

THE POLITICS OF PLACE:
THE ROLE OF REGIONALISM IN MID-EIGHTEENTH CENTURY
ANGLO-CHEROKEE DIPLOMACY

A thesis presented to the faculty of the Graduate School of Western Carolina
University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in History

By

Stephen Matthew Scheflow

Director: Dr. Andrew Denson
Associate Professor of History
History Department

Committee Members: Dr. Honor Sachs, History
Dr. Robert Ferguson, History

November 20

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis has taken a considerable amount of time and energy to complete over the past few years and many thanks are in order. I would first like to thank those who believed that I had what it takes to pursue a master's degree in history. I first learned about writing history in Dr. William Reger's historiography class at Illinois State University. Dr. Reger's courses always seemed to have disproportionately high expectations and page lengths for assignments. I owe him thanks for making semester projects seem less daunting after having completed several in the many courses I took with Dr. Reger. Secondly, I'd like to thank Dr. Alan Lessoff. Dr. Lessoff supervised my undergraduate capstone and always pushed me to produce the best work possible. Without Dr. Lessoff's encouragement, I might not have chosen to pursue a graduate degree.

Next, I would like to thank the faculty of Western Carolina University's history department. From my early excursions into applying for graduate schools, Dr. Elizabeth McRae always made Cullowhee feel like the best destination. I want to thank her for all her work in helping me choose WCU, as well as the continued help throughout my time at WCU. I am especially thankful for the wonderful learning opportunity and experience I gained while working as her teaching assistant. I want to thank Dr. Honor Sachs who challenged me to elevate my writings and hone my research in class and as a committee member for this thesis. I also thank her for her guidance with my first teaching experiences while working as her teaching assistant. I would also like to thank my second committee member, Dr. Robert Ferguson. Finally, I'd like to thank my thesis advisor, Dr. Andrew Denson, for working with me throughout this effort. It is fitting that my first graduate school experience was Dr. Denson's Cherokee history course, and he has continued his instruction through out the entire process. I gained valuable

experiences as Dr. Denson's research assistant, which led to a great friendship between myself and microfilmed newspapers.

I'd like to thank the staff of Western Carolina University's Hunter Library for all of their help. Thank you for (generally) having books in the correct location. Thank you for putting up with suitcases full of books to be renewed and returned. Thank you to the librarian who welcomed me to the "100 checked out book club." A bigger thanks to the librarian(s) who saw me leave that club. Thank you to the staffs at UNC-Chapel Hill's Davis Library and NC State's D. H. Hill Library for their help.

More important than those that actually helped me through the process are those that listened to me complain my way through it. I do not know how I could have managed graduate school and the challenge of writing a thesis without the countless nights at Tuck's and Innovation, arguing nonsense like "The Great Hot Dog-Sandwich Paradigm," Kirk or Picard, and hillbillies versus rednecks. Thanks, Nickollof, JD, John, Cagney, Dustin, Katie, Emily, John Lance, Phoebe, Meghan, Josh, Erin, Alan, and Faust. Thank to you to my friends back home who mistakenly asked about my progress and received long-winded explanations that seemed to explain little. Even Jeff deserves thanks for keeping me grounded by following up "How's the thesis coming?" with "You know, no one really cares, I was just being polite." Missing from these thanks is someone who deserves special thanks. Thank you Donna for all of the encouragement, support, and occasional prodding that contributed to this thesis' completion in insurmountable ways. Thank you for being my ballast during the struggles and my biggest fan during each incremental achievement.

Lastly, I would like to thank my family. A huge thanks to my parents, Doug and Lena Schefflow, who supported me throughout this long process and raising me in a home that valued

education. Thank you mom for all of your copyediting, as grammar never was my strong suit. Thanks John for the phone calls of encouragement to “keep truckin’” through the thesis. I would like to thank Tommy and Sarah for their support, even though it was most commonly expressed through “I don’t read,” and “you’re crazy,” respectively. I would like to thank my grandparents Richard and Helen Scheflow for all of their support. I would like to thank my дедушка (grandpa) for his support. I would especially like to thank my late бабушка (grandma) whose advice to always travel when possible led me to explore North Carolina as a viable destination. I would like to remember бабушка as the loving and sweet grandmother I knew, who upon hearing of my decision to attend WCU frantically told my mother she couldn’t let me move that far away from home.

Thank You,

Stephen M. Scheflow

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
THE ‘MURDER’ OF DANIEL MURPHY:.....	12
GATEWAY TO THE CHEROKEE NATION:	33
Building the Fort.....	38
Keowee’s Diplomatic Role in the War	45
The Forbes Campaign and Inter-Regional Homogenization, 1758-1763.....	53
THE CHEROKEE CAPITAL CITY:	67
The Cosmopolitan Capital and the Trouble with Tellico	71
The Descent to War	86
The Return to Peacetime Diplomacy	94
EPILOGUE.....	99
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	106

ABSTRACT

THE POLITICS OF PLACE: THE ROLE OF REGIONALISM IN MID-EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ANGLO-CHEROKEE DIPLOMACY

Stephen Matthew Scheflow, M.A.

Western Carolina University (November 2015)

Director: Dr. Andrew Denson

“The Politics of Place” examines the role of regionalism in Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy between 1750 and 1764. Using South Carolina’s colonial records pertaining to Indian Affairs, this thesis examines the era thematically. The thesis first explores the rumor of Daniel Murphy’s murder in order to illustrate how Cherokee regionalism worked diplomatically in the early 1750s. At that point regionalism was the dominant political and diplomatic influence for individual Cherokees. The following two chapters focus on the Lower Cherokee town of Keowee and the Overhill town Chota between 1751 and 1764. South Carolina built forts at both Cherokee towns during this era and the forts’ development and construction are a major focus of both chapters. Keowee and the other Cherokee Lower Towns were the most devoutly loyal to the English in the mid-1750s; however, the imprisonment of hostages at neighboring Fort Prince George deteriorated their relationship with the English. The massacre at Fort Prince George created the opportunity for nativist Cherokees to become diplomatically dominant. The transition from regional to ideological political divisions within the Cherokee nation represents one of the earliest foundations for Cherokee nationalism in the early nineteenth century. Chapter three observes the same political transition in Chota. The chapter begins with a description of Chota’s unique

experience because of its geographic location and the visitor that traveled to the town. It then follows the town, Overhill region, and Cherokee nation's descent into war with the English and ends with Chota's return to peacetime diplomacy. Throughout, the same political transition of ideological divisions supplanting regional divisions is apparent. Politically, regions divided the Cherokee nation in the early 1750s. By the Anglo-Cherokee War, in 1760, the Cherokee nation was beginning to conceptualize itself as a single entity, and made internal alliances across regions over the issue of war. This political change is a significant development towards a Cherokee national identity and pushes the historiography on Cherokee nationalism back twenty years from its traditional starting point of the end of the American Revolution.

INTRODUCTION

During the 1750s and early 1760s, the Cherokee's relationship with the English was tumultuous. The two peoples were allies, then enemies, and once again allies. This thesis examines the changing role of Cherokee regional identities in their diplomatic relations. Over the course of the long decade, Cherokee regionalism played a significant role in determining the outcome of the era's negotiations. Regionalism was initially the most important influence on Cherokee negotiations because it dramatically increased the volatile and erratic nature of Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy. After the massacre of Cherokee prisoners at Fort Prince George in 1760, Cherokee politics began nationalizing. The political centralization of the 1750s and early 1760s is the early development of centralized Cherokee political institutions. Over the next half century, the Cherokee underwent further centralization that eventually contributed to the foundation of the Cherokee Nation in the early nineteenth century.

However, in the eighteenth century, the Cherokee *nation* was not yet the Cherokee *Nation*. The distinction is subtle, yet significant. In the eighteenth century, the Cherokee organized their politics primarily around the town and region. The English bestowed the title of emperor on particular Cherokee headmen in order to simplify relations, but the Cherokee people did not fully acknowledge this. They maintained their political system based on autonomy and influence, rather than the Euro-American conceptions of power and authority. Due to this, the term Cherokee nation is referenced throughout the text, but the Cherokee Nation is not. The references allude to the conglomeration of distinct Cherokee regions, recognized by contemporaries and historians as a common people. While the Cherokee nation encapsulated distinct regions, each region maintained its own separate regional identity.

By 1750, both European colonials and Cherokees recognized the Lower, Middle, Valley, and Overhill towns as distinct regions. An explanation of the Cherokee regions' labels is also necessary for clarity. The terms region and towns are interchangeable. For instance, the Lower Towns, the Lower Region, and the Lower Cherokees are synonymous.¹ The Cherokee regions did not have the same geophysical limits as traditional political boundaries. The towns within a region were its loci of power and influence. This explains why the Valley Towns and the Valley Region were synonymous. Each region had a 'beloved' or 'mother' town that acted similarly to a regional capital. The beloved town of a region was not static and other towns with growing prominence could challenge for the position. Tyler Boulware notes that it was also "not unusual, however, for more than one beloved town to be acknowledged within a particular region, and disagreements resulted as to which town was the accepted regional center."² He explains further that, "Like regions, beloved towns rose and fell depending on political leadership, demographic changes, and geopolitical circumstances."³ Today, there is a consensus among historians that these regions existed.⁴ Hatley's examination of Anglo-Cherokee relations in *The Dividing Paths*,

Despite this recognition, historians have not fully examined how the Cherokee's regional identities influence their politics with Euro-Americans. Thomas Hatley discusses the role of Cherokee villages and the different regions in his work *The Dividing Paths*, however, he does

¹ For the Overhill Towns, they are commonly referred to simply as the Overhills, but also the Upper Cherokees, and the towns over the hills.

² Tyler Boulware, *Deconstructing the Cherokee Nation: Town, Region, and National among Eighteenth-Century Cherokees*, (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2011), 24.

³ Boulware, *Deconstructing the Cherokee Nation*, 24.

⁴ The current understanding is that these four regions existed, previously the Middle and Valley regions were lumped together and very infrequently the Out Towns are considered a fifth region. Tyler Boulware suggests, there is some difficulties in determining Cherokee regions, and that "one key is to not treat Cherokee Regions ahistorically or statically," *Deconstructing the Cherokee Nation*, 19. Thomas Hatley and Fred Anderson use the same Lower, Middle, Valley, and Overhill regions as Boulware.

not recognize divisions between the regions. His discussion of the Saluda Conference of 1755 between the Cherokee and South Carolina only mentions Anglo-American divisions while he represents the Cherokee as a singular people sending “mixed signals.”⁵ Although Historian John Oliphant admits that Cherokee regions “in diplomacy and war each tended to follow its own interests,”⁶ he fails to analyze the significance of that regional autonomy. Oliphant’s discussion of the location of Fort Prince George at Keowee characterizes the decision merely as part of Governor Glen’s scheme to force dependency on the Cherokee. He includes a paragraph about why South Carolina would build their Cherokee fort at Chota, rather than Tellico-Hiwassee. The next paragraph begins with the Commons house approval of £3000 for a fort among the Lower Cherokees with no explanation as to why the focus shifted from an Overhill to a Lower Town fort.⁷ Oliphant tends to acknowledge the Cherokee regions’ responses but does not see Cherokee regionalism as a contribution to the era’s issues. For Oliphant, the volatility of the 1750s was the result of “incessant pressure on the South Carolina frontier,” coming from colonial settlers. Encroaching Euro-Americans undoubtedly contributed to the turbulence, however, Cherokee regionalism was also instrumental. Historians have generally been unsuccessful in examining this phenomenon. Tyler Boulware’s *Deconstructing the Cherokee Nation* is a seminal examination of the Cherokee’s organization around the town and region. This thesis uses the framework of Boulware’s analysis and applies it to diplomatic negotiations during the 1750s and 1760s. Since Cherokees from each region had a regional identity, a form of regional factionalism influenced Cherokee politics throughout this period.

⁵ Tom Hatley, *The Dividing Paths: Cherokees and South Carolinians Through the Era of Revolution*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 75-76.

⁶ John Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier, 1756–63*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001), 2.

⁷ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 12.

Richard White's *The Middle Ground* permeates through the historiography of eighteenth century Native American-European relations. White's middle ground is the newly created mechanisms of intercultural exchanges between the French and Great Lakes Indians that unravels with the United State's emergence as the region's dominant power.⁸ Brett Rushforth applies White's interpretation to French slaving institutions in the Pays d'en Haut region. Rushforth finds that over time, "Natives and the French developed a sustained slave trade built upon decades of small-scale exchanges of bodies, goods, and ideas."⁹ While the relationship of the Cherokee and South Carolina falls outside of White's focus on the French and Great Lakes region, his theories transpose nicely over the North American southeast.¹⁰ Hatley's examination of Anglo-Cherokee relations in *The Dividing Paths*, offers a similar understanding. For Hatley, the middle ground was a more geographically defined frontier zone that influenced a society's core region, but did not necessarily create something new. He states, "Radical change... [emerged] on a single social margin—the frontier—and [worked] its way back toward the center. In this case it was in a shared geographical middle ground *between* the Cherokees and Carolina that gradually became center stage."¹¹ This thesis has elements that agree with both works, as there are examples that demonstrate the creation of something new and interactions that change the society's core.

⁸ Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815*, 2nd ed., (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), xxv-xxvi.

⁹ Brett Rushforth, *Bonds of Alliance: Indigenous and Atlantic Slaveries in New France*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012), 11.

¹⁰ However, this is not uniform across North America as seen in the case of Texas, see Juliana Barr's *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman: Indians and Spaniards in the Texas Borderlands*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), specifically pg. 7.

¹¹ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 80.

Additionally, this thesis fits into the growing historiography of frontier warfare and colonial violence. Historians Peter Silver and John Grenier both find that frontier warfare with Native Americans significantly influence Euro-American society. Silver examines the rhetoric of Indian hating in contemporary literature and finds that it works as a racial distinguisher. He argues that the colonial experiences and representations of Indian warfare influenced how Euro-Americans approached Native Americans into the twentieth century.¹² While Silver's work focuses on Euro-American society, Grenier's examines their military tactics. Grenier finds that the experience of frontier Indian wars led to a new acceptance of scorched earth tactics and a willingness to engage enemies logistical resources rather than their actual forces.¹³ Wayne Lee analyzes the legitimacy of violence in eighteenth century North Carolina and echoes the findings of Silver and Grenier. Lee contends that there were clear distinctions between acceptable uses of force against Native Americans or European enemies by colonial Americans.¹⁴

Regionalism and factionalism are two terms that need defining. Foremost, regionalism is merely geographic factionalism. The factionalism between regions is not necessarily anything greater than a difference of opinion.¹⁵ The significance of the disparate views can vary greatly but as Phil Buckner points out, "regionalism frequently arises out of a desire to be included within the larger political and cultural community."¹⁶ Within the Cherokee nation, regions may

¹² Peter Silver, *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America*, (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2008).

¹³ John Grenier, *The First Way of War: American War Making on the Frontier*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

¹⁴ Wayne Lee, *Crowds and Soldiers in Revolutionary North Carolina: The Culture of Violence in Riot and War*, (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001).

¹⁵ An anachronistic analogy would be modern political parties both 'fighting' for the greater good of the nation, but the other party is wrong. If the parties follow geographic lines this is an easy, albeit over simplified, way to conceptualize Cherokee regional factionalism.

¹⁶ Phillip A. Buckner, "Limited Identities and Canadian Historical Scholarship: An Atlantic Provinces Perspective," *Journal of Canadian Studies*. (April 1988), vol. 23, no. 1/2, 194.

also ally themselves against a particular region on a particular issue. Wanting a trader in one region over another does not carry the same weight as the decision to go to war or not, but both are examples of factionalism. The Cherokee's understanding of regional autonomy also caused factionalism. Since each region was autonomous, individual regions traditionally went to war and made peace independently. This causes diplomatic issues in 1753 when Governor Glen tries to establish peace between the entire Cherokee and Creek nations. Chapter 3 examines this particular instance further. In essence, regionalism and factionalism are nearly synonymous, but not completely and for the Cherokees, geography primarily delineated their factionalism before the Anglo-Cherokee War.

Anglo-Americans had similar divisions to Cherokee regionalism. Historian, Michael P. Morris states that Native Americans were able to use and manipulate rivalries. He writes, "Intercolonial and international rivalries in North America empowered various tribes to make their own trade demands on colonial government. These governments often acquiesced to Indian demands from fear of losing their Indian allies and trade to rival colonies or nations."¹⁷ The rivalry between the governors of South Carolina and Virginia primarily affected the Cherokee nation during the 1750s and 1760s. Additionally, Governor James Glen of South Carolina was frequently at odds with the Commons House of Assembly.¹⁸ This meant that Anglo-Americans were also far from unified negotiators with the Cherokee.

Historical analysis of the Cherokee people in the eighteenth century presents many challenges. Most of the primary source materials come from negotiations between the Cherokee nation and South Carolina. The two main issues are the evidentiary base and the spelling used in

¹⁷ Michael P. Morris, *Bringing of Wonder*, 9.

¹⁸ W. Stitt Robinson, *James Glen: From Scottish Provost to Royal Governor of South Carolina*, (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996), 64-66, 108.

the sources. It is necessary to address these issues in order to understand how to assuage the issues.

The Cherokees in the eighteenth century did not have a written language and therefore, they left no written documents solely of their own accord. Many of the sources are the written statements and correspondence from Euro-Americans to the Cherokee. The Cherokee did not receive these sources verbatim though. Colonial translators converted the documents and speeches into the Cherokees' native language. By the mid- to late-eighteenth century, however, the Cherokees had been consistently interacting with British colonials for over one hundred years. It is highly improbable that translators could not work effectively after such prolonged contact and the Cherokee would offer their approval of certain "linguists" as honest men to the Governor.¹⁹ Thus, the Cherokees assumedly understood most of the meanings of the original English documents despite lacking perfect translations.

The second concern, that of spelling, is a multifaceted issue. First, in terms of style, place names in this analysis will generally conform to modern spellings for the sake of uniformity. An issue with this methodology is that some eighteenth century spellings differ radically from their modern counterparts. Cross-referencing additional sources is required to ensure the correct location is being examined. The same principals will guide the usage of names. Cherokee nomenclature allows individuals to have multiple names. For example, the Tasitte of Hywassee becomes the Tacite of Hiawasee; the Raven of Hywassee becomes the Raven of Hiawasee. In the

¹⁹ Nathaniel Sheidley discusses the effectiveness of translators during the Henderson secession of 1775 in, "Hunting and the Politics of Masculinity in Cherokee Treaty-making, 1763-75," in *Empire and Others: British Encounters with Indigenous Peoples, 1600-1850*, ed. Martin Daunt and Rick Halpern (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 167, 167-8. Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, July 13, 1756, in *Colonial Records of South Carolina*, edited by McDowell, Jr., 135-139, 138.

previous example, the Tacite and Raven of Hiawasee are different names for the same individual and their use interchangeable. Just as the names of places and people, the terms used to describe them also present a particular challenge.

William L. McDowell, Jr.'s edited collections, *Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1750–1754* and *Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, 1754–1765* are quoted extensively throughout the thesis. In his preface, McDowell explains that he only made minimal edits to the original text of the documents contained within, and usually only for uniformity, such as the capitalization of the first word of sentences.²⁰ Quotes taken from McDowell's collections maintain this tradition and are used directly. Some terms from the original documents have been adopted into the modern lexicon. The two most significant terms are “bad talks” and “good talks.”²¹ In the mid-eighteenth century, the correspondence between colonial officials and the Cherokee frequently use these terms. Bad talks refer to an array of disagreeable messages. Rumors of Cherokee violence against Anglo-Americans, or Cherokee relations with the French, were both referred to as bad talks. A rumor among the Cherokee that the English are preparing to attack the nation was also considered bad talks. Essentially, any spoken or written word, truthful or rumor, which was detrimental to the Anglo-Cherokee relationship, was considered bad talks. Good talks were simply the opposite. Generally, during the 1750s and 1760s, bad talks ensued for various reasons and then efforts were made to return to good talks.

²⁰ William L. McDowell, Jr., ed., *Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, May 21, 1750–August 7, 1754*, (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970), 68-71, 178-184, 184-187, 187-196, hereafter cited as *DRIA I*, v-vi.

²¹ See *DRIA I*, 68-71, 178-184, 184-187, 187-196, and William L. McDowell, Jr., ed., *Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indians Affairs, 1754–1765*, 1970, reprint, (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives & History, 1992), 159-161, 214-224, 240-243, 462-463, 470-473, hereafter cited as *DRIA II*.

Two more terms from the primary sources that need explaining are “the norwards Indians,” and “the path.”²² First, the norwards Indians is simply Indians to the north of the Cherokee. The term is generally nonspecific of which Indian people it is referencing. The documents use the term interchangeably for the Shawnee, the Nottoway, the Cayuga, and the Iroquois Confederacy. When ascertaining what the specific Indian people documents were referencing is possible, their name is given. It is also pertinent to note that the primary sources frequently mention the Savannah Indians, which was a contemporary name for the Shawnee.

Second, when the documents refer to the path it is a reference to the Cherokee Trading Path. The path connected Charleston, South Carolina to the Lower Cherokee town of Keowee. References to the path were usually in regards to the health of the Cherokee-South Carolina relationship. When the path was clear and bright, the relationship was good and strong.²³ When the path was black, dark, or bloody, relations were troublesome.²⁴

The final term that needs defining is the politics of place. This modern term has significant scholarship surrounding it. This thesis, however, uses it separately from the modern usage in political sciences. Here, the politics of place denotes an instance in which a regional identity is a primary influence or tool used during diplomatic negotiations or decisions.

This thesis is organized in three thematic chapters that each flow chronologically. Chapter 1, “The ‘Murder’ of Daniel Murphy,” examines how the Cherokee and South Carolina used regionalism during the aftermath of the Cherokee trader’s rumored murder. The chapter establishes regionalism as an important diplomatic influence within the Cherokee nation in 1751.

²² For norwards see, *DRIA I*, 179-181, 488, and *DRIA II*, 15-6, 43, 203, 347-8, 382, 414; For the path see, *DRIA I*, 436-446, and *DRIA II*, 182, 443-44, 491-492.

²³ *DRIA II*, 182, 443-44.

²⁴ *DRIA I*, 436-446, and *DRIA II*, 443-444, 491-492.

It also explains how the Cherokees used their regionalism diplomatically after the spread of the rumor. The chapter shows how Cherokee regionalism influenced the subsequent treaty negotiations with South Carolina, internal divisions among the Cherokee nation, and the Cherokee's relationships with Virginia and the French.

Chapters 2 and 3 respectively examine the experience of the Lower Town Keowee and Overhill Chota, from the conclusion of the Daniel Murphy affair until 1762. Chapter 2, "Gateway to the Cherokee Nation," investigates the role of regionalism on Keowee's rise from a declining town in 1750 to its status as the epicenter of Cherokee-South Carolinian trade by 1762. The chapter emphasizes South Carolina's establishment of Fort Prince George adjacent to the town on its influential growth, the region's geographic proximity to South Carolina, and its unique experience as the most southern Cherokee region. The first two thirds of the chapter highlight the significance of regionalism in obtaining the fort and Keowee's role in the French and Indian War. The final third of the chapter focuses on the changing role of regionalism during the Anglo-Cherokee War. In Keowee and the Cherokee nation, the war diminished regional influences as Cherokee politics underwent nationalization. The chapter concludes with the establishment of Fort Prince George at Keowee as the recognized center of trade in South Carolina's 1762, "Act to Regulate the Cherokee Trade."

Chapter 3, "The Cherokee Capital City," follows the same format as chapter 2 and explores regionalism in Chota. This chapter emphasizes the Anglo-American designation of Old Hop, a Chota headman, as the Cherokee emperor and his town the nation's capital. Chapter 3 underlines the remote and mountainous geography of the Overhill region's influence on Chota headmen's regional identity. The region's geography allowed for great geopolitical autonomy from South Carolina and allowed the headmen of Chota the unique opportunity of courting

Virginian and French representatives. The chapter also contrasts Chota's unique experience in the northernmost Cherokee region against Keowee and the Lower Town's experiences. The chapter begins with an examination of the contribution of the presence of foreigners among the Overhill Cherokee's regional identity. It then documents the Cherokee's descent to war and reaffirms the conclusion from chapter 2 that the Anglo-Cherokee War nationalized Cherokee politics and lessened the influence of regional identities. The chapter closes with Chota and the Overhill Towns' struggle to reestablish peace and maintain regional dominance in an increasingly national Cherokee nation.

