, & it is from thence it shows to the greatest Advantage—The rest of the Town is indifferently improved, many very bad low clapboard Houses upon their Principal Streets which are in general narrow & confined."; Mercer's contemporary George Milligen promoting immigration to East and West Florida to the readers in England painted a rosier picture. "There are about eleven Hundred Dwelling Houses in the Town, built with Wood or Brick; many of them have a genteel Appearance, though generally incumbered with Balconies or Piazzas; and are always decently, and often elegantly, furnished; the Apartments are contrived for Coolness, a very necessary Consideration." See Milligen, *A Short Description*, pp.31-32

[120] *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly*, February 8, 1758, p.92 William Banbury asked "£287:19:5 for Board for Highland Soldiers at Mr. Maynes Wharff to be allowed." Bouquet to Londoun, October 16, 1757 "The Barraks are not finish'd for want of Materials. This day the Highlanders have 187 men quarter'd in private houses at the very instance of the Inhabitants, Five hundred more are to go in the barracks, and the rest remain in scatter'd houses, some of w^{ch}. will be tolerable if repaired and furnished."

[121] *LO 4937* (The Huntington Library: San Marino, CA); *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly*, January 26, 1758, p.69

profitable business relations, some locals appear to have overcharged British and Scottish soldiers to make extra profits, as the influx of a large number of Highlanders proved a boon for property owners. Elizabeth Richardson submitted a bill of £216:5 that included "a Charge of £42:10 for a Dining room," which the Committee thought "Unreasonable."[122] Similarly, the Committee concluded that Robert Fairweather charged £62:5 for "Lodging Capts. Hardin & Monro. In which there is an Overcharge of 2 Rooms £31:2:6 to be allowed."[123]

As the colonists and British troops engaged in transactions involving provisions, charges of alleged fraud and dishonest practices occurred. A scandal discussed in the Commons House involving one of the officers of the Highland Battalion, Alexander Montgomery, might have further eroded any support for paying for British troops amidst the quartering dispute. Three or four days after the first arrival of the Highlanders, Montgomery allegedly told a Mr. Doyley to supply more firewood than needed for the troops so that he and Doyley "would devide the Profits arising from the overplus."[124] Mr. Marlow testified to the Committee that Montgomery, the Quarter Master of the Highland Regiment, "demanded 177 Cords of wood per Week from him." When Marlow told Montgomery that it was impossible to procure the said amount, Montgomery reduced the amount to 80, which Marlow again said was too much. Finally, Montgomery allegedly answered Marlow that "35 or 40 or 50 at most will do but you &

---

[122] *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly*, January 26, 1758, p.71

[123] Ibid., February 8, 1758, p.93

[124] Ibid., December 2, 1757, pp.47-48. Doyley could not quote what Alexander Montgomery said in verbatim. He told the Committee of the Commons House that "One of these two Expressions he made use of but can't tell which, But think it was "go Snacks in it."

I will Settle that." Based on Marlow's testimony alone, the Committee concluded that "there was a Fraud intended upon the Public by the said Alexander Montgomery, Quarter Master of [the] Highland Regiment."[125] Consequently, this incident resulted in a tightening supply of wood to British troops, which enraged Bouquet furthermore, igniting his invectives against the Commons House.[126]

Despite the scandal involving the Quarter Master of the Highland regiment, the evidence related to British troops' economic exchanges and activities in Charles Town show a wide range of interactions. While they feuded over the precedents, legalities, and financial obligations of quartering troops, British officers—particularly those belonging to Montgomery's Highland regiment—stayed in residential houses and the owners seemed happy to make profits from lodging them. Artisans also made considerable profits supplying provisions to the troops quartered in the town. The only victims of the quartering dispute were the rank-and-file soldiers who had neither social status nor the economic means to share residential space with the upper or middling denizens of Charles Town.

---

[125] Ibid.

[126] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, Lieut. Doyley to Bouquet, December 2, 1757, p.246. The Commissary of Charles Town sent a letter of an apology to Bouquet excusing himself for a failure to provide woods. "I am Sorry to inform you that I cannot send any Wood immediately to your Sick People, the Reason is this; the Commisary was Yesterday Served with a Copy of the resolution of the House of assembly (which are drawn up in the Strangest manner possible) where in they make no Provision of Wood, for Hospitals, & only ordered two Coards of wood p Weeks to every hundred men, Should the Commissary act contrary to their resolutions, I absolutely must Incur the Assembly's Displeasure, & draw on my Self a Severe expence."

Rank-and-File

Bouquet's most common comments on the rank-and-file can be summarized into three points: poor quarters, pervasive drunkenness, and mass desertion. Although Bouquet constantly reminded the South Carolinians that the King's Troops deserved better quarters and greater respect than did enslaved Africans, his words on the rank-and-file barely resembled any hint of respect for them. His descriptions of his soldiers' poor living conditions did not contradict other accounts from Archibald Montgomery and the Virginian officers George Mercer and William Byrd. First, South Carolina's hot climate had a crippling effect on the British troops. "The Therm: from 86° the whole summer is fallen down to 61°," Bouquet wrote in October to a friend in Philadelphia, "Our men die very fast, and we have lost more in one month, than in the whole Winter at Philad[a]." The soldiers probably suffered from mosquito and water borne illnesses.[127] The absence of furniture also particularly distressed the troops as Montgomery clamored for "Bedding, Blankets, and Necessary Barracks Utensils," fearing that would otherwise have "to recourse to the bedding on board our Transports."[128] Poor quarters also made the troops more susceptible to sanitation issues and diseases as Bouquet imputed

---

[127] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet,* Bouquet to Peters, pp. 225-226. See also, *Representation of Field Officers Regarding Troops*, *The Papers of Henry Bouquet,* pp.248-249. Speaking of the First Highland Battalion, the British officers (Bouquet, Montgomery, Grant, and Tulleken) claimed that 500 men got sick and "the Regiment lost near 60 Men in less than three Months, still greater Numbers must have perish'd if some of the Inhabitants of this Town had not out of Compassion received near 200 of them into their Houses." To access William Byrd III's correspondence in print, see *The Correspondence of the three William Byrds of Westover, Virginia, 1684-1776, Vol. 2* ed. Marion Tinling (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1977) On mosquitoes and yellow fever in South Carolina, see J.R. McNeill, *Mosquito Empires: Ecology and War in the Greater Caribbean, 1620-1914* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 43, 203-207

[128] *LO 4689*, *Loudoun Papers* (Huntington Library: San Marino, CA)

sickness among his troops to "owing in part to the bad Accommodations given us."[129] By the end of September, Bouquet reported over 400 Highlanders being sick.[130]

Drunkenness pervaded the rank-and-file in Charles Town. Bouquet reported that his subordinate Major Tullekin "takes all possible Pains to Keep our Men in order & to prevent the sad Effects of Rum" and condemned these soldiers as such "drunken dirty fellows that we shall never make anything of them."[131] In the court martial of soldier John Campbell, accused of desertion, witnesses reported that they "saw the Prisoner drinking in a Tavern."[132] Another deserter defended himself that "he was in liquor, and imagined he had suffered some fatigue in the Camp which was the Cause of his Desertion," suggesting that miserable quartering conditions exacerbated the propensity to drink.[133]

Although Bouquet constantly lamented his troops deserting, the actual figures of those who were caught and brought to trial showed eight court martials, six of which resulted in convictions for desertion. Two "conspiring" deserters were acquitted.[134] The reasons for desertion varied. Drunkenness was a common excuse and defense cited among the soldiers, but locally recruited soldiers assigned to the Royal American Regiment sometimes deserted for other reasons. James Smith pleaded that "he was an Overseer to a Plantation when he enlisted, and did not receive his Wages from his

---

[129] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, Bouquet to Col. John Hunter, October 16, 1757, p. 211
[130] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, Bouquet to Dobbs, September 29, 1757, p. 203
[131] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, Bouquet to Stanwix, August 25, 1757, p.59
[132] *Judge Advocate General's Office: Courts Martial Proceedings and Board of General Officers' Minutes*, *WO 71/130*, October 10, 1757
[133] *WO 71/130*, Owen M^{c}Dearmot's Trial, October 10, 1757
[134] See *WO 71/66* (Letter bound copies) or *WO 71/130* (Original Letters) (London: National Archives at Kew)

Master when he came away, and that he went away with a view to get his Money and to inquire after a horse belonging" to him.[135] Another deserter who joined Bouquet's Royal American Regiment deserted to tend "a Crop of Corn and Potatoes at the time he enlisted" for which he had been unable to obtain a leave of absence.[136]

Slavery, Race, Class and British Soldiers

As someone who considered Pennsylvania as his "mother Country in North America," Bouquet instantly noticed the very different demography of South Carolina, noting that "This Town is large & not much crowded with white people."[137] In Charles Town alone, nearly four thousand enslaved and free Africans inhabited the town—about the same as the number of white inhabitants according to one contemporary's estimate.[138] Bouquet did not write any personal musings on Africans in racial terms as he usually did with American Indians, but he clearly understood the social hierarchy, seeing Africans in the Southeast as both laborers and property: he himself bought slaves and a plantation and hired managers to increase his private wealth.

---

[135] *WO 71/130*, James Smith's Trial, December 12, 1757

[136] *WO 71/130*, December 12, 1757

[137] Bouquet to Loudoun, October 16, 1757. *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, p.113. Writing in 1763, George Milligen claimed that "The *Negro* Slaves are about seventy Thousand; they, with with a few Exceptions, do all the Labour or hard Work in the Country…" *A Short Description*, p.25

[138] George Milligen, *A Short Description*, p.32 "The white Inhabitants are about four Thousand, and the *Negro* Servants near the same Number." Milligen claimed that he had "examined a pretty exact Register of the Births and Burials for fifteen Years, and find them, excepting when the Small-pox prevailed, nearly equal; the Advantage, though small, in in Favour of the Births, though to the Burials are added all transient People who die here, as Sailors, Soldiers, or the Inhabitants of the Country, whose Business of Pleasure bring them frequently to this Metropolis." In De Brahm's *Report of the General Survey in the Southern District of North America* published in 1773, the author noted, "The City is inhabited by above 12,000 Souls, more than half are Negroes and Mulattoes…" Louis De Vorsey, Jr., ed., *Report of the General Survey in the Southern District of North America*, *1772* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1971), p.90

Although Bouquet probably agreed with colonists about how Africans should be treated and kept under chattel slavery, he nevertheless clashed with the local planters over securing enough laborers for the fortification projects in Charles Town. To finish the fortification of Port Royal quickly, Bouquet expected resident slaves would prove a useful, cheap source of labor, but the planters withheld their slaves in order to run their plantations without disruption instead of assisting Bouquet. "It has never been possible to get a Sufficient Number of Negroes upon the Works," Bouquet rued, "Private Interest is always the first point here and public Spirit is no more the Second."[139] Consequently, he ordered the British troops to work and paid them at the same rate as the black laborers.[140]

Another incident that enraged Bouquet came from the lower house's decision to distribute one blanket for two soldiers instead of one for each man. This act particularly offended Bouquet's sensibility because he felt the social standing of British troops fared worse than the slaves. In addition, Bouquet found the colonists insufficiently grateful to the King's Troops for providing protection from a potential slave insurrection. He

---

[139] Bouquet to Loudoun, October 16, 1757, *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, p.218

[140] Ibid. Bouquet reported that "tho' the Commissioners had offered in Summer to Pay them at the usual Rate of 7/6^{d}, & afterwards at 5/ we have agreed that they should work 6 hours every day for 3/6d or 6^{d} Ster: to which they add a Gill of Rum." See also *S.C. Council Journal*, January 24, 1758, "His Excellency acquainted the Board that colonel Bouquet had been with him and informed him that He had been lately at Port royal, and being then informed that the Negroes employed in the building the Fortifications, would soon be called from that work by their respective owners In order to go upon their planting by which means The works upon the Fortifications would be upon a stand, Therefore had prepared the sending a Company of the Troops now in Charles Town to Port royal, some of whom might be employed upon the Fortifications, that He had been informed by some of the principal Inhabitants of Port royal, that empty Houses could be procured there for accommodating and lodging the Soldiers for £240 currency or there abouts for 3 months, and then the Barracks upon the Fortifications could be ready for their Reception, that they might have plenty of need [?] for the calling <adding?>; and as they had only of 9d pr [?]day currency for their Labour and the negroes 7/6d [indecipherable] would be assuring <assuming?> to the Public , besides having the works upon the fortifications carried are and compleated."

reported to Loudoun that "these People being very saving, tho the Province is rich & able to bear that Expence, they're extremely pleased to have soldiers to protect their Plantations, but will feel no inconveniences from making no great difference between a soldier & a Negro."[141] When Bouquet learned of the Commons House decision to provide one blanket for every two soldiers, he objected that even "the most covetous Planter finds it his Interest to allow One to the most despicable Slave."[142] His outraged accusation that South Carolina elites treated British soldiers worse than they did their slaves reflected slavery's power to inflect all human relationships as well as exacerbating the quartering controversy. Race, then, played an undeniable role in the standoff between Bouquet and the Commons House of South Carolina.

Ethnic Dimensions

Ethnicity added another layer of complexity to the quartering dispute. Bouquet's Swiss background and the predominantly German speaking makeup of the Royal Americans also played a role in the quartering dispute, albeit in a clandestine manner. While residing in Charles Town, the coterie of Swiss officers including Bouquet, Col. James Prevost, and Col. Frederick Haldimand purchased a plantation of over one thousand acres consisting of three tracts of land under the management of a fellow Swiss man Andrew Fesch and his wife Sophia.[143] Bouquet's purchase of a plantation, however,

---

[141] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, August 25, 1757, p.172. This draft letter likely had been drafted for the outgoing letter on October 16, 1757.

[142] *Representation of Field Officers Regarding Troops*, *The Papers of Henry Bouquet,* pp.248-249

[143] See footnote in S.K. Stevens, Donald H, Kent, and Autumn L. Leonard, *The Papers of Henry Bouquet Vol. 1* (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1972), p.256 Bouquet's purchase, in the names of Andrew Faesch and Peter Guinnand, consisted of three tracts of land

alarmed the members of the Commons House and the Council, who had Scottish background. Although Bouquet made a perfectly legal transaction, the South Carolina elites exploited it as a political pretext to oust Bouquet from Charles Town when an opportunity opened for them to conspire against the testy Swiss officer.

The decisive moment came in the winter of 1757. Bouquet issued an order to remove the Scottish Highlanders to Savannah to relieve the quartering situation in Charles Town. But the decision to continue to quarter the predominately German Royal Americans in Charles Town while removing the Scottish Highlanders drew a xenophobic response from Lyttelton and the members of the Commons House. Lyttelton hastily sent a private letter to Loudoun, alleging Bouquet had an ambition to be "in Command in this Province, where he is endeavouring to acquire Property."[144] Upon receiving Lyttelton's private letter, Loudoun accepted Lyttelton's allegation without objection, perhaps, in order to avoid any prolonged correspondence with the governor since Loudoun needed Bouquet as a second-in-command for the Fort Duquesne expedition anyway. Loudoun promised he would recall Bouquet from Charles Town but made it clear that he first suggested the idea of removing the Highlanders, implicitly

---

in Beaufort County comprising 1,097 ¾ acres. One tract was known as "Walnut Hill." Another tract of fifty-five acres, known as "Pickpocket," transferred to Faesch and Guinnand by John Drayton in 1757, was located on Charles Town Neck, north of Line Street between King Street and present Rutledge Avenue.

[144] Lyttelton to Loudoun, December 10, 1757. *The Papers of Henry Bouquet,* p.256. See the editors' footnote on p. 257 about the information on Bouquet's plantation: "Probably referring to Bouquet's purchase, in the names of Andrew Faesch and Peter Guinnand, of three tracts of land in Beaufort County comprising 1,097 ¾ acres. One tract was known as "Walnut Hill." Another tract of fifty-five acres, known as "Pickpocket," transferred to Faesch and Guinnand by John Drayton in 1757, was located on Charles Town Neck, north of Line Street between King Street and present Rutledge Avenue."

dismissing Lyttelton's accusation.[145] In response to Loudoun's message, Lyttelton once more directly expressed his discomfort at the Swiss officer and his friends buying large properties in South Carolina. "He is engaged with Colonel Prevost, Colonel Haldiman & some other foreign Officers to purchase Lands in this Province," Lyttelton noted, "Some Plantations they have already bought & have given out that they can draw for very large Sums."[146] Although Bouquet's economic activities did not establish an ambition to become the supreme commander of South Carolina, Lyttelton construed Bouquet's purchases as "interest in a Special manner to be establish'd, if possible, in the Command of the Forces here."[147]

Lyttelton made clear to the commander-in-chief of the British army in North America that these opinions were not only his but reflected a general sentiment of the Scottish elites in Charles Town. Lyttelton wrote that there were "very many Scotch Gentlemen of much consideration here, several of whom are in the Council & Assembly are pleas'd to see so many of their Countrymen engaged in the protection of this Colony," and they wanted the Highlanders to become naturalized inhabitants because that would be "most substantial & lasting benefit to these Parts that want very much an Addition of white Inhabitants."[148] These words suggest that Charles Town's elites of Scottish background welcomed Montgomery's Highlanders because they could become

---

[145] Loudoun to Lyttelton [Private], New York, Feb. 13, 1758 "As I find from Your Letter, that Lieu[t]. Colonel Bouquet, looks on himself now as a Proprietor in South Carolina, and from thence is taking Measures, to Answer his private Interest," wrote Loudoun, "I have, at Your desire, removed him where his business will be entirely Military." (San Marino: Huntington Library)

[146] Lyttelton to Lodoun, March 21, 1758. *The Papers of Henry Bouquet,* p.323

[147] Ibid.

[148] Lyttelton to Loudoun, December 10, 1757. *The Papers of Henry Bouquet,* p.256

a valuable source of white immigrants to mitigate their concerns about the dangers presented by black majority. As one British imperial historian notes, the British army served as "an important channel for emigration, especially to the North American colonies" and many officers and soldiers received land grants after the Seven Years' War.[149] Perhaps tired and frustrated with Bouquet's repeated demands to the South Carolinians that seemed go nowhere, Lyttelton sided with the colonists and endorsed the proposal to remove Bouquet from Charles Town. He concluded his reply to Loudoun writing that the Swiss officer had "been Squared & measured upon all Occasions by his views of establishing himself here & have seen so much of Duplicity & indirection in his behavior."[150]

Charles Town's elites, however, did not want just any whites to become immigrants. They despised the Royal Americans led by Bouquet mainly consisting of Pennsylvania Dutch. When the Commissioners of Fortification investigated vandalism and pillaging of the fortification materials, they singled out "a party of the Royal Americans" as the culprits responsible for destroying "Barrows & Fascines," stripping part of a wooden shed, and burning "some of the Cedar Posts four of which is equal in Value to a Cord of Wood." The commission also accused a "lately inlisted" Dutch man, Jacob Miller, for threatening to burn the shed and "the adjoining Store if Wood is deny'd or not found them."[151] Two court martials were held to try Miller and the accused Royal

---

[149] P. J. Marshall, *The Making and Unmaking of Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), p.66

[150] Lyttelton to Loudoun, December 10, 1757. *The Papers of Henry Bouquet,* p.256

[151] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet,* Commissioners to Lyttelton: Complaint Regarding Troops, Lyttelton to Loudoun, December 10, 1757. pp. 261-262

American soldiers but the court acquitted them because "the Witnesses could not prove the fact."

These incidents suggest that the ethnicity of British troops mattered in the quartering disputes, as Charles Town's Scottish elites' strong preference for the Highlanders directly conflicted with Bouquet's strategic decision. Bouquet's relentless demand for quarters, his purchase of personal properties, and his decision to remove the Highlanders made both Lyttelton and the Scottish elites of South Carolina appeal to Loudoun to remove Bouquet from his command. Bouquet's decision to relocate the Highlanders became an unexpected source of friction between him and the influential elites of South Carolina as they construed Bouquet's plan as a conspiracy to remove the Highlanders who would make an attractive addition to the white population of the colony dominated by a black majority. The Scottish connection between the elites or the middling sorts of Charles Town and the Highlanders also explains why those 187 Highlanders could find their quarters in private homes in September of 1757.

This ethnic animosity toward Bouquet from the South Carolinians contrasted starkly with Virginia officer George Mercer's opinion of the Swiss colonel. Mercer displayed a deferential attitude toward Bouquet and praised his fair treatment of provincial troops. He wrote to George Washington that Bouquet was "a good natured sensible Man" and "the only one of the Foreigners I am told on whom his Lordship much depends." Mercer especially appreciated Bouquet's respect for colonial officers, unlike what the Virginians had experienced under General Edward Braddock. "We are looked upon in quite another Light by all the Officers than we were by Genl Braddock or

Mr Orme," Mercer reported, "and do our Duty equally without any Partiality or particular Notice taken of one more than the other."[152]

British Soldiers' Interactions with Women

The first evidence of interaction between British troops and colonial women in Charles Town appeared during Bouquet's unhappy quartering in Charles Town in 1757. Only a few months after his arrival, Bouquet expressed a concern toward one of his captains, Francis Lander of the Royal Americans, to Loudoun. In his long report on the miserable quartering condition of Charles Town and complaining about the unaccommodating colonists, Bouquet closed the letter with a simple postscript: "P S: Captain Lander hath married today Miss Simson, reckoned the prettiest Girl in Town."[153] It is unclear why Bouquet added this information after a long letter without any elaboration. To Colonel John Stanwix, however, Bouquet also shared the same information but this time he expressed a concern with Francis Lander's marriage to the local woman adding, "I hope it will spread no farther as there is no great Temptation."[154] Perhaps Bouquet feared his field officers might attempt to sell their commissions en masse to get out of the army. In fact, Lander tried to sell his commission amidst the Fort

---

[152] George Mercer to George Washington, August 17, 1757, *The Papers of George Washington*, *Colonial Series 4*, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1984), p.372

[153] Bouquet to Lord Loudoun, October 16, 1757. *The Papers of Henry Bouquet,* p.218 "Two Days ago Capt. Lander married Miss Simpson one of our Beauties, I hope it will spread no farther as there is no great Temptation."

[154] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, Bouquet to Stanwix, October 18, 1757, p.222

Duquesne expedition and eventually got himself out of the army, presumably to settle down in Charles Town as a full-fledged immigrant.[155]

Bouquet's last comment to Stanwix also suggested that, among the circles of the British high command, the officers shunned the prospect of marrying local women in America. For instance, John Calcraft, an English politician and purchasing agent for the British army, sardonically advised Montgomery not to "get Married in America, but come home & follow yo^{r}. Old Wicked Course of Life here."[156] Despite the British officers' cautious attitude toward marriage in America, colonial elites brought up the subject to them. While visiting Charles Town in 1758, Virginian Colonel William Byrd casually relayed the message from the wife of James Glen, the former Governor South Carolina. "M^{rs}. Glen has ask'd me ten thousand Questions about you, & amongst others if 'twas likely you would Marry in America" Byrd wrote, "I told her I imagin'd you woud when the warm Weather set in."[157]

A couple of high profile British officers married colonial women during the Seven Years' War. Brigadier-General Thomas Gage married Margaret Kemble, a wealthy New Jersey woman related to the Delanceys in 1758 and Susannah Johnson, a young lady with "a large fortune," married Col. John Read of the Royal Highland

---

[155] "Register of St. Andrews Parish, Berkeley County, 1719-1774," *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, Vol. 14 (1913): 209-218, p.216 "Elizabeth the Wife of Cap^{t}. Francis Lander Buried Octob^{r} y^{e} 30th 1760" Tragically for Francis Lander, Elizabeth died only three years later as Register of St. Andrews Parish indicated. Capt. Lander himself died the following year in 1761. Register of St. Andrews Parish, Berkeley County, 1719-1774," *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, Vol. 15 (1914):39-50, p.39 "Cap^{t}. Francis Lander Buried p^{r} the Rev^{d} M^{r} Sergin of S^{t}. George Augst 28th 1761."

[156] *Ballindalloch Papers Box 48*, John Calcraft to Archibald Montgomery, December 7, 1759 (Edinburgh: National Archives of Scotland)

[157] William Byrd to Forbes, March 21, 1758. *Headquarters Papers related to John Forbes's Expedition to Fort Duquesne* (Charlottesville: Small Collections, University of Virginia)

regiment.[158] These cases were exceptional, however, because the colonial women belonged to the elite class of colonial society. Considering Landers's rank as a captain and the fact that Bouquet only described Simson as "the prettiest girl," Bouquet might have viewed this union as undesirable.[159]

Beyond these few documented unions, it is unclear how British officers viewed colonial women of Charles Town. Virginia officer George Mercer spilled a great deal of ink describing local white women's lack of pulchritude, entwining gender and class to describe the degenerate conditions of South Carolina, but this does not mean British officers shared Mercer's view.[160] On the contrary, Bouquet, Montgomery, and Grant all dined with the colonial women of Charles Town during their stay. For instance, Bouquet

---

[158] See Thomas M. Truxes. *Defying Empire: Trading with the Enemy in Colonial New York* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), p.33

[159] Peter Way, "Venus and Mars: Women and the British Army in the Seven Years' War," in *Britain and America go to War: the Impact of War and Warfare in Anglo-America, 1754-1815*, ed. Julie Flavell and Stephen Conway, (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2004), pp.41-68. Peter Way argues that the army was essentially a patriarchal institution and an extension of family in which "the elite officer class exercised patriarchal authority," exerting its control over rank-and-file's sexual activities. The army culture also harbored "militaristic misogyny" as evinced in officers' attempts to exclude women's presence from the army because they were thought to have corrupting influence on soldiers' discipline.

[160] George Mercer to George Washington, August 17, 1757, *The Papers of George Washington*, *Colonial Series 4*, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1984), p.370. "Youl be surprised I have not yet mentioned the fair Ones I wish I cou'd call Them so, I assure you they are very far inferior to the Beauties of our own Country…A great Imperfection here too is the bad Shape of the Ladies, many of Them are crooked & have a very bad Air & not those enticing heaving throbbing alluring Letch exciting plump Breasts common with our Northern Belles—I am afraid I have tired your Patience & doubt not but you are as much disappointed at reading This, as I was at having an Opportunity of writing it to you." George Milligen, later writing a short publicity piece to promote South Carolina to outsiders, disagreed with the Virginian's unflattering assessment. "Their personal Qualities of the Ladies are much to their Credit and Advantage; they are generally of a middling Stature, genteel and slender; they have fair Complexions, without the Help of Art. and regular Features; their Air is easy and natural; their Manner free and unaffected; their Eyes sparking, penetrating, and inchantingly sweet: They are fond of Dancing, an Exercise they perform very gracefully; and many sing well, and play upon the Harpshichord and Guitar with great Skill; nor are they less remarkable for Goodness of Heart, Sweetness of Disposition, and that charming Modesty and Diffidence, which command Respect whilst they invite Love, and distinguish and adorn the Sex------In short, all, who have the Happiness of their Acquaintance, will acquit me of Partiality, when I say they are excelled by none in the Practice of all the social Virtues, necessary for the Happiness of the other Sex, as Daughters, Wives, or Mothers." George Millgien, *A Short Description*, pp.24-25

dined with Anne Manigault, wife of Gabriel Manigault, at the house of a wealthy merchant.[161] Montgomery and Grant also dined with Bouquet's plantation manager's wife Sophia Fesch.[162] It is likely that the 187 Highlander officers lodged in private homes must have had similar social interactions since women took charge of providing accommodations as revealed in the list of people who applied for public credit for quartering the soldiers.[163]

While British officers socialized with the town's women and with those who had space to rent, the rank-and-file might have harassed local women. Terence Ryley, belonging to Major Tullenken's Company, was charged of "making a disturbance in Town" that involved an alleged sexual solicitation and assault toward a local woman named Sarah Beckett. Beckett alleged that while she went to Mr. Hopton's Tan yard house to fetch water, Ryley approached her and "kissed her, and insisted upon her going in with him to a little Brick House and wanted to Have to say to her, telling her that If she would not by fair she would by foul."[164] Ryley also allegedly "offered to make her a Present of Money or Handcurcheff" while he took her to the house.

Ryley's attempt on Sarah Beckett was interrupted when her brother-in-law John Wilson appeared at the scene and the two men traded blows against each other. Wilson's wife Mary also showed up, and "prevailed upon them" to stop their grappling and

---

[161] "Extracts from the Journal of Mrs. Ann Manigault, 1754-1781," (With notes by Mabel. L. Webber) *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, Vol, 20 (1920), p. 129. On July 28, Ann Manigault recorded "A visit from Col. Bocquet."

[162] Sophia Fesch to Bouquet, Sophy Hall, May [?], 1758 [B.M. Add. MSS 21643, f.84, L.]

[163] The following names appear in the record who "Lodged a Highlander Officer": Jane Boone, Rebecca Bennett, Sarah Baker, Isabella Robinson, Mary Cranmer, Magdelen Prioleau, and Elizabeth Richardson. *Journals of the Commons House of Assembly,* January 26, 1758

[164] *WO 71/130*, December 12, 1757

brawling. Ryley retreated from the fight but then returned with three more soldiers and pursued Wilson. Fearing for his life, Wilson "fetched out a Loaded Gun, and swore that the first man that came, to Attack him, he would blow his brains out." In response to this threat, however, Ryley went away again and then returned with nine more soldiers "some of them armed with Firelocks." Seeing a greater number of soldiers with arms, Wilson locked the door and hid himself. The soldiers allegedly threatened to break the door open, swearing that Wilson "was a damn'd fool not go on and ask'd him what he had brought them therefore." Mary yelled to the soldiers outside to drop the threat to which Ryley threatened that he would "knock her Brains out, with a Cow's horne and a piece of head to it, which he had in his hand." The soldiers persuaded Ryley to forget it and they went away, but Ryley persisted and broke the door's "Iron Staple and Wooden bolt," entered the house and searched for Wilson "holding his Thumb all the while on the dogshead of the Firelock, Cock'd." When Ryley could not find Wilson hiding, he allegedly took Wilson's Firelock and then went away.

If the colonists' accusation sounded convincingly damning, Ryley had his own version of the story in which he alleged that Sarah Beckett stole money from him. Ryley engaged in a verbal dispute demanding that Beckett return his money. When Ryley backed out from Wilson's threat to shoot anyone who entered the house, his "Comrades told him he was a fool not to get his money from the Whore" which made Ryley go back again "with a View to carry her to the Workhouse." Ryley stated that he stole Wilson's

gun because he "might come for it, and that so he should find out the Man who had rescued the Woman from him."[165]

This standoff between British soldiers and a colonial man suggests that a contest for masculinity colored tension between the soldiers of the Royal American Regiment and the inhabitants of Charles Town as the quartered soldiers imperiled colonial men's masculinity by intruding into their private homes and threatening their female family members. Peter Way's study of the army's attitude toward women suggest that the guilty party of soldiers appearing in court martials often cast the woman as the villain or the evil temptress who caused them to get drunk, desert, or act violently, but Sarah Beckett may well have taken money from Ryley.[166] Regardless of what actually happened, Ryley's case illustrates the extent of informal interactions that took place between Bouquet's quartered soldiers and Charles Town's women.[167]

***

Closer examination of British troops' activities in Charles Town during their nine-month stay shows wide ranging economic exchanges and cultural contacts between the British soldiers and the inhabitants that went well beyond a quartering dispute that is often simplified as a back-and-forth argument between Bouquet and the Commons House of Assembly. The actual, every day exchanges that occurred at various urban

---

[165] Ibid.

