At a 1974 conference in Harrisburg, one scholar declared that "the field of Pennsylvania Indian history" was "almost wide open." But the situation was not quite that grim; by the mid-1970s Pennsylvania had a long tradition of professional and avocational historical writing on its native peoples. With only rare exceptions, however, the literature was longer on colorful detail than rigorous interpretation and deeper in racial stereotypes than cross-cultural understanding. Intentionally or not, authors usually consigned the Indians of Pennsylvania to the timeless, unchanging category anthropologist Eric R. Wolf labels "people without history": natives interacted with colonists peacefully and unpeacefully but inevitably succumbed—for better or worse—to an aggressive Euro-American civilization; they fought nobly to preserve ancient ways but seldom adapted functionally to novel situations.

In the past decade and a half the historiographical situation has changed dramatically, as scholars influenced by the Civil Rights and Red Power movements, by research for the litigation of native American land claims cases, and by new appreciations of the ethnic, racial, and class antagonisms that have shaped the American past have blended historical, anthropological, and archaeological approaches to reexamine European-Indian interactions throughout North America. As a result, the Pennsylvania Indian field is no longer unplowed. Specialized studies have blossomed and borne some choice fruits. Yet the crop as a whole remains far from harvest, and its size and shape remain unclear.

In search of a little more clarity, this essay sketches one proposed shape for Pennsylvania's native past. Many details remain to be filled in, but recent historical, anthropological, and archaeological studies of Northeastern North America suggest a six-stage periodization: 1) The Evolution of Many Indian Pennsylvanias, from perhaps 12,000 B.C. to approximately A.D. 1550; 2) Indirect Contacts with European Culture, from approximately 1550 to 1625; 3) Responses to the European Invasion, from approximately 1625 to 1675; 4) Economic Dependency and Tenuous Cultural Autonomy, from approximately 1675 to 1754; 5) Indian Wars for Independence, from the beginning of the Seven Years War in 1754 to the last major Pennsylvania Indian land cession in 1794; and 6) Invisibility to the Dominant Culture, from 1794 to the present.

The thirteen-and-a-half-millennia-long period of The Evolution of Many Indian Pennsylvanias is, of course, actually comprised of dozens of epochs; far from being "people without history," the natives of what would become Pennsylvania were the products of long indigenous processes of cultural
development. Evidence from the Meadowcroft Rockshelter site in Washington county suggests that human occupation of the southwestern portion of Pennsylvania began as early as 12,000 BC. By approximately 10,500 B.C., glacial ice had retreated from more northerly areas to reveal a landscape drained by three great river systems: the Delaware and its tributaries in the east, the Susquehanna and its tributaries in the center, and the Monongahela and Allegheny and their tributaries in the west. Bisecting the watershed of each river system was an east-west line roughly traced by the Delaware Water Gap, the Blue and Allegheny mountains, and the Ohio River. The six regions thus defined created an enduring cultural geography unconstrained by today's artificial boundaries between Pennsylvania and New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, and Ohio.

Between 10,500 and 9,000 B.C., nomadic "Paleo-Indian" hunters began to exploit the game of each of the six regions. In the centuries after about 8000 B.C., as the climate gradually warmed and regional ecosystems assumed approximately their modern shapes, a number of "Archaic" cultures evolved in adaption to local environments. Small, autonomous populations migrated in seasonal cycles to exploit food resources, presumably employing a sexual division of labor in which women gathered and men hunted and fished. During what some archaeologists identify as a distinct "Transition" phase in the centuries around 1000 B.C., Archaic patterns developed at different times in different locations into "Early Woodland" cultures, the onsets of which were marked by the introduction of pottery and the establishment of relatively large, semi-sedentary population groups. By 300 B.C. these in turn had entered distinct "Middle Woodland" phases. Early and Middle Woodland hunter-gatherer economies rested on a pattern of shrewd exploitation of ecological resources that one archaeologist has labelled "primary forest efficiency." Corn horticulture, although practiced widely, apparently made only a small and relatively unpredictable contribution to a varied diet gleaned from rich woodlands, lakes, and streams.