The conclusions reached in chapters 2 and 3 are premised on an understanding of Cherokee regionalism at the beginning of the period in the early 1750s. Due to this, the thesis begins with an examination of Cherokee regionalism in the early 1750s. Chapter 1's analysis of the supposed murder of Daniel Murphy in 1751, illustrates how regionalism influenced the politics and diplomacy of the Cherokee nation. The diplomatic affair created by the rumored murder elicited displays of regionalism from the various Cherokee regions involved.

Understanding the impact of regionalism within the Cherokee nation during the 1750s is required to fully comprehend the dramatic changes Cherokee politics and diplomacy underwent over the course of the next decade.

THE 'MURDER' OF DANIEL MURPHY:

REGIONALISM IN THE MID-EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ANGLO-CHEROKEE FRONTIER

James Francis knew the importance of what he wrote on May 4, 1751. John Bryant gave his deposition on the affairs in the Cherokee Middle Towns to Mr. Francis and it was a startling report. Bryant told Francis that Cherokees murdered four white men, including the traders Daniel Murphy and Bernard Hughs.¹ Bryant's deposition was not the only report of the Cherokees murdering Murphy, nor the earliest. Similar stories are told in multiple accounts from late April and early May 1751 and the murder is even mentioned as late as May 1752. The crimes occurred in the Lower Town of Oustenalley and the Out Towns along the Tuckasegee and Oconaluftee Rivers.² South Carolina's experience during the Yamasee War between 1715 and 1717 gave the colony reason for concern regarding Bryant's deposition. Carolina had hoped to forge an alliance with the Cherokees during the war. The possibility of an alliance broke down when the colony learned of the Cherokees murder of Carolinian traders.³ The Cherokees eventually sided with South Carolina half way through the war, but the murder of traders was a clear declaration of

¹ "Deposition of John Bryant," Jas. Francis, memorandum, May 4, 1751, in *Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indians Affairs, May 21, 1750–August 7, 1754*, edited by William L. McDowell, Jr., 1958, reprint, (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives & History, 1992), 41, hereafter cited as *DRIA I*.

² Governor Glen to the Head Men of Oustenalley, June 8, 1751, in *DRIA I*, 81; The Out Towns are generally not considered their own region but they are a recognized set of towns along the Tuckasegee River, about 15 miles northeast of the core Middle Towns, Tyler Boulware, *Deconstructing the Cherokee Nation: Town, Region, and National among Eighteenth-Century Cherokees*, (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2011), 20.

³ Tom Hatley, *The Dividing Paths: Cherokees and South Carolinians Through the Era of Revolution*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 22-23; William L. Ramsey, *The Yamasee War: A Study of Culture, Economy, and Conflict in the Colonial South*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008), 132.

war. This memory was cause for concern three and a half decades later. This rumor had the power to start a war between two very important trading partners.

It is unknown when the murderous accounts were realized as false. As early as May 21, 1751, John Williams, “Master Trader in the Cherokee Nation,” swore “Murphy was then living and never hurted or damaged in Person or Goods.”⁴ Daniel Murphy appears in the documentary record as a living man more than a year after the event supposedly took place.⁵ Francis understood the meaning of murdered traders and it was a dreadful thought and because of the action’s implications information regarding a murdered trader spread rapidly.⁶ Indians along the Anglo frontier in North America often murdered traders as a prelude to war and South Carolina experienced this decades earlier.

When Governor Glen of South Carolina learned of the rumor he was aware that it was a dangerous situation. Glen knew there needed to be action. He quickly ordered all traders out of the Cherokee country.⁷ There was no need to keep traders in hostile territory and the Cherokees had to recompense their transgressions. South Carolina’s Commons House imposed an embargo on the Cherokees, despite Glen’s concerns that an embargo would alienate the Cherokees by giving their rivals, the Creeks, an unfair advantage. The initial rumor and the subsequent embargo led to a flurry of diplomatic affairs between Cherokee headmen and the colonial

⁴ Affidavit of John Williams, May 21, 1751, 19-20, in *DRIA I*.

⁵ Lud. Grant to Governor Glen, May 3, 1752, in *DRIA I*, 261.

⁶ The murdering of traders was a common preemptive to, or, declaration of war with indigenous peoples on the eighteenth century colonial south. Anyone involved in the Indian trade, colonial government, press, and anyone with any understanding of Native Americans would have understood its meaning. Peter Silver’s *Our Savage Neighbors* examines the fear of Indians within colonial society during the eighteenth century more in depth.

⁷ W. Stitt Robinson, *James Glen: From Scottish Provost to Royal Governor of South Carolina*, (Wesport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996), 89.

government. This explosion of diplomacy continued even after the rumor of his murder was dispelled.

Daniel Murphy's "murder" illustrated the volatility of Anglo-Cherokee relations in the mid-eighteenth century. The fleeting rumor quickly revealed the factional differences within both Cherokee and South Carolina society. The Lower Town and Overhill Cherokees were quick to reiterate their own regional independence. The South Carolina Assembly and royal governor James Glen sought different diplomatic solutions to resolve the crisis. Both Cherokee and South Carolina societies muddled through the affair amongst themselves, as well as with each other. The rumor showed that factionalism within the two societies helped generate the erraticism of their mid-eighteenth century relationship.

The central character of the rumor was Daniel Murphy. Very little is actually known about Murphy. He enters the documentary record on April 28, 1751, in the first mention of his murder.⁸ As quickly as he appears, he vanishes from the record after May 4, 1752.⁹ Very little information is gleaned from the limited sources that do appear in this brief stretch of time. What is known from the records is that he was a South Carolinian Cherokee trader. He formerly lived in a town named "Canutry" and later planned "to settle with his Slaves, Horses, and Leather," at the New Cherokee settlement of Aulola on the Holston River in modern day Tennessee.¹⁰ Essentially nothing else is known about him. Perhaps the move to settle suggests that Murphy was looking for a wife, or possibly had taken a Cherokee wife, but nothing is certain. Despite

⁸ Cornelius Doughart to James Maxwell, April 28, 1751, in *DRIA I*, 82-83.

⁹ Lud. Grant to Governor Glen, May 4, 1752, in *DRIA I*, 238.

¹⁰ Lud. Grant to Governor Glen, May 3, 1752, in *DRIA I*, 261; William R. Reynolds, Jr., *The Cherokee Struggle to Maintain Identity in the 17th and 18th Centuries*, (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2015), 54.

knowing very little about Daniel Murphy the man, his supposed murder offers valuable insights into the Cherokee-South Carolina relationship of the early 1750s.

At this time, Anglo-Cherokee relations were undergoing changes. First, the Overhill towns Hiwassee-Tellico and Chota, continued to compete over the dominance of Cherokee diplomatic affairs.¹¹ Tyler Boulware reminds twenty-first century observers that “beloved towns rose and fell depending on political leadership, demographic changes, and geopolitical circumstances.”¹² In the 1750s, “Chote was particularly active as... Old Hop... sent overtures to the French at Fort Toulouse and dispatched the Little Carpenter... to Williamsburg to negotiate for Virginia trade,” in an effort to “preserve their [Cherokee] independent operations.”¹³ Old Hop’s decisions to begin exploring alternative possibilities aided in his and Chota’s ascendancy to prominence within the Cherokee-Anglo relationship. The Cherokee’s willingness to explore alternate trade sources also illustrated broader geo-political realities of the times.

The French at Fort Toulouse posed a significant risk to British interests in the North American southeast. Through Fort Toulouse, the French built and maintained significant ties to the Cherokee’s traditional enemies the Creeks. South Carolina maintained a monopoly of the Cherokee trade, so Old Hop’s overtures to the French represented a threat.¹⁴ Glen also protested the delegation sent to Virginia, upon which the acting governor of Virginia withdrew his support for sending Virginian traders westward.¹⁵ So the Cherokee-South Carolina relationship, despite its significant and peaceful length, was threatened by the politics of the colony and the

¹¹ Robinson, *James Glen*, 89-90.

¹² Boulware, *Deconstructing the Cherokee Nation*, 24.

¹³ Robinson, *James Glen*, 90.

¹⁴ John Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier 1756–63*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 2001), 9.

¹⁵ Robinson, *James Glen*, 90.

international rivalries of the colonial powers. This all occurred during the build up to the contest for the continent as control of the Ohio River Valley was being contested between the English and French.

The ‘murder’ of Daniel Murphy is merely a drop in the ocean of colonial disputes in the North American southeast, but it reveals the complex nature of the relationship between the Cherokees and South Carolina. The ways in which the Cherokees and South Carolina dealt with this relatively minor crisis helps explain the course of Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy over the coming decades and also reveals the great importance of region within Cherokee-Anglo diplomacy.

In 1751, reports of the murder of a white man in the Cherokee interior emanated from the Cherokee Middle Towns. The reports stated that a colonial trader, Daniel Murphy was murdered and that Bernard Hughs’ goods were stolen from him. Some reports stated Cherokees killed him, and others claimed it was a false report, or that he merely received wounds.¹⁶ The significance of the possible murder of the colonial trader, Daniel Murphy, is in how those who commented on the event voiced and directed their commentary. The hasty diplomacy illustrated the transient nature of Anglo-Cherokee politics and how regionalism played an important role in negotiations.

The ‘murder’ in the Lower Towns, and the robberies in the Out Towns caused an outbreak of hysteria in South Carolina that needed to be dealt with. Based on the initial reports of theft and murder, South Carolina sought to punish the individual offenders for their actions. The towns where the actions took place were witnessing a growing resentment towards the English

¹⁶ Killed: “Deposition of John Bryant,” Jas. Francis, memorandum, May 4, 1751, 41; “Affidavit of William Thomson,” council chamber, 51; False Report: Skier Rosskee to John Dunning, Keowee, 1751, 19; “Affidavit of John Williams,” Fort Augusta, Georgia, May 21, 1751, 19-20; Wounded: “Governor Glen’s Talk to the Cherokees,” November, 13, 1751, 43-45 and 156-159; all in *DRIA I*.

while regions removed from the epicenters of violence generally maintained their friendly relations with the English.¹⁷ The Lower Town's growing resentment resulted from war with neighboring Indians and the disbanding of the region's towns.¹⁸ Due to incessant enemy raids, many of the Lower Towns relocated to the safety of the Cherokee interior. The move was not unprecedented but also not very common. The British pursuit of justice during this time illuminates the regional factionalism within Cherokee society.

On June 8, 1751, Governor James Glen of South Carolina sent out a flurry of correspondence. He wrote six letters in total but the letters took two distinct forms. What form a letter took depended upon the recipient's geographic location within the Cherokee nation. The first and more common form took a reprimanding tone and these were addressed to the towns of Kituhwa, Tuckasegee, Kewochee, and the Head Men of Tomasee, and Oustenally. All of these towns are either Out or Lower Towns, where the hostilities had taken place. In the second type of letter the tone was far more complimentary towards the recipients. Glen sent this type of letter to Tacite of Hiwasee and the "Cherokee Emperor," Old Hop, in the Valley and Overhill regions respectively.¹⁹ This reflects the differential views South Carolina had toward the Cherokee regions in the early 1750s.

The two different letter templates are a result of the Cherokee's intense regionalism. Clearly, the supposed transgressions were regional in nature, but had national implications.

¹⁷ Old Hop and Chota did send overtures to the French and Virginia, however, they maintained their friendly connections with South Carolina.

¹⁸ Talk from Skiogusto Kehowe and the Good Warrior Estuttowe to Governor Glen, April 15, 1752, in *DRIA I*, 247.

¹⁹ Governor Glen to the Cherokee Emperor, June 8, 1751, in *DRIA I*, 173. The "Emperor is assumed to be from the Overhill Region because of the region's association with the 'first Cherokee Emperor,' Moytoy at Tellico, and the rise of Chota to national prominence during this era, see Champagne, *Social Order and Political Change*, 56-59. Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 7-8. Boulware, *Deconstructing the Cherokee Nation*, 24, 58, 76.

Murphy's 'murder' revealed that the regionalism of Anglo-Cherokee politics also influenced the relationship's instability. Despite the maintaining of friendly relations by the non-offending Cherokee regions, the Overhills still found it pertinent to explore options outside of South Carolina because of possible consequences from the offending regions actions. The 'murder' was not the sole reason for the Cherokees exploring other options, but the French presence exacerbated the growing English concern of losing their valuable allies.

One of the letters that Governor Glen of South Carolina wrote was to Tacite of Hiwasee in the Cherokee Valley Towns. In the letter, Governor Glen discusses the events; "One of our Inhabitants [Daniel Murphy] going lately to the Cherokee Nation was wounded... with an Intent to kill him.... The three Towns, [Kituhwa], [Stecoe], and [Connutory] have behaved remarkeably ill; here our Traders' Stores were plundred, and their Goods and Skins publickly divided amongst the People."²⁰ Governor Glen wanted to punish the individuals from those towns who carried out the crimes. This pursuit of justice raised concerns for the neighboring Lower Towns. Glen also commends the Tacite for preventing his towns "from being infected with the Madness of others," and endeavoring "to cure and correct the Disorders of others."²¹ The "Madness of others," which Governor Glen refers to is the belief that was spreading through the Cherokee Out and Lower Towns was that the South Carolina forces near the border were being prepared to actually attack, rather than protect, the Cherokees.

Glen sent a similar flurry of letters to the officers in the South Carolina frontier out settlements on June 15, 1751. The letters reflect the growing Carolinian presence in the region and lends credence to the Out and Lower Cherokee fears of an impending English invasion. Glen

²⁰ Glen to Tacite of Hywasse, in *DRIA I*, 68.

²¹ Glen to Tacite of Hywasse, in *DRIA I*, 67.

ordered his officers to patrol the border and prevent any Indians “to pass downwards to molest or disturb the Inhabitants of this Province and you are to be equally carefull that no white Person whatever either with or without Goods, be permitted to pass toward the Cherokee Nation.”²² The Cherokees nearest South Carolina viewed the patrols as a threat. The patrolling forces’ arrival triggered rumors that South Carolina intended to attack the Cherokee. The fear generated by the patrol forces’ arrival is the madness that Glen commends the Tacite of Hiawasee for not letting overtake his own people. The interpretation of the patrol forces true intent was regional in nature as the more removed regions found less credibility that an attack was imminent and the more southeasterly regions found an attack much more plausible.

These orders undoubtedly upset the Cherokees of the regions close to South Carolina because the Middle and Out Cherokees of Joree, Tuckasegee, Tuckliha, Cowee, Watauga, and others sent Glen a letter of reconciliation for the incidents that took place and pleaded for the resumption of trade.²³ Their efforts were an attempt to assuage the fears caused by the rumors. Glen, however, wanted the assurance of apprehending the perpetrators before allowing traders to venture deeper into other Cherokee regions. The correspondence with the Overhill Cherokees does not take the same reconciliatory approach, but does reflect the regional nature of Cherokee diplomacy.

The letters Glen wrote to the Tacite of Hiwasee and the Cherokee Emperor reflect the Cherokee regional division. In both letters, Glen tells the respective recipient about the “Difficulty [of] sending Ammunition or Goods to your Towns from hence till such Times as we have obtained Satisfaction from the Lower Towns. W[e] therefore hope that as Friends and

²² Governor Glen to Captain Fairchild, June 15, 1751, and Governor Glen to Captain Gibson, June 15, 1751, in *DRIA I*, 169.

²³ Talk of the Cherokee Towns to Governor Glen, Joree, May 6, 1751, in *DRIA I*, 172-3.

Allies you'll concur with us to remove those Difficulties that you may be sooner supplied with Everything you want."²⁴ This move by Governor Glen is very near blackmail. He recognizes that the Valley and Overhill towns did not participate in or condone the actions of the Lower and Out towns. His refusal to send traders to their regions showed his wish that they would pressure the Lower and Out towns to comply with his disciplinary measures. This seemingly minor event also showed how the actions of one region can have a profound effect on the other regions.

Glen was not an absolute ruler of South Carolina and also had to contend with the colonial legislature on such matters as Indian affairs. At the behest of the South Carolina Commons House, the colony imposed a trade embargo against the Cherokee nation.²⁵ The effects of the Out Towns' plundering of trade goods did not remain within that particular region. Their actions reverberated throughout the entire Cherokee nation. In response, Governor Glen proclaimed to the colony's traders, "by the Advice of his Majesty's honorable Council, and in his Majesty's Name and Authority, Order you and each of you forthwith to leave the Cherokee Nation with all your Effects as you will answer the Contrary at your Peril."²⁶ Glen's orders affected the entire nation, and not just the regions where the actions took place. This event severely restricted the more remote Valley and Overhill towns to European trade goods. During times of war or the primary hunting season, these restrictions could be devastating and caused rivalries between the regions where the actions took place and the regions suffering the

²⁴ Glen to the Cherokee Emperor, *DRIA I*, 174; a similar statement is made in Glen to Tacite of Hywasse, 68.

²⁵ Robinson, *James Glen*, 89.

²⁶ Governor Glen to the Traders of the Cherokee Nation, June, 15, 1751, in *DRIA I*, 66-7.

consequences despite their innocence. Without intending to do so, the colonial legislature's decision exemplifies the Anglo-Cherokee relationship's volatility.²⁷

By imposing a trade embargo, South Carolina was giving the politically dominant Overhill Cherokees a just cause to pursue the European trade elsewhere. Old Hop's decision to send envoys to the French and Virginians is completely justified in the context of Cherokee regionalism. They were being punished for something they did not do, and their livelihoods were directly linked to the trade of deerskins. Governor Glen realized the possible negative outcomes from an embargo, but the factionalism within South Carolina was too strong to prevent it.²⁸ The colonial attempt to reconcile the Cherokees to justice by surrendering the individuals accused of crimes, actually created an environment in which reconciliation would be more difficult to achieve. Now, the situation would require full-scale diplomatic engagement.

In the more diplomatic setting of a council, the regional factionalism is apparent in the Cherokee's speeches to Governor Glen. The council began on November 13, 1751, with a speech from Governor Glen to the Cherokee head men gathered in Charleston. The Cherokee made an initial response the following day, but resolved to review the day's and previous day's speeches and make a final response on the 15th of November. The make up of the delegation, as well as the

²⁷ A key characteristic of Richard White's middle ground is newly developed customs and practices. Here, Glen appears to be more attuned to the middle ground than the Commons House because of his direct dealings with the Cherokee, see Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815*, 2nd ed., (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), xxvi-xxvii. The embargo also embodies Hatley's findings that the frontier greatly influenced the center because the frontier rumor spurred the colonial legislature into action; see Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, xiv-xv.

²⁸ This factionalism is part of the divide between Governor Glen and the colonial legislature that pervaded his tenure. Glen found the bureaucratic nature and lack of gubernatorial oversight an affront to the Crown's directions. Robinson examines this divide in *James Glen*, Chapter 4, "Between Scylla and Charybdis," as well as throughout the book.

differences in the days' primary speakers and the language they used illuminates the Cherokee's factionalism and how their regionalism played out politically.

There were many Cherokees at this council with Governor Glen. Those who spoke included the Tacite, or Raven, of Hiwasee, Tacite of Stecoe, Conotatche of Tugaloo, Skiagunsta the Warrior of Keowee, Sachetche of Tuckasegee, and the Raven of Toxaway.²⁹ The Raven of Hiwasee from the Valley Towns led the delegation, however, the rest of the speakers came from the Lower and Out Towns. This first suggests that the peace talks were regional in nature. There are no representatives from the Middle and Overhill regions present during these talks. Despite that, the Tacite of Euphasee, the Tacite of Ousteneca, Johney of Great Tellico, Captain Caesar of Chota, "and other head Men in the Name and Behalf of Ammouskossittee, their Emporer, send down to their Brother the Governor and beloved Men in Charles Town."³⁰ The fact that Governor Glen was not negotiating with the representatives of the 'Cherokee Emperor,' but rather representatives from the regions where the events took place shows that Cherokee regions operated independently. That does not mean that Cherokees from the Valley, Middle, and Out Towns did not have an influence on the proceedings, however.

Secondly, the council's proceedings suggest that the Tacite of Hiwasee was acting as a diplomatic intermediary. He led the delegation's opening remarks on both dates and the correspondence between he and Governor Glen includes multiple statements of their respect for one another.³¹ Having Tacite of Hiwasee present was mutually beneficial for the two parties because he, and others from the unoffending regions, could influence the other regions to

²⁹ Talk of the Cherokee Indians to Governor Glen, In Council, November 14, 1751, and Talk of the Cherokee Indians to Governor Glen, November 15, 1751, in *DRIA I*, 175-178, 178-184.

³⁰ Talk of Tasitte of Euphassee and Others, Charles Town, July 30, 1751, in *DRIA I*, 107.

³¹ Talk of the Cherokee Indians to Governor Glen, November 14, 175; Glen to Tacite of Hywasse, in *DRIA I*, 67.

extradite the criminals to the English. If successful, trade would return to their respective regions and Governor Glen would have his justice. The Tacite of Hiawasee was the primary Cherokee speaker on November 14, but the following day he would step aside.

The Tacite of Hiawasee led the Cherokee delegation when meeting with Governor Glen in November of 1751. On November 15, the Tacite of Hiawasee only made a very brief statement and concluded with “I think we did not give you a full Answer last Night. But I live a great Way from the Towns where these things happened and from whence the bad Talks came. I therefore desire that the Warriour of Keowee may speak.”³² At this point, Skiagunsta, the Warrior of Keowee, becomes the primary speaker for the Cherokee. He explains why the trouble and “bad talks” occurred in length. This is radically different from his statements the previous day in which he merely acknowledged the governor’s talks and stated that he would tell them to his people. This turnaround is likely due to Cherokees from other regions prodding Skiagunsta to cooperate for the sake of the greater Cherokee nation.

Skiagunsta’s explanation as to the causes of the troubling events is a reflection of one of the primary causes of regional factionalism. The Cherokee-Carolina borderlands were an incredibly diverse region full of enemies and allies. Along with their colonial neighbors, the Cherokee also had indigenous neighbors, some of whom allied with non-British colonial powers. The Cherokee enemy, the Creeks, bordered the Lower Towns and created a tension unparalleled in other Cherokee regions. Skiagunsta details that the killing of a white man was an accident caused by a Creek raid on the Cherokee people. Shortly after “Norward Indians” had recaptured Cherokee prisoners of the Creeks, a scout returned from a home with “Word that he heard People talk in the Creek Tounge and one Chickesaw Fellow, but that he heard no English Spoken,” and

³² Talk of the Cherokee Indians to Governor Glen, November 15, in *DRIA I*, 178.

“from which they considered that there was no white People there.”³³ After realizing that there were indeed whites in the home, the party did what they could to protect them from further harm, but a fatal blow was already dealt. This helps explain why that particular region acted the way it did; it was the geographic proximity to enemies that caused increased tensions and prompted individuals to act. Additionally, this elucidates another cause of regional factionalism.

The *bad talks* emanating from the Lower and Out Towns resulted in the cessation of trading for the entirety of the Cherokee nation. Governor Glen sent letters to Cherokee head men in the Valley and Overhill towns to explain that trade would be difficult without the submission of the Lower Towns. Only a week later he ordered all traders within the Cherokee nation to leave with all of their goods and the colony’s embargo followed soon after. This induced a defensive attitude for innocent Cherokees because they had not committed the crimes. By removing the trade of the unoffending Cherokees, South Carolina created a situation where those Cherokees distanced themselves from the offending region. Innocent Cherokees from other regions distanced themselves from the offenders in attempts to maintain their access to trade. These Cherokees would have blamed the embargo, at least somewhat on the Cherokees who committed the crimes. Due to other region’s actions some of the Cherokees are stripped of their subsistence and since the few perpetrators were concentrated geographically, the division reinforces Cherokee regionalism. Thus, access to economic opportunity plays a major part in the development and entrenchment of Cherokee regional factionalism.

Similar to the Cherokees’ regional factionalism, the British colonials were not a monolithically unified state. Anglo-America had many points of contention. As a whole, there were rivalries with the other colonial powers, France and Spain. There were the inter-colonial

³³ Talk of the Cherokee Indians to Governor Glen, November 15, in *DRIA I*, 179.

rivalries between South Carolina, Virginia, Georgia, and to a lesser extent North Carolina, and lastly there were different ideological factions within South Carolina. This examination will focus on the latter two points in the context of Indian diplomacy.