[166] Peter Way, "Venus and Mars: Women and the British Army in the Seven Years' War," in *Britain and America go to War: the Impact of War and Warfare in Anglo-America, 1754-1815*, ed. Julie Flavell and Stephen Conway, (Gainesville : University Press of Florida, 2004), p.54

[167] On women of other colonial cities and their social or sexual relations with British soldiers, see Karin Wulf, *Not All Wives: Women of Colonial Philadelphia* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2000)

places among the middling inhabitants of Charles Town (including women) and British troops suggests a different picture than the bickering words of Bouquet and the Commons House.

The quartering dispute in Charles Town needs a wider context accounting for race, ethnicity, economy, gender, and especially the presence of enslaved Africans and Indians in the Southeast. The remote locations and hot climate of the southeast as well as its distance from the British army headquarters in New York made Charles Town an undesirable destination for British officers and rank and file alike. A plantation-driven economy that neglected service sectors meant higher prices for provisions and a lack of wealth concentrated in the urban center, which resulted in poor and inadequate housing for British troops; the presence of enslaved Africans also contributed to Bouquet's increasingly hostile perception of how the elites and planter class of South Carolina treated British troops in relation to their slaves. His investment in plantation and slaves for profit further exacerbated tensions with the South Carolinian elites. Lastly, the ethnicity of Bouquet, the Royal Americans, and the Highlanders played a crucial role in complicating the tension between the Commons House and Bouquet. As a result, while Virginia officer George Mercer could not wait to meet and socialize with South Carolina planters, the Scottish Highlander Archibald Montgomery complained to Loudoun that "I wish we were free of those [dis?]honest Planters, which will soon happen of [if] your Lop is as willing to have us as we are Desirous to be near you."[168] William Byrd, who

---

[168] *LO 4689*, *Loudoun Papers* (Huntington Library: San Marino, CA). William Byrd arrived in Charles Town in late March of 1758 and recommended Loudoun the British troops to be relocated.

arrived in Charles Town in March 1758, immediately sympathized with Montgomery, reporting to John Forbes preparing the Fort Duquesne expedition that "That Gentleman & all his officers are heartily tir'd of this Place & sincerely wish to be removed to the Northward."[169] Thankfully, it did not take too long for Montgomery and his Highlanders to be recalled to Philadelphia to join the forces assembled to launch the expedition to Fort Duquesne.

Headquarters Papers related to John Forbes's Expedition to Fort Duquesne, William Byrd to John Forbes, March 21, 1758 (Small Collections, University of Virginia). "I sat down with great Pleasure to obey your Command, & to return you my thanks for your Letter of Recommendation to Coll. Montgomery, who has shewn me very great Civilities. That Gentleman & all his officers are heartily tir'd of this Place & sincerely wish to be removed to the Northward. I think 'tis pitty so fine a Battalion shoud lay the Summer in Garrison here, for its realy the finest I ever saw, but the hot weather disagrees very much with them. Coll. Montgomery will give you an Account of his Dipsutes with the Town's People about Quarters, I fear he will have but an uncumfortable time with them."

[169] *Headquarters Papers related to John Forbes's Expedition to Fort Duquesne*, William Byrd to John Forbes, March 21, 1758 (Small Collections, University of Virginia)

CHAPTER IV

THE CHOICES OF CHEROKEES IN THE FORT DUQUESNE EXPEDITION, 1758

> "…I have no mortal about me that understands Indian affairs or their Genius…how Grosly they had abused and imposed upon us for so many months, and now to leave us at the only they could be of any service to us…[170]
>
> —John Forbes to James Abercromby, August 11, 1758

Fort Duquesne Expedition, Cherokees, and Catawbas

In July 1758, a British-led coalition of British troops, Cherokee warriors, and a mix of provincial militia assembled in western Pennsylvania and set off to take Fort Duquesne and avenge the humiliating, crushing defeat suffered in the last attempt led by Edward Braddock. Much had changed during the intervening three years, but much also remained the same. John Forbes's expedition secured some five hundred Cherokee warriors in addition to about fifty men consisting of Catawbas and Tuscaroras in contrast to Braddock's failure to garner the support of Indians; however, much like the previous disastrous attempt, the British officers' ignorance and arrogance cost them dearly when they ended up losing most of the Cherokees and Catawbas from the expedition prematurely. Although the British finally took possession of the burnt remains of the fort and renamed it Fort Pitt, they earned the resentment of the Cherokees, which strengthened the position of hawkish Cherokee headmen to go to war against South Carolina two years later.

---

[170] John Forbes, *Writings of General John Forbes* ed. Alfred Proctor James (Menasha, WI.: Collegiate Press, 1938; reprint: Arno Press, 1971), pp.174-175, Forbes to Abercromby, August 11, 1758

This chapter focuses on how British officers and colonial messengers acting on behalf of the British army quickly destroyed a fragile alliance through their verbal, ritual, and physical actions with regard to gift-giving and by turning supposedly generous acts of gift-giving into confrontations. While many scholars have acknowledged Cherokee participation in the Fort Duquesne expedition, they have sidestepped the complex and often confusing accounts of the Cherokees in favor of a simpler narrative leading up to the Anglo-Cherokee War. One historian of the Fort Duquesne expedition underplayed the role of Cherokees by writing that because of "a lack of written accounts by their own hands they must remain silent participants in the campaign."[171] More surprisingly, the Catawbas' participation rarely receives notable attention; even James Merrell's celebrated study of the Catawbas, does not discuss the Fort Duquesne expedition and its relevance to the Catawba-British relations.[172]

Only recently have historians begun to reassess the role of Cherokees in analyzing why the alliance failed. Paul Kelton argues that the Cherokees played a greater role in "hidden diplomacy," bringing the Six Nations Iroquois to the British side and thereby pressuring the Ohioans allied with the French to come to the peace table.[173]

---

[171] Douglas R. Cubbison, *The British Defeat of the French in Pennsylvania*, *1758* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2010), p.84

[172] Tom Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); John Oliphant, *Peace* and W*ar on* the *Anglo-Cherokee* Frontier, 1756-63 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press : a Great Britain: Palgrave, 2001); David Corkran, The *Cherokee* F*rontier*: Conflict and Survival, 1740-62 (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962). Surprisingly scholars have often overlooked the Cherokee and Catawba participation in the Fort Duquesne expedition, including eminent scholars of white-Indian relations. They often focused on Indian traders and interpreters as the agents of "go-betweens" and cultural exchanges rather than British soldiers.

[173] On the latest summary account of the Cherokee towns' reaction to the Fort Duquesne expedition, see Paul Kelton, "The British and Indian War: Cherokee Power and the Fate of Empire in North America," *William and Mary Quarterly 69* (2012): 763-792 Tyler Boulware, "The Effect of the Seven Years' War on

Kelton argues that the Cherokees "undermined France's alliances and paved the way for the ultimate British victory," and that their military support to the British proved vital.[174] Kelton's rehabilitation of the Cherokees' role in the Fort Duquesne expedition is a welcoming revision to Forbes's accusation of "total defection & desertion." This study goes beyond such strictly military or diplomatic concerns to examine the exchanges between the British troops, the Cherokees, and the Catawbas on their road together to Fort Duquesne. These daily interactions often aggravated an already difficult alliance. The Fort Duquesne expedition also represented a continuation of British troops' experience with the inhabitants of the Southeast, even as they physically traveled out of the region together. It thus provides a bridge from the 1757 Charles Town occupation to the Anglo-Cherokee Wars of 1760-61.

Several scholars have noted that the Cherokee-British relations formed and fell apart during the Fort Duquesne expedition over gift-giving practices. Historians have debated the symbolism and meaning of gift-giving and how it actually worked in the context of white-Indian relations in North America. Wilbur Jacobs noted that the "old Indian custom of giving and receiving presents," a symbolic language of rituals that interwove social relations, status, and gender in Indian society, played a critical role in

---

the Cherokee Nation," *Early American Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal 5.2* (2007) 395-426. Boulware, Tyler. *Deconstructing the Cherokee Nation: Town, Region, and Nation among Eighteenth-Century Cherokees* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2011). See also, Matthew C. Ward, *Breaking the Backcountry: the Seven Years' War in Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1754-1765* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2003)

[174] Paul Kelton, "The British and Indian War: Cherokee Power and the Fate of Empire in North America," *William and Mary Quarterly 69* (2012): 763-792, 795

forging diplomacy between Europeans and Indians.[175] More recent studies suggest that differences existed between gift-giving for diplomatic purposes and trading to exchange goods and (military) services.[176] By the Seven Years' War, however, the long-standing diplomatic ritual of gift-giving had already been transformed, as the intense competition between French and British traders to court Indians changed formerly symbolic rituals into a fundamentally market-driven bargaining process.[177] Although there might have been regional variances within the gift-giving practices or exchanges with the Europeans, scholars of southeastern Indians agree with the broader thesis that fundamentally incompatible notions such as diplomacy and contractual agreement

---

[175] Wilbur Jacobs, *Wilderness Politics and Indian Gifts, 1748-1763* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1950); For the importance of gift giving in treaty makings after 1761, see also Dorothy V. Jones, *License for Empire* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982)

[176] For an overview of white-Indian diplomacy and recent studies, see the chapter five of Collin Calloway, *New Worlds For All* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), Richard White, *The Middle Ground* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991) Kathryn Braund, *Deerskins and Duffels*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), p.27 As Kathryn Braund notes, "Trade, the exchange of one commodity for another, was entirely another matter, aimed at the redistribution of scarce resources among various peoples." Richard White, *The Middle Ground* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p.95 As Richard White summed up the substantivist position on trade between Europeans Indians, "gifts were not merely bribes or wages; allies were not simply mercenaries…Life was not a business, and such simplifications only distort the past." See also Daniel K. Richter for a discussion to interpret Indian history from the perspective market economy in "Whose Indian History?" *WMQ 50:2* (1993): 379-393

[177] Hatley, *Dividing Paths*, p.48 "Euroamerican concepts of profit, credit, and debt were also gradually accommodated to Cherokee ideas of commerce. In a society in which accumulation of wealth was overridden by routines of gift-giving, and in which consumption was more important than accumulation, the notion of profit was difficult translate."; Richard White, *The Middle Ground* ((New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p.95 "Tied to the world market and embedded in the large world of the alliance, the fur trade became part of the middle ground." Also, as White notes, Indians "had indeed become part of a world market that then stretched across the Atlantic to Europe. When they accepted European goods and gave furs in return, a still emerging market system in Europe." Citing his case of Algonquian-French fur trade relations, White argues that "the fur trade could not be completely separated from the relationship of French fathers to their Algonquian children, that is, from relations of political and military alliance, a straightforward domination of the local Algonquian village by the market never emerged."

surrounded the act of gift-giving.[178] On the other hand, in his study of the Cherokee-British relations centered on the cultural meanings associated with gift-giving, Gregory Dowd argues that both sides completely understood what to expect from each other but that it was "the definition of the bond embodied by the gift that differed widely."[179]

The joint Cherokee-British military venture to Fort Duquesne provides an opportunity to examine daily relations between the southeastern Indians and British troops. The British intention to recruit Indian warriors requires no elaborate explanation. They regarded Indians as better woodsmen and nimbler scouts in the American woods against the French who also employed a legion of Indian warriors.[180] When the Cherokee warriors did not follow as the British instructed, however, Forbes and Bouquet both questioned the efficacy of having Indian warriors and scouts in the expedition. The more Forbes and Bouquet dealt with the Cherokees, the more frustrated they became. To put it another way, the presence of the Cherokee warriors caused disagreements and divide between the British and provincial officers over how to deal with them. While most Indian agents and colonial officers advocated retaining the Cherokee warriors at

---

[178] John Juricek, *Colonial Georgia and the Creeks* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2010), pp.5-6 Juricek writes, "for Europeans, diplomacy was conceived as an ongoing conversation, a private dialogue between kings or other sovereign authorities about weighty matters of common concern." Southeastern Indians, however, understood diplomacy as "a direct connection between communities" that included exchange of symbolic gift and wampum belts.

[179] Gregory Dowd, "Gift Giving and the Cherokee-British Alliance," in *Contact Points* ed. Andrew R.L. Cayton and Fredrika J. Teute (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), p.138

[180] *Lyttelton Papers*, Loudoun to Lyttelton, February 13, 1758. (Ann Arbor, MI: William L. Clements Library) "As I propose the Ensuing Campaign to carry on offensive Operations on the Ohio, against the Enemey, and as I have both from Virginia and Pensilvania had Accounts of the great Service, that the Body of Cherokees did, when they were there last year, and of the Promises they made of returning next Campaign, in greater Numbers, I have formed a Plan, of having as large a Body of them, on this Service as can be Collected, they themselves, give hops of Bringing 500 Fighting Men, but I should chuse to have as great a Body as can be collected, and for this purpose…"

any cost, the British officers complained about the expenses of "Indian presents." In addition, the spoiled relations between the Cherokees and British also spilled over to the Catawbas. Despite the Catawba warriors' contribution to the British war effort in the Fort Duquesne expedition, they did not earn gratitude from the British officers because Forbes and Bouquet viewed the Catawbas no differently from the Cherokees the moment they abandoned the expedition and went home.

Cherokee Decisions to Join the Expedition

Since Fort Prince George and Fort Loudoun were built in the 1750s, Anglo-Cherokee relations were only tenuously maintained through trade and presents. As Tom Hatley notes, "By the end of the 1750s, the Cherokees were becoming increasingly dissatisfied" with the British presence and the disorders they brought to Cherokee society.[181] Fort Loudoun and Fort Prince George became the focal points of trouble and trade since they were built. The Cherokees had also launched numerous raids on behalf of the British. One recent scholar estimates that the Cherokees made "at least seventeen raids on Fort Duquesne from Britain's mid-Atlantic forts between April and August" in 1758.[182] Whether the Cherokees would assist a prolonged British military expedition over a full winter hunting season, however, was an entirely different matter. The British had to impress the Cherokees and make an offer they could not refuse with an extravagant amount of gifts. The British did not.

---

[181] Hatley, The D*ividing* P*aths*, p.99

[182] Paul Kelton, "The British and Indian War: Cherokee Power and the Fate of Empire in North America," *William and Mary Quarterly 69* (2012): 763-792, p.778 According to Kelton, this figure might have been higher because the Cherokees since some parties avoided British posts.

One incident that clearly demonstrated that the Cherokees' expectation of proper presents occurred in 1757 when the Lower Cherokees violently confronted the Virginians for failing to reward them for the military service they had provided. Lower Cherokee leader Wauhatchee and a group of Cherokees visited Williamsburg to receive the promised presents but Virginia Governor Dinwiddie did not have the goods ready. Enraged at Dinwiddie's hapless reply, Wauhatchee and his men allegedly went "plundering the plantations & fighting the Inhabitants from their house," acting like "free booters in an Enemys Country."[183] The Lower Cherokees became angry because "the Govr knew not how to treat Indians" whereas "the French treated them always like Children, gave them what Goods they wanted."[184] Listening to the Cherokees' complaints, Captain George Mercer (who later accompanied Bouquet's Royal Americans to Charles Town) concluded, "the chief thing is A PRESENT and they expect a very good one."[185]

---

[183] *War Office: Baron Jeffrey Amherst, Commander in Chief: Papers WO 34/47*, Clements Read to Robert Dinwiddie, Lunenberg, April 5, 1757 (Kew: National Archives)

[184] George Mercer to George Washington, Fort Loudoun, April 24, 1757. *The Papers of George Washington*, juial *Series 4*, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1984), p.139

[185] *WO 34/47*, *The Swallow Warrior's Speech to Capt^n. Mercer*, "…Brother I have been amongst the French, and know what encouragement they give their Indians, which is the Reason they have so many to fight for them. The French have sent the Shawneas into the Upper Towns of our Nation took English flesh and pressed them to taste of it. They did not do it at that time, but it looks to me they intend to taste of it by their behaviour. They will not come to your assistance, although the Gov^nr. took them to be Warriors and his friends, and never so much as thought it worth his While to ask us that are Boys. But we heard there was such Letters sent from the Governor which was like a Dream to us. And we had the loss of our brothers the English so much at heart that we came now to take satisfaction. But as I find no presents here, I don't know it will be, and I make no doubt but the Overhills People will rejoice at it, when they see us coming back, and will say, These are the men that went to assit their Brother the English, see how they are loaded with presents. Brother we blame the Gov^nr. and not you." George Mercer to George Washington, Fort Loudoun, April 26, 1757. *The Papers of George Washington*, *Colonial Series 4*, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1984), p.142

As the Lower Cherokees' response to the Virginians demonstrated, the Cherokees made it no secret that they could always work for the French if the British failed to offer better quality and more presents. The British colonists knew more than anyone that the French and their Indian allies, notably the Shawnees, constantly courted the Cherokees in an effort to thwart the British strategies in the Southeast and war efforts in the Ohio Country. The Overhill Cherokees, in particular, kept open their diplomatic channels with the French via the Shawnees living among their villages who acted as the messengers propagating the pro-French position among the Cherokees.[186] They had every reason to accommodate the Shawnees and hear what the French had to offer in order to make a better deal for themselves out of the Anglo-French rivalry in North America. Moreover, empty promises, trade embargoes, and other numerous offenses by the British traders and soldiers encouraged the Overhill Cherokees to seek other options.[187] Newly arrived British officers in North America in general, however, appeared to have little understanding of the importance of presents or naively assumed the Cherokees could be easily bought and may have presumed political homogeneity.

---

[186] George Milligen, *A Short Description*, p.78. The British often blamed "troubles" in Indian on French while hiding their own acts which infuriated the Cherokees. George Milligen, writing after a conclusion of the Seven Years' War, blatantly claimed that "The Savages daily saw themselves cheated in Weight and Measure; their Women debauched, and their young Men corrupted: These Wrongs and Insulted were made the most of by *French* Emissaries amongst them, who took much Pains, with Success enough, to alienate their Affections from the *English*." On the Shawnees and their role among the French and the Cherokees, see Laura Spero "Stout, bold, cunning, and the greatest travellers in America: The Shawnee diaspora" (PhD dissertation: 2010) and Gregory Dowd, *Spirited Resistance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992)

[187] Gregory Dowd, *Spirited Resistance.* As Gregory Dowd suggests, *nativism*— the desire to purify and purge the dependence and addiction to British goods—might have formed an undercurrent of Cherokee politics. Corkran uses the term *nativism* in a loose sense and sometimes uses it interchangeably with "anti-English."

Loudoun's ambitious plan to recruit five hundred Cherokee warriors for the Fort Duquesne expedition failed to take into account recent Cherokee dissatisfaction with the British. For such a perilous and long-term engagement, Cherokee leader had to contend with many problems. In the Cherokee warriors' absence for many months, the Creeks could raid the Cherokee settlements. Even Atkin predicted that the French "will surely leave no Stone unturned at this Juncture" to "kindle a Flame" between the Cherokees and the Creeks.[188] In addition, the French and their allies—including the Choctaws, Illinois, Miamis, Ottawas, and Shawnees could raid the undefended Overhills settlements.[189] Given these circumstances and the pro-British figure Cherokee leader Attakullakulla had to walk a tight rope between accommodating British interests and those of his people.

William Byrd Meets Attakullakulla

When Virginian Colonel William Byrd visited Keowee in the spring of 1758 to recruit Cherokee warriors as Loudoun instructed, he had no idea he would encounter difficulties completing the assigned task. At the first meeting with Attakullakulla, Byrd explained the British plan to attack Fort Duquesne and promised gifts in return for the Cherokees' military aid, but the Cherokee leader replied "the Men were all out of the

[188] *Headquarters Papers related to John Forbes's Expedition to Fort Duquesne*, Edmond Atkin to John Forbes, May 20, 1758 (Small Collections, University of Virginia)

[189] Paul Kelton, "The British and Indian War: Cherokee Power and the Fate of Empire in North America," *William and Mary Quarterly 69* (2012): 763-792, 767

Nation" and "it would be in vain for him or me to attempt to raise any Number."[190] Besides Attakullakulla had another agenda to address before he would consider the British plan to invade Fort Duquesne. The British had not rewarded him for the expedition against the Savannahs and the French several months before, when he and the Great Warrior of Chota ventured down the Tennessee River in July 1757. Byrd attempted to inveigle Attakullakulla without addressing the missing reward and Attakullakulla gave a vague promise that he would meet Byrd at Chota in twenty-six days and accompany him to Winchester "with all his Force." Attakullakulla's words worried Byrd because "Delays will frustrate Lord Loudouns Designs against the Ohio."[191]

No records attest to what Attakullakulla actually did during those twenty-six days. Some scholars suggest that he attempted to contact the French to see whether they could offer presents to the Cherokees without the risk of sending many young men to the harms way; perhaps he simply needed more time to convince the Cherokees to join the British expedition. Twenty days after the first meeting with Attakullakulla, on May 1, Byrd reported from Keowee that he only managed to recruit sixty Cherokee warriors to go with him—a number far below the five hundred men that Loudoun originally planned. Moreover, Attakullakulla said "neither he or his Men woud go to Virginia" and accused of Byrd telling him lies. When Byrd protested, Attakullakulla retracted his

---

[190] *Lyttelton Papers* (Ann Arbor: William L. Clements Library), William Byrd to Lyttelton, West's on Little Saluda, March 31, 1758 While they did not encounter any Savannahs to kill, they discovered a new French settlement on the Savannah River and intercepted French letters from the Chocktaw runners. The British also called Attakullakulla as "Little Carpenter." I use his Cherokee name throughout this dissertation.

[191] Ibid., William Byrd to Lyttelton, West's on Little Saluda, March 31, 1758

position and said he would go to Virginia as soon as his wagon full of presents arrived.[192]

Although Byrd called Attakullakulla's vacillating words and refusal to go to Winchester "insolent," the Cherokee chief had every reason to confirm the delivery of presents with his own eyes to make sure the British kept their word. After all, the British had failed to reward him for the expedition he undertook against the Savannahs. As a prestigious leader, Attakullakulla not only had to win the minds of young Cherokee warriors with presents but also had an obligation to look after their interests. Twenty days after Byrd left Keowee and headed to Virginia, Attakullakulla explained to Lachlan McIntosh, an officer at Fort Prince George, that he could not "Prevail upon his young men to stir" to go Winchester until they received presents.[193] Every time the British messengers pressed Attakullakulla to hasten the Cherokee warriors to mobilize, he kept negotiating the terms, taking advantage of the British need for Indian warriors and demanding that presents be delivered without delay.[194] Indeed, Forbes later reported to William Pitt that "threats we dare not use, least they change sides," admitting that Cherokee warriors were vital to the British war effort because "our Enemies were kept in awe by the presence of so many Cherokees."[195]

The eagerness to recruit the Cherokee warriors made the British and colonial messengers so impatient that they took unconventional risks. For instance, after

---

[192] Ibid., Byrd to Lyttelton, Keowee, May 1, 1758

[193] Ibid., Lachlan McIntosh to Lyttelton, Fort Prince George, May 19, 1758

[194] Ibid., *Lyttelton Papers* (Ann Arbor: William L. Clements Library), George Turner to Lyttelton, Fort Prince George, May 19, 1758 George Turner basically echoed what McIntosh reported to Lyttelton.

[195] John Forbes, *Writings of General John Forbes*, p. 166. Forbes to Pitt, June 17, 1758. (Extracted from *Colonial Office 5/50*, pp.577-582)

experiencing such difficulties recruiting Cherokees warriors, Byrd gave a blank check to James Beamer, an indebted trader living in the Lower Cherokee town of Estatoe, hoping that the resident trader would encourage the Cherokees to join the expedition. Byrd suspected that Beamer instead dissuaded the Cherokees from going on the expedition because he lived "among the Cherokees upwards of thirty Years" and "is now so connected with that place that the Savages are quite at his Command."[196] Resident colonial traders had a powerful motive to discourage the Cherokees from going on a lengthy expedition that could provide justification not to pay debts owed the traders. The traders themselves would then accumulate debt to their own creditors in Charles Town.[197] In a desperate attempt, Byrd took a great risk of trusting a trader of questionable motives but felt he had no other options at that point.[198] "I wish you may not think me both mad & unreasonable," Byrd informed Lyttelton with trepidation, "but you know what sort of People I have to deal with."[199] The British may have thought they occupied a superior position as patrons buying services from the Cherokees but, in reality, their military plan was dependent on native assistance. Attakullakulla probably sensed that he had leverage against the British in this situation and was unwilling to comply unless the presents were delivered, given their history of failure to pay on time.

---

[196] *Lyttelton Papers* (Ann Arbor: William L. Clements Library), Byrd to Lyttelton, Keowee, May 1, 1758

[197] David Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962), p.133

[198] George Milligen, *A Short Description*, pp. 77-78. Colonists had an unkind view of traders operating inside Indian country. Milligen excoriated them as "a Shame to Humanity, and the Disgrace of Christianity; by their iniquitous and foolish Conduct, they changed the idea of superior Valour, Honour, and Discretion, the *Indians* had been used to form of the *English*, into a general Contempt and Dislike. – The Savages daily saw themselves cheated in Weight and Measure; their Women debauched, and their young Men corrupted."

[199] *Lyttelton Papers* (Ann Arbor: William L. Clements Library), Byrd to Lyttelton, Keowee, May 1, 1758

These mismatched expectations placed on each other continued to ossify the Cherokee-British relations over the terms of commitment to the expedition against Fort Duquesne.

Gift Giving Blunders

If the delays with delivery of presents started the Fort Duquesne expedition on a wrong foot, poorly executed gift giving protocols from the colonial officers and traders carrying out the orders on behalf of Forbes and Bouquet aggravated the Cherokee-British relations further. In addition, by the time the presents arrived, the situation had changed on the Cherokee side as they no longer wanted to commit to the long arduous expedition that seemed to require a larger sacrifice than necessary. Thus, when the messengers arrived to accompany Attakullakulla and his men to Virginia, they did not receive the answers they expected to hear. Instead of patiently persuading the Cherokees to reconsider their position by properly presenting the gifts, the British messengers dealt with the Cherokees in a highhanded and offensive manner.

When Virginia officer William Trent arrived at Fort Loudoun with the wagon loaded with gifts, "the head Warrior came to me & told me to give them the Goods" because "he wanted to sett off home early in the Morning." Rather than complying with the warrior's request, Trent attempted to chastise him by telling him that "it was just night, and rained hard; that it was too late to open them, but in the Morning they should have what was for them." The Indians refused to back down to Trent's lecturing and started "running with their Tammyhawks & Knives, ripped open the Bales, broke open

the Cases, and began to divide the Goods."[200] Trent admonished them for insulting him and behaving more like "Shawanese than Brothers and Cherokees," and ordered his men to arms. The Cherokees responded in the same manner, running to their arms and confronting Trent's men outside the fort. The Virginia officer threatened to order his men to fire and the Cherokees backed down and told him they would wait to collect the presents until the next morning.

Trent may have had his way in this confrontation but his highhanded treatment of the Indians as misbehaving children only made them feel insulted and bullied. Worse, he might have antagonized his potential Indian allies by turning a gift-giving procedure meant to please the Cherokees into a tense, hostile moment that destroyed a chance to secure their commitment to the expedition. Trent, however, triumphantly reported to his superior that he delivered "the Present as I thought fit, which they took without giving me any further Trouble and they now seem all in good Temper." Trent justified his action by describing the incident as a conundrum in which he could neither allow the Indians "to break up the Kings Stores and carry the Goods off before our Faces," because that would have made the British a laughing stock, nor resort to "use of Force," which would result in the Cherokees' complete withdrawal from the expedition. He argued "the Loss of Four or Five Hundred Pounds worth of Goods" was better than "the Loss of not having them on y^{e} Campaign, or perhaps turning them all to the French." Trent believed he successfully "settled" the affair and "pleased" the Cherokees at the

---

[200] *Headquarters Papers related to John Forbes's Expedition to Fort Duquesne*, William Trent to John St. Clair, May 23, 1758 (Small Collections, University of Virginia)

same time.[201] He could not have been more wrong in his self-congratulatory assessment as another messenger's visit to the Cherokees a month later makes clear.

After Trent's delivery of presents, Forbes sent George Turner, a colonial trader, to Fort Loudoun in order to press the Cherokees to join the Fort Duquesne expedition. The expedition's commander became more impatient and irritated that only a small number of Cherokees joined the British coalition force in Virginia while Attakullakulla and his men still had not departed from the Overhills. Turner, however, committed a diplomatic faux pas when he failed to present a belt of wampum with his talks. Attakullakulla immediately accused Turner for bringing "no Wampum," a failure that overshadowed anything Turner said because while his talks were "often Lyes but their belts never lied."[202] Attakullakulla reprimanded Turner explaining that had he "brought a large Belt of Wampon," the Cherokees should have believed him sooner.

Fortunately for Turner, Paul Demere, the commanding officer of Fort Loudoun, interjected himself into the conversation and disputed with Attakullakulla over his promise to go to Virginia with Turner. After a sharp exchange, Attakullakulla dropped the dispute, explaining it away by saying that he and Demere "are Warriors" who loved to "scold now and then."[203] Nonetheless, Attakullakulla refused to follow Turner to

---

[201] Ibid., Trent also added that "Soon after I had delivered out their Part of the Present, Wahatehe came down from the Fort with his Party, The Catawbas behaved very well, they all went into their Barracks and layed down." The act of lying down might have meant something else but Trent interpreted it as being content and idling.

[202] *Records of the Colonial Office, America and West Indies, CO 5/376, f. 53, Extract of a Letter from George Turner Esq^{r}. dated at Fort Prince George at Keowee the 2^{d} of July 1758* (Kew: The National Archives)

[203] *Lyttelton Papers* (Ann Arbor: William L. Clements Library), Paul Demere to Lyttelton, Fort Loudoun, June 24, 1758

Virginia because the Cherokee conjurer—a person privy to the spiritual world and knowledgeable as well as on matters of medicine and healing—foresaw "a Danger of much Sickness & Death" that awaited them should the Cherokees undertake the expedition immediately.[204] Dismissing Attakullakulla's words as a blatant lie, Turner blamed Attakullakulla for his artful deception.[205] "I have been so deceiv'd by Little Carpenter & all the rest of the Indians who promis'd to follow you, to Winchester," Turner reported to Forbes, "I am afraid you'll scarcely credit it."

When Turner accused Attakullakulla of deceiving him, the Cherokee leader stood firm and answered that he must heed the conjurer's words.[206] He further elaborated that the Cherokees did not want to go to war during "very hot Weather" and "did not love to lose their young men." As a token of future commitment, Attakullakulla gave Turner a belt of wampum for Forbes and told him they might assist the British in the fall.[207] The

---

[204] On the role of conjurer among Indian society, see Gregory Dowd, *Spirited Resistance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992); See also Charles M. Hudson, *The Southeastern Indians* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1976)

[205] *Headquarters Papers related to John Forbes's Expedition to Fort Duquesne*, George Turner to John Forbes, June 23, 1758 (Small Collections, University of Virginia) "I thought it my Duty to acquaint you with this as early as possible that you might not depend upon them any longer. I shall make all convenient speed to pay my Duty to you & lay before you my papers, which I hope will prove my Justification."

[206] Ibid., George Tuner to John Forbes, June 23, 1758 (Small Collections, University of Virginia) "I reply'd when the Proposal was first made they knew this March wou'd be in the hot months & I wonder'd they shou'd make that an objection now, That I had been detaind two Months in hopes of carrying a Body in & now They put me off with a Conjurer & I added that the woul'd not be Credited with the Commanding Officer nor with you nor Gov^{r}. Lyttelton. The Little carpenter said, They intended to go when they promis'd, but their Dependence was upon the Great Man above that their Conjurers knew his will by their magical operations & had told them that after Two moms [moons?] wou'd be a Great sickness amongst them that they shou'd lose a great many of their Men & the Rest wou'd be so much fatigued with Sickness Travelling, that they wou'd with Difficulty get home. That They coud not recruit their people as the Whites did, who were like the Leaves of the trees, & once more gave me a Positive Denial."