During the "Late Woodland" phase, which opened in approximately A.D. 1000, improved forms of horticulture began to be practiced on a major scale throughout the six Indian Pennsylvanias. The cultivation of new varieties of maize, beans, and squash did not so much replace earlier subsistence patterns as overlay them; in varying mixtures native peoples continued to rely on hunting and fishing for animal protein and on gathering for substantial portions of their diets. Thus, despite the denser concentrations of population that horticulture permitted and the more sedentary way of life it demanded, earlier patterns of seasonal migration and sexual division of labor persisted. Men continued to exploit scattered hunting and fishing locations and thus were away from home for much of the year; women meanwhile tended the crops and, as a result, largely controlled the cornfields and the houses and villages near which they were located.
By the sixteenth century, the two easternmost Indian Pennsylvanias—the upper and lower Delaware watersheds—were home for numerous Late Woodland bands of a few dozen to a few hundred people. Although scholars are far from unanimous agreement on the matter, it appears that these many small communities were at most organized into two or three loose confederacies. Those clusterings might best be described not as unified tribes or polities but as collections of peoples generally at peace with one another who recognized strong affinities of marriage, trade, and language—Munsee dialects were spoken in the north, Unami among the Lenape people of the south. Debate rages on the economic basis of Munsee and Lenape life, but evidence suggests that, like their Middle Woodland predecessors, both relied heavily on fishing, hunting, and gathering and derived only a portion of their diet from horticulture.

The principal Late Woodland inhabitants of the lower Susquehanna River watershed were a people scholars label “Shenk's Ferry,” after the archaeological site in Lancaster County from which their material culture was first clearly identified. Like the Munsees and the Lenapes, the Shenk’s Ferry people apparently lived primarily in small communities, although archaeologists have also located some substantial village sites. Scholars know frustratingly little else about them: their language is unrecorded, their origins cannot be clearly traced to any earlier inhabitants of the lower Susquehanna (although recent work suggests that they developed from an earlier “Clemson’s Island” culture), and they cannot be conclusively associated with any later historically documented group. Farther south in the Susquehanna-Chesapeake Bay watershed, a variety of localized Algonquian groups shared many cultural and linguistic similarities with the Lenapes to their northeast. Among these peoples, too, there seems to have been little political centralization. Nonetheless, those on the eastern shore of Chesapeake Bay are sometimes lumped together as “Nanticokes” and those on the western shore as “Conoys,” after the names of the local groups later most prominent in dealings with European colonists.

The residents of the northern Susquehanna drainage at the beginning of the Late Woodland phase were Iroquoian language speakers who bore local variants of a cultural tradition usually labeled “Owasco.” Owasco economies relied heavily on horticulture and supported communities ranging in size from several hundred to perhaps a thousand people. Large main villages were inhabited year-round (although for much of the year many adult males and some women were absent hunting and fishing) and typically were associated with several nearby smaller hamlets and a variety of seasonally occupied hunting and fishing camps. At intervals of roughly twenty years, communities migrated to new locations as soil, firewood, and other resources became exhausted.

Owasco communities seem to have been extremely independent, isolated, and hostile toward outsiders. Warfare was prevalent, and reciprocal retaliation produced an ongoing cycle of feuding not easily stopped. Out of the violence
emerged, across a broad region encompassing not only northern Pennsylvania but also most of present-day New York State, Southern Ontario, and the St. Lawrence Valley, a gradual consolidation of smaller communities into larger entities and of large villages into tribal groupings and confederacies. The amalgamations resulted partly from the practice of periodic village removals, partly from voluntary consolidations for defensive purposes, partly from the incorporation of war captives into victorious societies, and partly from the efforts of such native visionaries as the Iroquois Peacemaker, who sought to unite people in a League of Peace that would resolve disputes by means better than warfare. By the sixteenth century at least two such peace leagues had been established. One formed in Ontario among the five Huron nations, and the other in central New York among the Mohawks, Oneidas, Onondagas, Cayugas, and Senecas—the Five Nations of the Iroquois League.¹⁴

Around the margins of the Huron and Iroquois countries, other descendants of the Owasco peoples consolidated locally into substantial villages, tribal groupings, and perhaps confederacies, but remained aloof from the two historically documented peace leagues. Among these were at least two peoples of what would become northern Pennsylvania and southern New York: the Susquehannocks and the Eries. The archaeological jury is still out on the number and identity of other possible groups in the upper Susquehanna and Allegheny watersheds. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Susquehannocks lived in scattered hamlets on the North Branch of the Susquehanna River with perhaps a few outposts on the West Branch as well. Their culture shared common Owasco roots with the peoples who became the Onondagas and Cayugas of the Iroquois League; during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, as populations consolidated throughout the region, those who became Onondagas and Cayugas apparently moved gradually northward, while the emergent Susquehannocks moved southward. The Eries, meanwhile, perhaps migrated slowly northward through present-day northwestern Pennsylvania to southwestern New York. Their relationships with neighbors farther south in the Allegheny watershed within are still undetermined, for scholars know little about the peoples of this region, which may have been quite densely populated in the late sixteenth century.¹⁵