The same chain of events that illuminated Cherokee factionalism also reveals the factionalism of colonial South Carolina. During this period, South Carolina had a “near monopoly on the Cherokee trade,” and examining how the colony enforced this role sheds light on the rivalries between colonial allies.³⁴ Further factionalism appears within the colony. This is evident in the differing responses to the ‘murder’ and the correspondence between Governor Glen and his subordinates in the borderlands and Cherokee nation.

Beginning in the 1720s the colonial governor of South Carolina was royally appointed but by the 1750s, fissures began to crack between the governor and the colonial legislature. After his arrival in 1743, Glen quickly realized there was a problem with the colony’s distribution of power between the governor, Council, and Commons House. Glen found his limited oversight of the bureaucracy troublesome and was frequently at odds with the colonial legislature during his time in office.³⁵ The response to the ‘murder’ of Daniel Murphy was one of those cracks. Glen’s removal of traders from the Cherokee country was not the stringent response the legislature hoped for. The Commons House instead instituted a formal embargo on the Cherokee. This decision is evidence of factionalism within South Carolina and it is also regional. The colonial legislature believed their decision better than the royally appointed governor because Glen was not a South Carolinian. This is despite Glen’s broader geo-political understanding that an

³⁴ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 9.

³⁵ Robinson, *James Glen*, 21, 32-35, 56, 59, 64-67.

embargo would negatively affect the colony's relationship with the Cherokee.³⁶ The legislature's embargo also had unforeseen outcomes that further expose colonial factionalisms.

South Carolina claimed ownership over the Cherokee trade and the embargo aimed to stop all trade with the Cherokee. This goal was difficult to accomplish though. The governor quickly realized that a complete embargo needed to be enforced or illicit trading would seep into the Cherokee country. Glen's June 15, 1751, letters to Captain Fairchild and Captain Gibson told them to disallow any Indian from entering the province and "to be equally carefull that no white Person... from whatever Province they may pretend to come... of going into the Cherokees."³⁷ Fairchild and Gibson were rangers and the governor's first line of defense as they patrolled the frontier borderlands.³⁸ Glen's understanding that a trade embargo would invite traders from rival colonies into the Cherokee nation to poach the trade markets evoked his orders.

Glen's fear of poaching Virginia traders materialized in late August. Captain Fairchild wrote to warn Governor Glen of the impending breach. He explained that a trader, Richard Smith, was "assuring the Indians of a good cheap Trade from that Province [Virginia]," as South Carolina has "now grown troublesome."³⁹ Captain Fairchild's concern constituted the entire subject of his letter to Governor Glen, the first one sent since the initial orders. Virginian encroachment was clearly a primary concern for Governor Glen and South Carolina. Old Hop's overture to Virginia initially found strong support as "Colonel Lewis Burwell, president of the Virginia Council and acting governor, promised to encourage traders to the Cherokees and gave

³⁶ Robinson, *James Glen*, 89.

³⁷ Glen to Captain Fairchild, June 15, 1751, and Governor Glen to Captain Gibson, June 15, 1751, in *DRIA I*, 169.

³⁸ They were most likely mounted units based off the Virginian model. Two types of rangers existed in the colonies during this time, see John Grenier, *The First Way of War: American War Making on the Frontier, 1607–1814*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 35-36.

³⁹ Captain Fairchild to Governor Glen, near 96, August 24, 1751, in *DRIA I*, 122.

them presents worth over £200 before their departure.”⁴⁰ Glen protested this support and claimed the envoy was unauthorized and that they were guilty of crimes against South Carolina.

Virginian officials acquiesced and published an article in the *Virginia Gazette* explaining the Cherokee delegation’s ‘deceit’. Glen’s action following the bad news illustrated the preeminence of this concern.

Notwithstanding Virginia’s compliance with Glen, Captain Fairchild’s letter included some alarming intelligence on the situation in the Cherokee nation. Fairchild mentioned reports from the Lower Towns claiming “that the Indians of [Keowee] and [Oustenalley] are destroying their own Corn Fields by Way of fat’ning their Horses as if for some Journey.”⁴¹ The journey was to meet traders from Virginia and this was unacceptable for Glen. The governor’s reaction to the information showed that he now supported the legislature’s embargo and also how important the Cherokee trade was for South Carolina. The governor quickly sends a single letter to Captains Gibson, Fairchild, and Minnick so that the first one to receive it will be able to act immediately.

Governor Glen’s letter first made the recipient aware of the situation and then continued with orders. He commands that the captain escort any traders and their goods to the Congarees. He additionally states that “these Traders are to be piloted into the Cherokees” by licensed traders and orders that “You are to compel these Persons to come along with you to the [Congarees], and are to send them to [Charleston], or to detain them there... being very carefull that neither of them gets to the Cherokees.”⁴²

⁴⁰ Robinson, *James Glen*, 90.

⁴¹ Captain Fairchild to Governor Glen, in *DRIA I*, 122.

⁴² Governor Glen to Captains Gibson, Fairchild, and Minnick, September 12, 1751, in *DRIA I*, 124.

Governor Glen's orders prominently make three points. First, that the Virginian trade was a detriment to South Carolina and fuels the rivalry between the two colonies. Governor Glen disagreed with Virginia's approach towards Indian affairs and the Indian trade was as a prominent issue.⁴³ Colonial factionalism was geopolitical, and amounts to a refined form of regionalism. English inter-colonial relations acted quite similarly to Cherokee inter-regional relations. Additionally, despite the differences between South Carolina and Virginia, they would work together on some levels because they were distinct entities united under the English Crown. This is comparable to the cooperation of Cherokee regions. Colonial cooperation, despite disputes, also compares to the inter-regional cooperation of the Cherokee. The Tacite of Hiawasee's participation in the 1751 council as an Overhill Cherokee similarly showed an inter-regional ability to work together when necessary. Inter-regional and inter-colonial relations had some procedural differences, but the goals of peace and renewed trade were nearly identical.

Second, the desire to make sure that neither licensed nor unlicensed traders reached the Cherokees illustrated that there would be some South Carolinian traders willing to skirt the legislature's orders and continue trading illegally. There is clearly a point of factionalism between the Governor, South Carolina's legislature, and subordinates in the field. The potential of unlawful trade with Virginia brings this to light. Richard Smith, Abraham Smith, and Joseph Oliver, are three traders mentioned in the captains' and Glenn's correspondence in regards to illegal trading. Both Richard Smith and Abraham Smith appear as licensed Cherokee traders on a recorded list of licensed traders, but Joseph Oliver only appears in the documentary record in

⁴³ Harry M. Ward, *"Unite Or Die": Intercolony rRelations 1690-1763*, (Port Washington, NY: KenniKat Press, 1971), 157-159, North Carolina and Virginia throughout the eighteenth century had differences of opinion with Virginia over Indian Affairs, Glen was more concerned with the broader goals of the English Empire rather than the success and health of individual colonies.

accordance to the aforementioned incident.⁴⁴ The actions of the either illicit or opportunistic traders represented a challenge to the authority of the colonial legislature. These three saw no reason for South Carolina's trade embargo with the Cherokee to inhibit *all* trade with the Cherokee.

These three traders, if actually connected to the illegal trade, may have only been acting in their own best interests. After 1720, "the practice of taking Indian wives and fathering children of mixed blood," proliferated and with this tactic, South Carolinian traders began "settling among the Indians, building houses, learning the language, and respecting the traditions."⁴⁵ This suggests that many of the traders relied on trading as their primary source of income and further suggests why some traders may not have enthusiastically left the Cherokee nation as ordered to by Governor Glen. For a trader with a Cherokee family, leaving the country generally meant leaving behind his family because of the matrilineality and matrilocality of Cherokee society. The Commons House's embargo also undercut traders' business. Richard Smith translated and recorded a message from nine Lower Cherokee headmen to Governor Glen in which they apologize for and explain the events that took place in their region. The Cherokees "heartily beg [Governor Glen] not stop the Trade... on Account of what has happened," and "promise and assure [Glen], there shall never be any such ill Usage again."⁴⁶ This is as close as Richard Smith gets to the embargo issue. Smith here is probably more concerned with the continuation of trade than with South Carolina's sense of justice. The cessation of trade very well

⁴⁴ A List of the Licensed Creek Traders, May 21, 1750–August 2, 1751, in in *DRIA I*, 128.

⁴⁵ Edward J. Cashin, *Lachlan McGillivray, Indian Trader: The Shaping of the Southern Colonial Frontier*, (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1992), 9.

⁴⁶ The Head Men and Warriors of the Lower Cherokees to Governor Glen, May 10, 1751, in *DRIA I*, 62.

could have prompted Richard Smith to engage in illegal trading as a means of subsistence and this clearly showed the factionalism within the colony of South Carolina.⁴⁷

Finally, Glen's orders showed that the licensed traders who were assisting the illegal trade and making illegal promises to the Cherokees committed crimes against South Carolina. While the factionalism stemming from illegal trading does follow a regional pattern because of the locations of trade, it most closely reflects Cherokee society's understanding of autonomy. Traders engaging the Cherokee illegally were acting autonomously. The colony forbid all trade, however, individuals who did not agree with the policy or found the opportunities too great to leave untapped refused to follow the colonial dictates. These actions were criminal in the eyes of South Carolina, however, the crimes still happened. This is similar to a Cherokee individual committing a transgression that was explicitly forbidden and agreed upon. The criminality of trade showed that individual Carolinians were willing to act against their governing body. It is in an environment like this that rumors such as Murphy's 'murder' are able to grow towards crisis level. The factionalism of both societies created situations where so many threads needed to be counted, that some might inappropriately poke through the cloth of Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy.

Factionalism in South Carolina was prevalent in their diplomacy with the Cherokee. Itself affected by an intra-colonial divide, the colony's trade embargo with the Cherokee forced South Carolina to act against its colonial neighbors and impose restrictions on its own citizens. This factionalism, in essence a result of Cherokee factionalism, influenced how the events played out within South Carolinian society. The trade embargo and its enforcement prompted some South Carolinians to engage in illegal trading during this period. The disconnect showed factionalism

⁴⁷ Traders and their Cherokee wives served as bridges to White's middle ground. Their expulsion from the Cherokee country was a serious threat to the customs and practices forged over years of interaction and accommodation in the middle ground.

within South Carolina with a fissure between Governor Glen and the individual traders. In the mid-eighteenth century, factionalism on both sides of the dividing line created a particularly volatile Anglo-Cherokee frontier.

The Cherokee nation and South Carolina in the mid-eighteenth century had drastically different cultures. Even with the readily apparent differences, the two societies operated in surprisingly similar ways. During the affairs concerning the supposed death of Daniel Murphy and the plundering of Bernard Hughs, these factions took center stage. The correspondence and speeches of the Cherokee headmen clearly delineated and demarcated the factions. The ways Cherokee headmen responded to the transgressions and “bad talks” followed regional lines. Geography, both physical and geopolitical, significantly influenced the formation of Cherokee factions. In order to understand the process of Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy also requires a clear understanding of how regional factionalism worked within Cherokee society. It is clear that Cherokee regional rivals each had their own seat at the diplomatic table.

Colonial historians typically understand the Cherokee nation as a decentralized but unified people with certain levels of autonomy on the individual, town, and regional basis. The “murder” of Daniel Murphy clearly showed that Cherokee diplomacy and power was even more decentralized than generally acknowledged. Cherokee regions during this period frequently did not agree with each other. This forces the politics of Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy to incorporate this regional factionalism. As the November council of 1751 played out, regionalism pervades the diplomatic negotiations. Transgressions committed by individuals in two Cherokee regions caused the nationally significant diplomacy. The primary speakers during the discussions of the “bad talks” were Cherokees from the offending regions, while other regions remained generally

unaccounted for at the negotiations. This does not seem that unusual, however. The resumption of trade was a major concern for the Cherokees nationally and not just for the offending regions.

Factionalism also pervaded Anglo-American society. South Carolina had Virginia and Georgia as their primary colonial rivalries. The enforcement of the Cherokee trade embargo reflected these rivalries and caused divisions between the English colonies. Within South Carolina, a factional divide existed between the governor and the minor borderland actors. Just as Cherokees' had the autonomy to make their own decisions, traders also were able to choose to circumvent the Governor's orders and trade despite an embargo, albeit, illegally. Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy makes sense of this variability, and the "murder" of Daniel Murphy reveals this.

In the early 1750s, this particular incident brought all of these factions into clear light. The ways in which Cherokee and colonial factions functioned were very similar. This factionalism resulted in misunderstandings, and the restructuring of relations. In an era of increasing geopolitical turmoil, understanding the factions within the opposing societies is a critical analytical focus. Doing so reveals a clearer picture of the era and a well-grounded understanding in the diplomatic process between the two peoples. This approach shows that the politics of place was incredibly important in determining the outcomes of Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy.

GATEWAY TO THE CHEROKEE NATION:
KEOWEE AND THE CONSTRUCTION, UTILIZATION, AND SEIGE
OF FORT PRINCE GEORGE

In the eighteenth century, Keowee was a prominent Lower Cherokee town in present-day South Carolina. In 1753, the colony of South Carolina built Fort Prince George adjacent to the town, although around 1750, Keowee appeared to be in decline. Disease and warfare, often in tandem, devastated Keowee and other Cherokee towns throughout the eighteenth century. A 1751 memorial from Robert Bunning and three other experienced Cherokee traders, recalled a time when “there were six thousand stout Men in [the Cherokee nation],” but “They are now not Half.”¹ Despite the town’s history of episodic decline, by mid-century the construction of Fort Prince George would lead to the resurgence of Keowee as a regionally and nationally significant town in the Lower region. The fort also figured prominently in the region’s geopolitics during the period.

The Cherokee Lower Towns were a dynamic region in the early and mid-eighteenth century. Tugaloo was the region’s mother town throughout most of the century. Thomas Hatley explains how mother, or beloved, town status enabled greater autonomy not bestowed to less influential towns.² Hatley describes Keowee in the late 1750s as a mother town; however, Tyler

¹ Memorial of Robert Bunning and Others, November 22, 1751, in *Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, May 21, 1750–August 7, 1754*, ed. William L. McDowell, Jr., (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970), 148.

² Tom Hatley, *The Dividing Paths: Cherokees and South Carolinians Through the Era of Revolution*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 92.

Boulware labels Tugaloo as the Lower Cherokee mother town during the Seven Years' War.³ Boulware's analysis incorporates the fluidity of beloved town status and more accurately reflects the Cherokees' understanding. Early in the eighteenth century, most of the Lower Towns were along the Savannah River with few towns within the Keowee River Basin.⁴ Between 1730 and 1754, Keowee's prominence grew and the region's demographics reflected Keowee's swelling influence. After the construction of Fort Prince George and the outbreak of war, there were three times as many towns within the Keowee River Basin as along the Savannah River.⁵ Keowee's proximity to Fort Prince George, the security it offered, and the town's heightened ability to influence diplomatic affairs appealed to the war-torn region. Additionally, the coinciding demographic shift further aided the growth of Keowee's regional and national prominence within the Cherokee nation.

Keowee was the Cherokee Trading Path's terminus before South Carolina extended it to Chota with the completion of Fort Prince George. Keowee's location on the trading path allowed the town to develop into an important Cherokee town in the mid-eighteenth century. The advantage of Keowee's location was its access to resources, goods, people, and information going throughout the Cherokee nation and towards Charleston, flowed through the town. Keowee's location on the path also influenced the decision to build a fort there.

³ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 92; Tyler Boulware, *Deconstructing the Cherokee Nation: Town, Region, and Nation among Eighteenth-Century Cherokees*, (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2011), 73.

⁴ Boulware, *Deconstructing the Cherokee Nation*, 35.

⁵ Boulware, *Deconstructing the Cherokee Nation*, 73; on page 6 Boulware connects the relocation of the Lower Cherokee towns with their disbandment during the Cherokee-Creek War during the 1750s; the security offered by Fort Prince George appealed to the war-torn region and the demographic shift aided the growth of Keowee's regional and national prominence within the nation.

South Carolina's decision to build a fort near Keowee was not a simple resolution. The Cherokees prodded James Glen, the Royal Governor of South Carolina, to build a fort for years before South Carolina's colonial legislature complied and built Fort Prince George. The Lower Cherokees sought the protection of a fort because the Cherokee-Creek War was flaring up in the first half of the 1750s. Glen needed to prove, and then convince the colonial legislature, that building a fort was economically feasible, as well as profitable. In 1753, with provincial backing and his personal financial support, Governor Glen at the head of sixty soldiers and fifty workers built Fort Prince George, ensuring Keowee's ascendancy to prominence.⁶

Keowee's rise to distinction throughout the 1750s and early 1760s is a story fraught with factionalism and the volatility of Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy. The story of the town's rise is best told in three parts that each illustrate the factionalism, as well as the erratic nature of the Cherokee-South Carolina relationship throughout the period. The construction of Fort Prince George, Keowee's early role in the Seven Years' War, and the Cherokee's political factionalism mixing with regional homogenization during the Anglo-Cherokee War distinctly show the role of factionalism in Cherokee and Anglo-American society, while helping to explain their seemingly unstable relationship during the era.

Together, Keowee and Fort Prince George formed a major trade hub for the Cherokee nation and connected the inland Cherokees to Charleston, South Carolina, and the broader Atlantic World. The trade primarily occurred at established locations, and eventually, nearly exclusively at colonial forts. The Indian trade was a webbed network in which individual Indians

⁶ W. Stitt Robinson, *James Glen: From Scottish Provost to Royal Governor of South Carolina*, (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996), 96-97; ⁶ Daniel J. Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis: Cherokees, Colonists, and Slaves in the American Southeast, 1756-1763*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 24.

would gather deerskins and sell them to traders. The colonists funneled the skins towards Charleston and then on to England. By 1748, Charleston was processing approximately 160,000 hides for export.⁷ Keowee was not a Cherokee mother town; however, it was still a prominent town during this period in the Lower region and greater Cherokee nation.

The “Murder’ of Daniel Murphy” illustrated the ability of a single fictitious event to create and reinforce regional identities and associations within Cherokee society. It was merely one of many events, however, that did so over the following two decades. One source of the ‘bad talks’ emanating from the Cherokee country in 1751 was a result of the reported murder of the trader Daniel Murphy in Oustenalley, a Lower town. The initial misinformation set off a firestorm of ‘bad talks’ in the region that were not always directly related to Murphy’s supposed murder. When a council in November of 1751 finally convened, the regional nature of Cherokee society was evident. The Tacite of Hiawassee acted as a diplomatic intermediary from the Valley Towns for representatives of other Cherokee regions. Skiagunsta, the Warrior of Keowee, was a Lower Town representative.⁸ The difference between Skiagunsta’s participation on the first and second days of the council demonstrates that he wished to position Keowee, and even the Lower Towns, within the Cherokee nation and in the greater colonial context with South Carolina.

Skiagunsta’s participation showed that he desired to work with the other Cherokees and South Carolina. Given the Cherokee social system, he and every other delegate had every right to avoid the council. By attending and speaking, he displayed his desire to remain on relatively good terms with the unoffending Cherokees and the Carolinians. His speech on the first day was

⁷ Robert M. Weir, *Colonial South Carolina: A History*, (Millwood, NY: KTO Press, 1983), 17.

⁸ Talk of the Cherokee Indians to Governor Glen, In Council, November 14, 1751, and Talk of the Cherokee Indians to Governor Glen, November 15, 1751, in *Colonial Records of South Carolina*, edited by McDowell, Jr., 175-178, 178-184.

terse and lacked substance as he merely acknowledged the Governor's talks and stated that he would relay them to his townspeople.⁹ His initial speech first appears to be crude diplomacy, although it actually was a display of his regional identity and Keowee's unhappiness with the present circumstances. On the second day of the council, Skiagunsta elaborated in detail how and why bad talks arose. The dramatic shift in Skiagunsta's tone and context, additionally, reflected the inter-regionalism among the Cherokee. The occurring changes were far more likely to happen because of the presence of the Tacite of Hiawassee. His influence would have contributed to Skiagunsta's decision. The Lower Towns desired to be included in the greater Cherokee nation. At this time, the resumption of trade for all the Cherokee people was a larger concern than the squabbles emanating from the Lower region.

The month of negotiations resulted in a treaty between the Cherokee nation and the colony of South Carolina. The agreement contains numerous developments between the two parties. First, it erased all past transgressions. It also established a system of justice for crimes committed by Cherokees and by Carolinians that stated that neither nation as a whole is responsible for the actions of individuals. Additionally, the Cherokee and South Carolina re-established their trading relations with the treaty. Next, it prohibited the Cherokees from supplying French-allied Indians, and required that Cherokees give no credit to future bad talks.¹⁰ Most significantly, the treaty stated that once South Carolina began to build forts in the Cherokee country, Cherokees would aid in the construction.¹¹ The discussions between the Cherokee headmen and Governor Glen are largely devoid of substance though. The only significant

⁹ Talk of the Cherokee Indians to Governor Glen, In Council, November 14, 1751, in *Colonial Records of South Carolina*, edited by McDowell, Jr., 175-178.

¹⁰ Talk of Governor Glen to the Cherokees Concerning their Treaty, November 26, 1751, in *Colonial Records of South Carolina*, edited by McDowell, Jr., 187-196.

¹¹ Talk of Governor Glen to the Cherokees Concerning their Treaty, 191.

provision established was that the Cherokees would aid in their construction. Meanwhile, how many forts South Carolina would build, where they would build them, and when they would build them, remained unanswered questions.

Building the Fort

Fort Prince George was the first of two South Carolinian forts built in the Cherokee nation. Despite the Cherokee Overhill region's stronger and the Lower Towns' more contentious relationships with South Carolina, the colony built the fort in the Lower Towns in 1753.¹² The politics of Cherokee regionalism forced this odd decision. Remarkably, Fort Prince George was not an attempt to suppress the unruly Lower Towns, but a measure towards their protection, and thus their loyalty.

The Cherokee Lower Town's geographic vulnerability in 1752 and 1753 expedited the construction of a Carolinian fort. The sporadic Cherokee-Creek War, which began in 1715 and continued until the English brokered a peace in 1755, erupted at mid-century and devastated the Lower Towns. This vulnerability led to the hasty construction of Fort Prince George near Keowee. The spring of 1752 was a devastating season for the region because of incursions made by the Cherokee's French-allied enemies. By April, the Lower region was nearly uninhabited. Every Lower town, except for Estatoe and Keowee, had disbanded and the residents fled to other regions.¹³ This was not an unusual practice and even Keowee had been disbanded and reformed

¹² Boulware, *Deconstructing the Cherokee*, 96.

¹³ Talk from Skiogusto Kehowe and the Good Warrior Estuttowe to Governor Glen, April 15, 1752, in *Colonial Records of South Carolina*, edited by McDowell, Jr., 247, hereafter cited as *DRIA I*.

within the past decade.¹⁴ This mass exodus resulted from persistent attacks by the French-allied Creeks. By 1753, South Carolina began construction of a fort near Keowee to help defend the Lower Cherokee and maintain peace in the region. Since the Lower Towns were forced to disband, South Carolina realized that trade needed to continue in order to preserve Cherokee loyalty. At this moment, the Lower Towns were a vital bridge to the entire Cherokee nation. South Carolina was working against French interests and Governor Glen was feebly trying to minimize intertribal conflicts, which drained the Cherokees' and Creeks' abilities as English allies.¹⁵

The Creek attacks illustrate how geography and regionalism strongly influenced the Cherokee politics surrounding the construction of Fort Prince George. In 1751, the Lower Towns were involved in bad talks that were troublesome for South Carolina, but the next year the region desperately sought the colony's assistance. While other regions in the Cherokee nation remained generally unaffected by the Creek incursions, the Lower Towns took the full brunt of the offensive. The region's proximity to the Creek Indians created two intertwined difficulties, the threat of lethal violence, and an insufficient supply of goods. The Lower Towns consequently had to use the ammunition they received from their towns' traders for their own defense. This decision, however, prevented the Cherokees from using that same ammunition to commercially hunt deer and produce an income to pay off debts and purchase other necessities. Due to the circumstances, two principal headmen remaining in the Lower Towns requested gifts of ball and

¹⁴ M. Thomas Hatley, "The Three Lives of Keowee: Loss and Recovery in the Eighteenth-Century Cherokee Villages," 241, in *American Encounters: Natives and Newcomers from European Contact to Indian Removal, 1500–1850*, edited by Peter C. Mancall and James H. Merrell, (New York: Routledge, 2000).