[207] Ibid.

conjurer's omen may have been a convenient excuse for Attakullakulla, already wary of British intentions to avoid joining the expedition without further incentives.

Looking from the frame of Cherokee-British relations built on gift-giving diplomacy, Trent's ham-fisted distribution of presents only encouraged the Cherokee warriors to abandon fighting for the British, and Turner's diplomatic faux pas provided a perfect pretext for Attakullakulla to rebuff the British pressure to join the expedition. At the Overhills, Turner's basic mistake—bringing Forbes's message empty-handed—created the problem. The fact Attakullakulla quickly dropped his earlier argument with Demere by showing a sense of rapport and brotherhood as "warriors" suggests that he had no excuses to use against Demere for breaking the promise he made earlier. But Attakullakulla might have shrewdly exploited Turner's failure to present a wampum belt as a legitimate excuse to ignore Forbes's urgent message one more time and postpone the commitment to the expedition. Attakullakulla's gesture of giving a belt of wampum to Turner and his suggestion that he might assist Forbes's expedition in the fall might have been calculated to expose Turner's folly. Lastly, the conjuror's dream acted as the final nail in the coffin that effectively declared that the Cherokees would not fully mobilize their warriors for the Fort Duquesne expedition. Consequently, only a small Cherokee party of fifty men from the Lower villages embarked to Virginia on their own, and about eighty warriors accompanied Byrd. In the end, however, even they abandoned the British forces in less than two months, much to the ire of Forbes and Bouquet.

British-Colonial Fractures

Forbes's and Bouquet's orders regarding the Cherokees often caused rifts with the provincial officers. Forbes swiftly accepted Bouquet's proposal to be frugal with presents to the Indians without objections because he believed the presents actually "spoiled" them so much that they made "sordid and avaritious" demands to the British.[208] Extremely vexed with the Cherokee warriors who appeared to make his task more difficult, Forbes lashed out against everyone, even those employed in Indian affairs. "The Indians I cannot mention to you with any manner of patience," Forbes decried, "as I look upon them, their Interpreters, their Superintendents, and every creature any ways connected or attached to them, as the most imposing Rogues that I have ever had to deal with."[209]

Such a prejudiced attitude toward Indians blinded the British command to the proper course of action to contain violence when it broke out in Bedford County, Virginia and imperiled the Cherokee-British alliance. As soon as Turner sent Frobes the unwelcome news that Attakullakulla and his Cherokees would not join the Fort Duquesne expedition anytime soon, Byrd reported from Winchester that the Cherokees who had accompanied him since April started to return home without giving him any notice. Violence that broke out in Bedford Country agitated the Cherokee warriors and

---

[208] John Forbes, *Writings of General John Forbes*, p.230, Forbes to Bouquet, October 15, 1758 "…those Indians under Bosomworths direction and the others that were here who have been thoroughly spoiled by the presents already given them so as to make their Demands most insolent & most expensive have so far spoiled the rest that from the Carpenter down they appear either to be bullying us to a mean compliance with their most sordid and avaritious demands or they are absolutely determined to leave us and return home."

[209] Ibid.

they returned home outraged and disgusted. Although the exact timing of the very first incident remains unclear, the initial colonial reports solely blamed the Cherokees for the incidents in which white settlers shot and killed the Cherokees. But James Beamer's son, Thomas Beamer, who accompanied one party of Cherokee allies, provided a detailed account of the incident attesting that Virginians of Dutch background launched a surprise attack and killed the Cherokees. The casualties among the slain Cherokees included a warrior who had scalped a French Indian. After receiving the report from his son, James Beamer criticized the Virginians for "Very Bad Conduct at this Critical Juncture, Even If the Indains [sic] Did Rob and Steal," and plunging "the Whole Countrey In A Bloody Warr…"[210] Even contemporary observer George Milligen, who wrote a brief history of South Carolina in 1763, did not shy away from condemning the Virginians and defending the Cherokees' conduct.[211]

Undoubtedly, the news of violence in Bedford Country became a catalyst for the Cherokees to abandon the British expedition and go home, as timing of both events coincided and the Cherokee leaders expressed disgust and anger over the Virginians who killed warriors on their way up to Fort Duquesne to fight for the British. British officers,

---

[210] *Lyttelton Papers* (Ann Arbor: William L. Clements Library), James Beamer to Lyttelton, Estatoe, September 16, 1758. George Milligen did not shy away from condemning the Virginians when he (inadvertently) defended the Cherokees. "In the Beginning of the last War with *France*, the *Cherokees*, then hearty in our Interest, sent, at different Times, three or four Hundred Men to the Assistance of our Forces intended against *Fort-Du-Quesne*. ---In their Return Home from the Campaign of 1758, they lost many of their Horses, and, without Ceremony, made Use of such stray ones as fell in their Way, travelling through the West Frontiers of *Virginia*; and this they imagined to be no Crime, as they saw it frequently practiced by the white Men among them: However, it was resented, and punished with much Severity by some of the Inhabitants of that Province, who attacked several small Parties of the unsuspecting *Indians*, killing at different Times about 12 or 14 of them; the Savages were not backward in taking Satisfaction for their slain Countrymen; and this was the Beginning of a War, which, in the Sequel, was the Occasion of much Expence and Trouble to this Province…" George Milligen, *A Short Description*, p.77

[211] Ibid.

however, only concerned themselves with the Cherokees leaving the expedition and taking revenge against the Virginians in Bedford County instead of placating the Cherokees. Byrd appeared to grasp the implications the incident might have for those Cherokee warriors who had already marched ahead to join Forbes's army near Virginia's northern border: he warned Forbes that the Cherokee warriors might abandon the expedition, return home through Virginia, and exact revenge along the way. But Byrd suspected the Cherokees were themselves responsible for the violence and did not seem to have a clue why the warriors accompanying him suddenly became agitated. "The Indians here behave with the greatest Insolence," Byrd wrote, bewildered, "I do not know what to think of them."[212] Since he heard the news of violence in Virginia, Byrd reported he only had eighty-seven Cherokees remaining with when he arrived in Bedford, Virginia, as thirty of them had gone home. Perhaps to save face, Byrd attempted to minimize this alarming development and assured Forbes that he would "keep the Indians in good Temper" because "if they stay they will be of great service."[213] By the time Byrd reached Fort Cumberland in Pennsylvania, he had "seventy five Indians & a handful of my Regiment; the rest dispers'd all over this part of the country."[214]

John Forbes and Henry Bouquet had to take quick action if they wanted to retain the Cherokees for the rest of the expedition. Neither of the two British commanders

---

[212] *Headquarters Papers related to John Forbes's Expedition to Fort Duquesne*, William Byrd to John Forbes, May 21, 1758 (Small Collections, University of Virginia) Byrd offered to send a messenger from one of the Cherokees accompanying him "to prevent their coming away in Numbers" and laying "the utter Distruction of this part of the country, & an unavoidable Warr" with the Virginians.

[213] Ibid., William Byrd to John Forbes, June 23, 1758 (Small Collections, University of Virginia),

[214] Ibid., William Byrd to John Forbes, July 9, 1758 (Small Collections, University of Virginia)

followed such measures; on the contrary, they refused to investigate what actually happened in Bedford County, hastily accusing the Cherokees and, even worse, deciding to reduce the volume of gifts to be given to the Cherokees, arguing that good stewardship of resources required fewer gifts. The end result was clear: virtually all the Cherokees who planned to aid the British coalition force to Fort Duquesne called it quits and returned home.

Furthermore, Forbes's acerbic attitude towards the Indians caused unnecessary tensions with the Virginian officers George Washington and William Byrd. When Byrd relayed Cherokees' messages to Forbes explaining to the Scottish commander that the Indian party travelling with him demanded Forbes's army march on Braddock's Road instead of a new road Forbes was constructing, the commander sarcastically mocked the Virginia Colonel to Bouquet: "This is a new System of military Discipline truly; and shows that my Good friend Byrd is either made the Cats Foot off himself, or he little knows me, if he imagines that Sixty Scoundrells are to direct me in my measures."[215] Byrd's letter showed that the Cherokees wanted to have their say on how the expedition should be operated, suggesting that the Cherokees probably viewed themselves as equal partners of the alliance, not mere mercenaries as the British wanted them to be. In fact, the Cherokees possessed superior knowledge of warpaths to Fort Duquesne and its surrounding geography than the British, which certainly entitled them to believe that the British army would follow their advice. As Bouquet reported to Forbes once, one Cherokee chief "took his knife and drew a map on the table from Winchester to Fort

---

[215] *Writings of General John Forbes*, pp.156-157, Forbes to Bouquet, July 23, 1758, Carlisle

Duquesne, with all the rivers and roads which lead there, entering into the smallest details on the nature of the ground," which impressed the Swiss officer so much that he immediately gave presents to the chief.[216] Forbes, however, clearly thought otherwise and regarded the Cherokees' opinions as worthless.

George Washington also attempted to persuade Forbes to take Braddock's Road via Fort Cumberland as the Cherokees had advised. But Forbes refused, delaying their way to Fort Duquesne. Perhaps, aware of Forbes's arrogance, Washington intended to sting his pride when he composed a letter warning that the Cherokees might view the Scottish commander and his troops "in a despicable light" because of "our bad Success and inactivity."[217] Washington also criticized Forbes behind his back, informing Virginia Lieutenant Governor Francis Fauquier of Forbes's prejudice against Virginians' opinions.[218] When he heard the news of James Grant's defeat near Fort Duquesne, Washington vindicated his position on taking Old Braddock's Road and remained pessimistic of Forbes's plans.[219] Forbes, however, belittled Washington for criticizing his plan to bypass Fort Cumberland and take a different path to Fort Duquesne.[220] Forbes identified Washington as "the leader and adviser of their foolish suggestions" who dared

---

[216] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, *Vol.1* ed. S.K. Stevens, Donald H, Kent, and Autumn L. Leonard, (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1951), Bouquet to Forbes, Fort Loudoun, June 16, 1758, pp.95-96

[217] *The Papers of George Washington*, *Colonial Series 5*, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1984), Washington to Bouquet, August 2, 1758, p.355

[218] George Washing to Francis Fauquier, September 2, 1758 Quoted from *The Official Papers of Francis Fauquier, Lieutenant Governor of Virginia, 1758-1768, Vol.1*, p.51

[219] George Washing to Francis Fauquier, September 25, 1758 Quoted from *The Official Papers of Francis Fauquier, Lieutenant Governor of Virginia, 1758-1768, Vol.1*, pp.79-80

[220] John Forbes, *Writings of General John Forbes*, p. 157, Forbes to Bouquet, July 23, 1758

to take "the lead in so ridiculous a way that I could by no means suffer it."[221] Washington, of course, turned out to be wrong as the British took Fort Duquesne sooner than predicted.

Bouquet also disagreed with Washington over what to do with the Cherokees. As Bouquet could not prevent the Cherokees from returning home, he suggested dispensing all of Indians from the expedition to Washington. "It is a great humiliation for us to be obliged to Suffer the repeated Insolence of Such Rascals," Bouquet bristled, "I think it would be easier to make Indians of our White men, than to co[a]x that damned Tanny Race."[222] In reply, Washington politely disagreed with the Swiss-British officer's dismissal of the Indians' abilities in the woods. "I always send out some white people with the Indians," Washington wrote, "tho' I must confess that I think these Scalping Partys of Indians we send out will more effectually harass the Enemy (by keeping them under continuall alarms) than any Partys of white people can do."[223] Washington added that "if they were hearty in our Interest their Services would be infinitly valueable" because he could not "conceive the best white men to be equal to them in the Woods." Washington also suggested the Cherokees did not abide by British orders because they were "too sensible of their high Importance to us" and used it as leverage until their demands were satisfied.[224]

---

[221] John Forbes, *Writings of General John Forbes*, p.173, Forbes to Abercromby, August 11, 1758, Carlisle

[222] *The Papers of George Washington*, Bouquet to George Washington, July 14, 1758, p.287

[223] Ibid., Washington to Bouquet, July 16, 1758, p.291

[224] Ibid., Bouquet to George Washington, July 16, 1758, p.22

The Ineptitude of Forbes and Bouquet and New Gift Giving Policy

Meanwhile, as British commanders Forbes and Bouquet marched west through the woods of Pennsylvania they constantly received reports from these colonial officers, traders, and Indian agents on the latest news on the Cherokees. Unfortunately, both officers lacked knowledge of or experience with the affairs of the southeastern Indians, and neither had close relations with Edmond Atkin, the newly appointed Superintendent of Indian affairs in the southern colonies. Often, Forbes and Bouquet ignored advice from colonists or Indian agents and let their prejudice toward Indians affect their judgment. Rejecting informed advice from the colonial experts on Indian affairs, Forbes and Bouquet attempted to implement a policy of frugality when it came to Indian gift giving. Such a policy was fundamentally incompatible with the Indian practice of gift-giving.

Moreover, the irascible and arrogant personalities of Forbes and Bouquet played a large part in aggravating and ultimately terminating the fragile Cherokee-British military alliance. John Forbes's prejudice and ignorance toward Indians surpassed that of other British officers. He often could not comprehend why the Cherokees either abandoned or postponed joining the expedition. Rather than analyzing various reports and intelligence he received from numerous British and colonial personnel, he let his temper dictate his own judgments. When the Cherokees started to leave the army, Forbes fumed that he could no longer keep the Cherokees with the British forces "owing to their natural fickle disposition which is not to be got the better by words nor presents." He lashed out rather than trying to analyze the situation surrounding the Cherokees' change

of behavior.[225] One historian suggests that much of Forbes' vitriol came from his failure to see Cherokees' contributions or that they "had shifted circumstances to his [Forbes's] advantage."[226] Forbes's words, however, suggested that he was incapable of understanding or appreciating the values of Indian warriors. He continued to liken the Cherokees to fickle savages and animals who proved to be nothing but trouble to his expedition. For instance, Forbes informed Pitt that the Cherokees' decision to return home stemmed from their "being but bad Judges of time," possessing "fickleness of temper," and displaying stupid animal behavior of "Sheep…Where one leaps, all the rest follow."[227]

Forbes also spared no vicious invectives against Indians regardless of their contribution to the British cause. Attakullakulla's fame as the loyal friend of the British had no effect on Forbes as he called the Cherokee chief "a Dog."[228] Similarly, upon receiving Bouquet's report on the death of Catwaba Captain Bullen, who garnered respect among provincial officers and British officers, Forbes only offered a lip service but implicitly slighted the slain Catawbas as useless Indians. "I am very sensible of the loss of Cap^{t} Bullen & Cap^{t} French at this period of time," Forbes replied to Bouquet,

---

[225] John Forbes, *Writings of General John Forbes*, p.112, Forbes to Bouquet, June 10, 1758

[226] Paul Kelton, "The British and Indian War: Cherokee Power and the Fate of Empire in North America," *William and Mary Quarterly 69* (2012): 763-792, 784; *Thomas Barton's Diary*, August 15, 1758. (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Historical Society) Thomas Barton described the meeting between the Delawares and the Cherokees as an amicable one but the Delawares killed Captain Bullen of the Catawbas a few days later the meeting, suggesting it was a ruse. "Arriv'd this Evening from Fort Augusta M^{r}. Dunlap, & brought with him Captain Ambust the Son of Teedyuscung the famous Delaware Chief, accompanied by 2 other Delaware Indians," Barton observed, "The Cherokees who were here receiv'd them into Friendship by smoking a Pipe with them, & giving them Victuals."

[227] John Forbes, *Writings of General John Forbes*, p. 141, Forbes to Pitt, July 10, 1758

[228] John Forbes, *Writings of General John Forbes*, p.234, Forbes to Peters, October 16, 1758

"Altho' it is long ago since I held the Indians in the utmost Contemp[t] except in small partys to commit murder by surprise."[229]

Recent studies discredit much of Forbes's vitriol against the Cherokees in the Fort Duquesne expedition. For instance, Paul Kelton argues that the presence of Cherokees "sent an ominous message to France's allies," especially the Ohioans.[230] Much of the Cherokees' contributions came from "hidden diplomacy" that helped to create "a formidable pro-British alliance among the indigenous peoples of eastern North America."[231] Ironically, while Forbes made no secret about his hatred toward Indians, he desperately wanted at least a few Indians among British troops. His dissonant desire for Cherokee warriors on one hand and his extreme prejudices against them on the other hand drove Forbes to a state of paranoia. He reacted to every piece of news related to the Cherokees "deserting" him with splenetic temper and cynicism.

While Bouquet actually interacted with the Cherokees (unlike Forbes who was confined to a sick bed throughout the expedition), he too saw Indians as mischievous, fickle, greedy children.[232] In addition to Jeffrey Amherst's effort to cut back on the expenses of Indian gifts, Bouquet's simplistic, one-dimensional view of Indians

---

[229] Ed. S.K. Stevens, Donald H, Kent, and Autumn L. Leonard, *The Papers of Henry Bouquet Vol. 2 The Forbes Expedition* (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1951) p.439

[230] Paul Kelton, "The British and Indian War: Cherokee Power and the Fate of Empire in North America," *William and Mary Quarterly 69* (2012): 763-792, 778

[231] Paul Kelton, "The British and Indian War: Cherokee Power and the Fate of Empire in North America," *William and Mary Quarterly 69* (2012): 763-792, 791

[232] Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, May 29, 1758 [B.M., Add. MSS. 21652, f. 17, A.L.S.] Vol. 16, p.29 (Translation) One time Bouquet called the Indians with him as "our indocile brothers" at a disposal of his command.; Colin Calloway, *The Scratch of Pen,* p.87 Calloway agrees that Bouquet's hardened attitude toward Indians. "He seems to have despised all Indians, had no qualms about infecting them with smallpox, and recommended bringing bloodhounds from England to track down Indian raiding parties" to "extirpate or remove that Vermin."

prompted Bouquet to recommend that Forbes scrimp on the presents allocated to the Indian warriors. Bouquet's proposal could not have come at a worse time as it coincided with the Virginians' murder of Cherokees accompanying the expedition. Regardless of the Cherokees' mounting anger, Bouquet proposed to end the practice whereby multiple colonial Indian agents gave presents to Indians at various locations. Instead, he recommended that one person be placed in charge of storing Indian gifts and distributing presents to Indians at a single location. His proposals, however, were formulated out of his distorted view of the Indians more than anything. "I do not know anything about the way Indians are managed," Bouquet confessed, but "it seems obvious – judging by their greediness – that they would be led there more easily."[233] Being ignorant of Cherokee culture, Bouquet constantly failed to comprehend their intentions or correctly interpret their actions. At one point, Bouquet candidly admitted that he was "not familiar enough with their manners and customs…"[234]

Yet Forbes readily agreed with Bouquet's proposal, believing that he had treated and rewarded the Cherokees fairly. "Altho we had both the power and justice on our side to have retained those presents," Forbes reported his superior General James Abercromby, "yet we freely gave them in order to shew their Nation that every promise

---

[233] Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, June 3, 1758 [B.M., Add. MSS. 21652, f. 25, A.L.S.] Vol. 16, p.47 (Translation) "I do not know anything about the way Indians are managed," Bouquet confessed, "but I believe that everything concerning them should be turned over to a single person who would account to you for all of it. The variety of measures which have been taken has done much harm, as well as the presents given by different hands and in different places. I think we should have only one storehouse, in which should be deposited the presents from the provinces (if they give any) and from the King; and by transporting this general storehouse to the place where it is necessary to have Indians, it seems obvious – judging by their greediness – that they would be led there more easily."

[234] Bouquet to Forbes, Fort Loudoun, June 16, 1758, p.96

made on our part would have been fulfilled, and any services done us would over and above met with suitable rewards…"[235] Forbes's self-righteous claim that he fairly managed Indian presents failed to resonate not only with the Cherokees but also with colonial officers and Indian agents. His words revealed a narrow, limited understanding of Indian gifts: as a payment for services that ought to reflect proportionate value. Forbes believed the Cherokees received excessive and extravagant presents but had done nothing for the British in return. He also completely ignored the murders in Virginia, believing it a separate issue and failing to understand that he could partially diffuse it through gift-giving. As Wauhatchee of the Lower Cherokees (Estatoe) protested the killings in Virginia to Lyttelton's messenger, he promised that "everything will be made up on both sides" when he see "the Amunition and other things mentioned in our Talk this Day."[236] Oblivious to the fact that the Cherokees sought presents for the murder of their warriors in Virginia, Forbes refused to spare any additional goods.

Duplicitous Interpreters and Cherokee Dissent

Often, frustrated British and colonial officers blamed interpreters whenever the Indians acted against their wishes. These accusations served as convenient excuses to deny responsibility for failed tasks. William Trent, who had offended the Cherokee gift recipients, blamed "an Indian interpreter" for the incident that nearly resulted in bloodshed at Fort Loudoun. He claimed to have used "every Argument I could to

[235] John Forbes, *Writings of General John Forbes*, pp.174-175, Forbes to Abercromby, August 11, 1758, Carlisle

[236] *Lyttelton Papers* (Ann Arbor: William L. Clements Library), Ohatchie's Talk to Lyttelton, August 1, 1758

dissuade" the Indians from disorderly present distribution but "there was none but an Indian Interpreter, he only told them what he pleased of what I said to them." Distrust of an Indian interpreter whom he believed might purposefully obstruct his message to the Cherokees, Trent requested that his superiors send an interpreter named "Smith or some other of the Interpreters here immediately." Trent once again emphasized that he "could have stopped" the Cherokees from leaving if he only had had a trustworthy interpreter.[237]

Two weeks after the first incident, Trent held a conference with the Cherokees when an Indian interpreter "Anthony" and "another Indian from Carlisle" arrived at Fort Loudoun. At the conference, the Cherokees threatened Trent that if he did not "make them a large Present to Carry home with them, they would Rob all the English Houses they met with in their way home." In addition, they told Trent "some of their Young Men had been at the French Fort last Summer, that the French were good Men, and as the Creeks intended to join them, the Cherokees wou'd join them also, and make War upon the English." Again, Trent assumed the Indians attempted to bully him. He reckoned the Indians' new demand as a scheme "to intimidate me in order to get large Presents" and accused "Scoundrel Anthony" of creating "all this Confusion" and fomenting unrest among the Cherokees.[238] What the Cherokees said and did after their

---

[237] *Headquarters Papers related to John Forbes's Expedition to Fort Duquesne,* William Trent to St. Clair, May 22, 1758, Fort Loudoun (Va.), (Small Collections: University of Virginia)

[238] Ed. S.K. Stevens, Donald H, Kent, and Autumn L. Leonard, (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1951), *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, Capt. William Trent to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, June 5, 1758. p.36

threats, however, reveal that Anthony had nothing do with their discontent and that they actually protested the Cherokee-British gift giving in ways that they found unacceptable:

> "…when the Indians found that I would not be Prevailed on to give them very large Presents to return home with, one of them pulled of his Shirt and throwed it to me. I took it up and jocosely thanked him, and told him I was a poor Man and wanted a Shirt, he told me that he did not give it to me, but the Coll. (meaning you) and desired me to get it washed and give it to you. Then a Number more brought their Bundles and throwed them down and told me to keep them and give them to you as you loved goods; this was owing to Anthony who told them you would give them nothing, that they might see what they had to Expect from you by the way he was Cloathed…"[239]

These symbolic acts and words also suggested mounting frustration from the Cherokees over how the British regarded gift giving since the day Byrd visited the Lower Cherokee villages and met Attakullakulla. The British constantly disappointed the Cherokees when they talked of presents. The messengers brought no presents with them or no wampum belt to show their good faith, failed to deliver promised goods immediately, and displayed a stingy attitude when gifts were presented. These patterns of behavior from the British must have annoyed the Cherokees especially compared to the French who frequently made gifts without asking as much in return.

Upon learning of the Cherokees' reaction to the British refusal to give them more presents, Bouquet also blamed the translator Anthony (or "Antoine" in French) for the trouble. He hastily assembled the Indian chiefs with him in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and

---

[239] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, Capt. William Trent to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, June 5, 1758, p.37. See also Dowd, "Gift Giving and the Cherokee-British Alliance," in *Contact Points,* pp.142-143. Gregory Dowd interprets Trent's reaction of "jocosely" thanking the Cherokee warrior insinuated, "that he was above fighting over a shirt" that revealed "Britons' ideas of status and their developing conceptions of savagery and nationality." In addition, the incident represented "a mundane emblem of the fraying Cherokee-British alliance" in which the British officers "extend their customary standards of inequality in their dealings with Indians," reflecting "the unequal relationship of patron and dependent."

"pointed out to them the infamy of the conduct of that rascal Antoine." But the chiefs responded to Bouquet's angry address with laughter, dismissed Anthony's behavior, and told the exasperated Swiss officer that Anthony "must beware" of Bouquet.[240] The chiefs' reaction suggested that they might have already known about Anthony's plan and even secretly admired him for attempting to exact more presents from the British; the chiefs seemed amused at Bouquet's panic and frustration at the interpreter's misdirection. Perhaps, the chiefs also wanted to evade further inquisitive questions from Bouquet by laughing off the incident as harmless.

Regardless of what the chiefs actually thought about Anthony's empty threats, blaming Indian interpreters became a common pattern for both British and colonial officers who could not direct Indian allies as they wished. None of them succeeded in persuading the Cherokees to stay to the end of the Fort Duquesne expedition because they never realized the crux of the problem lay with the miserly policy on Indian presents and the inherent unequal relations embodied in gift giving as the British attempted to dictate the terms to presumed inferiors. Although colonial officers and various Indian agents offered advice, the British officers in charge—Forbes and Bouquet—ultimately rejected these proven measures based on their experiences, insisted on reducing the cost of Indian presents, and blamed interpreters and Cherokee greediness for the tensions that arose as a result of their misguided policies.

---

[240] Bouquet to Forbes, June 7, 1758. Ed. S.K. Stevens, Donald H, Kent, and Autumn L. Leonard, (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1951), p. 49

Catawbas

Scholars have largely ignored the Catawbas' involvement in the Fort Duquesne expedition. Although the number of Catawba warriors may have been small compared to their Cherokee counterparts, they played a key role in persuading the Cherokees to join the British expedition, and provided vital contributions to the British effort to capture Fort Duquesne from the French. In the end, however, the Catawbas, who almost always fully supported the British, could not follow the demanding, arduous expedition to the end when they lost prominent headman Captain Bullen in the hands of Delawares and then suffered a deadly small pox outbreak. Despite their loyalty to the British, they earned no respect from the British officers.

Unlike the Cherokees, the Catawbas had good reason to join the expedition. As Merrell's work demonstrates, their longstanding trade relations with the British and dependence on South Carolina bred a political consensus among the Catawbas to accommodate British requests. In 1757, the Catawbas assured the South Carolinians that they would support the British plan to invade Fort Duquesne. They brought the scalp of a French Indian and nineteen deerskins as tokens of their pledge to support the British. The Catawbas believed that the British had "behaved Like brothers in helping us in our distress Both last year & this which preserved in a great measure ye lives of our wifes & children and Enabled us to Go to war against y^{e} French," and assured them that they would lend help "with the utmost of our power." At the same time, however, they brought complaints regarding the site of a new English fort to be built in their territory and illegal sales of rum, hoping the British would rectify their vices within the Catawba

communities.[241] The Catawbas also pressured and persuaded the Cherokees to join the Fort Duquesne expedition when Hagler sent a talk to Attakullakulla in May 1757 urging the Cherokees to "Assist our Brothers the white People against the French and there Indians" to which the Cherokees at Chota responded "with approbation and apluases of them all."[242]

In the course of the Fort Duquesne expedition, Captain Bullen of the Catawbas assisted the British officers—Bouquet, in particular—in immeasurable ways. One time, he turned in a soldier to Bouquet who attempted to desert to the French.[243] John Bow, a soldier belonging to the Pennsylvania Regiment, allegedly approached Bullen at a tavern and offered a bribe to defect to the French at Fort Duquesne. Bullen himself testified in the court martial that the prisoner told the Catawba chief that "he was sorry that he was going out to Fight the French as they were too strong for the English & that if Capt^{n}. Bullen would go off to the French with him he would have Lai'd Cloaths & his Hat full of Money…."[244] Other witnesses also added that Bow attempted to persuade Bullen that "the English wrong'd the Indians out of their pay" and encouraged the Catawba warrior

---

[241] *Lyttelton Papers* (Ann Arbor: William L. Clements Library), Catawbas Headmen to Lyttelton, June 16, 1757 The Catawbas protested "But the people of North Carolina who call themselves your brothers have parceld out our Lands even to our very towns we daly complain to them but are not heard we likewise made complaint to the Late Governor of this province he promised us our lands but as yet we have not Got them."

[242] Ibid., King Hagler to Attakullakulla, May 26, 1757

[243] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, June 3, 1758, p.19

[244] *Haldimand Papers, Haldimand Unpublished Papers and Correspondence, 1758-84 (Reel 10), Mss. 21682* (Microfilm: David Library) Provincial forces enlisted in Forbes's expedition apparently had some "Frenchmen" in the army. They could have been defectors. For instance, Bouquet reported to Forbes, "My presentiment about the Frenchmen who are soldiers in the provincial troops, was well founded." It prompted Bouquet to imprison two additional Frenchmen in Carlisle, Pennsylavania." *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, p.19

to desert with "as many white Men & Indians."[245] Bow's attempt to entice Captain Bullen by promising cloth and money indicated that resentment over gift-giving and payment might have spread to such a degree that even a colonial rank-and-file soldier could detect dissatisfaction among the Indians and use that fact as leverage. This incident also suggested that British officers remained more oblivious and insensitive to the issue surrounding the payment to the Indian warriors than colonial soldiers.

Bouquet certainly acknowledged the vital contribution that the Catawbas and Captain Bullen made to the British interest. He even went on to describe Captain Bullen as his adopted son to Forbes.[246] When most of the Cherokee warriors abandoned the British in Pennsylvania, Bouquet commended the Catawbas' loyalty to the British declaring that "This last tribe will not leave us."[247] Later, the news of Captain Bullen's death made Bouquet lament "This mishap, under the circumstances, is a very great loss."[248] With the death of Captain Bullen, the only Indian whom Bouquet trusted, his fondness for the Catawbas evaporated when the remaining Catawba warriors suddenly abandoned the expedition. Bouquet responded in shock and anger upon hearing the news: "The Catawbas have left us like scoundrels, after bringing us one scalp, which

---

[245] Ibid.

[246] Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, June 3, 1758, p.15. In French, Bouquet wrote, "J'ay içy le Cap^{ne}. Bullen Chef des Catawbas, & l'ay adopté pour mon fils, Il promet que Ses gens ne nous abandonneront pas; Le peu de Cherakees que nous avons içy, Sont fort Contens de meme que Wohatchée qui a beaucoup de Credit parmi Eux." "He promises that his men will not leave us. The few Cherokees we have here are well disposed, as well as Wohatchée, who has much influence among them."

[247] Bouquet to Forbes, Fort Loudoun, June 11, 1758. Ed. S.K. Stevens, Donald H, Kent, and Autumn L. Leonard, (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1951), p.74

[248] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, Bouquet to Forbes, August 26, 1758, pp.424-425

was recognized by the Cherokees as an old scalp which they themselves gave them in the spring."[249]

Because several Cherokee parties from different villages joined the expedition and acted independently and Bouquet rarely made distinctions between them, it is unclear which group of Cherokees identified the scalp, but they might have misled Bouquet deliberately in order to drive a wedge between the British and the Catawbas. Anthony, accused of fomenting a dissent among the Cherokee parties by Trent and Bouquet, also allegedly told the Cherokee warriors earlier that "how well Captain bullen was used, and how Ill the Cherokees were used at Carlisle" by the British.[250] Perhaps, the Cherokees might have wanted to sabotage the Catawba-British relations as retaliation against the British for refusal to give them additional presents.