Farther south, the principal Late Woodland inhabitants of present-day southwestern Pennsylvania, southeastern Ohio, northeastern Kentucky, and West Virginia were the Monongahelas. Their towns were densely settled and politically and materially complex, but, as is the case with the Shenk’s Ferry people, their language and relationship—if any—to cultures known to Europeans in historic times are uncertain.¹⁶ Recent research suggests, however, that they were the Iroquoian-speaking group known vaguely to Dutch colonizers as the "Black Minquas" and to the French as the "Attiouandern."¹⁷ Along the Ohio River to the south and west of the Monongahelas were the burial mounds and
ceremonial centers of the Fort Ancient culture. Perhaps because of a "mini ice age" that reduced the yields of over-extended horticultural systems, both the Fort Ancient people and the Monongahelas seem to have been declining in economic and demographic strength by the mid-sixteenth century.\footnote{8}

While during the Late Woodland phase developments proceeded independently in the six regions of Indian Pennsylvania, the various peoples remained in contact—friendly and unfriendly—with each other and shared many broad cultural traits. Most participated in far-flung networks of small-scale trade that, through countless intermediaries, eventually brought to Pennsylvania items from as far away as the Rocky Mountains, the upper Great Lakes, and the Atlantic coast of the Carolinas. Principal commodities in this commerce—which utilized the same waterways and nodes of exchange that would later be exploited by European traders—were ritual items and articles of personal adornment, particularly shells and minerals Indians believed to embody spiritual power from sources under the earth or water.\footnote{9}

Despite their participation in long-distance trade networks, none of the six Indian Pennsylvanias was among the earliest focuses of European expansion into North America; geography insulated Pennsylvania natives from many of the novel forces that challenged Indian peoples more in the eye of the storm. Yet insulation did not necessarily mean isolation. The effects of the European rippled through the six cultural regions during the period of \textit{Indirect Contact with European Cultures}, dating from approximately 1550 to 1625.

One of the earliest effects of indirect contact may have been epidemic disease. The long isolation of North and South America from Europe, Africa, and Asia and their human, animal, and microbial populations made Indian peoples "virgin soil" for such common Eastern Hemisphere illnesses as smallpox, measles, and influenza. Universally, the result was devastating to native Americans and their ways of life. Demographers, anthropologists, and historians now agree that, once the diseases hit any given area, native population declined by ninety to ninety-five percent before reaching a new plateau a century or more later.\footnote{20} If little controversy remains among scholars about the appalling impact of European diseases, heated disagreement prevails on the timing of the first epidemics in the Northeast.\footnote{21} No firm conclusions on when Pennsylvania natives first died from imported maladies can yet be reached, nor—barring revolutionary progress in methodology and evidence—are any likely to be reached soon. But it seems reasonable to speculate that in the lower Delaware and Susquehanna watersheds epidemics may have preceded direct European contact, while farther inland they did not occur until the second quarter of the seventeenth century.\footnote{22}

European microbes may or may not have invaded Pennsylvania in the sixteenth century, but there is no doubt that European trade goods did, as they passed from Indian to Indian through traditional forms of exchange. In Pennsylvania, occasional items of European manufacture seem to have appeared
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first among the peoples of the Susquehanna watersheds, having filtered northward from natives who traded with or plundered Spanish and English ships on the shores of Chesapeake Bay and the Outer Banks of North Carolina. Shortly thereafter, the first European goods trickled into the Delaware valley from various points along the mid-Atlantic coast. Later, other foreign items would find their way to Pennsylvania from the St. Lawrence and Hudson rivers.

The least dramatic ramifications of the indirect trade in European goods occurred in the area in which one might expect the most rapid change: material culture. For Indians in Pennsylvania and elsewhere in the interior of the Northeast, the introduction of European products began a gradual evolution, rather than a startling revolution, in material life. Rare and novel things from across the ocean fit easily into ancient cultural patterns of long-distance commerce in luxury goods, ritual items, and substances believed to embody spiritual power. Accordingly, the European items most likely to be unearthed from sixteenth-century archaeological sites in Pennsylvania are solitary glass beads and fragments of copper, brass, and iron, all of which corresponded in color, texture, and appearance to the sacred shells, chunks of minerals, and pieces of unsmelted copper that Indians had highly prized for centuries. Natives acquired and used these and other new goods in distinctly “Indian” ways, as religious objects and sources of raw materials for native-style tools, weapons, jewelry, and ritual items. In the period of indirect trade a brass pot or an iron axe head was more likely to be cut up and reprocessed than to be employed as its European manufacturer intended (Figure 1). Before 1600 such items rarely, if ever, reached Pennsylvania in their original forms.

The most striking results of the indirect participation of Pennsylvania natives in trade with Europeans occurred not in material life but in Indian communities’ relationships with each other. Throughout Northeastern North America, warfare apparently intensified considerably in the late sixteenth century. At bottom, the violence was probably economically motivated, but, as with the ways in which Indians adopted glass beads and brass pots, the novel characteristics of sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century warfare should not be overstated. Warfare to secure access to valued items did not necessarily translate into an effort to corner the market or to become commercial intermediaries in a business-school sense, nor is there any reason to believe that for those involved any clear lines separated the new warfare from older patterns.

