The frontier has ever been a fertile field for fiction writers, perhaps because life was raw and rugged, the people were recalcitrant and even rebellious, and the Indians accumulated a smoldering resentment against the constant pressure for land and more land in exchange for the white man's rum, religion, and finally reservations. Keeping peace with the Indians was an ever-present problem for most of the colonies. To Virginia, especially, with its extensive frontier, the actions of the Indians north of the Ohio, the Six Nations and more particularly the Delawares, as well as those of the powerful southern tribes, kept the problem of frontier protection acutely to the fore, especially as petitions from the frontier people set forth their tribulations and importuned the assembly for aid of one sort or another. On its southwest, Virginia had one of the fiercest and most warlike tribes, the powerful Cherokees along the Holston and Tennessee Rivers, whose upper towns were in North Carolina and whose lower towns were in South Carolina. Fortunately for the colonies, the once very powerful Cherokee nation, with more than six thousand fighting men and sixty-four towns and villages, had been reduced about one-half by the smallpox epidemic in 1738. In 1763 they numbered 4000.

On June 5, 1758 the new lieutenant governor of Virginia, Dr. Norkus, teacher of Advanced Placement in United States History at Taylor Allderdice High School, adapted the above article from a chapter in her doctoral dissertation.—Ed.
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Francis Fauquier, took his oath of office. At a council meeting the next day, the governor had his first insight into the Indian problem through communications from Sir John St. Clair, Colonel William Byrd and Christopher Gist, dated June 1 from Winchester, respecting military matters. The French and Indian War had been lagging since its inception in 1754, but more recently William Pitt had breathed new life into the cause. The promise of reimbursement for their expenses had led the colonies to recruit new forces for the forthcoming campaigns. Both Byrd and Gist had been trying to obtain and to hold in line the Cherokees needed for the forthcoming campaign. It was a vexatious task. The governor was soon to learn that there was no more mercurial creature to handle than the Indian. He came too early, left too early, and was constantly pressuring for a "handout." Gist complained of their constant return home for which he provided conductors except when they ran away; nevertheless, he had expectations of good behavior on their part. What troubled Gist was the need for scouts.

Lord Loudoun, acting on the well-known principle that it takes a thief to catch a thief, wanted to have a strong Indian force to use against the French and Indians. William Byrd had gone into the Cherokee country for that purpose. By May 1, 1758, about 600 Cherokees had assembled at Winchester, Virginia, of which 400 were equipped and sent out as scouting parties along the Ohio. Since the Virginia regiments were not yet organized, the Cherokees had become impatient and had begun to return home. Some, however, moved on to Carlisle and even to Philadelphia, much to the distress of Brigadier General John Forbes in command of the expedition to capture Fort Duquesne. Forbes realized that maintaining the support of the Indians was a delicate affair, that it was necessary to keep them occupied, well-supplied, and awed by the size of the army and artillery.

Forbes took steps to keep the Indians in line. He placed an embargo on all Indian goods in Philadelphia to prevent private traders from buying them up. Even then the General doubted that supplies were sufficient to keep the Indians pacified until goods arrived from England. He sent Captain Abraham Bosomworth to
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Winchester to assist Byrd in organizing the Indians under his command.\(^6\) To keep the Indians occupied so that they would not arrive northward before they were needed, Forbes suggested to Washington that he use them to survey the paths leading to the Ohio.\(^7\)

