

## ABSTRACT

KRIEGER, BRIAN I. Power Struggle in the Old Northwest: Why the United States Won and the Indians Lost the Indian War, 1786-1795. (Under the direction of Dr. Craig Thompson Friend.)

After the American Revolution, an influx of white settlers into the Old Northwest threatened to upset the balance of power that had existed in the region for decades. Various Indian tribes, frontiersmen, the United States government, and the British in Canada all sought to exercise military, economic, and political control over the Old Northwest. Flawed connections within and between groups who lacked the ability or willingness to compromise shaped the brutal nature of the war and posed an obstacle to peace negotiations. Over the course of the conflict, internal power struggles weakened the western Indian confederacy and their British “allies.” Contrarily, the ability of the federal government to improve relations with the frontier militias paved the way for an American victory at the Battle of Fallen Timbers, ensuring U.S. control of the region. After the Treaty of Greenville, the inability of Indians and Americans to overcome their differences hampered assimilation, resulting in further native resistance and their forced removal westward. Studying the Indian War in terms of power shifts and relationships offers a thorough picture of this seminal conflict, while identifying how factors such as race, culture, and politics affected the war and its aftermath.

Power Struggle in the Old Northwest: Why the United States Won and the  
Indians Lost the Indian War, 1786-1795

by  
Brian I. Krieger

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of  
North Carolina State University  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts

History

Raleigh, North Carolina

2008

APPROVED BY:

---

Dr. Joe Caddell

---

Dr. David Gilmartin

---

Dr. Craig Thompson Friend  
Chair of Advisory Committee

## DEDICATION

I hope our wisdom will grow with our power, and teach us,  
that the less we use our power the greater it will be.

-Thomas Jefferson

## BIOGRAPHY

Brian Krieger was born on January 26, 1983, in Columbus, Ohio. He grew up in Indiana and graduated with Honors from Indiana University – Fort Wayne in 2005 with a Bachelor’s Degree in Secondary Education. After graduation, Brian and his wife, Nicole, moved to Raleigh, North Carolina to pursue teaching careers. While teaching eighth grade social studies, Brian attended graduate school at North Carolina State University. He graduated with a Master’s Degree in History in 2008. In his free time, Brian enjoys traveling with Nicole and their daughter, Felicity, attending NC State athletic events, and pondering the many mysteries of the television show *Lost*.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this work has been an undertaking three years in the making. Undoubtedly, the process would have been longer and more arduous had I not had the assistance of archivists and librarians to help me along the way. I cannot begin to thank adequately the staffs who serve at the following institutions and organizations: the D.H. Hill Library at North Carolina State University, the Graduate and William L. Clements Libraries at the University of Michigan, the Sullivant Library at the Ohio State University, the Carlson Library at the University of Toledo, the Alderman Library at the University of Virginia, the Allen County Public Library, the Kalamazoo Public Library, the Ohio Historical Society, the Indiana Historical Society, and the Fort Wayne Historical Society.

Special thanks are due to my thesis committee: Dr. Craig Thompson Friend, Dr. David Gilmartin, and Dr. Joe Caddell. Additionally, I would like to thank Norene Miller (Director of Student Services) and Dr. Steven Vincent (Director of Graduate Studies) for their continued support. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Rory T. Cornish of Winthrop University for teaching me that second best is never good enough.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my family and friends who supported me in this endeavor. Deserving special gratitude are: my brothers, Andy and Aaron, for their continued support; my Dad for driving me home from Ann Arbor when I succumbed to food poisoning; my Mom for always encouraging me, and my wife, Nicole, for helping me format and organize my thesis. Your encouragement inspired me to tell a story that needed to be told.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	vi
POWER STRUGGLE IN THE OLD NORTHWEST: WHY THE UNITED STATES WON AND THE INDIANS LOST THE INDIAN WAR, 1786-1795	
INTRODUCTION: SCHOLARSHIP ON THE INDIAN WAR IN THE OLD NORTHWEST .....	1
NOTES .....	23
CHAPTER 1: ORIGINS OF WAR AND THE RISE OF THE INDIAN CONFEDERACY .....	26
NOTES .....	54
CHAPTER 2: THE INDIAN WAR IN THE OLD NORTHWEST .....	57
NOTES .....	95
CHAPTER 3: THE CONQUEST OF THE OLD NORTHWEST .....	100
NOTES .....	134
CONCLUSION: TO MAKE A NEW WORLD .....	138
NOTES .....	156
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	159

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- CVSP* Calendar of Virginia State Papers
- DM* Draper Manuscripts
- JCC* Journals of the Continental Congress
- MP* Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections

## INTRODUCTION

### SCHOLARSHIP ON THE INDIAN WAR IN THE OLD NORTHWEST

The Indian War that engulfed the Old Northwest from 1786 to 1795 was a convoluted power struggle that featured a host of enemies and allies jockeying for political, economic, and militaristic control of the Ohio River Valley and Great Lakes region. The territory, which once belonged solely to American Indians, attracted the attention of American frontiersmen, British agents in Canada, the United States government, and Indian tribes both neutral and belligerent. Torn between competing interests, these groups often struggled against their allies as much as their enemies.

At various times during the war, different factions held the upper hand and appeared to tip the balance of power in the Old Northwest. However, intra-tribal conflict prevented the Indians of the western confederacy from capitalizing on the weaknesses of the United States army. Even after the Indians routed General St. Clair and his army in 1791, neutralist and militant chiefs remained divided over the best way to deal with the United States government and American frontiersmen. Their allies, the British, sensed the confusion in the native ranks, and they quietly retreated from banging the war drums. As the war dragged on, American frontiersmen lost ground and were forced to submit to federal authority. A joint force of backcountry militia and federal troops eventually crushed native resistance at Fallen Timbers. Following the battle, the United States claimed superiority over the region.

Conflicting relations posed the greatest obstacle to peace negotiations during the war and assimilation afterwards. Although differences had always existed between Indians and

Euro-Americans, the relationships between these groups became more strained as the “middle ground” dissipated following the French and Indian War. Increasing numbers of Americans in the Old Northwest threatened to upset a balance of power that had become tenuous by the 1780s. The erosion of the “middle ground” bore hatred and savagery unparalleled when a balance of power had existed on the frontier. These problems culminated in the Indian War and the United States’ conquest of the region. This work seeks to examine how such conflicted relationships led to power shifts that shaped the Indian War. In so doing, I hope to provide a thorough, objective picture of this seminal conflict in North American history.

Historians have often tried to oversimplify the Indian War in the Old Northwest. They have obscured the complex relationships and dynamics that are essential to understanding the conflict, using instead a particular theme such as “race,” “politics,” or “culture” to explain the progression of the war. For example, scholars in the 1960-70s portrayed the Indian War as a racial conflict. The 1980s brought economic and political factors to the forefront of the struggle. Historians today contend that cultural differences mitigated war. Varying interpretations of the Indian War reflect the dramatic changes in the practice of history over the last thirty years. Three decades ago, those privileged to do the interpreting were mostly white and male. Since then, civil rights, antiwar, and women’s movements have reshaped what historians and readers consider suitable topics of study, bringing into the profession and interpretation women, African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans.<sup>1</sup>

Historical interpretation can, perhaps, best be explained by Italian philosopher Benedetto Croce who observed that “Every true history is contemporary history.” Croce insisted that the past “in itself” is unknowable. History rather reflects the need of historians (and readers) to make sense out of their own worlds. Croce’s argument appears to have much merit when one considers the differing interpretations of the Indian War from decade to decade. This particular assessment of the Indian War is an attempt to examine scholarship from each of the past few decades to provide a more complete understanding of the conflict and verify that different groups fought for different reasons. But writing in a world where military alliances, corporations, and political parties directly shape the future, it seems only fitting that this work seeks to understand how groups struggle for and maintain power. Though unintentional, this work, like those that came before it, is influenced by contemporary issues.<sup>2</sup>

Racism has long been a popular theme in written accounts of the Old Northwest. Historians throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries used racism to explain the hatred and violence that surrounded native/white relations in the Great Lakes region. During the 1960-70s, Reginald Horsman and Francis Paul Prucha convincingly interpreted race relations as a cause of the Indian War in the Old Northwest. Relying on the accounts of frontiersmen and army officers, Horsman and Prucha emphasized hostile racial attitudes in their writings, portraying the Old Northwest as a racially charged battleground: a place in which participants killed each other because of physical dissimilarities, yet embraced some aspects of culture.

In *Expansion and American Indian Policy, 1783-1812* (1967), Reginald Horsman proposed that racism directed against both natives and frontiersmen stimulated warfare in the Old Northwest. In the post-Revolutionary era, frontiersmen were a mixed lot of Scots-Irish, English, Dutch, French, and German-speaking peoples. Although divided by language, religion, and occupation, these groups united as *white*. Shared experiences on the frontier, especially Indian attacks and the fear of Indian captivity, offered these varied groups a common bond, and they came to view the Indians as everything that was *nonwhite*. In essence, the Indians represented the anti-settler: a people who embodied savagery, heathenism, laziness, disorder, and mistrust.

Such racist sentiments were not unique to the settlers of Kentucky and Ohio. Historian John Demos noted that racism was fervent in Puritan New England as early as the turn of the eighteenth century. Settlers feared that contact with the Indians resulted in “a fall to Darkness and Superstition...and that savagery was the inherent state of the Indians.” The Indians, most notably the young warriors, remained equally fervent in their racial attitudes against the whites. They portrayed whites as liars, cheats, troublemakers, and a people confused about traditional gender roles.<sup>3</sup> The racist attitudes that existed between Indians and whites only intensified in the years following the Revolution. Continuous fighting and revenge killings reinforced racial attitudes and made a peaceful resolution unlikely. By 1786, racial violence on the frontier necessitated involvement by the United States army which stepped in to act as a buffer between the two groups. The chaos caused by the racial

intolerance of the Indians and frontiersmen directly threatened the safety and welfare of the fledgling United States, particularly the Northwest Territory.<sup>4</sup>

Horsman argued quite convincingly in his book that had it not been for extreme racial violence on the frontier, the United States could have avoided becoming embroiled in an Indian war. The United States government had made significant progress in dealing with northwestern tribes since adopting Henry Knox's "right to land" policy in 1787. This policy relied on diplomacy, rather than force, to acquire Indian lands.<sup>5</sup> The United States army, under the command of Lieutenant Colonel Josiah Harmer, therefore, acted as a peacekeeping force on the frontier and spent more time chasing wayward American settlers than it did hostile natives. Yet, despite the best efforts of government officials and neutralist Indian chiefs, the racial atrocities committed on the frontier intensified to the point where roaming bands of frontier militia and native warriors became locked in an undeclared war. Mediators on both sides failed to quell the race war that spilled into the Old Northwest. The frontiersmen succeeded in entangling the United States in a war of conquest and racial genocide despite the protests of those, on both sides, who sought a peaceful resolution.

Francis Paul Prucha agreed that racial violence on the frontier led to conflict in the Old Northwest, but he accused the United States government of turning a border dispute into a war of conquest. Prucha saw the army as an extension of white society onto the frontier, maintaining that the commanders of the army harbored racist attitudes and that was why they forced Indians to succumb to the demands of white society. While the frontiersmen had initiated the Indian War, it was the federal troops who ultimately subdued the northwestern

tribes. Building upon the letters of John Hamtramck, commandant of Vincennes, and General Anthony Wayne, Prucha claimed that the army Regulars became increasingly racist as the conflict wore on. Following the destruction of St. Clair's army in 1791, they were just as likely to commit atrocities in battle as their counterparts in the militia.<sup>6</sup>

Prucha's interpretation of the Indian War portrayed the United States government as an active and overbearing participant in the conflict, contrasting to Horsman's interpretation that the United States government—and by default the army—was too passive and unsure of how to create, let alone enforce, federal Indian policy. Though Horsman and Prucha differed over the degrees to which participants involved themselves in the struggle, they both asserted that racism motivated Indians and whites to engage in warfare. Expanding on Horsman's work, some historians have argued that the United States lacked decisiveness because it feared taking a course of action to strengthen political ties between the northwestern Indians and the British, thereby allowing Native Americans to shape U.S. diplomacy.<sup>7</sup>

Horsman and Prucha both drew clear distinctions between racism, prejudice, and savagery in their works. It was racism—the overt hatred of another race of people—rather than prejudice—unfavorable feelings or attitudes—that led to warfare between Indians and whites. Prejudice had always existed between Indians and whites because the two groups were culturally dissimilar. However, these differences had never been strong enough to result in prolonged warfare. Racism, in contrast, developed over time as years of competition, mistreatment, and warfare took their toll on Indian/white relations. In a recent

essay, historian John Mack Faragher supported this argument by differentiating between prejudice and racism on the Lower Missouri frontier.

Faragher's study found that for nearly fifty years, Osage, Delaware, and Shawnee Indians and whites coexisted on the frontier with minimal violence. A mingling of customs took place with the Indians building log cabins and adopting white farming methods, while the whites approved of Indian medicines and clothing. The two groups even implemented a mixed militia system, numbering three hundred Indians and whites. Each group held prejudices about the other. Indians disapproved of the settlers' propensity for violence, while the settlers resented the Indians' religious views and trading techniques. However, none of these differences were threatening enough to initiate warfare.<sup>8</sup>

But over time, things changed between the Indians and whites of the Lower Missouri. Arguments over land claims turned violent, resulting in murders. Christian missionaries condemned the Indians for their heathen ways, while some radical Indian shamans led nativist-revival movements. The fur trade declined; each side blamed the other. Hard times (especially for the natives) strained relations between the two groups. In this volatile situation, racism spread on both sides. Faced with the loss of their land and the destruction of their way of life, the Indians waged war against the settlers of the Lower Missouri. After a short, but bloody campaign, the Indians were removed westward onto the Great Plains. The struggle between the settlers and Indians of the Lower Missouri replicated, in a condensed version, the history of the Old Northwest.<sup>9</sup>

Savagery, a term mentioned by both Horsman and Prucha, was a terrible consequence of racism. In short, savagery referred to the extreme acts of violence carried out by both Indians and whites. Torture, mutilation, genocide: all are examples of savagery and each one occurred during the Indian War. The purpose of savagery was to terrorize the enemy, stifling their will to fight. After the war, American frontiersmen lynched hundreds of Indians who opposed assimilation.<sup>10</sup> Such atrocities infuriated many Indians, like Tecumseh, and led to renewed fighting. Thus, racism bred savagery, perhaps the most terrible of all Indian/white relationships.

The Indian War, therefore, served as an outlet for racism to spread throughout the United States. Prucha's research suggested that racism affected Americans in all regions and all social classes. His comparative study in New England and the South during the late eighteenth century exposed a growing American racial Anglo-Saxonism. Horsman later explored this theme in his seminal work, *Race and Manifest Destiny* (1981). He addressed how eighteenth-century imperialism focused on influence and territorial sovereignty. Beginning in 2001, scholars such as Celia Barnes and John Sugden expanded on this theme when describing power shifts during the Indian War. More interested in race than power struggles, Horsman did not seek to address Indian/white relations in that context, a surprising decision considering that race and power are not exclusive points. Had Horsman drawn a clear connection between racism and the extension of American power, he may have been able to explain how Manifest Destiny was fundamentally at odds with U.S. plans for assimilation after the Indian War.

Although racism certainly contributed to the outbreak of war in the Old Northwest, it was not the sole cause. Research indicates that racism spread *during* the war and became a major problem in the years *after* the war. Frontiersmen exhibited the greatest degree of racism, although as Horsman and Prucha proved, racism had spread throughout the United States by 1800. Contrarily, most Indians differentiated among whites, differentiating between frontiersmen, federal soldiers, eastern politicians, and the British. Since natives responded differently to each group, racism was seemingly less of a motivation for warfare on their behalves. While racism may explain why some white Americans became engrossed in the war, it cannot explain what led Native Americans to take part in the fighting.

In the 1980s, scholars investigated the economic and political causes that led to the Indian War in the Old Northwest. Historian Dorothy Jones researched state and federal records from the 1780s and 1790s and found that economic factors played a significant role. Politicians of the era bemoaned the precarious financial situation in which the United States found itself after the Revolution. Congress, and later the Washington administration, saw the Old Northwest as an investment that could return huge dividends. Politicians believed that the sale of western lands, coupled with the expanding markets emanating from settlements along the Ohio River, could alleviate some of the nation's \$40 million war debt.<sup>11</sup> States carved out of the Northwest Territory could be taxed to help the struggling nation. The fur trade, which had dwindled significantly since the mid-eighteenth century, was still a motivating factor for the United States to conquer the Old Northwest. Pressure from land companies and speculators, most of which were directly connected to the politicians, also put

pressure on the United States.<sup>12</sup> Although the United States could barely afford, let alone supply, a small frontier army, citizens pressured the government to secure the Old Northwest. Indian raids along the frontier justified the federal government's decision to launch punitive expeditions against the natives.

The prospect of financial security pressed the United States to engage in war against the northwestern Indians. The fur trade experienced a resurgence in the 1780s, and the Americans hoped to monopolize the western trade system. Historian James Ronda suggested that commerce, particularly the fur trade, dictated U.S./Indian diplomacy until the 1830s. He noted that British traders representing the North West Company and the Hudson's Bay Company dominated trade with the Indians in Canada and throughout the Louisiana Territory.<sup>13</sup> The Indian War in the Old Northwest offered the United States an opportunity to drive belligerent natives and the British out of a rich trading region, thereby ensuring American economic dominance of the area.

Current research by Leonard Dinnerstein and Reginald Stuart suggests that economics played a central role in defining the relationship between the United States and Britain in the Old Northwest. After the Revolution, Britain refused to give up its posts in the Old Northwest until British businessmen and Tories were compensated for debts and lost property. The British used Detroit and other frontier outposts as bases for a lively trade and propaganda effort among the tribes. These circumstances led to increased tension between Americans and the British in Canada. It is no coincidence that one sees the greatest hostility between the United States and Britain in the early years of the Indian War, when both nations

sought economic stability and control of the fur trade. However, as both nations agreed to commercial treaties and the British were awarded “privileged trade status” in the Old Northwest, tensions between the two powers decreased. In the end, economic factors never became serious enough to warrant much British involvement in the Indian War.<sup>14</sup>

Dorothy Jones’s work corroborates, therefore, that economics was less of a motivation for some groups involved in the war. The loss of Indian trading partners alone did not entice the British to enter the war. The Indians certainly did not go to war to turn a profit. Had they wanted money, they would have taken part in Henry Knox’s “right to land” policy and ceded land to the United States. Jones determined that economic factors alone could not explain the conflict, conceding that political factors may have been more prominent in the war than what she had anticipated.

Examining the Indian War from a political context did not represent a new approach to the problem. Francis Paul Prucha’s *American Indian Policy in the Formative Years, 1790-1834* (1962) did just that. Other notable historians of the 1960s and 1970s such as Bernard Sheehan, Reginald Horsman, and Paul Woehrmann published political histories of the Old Northwest as well.<sup>15</sup> However, most political accounts of the Old Northwest narrowly focused on a particular group, typically the federal government of the United States. Wiley Sword’s *President Washington’s Indian War* (1985) differed from other works in that it chronicled the political decisions of a number of peoples. Sword accomplished this feat by referencing letters and correspondence from soldiers, traders, militiamen, and native leaders. Sword’s book was among the first to dissect the political motives of the British in

Canada, as well as the American Indians. Sword found evidence that the British used the Indians as a buffer between Canada and the United States. His research corroborated what Richard Slotkin had noted a decade earlier: that the Indians kept the war going because of British support and protection.

Central to British involvement in the war was the prospect of an independent Indian buffer state that could protect British trade interests in North America. The British, who after St. Clair's Defeat sought ways to cut ties with the natives, nevertheless encouraged them to resist American expansion by offering them token gifts and false promises of military support. According to Sword an imagined "alliance" existed between the British and the American Indians with the British pulling most of the strings. Contemporary historians tend to disagree with this view, but they cannot entirely discount Sword's evidence.<sup>16</sup>

Sword's work suggested that flawed political decisions led to the Indian War in the Old Northwest. The failure of the United States government to create and implement Indian policy contributed to the outbreak of war. As long as the Indians remained an autonomous force on the frontier, the United States could not impose its will on them. Historian Anthony Wallace went even further by suggesting that the Indian confederacy held the upper-hand in diplomacy until the Battle of Fallen Timbers. He noted that an American peace commission at Detroit in 1792 was prepared to offer up all land cessions made at Fort Harmar and evacuate Forts Washington and Harmar. The writings of George Washington, Philip Schuyler, Henry Knox, and Arthur St. Clair all attest to this point. Sword, however, underestimated the immense diplomatic strength of the Indian confederacy. He suggested

that American military leaders such as St. Clair and Josiah Harmar twisted governmental directives to accommodate different interest groups and avoid war with Britain. These actions, more than native strength, resulted in the continuation of hostilities in the Old Northwest.<sup>17</sup>

Although American military leaders sought to appease everyone, they were instead labeled as ineffectual, either disregarded or despised by the many different factions that existed in the Old Northwest. Sword did much to further scholarship of the Old Northwest by exposing the precarious position that political leaders found themselves in during the Indian War. His comparisons of Joseph Brant and Arthur St. Clair, Little Turtle and Josiah Harmar, and Sir Guy Carleton and George Washington depicted men who sought to avoid war, while struggling to make political decisions beneficial to their particular group.<sup>18</sup> Sword's examination of these men and their actions emphasized their similarities rather than their differences. Leaders on all sides floundered at diplomacy and failed to grasp the significance of factors like racism and economics that propelled the conflict forward. Political leaders—whether in Philadelphia, London, or distant native villages—did not understand the intricacies of the struggle laid out before them. Their actions do not imply ineptness although such accusations still surface from a few historians such as Daniel Barr and Frazer Dorian McGlinchey. Rather, these leaders were trying to negotiate their way out of problems that had existed for several generations. Indians and Euro-Americans had a history of violence that dated back to the massacres at Jamestown and the Pequot War of

1637. Such longstanding differences could not be settled quickly by a treaty forced upon one group under duress.<sup>19</sup>

In his article “The Indians’ Revolution,” historian Francis Jennings suggested that peace treaties contributed more to the Indian War than almost any other issue. The fact that treaty negotiations were carried out by powerless diplomats and aged chiefs illustrated how neither group really understood the other. Most disastrous was the Americans’ propensity to treat a clan or band of natives as a political entity, when in fact they were not. Only the Treaty of Greenville proved successful because it was an agreement between peers. Jennings concluded that the United States’ conquest of the Old Northwest was due to its ability to manipulate negotiations and force fraudulent treaties on the natives.<sup>20</sup>

In contrast, Sword’s analysis suggested that the Americans attained success because they were the first group to eliminate most internal disagreements and consolidate their political and military capabilities. The inability of the American Indians and the British to unite and achieve a common political goal certainly helped too. According to Sword, the struggle for political superiority led to conflict in the Old Northwest that continued until the 1830s, when the Indians were forcefully removed from the region by the United States army.<sup>21</sup>

Contemporary political historians model their books about the Indian War upon earlier works by Jones and Sword. Although atypical of current trends in the field, some historians embrace the political histories of the 1980s.<sup>22</sup> Yet, most contemporary scholars support cultural history, or ethnohistory, as a way of interpreting the events that unfolded in

the Old Northwest. Cultural historians suggest that the Indian War took place because the Native Americans and the Euro-Americans could not establish a peaceful “middle ground” in which both groups of people interacted and shared with one another. While not discounting that racism, economics, and politics compounded the war, cultural historians argue that longstanding cultural differences such as language, religion, and personal beliefs led the white settlers to pursue a course of cultural genocide against the natives. Cultural historians view the Indian War as less a war than another step in the overarching story of Euro-American conquest of the New World.

Richard White’s *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (1991) changed the way historians viewed the Indian War in the Old Northwest. White’s book promoted the “New Indian” history that had steadily developed since the mid-1970s. As such, White portrayed the Indians as active participants in the events that unfolded in the Old Northwest. While his book did not completely reinterpret the war from a native perspective it did abandon the Eurocentric attitudes that plagued similar works. White also suggested that the frontier was a place of cultural interaction where no particular group could gain the upper hand. The *pays d’en haut*, or Great Lakes region, was a place of mixed cultures until the colonies won their independence. Following the Revolution, American settlers poured westward and occupied native lands. Over time, the American settlers gained the upper hand in the region and imposed their will on the natives. The Americans differed from the British, French, or Dutch in that they did not seek a peaceful “middle ground.” The Americans viewed the Indians as heathens,

savages, and obstacles to progress and republican ideals. The settlers initiated the Indian War because they opposed native culture and felt threatened by it.<sup>23</sup>

White's work exposed how relationships among the American Indians were forged and broken during the conflict. Interestingly, he found that some Indian tribes engaged in war to preserve the "middle ground" while others fought to drive the Americans from it. His examination of the American Indians suggested that the tribes were connected ethnically, rather than militarily or politically. He found that deep rifts existed amongst the natives with some individuals favoring accommodation, some urging a return to traditional ways, and some simply trying to stay out of the brewing conflict.

In his own research pertaining to Native American ethnicity, Daniel Richter found that most Indians in the Old Northwest lived in multiethnic, multilingual villages. It was not uncommon for Indians to affiliate with friends or relatives in another tribe over their own particular tribe or clan. Furthermore, native loyalties on the village level went a long way in shaping whether or not individual natives trusted Americans as well as other Indians. Differences in opinion weakened tribal unity and resulted in power struggles at the village level. White and Richter both noted that divisions within the tribes made it impossible for the Indians to mount any significant resistance to American conquest.<sup>24</sup>

Andrew Cayton referenced military outposts and frontier towns in his book *Frontier Indiana* (1996) to explain why differences existed among Americans in the Old Northwest. Citing the journals and letters of soldiers and militiamen Cayton professed that the frontier was not the absence of order but a place where many different groups sought to control a

cultural “contact zone.” He noted that hostile relationships existed between the frontiersmen and the army soldiers because the frontiersmen hoped to gain control of the region and the soldiers frequently disrupted their plans. Many of the soldiers adopted aspects of native culture such as clothing, weapons, recreational games, and language. This too wrought the ire of the frontiersmen. According to Cayton, the tense relationship between soldier and civilian that existed on the frontier was similar to the tribal relationships that White explored in his book. The fact that American soldiers and frontiersmen rarely came to blows over their differences remained the key difference between them and their native adversaries. When the war began in 1786, the soldiers attempted to curb militia violence in the face of a deteriorating “middle ground.” Unable to do so, the soldiers fought to gain control of the Old Northwest before their civilian counterparts did.<sup>25</sup>

Perhaps the most useful contributions made by cultural historians to the history of the Old Northwest center around the struggle for assimilation. Once the Indian War ended, northwestern tribes faced two options: assimilate into American culture or face removal west of the Mississippi River. Despite their best efforts, the Indians were never accepted into American society, laying the path for their forced removal in the 1830s. In “Cultural Differences Lead to Misconceptions and Conflict,” Alvin M. Josephy Jr. argued that cultural differences made assimilation impossible. In particular, the Indians’ refusal to abandon their religious views and their failure to “develop” the land clashed with the ideals of western expansion. As the frontier was settled and a sense of “Americanism” spread throughout the

nation, the Indians became obstacles to American society. Clinging to their traditional ways, the Indians were denied education, government aid, and legal rights. At length, intolerance of native culture led even the most progressive Americans to support a policy of removal.<sup>26</sup>

The work of cultural historians is only the latest progression in scholarship concerning conflict in the Old Northwest. Over the past few decades, historians have struggled to explain the Indian War of the 1780-90s in terms of race, economics, politics, and culture. Undoubtedly these themes, and many others yet to be explored, contributed to the conflict. Rarely is there one single cause for a war. Similarly, there is rarely one primary reason why participants engage in warfare. The various works covered thus far can attest to that. Just as they have for decades, scholars writing on the Old Northwest continue to interpret the Indian War in unique ways. Within the last few years a growing number of historians have begun to emphasize the importance of power shifts in shaping the course of the war. Such historians write within the realm of cultural history, but their narratives resemble the political works of the 1980s.

Flawed interaction among allies is central to the notion that power shifts affected the outcome of the Indian War. No where else does this become more apparent than in the conflicting relationships between the Indians and the British and amongst the Indians themselves. Addressing the critical Indian council held at the Glaize in September 1792, John Sugden noted the crumbling unity of the western Indian confederacy despite its recent victory over St. Clair's army. Referencing correspondence from British traders, soldiers, and two Moravian missionaries, he noted that civil chiefs—most notably the prominent Ottawa

chief Egushaway—sparred politically with rival war chiefs who had been in power since 1789. Sugden proposed that such internal power struggles weakened the Indian confederacy at a time when it stood on the brink of exercising its territorial sovereignty of the Old Northwest. The divisiveness within the native ranks lessened the number of warriors who took part in the following year's campaign. The Indians found themselves outnumbered and under siege by frontier militias and the United States army. Consequently, the Indians lost the war because they never took advantage of the power shift that occurred after St. Clair's Defeat.<sup>27</sup>

Celia Barnes's *Native American Power in the United States* (2003) is the most recent book to recount the power shifts that occurred during the Indian War. Barnes makes a convincing argument that the Indians' inability to draw the British into the conflict cost them the war. Like Sugden, she thought that the pivotal years of 1792-93 witnessed a power shift in favor of the western Indian confederacy. However, she proposed that native negotiators and intermediaries at Detroit failed to enlist British military support. The Indian-British military alliance never fully materialized. She goes even further in support of her argument by stating that the British manipulated the natives at this critical juncture in the war. Sir Guy Carleton and Alexander McKee—hoping for the creation of an Indian buffer state—provided the Indians with rifles and supplies, and encouraged them to intensify the guerrilla war along the Ohio River. Historian Andrew Cayton suggested that the British used their status as patriachs to coerce the Indians into continued violence and raiding along the frontier. The Indians may have been better off to meet with the Americans diplomatically and work from a

position of strength. Barnes agreed with Cayton, noting that British officers encouraged the tribes to stand firm against American overtures at peace. The native diplomats listened to their British “allies” and committed themselves to further resistance without military support.<sup>28</sup>

Poor political decisions between natives and Euro-Americans is prominently featured in Kathleen DuVal’s *The Native Ground*. Studying the Indian societies that existed along the Mississippi and Arkansas Rivers, she found that Euro-American power was dependent on the newcomers’ ability to take advantage of the natives’ sovereignty. Euro-Americans became adept at piggy-backing from one powerful tribe to another, while eliminating weaker tribes. DuVal argued that the newly empowered Euro-Americans used their understanding of alliances to confer power on certain tribes, isolate others, and ultimately shatter tribal unity.<sup>29</sup>

While political manipulation weakened the tribes, DuVal concluded that it was the Indians’ inability to create military alliances that forced them to submit to Euro-American conquest. She found that despite having a common goal—driving the settlers from their lands—the tribal connections in the region provided no precedent or structure for forming military coalitions. Native “alliances” had always been tied to trading connections or security concerns. In contrast, Euro-Americans had a long history of military organization and warfare. Native peoples, however, had never fought a war of conquest on par with the Euro-Americans, contributing to their eventual defeat and decline.<sup>30</sup>

The few published books that study power shifts during the Indian War have much in common with one another. First of all, each book blends political, cultural, and military

history in order to encompass the vast notion of *power*. Also, each book has focused overwhelmingly on the native perspective. Scholars have attempted to explain why the Indians lost the war rather than why the Americans won it. This line of thought has led to several unanswered questions and gaps in our historical understanding of how power shifts affected the war. The literature requires a new direction. Examining how power shifts affected the Americans and the British is necessary to understanding their roles in the conflict. Considering how the Americans took advantage of the mistakes of the Indian confederacy might offer new insight on the outcome of the war. Finally, little has been written on how power shifts contributed to the outbreak of war. Research in this last area might support the efforts of historians who adhere to White's "middle ground" theory. All of the aforementioned questions require further research and reading so that scholars may write more accurately about the Indian War in the Old Northwest.

Each book or article referenced thus far has offered answers as to why the Indian War started and why particular groups chose to fight. Yet, these sources are incomplete because not one of them addressed all the conflicting relationships that existed between participants. Furthermore, excluding Wiley Sword, no author has written a complete account of the Indian War. To most scholars, the Indian War is but a part of a larger story they are trying to tell; an event that needs to be recognized but not studied at length. But understanding the origins of the conflict is necessary in order to appreciate the course of the war and its ultimate outcome.