¹⁵ Robinson, *James Glen*, 86.

powder. They also wanted South Carolina to seek peace with the Creeks.¹⁶ The two headmen's primary concern was preventing their removal *from* the region, and not the decimation of the region's towns without the aid. Their concern reflected the importance of their home region to their identity and illustrated the regionalization of Cherokee politics.

The Lower Towns' appeal to South Carolina illustrated how the Cherokee nation was not a unified political entity during the eighteenth century. The Lower Towns did not receive aid from any of the other Cherokee regions, not even from the geographically adjacent Middle Towns or from the Overhill Towns. This is because the affairs of a particular region are not necessarily the affairs of the whole nation and requesting aid from other regions could be burdensome. This is especially pertinent in this era as town economies, town health, trade, and war contributed to the breakdown of intra-regional trade. Hatley explains that these factors disrupted "the older round of village activities and crippled the effectiveness of the basic life support provided in the towns."¹⁷ During the trying times of the early 1750s, locality took precedence.

The Lower Cherokee war with the Creek Indians reveals that region was the primary influence on Cherokee's identity. After the Creek had already killed thirty-three Lower Cherokees, Estatoe and Keowee still held out hope so that the Cherokee nation might maintain their presence in the region and preserve some level of continuity.¹⁸ The strength of Estatoe and Keowee's regional identity weakens the stature of kinship as a nationally unifying institution because kinship did not bring the Cherokee nation into the Lower Towns' affairs. Kinship may have guided Cherokees to accept refugee clan members of other regions into their homes and

¹⁶ Talk from Skiogusto Kehowe and the Good Warrior Estuttowe, in *DRIA I*, 247.

¹⁷ Hatley, "The Three Lives of Keowee," 244-247, quote on 244.

¹⁸ Talk from Skiogusto Kehowe and the Good Warrior Estuttowe, 247.

towns. The war also showed other region's unwillingness to send aid to the Lower Towns before Lower Towns deemed disbandment essential.¹⁹ At this time of despair, the Lower Towns' affairs were not the affairs of other regions until they geographically entered another region. Most of the region fled and those who stayed in the Lower Towns sought English assistance because they could not expect aid from other Cherokee regions. The remaining Lower Cherokees turned to South Carolina because they were geopolitical neighbors and the only viable source of aid. The Lower region's location was not only important because of their close proximity to the Creek, but for South Carolina, the region represented a gateway to the rest of the Cherokee nation.

South Carolina's main concern was not the return of the disbanded Lower Towns to their original locations, but the possibility of French success with the Overhills. The English feared that without access to the Overhills by way of the Lower Towns, the entire Cherokee nation might have aligned with the French. However, the Cherokee's insistence upon a fort at Keowee was not persuasive enough for South Carolina to follow through with the governor's 1751 promise. Despite the pleas from the Lower Towns, the colonial legislature could not justify the expense of constructing a fort.²⁰ It would take a regional faction of South Carolina frontiersmen to finally push the colonial legislature towards construction. The colony's Cherokee traders convinced the colonial council to act with their petition to build a fort at Keowee, arguing that it was immediately necessary to maintain Cherokee allegiance. In a letter to Governor Glen, a Lower Town trader, James Beamer, forwarded the sentiments of many Cherokee headmen in a soft reminder of his promise to build a fort in the region. Later, Beamer added that if the French did come, the English presence would be a great trouble for Glen unless his "Excellency settles

¹⁹ Theda Perdue, *Cherokee Women*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 46.

²⁰ Saturday AM, July 7, 1753, *DRIA I*, 456.

[a] Fort directly in those Lower Towns.”²¹ Governor Glen agreed with Beamer’s assertions and under his personal direction, supervised the completion of Fort Prince George in late 1753.²² The construction of Fort Prince George among the Lower Cherokees reflects the regional nature of Anglo-Cherokee relations. For South Carolina, Keowee was the gateway to the Cherokee nation.

Fort Prince George’s construction in 1753 was a result of various elements of Cherokee regionalism and South Carolinian factionalism that also played a role in their relationship’s volatile nature. First, the colonial legislature’s embargo in response to the ‘murder’ of Daniel Murphy and the Creek devastation of the Lower Towns soured Anglo-Cherokee relations. During this time, the Overhill Cherokees explored alternate possibilities, but the Lower Towns’ only potential access to European trade goods was through South Carolina. The circumstances of war and a 1752 famine exacerbated the Lower Towns’ need for solid trade relations. This explained why the Lower Towns desperately sought to prove their loyalty to South Carolina. Their desire for a fort that would ensure the region direct access to trade goods and contribute to the return of a relatively peaceful existence with the Creeks was a reflection of the Lower Towns geopolitical dependency on South Carolina.

Second, the establishment of peace between the Cherokee and Creek was a major issue entwined with South Carolina’s decision to build a Cherokee fort. The autonomous nature of Cherokee society made this peace difficult. The meeting of July 5 between Cherokee headmen of the Overhills and Lower Towns showed that while some towns made peace, this did not ensure a peace between both peoples. Skiagunsta reiterated this when he stated “I have shaken Hands

²¹ James Beamer to Governor Glen, March 2, 1752, in *DRIA I*, 220-221.

²² Marshall W. Williams, “Fort Prince George, South Carolina,” in *The Archaeology of French and Indian War Frontier Forts*, edited by Edward Babits Lawrence and Stephanie Gandulla, (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2014), 56. Robinson, *James Glen*, 97.

with the Creeks, and like the Talk,” but, “we are but two Towns at Present in the Lower Cherokees.”²³ Two days later, Skiagunsta addressed the Overhills’ previous hesitancy towards peace by saying that the boys from over the hills had “talked madly,” and that he was thankful they realized their folly.²⁴ Skiagunsta’s words had an air of contempt towards the other Cherokees who had previously stalled on peace. The Lower Towns’ disbandment forced those who remained to swiftly settle for peace. Skiagunsta mentioned the South Carolinian promise to build a fort at Keowee and repeatedly reminded the governor of this.

Keowee’s location on the Cherokee Trading Path was important because of the strong ties engendered between the Cherokee and Charleston along the trading path. Glen’s decision on the fort’s location was a political maneuver against the Overhill Cherokee by first building a fort in the more docile Lower Towns.²⁵ Robinson asserts that the Lower Towns were more loyal. More accurately, however, it was the region’s dire need of the benefits of loyalty. Without English support the Lower Cherokee were vulnerable to Creek attacks. These circumstances allowed Glen the diplomatic opportunity to prevent the Overhills from turning to the French.

Third, factionalism within South Carolina also influenced the fort’s construction. The South Carolina Assembly was not as quick to decide upon the matter. The Assembly had issues with the value of a fort and questioned the fort’s financial backing.²⁶ Glen used reports from Carolinian traders in the Cherokee country as evidence for the fort’s necessity and the legislature eventually approved the fort. This colonial factionalism was relatively minor and South Carolina

²³ Thursday AM, July 5, 1753 in *DRIA I*, 436-446, quotes on 444; Skiagunsta is making reference to the fact that the disbanded Lower Towns have not yet returned as Fort Prince George had not yet been constructed but is also a reflection that individual towns traditionally made their own peace with enemies.

²⁴ Saturday AM, July 7, 1753, in *DRIA I*, 449-456, quote on 452.

²⁵ Robinson, *James Glen*, 96.

²⁶ Robinson, *James Glen*, 96.

easily overcame it. Had the legislature's decision differed, the resulting situation would be unrecognizable.

Finally, the layers of factionalism influencing Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy also contribute to its inherent volatility. Keowee and the Lower Cherokee initially benefited from the relationship's murkiness. Their inability to find alternate sources of trade goods necessitated their loyalty to the English, which in turn rewarded the Lower Cherokee with a fort. Governor Glen's decision on the Lower Town region as the fort's future location was only feasible after the legislature's decision to provide the fort with financial backing. Without the regionalism and factionalism, the Cherokee-South Carolina relationship would not have had the difficulties of agreeing to the rather simple terms they managed to reach. The Lower Towns' trying times following the Creek attacks created an ideal situation for South Carolina to establish a fort in the area that profoundly dictated Keowee's regional and national roles for the next decade.

During this time, the French made inroads with the Overhill Cherokee, but not with the Lower Cherokee. Fort Prince George anchored the Lower Cherokee loyalty to the British because of the fort's political, militaristic, and economic importance. The colonial government finally agreed to construct a fort at Keowee during the council held by Governor Glen in Charleston in the summer of 1753.

Representatives from all of the Cherokee regions attended the council. South Carolina was particularly interested in Old Hop's correspondence and guidance because he was unable to attend due to concerns with travel. Old Hop, of the Overhill town Chota, established the closest thing to a Cherokee national capital. During the council at Charleston in 1753, the Cherokee and Creek settled a peace agreement only after Old Hop had sent down his approval. The Cherokee's

and Governor Glen's speeches and actions during these negotiations reflect the Lower Towns' secondary position of importance in the Anglo-Cherokee relationship.

Fort Prince George offered the protection needed for other Lower Cherokee towns to return to the region and catapulted Keowee towards beloved town status. Keowee's national prominence among the Cherokee also rose because it was now the most significant trading and distribution center. The town also grew into one of the primary meeting locations for Anglo-American and Cherokee diplomats.

Keowee's Diplomatic Role in the War

War erupted between the English, French, and their Indian allies in North America in 1754 over disputes in the Ohio River Valley. By the war's outbreak, Keowee and the Lower Towns had undergone significant changes. Fort Prince George and Keowee had become the epicenter of Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy after South Carolina's construction of the fort in the fall of 1753. The fort ensured a safe haven for Cherokee headmen to interact with various colonial commanders, traders, and diplomats. When travel to Charleston was still necessary, Keowee was now a major stop on the path runners would use to deliver information in both directions between Chota and Charleston. Even though Keowee became a prominent location of Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy in the Cherokee country, South Carolina's primary diplomatic interest was Old Hop. Keowee thus remained in a secondary position in terms of importance behind Chota. Keowee and its constituents used their geographic location and the politics of place as a means of attaining regional goals and thereby contributing to the volatility of the Cherokee-South Carolina relationship.

For two years, Fort Prince George stood as the only fort within the Cherokee country and this afforded Keowee's rise as a more significant town. By 1754, the Lower Towns "[were] daily more and more confirmed in their Minds of the Benefite that [Fort Prince George] will in Time be to them and their Successors."²⁷ Within two years of the fort's construction, the Lower Towns returned from their dispersal and there were seven towns larger or equivalent in size to Keowee.²⁸ Throughout this growth, Fort Prince George's proximity allowed Keowee to maintain its prominence. The growing imperial conflict also brought the town increased trade opportunities because of the fort.

In the summer of 1754, Virginia was trying to establish trade with the Overhill Cherokee. However, due to the imperial crisis at hand, they proceeded through Keowee. The war with France and the security of the fort brought new opportunities to Keowee. One of which was Virginians who sought trade. Due to various regional issues such as declining game, the debts of poor hunts, and war with neighboring Indians, the Lower Towns had depended on trade with South Carolina since 1742.²⁹ Virginia wanted to open trade with the Overhills and frontier warfare with France funneled Virginian emissaries through Keowee to Chota. War between France and England eroded inter-colonial rivalries as they coalesced under the threat of a common enemy. Due to this, South Carolina was more concerned that the Cherokee received

²⁷ Ludovic Grant to Governor Glen, July 22, 1754, in *Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indians Affairs, 1754–1765*, 1970, reprint, (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives & History, 1992) edited by William L. McDowell, Jr., 15-20, quote on 17, hereafter cited as *DRIA II*.

²⁸ James Beamer to Captain Rayd. Demere, July 28, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 151; the size of the towns in the report are measured in number of gunmen in each town and it is important to note that size does not equate to importance. The report also affirms that the Lower Towns are now more populace than the Middle Towns.

²⁹ John Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier, 1756–63*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 2001), 19.

adequate English supplies than by whom actually supplied the nation. Economically, Keowee and Fort Prince George also acted as the major distribution center of the Cherokee nation.

Traders brought goods and provisions, like cattle, to Keowee to sell at the fort and distribute throughout the nation. In addition to traders bringing goods into the town, South Carolina also shipped goods, provisions, and men into Keowee

The English used Fort Prince George at Keowee as the gateway to the Overhill Cherokee. Keowee was the staging ground for all South Carolinian operations in the Cherokee nation. This is evident in South Carolina's Captain Raymond Demere's correspondence during his prolonged stay at the fort. Demere was going to be the commander of South Carolina's Overhill fort, but due to extenuating circumstances such as illness and the presence of the enemy, he stretched his time in Keowee. While he was at Fort Prince George though, he used the fort as a command center for the construction of the Overhill fort. The men who would build the fort in the Overhill region would initially stop at Keowee and then proceed further on as circumstances permitted.³⁰ The soldiers' presence brought small-scale economic potential for residents of Keowee and also potential husbands for the town and region's women. Keowee's diplomatic importance also grew because of the fort's location.

The fort was a significant piece of diplomatic infrastructure. It brought Overhill Cherokees down from the mountains to meet with South Carolinians, and even brought figures as prominent as the governor to Keowee. This was important for Keowee because for all interactions that occurred there between South Carolina and the Overhills, the Lower Town headmen were able to easily represent their region because of the geographic proximity. Non-Keowee headmen from the Lower Towns were able to meet with South Carolina representatives,

³⁰ Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, August 1, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 156-157.

like Captain Raymond Demere, at Fort Prince George within a days notice. Headmen also used the fort to request more supplies in times of need.³¹ The fort's location gave Keowee and the Lower Towns these opportunities, which required inconveniently great levels of effort for other Cherokee regions.

When the Overhill leader the Little Carpenter met with South Carolina, he often did so at Fort Prince George. While there, he would inquire about the progress in building an Overhill fort, obtain news, and make reports on the status of trade in his region. While Overhill leaders met South Carolinians at the fort, Lower Town headmen had the chance to accompany them, and even possibly affect their negotiations.³² During Demere's extended stay in Keowee, the Overhills grew increasingly irritated with the failure to follow through with the promise of a fort. The Lower region was able to use this regional divide to their benefit.

In 1753, the Overhill region was the preeminent Cherokee region in Anglo-Cherokee politics. This was because of the growing French presence of minor representatives and their Indian allies in the region. Gifts given to the Cherokee reflect this in that the Overhill Cherokee's gift was twice the size of the Lower Cherokee's.³³ Despite the Lower Towns growing loyalty and the close interactions brought by the fort, the region never became the primary focus of South Carolina's Cherokee diplomacy.

The Overhill Cherokee controlled the negotiations between Governor Glen and the Cherokee nation at the Saluda Conference of 1755, but the issue of white settler encroachment

³¹ Captain Rayd. Demere to Governor Lyttelton, , June 23, 1756, and Captain Rayd. Demere to Governor Lyttelton, June 24, 1756, both in *DRIA II*, 124-126, 126-127.

³² Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, July 21, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 146-147; Interestingly, Demere thought Little Carpenter was sent by Keowee Cherokees to get rum from him, which he denied, but after Keowee headmen had come with the Little Carpenter he allowed a "Cagg of Rum" for Little Carpenter and the town's headmen.

³³ Saturday AM, July 7, 1753, in *DRIA II*, 449-456, 449.

was a Lower Town concern.³⁴ In 1747, Governor Glen bought the left bank of the Long Canes Creek from the Cherokee, establishing the waterway as the fixed frontier. However, authorized land surveys spanned the creek as early as 1751. John Oliphant explains that between the 1751 surveys and 1756, there was an explosion of backcountry settlers that increasingly encroached on Cherokee lands.³⁵ Cherokees at the conference protested this settlement claiming the Long Canes Creek as the line of the fixed frontier. Most likely, those who protested the white encroachment were Lower Town headmen and not Old Hop, the Cherokee delegation's Overhill leader.

Establishing a fixed frontier was a major issue for the Lower Cherokee and an examination of Glen's purchase of the Long Canes settlements, and the Saluda Conference, explain why this Lower Town issue would become a major Anglo-Cherokee diplomatic issue by the end of the 1750s. Glen originally purchased the lands from only a few Lower Town headmen, who did not consult other Cherokees. Cherokees furious over the concession united politically under Old Hop because of the sale.³⁶ The Cherokee and Governor Glen understood the terms of the exchange differently. The Cherokee probably thought the sale fixed the boundary line at the creek and the settlers near there as an opportunity to harmoniously grow into each other's interests, while Glen thought little of it.³⁷ The Cherokee would have also expected South Carolina's obligation to renew the terms so long as they remained true. This occurs in the

³⁴ The Overhills were actually expanding during this period because of a vacuum created by the declining Iroquois presence, Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 18.

³⁵ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 15-18.

³⁶ Daniel J. Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis: Cherokees, Colonists, and Slaves in the American Southeast, 1756-1763*, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 35.

³⁷ Robert A. Williams, Jr., *Linking Arms Together: American Indian Treaty Visions of Law and Peace, 1600-1800*, (New York: Routledge, 1999), 129-131.

seventeenth article of the Cherokee 1751 treaty with South Carolina that reaffirms the fixed frontier as the Long Canes Creek's "dividing Waters."³⁸

At the Saluda Conference Governor Glen failed to fulfill the obligation of renewal. Despite Cherokee claims at the conference that the Long Canes was the fixed frontier, Glen does not address the issue according to given accounts of the conference's proceedings.³⁹ Governor Glen and the Cherokee finalized the Treaty of Saluda on July 2, 1755, however, by February 1756, James Beamer was relaying Lower Cherokee complaints of white encroachment to the governor.⁴⁰ Perhaps Old Hop and Glen did not discuss the issue in depth because Old Hop thought the original sale illegal or because the Little Carpenter's insistence that trade was the most important issue. Regardless, the Lower Town issue went unresolved. In March 1756, after South Carolina failed to deliver on Glen's promises, the Cherokee offered four hundred warriors to Virginia in exchange for ammunition, gifts, and an Overhill fort.⁴¹ The Treaty of Broad River was a political triumph for the Little Carpenter, but also failed to address the encroachment issue.

Colonial encroachment on Cherokee lands was a major concern for the Lower Towns. White settlements so close to the Cherokee nation created many problems. The increasing population density escalated the potential for violent interactions. Colonial hunters also seriously undercut male Cherokee's subsistence through the deerskin trade. With fewer skins to trade for goods like ammunition, the Lower Cherokee suffered additional stresses with commitments to

³⁸ Talk of Governor Glen to the Cherokees Concerning their Treaty, November 26, 1751, in *DRIA I*, 187-196, 17th article on 192.

³⁹ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 17; Thomas Bromley, June 18, 1761, James Glen Papers, South Carolina Library, Digital Library, hereafter cited as JGP, folder 4; William Bull, June 18, 1761, JGP, folder 4; James Glen, "To the Right Honourable the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury," JGP, folder 8.

⁴⁰ James Beamer to Governor Glen, February 11, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 94-95.

⁴¹ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 21-22.

war. Oliphant contends that the colonial encroachment was “the key to Cherokee restlessness in the 1750s,” but fails to place the Lower Town issue in the context of the Overhills domination of Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy.⁴² When viewed through the lens of Cherokee regionalism, the question of why the most important issue was able to ferment for nearly a decade becomes clear. The most influential Cherokee diplomats from the Overhill Towns did not share the same level of concern expressed by the Lower Towns. South Carolina’s failure to slow the western migration of settlers primarily contributed to discontent towards the colony in the Lower Towns.

By 1756, South Carolina’s growing frustrations with the Overhills meant they needed to be especially observant of the Lower Towns in order to eliminate the possibility of losing the whole Cherokee nation to the French or Virginia. The Lower and Middle Towns also experienced a famine in this year and gave South Carolina the opportunity to practice *panem et circenses* diplomacy.⁴³ The Cherokee admittedly aligned with whoever gave them the most gifts and the famine explains the large amounts of provisions given to Keowee between June and August of 1756.⁴⁴ Keowee was not the sole recipient of goods on this report. Keowee received multiple supplies of rice, bread, and flour while Old Hop received a single supply of flour and the Little Carpenter and his company only received hatchets.⁴⁵ The discrepancy in these gifts showed that South Carolina was maintaining their strong relations with the Lower Towns

⁴² Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 18.

⁴³ Captain Rayd. Demere to Governor Lyttelton, July 19, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 143-145, 145; The Latin *panem et circenses* translates to bread and circuses, a political tool of appeasement to prevent discontent.

⁴⁴ Captain Rayd. Demere to Governor Lyttelton, September 20, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 208-209; An Account of Provision Delivered to the Indians, June 20–August 24, in *DRIA II*, 175-176.

⁴⁵ An Account of Provisions Delivered to the Indians, June 20–August 24, in *DRIA II*, 175-176, the fact that the town of Keowee is listed as where Old Hop and Little Carpenter are named specifically also suggest that the English were concerned with helping the whole of the Lower Towns’ population but were mostly concerned with maintaining the favor of the Overhill individuals.

through Keowee. At the same time, South Carolina and Virginia's inability to provide adequate protection to the Overhills opened the region to French-allied Indian raids; during which, Creek, Shawnee, and French representatives reasoned that only France could provide the Cherokee security.⁴⁶ South Carolina's assistance, however, endeared the Lower Towns so much so that "They [said] that the Overhill Towns may do whatever they please but if they incline to turn to the French they will divide the Nation and be true to the English."⁴⁷ Here the Lower Towns are using their position as the middleman between the Overhills and Charleston to obtain desperately needed goods. The flourishing Keowee-South Carolina relationship was mutually beneficial to both parties and hinged on regionalism. Keowee and the Lower Towns were able to gain concessions from South Carolina because without their loyalty and assistance the colony was unable to reach the decisive Overhill region. This is an illustration of the politics of place and the importance of region within Cherokee society.

In 1756 and 1757, the strength of the Lower Towns relationship with the English was at its zenith. The Cherokee nation fought French-allied Indians in the Virginia backcountry and the nation acted as a buffer zone for South Carolina early in the Seven Years' War. The same period brought many changes for Keowee and the Lower Towns, and the Cherokee nation. The construction of Fort Loudon undermined Keowee's preeminence as the diplomatic epicenter because the Overhill political leaders now had access to the English in their own region. The installation of William Henry Lyttelton as Governor of South Carolina brought a new personality to Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy. The Cherokee nation's increased participation in the Seven Years' War, and particularly the Forbes campaign, helped homogenize the nation as the different

⁴⁶ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 23.

⁴⁷ Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, September 12, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 199-205, quote on 200.

regions increasingly grew together ideologically. The solidifying of the Lower Town-South Carolina relationship was mutually beneficial to both parties and it was sustainable, however, it would not last.

The Forbes Campaign and Inter-Regional Homogenization, 1758-1763

The Forbes Campaign of 1758 was the high-water mark of Anglo-Cherokee relations in the mid-eighteenth century. The Cherokee aided the English attack on Fort Duquesne near present-day Pittsburgh. The campaign, however, also created the circumstances in which the Cherokee abandoned the alliance and went to war with the English. The Cherokee's inter-regional homogenization against the English was not complete and the Cherokee nation split into a dominant war faction and a rapidly declining peace faction. This inter-regional factionalism exacerbated the relationship's volatility with explosive results. South Carolina and the Cherokee nation went to war with each other in 1758 and the Anglo-Cherokee War raged on until 1761.⁴⁸

The Forbes Campaign was the beginning of the end of the Anglo-Cherokee alliance. While on the campaign, Cherokee warriors "found only frustration in Forbes's stolid advance and insult in his commanding manner," and this caused many of the Cherokees to depart early.⁴⁹ Additionally, the returning Cherokee warriors met hostilities from backcountry Virginians who accused the warriors of theft and subsequently murdered some of the Cherokees. Daniel Tortora explains the violent outbursts resulting from horse theft and miscommunication by both

⁴⁸ In *The Middle Ground*, Richard White argues that American domination of the Ohio River Valley doomed the middle ground. For the Cherokee in the south, the Anglo-Cherokee War is the first realization that the southern middle ground was on the verge of crumbling, xxvi, xxxi.

⁴⁹ Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766*, (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 458.