The Catawba warriors probably became disillusioned with risking their lives for the British and suffering disrespect in return. While Catawba headmen committed to the British cause, the young warriors seemed to think otherwise. Bouquet reported Captain Bullen, who commanded the Catawba war party, "received only scorn at Cumberland" from his own men, which indicated that the Catawba warriors no longer wanted to support the British expedition as their leaders had pledged.[251] Their response also suggested the Cherokees fomenting a division between the Catawbas might have worked given the strong words of commitment from the Catawba headmen.

---

[249] Ibid., Bouquet to Forbes, July 11, 1758, p.180
[250] Ibid., Trent to Bouquet, June 5, 1758, p.37
[251] Ibid., Bouquet to Forbes, Camp near Reas Town, July 11, 1758, p.180

If the Cherokees had sown a division between Catawbas and British, the Catawba warriors might have resented both the Cherokees' presence and their connections to the Delawares. The British invited the Delawares to hold Indian conference with the Cherokees, because Forbes and Bouquet hoped that the presence of Cherokees would help bring the Delawares to the British side.[252] A few days later, however, the Delawares ambushed, killed, and scalped two Catawbas including Captain Bullen. Understandably, the Catawbas became furious with the Delawares but also with the British because they were "mad to entertain & give Presents not only to our Enemies, but their own.'"[253] The Catawbas also probably resented the Cherokees for cementing ties with the Delawares who killed their leader. Distaste for the British and mistrust of the Cherokees convinced them to abandon the expedition.[254]

When the Catawba warriors finally departed for home in July of 1758, Bouquet swiftly condemned them, fuming that "they have behav'd in the most shameful manner, and run away a parcel of thieves rather than Warriors without seeing me." Bouquet also suggested to Forbes "it would be very necessary to send a message to their Nation to

---

[252] Ibid., Bouquet to Forbes, Camp near Reas Town, July 15, 1758, p. 215 "As the Delaware Ambas who accompanied the volunteer Dunlap on his trip to the Ohio has given good evidence of his fidelity, I have induced the Cherokees to receive him; and they are sending him a string wampum. This Indian might be essential when we are on the spot, to push the negotiations already begun, and I have instructed Dunlap to go and look for him."

[253] *Thomas Barton's Diary*, August 27, 1758 (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Historical Society)

[254] Barton described the meeting between the Delawares and the Cherokees as an amicable one. *Thomas Barton's Diary*, August 15, 1758 "Arriv'd this Evening from Fort Augusta M^{r}. Dunlap, & brought with him Captain Ambust the Son of Teedyuscung the famous Delaware Chief, accompanied by 2 other Delaware Indians," Barton observed, "The Cherokees who were here receiv'd them into Friendship by smoking a Pipe with them, & giving them Victuals." Bouquet also wrote the Cherokees and the Delawares as having "a very good humor yesterday" as they "have done nothing but dance since our last treaty."

complain of their Conduct, and know at once if they are Friends or Enemies."[255] Later, Bouquet's sense of betrayal by the Catawbas led him to write to Amherst in the wake of Pontiac's War that "they [the Catawbas] are no more a Nation; I would rather chuse the Liberty to kill any Savage that may come in our Way than to be perpetually doubtful whether they are Friends or Foes."[256]

Bullen's funeral provided a clue to why the Catawbas abandoned the British. The Indian warriors and the British and colonial troops congregated together for the funeral. At the scene, Pennsylvanian army chaplain Thomas Barton eulogized Captain Bullen as "the famous Catawba Chief, always strictly attach'd to the British Interest" and described that "54 Indians of the Catawba, Tuscarora, & Ottawaw Nations" came to his funeral and lamented "the loss of their brave Captain Bullen."[257] One of the chiefs (whom Barton did not identify) delivered a speech in English that "Our Success has not been equal to our Zeal, & the Reason is, we had too far to travel to the Enemy; find our Provisions being generally spent before we could reach their Borders, we were oblig'd to return before we could kill or scalp."[258] This speech revealed the perilous expedition the southeastern Indians undertook, and provides some explanation to why both the Catawbas and Cherokees may have quit. Despite the speaker's pledge to avenge the

---

[255] George Washing to Francis Fauquier, July 10, 1758 Quoted from The Official Papers of Francis Fauquier, Lieutenant Governor of Virginia, 1758-1768, Vol.1, p.51 Captain Johny and Jemmy Bullen is the same person and George Washington quoted Bouquet's message to Fauquier.

[256] Col. Henry Bouquet to Sir Jeffery Amherst, June 25, 1763 [B.M., Add. MSS. 21634, f. 304, C.], p.203

[257] *Thomas Barton's Diary*, August 25, 1758 (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania)

[258] Ibid., August 27, 1758

death of Bullen by proceeding to Fort Duquesne, the Catawbas might have realized that this was not the best option.

The death of Captain Bullen effectively ended the Fort Duquesne expedition for the Catawbas. They provided invaluable assistances for the British army as they scouted for enemies in the woods, escorted supply wagons, and discovered potential enemies within the British army. Captain Bullen acted as a lynchpin who held the Catawba warriors steadfast in the demanding expedition and was the only person who British and colonial officers like Bouquet and Washington could rely on despite their differences. With the charismatic figure lost, however, Bouquet no longer held the remaining Catawbas in high esteem as he hastened to denounce them as "scoundrels" and "savages" alongside the Cherokees.

In short, the Catawbas paid dearly for their loyalty to the British. Not only did they lose their prominent headman, they gained neither respect from the British officers nor immediate presents for their service and sacrifice. The site of the new fort remained to be settled, and Carolinians and illegal traders still sold rum to intoxicate their youths. Disappointed, the rest of the Catawba warriors turned back after the death of Captain Bullen, carrying smallpox that would further decimate their population.[259]

---

[259] George Milligen, *A Short Description*, p.75. "The *Catawbas* have been long our Interest; many of them joined our Forces acting on the *Ohio*, in the Campaigns against *Fort Duquesne*, till it was reduced; there they unluckily got the Small-pox, and carried the Infection Home with them, which has almost extirpated this Nation." Merrell, *The Indians' New World*, pp.193-195

The End of the Fort Duquesne Expedition

While some Cherokees might have instigated the Catawbas to desert and return home together in July 1758, some remained with the British until August in hopes of exacting more presents from Bouquet.[260] Even after losing almost every Cherokee warrior and scout, however, Bouquet remained stubborn and insisted on the strict rationing of presents to maintain the elusive notion of "fairness" that he held as synonymous with not yielding to the Indians' demands. When the Cherokee party that accompanied Byrd demanded additional presents, Bouquet asked what they wanted and received "a List of Goods the most extravagant that ever was thought of."[261] Outraged, Bouquet declared, "I shall not change the policy on which we have acted up now" and treat them all the same as with the rest of the Indians.[262] Bouquet's obstinance, however, only encouraged the Cherokees to return home. Like his superior Forbes, Bouquet blamed various Indian agents for "many petty jealousies in the management of their

---

[260] It is not true that no single Cherokee remained with the expedition force. See Bouquet to Forbes, Raystown Camp, August 8, 1758. Yellow Bird, who Bouquet described as "a second Alexander," supposedly delivered a following speech: "Go tell the tribe that you have abandoned our brothers the English, after stealing their goods, but say to our kinsmen that of the Keevee [Keowee] will not abandon them." Thirty Cherokees travelling with Bosomworth from Winchester continued to accompany the coalition of British and provincial forces. Also, Yellow Bird from Keowee reprimanded the Cherokees who quitted the expedition. Col. George Mercer to Col. Henry Bouquet, August 30, 1759, [B.M., Add. MSS. 21644, f. 347, A.L.S.], Series 21644 Part 2, p.63 A year after the Fort Duquesne expedition, George Mercer of Virginia regiment wrote to Bouquet mentioning Mr. Chatter Box: "M^{r}. Chatterbox a Cherokee Indian whom you must remember is one of this Party, & has embraced Me to Day again & again, & is very desirous of seeing his Friends & Brothers the English at the Fort he helped Them to take…" A Cherokee named Mr. Chatter Box also remained with Bouquet, acting as his close confidante like the Catawba headman Captain Bullen.

[261] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, Bouquet to Washington, Camp near Reas Town, July 23, 1758, p.263. Bouquet claimed that "The little Boys as well as the Chief Warriors were to receive Each a 1000, of Wampum, one Gorget, Silver Arm Plates, Wrist bands, 5 Strouds, an infinity of articles of less value.

[262] Ibid., Bouquet to Forbes, Camp near Reas Town, July 23, 1758, p.262

affairs" that risked "losing our Indians."[263] Unable to contain the deteriorating situation by himself, Bouquet hurriedly sent a letter to Washington to request help as the Virginian officer was known as "a better Judge of their humour, dispositions, and Circumstances." Bouquet, however, stressed in the letter that the notion of fair distribution of presents must be strictly observed, essentially putting Washington in a difficult position to resolve the situation.

Tired of the constant stream of Cherokees abandoning him, Bouquet finally decided to dispense with the Cherokees and gave them presents, hoping to prevent the Cherokees from taking revenge against the Virginians in Bedford County on their way home. The Cherokees nevertheless plundered the Virginian settlements. Virginia Lieutenant Governor Francis Fauquier reported to South Carolina Governor William Henry Lyttelton that the Cherokees "stole the Horses, Provisions, and whatever else they could lay their hands on, belonging to the poor Inhabitants settled near the Road" as on their way home because "they were not contented with what they had got."[264] Fauquier might have hoped to deflect any criticisms from South Carolina and the British commanders by stressing the Cherokees' treacherous characters while exonerating the Virginian settlers for any blame they might receive for killing the Cherokee warriors, thus destroying the Cherokee-British relations. The South Carolinians, however, disagreed with the perspective of the Virginians. Five years later, George Milligen, a contemporary writer of South Carolina defended the acts of returning Cherokees and

---

[263] Ibid., Bouquet to Forbes, Camp near Reas Town, July 23, 1758), p.262

[264] Francis Fauquier to William Henry Lyttelton, October 13, 1758 Quoted from *The Official Papers of Francis Fauquier, Lieutenant Governor of Virginia, 1758-1768, Vol.1*, p.89

blamed the Virginians of Bedford County for their senseless attacks against the Cherokee allies: "There is no Acquitting those People who attacked the *Cherokees* of Ingratitude: The *Indians* had been to war in their Defence, neglecting their Hunting Season, (to them their Harvest) and subjecting themselves to all the Inconveniencies and Dangers attending a long March of 1000 or 1200 Miles, out and Home."[265]

Hence, the British did not get anything in return for the presents they gave away because they missed the right timing: the British neither retained the Cherokee warriors nor they prevent the Cherokees from exacting revenge against the Virginians. Bouquet, however, rationalized this unhappy situation by disparaging the Cherokees as immature shirkers and dismissing them as cowards.[266] Faced with the increasing number of Cherokees abandoning the expedition, Bouquet justified the unfavorable situation to Forbes as a blessing in disguise. He consoled the bed stricken commander that the French must be having exactly the same problem. "We have no regular attack to fear, and the French will find as many difficulties in keeping their Indians as we; and if we both lose them, the advantage surely remains on our side."[267]

Of all the British and colonial officers, British officer James Grant (who later became the commander of the 1761 Cherokee expedition) treated the Cherokees most according to Cherokee gift-giving practice. When he was given an assignment to deliver presents, at Fort Loudoun in Virginia, a party of the Cherokee warriors waited for Grant

---

[265] George Milligen, *A Short Description*, p.77
[266] *The Papers of Henry Bouquet*, Bouquet to Forbes, Raystown Camp, August 8, 1758, pp.338-339
[267] Ibid., Bouquet to Forbes, Carlisle, June 7, 1758, p.64

to arrive so that they could collect presents and return home.[268] Although Forbes and Bouquet worried that the Cherokees might cause a trouble, Grant found nothing of the sort. When the Indians appeared impatient to "go off without waiting for their presents," Grant immediately delivered the goods to them "in hopes to bring them into better temper and to prevent the consequences which might attend their bad humor in going home." Grant's swift gift giving seemed to have made the Indians "quite happy & pleased with getting possession of their Presents." Soon, "the chief men" told Grant "they would hear every thing which I had to say to them, as we were Friends, Brothers." Encouraged by the Indians' response, Grant proposed to "the Whole Party to dine with me," but the Indians went home "very quietly without waiting either for Talk or dinner" and "they had done no harm except carrying off a few horses." Unlike other British or colonial messengers before him who resorted to the language of treacherous and greedy savages, Grant singled out "George the Indian" as "more to blame then the others" for carrying off the horses rather than calling out the entire group.[269] Grant's handling of the presents contrasted starkly with William Trent who attempted to chastise the Cherokees for similar behavior but his saving act may have become a bit too late.[270]

Although Attakullakulla did everything he could to avoid participating in the Fort Duquesne expedition, in the winter of 1758, he eventually had to travel north meet Forbes and then Virginia Lieutenant Governor Francis Fauquier to resolve the crisis in

---

[268] Ibid., Ourry to Bouquet, Fort Loudoun, August 12, 1758, p.358-59

[269] *Headquarters Papers related to John Forbes's Expedition to Fort Duquesne*, James Grant to John Forbes, August 16, 1758 (Small Collections, University of Virginia)

[270] Collin G. Calloway, *White People, Highlanders, and Indians* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008). On Highlanders during the Seven Years' War, see Stephen Brumwell, *Redcoats* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp.264-289

Bedford County and to prevent further violence between the Virginians and the returning Cherokees.[271] On his way home, however, an angry Forbes, who received reports of the Cherokees' conducts in Virginia on their way home, ordered his men to strip Attakullakulla's arms and armor at Winchester, wounding the chief's pride. Despite this humiliation, Attakullakulla told his people at a large meeting that "they were to Blame and not the White People and that all the Mischief that was done was owing to there own behavior" and those who commit "any more Mischief to the White People they should Immediately die for it.[272] But the chief also made it clear that he only went to the northward "to make up differences between the People of Virginia & my People" and that his return "would be of more Service than my going to Warr."[273]

Attakullakulla's defense suggested that he never formally recognized the British notion of military service for the presents delivered to him and his people.[274] With the British takeover of Fort Duquesne completed in November 1758, however, disputing whether the Cherokees actually "deserted" or not became an afterthought. The real problem lay with the supposed Cherokee-British military alliance forged in the beginning. A series of mishaps over the promise, delivery, and distribution of presents

---

[271] *Lyttelton Papers* (Ann Arbor: William L. Clements Library), Demere to Lyttelton, Fort Loudoun, January 1, 1759

[272] Ibid., McIntosh to Lyttelton, Fort Prince George, March 20, 1759

[273] Ibid., The Little Carpenters' Talk to Lyttelton, March 20, 1759

[274] Attakullakulla and the Cherokees apparently knew that the French intended to blow up Fort Duquesne and saw no reasons for their presence or assistance. It is unclear whether Attakullakulla received the intelligence from the French or later heard from the British. *GD 77/200/6*, Phillip Morrison to James Fergusson of Craigdarroch, April 18, 1759 (Edinburgh: National Records of Scotland) A merchant of Charles Town Phillip Morrison reported that Attakullakulla (Little Carpenter) the several Cherokees "came down partly with a view to receive presents…partly to apologize for their leaving our people when marching against fort Du'Quesne. They pled that [?] they were [redily?] informed that the French intended to blow up the fort & that on that account they saw no occasion for their presence or assistance."

dissatisfied the Cherokees who had experienced the empty promises from the British before. On the other hand, delaying tactics, changing words, and wavering commitments frustrated the British.

The British commanders of the expedition also killed any remaining possibilities of salvaging the alliance when they insisted on a new policy of frugality with regard to Indian presents, against the recommendations of those more familiar with Indian affairs. Their failure to see the presents as anything but direct payment for service only led them to believe the Cherokees repeatedly deceived them to extort more presents. Forbes and Bouquet also underestimated the impact of the violence in Bedford County on the Cherokees and did nothing to placate Cherokees' anger. Instead, they demanded the Cherokees continue to march with the expedition forces. Only when the dissatisfied Cherokees started to abandon the British and head home did the British commanders reluctantly give orders to Grant to deliver presents to the warriors, out of fear that they might attack the Virginian settlements. Regardless, the Cherokees decided to take what they believed their missed payment for the expedition by plundering from the Virginians or restore balance for lost kinsmen.

The colonial messengers working for the British army also mishandled the protocols of gift giving to the Cherokees, which further deteriorated the already frail Cherokee-British alliance founded upon suspicions and reluctance. Although provincial officers like Washington and Byrd fared better in dealing with the Indians, Turner and Trent made critical mistakes and blunders in their meetings with the Cherokees over delivering the presents and messages. Trent, in particular, greatly offended and

antagonized the Cherokees with his highhanded treatment and insulting words. The ultimate responsibility, however, lay with Forbes and Bouquet who misidentified the source of the Cherokee dissatisfaction. The British officers' crude stereotyping and extreme prejudice against the Cherokees also led to unnecessary frictions with colonial officers, the Indian superintendents, and others. James Grant, who suffered an ignominious defeat at the hand of French, seemed to be the only *British* officer in the Fort Duquesne expedition displayed an apt ability to interact with the Indians.[275]

The Fort Duquesne expedition ultimately ended with a triumphant victory for the British army and the coalition of provincial troops, but at the costly expense of poisoning the relations with the Cherokees. The prominent southeastern Indian nation certainly did not forget the offenses and insults they received from the British. Only little more than a year later, the Cherokees waged a war against the colonists that dragged the British army back to South Carolina. The British troops now had to fight their former allies and the leading British commander was none other than James Grant—the only British officer who had displayed any understanding of Cherokees.

---

[275] *Dalhousise Muniments* (Microfilm), *2/87/2*, Archibald Montgomery to John Forbes, April 27, 1758. The Britons and the colonists appeared to believe in a mythic notion that the natural affinity between the Highlanders and the Cherokees existed. For instance, Archibald Montgomery, a Highlander himself, wrote to Forbes that the Indians would be "Glad to see the Highlanders for they are as fond of them as I am." John Forbes, *Writings of General John Forbes*, p. 166, Forbes to Pitt, June 17, 1758Also, Forbes hoped that "seeing of our Cannon and their Cousins the Highlanders" might make the Cherokees stay with British troops. On the contemporary perception of the mythical connection between Indians and Highlanders held by the English and Lowland Scottish, see Colin Calloway *White People, Indians, and Highlanders* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp.88-116

CHAPTER V

BRITISH TROOPS, CHARLES TOWN, AND THE ANGLO-CHEROKEE WAR, 1760-61

> "Thus ended this Campaign which for Fatigue, difficult Ground & in most other Circumstances must be allow'd to have been the severest serv'd in America since the commencement of the War."[276]
>
> —Christopher French, *Journal of an Expedition to South Carolina*, 1761

Outbreak of the Anglo-Cherokee War

With the anticlimactic conclusion of the Fort Duquesne expedition in the winter of 1758, Jeffrey Amherst, the new chief-in-command for the British army in North America, had no intention of sending British troops back to the Southeast since the French activities on the southwestern borders of the British colonies presented no immediate danger. Meanwhile, the Cherokees had learned once again from the Fort Duquesne expedition that the British disrespected them. Despite the heightened tensions among the Cherokees, troubles continued to brew at Fort Loudoun and Fort Prince George as the garrison soldiers and colonial traders committed petty crimes, eventually resulting in violence. Soon, the old business of accusations and counter-accusations, denials, lies, rumors, and panic returned among the Cherokees and the South Carolinians as a result. This time, however, the incident escalated into a war that lasted for nearly two years and dragged British troops back into the southeast.

---

[276] Christopher French, *Journal of an Expedition to South Carolina,* November 14, 1761 (Washington, DC: The Library of Congress)

British troops' involvement in the Anglo-Cherokee War entailed two campaigns—one waged by Colonel Archibald Montgomery in 1760 and the second by Lieutenant-Colonel James Grant in the following year.[277] Of these two expeditions, only James Grant's expedition has received close scrutiny from scholars.[278] Although historians have written extensively on the two campaigns, they have highlighted cold-blooded killings, body counts, military tactics, and the diplomatic ruses Grant and Attakullakulla used against one other.[279] Such foci privilege the communications

---

[277] Colonel Archibald Montgomery led the 1760 expedition with James Grant as his second command

[278] This is partly because of the availability of sources for Montgomery's expedition is limited compared to Grant's expedition.

[279] Lawrence H. Gipson, *The Triumphant Empire: New Responsibilities within the Enlarged Empire, 176h3-1766* (New York: Knopf, 1968) J.R. Alden, *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier* (New York: Gordian Press, 1966), David Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier: Conflict and Survival, 1740-62* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962), Tom Hatley, *The Dividing Paths : Cherokees and South Carolinians through the Era of Revolution* (New York : Oxford University Press, 1993), John Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier, 1756-63* (Baton Rouge : Louisiana State University Press : a Great Britain: Palgrave, 2001), J. Russell Snapp, *John Stuart and the struggle for empire on the southern frontier* (Baton Rouge : Louisiana State University Press, 1996), Robin Fabel, *Colonial Challenges : Britons, Native Americans, and Caribs, 1759-1775* (Gainesville : University Press of Florida, 2000), Stephen Brumwell, *Redcoats* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War*, (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), Alan Cames, "The Lyttelton Expedition of 1759: Military Failures and Financial Successes," *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, vol. 77 (1976): 10-33 D.E. Leach, *Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America 1607-1763* (New York: MacMillan, 1973), Paul David Nelson, *General James Grant: Scottish Soldier and Governor of East Florida*. (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1993), Walter Stitt Robinson, *The Southern Colonial Frontier 1607-17 63* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1979), Steve Bruce, "The Cherokee Wars 1759 to 1761," *Miniature War Games* 140 and 141 (1995), Michael James Foret, "On the Marchlands of Empire: Trade, Diplomacy, and War on the Southeastern Frontier, 1733-1763" (Ph.D. diss., College of William and Mary, 1990) For contemporary accounts of the Cherokee expedition, see Christopher Gadsden [Pseudonym: Philopatrios], *Some Observations of the Two Campaigns against the Cherokee Indians.* (Charles-Town [S.C.]: Printed and sold by Peter Timothy., MDCCLXII. 1762) Evans Digital Edition, Early American Imprints, Series I: Evans, 1639-1800, #9242, #9243, George Milligen Johnston, *A Short Description of the Province of South-Carolina*. (London: Printed for John Hinton, 1770) Huntington Library, Sabin Collection, Unit 283: Range 53,859-53,860, James Adair, *History of the American Indians*. (London: 1775) ed. Kathryn E. Holland Braund (Tuscaloosa : University of Alabama Press, c2005), William De Brahm, *De Brahm's Report of the General Survey in the Southern District of North America*, ed. Louis De Vorsey, Jr. (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina, 1971) On colonial South Carolina during the Seven Years' War, see Jack Greene and J.R. Pole, *Colonial British America: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University,

between top officials (for instance, the diplomatic talks between Attakullakulla and Grant) and obfuscates day-to-day life, in which British soldiers and Indian warriors shared a host of common experiences that defined their relations.

While scholars have used three surviving written records by British officers—those of James Grant, Major Alexander Monypenny, and Captain Christopher French—to reconstruct the narrative of the infamous scorched-earth campaign of 1761, they have not considered what the sources can reveal about everyday interaction between British troops, Indians, and enslaved Africans.[280] The officers' papers reveal a complicated picture of everyday informal exchanges—such as hunting, ceremonial rituals, drinking, stealing, and accidents—at various sites such as forest camps, forts, downtown Charles Town, and Cherokee villages, etc. These sources also allow us to expand our understanding of the social histories of both British rank-and-file and young Indian men in the regional space of the southeast in the eighteenth century.[281]

1984), Michael Morris, "The High Price of Trade: Anglo-Indian Trade Mistakes and the Fort Loudoun Disaster," *Journal of Cherokee Studies* 17 (1996)

[280] In addition to the sources scholars have used previously, I incorporated Alexander Monypenny's correspondence with William Amherst, Jeffrey Amherst's brother, found in the British Library in this work. *Alexander Moneypenny: entry-book as brigade-major, relating to his service with the British army in North America, in the New York area and elsewhere; 1759-1761*, *Add. Ms. 83699* (London: The British Library)

[281] Stephen Brumwell, *Redcoats*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 189-190. From the rich, personal accounts made available by a few literate British officers in the Cherokee expeditions. Brumwell concludes that British troops adopted Indian techniques and material artifacts to alleviate their pain in the wilderness in North America. I argue here that Indian influence on British troops beyond these military tactical matters but their perception of Indians.

In-between the Fort Duquesne Expedition and the New War

The sour ending of the Fort Duquesne expedition left the Cherokees and the South Carolinians at odds against each other. The final incident that provoked Cherokee anger occurred at Fort Prince George when the garrison officers sexually assaulted Cherokee women, and Cherokee factions responded by killing the responsible soldiers and officers. Governor William Henry Lyttelton reacted out of proportion when he seized the Cherokee peace delegations visiting Charles Town to diffuse the spiraling crisis. Having seized the Cherokee hostages in Charles Town, Lyttelton hastily assembled a thousand provincial troops, marched to Fort Prince George, and brashly insisted that the Cherokees turn over to him twenty-four of their men whom he claimed were responsible for murders of colonists since the winter of 1758, to face English justice. These terms outraged the Cherokees, including Attakullakulla who had advanced a pro-British policy for many years. With Lyttelton's army at the doorstep of the Lower Cherokee country and the lives of hostages at stake, Attakullakulla had little choice but to acquiesce to Lyttelton's unreasonable terms. Thinking he had secured a peace and subjugated the Cherokees, Lyttelton triumphantly returned to Charles Town, without realizing that he had tipped the delicate balance within the Cherokee leadership that had held them back from launching a full-scale war against the colonial soldiers and traders in their country.

When Lyttelton learned of the siege of Fort Loudoun situated near Chota and the attacks near Fort Prince George, he knew South Carolina's troops alone could not provide relief. Thus, Lyttelton hastily sent a letter to the commander-in-chief of the

British army in North America requesting reinforcement, to which Jeffrey Amherst responded with a swift condemnation of the Cherokees "for their perfidious Breach of the Treaty of Peace," and ordered a detachment of British troops to be sent from New York to South Carolina.[282] The officers in charge of the expedition were Archibald Montgomery and James Grant, both Highlanders who had quartered in Charles Town in 1757 with Henry Bouquet's Royal Americans. Although Lyttelton had initiated the war, he had no intention of seeing it through. He transferred himself to Jamaica and left the unfinished business to Lieutenant-Governor William Bull.[283]

Montgomery's Highlanders Return to South Carolina

When Archibald Montgomery and James Grant returned to South Carolina with the Highlanders, they could not expect well-organized assistance from the South Carolinians because of the outbreak of small pox a few months prior to their arrival.[284] Eliza Lucas Pinckney described Charles Town colonists as being "continually insulted by the Indians on our back settlements." Moreover, "a violent kind of small pox rages in Charles Town that almost puts a stop to all business."[285] She remained hopeful that

---

[282] *James Grant of Ballindalloch papers, Army Career Series, Box 32*, Jeffrey Amherst to Archibald Montgomery, March 8, 1760 (Edinburgh: National Archives of Scotland)

[283] Lyttelton's reckless handling of the crisis and abrupt departure from South Carolina drew criticisms from the contemporaries and historians alike. See Oliphant, *Peace and War*, pp. 109-110

[284] *South Carolina Gazette*, April 19, 1760. The casualty of the small pox, according to *South Carolina Gazette*, amounted to "about 380 Whites (including a very considerable Number of Acadians and Soldiers) and 350 Negroes have died during the Progress of it."

[285] Eliza Lucas Pinckney to Mrs. Evance, March 15, 1760. Quoted from *The Letterbook of Eliza Lucas Pinckney, 1739-1762* , ed. Elise Pinckney (Columbia, S.C.: The University of South Carolina, 1972)

Montgomery's Highlanders would "manage these savage Enemies" and swiftly save South Carolina from the crisis. Her predictions proved wishful thinking.

Montgomery's 1760 expedition produced voluminous war propaganda highlighting the body counts and the attrition inflicted against the Cherokees, which the *South-Carolina Gazette* published.[286] For instance, after ambushing the Cherokee settlement of Estatoe, Montgomery's letter to Bull reported that "almost all the Indians in and about the Houses were killed with Bayonets, a good Many Women and children were made Prisoners, some could not be saved."[287] Grant also emphasized the formidable power of the Highlanders against the outmatched Cherokees as he recounted the burning of Estatoe and Cowee (Sugar Town), adding that he "could not help pitying them a little."[288] Grant also emphasized the barbarity of Cherokees when he described the body of a tortured colonial man whose sufferings made Grant "no longer possible to think of mercy" as he justified the Highlanders' slaughter of the Cherokees.[289]

---

[286] The bulk sources on Montgomery's expedition come from the correspondence between Montgomery and Amherst, Grant's correspondence with Bull, and South Carolina Gazette that published these correspondence. See also James Adair's account in *The History of the American Indians*, ed. Kathryn E. Holland Braund (Tuscaloosa : University of Alabama Press, c2005), p. 268. Adair glorified Montgomery and his Highlanders and their superiority over provincial troops.

[287] *WO 34/47*, Montgomery to Amherst, June 4, 1760 (Kew: National Archives)

[288] *South Carolina Gazette*, June 10, 1760 "The town consisting of above 200 houses…was plundered and laid in ashes; many of the inhabitants who had endeavoured to conceal themselves, I have reason no believe perish'd in the flames, some of them I know of for certain. In order to continue the blow, and to shew those savages that it was possible to punish their insolence, we proceeded on our march, took all their towns in our way, and every hose and town in the Lower Nation shared the same fate with *Estatoe*."

[289] Ibid.

On the other hand, Montgomery and Grant downplayed the casualties on their side as "very inconsiderable."[290] After the Highlanders ravaged the Lower Cherokee villages and returned to Fort Prince George, Montgomery announced "the Lower Cherokees who were the most Guilty have been sufficiently Corrected for their Insolence" and making peace immediately would be "the best thing which can happen to this Province." In reality, Montgomery no longer wanted to continue the expedition because the Highlanders could not venture into the Middle settlements deep in the mountains. He confessed to Bull "'tis almost impossible to proceed over the Mountains, and indeed it does not appear to be necessary in the present situation of affairs there can be no great advantage in continuing A War…"[291] To avoid embarrassment to the Commons House of Assembly, Bull informed the Highlander Colonel that he "edited out" Montgomery's frank admission that the expedition could no longer continue.[292] Ultimately, Montgomery and the Highlanders returned to New York on September of that year, leaving only a few detachments of Highlanders to defend Fort Congarees and Fort Ninety Six.

Montgomery's abrupt return to New York caused an uproar in the Commons House of South Carolina as Fort Loudoun fell and the Cherokees executed twenty-five garrison men, three women, and all the officers except John Stuart, whose friendship

---

[290] De Brahm's account written about a decade later claimed the Cherokees killed "100 Men" of Montgomery's Highlanders that exceeded the supposed number Montgomery claimed to killed the Cherokees.

[291] *WO 34/47*, Montgomery to Amherst, June 4, 1760 (Kew: National Archives)

[292] *James Grant of Ballindalloch papers, Army Career Series, Box 32*, June 11, 1760 (Edinburgh: National Records of Scotland)

with Little Carpenter saved his life.[293] Thus, Montgomery's failure to save Fort Loudoun and bring the Cherokees to the peace table infuriated the South Carolinians. The angry members of the Commons House inquired whether Bull had prepared Montgomery with sufficient provisions and men. Bull denied any knowledge of what transpired between Lyttelton and Montgomery, averring "I do not recollect that Colonel Montgomery ever made to me a Demand of further Assistance of Men, or that he ever expressed any hesitation."[294] The legislature felt they had no alternative but to wait for the return of another detachment from New York until next year.[295]

Quartering without Controversy?