This work seeks to correct decades of oversight by examining the intricacies of the Indian War: how the war started, why certain groups fought, how conflicting relationships

altered the course of the war, and what results emerged from the conflict. Themes such as “race,” “politics,” “economics,” and “culture” will be referenced equally in this work so that the conflict can be appreciated for its full complexity. As the very first war under the United States Constitution, the contest was both a catalyst for national development and a check on Indian and British authority. For its past significance alone, the power struggle in the Old Northwest deserves to be studied as one of the most important events of the early American republic. But beyond that, the Indian War offers us some timely lessons on power and relationships. Little change exists between the basic confrontations of past and future generations. Let us, then, learn from these past mistakes to better improve our lives and the lives of our fellow man.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Francis G. Couvares, Martha Saxton, Gerald N. Grob, and George Athan Billias, eds., *Interpretations of American History Volume II: Patterns and Perspectives* (New York: Free Press, 2000), 1-2.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 1-2.

<sup>3</sup> Reginald Horsman, *Expansion and American Indian Policy, 1783-1812* (Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1967), 31-35; John Demos, *The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story from Early America* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1994), 204-205, 213.

<sup>4</sup> Horsman, *Expansion and American Indian Policy*, 74-76.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 22-25.

<sup>6</sup> Francis Paul Prucha, *The Sword of the Republic: The United States Army on the Frontier, 1783-1846* (New York, N.Y.: MacMillan Company, 1969), 17-21. For a primary account of Arthur St. Clair's campaign, see Ebenezer Denny, *The Military Journal of Ebenezer Denny* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1860), 358-75.

<sup>7</sup> For a contemporary reinterpretation of Horsman's thesis, see Celia Barnes, *Native American Power in the United States, 1783-1795* (Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2003).

<sup>8</sup> John Mack Faragher, "More Motley than Mackinaw: From Ethnic Mixing to Ethnic Cleansing on the Frontier of the Lower Missouri, 1783-1833," in Andrew Cayton and Fredrika J. Teute, eds., *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750-1830* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 308-10.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 310-13.

<sup>10</sup> Francis Jennings, *The Founders of America: How Indians Discovered the Land, Pioneered In It, and Created Great Classical Civilizations; How They Were Plunged Into a Dark Age by Invasion and Conquest; And How They Are Reviving* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1993), 304-05, 322-23.

<sup>11</sup> Wiley Sword, *President Washington's Indian War: The Struggle for the Old Northwest, 1790-1795* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985), 4-5.

<sup>12</sup> Dorothy Jones, *License for Empire: Colonialism by Treaty in Early America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 4-10.

<sup>13</sup> James P. Ronda, *Lewis and Clark among the Indians* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 10-12.

<sup>14</sup> Leonard Dinnerstein and Roger L. Nichols, *Natives and Strangers: A Multicultural History of Americans* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 7-8, 48; James T. Wall, *The Boundless Frontier: America from Christopher Columbus to Abraham Lincoln* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1999), 215-16; Reginald C. Stuart, *United States Expansionism and British North America, 1775-1871* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 34-35, 37.

<sup>15</sup> See Bernard W. Sheehan, *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1973); Reginald Horsman, *The Frontier in the Formative Years, 1783-1815* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1979); and Paul Woehrmann, *At the Headwaters of the Maumee: A History of the Forts at Fort Wayne* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1971).

<sup>16</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 240-48, 287-98; Richard Slotkin, *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1973), 322. Contemporary historians believe that the Native Americans frequently played the British and the Americans off each other. The Indians were certainly expert diplomats, but accounts vary as to their degree of success. For a study of Indian diplomacy, see Daniel Richter, *Facing East from Indian Country* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001); or Gregory Evans Dowd, *A Spirited Resistance: The North American Indian Struggle for Unity, 1745-1815* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).

<sup>17</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 59-65; Anthony F.C. Wallace, *Jefferson and the Indians: The Tragic Fate of the First Americans* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999), 172-74.

<sup>18</sup> Sir Guy Carleton, governor-general of Canada, has often been overlooked by historians despite his central role in the diplomacy of the Old Northwest. Sword offered a lengthy examination of Carleton and his political intentions in his book; *President Washington's Indian War*, 258-71.

<sup>19</sup> Francis Paul Prucha, *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 6-7.

<sup>20</sup> Francis Jennings, "The Indians' Revolution," in Albert L. Hurtado and Peter Iverson, eds., *Major Problems in American Indian History: Documents and Essays* (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath & Company, 1994), 172-74; Prucha, *The Great Father*, 2-3.

<sup>21</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 7-11, 323-30.

<sup>22</sup> For current works of political history pertaining to the Old Northwest, see Barnes, *Native American Power in the United States*; R. Douglas Hurt, *The Ohio Frontier: Crucible of the Old Northwest, 1720-1830* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998); or Wilbur Edel, *Kekionga: The Worst Defeat in the History of the United States Army* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger Publishing, 1997).

<sup>23</sup> Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 11-22, 413-30.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 410-425, 448-452; Richter, *Facing East from Indian Country*, 168-69. For more information on tribal relationships see Daniel Barr, *The Boundaries Between Us: Natives and Newcomers along the Frontiers of the Old Northwest, 1750-1850* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 2006); or Gregory Nobles, *American Frontiers: Cultural Encounters and Continental Conquest* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1997).

<sup>25</sup> Andrew Cayton, *Frontier Indiana* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), 94-110, 120-28. See Gayle Thornbrough, ed., *Outpost on the Wabash: The Letters of Major John Francis Hamtramck 1787-1791* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1957), for a primary account of the soldiers stationed at Post Vincennes; or the *Military Journal of Josiah Harmar* at the William Clements Library, Ann Arbor, for a primary account of the soldiers stationed at Fort Washington (Cincinnati).

<sup>26</sup> Alvin M. Josephy Jr., "Cultural Differences Lead to Misconceptions and Conflict," in Don Nardo, ed., *North American Indian Wars* (San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 1999), 12-14, 34-35.

<sup>27</sup> John Sugden, *Blue Jacket: Warrior of the Shawnees* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000), 132-36.

<sup>28</sup> Barnes, *Native American Power in the United States, 177-78*, 195-98; Andrew Cayton, “Noble Actors Upon the Theatre of Honour: Power and Civility in the Treaty of Greeneville,” in Cayton and Teute, eds., *Contact Points*, 253.

<sup>29</sup> Kathleen DuVal, *The Native Ground: Indians and Colonists in the Heart of the Continent* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 7-9.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 164-65.

## CHAPTER 1

### ORIGINS OF WAR AND THE RISE OF THE INDIAN CONFEDERACY

The Shawnee Indians paced nervously around the fire as the Kentuckians rounded up the last of the captives. In the tall grass outside of the village of Mackachack in the Ohio territory, militiamen scalped a fallen Cherokee who had resisted the attack. Working quickly, a couple of militia officers stripped the bodies of three young Shawnees who had tried to escape to the safety of the Mad River. Another Kentuckian lit a torch and prepared to set a hut ablaze. Chief Moluntha, the principal leader of the village, attempted to calm his people by chatting with the invaders. When the shooting began around noon on October 6, 1786, Moluntha had gathered up his family and walked out to meet the Kentuckians. He was too old to run away from them and besides, his land cessions at the mouth of the Great Miami earlier in the year hinted at his willingness to accommodate the Americans. He shook their hands, passed around a pipe filled with tobacco, and pointed to the American flag flying from his lodge pole. Although apprehensive, he tried to make the best of the situation.

The fighting appeared to be over until Hugh McGary, a militia commander from Lincoln County, Kentucky, strode up to the aged Shawnee chief. McGary had survived the devastating native victory at Blue Licks in 1782, but he still harbored a deep hatred for the Shawnee. Moluntha extended his hand, and McGary took it. “Was you in the battle of the Blue Licks?” McGary asked him. Moluntha had not taken part in the battle, but he was unsure of how to answer McGary; he misunderstood the question. Not wanting to offend

the militia officer, Moluntha smiled and nodded his head. “Then God damn you,” McGary screamed, “I’ll give you Blue Lick play!” He pulled a tomahawk from his belt and in one swift motion he cleaved open the old man’s skull. The villagers burst into a panicked frenzy as a few militiamen tackled and restrained McGary. Simon Kenton, who served as a scout for the expedition, nearly broke through the crowd and killed McGary in retaliation. With order restored, the Kentuckians burned the village of Mackachack to the ground. With prisoners in tow, the militiamen left the Ohio territory for Kentucky and declared their expedition a success.<sup>1</sup>

The Kentuckians’ attack on Mackachack, coupled with the unprovoked murder of Moluntha, intensified the power struggle between American Indians and Euro-Americans in the Old Northwest. These groups were engaged in an ongoing struggle to claim superiority—politically, economically, and militarily—of the Great Lakes region. After the destruction of Mackachack, both sides went on the offensive, using violence and intimidation to wear the other down. Warfare between these groups certainly contributed to the final outcome of the struggle: American conquest of the land and the forced removal of the Indians. And yet, warfare alone cannot explain why the Americans emerged as the dominant force in the Old Northwest. The inability of the Indians and the British to create political and military alliances was another key factor why the Indians lost the war in the Old Northwest. Internal power struggles further divided the tribes of the Old Northwest against each other, causing more damage than the American military. However, during the

first few years of the war, the Indians successfully created a military confederacy that challenged the Americans for supremacy of the Northwest Territory.<sup>2</sup>

The end of the American Revolution had not brought peace to the Old Northwest. Rather, both Indians and Euro-Americans continued their decades long struggle to gain the upper hand in the region. The Indians remained hopeful that the British could continue to support them in their fight against the Americans. Bolstered by the words of Alexander McKee, the principal British agent at Detroit, the Indians continued to harass American settlements along the frontier. Speaking at the Sandusky Council in September 1783, McKee held out the promise of continued patronage by the British and made good on his promise by sending the schooner *Faith* to Detroit later in the month, providing the Indians with new guns, clothing, and other goods. Still, McKee stopped short of offering any overt military commitment.<sup>3</sup>

British self-interest defined the Crown's relationship with the Indians. But the relationship between the British and the Indians was never sufficiently important enough to warrant Great Britain going to war against the United States. As a result, the British shied away from offering any direct support to the Indians, regarding the Indians as their personal dependents and managing them accordingly. Remaining satisfied to obtain the goods necessary to carry on their war with the Americans, the Indians recognized Britain's reluctance to engage in open warfare with the Americans, but they still fostered hopes that native victories might entice the English to take a more active role in the conflict. Even after the Indians achieved overwhelming victories against American armies in 1790 and

1791, their British “allies” refused to challenge the United States for supremacy of the Old Northwest. The relationship between the British and the Indians could be described as equivocal at best. In response to the growing threat of American expansion, the Indians attempted to solidify their position through inter-tribal confederacies.<sup>4</sup>

The village represented the basic political unit for Indians of the Old Northwest. Most Indian villages numbered a few hundred occupants derived from various tribes: Miami, Shawnee, Cherokee, Ottawa, Delaware, and a host of others. Trade, worship, marriage, and other tangible relationships connected villagers to each other through culture. Indians typically associated themselves with their village, although smaller tribal divisions of phratry and clan did come into play.

Village identity, however, became problematic as relations with the Americans soured. Beginning in 1783 at Sandusky, native leaders throughout the Old Northwest pursued a grand Indian confederacy to repel the Americans. The Indian confederacy adhered to tribal identity rather than village association for two main reasons. First, a number of political chiefs—such as Moluntha at the Shawnee village of Mackachack—had declared that their villages were neutral and refused to openly engage in war against the Americans. Second, the emphasis on tribal identity spoke directly to the young, nativist warriors who carried the burden of fighting the Americans. Lacking the political power of the older chiefs, younger warriors correctly assumed that a successful war against the Americans could provide them with power and prestige among their own people.<sup>5</sup>

Ongoing power struggles within the native community weakened the Indian confederacy from its inception. Members of the confederacy joined and left the group whenever they saw fit. Chiefs jockeyed for power and withdrew their support and warriors whenever they wanted to make a point. Neutral chiefs parlayed with the Americans and occasionally ceded lands. Such actions undermined the militaristic nature of the confederacy. Disagreement over a central authority rendered a standing army or treasury impossible. In contrast, the Americans, working under a confederated government until 1787, managed to equip a small army and keep the treasury afloat. Early on, such differences loomed large as abstract political categories than as realities of power in the Old Northwest. In actuality, both native and American confederacies were feeble. Still, the Americans' ability to unite against a common adversary significantly improved their chances of winning a protracted war against the northwestern Indians.<sup>6</sup>

Flawed relations among the Americans stemmed from opposing attitudes between frontiersmen and those who represented the federal government of the United States, in particular the army. The main point of contention between the two groups was over land claims. On September 22, 1783, Congress passed a resolution to "prohibit and forbid all persons from making settlements on lands inhabited or claimed by Indians without the limit or jurisdiction of any particular state." Yet, because the resolution provided no penalty or any practical means of enforcement, it was virtually ignored by settlers. After exploring seventy miles along the Ohio River in April 1785, Ensign John Armstrong wrote that American settlers were moving into the Ohio lands "by forties and fifties at a time."

Similarly, Colonel Josiah Harmar, commander of the First American Regiment (now the United States Army), recorded that from October 1786 to May 1787, “177 boats, 2,689 souls, and 102 wagons” passed Fort Harmar bound for the Ohio country.<sup>7</sup>

In 1787, Congress passed the Northwest Ordinance which allowed for the sale and settlement of lands in the Northwest Territory. Land speculators and notable politicians such as George Washington, Henry Knox, and John Cleves Symmes bought up huge tracts of land. In order to protect their investments, Congress officially authorized a military practice that had been underway for at least two years: various army detachments ranged the Ohio River valley destroying illegal homesteads and forcing squatters off the land. Relationships between the frontiersmen and the federal government soured, with the frontiersmen coming to resent the presence of the United States army on the frontier. For their part, the army Regulars chastised frontiersmen for stirring up trouble with the natives. Settler and soldier alike wanted control of the Old Northwest, and the conflict of interests led to a power struggle among the Americans. Yet, for all their differences, the settlers and soldiers could agree on one point: Americans, not Indians, should control the Northwest Territory.<sup>8</sup>

U.S. army frustration with frontiersmen was well-grounded. The start of the Indian War in the Old Northwest can be attributed to their incursions into the Old Northwest following the end of the American Revolution, antagonizing the Indians as well as state and federal governments. The Kentuckians, in particular, were responsible for hundreds of injuries and depredations against the Indians. Writing to Governor Patrick Henry of

Virginia in 1785, Daniel Boone noted that “The injries done to the Indens are terrible. An Inden warr is expcted.” He urged that reinforcements be sent to defend the territory. Joseph Brant, prominent leader of the Mohawks, also suspected that the Kentuckians meant to incite a war. In 1785, he traveled to London to seek the support of the British. As usual, the British promised some aid but stopped short of consenting to a military alliance. By 1786, tensions ran high in the Old Northwest, and both Indians and Americans prepared for the violence yet to come.<sup>9</sup>

In July 1786, a unique proclamation circulated throughout Kentucky District calling for the “implied contract between settlers of this country to support and defend each other against our relentless and common enemies [the Indians].” Issued by the citizens of Jefferson County, now present-day Louisville, the proclamation called all white males to arms. By signing the proclamation, County Lieutenant William Pope and others argued that the security of the Kentucky country might be ensured by mutual support for the common defense. Yet, a covert and integral part of the Jefferson County appeal-to-arms remained undisclosed to the general public. The proclamation also called for offensive operations—preemptive strikes not only to disrupt Indian raids but also to avenge recent wrongs suffered at the hands of the “marauding savages.” The Jefferson County appeal to arms was nothing less than a declaration of war against the Indians. Kentuckians—who for months had been in turmoil from Indian raids—united with one another and rejoiced at the chance to engage the “Indian banditti” in warfare.<sup>10</sup>

The Jefferson County appeal-to-arms marked the first move in the great power struggle to secure the Old Northwest. The proclamation was met by much enthusiasm from the settlers, but it had a wholly different effect on the state and federal governments. The Virginia Council dawdled in indecision over the document. The Council recognized the need to defend Kentucky District, but it rejected the idea of offensive campaigns against the natives. Unable, or perhaps unwilling, to support or reject the call to war, the Virginia Council remained mute even after the first shots of war were fired. In contrast, the Confederated Congress dismissed the document outright. The Articles of Confederation denied states the right to engage in offensive warfare against the Indians, without the approval of Congress. Furthermore, the United States remained racked by Revolutionary War debts and could ill-afford conflict with the northwestern Indians. Frustrated by the opposition they faced from their own state and federal governments, the settlers engaged the Indians without any additional support. Rumors swirled throughout Kentucky District that Spain, or possibly France, might come to the aid of the embattled settlers. The rift between the government and its citizens on the frontier continued to widen.<sup>11</sup>

When Colonel Harmar and his officers learned of the Kentuckians' intentions, they braced for an impending crisis on the frontier. Based primarily at Fort Harmar, near present-day Marietta, Ohio, and at Vincennes on the Wabash River, the soldiers of the First American Regiment found themselves in frequent conflict with American settlers. They saw the Kentuckians and backcountry militia not as allies but as enemies of the state and of good order. Harmar wrote that "The sovereign authority of the United States is frequently

defied by the Kentuckians.” Major John Hamtramck, who commanded Post Vincennes, found it, “very mortifying to see the authority of the United States so much sneered at by its wayward citizens.” Neither commander had much respect for backcountry settlers. In contrast, the soldiers often found the Indians to be more respectful and peaceful than the settlers, although this changed once the war broke out. By 1786, the American army found itself in a precarious situation, instructed to protect both settler and native alike. It was an impossible task.<sup>12</sup>

Without additional support from the United States, the Kentuckians resolved to strike the Indians as quickly as possible. On August 2, 1786, field officers from the three counties in Kentucky District voted unanimously to launch an expedition against the Wabash Indians and the Shawnees along the Mad River. Officers chose George Rogers Clark, who commanded western forces during the Revolution, to lead the assault on the Wabash. Benjamin Logan, a veteran frontiersman and notable militia captain, headed the attack on the Shawnees along the Mad River. After weeks of logistical problems, Clark’s twelve hundred man force moved out of its base at Clarksville on September 17, bound for Post Vincennes and the Wabash country. Logan’s smaller force of nearly eight hundred men left Limestone two weeks later, heading due north towards the Shawnee village of Mackachack.<sup>13</sup>

The Kentuckians sought to attack two very different groups of Indians. The Wabash tribes—largely Weas, Piankashaws, and Miamis—were perhaps the most troublesome Indians to the frontiersmen. The Miamis, in particular, frequently raided throughout

Kentucky under the direction of British Indian Agent Alexander McKee. The Wabash tribes also staunchly supported the growing Indian confederacy in the Old Northwest. When Joseph Brant ventured to the Wabash territory to espouse native unity against the “Long Knives,” chiefs and warriors alike received him well.<sup>14</sup>

The Indians at Mackachack represented a divided lot. Most of the young warriors supported the charismatic leaders Blue Jacket (Shawnee) or Buckongahelas (Delaware). Both chiefs were prominent figures in the Indian confederacy. However, a large contingent of natives still supported Moluntha, the aged Shawnee chief who urged accommodation with the Americans. In goodwill, he signed the Treaty of Fort Finney in January 1786, which ceded southeastern Ohio to the United States. Despite Moluntha’s neutralist attitude, Kentuckians targeted his village because a number of young warriors residing there had taken part in raiding Kentucky. Also, Moluntha had fought against the Americans in his younger days, and the frontiersmen had long memories.<sup>15</sup>

Clark’s force reached the Wabash country the first week of October. Rather than marching directly against the natives, Clark and his men waited for supplies at Vincennes. Most of the army’s supplies had been loaded onto keelboats and sent down the Ohio and up the Wabash. Unfortunately, low water levels impeded the progress of the boats. By the time the boats reached Vincennes, most of the perishables had spoiled. Worse still, reports circulated that the Indians had gathered over a thousand warriors. While the Indians strengthened their numbers, the confidence of the frontiersmen waned. At the mouth of the Big Vermillion River, over three hundred Logan County men deserted en masse. With a

growing mutiny on his hands, Clark marched back to Vincennes and disbanded his army. The problems that plagued Clark's expedition—want of supplies, an alerted enemy, and low morale—hindered future battle plans for militiamen and Regulars alike. Logan's force, unencumbered by such difficulties, continued its march northward towards Mackachack.<sup>16</sup>

In spite of the efforts of a lone Kentuckian who deserted and warned some of the Indians at Mackachack about the impending battle, Logan's force met little resistance when it arrived at the village on October 6. Most of the four hundred warriors who resided in the village were off hunting in the Wabash territory with Joseph Brant and Blue Jacket. As a result, only a handful of Shawnee warriors were killed, and the village quickly fell to the Kentuckians.

Logan ordered his men to act with restraint, but as was often the case with backcountry militia, the frontiersmen quickly resorted to theft and violence, climaxing in Hugh McGary's unprovoked murder of Moluntha. In response, Logan and his officers ordered their subordinates to shoot down any man who killed an Indian prisoner. After burning the nearby village of Wapatomica, the Kentuckians marched south to cross the Ohio. At a cost of just three men killed, Logan's raid succeeded in destroying two key Shawnee villages and fifteen thousand bushels of corn, and capturing twenty-eight Indian prisoners.<sup>17</sup>

The raids carried out by Clark and Logan immediately effected the war in the Old Northwest, but not in the way the Kentuckians had hoped. Instead of crushing Indian resistance in the Ohio country, the attacks inadvertently strengthened the Indian

confederacy. The brutal murder of Moluntha and the destruction of his village convinced many neutralist Indians that their only hope of survival rested with the confederacy. The Shawnee in particular abandoned hopes of reconciliation with the Americans. Armed and equipped by the British at Detroit, the Shawnee became the most active and ardent supporters of the Indian confederacy. Just weeks after the raid on Mackachack, an army officer wrote that, "There are now more Shawnees on the south side of the Ohio than have been discovered at one time for two years past." During the winter of 1786-87, frequent Indian raids ravaged the Kentucky district. The Indians, united by their strengthening confederacy, found a prime opportunity to disrupt the power structure in the Old Northwest.<sup>18</sup>

At this critical juncture, the Indians made the mistake of trying to obtain power through diplomacy instead of warfare. That diplomacy remained possible suggests that although radical elements in the Indian nations had gained influence, neutralist chiefs still wielded considerable influence within the ranks of the confederacy. Treaty negotiations, peace talks, and gift exchanges were typical during the mid-1780s as the officers of the United States army became the de facto representatives of the national government in the Old Northwest.<sup>19</sup>

From the Indians' perspective, however, there was significant difference between the army Regulars, who they referred to as the "real Americans," and the frontier settlers who were known as "Big Knives." Unlike the frontiersmen, federal soldiers did not pose an immediate threat to the welfare and survival of the natives. The soldiers rarely attacked

the Indians, focusing instead on the backcountry banditti who robbed and murdered both Indians and whites. Furthermore, the soldiers were too few and ill-equipped to upset the balance of power in the region. Yet, following the violence of 1786, hundreds of additional federal troops entered the Old Northwest and constructed new forts throughout southern Ohio. Despite an increased American presence in the region, the Indians refrained from large-scale military action, continuing to seek power through diplomacy by manipulating the likes of Harmar and Arthur St. Clair who scorned the Indians, but generally acquiesced to their wishes. By negotiating with the United States army, the Indians hoped to maintain the balance of power in the region without much bloodshed.<sup>20</sup>

However, the passage of the Northwest Ordinance upset any chance for a cessation of hostilities. The United States army was given the difficult task of organizing and pacifying the Northwest Territory. As the army facilitated white civilization into the region, the soldiers came into conflict with the Indians. Minor skirmishes broke out between the two groups as more and more soldiers appeared in the region. In 1787, a force of three hundred Indian warriors attacked an army convoy at the mouth of the Wabash, inflicting heavy casualties. This last engagement all but severed ties between the Indians and the federal soldiers. The Indians no longer distinguished between the “real Americans” and the “Big Knives.” Frustrated by frequent attacks, the federal soldiers came to rely on the frontier militias for support.<sup>21</sup>

The organization of the Northwest Territory and the expansion of American military power in the region dealt a tremendous blow to native diplomacy. Indian raids and

kidnappings also undermined the efforts of native diplomats. But these problems alone do not explain why the natives failed to obtain power through diplomacy. The ongoing problem that faced the Indian confederacy was its own divisiveness. Although the confederacy grew in numbers after Clark's and Logan's raids, it did not become more cohesive. At least one tribal faction, led by the Wyandots, called for peace with the Americans at any price. Another group, consisting of Miamis, Shawnees, and Ottawas, rejected any overtures of peace. Several other tribes followed the lead of Joseph Brant and sought compromise with the Americans. Further complicating the situation were the British who by 1787 had assumed a more active role in the power struggle playing out in the Old Northwest.<sup>22</sup>

In the winter of 1786-87, Sir Guy Carleton returned to Canada as the reappointed military governor of Quebec. Carleton had served as the commander in Canada during the American Revolution, and he enjoyed the trust and admiration of the Indians. Though aging at sixty-two, Carleton remained determined as ever to support the Indians and check American power in the Old Northwest. He and British Indian agent Sir John Johnson, anticipating a war with America, suggested that the British maintain their forts in the region. Johnson went a step further, relating to Joseph Brant that the British harbored a strong willingness to militarily support the Indian confederacy. He warned, however, that "the King cannot begin a war with the Americans because some of their people encroach and make depredations upon parts of Indian country."<sup>23</sup> Confederacy leaders took this to mean that the British could be drawn into a war against the Americans. A string of

victories against the Americans might entice the British to step in and apply some leverage during treaty negotiations. The Indian confederacy met at Detroit in December 1787 to plan future raids against the Americans and to gather additional supplies for the spring offensive. It seemed that the Indians had at last obtained an overt commitment of British support.<sup>24</sup>

Native resistance increased dramatically following the 1787 council at Detroit. Carleton's and Johnson's words convinced many young warriors to take up arms against the Americans, but Brant still did not answer the call for bloodshed. He feared that British promises might further divide the fragile confederacy. He also suspected that the British had no intention of lending military support to the natives. Recognizing that the growing number of Americans in the region would tip the balance of power, Brant favored a new treaty with the Americans to replace the much maligned Treaty of Fort Stanwix (1784), which had deprived the Indians of all lands west of Pennsylvania. Brant's decision to continue diplomacy with the Americans, however, did not sit well with the younger warriors. Encouraged by the British and intent on reversing the power structure within the native ranks, the younger warriors ignored Brant's call for mediation. Although still respected for his political prowess, Brant gradually lost the support of the militant faction of the confederacy. War chiefs such as Blue Jacket and Little Turtle became new voices within the confederacy.<sup>25</sup>

News of a power shift within the Indian confederacy elicited a strong response from the American government in Philadelphia. The prominence of the militant tribes indicated

to Congress that the Indians planned to launch a full-scale frontier war. Secretary of War Henry Knox had realized that the United States had become embroiled in an undeclared Indian war some two years earlier, and while Congress had demanded a response to the injustices carried out on the frontier, Knox resisted calls for a military campaign because the government simply could not afford it. Instead, he urged Congress to give diplomacy another chance, recommending that the United States purchase the Indian lands through treaty negotiations. Extinguishing land claims through compensation might be more economical than mounting a campaign to subdue the Indians. But Knox's plan had one major flaw: the majority of Indians did not consider land a saleable commodity, and they would not willingly enter into such an agreement. Knox also underestimated the tenacity of the militant factions in control of the confederacy.<sup>26</sup>

In December 1787, Knox ordered Arthur St. Clair, governor of the Northwest Territory, to negotiate with the Wabash tribes who had been responsible for the majority of attacks along the Ohio River. They were staunchly opposed to land cessions. Still, Knox hoped that St. Clair could convince the tribes not only to end their attacks but also to come under the authority of the United States, potentially marking the end of the Indian confederacy. A bolder power play had yet to be seen in the war. Only a supremely confident diplomat with a knowledge of native customs and culture could have pulled off such a political coup. Unfortunately for the United States, the penultimate assignment rested in the hands of St. Clair, a man known for his callous nature and diplomatic inexperience.<sup>27</sup>

Knox may have recognized St. Clair's faults for he instructed Indian commissioner Richard Butler to assist St. Clair in the negotiations. Butler was an established Indian diplomat who had taken part in several treaties including those at Fort Stanwix (1784) and Fort McIntosh (1785). Butler, however, placed little faith in the success of his mission. He wrote to Knox that the Indians found St. Clair to be "obnoxious" and that "they will place no confidence in him and probably deceive him."<sup>28</sup> Despite his objections, Butler convinced several Indian tribes to attend the treaty conference at the falls of the Muskingum in summer 1788.