Cherokees and colonials.⁵⁰ There were at least thirty Cherokees killed during their return, but most historians consider this a low estimate or the number exclusive to the Lower Towns.⁵¹ These clashes forced a wedge between the Cherokee and the English. Nativist Cherokees from the Overhill and Lower regions both sought revenge for their murdered relations. The Lower Towns also had the further burden of having their hunting grounds poached by backcountry South Carolinians beyond the Cherokee-established frontier line of Long Canes Creek.⁵² These colonial misgivings alienated the Lower Towns so badly that they turned away from the English. The transgressions lost South Carolina the Lower Towns' and most of the nation's allegiance. The additional burden faced by the Lower Towns was able to push the region most loyal to the English astray. Only two years earlier, the Lower Towns were vocally willing to divide the nation if the Overhills joined with the French.⁵³ After the Forbes Campaign, the Cherokee nation initially split into accommodationist and nativist factions that crossed regional lines. This homogenization occurred convergently in the various regions.

In the preceding year, 1757, Cherokee warriors fulfilled their obligations by going to war for Virginia and the English. Overhill diplomats made the obligation, but the Lower Towns fulfilled it. The Cherokees sent approximately seven or eight bands of warriors, only one of which was from the Overhill region. Lower Town warriors constituted most of the Cherokee contingent.⁵⁴ Virginia and Governor Dinwiddie made a crucial mistake in receiving the Cherokee warriors. Bedford Court House on the Overhill path received most of the presents and gifts

⁵⁰ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 48-50.

⁵¹ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 799, n.2.

⁵² Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 41-44, 14, 17; Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 458.

⁵³ Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, September 12, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 199-205, specifically 200.

⁵⁴ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 38.

prepared by Virginia for the warriors. This mistake reveals how Cherokee regionalism continued influencing Anglo-Cherokee relations.

The Cherokee nation was already weary of their English allies and only the Lower Towns contributed significant support. Virginia was, unaware of where the Cherokees were coming from, knew the Cherokees came from the Lower Towns and mistakenly sent the goods towards the Overhills, or, oblivious to the fact that sending the goods towards the Overhills would offend and insult the Lower Town warriors. In any event, Virginia offended the warriors. Wawatchee, the Lower Town headman leading the war party, permitted the warriors to take what they needed after finding no gifts and an absent guide at the arranged meeting location.⁵⁵ The Lower Cherokee's actions disenchanted the backcountry settlers' sentiments. The warriors did not immediately leave the area, but actually engaged French forces once they left. The actions of insulted Lower Cherokee warriors in 1757 precipitously estranged the Cherokees from the English.

In 1758, English Brigadier-General John Forbes was organizing an expedition against France's Fort Duquesne in the Ohio country. The Cherokees supplied nearly four hundred warriors towards the English call to muster five hundred warriors from the southern Indians.⁵⁶ Corkran attributes the repeated English failures to enlist more Cherokees for war on "the ominous note of Cherokee-Virginia hostility."⁵⁷ Thus, Cherokee regionalism affected the

⁵⁵ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 39; David H. Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier: Conflict and Survival, 1740-62*, (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962), 115-117.

⁵⁶ Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 146; John Richard Alden, *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier: A Study of Indian Relations, War, Trade, and Land Problems in the Southern Wilderness, 1754-1775*, (New York: Gordian Press, 1966), 76-77.

⁵⁷ Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 147.

Cherokees' earliest participation in the campaign because of the Lower warriors' actions the previous year.

Similarly to the events of 1757, the Cherokee in Virginia for the Forbes Campaign did not receive the expected presents for their service. The news that Forbes was not ready for war additionally disturbed the Cherokees gathering at Winchester, Virginia.⁵⁸ These factors led most of the frustrated Cherokee warriors to desert the expedition and return home. The returning Cherokees clashed with backcountry settlers in Virginia throughout the summer, deteriorating the Anglo-Cherokee relationship.⁵⁹ The previous summer's hostilities exacerbated the colonial settlers' fear of Indians, while the Cherokee's colonial dissatisfactions preempted their search for goods. Both factors grew from Cherokee regionalism and led to further changes brought on with war.⁶⁰

The Anglo-Cherokee War was defined by the Cherokee sieges at Fort Prince George and Fort Loudon. In the spring of 1760, Cherokees attacked the forts they once pleaded the English to build. The siege at Fort Prince George was the first significant military engagement of the war outside of frontier clashes. The maturation process of initiating the siege at the Lower Town fort reveals the factionalism of the Cherokee nation in three particular ways.

First, the Cherokee's political factionalism was changing from regional factionalism to ideological factionalism. This was a transitional period for Cherokee diplomacy as both the fading regional factions and new ideological factions appear in their diplomacy. The two new factions were the peace-leaning accommodationists and the war-leaning nativists. While

⁵⁸ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 57.

⁵⁹ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 61-65.

⁶⁰ According to Hatley this was also growing into a significant class issue in the colony, Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 173-175.

Cherokee regionalism persisted, this new form of politics transcended the individual regions. All of the Cherokee regions internally divided into peace and war factions. Due to this, Cherokee politics underwent nationalization, as cooperation among the peace and war factions extended throughout the Cherokee nation, rather than intra-regionally. The year leading up to the siege illustrated how and why these changes came to the Cherokee nation.

Following a series of 1759 retaliatory raids on the colonial backcountry in response to the Forbes Campaign, some Cherokees still sought peace with South Carolina. Interestingly, individuals from both the Overhills and the Lower Towns still believed in peace, but they still maintained regional divides in their negotiations. In mid May, Tiftoe of Keowee, a prominent headman of the town, proclaimed “All these [Lower] Towns and the Middle Settlements are according to our Promise still, and have good Thoughts, as we desire to live in Friendship with the white People.” He continues, “As for the Mischief that has been done, it was alone the outside Town over the Hills, Setticoe.”⁶¹ It is highly unlikely that no Lower or Middle Town warriors participated in the raids of 1759. Two days before Tiftoe gave the talk of Keowee to Lyttelton, Wawhatchee gave the talk of the Lower Towns to the governor.⁶² He also placed blame on the Overhill town, Setticoe, and described their actions as drunken mischief, and hopes that they are now sober. Most tellingly, he admits that although “there are some Rogues among us, our Thoughts are good.”⁶³ The raids were retaliation for murdered Cherokee warriors returning from the Forbes Campaign and the Lower and Middle Towns suffered casualties. The

⁶¹ Tiftoe to Governor Glen, May 13, 1759, in *DRIA II*, 492.

⁶² According to Brent Yanusdi Cox’s Appendix VI, “Some Cherokees Mentioned in Historical Records Before 1775,” in *Heart of the Eagle*, Wawhatchee was a headman of three Lower towns, one of which was Keowee, 236.

⁶³ Cherokee Lower Towns to Governor Lyttelton, May 11, 1759, in *DRIA II*, 491-492, quote on 492.

fact that Cherokee blood law gave the “brother or nearest male relative,” not the opportunity, but the “responsibility for avenging the death,” dismisses the possibility that no Lower or Middle Town warriors participated.⁶⁴ There was a particularly notable raid committed by Setticoe warriors, but it was not the only raid.⁶⁵ Tiftoe used the sensation of that particular raid in an attempt to protect his region’s warriors and maintain peaceful relations with his region. However, the headmen’s attempts were futile because the accomodationists’ influence in the Lower Towns had declined significantly by September 1758.⁶⁶ By conflating all of the raids with a single Overhill raid, Tiftoe was able to maintain the façade of Lower and Middle Town innocence.

Here Tiftoe’s effort represents the earliest period of transitioning to ideological, rather than regional, factionalism dominating Cherokee politics. Keowee’s location in the Lower Towns that were more inclined to South Carolina than Virginia, probably slowed Tiftoe’s transition out of regional politics. Tiftoe was most likely lying in an attempt to protect his region, even those among the war faction whom supported retaliation for the Forbes Campaign fiasco. According to John Phillip Reid, retaliation to earlier offenses was the foremost cause of war for the Cherokee nation and its people.⁶⁷ Tiftoe’s attempt to conceal his region’s involvement showed that he feared South Carolina’s response to the war faction’s actions and that he was desperately trying to hold on to the regionalism of the previous decade. South Carolina’s threat of a trade embargo pacified the Lower Towns and the Little Carpenter’s diplomacy kept the

⁶⁴ Theda Perdue, *Cherokee Women: Gender and Culture Change, 1700–1835*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 49-50, quotes on 50.

⁶⁵ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 114.

⁶⁶ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 63.

⁶⁷ John Phillip Reid, *A Law of Blood: The Primitive Law of the Cherokee Nation*, (New York: New York University Press, 1970), 153, and all of “A Way to War,” 153-161.

Cherokee nation out of war for the time. Despite Tiftoe's and other Cherokees' attempts to maintain peace, Lyttelton was tired of the Cherokee's frontier misgivings.

Governor Lyttelton made the decision for South Carolina to go to war with the Cherokee nation. War with the Cherokees was a divisive issue in South Carolina, primarily because of a war's financial requirements. The war was justifiable, but some South Carolinians were unwilling to commit. Hatley examines the Governor's decision but does not draw a comparison to the Cherokee's wartime decision-making process. He writes, "As Lyttelton began to take matters into his own hands, his condescension became outright indifference to the sentiments of the Assembly," but "More and more, however, the popular climate seemed to offer Lyttelton encouragement."⁶⁸ Similarly to the Cherokee, South Carolina was not unanimously ready for war. The colonial legislature hesitated because of the huge costs associated with military expeditions. However, Lyttelton received "encouragement," from backcountry South Carolinians who were the targets of some of the Cherokee raids. The cost for survival was not too expensive for those threatened. Many men along South Carolina's frontier eventually joined the militias raised to advance on the Cherokee.⁶⁹ This is an expression of the politics of place in South Carolina. Lyttelton was able to use the legitimate calls for war from the backcountry to his own end, despite the eastern-based provincial Council's hesitations to support the expensive endeavor, the desperate backcountry settlers rose to the occasion. As South Carolina prepared for war and Lyttelton's seizure of control set the stage for his greatest folly, the Cherokee made another attempt at peace.

⁶⁸ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 113.

⁶⁹ George Lloyd Johnson, Jr., *The Frontier in the Colonial South: South Carolina Backcountry, 1736–1800*, (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997), 51.

Two weeks after Lyttelton chose war, a Cherokee delegation arrived in Charleston to apologize for their hostile actions. The Governor arrested three of the Cherokee headmen and then decided that “a show of force would bring the Cherokees to their senses, he carried his hostages up-country to Fort Prince George at the head of thirteen hundred provincial soldiers.”⁷⁰ Due to Lyttelton taking control of the situation away from the colonial legislature, he was able to unilaterally make South Carolina’s diplomatic decisions towards the Cherokee. He also naïvely anticipated the return of normal relations upon his arrival and “brought a great gift, including three tons of gunpowder,” to distribute once the Cherokee turned in those responsible for the violence.⁷¹ Lyttelton imprisoned the Cherokee delegation in Fort Prince George and demanded that the Cherokee surrender a murderer for the release of each of his captives. Lyttelton only apprehended two Cherokees before returning to Charleston and ordered the fort’s commander to continue holding the prisoners and only distribute the gifts after he received the murderers.

As the Governor held the Cherokee hostages at Fort Prince George, Keowee and the Lower Towns became the epicenter of Anglo-Cherokee relations. Major Cherokee headmen from every region came to Keowee to speak with the English at Fort Prince George during this moment of crisis. The Cherokee’s primary concerns were to free their prisoners and the return of trade, particularly ammunition.

Second, this period also witnesses the Cherokee’s growth towards political unanimity on the issue of war with the colonies. The peace faction’s mishandling of major diplomatic issues clears the way for the war faction’s rise to political dominance. During Lyttelton’s political spectacle, the accommodationists’ repeated failures opened the door for the rise of the war faction.

⁷⁰ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 114; quote, Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 460.

⁷¹ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 460.

Some prominent accommodationist Cherokee headmen agreed to cooperate with Lyttelton and they suffered for it politically. The headmen had no moves to make. Since the Cherokees who retaliated acted within their socially proscribed norms of violence, they would have to give their selves up voluntarily. Even with the accommodationist headmen's support, Lyttelton was unable to settle the situation. The peace leaning headmen's influence over Cherokee affairs diminished because they did not resolve the crisis and the Cherokees remained without ammunition for hunting and protection.

Before the siege, Cherokees attempted to free their prisoners diplomatically. On February 14, 1760, the Little Carpenter, Aganstata, and the Little Raven, Overhill headmen from Chota, attempted again. The commander, Alexander Miln "gave the same Anser... as [he] did to all the others who came on the same Errand..., that I [was] here under the Governor, and could not act contrary to my orders."⁷² The commander refused to give up to hostages without apprehending the criminals. The innocent headmen would remain in custody as prisoners until the Cherokees quenched Lyttelton's thirst for justice. This was the Cherokees final attempt at a peaceful resolution.

With the accommodationist Cherokee's options exhausted, the nativist faction rose to the diplomatic forefront. Two days later, the Cherokee attempted to free the prisoners by force. At this moment, the nativist war faction becomes the politically dominant Cherokee faction. On February 16, two Keowee women approached the fort and a Mr. Ducharty met them near the river. Aganstata, from the Overhill town Chota, arrived at this moment and requested Lieutenant Coytmore's presence, upon which Coytmore joined the impromptu meeting. Aganstata gave a signal and he and the two women fled as Cherokees concealed on the banks of the river fired on

⁷² Alexr. Miln to Governor Lyttelton, February 24, 1760, in *DRIA II*, 497-501, quote on 498.

Coytmore and Ducharty, fatally wounding the lieutenant.⁷³ The Cherokee then began firing on the fort as the hostages attacked the garrison with concealed knives and tomahawks from within.⁷⁴ The hostages' ill-fated actions led to their massacre. In terms of regionalism, the attack in the Lower Towns is important but it is not the only significant aspect.

The massacre of the captive headmen sealed the fate of the Cherokee nation. War was now the only option. Earlier, Cherokees from Keowee like Tiftoe and Wawhatchee attempted to maintain the diplomatic benefits of their political regionalism. The inability to free the captives was an embarrassment for the peace faction and the massacre dissolved any legitimacy still associated with the accommodationists. The politics of the Cherokee nation was in a transitional phase from regional factions to ideological factions.

Finally, the siege at Fort Prince George illustrated the totality of the war faction's homogenization of the Cherokee nation. Keowee's active role in the engagement reflected the success of the war faction's political ascendancy. Into 1759, the Lower Towns were the most devoutly loyal region towards the English. The beginning of hostilities in 1758, melted this strong relationship quickly and the Lower Cherokee eventually re-take the spotlight in Anglo-Cherokee politics away from the Overhills, if only for a relatively brief period. The massacre at Fort Prince George destroyed any possibility for South Carolina to maintain diplomatic relations with accommodationist Cherokees. The fort's proximity to the Lower Towns had buttressed their loyalty for nearly six years. The fort was previously a high point of the Cherokee-South Carolina relationship, but the massacre within its walls propelled the Lower Towns towards the nativist faction. The hostilities stemming from the Forbes Campaign and the failure of the

⁷³ Alexr. Miln to Governor Lyttelton, February 24, 1760, in *DRIA II*, 497-501, particularly 499.

⁷⁴ Alexr. Miln to Governor Lyttelton, February 24, 1760, in *DRIA II*, 497-501, particularly 499-500.

accommodationists to reconcile better trade terms with the English pushed the whole of the Cherokee nation towards war, but it took the massacre to lead the most ardent accommodationists to war. The war faction's takeover of the Cherokee nation was complete as the once devoutly loyal Lower Towns guided the nation into the conflict.

The siege of Fort Prince George was the major engagement of the war and its location in the Lower Towns was significant. First, it showed that the Lower Towns found the English irreconcilable. The English failure to accept any peace overtures ruined any chance of accommodationist ideology guiding Cherokee politics. The regional politics of the Cherokee nation during the previous decade receded as the war faction began uniting the nation against the English. Second, the leadership of Aganstata, an Overhill headman, exemplified the homogenization of the Cherokee regions. The initial decision to free the prisoners by whatever means necessary originated with Lower, Middle, Out, and Valley warriors, and Overhill warriors quickly joined the others.⁷⁵ The participation of warriors from every Cherokee region, and Aganstata's leading role in opening the siege, reflected the nationalization of Cherokee politics. The participation of Lower Town Cherokees also illustrated the advances the war faction made in the region, as well as the frustration of the accommodationists' repeated failures.⁷⁶

Once the siege of Fort Prince George began, Cherokee warriors also started raiding English settlements. The Cherokee raiding parties killed or captured over one hundred Anglo-Americans.⁷⁷ The violence prompted a dramatic response from South Carolina. Colonel Archibald Montgomery, thirteen hundred regulars, and other auxiliary forces entered the Lower

⁷⁵ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 92.

⁷⁶ This is an example of a major change coming from the single social margin of the frontier described by Hatley, see Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, specifically, 105-129.

⁷⁷ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 461.

Towns in June 1760, and proceeded to burn five towns, including Keowee.⁷⁸ The surviving Lower Cherokees fled to the adjacent Middle region. The Cherokee repelled Montgomery's advance into the Middle Towns. In 1761, James Grant replaced Montgomery and invaded the Middle Towns again. This time, the Cherokee defense "exhausted most of their ammunition," and then "the warriors could only pick off unwary sentries and watch helplessly from the woods" as Grant razed the Middle Towns.⁷⁹ That autumn the Cherokee sued for peace as the Anglo-Cherokee War devastated their population and destroyed the Lower and Middle Towns.⁸⁰

The Anglo-Cherokee War tightly bound the Cherokee regions together. Initially, the nation divided over the issue of war, but the massacre at Fort Prince George quelled the influence of the peace faction. Across regional lines, the war significantly homogenized Cherokee attitudes towards their former allies. The English colonies experienced this same homogenization at the beginning of the Seven Years' War. South Carolina was initially disturbed by Cherokee preludes with Virginia, however, the war brought South Carolina and Virginia together against the French. Cherokee explorations of Virginian trade became less troublesome for South Carolina in the shadow of a common enemy.

⁷⁸ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 461; Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 130, the other towns were Estatoe, Toxaway, Qualatchee, and Conasatche.

⁷⁹ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 466.

⁸⁰ The total war tactics of Grant and Montgomery were a reflection of Euro-American's interactions with Native Americans. John Grenier states that "the British Army came to terms with Americans' first way of war in the Seven Years' War and the Indian Wars of the early 1760s," see John Grenier, *The First Way of War: American War Making on the Frontier*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), quote on 117; Grant and Montgomery's tactics also reflect Wayne Lee's findings that Euro-Americans found certain warfare more suitable for certain opponents, see Wayne E. Lee, *Crowds and Soldiers in Revolutionary North Carolina: The culture of Violence in Riot and War*, (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001), 117-129, 99, 199.

The Cherokee's situation during the Anglo-Cherokee War was particularly effective on their inter-regional unification because the war put the Cherokee nation on a diplomatic island. War with South Carolina ended the Cherokee's longest lasting Euro-American trade relationship. To support the war effort the Cherokee needed access to goods. The Creek and other Indians of the Ohio Country were unwilling to aid the Cherokee and the French at Fort Toulouse had no goods to spare.⁸¹ The Cherokee's inaccessibility to alternative trade sources explains the success of the war faction's homogenization of the nation.

By 1762, the end of the Seven Years' War was within sight. With the Treaty of Paris of 1763, France ceded all North American possessions to England, which eliminated one of the only bargaining chips the Cherokee held. As England became the only European power with the ability to supply the Cherokee nation, peace was more suitable than war. The 1762, "Act to Regulate the Cherokee Trade," was beneficial for Keowee because it stated "that Fort Prince George at Keowee, shall be and is hereby appointed the only Place, from whence to carry on the Cherokee Indian Trade."⁸²

For the Lower Cherokee town of Keowee, the long decade between 1751 and 1762 was tumultuous. The regional factionalism of the Cherokee nation's politics entrenched the town. Throughout most of the 1750s, regional factionalism dominated Cherokee politics. The influence of regionalism was far reaching. It affected Cherokee relations with the Creek, colonial trade relations, and determined the location of English forts. Keowee and the Lower Towns used their regional identities to maximize potential benefits and minimize negative outcomes. As ideological factions came to dominate the Cherokee nation's politics, subordinated regionalism

⁸¹ Anderson, *Crucible of War*, 462.

⁸² "Act to Regulate the Cherokee Trade," in *DRIA II*, 557-563, quote on 557.

persisted. The Cherokee nation did not unify politically in this era. During the Anglo-Cherokee War, the war faction's national influence briefly appears to unite the Cherokee nation. The war faction's unification was national, but not absolute. Some Cherokees maintained their accommodationist approach through the conflict. The factionalism of this era was present in the Cherokee-South Carolina diplomatic relationship. This resulted in an era of Anglo-Cherokee volatility because the complex nature of Cherokee factionalism required South Carolina to engage with each faction diplomatically. Additionally, factionalism within South Carolina, while less influential, also contributed to the unstable relationship. The Cherokee nation's decentralized diplomatic relations with Anglo-Americans in the mid-eighteenth century was notably more so than current understandings admit. Using Keowee as a lens for Cherokee diplomacy, reveals regionalism's significance and adds a further layer of complexity to Anglo-Cherokee relations in the mid-eighteenth century.

THE CHEROKEE CAPITAL CITY:
REGIONALISM IN CHOTA DURING PEACE AND WAR

The Cherokee political system of the mid-eighteenth century did not have a rigidly defined political leader or capital. Their decentralized system did not prevent South Carolina, and more broadly, the English, from establishing what amounted to a political leader. In the mid-eighteenth century, South Carolina viewed Old Hop of Chota as the Cherokee “Emperor.”¹ Old Hop undeniably held significant influence on the Overhill Cherokees and the greater Cherokee nation; however, his influence was not in line with the Euro-American conceptions of political power. Due to his close relationship with South Carolina and his political influence, Old Hop was regarded as the leader of the Cherokee nation.² Even though Anglo-Americans viewed Old Hop and Chota as the Cherokee emperor and capital, their diplomacy was not as simple as the meeting of two dignitaries. They both used the politics of place as a diplomatic tool during that era.

Throughout the 1750s and 1760s, Chota and the Cherokee Overhill region used their regionalism diplomatically. Similarly to Keowee during the same period, Chota asserted Cherokee regionalism. The Overhill Cherokee used their regional autonomy to engage in diplomacy when it was regionally, and sometimes nationally, advantageous or necessary. In the 1750s, the geographic barrier of the Appalachian Mountains offered Chota and the Overhill

¹ Samuel Cole Williams, LL.D., ed., *Lieut. Henry Timberlake's Memoirs, 1756–1765: With Annotation, Introduction and Index*, 1927, reprint, (Marietta, GA: Continental Book Company, 1948), 39, n. 20.

² The distinction between influence and power is greatly significant here. Power, implies the ability to use force while influence is merely the ability to persuade from a position of respect and not necessarily authority.

Cherokee greater geopolitical autonomy from South Carolina than other Cherokee regions. The town's distance from South Carolina meant it had easier access to other Anglo and Euro-Americans. This diplomatic freedom allowed Chota to develop into the Cherokee's cosmopolitan capital city.³

However, during this period, Cherokee diplomacy underwent changes. The Anglo-Cherokee War's inter-regional cooperation seen in Keowee also occurred in Chota. Due to the war, the regional specificity of Cherokee diplomacy nationalized as all Cherokee regions split into accommodationist and nativist factions. Throughout the era of inter-regional homogenization, Chota maintained its regional identity as its diplomatic importance receded. Before the outbreak of war, Chota's regional identity contributed to the instability that eventually led to the conflict. Outside the tight diplomatic clutch of South Carolina, Chota frequently received French, Virginian, and various Indian visitors.

Overhill regionalism contributed to the Cherokee's participation in the conflicts of the era, which in turn also influenced Cherokee regionalism nationally. The same decline in regionalism's prominence seen in Keowee also occurred in Chota. Throughout the eighteenth century, kinship's influence on decision-making regarding war diminished. Theda Perdue asserts that by mid-century, the "intensity, scale, and duration of warfare increased dramatically" and that when the Cherokee fought for the English "they expanded the scale of warfare far beyond what had been customary."⁴ Perdue's examination of Cherokee warfare wisely observes its growth during the era, its effect on gender roles, and its effect on kinship as an internal political

³ The term capital city is applied loosely here. Chota was not a capital city in the Euro-American sense, but was the most influential Cherokee city as well as a major diplomatic center.