The Susquehannocks provide a case study in patterns of trade and warfare in the period of indirect contact. Their homeland in the upper Susquehanna watershed left them less favorably situated than their Shenk’s Ferry neighbors to the south, who were acquiring—probably from other natives—small but significant quantities of glass beads and metal from the Chesapeake Bay region. At the same time, however, the Susquehannocks were more advantageously placed than their Onondaga neighbors to the north. A multi-sided conflict ensued, pitting the
During the period of indirect contacts with Europeans and in the early years of direct trade, Indians frequently employed items of European manufacture as raw materials for native products. Parts of a brass kettle, for example, could be reprocessed into a) an awl ground from the straightened iron handle; b) projectile points cut from the heavy metal of the handle lugs; c) a knife blade fashioned from the body of the kettle; d), e), f) tubular and conical beads and bangles rolled from sheet brass; and g) a pendant made from a handle lug.

Susquehannocks against the Shenk's Ferry people and against the Onondagas and perhaps other League Iroquois; other, poorly known, peoples in the region may also have been involved. By the time European documents began to record events in the lower Susquehanna watershed, the Shenk's Ferry people had ceased to exist as an identifiable entity. Their former homeland was now controlled by the Susquehannocks, all or most of whom—still at war with their northern neighbors—had moved south to a single heavily fortified village in present-day Lancaster County, from which they enjoyed unimpeded access to sources of European goods on the Chesapeake Bay.27

As economic and other indirect and direct contacts with Europeans intensified in the early seventeenth century, the natives of the six cultural regions of Indian Pennsylvania increasingly became enmeshed in a single system of exchange, warfare, and diplomacy in which European traders were important actors. In tracing these developments, historians can for the first time employ the kinds of written sources with which they are most comfortable. The existence of such sources marks the point at which the European invasion of the Susquehanna and Delaware watersheds commenced in earnest. Incursions began first in the
lower Susquehanna region, when in 1608 Englishman John Smith met a group of Susquehannocks near the head of Chesapeake Bay. Soon thereafter Dutch traders became active in the lower Delaware watershed. By the second quarter of the seventeenth century, year-round European outposts in both areas had punctured the insulation of the Lenapes and Susquehannocks and initiated a half century of intense rivalry among various European competitors for the two regions’ Indian commerce. Thus began a third period of Pennsylvania Indian history, dating from approximately 1625 to 1675.

Initially in this phase of Responses to the European Invasion, the competition among European traders and colonizers in the Delaware and Chesapeake regions brought considerable advantages for the Lenapes and the Susquehannocks, who after some initial armed conflict apparently came to a mutual accommodation on trade that allowed the latter access to both market centers. The former trickle of trade goods into Indian villages became a flood, but earlier patterns of economic and material evolution rather than revolution continued. As imported items became vastly more plentiful, the use of metal goods as raw materials for native crafts was joined by the wholesale substitution of European for native items: brass kettles for clay pots, woollen cloth for animal skins, glass beads for sea shells, firearms for bows and arrows. In almost every case, however, the new items fit into traditional cultural niches and continued to be used in “Indian” ways, a fact to which European producers quickly adapted by manufacturing varieties of cloth, tools, weapons, and jewelry specifically designed for finicky native customers. Yet the substitution of specially manufactured European goods for domestically produced items need not imply the loss of native material culture traditions. On the contrary, an efflorescence of native material culture was likely to occur. Some craft skills disappeared, but others blossomed as new metal tools allowed both new and old materials to be worked in ways firmly rooted in native traditions to produce stunning pipes, jewelry, combs, and other luxury and ritual items (Figure 2).

One clear result of the direct and large-scale involvement of Delaware and Susquehanna valley peoples in trade with Europeans was an acceleration of military conflicts. In the mid-seventeenth century, native groups throughout the Northeast became embroiled in what have often been labeled the “Beaver Wars”—conflicts largely, but by no means entirely, over access to fur supplies and European market outposts. The European powers contending for control of the trade and lands of the Delaware and Susquehanna watersheds were almost inevitably pulled into the struggles of their native trading partners and driven in turn to exploit their Indian connections to preempt territory and seize commercial advantages from colonial rivals. For all the natives involved, the conflicts further devastated populations already ravished by disease, but the peoples initially most successful in negotiating the economic and military thickets were
those with the strongest trading ties to Europeans: the Susquehannocks and the Five Nations Iroquois. The Susquehannocks—with free access to traders on both the Maryland Chesapeake and the Swedish, Dutch, and English Delaware and, apparently, firm control of hunting territories throughout the Susquehanna watersheds and points west—prospered materially and turned their village into a fortress bristling with European firearms. There they more than held their own against their only significant documented military foes, the Onondagas, Oneidas,
Cayugas, and Senecas of the Five Nations Iroquois (the Mohawks apparently did not participate), whose principal trading partners were the Dutch of Fort Orange (later Albany) on the Hudson River.32