In January of 1761, the British expeditionary force of 1200 troops under the command of Colonel James Grant arrived in Charles Town from New York to continue

---

[293] *The Journals of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina*, April 22, 1761 (South Carolina Department of Archives and History)

[294] *The Journals of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina*, April 23, 1761 (South Carolina Department of Archives and History) Bull continued that Montgomery, "on the contrary the greatest chearfulness of proceeding in the Expedition against the Cherokees, with his Majestys Troops sent from New York by General Amherst, & such of the Provincials as should be ready to Join him at the Congarees, and Ninety Six, in that service, which I never gave hops to expect would amount to a greater Number than were actually there. But I must observe that Colonel Montgomery, & Colonel Grant mentioned to me, their Disappointment in not finding on their arrival here Carriages ready to expedite their March, or any considerable Number of the thousand foot, & five hundred Rangers, Noted by the Assembly for that Expedition, And the General expected from is Information thereof, and the great danger to which this Province was at that time exposed, that they would all then have been ready: This furnished me with an Opportunity in my Answer to the Generals Letters, which I made use of to inform his Excellency of the sev^{l}: reasons why the Levies of men went on so slowly at the particular time which I also mentioned to Colonel Montgomery and Colonel Grant."

[295] The Cherokee War made the settlers in backcountry to flee. See *Society for Propagation and Gospel Letterbooks, Vol. 5, 45-296-10*, James Harrison to the Society in London, April 14, 1760, (Charleston, SC: South Carolina Historical Society) "The War w^{ch} we are unhappily engaged in with the Cherokee Indians, makes it impossible for me to inform you with any tolerable Degree of Certainty of the Number of the Inhabitants in this Parish: I can only tell you in General they are greatly increased; many of the Frontier Settlers having for their present Security removed from their Habitations, & settled with their Families amongst us."

the invasion of Cherokee country that Montgomery had aborted a year earlier.[296] Unlike Montgomery's expedition that had stayed away from Charles Town because of the small pox outbreak, Grant's troops were quartered in the colonial town of about 8,000 free and enslaved residents for over three months as they prepared provisions and planned logistics.[297]

As Bouquet had in 1757, Grant began by trying to settle the quartering issue. Upon arrival, Major Alexander Monypenny found that the colonists "had no immediate view of a campaign, & yet the Barracks were in no condition to receive Troops, & neither Bedding, Firing, & nor Utencils provided."[298] Grant also observed that "The Barracks were much out of Repair" and the colonists had done nothing "for the Reception of the Troops." Fortunately, Grant had no trouble procuring quarters and had no reason to complain because the colonists "have been pretty diligent since our arrival."[299] Undoubtedly, the looming fear of a Cherokee invasion altered the colonists' behavior. Four years earlier no imminent danger threatened the colony.

Within a month, Grant reported that the quartering issue had been resolved, and suggested that the colonists wasted little time in providing barracks in which the troops

---

[296] In 1760, Col. Montgomery's Highlanders did not set their foot in Charles Town because of the outbreak of small pox epidemics.

[297] This figure is from George Milligen Johnston's essay published in 1763. See *A Short Description of the Province of South-Carolina*. (London: Printed for John Hinton, 1770), p.32. Johnston claimed he have "examined a pretty exact Register of the Births and Burials for fifteen Years" and noted that "the white Inhabitants are about four Thousand, and the *Negro* Servants near the same Number."

[298] *Add. Ms. 83699*, (London: British Library), Alexander Monypenny to William Amherst, January 17, 1761

[299] *WO 34/47*, James Grant to Jeffrey Amherst, January 17, 1761

could be "tolerably well accommodated."[300] The old and new barracks were located less than a mile away from the center of town, and British officers and the rank-and-file alike often roamed free in the town, either under the approval of their superiors or by transgressing military orders.[301] Soldiers could be found strolling down the streets of Charles Town, "skulking" in alleys, perusing the market place, and drinking in local taverns.[302] These movements created numerous opportunities for the soldiers to interact with the town's inhabitants.

Although Monypenny strictly enforced several measures to restrict the movement of the rank-and-file, many soldiers found their way to the center of Charles Town. Guards were posted at ten in the morning every day and paraded around the barracks to suppress desertions and enforce curfew.[303] The soldiers could leave only if they had "Passports" from authorized officers.[304] Such measures represented a response to soldiers' frequently nighttime excursions to town. Indeed, on February 10, Monypenny

---

[300] *Add. Ms. 83699*, (London: British Library), Monypenny to William Amherst, January 17, 1761; *WO 34/47*, James Grant Jeffrey Amherst, January 29, 1761, Alexander Monypenny labeled barracks in Charles Town as "the Old Barracks" and "the New Barracks" to differentiate between a new one built after the quartering dispute of 1757 and the existing old, tattered barracks.

[301] For the location of the barracks in Charles Town, see Walter J. Fraser, *Charleston! Charleston!* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1989), p.91. The new barracks was located on a site that is now part of the campus of College of Charleston.

[302] For British officers, they could access the downtown more easily as some of them billeted in the town rather than staying in the barracks while the British command imposed strict curfew on rank-and-file. The word "Skulking" was often used in the court martial records to describe soldiers accused of desertions.

[303] Alexander Monypenny, *Order Book of the Grant Expedition,* January 14, 1761. Printed in *Journal of Cherokee Studies* (1977): 302-319. An officer of a Company visited the barrack rooms after tattoo, which beat at nine, to check for missing soldiers and "to order evr'y man who is absent, to be confin'd; & it is expected the officer will frequently repeat this Role Calling, to prevent the Mens going into Town in the night."

[304] Ibid., January 15, 1761 "Captains & commanding officers of Companys to give Passports to officers, Servants, & men they have occasion to send to Town in the Night," Monypenny ordered, "to prevent their being taken up & confin'd by the Patroles of the Main Guard, who have orders to confine ever'y Soldier they meet in the night, without a Passport."

issued another order, suggesting that officers had enforced the measures loosely, and that soldiers had succeeded in accessing the streets of Charles Town at night. "The Officers are to endeavor to oblige their men strictly to obey the order of the 14th January, particularly as to not going into Town after Retreat," Monypenny warned, "The Irregularitys occasion'd by a neglect of this order, are too obvious."[305]

Despite the officers' repeated attempts to impose a curfew, the British rank-and-file stepped outside the confined spaces of the barracks and ventured into the public spaces of Charles Town.[306] Soldiers' thirst for alcohol often motivated them to take such risky actions. For instance, an accused deserter, James Burleigh, was found wandering drunk "in the Streets in Charlestown." When a soldier apprehended Burleigh for a second time after he escaped "from the Sentry at Guard" at the barracks, Burleigh was found with "a Shirt belonging to another Man of the same Room." According to another witness, Burleigh acknowledged that he took the shirt and "sold it in the Town" but added that "he was drunk or he would have not done it."[307] When the Court asked why he fled for the second time from the barracks, Burleigh said that he feared punishment and contemplated going to "the Governors Lady to beg her to intercede for him."[308] Not only did Burleigh's case demonstrate British troops' engagement in informal economic exchanges at the local market to obtain liquor, but his belief that he could appeal to "the

---

[305] Ibid., February 10, 1761

[306] Ibid., February 11, 1761, For instance, Monypenny ordered: "A Return of the number of Deserters lost by each Corps. since they landed in South Carolina, to be given in immediately to the Adjutant of the Day," and noted that "The Three men of the Royal, try'd for Desertion are for given by Colonel Grant, & are to be Reas'd to join their this Evening, at Retreat Beating."

[307] *WO 34/47*, General Court Martial Proceedings, February 9, 1761 (Kew: National Archives)

[308] Ibid.

Governor's Lady" to save him from the trouble also reflects his sense that he—a quartered soldier—possessed enough presence in Charles Town to ask for help from the local community's patron.

Although British officers might have found the quartering conditions tolerable compared to four years earlier, many members of the rank-and-file nonetheless attempted to desert. The British soldiers in the Cherokee expeditionary force consisted of English, Scottish, and Irish who had served in northern campaigns. Court martial testimonies that took place in Charles Town in 1761 indicate that soldiers with previous campaign experience in the north often got sick in the southern climate. When Edward Campbell faced a court martial for his desertion in the summer of 1760, he defended himself by blaming fellow deserter Cornelius Donovan for talking him into it, and then claiming that "a Fever and Ague which Continued for three months" had prevented his return and impaired his ability to understand the Articles of War.[309] A few deserters' testimonies clearly indicated that they disliked campaigning in the southern colony. Accused deserter James Fitch defended himself by saying that he heard "a Report that Men of the Royal was to be drafted into the South Carolina Independent Companies," so he "endeavor'd as soon as he could to Joyn the Best of the Regiment to the Northward." Unfortunately, he got ill "which continued Eleven Weeks and prevented him" from joining the desired regiment of the north.[310]

---

[309] Ibid. When Campbell applied to Lieutenants Cooke and Burton to attest for his character, they both testified that they knew Campbell since the "Siege of Louisbourgh" and since "the regiment left Limerick (of Ireland)."

[310] Ibid.

In contrast to the rank-and-file, officers lodged in residential houses, mirroring the pattern of Bouquet's quartering in 1757. Monypenny noted that "about half the Officers are in barracks, the other half are Billetted in Town, by the Consent of the Landlords, the Province promising to pay them (whose Credit is not very high)."[311] These landlords who had credit problems might have been eager to take the opportunity to billet British officers to solve their financial problems, which eased the burden on Grant to find quarters for his officers.[312] British officers also freely went out to the center of Charles Town and attended social entertainment at a local playhouse in the evenings.[313] Charles Town offered plenty of entertainment for a transient population like the British troops.[314] For example, local tavern-owner John Gordon frequently advertised plays and shows to entice customers to his tavern and colonial government officials entertained the British officers in the Council Chamber of the State House.[315]

---

[311] *Add. Ms. 83699*, (London: British Library), Monypenny to William Amherst, January 17, 1761; Alexander Monypenny, *Order Book of the Grant Expedition,* January 20, 1761 "A list of the officers names billeted in Town, with their Land-lord's names," Monypenny ordered, "to be given in to the Adjt of the Day Retreat beating this Evening."

[312] See *Journals of the Commons House of Assembly*, March 17, 1762, ff. 27-40. Samuel Groves, James Linguard, Felix Long, James Ladson, and James Reid received credit for lodging officers.

[313] *Order Book of the Grant Expedition*, March 14, 1761 A lost item notice posted indicates that British officers watched performances at a play house: "Lost last night out of the Green Room at the Play House, a Silver Baskett Hilted Sword, the maker's name *Tapp in the Strand*," Moynpenny notified, "If any Gentleman has taken it by mistake, he is desired to send it to the Adjutant of the 2d Division of Independts. If any Person has found the above Sword, or will discover the Person who has it, by applying as above shall receive a Guinea Reward."

[314] George Milligen, *A Short Description*, p.25 Charles-Town sported "a genteel Playhouse, where a very tolerable Set of Actors, called the *American* Company of Comedians, frequently exhibit; and often Concerts of vocal and instrumental Music, generally performed by Gentlemen."

[315] George Milligen found the council-chamber of the State House most dissatisfying because it "appears rather crouded and disgusting, than ornamented and pleasing, by the great Profusion of carved Work in it." George Milligen, *A Short Description*, p.35; According to *South Carolina Gazette*, British officers "were very politely complimented and agreeably entertained, by the officers of the army, with a comedy and a farce, in the council chamber." *South Carolina Gazette,* March 21, 1761

The British troops formally shared space inside church on Sundays with civilians of Charles Town as they sat alongside one another and listened to sermons. Religion culturally connected the colonists to both Bouquet's Royal Americans and Grant's Highlanders. William Hutson, a dissenting minister of the Anglican Church, noted the presence of British troops in his diary in March 1758, writing that he had to use "some military terms, & to carry on something on an Allegory of that kind" in order to "speak practically to the poor soldiers."[316] Troops' attendance at Sabbath in St. Michaels or St. Phillips might have provided them with opportunities to interact with the town's inhabitants and even to find some solace when a minister like Hutson, "concerned for the poor Soldiers," attended to their spiritual needs.[317]

British troops also occupied public spaces and interacted with the local inhabitants freely during everyday social and economic activities. Soldiers purchased provisions at the market under the supervision of officers.[318] Occasional funerals of British officers also provided a break from the daily life of military drills for the rank-and-file, allowing them to leave the barracks for a few hours. On February 7, Monypenny issued an order to assemble the troops "near Major Hamilton's lodgings, to

---

[316] William Hutson, March 5, 1758 "Having Occasion to use [indecipherable] some military terms, & to carry on something on an Allegory of that kind—was led into the Appointment to speak practically to the poor Soldiers, several of whom were present—found myself very desireous that some [spiritual?] Good might be done among them & was enabled to pray for it." Quoted from Daniel Tortora, "A Faithful Ambassador": The Diary of Rev. William Hutson, Pastor of the Independent Meeting in Charleston, 1757-1761**,** *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*, Vol. 107, No. 4 (Oct., 2006), pp. 272-309.

[317] Ibid., March 12, 1758. Hutson's preaching to the troops continued the next Sunday. "My Heart, these two Sabbaths past has been particular concerned for the poor Soldiers. O that some Good might be done among them!"

[318] *Order Book of the Grant Expedition,* January 14, 1761 Monypenny ordered "no Soldier to go into Town, till after Morning Role Calling, or Exercise, except when sent for Provisions, or to the Market, which is to be done regularly by a non Commission officer going with, & bring back their Men."

attend the Funeral of Ensign Elrington of Brigadier General Whitmore's Regiment" in order to "pay the military Honours," and then the men marched to church the next day.[319] Thus, funerals provided rare authorized opportunities in which the British troops could share the public spaces of Charles Town.[320]

The affairs of the British monarchy also provided special occasions for the British rank-and-file and colonists to participate together in public ceremonies as the subjects of the British Crown. When "the melancholly News of Death of the late King" George II reached the southern province from New York on January 30, the British troops attended Sunday services at a local church.[321] Following the end of mourning for George II, the proclamation of George III on February 7 occasioned a massive public ceremony that involved the British regulars, provincial troops, free inhabitants, and slaves on Broad Street. They occupied the physical space of downtown Charles Town together to create a temporary communal identity as the King's Subjects. The Cherokee prisoners relocated to the new guard house at one of the corners of town square must have also witnessed the strange spectacle unfolding before their eyes as the "the regulars and militia march'd by divisons to the bay, and drew up there, and the procession went off to *Granville*'s bastion…followed by a general volley of small arms, and 3 huzza's."[322] As Brendan McConville and Robert Olwell suggest in their studies, this

---

[319] Ibid., February 7, 1761

[320] Ibid., February 19, 1761. A second funeral in Charles Town happened on February 19 as "The Officers are desired to assembly precisely at 4 OClock this afternoon at the same house Ensn. Elrington died at, to attend the funeral of Lieut. Elliott of the Marines."

[321] Ibid., January 31, 1761, "The Men to go to church as usual."

[322] See also *His Majesty's Council Journals of South Carolina*, February 6, 1761. The Council Journal of South Carolina also provided almost an identical account though it specifically identified the

public celebration of the British monarchy showed the strong royalism in the southern colony that contributed to a sense of community encompassing all the British subjects despite the ethnic and racial diversity of the congregants.[323]

British Officers' Relations with Women

As in Bouquet's quartering in 1757, colonial women continued to assume the role of social conduit between provincial and British officers during the Anglo-Cherokee War. During Grant's Cherokee expedition, South Carolina provincial officer John Moultrie fraternized with Grant and Monypenny at Fort Ninety Six.[324] Moultrie's letters to prospective marriage partner Eleanor Austin in Charles Town reveal that British officers built social connections with colonial women, which could then become useful in building personal ties with colonial officers. "If it was not for my pleasant & much loved friend Moneypenny I don't know what I shou'd do to get accounts of you, you ought to regard him, for he very s[e]riously loves us," Moultrie wrote to Austin, "he

---

British regiments in the ceremony: "His Honour then walked in Procession down Broad Street accompanied by the Members of Assembly, Colonel Grant the Captains of His Majesty's Ships and all the other officers Civil and Military, and many of the principal Inhabitants and Planters, the Sword of State being carried before him by Daniel Doyley Esqr. Provost Marshal. The Proclamation was made a second time in the great Square at the State House; The same was repeated at the Main Guard Houses, whence the Procession moved on toward Granville's on [?] Bastion when the King's troops commanded by Col. Grant being drawn up in Broad Street, wheeled the right by Divisions, and formed on the Bay, on the right of all of the Independents, Second Division of Ditto, the Battalion Companies of the 17th the Royals, First Division of the Independents, Second Division of Ditto, the Battalion Companies of 17th & 22d. and on the left of all the Light Infantry of the 22d to the left of the Regulars, was drawn up the Charles Town regiment of Militia, which had been under arms from 9 o'clock."

[323] See Robert OlWell, *Masters, Slaves, & Subjects* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998); On royalism in colonial America, see *The King's Three Faces: the Rise & Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, c2006)

[324] Moultrie later eloped with Eleanor Austin as her father opposed the marriage. Moultrie's Scottish family background may have made him easier to befriend Monypenny and Grant who both came from Scotland.

enquires of every oppertunity from Town how you are, & constantly lets me know & wishes us well."[325] Colonial officers like Moultrie also might have exaggerated their friendship with British officers to impress Austin to promote their social connections with the British officers to boast their social standing to people. After destroying the Cherokee villages and encamping at Fort Prince George, Moultrie boasted to Austin ,"Every night Col Grant, Sir Harry Seton, our pleasant friend Moneypenny, my self & sometimes one or two more meet & sit till eleven & we never miss bringing you into the company…"[326]

Some British officers engaged in sexual relations with women of African descent while quartered in Charles Town. William Amherst, brother of the commander-in-chief, sent a letter to Grant suggesting Major Alexander Monypenny's penchant for having sex with black women:

> The few Anecdotes you gave me regarding Monypenny confirm me in the opinion I had always conceived of his consummate slyness in all his dealings with the fair sex. he did not use to carry on his business with the blacks so secretly in this part of the world. I suppose he did not think them entitled to the same regard for reputation, or he might have another view in it, of raising his own, for what will not a white woman expect (& she will readily by to have her expectations answer'd) from a Man, who is known to satisfy every week, no less than half a dozen blacks? This is a part of his history, which perhaps you have not heard, but it is pretty well known to have happen'd at Albany.[327]

No outgoing letters from South Carolina mention what Amherst called "the few Anecdotes," but the letter suggests that Monypenny kept black mistresses, possibly

---

[325] John Moultrie to Eleanor Austin, April 29, 1761 (Charleston: Typescripts; South Carolina Historical Society)

[326] John Moultrie to Eleanor Austin, September 1, 1761

[327] *Ballindallloch Papers, Box 33,* William Amherst to James Grant, May 13, 1761 (Edinburgh: National Records of Scotland)

publicly, to satisfy his sexual urges. Although Monypenny allegedly already had sexual relations with black women in Albany openly, it appears he became more discreet with his sexual activity in black majority Charles Town. Amherst's comments on Monypenny's alleged sexual behavior with black women suggested British officers' sexual activities in America with African women were tolerated, although they provided fuel for private gossip among their peers. It also exhibited a few elite British officers' view of colonial white women through the lenses of race and gender when he commented "a white woman" would be attracted to a sexually virile man such as Monypenny who had ability to satisfy at least half a dozen black women every week. As Kathleen Brown argues in her study of sexuality and power in colonial Virginia, elite male planters celebrated male virility and believed that women's desire for sexual pleasure exceeded those of men. In addition, sex with African women signified "an expression of gender, racial, and class dominance" in a colonial slave society. Amherst's gossip over Monypenny's sexual activity in Albany and Charles Town suggests that at least a few elite British officers assimilated into a colonial slave society and adopted colonial planters' attitudes toward sex and women.[328]

It is worth noting that no direct evidence suggests British officers had sexual relations or expressed sexual desire toward Indian women in contrast to colonial officers.

---

[328] Kathleen M. Brown, *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), p.332. On the subject sex, race, and gender in colonial America, see also Susan Dwyer Amusssen, *Carribean Exchange: Slavery and the Transformation of English Society, 1640-1700* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), Paul Finkleman, "Crimes of Love, Misdemeanors of Passion: The Regulation of Race and Sex in the Colonial South," in eds. Catherine Clinton and Michelle Gillespie, *The Devil's Lane: Sex and Race in the Early South*, pp. 124-138. Jennifer Spear, *Race, Sex, and Social order in Early New Orleans* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008)

For instance, while William Byrd stayed in Keowee, he included a salacious writing about the Cherokee women in his letter to Forbes, unaware of the Scottish Brigadier-General's extreme disdain for Indians. "The Squaws are the only good things to be met with here, & I can not break them of anointing themselves with Bears-Grease, & depriving themselves of the greatest Ornament of Nature," wrote Byrd, "As I am now intirely out of the Christian World, you must expect me to converse about nothing but Savages, therefore lest the Topic shoud be as disagreeable to you as their Society is to me." Byrd's sexually suggestive comments on the Cherokee women reflected colonists' relatively lenient view and the fact that sexual unions between colonial officers and traders and Indian women at forts located in Indian country were the norm in colonial America.[329] British officers like Forbes might have bristled at such comments from Byrd since he who primarily viewed Indians either as enemies to be destroyed or useless, greedy mercenaries that wasted the British army's resources.[330]

Similarly, John Moultrie, South Carolina provincial officer, who participated in the Anglo-Cherokee Wars, wrote several love letters to the woman he was courting in Charles Town. Moultrie's descriptions of the Cherokee women contained sexual innuendos when he wrote: "I hope you will not be angry or jealous of me for making free with the Cherokee squaws…it was being pretty free to drive them naked out of their

---

[329] A few notable individuals worth mentioning are Lachlan McIntosh, the officer and later the commander of Fort Prince George, had an Indian wife and child. Lachlan McGillivray is also a prominent trader with Scottish background who married with a Creek woman.

[330] *Headquarters Papers related to John Forbes's Expedition to Fort Duquesne*, Byrd to John Forbes, April 30, 1758 (Small Collections, University of Virginia)

beds to hide in the woods & mountains."[331] British officers, however, did not resort to such sexually explicit language when referring to Indian women other than "squaw" or the prisoners and captives of war.[332] This suggests that British officers excluded Indian women from the discourse of Indian affairs, focusing instead on the subjects of Indian warriors and their martial abilities, unlike their colonial counterparts.

Indian Visitors to Charles Town

While Grant and his British troops were quartered in Charles Town, they received Indian visitors to forge alliances against the Cherokees. Catawbas, Creeks, Choctaws, and Chickasaws visited Charles Town in the spring of 1761 to affirm diplomatic ties with the British. British troops' exchanges with Indians in Charles Town consisted of communal diplomatic rituals meant to bind British troops, northern Indians, and southeastern Indians who shared a common goal of fighting against the Cherokees. For southeastern Indians like the Creeks and Chickasaws, historical animosity and rivalries offered an opportunity weaken the Cherokees' power and influence in the region. The fact that these encounters occurred in the urban setting of Charles Town and in the presence of English colonists made these encounters rather unique compared to meetings at remote forts.[333] These meetings in Charles Town meant that northern

---

[331] John Moultrie to Eleanor Austin, July 10, 1761 (Charleston, SC: South Carolina Historical Society)

[332] See Chapter Six on how British troops treated the Cherokee women prisoners in Grant's expedition.

[333] Capt. French and British rank-and-file, who usually interacted with Indians in Indian territory or in forts in New York. For instance, see French's journal entry on January 12, 1758 (Microfilm, Library of Congress)

Indians, British troops, and southeastern Indians forged military ties mediated by the Carolinians and the British officers. As demonstrated in the Fort Duquesne expedition, when the Catawba warriors became furious with the British because they made a diplomatic overture to Delawares who later killed Captain Bullen, the British could not afford to have divisions among the Indian warriors during an expedition.

When Hagler visited Charles Town with his people in February 1761, the Catawbas "Done'd the War Dance" while the British officers "smaok'd the Calumet with them."[334] By adopting and performing Indian diplomatic rituals, British officers (and, perhaps, the rank-and-file) had a chance to familiarize themselves with the Catawbas.[335] After the meeting with the British soldiers, Bull then arranged a special meeting in the Council Chamber in order to "prevent any jealousies between the Mohawks and the Catawbas for the future" because both sides accused against each other of kidnapping, imprisoning, and not returning their prisoners six years ago.[336] At the meeting, Hagler and Silver Heels settled the dispute and affirmed their friendship and alliance with the British, which pleased Bull as he closed the meeting saying both

---

[334] Ibid., February 24, 1761

[335] White settlers in the backcountry frequently shot Indians indiscriminately because they could not tell friendly Indians apart from hostile ones. See below for the hunting accident involving Peter the Mohawk. In Montgomery's 1760 expedition, Grant instructed that "The Catabaw Indians are always to be known, by a Piece of Tartan on their Heads The Troops to be informed of this that they may not any time take them for Enemy Indians a few more Catabaws are expected who have not yet got this Badge." *James Grant of Ballindalloch papers, Army Career Series, Box 32,* May 21, 1760

[336] *His Majesty's Council Journals of South Carolina*, March 2, 1761 (Columbia, S.C.: microfilm at SCDAH) The Council Minutes noted that Hagler "brought upwards of forty men women & childen with them, and now attended in order to be heard concerning the six Mohawks…"

the Mohawks and the Catawbas have "cleared up whatever seemed to be dark between them and…that they will go with one heart & hand to against the Cherokees."[337]

British troops also performed a military ceremony to Indian visitors to serve the interest of the colonists. In the midst of British preparation against the Cherokees, the Creeks visited Charles Town to file a complaint against colonial traders operating in the Creek country.[338] Bull received the Wolf King in the Council Chamber, thanked him for "friendship and protection to many of the English Traders" under the threats of "your mad young people" who intended to harm the traders. Bull requested that the Wolf King continue to provide protection to the colonial traders but also threatened him referencing how the Choctaws became economically destitute after "they quarreled with the English" and mentioning "the "poverty and distress of the Cherokees, since they broke out with the English." He told the Wolf King that "the Great King's warriors" arrived in Charles Town to punish the Cherokees and then added: "Think on those things how different from them is your situation, while you live in friendship with the English, who now do, and who only can supply you with cloathing and all other necessaries."[339] In response to Bull's threats, the Wolf King clarified that the recent murder of traders were the acts of "mad young men" contrary to "the will of wise men" and expressed his regret about "many white men & children being killed by the Cherokees." The Wolf King,

---

[337] Ibid., March 4, 1761

[338] Ibid., January 16, 1761, "Some of the Headmen of the Creek Nation of Indians, had taken offence, on account of some bad treatment they had met with upon their coming to Augusta, from some of the Inhabitants thereabout, particularly the Wolf King, who hitherto been a good friend to the English." Consequently, the Board of the Council recommended that "the Wolf King should be invited to come to Charles Town in order to make matters straight with him, and advised His Honour to send an invitation to the Wolf to come hither before his return to the Nation, for that purpose accordingly."

[339] Ibid., February 11, 1761

however, might have told Bull what he wanted to hear to maintain the trade relations with South Carolina.

A week later, perhaps in order to demonstrate to the Wolf King the formidable power of "the Great King's warriors" sent to Charles Town to invade the Cherokees, the British army performed an elaborately scripted ceremonial reception for the Creek Wolf King. "[A]t the Governor's Request We had a Field Day to please him," Monypenny wrote, "It was in an open Plain, & we fir'd four Rounds in different Ways."[340] Monypenny intended "to show our Numbers to Advantage," but the effort of the British troops backfired. After the ceremony ended, according to Christopher French, the Wolf King responded that "he was much pleas'd wth. our appearance, & say'd we loaded very fast, but was surpris'd we did not fire as soon as we loaded."[341] Monypenny likewise chafed at the Wolf King's critique:

> He said (or is said, to have said, (I have no great Faith in Indian Interpreters) that, we were a fine Sight, very fit for Towns, not so much, for the Woods. That we kept too close together, & he hop'd we were not to fire in such large Bodys against the Cherokees; Was pleas'd with the Petticoats of French's Company, Said Cap Rickman [?] was a Man & a Half, & ask'd whether he went to War a Foot, or a Horseback.[342]

Monypenny clearly intended to awe the Wolf King in order to send a message about the consequences if they joined the French or attacked the colonists as Bull told him earlier in the council chamber. The Wolf King's quips to the British troops,

---

[340] *Add. Ms. 83699*, February 17, 1761, (London: British Library), See also Christopher French, *Journal*, February 17, 1761 "The whole Army was under Arms, & about Twelve o'Clock the Wolf King & his attendts. came to the Field, & walk'd along our Front & Rear with the Governor," French wrote, "we afterwards fir'd, & then march'd past him by Files."

[341] Ibid.

[342] Ibid.

however, suggested that he would be neither bullied by Bull's threats nor "the Great King's warriors." Monypenny's reactions also suggested that he not only felt humiliated in front of the Creek Indians but also the colonists as he readily blamed the Indian interpreter to discredit the Wolf King's criticism. Considering Monypenny had mocked the Wolf King as "a merry Monarch, & generally drunk before Noon" when he saw the Creek visitor in Charles Town, he probably could not take in such a criticism that slighted the King's Troops.[343]

British troops not only interacted with their Indian visitors and allies but also terrorized the Cherokee hostages imprisoned in Charles Town. Only a few days after his disembarkation in Charles Town, Colonel Grant went to see Lieutenant Governor Bull in person and requested that Bull provide "a proper lodging" and keep "well entertained" the Mohawk warriors who sailed with British troops.[344] While the Mohawks presumably stayed comfortably in Charles Town thanks to Grant's request, the Cherokee women prisoners confined at a guard house only a block across from the barracks suffered from maltreatment and a lack of clothing.[345] Indeed, their appalling conditions prompted Lieutenant Governor Bull to go the Council and its board members agreed to purchase the clothing at "the expense of the Public."[346] A month later, Grant formally requested

---

[343] Ibid., Monypenny, however, soon learned from Lieutenant-Governor William Bull that the Wolf King was "a Man of Consequence in his Nation" and to be "treated with Respect" on account of his "great Service to the English Traders in the lower Creek Settlements" in the previous year.

[344] *His Majesty's Council Journals of South Carolina*, January 8, 1761 (Columbia, S.C.: microfilm at SCDAH). See also *Journals of the Commons House of Assembly*, March 17, 1762, f.33. Felix Long received the credit of £77 for "Lodging of the Mohawk Indians."

[345] These were presumably the Cherokee hostages Lyttelton seized in the winter of 1759.

[346] *His Majesty's Council Journals of South Carolina*, January 8, 1761, Bull notified the Council to provide clothing to the "almost naked" prisoners and "preserve them from the inclemency of the weather."

that Bull relocate the Cherokee prisoners because "great abuses were daily committed by the soldiers on Duty at the Main Guard, upon the Cherokee women prisoners in part of the said Guard-House, and of such a nature, as was not in his power effectualy to remedy."[347] When Grant suggested relocating the Cherokee prisoners "to some other proper place," the Council agreed to move them to "the armory house for that purpose, and advised such reparations to be made therein, as was necessary for the security and accommodation of the Prisoners."[348] Grant's request that Bull relocate the Cherokee women to a location farther from the barracks, rather than trying to issue an order to prevent soldiers from raping the women, also suggests the Colonel's inability to curb his soldiers, providing further evidence of troops' freedom in the colonial town. No white inhabitants filed any complaints of sexually abused colonial women. On the contrary, the newspaper praised the troops and their decorum during their stay, suggesting that the British troops in Charles Town might have preyed on the most vulnerable Indian women instead of colonial women.[349]

Records of theft and robbery involving troops and Indians suggest a context of illicit informal exchanges, but also the limits of diplomacy. A striking incident involved the Wolf King and a British rank-and-file soldier. When the Creek Wolf King lodged in Charles Town, one of the British soldiers slipped past the barracks guards and found his way to the streets of Charles Town at night. Upon encountering an Indian wearing

---

[347] According to the contemporary map of Charles Town, the distance between the barracks and the Guard-House near Town Gate was less than a half mile.