⁴ Theda Perdue, *Cherokee Women: Gender and Culture Change, 1700–1835*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 87, 89.

system.⁵ Her failure to recognize the strength of Cherokee's regional identities consequently misses one of Cherokee warfare's biggest developments during the 1750s and 1760s. During this period, Cherokee warfare became national. Previously, small bands of individuals or regions engaged in war, but the French and Indian War and Anglo-Cherokee War forced war to become a national initiative. The declining influence of the Cherokee's regional identity in both Keowee and Chota reflects this change. As contemporaries still considered Chota a Cherokee capital, its influence on national affairs significantly increased during this period.

Chota did not always have the English distinction as the Cherokee capital. Intermittent habitation of the area began as late as 3,000 years ago, but Chota was not founded until the 1730s.⁶ Originally, Chota might have been a hamlet of the town of Tanasi. The power and importance of Chota grew rapidly over the next two decades. By 1750, the town surpassed Great Tellico as the most powerful Cherokee town in large part to the triumvirate of Old Hop, Little Carpenter, and the Great Warrior.⁷ Chota's three powerful leaders were the Cherokee nation's most important diplomats of the era, and by 1756, they secured the construction of an Overhill fort from South Carolina.

In 1757, South Carolina built Fort Loudon along the Tennessee River near Chota. The fort played a major role in the Overhill Cherokee's relationship with South Carolina. Its promise, construction, and presence were prevalent topics in the era's diplomatic negotiations and correspondence. For the English, it helped diminish the threat of a Cherokee-French alliance. As a nexus of trade goods and correspondence, it helped prevent the Overhills from seeking

⁵ See Chapter Four, "War," in Perdue, *Cherokee Women*, 86-108.

⁶ Colin G. Calloway, *The American Revolution in Indian Country: Crisis and Diversity in Native American Communities*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 185.

⁷ Calloway, *The American Revolution in Indian Country*, 185-6.

alternative trade sources. The fort's remote location was also a liability for the English and it was the site of a major battle during the Anglo-Cherokee War in 1760. Ironically, the nearest Overhill town, Chota, was known as a refuge of peace.

Another major component of Chota's importance was its designation as a town of peace. Not only was Chota the Overhill beloved town, it was the Cherokee nation's only town of refuge.⁸ Chota's diplomatic importance magnified the significance of the town's status as a white city of peace. Foreign emissaries that came to Chota spoke their messages freely. If Cherokee headmen, or the English, disagreed with or disapproved of emissaries' messages, they could not silence their talks.⁹ Non-Cherokee Indians who had raided English-allied Indians would not be extradited to the English in Chota. Allowing foreigners a platform or refuge in Chota, and lesser Overhill towns, was a significant issue in the 1750s for the Cherokee and English.

Chota's intramontane location was one of the town's most vital assets. Between 1750 and 1760, the town's remote location offered opportunities, which also contributed to the instability of Anglo-Cherokee relations during this period. Chota's white-city status brought many foreigners with diplomatic talks into the town.¹⁰ The headmen of Chota also often sent Cherokee diplomats to foreign peoples because of their diplomatic distinction. The Overhills' frequent contact with other Indian peoples, Virginia, and French emissaries was troublesome for South Carolina, the Cherokee's primary trading partner.

⁸ Calloway, *The American Revolution in Indian Country*, 186.

⁹ Calloway, *The American Revolution in Indian Country*, 187.

¹⁰ Calloway explains that the Prince of Chota stated "he sat 'on a white Seat under a White Canopy,' to hear good talks." White was understood as a symbol of peace also reflected in white wampum also representing peace, while black wampum represented war, *The American Revolution in Indian Country*, 187.

South Carolina's lengthy and considerable involvement with the Cherokee was vitally important for both the colony and English interests in the 1750s. French incursions from the North and West were a substantial threat to English interests in North America. With an Anglo-Cherokee alliance, the Cherokee nation provided a necessary buffer zone between the opposing imperial powers. South Carolina did not solely focus on the Overhill region, but the political influence of Chota's headmen and their willingness to accept foreigners in their town made the region's loyalty crucial to maintaining the nation's allegiance. In the late 1750s, Chota is a second example of the declining strength of Cherokee regionalism under growing political tensions with the English. Chota's regional identity fundamentally influenced the tensions between the Cherokee nation and South Carolina but faded behind a more nationalized outlook.

The Cosmopolitan Capital and the Trouble with Tellico

Leading up to the Anglo-Cherokee War, Indian, Virginian, and French visitors to Chota brought unique demonstrations of regionalism that challenged the strength and stability of the Cherokee-South Carolina alliance. Native American visitors were often in the French interest or hostile towards England's Indian allies. Their presence was an issue throughout the decade. Virginians among the Overhills was an issue for South Carolina's monopoly on the Cherokee trade. Overhill headmen were able to use this lack of colonial unity to their advantage. Chota's acceptance of foreign emissaries created a cosmopolitan identity for the town and region. Within Chota, it was common for visitors from multiple nationalities to be visiting the town. The geographic location of Chota made this possible and the extent to which emissaries from other nationalities visited the nation was unparalleled by any other Cherokee town. Foreigners' presence in Chota contributed to the town's regional identity as a cosmopolitan capital city. The

headmen also faced challenges to their influence in the Cherokee nation because of their negotiations with the English. The presence of French emissaries was the greatest threat to the Anglo-Cherokee alliance of the era and deeply concerned South Carolina. Chota headmen maintained their alliances with the English but other Overhill towns challenged Chota's influence in an intra-regional struggle. The Overhill region's location made the foreign emissaries visits possible. The Cherokee and Anglo-American responses to their presence elicited expressions of political regionalism that intensified Anglo-Cherokee tensions.

First, Indians from surrounding tribes frequently brought bad talks, distrust, and occasionally war. To understand and resolve these issues, Chota's headmen used political regionalism. Eighteenth century Cherokees and Euro-Americans commonly labeled Indian visitors to Chota and the greater Cherokee nation as "Norward Indians."¹¹ Generally, the documents do not distinguish the tribal association of Norward Indians. The term applied to many different tribes, typically allied with the French, including the Savannah or Shawnee, the Nottoway, the Cayuga, and the Iroquois Confederacy or Six Nations. Occasionally, the documents make distinctions, however, at times they are contradictory. Other visitors to Chota and the Cherokee nation included the Catawba and Creek Indians. Since Chota offered the protection of diplomatic immunity, it was the primary destination for indigenous non-Cherokee visitors.

¹¹ The term "Norward Indians" is used extensively in the documentary record of the era. In William L. McDowell, Jr., ed., *Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, May 21, 1750–August 7, 1754*, (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970), 179-181, and 488, hereafter cited as *DRIA I*. In William L. McDowell, Jr., ed., *Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indians Affairs, 1754–1765*, 1970, reprint, (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives & History, 1992), 15-6, 43, 203, 347-8, 382, and 414, hereafter cited as *DRIA II*. Neither list of the term's appearance is exhaustive.

In the first half of the decade, Chota's open door tradition became an international concern. As early as February 1753, Governor Glen of South Carolina had designs for a peace settlement between the Cherokee and their traditional enemy the Creek.¹² Governor Glen convened a council concerning the colony's Indian affairs that lasted from May 28 to August 23, 1753. While in council with headmen from Chota and other Cherokee towns, Glen told the headmen "that the cheif Thing for which I sent for you was to conclude a Peace with the Creeks," and that topic dominated the day's session.¹³ Chota approval of an established peace was paramount for South Carolina's goal. During the council's negotiations and correspondence with Old Hop in Chota, the Overhill Cherokees practiced a form of regional diplomacy.¹⁴

The Overhill Cherokee brought their regional perspective to the negotiations. Their neighbors, the Savannah, or Shawnee Indians, were at odds with South Carolina since the colony was holding some Shawnee prisoners. Throughout the Overhill Cherokee's negotiations with South Carolina, Overhill headmen repeatedly broached the issue of the Shawnee prisoners. A Cherokee peace with the Creek was not disconcerting to the Shawnee. However, the Overhills understood that working with South Carolina while they held Shawnee prisoners would appear to the Shawnee as collusion between the Overhills and their tribesmen's captors. An association with South Carolina was a detriment to the Overhills' otherwise friendly relations with the neighboring Shawnee. Cooperation with South Carolina would be especially injurious to their relationship with the Shawnee because the English were reportedly holding the prisoners in

¹² Ludwick Grant to Governor Glen, February 8, 1753, in *DRIA II*, 367.

¹³ Thursday, A.M., the 5th Day of July, 1753, in *DRIA I*, quote on 436, 436-446.

¹⁴ Councils are a major component of Richard White's middle ground and it is for the Cherokee-South Carolina middle ground. Here the council is developing new Cherokee norms of a uniform peace with the Creeks, instead of the traditional regional peace agreements; see Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*, 2nd ed., (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), .

Chota.¹⁵ This unique regional component steered the Overhill Cherokee's negotiations of a Creek peace with South Carolina.

Overhill regional diplomacy during the 1753 council took two forms. The first appears as Old Hop and other Overhill headmen showing a general disregard for the issue of peace with the Creek. Old Hop told an Overhill delegation before setting out for the council "to make Haste down with our People, to [Governor Glen], and to attend to what [Glen] should say about Matters of white People and our Trade, but to give no Answer as to Peace with the Creeks, but to leave that Matter to," him.¹⁶ Old Hop's desire slowed the diplomatic process and so did his representatives in Charleston. The delegation avoided discussion of the issue in council. Since the peace was Glen's primary concern, he was forced to reiterate to the Cherokee that in regard to the peace, "There are other Things proper to be mentioned, but as you have not fully answered that Point, if you have any Thing else to say I am ready to hear you."¹⁷ The Overhill Cherokee might not have actually been concerned with a Creek peace because traditionally, their approval was unnecessary. The English requirements for peace required the approval of the Cherokee nation and not just the involved region.¹⁸

Old Hop's diplomatic faculties suggest the aforementioned form of regional diplomacy was not the primary motivation for his hesitancy. He was most likely deliberately feigning the first form to protect the Overhill towns from potential backlash from the neighboring Savannah Indians. During the 1753 council in Charleston, South Carolina was holding two Savannah prisoners for the murder of a white man in their country. The Creek Indian, King Tom, in Chota,

¹⁵ 3rd Day of July, 1753, in *DRIA I*, 432-433.

¹⁶ Wednesday, A.M., the 4th Day of July, 1753 in *DRIA I*, 433-436, quote on 435.

¹⁷ Thursday, A.M., the 5th Day of July, 1753, in *DRIA I*, 436-446, quote on 436.

¹⁸ Primarily the Lower Towns.

reportedly saw the prisoners in Chota.¹⁹ If the reports were true, the Chota headmen would have been familiar with their presence and probably their intentions. Without the release of the prisoners, the Savannah might attack Overhill settlements as the closest English allies, or cause diplomatic issues by traveling through the Cherokee nation to attack English settlements or their other allies. Due to this awareness, the Overhill Cherokee repeatedly broached this issue while in council with Governor Glen. On July 3, a planter named Morgan Sabb aspired to give his account of the Savannah prisoners to the governor. During Sabb's council, Glen called for Little Carpenter's presence. Upon his arrival, Little Carpenter told Glen that the Savannah Indians were in the French interest. Additionally, if the governor would not execute the prisoners, his delegation would "carry them back to their own Country, and acquaint the Head Men of their Town how Matters are," and that the Cherokee would "take care that they shall no more come into your Settlements."²⁰ Two days later, an Overhill Cherokee named Long Jack initiated further discussion on the Savannah prisoners. Glen told Long Jack and Little Carpenter that the prisoners were caught trying to capture their own prisoners in South Carolinian settlements. Despite this knowledge, Long Jack and Little Carpenter continued to speak of the Savannah's friendly intentions towards the Overhills and even threatened to cease the pursuit of a peace with the Creek.²¹ By the spring of 1754, the Cherokee and Creek were at peace, but Old Hop's designs had only momentarily prevented his fears.

The Overhill Cherokee were warring with the French-backed Savannah Indians shortly after their failure to secure the release of the prisoners. By July of 1754, South Carolinians labeled the conflict with French Indians a general war and stated that the enemy infested the

¹⁹3rd Day of July, 1753, in *DRIA I*, 432-433.

²⁰ 3rd Day of July, 1753, in *DRIA I*, 431-433, quotes on 433.

²¹ Thursday, A.M. the 5th Day of July, 1757, in *DRIA I*, 436- 446, particularly 442-446.

region, and even mentioned a rumor that the Chickasaw were going to resettle among the Overhill Cherokee because of the war.²² Therefore, the war opened up the possibility of hostile Indians as well as refugees moving into the Overhill region. This situation is exactly what Old Hop was trying to avoid. The norward Savannah visited Chota peacefully before the prisoner quagmire as French representatives. South Carolina's handling of the situation brought the French Indians upon the Cherokee and Old Hop understood this. Old Hop wrote to Governor Glen on behalf of all of the Overhill towns in September of 1754. The message pleads for shipments of desperately needed ammunition to fight the French-allied Savannahs. Old Hop also explicitly places the blame for these hostilities on South Carolina's unwillingness to release the Savannah prisoners from the previous year.²³

Old Hop clearly understood the geopolitical circumstances surrounding South Carolina's 1753 council on Indian affairs. Despite the Savannah's previously friendly talks and the potential backlash for the Overhills' failure to secure the colony's release of the prisoners, Old Hop still did not turn to the French against the English. Rather, his decisions resulted in the French Indians' attacks on the Overhills and other English allies. The French offers were either too unreliable or insufficient to convert Old Hop, or the English promises too great to risk losing. Regardless of which was the greater influence on Old Hop, he was acting in the best interests of the Overhills. He was attempting to prevent war with the norward Savannah. This was primarily an Overhill concern because of the region's proximity to the hostile Indians. The growing war with the French Indians brought Virginia into Chota's purview.

²² Ludovic Grant to Governor Glen, July 22, 1754, in *DRIA II*, 15-20, particularly, 16-18.

²³ Cherokee Head Men to Governor Glen, September 21, 1754, in *DRIA II*, 7-8, particularly 8.

Second, the war's demand for ammunition led the Cherokee to consider an alternative source of trade with Virginia. The budding Cherokee-Virginia relationship threatened South Carolina's monopolistic trading alliance and brought diplomatic confusion to the Anglo-Cherokee relationship. The political discord between South Carolina, Virginia, and their respective governors created a chaotic situation. The Overhill Cherokee used political regionalism to maximize their gains and their negotiations now had continental consequences. The conflict with the French Indians stressed the Overhill Cherokee's limited supplies of ammunition and had a significant human cost. The Cherokee had previously sent overtures to the Virginians in search of trade in 1751. This earlier attempt faced strong opposition in Charleston.²⁴ Glen's actions to prevent Virginian usurpation of Cherokee trade illustrated the substantial impact that regionalism had on Glen's Cherokee diplomacy. The Overhills' diplomacy with Virginia further exposes regionalism's ability to foster instability between the Cherokee and South Carolina.

The French and Indian War, starting in early 1754, quickly superseded the Overhill Cherokee conflict with the norward French Indians. The imperial necessity of maintaining the Cherokee buffer zone against France and its Indian allies prompted Governor Dinwiddie of Virginia to send trade overtures to Old Hop in Chota.²⁵ The efforts of the Governors of Virginia

²⁴ The 1730 treaty signed by Cherokee representatives and King George in London that Little Carpenter frequently cites to justify soliciting Virginia is ambiguous on the matter of trade with South Carolina versus other English colonies. The King states that he has ordered the English in Carolina to trade with them, but later states that "the Cherokees shall not suffer their People to trade with the White Men of any other Nation but the English." "Excerpt from the Articles of Friendship & Commerce, prepared by the Lord Commissioners for Trade and Plantations to the Deputies of the Cherokee Nation in South Carolina by His Majesty's Order, on Monday the 7th Day of September 1730," in *Cherokee Voices: Early Accounts of Cherokee Life in the East*, 7-11, edited by Vicki Rozema, (Winston-Salem, NC: John F. Blair, Publisher, 2002), 8, quote on 9.

²⁵ Ludovic Grant to Governor Glen, July 22, 1754, in *DRIA II*, 15-20, particularly, 15.

and South Carolina left Old Hop dissatisfied. Dinwiddie's letter brought talks of trade but it did not deliver any immediately needed ammunition. Disillusioned by Glen's failures, Old Hop informed the governor, "That he would not write for Ammunition again, because he had been disappointed before."²⁶ Glen realized the two plausible outcomes—the Cherokees ally with France or Virginia supplants South Carolina in the Cherokee trade—did not reflect the desired success of his Indian diplomacy. Governor Glen chose a third option. He agreed to meet a large Cherokee delegation led by Old Hop half way between their respective cities, Charleston and Chota, at Saluda Old Town.

The Saluda Conference of 1755 was important because Governor Glen's regional diplomacy results in Chota's apparent capriciousness in the following years. During the negotiations at Saluda, Glen promised the Cherokee with an Overhill fort and trade goods, while seeking total English sovereignty over the Cherokee.²⁷ The Saluda Conference failed to achieve its goals. The negotiations withheld Cherokee support of Virginian military expeditions against the French which further pit the English against the French and increased tensions between Virginia and South Carolina. For historian Michael P. Morris, the Cherokee's actions exemplify his understanding that "Intercolonial and international rivalries... empowered various tribes to make their own trade demands."²⁸ This diplomatic strength, however, also turned into a major source of confusion.

²⁶ Ludovic Grant to Governor Glen, July 22, 1754, in *DRIA II*, 15-20, particularly, 15, quote on 19.

²⁷ Daniel J. Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis: Cherokees, Colonists, and Slaves in the American Southeast, 1756-1763*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 28; John Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 2001), 14.

²⁸ Michael P. Morris, *The Brining of Wonder: Trade and the Indians of the Southeast, 1700-1783*, (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 9.

Examinations of the conference recognize its importance to Anglo-Cherokee relations but fail to fully acknowledge the role of regionalism.²⁹ The Cherokee and English use of regional politics fundamentally influenced the outcome of the conference, whose ramifications persisted through the decade. John Oliphant's *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier* offers the most thorough examination.³⁰ However, Oliphant does not view the regionally induced political factionalism among the Cherokee and South Carolinians as the key to understanding their relationship. Oliphant primarily examines the treaty's effects on the Cherokee-South Carolina relationship. Examining regionalism's influence on the treaty's creation helps explain why the Cherokee and South Carolina agreed to such lofty and unattainable terms at the conference, whereas, for Oliphant, they sign the treaty and he explains its failures between 1755 and 1758. His thorough examination of the treaty's fallout makes the initial pact seem incomprehensible, but the lens of regionalism explains why both parties made such a troublesome treaty.

The conference between Governor Glen and Old Hop produced the Treaty of Saluda on July 2, 1755. One of Glen's greatest concerns was the Cherokee acknowledgement of British sovereignty while the Chota triumvirate's primary concerns were trade and the construction of an Overhill fort.³¹ The treaty meant to give both parties exactly what they wanted. Historians have overwhelmingly focused on this aspect of the conference. They examine the mystery of treaty's actual terms, Glen's misrepresentation of the treaty, and its failure to settle other issues between

²⁹ Tom Hatley, *The Dividing Paths: Cherokees and South Carolinians Through the Era of Revolution*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 75-83; W. Stitt Robinson, *James Glen: From Scottish Provost to Royal Governor of South Carolina*, (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996), 100-104.

³⁰ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 13-23.

³¹ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 14.

the Cherokee and South Carolina.³² Despite the actual agreements made in the treaty, its lofty endeavors went unfulfilled. Other imperial officials and the South Carolina Commons House of Assembly still widely recognized the Cherokee nation as independent and trade disputes remained commonplace.³³ The treaty's failure to accomplish South Carolina's and the Cherokee's primary goals reveals the importance of regionalism in Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy.

The fear of Virginian encroachment on the Cherokee trade was the principal influence on Glen during the Saluda Conference. Historians view the decision to meet at Saluda primarily as a Cherokee assertion of sovereignty by insisting on equal terms for the diplomatic negotiations.³⁴ Governor Glen was not particularly averse to traveling for Cherokee diplomacy when necessary, having supervised Fort Prince George's construction personally. The ease with which Glen acquiesced to the Cherokee desire to meet half way was a reflection of the strength of regionalism on Glen's politics. Rather than Glen's agreement to Saluda as an acceptance of the Cherokee sovereignty he hoped to dismantle, as some historians suggest, he was actually attempting to out maneuver Virginia diplomatically. Facing political failure, the choice was the governor's last chance effort to maintain the Cherokee-South Carolina alliance and his political honor, as well as Carolina's trading monopoly. The astute diplomat Old Hop realized South Carolina's desperation and opportunistically forewent a trip to Charleston for one to Saluda. He might also have been using the refusal to meet at Charleston to gauge Glen's response to better

³² Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 28; Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 14-20; Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 75-91. Robinson, *James Glen*, 100-103, Robinson does discuss the treaty's divisive reception among other colonial governors.

³³ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 14-15, and 18-20.

³⁴ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 75-76; Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 13-14; Robinson, *James Glen*, 100-101.

judge the truthfulness of the governor's talks. Glen's acceptance of meeting at Saluda was more accurately his attempt to thwart his rivals than his recognition of Cherokee sovereignty.³⁵

After the signing of the Treaty of Saluda in 1755, South Carolina, and its newly appointed Governor, William Henry Lyttelton, initially failed to deliver upon Glen's promises. Trading issues between the Cherokee and South Carolina remained unsolved. The new system aimed to reduce competition, but abusive traders, most significantly in Chota and Great Tellico, undermined the effort.³⁶ In regards to securing funding for Fort Loudon, Glen, and later Lyttelton, was destined for failure. Governor Glen was pivotal in convincing the Board of Trade and the Secretary of State for the Southern Department, Thomas Robinson, to appropriate funds for the fort. However, Robinson made Governor Dinwiddie of Virginia the "administrator of the fund, with instructions to cooperate with Glen in building *the* fort."³⁷ Due to Glen's failure to secure sufficient funding from the Crown's budget or the Assembly, South Carolina's construction of an Overhill fort stalled.

Dinwiddie in Virginia was nominally following the Crown's directives. Of the budgeted £10,000, Dinwiddie allocated £1,000 to Glen.³⁸ As Glen scrambled, Dinwiddie constructed a crude Virginian Overhill fort, completing the Crown's task of building *the* Cherokee fort in July 1756.³⁹ For the English Crown, distinguishing between which colony built *the* Overhill fort was irrelevant. However, for the Cherokee, Virginia's fort did not fulfill South Carolina's promise for

³⁵ Here, in the context of the middle ground, Glen is contributing to the middle ground by working with the Cherokee, see Richard White, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815*, 2nd ed., (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), xxii-xxvi.

³⁶ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 20.

³⁷ Robinson, *James Glen*, emphasis added, 103.

³⁸ Robinson, *James Glen*, 103.

³⁹ Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, July 28, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 149-150.

a fort. The Cherokee approached the situation in the context of the Treaty of Saluda and Glen's promise of a South Carolinian fort.

For the Chota triumvirate, obtaining a fort from South Carolina was an important issue. Since Glen formally promised a fort with the Saluda treaty, failing to obtain the fort would undermine the headmen's diplomatic influence in the Cherokee nation. The Overhill headmen used political regionalism to maximize their gains. Using their regional autonomy, Chota headmen pitted the colonial rivals against each other while also seeking the best possible outcome for their region. Dinwiddie's Overhill fort was a charade and only built to gain Cherokee military service. Virginia did not send troops to build the fort but common laborers because Dinwiddie had no intention to garrison the fortification.⁴⁰ By August, Captain Demere, the South Carolina officer charged with supervising and commanding the Overhill fort, was actively making progress towards fulfilling former-Governor Glen's promise. Major construction on the fort began in October and finished in December of 1756, while improvements continued well into 1757.⁴¹ Regardless of their condition, Old Hop's ability to get two colonial rivals to build forts in the region was a diplomatic success. By exacerbating the regional factionalism of the South Carolina-Virginia rivalry through South Carolina's fear that its rival was "building a Fort... with a View of ingrossing the Trade to themselves," Old Hop was able to buy Chota time

⁴⁰ Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, July 12, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 133-134; Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, July 10, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 132-133; Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, July 28, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 149-150.