Several Indian raids carried out against federal troops in the spring of 1788 all but doomed the negotiations. One raid in particular wiped out half of a thirty-six man detachment sent to re-supply Vincennes. Worse still, reports filtered in to St. Clair that three thousand Indian warriors had assembled along the Wabash for a war council. British Indian agent Alexander McKee attended the council and passed out gifts to the war chiefs. He also pledged British support for years to come. An angry St. Clair declared that if the treaty council convened, it would do so beneath the guns of Fort Harmar.<sup>29</sup>

The surge in native resistance dealt a tremendous blow to the work of Joseph Brant. Brant remained a prominent member of the Indian confederacy despite his overtures at peace. However, St. Clair did not differentiate between the moderate Brant and the more militant Indians engaged in warfare against the United States. In order to demonstrate his loyalty, Brant began to distance himself from the militant faction of the confederacy. He told St. Clair that the Mohawks, Hurons, Chippewas, Ottawas, Potawatomis, and Delawares

were prepared to accept a small land cession rather than “leap into a destructive war with the United States.” He also warned that the Miamis, Shawnees, and Kickapoos favored war and refused to agree to any concessions. To facilitate negotiations with the Americans, Brant proposed that the confederacy cede all lands south and east of the Muskingum River. St. Clair rejected the offer, stating that it was still too far east. Brant and his delegation, frustrated by St. Clair’s inability to compromise, left Fort Harmar and returned home.<sup>30</sup>

When treaty negotiations finally commenced in November 1788, only two hundred Indians attended, and they hardly represented the confederacy. Not a single Shawnee, Miami, Wabash, or Mohawk representative appeared at the council. The Wyandots, led by Shandotto, and the Delawares, led by Captain Pipe, used the opportunity to bid for leadership of the confederacy. Both nations stressed the illegitimacy of Iroquois land claims while jockeying for special trading privileges with the Americans. St. Clair cared little for the power struggles amongst the tribes. His priority at the council entailed validating land cessions made in earlier treaties. He told the Indians that the land belonged to the Americans by virtue of their victory over the British. He explained the willingness of the United States to pay for the land cessions, but that if the tribes refused his offer they could expect war. St. Clair’s strong arm tactics offended attendees, most of whom refused to sign the treaty. Eventually several minor chiefs signed the Fort Harmar Treaty and brought the proceedings to a close. Major Ebenezer Denny called the entire council a farce, noting that several of the chiefs left black wampum at the fort: a promise of war.<sup>31</sup>

The treaty council at Fort Harmar began as an attempt by the United States to peaceably acquire land while also disrupting the Indian confederacy. In the end, the United States achieved neither goal. Instead, the treaty discredited the peaceful factions of the confederacy and reaffirmed the status of the militant chiefs. Not surprisingly, the Indians who signed the treaty lost all credibility within the confederacy. Other political casualties included Brant and the Iroquois chiefs who had urged accommodation with the Americans. After the treaty, Brant moved to Detroit and instructed the Shawnees at Kekionga (or Miami Town) to act on his behalf. Kekionga then became the principle seat of government for the confederacy. The treaty also resulted in more Indian raids throughout Ohio and Kentucky, which in turn led to more federal troops being garrisoned in the region. The British could not have been more pleased with the outcome of the treaty, and they vowed to their Indian allies that they would take on a larger role in the escalating conflict.<sup>32</sup>

The treaty council at Fort Harmar ushered in a new, more militaristic phase of the Indian War in the Old Northwest. The failed conference convinced Indians and Americans alike that diplomacy alone could not deliver the power that both sides coveted. Successful military campaigns became the indicators of power, suggesting the ability of one group to impose its will on another during diplomatic negotiations. For the Americans, victories on the battlefield not only secured the Northwest Territory for settlement, but also confirmed the strength of the new nation in the eyes of interested European powers. The Indians needed to rout the United States army in order to bring the Americans back to the bargaining table on native terms. The promise of British assistance—if the natives could

put together a string of victories—also weighed heavily on the Indians' decision to expand the war against the Americans. By 1789, leaders on all sides recognized that warfare was the quickest and perhaps the only way to take control of the Old Northwest.<sup>33</sup>

American leaders, most notably Washington and Knox, thought a war between the United States and the Indians might also ease tensions between citizens in the east and those living in the backcountry. Grievances on the frontier were many, and residents petitioned the federal government in vain for redress. For years the backcountry settlers suffered from economic and physical insecurity. Poor transportation routes, few local judicial institutions, absentee landowners, and unimproved communities: all hinted at the national government's apparent disregard for the welfare of the West. Although many frontiersmen preferred that the national government stay out of their affairs, the Indian War caused them to rethink their position. Kentucky and Ohio settlers had been engaged in organized warfare with the Indians since the militia raids of 1786, if not longer. Although the Kentuckians initiated the war, the conflict had stretched beyond their ability to mount a successful defense. Survival necessitated that the frontiersmen work with the United States army to suppress native resistance. As for the national government, it risked cultivating rebellion in the West if it did not step in on behalf of the beleaguered citizens.<sup>34</sup>

By spring 1789, hundreds of settlers lived north of the Ohio River on contested land. Militant Indians relentlessly attacked the white settlers who crossed the Ohio, but they could not stem the flow of incoming pioneers. In an effort to stop the settlers before they even reached Ohio, the Indians turned the Ohio River into a principle battleground. Using

white decoys, Indians who spoke English and dressed as whites, wild-game calls, and seemingly abandoned river craft, the Indians caught many an unwary traveler in an ambush. As an alternative to raiding Kentucky, the river raids provided the Indians with hundreds of susceptible targets without the risk associated with operations amid more populous white settlements. While raids on the Ohio proved valuable in terms of goods and horses stolen, the ultimate payoff was the Indians' ability to spread fear amongst the settlers. With each passing year the Indians took fewer and fewer white captives, while elevating the brutality and violence of the killings. Years of racism, unavenged murders, and long-suffered injustices turned the frontier conflict into a war of terror. The popular river town of Limestone, Kentucky, saw its population dip as a result. Residents noted that bodies and burning rafts frequently floated past Limestone; each one a reminder of the cost of war.<sup>35</sup>

Frontiersmen similarly employed terror tactics in their struggle against the Indians. The American settlers still raided Indian villages in 1789, but like their Indian counterparts, they too recognized the benefits of unorthodox tactics, partially out of a desire to limit American casualties. By autumn 1788, the *Kentucky Gazette* reported that settlers had spiked foodstuffs with arsenic and other poisons to kill off Indian raiders. American traders had noted that the Indians drank more heavily while under duress so, as the war escalated, traders supplied more liquor to the natives, which contributed to the destruction of tribal culture and loss of life. Americans also attacked the Indians economically by reducing the fur trade, even though the demand for furs rose between 1783 and 1786. Though this tactic did not directly affect most Indians, it did make it somewhat more difficult for the

confederacy to purchase British goods. Finally, there were always avowed Indian haters like “Savage” Daniel Morgan and Hugh McGary who willingly tortured and murdered Indians to spread fear among the general populace.<sup>36</sup>

In the aftermath of the Fort Harmar Treaty, the savagery of both Indians and American settlers reached horrendous new levels. Murders, scalplings, and terror tactics became the preferred methods of warfare. Coinciding with the violence was a sense of intense racial hatred. Racism had always existed between Indians and whites. However, the retaliatory killings and raids between 1786 and 1789 multiplied racial tensions in the Old Northwest. Frontiersmen, though divided by ethnicity and background, began to recognize themselves as “white” while conversely viewing Indians as “savage, red men” or simply “nonwhite.” Racial awareness unified the settlers in a way that nothing else could. The Indians, too, held racial attitudes against the settlers, but they were less inclined to use race as justification for warfare. On the battlefield both groups expressed racial intolerance through torture and mutilation. The purpose of the war was still to decide which group could control the Old Northwest, but racism turned it into an increasingly bloody affair.<sup>37</sup>

In spring 1789, the soldiers of the United States army found themselves frequent victims of the racially charged violence that swept through the Old Northwest. A federal report issued in June noted that Shawnees murdered one soldier outside of the river town of Belpre, five soldiers near Marietta, Ohio, and one unfortunate soldier found outside of Fort Knox who had been “shot in two places and scalped; his body had been shot with two arrows, his heart taken out, and his privates cut off.” Officers recorded seventeen settlers

killed and another fifteen wounded as a result of raids on Fort Washington (present-day Cincinnati). The psychological effect of such violence kept many soldiers within the confines of the fort, while dozens of settlers abandoned the country.<sup>38</sup>

In July 1789, an independent expedition of Kentucky militia under Major John Hardin set out to disrupt Indian activity in the Wea villages along the Wabash River. Hardin and his 220-man force hoped to interdict several Indian war parties rumored to be bound for Kentucky. On August 9, scouts discovered a Shawnee hunting party that numbered twenty-two men, women, and children. The scouts attacked the group without warning, killing twelve Indians, including an infant. Proceeding on to Vincennes, Hardin's raiders arrived in the town displaying the scalps of the slain. An irate Major John Hamtramck informed Hardin and his men that they had killed members of a peaceful clan of Shawnees and worried that, "this Kentucky affair will undo everything." His prediction proved all too accurate. Within weeks, several peaceful tribes pledged support to the western Indian confederacy. Fueled by events such as Hardin's raid, the confederacy swelled in numbers. The United States found itself in danger of being overpowered by the Indians and their British allies.<sup>39</sup>

By summer 1789, the Indian confederacy proved to be more united and better coordinated than the forces of the United States. Although federal troops and backcountry militias united for protection, they still squabbled over issues of rank and jurisdiction. The United States army had minimal numbers and resources, and a concerted and sustained Indian

policy remained elusive. In contrast, native war chiefs collaborated to inflict damage on the Americans, while Indian warriors armed themselves with British weapons.

Richard Butler, superintendent of Indian affairs, noted that “the Indians have laboured exceedingly to form a general confederacy among themselves from north to south in order to become more formidable, and as far as they are capable of being bound to each other I believe they are.” He also remarked that a “general war against the Indians, with European supplies and friends, would give a severe shock to our frontier.” Governor St. Clair echoed these thoughts when he wrote that “the Northwest Territory is becoming a source of mischief and increased expense, and that an Indian war would be attended with many evils.” Both men realized that a declaration of war against the confederacy could cost the United States the Northwest Territory.<sup>40</sup>

Writing to newly commissioned Brigadier General Josiah Harmar, Knox remarked, “I most sincerely hope some expedients may be devised for avoiding an Indian war. This event would at present be embarrassing beyond conception. It has been with the greatest difficulty that money has been obtained for recruits, clothing, and stores which have been forwarded during the present year. If an Indian war should arise, it is greatly to be apprehended that it must languish for want of money. In this case, it might be protracted to such a length to produce extreme distress and disgrace.” Well aware of the precarious situation that existed on the frontier, Knox knew that the United States was locked in an undeclared war with the Indians. The national government had to protect its citizens and its own interests, but to do so might invite failure as well as military involvement by Britain.

By September 1789, the situation on the frontier had become critical. St. Clair warned Washington and Knox that inhabitants could take no more; war existed on all fronts. In order for the United States to wrest power from the Indians and the frontiersmen it had to commit to war.<sup>41</sup>

For the Indians, the timing was perfect. Shocked by the persistent violence and brutality of the American frontiersmen, many Indians who had favored peace in 1786 either sided with the militants or left the region altogether. Few accommodationists remained; most Indians admitted the futility of seeking a peaceful solution. The confederacy boasted over four thousand warriors, including several exemplary war chiefs who had risen to prominence after the Fort Harmar Treaty. As for a strategic base of operations, the Miami village of Kekionga became home to thousands of Indians from various tribes, including many British and French traders. Furthermore, the promise of British assistance motivated the Indians to act as soon as possible. The winter of 1789 found the Indians making final preparations for the imminent battles to come the following year.<sup>42</sup>

War against the Americans led to many political changes for the Indian tribes of the Old Northwest. Prior to the war, civil chiefs such as Joseph Brant, Moluntha, and Old Tassel dominated councils and treaty conferences. These leaders urged accommodation with the Americans, planning to usurp American power in the region through nonviolent means. Controlling the fur trade and challenging the Americans diplomatically could ensure native control of the Old Northwest. The chiefs claimed some success until the raids of 1786 brought war to the region. As the war progressed, the political influence of the

civil chiefs diminished and the war chiefs became the new leaders of the confederacy. By 1789, Moluntha and Old Tassel were dead, having been murdered by frontiersmen. Brant survived but was no longer a viable leader of the confederacy. The entire power structure of the Indian confederacy changed as a result of war.<sup>43</sup>

During the winter of 1789, the war chiefs stripped the last remnants of tribal business from the hands of the civil chiefs. In councils, the war chiefs sat at the front, symbolizing their ascendancy over tribal chiefs. Militant leaders such as Blue Jacket (Shawnee), Little Turtle (Miami), and Captain Johnny (Shawnee) met frequently with the British at Detroit. Governor Carleton wrote, "The Indians seem now to be determined to remove all American settlements northwest of the Ohio. They have dispatched war pipes to the different nations, and they have sent a large deputation of Wabash and Miami Indians to Detroit to announce their determination for war, and to demand a supply of ammunition." The British complied, and the Indians left Detroit with boxes of powder, lead, and some rifles. Distribution of war pipes proved successful as well. Several bands of Cherokee Indians from western Virginia joined the confederacy, as did Buckongahelas of the Delaware tribe. Buckongahelas's village had been destroyed, along with Moluntha's, during Logan's raid. Still resentful of the Americans, Buckongahelas and his warriors became ardent supporters of the confederacy. The addition of Cherokee and Delaware warriors, supplemented by British weapons, strengthened the Indian confederacy as the war moved into its bloodier second stage.<sup>44</sup>

In just over three years time, war had transformed the political, economic, and military configurations of the Old Northwest. Prior to the war, the frontiersmen enjoyed political freedoms largely independent from the national government. But the Northwest Ordinance and the Constitution legitimized the political authority of the United States on paper, and the arrival of federal troops in the Northwest Territory established the presence of the United States in the West. The United States gradually took political power from the hands of the frontiersmen, who posed a direct threat to the authority and security of the new nation. The Indians, too, experienced a change in political leadership as young, militant war chiefs replaced older, accomodationist civil chiefs. Meanwhile, the British nurtured their own political resurgence in the region as the Indians once again turned to them for supplies, advice, and military support.

Economies were also affected by the war in the Old Northwest. Commerce was disrupted on the Ohio River as a result of Indian raids. The sudden keelboat attacks cost American businessmen thousands of dollars. The fur trade suffered as a result of the war, hurting both groups by limiting the profits of American traders and hindering the Indians' ability to purchase British goods. Only the British benefited from the decline of the fur trade, as the confederacy's dependence on British trade goods provided the English with invaluable diplomatic leverage during treaty negotiations. The North West Company and the Hudson's Bay Company capitalized on the economic turmoil by creating trade routes with the Indians as far west as present-day Nebraska that remained intact and profitable until the War of 1812.<sup>45</sup>

The Indian War also drastically changed the military configurations that existed in the Old Northwest. Continual Indian raids against the settlers expanded the need for and importance of backcountry militias. The war also forced the United States to post more soldiers on the frontier, as well as to build more forts. Under constant pressure from the Indians, federal troops and backcountry militiamen formed a weary alliance with each other for protection. As the war progressed, the Indians saw their sporadic raiding develop into a successful guerrilla war. Meanwhile, the number of warriors fighting for the western confederacy increased threefold between 1786 and 1789. Even the nature of the war changed, from raiding and retaliatory killings to borderline terrorism and racial genocide.

In spring 1790, as the war entered its second phase, large-scale engagements between the participants once again redefined the course of the war and altered the military configurations in the Old Northwest. Conflicting relationships between the Americans, the Indians, and the British, had contributed to the outbreak of war in the Old Northwest. Attempts by each group to seize power in the Great Lakes region, however, had failed to materialize by the winter of 1789-90. With spring came renewed efforts to assert dominance in the territory. Deficient relationships continued to alter the course of the war, but between 1790 and 1792 the incapacity to compromise and work together took its toll within the ranks of allies more so than between enemies.

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> Henry Howe, *Historical Collections of Ohio* (Cincinnati, Ohio: n.p., 1900), 299-301; Benjamin Logan, record of 6 October, 1786, *Wisconsin Historical Society*, 12 S 136, Draper Manuscripts (hereafter *DM*), Wisconsin Historical Society, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Isaac Clinkenbeard, interview by John Dabney Shane, February 1840, ICC3, *DM*.

<sup>2</sup> Hugh McGary was found guilty of murdering Moluntha by thirteen of his peers. The court martial ruled that he was to be suspended from rank for one year. See William Palmer, ed., *Calendar of Virginia State Papers* (hereafter *CVSP*), 4 vols. (Richmond, Va., n.p., 1884), 4: 258-60.

<sup>3</sup> Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 413-14; Clarence Burton, ed., *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections* (hereafter *MP*), 28 vols. (Lansing: Michigan Historical Society, 1889), 20: 178-83.

<sup>4</sup> Burton, ed., *MP*, 11: 355-58, 385-87.

<sup>5</sup> White, *The Middle Ground*, 416-20; John Sugden, *Blue Jacket: Warrior of the Shawnees* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000), 74-5.

<sup>6</sup> Reginald Horsman, *Expansion and American Indian Policy, 1783-1812* (Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1967), 32-48.

<sup>7</sup> Consul Willshire Butterfield, ed., *Washington-Irvine Correspondence* (Madison, Wisc.: n.p., 1882), 196-97; William Henry Smith, ed., *The St. Clair Papers: The Life and Public Service of Arthur St. Clair*, 2 vols. (Cincinnati, Ohio: n.p., 1882), 2:3, 20.

<sup>8</sup> E. Hinderaker, *Elusive Empires: Constructing Colonialism in the Ohio Valley, 1673-1800* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 247-48; Smith, ed., *St. Clair Papers*, 2: 20.

<sup>9</sup> Letter from Daniel Boone to Patrick Henry, 16 August, 1785, 32C8IA, *DM*; Burton, ed., *MP*, 24: 35-37.

<sup>10</sup> Palmer, ed., *CVSP*, 4: 156-61.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 4: 157; *Journals of the Continental Congress* (hereafter *JCC*), 3 vols. (Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1904-37), 2: 197-98.

<sup>12</sup> Letter from Josiah Harmar to Henry Knox, 1 July, 1785, Letter Book A, Harmar Papers, William Clements Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; letter from Josiah Harmar to John Hamtramck, 15 February, 1789, Letter Book B, Harmar Papers; Gayle Thornbrough, ed., *Outpost on the Wabash: The Letters of Major John Francis Hamtramck 1787-1791* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1957), 150-52.

<sup>13</sup> Palmer, ed., *CVSP*, 4: 157-66; Leonard Helderman, "The Northwest Expedition of George Rogers Clark, 1786-87," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 25 (spring 1938): 317-30.

- 
- <sup>14</sup> Wiley Sword, *President Washington's Indian War: The Struggle for the Old Northwest, 1790-1795* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985), 34-5; Brant journal entry, 9 August, 1793, Canada/Indian Affairs Papers, 15 vols., Canada State Department Record Office, Quebec, 8: 8466. For more information on the diplomatic missions of Joseph Brant, see William Leete Stone's *The Life of Joseph Brant* (New York: Alexander V. Blake, 1838).
- <sup>15</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 68-72, 74-76; entry of 26 January, 1786, in Neville B. Craig ed., *Military Journal of General Richard Butler* (Pittsburgh, Penn.: Dumars, 1848), 82.
- <sup>16</sup> Helderman, "Northwest Expedition," 321-27; Temple Bodley, *George Rogers Clark: His Life and Public Services* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1966), 288-90.
- <sup>17</sup> Burton, ed., *MP*, 24: 34-37; account of Logan's raid, 1 W 264, *DM*.
- <sup>18</sup> Randolph Downes, *Council Fires on the Upper Ohio* (Pittsburgh, Penn.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1969), 301-03; 1 W 267, *DM*; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 41.
- <sup>19</sup> White, *The Middle Ground*, 427-29; Francis Paul Prucha, *The Sword of the Republic: The United States Army on the Frontier, 1783-1846* (New York: MacMillan Company, 1969), 17-21.
- <sup>20</sup> Ebenezer Denny, *Military Journal of Ebenezer Denny* (Philadelphia, Penn.: J.B. Lippincott & Company, 1860), 306-07; letter from Josiah Harmar to Henry Knox, 24 November, 1787, Letter Book B, Harmar Papers.
- <sup>21</sup> Clarence E. Carter, ed., *The Territorial Papers of the United States: The Territory Northwest of the Ohio River, 1787-1803*, 2 vols. (Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1934-75), 25-8; Thornbrough, ed., *Outpost on the Wabash*, 138-41.
- <sup>22</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 60-62; Smith, ed., *The St. Clair Papers*, 2: 94-5.
- <sup>23</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 42-44; William Leete Stone, *Life of Joseph Brant: Thayendanegea*, 2 vols. (1838; reprint, New York, N.Y.: Adamant Media, 2003), 2: 270-71.
- <sup>24</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 42-43.
- <sup>25</sup> Celia Barnes, *Native American Power in the United States, 1783-1795* (Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2003), 70-74; N. Craig, *The Olden Time*, 2 vols. (Pittsburgh, Penn: Westcott, 1927), 2: 423-25.
- <sup>26</sup> Letter from Richard Butler to Henry Knox, 28 March, 1787, *JCC*, 2: 294; letter from Henry Knox to Winthrop Sargent, 2 March, 1787, Henry Knox Papers, Letter Book B, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston; Barnes *Native American Power*, 73-76.
- <sup>27</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 53-55; Barnes, *Native American Power*, 74-75.
- <sup>28</sup> Letter from Richard Butler to Henry Knox, 6 December, 1787, *JCC*, 3: 22.
- <sup>29</sup> Letter from George McDowell to Josiah Harmar, July 1788, Harmar Papers, 8: 25; letter from Josiah Harmar to Henry Knox, 14 September, 1788, Letter Book D, Harmar Papers; letter from Joseph Spear to Josiah Harmar, December 1788, Harmar Papers, 9: 40.

- 
- <sup>30</sup> Letter from Joseph Brant to Robert Langan, 7 October, 1788, quoted in Stone, *Life of Joseph Brant*, 277; Barnes, *Native American Power*, 75.
- <sup>31</sup> Denny, *Military Journal*, 279-80, 334; Carter, ed., *Territorial Papers*, 1: 174-80.
- <sup>32</sup> Smith, ed., *St. Clair Papers*, 2: 157-59, 245; Carter, ed., *Territorial Papers*, 2: 359-66.
- <sup>33</sup> Barnes, *Native American Power*, 78-85.
- <sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 82-4.
- <sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 120; 1 W 409, *DM*; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 72-74; Smith, ed., *St. Clair Papers*, 2: 20, 45.
- <sup>36</sup> 18 CC 18, *DM*; John Frank and Roland Moore, "Historical and Cultural Roots of Drinking Problems Among American Indians," *American Journal of Public Health* 90 (March 2000): 344-45; R. Louis Gentilcore, "Vincennes and French Settlement in the Old Northwest," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 47 (September 1957): 292; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 73.
- <sup>37</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 75-77; Frazer Dorian McGlinchey, "A Superior Civilization: Appropriation, Negotiation, and Interaction in the Northwest Territory, 1787-1795," in Daniel Barr, *The Boundaries Between Us* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University, 2006), 120-22.
- <sup>38</sup> 2 W 49-52; 23 U 173-76, *DM*; item, in Palmer, ed., *CVSP*, 5: 7-9.
- <sup>39</sup> 2 W 71-74, 89, 93, *DM*; letter from John Hamtramck to Josiah Harmar, 14 August, 1789, Letter Book B, Harmar Papers.
- <sup>40</sup> Barnes, *Native American Power*, 125-27; letter from Richard Butler to Henry Knox, 28 March, 1787, *JCC*, 2: 288; Smith, ed., *St. Clair Papers*, 2: 100-103.
- <sup>41</sup> 1 W 486, *DM*; Smith, ed., *St. Clair Papers*, 2: 124.
- <sup>42</sup> Barnes, *Native American Power*, 129-31; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 101-103.
- <sup>43</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 88-92.
- <sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*; Burton, ed., *MP*, 12: 10; Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 93-94.
- <sup>45</sup> James P. Ronda, *Lewis and Clark Among the Indians* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 10-12.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE INDIAN WAR IN THE OLD NORTHWEST

By the late 1780s, the inability and unwillingness of various factions to create a balance of power in the Old Northwest thrust regional inhabitants into a protracted war. Retaliatory killings, punitive expeditions, and skirmishes between Indians and whites dashed any hope of finding a peaceful solution to the question of who would control the Ohio country. Neither Indian nor white was willing to give up diplomatic, militaristic, and economic control of the region without a fight. As the war progressed into 1790, new developments altered the course of the conflict.

Foremost, a new United States government solidified under President George Washington and Secretary of War Henry Knox, marking a new direction in federal Indian policy. Washington and Knox hoped to avoid the expansion of war while ensuring American control of the Old Northwest. But the malicious acts of the frontiersmen confounded federal directives, and backcountry militias and federal troops continued to undermine each other on the battlefield. Animosity between the two “allies” nearly cost the United States the Old Northwest. For their part, the Indians nullified several key military victories with stubborn, unrealistic diplomacy. The Indian confederacy also succumbed to internal feuding and partisan politics, damaging native resistance far beyond what the Americans could have hoped to inflict. Nearly five years after the outbreak of war, disputes among allies ensured unparalleled bloodshed and destruction in the Old Northwest, changing the nature of the conflict as well as its final outcome.

Years of faulty dealings between the confederated western tribes and the settlers of the backcountry completed the process of defining the Indians as “Others.” Racial and cultural differences always existed between the two groups, but it was the ongoing mistreatment and exploitation of both sides that ultimately led to war. As the war progressed most neutralist native leaders were either killed or silenced so that Americans heard only the ominous threats of the war chiefs. By spring 1790, the Indians no longer differentiated between the federal soldiers, once called “real Americans,” and the frontiersmen, derided as “Big Knives.” From the native perspective, all Americans represented a threat because of the continual influx of settlers and soldiers into the Ohio country. These oversimplified notions of friend and foe hindered the efforts of the United States to implement a new federal Indian policy when Washington assumed Office. The attempts by politicians in Philadelphia to enact a plan to assimilate the Indians and bring an end to the war stalled on the frontier because of longstanding differences between the Indians and the Americans.<sup>1</sup>

The Confederation Congress had attempted as early as 1787 to reverse the conquest theory that dictated American Indian policy in the 1780s. Recognizing Indian ownership of the soil, Article III of the Northwest Ordinance (1787) had proclaimed:

The utmost good faith shall always be observed towards the Indians; their lands and property shall never be taken from them without their consent; and in their property, rights and liberty, they never shall be invaded or disturbed, unless in just and lawful wars authorized by Congress; but laws founded in justice and humanity shall from time to time be made, for preventing wrongs being done to them, and for preserving peace and friendship with them.

A new federal Congress expanded upon this idea in 1789 when it approved the commission of several Indian agents in the Old Northwest to “negotiate and entertain” the Indians in “all areas of diplomacy and trade.” Congress, though financially insecure, even set aside appropriations of \$20,000 to defray expenses. However, these changes did little to curb resistance among northwestern Indians unwilling to cease their war against the frontiersmen. The new directives proved more effective in the Old Southwest where Indian tribes such as the Cherokee, Creek, and Chickasaw cooperated with the Indian agents of the United States, if only to play the Americans off the Spanish along the gulf coast.<sup>2</sup>

Necessity required that changes be made to federal Indian policy. Secretary of War Knox often wrote that peace was essential because the United States lacked the money and manpower to quell an Indian rebellion in the Northwest Territory. But changes in federal Indian policy also came from another source. Politicians such as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Thomas Mifflin became increasingly concerned about national honor once the federal government came to power in 1789. These leaders informed Congress that justice and expediency should control the new direction of Indian affairs. These men knew that history remembered villains as well as heroes and they preferred that future generations view them as the latter rather than the former. Thus, Washington and his cabinet made it a priority to adopt Knox’s more benevolent plan of assimilation and land acquisition.<sup>3</sup>

In May 1789, Washington and Knox submitted to the Senate a report on the ineffectiveness of the treaties concluded at Forts Harmar, Stanwix, and McIntosh. Knox

blamed the treaties' failures on their lack of a purchase plan and the continued influence of frontiersmen upon Indian hostility. Writing specifically on the war between the Kentuckians and the Wabash tribes, Knox reported that "the injuries and murders have been so reciprocal, that it would be a point of critical investigation to know on which side they have been the greatest." He further suggested that "the deaths of a number of Piankeshaws, who prided themselves on their attachment to the United States, has led to much dissatisfaction among the tribes." Both Knox and Washington warned the Senate that, without prompt action, there would be a general war between the United States and the northwestern Indians, and, in order to avoid such a predicament, Knox laid out his plan for the peaceful acquisition of northwestern lands, the immediate process to civilize the natives, and the gradual assimilation of the Indians into American society.<sup>4</sup>

For Senators of a new and fiscally insecure government, the rationality and morality of Knox's plan was secondary to the financial stakes, and Knox recognized this. He informed Senators that the cost of enlarging and equipping the army to fight the northwestern Indians might exceed \$200,000 a year, an exorbitant price given the demands on the new government. Conversely, he figured that while it might take the United States fifty years to peacefully buy the land from the natives, this more benevolent policy might only cost \$15,000 a year and far less bloodshed. Knox and future Secretary of War Timothy Pickering argued that as whites approached treaty boundaries and hunted game, and as the land was valuable to the Indians only as hunting grounds, natives would willingly sell additional land for "small considerations." Knox and Pickering urged

Congress to speed the assimilation process along by donating domesticated sheep and cows to the northwestern Indians, and paying teachers and farmers to live among the Indians and “hurry the process of civilization.” As the Indians became more civilized they would gradually give up their traditional ways and lands, and assimilate into American society.<sup>5</sup>

Knox had tested his policy on the Creek Indians residing in the South. In 1789, Indian agents successfully negotiated several land sales with the Creeks, finding Knox’s plan to be less costly and more honorable than forced coercion. Like most white Americans, Congress held a transcendent sense of Indian identity, blurring historical, political, and cultural differences and lumping all Indians together as fundamentally the same. Congress felt that if Knox’s plan worked in the South, it would be equally successful in the Northwest.<sup>6</sup>

Knox’s Indian policy, while far superior to the plan that preceded it, ultimately proved ineffectual in the Old Northwest. Diplomacy between the United States and the northwestern tribes failed for a number of reasons. Indian agents failed to distinguish among varying Indian nations with whom they negotiated. Agents assumed that all Indians, regardless of tribal identity or where they lived, wanted the same things. In fact, each tribe sought unique privileges from the United States in exchange for land. Some tribes wanted money, others favored trading licenses, a few wanted political authority over weaker tribes: the demands of the northwestern tribes rarely coalesced. Knox’s plan also assumed that the Indians wanted to become civilized and assimilate into American society.

While a few tribes—most notably the Wyandots and Mingo—favored peace and a plan of “civilization,” the Shawnee, Wabash, and other tribes did not. Indian agents could not guarantee citizenship or civil rights to the natives since the Constitution only briefly addressed Indians in terms of commerce (Article I Section 8) and taxation (Amendment XIV Section 2). Furthermore, Knox presupposed that Indians would be accepted into frontier society if they chose the path of assimilation. Due to differences in race and culture, not to mention the ill-will caused by years of fighting, such an assumption seemed erroneous at best.<sup>7</sup>

Most glaringly, Knox’s Indian policy faltered in the Northwest because of the war itself. By 1790, the western Indian confederacy stood ready to upend the balance of power in the Old Northwest. Recent military victories over backcountry militias, coupled with disruption of trade along the Ohio River, strengthened the confederacy’s diplomatic leverage. War chiefs such as Blue Jacket and Little Turtle who had replaced more accommodating civil chiefs like Moluntha and Joseph Brant chose to reject Knox’s policy so long as they continued to enjoy military victories. The Indians recommitted themselves to protecting their lands, lifestyles, and fur trade. As long as the Indians remained a viable fighting force, Knox’s plan could not be forced upon them.<sup>8</sup>

Even as Washington and Knox weighed the option of American military intervention in the war, they proposed new commerce laws in a vain effort to coerce the northwestern tribes to accept U.S. hegemony. Both mistakenly believed that faulty treaties and commerce were to blame for the violence in the Old Northwest. An evolving trade

relationship between the United States and the Indian tribes could end hostilities.