In contrast to the Susquehannocks and the Iroquois, the peoples who fared worst in the Beaver Wars were those most isolated from direct trade with Europeans. The Monongahelas, Eries, and perhaps other peoples of the western watersheds literally disappeared from the map before the century's midpoint and before European chroniclers could record much about them. Direct evidence on the more westerly Fort Ancient people's ultimate fate does not exist, although scholars have frequently asserted that they were the ancestors of the Shawnees, who would migrate in small bands to Pennsylvania and elsewhere beginning in the late seventeenth century. By that time, most of the Allegheny, Monongahela, and upper Ohio region was apparently depopulated.33

For more fortunate peoples such as the Susquehannocks, large-scale participation in trade with Europeans wrought a gradual reversal of pre-contact economic patterns. For centuries, Indian Pennsylvanians had produced for themselves nearly all of the basic needs of their lives and engaged in long-distance trade only to acquire luxury and ritual items. By the late seventeenth century, however, peoples of both the Delaware and Susquehanna watersheds relied on trade with Europeans for such mundane necessities as clothing, tools, and weapons, while producing luxury and ritual goods at home from domestic or imported materials. The trade was an inherently unbalanced proposition involving the export of raw materials—furs and hides—for the profit and capital accumulation of merchants, manufacturers, and financiers located in European imperial centers.34

But for the natives the real disadvantages became apparent only after substantial numbers of European immigrants began to pour into Pennsylvania and surrounding Atlantic coast regions. In the diversified agricultural and mercantile economies the newcomers created, the Indian trade played an ever decreasing role; what Europeans soon wanted most from the natives was their land rather than their furs. Yet native Pennsylvanians had become irrevocably dependent on trade with Europeans in order to maintain their lifestyles. Between approximately 1675 and 1754, as pressures on their lands mounted and as trading conditions worsened, the peoples of Indian Pennsylvania perpetually sought to stave off disaster during a period of Economic Dependency and Tenuous Cultural Autonomy.

Dependency and its attendant threats to cultural autonomy came first to the natives of the lower Delaware watershed. By the mid-seventeenth century, the Lenapes' initial geographic advantages in the trade with Europeans had turned into disadvantages, as their powerful western and northern neighbors, the Susquehanocks and Iroquois, excluded them from prime sources of beaver pelts and other furs and hides. Thus their slide into economic dependence on trade
with Europeans coincided with economic irrelevance to Dutch, Swedish, and English merchants who found better suppliers of furs in the Susquehannocks travelling eastward to trade on the Delaware. As a result, foodstuffs, more than pelts, may have become the Lenapes’ most valuable commodity in exchanges for European goods, giving horticulture unprecedented importance to their livelihood. The same agricultural productivity that in the short run aided Lenape economic survival, however, made European farmers early covet their village sites and homelands. Meanwhile, as the only Pennsylvania natives who lived in close proximity to substantial numbers of colonists, the Lenapes were more consistently exposed than others to imported epidemic diseases. By the turn of the eighteenth century most had vacated their traditional territories for new homes on the Forks of the Delaware, the Lehigh River, the North Branch of the Susquehanna River, and the Brandywine Creek. There, along with substantial numbers of Munsee refugees whom New York and New Jersey colonists had similarly displaced from homelands in the upper Delaware watershed, the Lenapes began to embrace for the first time a collective ethnic identity as “Delawares.”

The Susquehannocks were next to succumb. For reasons that remain obscure and highly controversial, their military fortunes suddenly reversed in the mid-1670s. The only certainties are that the Susquehannock-Iroquois war came to an end in 1675; that at about the same time the Susquehannocks moved under Maryland’s protection to new homes on the Potomac River; and that once settled there they suffered dearly in the Chesapeake Anglo-Indian war accompanying Bacon’s Rebellion in Virginia. Most of the surviving Susquehannocks ultimately returned north to resettle in various parts of the Susquehanna and Delaware watersheds under the protection of the Iroquois, the Delawares, and the English government of New York. By the eighteenth-century, English colonists would call those who remained ethnically distinct from other Indians of the region “Conestogas.”

The Conestogas and Delawares were among the earliest of many refugee and remnant groups who adapted to dependency by seeking shelter in central Pennsylvania from wars with Indian and European foes, from pressures on their homelands and hunting territories, and from epidemic depopulation. Well before the end of the period of economic dependency and tenuous cultural autonomy, most surviving Pennsylvania natives would leave their traditional homes. As a result, by the 1720s the cultural landscape of Pennsylvania had been transformed; it was now dotted with polyglot refugee communities of Conestogas, Delawares, Shawnees, Nanticokes, Conoys, and others—such as Tuscaroras from the Carolinas—whose homelands were farther afield.