⁴¹ Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, October 28, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 232-237; Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, January 12, 1757, in *DRIA II*, 311-313; Demere did not find the fort defensible until July of 1757, Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, July 30, 1757, in *DRIA II*, 391-396.

to explore all of its options.⁴² South Carolina's repeated shortcomings in executing their promises turned Chota's focus towards Virginia.

South Carolina learned of Virginia's design to leave their fort without a garrison and their failure to supply adequate munitions meant that they might be able to further stall in building their fort. To expedite the Carolinian endeavor, the Chota triumvirate began a campaign pressuring Governor Dinwiddie, even before the fort's completion, to supply a garrison of one hundred Virginian troops.⁴³ While the Cherokee actually did desire a Virginian garrison, they were also familiar with the colonial rivalry. The Cherokee were also aware of the potential benefits a garrisoned Virginian fort would bring in obtaining trade from that colony. At this moment though, Virginia was more concerned with protecting its backcountry than opening trading relations through a garrison in the Cherokee nation.

Virginia expected Cherokee assistance in the war against the French and their Indian allies, but the Cherokees remained too inadequately supplied to go to war. Throughout 1756, the Overhill Cherokees continuously requested more ammunition for the war effort, but Virginia was under the impression that South Carolina would supply it.⁴⁴ The confusion surrounding supplying the Cherokee nation with goods made French overtures to the Overhills more alluring.

Finally, the French presence in Chota brought further expressions of regionalism and the greatest threat to the stability of the Cherokee-South Carolina alliance. France carried the weight of an imperial crisis for English interests in the North American southeast. The factionalism of

⁴² Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, July 12, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 133-134, quote on 133.

⁴³ Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, July 12, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 133-134.

⁴⁴ Connecortee to Governor Glen, March 20, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 108-109; The Little Carpenter's Speech to Captain Raymond Demere, July 13, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 137-138; Old Hop to the Governor of Virginia, August, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 167-168; Major Lewis to Captain Demere, July 7, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 138-139.

the Cherokee's three party relationship with South Carolina and Virginia allowed France to increase their influence among the Overhills.

Chota was not a hotbed of French support, but the town's leaders welcomed the overtures. French representatives and Indian allies visited Chota in 1756 in hopes of stealing the Cherokee's allegiance from the English.⁴⁵ The Chota Triumvirate split on the French issue as the Little Carpenter was committed to building strong relations with Virginia. Meanwhile, Old Hop maintained correspondence with the French and found a Franco-alliance increasingly tempting.⁴⁶ Examining the impact of French visitors on the Overhill Cherokees reveals another level of factionalism that complicated the Cherokee-South Carolina relationship.

The French found their strongest support in the Overhill town of Great Tellico. The town had previously challenged Chota's role as the Cherokee capital and saw the French as their opportunity to reclaim that status. The English also pushed the town towards the French interest when Demere carried out an unprovoked raid on French-allied Shawnee emissaries visiting Tellico in June 1756.⁴⁷ The town continued to allow the French presence and began petitioning Chota to the French interest.

On December 8, 1756, Captain Demere, alarmed about Tellico visitors at Chota, wrote to Governor Lyttelton. Demere was worried about the gifts that the French offered the Cherokees and believed that the Cherokees would soon have to choose a side.⁴⁸ Earlier, Old Hop had told Demere that the enemies of the English were his and the Cherokee nation's enemies.⁴⁹ Tellico's

⁴⁵ Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, June 15, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 121-122; Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, July 10, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 132-133; Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, August 21, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 164-168.

⁴⁶ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 23.

⁴⁷ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 109.

⁴⁸ Captain Rayd. Demere to Governor Lyttelton, December 8, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 263-264.

⁴⁹ Captain Raymond Demere to Governor Lyttelton, October 16, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 224-226.

continued engagement with the French imbued Demere's later distrust. Chota and Old Hop's failure to make a clear decision on the French issue led to many rumors in the Cherokee nation. One was that the towns of Tellico and Chatuga were disbanding and settling with the French.⁵⁰ Another was that Old Hop was taking part in a plot to attack Fort Loudon.⁵¹ As early as January of 1757, Tellico began turning back towards the English, but the Tellico-French connection remained throughout the year.⁵² As the Cherokee nation drifted towards war with the English in 1758, the French presence in the Overhills again became an important issue for the region, the Cherokee nation, and Anglo-America.

Foreigners in Chota were a reflection of Cherokee regionalism. The town's intramontane location allowed Overhill Cherokee regionally specific opportunities and challenges. Native American visitors to Chota delayed peace with the Creek Indians. They also represented a unique threat to the security of the Overhill region. Virginians, as a second representative of the English Crown, brought confusion to the Anglo-Cherokee alliance. South Carolina and Virginia both sought the Cherokee as an ally against the French and their Indian allies, but competition between the two hampered clear diplomatic relations. Lastly, Chota's distance from Charleston allowed the town to look beyond South Carolina and Virginia for Euro-American allies. A French presence in Chota and other Overhill towns was common and exposed divisions within the region.

⁵⁰ The Old Warrior of Tomotley to Captain Rayd. Demere, November 9, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 244-245.

⁵¹ Intelligence from Indian Nancy to Captain Rayd. Demere, December 12, 1756, in *DRIA II*, 269.

⁵² Captain Rayd. Demere to Governor Lyttelton, January 15, 1757, in *DRIA II*, 314-316; Captain Rayd. Demere to Governor Lyttelton, June 10, 1757, in *DRIA II*, 381-383.

The Descent to War

Regionalism permeated the Overhill Cherokee and Chota's participation in France and England's imperial French and Indian War. Old Hop and the Overhills initially bought the Cherokee nation time. By playing South Carolina and Virginia against each other the Cherokee were able to avoid plunging into the conflict themselves. The Little Carpenter then commits the nation to an alliance with Virginia for the benefit of the Overhills. Overhill regionalism, however, also limited the region's participation in the Little Carpenter's commitment. Due to various issues with the Cherokee's participation in the Virginian campaigns of the late 1750s, the Anglo-Cherokee alliance falters. Once war breaks out between the Cherokee nation and South Carolina, Chota became the focus of the Cherokee's political shift from regional factionalism to ideological factionalism.

The issue of war divided the Cherokee people. Across the entire nation, the Cherokee split into pro-English accommodationist and pro-war nativist factions. Since this new division in Cherokee politics occurred in all of the nation's regions, it diminished the strength of regional divisions. The war caused a shift in Cherokee politics from regional factionalism towards national ideological issues. Due to the diplomatic importance of Chota's headmen, the town's shift to ideological factionalism was particularly important.

Old Hop and the other Chota headmen were able to exploit the South Carolina-Virginia rivalry in the mid-1750s. After the Saluda Conference, Cherokee diplomatic power coalesced around Old Hop and Chota.⁵³ Old Hop was using his diplomatic acumen to prevent the Cherokee nation from entering binding and burdensome alliances while exploring all possible alternatives. The Saluda Treaty weakly bound the Cherokees to South Carolina and in March 1756, the Little

⁵³ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 93.

Carpenter negotiated the Treaty of Broad River with Virginia. The agreement called for four hundred Cherokee warriors to assist Virginia in exchange for munitions, gifts, and an Overhill fort. The treaty was advantageous for the Little Carpenter and other Overhill Cherokees. For the Overhill leaders, Broad River assuaged South Carolina's diplomatic shortcomings resulting from the Treaty of Saluda. It was also an opportunity to break from South Carolina's trade monopoly.⁵⁴ The Overhill headmen failed to realize the regionally specific byproducts of the Saluda and Broad River Treaties.

The Cherokee nation supplied auxiliaries to Virginia's campaigns in 1757 and 1758, however, disproportionately few warriors came from the Overhill settlements. While Old Hop and Chota maintained a relationship with the French and their Indian allies, the Saluda and Broad River Treaties kept the Cherokee in the English interest. This meant that the intramontane Overhill towns were vulnerable to French-allied attacks from the Savannah and other northern Indians.⁵⁵ The previous section highlighted the Overhills' diplomatic advantage with regards to foreign emissaries, but the same accessibility brought the regionally specific challenge of French supported raids.

Between 1756 and 1758, France and their Indian allies ravaged the English backcountry in Virginia and the Cherokee Overhill region. The French threat necessitated that Overhill warriors remained at home for protection. Due to this, the Lower Towns primarily supplied the Cherokee auxiliary warriors for Virginia in 1757.⁵⁶ For the backcountry settlers of Virginia, the sight of traveling Cherokee warriors in full military regalia was unsettling. Since 1754, the

⁵⁴ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 21.

⁵⁵ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 22-3.

⁵⁶ Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 146; John Richard Alden, *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier: A Study of Indian Relations, War, Trade, and Land Problems in the Southern Wilderness, 1754-1775*, (New York: Gordian Press, 1966), 76-77.

French-allied Shawnee devastated the Virginia backcountry. Raids in which the French Indians took captives were common throughout 1756 and 1757.⁵⁷ For the Cherokee, the most important factor of the enemies' raids was the fear they instilled among white settlers. The fear of raids and capture by enemy Indians prompted tens of thousands of backcountry settlers to seek safety in the east. The fear of an Indian attack paralyzed the white settlers that remained in the backcountry.⁵⁸

The treaties signed at Saluda and Broad River by the Overhill Cherokee profoundly affected Anglo-Cherokee relations in the late 1750s. The treaties created the ideal situation for the deterioration of the Cherokee's alliance with the English. Chota's display of regional interests put Cherokee warriors from the entire nation on the warpath straight through the Virginia backcountry full of settlers terrified of Indians.

Through 1758, the Cherokee maintained their tenuous relationship with the English. By 1757, the South Carolinian Cherokee trader, Ludovick Grant feared that the Cherokees might murder the English traders and ally with France.⁵⁹ During this time, the Little Carpenter suffered major political setbacks. He was blamed for the Treaty of Broad River's inability to deliver the agreed upon goods. This failure helped create a nativist faction in favor of retaliation for

⁵⁷ Matthew C. Ward, *Breaking the Backcountry: The Seven Years' War in Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1754–1765*, (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2003), 68-73, 146-147; Colin G. Calloway, *The Shawnees and the War for America*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2007), 28-29; Also see "Appendix: Named Captives Taken on the Allegheny Frontier, 1754–65," in Ian K. Steele's, *Setting All the Captives Free: Capture, Adjustment, and Recollection in Allegheny Country*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013), 439-451.

⁵⁸ Matthew C. Ward, "Fighting the 'Old Women:' Indian Strategy on the Virginia and Pennsylvania Frontier, 1754–1758," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 103, no. 3 (July, 1995): 297-320, 310-317; For the effects of Indian war on Anglo-American society see Peter Silver's *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed America*, (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2008), for specifically Cherokee instances see, 303, and 347 n. 9.

⁵⁹ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 53.

murdered Cherokees in the Overhill Towns. By 1759, the results of Overhill headmen's regionalism led to war with the English and a major shift in internal Cherokee politics.

Before 1759, regional factionalism was the primary division within Cherokee diplomacy but this gave way to ideological factionalism. The new fissure over retaliation and war with the English split the Cherokee nation into nativist and accommodationist factions. The Little Carpenter was a leading headman in the accommodationist camp and believed in the possibility of settling the Cherokee's issues with the English. In April 1759, the Little Carpenter and a party of fifty Cherokee men, women, and children travelled to Charleston to secure the Carolinian peace. He pledged to restrain the nation's warriors from attacking English settlements.⁶⁰ Despite the Little Carpenter's promises, while he was in Charleston, Overhill Cherokees from Settico took their revenge on a string of English settlements in North Carolina.⁶¹ Other Cherokee regions disavowed the actions of the troublemakers.⁶² The Overhills debated the issue.

Pragmatically, the Little Carpenter was without options. The English confusion of jurisdiction over Cherokee affairs allowed Governor Lyttelton of South Carolina to demand satisfaction for the Cherokee's backcountry raids. Overhill headmen could not apprehend the guilty Cherokees because it would undermine their socially prescribed motivations to honor their dead, while failing to do so compromised the Little Carpenter's diplomatic influence. The Little Carpenter's inability to apprehend the perpetrators also made convincing Lyttelton to address other Cherokee concerns more difficult.⁶³ Later in 1759, the Little Carpenter offered menial

⁶⁰ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 63.

⁶¹ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 63-64; Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 72-73.

⁶² Keowee, Tiftoe to Governor Lyttelton, May 13, 1759, in *DRIA II*, 492; Lieutenant Coytmore to Governor Lyttelton, May 8, 1759, in *DRIA II*, 487-488.

⁶³ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 64.

support against French-allied Creek settlements near the Overhill region, but floundered politically. He was unable to gain supporters for an attack and the Slave-Catcher of Chota actually led an Overhill delegation to the Creek settlements and then to meet the French directly at Fort Toulouse.⁶⁴ The Little Carpenter and the accommodationist faction were quickly losing ground in the Cherokee nation.

Throughout 1759, the Cherokee retaliatory raids continued and the tensions between South Carolina and the Cherokee grew. The Slave-Catcher of Chota's interactions with the French revealed that the French were not immediately prepared to supply the Cherokee. Without French support, a lasting war was only injurious for the Cherokee. The threat of diplomatic isolation restrained the Cherokee from attacking the English forts in their nation. It also explains the Chota headmen's accommodationist attractions. The potential isolation led to an accommodationist political resurgence that generated a cross-regional peace delegation to Governor Lyttelton and South Carolina led by the Great Warrior of Chota. Lyttelton's imprisonment of the delegation signaled the death knell of the Anglo-Cherokee alliance.

With his prisoners detained in Fort Prince George at the Lower Cherokee town of Keowee, Governor Lyttelton's attempts to restore peace inadvertently became the Cherokee call to arms. The Cherokee accommodationist faction's fate was now the fate of the prisoners in Fort Prince George. In February 1760, the Little Carpenter, the Great Warrior of Chota, and the Little Raven made the final attempt at a diplomatic resolution, but ultimately failed.⁶⁵ With Old Hop's absence, two legs of the Chota Triumvirate were unable to resolve the hostage crisis. Only days

⁶⁴ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 64-65.

⁶⁵ Alexr. Miln to Governor Lyttelton, February 24, 1760, in *DRIA II, 1754-1765*, 497-501.

later, nativist Cherokees made a forceful attempt to free the prisoners. The attempt resulted in the massacre of the Cherokee prisoners and the breakdown of the accommodationist faction.

The Chota headmen were unable to dissuade the Cherokee nation from war with the English. By January 1760, Middle and Lower Cherokee warriors raided South Carolina's backcountry.⁶⁶ Accommodationist headmen's, and particularly the Little Carpenter's, political influence was waning. The Chota Triumvirate was fracturing and shattered with Old Hop's death in January 1760. After his death, the Little Carpenter and the Great Warrior's political rivalry embodied the weakening of Cherokees' regional identities under the pressure of potential war. As early as their return from Fort Prince George, the Great Warrior began condemning the accommodationist approach among the Lower Towns.⁶⁷ For the Cherokee, the Great Warrior's nativism filled the void left by Old Hop's death. The nation, frustrated with his repeated failures, marginalized the Little Carpenter's influence.⁶⁸

Due to Chota's diplomatic importance and its headmen's role as the nation's diplomats, the fracturing of Cherokee society into accommodationist and nativist factions appears protracted in the documentary record. In the Lower and Middle Towns, the rise of the war faction occurred relatively quickly. Accommodationists and nativists were present throughout the Cherokee nation and certainly debated the definitive issue. The debate appears drawn out in Chota because of the diplomatic importance South Carolina placed on the town's headmen. The English viewed the Little Carpenter as the emperor of the Cherokee nation even though the Great Warrior was the nation's most influential headman.⁶⁹ Both headmen were from Chota, and their importance to the

⁶⁶ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 104.

⁶⁷ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 92.

⁶⁸ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 97.

⁶⁹ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 97.

English made the town the center of the debate. Single-issue Cherokee factionalism dominated Anglo-Cherokee diplomacy in 1759 and 1760, but the influence of Cherokee regionalism remained.

Even though issue-based factionalism was the primary influence on Cherokee diplomacy, regional factionalism nevertheless affected nativist actions. The *Cherokee nation* was at war with the English. Not all Cherokees participated or supported the war, but the involvement of every region made it a national war. Despite the conflict's national participation, individual regions still carried out their own militaristic affairs. Lower Cherokee warriors invested Fort Prince George and raided South Carolina and the Middle Towns raided Georgia, while the Overhills besieged Fort Loudon and attacked English settlements in the North Carolina backcountry.⁷⁰ Tortora asserts that the Overhills' decision to establish another front, instead of a single united front, is a reflection of "the way the Cherokees coordinated their efforts by village cluster."⁷¹ He continues with a description of the Overhill's "easy targets," but stops short of asking why the Overhill Cherokee did not join the seemingly more organized Middle and Lower Towns' offensive. This is important because when examined, the Overhill campaign does appear as part of a national Cherokee effort.

Why the Overhill Cherokee attacked the relatively inconsequential North Carolinian outpost, Fort Dobbs, is a complex question, with an equally complex answer. Examining the Overhill's decision within the context of Cherokee regionalism brings some clarity to their decision. The region's headmen may have thought of Fort Dobbs as a threat to their towns. Another potential reason was for honor. Since the Lower and Middle Cherokees successfully

⁷⁰ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 110-111; Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 108, 108-109.

⁷¹ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 108.

pushed the South Carolina frontier a hundred miles eastward, Overhill warriors may have seen the North Carolina settlements as an easier logistical opportunity to gain prestige, honor, and social advancement.⁷² Attacking the inadequately fortified, North Carolina backcountry meant the dispersed white settlers were vulnerable to Cherokee raids. Self-preservation, in the sense that defenseless targets would minimize Overhill casualties, may also have influenced the decision. These justifications help make sense of the decision, but do not fully explain it.

The Overhill Cherokee did not venture south to attack the English because the Overhill towns were the Cherokee nation's vanguard on their northern front. The Anglo-Cherokee War invited hostile attention from the English-allied Iroquois Confederacy from the north. The Iroquois inflicted heavy losses among the Overhills.⁷³ Just as the Shawnee had limited Overhill involvement in the Virginia expeditions, Iroquois raids contained Overhill warriors to their northern region. Tortora oversimplifies the Overhill operations in North Carolina as traditional Cherokee efforts coordinated through "village clusters."⁷⁴ Instead of joining the offensive in Georgia and South Carolina, the Overhill Cherokee could have consciously made the decision to safeguard the rest of the nation from Iroquois advances. Thus, the nativist Cherokee faction led the nation to war but Overhill regionalism buttressed the Lower and Middle Towns ability to fight Georgia and South Carolina.⁷⁵

⁷² Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 111.

⁷³ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 158.

⁷⁴ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 108.

⁷⁵ The nativist's faction rise to prominence, and the major shift from regional to ideological factions is an example of how radical change developed on the frontier and influenced the nation. The nativist-accommodationist split in the Cherokee nation happened because of encounters with Euro-Americans on the frontier, see Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 80.

The Return to Peacetime Diplomacy

The Cherokee's resounding military successes did not continue in 1760 and 1761. South Carolina regained control of the conflict and reestablished peaceful relations with the Cherokee by 1762. Unprecedented factional challenges saturated a renewed Anglo-Cherokee alliance. The Cherokee nation and the English Empire's political worlds were both undergoing major changes. These changes exacerbated the difficulties of rectifying the Anglo-Cherokee alliance because of various Anglo-Cherokee factionalisms.

During the Anglo-Cherokee War, the English conducted three expeditions into the Cherokee nation. The first was Governor Lyttelton's feeble attempt to coerce peace from the Cherokees in which he brought their captives to Fort Prince George in 1759. The colonial press initially heralded Lyttelton's expedition as a major victory but this action actually did little towards settling a lasting peace.⁷⁶ At the head of over thirteen hundred troops in summer 1760, Archibald Montgomery led an expedition against the Cherokee Lower Towns. In a thirty-six hour period beginning on the morning of June 1, Montgomery's troops burned five of the Lower Cherokee's towns and killed or captured over one hundred Cherokees.⁷⁷ Many of the Lower Cherokee fled to the Middle Towns as their hometowns lay in waste. Montgomery intended to carry his successful destruction into the Middle Towns on his way to relieve the besieged garrison at Fort Loudon. The Middle Cherokee used the advantage of their region's steep mountainous geography to halt Montgomery's advance. The Cherokee warriors succeeded and

⁷⁶ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 124-125; Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 69-112.

⁷⁷ Corkran, *The Cherokee Frontier*, 208; Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766*, (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 462.

sent his contingent on an abrupt, nocturnal retreat.⁷⁸ Montgomery's second in command, James Grant, was preparing to lead an expedition against the Cherokee in the spring of the following year. Grant's campaign brought Montgomery's destruction to the Middle Towns where he burned fifteen towns and their crops. These campaigns devastated the Cherokee nation.

In 1761, the Cherokee nation lacked the logistical support to continue war and the South Carolina expeditions left many starving and their towns razed. Before Grant marched into the Middle Settlements, the Great Warrior and the Little Carpenter met Grant at Fort Prince George to establish peace. They were unable to agree to Grant's demand of complete capitulation and the return of all white captives. The result was Grant's campaign sought a display of force great enough to discredit the war faction and seize control of peace negotiations.⁷⁹ Grant's success had a profound impact on the Cherokee nation.

South Carolina's Cherokee offensive of 1761 ensured the diplomatic primacy of Chota despite its headmen's years of diplomatic failures. With the destruction of the Lower and Middle Towns in subsequent years, only the Overhill region remained intact. This continuity help ensure that Chota headmen would retain their influence because they were in charge of solving the crisis of their starving nation. The Cherokee went unsupplied, isolated, and starving, and necessarily formed a refugee camp near Fort Prince George. This meant Grant had successfully made war untenable for the Cherokee.⁸⁰

Factionalism remained prevalent in the negotiations for a renewed Anglo-Cherokee peace. It took months of negotiation between the Cherokee and South Carolina to settle peace terms. Beginning in August 1761, the Little Carpenter and Grant agreed to an initial settlement,

⁷⁸ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 131-132.

⁷⁹ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 140.

⁸⁰ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 146-148.

but Grant had many opponents in Charleston who believed he was weak and inept, and that his terms were too generous.⁸¹ By November, the Little Carpenter was in Charleston to confirm the unpopular treaty, but Overhill headmen were already looking for more favorable provisions from Virginia.⁸²

Disenchanted with the Little Carpenter's negotiations with South Carolina, other Overhill headmen sought a treaty with Virginia that would materially benefit the Cherokee nation. The Great Warrior, Standing Turkey, and the Mankiller of Tellico met with Colonel Adam Stephen of Virginia on the Great Island of the Holston as the Little Carpenter dealt with South Carolina. Negotiations were quick for the Overhill headmen. By November 20, they had secured a Virginian treaty with generous terms. The Cherokee headmen would denounce war and make a firm peace. They would also give up the Cherokees, or the scalps of individuals, who murdered Virginians. The second term was actually lenient because there was no time limit or other conditions, and Cherokees could attempt to use any Indians' scalp for the term's fulfillment.⁸³ The Treaty of Long-Island-on-the-Holston was an Overhill success, and signed before South Carolina formalized their treaty with the Little Carpenter.

Factionalism permeated the treaties' negotiations and their outcomes. The Lower Towns lost significant tracts of hunting grounds in the Treaty of Charleston.⁸⁴ The Little Carpenter's support among the Cherokee was declining because of the issue of land. The Little Carpenter was happy to accept the new boundary lines instead of those agreed upon initially.⁸⁵ He also

⁸¹ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 174-178; Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 159.

⁸² Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 165.

⁸³ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 165.

⁸⁴ Even with some colonial concessions, the loss of land was noteworthy, Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 180-182.

⁸⁵ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 186.

hedged against the Lower Towns diminishing support by becoming Grant's de facto puppet emperor, despite refusing the actual title.⁸⁶ Cherokee regionalism in the Lower Towns dissatisfaction with the treaty was one of the reason ambitious Overhill headmen skirted the Little Carpenter's efforts to seek better terms from Virginia.

The Treaty of Long-Island-on-the-Holston was the direct result of colonial regionalism because of Virginia and South Carolina's colonial rivalry. Virginia's lenient and quick resolution for peace was a calculated political maneuver. The news of the Cherokee's prolonged negotiations in Charleston shocked Virginia. Understanding the opportunity, it acted quickly. The expedited diplomacy allowed Virginia the opportunity of envisioning their post-war trading success and domination.⁸⁷ Virginia's opportunity stemmed from South Carolina's internal factionalism.