Unbeknownst to them, strengthening ties between the western Indian confederacy and the British doomed this policy from the beginning. Nevertheless, Congress, at Washington's behest, approved a series of intercourse acts to regulate trade with the natives starting in 1790. The first intercourse act established a temporary commission to investigate frontiersmen's abuses of the Indians. Although the commission ruled that Kentuckians were largely to blame for the war thus far, the Senate merely noted the findings and brushed them aside. Still, the intercourse act achieved moderate success by laying the groundwork for treaty enforcement and by protecting loyal Indians from obstreperous whites. The act also commissioned five trade agents who gradually carried on diplomacy with the tribes. Ultimately, however, the intercourse act did little to alter the course of the war.<sup>9</sup>

The Washington administration achieved greater success with future legislation. Military victories over the northwestern tribes in 1792 and 1793 paved the way for the implementation of a second intercourse act (1793) which realized Knox's dream of "civilizing" the Indians. The law appointed teachers and farmers to work with the tribes and assist them in adopting a sedentary lifestyle. The act also strictly demanded trade between the United States and the Indians, intended to eliminate the need for British and French traders in the region. Other intercourse acts increased the number of trade agents to fifteen (1795) and established a factory system whereby trade goods were shipped to the newly purchased Louisiana Territory (1806). However, by the 1790s, relations were to damaged to be healed by the trade laws enacted by the Washington administration. Few

Indians were willing to sacrifice land or power in exchange for trade with the United States.<sup>10</sup>

While willing to act legislatively, Washington and Knox were reticent to act militarily. Despite intense pressure from western Congressmen, Washington refused to launch a punitive expedition against the tribes. Both he and Knox, adamant that justice and humanity be the cornerstones of the new federal Indian policy, hoped to reach a peace settlement with the Indians and then deal with the rowdy backcountry settlers. Knox sent peace emissaries to both the Old Northwest and the Old Southwest, instructing the diplomats to be firm with the Indians and to warn them that when treaties, laws, proclamations, and trade provisions failed to ensure tranquility on the frontier, the United States would take military action against the tribes. The forceful tone of the federal government confirmed that all Americans—whether frontiersmen, federal troops, or eastern politicians—posed a threat to native control of the Old Northwest.<sup>11</sup>

Washington's overtures at peace came to a crashing halt in April 1790. A commission led by Major John Doughty, a veteran of the battle of Yorktown and a former commander at West Point, encountered fierce resistance along the Tennessee River. Doughty and his fifteen-man contingent were en route to a Chickasaw village to sign a peace treaty. However, from their canoes, a war party of Shawnees and Cherokees began harassing the Americans and ultimately intercepted the group along the river bank. Shortly after accepting peace medals and flags from the Americans, the Indians opened fire on them. The murderous volley killed seven diplomats and wounded four more. Doughty and

the survivors fought off the Indians and retreated to Kentucky. The attack stoked fears in Congress that the southern Indians might join their northern brethren in open war against the United States.<sup>12</sup>

Just two weeks later, peace emissaries from Vincennes, led by the notable trader and Indian agent Antoine Gamelin, traveled up the Wabash River towards Kekionga, a stronghold of the western Indian confederacy. Along the way, Weas and Kickapoos threatened Gamelin and his men. The peace commissioners reached the Miami villages on April 23, frightened but alive. But bad news attended Gamelin's arrival. The Miami chief Little Turtle was away at Detroit purchasing weapons for the ongoing war with the Kentuckians. With Little Turtle absent, diplomacy fell to Blue Jacket, principal war chief of the Shawnees. Blue Jacket did not want to parley with the diplomats, informing them that "the Americans deceived them [the Shawnee] from all quarters" and that the Americans, "sought to take away their land by degrees until whites occupied all territory north of the Ohio." He also responded that "no peace settlements could be reached until the "father" at Detroit was consulted." After several tense days spent among the Indians, Gamelin and his men gave up on negotiations and returned to Vincennes. Upon learning of the failures of both southern and northern peace commissions, Washington fumed to Knox that they could no longer hope to avoid a war with the confederated tribes.<sup>13</sup>

In May 1790, renewed violence on the frontier underscored the necessity of a military campaign against the western Indian confederacy. Murders and attacks on Ohio River keelboats became everyday occurrences. White settlers demanded protection by the

United States army. The citizens of Mill Creek, Ohio Territory, spoke for most settlers when they petitioned that “We are largely unprotected...the men are out east collecting family members and trading...the [federal] soldiers must protect us from the savages; the very survival of the territory depends on it!” On May 27, Knox suggested to Washington that a military expedition was unavoidable. He preferred the government battle Indians, than Indians *and* settlers and optimistically claimed that the hostilities being carried out in the territory were the result of a minority of “banditti” Indians against whom a federal force of a few hundred regulars could prove victorious. Washington agreed and instructed Brigadier General Josiah Harmar and Governor Arthur St. Clair to begin making preparations for an attack on the Miami villages at Kekionga.<sup>14</sup>

Harmar and St. Clair faced a daunting task in raising an army to combat the hostile western tribes. A defense report issued in April 1790 found that the federal army consisted of one regiment of infantry and one battalion of artillery, totaling 840 officers and enlisted men. Ill-equipped, inefficient, and suffering from poor morale and frequent desertions, the United States army lacked both the material and mental edge to fight Indian warriors on the frontier. Congress further complicated things by refusing to provide the army with more money or manpower. The republican fear of standing armies permeated Congress, and Senators Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts and William Maclay of Pennsylvania ensured that the army remained small and manageable. Congress even reduced the pay of enlisted men from four dollars a month to two dollars in order to pay for clothing and hospital

stores. Upon learning of the pay reduction, one disgusted federal officer wrote to Congress and asked “Are you determined to break up the army?”<sup>15</sup>

Not that soldiers needed much reason to abandon the army. Soldiers grew accustomed to boredom, insufficient rations, irregular pay, and severe discipline from their commanding officers. Most federal troops hailed from Pennsylvania, Connecticut, or New York and had little, if any, experience fighting Indians. Their officers had served in the Continental Army and clung to the open-field tactics they had perfected under the tutelage of Baron von Steuben. Such battlefield maneuvers proved fatal against the Indians’ ambushes and guerilla tactics. Federal troops’ preference for negotiation rather than combat made perfect sense in light of the army’s obvious weaknesses. And they also blamed frontiersmen for instigating the Indian War, exacerbating tensions between soldiers and frontiersmen throughout the war.<sup>16</sup>

With federal troops spread thin along the vast western frontier, the task of protecting settlers and towns continued to fall upon the state militias. In September 1789, Washington called up militias from Virginia and Pennsylvania to combat the Indian “banditti” along the Ohio River. Unfortunately, militiamen often attacked neutralist tribes who posed no threat to the welfare of the settlers.<sup>17</sup> Such attacks frustrated federal soldiers and contributed to ongoing problems between the two groups. Particularly abhorrent to the Regulars was the myth that *all* backcountry militiamen knew how to fight Indians and survive in the wilderness. In actuality, most militias served as male social groups focused on winning political elections, not fighting Indians. Militia units proved rather ineffective at fighting

Indians and were much more valuable as scouts, interpreters, and teamsters working in conjunction with federal forces.<sup>18</sup>

The unpredictability of the militias infuriated the Regulars and further alienated the two purported allies. Federal troops all signed on for a basic three-year enlistment term and received the same training. Militia, in contrast, only had to attend “camps of discipline” for forty-two days each year. Regulations and training varied from camp to camp. Disparities in training, obedience, and leadership plagued most military expeditions that involved militia units. Congress did not move to enact a universal militia law until after Indian warriors crushed St. Clair’s forces in 1792. The Uniform Militia Act of 1792 required every “free able bodied male citizen” aged eighteen to forty-five to enroll in a local militia unit. Local militia units then adopted the same training methods employed by the United States army.<sup>19</sup>

Despite growing animosity between federal troops and militiamen, in August 1790, St. Clair and Harmar began to assemble a strike force comprised of both. Stricken by gout and fever, St. Clair decided not to take part in the expedition although he did help organize it. With St. Clair out of commission, command of the expedition went to brigadier-general Josiah Harmar. Harmar had been a colonel in the Pennsylvania line during the Revolution and had seen action at Brandywine, Monmouth, and Yorktown. His superiors regarded him as a “good soldier, capable in combat, though not very flashy and sometimes lacking initiative.” After Yorktown, Harmar personally delivered the ratified Treaty of Paris to the British, thereby officially ending the war. Harmar’s mentor, Thomas Mifflin, the President

of Congress, ensured that his protégé take command of the United States army in 1784. Over the next six years, Harmar commanded the frontier army and worked diligently to avoid war with the Native Americans.<sup>20</sup>

At first, things appeared to be going well for Harmar's ragtag army. Major John Wyllys reported in late August that "the Virginia militia appear to be in high spirits" and "raised another company in addition to their quota." The Regulars and the volunteers even trained together in preparation for the upcoming campaign. Still, in the midst of such progress, several delays cost the expedition dearly. First, valuable food stores arrived late due to low water levels on the Ohio and Scioto Rivers. Hungry soldiers were dismayed to find that most of the provisions had spoiled en route to their camp. Second, local merchants withheld powder and lead from the army in hopes of price gouging. Finally, militia units from Kentucky and Pennsylvania took longer to arrive than expected. The delays led to low morale and several desertions.<sup>21</sup>

Morale plummeted when the Kentucky volunteers arrived on September 18. Ebenezer Denny, a career soldier from Pennsylvania, recorded that "the Kentucky militia appeared raw and unused to the woods...half of the men did not have weapons and the other half possessed weapons of poor quality. General Harmar was much disheartened by the Kentuckians." After the Pennsylvania units arrived in similar fashion, an entire company of Virginia volunteers packed their belongings and rode out of camp. [Obviously the propertied citizens did not respond to Harmar's call for troops.] Due to the length of the

commitment only poor, ill-equipped men signed up for the expedition. Most of the volunteers looked too young or too old to battle the warriors at Kekionga.<sup>22</sup>

As if Harmar needed any more problems, he learned prior to breaking camp that a decision had been made at the executive level that threatened the very security of the expedition. Astonishingly, Knox and St. Clair announced the imminent campaign against the northwestern Indians to the British at Detroit. Knox fretted that an American army traveling so close to Detroit might distress the British and result in war with England. Not surprisingly, the British wasted little time in informing their Indian allies of the impending attack. When Harmar and his force of 1,453 men, including 320 Regulars, marched northward on October 3, they found signs of Indian surveillance—tracks, a broken camp, a skinned bear—all around them. Unwilling to turn around, Harmar marched on towards the Miami villages at Kekionga.<sup>23</sup>

Harmar's reluctance to abort his mission exemplifies how conflicting relationships among allies contributed to a longer, bloodier conflict in the Old Northwest. First, Knox and St. Clair put a tremendous amount of pressure on Harmar to end the war with one devastating blow to the stronghold of the western Indian confederacy. St. Clair wrote to Harmar on October 1, reiterating the importance of the mission:

The principle object of the expedition is to chastise the Indian Nations who have of late been so troublesome to the frontiers of Vincennes and upon the Ohio River...Those who have committed the greatest depredations are the Miamies and the Shawanese...Offers of peace and friendship have been made to them and to the Nations on the Wabash and they have been rejected. Chilicothay, the Shawanese village, will be your force object and must be destroyed. Also, there are a number of French and English people settled at the Miami towns; they have concealed the Indians' weapons and corn and should be made to smart for it.

If Knox and St. Clair truly wanted Harmar's army to destroy Kekionga and rout the natives, they should have petitioned Congress for more men, more provisions, and better weapons. Instead, they sent Harmar and his men into a certain ambush at the hands of a battle-tested and determined foe. Knox warned that Harmar's reputation "would be blasted forever" if the campaign should fail, a possibility that certainly weighed heavy on the general.<sup>24</sup>

Still, Harmar expected victory. A second army led by Major John Hamtramck, consisting of 330 men (only fifty of whom were Regulars), left Vincennes on September 30 to raid the Vermillion and Wea towns along the Wabash River and divert attention from Harmar's much larger campaign. Unfortunately, Hamtramck's militia appeared just as despondent as those who accompanied Harmar. Desertions became so frequent that by the end of the first week Hamtramck had lost nearly half his men. After burning an abandoned Wea village, disgruntled Kentuckians launched a full-scale mutiny. The militiamen complained of low rations and a rapidly spreading fever among the men. Left with no other choice, Hamtramck cancelled the raid and returned to Vincennes.<sup>25</sup>

Quarrels between the Regulars and the militia began to plague Harmar's expedition as well. Besides desertions and general misconduct, some militiamen harassed neutralist Indians and traders whom they encountered along the march. Harmar noted, "There was little point in trying to restrain them [Kentuckians] from acts of retribution. Often they abandoned their posts at night to terrorize and pillage." Of particular concern to Harmar was a growing feud between Colonel John Hardin (Regular army) and Lieutenant Colonel James Trotter (Kentucky militia). Both men sought glory and the right to lead the assault

on Kekionga. Their constant bickering further divided the Regulars and militiamen. Hoping to end the feud once and for all, Hardin and his men rode hard on October 15, covering over twenty miles of thick brush and swamp forest before arriving at Kekionga around three o'clock that afternoon. What they discovered surprised them. The vast network of huts, cabins, and trading posts was completely deserted.<sup>26</sup>

The evacuation of Kekionga, just a day before Hardin's men rode into the village, stirred the long dormant western Indian confederacy. In spring 1790, the northwestern tribes appeared ready to inflict significant damage on the homesteads and forts that dotted the Ohio country. War chiefs had taken over stewardship of the tribes, and negotiations with the British were going well. Yet, the Indians never took the offensive. Many warriors left the Miami villages in late spring to assist in planting or hunting parties. Others moved southward and attacked shipping on the Ohio River. War chiefs such as Little Turtle, Blue Jacket, and Buckongahelas debated whether to attack the Americans or wait for British assistance. In the end, the Indians sat idle throughout the spring and summer. Word of impending American raids filtered into Kekionga every few weeks, but nothing materialized from the false alarms. Eventually most of the Wyandots and Delawares moved on convinced that the lapse in fighting indicated an end to all hostilities. The confederacy's inaction dramatically weakened native power in the region. White settlers and soldiers continued to flood the Ohio country while the Indians continually moved north and west.<sup>27</sup>

Ironically, in 1790 the Indian army shrank in numbers but strengthened in resolve while the American army grew in numbers but was nearly ripped apart by differences of opinion. American leaders ranging from Washington's cabinet to Congress to military officers in the field seemed unsure of how to end the war. The chiefs of the western Indian confederacy argued just like the Americans, but they rarely let their personal goals get in the way of their ultimate objective. The two most influential leaders of the confederacy, Blue Jacket and Little Turtle, ensured that the lesser chiefs stayed the course, posing a stark contrast to those in charge of the United States government and military.<sup>28</sup>

Blue Jacket and Little Turtle brought a wide range of skills and talents to the Indian confederacy, and although they eventually became rivals, they worked together in 1790 to reestablish native sovereignty over the Old Northwest. Blue Jacket (originally called Sepettekenathe or "Big Rabbit") was born around 1743 in central Ohio. Regional legend held that Blue Jacket was a captured white child named Marmaduke van Sweringen but scientists have recently declared him "one hundred percent Native American."

He first rose to prominence during the American Revolution as a skilled warrior and outspoken critic of white encroachment into Kentucky. After the Revolution, his connections with British and French-Canadian traders made him among the wealthiest of all Shawnee Indians. In 1786, angered by militia raids on his village, Blue Jacket became the leading advocate for a western Indian confederacy. He used his wealth, power, and intelligence to rally hundreds of young warriors against the armies of Harmar, St. Clair, and later, Anthony Wayne.<sup>29</sup>

Blue Jacket's greatest contribution to the Indian confederacy was his military prowess. While Little Turtle proved an expert at diplomacy and logistics, it was Blue Jacket who instilled confidence on the battlefield. Even Blue Jacket's appearance rendered him a force to be reckoned with. Unlike American military commanders—Harmar, St. Clair, and Richard Butler come to mind—who were often overweight and/or sickly, Blue Jacket appeared physically fit and quite striking. The best description of Blue Jacket comes from Oliver Spencer who was captured by the Shawnees in 1792. He described Blue Jacket as “the most noble Indian I ever saw...over six feet tall; stout and muscular, with piercing eyes. His countenance open and intelligent, expressive of firmness and decision. He also wore a medallion of His Majesty, George III.”<sup>30</sup>

Unlike Blue Jacket, there exists a number of sources detailing the life of Little Turtle. Little Turtle (or Meshekinnoquah) claimed to have been born about 1752 in Ohio, although he grew up near present-day Churubusco, Indiana. His father was a civil chief of the Miami tribe, and his mother was a Mohican. Since inheritance followed maternal lines, Little Turtle could not succeed his father as chief. However, in 1780, Little Turtle led an assault on Colonel Augustin Mottin de La Balme's forces near the Eel River. La Balme, an associate of the Marquis de Lafayette, was on his way to attack the British at Detroit when he and his eighty cavalry soldiers rode into Little Turtle's ambush. The Indians killed La Balme and wiped out his entire force. After the battle, Little Turtle became principal war chief of the Miami Indians.<sup>31</sup>

After the Revolution, Little Turtle moved his family to Kekionga and made a name for himself in the fur trade. His diplomatic skills ensured strong ties between the Miami Indians at Kekionga and the British at Detroit. Under his watchful eye, Kekionga grew to include nearly half a dozen villages made up of Miami, Shawnee, Delaware, Potawatomi, and Ottawa Indians. Heralded for his cunning mind and oratory skills, Little Turtle became the voice of the western Indian confederacy. In 1790, his daughter married William Wells, a white American who fought alongside the natives at Kekionga and at St. Clair's Defeat (1791). Little Turtle and Wells went on to become the peacetime leaders of the northwest Indians after 1795. It is from Wells's letters and correspondence that historians have been able to piece together an accurate depiction of Little Turtle.<sup>32</sup>

The great village of Kekionga, home to Little Turtle and Blue Jacket, straddled the St. Mary's, St. Joseph's, and Maumee Rivers in what is now northeastern Indiana. Visitors to the city marveled at surrounding cornfields, gardens, and fruit orchards, as well as the bustling fur trade that took place within the village. Seven towns and three trading posts made up the village, with Omee being the principal Miami settlement and Chillicothe serving as the primary Shawnee town. Blue Jacket, Little Turtle, and the other war chiefs hesitated to abandon the location when they learned of Harmar's approaching army. They knew that if the Americans planned to destroy the village along with its immense stores of food and supplies, it would be a terrible blow to the Indian confederacy. But fewer than seven hundred warriors could be accounted for, too small a number to protect Kekionga. Thus, on October 14, the Indians reluctantly evacuated Kekionga and moved fifteen miles

westward toward the Eel River. As they retreated, the Indians burned much of the village and hid as much food as they could.<sup>33</sup>

The ensuing battle of Kekionga, more commonly known as Harmar's Defeat, illustrates how personal relationships decided the outcome of battles and the course of the war. The ability of allies to work together, follow orders, and trust one another was paramount to winning battles. Failure to do these things resulted in loss of life and a continuation of hostilities. Prior to 1790, conflict between Indians and frontiersmen had dictated the course of the war. But the war changed when the United States and the British got involved. The Indian war in the Old Northwest became a war of factions. The first group to impose its will on others, conquering enemy and ally alike, could claim victory. A civilian immigrant awaiting word of the battle's outcome echoed these thoughts when he said, "The prospects for peace on our frontier seems to be vanished at the present. Indians, British, [American] soldiers; all of them disrupt our lives. If they kill each other, we may have peace."<sup>34</sup>

Harmar's incompetence boded poorly for the upcoming battle. Upon entering the Miami villages on October 17, the militia scattered and looted everything of value. The Regulars attempted to set up a defensive perimeter, but the task was too large for such a small number of men. The militia further complicated matters by wandering in and out of camp whenever they pleased. On October 18, Harmar recorded that nearly one hundred packhorses had been driven off during the night. The disappearance of ten militiamen confirmed that Indian warriors lurked in the nearby forest. Harmar dispatched Trotter and

his Kentucky cavalry to reconnoiter the Eel River area. After traveling just two miles, Trotter's force skirmished against Indians, killing and scalping two before returning to camp. Upset by the patrol's meager results, Harmar ordered Hardin and his men to engage the Indians the following morning.<sup>35</sup>

Hardin and about 180 men broke camp on the morning of October 19, marching toward the Eel River. Major Ebenezer Denny noted with disgust how, "Col. Hardin had not traveled more than three miles when he lost a third of his force. Most of the militia, reluctant to take part in the fight, dropped out of ranks and returned to camp." Seven miles farther, Hardin came upon an abandoned Indian camp set in a clearing bordered by a swamp. As the remaining militia rushed to loot the camp, the woods suddenly exploded in musket fire. The ambushade by Little Turtle and 150 Miami warriors decimated Hardin's ranks. The militia broke ranks and ran, leaving the Regulars under Captain John Armstrong to battle the Indians alone. Surrounded and outnumbered, the Americans did not last long. Armstrong and Ensign Asa Hartshorne evaded death by hiding in the swamp for three hours as the Indians looted and scalped the dead. The two men returned that night determined to kill the militia who had abandoned them and their comrades during the fight. Major John Wyllys and his men restrained the bedraggled officers before they could make good their promises. Upon recounting the ordeal to Harmar, Hardin broke down in tears as he described how the "cowardly militia" abandoned his men.<sup>36</sup>

The Battle of Heller's Corner cost the Americans more than 130 men, divided the militia and Regulars, and crushed the morale of the army. Desertions increased as news of

the battle spread. Major William Paul, commander of the Pennsylvania militia, informed Harmar that the troops appeared on the brink of revolt.

In contrast, the Indians rejoiced over their victory. As word of the battle spread, the confederacy's ranks were further bolstered by Ottawas from the north, Delawares from the east, and Sacs and Foxes from the west. By October 21, Blue Jacket and Little Turtle estimated their strength at around eight hundred warriors.

Isolated in the wilderness, surrounded by enemies, and watching his army tear itself apart, Harmar was unable to assert his authority. Years of mismanagement and internal feuding coalesced in the wrong place at the wrong time. He did have the foresight to try to get his army out of the area before the Indians counterattacked, or his militia turned against him. On October 20, the Americans burned five Indian villages, including Chillicothe; British and French trading posts were also destroyed. Harmar noted with satisfaction that his men torched twenty thousand bushels of corn as well. Telling his men that "economy was the main object of the expedition," Harmar declared the mission a success and planned to return to Fort Washington the following day.<sup>37</sup>

Harmar's army marched eight miles on October 21, setting up camp southeast of Kekionga. That night, scouts discovered approximately 120 Indians who had returned to Kekionga to salvage food and supplies. Colonel Hardin, still incensed over the fiasco at Heller's Corner, urged that the army counterattack or else expect the Indians to harass them all the way back to Fort Washington. Harmar relented and instructed Major Wyllys to take four hundred soldiers, including sixty Regulars, back to Kekionga to surprise the Indians.

Wyllys and Hardin drew up a complex attack plan that called on two militia wings led by Majors Horatio Hall and James McMillan to surround the village while Wyllys and the Regulars slashed their way through the center of Kekionga. After nearly two hours of delays, the soldiers moved out around 2:00 on the morning of October 22.<sup>38</sup>

The Battle of Kekionga started off badly for the Americans and ended in disaster. Hall's troops crossed the St. Mary's River as planned, but they gave up the element of surprise when they engaged several Indian scouts posted along the river. The gunfire alerted Blue Jacket and Little Turtle who quickly organized their warriors in a charred cornfield near the smoldering remains of Chillicothe. McMillan's troops then broke ranks to chase after a few Indian decoys near the St. Joseph River. Crossing the Maumee, Wyllys and his men continued according to plan, unaware that their flanks were exposed. Wyllys inadvertently marched his men right into the Indians' trap. Shawnee warriors bounded out of the cornfield and massacred the Regulars. Hardin attempted to round up the militia, but there was no longer any semblance of order. The battle became a rout as hundreds of men splashed across rivers and ran through underbrush in their mad retreat. The Americans left 183 men killed or wounded around Kekionga. The Indians purportedly lost eleven warriors. One observer claimed that the Maumee River ran red for hours after the battle.<sup>39</sup>

That night, Blue Jacket tried in vain to convince other war chiefs to attack Harmar's bloodied force and wipe out the whole American army. But bickering within the native ranks dashed any prospect of a total victory. The Ottawas and Ojibwes, reacting to a lunar eclipse that lasted nearly two hours, advised that death and defeat clouded any further

action. They refused to fight and broke camp. Likewise, the Sacs and Foxes wished to return home to the Illinois country. Even the belligerent Miami Indians proposed returning to Kekionga to begin the task of rebuilding their beloved village. Bit by bit, the warriors of the western Indian confederacy walked away until Blue Jacket and Little Turtle could no longer mount any serious resistance. The absence of a singular confederacy leader meant that each tribe determined on its own whether or not to fight. The tribal loyalties of Indian combatants once again proved to be a hindrance to the overall military success of the native confederacy. While not as self-destructive as the contest between the American militia and Regulars, the tribalism that defined Indian warfare posed a serious obstacle to unified native control of the Old Northwest.<sup>40</sup>

Unlike the Indians, the Americans adhered to a clear chain-of-command during military operations. Although resentment and jealousy divided officers of the militia from those of the army, both groups recognized General Harmar as the field commander. This was especially the case after the battle when it became necessary to blame someone for the expedition's shortcomings. When Harmar's force reached Fort Washington on November 3, militiamen immediately denounced the expedition and blamed Harmar for "the dreadful slaughter of the militia" and for the "terrible results of the federal campaign." They rumored that Harmar had been drunk during much of the campaign and that he had abandoned most of the wounded on the battlefield. Several militia officers, including Colonel Trotter, criticized Harmar for not taking part in the battle at Kekionga. When the rumors and outright lies reached President George Washington, he angrily wrote,

I expected little [from Harmar] the moment I heard he was a drunkard. I expected less as soon as I heard that on this account no confidence was reposed in him by the people of the Western Country. And I gave up all hope of Success as soon as I heard that there were disputes with him about command...my mind is prepared for the worst; that is, this expedition was without honor or profit.

Despite the support of his officers and men, Harmar's reputation was irrevocably damaged by the debacle at Kekionga. Washington named Arthur St. Clair commanding general in March 1791 and Harmar voluntarily resigned his commission the following December. Although a court of inquiry exonerated Harmar, the ordeal forever clouded his otherwise exemplary record. Even today the Battle of Kekionga is more popularly known as Harmar's Defeat.<sup>41</sup>

More importantly, the aftermath of Harmar's expedition illuminated the increasingly troubled relationship between the militia and the federal soldiers. The rift between the two groups contributed more to the outcome of the battle than any other factor. On the return trip to Fort Washington, the militia became so mutinous that the Regulars marched for two days with fixed bayonets; arguments and fistfights became part of the daily routine. The militiamen's ridicule of General Harmar intensified the animosity between the two camps. Federal troops, already misused, ill-paid, and underfed, became more despondent when the Washington administration seemed to side with the frontiersmen.<sup>42</sup> When their enlistments expired in January 1791, more than a hundred federal soldiers at Fort Washington quit the service. Federal officers implored Congress to reassess the late Indian campaign so that a better expedition could be launched the following year. Congress ignored the requests which led to bitterness between the politicians and the military officers. The breakdown of

American unity set the stage for perhaps the severest defeat of an American army in the history of the Indian wars.<sup>43</sup>

While American reassessments following Harmar's campaign tended to be superficial, the British response faltered even worse. Indecision and miscalculation by Parliament severed ties between the British in Canada and the Indians, and ultimately reduced the British to little more than an inquisitive third party. Strategically, the United States became most vulnerable between November 1790 and December 1791. With the United States army in shambles, the backcountry militia ineffective, and the western Indian confederacy swelling in numbers the time was right for the British to intervene diplomatically. Blue Jacket argued as much when he met with Major John Smith of the Fifth Regiment of Foot and Alexander McKee at Detroit in November 1790. He used every argument he knew—strategic, economic, and moral—to induce the British to help. He repeated the rumor that Harmar's expedition had intended not only to destroy the Indian towns but also push British traders from the region. Blue Jacket threatened to end the fur trade if the British failed to act. In reality he had no control over the fur trade, yet his threat moved Smith to offer valuable supplies to the confederacy and, with McKee, pledged to contact Lord Dorchester, governor of Canada, about military support.<sup>44</sup>

In January 1791, Lord Dorchester instructed Smith and McKee to “preserve the status quo” while he contacted Lord Grenville, the Foreign Secretary in London. Dorchester's letter to Grenville detailed the natives' recent military victories and hinted at the collapse of the fur trade. A fierce Atlantic storm and Grenville's refusal to sort through

his mail, however, prevented Dorchester from receiving a reply until late September—eight months after Dorchester initiated contact with the Foreign Secretary. Grenville's response, issued by Secretary of State Henry Dundas, abandoned the British alliance with the Indians. Instead, they were to be seen as "neighboring entities." Britain could not afford another war with America, Dundas warned: "strict neutrality must be adhered to." Dundas continued, "the most attention and regard His Majesty may give the tribes is the securing of hunting grounds through negotiation." The new policy of neutrality made the British no more than an inquisitive third party in the trans-Appalachian West. The British officially bowed out of the regional power struggle. Aside from trade and advice, the Indians could no longer count on the British to tip the balance of power in their favor.<sup>45</sup>

While the British debated foreign policy, the western Indian confederacy remained on the move. Following Alexander McKee's advice, the war chiefs moved their base of operations from the Miami towns over a hundred miles eastward to the junction of the Auglaize and Maumee Rivers, a site referred to as the Glaize. British trading posts, the British Fort Miamis, and a quick route to Detroit made the Glaize (near present-day Toledo) an appealing location. The Indians also continued to harass frontier settlements in the Symmes tract of southern Ohio and around Marietta. In January 1791, Blue Jacket led two hundred Miami and Shawnee warriors on a raid of Dunlap's Station in the Symmes tract where the Indians laid siege to the federal garrison, killing three soldiers and wounding several others. Before they were driven off by a relief column from Fort Washington the Indians destroyed a powder magazine and the majority of the garrison's crops and cattle.

Word of Harmar's Defeat and Dunlap's Station spread throughout the native communities, enthusing many ardent, young warriors. By the summer of 1791, the western Indian confederacy had grown to include Ottawas and Wyandots from the Detroit region and several bands of Delawares and Wyandots from Sandusky.<sup>46</sup>

As war chiefs Little Turtle and Blue Jacket consolidated power in the spring and summer of 1791, the United States struggled to hold its army together. Frustrated by a lack of pay and still resentful of the previous year's campaign, federal soldiers refused to counter growing Indian hostilities in the region. Washington and Knox came to rely more and more on the militias. Fearing a loss of initiative, Washington announced a "desultory campaign" of militia raids and diplomatic parleys resonant of the war five years earlier.<sup>47</sup>

Washington's desultory campaign further alienated the federal troops from the government in Philadelphia. Soldiers scoffed at the support being given to the backcountry militias. Furthermore, since militias represented western settlements, as the militias raided Indian villages, the Indians could easily target frontier families for retaliatory attacks. Militia raids supplemented the ranks of the confederacy as well. Finally, federal diplomatic parleys failed to end the war. An Iroquoian peace delegation led by Joseph Brant of the Mohawks and Cornplanter of the Senecas met in Philadelphia in November 1791 and agreed to stay out of the conflict. The meeting, however, was a hollow victory since the Iroquois had posed no real threat to the welfare of the United States. Importantly, however, Brant informed Knox that the Shawnees and Miamis were "unreasonable" and that he could

not convince them to end the conflict. Only a resounding victory on the battlefield could secure the region for the United States.<sup>48</sup>

In the fall of 1791, American hopes of conquering the Old Northwest rested with Governor Arthur St. Clair and the enlarged but largely disgruntled United States army. St. Clair, a veteran of the Revolutionary War, suffered from several serious illnesses including bilious colic, rheumatic asthma, and gout. Incapable of vigorous command and unaccustomed to Indian fighting, he never enjoyed the full support of his men. His second in command, Richard Butler, fared little better with the men. A former Indian trader who had fathered Shawnee children, Butler was seen as unapproachable by most of the men. Additionally, St. Clair and Butler's disdain for each other divided the officer corps before the army even began marching.<sup>49</sup>

The nature of St. Clair's expedition differed greatly from Harmar's campaign of the previous year. Knox instructed St. Clair to use the army to build a series of forts from Fort Washington to Kekionga, the site of Harmar's Defeat. St. Clair could engage any Indian war parties he encountered, but the construction of the forts remained the primary purpose of the mission. Washington and Knox hoped that a series of garrisoned forts would cut British supply lines to the natives as well as isolate the Wabash tribes from their eastern Miami brethren. St. Clair had at his disposal 2,300 men consisting of two regiments of Regulars, nearly two thousand federal levies enlisted for six months, several hundred militia, and artillery. A wagon train of over one hundred women and children also accompanied the army on its march. The sheer size of St. Clair's army ensured logistical

problems, most notably a shortage of rations and the need for several wilderness roads to be cut along the way. Nor did the army enjoy the element of surprise. However, these problems paled in comparison to those that existed within the American ranks.<sup>50</sup>

Tensions began to mount soon after St. Clair's army left Fort Washington on September 17 and marched to the Great Miami River. The militia and many of the levies stopped at the river to fish and hunt in order to supplement their inadequate rations. The Regulars remained in camp, and over the next two weeks, constructed Fort Hamilton. Despite their freedom to enter and leave camp whenever they pleased, militiamen began to complain of the workload and poor rations, becoming more rebellious when St. Clair instructed them to hack two parallel roads through the wilderness. After a few days and dozens of desertions, General Butler countermanded the order so that the militia had to build but a single road. When St. Clair learned of the change, he angrily reprimanded Butler in front of the men which further alienated those who supported Butler. Mid-October found the American army divided, hungry, shrinking, and just fifty miles north of Fort Washington.<sup>51</sup>

St. Clair's army completed its second fort, christened Fort Jefferson, on October 24. However, the fort offered little protection from the snow and rain that encumbered the soldiers. Stuck near modern-day Greenville, Ohio, the army appeared on the brink of collapse. Besides want for food, the soldiers fretted over the "many hundred dozens" of musket cartridges that had been ruined by the inclement weather. Further complicating matters, the entire Virginia battalion of levies claimed that their enlistment was up, and

dozens of them abandoned the march. Thirty Kentucky militiamen also deserted. In an effort to instill some sense of order, St. Clair directed the execution of three deserters. His actions did little to raise morale. The final blow came on October 31 when sixty Kentucky militiamen decamped and threatened to attack the supply convoys plodding along behind them. St. Clair dispatched the First Regiment of Regulars—the best troops in the army and veterans of Harmar’s campaign—after the renegade militia. They would be absent when the army finally engaged the Indians because they were still protecting the supply convoy. By November 1, a federal lieutenant noted that only 1,200 Regulars and levies and some 250 militia remained on hand.<sup>52</sup>

On November 3, what remained of St. Clair’s army made camp along the banks of the Wabash River, just fifty miles from Kekionga. A force of 320 militia and levies crossed the river and set up an advanced guard. The remainder occupied an open field on the eastern shore, surrounded by dense timber. A light snow fell on the men and added to their misery. Throughout the evening, General Butler received reports of Indian war parties lurking in the woods and stealing horses but fearing another hostile confrontation with his commander, he refused to bring the matter to St. Clair’s attention. As a result, Blue Jacket and Little Turtle deployed 1,050 warriors unchecked. The Indians lay hidden less than a mile from St. Clair’s camp. That night, Blue Jacket led the tribal chiefs in a war dance, prophesizing clear skies the following day and a great Indian victory.<sup>53</sup>

The skies cleared just before sunrise on November 4 as Blue Jacket had predicted. Shawnee warriors painted red and black attacked the militias first, unleashing two strong

volleys that killed dozens of militiamen and drove countless others into the icy Wabash. Panicked militiamen crashed into the federal troops who tried in vain to form battle lines. A few terrified militiamen opened fire on the Regulars. Winthrop Sargent, adjutant general to St. Clair, emerged from his tent to an “Indian yell that sounded not terrible, but rather like an infinitude of horse bells opening up.” The sound certainly frightened the militia, many of whom fled into the woods only to be mowed down by concealed natives. The Indians advanced from one tree or log to the next, pouring a continuous fire into the American lines. Within minutes nearly all the artillerymen lay dead. Indian sharpshooters also began to take a toll on the federal officers. Cool and persistent under fire, the Native Americans slowly decimated the American army.<sup>54</sup>

The Americans themselves ensured an apparent loss would become a massacre. Ebenezer Denny recalled that “the militia acted like a mob at a fair and could not be led to discharge a single gun with effect...they were perfectly ungovernable.” In turn, the Regulars refused to advance near the river to save the militiamen stranded along the banks of the Wabash. Pouncing on the unfortunate militia, the Indians killed and then mutilated them. St. Clair and Butler gave conflicting orders that had the federal officers running in circles. Such costly blunders allowed the Indians, led by William Wells (Little Turtle’s son-in-law), to enter the camp and seize the artillery. All the while the Indians continued to advance, and more and more Americans fell.<sup>55</sup>

In an effort to retake the artillery, Butler and the Second Regiment of Regulars charged the Indians with fixed bayonets. Only three men survived the attack: Butler, an

easy target on horseback, was shot down after about forty paces. Mortally wounded, the general requested that he be propped against a tree and given two loaded pistols. Butler's two younger brothers, Thomas and Edward, attempted to rescue him, but the general ordered them to retreat as fast as they could. A pair of young Shawnees tomahawked Butler and ripped out his heart, which was then cut into pieces and consumed by the twelve war chiefs who led the assault that day. Though the Indians considered the act to be a great sign of respect for the fallen general, the Americans were horrified by the apparent desecration of Butler's body. Years later, during the Battle of Fallen Timbers, American soldiers yelled, "For Butler!" while they rallied and overtook the Indians.<sup>56</sup>