[348] *His Majesty's Council Journals of South Carolina*, February 2, 1761 (Columbia, S.C.: microfilm at SCDAH)

[349] *South Carolina Gazette,* March 21, 1761 "The behaviour of these troops during their stay in Charles-Town has given the greatest satisfaction to the inhabitants…"

seemingly valuable headgear, the soldier took the chief's gold-laced hat. Wolf King apparently appealed to Lieutenant Governor Bull who in turn complained to Colonel Grant. The British commander immediately instructed his subordinate Monypenny to issue an order to search for and apprehend the offender. Both Grant and Moneypenny clearly understood the gravity of this incident, and that they could not afford to offend the Wolf King and the Creeks whom they believed to be—"a nation of Indians always in the English Interest."[350]

This particular incident reveals how British soldiers and Indians shared public space in Charles Town. Their interactions extended beyond the more common images of British commanders and Indian headmen holding formal meeting or fighting common enemies together as war allies in the field. The particular setting in which this incident occurred also reveals the importance of the geography of occupied Charles Town. The relatively close distance between the barracks and the center of town meant that any British soldier willing to break curfew could slip into the streets of Charles Town at night (usually to get a drink or sell items to obtain cash) and run into Indians. The fact that the British soldier could rob a high profile Indian visitor like the Wolf King at such a time and place also indicates the degrees of freedom and comfort with Indian visitors strolling around the colonial town without either supervision or protective escort.

---

[350] *Order Book of the Grant Expedition*, February 10, 1761, p.310. According to Monypenny's order book, tattoo (a signal on a drum, bugle, or trumpet at night, for soldiers to return to their quarters) sounded at nine.

British Troops and Enslaved Africans in Charles Town

The first encounters between the British troops and enslaved Africans of South Carolina happened during Montgomery's short, ill-fated first Cherokee expedition of 1760. When Montgomery's Highlanders disembarked at Monk's Corner, the small pox had struck South Carolina and the colonists refused to send out their slave runners to contact the troops out of fear that their slaves might get infected too. Montgomery reported to Amherst that "the People in the country afraid of the disorder Spreading Amongst their Negros are unwilling to have Any communication with the Town or the People that come from it."[351] It is unclear whether "the disorder" Montgomery mentioned referred to the small pox that would kill off slaves or the possibility of insurrection against their masters as the slaves take advantage the disarray in Charles Town hit by the epidemic. Neither Montgomery nor Grant showed sympathy for the colonists, however; instead, the British officers complained of the colonists and their selfish interest in protecting their slaves and neglecting the British troops who had travelled a great distance to relieve them. Grant attempted to convince the South Carolinians that they had nothing to fear from the British troops who "could have no Infection of small Pox," but to no avail.[352]

The Cherokee Wars allowed enslaved Africans who participated in the conflict a window of opportunity to gain their freedom as they petitioned to the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina. Montgomery's 1760 expedition saw a number of

---

[351] *WO 34/47*, Archibald Montgomery to Jeffrey Amherst, April 12, 1760 (Kew: National Archives)
[352] *WO 34/37*, James Grant to Jeffery Amherst, April 17, 1760 (Kew: National Archives)

enslaved Africans petitioning for freedom, citing their military service against the Cherokees. Because South Carolina prohibited blacks from bearing arms after the Stono Rebellion of 1739, enslaved Africans acted in war primarily as "pioneers."[353] As Peter Wood notes, these pioneers "increasingly took over their responsibilities as 'pathfinders' in the southern wilderness."[354] A contemporary observer William De Brahm explained that African pioneers "cut down small Trees in the Way of the Carriages, to forward and guide through unfrequented Forrests, assist with their Boats and Hands to set them over Streams, River, and Creeks."[355] Lastly, pioneers carried letters and transported goods between Charles Town and the forts in Indian countries.[356] These African pioneers mostly toiled as plantation slaves or transported people and goods in peacetime but they provided vital support to the Cherokee expeditions as the British army actively recruited them.

Although the fear of slave insurrections lingered in the minds of many white South Carolinians in the wake of the Cherokee War, the imminent threat of Cherokee attack forced the colonists to arm a small number of slaves.[357] Indeed, the South

---

[353] Peter Wood, *Black Majority* (New York: Norton, 1974), p.95. Peter Wood note in *Black Majority* that the term "Pioneers" applied to black workers a half century earlier of the American Revolution era whom he declared as South Carolina's "first real 'Afro-Americans.'" More specifically, the term applied to "Negroes 'engaged in the public service' and earning money for their masters on wartime task forces," which first appeared in Oglethorpe's Florida expedition in 1740.

[354] Ibid., p.117

[355] *Report of the General Survey in the Southern District of North America* Louis De Vorsey, Jr., ed., *Report of the General Survey in the Southern District of North America* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1971), p.78

[356] For instance, see the entry on *Journals of Commons House of Assembly*, January 19, 1758. Lieutenant Outerbridge submitted an account to the Commons House asking the reimbursement for "supplying the Negroes who carry'd Indian Presents to Fort Moore…" p. 274

[357] Brumwell, *Redcoats* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p.76 British army stayed from recruiting "racially mixed population" of its American colonies. Recruiting instructions under

Carolina government provided armed black soldiers, in addition to pioneers, to Montgomery's expedition in 1760. Lieutenant Governor Bull informed Grant that he gave orders "to have half our Militia with a number of Negroes good Gunmen, and faithful to their Masters equal to the third of whites, should be ready to take the Field."[358] Bull's decision to enlist African-Americans into the militia must have been not easy considering that only ten days earlier he had sent a report to Montgomery describing Tacky's Rebellion in Jamaica.[359]

By serving in South Carolina's provincial army, enslaved Africans seized rare opportunities to claim freedom. Although only a small number of slaves who risked their lives earned that ultimate prize, the willingness of the South Carolinian elites to grant freedom to any slaves or to circumvent the ban on arming slaves suggests how much they feared the Cherokees. In 1761, Joe Fleming, "a Mullatto Man" and "the Property of William Killingsworth of Berkley County Planter" submitted a petition to the South Carolina Commons House of Assembly claiming that he "duly Inlisted in his Company of Rangers and was upon the late Expedition to the Cherokee Nation Commanded by the

---

William Shirley in 1755 warned against enlisting blacks, mulattoes, and Indians. Brumwell notes that the British Army had a tradition of recruiting black men and boys as drummers and regimental musicians, it made no effort to enlist them as private soldiers despite the ample evidence that both free and enslaves blacks shouldered arms in provincial regiments and ranging companies. Brumwell's general observation comes from the secondary source based on the northern campaign in New York. See also S. A. Padeni, "Forgotten Soldiers: The Role of Blacks in New York's Northern Campaigns," *Bulletin of Fort Tiacoronga Musuem* Vol. 16, No.2 (1999): 152-69, Jane Landers, *Black Society in Spanish Florida* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999)

[358] *Ballindallloch Papers, Box 32,* William Bull to James Grant, Charles Town, June 2, 1760 (Edinburgh: National Records of Scotland); James Grant's Orderly Book, April 9, 1760 (Edinburgh: National Archives of Scotland) Grant recorded of "The Pioneers & Hatchet men with 10 men per Company" in his orderly book.

[359] Ibid., May 23, 1760 (Edinburgh: National Records of Scotland) "We have just rec^{d}. an Account of an Insurrection of the Negroes at Jamaica who killed a good number of white People before they were subdued," Bull wrote, "the Principal offender was taken."

honorable Colonel Montgomery." "Two Credible witnesses" supported Fleming's claim that he "did kill and Scalp one Cherokee Indian for which said Mullato prays some Allowance from this House."[360] The committee of the Commons House accepted the "Certificate of the Affidavits" submitted by Fleming and freed him "at the Expence of this Province & that his master be paid Five hundred Current money for the same." The committee reached the decision upon the calculation that Fleming's example might act "as an encouragement to such Slave or Slaves" so that they "may here after behave well in a Military service."[361]

Abram, a prominent black messenger who frequently appeared in the *South Carolina Gazette* traversing between Charles Town and the Cherokee Country, also won freedom. Unusually, Bull recommended to the Commons House that it consider awarding Abram his freedom in June 1760.[362] Almost a year later, a special committee appointed by the Commons House granted freedom to Abram citing "the Singular Services done by the said Negro to this Province in carrying Expresses to & from Charles Town to the Garrisons of Fort Loudoun & Fort Prince George in the Cherokee Country amidst a Variety of Dangers & difficultys." The committee publicly declared that the likes of Abram "will excite other Negro Slaves on proper Occasions to

---

[360] *The Journals of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina*, April 23, 1761 (South Carolina Department of Archives and History)

[361] Ibid., April 23, 1761

[362] Ibid., April 22, 1761. See also, Tom Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), p.133 Hatley writes that "So great was the terror of among the western population that the commander at Keowee could not find any white person willing to travel from Augusta to Orangeburg…Midsummer questions about the fate of the Fort Loudoun garrison, which had been under siege since Montgomery's march, were answered at last by Abram, a black messenger who had become the primary link between the Overhill fort and the colonials after no white colonist had been willing to volunteer for the duty."

undertake the like Dangers & necessary service for the Province in hopes of meeting with the like reward & that therefore the same ought cheerfully to be complied with."[363]

Enslaved Africans continued to contribute to Grant's expedition militarily but their relations with the British army started in Charles Town. Although free and enslaved blacks worked and even fought with Grant's troops, they received no better treatment from the King's Troops for their service. When all the British troops disembarked in Charles Town and quartered in January of 1761, Grant and Monypenny quickly ordered provisions to feed the army but they found the cattle too "poor & weak" to use as edible meat. [364] Quarter Master David Wilson gave "Condemned" provisions in the store to "Negroes and other persons, who coud eat such rotton Provisions" in order to avoid paying fines for dumping the spoiled food "over the wharf."[365] This incident demonstrated British troops' casual economic exchanges with the town's poor and enslaved, but also their disregard for such individuals. While colonial official might value certain individual's contribution to the war effort, it is not clear that British officers shared such regard. They certainly did not extend it to the town's black population in general, whatever their potential military contribution.

Nevertheless, British officers did expend considerable effort recruiting "Negroe Pioneers" to prepare for the expedition. They believed Africans had a special ability to work in grueling heat. "They will be very useful in making roads or Posts," Monypenny

---

[363] *The Journals of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina*, April 23, 1761 (South Carolina Department of Archives and History)

[364] *Order Book of the Grant Expedition,* January 13, 1761. War Office 34/47, James Grant Jeffrey Amherst, January 17, 1761

[365] *James Grant of Ballindalloch Papers, Army Career Series, Box 33*, David Wilson to James Grant, January 22, 1761

informed the commander-in-chief's brother, "especially as they can work in the Sun."[366] The plan to recruit African pioneers, however, met with some reluctance from local planters. Monypenny noted that Bull advertised in an effort to recruit pioneers but he received no responses. Just like four years before, the local planters hesitated to lend their slaves to the British army, lest they run away or get killed by the Cherokees. Monypenny, however, did not give up his effort and sent "a Paper round to the principal Planters to subscribe to furnish one, or two, each."[367] Two weeks later, Monypenny reported progress: Grant and the provincial officers carried the subscription around to persuade the planters and procured "50 Negroe Pioneers."[368] These hard-won pioneers proved essential to the British troops as they marched through woods and over rivers, streams, and creeks. The British army's effort to recruit African pioneers in Charles Town presented a paradox: British officers competed against local planters and even coerced them for the access to African pioneers but at the same time befriended the planters to acquire planter social and economic networks instrumental to their own aspirations to purchase and manage plantations, as Bouquet did and Grant would do later as the Governor of East Florida.[369]

---

[366] *Add. Ms. 83699*, (London: British Library), Monypenny to William Amherst, March 15, 1761
[367] Ibid.
[368] Ibid., Monypenny to William Amherst, March 30, 1761
[369] See Chapter Two for Bouquet's involvement in purchase slaves and the Conclusion of this dissertation for Grant's second career as the Governor of East Florida.

British Troops Leave Charles Town

In late March, the British army and the provincial troops departed Charles Town to invade the Cherokee Country, ending nearly three months of quartering. The army consisted of some 1200 British regulars, 1000 South Carolina provincials, 80 "Negro pioneers," joined later by Catawba and Upper and Lower Chickasaw warriors. After destroying the Lower and Middle Cherokee settlements and spending months through the fall of 1761 finalizing a peace treaty, Grant and his troops marched back to Charles Town in December, boarded transports, and sailed away toward the West Indies on Christmas Day. Although a few detachments remained in "the richest City in the Southern District of North America," no significant presence of British troops could be felt in Charles Town until 1780 when an occupying force arrived during the American Revolutionary War.

Grant's quartering in Charles Town in 1761 shows that British troops actively engaged in numerous social and economic exchanges as they had during Bouquet's visit in 1757. A couple of notable differences existed, though. The absence of a vocal quartering dispute between the British commander and the members of the Commons House of South Carolina, and the apparent lack of ethnic tension between the troops and the inhabitants of Charles Town contrasted with Bouquet's quartering four years before. British soldiers engaged in social and economic exchanges with the free and enslaved inhabitants of Charles Town, as well as with the Indian visitors. The troops often shared public spaces together to socialize and perform military rites as the British subjects or the diplomats receiving the Indian visitors. Some of these exchanges were informal and

criminal in nature, ranging from robbery to desertion to raping the imprisoned Cherokee women in Charles Town.

The context of Grant's quartering, however, significantly differed from Bouquet's because of the imminent Cherokee threat that amplified the fears of slave revolt. The colonial elites could not afford to dispute with Grant when their property and lives were at stake. They provided whatever assistance (if not coerced by British officers) required to Grant and entertained his officers. *South Carolina Gazette*'s news column on the departure of Grant's army to the Cherokee country probably accurately reflected the colonists' attitude: "The behaviour of these troops during their stay in Charles-Town has given the greatest satisfaction to the inhabitants"[370] Unlike Bouquet's penchant for hyperbole, the British officers did not complain or criticize elite South Carolinians during their stay in Charles Town. As they marched toward Fort Prince George, however, they soon found disagreements with the colonial elites Charles Town and the provincial officers accompanying them over the course of the Cherokee expedition.

---

[370] *South Carolina Gazette,* March 21, 1761

CHAPTER VI

DAILY INTERACTIONS IN THE CHEROKEE COUNTRY

As Grant's expedition force departed Charles Town and marched toward Cherokee country, British troops engaged in different kinds of interactions with the participants in the war. Sometime these interactions revolved around intense combat and arduous marches over the mountains as Grant's troops and its Indian allies raided and burned the Middle Cherokee settlements. British troops, however, spent the majority of their time in the woods, camps, and paths engaging in everyday interactions dealing with unforeseen accidents involving the Indian warriors accompanying them while not fighting or pursuing the enemies. These daily exposures to the behaviors of the Indians and sharing spaces with them gradually changed British officers' attitude toward southeastern Indians in a positive manner over time and the Indian warriors appeared to have reciprocated the sentiment to the British troops.

Disagreements over the Cherokee Expedition

Despite the similarities between Britons and colonists as the subjects of the British Crown working to further the interests of British empire, when it came to Indian policies, they differed. As outsiders with no permanent ties to the land or to long-term affairs in the southeast, British officers more often could see events from Indian perspectives. Excluding the irascible officers such as Jeffrey Amherst, John Forbes, and Henry Bouquet who excoriated Indians and frequently expressed their desire to

exterminate "savages,"[371] the British officers involved in the 1760 and 1761 Cherokee expeditions sometimes surprisingly defended the Cherokees and condemned the South Carolinians.

For the British officers, the Cherokee expedition represented an unnecessary diversion from the main theater of war unfolding in the north. As historian John Oliphant writes, the commander-in-chief Jeffrey Amherst saw the new trouble in South Carolina as "an irritating distraction from the imminent drive on Montreal."[372] Another reason the British officers might have disliked their assignments in "the southern provinces" had to do with the lack of opportunity to socialize and network with their peers that could hamper their personal ambitions. For instance, when James Grant arrived in Charles Town in 1757, he wanted to go to New York as soon as possible where he could have a better chance of promotion within the British army. "I do not like to be left here with Regr. upon the footing of Charles-Town Guards," Grant wrote to his family member in Lethen, Scotland, "I chuse to be a little nearer the Army, we have no sort of communication with them at present, and 'tis not the plan to come here to be idle." He asked for a favor to General Abercromby to "contrive business" or "some scheme" to bring him near the Headquarters of the British army in New York.[373] The British officers

---

[371] Stephen Brumwell, *Redcoats*, pp. 188-189. Jeffrey Amherst, the commander-in-chief of British army in North America, was most infamous for his ruthless policies against Indians, including a distribution of blankets infected with small pox. Col. Henry Bouquet proposed hunt down the Indian "vermin" with dogs. Brumwell points that such a sharp turn in their language in 1763 in the wake of Pontiac's War and notes that neither Amherst nor Bouquet previously held such extreme hatred against Indians.

[372] John Oliphant, *War and Peace*, p.113

[373] James Grant to Alexander Brodie, September 22, 1757 (Columbia, SC: South Caroliniana Library)

who received the assignment to South Carolina believed they had nothing to gain in terms of their military reputation in the British army since it did not constitute a cornerstone of the British initiative against the French in North America.

Moreover, as one historian of the British soldiers in the Seven Years' War noted, British troops "bore the brunt of the actual fighting" and the Cherokee expeditions were no exception as they had to fight enemies provoked by the colonists.[374] The British troops returned to the Southeast only because they had to clean up the mess the colonists created. Hence, the British officers' reluctance to fight the Cherokees and their disdainful attitude towards the South Carolinians created a different dynamic among the participants of the war. British officers' apathy toward the Southeast led them to be more critical of the South Carolinians in assessing which side was more responsible for causing the Anglo-Cherokee war.

As the commander of 1760 Cherokee expedition, Archibald Montgomery had no qualms about ordering his men to "put the Indians to Death" or calling Indians "savages" and "Rogues" but he questioned the colonists' claims about the Cherokees. "[T]hey are for putting all the Cherokees to Deaths, or Making Slaves of them," Montgomery reported, "but I fancy they have sometimes been hardly dealt by, and if they could tell their own story I doubt Much if they are so much to blame as has been Represented by the People of this Province."[375] A year later, Montgomery's replacement James Grant also echoed the sentiment. He conjectured that most of the Cherokees "are sory for what

---

[374] Stephen Brunwell, *Redcoats* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 4-5
[375] *WO 34/47*, Archibald Montgomery to Jeffrey Amherst, May 24, 1760

has happened" and "will be glad to come into Terms" as soon as the British troops march into their country.[376] While scholars disagree on whether Grant really desired a quick peace treaty given how ruthlessly he applied scorched-earth warfare on the Cherokees, one cannot dispute that a faction emerged among the South Carolinian elites who vocally and publicly criticized Grant for arranging a peace treaty with the Cherokees that did not meet the colonists' demands.[377]

Not only did the British officers in charge of the Cherokee expeditions criticize the South Carolinians, but the subordinate officers serving in the campaigns also displayed a similar attitude. Major Alexander Monypenny disapproved of Lachlan McIntosh, the commander of Fort Prince George, who gave presents to Attakullakulla for returning a hundred English hostages because "the Capitulation of Fort Loudoun, & other violences committed by them, are too flagrant to be easily forgiven..."[378] Nevertheless, Monypenny believed that the colonists had exaggerated the crisis in order to bring in the Kings' Troops. "Notwithstanding the great Cry of Violences from the Indians," Monypenny wrote, "scarcely an Act of Hostility can be prov'd."[379] These remarks from the British officers leading the expedition suggested that they reluctant fought on behalf of the South Carolinians.

---

[376] *WO 34/47*, James Grant to Jeffrey Amherst, April 17, 1761

[377] See Hatley's *The Dividing Paths* and Fabel's *Colonial Challenges* for portrayal of Grant as a ruthless and an effective "automaton" or war machinery. Oliphant details Grant's correspondence with Amherst and Bull to argue that Grant took as humane approach as he could by deliberately hiding information from Amherst and Bull to reach a peace negotiation with the Cherokees as quickly as possible.

[378] Alexander Monypenny, *Diary*, March 23, 1761. Printed in *Journal of Cherokee Studies Vol.2* (1977): 320-331

[379] *Add. Ms. 83699*, (London: British Library), Alexander Monypenny to William Amherst, January 17, 1761

British Officers' Attitude toward Indian Warriors

Grant's 1761 expedition differed significantly from Montgomery's attempt a year before because the new army included Mohawks, Stockbridges, Chickasaws, and Catawbas. Consequently, everyday interaction occurred between the British troops and their Indian allies. The British officers attempted to exert control over the Indian warriors but often failed as the Indians often ignored and acted independently from the British which frustrated Grant and Monypenny. The two officers also often expressed disgust or fascination with what they perceived as the Indian warriors' savagery. However, repeated everyday interactions enabled the British officers to change their preconceptions of the southeastern Indians by the end of the Cherokee expedition.

British officers generally made disparaging comments about southeastern Indian warriors.[380] For instance, while the South Carolinians valued the Catawbas' loyalty to the English and their martial skills, Monypenny and Grant shared no enthusiasm for the Indian warriors of the Carolina piedmont. [381] When the Catawbas joined the British troops at Saluda Town, both Monypenny and Grant expressed disgust toward them for their destitute appearances and lack of arms. "18 of 40 Catabaws join'd us," Monypenny wrote tersely, "They are Drunken Beggars."[382] Grant also informed Bull in Charles Town that, "Those cursed Catabaws came in with Col^{o}. Ayrs the night before we marched destitute of many things." Grant had to obtain arms from a provincial officer

---

[380] *Add. Ms. 83699*, (London: British Library), Monypenny to William Amherst, June 1, 1761

[381] James Merrell, *The Indians' New World* (Chapel Hill : Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Va., by the University of North Carolina Press, 1989), p.197

[382] Alexander Monypenny, *Diary*, May 3, 1761

and ordered the Indian Corps' leader Captain Quentin Kennedy to "buy Paint, Knives, & c[a]."[383] As Bull's reply to Grant indicated, however, the Catawbas might have deliberately showed up without arms in order to obtain guns and other new arms since they knew the British could not just turn them away.[384]

Of the three British officers who left written records in the Cherokee expedition of 1761, Christopher French remained sanguine toward the Indians he encountered in the Southeast. Captain French, a newcomer to the southern colony, showed an untiring interest in describing Indians' visits to Charles Town. As a seasoned British officer from Ireland, French had traveled extensively throughout British North America since his arrival in 1756 and participated in the grueling Siege of Louisbourg. He had seen Indians before his arrival in Charles Town. While stationed at Fort Horkimer, New York, in 1758, French met Indians and already showed an obsessive interest in their practice of scalping and other forms of wartime violence.[385] No wonder, then, that he seemed mostly curious about the Indians whose presence dominated the political and economic affairs in the Southeast.[386]

---

[383] *James Grant of Ballindalloch papers, Army Career Series, Box 33*, Grant to Bull, May 5, 1761.

[384] Ibid., Bull to Grant, Charles Town, May 6, 1761. Bull replied to Grant's letter that the Catawbas "The Catawbas were all well armed last year and never used a Gun in the Service of this province after the Action of Estatoe; And tho' we have fed and cloathed their whole Nation since the Commencement of the Cherokee War, they talk as it we had done nothing for them. They were to bring forty only of their best Men, and were promised ammunition, Boots, and Flaps to equip them for War; I could not imagine they would want Guns, for those we gave them last Year could not be worn out, as they tell us they cant Hunt, Wherefore we gave them provisions and Cloathed."

[385] French, *Journal of Christopher French*, January 12, 1758 (Microfilm, Library of Congress)

[386] Ibid., January 9, 1761 (Microfilm, Library of Congress) He clearly understood the vital role of Indians in the southern colony: "the Chief Commodities of this Country are Rice/wch. is the staple/ Indigo, & Deerskins," French noted, "but the quantity of the latter depends on the Inhabitants being at Peace or War wth. the Indian."

French was one of few British officers who voluntarily shared space with Indians by frequently engaging in informal social exchanges in the woods, Indian encampments, and Indian country. French also claimed to have some knowledge in interpretation skills when he supposedly assisted the communication between the Chickasaws and the Seneca with the help of a Chickasaw interpreter "in order to create a good understanding between them."[387] French's rank as a captain (low compared to Lt. Col. Grant and Major Monypenny), basic interpretation skills, and his curiosity toward Indians might have allowed him to spend more time with Indians than any other British officer as he hunted, traveled, dined, and conversed with young Indians warriors, and chiefs.

Unlike French, Grant and Monypenny became more frustrated over time with the Indian warriors because they could not control them exactly as they wished. For instance, after burning the Cherokee towns of Etchoe, Tasse, and Keweasee, the twenty Lower Chickasaw warriors declined to accompany Grant's forces because they became "tired of the service, or thinking we should get into a scrape" and went home.[388] In the same manner, the Catawbas refused to accompany the British troops any further and went to Charles Town to collect their presents for the service they had provided. As happened in the Fort Duquesne expedition, Grant could not do anything to retain them.

---

[387] *His Majesty's Council Journals of South Carolina*, March 2, 1761 (Columbia, S.C.: microfilm at SCDAH) The Council Minutes noted that Hagler "brgouht upwards of forty men women & childen with them, and now attended in order to be heard concerning the six Mohawks…"

[388] *James Grant of Ballindalloch papers, Army Career Series, Box 33*, *Journal of the Cherokees Expedition from Fort Prince George*, first version, June 21, 1761 (microfilm, Washington D.C.: Library of Congress) According to *South Carolina Gazette,* two Catawbas also returned to Charles Town with the Chickasaws to collect bounties for scalps although neither Grant or French mention about the Catawbas leaving. See also *South Carolina Gazette*, July 11, 1761

On another occasion, as the British troops entered the Middle settlements, Grant required more intelligence in order to surprise the enemies. A week later, Grant sent out two Indian Scouts "with directions to bring in a Prisoner if possible" but the Chickasaws, Mohawks, and Catawbas all brought scalps instead of prisoners. Disappointed, Grant wrote, "they could not get 2 Prisoner without risking too much by that means we could get no Intelligence of the Cherokees..."[389]

British officers also failed to provide protection to Cherokee prisoners from the Catawbas or the Chickasaw that they captured, which suggested the British army's impotence to impose strict orders on Indian warriors. British troops often interrogated the captured Cherokee women to obtain intelligence. For instance, upon arriving at the Cherokee settlement of Ayoree, French and his troops captured a Cherokee woman. French claimed that he and his men "gave her some provisions, and convey'd her privately out of camp lest she should be scalp'd by our Indians, who wanted much to do it." When another Cherokee woman was brought out of camp, however, the Indian warriors "got hold of her soon kill'd & scalp'd her, they then threw her Body into the River." Although French claimed that the British troops attempted to save the Cherokee women prisoners by moving them out of camp and therefore out of sight from the Catawbas or the Chickasaws, they stopped at short of providing protection to these prisoners. On the contrary, French merely mused over a Cherokee woman about to be killed by the Indian warriors, commenting that "that the sqwa [squaw] we brought to

---

[389] James Grant, *Journal of the Cherokees Expedition from Fort Prince George,* June 21, 1761

camp smiled at us even when she must have expected to be put to Death every Instant."[390]

Stephen Brumwell argues that British troops condoned a series of killings of the old and the Cherokee women, which showed "an apparent hardening of attitudes towards Indian non-combatants" and "suggest sympathy for these pathetic victims, but also indicate an unwillingness to protect them."[391] Thus, Brumwell argues, the British army violated the norms of violence and transgressed the self-proclaimed performing honours of war. Brumwell might have been right with his thesis concerning the British soldiers' unwillingness to protect the war prisoners, but he overlooks how little control the British army had over its Indian allies. The Indian warriors killing the defenseless the Cherokee prisoner reflected that the British troops neither had power nor leverage to intervene and stop them.

Silver Heels Incident

Another incident that demonstrated the British officers' lack of power and knowledge to intervene in Indian affairs involved allied Mohawk warrior Silver Heels. On the way to Congarees, at Eutaw Spring, James Grant reported that "Silver Heels our favorite Indian who behaved extremely well on board & Charles Town was guilty of a great piece of Barbarity." Silver Heels, a Mohawk who had joined the British in their expedition against the Cherokees, had "cut with his Tomyhawk a man & two Women,

[390] French, June 12, 1761. Alexander Monypenny's diary, unfortunately, breaks off on May 31. Also, see Theda Perdue, *Cherokee Women* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), p.97. Cherokee women became vulnerable to the invading forces because they were farmers and less mobile.

[391] Stephen Brumwell, *Redcoats* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 187-188

same Indians, who live in a Plantation and are the only people of their Nation the Northern Indians have left."[392] Grant thought it best to execute Silver Heels but he washed his hands of the matter and let the Mohawks resolve the incident. "I could have wished that Silver Heels had been put to Death, when he committed this Act of cruelty," Grant confided to his superior, "but did not chuse to have it done afterwards."[393] Grant's carefully crafted words to Amherst implied that he had a full control and authority over the accompanying Indian warriors.[394] Thus, when Grant wrote to Amherst that he "did not chuse to have it done afterwards," he implied that he possessed the power to impose corporal punishment. Grant, however, wrote a different report to Bull in Charles Town:

"The Barbarity of Silver Heels has given me great Uneasiness – I wish he had been put to death at the time that it happened. The other Indians intended afterwards to kill but it was then too late & I directed Capt[n]. Kennedy to prevent it. One does not realy know how to Act with such Savages, If I had a greater number of them, He should suffer, or had a Solders done the same thing, he should not have lived an hour."[395]

As suggested in the correspondence with the Lieutenant Governor of South Carolina, even if Grant really wanted to punish Silver Heels, it would have been an unpractical option for several reasons. Such action would have surely angered the other

---

[392] War Office 34/47, James Grant to Jeffrey Amherst, April 25, 1761 (Microfilm, The National Archive of UK, Kew); *His Majesty's Council Journals of South Carolina*, March 4, 1761 (Columbia, S.C.: SCDAH) Before the incident, Silver Heels talked with Hagler representing the Mohawks' interest in the Council Chamber of Charles Town though he clarified "I am not a Headman; nor am I come hither to treat of matters of that kind, but to go to war."

[393] Ibid.

[394] John Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, pp.140-168. We need to be careful not to accept Grant's words to his superior at face value as Oliphant argues that Grant withheld some information from Amherst in his reports to achieve his own objective of securing a peace treaty with the Cherokees as quickly as possible.

[395] *Ballindalloch Box 33*, James Grant to William Bull, April 17, 1761

five Mohawks who had their own justice system dealing with manslaughter; moreover, the Mohawks fought alongside British troops as allies, and therefore Silver Heels was not subject to British court martial law. Lastly, Grant was in desperate need of Indian warriors to provide vital assistance to the Cherokee expedition to such a degree that he could not afford to lose even one. First and foremost, however, Grant probably had no ability to control them as he himself implied when he wrote, "One does not realy know how to Act" with Indians.

Monypenny's account of the same incident involving Silver Heels mostly agreed with Grant's. Monypenny, however, filled in a missing detail for the possible motive, attributing Silver Heels's violence to "a fit of Drunkenness."[396] Evidently, Monypenny also believed British troops should carry out the execution. "We wish'd, he had been shot, when he committed this outrage," Monypenny wrote, "but his Brethen offering to kill him next Day, Coll. Grant thought it too late, & forbad it."[397] Monypenny also deferred it to his superior's decision and washed his hands of the matter, without protesting Grant's decision or disapproving it. Curiously, Christopher French, who was obsessed with describing killings by Indians in graphic manner, did not record the incident or provide a follow-up to the story.