The prominent role the Five Nations Iroquois played in welcoming the refugees, in allotting them lands in the Susquehanna watersheds, and in presuming to speak for them in dealings with colonial governments led many Euro-
American writers to assert that Pennsylvania Indians were subjects in an Iroquois "empire." The reality behind the misleading image of empire was "the Covenant Chain," a shifting network of economic, diplomatic, and military alliances among a variety of native peoples and English colonial governments in which the central links were the English governor of New York and an anglophile faction among the headmen of the Five Nations Iroquois. Within the contexts of the Covenant Chain and the struggles of European empires for economic and political dominance in eastern North America, Pennsylvania natives faced constant threats to their economic livelihood and political autonomy. Their survival depended largely upon preserving their military neutrality through attempts to play the Iroquois and the governments of the various English and French colonies and against each other.

Two events of the 1680s defined important parameters of this "play-off" system of diplomacy: the establishment of the English province of Pennsylvania and the beginning of the first Anglo-French imperial conflict, the War of the Austrian Succession (known in Anglo-America as King William's War, 1689-1697). New York's close relationship with the Iroquois—who had been at war with the French off and on through much of the seventeenth century and most recently for two years before the English joined the fray in 1689—led to various pressures through the Covenant Chain to enlist the Indians of Pennsylvania in the struggle. Yet William Penn's pacifist principles forbade him or his new colony from participating in the crown's war against France or from helping the neighboring province fight on nearby frontiers. Building upon the precedent of peaceful relations enshrined in the legend of the "Treaty of Shackamaxon," both English and Indian Pennsylvanians were able to remain aloof, for the most part, from the first imperial contest as well as the second, the War of the Spanish Succession (Queen Anne's War, 1702-1714).

But by no means were the conflicts between European empires the only eighteenth-century wars significant for the Pennsylvania Indians. Often more pressing was their involvement in almost constant low-grade raiding between the Iroquois and various native groups to the south of Pennsylvania. In some cases, the conflicts had been brought northward by Indian refugees (this was particularly the case with the Tuscaroras); in others Iroquois fighters enlisted Pennsylvania Delaware, Conestoga, and Shawnee members of the Covenant Chain in southern campaigns; in still others, communities in the Susquehanna watersheds bore the brunt of attacks from southern raiders heading northward toward Iroquoia. The many-sided north-south antagonisms were intractable; eighteenth-century British colonial officials deemed them a continual threat to the safety of their frontiers.

In these and other matters for a generation after the end of Queen Anne's War in 1713 and William Penn's death in 1718, the central figure in Pennsylvania's relations with the natives was James Logan, who served as the Penn family's
personal agent, secretary of the province, and commissioner of property. A land speculator and fur trader in his own right, Logan mixed his private interests with those of the financially strapped Penns to engage in vast land speculations made possible by unscrupulous transactions with the natives. Logan's policies, abetted by a few Iroquois leaders who themselves were desperately trying to maintain the autonomy of their own people and homelands, eventually forced nearly all the Indians of Pennsylvania—natives and refugees alike—out of the lower Delaware and lower Susquehanna watersheds and placed tremendous pressure on those who clung to lands in the upper portions of those river systems. The dispossessed Indians moved west to the Allegheny, Monongahela, and upper Ohio river watersheds—collectively known as "the Ohio country"—where, with a variety of emigrant Iroquois ("Mingos") and Shawnees, they settled in ethnically mixed communities and nursed deep resentments against Euro-Americans in general and the Pennsylvania government in particular.

In their new homes, the Ohio country Indians were joined by a variety of other recent arrivals—Christian missionaries, British government agents and interpreters, traders and land speculators from Virginia and other colonies, military officers from New France, and a diverse group of other Euro-American and métis interlopers—all of whom were turning the region into the focal point of the global struggle between the British and French empires and embroiling the Indian residents in their conflicts. The rivalries became particularly intense during and after the War of the Austrian Succession (King George's War, 1744-1748), although no armed clashes yet occurred in the Ohio country.