With Butler and most of the officers dead, St. Clair mounted a horse and attempted to rally the men. He was not mounted more than a minute before his horse fell. Indians shot a second horse out from under him as well. Sick and exhausted, St. Clair refused to ride any longer. He ordered a general retreat along the wilderness trace to Fort Jefferson. An officer on horseback plucked St. Clair from the battlefield, and the two men galloped away.<sup>57</sup>

The Americans evacuated the battlefield in total disorder. The footrace along the wilderness road became a matter of life and death in which scores of wounded soldiers fell behind to die. George Adams, a veteran of Harmar's campaign, and some of the surviving Regulars made a gallant stand along the trace. With fixed bayonets, they rushed forward and cleared the road of hostile natives so that the slower and weaker survivors could follow.<sup>58</sup>

The Indians, content with the outcome of the battle, stopped chasing the fleeing soldiers after just four miles. They turned their attention to the dozens of women and children who the militias and army had left behind. The Indians killed most of the civilians because they could not provide for so many captives on the long journey back to the Glaize. Unfortunately, they tortured many of the women and children before killing them. One woman in particular begged for death after the natives thrust fiery stakes into her body; she survived for an hour, crying out all the while. Thus was the nature of the Indian War in the Old Northwest. The war was a violent, bloody affair in which both sides acted inhumanely in hopes of weakening the willpower of the enemy. Power could be obtained through fear, and both sides knew it.<sup>59</sup>

Back on the trace, the First Regiment of Regulars ran among a flood of hysterical men, women, and children fleeing the battle. Hearing distant artillery earlier that morning, Major John Hamtramck and his men gave up the search for the renegade militia and rode hard to support their comrades. They arrived too late. By 9:30 in the morning the battle was over. Hamtramck led the majority of his men to Fort Jefferson. He feared an Indian attack on the fort, and he wanted to secure the area for the sick and wounded returning from St. Clair's defeat. Consequently, only a small number of the First Regiment assisted in the retreat of the army, a token force too small to return to the battlefield and rescue the wounded. Later that night, Hamtramck lamented the loss of so many of his fellow officers. St. Clair, bedridden because of his gout, pondered whether he had just cost the United States the Northwest Territory.<sup>60</sup>

It took three days for a supply convoy from Fort Hamilton to deliver food and medicine to the downtrodden soldiers at Fort Jefferson. By that time, dozens had already succumbed to their wounds and perished. St. Clair, still confined to his bed and possibly suffering from shock, went days without food, water, or sleep. Those soldiers well enough to walk left the fort and headed for Fort Washington, where Winthrop Sargent noted that virtual anarchy prevailed between the militia and the federal soldiers. “All relation between officers and men was forgotten, and not even the semblance of duty acknowledged. They [the militia and federals] blamed each other for the destruction of the army,” he wrote. Two weeks later a relief column from Fort Washington evacuated the remaining men at Fort Jefferson. Charged with accounting for the dead and wounded, Ebenezer Denny figured that 630 men had been killed or captured and another 283 wounded. He also noted that thirty women and twelve children died during the battle. Losses of equipment and war material cost the United States \$33,000. Not since Braddock’s Defeat (1755) during the French and Indian War had a native force so completely decimated an Anglo-American army.<sup>61</sup>

After years of guerrilla fighting, the western Indian confederacy had finally destroyed a major American army, a victory that cost the natives just thirty-five lives. Blue Jacket’s prediction of November 3 proved chillingly accurate. Still, at a council along the banks of the Ottawa River, Blue Jacket lobbied unsuccessfully to continue raiding American settlements throughout the coming winter. He believed that the Indians could only maintain their advantage through a sustained and unrelenting physical offensive in the

Ohio region. Little Turtle and Yeshiva, a Shawnee chief who favored diplomacy, convinced the other chiefs that it was too late in the year to launch another campaign. Securing food and shelter for the coming winter months became the confederacy's primary concern. Importantly, the council marked the first time that Blue Jacket and Little Turtle disagreed on the best interest of the confederacy. Embittered by the authority being granted to Little Turtle, Blue Jacket said nothing else on the matter. The war chiefs dispersed, agreeing to meet at the Miami Rapids in the spring. Having achieved the initiative militarily, the Indians allowed their advantage to dissipate during the cold winter of 1791-92. The following year indecision and personality conflicts would weaken the confederacy and allow the United States to emerge once again as a force in the region.<sup>62</sup>

On December 13, 1791, the *Maryland Journal* broke the bad news of St. Clair's defeat with the ominous headline: "Bloody Indian Battle!" Stunned, the American public cried out for vengeance. Washington promised action but did not specify when the next expedition would take place. With the army largely destroyed, frontier residents figured that it was only a matter of time before Indian war parties overtook them. The citizens of Marietta offered additional apportionments to any federal soldiers who served in the area. In Pittsburgh, state officials warned that their small garrison and meager arms could not repel an Indian invasion. Rumors spread that Joseph Brant and the Six Nations intended to break their peace agreement and attack western Pennsylvania. Some even claimed that the British planned to recapture the Old Northwest. Such rumors, though completely unfounded, convinced some pioneer families to return to the east coast.<sup>63</sup>

Congressional committees convened to ascertain why expeditions by both Harmar and St. Clair—both of whom were reliable officers—had failed so terribly. Officers cited a lack of supplies and inadequate training, but Congress uncovered a deeper problem: flawed relations between the federals and militiamen. While in session, federal officers and militia officers openly blamed each other with accusations of cowardice, dereliction of duty, and sheer stupidity. Congress became more alarmed when St. Clair described his tumultuous relationship with the late General Butler. St. Clair even suggested that “a deep cabal of officers” had plotted against him, and that the army had been beaten only after those men had “poisoned its ranks.” Some junior officers, Ebenezer Denny among them, exposed the rifts that existed between the senior officers and the War Department.<sup>64</sup>

When the sessions of inquiry ended in spring 1792, Congress met with Washington and Knox to reflect on the committees’ findings. Appalled by the factionalism that plagued the American war effort, Washington vowed a new change in policy. He removed St. Clair from field command—though he did allow St. Clair to continue on as governor of the Northwest Territory—and began the search for a new general. The army needed discipline and training, and Washington intended to find someone who could instill these qualities in the men. Washington and Knox both conceded that dependence on militia only empowered the enemy; that too would need to be changed before the next campaign. Finally, Washington wrote to the proponents of peace in Congress, “We are involved in actual war! Defensive policies [peace settlements] are not only impracticable against such an enemy, but the expense attending them would be ruinous.” In effect, Washington committed

himself and the United States to the conquest of the Old Northwest. Regardless of human and monetary costs, the United States determined to win the war and assert its authority over the Indians.<sup>65</sup>

A sharp deviation from the retaliatory killings and raids that defined the early years of the war, the large scale battles of 1790-91 reconfigured the militaristic and diplomatic realities that existed during the first phase of the conflict. The second phase of the war cost the United States men and money, but failed to drive the backcountry settlers from the region. After two years of defeat, the United States realized that success would not come without restructuring the military and committing itself to the war effort.

The Native Americans, in contrast, were empowered by the events of 1790-91. After two years of victories, the western Indian confederacy attracted new support among the tribes. But problems loomed on the horizon. The British had backed away from the conflict and refused to help the Indians. The relationship between Blue Jacket and Little Turtle deteriorated as both chiefs sought more power. And the Indians were running out of time to wrest power away from the Americans. In the final phase of the war (1792-95), conflicting relationships changed the course of the conflict one last time as the western Indian confederacy collapsed and the United States laid claim to the Old Northwest.

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> Mary E. Young, "The Dark and Bloody but Endlessly Inventive Middle Ground of Indian Frontier Historiography," *Journal of the Early Republic* 13 (Summer 1993): 198-99.

<sup>2</sup> Stewart Rafert, *The Miami Indians of Indiana: A Persistent People, 1654-1994* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1996), 46; Peter Onuf, *Statehood and Union: A History of the Northwest Ordinance* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), 5; United States Department of the Interior, *Federal Indian Law*, 2 vols. (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958), 1: 11-13, 20.

<sup>3</sup> Reginald Horsman, "American Indian Policy in the Old Northwest," *William and Mary Quarterly* 18 (January 1961): 42-44.

<sup>4</sup> Idem, *Expansion and American Indian Policy, 1783-1812* (Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1967), 53-54; letter from Henry Knox to George Washington, 23 May, 1789, *Annals of Congress*, (Washington D.C.: n.p., 1925-28), 40-41; letter from Henry Knox to George Washington, 15 June, 1789, *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, 2 vols. (Washington D.C.: n.p., 1832-34), 1: 12-14.

<sup>5</sup> Reginald Horsman, "The Indian Policy of an Empire of Liberty," in Frederick E. Hoxie, ed., *Native Americans and the Early Republic* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999), 42-44; Indian policy report of 15 June, 1789, *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, 1: 12-15; letter from Timothy Pickering to Rufus King, 1 June, 1785, Charles R. King, ed., *The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, 6 vols. (New York: n.p., 1894-1900), 1: 104-05.

<sup>6</sup> Letter from Henry Knox to George Washington, 7 July, 1789, *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, 1: 52-54; John Wood Sweet, *Bodies Politic: Negotiating Race in the American North, 1730-1830* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 316-18.

<sup>7</sup> Letter from Benjamin Lincoln to Henry Knox, 21 August, 1793, *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, 2: 359-60; Leonard Levy, ed., *Encyclopedia of the Constitution*, 4 vols. (New York: MacMillan, 1986), 1: 51-2.

<sup>8</sup> Jeremy Black, *America as a Military Power: From the American Revolution to the Civil War* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger Publishing, 2002), 81-3.

<sup>9</sup> Francis Paul Prucha, *American Indian Policy in the Formative Years: The Indian Trade and Intercourse Acts, 1790-1834* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), 51-4; U.S. Congress, *Indian Affairs and Treaties, Statutes at Large* 2, sec. 33, 137 (1790).

<sup>10</sup> *Indian Affairs and Treaties, Statutes at Large* 2, sec. 8, 312 (1793); *Indian Affairs and Treaties, Statutes at Large* 3, sec. 2, 422 (1795); *Indian Affairs and Treaties, Statutes at Large* 9, sec. 1, 362 (1806); Prucha, *American Indian Policy in the Formative Years*, 53-55.

<sup>11</sup> Francis Paul Prucha, *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 22-24.

<sup>12</sup> John Tebbel and Keith Jennison, *The American Indian Wars* (Edison, N.J.: Castle Books, 2003), 131-32.

- 
- <sup>13</sup> Letter from John Hamtramck to Josiah Harmar, 16 May, 1790, Letter Book D, Harmar Papers, William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; Wiley Sword, *President Washington's Indian War: The Struggle for the Old Northwest, 1790-1795* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985), 85.
- <sup>14</sup> R. Douglas Hurt, *The Indian Frontier, 1763-1846* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002), 108-109; letter from the citizens of Mill Creek Village to Josiah Harmar, 29 May, 1790, Vol. 13, Harmar Papers; William Henry Smith, ed., *The St. Clair Papers: The Life and Public Service of Arthur St. Clair*, 2 vols. (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1882), 2: 146-48.
- <sup>15</sup> *American State Papers: Military Affairs*, 6 vols. (Washington D.C.: Gales and Seaton, 1832-1861), 1: 5-7; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 82-83; James Ripley Jacobs, *The Beginnings of the U.S. Army, 1783-1812*, 9 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947), 4: 50-51.
- <sup>16</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 82; Andrew Birtle, "The Origins of the Legion of the United States," *Journal of Military History* 67 (May 2003): 1255-57; Arthur Gilbert, "The American Indian and United States Diplomatic History," *The History Teacher* 8 (Feb. 1975): 233-34.
- <sup>17</sup> *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, 1: 57. Neutralist Indians, especially factions of the Shawnee, Wea, and Piankashaw tribes, were often targeted by militias because their villages were easily discernible. In fact, most neutralist villages appeared on local maps as trading centers. Furthermore, attacks on neutralist tribes often resulted in much plunder at the cost of just a few lives.
- <sup>18</sup> Mary Ellen Rowe, *Bulwark of the Republic: The American Militia in Antebellum West* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 2003), 71; Mark Pitcavage, "Ropes of Sand: Territorial Militias," *Journal of the Early Republic* 13 (winter 1993): 481-82.
- <sup>19</sup> Donald Boyer, Jr., "The Infantry of the Regular Army," *Military Affairs* 11 (summer 1947): 103; U.S. War Department, *War Department, Statutes at Large*, 2, sec. 2, 26 (1790); Lawrence Delbert Cress, *Citizens in Arms: The Army and the Militia in American Society to the War of 1812* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 119-20.
- <sup>20</sup> Francis Heitman, *Historical Register of Officers of the Continental Army During the War of the Revolution, April 1775-December 1783* (Washington D.C.: Rare Books Publishing, 1914), 274; Fred Reynolds, ed., *General Josiah Harmar's Papers and Journal, Including an Account of His Retreat from Fort Wayne (Miamitown) in 1790* (1792; reprint, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966), 1-2.
- <sup>21</sup> Letter from John Wyllys to Josiah Harmar, 21 August, 1790, Vol. 13, Harmar Papers; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 90-93.
- <sup>22</sup> Ebenezer Denny, *Military Journal of Ebenezer Denny* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Company, 1860), 344; John Seidel, "Class Warfare: The American Militia System," in Asher Silberman, *Invisible America: Unearthing Our Hidden History* (New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1995), 116.
- <sup>23</sup> Smith, ed., *St. Clair Papers*, 2: 163, 185; Reynolds, ed., *General Josiah Harmar's Papers and Journal*, 6.
- <sup>24</sup> Letter from Arthur St. Clair to Josiah Harmar, 1 October, 1790, Vol. 13, Harmar Papers; letter from Henry Knox to Josiah Harmar, 30 September, 1790, *Wisconsin Historical Society*, 2 W 330, Draper Manuscripts (hereafter *DM*), Wisconsin Historical Society, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

- 
- <sup>25</sup> Gayle Thornbrough, ed., *Outpost on the Wabash: The Letters of Major John Francis Hamtramck 1787-1791* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1957), 259-62.
- <sup>26</sup> Reynolds, ed., *General Josiah Harmar's Papers and Journal*, 6-7; letter from Josiah Harmar to Arthur St. Clair, 1 October, 1790, Vol. 13, Harmar Papers; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 104-106.
- <sup>27</sup> 2 W 330, *DM*; Andrew Cayton, "How the Indians Lost Their Land: Law and Power on the Frontier," *Journal of Southern History* 73 (Feb. 2007): 147-48.
- <sup>28</sup> John Sugden, *Blue Jacket: Warrior of the Shawnees* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000), 89-92.
- <sup>29</sup> Carolyn Rowland, "Was the Shawnee War Chief Blue Jacket a Caucasian?" *Ohio Journal of Science* 106 (Sept. 2006): 126-29; Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 32-4.
- <sup>30</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 33-35; Oliver Spencer, *The Indian Captivity of O.M. Spencer* (Chicago: R.R. Donnelly & Sons, 1917), 89-92.
- <sup>31</sup> Jerry Keenan, *The Encyclopedia of American Indian Wars, 1492-1890* (Denver: ABC-CLIO Press, 1997), 126-27; Harvey Lewis Carter, "A Frontier Tragedy: Little Turtle and William Wells," *The Old Northwest* 6 (Spring 1980): 3-6.
- <sup>32</sup> Harvey Lewis Carter, *The Life and Times of Little Turtle: First Sagamore of the Wabash* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987), 54-55; John Ankenbruck, *Five Forts: A History of Fort Wayne* (Fort Wayne: News Publishing Company, 1972), 28; Carter, "A Frontier Tragedy," 10-12.
- <sup>33</sup> Denny, *Military Journal*, 145; Staff of the Allen County Public Library, *General Harmar's Campaign, 1790* (Fort Wayne: Fort Wayne Historical Society, 1954), 1, 4-6.
- <sup>34</sup> Letter from John Pratt to Samuel Wyllys, 4 November, 1790, in *Wyllys Papers* (Hartford: Connecticut Historical Society, 1892), 38.
- <sup>35</sup> Reynolds, ed., *General Josiah Harmar's Papers and Journal*, 7-9.
- <sup>36</sup> Denny, *Military Journal*, 349; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 107-108; Reynolds, ed., *General Josiah Harmar's Papers and Journal*, 8-10.
- <sup>37</sup> Reynolds, ed., *General Josiah Harmar's Papers and Journal*, 9-10; report from Josiah Harmar to Henry Knox, 23 November, 1790, Vol. 13, Harmar Papers.
- <sup>38</sup> Reynolds, ed., *General Josiah Harmar's Papers and Journal*, 10-12; Denny, *Military Journal*, 352-53.
- <sup>39</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 103-105; *American State Papers: Military Affairs*, 1: 26-28; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 113.
- <sup>40</sup> Statements of Godfroy and Blue Jacket, 1 November, 1790, *Britain/Colonial Office Papers*, CO 73: 31-2, 37, Public Archives of Ottawa, Canada.
- <sup>41</sup> 2 W 403-04, *DM*; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 120-23; John C. Fitzpatrick, ed., *George Washington's Writings*, 39 vols. (Washington D.C.: Library of Congress, 1931-1944), 31: 156-57.

---

<sup>42</sup> Denny, *Military Journal*, 150-51; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 120-21. George Washington's public attack on Josiah Harmar may have been a private attack on Harmar's mentor, Thomas Mifflin. Washington and Mifflin had a contentious relationship that dated back to the Revolution. It is quite possible that Washington hoped to blot Mifflin's record by attacking his protégé. If such was Washington's intention, he was not successful. Mifflin successfully deflected comments about Harmar's Defeat and continued to support his friend for the remainder of his life.

<sup>43</sup> Letter from Josiah Harmar to Joseph Howell, 5 January, 1791, Vol. 13, Harmar Papers.

<sup>44</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 122-23; speech of Blue Jacket, 4 November, 1790, *Britain/Colonial Office Papers*, CO 72: 81, 87; 73: 35, 40-1.

<sup>45</sup> Letter from Lord Dorchester to Major John Smith, 8 January, 1791, *Britain/Colonial Office Papers*, Q 49: 173; letter from Henry Dundas to Lord Dorchester, 16 September, 1791, *Britain/Colonial Office Papers*, Q 52: 206-09.

<sup>46</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 108-109; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 126-29, 223; Earl Olmstead, *Blackcoats Among the Delaware* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1991), 85.

<sup>47</sup> Jared Sparks, ed., *The Writings of George Washington* 12 vols. (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1858), 10: 154-56.

<sup>48</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 133-34; Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 114-15; Thornbrough, ed., *Outpost on the Wabash*, 283.

<sup>49</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 115-16; Smith, ed., *The St. Clair Papers*, 2: 85.

<sup>50</sup> Denny, *Military Journal*, 355-58; Paul Woehrmann, *At the Headwaters of the Maumee: A History of the Forts of Fort Wayne* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1971), 36-39; David Horr, *Miami, Wea, and Eel-River Indians of Southern Indiana* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1974), 126, 131.

<sup>51</sup> Clarence Burton, ed., *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections* (hereafter *MP*), 28 vols. (Lansing: Michigan Historical Society, 1889), 24: 222-23; Denny, *Military Journal*, 358-60.

<sup>52</sup> *American State Papers: Military Affairs*, 1: 37-38; Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 116; Winthrop Sargent, "Winthrop Sargent's Diary While with General Arthur St. Clair's Expedition Against the Indians," *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* 33 (spring 1924): 250-52. It should be noted that over one hundred men were left behind at Fort Jefferson because they were too sick to participate in the battle. Taking this into account, it can be estimated that 600 to 700 men deserted the army en route to Kekionga.

<sup>53</sup> Denny, *Military Journal*, 367-70; George Ash, "Ash's Account of St. Clair's Defeat," *Cincinnati Chronicle and Literary Gazette*, 7 November 1829, 17. George Ash, known as the White Shawnee, fought alongside the Indians during St. Clair's defeat. He claimed to have been present for Blue Jacket's war dance, although he was not permitted to participate.

<sup>54</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 122-24; Sargent, "Winthrop Sargent's Diary," 258-59.

<sup>55</sup> Denny, *Military Journal*, 370-71; Harvey Lewis Carter, "A Frontier Tragedy: Little Turtle and William Wells," *The Old Northwest* 6 (spring 1980): 7-8.

---

<sup>56</sup> *St. Clair Papers*, 2: 259-61; 4 JJ 102, DM.

<sup>57</sup> *St. Clair Papers*, 2: 260-62.

<sup>58</sup> Frazier Ellis Wilson, "St. Clair's Defeat," *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* 10 (fall 1908): 379-80.

<sup>59</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 187-88; Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 127.

<sup>60</sup> Thornbrough, *Outpost on the Wabash*, 312-14; *St. Clair Papers*, 2: 175-76.

<sup>61</sup> Sargent, "Winthrop Sargent's Diary," 253-54, 262-63; Denny, *Military Journal*, 170-71.

<sup>62</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 128-29; Burton, *MP*, 24: 336; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 196-97.

<sup>63</sup> 4 JJ 206, 223, DM; James Baldwin, *The Conquest of the Old Northwest and Its Settlement by Americans* (New York: American Book Company, 1956), 203-206; *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, 1: 216.

<sup>64</sup> United States National Archives and Records, *General St. Clair's First Communication of Inquiry, Records Relative to the Expeditions of Generals St. Clair and Wayne Against the Indians* (College Park, MD.: U.S. National Archives, 1999) [database on-line], available from website [www.archives.gov](http://www.archives.gov); *American State Papers: Military Affairs*, 1: 39.

<sup>65</sup> Albert Douglas, "Major General Arthur St. Clair," *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society Publication* 16 (August 1907): 455-58; Sparks, ed., *Writings of George Washington*, 12: 71-73.

## CHAPTER 3

### THE CONQUEST OF THE OLD NORTHWEST

The third and final stage of the Indian War in the Old Northwest occurred between 1792 and 1795. In many ways, these years bore councils, battles, and treaties much like those that occurred in the previous phases of the war. But new developments also proved incongruent with the earlier trends of the war. The United States's sudden commitment to the war; the restructuring of the army; the dissipation of border violence; the political ruptures within the Indian confederacy; Britain's decision to cut ties with the natives—these changes promoted an increasingly real sense of finality throughout the last four years of the war.

Thomas Jefferson, ever the astute observer, noted in 1793 that the power struggle in the Old Northwest was nearing its end. Though away in Europe during much of the war, he followed the developments of the conflict with great interest. He recognized how the inability of Americans—both along the east coast and in the backcountry—to compromise and work together to achieve a common goal had resulted in years of bloodshed and lost opportunities. But he anticipated a change: “there will be a great revolution of opinion in the United States to see how they [Indians] are to be dealt with.” Jefferson predicted that westerners—even those still inclined to view the Indians as redeemable—believed that nothing less than the state securing the West by vanquishing the Indians and removing them from white settlement areas could rescue it from disorder.<sup>1</sup>

Jefferson accurately identified a “factitious spirit prevailing in the country” that had impeded the efforts of the Americans from conquering the Old Northwest. But things changed after Washington’s impassioned letter to Congress in 1792. A “great revolution of opinion” occurred in the minds of Americans who coveted the Old Northwest. After Washington’s address, easterners and westerners alike knew that the region could only be conquered by the federal government. Jefferson supposed that the Indians faced a cataclysm that could only be prevented by the aid of the British. Seeking to thwart any designs of British intervention, Jefferson warned British minister George Hammond that “The United States is entitled to preemption of its lands in the Northwest because of the outcome of the Revolution, and an invasion of those limits by any other white nation would be an act of war.” According to Jefferson, by 1793 the United States possessed the willpower requisite to win the war. All that was needed was an army capable of delivering victory.<sup>2</sup>

During the second phase of the Indian War, the United States solidified its government and adopted a new federal Indian policy. However, these measures proved inconsequential because internal feuding ravaged the United States army. Without a strong military to enforce the new directives, the United States could not topple native resistance. Without crushing native resistance, the United States could not tip the balance of power in the Old Northwest. Jefferson was right: the United States desperately needed a disciplined, well-trained army. The personnel changes that followed in the wake of the congressional inquiries of 1791-92 paved the way for an army that could conquer the Old Northwest.<sup>3</sup>

After St. Clair's Defeat, President George Washington and Secretary of War Henry Knox drastically changed the structure of the United States army. Washington confided to Knox that a new American army must possess a combination of knowledge, skill, and discipline in order to defeat the Indians on their own terms. He began the search for a new commanding general who possessed these qualities but also had political ties to the southern states where Washington anticipated Indian trouble as well. Meanwhile, Knox ordered the military be increased to 5,168 men who enlisted for no more than three years. He expanded the cavalry service and created an entire regiment of riflemen. Friendly Chickasaw and Choctaw Indians were recruited as scouts and spies, and full-time quartermasters promised to keep the army well fed and supplied. Washington and Knox even convinced Congress to raise the pay of the soldiers. Despite its astronomic cost of over \$1 million, Congress enacted the army bill on March 5, 1792.<sup>4</sup>

Washington faced a daunting task in choosing a new commander to replace the vanquished Arthur St. Clair. After two disastrous campaigns, few officers wanted to affix their name to any western expedition. Washington favored Henry "Light Horse Harry" Lee (then governor of Virginia) or Charles Pinckney of South Carolina. Lee declined the offer outright while Pinckney remained problematic because of his status as a junior officer. Knox recommended Daniel Morgan, the hero of Cowpens, for the job, but Morgan declined citing ill health. Eventually Washington's cabinet settled on Anthony Wayne, a forty-seven-year-old Pennsylvania infantry commander. Nicknamed "Mad Anthony," the general had a reputation for zeal in combat and an emotional persona. Washington, pleased

that Wayne had political ties to the South, acquiesced to the appointment. Having just recently lost a seat in the House of Representatives, Wayne desperately needed a job to pay off his mounting debts. He accepted Washington's offer without hesitation and rode to Pittsburgh to take command of the frontier army.<sup>5</sup>

When Wayne arrived in Pittsburgh in June 1792, he saw firsthand the deplorable condition of the army. Though most of the troublemakers had been expelled from the service, Wayne knew it would take time to restore confidence and pride. Thankfully he did not have any militia to worry about. In an officer's council on June 15, Wayne renamed the army the Legion of the United States, or the American Legion for short. He modeled his army after the great Roman legions of antiquity. As such, he emphasized esprit de corps and even designed different colored uniforms for each of the four sublegions (regiments). He instilled discipline in the men. Those who slept on duty received one hundred lashes; deserters were executed. He drilled his soldiers and staged mock battles with the riflemen acting as Indians. Though a harsh commander, Wayne encouraged the troops and gained their approval. By April 1793, the American Legion consisted of nearly two thousand crack soldiers.<sup>6</sup>

Though pleased with the condition of the army, Wayne wanted to be sure that his men established solid relationships with each other. When the shooting started, he wanted to be certain that his flanks held firm. With this goal in mind, he moved his army twenty-two miles west of Pittsburgh to a remote location he dubbed Legionville, a Spartan campground where the federal troops and some of the Kentucky militia prepared for the

upcoming campaign. In November, after months of preparation, Wayne deemed the Legion ready for action. However, Washington and Knox ordered Wayne and his army to build winter quarters and await further instructions. The weather remained mild through January, and Wayne implored Washington to let him march northward and engage the Indians. But Washington had other plans. Bypassing Wayne, Washington enlisted the help of Joseph Brant and the Six Nations to broker a peace settlement with the hostile western tribes.<sup>7</sup>

During the 1780s, Joseph Brant had epitomized native power and resistance. Speaking for the Six Nations at councils in Detroit and throughout Ohio, he had urged his hostile western brethren to seek accommodation with the Americans. Brant recognized the difference between fighting Kentucky militia and federal soldiers. He knew that, without British support, the Indians could not defeat the United States in a protracted war. Denounced for his moderate views, Brant spent the second phase of the Indian War in New York and Canada, coolly rejecting an invitation to take part in what became “St. Clair’s Defeat.” After that battle, Brant recognized a chance to broker a peace settlement between the United States and the western Indian confederacy. Several contacts at Detroit informed him that native leadership in the confederacy had turned factious after St. Clair’s Defeat. Hoping to end the war and regain his lost prestige, Brant agreed to carry out diplomatic missions for the United States.<sup>8</sup>

When Brant arrived in Philadelphia on June 20, 1792, he marveled at the drastic change in U.S. Indian policy. The creation of the American Legion and the additional money afforded to the War Department illustrated just how serious the United States had

become about securing the Old Northwest. The government offered Brant land in New York and an annual sum of \$1,500 for his diplomatic services. He declined the money but offered to carry out the mission, leaving Philadelphia and arriving at a treaty council at Fort Niagara in July. Unfortunately for Brant, he underestimated the toll that intra-tribal fighting had extolled on the Indian confederacy. Few native leaders listened to what he had to say. The war chiefs quarreled amongst themselves, unable to decide on a route of diplomacy with the United States. Most of the upper-Great Lakes tribes complained about growing Shawnee hegemony; a few war chiefs considered the Shawnees to be a greater threat than the Americans. Brant noted that most of the chiefs chose to remain idle in a bid to gain more political power. Disgusted by the lack of cooperation among the tribes, Brant left Niagara a failure.<sup>9</sup>

Brant's was not the only peace mission launched in 1792. Several other peace emissaries failed to bring the war to a close. Intending to parley with the Miami Indians at Kekionga, Alexander Trueman left Fort Washington in May. Just sixty miles from Kekionga, a few Shawnee warriors overtook Trueman and his entourage and killed them. Similarly, Colonel John Hardin, survivor of Harmar's ill-fated campaign, was shot dead en route to a peace conference at Sandusky. When Wayne learned of these events, he criticized the administration for continuing to seek a peaceful resolution to the war. Wayne viewed the Indians as a haughty and insidious enemy who acted on behalf of the British. He prodded Washington to unleash the American Legion on the Ohio country. Washington, however, remained cautious. He agreed with Knox to promote peace at the

Grand Council on the Glaize in September 1792. Privately both men acknowledged that if peace could not be reached by 1793, “the superior force of the American army would entreat the natives to sue for peace.”<sup>10</sup>

The Grand Council, held at Captain Johnny’s village on the Glaize, represented the most organized effort for a peace settlement between the Treaties of Fort Harmar (1789) and Greeneville (1795). A drought delayed the proceedings by a month, but by late September, thousands of Indians from as far away as New York, present-day Wisconsin, and present-day Alabama gathered to voice their concerns about the war. The Shawnees and Miamis began by urging renewed attacks along the Ohio River. Blue Jacket and Little Turtle, increasingly at odds with each other, disagreed on when the attacks should commence. Following St. Clair’s Defeat, the two war chiefs had become political rivals who no longer sat next to each other during tribal councils. The Seneca delegates, acting on behalf of the United States, took note of this rift in leadership and sought to exploit it. Seneca chief Red Jacket urged the war chiefs to negotiate with the Americans from their “new position of power.” With little chance of British intervention and a new American army looming on the horizon, Red Jacket’s words seemed to sway a number of the older chiefs.<sup>11</sup>

Hendrick Aupaumut, another agent of the United States, also hoped to exploit the eroding relations within the confederacy to entice the chiefs to sue for peace. Aupaumut, a Stockbridge Indian from Connecticut, spoke convincingly of the benevolence of President Washington. When a few younger war chiefs objected to Aupaumut’s words, the diplomat

informed them that “Washington was not a Big Knife, and that if he wanted them all dead, he would have sent the army [the Legion] after them.” Aupaumut turned several bands of Ottawa, Chippewa, and Potawatomi Indians against the belligerent Shawnees. More than a few war chiefs, including Captain Pipe, Big Cat, and most notably Buckongahelas, agreed with Aupaumut’s appraisal of the situation. The actions of Red Jacket and Aupaumut at the Grand Council drove a significant wedge into the leadership of the western Indian confederacy.<sup>12</sup>

As the Grand Council persisted through October, incessant backbiting and political sparring dominated the meetings. Beyond the Glaize, the drought worsened and forced the chiefs to think of more immediate concerns like finding food for the winter. Unable to reach a resolution, several delegations—the Ottawas, Sauks, Foxes, Potawatomes, and Wabash tribes—left the Glaize and within months chose to make peace with the United States. Losing support, the Shawnees boldly proclaimed on October 7 that a number of the tribes had fallen victim to the “sweet speeches” of the United States and no longer cared to defend their country. Buckongahelas and his Delawares, stung by the harsh words, reaffirmed their support for the confederacy. The Shawnees closed the Grand Council by declaring that peace could only be reached if the United States agreed to the boundary lines dictated by the Treaty of Fort Stanwix (1768).<sup>13</sup>