Despite all the talks of capital punishment from Grant and Monypenny, however, Silver Heels lived and continued to accompany the British troops.[398] Silver Heels's

---

[396] *Diary of Alexander Monypenny*, April 15, 1761, p.322

[397] Ibid.

[398] References to Silver Heels can be also found in the correspondence between Jeffrey Amherst, Thomas Gage, and Sir William Johnson in 1763 and afterwards, working as a messenger for the British army.

incident occurred on the night of April 13 according to Monypenny's account but he appeared in French's diary three weeks later socializing with the Chickasaws.[399] Monypenny also later noted the presence of Silver Heels in July.[400] Silver Heels's escape from the proposed death penalty suggests the degree to which the accompanying Mohawks acted independently from British commanders. After hearing Silver Heels's defense, his fellow Seneca Indians might have decided that Silver Heels's action did not deserve a punishment by death and ignored British officers' demands.

Understanding Indians?

Despite the varying degrees of their attitudes and opinions on Indians, all British officers agreed on one thing: they identified Indian violence as particularly inhumane and cruel. French obsessively recorded the violence with which Indian warriors dismembered their enemies' bodies. For instance, after three hours of fighting in the field against the Cherokees on June 10, the British troops halted and set up a camp to tend their wounded. Here, French offered a graphic account of how a Catawba killed a Cherokee warrior: "[A] Cherokee warrior was brought in" to the camp and "(unlucky for him) was met by a Relation of a Catawba Indian who was kill'd in the Action, who knock'd him down wth. a war club Tomahawk'd & scalp'd him, then blew out his Brains, cut open his Breast, & Belly, & cut off his privy parts, & other ways mangled

---

[399] French, *Journal*, May 6, 1761 Despite the language barrier between War Tomahawk and Silver Heel, French claimed that he and his fellow officer Hodgkinson successfully mediated the communication between the two chiefs with the help of a Chickasaw interpreter "in order to create a good understanding between them."

[400] *Add. Ms. 83699*, Monypenny to William Amherst, July 10, 1761 (London: British Library)

him a most shocking manner."[401] About two weeks later, French described another grim execution of an "old Cherokee" by "our Indians" as they ran "a large stick down his Throat stuck an Arrow into back of his sides, one into his neck & left a Tomahawk sticking in the Head."[402]

Later, amidst the burning and pillaging of Cherokee towns, French managed to find time to explore an Indian burial site and, possibly, attempt a grave robbery. "[O]n our return we were shown a great Rock by that River side under which our Guide told us," French wrote, "a great Warrior was buried sitting, wth. laced cloaths on, & a conjuring Box by him." French admitted that "we had a Curiosity to see him, but when we had open'd the entrance the stench added to our hurry to return prevented our going any farther."[403] French's attempt to open the grave of the Cherokee warrior demonstrated his disregard for the Indian burial site, which he had no qualms about opening to satisfy his curiosity to see a supposedly magical item. His act contrasted starkly with his treatment of the bodies of dead British soldiers, which he burned or threw into a river to prevent Indians from scalping.[404]

French's portrayal of the Catawbas primarily in the frame of violence inflicted on the Cherokees and his attempt rob the burial site suggest a British view of Native Americans in the eighteenth century that emphasized their savagery and exoticness and

---

[401] Ibid., June 10, 1761

[402] Ibid., June 28, 1761, Monypenny to [William Amherst?], June 1, 1761 Monypenny too observed this latest killing by a Catawba warrior but with less fascination: "Here our Indians committed another act of cruelty in killing another old man..."

[403] Ibid., June 27, 1761

[404] See the journal of entries June 11 and June 18, 1761 in French's *Journal of an Expedition to South Carolina*

influenced his choice of events to record. As Merrell conjectures, the Catawbas honed their martial skills because of the open paths to the Iroquois and the Cherokees. Kinship and social obligations among Indians in eastern North America required that they avenge the community's war losses.[405] Unaware of these social and cultural contexts, French clung to his preconceived image of the Indian savagery even though he engaged with them daily throughout the Cherokee expedition. Still, his fascination with supposed Indian barbarity did not preclude him from building a sense of rapport with the Catawbas with whom he fought.

After the campaign ended in late July and the Cherokees and British settled peace terms, French and Kennedy travelled as the British army's envoys to the Catawbas, presumably to thank them for their service to the expedition.[406] The two British officers met with Hagler the next day and celebrated their friendship by sharing rum and food. The Catawbas' hospitality also appeared to move French. "[W]e observed they shew'd us all the Civility in their Power," French wrote, "all the People of their Castle, old & young came & shook hands with us, at night we had a Bear Skin & two Blanketts furnish'd us."[407] Although French might have been an exception, his case suggests that British soldiers who interacted with Indians on a daily basis could, like colonists familiar with the Indian affairs, learn to *get along* with Indians. Grant's Cherokee expedition certainly provided opportunities for British soldiers where they could learn about the indigenous inhabitants of the Southeast.

---

[405] James Merrell, *The Indians' New World*, pp.119-121
[406] French., November 3, 1761
[407] Ibid., November 4, 1761

Although Grant and Monypenny often expressed their disappointment and disdain towards Indians, they acknowledged the contributions southeastern Indians made—particularly the Upper Chickasaws toward the end of the major campaigns against the Cherokees. Grant declared the Chickasaws as "quite a Different Species of People from any other Indians I ever met with" and confessed that he "never could bear an Indian before" but he had become "realy fond of those Chickesaws."[408] The Upper Chickasaws impressed Grant, who saw their discipline and austerity in terms of European military values:

> [T]hey have been sober and regular, they have obeyed every order as much as any Soldier in Camp, they never asked for anything, when other Indians Complained of short allowance of Provisions in the Cherokee Country; they said that they enough, and that Warriors should not eat much; when they went to War I realy believe I might have ordered them to observe a Fast Day or two if it had been thought Necessary.[409]

Monypenny had derided Indian warriors in the expedition but, like Grant, praised the Upper Chickasaws without reservation. Monypenny wrote in astonishment that the Chickasaws "are different from any Indians, I ever saw" because they were "never sulky, always [put] a smile on their Faces, & do what they are desir'd, entering into our Views."

---

[408] *James Grant of Ballindalloch Papers, Box 29*, Grant to Bull, July 15, 1761 [Microfilm: The David Library of the American Revolution]

[409] Ibid.

The Chickasaws also voluntarily gave money to support the British troops' wives and children, which earned gratitude from Monypenny.[410] Monypenny reported that the Chickasaws did "a very charitable thing to our Soldiers Wives & Children, in giving four pence half penny dayly to each of them, above the Number allow'd King's Provision."[411] The Chickasaws' act of generosity particularly touched the soldiers of the 22nd Regiment who received the payment.[412] At least twenty-five soldiers' wives were quartered in the barracks in Charles Town and each wife had two or three children.[413] The soldiers' wives left at Charles Town received relief from the Commons House because of their abject poverty, and this caught the attention of the colonists. The Commons House approved the proposal to allow the women and their children to pay "a sum of 2/6 per Diem" because they were "not Intitled to His Majestys Allowance during the absence of the Army from Charles Town."[414] Colonial government had supported

---

[410] It is unclear how many women accompanied the expedition but it is likely most of the women were left in Charles Town.

[411] *Add. Ms. 83699*, (London: British Library), Monypenny to [William Amherst?], September 1, 1761

[412] Ibid.

[413] *The Journals of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina*, July 30, 1761 (South Carolina Department of Archives and History) Bull addressed the Assembly as followed: "Ensign Milligen of His Majestys Independent Companies who also as Surgeon hath the care of the Soldiers living in the Barracks left behind by Colonel Grant one Account of their Infirm Health hath represented to me that there are 25 Women Soldiers wives over and above the Number who by the Regulations of the Army Receive His Majestys Allowance of Provisions several of these poor Women have also two or three Children to maintain who have long struggled under their Distress with the Scanty share of their Husbands pay when they can no longer support themselves with unless they receive some Assistance from this Province and as by the Poor Acts they cannot properly Considered as parochial Poor I earnestly recommend them to your Care for the time of their remaining here while their Husbands in the Service of this Province against the Cherokees every small Allowance to each will be every great Relief to them and not fell by you but with a Satisfaction in having relieved the Distressed."

[414] Ibid.

soldiers' wives being barred from following their husbands in campaigns in North America.[415]

No wonder, then, that the soldiers of 22nd regiment expressed a gratitude to the Upper Chickasaws who paid four pence and half penny per day to their wives and children given their pay in the army. It is unclear how the Chickasaws learned about the plight of the soldiers' wives and children because Grant and Monypenny forbade women to follow the army. They probably obtained the information directly from the soldiers, which suggests that the Chickasaws and the British troops communicated beyond the subjects limited to military operations. Perhaps both sides developed enough brotherly feeling for one another that enabled the Chickasaw warriors to sympathize with the British troops' family members.

Hunting

As British troops and Indian warriors marched toward Cherokee country, accompanying them as well as the captive Cherokees in tow, Grant's expedition boasted a special unit that physically integrated British troops and Indian warriors. This unit, called the Indian Corps, was commanded by British Captain Quentin Kennedy of the British and James Colbert, a white man, fighting with the Chickasaws. [416] When

---

[415] For instance, during Braddock's expedition when Pennsylvania's assembly voted to provide a financial relief to the wives left out of the expedition.

[416] Fabel, *Colonial Challenges*, p.77 Robin Fabel writes that Amherst scorned "I have no opinion of that kind of gentry" to Grant's proposal to have an Indian unit in his expedition, but it seems Amherst's remark actually referred to Major Roger's "Eight or ten Indians," showing his general disdain for Indian warriors rather than disapproving of the Indian unit in Grant's expedition. The quote is from *James Grant of Ballindalloch papers, Army Career Series, Box 33*, Amherst to Grant, February 27, 1761; See Colin

Monypenny ordered Kennedy to form "The Indians into one Body," Monypenny counted 18 Catawbas, "(9 Chickesaws, the finest Indians I ever saw), 6 Mohawks, and 15 Stockbridges," and more than 30 English and Scottish volunteers.[417] The British soldiers and the Indians shared spaces and spent time together in the woods and mountains at Fort Prince George, at camping sites, and in Cherokee villages. They hunted together, explored the Cherokee country, and shared meals together at camping sites. The Chickasaw and Catawba warriors also scouted ahead for Grant's army, hunted down the fleeing Cherokees, and burned down Cherokee villages.

Hunting constituted an important activity that brought British troops and Indians together in the woods of southeastern North America. Sometimes Indians hunted alone, but that carried the risk of white settlers indiscriminately shooting them out of fear and suspicion. On May 24, Monypenny gave account of a hunting accident involving a Mohawk who accompanied British troops, which he called "a very unlucky Accident."[418] In contrast to Monypenny's somewhat partial tone toward Peter, Grant offered a more stern account when he reported the incident to Amherst. He placed blame solely on Peter for going out alone "contrary to orders" and "his Misfortune was owing

---

Calloway's *White People, Indians, and Highlanders* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), p.99 Quinton Kenny was a Lowland Scot who led Highlanders Indians earlier in the Seven Years' War. He came to America with Braddock in 1755 and survived the slaughter of Monongahela. See also Edward J. Cashin, *Guardians of the Valley*, (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina, 2009)

[417] Monypenny, *Diary*, May 18, 1761; *Add. Ms. 83699*, (London: British Library), Monypenny to William Amherst, June 1, 1761 "Co^{ll} Grant has form'd the Indians into a body, Commanded by C. Kennedy. Indians about 90, & about 40, White Savages."

[418] Ibid., May 6, 1761. "This Afternoon, Peter, one of the Mohawks, who came with us from New York an excellent Fellow, went out a hunting alone; He had wounded a Deer, & was tracking it, when discover'd by a Man, who was one of several (ten) who had lately (last Year) abandon'd their settlements hereabouts for Fear of the Cherokees, and were collecting their Horses & cattle in the wood; He took Peter for a Cherokee, & shot him thro the shoulder; a very unlucky Accident."

to himself, for I allow none of them to go into the Woods, but when they have white men along with them."[419]

Although Grant supposedly "ordered" that Indians must hunt together with British troops to prevent white settlers from shooting the Indian allies indiscriminately, it is unlikely that young Indian warriors would have followed such instructions.[420] Not only did many Indians resist British claims to authority, Peter also may have believed that the presence of British soldiers would have compromised his ability to track and kill a deer. For instance, French told an anecdote that revealed British troops' lack of hunting skills in the American woods. French went out hunting with twelve of his men "for fear of meeting any Cherokees" but the party soon got lost and wandered in the woods even though he had a compass. French's hunting party also did not have "the good Fortune to kill any Thing."[421]

African Pioneers in Grant's Expedition

Suffice it to say that British soldiers needed Indians whether in hunting or fighting against the enemies, but African pioneers also aided Grant's army in significant ways. As French recorded the progress of the expedition's march to Fort Ninety Six, he made an unusual passing reference to "blacks" working for the British army. Because of rough terrain and abundant creeks and rivers on the path, the troops employed "Pioneers" to build bridges and pave roads. As French wrote in his diary, the British

---

[419] War Office 34/37, James Grant to Jeffrey Amherst, June 2, 1761
[420] Alexander Monypenny, *Diary*, May 6, 1761
[421] French, May 25, 1761. On the same date of entry, Monypenny simple wrote, "Halted."

army "mended the Road w. the black Pioneers as we march'd."[422] Grant also requested from Lieutenant Governor Bull camp kettles for the pioneers, which suggest that he valued the tasks pioneers carried out in the expedition enough to attend their needs and relay their requests to the Lieutenant Governor.[423] As Bull accepted Grant's request, he hoped that the pioneers "behave with much diligence expertness & order as to give you Satisfaction," suggesting that both colonial elites and British officers understood that the presence of African pioneers was critical to the success of expedition as the army ventured into the Cherokee country.[424]

Although the British officers did not give voices to the African pioneers in their written records during the expedition, they must have communicated with the British troops, exchanging information about the surrounding geography as they built bridges and paved roads while venturing deep into the Cherokee country. Christopher French relayed a similar reference on the local knowledge of African-descended people the following year, when the British sailed to conquer French Dominique in 1762. French wrote that British troops took "negro men & women Prisoners" and grilled them for geographic information.[425]

---

[422] French, *Journal of an Expedition to South Carolina*, April 26, 1761; Alexander Monypenny, *Diary of Alexander Monypenny*, May 5, 1761 Monypeny also recorded a similar entry to French's when he wrote "sending on the Pioneers &c. to mend the Road."

[423] *Ballindallloch Papers, Box 33,* James Grant to William Bull, April 2, 1761 (Edinburgh: National Records of Scotland) "Our Negroes begin to come in, I fancy we shall get our Number but I have got no Camp Kettles for them. I wish You would be so good as to Order the Commissary to send up Ten Kettles for them which may be paid for out of this pay or in what other manner you think Proper."

[424] Ibid., Bull to James Grant, May 16, 1761 (Edinburgh: National Records of Scotland)

[425] Christopher French, *Journal of a Voyage from Charles Town South Carolina to Dominique in the West Indies, Volume 1 Part 2* February 4, 1762 (Microfilm; Library of Congress, Washington D.C.)

In addition to working for the British army as pioneers clearing paths, enslaved Africans worked as wagoners carrying provisions to the troops on the campaign trail. Monypenny found "Some Negroe Slaves" among the Provincial Rangers whom Grant reviewed at Fort Ninety Six.[426] Once Grant's troops entered the abandoned Cherokee settlements and applied "scorched-earth" tactics, black pioneers assisted the fatigued British troops in torching Cherokee villages and corn fields. In his pocketbook journal, Grant recorded "Some corn was destroyed by the Rangers & Negroe Pioneers" since "the Troops were realy not fit to act" while he "reduced the Duty as much as possible to recover & set them to rights with two or three nights sleep."[427] Some pioneers also repaired the forts when they did not accompany the army and were left behind.[428]

Charles Town without British Troops

With the British and provincial troops gone to the Cherokee country, Charles Town's colonists became anxious and fearful that a slave insurrection might occur. The Cherokee prisoners (one man and two women) locked up in the armory house escaped, probably taking the advantage of Charles Town's absence of patrol force. This incident

---

[426] *Add. Ms. 83699*, (London: British Library), Monypenny to [William Amherst?], June 1, 1761. Precise number of "negroes" in Grant's expedition is not clear though the editors E. Raymond Evans and Duane H. King in the transcription of French's journal printed in *Journal of Cherokee Studies*, Volume 2 No. 3 (Summer, 1977) gives the exact figure of 81 although neither did Grant's return of troops from the Ballindalloch manuscripts nor Alexander Monypenny's papers. They only show 40 "Negro Pioneers," divided into two units. For evidence, see *Ballindalloch Papers, Box 33* and *Add. Ms. 83699*, (London: British Library), July 10, 1761

[427] *Ballindallloch Papers, Box 33,* July 30 and 31, 1761

[428] John Moultrie to Grant, Ninety Six, April 10, 1761. Moultrie reported to Grant that "There be also 7 negroes, these also stay; I shall keep them at work building the Store house and enlarging the fort untill, I hear from you, as Bell told me you desired he might keep all the negroes in the Service." In a rare instance, "a free Negro" worked as a surgeon for the South Carolina's provincial army. See *Journals of Commons House of Assembly*, January 16, 1761

sparked a commotion among the inhabitants of Charles Town that revealed the degree to which fear over slave insurrections persisted during the Seven Years' War. Reaction to the Cherokees' escape also demonstrated that the presence of British troops in Charles Town had indeed provided a psychological comfort to the colonists. Although the incident started off with the Cherokees, the colonial elites quickly bolstered the town's security to suppress any suspicious behaviors among slaves.

The colonists initially suspected the Creeks visiting in Charles Town of helping the Cherokees to escape.[429] In response to this accusation, the Creek headmen immediately denied "having the least knowledge of the escape of the said prisoners" and promised to either capture them or bring their scalps.[430] Bull then expressed a concern to the Council that the lack of "guard or watch in the town since the departure of the regular forces" could bring "many evil consequences" and noted that "several gentlemen had voluntarily undertaken to perform watch duty by turns." The colonists searched for runaway slaves and detained "thirteen negroes" and arrested one slave "who insulted the guard" after a pursuit. In addition, the colonists spotted two slaves on horseback late at night without their passes. One of the slaves ran away but "the other was apprehended and secured in the Guard House, a bayonet was found on him."[431] Ironically, only a couple of days after the colonists' outrageous accusation against the Creeks and cracking down on the slaves, they captured the fugitive Cherokees and brought them back to

---

[429] *His Majesty's Council Journals of South Carolina*, June 17, 1761 (Columbia, S.C.: microfilm at SCDAH)

[430] Ibid.

[431] Ibid., June 16, 1761 (Columbia, S.C.: microfilm at SCDAH)

Charles Town who "were again secured in the former place of confinement."[432] This incident demonstrated that the colonists' constant fear over Charles Town's black population amplified during the Cherokee wars as they connected seemingly disparate incidents as evidence of a conspiracy. The escape of Cherokee prisoners not only prompted the colonists to bolster the patrol over the black population, but also hastily accused the visiting Creeks as accomplices, indicating the level of their paranoia.

The long absence of British and provincial troops in Charles Town for nearly five months might have encouraged slaves to run away. Even after the heightened security and crackdown on Charles Town's resident slaves, Grant also lost his slaves while encamped at Fort Prince George with his troops. Henry Laurens, a prominent South Carolina planter apologized to Grant in November of 1761: "I am ashamed to inform you that three of the four Negroes which you caused to be put under the care of the Provincial Qu[arter] Guard have escaped."[433] This incident revealed that slaves continued to run away from Charles Town as slave patrols weakened while the colonists' attention was focused on the war effort. The Anglo-Cherokee War opened a greater window of opportunity for the resident slaves to run away, while some participated in the war as the pioneers hoping to obtain freedom.

***

The Cherokee expedition of 1761 was far more complex than a simple story of British troops marching into the Cherokee country and laying waste to their cornfields.

---

[432] Ibid., June 19, 1761 (Columbia, S.C.: microfilm at SCDAH)

[433] *Ballindallloch Papers, Box 33,* Henry Laurens to James Grant, November 15, 1761 (Edinburgh: National Records of Scotland)

The Highlander officers of the British army, Montgomery and Grant, became the reluctant commanders of the Cherokee expedition, although neither exhibited much desire to commit to the interests of South Carolina. From the British officers' perspective, the colonists shared responsibility for causing an unneeded conflict that wasted the time and resources of the British army. At a personal level, James Grant deemed the Cherokee expeditions in the Southeast a distraction to earn him a fast promotion in the ranks of the British army.

Daily interactions that took place between the British soldiers and the Indian warriors who joined Grant's expedition provide an interesting counterpoint to Forbes's Fort Duquesne expedition fraught with condemnations against the Indian warriors by the British officers. The Chickasaws, Catawbas, and Mohawks accompanying the British troops provided vital contributions to the British war effort but also various daily incidents or accidents also revealed the nature of Indian-British relations in the war. British officers wished to exert authority over the Indian warriors but often failed, as the Indians freely ignored the British army regulations. It was not a coincidence that the British officers praised the Upper Chickasaws who obeyed their orders without complaints and stayed with the British troops till the end, while excoriating the Catawbas and the Lower Chickasaws who abandoned the expedition in the midway. While it is difficult to ascertain how the Indian warriors viewed the British troops, the varying actions from the Catawbas and the Upper Chickasaws suggest that they created a sense of fraternity as they welcomed British officers visiting their country or paid money to the British soldiers' wives and children.

African pioneers also contributed to Grant's Cherokee expedition immeasurably as they mended roads, built bridges, repaired forts, transported wagons, and burned the Cherokee cornfields. Some of these pioneers might have persuaded their masters to let them join the British army, hoping that lending their skills to the British troops would win their freedom eventually. Ironically, as the African pioneers played an instrumental role for Grant's expedition, the slaves who remained in Charles Town used the lax security and patrols to runaway for their freedom as the 1500 acres of Cherokee villages and cornfields burned.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION: BRITISH TROOPS, EMPIRE, AND THE SOUTHEAST

As King's Troops representing the British monarch, the British troops in the Southeast disrupted but also assimilated into the social relations of the Southeast built on colonial notions of race, ethnicity, and class. Recruited from the British domains in Europe and the British Isles and North America, these troops projected a distinctive martial identity to the indigenous, creole, and enslaved peoples of North America. Although officers attempted to assert authority over colonial men in the name of His Majesty's Troops, they met with stiff resistance and opposition from the colonists. Consequently, the British troops came to terms with the workings of the Southeast. Only after the Cherokee War erupted in 1760 did colonists readily comply with the demands of British officers, as long as they repelled the Cherokee attacks on the colonial forts. High-ranking British officers wielded power and authority that challenged that of the colonial elites but brought different interests and attitudes. In particular, the British officers did not support the colonists' aggressive Indian policies against the Cherokees and showed great reluctance to fight on behalf of ungrateful colonists unwilling to provide provisions and shelters for the King's Troops. But when it came to expanding their economic fortunes in North America in addition to their army salary, the British officers actively learned from and emulated the leading planters of Charles Town.

While British junior officers and rank-and-file possessed modest socioeconomic status that did not allow them to partake in the Southeast's plantation economy or

rapidly climb up the social ladders within the British army, they nevertheless contributed to the urban economy of Charles Town and had destabilizing effects on the colonial Southeast through their social interactions with its inhabitants. Henry Bouquet's and Archibald Montgomery's account books reveal extensive economic activity when the troops were quartered in Charles Town, showing transactions involving arms repairs, transportation, clothing, and provisioning.[434] Renting rooms and billeting quarters for officers proved most profitable to those inhabitants with extra rooms in their homes. While the Royal American or Highlander rank-and-file stayed in rundown barracks, they nevertheless spurred economic activity in Charles Town. The artisans and workshop owners producing provisions for the troops, such as candles, pepper, beds, hay, and sheets, applied for public credit after supplying the contracted goods to the British army. In addition, Bouquet's disdainful description of his troops' sorry state of drunkenness and the court martial records of intoxicated offenses suggested the rank-and-file's thirst for alcohol created a sizeable demand for liquor.

The quartering of Bouquet's Royal Americans and Scottish Highlanders from the summer of 1757 to the spring of 1758 represents a misunderstood moment in colonial history. Because of the vocal debates over fiscal and constitutional issues among the Anglo-Americans with the advent of the Quartering Act of 1765, historians, too, have overlooked how British troops' occupation of the urban spaces in Charles Town affected social relations implicating race, class, ethnicity, and gender that ultimately shaped the

---

[434] For instance, see Bouquet's Account [B.M., Add, MSS. 21633, f.6-8] and Montgomery's ledgers from *Ballindalloch Papers*, *Box 49*

course of the quartering dispute. British troops' quartering in Charles Town revealed an abundance of intercultural relations only possible in the Southeast. Such interactions went beyond British regulars and provincial soldiers bickering over differential treatment, disagreeing over tactics, or disputing the defraying of military expenses and quartering. While quartered in Charles Town for months in 1757 and 1761, the British troops participated in formal and informal exchanges (including those of a criminal nature such as robbing, stealing, and assaulting) with the colonists, southeastern Indians (Cherokees, Creeks, and Catawbas), and free and enslaved Africans.

Of course, British soldiers were not passive recipients of the Southeast's political economy and culture. The British officers and rank-and-file also maintained a sense of superiority over the provincials. They often showed condescension toward the southern colony and its inhabitants for their perceived backwardness. Nearly all British officers at times criticized the provincial soldiers' lack of discipline and the civilian colonists' self-interestedness.[435] They also acted as agents of change in the Southeast as they brought their own cultural baggage and experiences from Europe, Britain, and the northern colonies. For instance, Bouquet and the European officers belonging to the Royal American regiment contributed to the fortification of Fort Johnson and Port Royal thanks to their engineering expertise. Bouquet instructed the South Carolinians how to

---

[435] For instance, see *James Grant of Ballindalloch papers, Army Career Series, Box 33*, Grant to Bull, Camp at Congarees, April 27, 1761 "Cap^{n}. Brown who should have been at Ninety Six with his Company, was here when we arrived, amusing himself with Rum wherever he could find it, & not thinking of Collecting the men together, Cap^{n}. Russell had either a real or pretended fit of sickness, & his men were not here as they were ordered, to receive our Cattle…The Officers are worse than the Men. This same Old Drunken Cap^{n}. Brown should be sent about his Business I would not give him his Ration of Provisions for all the service he will do he publick."

construct barracks. The British soldiers not only transmitted knowledge related to military operations but also acted as conduits of information, bringing news from all over the Atlantic world and sending information about the Southeast back to the British army's headquarters in New York, and their families in Scotland, England, Ireland, and Continental Europe.

Situated in the unfamiliar surroundings in the Southeast, British troops initiated, often out of necessity, extensive intercultural and social relations with their Catawba, Creek, and Chickasaw allies. These exchanges between British troops and Indians took place in the streets, markets, barracks, and public buildings of Charles Town. They shared vital information with one another about their joint plans to subdue the Cherokees and they affirmed their bonds of alliance through participating in various diplomatic and military rituals. For instance, British regulars' firing of rounds to impress the Creek Wolf King exposed the weakness of British troops and their tactics in the warfare against the Cherokees. In addition, these interactions revealed British officers' desire to establish Indian-British relations in terms of respect and deference in which the British positioned themselves as superior and the Indians inferior. But the Wolf King's quip regarding British troops' inefficiency and ineptitude demonstrated that the Indians did not care at all about British presumptions, which insulted the pride of British officers.

The generalization of the British-Provincial officers' attitude toward Indians based on the campaigns in the Ohio Country needs a careful reassessment. For instance, Fred Anderson writes that George Washington "shunned" Indians as allies because, as a land speculator, he wanted to remove the Indian presence from the Ohio Valley, and also

because he could not move beyond his humiliating defeat at the hands of Indians at Monongahela.[436] Anderson also characterizes Washington's attitude towards the Cherokees as an unflattering one.[437] In the context of the Fort Duquesne expedition in which the Cherokees played a vital role, however, the situation was reversed. Washington pressured Forbes to take immediate action, suggesting that if he did not the Cherokees might look down on him as a coward, stinging the Scottish Brigadier-General's haughty pride. Washington also disagreed with Bouquet over the usefulness of the Cherokees, insisting that "Scalping Partys" of Cherokees would be more effective in harassing the enemies than "any Partys of white people can do."[438]

In the Southeast, British troops' relations with Native Americans extended far beyond fighting together in the Cherokee Country. The Fort Duquesne Expedition of 1758 revealed the significant role the Cherokees and Catawbas played in the coalition of British and colonial armies. Gift-giving practices between the Cherokees and the British affected not only the expedition but also the ensuing Anglo-Cherokee War in 1760. As Gregory Dowd shows, both the Cherokees and British understood the reciprocal expectations related to gift-giving practices but "the definition of the bond embodied by the gift" had significant cultural differences, which soured the Cherokee-British relations

---

[436] Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War*, p.106

[437] Ibid., p. 204 "Although Lieutenant Governor Dinwiddie made efforts to supplement Washington's forces with Catawba and made efforts to supplement Washington's forces with Catawba and Cherokee warriors imported from the Carolinas, Washington never found them to be more than burdensome: they consumed inordinate amounts of supplies, came and went as they pleased, and generally "behaved very insolently" when he tried to employ them as scouts."

[438] Washington to Bouquet , July 16, 1758, *The Papers of George Washington*, *Colonial Series 5*, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1984), p.291

during the Fort Duquesne expedition.[439] This study confirms much of Dowd's argument that the British officers in charge of gift-giving to the Cherokees—John Forbes and Henry Bouquet—not only disdained the Cherokees but also believed they must correct "the insolent behaviors" of Cherokees, which meant putting an end to generous gifts.

Slavery and the plantation economy of the Southeast had a long lasting impact on the British officers' future careers, social mobility, and economic fortunes. Although the presence of significant numbers of British troops in Charles Town ended with the conclusion of the Cherokee expedition of 1761, social ties and networks British officers had built with the colonial elites remained in effect as they continued via correspondence and business transactions. Both the top ranking British officers, Col. Henry Bouquet and Lt. Col. James Grant, who once visited Charles Town, maintained social and economic connections with the inhabitants of Charles Town. They continued to correspond with their proxies and friends after their departures in 1758 and 1761, respectively.

For the officers of status and connections within the British army like Bouquet and Grant, the Southeast presented an ideal opportunity to expand their wealth, following the examples of local elite planters. The plantation economy of the Southeast quickly tempted British officers with social connections and economic means to try out their luck in rice and indigo plantations. Despite the short duration of their military assignments in South Carolina, Bouquet and Grant capitalized on their social status and networks within the British army to establish connections with the local elites of Charles

---

[439] Gregory Dowd, "Gift Giving and the Cherokee-British Alliance," in *Contact Points* ed. Andrew R.L. Cayton and Fredrika J. Teute (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), p.138

Town. With the help of established local planters and merchants, British officers readily used their monetary credit from North America, Europe, and Britain to acquire slaves, plantations, and hire managers to run their properties, while they campaigned elsewhere.