Beginning in 1754, the tangle of diplomatic, economic, and imperialistic rivalries exploded in warfare, which would soon become the global struggle between the British and French empires known as the Seven Years War. In that conflict, for the first time the province of Pennsylvania and its Indian neighbors engaged in unrestrained violent conflict. Dispossessed Delawares, Shawnees, and Senecas took advantage of French expansionism in the Ohio country to redress long-standing grievances with the Euro-Pennsylvanians who had appropriated their former homes and now coveted their new ones. Quakers, meanwhile, withdrew from the provincial government, to be replaced by figures with no religious scruples against warfare. With virtually no Indian allies, the British in the early phases of the Seven Years War suffered repeated military debacles, of which the stunning defeat of Edward Braddock's troops on route to Fort Duquesne in 1755 was only the first. Anglo-Pennsylvania's military situation was particularly desperate; attacks by Ohio country Indians drove virtually all Europeans out of the area west of the Susquehanna River. Two events of 1758, however, turned the tide toward the British: first the fall of French Fort Frontenac on Lake Ontario disrupted the trading network on which the Ohio country peoples depended for French arms and supplies; second, at the Treaty of Easton, Pennsylvania agreed to restrain European settlement west of the Appala-
chian Mountains in exchange for a Delaware pledge that the Ohio country Indians would cease their military support of the French. As a result, the French were forced to abandon Fort Duquesne and with it their territorial pretensions south of the Great Lakes. These events in turn were keys to the British victory sealed on the Plains of Abraham at Quebec in 1759.46

No matter which side the Indians of Pennsylvania chose in the Seven Years War, the diplomatic and economic results were disastrous. Under the terms of the 1763 Treaty of Paris, Great Britain emerged from the conflict as the sole European imperial claimant to North America east of the Mississippi. Meanwhile formerly pacifist Pennsylvania had become an integral and militant part of its empire. Those two facts alone made inoperative the play-off system of diplomacy that, however imperfectly, for two generations had helped ensure Pennsylvania Indian autonomy. The Seven Years War became, therefore, merely the opening act in a forty-year series of Indian Wars for Independence from rule by Great Britain and, later, the newly independent United States. That the struggle lasted for four decades is testimony to the political strength and cultural resilience of the multi-ethnic communities Pennsylvania Indians created in the Ohio country.47

A notable phase of the Pennsylvania natives’ battle to preserve their independence began at the close of the Seven Years War. From the Ohio country, the Delaware prophet Neolin preached a gospel of pan-Indian resistance to European domination that inspired uprisings under various leaders from many native groups, among them the Ottawa war chief Pontiac, whose name later historians attached to the entire phenomenon. In the Pennsylvania theatre, “Pontiac’s War” was marked by atrocities on both sides until, in the summer and fall of 1764 the British military gained the upper hand and imposed peace treaties on the Ohio country Delawares, Shawnees, and Mingos.48 Nonetheless, violence continued sporadically on the Pennsylvania frontier. As in the infamous massacre of twenty Conestoga men, women, and children by the “Paxton Boys” in late 1763, Euro-Americans were usually the initiators.49

Between 1775 and 1783, the Indian wars for independence from European hegemony intertwined with the Euro-American War for Independence from Great Britain. As the era of the Seven Years War gave way to the era of the American Revolution, Ohio country Indians again found themselves defending their lands from expansionist Virginians and Pennsylvanians and allying themselves with the European power—this time Britain instead of France—that stood in the way of the colonists’ designs. In the upper Susquehanna watershed, meanwhile, warfare between the Euro-Americans and the British and their respective native allies wreaked devastation upon the Indian communities that had thus far managed to cling to homes in more eastern areas of Pennsylvania.50

In the end, the success of the Pennsylvania colonists’ bid for independence helped ensure the failure of the Pennsylvania Indians’ struggle. Under the Articles of Confederation, the Continental Congress and the various states disputed
bitterly, but each attempted to treat Indian allies of the British as conquered peoples upon whom they could impose peace terms and force land cessions. A string of coerced or fraudulent treaties culminating in 1794 at Canandaigua, New York, accordingly completed Pennsylvania’s boundaries in essentially their modern form and deprived Indians of claims to self-governing territories within them. A lone exception was the “Cornplanter Tract” on the upper Allegheny River, which, for over a century and a half, was home to a small community of Iroquois closely affiliated with the much larger Allegany Seneca Reservation north of the state line.51

By 1794, then, the Indian wars for independence had been lost within the modern boundaries of Pennsylvania, although they would continue in areas farther west for another generation.52 Throughout the past two centuries, nonetheless, native Americans have remained a part of the state’s ethnic mosaic. Yet, with few exceptions, their presence has remained invisible to members of the dominant society and to the bulk of the Euro-American scholars who have written the state’s history. Documentation on the Cornplanter Senecas and other Indians who remained within the interstices of Euro-American society in nineteenth-century Pennsylvania is virtually non-existent. Even their numbers are unknown; census takers who assumed that the only “real” native Americans lived far to the west, seldom bothered to distinguish non-reservation Indians from other people of color.53 The most recent phase of native history in the state, therefore, is one of Invisibility to the Dominant Culture.