The delay in signing the Treaty of Charleston was due to an internal division within South Carolina. Grant was the British commander in South Carolina and during his tenure openly criticized provincial militias. His attitudes engendered malcontent from South Carolinians. The colonial legislature wanted a stringent settlement that would include Cherokee executions.⁸⁸ Grant believed that the critical issue of the peace settlement was reestablishing trust among the Cherokee.⁸⁹ For Grant this meant offering favorable terms, but the legislature whose settlements and citizens were victims of the war sought to punish the Cherokee. The legislature's influence was strong enough to keep acting royal governor, William Bull, from supporting the British commander.⁹⁰ Grant was eventually able to persuade South Carolina that executions were

⁸⁶ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 147, 162.

⁸⁷ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 165.

⁸⁸ Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 159-160.

⁸⁹ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 180.

⁹⁰ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 176-190.

an unattainable settlement term, but the prolonged negotiations had already done their damage. South Carolina's political factionalism allowed Virginia's treaty with the Cherokee. Both the prolonged negotiations and the meager concessions of South Carolina convinced the Overhill Cherokee that a better deal lay with the colonial leaders of Virginia.

Although Chota's headmen and the English colonies restored peace on the Anglo-Cherokee frontier, the overall status of this region remained precarious. Settlers' encroachment from South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia on Cherokee lands remained a source of Anglo-Cherokee tensions and bred discontent among colonials towards the English Crown.⁹¹ The Cherokee were no longer in a position to resist the English. The Cherokee nation's headmen split into pro-South Carolina, pro-Virginia, and pro-French factions, but diplomatic victories eluded them. By 1762, regional and political factionalisms helped guide the Cherokee and English towards the Anglo-Cherokee War which left the Cherokee nation in a remarkably diminished state.

⁹¹ Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier*, 191-199; Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 170-179.

EPILOGUE

The Cherokee nation in 1762 was unrecognizable from its 1750 self. During this twelve-year period, the Cherokee nation fought various wars with neighboring Indians, South Carolina, Virginia, Georgia, North Carolina, and the French. The wars complicated the long decade's diplomatic relations. Chota headmen, representing the Cherokee nation, negotiated three treaties with South Carolina alone—the Treaty of 1751, the Treaty of Saluda in 1755, and the Treaty of Charleston in 1761.¹ The Cherokees signed additional treaties with Virginia and the French. The internecine warfare and pursuant diplomatic struggles defined the era.

Throughout all of the long decade's affairs, internal factionalism among the Cherokees and Anglo-Americans stifled a healthy and lasting Anglo-Cherokee alliance. The major development for the Cherokee nation during the era was the shift from regional factionalism to ideological factionalism. Before 1759, regionalism was the Cherokee's primary diplomatic division. The period leading up to the Anglo-Cherokee War divided the nation into pro-war nativist and reconciliatory accommodationist factions. The Cherokee nation's shift towards issue-based factionalism brought greater national unity among the regional factions. This was a significant change in Cherokee politics. Regionalism once defined Cherokee politics but their diplomacy grew increasingly national in scope because the dividing issue of war crossed regional lines. Cherokee diplomacy for the first time meaningfully united the different regions instead of the regions causing diplomatic discord. This places the origins of Cherokee political

¹ The Chota headmen would have *signed* three treaties, however, Governor Glen invited Cherokees from every town except Chota to Charleston to sign the treaty in 1751 despite their participation in its negotiations. However, they still participated in its negotiations, Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis*, 23; Peter Timothy to Governor Glen, [excerpts] from the *Virginia Gazette*, August 8 & 16, 1751, in *DRIA I*, 151-154.

centralization in the early 1760s instead of the generally understood period immediately following the American Revolution. The change also increased confusion and created new diplomatic challenges. Additionally, regionalism still persisted and maintained some of its influence on Cherokee diplomatic affairs. The complexity of Anglo-American politics mirrored the Cherokee's factionalism.

Between 1750 and 1762, the English in North America had similar political fissures as the Cherokee nation. The rivalries between individual colonies and their governors were similar to the Cherokee's regional factionalism. Sometimes these divisions proved beneficial to the Cherokees, as they were able to play one off the other. The English attempts to centralize Indian affairs only produced further diplomatic confusion. The factionalism between the English Crown and its colonials, although regional in nature, more closely resembled the Cherokees' issue-based factionalism. This colonial factionalism appears repeatedly throughout the 1750s. It manifests itself in the struggles of various royal governors of South Carolina, the crown's military commanders, and Indian superintendents with the colonial legislature. Just as Cherokee factionalism contributed to the era's diplomatic volatility.

The various factionalisms prevalent among the Cherokees and English between 1750 and 1762 created the long decade's turbulence. The Chota headmen and the various English representatives they negotiated with were at no point representative of their entire respective nations. Examining the era through the lens of the Cherokees' and Anglo-Americans' fragmentary identities can help us understand the outwardly irrational actions of the Cherokee nation and the English empire.

By 1762, Keowee had grown from an average Lower town to the region's most important town despite the ravages of war in the region. It also became the nation's primary trading

location with South Carolina's 1762, "Act to Regulate the Cherokee Trade."² The Overhill town, Chota, had cemented its position as the Cherokee nation's leading diplomatic center as it quelled Great Tellico's attempts to supplant it as such. With the signing of the Treaty of Paris and the end of the Seven Years' War, England gained control of France's American territories east of the Mississippi River and Canada, as well as Spain's possessions in Florida.³ For the Cherokee nation, the North American landscape was fundamentally different in 1763 from only a decade earlier.

From the Cherokee perspective of 1763, war was finally over and good trade relations were re-established with the only viable European power remaining in North America. It must have appeared that the Cherokee nation was in a position for the dawning of a golden age as a British Indian ally. The issue of encroaching backcountry settlement became the primary Anglo-Cherokee diplomatic concern. However, King George III's Royal Proclamation of 1763 addressed this issue directly. It prohibited settlement in the Indian lands and ordered those already illegally settled there to remove themselves. Through diplomatic efforts such as this, England was able to foster alliances with the Indian peoples, including the Cherokee nation, in the continent's next great conflict.

According to Thomas Hatley, the establishment of the Indian boundary line was also important for colonial politics. With the new fixed border, the backcountry communities most affected by the Anglo-Cherokee war were able to turn their political attention back eastward and this contributed to the development of the Regulator Movement in 1767.⁴ While the Regulator

² "Act to Regulate the Cherokee Trade," in *DRIA II*, 557-563.

³ Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766*, (New York: Vintage Books, 2000), 505-506.

⁴ Tom Hatley, *The Dividing Paths: Cherokees and South Carolinians Through the Era of Revolution*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 179-180.

Movement focused on white colonial society, Hatley notes that Cherokee society influenced the movement's cultural reforms.⁵ The Regulator Movement's anti-Cherokee social reforms were not the most important aspect of the movement.

For Anglo-Cherokee relations, the most important facet of the Regulator Movement was Euro-American's willingness for intra-societal violence. According to Wayne E. Lee, the Regulators were attempting to maintain a sense of legitimacy to their protests and eventual violence. They were operating through socially prescribed escalations of violence and force.⁶ The important aspect remains that colonial society was so easily able to reach the level of open, military violence. Even though the Regulator Movement did not draw the Cherokee into war, the next colonial conflict would.

By the early 1770s, trouble was brewing on the Southern Indian frontier. Backcountry settlers grew increasingly upset with their colonial governments because the settlers believed they were in an "immoral alliance" with the Cherokees and Creeks.⁷ This contributed to a growing resentment between the backcountry settlers and the eastern governments. Between the 1763 and the early 1770s, the backcountry population of South Carolina exploded. The Cherokees sought the assistance of the metropolitan authorities to protect their lands. However, South Carolina's Commons House of Assembly and Lieutenant Governor Bull were conflicted with the situation. They knew that the English Empire could not afford another Indian war, but

⁵ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 181-183.

⁶ Wayne E. Lee, *Crowds and Soldiers in Revolutionary North Carolina: The Culture of Violence in Riot and War*, (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001), 83-84, 8.

⁷ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 185.

the backcountry settlers protected the coastal regions from potential Cherokee attacks. The situation also contributed to growing tensions between the governor and the colonial assembly.⁸

As the divide between pro and anti-British factions grew in the colonial south, both sides attempted to garner Cherokee support. Alarmed by loyalist attempts to court the Cherokees, the anti-British Whig faction established their own Indian Department in 1775, to explain to the Cherokees that British taxes also affected their ability to maintain the Cherokee trade.⁹ By 1775, it was clear that the Cherokee nation was going to have a role in the impending conflict as rumors and attempted munitions shipments proliferated.¹⁰ It was now clear that the peace made in 1763, would not last much more than a decade.

As the Anglo-American crisis of the 1770s crawled toward revolutionary heights, it became clear that there would be some Cherokee involvement. The Cherokee nation's participation followed a similar process. Just as the Cherokee nation split into accommodationist and nativist factions during the Anglo-Cherokee War during the 1750s and 1760s, the same divide emerged during the period leading up to the American Revolution.

The swelling number of Anglo-American settlers encroaching on Cherokee lands led to peacetime land cessions. The most prominent was the Sycamore Shoals treaty of 1775, during which the Little Carpenter led an accommodationist faction willing to sell Cherokee land, while his son, Dragging Canoe, represented a nativist faction willing to fight for their land and found the treaty fraudulently signed by old men unable to represent the whole Cherokee nation.¹¹ The Cherokee nation's factionalism during the 1770s was more divisive than its earlier rift. Despite

⁸ Daniel J. Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis: Cherokees, Colonists, and Slaves in the American Southeast, 1756–1763*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 188-190.

⁹ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 187.

¹⁰ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 188.

¹¹ Hatley, *The Dividing Paths*, 217-218

this, Cherokee factionalism during the Seven Years' War foreshadowed the Cherokee's involvement during the American Revolution.

The American Revolution did not actually divide the Cherokee nation into accommodationist and nativist factions. Rather, it intensified the division that already developed in the early 1760s. The Cherokee nation's experience during the American Revolution was a continuation of the burgeoning political and diplomatic environment of the earlier conflict. Leading up to the Anglo-Cherokee War, the Cherokee nation was already drawing the factional lines between the accommodationists and the nativists. Eventually, the pro-war nativist faction drove the Cherokee nation to war with the British. As the nativists grew dominant, the Cherokee political landscape also began changing. The trans-regional nativist faction plunged the *entire* Cherokee nation into war. Before the Anglo-Cherokee War, individual regions made war and established peace independently. This war, however, is an early indication of the centralization of Cherokee political power.

Generally, historians look at the Cherokee's experience during the American Revolution as laying the foundations for nationalization. Theda Perdue and Michael D. Green begin their examination of the Cherokee Nation with the "civilization" efforts of the United States immediately following the Revolutionary War with the Cherokee's "ultimate expression of nationalism" occurring "in 1827 with the drafting of the Nation's constitution."¹² However, the Cherokee nation's experiences during the 1750s and 1760s established the basic pattern of Cherokee centralization in the face of an overwhelming outside force. The diplomatic island the Cherokee nation found itself on during the Anglo-Cherokee War is the first time the nation

¹² Theda Perdue and Machel D. Green, *The Cherokee Nation and the Trail of Tears*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2007), 23, 20-41, quote on 54.

understood itself as a single united entity. While a Cherokee nation-state did not materialize until the early nineteenth century, the Anglo-Cherokee War planted its seed significantly earlier than the American Revolution.

As discussed in chapters 2 and 3, the Anglo-Cherokee War left the Cherokee nation diplomatically isolated. War with Anglo-America, and France unable or unwilling to offer support forced the Cherokee to view themselves in a more nationalistic sense. Daniel Tortora asserts that the Overhill Cherokee's offensive campaign near Fort Dobbs in North Carolina during the war was a reflection of how "the Cherokees coordinated their efforts by village cluster."¹³ However, the examination in chapter 3 reveals that the offensive makes more sense when interpreted as part of a national war effort. The origins of the Anglo-Cherokee and their actions during the conflict reveal that the political centralization of the Cherokee nation began in the early 1760s and much earlier than generally thought.

¹³ Daniel J. Tortora, *Carolina in Crisis: Cherokees, Colonists, and Slaves in the American Southeast, 1756–1763*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 108.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Theses and Manuscripts

- Alden, John Richard. *John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier: A Study of Indian Relations, War, Trade, and Land Problems in the Southern Wilderness, 1754–1775*. New York: Gordian Press, Inc., 1966.
- Anderson, Fred. *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754–1766*. New York: Vintage Books, 2001.
- Barr, Juliana. *Peace Came in the Form of a Woman: Indians and Spaniards in the Texas Borderlands*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- Boulware, Tyler. *Deconstructing the Cherokee Nation: Town, Region, and Nation among Eighteenth-Century Cherokees*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2011.
- . "The Effect of the Seven Years' War on the Cherokee Nation." *Early American Studies, An interdisciplinary Journal* 5, no. 2 (Fall 2007): 395-426.
- Buckner, Phillip A. "Limited Identities and Canadian Historical Scholarship: An Atlantic Provinces Perspective." *Journal of Canadian Studies*. April 1988. Vol. 23, no. 1/2, 177-198.
- Calloway, Colin G. *The American Revolution in Indian Country: Crisis and Diversity in Native American Communities*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- . *New Worlds for All: Indians, Europeans, and the Remaking of Early America*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- . *The Shawnees and the War for America*. New York: Penguin Books, 2007.

- . *White People, Indians, and Highlanders: Tribal Peoples and Colonial Encounters in Scotland and America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Calloway, Colin G., Gerd Gemünden, and Susanne Zantop, eds. *Germans and Indians: Fantasies, Encounters, Projections*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002.
- Cashin, Edward J. *Lachlan McGillivray, Indian Trader: The Shaping of the Southern Colonial Frontier*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1992.
- Castro, Wendy Lucas. "Stripped: Clothing and Identity in Colonial Captivity Narratives." *Early American Studies, An Interdisciplinary Journal* 6, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 104-136.
- Chambers, Ian. "Spatial Personas: A New Technique for Interpreting Colonial Encounters in Colonial North America." *History Compass* 6, no.4 (2008): 1164-1172.
- Champagne, Duane. *Social Order and Political Change: Constitutional Governments Among the Cherokee, the Choctaw, the Chickasaw, and the Creek*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- Conley, Robert J. *The Cherokee Nation: A History*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005.
- Corkran, David H. *The Carolina Indian Frontier*. South Carolina Tricentennial Booklets, 6. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970.
- , *The Cherokee Frontier: Conflict and Survival, 1740–62*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962.
- . *The Cherokee Frontier: Conflict and Survival, 1740–62*. 1962. Reprint, Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1985.
- Cox, Brent Yanusdi. *Heart of the Eagle: Dragging Canoe and the Emergence of the Chickamauga Confederacy*. Milan, TN: Chenanee Publishers, 1999.

- Crass, David Colin, Steven D. Smith, Martha A. Zierden, and Richard D. Brooks, eds. *The Southern Colonial Backcountry: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Frontier Communities*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1998.
- Dobbs, G. Rebecca. "Backcountry Settlement Development and Indian Trails A GIS Land-Grant Analysis." *Social Science Computer Review* 27, no. 331 (19 February 2009): 331-347.
- Ekrich, A. Roger. "*Poor Carolina*": *Politics and Society in Colonial North Carolina, 1729-1776*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981.
- Fabel, Robin F. A. *Colonial Challenges: Britons, Native Americans, and Caribs, 1759-1775*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2000.
- Fortwendel, Jr., Cletus Francis Joseph. "Federal Agent Silas Dinsmoor and the Cherokees: A Study in Frontier Policies, Politics, and Personalities." Master's thesis, Western Carolina University, 1996.
- Fulford, Tim and Kevin Hutchings, editors. *Native Americans and Anglo-American Culture, 1750-1850: The Indian Atlantic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Grenier, John. *The First Way of War: American War Making on the Frontier, 1607-1814*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Hatley, Thomas. *The Dividing Paths: Cherokees and South Carolinians Through the Era of Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Hatley, M. Thomas. "The Three Lives of Keowee: Loss and Recovery in the Eighteenth-Century Cherokee Villages." In *American Encounters: Natives and Newcomers from European Contact to Indian Removal, 1500-1850*, edited by Peter C. Mancall and James H. Merrell, 241-260. New York: Routledge, 2000.

- Hughes, Kaylene. "Populating the Back Country: The Demographic and Social Characteristics of the Colonial South Carolina Frontier, 1730–1760." PhD diss., Florida State University, 1985.
- Jennings, Matthew. *New Worlds of Violence: Cultures and Conquests in the Early American Southeast*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2011.
- Johnson, Jr., George Lloyd. *The Frontier in the Colonial South: South Carolina Backcountry, 1736–1800*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997.
- Kuttruff, Carl, Beverly Bastian, Jenna Tedrick Kuttruff, and Stuart Strumpf. "Fort Loudoun in Tennessee: 1756-1760: History, Archaeology, Replication, Exhibits, and Interpretation." Report of the Tennessee Wars Commission and Tennessee Division of Archaeology. Research Series No. 17. Waldenhouse Publishers, Inc., 2010.
- Lee, Wayne E. *Crowds and Soldiers in Revolutionary North Carolina: The Culture of Violence in Riot and War*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001.
- Lefler, Hugh T. and William S. Powell, eds. *Colonial North Carolina: A History*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973.
- Lumpkin, Henry. *From Savannah to Yorktown: The American Revolution in the South*. New York: Paragon House Publishers, 1987.
- Mancall, Peter C., and James H. Merrell, eds. *American Encounters: Natives and Newcomers from European Contact to Indian Removal—1500–1850*. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- McLoughlin, William G. *Cherokee Renaissance in the New Republic*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Morgan, Edmund S. *Inventing the People: The Rise of Popular Sovereignty in England and America*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1988.

- Morris, Michael P. *The Bringing of Wonder: Trade and the Indians of the Southeast, 1700–1783*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999.
- Oliphant, John. *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier 1756–63*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 2001.
- Otto, John Solomon. *The Southern Frontiers, 1607–1860: The Agricultural Evolution of the Colonial and Antebellum South*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1989.
- Perdue, Theda. *Cherokee Women: Gender and Culture Change, 1700–1835*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- . *“Mixed Blood” Indians: Racial Construction in the Early South*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2003.
- Perdue, Teda and Michael Green. *The Cherokee Nation and the Trail of Tears*. New York: Penguin Books, 2007.
- Ramsey, William L. *The Yamasee War: A Study of Culture, Economy, and Conflict in the Colonial South*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008.
- Raper, Charles Lee. *North Carolina: A Study in English Colonial Government*. 1904. Reprint, Spartanburg, SC: The Reprint Company, 1973.
- Reid, John Phillip. *A Law of Blood: The Primitive Law of the Cherokee Nation*. New York: New York University Press, 1970.
- Reynolds, Jr., William R. *The Cherokee Struggle to Maintain Identity in the 17th and 18th Centuries*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2015.
- Richter, Daniel. *Facing East from Indian Country: A Native History of Early America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

- Rushforth, Brett. *Bonds of Alliance: Indigenous & Atlantic Slaveries in New France*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012.
- Robinson, W. Stitt. *James Glen: From Scottish Provost to Royal Governor of South Carolina*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996.
- . *The Southern Colonial Frontier, 1607–1736*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1979.
- Sheidley, Nathaniel. “Hunting and the Politics of Masculinity in Cherokee Treaty-making, 1763–75.” In *Empire and Others: British Encounters with Indigenous Peoples, 1600–1850*, edited by Martin Daunton and Rick Halpern, 167–185. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.
- Shoemaker, Nancy. *A Strange Likeness: Becoming Red and White in Eighteenth Century America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Silver, Peter. *Our Savage Neighbors: How Indian War Transformed Early America*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2008.
- Steele, Ian K. *Setting All the Captives Free: Capture, Adjustment, and Recollection in Allegheny Country*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2013.
- Swearingin, Steven David. “A Reassessment of Cherokee Identity Consciousness During the Colonial Era: Myth, Historiography, and Material Culture.” PhD diss., Southern Illinois University, 2005.
- Thorp, Daniel B. *The Moravian Community in Colonial North Carolina: Pluralism on the Southern Frontier*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1989.
- Ward, Harry M. *“Unite Or Die”: Intercolony rRelations 1690–1763*. Port Washington, NY: KenniKat Press, 1971.

- Ward, Matthew C. *Breaking the Backcountry: The Seven Years' War in Virginia and Pennsylvania, 1754–1765*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2003.
- . “Fighting the ‘Old Women:’ Indian Strategy on the Virginia and Pennsylvania Frontier, 1754–1758.” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 103, no. 3 (July, 1995): 297-320.
- Watson, Alan D. *Society in Colonial North Carolina*. Rev. ed. Raleigh: Division of Archives and History North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, 1996.
- White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815*, 2nd edition. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Williams, Marshall W. “Fort Prince George, South Carolina.” In *The Archaeology of French and Indian War Frontier Forts*, edited by Edward Babits Lawrence and Stephanie Gandulla, 52-68. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2014.
- Williams, Jr., Robert A. *Linking Arms Together: American Indian Treaty Visions of Law and Peace, 1600–1800*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Primary Sources

- Cain, Robert J., ed. *The Colonial Records of North Carolina: Records of the Executive Council 1755–1775*. Vol. IX of the *Second Series of the Colonial Records of North Carolina*. Raleigh: Division of Archives and History North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources, 1994.
- Doren, Mark Van, ed. *Travels of William Bartram*. New York: ZDover Publications, 1928.

- Fries, Adelaide L., ed. *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*. Raleigh, NC: Edwards & Broughton Printing Company, 1922.
- King, Duane H., ed. *The Memoirs of Lt. Henry Timberlake: The Story of a Soldier, Adventurer, and Emissary to the Cherokees, 1756–1765*. Cherokee, NC: Museum of the Cherokee Indian Press, 2007.
- Lefler, Hugh Talmage, ed. *North Carolina History: Told by Contemporaries*. 4th ed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1965.
- James, PhD., Alfred Procter, editor. *Writings of General John Forbes: Relations to his Service in North America*. Menasha, WI: The Collegiate Press, 1938.
- McDowell, Jr., William L., ed. *Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indians Affairs, May 21, 1750–August 7, 1754*. 1958. Reprint, Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives & History, 1992.
- . *Colonial Records of South Carolina: Documents Relating to Indians Affairs, 1754–1765*. 1970. Reprint, Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives & History, 1992.
- Merrens, H. Roy, editor. *The Colonial South Carolina Scene: Contemporary Views, 1697–1774*. South Carolina Tricentennial Booklets, 7. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1977.
- Olsberg, R. Nicholas, ed. *The Colonial Records of South Carolina: The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, 23 April 1750–31 August 1751*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1974.
- Powell, William S., ed. *The Correspondence of William Tryon and Other Selected Papers*. Volume I: 1758–1767. Raleigh: Division of Archives and History Department of Cultural Resources, 1980.

- . *The Correspondence of William Tryon and Other Selected Papers*. Volume II: 1768–1818. Raleigh: Division of Archives and History Department of Cultural Resources, 1981.
- Rice, Connie Park. “Letters from William Haymond to His Nephew, Luther Haymond, Recalling the Settlement of Western Virginia and Conflicts with Native Americans between 1773 and 1794.” *West Virginia History: A Journal of Regional Studies*, New Series 2, no. 2 (Fall 2008): 79-98.
- Rozema, Vicki. *Cherokee Voices: Early Accounts of Cherokee Life in the East*. Winston-Salem, NC: John F. Blair, 2002.
- Tiffany, Nina Moore and Susan I. Lesly eds. *Letters of James Murray: Loyalist*. (Boston: Printed, not published, 1901).
- Waddel, Alfred Moore. *A Colonial Officer and His Times, 1754–1773: A Biographical Sketch of Gen. Hugh Waddel*. 1890. Reprint, Spartanburg, SC: The Reprint Company, 1973.
- Williams, LL.D., Samuel Cole, editor. *Lieut. Henry Timberlake’s Memoirs, 1756–1765: With Annotation, Introduction and Index*, 1927, reprint. Marietta, GA: Continental Book Company, 1948.