James Grant perhaps best represents a British officer consumed by the power of slavery and the plantation economy in the Southeast. Grant briefly went back to Britain in 1762 but soon returned to North America as the Governor of East Florida--a newly created British territory acquired from Spain by the Treaty of 1763. During his eight-year tenure as the Governor of East Florida from 1763 to 1771 in St. Augustine, Grant sought to transform Florida into a colony of South Carolina, an idea John Barnwell had presented to the Board of Trade some fifty years before. He immediately made use of connections with the planters and merchants in South Carolina he befriended. Indeed, Grant appointed numerous South Carolinians to key offices in East Florida and "imported" people from South Carolina and Georgia to populate the colony.[440] Consequently, many South Carolinians filled important official positions in East Florida. John Savage, James Moultrie, John Moultrie (who expressed his fondness and friendship with Grant during the Cherokee expeditions), John Holmes, John Ainslie, and William Drayton filled councils and courts of the new colony.[441]

Grant also continued to build on the relationship he established with John Stuart during the Cherokee expedition. Stuart became the new Indian Superintendent of the southern colonies following the death of Edmond Atkin in 1762. This collaboration

---

[440] Paul David Nelson, *General James Grant* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1993), p.48
[441] Ibid., p.61

proved crucial for Grant who had to manage East Florida's relations with the Seminoles, Creeks, Chickasaws, Choctaws, and others in the region. In addition, Grant also used his Highlander connections to speculate on East Florida's land, trying to resell it to people on the other side of the Atlantic. He asked Lord Adam Gordon—a fellow Highlander who visited St. Augustine—to advertise the prospect of East Florida by organizing the East Florida Society of London; this ambitious colonization effort failed, however. During his eight years of tenure as the Governor of East Florida, Grant further strengthened ties with South Carolina as he visited Charles Town regularly to see his friends and became a member of the St. Andrew's Society.[442]

Henry Bouquet's Walnut Hill plantation near Charles Town also illustrates the arrogant Swiss-British officer succumbing to the pervasive power of the plantation economy in the Southeast. After his departure from Charles Town after quarreling with South Carolina's legislature in 1758, he continued correspondence with his property managers. During his short nine-month stay, however, Bouquet relied on his Swiss connections in the British army—Colonels James Prevost and Frederick Haldimand—and the local Swiss resident Andrew Fesch, his brother Rodolph, and his wife Sophia. In 1761, Sophia Fesch reported to Bouquet that his plantation had a good prospect of making a handsome profit. "I shall only tell you that the weather is at its best and that the plantation has never been so flourishing," Sophia wrote, "everything is in order, all is

[442] Ibid., pp.58-72

quiet, and we hope to have a good harvest."[443] Soon, however, a dispute between Bouquet's managers threatened the fate of his plantations as powerful South Carolinian merchants like Benjamin Rattray and Robert Raper used their connections in London to ruin Bouquet's property.[444] In a desperate attempt to stop the confiscation of his indebted property from his creditors, Bouquet begged "the said lands and Negroes" not to be taken away from his managers in Charles Town.[445] By January 1763, however, Bouquet's plantation was completely liquidated. This event also forced Sophia Fesch, now a widow after her husband's death, to leave South Carolina and depart to Italy--"the only refuge" for her. She became disgusted with her misfortune in South Carolina: "I leave this wretched world, which, I confess to you, will be without regret," wrote the exasperated Swiss widow, "I have suffered too much in it."[446]

Rodolph Fesch, a brother of Andrew Fesch, arrived in Charles Town from the West Indies to console the grief-stricken widow and recommended to Bouquet that he pay one last visit to Charles Town to close the business of his liquidated plantation. "Is not the investment you have in this province worth the trouble for you to make a trip here?" Fesch wrote, "It seems so to me, and if you were here for a couple of months you could arrange your affairs and give your orders, so that your interests would suffer small

---

[443] Sophia Fesch to Bouquet, Charles Town, September 4, 1761 [B.M., Add. MSS. 21647, f. 130, A.L.S.], Vol. 8, pp. 101-102

Ibid., Sophia Fesch claimed that a young man named Andrew Dellient brought troubles when he attempted to "drive us away and take possession of everything. "He came to the plantation where he gave him airs by giving orders to the overseer," Sophia wrote, "Fortunately, I was there, or there would have been great confusion, for neither the overseer nor the negroes knew what to do."

[445] Bouquet to John Rattray, Fort Pitt, June 13, 1761 [B.M., Add. MSS. 21646, f. 274, C.] Vol.7, p.204

[446] Sophia Fesch to Bouquet, Charles Town, January 25, 1763 [B.M., Add. MSS. 21649, f. 31, A.L.S] Vol. 11, p.26

loss."[447] This suggests that Bouquet had indeed invested a considerable sum of capital in South Carolina. Bouquet never returned to Charles Town nor replied to Sophia and Rodolph. He died as a bitter man in the Ohio Country in 1764, fighting and cursing the Indians there till his death in the wake of Pontiac's War. Ultimately, Bouquet's actions spoke louder than his scathing words against the southern colonists; in fact, privately, he strived to become one of the local planters.

British officers not only recognized the usefulness of slaves for their tasks but also clearly understood the social implications of slavery and race in the Southeast, often taking advantage of the context to strengthen the condemnations of ungrateful colonists knowing the power race held for colonists. The British forces in Charles Town employed a considerable number of enslaved Africans for the fortification works and for the Cherokee expedition as pioneers, which opened up a possibility for those slaves to petition for freedom. The British officers railed against at the planters for their unwillingness to provide their slaves for the British army. In the eyes of British officers, the African pioneers' skills were invaluable for the success of expedition and their labor crucial to complete the fortification projects. As much as the Commons House of Assembly's parsimony over providing money for provisions and quarters for the troops irritated the British officers, the planters' unwillingness to loan their slaves for the British army angered them. Equally, Bouquet also found the colonists' treatment of King's Troops unacceptable when they offended his sensibility by providing his troops

---

[447] Capt. R. Fesch to Bouquet, January 25, 1763 [B.M., Add. MSS. 21649, f. 32, A.L.S.] Vol. 11, p.28

with fewer blankets than they did for their "negro slaves." Although Bouquet disdained his rank-and-file soldiers for their drunkenness and wretchedness, he found it useful to appropriate the language of race and slavery to condemn the colonists in his report to Loudoun. Similarly, Grant and Monypenny complained to their superiors and friends in New York about planters hiding their slaves in order to dodge the British army's efforts to conscript them.

The Royal Americans and Scottish Highlanders quartered in Charles Town in 1757 also brought simmering ethnic tensions between Scottish and German colonists to the surface. Ethnic tensions between Scots and the German-speaking "Dutch" also shaped the British troops' experiences in the Southeast. The German-speaking background of Bouquet and his Royal American regiment met both formal and informal opposition from Charles Town's elites and middling sorts. Charles Town's elites, large numbers of whom claimed Scottish descent, resented Bouquet and his coterie buying properties, as well as the Swiss Colonel's decision to remove the newly arrived Highlanders and instead garrison the town with the German-speaking Royal Americans. The workshop owners dependent on the labor of European indentured servants resented Bouquet's Royal Americans because their own German-speaking servants ran away to join Bouquet's regiment. The Commission of the Lower House of Assembly also singled out "Dutch" soldiers from Bouquet's Royal Americans for stealing wood. Lastly, those soldiers accused and convicted of drunkenness, desertion, and assaults who appear in the court martial records all hailed from Bouquet's Royal American regiment. No single case of a Highlander facing such accusations appear in the court martial records, which

suggests that the inhabitants of Charles Town might have harbored more animosity towards German-speaking soldiers and more often reported their delinquent behavior to the authorities.

British troops' interactions with colonial, Indian, and African women in the Southeast exhibited both mutually beneficial and exploitative relations. Although high-ranking British officers looked down on the prospect of marrying colonial women, some British officers did so anyway. They also socialized with elite colonial women as they attended entertainments in playhouses and dined together in private houses. British rank-and-file soldiers sequestered in terrible, rundown barracks had fewer opportunities to have social interactions with colonial white women. They sometimes sexually assaulted colonial women and may have frequented brothels. Members of the British rank-and-file also sexually exploited and raped Cherokee women imprisoned in the town's jail. British officer Alexander Monypenny openly had sexual relations with African mistresses, making himself a subject of gossip among his peers, but such behaviors did not affect his reputation as a competent officer. In fact, Grant praised Monypenny for his diligence and expertise in the Cherokee expedition of 1761.[448]

For southeastern Indians, the British troops were a mixed blessing. In the eyes of the Cherokees, the British troops were no better than the colonists. John Forbes and Henry Bouquet disrespected the Cherokee warriors' service in the Fort Duquesne expedition by their stingy gift giving. Archibald Montgomery and James Grant

---

[448] *WO 34/47,* Grant to Amherst, July 10, 1761 "I should not do Justice to Major Monypenny if I did not inform Your Excellency, that he has been extremely diligent & attentive & of great use to me upon all Occasions."

devastated their land and brought suffering to their people. Still, two Highland officers generally sympathized with the Cherokees' cause against the South Carolinians and worked to negotiate peace terms acceptable to the Cherokees, because their disdain for the South Carolinians rivaled their disdain for the Cherokees. On the other hand, the Catawbas received promises of a new fort under the British protection and a resident trader in their country for assisting the British against the Cherokees, but they paid a steep price. The outbreak of small pox during the Fort Duquesne expedition and the colonists' unwillingness to keep their end of bargain and make additional gifts left them shortchanged. The Chickasaws, who participated in Grant's expedition of 1761, earned a genuine respect for their martial skills, discipline, and their gifts to the soldiers' wives and children from the Highland officer, and they also received generous gifts for their service. Nevertheless, their long-term survival in the southeast among the Creeks and other Indian nations nearby remained uncertain as neither the British troops nor colonial soldiers could protect them without a British fort erected in their country. Still, the southeastern Indians' geopolitical balance of powers remained relatively intact by the conclusion of the Seven Years' War. With the official exit of French presence from the Southeast, however, they would soon face tremendous upheaval.

Some enslaved Africans of South Carolina saw possibilities to gain their freedom by siding with the British army against the Cherokees. Although the British army probably did not treat the African pioneers any better than they did the Catawba and Chickasaw warriors in the expeditions, Grant and Monypenny found them important enough to circulate recruitment advertisements in Charles Town and request additional

supplies and provisions for them. British officers like Bouquet and Grant, however, were happy to enslave more Africans as they purchased "negros" from local slave traders to run their own plantations near Charles Town and St. Augustine.

British troops' experience in the southern colonies yields a different picture of intercultural relations than in the northern colonies where scholars and historians have focused. The pivotal battles around the Ohio Country, New York, Pennsylvania, and Canada have attracted the lion's share of historians' attention to the northern theaters. To be sure, these places provided plentiful opportunities for intercultural exchanges with the Six Nations, Shawnees, Delawares, Ohioans, and many others. In the Southeast, however, the presence of a plantation economy, racial slavery, and the geopolitical dynamics of southeastern Indian nations provided a different context for British troops than their counterparts faced in the north.

For British officers, the absence of highly valuable strategic towns or forts to conquer against the French empire in the Southeast deprived them of the chances to pursue military glory and fame. As a result, Bouquet spent the idle nine months in South Carolina disputing with the Commons House of Assembly over quartering the British troops, acting as the military advisor and administrator in "the southern provinces," and purchasing plantations and slaves. A few years later, Archibald Montgomery and James Grant reluctantly led the British troops in the Cherokee Wars of 1760 and 1761 in which they disagreed with the South Carolinians' policies against the Cherokees. These disagreements, however, ultimately mattered little as the British officers followed the orders of the North American commander-in-chief Jeffrey Amherst, whose power was

also limited by colonial politics and opposition. Thus, British officers with social status and economic means in Charles Town sought to make their unwanted assignment to the region into a profitable opportunity as they courted local planters and purchased slaves and plantations.

Some subaltern British officers involved in the Southeast during the Seven Years' War extended their military careers to the American Revolutionary War. Christopher French represented one of these subaltern British officers climbing the career ladder of the British army during the Seven Years' War and the War of American Independence. After the Cherokee expedition of 1761, French sailed through the West Indies to participate in the British expeditions against French Dominique and Havana. In 1764, French returned to the mainland as he embarked on an expedition along the Mississippi River from Louisiana. His illustrious career as the Captain of the 17th and 22nd Regiment apparently earned him a promotion to colonel. To be sure, not all British soldiers had such success either in military or civilian careers. Rodolph Fesch, the brother of Andrew Fesch, expressed his frustration to Bouquet after two years of service in the West Indies because he earned no promotion beyond captain: "This profession is not worth a damn to anyone who has no influence in the proper places."[449]

Although we do not have ample evidence of how the British rank-and-file under the command of Bouquet and Grant viewed the various inhabitants of the Southeast, they nevertheless made exchanges with the inhabitants of Charles Town as they

---

[449] Capt. R. Fesch to Bouquet, January 25, 1763 [B.M., Add. MSS. 21649, f. 32, A.L.S.] Vol. 11, p.28

frequently shared public spaces. Despite relative isolation and the curtailed mobility once quartered in barracks, the British rank-and-file continued to interact with colonists and enslaved Africans in Charles Town through informal social and economic exchanges as the soldiers bartered, deserted, got drunk, shared public spaces in church and the town's square, and committed crimes among inhabitants. They also interacted extensively with the southeastern Indians during the Cherokee and Fort Duquesne expeditions.

The mobility of the King's Troops and the global scale of warfare in the eighteenth century allowed them to assume their role as the foremost and formidable imperial agents for the British Empire. Although unity against the French and her Indian allies helped to maintain a shared political identity as the King's subjects and some cultural cohesiveness as Britons among the colonists, British troops in the Southeast maintained their distinct identity as cultural outsiders. When British soldiers had first-hand contacts with the southeastern Indians and did not rely on the filtered information via colonial Indian agents, they could develop sympathetic attitudes toward the Indian perspectives that served the British interest better than did the parochial interests of colonists, as in the Cherokee Wars of 1760-61.

While British soldiers often judged the inhabitants of the Southeast based on their notions of race, class, and gender to maintain their identity as King's Troops, these differences did not preclude their pursuit of economic interests with the local planters or their sharing of social and physical spaces with Indians and enslaved Africans. Furthermore, these examples drawn from the "southern frontier" complicate the question

of whether the British empire integrated or disintegrated in the aftermath of the Seven Years' War. While the British army's protection from possible slave insurrections and contributions to the local economy strengthened the bonds among British subjects across the Atlantic, disagreement over the policies toward the Native Americans in the region proved divisive.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Manuscripts

British Library, London

Add MSS 21,631-660: The Bouquet Papers, 1757-65

Add MSS 21,661-892: The Haldimand Papers, 1756-90

Add MSS 22,680: Miscellaneous Papers relating to America, 1739-1772

Add MSS 25,411: Grant Family Correspondence, Vol. VII, 1754-57

Add MSS. 33,029: Papers relating to the affairs of the American and West Indian Colonies, consisting of instructions, memoranda, memoirs, petitions, and other documents which passed through the Duke of Newcastle's hands in the course of public business, 1701-1768

Add MSS. 35,910: Hardwicke Papers. Vol. DLXII. American Papers, 1759-1764

Add. MSS. 83,699: Alexander Moneypenny, entry-book as brigade-major, relating to his service with the British army in North America, in the New York area and elsewhere, 1759-1761

National Archives, Kew

Colonial Office

CO 5: America and West Indies

War Office

WO 34: Amherst Papers

WO 71: Courts Martial, Proceedings.

National Records of Scotland, Edinburgh

Gifts and Deposits

GD 219: Papers of the Murray Family of Murraythwaite, Dumfriesshire

GD 77: Papers of the Fergusson family of Craigdarroch, Dumfriesshire

GD 45: Papers of the Maule Family, Earls of Dalhousie

GD 494: Papers of General James Grant of Ballindalloch

The Library of Congress, Washington D.C.

Christopher French Papers, 1756-1778

South Caroliniana Library, Columbus, SC

James Grant to Alexander Brodie, 1757

Pennsylvania Historical Society, Philadelphia

Thomas Barton Diary, 1758

The Newberry Library, Chicago

Sir William Johnson Letters, 1755-1773

Henry Van Schaack Papers, 1756-1809

George Croghan Letters, 1763-1770

Sir Alexander Cuming Papers, 1734-1767

William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor

William Henry Lyttelton Papers, 1730-1806

Thomas Gage Papers, 1754-1807

Huntington Library, San Marino

Loudoun Papers

Abercromby Papers

Loudoun's Notebook (Huntington Manuscript 1717)

South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston, SC

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Letter books, 1702-1786 (Microfilms)

Gubbins, M.C.B. Transcripts and abstracts of Moultrie family papers, 1746-1965

William R. Coe Collection, 1699-1741

South Carolina Department of Archives and History

His Majesty's Council Journals of South Carolina (Microfilms and manuscripts)

The Journals of the Commons House of Assembly (Manuscripts)

Small Library, Charlottesville, University of Virginia

Headquarters Papers related to John Forbes's Expedition to Fort Duquesne, 1758

Printed primary sources

Adair, James. *History of the American Indians*. (London: 1775) ed. Kathryn E. Holland Braund (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, c2005)

The Correspondence of the three William Byrds of Westover, Virginia, 1684-1776, Vol. 2 ed. Marion Tinling (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1977)

De Brahm, William. *Report of the General Survey in the Southern District of North America* ed. Louis De Vorsey, Jr. (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina, 1971)

Gadsden, Christopher. *Some Observations of the Two Campaigns against the Cherokee Indians.* (Charles-Town [S.C.]: Printed and sold by Peter Timothy, MDCCLXII. 1762)

Milligen, George. *A Short Description of the Province of South-Carolina*. (London: Printed for John Hinton, 1770)

Hutson, William. "A Faithful Ambassador": The Diary of Rev. William Hutson, Pastor of the Independent Meeting in Charleston, 1757-1761**,** *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*, Vol. 107, No. 4 (Oct., 2006)

The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, Nov. 20, 1755-July 6, 1757, *Vol.14* ed. J. H. Easterby (Columbia, S.C.: Historical Commission of South Carolina, 1989)

Johnson, Sir William. *The Papers of Sir William Johnson*, (Albany: University of the State of New York, 1921-)

Manigault, Anne. “Extracts from the Journal of Mrs. Anne Manigault," *South Carolina Historical Society and Genealogical Magazine 20, 21* (1919-20): 52-63, 204-12

Monypenny, Alexander. “Order Book of the Grant Expedition,” *Journal of Cherokee Studies* (1977): 302-319

Monypenny, Alexander. “Diary of Alexander Monypenny,” *Journal of Cherokee Studies Vol.2* (1977): 320-331

The Papers of George Washington, *Colonial Series 4*, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1984)

The Official Papers of Francis Fauquier, Lieutenant Governor of Virginia, 1758-1768 ed. George Reese (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1980-1983)

The Papers of Henry Bouquet, ed. S.K. Stevens, Donald H, Kent, and Autumn L. Leonard, (Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, 1972)

Writings of General John Forbes ed. Alfred Proctor James (Menasha, WI.: Collegiate Press, 1938; reprint: Arno Press, 1971)

Pinckney, Eliza. *The Letterbook of Eliza Lucas Pinckney, 1739-1762*, ed. Elise Pinckney (Columbia, S.C.: The University of South Carolina, 1972)

Richardson, William. “An Account of the Presbyterian Mission to the Cherokees 1757-1759,” *Tennessee Historical Magazine,* 2nd. Ser.,vol.1 (1931)

Timberlake, Henry. *The Memoirs of Lieutenant Henry Timberlake*, (Original print, London: 1765), ed. Duane H. King, (Cherokee, N.C.: Museum of the Cherokee Indian Press, 2007)

Secondary Sources

Alden, J.R. *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier* (New York: Gordian Press, 1966)

Amusssen, Susan. *Carribean Exchange: Slavery and the Transformation of English Society, 1640-1700* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007)

Anderson, Fred. *Crucible of War* (New York: Vintage Books, 2000)

Anderson, Fred. *A People's Army: Massachusetts soldiers and society in the Seven Years' War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984)

David Armitage and Michael Braddick. *The British Atlantic World*, 2nd ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009)

Axtell, James. *The Indians' New South: Cultural Change in the Colonial Southeast* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1997)

Bailyn, Bernard. *Atlantic History: Concepts and Contours* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005)

Baugh, Daniel. *The Global Seven Years War, 1754-1763* (New York: Longman, 2011)

Bickham, Troy. *Savages within the Empire: Representations of American Indians in eighteenth-century Britain* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005)

Bond, Bradley G. *French Colonial Louisiana and the Atlantic World* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 2005)

Boulware, Tyler. "The Effect of the Seven Years' War on the Cherokee Nation," *Early American Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal 5.2* (2007) 395-426

Boulware, Tyler. *Deconstructing the Cherokee Nation: Town, Region, and*

Nation among Eighteenth-Century Cherokees (Gainesville University Press of Florida, 2011)

Brown, Kathleen. *Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996)

Braund, Kathryn. *Deerskins and Duffels* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008)

Bruce, Steve. "The Cherokee Wars 1759 to 1761," *Miniature War Games* 140 and 141 (1995)

Brumwell, Stephen. *Redcoats* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Bushnell, Amy. *The King's Coffer: Proprietors of the Spanish Florida Treasury, 1565-1702* (Gainesville: University Presses of Florida, 1981)

Calloway, Collin. *New Worlds for All: Indians, Europeans, and the Remaking of Early America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997)

Calloway, Colin. *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Calloway, Colin. *White People, Indians, and Highlanders* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Canny, Nicholas. "Writing Atlantic History; or, Reconfiguring the History of Colonial British America," *The Journal of American History 86* (1999): 1093-1114

Andrew R.L. Cayton and Fredrika J. Teute, *Contact Points: American frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750-1830* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998)

Carney, Judith. *Black Rice* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001)

Carson, James. *Making an Atlantic World: Circles, Paths, and Stories from the Colonial South* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2007)

Catherine Clinton and Michelle Gillespie, *The Devil's Lane: Sex and Race in the Early South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997)

William S. Coker, and Thomas D. Watson, *Indian Traders of the Southeastern Spanish Borderlands* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida; Pensacola : University of West Florida Press, c1986)

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

Colley, Linda. *Captives: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1600-1850* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2002)

Conway, Stephen. "From Fellow-Nationals to Foreigners: British Perceptions of the Americans, circa 1739-1783," *William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, Vol. 59, No. 1* (Jan., 2002): 65-100

Conway, Stephen. "British Army Officers and the American War for Independence," *William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, Vol. 41, No. 2* (Apr., 1984): 265-276

Conway, Stephen. *War, State, and Society in mid-eighteenth-century Britain and Ireland* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006)

Corkran, David. *The Cherokee Frontier: Conflict and Survival, 1740-62* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962)

Crane, Vernon. *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732* (Durham, N.C., Duke University Press, 1928; reprint, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956)

Cubbison, Douglas. *The British Defeat of the French in Pennsylvania*, *1758* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2010)

Dawdy, Shannon Lee. *Building the Devil's Empire: French Colonial New Orleans* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008)

Dowd, Gregory. *Spirited Resistance* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992)

Dowd, Gregory. *War under Heaven: Pontiac, the Indian Nations, & the British Empire* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002)

Edelson, S. Max. *Plantation Enterprise in Colonial South Carolina* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006)

Elliott, John. *Empires of the Atlantic World* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2006)

Ethridge, Robbie. *Creek Country: The Creek Indians and Their World*. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003)

Ethridge, Robbie. ed. *Mapping the Mississippian Shatter Zone* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009)

Robbie Ethridge and Charles Hudson. *The Transformation of the Southeastern Indians,1540-1760.* (Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 2002)

Fabel, Robin. *Colonial Challenges: Britons, Native Americans, and Caribs, 1759-1775* (Gainesville : University Press of Florida, 2000)

Farragher, John. *A Great and Noble Scheme* (New York : W.W Norton & Company, 2005)

Julie Flavell and Stephen Conway, *Britain and America go to War: the Impact of War and Warfare in Anglo-America, 1754-1815* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2004)

Foote, William A. "The Army in the Eighteenth Century" in *A Guide to the Sources of British Military History* ed., Robin Higham, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971)

Foret, Michael James. "On the Marchlands of Empire: Trade, Diplomacy, and War on the Southeastern Frontier, 1733-1763" (Ph.D. diss., College of William and Mary, 1990)

Fraser, Walter. *Charleston! Charleston!* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1989)

Frey, Sylvia. *The British Soldier in America: A Social History of Military Life in the Revolutionary Period* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981)

Fulford, Tim. *Romantic Indians: Native Americans, British Literature, and Transatlantic Culture, 1756-1830* (Oxford; New York : Oxford University Press, 2006)

Tim Fulford and Kevin Hutchings, *Native Americans and Anglo-American Culture, 1750-1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Gallay, Alan. *The Indian Slave Trade: the Rise of the English Empire in the American South, 1670-1717* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002)

Gipson, Lawrence. *The British Empire before the American Revolution* (15 vols., Caldwell, Idaho, and New York, 1936-72)

Gould, Eliga. *The Persistence of Empire: British Political Culture in the Age of American Revolution* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2000)

Grady, Timothy Paul. *Anglo-Spanish Rivalry in Colonial Southeast America, 1650-1725* (Brookfield, VT : Pickering & Chatto, 2010)

Greene, Jack. "The South Carolina Quartering Dispute, 1757-1758," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 60 (1959): 193-204

Greene, Jack. *The Quest for Power; the Lower Houses of Assembly in the Southern Royal Colonies, 1689-1776* (1963; reprint New York: W.W. Norton, 1972)

Greene, Jack. *Colonial British America: Essays in the New History of the Early Modern Era* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1984)

Jack Greene and Philip Morgan, *Atlantic History: A Critical Appraisal* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009)

Hadden, Sally. *Slave Patrols: Law and Violence in Virginia and the Carolinas*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001)

Hahn, Steven. *Invention of Creek Nation* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004)

Hart, Emma. *Building Charleston* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2010)

Hatley, Tom. *The Dividing Paths: Cherokees and South Carolinians through the Era of Revolution* (New York : Oxford University Press, 1993)

Hinderaker, Eric. *Elusive Empires: Constructing Colonialism in the Ohio Valley, 1673-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Eric Hinderaker and Peter Mancall. *At the Edge of Empire: The Backcountry in British North America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003)

Hodson, Chris. *The Acadian Diaspora* (New York : Oxford University Press, 2012)

Holton, Woody. *Forced Founders* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999)

Houlding, J.A. *Fit for Service: the Training of the British Army, 1715-1795* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981)

Hudson, Angela. *Creek Paths and Federal Roads: Indians, Settlers, and Slaves and the Making of the American South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010)

Hudson, Charles. *The Southeastern Indians* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1976)

Ivers, Larry E. *Colonial Forts of South Carolina, 1670-1775* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1970)

Jacobs, Wilbur. *Wilderness Politics and Indian Gifts, 1748-1763* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1950)

Jones, Dorothy. *License for Empire* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982)

Jennings, Francis. *Empire of Fortune: Crowns, Colonies, and Tribes in the Seven Years War in America* (New York: Norton, 1988)

Juricek, John. *Colonial Georgia and the Creeks* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2010)

Kelton, Paul. "The British and Indian War: Cherokee Power and the Fate of Empire in North America," *William and Mary Quarterly 69* (2012): 763-792

Krebs, Daniel. *A Generous and Merciful Enemy: Life for German Prisoners of War during the American Revolution* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2013)

Landers, Jane. *Black Society in Spanish Florida* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999)

Leach, Douglas. *Arms for Empire: A Military History of the British Colonies in North America 1607-1763* (New York: MacMillan, 1973)

Leach, Douglas. *Roots of Conflict: British Armed Forces and Colonial Americans, 1677-1763* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986)

Michelle LeMaster and Bradford Wood. *Carolina Lowcountry and the Atlantic World: Creating and Contesting Carolina: Proprietary Era Histories* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2013)

Mapp, Paul. *The Elusive West and the Contest for Empire, 1713-1763* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press; Williamsburg, Va.: Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 2011)

Marshall, Peter. *The Making and Unmaking of Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)

McConnell, Michael. *Army and Empire: British soldiers on the American frontier, 1758-1775* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004)

McConville, Brendon. *The King's Three Faces: the Rise & Fall of Royal America, 1688-1776*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, c2006)

John McCusker and Russell Menards, *The Economy of British America* (Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina, 1985)

McNeill, J.R., *Mosquito Empires: Ecology and War in the Greater Caribbean, 1620-1914* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010)

Meinig, D.W. *The Shaping of America*: *Atlantic America, 1492-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004)

Merrell, James. *The Indians' New World: Catawbas and Their Neighbors from European Contact through the Era of Removal* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989)

Morgan, Philip D. *Slave Counterpoint: Black Culture in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake and Lowcountry* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998)

Morris, Michael. "The High Price of Trade: Anglo-Indian Trade Mistakes and the Fort Loudoun Disaster," *Journal of Cherokee Studies* 17 (1996)

Nash, Gary. *Red, White, and Black: The Peoples of Early America*, 6th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1982)

Nelson, Paul. *General James Grant: Scottish Soldier and Governor of East Florida*. (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1993)

Oatis, Steven J. *South Carolina's frontiers in the era of the Yamasee War, 1680-1730* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. 2004)

Oliphant, John. *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier, 1756-63* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001)

Olwell, Robert. *Masters, Slaves, & Subjects* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998)

Padeni, S.A. "Forgotten Soldiers: The Role of Blacks in New York's Northern Campaigns," *Bulletin of Fort Tiacoronga Musuem* Vol. 16, No.2 (1999): 152-69

Pargellis, Stanley. *Lord Loudoun in North America* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1968; first print, 1933)

Paulett, Robert. *An Empire of Small Places: Mapping the Southeastern Anglo-Indian trade, 1732-1795* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012)

Perdue, Theda. *Cherokee Women* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999)

Piecuch, Jim. Three peoples, *One King: Loyalists, Indians, and Slaves in the Revolutionary South, 1775-1782* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2008)

Piker, Joshua. *Okfuskee: A Creek Indian town in colonial America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004)

Ramsey, William L. *The Yamasee War: A Study of Culture, Economy, and Conflict in the Colonial South.* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2008)

Richter, Daniel K. "Whose Indian History?" *WMQ 50:2* (1993): 379-393

Richter, Daniel K. *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 2001)

Robinson, Walter. *The Southern Colonial Frontier 1607-1763* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1979)

Rogers, Allen. "Colonial Opposition to the Quartering of Troops During the French and Indian War," *Military Affairs 34* (1970): 7-11

Rogers, Alan. *Empire and Liberty: American Resistance to British Authority, 1755-1763*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974)

Matt Schumann and Karl Schweitzer. *The Seven Years War: A transatlantic history* (New York: Routledge, 2008)

Shoemaker, Nancy. *A Strange Likeness: Becoming Red and White in Eighteenth-century North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004)

Shy, John. *A People Numerous and Armed: Reflections on the Military Struggle for American independence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976)

Silver, Peter. *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2007)

Snyder, Christina. *Slavery in Indian Country* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010)

Spear, Jennifer. *Race, Sex, and Social order in Early New Orleans* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008)

Spero, Laura. "Stout, bold, cunning, and the greatest travellers in America: The Shawnee diaspora" (PhD dissertation: University of Pennsylvania, 2010)

Steele, Ian. *Warpaths: Invasions of North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994)

Steppler, Glenn. *The Common Soldier in the Reign of George III, 1760-1793* (PhD. dissertation.: University of Oxford, 1984)

Truxes, Thomas M. *Defying Empire: Trading with the Enemy in Colonial New York* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008)

Usner, Daniel. *American Indians in the lower Mississippi Valley* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998)

Vaughan, Alden. *Transatlantic Encounters: American Indians in Britain, 1500-1776* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)

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

Gregory A. Waselkov and Peter H. Wood and M. Thomas Hatley. *Powhatan's Mantle: Indians in the Colonial Southeast, Revised and Expanded Edition.* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2006)

Weber, David. *The Spanish Frontier in North America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, c1992)

Weir, Robert M. *Colonial South Carolina: A History* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1997)

White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991)

Wood, Peter. *Black Majority* (1974, reprint New York: W. W. Norton, 1996)

Wulf, Karin. *Not All Wives: Women of Colonial Philadelphia* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2000)