Although the Shawnee leadership declared the Grand Council a success, the reality was that internal feuding and American agents had greatly weakened the confederacy. Political scheming and power grabs within its own ranks accomplished what years of war

and famine could not: the breakup of the western Indian confederacy. Although it took another two years for the confederacy to finally collapse, the initial break in the union occurred at the Glaize in 1792. Meeting with U.S. agents in December, Red Jacket and Cornplanter informed their contacts that the confederacy had decided to continue raiding white settlements until the Americans agreed to give up the Ohio country. The chiefs did offer some consolation by informing the agents of the split between the belligerent Ohio tribes and the Great Lakes tribes. Washington and Knox, however, viewed the Grand Council as a failure because the United States did not obtain a peace settlement.<sup>14</sup>

Though displeased by the failed attempt to end the Indian War, Washington and Knox did recognize the split in the confederacy as an important turning point in the conflict. A divided Indian confederation meant better odds at achieving a decisive military victory. As native leadership succumbed to factionalism at the Glaize, an equally important turn of events occurred at the far away military post of Vincennes. On September 27, General Rufus Putnam met with chiefs of the Illinois and Wabash tribes and began treaty negotiations. For years the Illinois and Wabash tribes had harassed western settlements and fought alongside their Miami brethren. But when the Miami Indians relocated from Kekionga to the Glaize in 1791, they left behind their comrades. Unable to continue the war on their own, the tribes capitulated to Putnam. His treaty with these western tribes further diminished the military strength of the native confederacy. Developments at the Glaize and Vincennes assured Wayne that when his Legion met the Indians in combat it would face a divided and weakened opponent.<sup>15</sup>

With the Grand Council concluded and the confederacy splintering, both Little Turtle and Blue Jacket sought to reestablish himself as the de facto leader of the Indian confederacy. Blue Jacket chose to travel to Detroit and pressure the British into joining the war effort. Rebuffed by Alexander McKee, he left Detroit having lost valuable time as winter set in. Bad feelings, traditional winter ceremonies, the need to hunt, and liquor peddled along the Maumee all disrupted his attempts to launch a new campaign. Little Turtle, in contrast, assembled two hundred warriors in November and hastened southward to raid a number of small American forts. Operating along the wilderness road that connected Forts Jefferson and Hamilton, the Indian raiders eventually surprised one hundred Kentuckians encamped near Fort St. Clair. In the ensuing skirmish, known as Adair's Fight, the Indians killed or captured fourteen men and stole nearly one hundred packhorses. The victory bolstered Little Turtle's bid to supplant Blue Jacket as leader of the confederacy. Increasingly, the Indians viewed frontier raids less as military victories than as political leverage to be invoked during tribal councils.<sup>16</sup>

Hoping that diplomatic means would further divide the Indian confederacy, Washington and Knox rejected Wayne's pleas for a military campaign in the summer of 1793. Despite having trained rigorously for nearly ten months, the American Legion remained encamped near Pittsburgh. Knox blustered to Wayne that "the majority of citizens in the United States are in extreme dislike to an Indian War" and that "President Washington fears our modes of population and war will destroy the natives, much like the Spaniards did to those in Mexico and Peru." Wayne found such statements ironic

considering the United States *was* engaged in a war and, as of 1793, *had not* inflicted a severe defeat on the Indian confederacy. Furthermore, Wayne noted that most frontier citizens clamored for a decisive battle that would secure the Pittsburgh-Philadelphia trading corridor. Even the citizens on the east coast favored action in order to protect their claims to the Ohio country. Wealthy politicians—Washington and Knox among them—knew that the Ohio country had already become a central axis for commerce, credit, and capital flow into the new republic. Oblivious to Wayne's requests, Knox dispatched more peace commissioners to the Old Northwest. Diplomats, not soldiers, dictated the course of war in 1793.<sup>17</sup>

After the previous year's diplomatic blunders, Washington and Knox knew that no American peace commissioner could deliver full control of the Old Northwest to the United States. However, diplomats could continue to weaken the Indians by turning them against each other. Well aware that a power struggle was under way within the native ranks, Washington hoped to compound the situation by sending three delegates—Timothy Pickering, Benjamin Lincoln, and Beverly Randolph—to Niagara to spread discontent among the tribes. Arriving in May, the three diplomats quickly informed the gathered Indians about a new Intercourse Act that targeted miscreant frontiersmen and fined surveyors \$1,000 for trespassing on native lands. Pickering reported to Knox that the Indians were so receptive to the news that he and the other diplomats decided to go forward with formal treaty talks.<sup>18</sup>

Acting somewhat independently, Pickering and his fellow diplomats worked to widen the growing rift between the tribes of New York, Pennsylvania, and eastern Ohio, and their hostile western allies. Pickering found the eastern tribes weary of war with the United States and jealous of the Shawnee, who they claimed received better trade deals from the British. After speaking with several chiefs, Pickering found the situation more favorable than he had imagined. The tribes wanted to make peace with the United States and begin trade talks. The Americans offered a “right to land treaty” worth over \$50,000 in trade goods and an annual annuity of \$10,000. Bands of Wyandots, Delawares, and Six Nations accepted the offer and pledged to drop out of the conflict. The Indians also agreed to recognize the boundaries dictated by the Fort Harmar Treaty (1789). The disenchanted native allies of the North parted ways with the Indian confederacy.<sup>19</sup>

Pickering, Lincoln, and Randolph’s actions frustrated the British in Canada. British officials ordered by London not to negotiate with the Indians, believed that the collapse of the Indian confederacy might foreshadow an American invasion of Canada. John Graves Simcoe, the lieutenant governor of Upper Canada (Ontario), met with the Americans at Niagara to gauge their intentions. He learned that the United States had no “immediate” plans for attacking Canada, but such a vague response put Simcoe on edge, especially when news from Europe confirmed that Britain and France had once again declared war on each other. Fear of a joint Franco-American army invading Canada forced Simcoe to relax trade restrictions that existed between the British at Detroit and the Indian confederacy,

guaranteeing that when the Indians met Wayne's Legion, or any American force, they would have the weapons and supplies necessary to fight back.<sup>20</sup>

Governor Simcoe knew, however, that weapons and logistics alone could not deliver victory on the battlefield. The armies of Harmar and St. Clair proved that superior technology meant little if conflicting relations plagued the ranks. At some point, Wayne's Legion would cross the Ohio and engage the Indians. If the Indian confederacy could not mount a unified defense, then the war would be lost. Under these circumstances, Simcoe met with native leaders in August 1793 at the Miami Rapids to repair political accord within the confederacy.<sup>21</sup>

The council at the Miami Rapids marked the first time the British and Indians deliberated on the war effort in nearly two years. In attendance were such notable leaders as Blue Jacket, Joseph Brant, Little Turtle, Captain Johnny, Alexander McKee, and Governor Simcoe. Simcoe started the proceedings by evaluating the current state of the confederacy. In 1793, the confederacy claimed roughly two thousand warriors: as usual, the Shawnees and Miamis made up the majority of the confederacy; the Cherokee and several bands of Delawares remained loyal as well. However, Simcoe noted that the Wyandots, Sauks and Foxes, Kickapoos, Illinois, Chickasaws, and Six Nations had all abandoned the confederacy. On the political front, divisions between the Shawnees and Miamis threatened to split the confederacy in half. Furthermore, two years of drought had led to diminished food supplies for the confederacy. Simcoe marveled at how far the Indians had fallen since St. Clair's Defeat.<sup>22</sup>

Deciding on a course of action proved to be a major point of contention at the council. Captain Johnny, speaking on behalf of the Shawnees, pushed for new attacks along the Ohio River. He also proposed that the Indians continue to fight until the Americans agreed to the boundaries dictated by the Treaty of Fort Stanwix (1768). In opposition, Little Turtle of the Miamis warned that the Indians must first send out spies to monitor Wayne's Legion. He blasted the Shawnees for making no plans since St. Clair's Defeat and for assuming that a similar victory awaited them when they faced a new American army. Joseph Brant, representing the Six Nations, urged the Indians to cede some of their land before they lost it all. Recounting his exploits in Philadelphia the previous year, Brant informed the tribes that the United States was more determined than ever to conquer the Northwest. Brant ominously warned the council that "Both Great Britain and the United States act by a regard to self interest and cannot be trusted...and be aware that the Americans are now the great power on the continent." Simcoe, angered by Brant's words before the council, declared him a "traitor to the Western Indians."<sup>23</sup>

Despite the presence of so many great minds, leaders at the Miami Rapids council could not agree on any tangible ways to heal the political wounds inflicted on the confederacy. Powerful egos and strong personalities dominated the conference, making it impossible for the tribes to agree on a singular course of action. Beyond the confederacy, years of unsatisfactory dealings with the British added weight to Brant's words: Simcoe and McKee could not be trusted. In the end, the majority of the confederacy decided to adopt the Shawnees' plan to continue fighting until the Indians expelled the Americans

from the Ohio country. Dissatisfied minorities, Little Turtle among them, pondered whether the war could still be won. Simcoe left the council convinced of the “ignorance” of the Indians. He warned British officials in London that the Indians could not be trusted, particularly the Six Nations who he feared had entered into a secret alliance with the United States. Simcoe’s effort to unify the Indians to protect British interests had failed. The British made no more attempts to alter the course of the war.<sup>24</sup>

At this critical point in the war, the United States army matured by fostering good relations with the people of the backcountry. In contrast, to earlier American armies, the Legion of the United States garnered much praise from frontier citizens for its discipline and appearance. Legionaries traveling in Pittsburgh or Cincinnati dressed well and behaved. Such positive interactions with the citizenry quelled fears of a standing army on the frontier. The Legion won the respect of many frontiers people when, during the fall of 1793, it helped contain a smallpox outbreak in Ohio. In turn, when Wayne called forth the Kentucky militia in 1794, he received capable men who knew how to hunt and track. Gaining the respect and trust of the militia made Wayne vastly more effective than the generals who had served before him.<sup>25</sup>

Equally as important was the effort made by the Legionaries to make peace with the Indians. In the wake of St. Clair’s Defeat, many tribes parted ways with the confederacy and swore amity to the United States. Though Wayne detested most Indians, he recognized the importance of treating them with respect so as to avoid future conflicts. Prior to the outbreak of war between the frontiersmen and the Indians in 1786, federal soldiers

experienced few problems with the natives. Wayne wanted to ensure that when the war ended federal soldiers and Indians alike resumed their old ways. Thus, he allowed his soldiers to serve as diplomats, doctors, traders, and ethnologists for the Indians. He also encouraged his aide-de-camps to carefully record all land sales in Indian territories so that land speculators could not cheat the Indians once the war ended. Word of American generosity spread among the tribes and became an important factor in the Indians' eventual decision to submit to the United States.<sup>26</sup>

Wayne's ability to gain the confidence of frontiersmen and Indians strengthened the American military and proved to be disastrous for the native confederacy. When Knox finally allowed him to move north of the Ohio in November 1793, Wayne did so unopposed and in command of over two thousand determined soldiers. He marched his army directly to the site of St. Clair's Defeat, arriving on Christmas Day. During a military review of federals and militiamen, Wayne proclaimed that a new era had begun. He informed the men—some of whom had survived the defeat two years earlier—that they stood on hallowed ground, and that the construction of Fort Recovery on that site marked the beginning of the end of the Indian confederacy. Pragmatically, Wayne's decision to erect a fort served two purposes: first, the fort allowed Wayne's cavalry to strike close to the Glaize; second, the fort provided a base from which Wayne could recover artillery and small arms hidden after the retreat of St. Clair's army. But the reclaiming of St. Clair's battlefield did something else too. Whether intended or not, Wayne's actions inspired federals and militiamen alike to set aside their differences and work together.<sup>27</sup>

Wayne created strong ties between federals and militia by coaching his men that the Indians represented the single greatest threat to the New Republic. The Legionaries adhered to Wayne's message, turning their animosity towards the Indians and away from each other. But privately, Wayne feared a greater threat than the Indians; he feared the British. He always considered the Indians too "immature" to launch a serious campaign of resistance on their own. He believed that British agents manipulated the Indians and encouraged them to keep fighting.

Wayne's apprehensions appeared justifiable when he learned in spring 1794 that Lord Dorchester ominously declared that the United States and Great Britain would be at war by the end of the year. In April 1794, the British expanded Fort Miamis at the Miami Rapids. Garrisoned by 150 men with artillery, Fort Miamis marked a dangerous new development in Anglo-American relations. Expecting to fight the British too, Wayne emboldened his men with patriotic rhetoric, emphasizing American virtues and speaking of a national destiny. His words, and the very real threat of a war with Britain, drew federals and militiamen even closer during their encampment at Greeneville.<sup>28</sup>

In April 1794, news of Lord Dorchester's actions in the Old Northwest reached President Washington in Philadelphia who quickly opted to diffuse the situation by sending Chief Justice John Jay to England to negotiate a truce. Washington considered Jay "fair and firm in negotiation" and possessing "good sense and judgment." Jay set sail in May with instructions to resolve such longstanding differences as the abandonment of western posts and territorial boundaries between Canada and the United States. Bypassing British

officials in Canada and sending Jay directly to England proved a foreign policy triumph for Washington. As long as Jay remained in London on a peace mission, British officials denied Lord Dorchester and Governor Simcoe the license to intercede in the Indian War. Washington assured Wayne that he could carry out his summer offensive against the Indians without fear of British intervention.<sup>29</sup>

Limited supplies, especially a lack of packhorses, kept the Legion of the United States encamped at Greeneville until July. While Wayne battled logistics, William Wells led a detachment of Choctaw scouts and backcountry rangers on a reconnaissance of the Glaize. Wells, Little Turtle's son-in-law, had rescinded his allegiance to the Indian confederacy after St. Clair's Defeat. Hired as a scout and interpreter by the army, he proved very adept at spying and foraging, reporting to Wayne that the Glaize teemed with native activity, including the recent arrival of six hundred upper-Great Lakes Indians. On June 27, Wells and his command ran into a party of Indian scouts, and, after a brief skirmish, returned to Greeneville to sound the alarm. Unbeknownst to Wells, his command had stumbled upon an Indian force of 1,100 warriors intent on destroying Fort Recovery.<sup>30</sup>

The Indians launched their attack on the morning of June 30, surprising the federal garrison because intelligence (from Wells and his scouts) indicated an attack on Greeneville, not Fort Recovery. Initially, the abundant supplies and munitions in a federal wagon train enticed the young warriors. Less than 150 dragoons and riflemen guarded the wagon train, and most of those men faded away as soon as the shooting began. The Indians quickly overtook the wagons and plundered most of the goods. Their decision proved to be

ruinous in the long run because it gave the federal soldiers time to prepare artillery and secure the fort.<sup>31</sup>

After the capture of the wagon train, the Indians seemed hesitant to take a direct course of action. Blue Jacket, mastermind of the attack, preferred to lay siege to the fort, reasoning that the Americans already needed food and supplies—hence, the large wagon train en route to the fort. Furthermore, the Americans commanded three cannons capable of shattering any native offensive. He already had his political victory (the assault on the wagon train), and he saw little need for further bloodshed, telling the other chiefs to simply wait out the Americans. Little Turtle, commanding a small number of Miamis, rejected Blue Jacket's plan. He suggested that the Indians leave with their plunder and set up defenses at the Glaize for the imminent arrival of Wayne's Legion. Deemed cowardly, Little Turtle's plan attracted few followers. In the end, most Indians supported Egushawa, an Ottawa chief, who commanded the upper-Great Lakes Indians. Whether impatient or sensing a political victory, Egushawa led a suicidal attack on the fort.<sup>32</sup>

Though less than two hundred men defended Fort Recovery, they successfully repelled each assault. Canister shots decimated the Ottawa and Ojibwe warriors who refused to seek cover. Blue Jacket and Little Turtle watched the attacks continue for over four hours before successfully convincing Egushawa and his warriors to stop their assault. The following day the Indians once again tried to capture the fort. By early afternoon, American scouting parties and bands of Choctaw Indians from Greeneville arrived to relieve the federal garrison. Knowing that the American Legion would arrive shortly, the

Indians broke off the attack, hastily buried their dead, and made off with three hundred horses. The Americans rejoiced over their stout defense of Fort Recovery.<sup>33</sup>

As they retreated, the Indians began to blame each other for the poor outcome of the siege. The Shawnees lambasted Egushawa for his foolhardy attack on the garrison. In response, the upper-Great Lakes tribes questioned the bravery of the Shawnees. The Ottawas and Chippewas even accused the Shawnees of firing into their ranks. When Blue Jacket tried to take control of the situation, the upper-Great Lakes Indians complained of the Shawnee hierarchy that dominated policy making. Fed up with Shawnee authority, they simply went home. After years of Shawnee dominance in tribal councils and battles, the smaller tribes refused to take any more. Internal power struggles finally splintered the western Indian confederacy. With only a few allies, less than a thousand warriors, and no hope of support from Britain, Blue Jacket conceded to Captain Johnny at the Glaize that things looked bleak for the confederacy.<sup>34</sup>

For Wayne and his Legion of the United States, morale skyrocketed after the defense of Fort Recovery, and Wayne noted with satisfaction that the soldiers “appeared ready for a fight.” He also cleared up his supply problems, and by mid-July the army once again had enough rations for a campaign. Finally, on July 29 Major General Charles Scott arrived at Greeneville with 1,600 mounted Kentuckians. Unlike earlier militia units who were ill-equipped and poorly trained, Scott’s men were accustomed to frontier fighting. When Wayne left Greeneville, he commanded a legion of over 3,500 men, larger than any

previous frontier army. More importantly, he commanded an army united by the common goal of securing the Old Northwest for the United States.<sup>35</sup>

With Wayne on the move, the Indians made a last ditch appeal to the British for assistance. Little Turtle traveled to Detroit to meet with Colonel Richard England in an effort to obtain two cannons and twenty soldiers. At the same time, Blue Jacket pressured Alexander McKee and the garrison at Fort Miamis for help. The British rebuffed both chiefs. In mid-July, John Jay and Lord Grenville reached an agreement in London to maintain peace on the frontier. Though the intricacies of Jay's Treaty remained debatable, the bottom line was that the United States and Great Britain would avoid war with each other. Jay wrote to President Washington that:

Lord Grenville and myself reached an agreement for preserving things in a pacific and unaltered state between us and the British on the side of Canada. Though I believe the British in Canada looked upon the war as inevitable, I do also believe that Lord Dorchester was instructed to act comfortably to that idea, and that Simcoe was governed by it.

Parliament instructed Lord Dorchester to cease all hostile measures against the United States and to return any captured property or prisoners held at Detroit. The British officially bowed out of the power struggle for the Old Northwest. It could not have come at a worse time for the Indians.<sup>36</sup>

Wayne and his army made good time marching towards the Glaize. With few desertions and no internal power feuds, Wayne could commit himself entirely to the military engagement at hand. His predecessors had never been so lucky. Though he rushed his men forward, Wayne guarded against any surprise attacks. Every night his men

constructed breastworks for protection. During the day, the men marched in strict battle lines. Scouts reconnoitered the area and kept an eye out for ambushes. Wayne made sure that his legion did not repeat the errors of St. Clair's army.<sup>37</sup>

On August 8, 1794, the Legion of the United States marched triumphantly into the Glaize, the Indians having evacuated the village just two days prior. The soldiers foraged for fruits and vegetables and searched for hidden Indian artifacts. Wayne marveled at the majestic scenery and termed the place "the grand emporium of the hostile Indians of the West." The smoldering ruins of several houses and trading posts confirmed that the Indians were only a couple days ahead of the advancing army. Instead of chasing them, however, Wayne ordered his men to construct a fort which he named Fort Defiance. The fort stood completed by August 15 and the army once again pushed forward. An excited officer wrote, "We are all in high spirits and there is a jaunty air." Wayne himself expected the Indians to surrender within days.<sup>38</sup>

At a tribal council held on August 19, the war chiefs of the western Indian confederacy debated their next move. One thousand warriors waited at the Miami Rapids to attack the oncoming Americans. Fifty Canadian militiamen under William Caldwell arrived to help the Indians, as did two hundred "renegade whites" who lived amongst the Indians. Although Wayne left several hundred soldiers behind at Forts Adam and Defiance his army still numbered three thousand men. Seeing that the Indians were outnumbered and facing annihilation, Little Turtle made an impassioned speech calling for an end to the war.<sup>39</sup>

It no longer mattered whether or not Little Turtle's speech offended the Shawnee hierarchy. Political moves seemed pointless to the chief when an invading army stood ready to destroy the last bastion of native resistance in the Old Northwest. Realizing that the war was over, Little Turtle rose before the war council and delivered his most memorable speech:

We have beaten the enemy twice under different commanders [Harmar and St. Clair]. We cannot expect the same good fortune always to attend us. The Americans are now led by a chief who never sleeps. The night and day are alike to him, and during all the time he has been marching upon our villages, notwithstanding the watchfulness of our young men, we have never been able to surprise him. Think well of it. There is something that whispers to me, it would be prudent to listen to his offers of peace.

The war chiefs initially received the speech in silence. Then Blue Jacket denounced Little Turtle as a coward. Egushawa bluntly stated that Little Turtle wished "to smoke in the lodges of the Long Knives." Little Turtle, his pride offended, offered his services (and those of the Miamis) to the confederacy, but the irrational chiefs ignored him. The power struggle within the confederacy claimed its final victim; the great alliance between Shawnee and Miami was extinguished with the council fire.<sup>40</sup>

That night Blue Jacket led his warriors five miles southwest of Fort Miamis to a place known as Presque Isle, or Fallen Timbers. Dense undergrowth and tangled thickets, remnants of a devastating tornado, covered the region. Indian scouts tracked Wayne's approaching army, occasionally picking off an unwary soldier. Alexander McKee, present only as an observer, recorded that the Indians seemed "anxious" as they waited for the Americans to approach. Unlike his warriors, Blue Jacket remained determined to fight.

McKee noted that the chief appeared in rare form, “impetuous, if not brilliant; he was just the type of military leader the British required in the existing crisis.” Against all odds, McKee still hoped that Blue Jacket could defeat yet another American army. Though a great military leader, Blue Jacket’s failures as a diplomat had splintered the native confederacy. His inability to resolve differences with Joseph Brant and the Six Nations, the upper-Great Lakes tribes, and finally Little Turtle and the Miamis weakened the confederacy militarily. Blue Jacket and the other tribal chiefs provided Wayne the opportunity to forever upset the balance of power in the Old Northwest.<sup>41</sup>

Wayne took advantage of his adversaries’ mistakes on August 20 when his Legion of the United States finally engaged the Indians. Slowed by rain, Wayne’s force did not run into the Indians until late morning. When they did, they found the Indians in a strong defensive position. Using the Maumee River to cover his flanks, Blue Jacket aligned his warriors in three lines extending over two miles. The native position should have been secure except that several hundred Indians had broken ranks and ventured to Fort Miamis for food. Wayne’s advance guard, several hundred Kentucky militia under Major William Price, marched within one hundred yards of the natives before they were fired upon. A sharp skirmish ensued, and the natives, led by a young Shawnee warrior named Tecumseh, drove the Americans back. For a moment, the American line wavered and the Indians rushed forward to scalp the fleeing soldiers.<sup>42</sup>

What happened next surprised the Indians. The next line of Americans, riflemen under Captain Uriah Springer, did not retreat. Instead, the militia calmly absorbed Price’s

fleeing men and continued to fire on the charging Indians, allowing the Legionaries under Captain John Cook, Colonel John Francis Hamtramck, and Brigadier General James Wilkinson to charge the Indians at bayonet point. The Americans advanced and fired on the Indians until the native lines collapsed. Major General Charles Scott and his mounted Kentucky militia hit the natives on their right flank and drove them into utter confusion. Finally, the center of the native line disintegrated when a band of Ottawa warriors found themselves out of position and nearly surrounded. The Indians hastened to retreat as the Legion's dragoons charged them with flashing sabers. Although a few pockets of resistance—Tecumseh's warriors and Caldwell's Canadian militia—refused to yield ground, the main Indian force retreated to Fort Miamis. After just thirty minutes of fighting the battle was over. Control of the Old Northwest rested exclusively with the Americans.<sup>43</sup>

Hoping to avoid igniting a British war with the United States, Major William Campbell, commander of Fort Miamis, ordered his men to lock the fort and refrain from firing on the Americans. Campbell also forbade his garrison from helping the Indians who then retreated to Swan Creek, about eleven miles south of the fort. As Wayne and his Legionaries approached, Campbell implored the general to be rational and avoid further bloodshed. Flush with victory, Wayne ordered Campbell to surrender the fort or suffer the consequences. After a heated conversation between the two commanders, Wayne decided not to attack. Instead, he ordered his aide, William Henry Harrison, to set fire to the surrounding cornfields and prairies. This action provoked no response from Campbell. Convinced that the British intended to stay out of the conflict, Wayne marched his army

back to Fort Defiance. Along the way, his men burned every Indian settlement they encountered.<sup>44</sup>

Wayne's victory over the northwestern Indians came down to his ability to unite the militiamen and Legionaries, rather than superior technology, manpower, or logistics. During the critical point of the battle, when Captain Springer's militia could have run away, the volunteer soldiers held firm and bought time for the Legionaries to engage the Indians. In previous battles, the carelessness of the militias prevented the Regulars from coordinating and carrying out attacks. At Fallen Timbers, the two allies proved that they could in fact work together and achieve success. Wayne's talent for training and disciplining men from different backgrounds, regions, and allegiances should not be overlooked when considering the outcome of the battle. Neither should his ability to foster esprit de corps among men who prided themselves on individuality. Such intangibles enabled the United States army to defeat a difficult foe on foreign ground.<sup>45</sup>

The attributes that had twice allowed the Indians to defeat the United States army—unity, strong leadership, and willpower—were absent at Fallen Timbers. The Indians went into battle divided against each other. Irreparable political rifts between the various northwest tribes carried over to the battlefield. Most noticeably, the upper-Great Lakes tribes acted independently of Blue Jacket's main force. In regards to leadership, the Indians lacked their most dynamic and successful war chief, Little Turtle. Upset by the previous day's war council, he and most of his warriors never took part in the battle. The Indians did have Blue Jacket present, but he failed to get into the battle until the last few minutes of

fighting. Finally, the Indians lacked the willpower they had channeled against Harmar and St. Clair. After years of war and victories over two American armies, the Indians' spirit seemed broken by intra-confederacy fighting and failing supplies. Both American and British reports prior to the battle spoke of the "melancholy nature of the Indians" and their "inability to command a warlike or gallant nature." The Indians' loss of determination, more than any battlefield victory, allowed the United States to tip the balance of power in its favor once and for all.<sup>46</sup>

Though a small battle compared to Kekionga and St. Clair's Defeat, Fallen Timbers had an immediate impact on the conquest of the Old Northwest. First, the battle eliminated the threat posed by the western Indian confederacy. Though the battle cost the Indians just forty lives, the war chiefs agreed that the struggle was over. Divided and without British support, the Indians could not hope to carry on the war any longer. More pressing needs such as finding food faced the native leaders. After the battle, Wayne's Legion roamed the countryside burning all crops they found, hoping to starve the Indians into a peace settlement. Wayne also reasoned that if the Indians did not agree to peace, at least they would be too preoccupied with hunting and farming to mount a retaliatory campaign for some time. His assertions proved accurate. On January 29, 1795, Blue Jacket announced that the Indians planned to meet with Wayne in June to conclude peace negotiations. Although factions of Indian banditti continued to harass white settlers, the Indian army encamped at Swan Creek turned away from warfare and focused on more domestic matters.<sup>47</sup>

Another important result of Fallen Timbers was the United States' immediate monopolization of the Indian trade. Just weeks after the battle, Wayne's Legion marched to the headwaters of the Maumee, the site previously known as Kekionga. They surveyed the spot where, just four years earlier, the United States army first tasted combat. Wayne reclaimed the battlefield, just as he had done at Fort Recovery, and ordered that a fort be built to "control the Indian trade along the important navigable interior waterways." On October 22, 1794, Fort Wayne stood complete. Commanded by Colonel Hamtramck and boasting three hundred men and fifteen cannons, Fort Wayne stood as a symbol of American military strength in the Old Northwest. Wayne's men also carved a wilderness road from Fort Wayne to Fort Defiance, thereby controlling all modes of trade via water and land. As Wayne guessed, it did not take long for the Indians to abandon their British trading partners in Canada for the more accessible and better supplied Americans.<sup>48</sup>

Perhaps the most important result of Wayne's victory was its effect on the American populace. Returning to Greenville on November 2, 1794, the soldiers of the Legion of the United States were overcome by the praise of a grateful nation. President Washington wasted little time in congratulating the Legionaries, declaring that "In all quarters of the country there is applause, and you [the soldiers] have the unanimous thanks of the President and Congress." As word of the pacification of the tribes spread, a wave of immigrants flowed into the Ohio country. Within five years Marietta became a bustling river port; within eight years Cincinnati became the "gem of the west." In 1803, Ohio became the seventeenth state admitted to the Union. Although some recalcitrant tribes still existed in

Ohio, most notably the Shawnees under Captain Johnny and Tecumseh, the majority of the Ohio Indians forever laid down their arms. Though still a wild place, the northwestern frontier was no longer seen as a threat to the livelihood of the Republic.<sup>49</sup>

The inability of the Indians and Americans to peaceably relate to each other had ignited the Indian War in 1786. Nearly a decade later, the conflict reached its resolution. A disciplined American army finally routed the Indians and tipped the balance of power. Although most Indians submitted to the United States, Wayne feared a continuation of hostilities if both sides could not treat each other with fairness and civility. To this end, Wayne refused to launch any military campaigns in the spring of 1795. In possession of a standing army and a string of forts from Cincinnati to Fort Wayne, Wayne could have used intimidation to bring the native leaders to the bargaining table. Instead, he relied on diplomats to convince the Indians to meet at a grand peace council at Greeneville in June 1795. Wayne did not rush the Indians; the longer they held out, the more they came to depend on the United States for food and supplies. Timothy Pickering, the new Secretary of War, liked Wayne's strategy and believed it to be the quickest and safest way to secure the Northwest Territory.<sup>50</sup>

To their credit, most Indians did not seek out opportunities to attack the Americans following the defeat at Fallen Timbers. Blue Jacket, speaking on behalf of the confederacy, met with Wayne in February and proclaimed that "Our hearts and minds are changed, and we now consider ourselves your friends and brothers...the fate of war has made us allies." To add weight to Blue Jacket's words, Wayne agreed to grant the chief special trade

privileges and an annual subsidy of \$300. Reacting to Blue Jacket's deal, several other notable chiefs, including Joseph Brant, jockeyed for positions of power within the new American trade network. The Americans bribed Brant and many other chiefs—anything to avoid further native resistance.<sup>51</sup>

Wayne did not mind turning native leaders into trade liaisons because he did not foresee the Americans trading with the Indians much longer. Like Thomas Jefferson, Wayne wagered that in a few decades the Indians would be assimilated into American culture. They would cease to exist as separate entities within the borders of the United States. When that happened, the United States would control all internal trade networks and be free of native involvement. Furthermore, the United States did not commit itself to the war effort in order to capitalize on the Indian trade. Since the beginning, the United States coveted the *land* of the northwest. The land could be settled, exploited, and used to expand the nation. Wayne willingly sacrificed trade in his peace negotiations, in order to secure land. He astutely perceived the land to be the most significant asset of the war.<sup>52</sup>

Obtaining peace and land became Wayne's top priorities as he met with Indian leaders in the summer of 1795. By July, most war chiefs had assembled at Greeneville to negotiate with Wayne and bring an end to the conflict. Blue Jacket, Little Turtle, Tarhe, Buckongahelas, Egushawa, Red Pole, and a host of lesser chiefs attended the proceedings. Only Captain Johnny and Tecumseh remained conspicuously absent. The majority of chiefs in attendance wanted peace and supplies, but a vocal faction of young warriors (more than one thousand were encamped at Greeneville) insisted that the Ohio River separate the

Americans and Indians. Wayne rejected the request, and the more radical Indians soon withdrew from that position when they learned of the ratification of Jay's Treaty. The British announced in July that they intended to abandon their posts in the Old Northwest and stay out of Indian affairs.<sup>53</sup>

With no more obstacles to diplomacy, Wayne put forward the terms of his treaty on July 27. In presenting the treaty, Wayne and his officers worked diligently to appease the Indians. They wore dress uniforms and acted with the utmost civility. Likewise, the native chiefs conducted themselves honorably and listened to the Americans with great sincerity. Both sides recognized that the treaty proceedings offered a chance to mediate conflict and avoid further violence. After nearly ten years of war, relationships needed to be repaired and both sides agreed that the healing process should start at Greeneville. Not surprisingly, one of the first orders of business was the exchange of prisoners. Dozens of white and Indian captives returned to their family and friends. One of Wayne's officers wrote that the scene "warmed his heart" although he believed it would take years for some of the "savage white children" to become settled in their new life.<sup>54</sup>

The exchange of captives proved to be critical in reestablishing positive relations between the Indians and Americans. With that act concluded, Wayne found the chiefs to be even more receptive to the ten articles of his treaty. Among other things, the treaty called for an end to the Indian War (Article I), the establishment of hunting and farming areas for the Indians (Articles V and VII), and the expansion of the Indian trade (Article VIII). Most significantly, the treaty surrendered two-thirds of Ohio and southern Indiana to the United

States. Wayne expanded the Harmar Treaty line to encompass everything from the Cuyahoga River to Fort Recovery and westward to the Ohio River, opposite the mouth of the Kentucky River. In addition, the Americans secured lands around Fort Wayne and Fort Defiance and 150,000 acres in southern Indiana for the soldiers of George Rogers Clark's frontier army. For this abject submission, the Indians received \$20,000 in trade goods and annuities amounting to \$9,500 annually.<sup>55</sup>

Most native leaders rushed to attach their names to the treaty so they could receive more money and favorable trade status with the United States. Besides, Wayne's insistence on the Harmar Treaty boundary line did not surprise anyone. He demanded the same land that countless other generals and diplomats had sought. Little Turtle, however, stood out as the lone voice of dissent among the tribes gathered at Greenville. Fearing the loss of hunting lands in southern Ohio, he accused Wayne of "usurping the best parts of our land." Wayne responded that Little Turtle stood in opposition to the will of the majority. Little Turtle refused to sign the peace treaty on August 3, although he later added his name to the treaty and took up residence with his family at Fort Wayne. In time, he reconciled with his son-in-law, William Wells, and the two men ran a prosperous trade network along the Maumee River until Wells's death during the War of 1812.<sup>56</sup>

On August 3, 1795, the Indian War in the Old Northwest ended. Over one thousand Indians and two thousand Americans turned out to witness the historic event. The Indians assembled according to tradition with their "elder brothers" the Wyandots and Delawares signing first. When Buckongahelas signed the treaty, he told Wayne, "I promise to be a

true friend to the United States as I have heretofore been an active enemy.” Several other chiefs made similar promises, and most held true to their word. Ten years later, when Tecumseh tried to resurrect the western Indian confederacy, he found little support among the chiefs who took part in the treaty ceremony at Greeneville. The Americans signed the treaty last. Wayne said little about the event except that “the terms were unanimously and voluntarily agreed to” and that “the chiefs appeared cheerful when signing the treaty.” After the signing, peace medals and trade goods were distributed, and the Americans and Indians feasted together. After two more days of revelry, the Indians disbanded and the proceedings officially came to a close.<sup>57</sup>

The civility and respect exemplified by American and Indian leaders at Greeneville went a long way in bridging the gap between the former enemies. In the months after the treaty conference, dozens of bands of renegade Indians came forward to make peace with the United States. Blue Jacket, once the greatest advocate for war, became the loudest proponent of peace. Like the war chiefs of other tribes, Blue Jacket reluctantly returned political authority back to the civil chiefs. He convinced Pucksekaw, leader of the largest band of renegade Shawnees in Ohio, to submit to the United States. But he failed to sway Tecumseh who led a band of dissident Shawnees out of Ohio to present-day Lafayette, Indiana.<sup>58</sup>

From his post at Greeneville, Wayne noted a steep decline in Indian raids in the months after the treaty. By 1796, hostile encounters between whites and Indians virtually stopped. Wayne transferred most authority to the commanders of the outer posts since they were

most susceptible to Indian attacks. But the attacks never came. Tired of war, the Indians focused their energy on adapting to a new way of life. American missionaries and teachers ventured into the Old Northwest to try and assimilate the Indians to American culture. The Indians learned how to speak English, cultivate the earth, and worship a new god. From the outside, it appeared that the Indians and Americans had reached a new level of constructive interaction. But things were not as they seemed. New settlers pouring into Ohio viewed the Indians as hostile squatters on their land. The Indians, in turn, disapproved of the Americans' efforts to change their ways of life. The same problems that started the Indian War in 1786 resurfaced in 1796 and threatened to undue the fragile peace of Greeneville. In the post-war years, it would take the best efforts of leaders on both sides to maintain the peace and foster virtuous relationships between Americans and Indians.<sup>59</sup>

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> Patrick Griffin, *American Leviathan: Empire, Nation, and Revolutionary Frontier* (New York: Hill & Wang, 2007), 240-41.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 241-42; *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, 20 vols. (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1903-04), 1: 340-41.