For Whites in this period, Indians became a romanticized phenomenon of the state’s distant colonial past. Such views are epitomized by the works of the early nineteenth-century Pennsylvania artist Edward Hicks, whose allegorical paintings of the “Peaceable Kingdom” often include depictions of William Penn’s amicable dealings with the natives (Figure 3).54 Hicks’s equation of peaceful Indian-European relations with the biblical impossible dream of the lion who lies down with the lamb is in itself an indication of white attitudes. So too are various attempts in nineteenth-century folklore and print to justify the collapse of peaceful relations in the period between the Seven Years War and the American War for Independence.55 A further measure of the perverse twists that romantic mid-nineteenth-century White Pennsylvanians’ ideas about Indians could take is the popularity among the state’s middle-class males of “The Improved Order of Red Men.” The first of many Pennsylvania “tribes” of that fraternal organization specializing in pseudo-Indian motifs and rituals was established in 1849. Revealingly, a souvenir book produced by the organization has apparently long been shelved in the reference section of the Pennsylvania State Library beside sources on genuine native cultures.56

Also illustrative of nineteenth-century White Pennsylvania attitudes was the 1876 Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia, for which Spencer Fullerton Baird—a former professor at Pennsylvania’s Dickinson College then an official of the
Like most of the many versions of the Peaceable Kingdom painted by Quaker artist Edward Hicks (1780–1849), this 1826 work contains a vignette of William Penn's treaty with the Indians and illustrates the romanticized views nineteenth-century Euro-Pennsylvanians held of their state's native past.

Smithsonian Institution—planned an important exhibit on native American life. Logistical problems, inter-agency feuding, insufficient funding, and poorly organized display cases ensured an exhibit that never seriously challenged visitors' beliefs that Indian cultures were museum piece relics of a bygone era. But just as important in shaping the messages conveyed at the Centennial Exhibition were the biases of Baird and other White Americans who considered themselves friends of the Indians. Eastern White reformers concerned about Indian issues were only dimly—if at all—aware of the continued existence of natives within their own midst and saw the cultures of the Western Plains as dying remnants tragically ill-adapted to the present. For their own good, therefore, surviving Indians must be pressed toward rapid assimilation into the Euro-American cultural order.

Late-nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Pennsylvania was home to two major institutional manifestations of the assimilationist impulse: the Indian Industrial Training School, which opened in Carlisle in 1879, and the politically
influential Indian Rights Association, organized in Philadelphia in 1882. The highly publicized educational experiment in Carlisle, brainchild of U.S. Army officer Richard Henry Pratt, emphasized elementary literacy and training in the manual arts as means of "civilizing" its Indian students, who were drawn from throughout the United States. After a colorful career, Pratt retired amidst a storm of bureaucratic wrangling in 1904, and fourteen years later the rudderless school closed, largely unmourned.\textsuperscript{5}\textsuperscript{9} The Indian Rights Association, by contrast, endures to the present day, although it has drastically changed its agenda; Indian self-determination, rather than assimilation, is now its goal, and native Americans now shape its programs.\textsuperscript{6}\textsuperscript{0} Still, for most of the twentieth century assimilationist policies prevailed in the dominant culture and on those rare occasions when state politicians addressed native issues. The trend reached a symbolic climax in 1964, when the completion of the Kinzua Dam on the Allegheny River flooded the entire Cornplanter Tract and forced its remaining residents to relocate to suburban ranch-style houses the Federal government built for them in western New York.\textsuperscript{6}\textsuperscript{1}

Although the Kinzua Dam obliterated the last identifiable native community land base in the state, Pennsylvania Indian history no more ended in 1964 than it had in 1794. In 1980 there were, according to Federal Census figures, 9,179 self-identified native Americans among the state's population—roughly the same number of people scholars usually attribute to the post-epidemic Iroquois League in about 1680.\textsuperscript{6}\textsuperscript{2} The 1990 Census will probably record a substantial increase, as several active native American organizations in the state stimulate Indian cultural awareness. The context in which thousands of late-twentieth-century Pennsylvanians of varied ethnic background embrace an Indian identity within the dominant social order deserves more serious consideration than researchers have yet displayed.\textsuperscript{6}\textsuperscript{3} The lack of attention may be a measure of the successful integration of native Americans into the state's social, economic, and political mainstream. More likely, however, it testifies to the enduring racism of a dominant culture that refuses to recognize the existence—much less the current needs and past history—of non-reservation native people.

The period of Pennsylvania Indian invisibility to the dominant culture thus continues to the present day. It is unlikely to end soon if writing on the state's Indian past continues to be populated by "people without history." The framework for Pennsylvania Indian history proposed here stresses process, change, and adaptation within millennia of deep native continuities. Without minimizing the significance of the European presence, it allows researchers, writers, and teachers to conceptualize the native past in ways focused on the Indian side of the cultural divide. As future scholarship builds upon, modifies, and even reconstructs the framework, historical understanding of the state's native past on its own complex terms may begin at last to render the invisible visible.
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