<sup>3</sup> Reginald Horsman, *The New Republic: The United States of America, 1789-1815* (Harlow, Eng.: Longman Publishing, 2000), 36-37.

<sup>4</sup> John R. Elting, "The Legion Which Saved the United States," *The Classical Journal* 57 (October 1961): 30; Wiley Sword, *President Washington's Indian War: The Struggle for the Old Northwest, 1790-1795* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985), 204.

<sup>5</sup> Jared Sparks, ed., *The Writings of George Washington*, 12 vols. (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1858), 12: 138-39; J.D. Waghelstein, "The United States Army's First War: War in the Northwest Territory, 1790-95," *Small Wars and Insurgencies* 12 (summer 2001): 3-4.

<sup>6</sup> Harry Emerson Wildes, *Anthony Wayne: Trouble Shooter of the American Revolution* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1969), 366-67, 374-75; Richard D. Knopf, *Anthony Wayne, A Name in Arms* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1960), 49-50, 224-25, 235.

<sup>7</sup> Wildes, *Anthony Wayne*, 378-80; Knopf, *Anthony Wayne*, 228.

<sup>8</sup> Douglas W. Boyce, "A Glimpse of Iroquois Culture History Through the Eyes of Joseph Brant," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 117 (August 1973): 286-87; Dorothy Jones, *License for Empire: Colonialism by Treaty in Early America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 160; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 210-11.

<sup>9</sup> William Leete Stone, *The Life of Joseph Brant: Thayendanegea*, 2 vols. (1838; reprint, New York: Adamant Media, 2003), 2: 328-29; Clarence Burton, ed., *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections* (hereafter *MP*), 40 vols. (Lansing: Michigan Historical Society, 1889), 24: 456.

<sup>10</sup> Burton, ed., *MP*, 24: 414-15; letter from Anthony Wayne to James Wilkinson, 5 August, 1792, in Rowena Buell, *The Memoirs of Rufus Putnam*, (Pittsburgh: Houghton Mifflin, 1903), 331; letter from Henry Knox to George Washington, 26 December, 1791, *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, 2 vols. (Washington D.C.: n.p., 1832-34), 1: 197-99.

<sup>11</sup> Reginald Horsman, *Expansion and American Indian Policy, 1783-1812* (Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1967), 96-7; letter from Anthony Wayne to James McHenry, 3 October, 1796, in Knopf, *Anthony Wayne*, 532; William Leete Stone, *The Life and Times of Red Jacket, or Sagoyewatha* (1841; reprint, St. Clair Shores, Mich.: Scholarly Press, 1970), 205-207.

<sup>12</sup> Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 458-60; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 213.

<sup>13</sup> Burton, ed., *MP*, 24: 493-95; White, *The Middle Ground*, 461-62.

---

<sup>14</sup> *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, 1: 322; John Sugden, *Blue Jacket: Warrior of the Shawnees* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000), 137-38.

<sup>15</sup> Thomas Cochran, ed., *The New American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, 13 vols. (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1972) 4: 117-20.

<sup>16</sup> Stewart Rafert, *The Miami Indians of Indiana: A Persistent People, 1654-1994* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1996), 51; Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 143-44; *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, 1: 335.

<sup>17</sup> Cochran, *New American State Papers*, 4: 119-20; letter from Henry Knox to Anthony Wayne, 5 January, 1793, in Knopf, *Anthony Wayne*, 164-65; Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 44-45.

<sup>18</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 143; Francis Paul Prucha, *American Indian Policy in the Formative Years: The Indian Trade and Intercourse Acts, 1790-1834* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), 145; Andro Linklater, *The Fabric of America: How Our Borders and Boundaries Shaped the Country and Forged Our National Identity* (New York: Walker & Company, 2007), 79-80.

<sup>19</sup> Cochran, *New American State Papers*, 4: 120-23; Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 143-44. It should be noted that the central-Ohio Delawares under Buckongahelas refused to sign the Treaty of Niagara. This band of Delawares continued to resist American expansion until the Treaty of Greeneville (1795).

<sup>20</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 230-31, 240-42.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 244-45.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 245-47; Jerry E. Clark, *The Shawnee* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1993), 69-70.

<sup>23</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 246-47; Larry Nelson, ed., *A History of Jonathan Alder, His Captivity and Life with the Indians* (Akron, Ohio: University of Akron Press, 2002), 108-109; Stone, *The Life of Joseph Brant*, 2: 358.

<sup>24</sup> Reginald Horsman, *Expansion and American Indian Policy*, 97-99; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 248.

<sup>25</sup> Alan D. Gaff, *Bayonets in the Wilderness: Anthony Wayne's Legion in the Old Northwest* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004), 182-84; Joseph G. Dawson, "Anthony Wayne, A Soldier of the Early Republic," *Library Journal* 110 (September 1985): 77.

<sup>26</sup> Jane Smith and Robert Kvasnicka, eds., *Indian-White Relations: A Persistent Paradox* (Washington D.C.: Howard University Press, 1976), 131-32; John Glen and Alan January, "Indiana Before Statehood," *Indiana Magazine of History* 99 (September 2003): 265-66.

<sup>27</sup> Frank Monaghan, *John Jay: Defender of Liberty* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1935), 363; Gaff, *Bayonets in the Wilderness*, 184-85.

<sup>28</sup> Richard Drinnon, *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire Building* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980), 96; Wildes, *Anthony Wayne*, 408-409; Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 159.

- 
- <sup>29</sup> Harry Carman and Harold C. Syrett, *A History of the American People*, 2 vols. (New York: Random House, 1954), 1: 240-41; Monaghan, *John Jay*, 361-62.
- <sup>30</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 269-71; Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 161-62.
- <sup>31</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 273-77.
- <sup>32</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 166-68.
- <sup>33</sup> Gaff, *Bayonets in the Wilderness*, 248-50.
- <sup>34</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 277-78; Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 167-69.
- <sup>35</sup> Paul David Nelson, "General Charles Scott, the Kentucky Mounted Volunteers, and the Northwest Indian Wars, 1784-1794," *Journal of the Early Republic* 6 (fall 1986): 244-46; Lawrence Delbert Cress, *Citizens in Arms: The Army and the Militia in American Society to the War of 1812* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 130; Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 170.
- <sup>36</sup> Knopf, *Anthony Wayne*, 349-50; letter from John Jay to George Washington, 21 July, 1794, in William Jay, *The Life of John Jay*, 2 vols. (New York: Libraries Press, 1833), 2: 218-19; letter from Anthony Wayne to Henry Knox, 16 July, 1794, in Letter Book C, Wayne Papers, William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- <sup>37</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 280-81; Glenn Tucker, *Mad Anthony Wayne and the New Nation: The Story of Washington's Front-Line General* (Harrisburg, Penn.: Stackpole Books, 1973), 233-34.
- <sup>38</sup> Dwight L. Smith, ed., *From Greenville to Fallen Timbers: A Journal of the Wayne Campaign, July 28-September 14, 1794* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1952), 270, 272-74; Burton, ed., *MP*, 34: 538; Wildes, *Anthony Wayne*, 421.
- <sup>39</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 278-90.
- <sup>40</sup> Tucker, *Mad Anthony Wayne*, 234-35; Henry Rowe Schoolcraft, *Travels in the Central Portions of the Mississippi Valley* (New York: Collins and Hannay, 1825), 49-50.
- <sup>41</sup> Gaff, *Bayonets in the Wilderness*, 299-90; Richard D. Knopf, "Two Journals of the Kentucky Volunteers, 1793-94," *Filson Club Quarterly* 27 (spring 1953): 45-46.
- <sup>42</sup> Tucker, *Mad Anthony Wayne*, 240-41; Gaff, *Bayonets in the Wilderness*, 302; Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 176-77.
- <sup>43</sup> Smith, *From Greenville to Fallen Timbers*, 293-94, 297; Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 177-78.
- <sup>44</sup> Tucker, *Mad Anthony Wayne*, 242-43; Wildes, *Anthony Wayne*, 424-25.

---

<sup>45</sup> Gaff, *Bayonets in the Wilderness*, 306. Though technology, manpower, and logistics were better for Wayne's army than previous American forces, these factors did not define the outcome of the battle. Regarding technology, both Americans and Indians used muskets and rifles during the battle. The Americans did have artillery, but it was barely employed because of the thick undergrowth at Presque Isle. As for manpower, only nine hundred American soldiers engaged the Indians while the remainder was held in reserve. Fighting odds were close to 1:1 during the battle. Finally, logistics actually favored the Indians since they were much closer to Fort Miamis than the Americans were to Fort Defiance. One advantage that the Americans had—that has not been vigorously studied by scholars—over the Indians was the use of dragoons. The American cavalry proved invaluable to Wayne since they ultimately shattered the center of the native line.

<sup>46</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 180; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 303, 312-13.

<sup>47</sup> Wildes, *Anthony Wayne*, 424, 426; Tucker, *Mad Anthony Wayne*, 245; Knopf, *Anthony Wayne*, 365; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 318.

<sup>48</sup> Tucker, *Mad Anthony Wayne*, 247-48; letter from John Hamtramck to Anthony Wayne, 18 October, 1794, in Letter Book C, Wayne Papers; Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 181.

<sup>49</sup> Tucker, *Mad Anthony Wayne*, 248-49; letter from George Washington to Anthony Wayne, 2 December, 1794, in Knopf, *Anthony Wayne*, 365; Ohio Historical Society, *Ohio Statehood* (Columbus: Ohio Historical Society, 1996) [database on-line], available from website [www.ohiohistory.org](http://www.ohiohistory.org); Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 199.

<sup>50</sup> Daniel K. Richter, *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001), 225-26; letter from Timothy Pickering to Anthony Wayne, 14 April, 1795, in Knopf, *Anthony Wayne*, 393-94.

<sup>51</sup> "Blue Jacket's Speech," 8 February, 1795, in Letter Book D, Wayne Papers; Burton, *MP*, 20: 119.

<sup>52</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 323-24.

<sup>53</sup> Tucker, *Mad Anthony Wayne*, 248-49; Gaff, *Bayonets in the Wilderness*, 365-66.

<sup>54</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 204; Andrew R. L. Cayton, "Noble Actors Upon the Theatre of Honour: Power and Civility in the Treaty of Greeneville," in Andrew Cayton and Fredrika Teute, eds., *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750-1830* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 238-39; Gaff, *Bayonets in the Wilderness*, 366.

<sup>55</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 204; Academic Search Premier, *The Treaty of Greenville* (Providence, R.I.: Great Neck Publishing, 1997) [database on-line], available from EBSCOhost <http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/ehost>; Tucker, *Mad Anthony Wayne*, 249.

<sup>56</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 205-206; *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, 1: 576-77.

<sup>57</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 206-207; *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, 1: 582; Knopf, *Anthony Wayne*, 442-43.

<sup>58</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 208-209.

<sup>59</sup> Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 330-31.

## CONCLUSION

### TO MAKE A NEW WORLD

By 1795, the Old Northwest had transformed from a vacant wilderness to an arena of contacts and encounters, a bloody battlefield of conflict, and finally a land of hybrid cultures. After the Indian War, the United States began to assert its authority over the region by controlling the settlement, trade, and militarization of the Old Northwest. American Indians were caught up in these rapid changes. Defeated, but not yet vanquished, they faced two options offered by the U.S. government: assimilate into American culture or face removal to lands west of the Mississippi River. Leaders on both sides struggled for years to make assimilation work. But prejudices, a growing sense of racism, and the concept of “otherness” hampered efforts of reform-minded individuals in the federal government to bring peace to the Old Northwest .<sup>1</sup>

During treaty negotiations at Greeneville in 1795, an aging Chippewa chief informed General Anthony Wayne that “The British urged us to bad deeds and reduced us to our present state of misery.” The chief wondered if the United States would have pity on the tribes and “help them do what is right.” Wayne replied that the United States would “honor the treaty” and that both Indian and American could “make a new world.” Sadly, neither Wayne nor the aged chief could foresee the obstacles that would arise to assimilation. There would be no “new world.” The anger and resentment felt by Indians and settlers towards each other prior to the outbreak of war in 1786 had been compounded by years of bloody conflict, and were exacerbated in the post-war years by acts of violence, economic coercion, and native religious movements.<sup>2</sup>

Most detrimental to the policy of assimilation was the legacy of the war itself. The conquest and settlement of the “frontier” became the basis of an American national identity. When confronted with images of natives as painted, bloodthirsty, heathen savages, two Americans, whether a soldier and a settler, or an easterner and a frontiersman, could not help but feel like kin. The ability of militiamen and federal soldiers to set aside their differences and work together to defeat the Indians facilitated new, positive relations between easterners and frontiersmen. Purposefully excluded from this sense of “Americanism” were the Indians. Differences in appearance, religion, and culture still existed when the war ended and prevented Indians and whites from coexisting. Furthermore, Americans derided the Indians as conquered, devious enemies. The inability of Indians and Americans to put the war behind them and settle longstanding differences doomed the process of assimilation from the start. Just ten years after the Treaty of Greeneville, most northwestern Indians had already relocated beyond the Mississippi, and those who remained behind faded into an Americanized landscape.<sup>3</sup>

Conflict between the Indians and Euro-American settlers dated back over sixty years and engulfed the lives of three generations. The Treaty of Greeneville did not end animosities between Indians and Americans, nor did it restore a balance of power on the frontier. Yet, the treaty did offer some hope to combatants on both sides. The treaty promised a peaceful, orderly settlement of the Old Northwest, emphasizing negotiations with the Indians rather than para-military warfare or full-fledged military campaigns. Although

the treaty did not entirely please either side, most Indians and Americans, leaders and common folk alike, tried to keep peace within its framework.<sup>4</sup>

Following the peace negotiations at Greeneville, Wayne oversaw construction of several forts and roads along the Maumee River. Passing through many Indian villages, Wayne observed hundreds of acres of farmland and log houses replete with the same manufactured items as were found on pioneer homesteads. He wrote promisingly to former Secretary of War Henry Knox of the Indians' ability to adapt to white culture. Knox was elated by the news. Ever fearful of how history would judge his handling of the Indian War, Knox always attempted to conjoin "policy and justice." Hoping to bring Christianity to the Indians, Knox had started a missions program in 1785 that raised thousands of dollars each year to provide the natives with Bibles and books on morality. Through religion and agriculture, Knox believed the Indians could assimilate to white America. Wayne, however, did not share Knox's optimistic vision of the West. Having lived on the frontier for several years, Wayne recognized the overwhelming chore of assimilation, even as he admired native efforts to adopt a sedentary lifestyle.<sup>5</sup>

Forced to recoup their strength and confidence, the tribes of the western Indian confederacy disbanded after signing the Treaty of Greeneville. Few Indian chiefs believed that Greeneville marked the Americans' final land cession in the Old Northwest. But with their numbers depleted, the British abandoning their forts in the region, and the American army gaining in strength, the natives could no longer stop the United States from seizing their

lands. Peacetime also saw the breakup and relocation of countless native clans and the abandonment of intertribal support.<sup>6</sup>

The Shawnee, once the heart of the resistance movement, built new villages at the headwaters of the Auglaize and Miami Rivers, and sought a close association with the United States in the years following Greenville. The Shawnee people solicited assistance from the Quakers, and they petitioned the federal government to help build farms and gristmills. Yet, Ohio settlers remained distrustful of the Shawnee. Beyond a history of warfare between the Shawnee and the United States, settlers feared an emerging resistance movement led by Tecumseh. Furthermore, their close proximity to white settlements ensured that Shawnee Indians were always scrutinized for drunkenness and disorderly conduct. Criticized, harassed, and fearful of losing their way of life, most Shawnees voluntarily relocated westward. By 1800, fewer than half of all Shawnee Indians lived in Ohio; most lived peaceably alongside American and French traders in present-day Missouri and Alabama.<sup>7</sup>

After signing the Treaty of Greenville, Blue Jacket moved his followers to a Wyandot reservation along the Detroit River, a move that further divided and weakened the Shawnee tribe. From his new home, Blue Jacket helped the American government seek out recalcitrant Shawnee warriors. Despite having received an officer's commission by Wayne (and an annual annuity by the U.S. government), Blue Jacket purportedly offered guidance and mild support to Tecumseh and his followers. Ever the cunning diplomat, Blue Jacket played the Americans and his native brethren against each other until his dying day. Exactly when that day was has been lost to history. Most scholars cite 1808 as the year of his death

because it was the last time he collected his yearly annuity. What is known, is that his family remained in Michigan until 1843 when they were forcibly removed to Kansas by the U.S. military.<sup>8</sup>

Unlike the Shawnee, the Miami tribe distanced themselves from white settlers, resettling near the Forks of the Wabash and joining with the Wea and Piankashaws to form the Mississinewa Council. They continued to hunt, farm, and trade animal pelts along the Great Lakes; and due to their relative isolation, they avoided the alcoholism, starvation, and tribal breakdown that plagued the Shawnees. From his residence in the shadow of Fort Wayne, Little Turtle looked out for the welfare of the Mississinewas. Aided by his son-in-law, William Wells, he negotiated with the Americans to procure cattle and pigs for his people. Faced with the increasing threat of assimilation or removal, Little Turtle grew frustrated with the U.S. government's unwillingness to facilitate assimilation by providing the Indians with tools and farm equipment. Colonel John Hamtramck, commandant of Fort Wayne, encouraged Little Turtle to voice his concerns to the president, and in 1796, he journeyed to Philadelphia to meet with President Washington.<sup>9</sup>

Little Turtle traveled with a procession of northwestern chiefs, including Blue Jacket, Red Pole, and Black Chief. Receiving the chiefs in Philadelphia, noted artist Charles Willson Peale wrote that "The Indian chiefs were at first hostile towards each other, but gradually warmed to each other. Blue Jacket and Little Turtle argued frequently, and the former refused to sit near the latter." Red Pole knew that, despite their suspicions of each

other, the chiefs had to present a united front. He assumed command of the native delegation and did most of the talking when the chiefs met with President Washington.<sup>10</sup>

Little is known of the conversation between Washington and the northwestern chiefs. Official records show that the Indians gave Washington several peace pipes and a large buffalo skin adorned with artwork. They spoke with the President for several hours about assimilation and supplies. Before dinner, Red Pole denounced the Indian War saying:

We have come a long way to see Our Father, the President. We have long listened to the British, but have discovered the error of our ways. We have made peace with the fifteen fires and will forever listen to our great Father, the President.

The words seemingly pleased Washington who responded by making all the Indians “American chiefs” and promising to bring the Indians’ concerns before Congress. Finally, Washington gave each chief a line of credit to purchase supplies on their trek home.<sup>11</sup>

Little Turtle and Wells were in no hurry to return to Fort Wayne. Always fascinated by Anglo-American culture, Little Turtle remained in Philadelphia for several weeks. Everywhere he went, Little Turtle received celebrity treatment. While attending dinner parties, horse races, and gala balls, he regaled the city’s elite with stories from the Indian War. Gilbert Stuart painted his portrait and donated it to the War Department, where it hung until the British burned it during the War of 1812. Little Turtle and Wells also met with C.F. Volney, a close friend of Thomas Jefferson, and recorded the first extensive word list of the Miami language. In another meeting with Washington, Little Turtle received a ceremonial sword and a portrait of the President.<sup>12</sup>

Little Turtle left Philadelphia with a reputation as “an eloquent man, skilled in oratory and debate” and “sociable, fond of good conversation, food, and wine.” Volney wrote that “he was tolerant of those who did not understand his ways.” Escorting Little Turtle to Pittsburgh to buy supplies, General James Wilkinson recorded how “he is certainly a remarkable man, and quite content.” After his visit, easterners began to associate all Indians with Little Turtle, reinforcing the myth of the “noble savage.” Educated elites and political leaders pointed to Little Turtle as a prime example of how a formerly hostile, heathen native could be remade into a peaceful, family farmer. Little Turtle also shattered the misconceptions that all Indians were silent, aloof, and opposed to white civilization. Easterners saw Little Turtle as living proof that assimilation worked. Even Secretary of State Timothy Pickering became caught up in the illusion, urging General Anthony Wayne to reduce the number of garrisons in the Old Northwest.<sup>13</sup>

Wayne, more aware of the myth of the noble savage, refused to do so. Most Indians resented losing their culture through assimilation. The federal government offered Indians all the luxuries of white culture—money, tools, farm equipment, alcohol—but at the expense of their own way of life. In contrast, the British had neither required nor wanted to change native culture. Perhaps that is why the Indians continued to collaborate with the British, even after the betrayal that had occurred at Fort Miamis. Although the British had abandoned the Indians during the war, the northwestern tribes continued to turn to the British for food, supplies, and weapons—all with the acquiescence of the United States. The Jay Treaty had given the British privileged trade status with the Indians on American soil. Frontiersmen

were outraged when they learned that the Indians were still engaged with the British, a situation that posed a dual threat to westerners: by trading with the British, Indians impaired growth of the American fur trade; and, by acquiring guns, the Indians appeared to be rearming for another war. Eager to defuse the crisis, Congress ordered the army to carry out a key stipulation of Jay's Treaty and assume control of British forts in the Old Northwest.<sup>14</sup>

In July 1796, Wayne led a small detachment of American soldiers to Detroit to take possession of the fort. In a simple ceremony, the British garrison marched out, and the American flag was raised. In previous weeks, forts at Niagara, Sandusky, and Michilimackinac had been handed over to the Americans as well. By the fall, the British had moved their base of operations to Fort Malden at Amherstberg on the Detroit River. World events had forced the British to placate the Washington administration. Another war with France seemed likely, and a growing nationalism in the United States frightened the British—especially those in Canada. Rumors persisted that the Americans and Spanish might forge an alliance in the Gulf South, thereby jeopardizing British possessions in the Caribbean and making the British reconsider distribution of their military. As they abandoned their forts, the British reduced trade with the Native Americans along the U.S.-Canadian border. When Indian agent Alexander McKee died in January 1799, the British elected not to replace him.<sup>15</sup>

The loss of British encouragement and supplies devastated the northwestern tribes. After 1796, the Indians had no choice but to turn to the United States for assistance and goods. In exchange for furs, crops, and land, Indians received money to build tanneries, grist

and saw mills, and ironworks—American industries unfamiliar to Indians who could not produce enough goods to make a profit and subsequently lost ownership of their property. The Indians' failure to acquire wealth only compounded their inability to assimilate into American culture.<sup>16</sup>

Trading with the Americans posed another problem for the Indians in the form of alcohol. Most tribes wasted their annuities or meager profits on whiskey, made readily available by American merchants. Unaccustomed to the effects of alcohol, Indians tended to drink themselves into worthless stupors or turn on each other in violent, often murderous, rages. Frontiersmen referred to such instances when arguing against assimilation. Federal soldiers, too, saw the effects of alcoholism. At Fort Wayne, they lamented how the Indians drank themselves into poverty and then begged for scraps. William Henry Harrison, veteran of the Battle of Fallen Timbers and future President of the United States, said that alcohol had turned the Indians into “the most depraved wretches on Earth.” Over time, the stereotype that all Indians were murderous drunks strengthened the government's case for removal.<sup>17</sup>

Having returned from his trip to Philadelphia, Little Turtle witnessed firsthand the ill effects of alcohol on his people. Although he had secured the largest annuities per capita of any tribe, Little Turtle watched the Mississinewas squander their earnings on alcohol. He lamented that “More of us have died since the Treaty of Greeneville than we lost by the years of war before, and it is all owing to the introduction of liquor among us.” He attempted to ban the sale of alcohol to Indians, but without the support of the federal government, he

failed. In 1797, Little Turtle traveled eastward once more and brought his concerns before President John Adams, who proved to be less empathetic than Washington. A devout Unitarian, Adams held strong views on moral accountability as well as race and he chastised Little Turtle for the Indians' "heathen drunken ways" and "mystical prophecies." He not only refused to help Little Turtle, but also questioned the Indians' ability to govern their own territory.<sup>18</sup>

Although rebuffed by the President, Little Turtle did not end his quest to discontinue alcohol sales to Indians. He brought his plight before Vice-President Thomas Jefferson. But Jefferson saw alcohol as a means of forcing assimilation on the Indians, privately telling William Henry Harrison (who had become Secretary of the Northwest Territory) that "Chiefs should be encouraged to run up large debts among our traders; even if they buy whiskey. When said debts get beyond what the individuals can pay, they become willing to lop them off by a cession of lands. We do not want self-sufficient Indian societies living in American territory." Thus, despite the efforts of Little Turtle, alcohol continued to flow into Indian villages throughout the Old Northwest, resulting in added tension between natives and frontiersmen who the government expected to peaceably coexist.<sup>19</sup>

Conflict in the Southwest—and the northwestern Indians' response to it—also had a debilitating effect on assimilation in the Old Northwest. Beginning in September 1796, southern tribes intensified their raids on keelboats traveling down the Mississippi River. Operating from a Spanish base at Chickasaw Bluffs (present-day Memphis), southern Indians interrupted trade originating from the Ohio country. Congress reacted swiftly, reorganizing

the army into regiments and sending half the troops to the Southwest to keep watch over the Spanish and their Indian allies. The Indian raids did little to convince westerners that they should welcome natives into American society. Worse still, several northern bands of Shawnees, Ottawas, Ojibwes, and Wyandots traveled southward to attend a multitribal congress held by the Chickasaws and Cherokees. Although most northwestern tribes avoided the conflict, their tacit approval of the situation did not escape the notice of the frontiersmen.<sup>20</sup>

Violent confrontations between Indians and frontiersmen increased as the tribes battled poverty and alcoholism, and the settlers worried about native connections to the British and the belligerent southern tribes. Theft, rape, and murder between Indians and whites became common in frontier towns. The national government expected the army to keep peace between the opposing groups as the Indians assimilated into American culture. This was easier said than done. In 1796, Congress ordered the army to be reduced by 60 percent over the next two years. Shortly thereafter, half the army was deployed to the Southwest, resulting in the closure of half a dozen forts throughout the Ohio country. Also, once the Indian War had ended, old problems of poor food, inadequate equipment, and stalled pay grew worse. Bored and with little hope of promotion, most soldiers chose not to reenlist when their term expired. The weakened military presence in the region dealt a tremendous blow to the government's assimilation plan.<sup>21</sup>

In December 1796, Wayne died unexpectedly of gout while inspecting a fort at Presque Isle, Pennsylvania. Wayne's old nemesis, James Wilkinson, succeeded him as

commander of the United States army. Wilkinson lacked his predecessor's ability to maintain order in the ranks and keep peace between the natives and settlers. Practical issues that divided Indians and Americans such as boundaries, land payments, and legal rights had always been handled effectively by Wayne. Wilkinson, however, tended to side exclusively with the settlers in any dispute. He rarely held direct negotiations with the Indians, instead allowing Indian agents who lacked any substantial diplomatic power to confer with the tribes.<sup>22</sup>

Facing a less effective and clearly biased Wilkinson, tribal leaders turned to government officials for help. Shortly after taking office, Secretary Harrison met with Shawnee, Wyandot, and Mingo chiefs in Cincinnati. The chiefs pleaded for protection from white settlers and an end to the liquor trade. Although sympathetic to their plight, Harrison lacked the necessary manpower to rectify the situation. Another group of chiefs, including Blue Jacket, pressured Governor Arthur St. Clair to take a more active role in bringing peace to the Old Northwest. St. Clair rejected the Indians' claims that they were being ignored, citing approval of forty-four separate Indian treaties since 1786. (He failed to mention that most of those treaties dealt with land cessions.) St. Clair, still incensed over the defeat he suffered in 1791, dismissed the chiefs without acquiescing to their requests, thinking the matter to be "of little importance." To the Indians though, the situation was one of life or death. Disease, war, genocide, and the destruction of their ways of life resulted in smaller generations of Native Americans. Their very survival depended on improving relationships that had plagued them in the past.<sup>23</sup>

Tecumseh, a prominent Shawnee war chief, realized the urgency of the situation. A veteran of the Battle of Fallen Timbers, he witnessed firsthand the collapse of the western Indian confederacy. Tecumseh attributed the defeat to two factors: the failure of the British to support the Indians, and the inability of native leaders to work together. As he rose to prominence in 1795, Tecumseh could do little to garner British support. But he did intend to improve relationships between the tribes. He led a band of Shawnees to Indiana in 1798, urging other Indians to follow him. As assimilation failed, more tribes turned inward, placing increasing importance on their own cultural traditions and their commonalities with other native peoples. Resisting assimilation, several bands of Shawnee, Cherokee, and Upper Great Lakes Indians moved westward, joining Tecumseh's tribal confederacy.<sup>24</sup>

By 1800, most northwestern Indians had taken the path of assimilation, religious renewal, or resistance. Tecumseh's confederacy appealed to those who favored a blending of the latter two options. In its early stages, the confederacy lacked the religious fervor and hostility that characterized it in later years. Still, Tecumseh and his followers posed an obstacle to assimilation. More so, Tecumseh was a skilled warrior capable of mixing European warfare and frontier fighting. In short, he was a threat to U.S. control of the Old Northwest. Harrison described him as "One of those uncommon geniuses which sprang up occasionally to produce revolutions and overturn the established order of things." Wilkinson, too, was aware of the threat posed by growing native resistance. But with the army stretched from Michigan to Tennessee, he could not spare the manpower to dislodge Tecumseh and his

followers. Thus, Tecumseh's confederacy grew until it was eventually crushed during the War of 1812.<sup>25</sup>

Meanwhile, those Indians who accepted assimilation had to face the repercussions of native resistance. Black Hoof, chief of the Shawnees at Wapakoneta, Ohio, spoke for most natives when he declared that "The westerners [Tecumseh's followers] are a destabilizing influence. They move to and fro; not just Shawnees, but also Wyandots, Ottawas, and others from further afield. They disturb the white settlers and have ruined the good relations those pioneers enjoyed with Black Hoof and his people." Indeed, native resistance dashed any chance that assimilationists like Black Hoof could repair relations between Indians and frontiersmen. Most settlers did not differentiate between Tecumseh's wayward Shawnees and Black Hoof's loyal Shawnees. The popular view was that they were all Shawnees; hence they were all problematic.<sup>26</sup>

From his home at Fort Wayne, Little Turtle continued to preach assimilation to his people until his death on July 14, 1812. Adverse conditions had made assimilation impossible. The decline of game animals forced the natives to scavenge through the soldiers' garbage for food. The fur trade dissipated as demand slumped and prices bottomed out, leaving the Indians in poverty. And, of course, alcohol continued to claim lives. Americans saw these circumstances as proof that the Indians could not handle assimilation. Calls for removal became louder. As throngs of settlers poured into the Old Northwest seeking land, easterners and westerners finally agreed that there was no place for Indians in American society.<sup>27</sup>

Acquisition of land was only the most obvious reason why Americans wanted to remove the Indians, although it was one of the strongest motivations. The Land Act of 1796 opened up fifty thousand acres of land for settlement in Ohio. Just four years later, another land act offered such reasonable credit terms that nearly 750,000 acres were sold in just two years. Available land, improved roads, and a reduced native population enticed many easterners to relocate to the Old Northwest. Despite the abundant land, settlers contested the Indians' rights to possess so much territory. Native farming communities were small, and it appeared to settlers that the Indians "were not improving the land." The settlers' complaints fell on receptive ears in Washington. Timothy Pickering, newly appointed Secretary of State, told President Adams that "the Indians should relinquish their territories so that further inroads can be made [in the Northwest]."28

Westerners had long wanted to expel the Indians so that they could "civilize" the Old Northwest. Settlers envisioned productive farmlands, thriving cities, and substantial trade on the many rivers and lakes that crisscrossed the region. The Indians never shared that vision; in fact, they stood opposed to it. Such changes signified the helplessness of the tribes and the end of their power struggle. For years, the U.S. government had used the army to keep settlers at bay. By 1800, the army had largely moved on, and easterners no longer viewed the Indians as "noble savages." Instead, easterners believed that the Indians had failed to live up to the standards of the Enlightenment. They had been given time to assimilate, but they did not change. They had been given the tools of industry, but they never produced. They had been given the message of the Christian God, but they failed to convert.<sup>29</sup>

At the end of the eighteenth century, several other factors coalesced to convince people that assimilation had failed and removal was the only option left for the Indians. The popular image of the “noble savage,” once epitomized by Little Turtle, was replaced by a far darker image of the Indian as a “bloodthirsty heathen.” Although this viewpoint had existed for years on the frontier, easterners became aware of it in the 1790s thanks to the captivity horror stories of Charles Brockden Brown. Brown’s works became some of the most popular novels in America. Easterners became engrossed in the stories, failing to draw a distinction between fact and fiction. The influence of these stories convinced easterners that the Indians still posed a grave threat to the nation. Real-life events, such as Tecumseh’s nativist movement, perpetuated these myths, lending support to the argument for removal.<sup>30</sup>

A growing sense of racism also factored into the argument for removal. Thinking the Indian “incapable” of assimilation, easterners turned to racial differences to explain why Native Americans did not prosper in American society. A “weak mental capacity” explained why Indians lacked ingenuity or business-sense. “Vulnerable health” rationalized why Indians were prone to drunkenness and European diseases. Other racial stereotypes suggested that Indians were “lazy,” “unorganized,” or “incapable of emotion.” Such beliefs contrasted sharply with Christianity, so authors and clergymen began to refer to the Indians as “degenerate sons of Adam” who were “inferiorly organized and endowed.” In later years, scientific studies would be employed to offer “credibility” to the argument that Indians and Americans were of two distinct races. In the early 1800s, though, many easterners believed

that a separation of the races was the only way to ensure the livelihood of both Indian and American.<sup>31</sup>

Perhaps most detrimental to the United States' policy of assimilation was the concept of "otherness" that grew out of the Indian War. Demand for territory, negative images in the public conscious, racism: all of these problems faced Indians long before the creation of the United States. But the idea of an American identity had not coalesced before the conquest of the Old Northwest. The ability of frontiersmen and federal soldiers to perceive similarities in attitudes, values, social status, and physical appearance promoted positive relations between easterners and westerners. Although stronger in perception than reality, similarities shared by all white Americans were nonetheless magnified by the existence of a different, native "other." After the Indian War, Native Americans were not just defeated enemies, but also strangers—remnants of a cultural middle ground that had long since disappeared.<sup>32</sup>

The Indians' refusal to acknowledge how white settlers and their federal government had permanently gained the upper hand forever cast them in the role of "other." They favored a *controlled assimilation*, whereby they could integrate aspects of American society into their own existing way of life. Even the most ardent assimilationists—Little Turtle and Black Hoof—refused to abandon all the qualities that made them Indian. This stance was unacceptable to Americans. Between 1830 and 1850 the northwestern Indians were systematically removed to Kansas and Oklahoma. Shuttled westward in canal boats without adequate food, clothing, or equipment, nearly a third died within one year. America's conquest of the Old Northwest was complete.<sup>33</sup>

In reflecting on the Indian War and its outcome, one cannot help but draw correlations between relationships and shifts in power. The ability of one group—whether it was Indian, British, or American—to temporarily exercise territorial sovereignty resulted in large part from positive diplomatic, economic, and military relationships. It is no coincidence that the United States gained the upper hand in the conflict when the frontier militias and the army started working together. Conversely, the inability of native leaders to share power doomed the western Indian confederacy. After the war, the inability of Indians and Americans to improve relations ensured the failure of assimilation, resulting in the removal of the northwestern tribes. Unfortunately, over two hundred years later, the Indian War in the Old Northwest remains an overlooked part of the history of North America. This is disheartening not only because the conflict shaped the futures of the United States, the northwest Indians, and the British, but also because of the important lessons that could be learned from studying this significant power struggle.

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease, *Cultures of United States Imperialism* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1993), 16, 62-3.
- <sup>2</sup> Record of the treaty negotiation at Greeneville, *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*, 2 vols. (Washington D.C.: n.p., 1832-34), 1: 571-73.
- <sup>3</sup> Calvin Martin, *The American Indian and the Problem of History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), 54; Peter Turchin, *War and Peace and War: The Life Cycles of Imperial Nations* (New York: Pi Press, 2006), 51; Wiley Sword, *President Washington's Indian War: The Struggle for the Old Northwest, 1790-1795* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985), 323-24.
- <sup>4</sup> Fallen Timbers Battlefield Preservation Commission, "The Battle of Fallen Timbers," pamphlet and battlefield map issued by the *Ohio Historical Society*, May 2000; Robert M. Owens, *Mr. Jefferson's Hammer: William Henry Harrison and the Origins of American Indian Policy* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007), 35.
- <sup>5</sup> Stewart Rafert, *The Miami Indians of Indiana: A Persistent People, 1654-1994* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1996), 54-55; Helen Carr, *Inventing the American Primitive: Politics, Gender, and the Representation of Native American Literary Traditions, 1789-1936* (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 44-45.
- <sup>6</sup> Reginald Horsman, *Expansion and American Indian Policy, 1783-1812* (Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1967), 103-104.
- <sup>7</sup> Colin Calloway, "The Continuing Revolution in Indian Country," Frederick E. Hoxie, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, eds., *Native Americans and the Early Republic* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999), 54-55, 60.
- <sup>8</sup> Helen Hornbeck Tanner, "The Glaize in 1792: A Composite Indian Community," *Ethnohistory* 25 (winter 1978): 35-36; John Sugden, *Blue Jacket: Warrior of the Shawnees* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000), 210-12, 254.
- <sup>9</sup> Rafert, *The Miami Indians of Indiana*, 62-64.
- <sup>10</sup> Harvey Lewis Carter, *The Life and Times of Little Turtle: First Sagamore of the Wabash* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987), 157; John C. Fitzpatrick, ed., *The Writings of George Washington*, 35 vols. (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1931-44), 35: 302; Charles Coleman Sellers, "Good Chiefs and Wise Men: Indians as Symbols of Peace in the Art of Charles Willson Peale," *American Art Journal* 7 (November 1975): 10.
- <sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 12, 14; Fitzpatrick, ed., *The Writings of George Washington*, 302-303.
- <sup>12</sup> Rafert, *The Miami Indians of Indiana*, 62-64; Carter, *The Life and Times of Little Turtle*, 5-7.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 7-8; James Wilkinson, *Memoirs of My Own Times*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia: Reprint Services, 1816), 2: 154-55; Vincent N. Parrillo, *Strangers to These Shores: Race and Ethnic Relations in the United States* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1997), 230; Paul David Nelson, *Anthony Wayne: Soldier of the Early Republic* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), 285.

<sup>14</sup> Reginald C. Stuart, *United States Expansionism and British North America, 1775-1871* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 35-36; Rafert, *The Miami Indians of Indiana*, 61-62.

<sup>15</sup> J. Leitch Wright, Jr., *Britain and the American Frontier, 1783-1815* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1975), 104-105; Tanner, "The Glaze in 1792," 34-35. It should be noted that Alexander McKee's son, Thomas, succeeded him as de facto Indian agent in the Great Lakes region. An ineffective leader, Thomas was never embraced by the British government. He was also an alcoholic who, on more than one occasion, embarrassed himself in front of several prominent Indian chiefs. Thus, few Indians thought highly of Thomas either.

<sup>16</sup> William Earl Weeks, *Building the Continental Empire: American Expansion from the Revolution to the Civil War* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996), 22; Stuart, *United States Expansionism and British North America*, 42-43.

<sup>17</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 228-29; Clarence Burton, ed., *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections* (hereafter *MP*), 40 vols. (Lansing: Michigan Historical Society, 1889), 34: 738; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 339.

<sup>18</sup> Carter, *The Life and Times of Little Turtle*, 160-61; Burton, ed., *MP*, 14: 273, 486; Richard Drinnon, *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire-Building* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980), 76-77.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 82-83; Clarence E. Carter, ed., *The Territorial Papers of the United States*, 27 vols. (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1934-69), 7: 88-92.

<sup>20</sup> Nelson, *Anthony Wayne*, 286-87; Maurice Matloff, *American Military History, 1775-1902*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Combined Books, 1996), 1: 114-16; Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 225.

<sup>21</sup> Nelson, *Anthony Wayne*, 291-92; Owens, *Mr. Jefferson's Hammer*, 40-42.

<sup>22</sup> Carter, *The Life and Times of Little Turtle*, 157-58; Richard White, "The Fictions of Patriarchy: Indians and Whites in the Early Republic," Frederick E. Hoxie, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, eds., *Native Americans and the Early Republic*, 71-72.

<sup>23</sup> Owens, *Mr. Jefferson's Hammer*, 45-47; William Henry Smith, ed., *The St. Clair Papers: The Life and Public Service of Arthur St. Clair*, 2 vols. (Cincinnati, Ohio, 1882), 2: 463-65; Charles D. Bernholz, "The Absent American Indian Treaties: An Update," *Journal of Government Information* 29 (February 2002): 39-40; Silvia Pedraza and Ruben G. Rumbaut, *Origins and Destinies: Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in America* (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing, 1996), 45.

<sup>24</sup> John Sugden, "Tecumseh's Travels Revisited," *Indiana Magazine of History* 96 (June 2000): 152-53; Leonard Dinnerstein and Roger L. Nichols, *Natives and Strangers: A Multicultural History of Americans* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 49; Matloff, *American Military History*, 1: 113-14.

<sup>25</sup> Joel W. Martin, "Cultural Contact and Crisis in the Early Republic: Native American Religious Renewal, Resistance, and Accommodation," Frederick E. Hoxie, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, eds., *Native Americans and the Early Republic*, 253-54; W.E. Lee, "Mind and Matter: A Cultural Analysis of American Military History," *Journal of American History* 93 (March 2007): 14-15; Carl F. Klink, ed., *Tecumseh: Fact and Fiction in Early Records* (Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1961), 89-90.

<sup>26</sup> Sugden, *Blue Jacket*, 237-39.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 228-30; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 334-35.

<sup>28</sup> James T. Wall, *The Boundless Frontier: America from Christopher Columbus to Abraham Lincoln* (Lanham, MD.: University Press of America, 1999), 219; Reginald Horsman, *The Frontier in the Formative Years, 1783-1815* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970), 71-73; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 338. The importance of the Land Act of 1800 was that it allowed land to be sold in 320 acre lots, and buyers only needed to pay one-fourth of the cost up front. Buyers were then given four years to pay off their debt. Never before had such a generous land deal been extended to middle-class farmers.

<sup>29</sup> Carr, *Inventing the American Primitive*, 52-53.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 37-38; Nick Westendorf, "Reaction to Early American Novels: World Opinion of the Birth of a Media Culture" (paper presented at the University of Chicago, 18 October 1998), [database on-line], available from Google Scholar [www.lib.ncsu.edu/scholar](http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/scholar), 7-8.

<sup>31</sup> Carr, *Inventing the American Primitive*, 25-27; Reginald Horsman, "Scientific Racism and the American Indian in the Mid-Nineteenth Century," *American Quarterly* 27 (May 1975): 154-56.

<sup>32</sup> Parrillo, *Strangers to These Shores*, 4-7; John A. Dickinson, review of *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*, by Richard White, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 24 (summer 1993): 157-58.

<sup>33</sup> Raymond H. C. Teske and Bardin H. Nelson, "Acculturation and Assimilation: A Clarification," *American Ethnologist* 1 (May 1974): 357-59; Sword, *President Washington's Indian War*, 339.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts

Ann Arbor, Michigan. University of Michigan Graduate Library. Microfilm copies of the Henry Knox Papers (original in the New England Historic Genealogical Society Collection, Boston).

Ann Arbor, Michigan. William L. Clements Library. Anthony Wayne Papers (original in the Pennsylvania Historical Society, Philadelphia).

Ann Arbor, Michigan. William L. Clements Library. Josiah Harmar Papers.

Columbus, Ohio. Ohio Historical Society. Arthur St. Clair Collection.

Columbus, Ohio. The Ohio State University Graduate Library. Microfilm copies of the Lyman C. Draper Manuscript Collection (original in the Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison).

Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. Public Archives of Canada. Obtained online through the Colonial Office Records, Q Series.

Published Materials

*The Treaty of Greenville*. Providence, R.I.: National Historical Records, 1997. Database on-line. Available from Academic Search Premier, AN 21213338.

Ankenbruck, John. *Five Forts: A History of Fort Wayne*. Fort Wayne, Ind.: News Publishing Company, 1972.

*Annals of the Congress of the United States*. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1925-28.

Ash, George. "Ash's Account of St. Clair's Defeat." *Cincinnati Chronicle and Literary Gazette*, 7 November 1829, 17-20.

Baldwin, James. *The Conquest of the Old Northwest and Its Settlement by Americans*. New York: American Book Company, 1956.

Barnes, Celia. *Native American Power in the United States, 1783-1795*. Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2003.

- Barr, Daniel. *The Boundaries Between Us*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 2006.
- Bernholz, Charles D. "The Absent American Indian Treaties: An Update." *Journal of Government Information* 29 (January 2002): 39-41.
- Birtle, Andrew. "The Origins of the Legion of the United States." *Journal of Military History* 67 (summer 2003): 1249-1261.
- Black, Jeremy. *America as a Military Power: From the American Revolution to the Civil War*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger Publishing, 2002.
- Bodely, Temple. *George Rogers Clark: His Life and Public Services*. New York: Reprint Services Corp, 1966.
- Boyce, Douglas W. "A Glimpse of Iroquois Culture History Through the Eyes of Joseph Brant." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 117 (August 1973): 286-294.
- Boyer Jr., Donald. "The Infantry of the Regular Army." *Military Affairs* 11 (summer 1947): 103-115.
- Buell, Rowena. *The Memoirs of Rufus Putnam*. Pittsburgh: Houghton Mifflin, 1903.
- Burton, Clarence ed. *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections*. 40 vols. Lansing, Mich.: Michigan Historical Society, 1889.
- Butterfield, Consul Willshire ed. *Washington-Irvine Correspondence*. Madison: n.p., 1882.
- Carman, Harry and Harold C. Syrett. *A History of the American People*. 2 vols. New York: Random House, 1954.
- Carr, Helen. *Inventing the American Primitive: Politics, Gender, and the Representation of Native American Literary Traditions, 1789-1936*. New York: New York University Press, 1996.
- Carter, Clarence E., ed. *The Territorial Papers of the United States*. 27 vols. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1934-69.

- The Territorial Papers of the United States: The Territory Northwest of the Ohio River, 1787-1803*. 2 vols. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1934-75.
- Carter, Harvey Lewis. "A Frontier Tragedy: Little Turtle and William Wells." *The Old Northwest* 6 (spring 1980): 3-14.
- The Life and Times of Little Turtle: First Sagamore of the Wabash*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987.
- Cayton, Andrew and Fredrika Teute, eds. *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750-1830*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.
- Cayton, Andrew. *Frontier Indiana*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.
- "How the Indians Lost Their Land: Law and Power on the Frontier." *Journal of Southern History* 73 (February 2007): 142-55.
- Clark, Jerry E. *The Shawnee*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1993.
- Cochran, Thomas ed. *The New American State Papers: Indian Affairs*. 13 vols. Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1972.
- Connecticut Historical Society. *Wyllys Papers*. Hartford: Connecticut Historical Society, 1892.
- Couvares, Francis G., Martha Saxton, Gerald N. Grob, and George Athan Billias, eds. *Interpretations of American History Volume II: Patterns and Perspectives*. New York: Free Press, 2000.
- Craig, N. *The Olden Time*. 2 vols. Pittsburgh: Westcott, 1927.
- Craig, Neville B., ed. *Military Journal of General Richard Butler*. Pittsburgh: Dumars, 1848.
- Cress, Lawrence Delbert. *Citizens in Arms: The Army and the Militia in American Society to the War of 1812*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.
- Dawson, Joseph G. "Anthony Wayne, A Soldier of the Early Republic." *Library Journal* 110 (September 1985): 77-84.

- Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Demos, John. *The Unredeemed Captive: A Family Story from Early America*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1994.
- Denny, Ebenezer. *Military Journal of Ebenezer Denny*. Philadelphia: JB Lippincott & Company, 1860.
- Dickinson, John A. Review of *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*, by Richard White. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 24 (summer 1993): 157-159.
- Dinnerstein, Leonard and Roger L. Nichols. *Natives and Strangers: A Multicultural History of Americans*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Douglas, Albert. "Major General Arthur St. Clair." *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society Publication* 16 (August 1907): 449-58.
- Dowd, Gregory Evans. *A Spirited Resistance: The North American Indian Struggle for Unity, 1745-1815*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.
- Downes, Randolph. *Council Fires on the Upper Ohio*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1969.
- Drinnon, Richard. *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire Building*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980.
- DuVal, Kathleen. *The Native Ground: Indians and Colonists in the Heart of the Continent*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- Edel, Wilbur. *Kekionga: The Worst Defeat in the History of the United States Army*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger Publishing, 1997.
- Elting, John R. "The Legion Which Saved the United States." *The Classical Journal* 57 (October 1961): 30-44.
- Fallen Timbers Battlefield Preservation Commission. "The Battle of Fallen Timbers." Toledo: Ohio Historical Society, 2000. Pamphlet and battlefield map.
- Fitzpatrick, John C. ed. *George Washington's Writings*. 39 vols. Washington D.C.: Library of Congress, 1931-1944.

- Fixico, Donald L. *Rethinking American Indian History*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997.
- Ford, Worthington C., ed. *Journals of the Continental Congress*. 2 vols. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1904-37.
- Frank, John and Roland Moore. "Historical and Cultural Roots of Drinking Problems Among American Indians." *American Journal of Public Health* 90 (March 2000): 344-351.
- Gaff, Alan D. *Bayonets in the Wilderness: Anthony Wayne's Legion in the Old Northwest*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2004.
- Gentilcore, R. Louis. "Vincennes and French Settlement in the Old Northwest." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 47 (September 1957): 285-297.
- Gilbert, Arthur. "The American Indian and United States Diplomatic History." *The History Teacher* 8 (February 1975): 231-42.
- Glen, John and Alan January. "Indiana Before Statehood." *Indiana Magazine of History* 99 (September 2003): 255-72.
- Griffin, Patrick. *American Leviathan: Empire, Nation, and Revolutionary Frontier*. New York: Hill & Wang, 2007.
- Heitman, Francis. *Historical Register of Officers of the Continental Army During the War of the Revolution, April 1775-December 1783*. Washington D.C.: Rare Books Publishing, 1914.
- Helderman, Leonard. "The Northwest Expedition of George Rogers Clark, 1786-87." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 25 (December 1938): 317-334.
- Hinderaker, E. *Elusive Empires: Constructing Colonialism in the Ohio Valley, 1673-1800*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Horr, David. *Miami, Wea, and Eel-River Indians of Southern Indiana*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1974.
- Horsman, Reginald. "American Indian Policy in the Old Northwest." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 18 (January 1961): 40-62.

- Expansion and American Indian Policy, 1783-1812*. Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1967.
- “Scientific Racism and the American Indian in the Mid-Nineteenth Century.” *American Quarterly* 27 (May 1975): 152-168.
- The Frontier in the Formative Years, 1783-1815*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1979.
- The New Republic: The United States of America, 1789-1815*. Harlow, Eng.: Longman Publishing, 2000.
- Howe, Henry. *Historical Collections of Ohio*. Cincinnati: n.p., 1900.
- Hoxie, Frederick E., Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, eds. *Native Americans and the Early Republic*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1999.
- Hurt, R. Douglas. *The Indian Frontier, 1763-1846*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002.
- The Ohio Frontier: Crucible of the Old Northwest, 1720-1830*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.
- Hurtado, Albert and Peter Iverson, eds. *Major Problems in American Indian History: Documents and Essays*. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath & Company, 1994.
- Jacobs, James Ripley. *The Beginnings of the U.S. Army, 1783-1812*. 9 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947.
- Jay, William. *The Life of John Jay*. 2 vols. New York: Libraries Press, 1833.
- Jefferson, Thomas. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*. 20 vols. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1903-04.
- Jennings, Francis. *The Founders of America: How Indians Discovered the Land, Pioneered In It, and Created Great Classical Civilizations; How They Were Plunged Into a Dark Age by Invasion and Conquest; And How They Are Reviving*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1993.
- Jones, Dorothy. *License for Empire: Colonialism by Treaty in Early America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

- Kaplan, Amy and Donald E. Pease. *Cultures of United States Imperialism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.
- Keenan, Jerry. *The Encyclopedia of American Indian Wars, 1492-1890*. Denver: ABC-CLIO Press, 1997.
- King, Charles R., ed. *The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*. 6 vols. New York: Kessinger Publishing, 1894-1900.
- Klink, Carl F., ed. *Tecumseh: Fact and Fiction in Early Records*. Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1961.
- Knopf, Richard D. *Anthony Wayne, A Name in Arms*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1960.
- “Two Journals of the Kentucky Volunteers, 1793-94.” *Filson Club Quarterly* 27 (spring 1953): 40-53.
- Lee, W.E. “Mind and Matter: A Cultural Analysis of American Military History.” *Journal of American History* 93 (March 2007): 1116-1142.
- Levy, Leonard ed. *Encyclopedia of the Constitution*. 4 vols. New York: MacMillan Publishing, 1986.
- Linklater, Andro. *The Fabric of America: How Our Borders and Boundaries Shaped the Country and Forged Our National Identity*. New York: Walker & Company, 2007.
- Martin, Calvin. *The American Indian and the Problem of History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Matloff, Maurice. *American Military History, 1775-1902*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Combined Books, 1996.
- Monaghan, Frank. *John Jay: Defender of Liberty*. New York: Bobbs-Merril Company, 1935.
- Nardo, Don ed. *North American Indian Wars*. San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 1999.
- Nelson, Larry ed. *A History of Jonathan Alder, His Captivity and Life with the Indians*. Akron, Ohio: University of Akron Press, 2002.

- Nelson, Paul David. *Anthony Wayne: Soldier of the Early Republic*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.
- “General Charles Scott, the Kentucky Mounted Volunteers, and the Northwest Indian Wars, 1784-1794.” *Journal of the Early Republic* 6 (fall 1986): 241-49.
- Nobles, Gregory. *American Frontiers: Cultural Encounters and Continental Conquest*. New York: Hill & Wang, 1997.
- Ohio Statehood*. Columbus: Ohio Historical Society, 1996. Database on-line. Available from Ohio Historical Society webpage, 020205te.pdf.
- Olmstead, Earl. *Blackcoats Among the Delaware*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1991.
- Onuf, Peter. *Statehood and Union: A History of the Northwest Ordinance*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.
- Owens, Robert M. *Mr. Jefferson's Hammer: William Henry Harrison and the Origins of American Indian Policy*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007.
- Palmer, William P. ed. *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*. 4 vols. Richmond: n.p., 1884.
- Parrillo, Vincent N. *Strangers to These Shores: Race and Ethnic Relations in the United States*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1997.
- Pedraza, Silvia and Ruben G. Rumbaut. *Origins and Destinies: Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in America*. Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth Publishing, 1996.
- Pitcavage, Mark. “Ropes of Sand: Territorial Militias.” *Journal of the Early Republic* 13 (winter 1993): 481-500.
- Prucha, Francis Paul. *American Indian Policy in the Formative Years: The Indian Trade and Intercourse Acts, 1790-1834*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984.
- The Sword of the Republic: The United States Army on the Frontier, 1783-1846*. New York: MacMillan Company, 1969.

- Rafert, Stewart. *The Miami Indians of Indiana: A Persistent People, 1654-1994*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1996.
- Reynolds, Fred ed. *General Josiah Harmar's Papers and Journal, Including an Account of His Retreat from Fort Wayne (Miamitown) in 1790*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966.
- Richter, Daniel K. *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Ronda, James P. *Lewis and Clark Among the Indians*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984.
- Rowe, Mary Ellen. *Bulwark of the Republic: The American Militia in Antebellum West*. New York: Praeger Publishing, 2003.
- Rowland, Carolyn. "Was the Shawnee War Chief Blue Jacket a Caucasian?" *Ohio Journal of Science* 106 (September 2006): 126-129.
- Sargent, Winthrop. "Winthrop Sargent's Diary While with General Arthur St. Clair's Expedition Against the Indians." *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* 33 (spring 1924): 239-257.
- Schoolcraft, Henry Rowe. *Travels in the Central Portions of the Mississippi Valley*. New York: Collins & Hannay, 1825.
- Sellers, Charles Coleman. "Good Chiefs and Wise Men: Indians as Symbols of Peace in the Art of Charles Willson Peale." *American Art Journal* 7 (November 1975): 10-18.
- Sheehan, Bernard W. *Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1973.
- Silberman, Asher. *Invisible America: Unearthing Our Hidden History*. New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1995.
- Slotkin, Richard. *Regeneration Through Violence: The Mythology of the American Frontier, 1600-1860*. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1973.
- Smith, Dwight L. ed. *From Greeneville to Fallen Timbers: A Journal of the Wayne Campaign, July 28-September 14, 1794*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1952.

- Smith, Jane and Robert Kvasnicka, ed. *Indian-White Relations: A Persistent Paradox*. Washington D.C.: Howard University Press, 1976.
- Smith, William Henry ed. *The St. Clair Papers: The Life and Public Service of Arthur St. Clair*. 2 vols. Cincinnati: n.p., 1882.
- Sparks, Jared ed. *The Writings of George Washington*. 12 vols. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1858.
- Spencer, Oliver. *The Indian Captivity of O.M. Spencer*. Chicago: R.R. Donnelly & Sons, 1917.
- Staff of the Allen County Public Library. *General Harmar's Campaign, 1790*. Fort Wayne: Fort Wayne Historical Society, 1954.
- Stone, William Leete. *Life of Joseph Brant: Thayendanegea*. 2 vols. New York: George Dearborn, 1838. Reprint, New York: Adamant Media, 2003.
- The Life and Times of Red Jacket, or Sagoyewatha*. Chicago: Wiley & Putnam, 1841. Reprint, St. Clair Shores, Mich.: Scholarly Press, 1970.
- Stuart, Reginald C. *United States Expansionism and British North America, 1775-1871*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- Sugden, John. *Blue Jacket: Warrior of the Shawnees*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000.
- "Tecumseh's Travels Revisited." *Indiana Magazine of History* 96 (June 2000): 150-168.
- Sweet, John Wood. *Bodies Politic: Negotiating Race in the American North, 1730-1830*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.
- Sword, Wiley. *President Washington's Indian War: The Struggle for the Old Northwest, 1790-1795*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1985.
- Tanner, Helen Hornbeck. "The Glaze in 1792: A Composite Indian Community." *Ethnohistory* 25 (winter 1978): 15-39.
- Tebbel, John and Keith Jennison. *The American Indian Wars*. Edison, N.J.: Castle Books, 2003.

- Teske, Raymond H. C. and Bardin H. Nelson. "Acculturation and Assimilation: A Clarification." *American Ethnologist* 1 (May 1974): 351-367.
- Thornbrough, Gayle ed. *Outpost on the Wabash: The Letters of Major John Francis Hamtramck 1787-1791*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1957.
- Tucker, Glenn. *Mad Anthony Wayne and the New Nation: The Story of Washington's Front-Line General*. Harrisburg, Penn.: Stackpole Books, 1973.
- Turchin, Peter. *War and Peace and War: The Life Cycles of Imperial Nations*. New York: Pi Press, 2006.
- United States Congress. *American State Papers: Indian Affairs*. 2 vols. Washington D.C.: n.p., 1832-34.
- American State Papers: Military Affairs*. 6 vols. Washington D.C.: Gales & Seaton, 1832-34.
- *Indian Affairs and Treaties, Statutes at Large*. 2 vols. Washington D.C.: n.p., 1790-1806.
- United States Department of the Interior. *Federal Indian Law*. 2 vols. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958.
- United States Department of War. *Statutes at Large*. 2 vols. Washington D.C.: n.p., 1790-1810.
- Waghelstein, J.D. "The United States Army's First War: War in the Northwest Territory, 1790-95." *Small Wars and Insurgencies* 12 (summer 2001): 1-18.
- Wall, James T. *The Boundless Frontier: America from Christopher Columbus to Abraham Lincoln*. Lanham, M.D.: University Press of America, 1999.
- Wallace, Anthony F.C. *Jefferson and the Indians: The Tragic Fate of the First Americans*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Weeks, William Earl. *Building the Continental Empire: American Expansion from the Revolution to the Civil War*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996.
- Westendorf, Nick. "Reaction to Early American Novels: World Opinion of the Birth of a Media Culture." Paper presented at the University of Chicago, 18 October 1998. Database on-line. Available from Google Scholar [www.lib.ncsu.edu/scholar](http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/scholar).

- White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Wildes, Harry Emerson. *Anthony Wayne: Trouble Shooter of the American Revolution*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1969.
- Wilkinson, James. *Memoirs of My Own Times*. 3 vols. Philadelphia: Reprint Services, 1816.
- Wilson, Frazier Ellis. "St. Clair's Defeat." *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* 10 (fall 1908): 374-81.
- Woehrmann, Paul. *At the Headwaters of the Maumee: A History of the Forts of Fort Wayne*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1971.
- Wright Jr., J. Leitch. *Britain and the American Frontier, 1783-1815*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1975.
- Young, Mary E. "The Dark and Bloody but Endlessly Inventive Middle Ground of Indian Frontier Historiography." *Journal of the Early Republic* 13 (summer 1993): 193-205.