The Indian problem continued to be a difficult one. By the time of Fauquier's arrival in the colony, Byrd with sixty Cherokees was present at Winchester. There he waited for the coming of the Cherokee chief Attakullakulla who was to bring two or three hundred more.\(^8\) The Cherokees were in good humor and were well-behaved, but Byrd requested of governor and council the usual presents for them, especially wampum and silver ornaments.\(^9\) Forbes was delighted with the prospect of aid from Attakullakulla and his followers because he expected their presence to restore the waning enthusiasm of those already on hand.\(^10\) Among other reasons, he wanted to retain the Cherokees in order to awe the northern Indians who might otherwise become active enemies.\(^11\) In spite of all his efforts, however, by July 9, most of the Cherokees had left, except for fifty at Raystown with Colonel Henry Bouquet and sixty at Fort Cumberland with Colonel Byrd.\(^12\) But the outlook was not as discouraging as it seemed, for Forbes at Carlisle expected the arrival of fifty Catawbas and a group of one hundred with Attakullakulla. That these had not deserted, Forbes attributed to the influence of William Byrd. Former Governor Glen of South Carolina had also used his influence with the Indians. To prove their loyalty and continued service in the campaign, some of those who remained deposited their goods in the general stores. But since a slight offense could undo a month's good work, it was impossible to predict from day to day what their numbers would be.\(^13\) About the middle of August, the Catawbas, in need of a complete outfitting, arrived at Winchester.\(^14\) The long-awaited Attakullakulla or Little Carpenter (as he was more popularly known) finally arrived with sixty warriors about the middle of October; but he proved a dubious blessing, for his extravagant demands exceeded the already unreasonable demands of the other Indians and only served to increase discontent. Forbes decided that, since so many
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thousands of pounds had already been thrown away on the Indians, it would be foolish to lose the Little Carpenter and the rest for a few hundred pounds more.\textsuperscript{15} The Little Carpenter and some of the others, however, having obtained their presents, left the army before the campaign was over, much to the indignation of Forbes who ordered them pursued and stripped of their presents.\textsuperscript{16} The Catawbas under Captain Johnne also failed to furnish any aid and like “a parcell of thieves” fled back to Winchester.\textsuperscript{17}

Governor Fauquier, very soon after his arrival in the colony, therefore, was to record that he had “never entertained any high Opinion of the Friendship of any Indians, nor form’d any great Expectations from their Services.” To the suggestion that he send a messenger to the Catawba nation, the governor prudently observed that “it will be too late to undertake any Thing of that Sort for the Benefit of this Campaign, and according to their Behaviour in it, we shall be better able to know what to say to them at the End of it.” He recommended that Washington keep in a good humor the Catawbas still with him, “lest they should do Mischief to the Inhabitants in their Return home (as some have done) if they leave you in an ill Humour.”\textsuperscript{18} Thus, after a considerable expenditure of money, the amount of aid obtained from the southern Indians was practically negligible.

Military matters pressed upon the governor most severely during the first few months of his administration. As indicated by Fauquier, the Indians on their way homeward, in one way or another, ran afoul of the frontiersmen. Although the two Virginia regiments were ready early in June to proceed to Fort Cumberland, one company of Washington’s regiment was sent to the frontier because of “a Scuffle between some of the Cherokee Indians, and some of our people whose patience was worn out by repeated Insults and Robberies, committed on them, and at last took up Arms in their Defense.” According to Fauquier, the Indians had admitted being
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the aggressors in the affair, which William Byrd was attempting to adjust.\textsuperscript{19} By the end of June, the provincial troops of Virginia, Pennsylvania and Carolina (Maryland had "not sent a man") had moved to join Forbes for the advance to Fort Duquesne.\textsuperscript{20}

Much water was to run over the mill, however, before Governor Fauquier could send to England a report of the capture of Fort Duquesne. To the impatient Virginians, the troops seemingly moved at a snail's pace, and many a time they were akin to the Cherokees in their discontent and restlessness. The Virginians had responded to the requests of Loudoun and William Pitt with an alacrity and an enthusiasm not beheld in the other southern colonies. But then as now, military manoeuvres did not always run smoothly and a military command was as likely to break a man as to make him.

Not until April 24 did Washington receive orders to complete his regiment which needed 180 men. The £1800 for recruiting was not forthcoming; Washington kept prodding Acting-Governor Blair, President of Council; finally, in exasperation he demanded to know whether he was to use his private fortune for the purpose.\textsuperscript{21} Sir John St. Clair, quartermaster, who labored at Winchester, place of rendezvous, to equip the regiments with tents, blankets, tools, arms and various types of field equipage, found obstacles facing him. Blair's refusal to grant him the king's arms in the governor's house, presumably because they would be needed for a fort in the Indian country, incensed the irascible, constantly feuding quartermaster-general, who sarcastically commented that surely the arms had not been placed there merely to adorn the place.\textsuperscript{22} Blair finally "stript" the house and the magazine of its arms and, though lacking funds, bought tents and kettles at Philadelphia for which he expected payment from England.\textsuperscript{23}

Washington's difficulties with Blair were settled by a visit to Williamsburg where he addressed a letter to the acting-governor outlining twelve points for his consideration.\textsuperscript{24} These included pay
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equalization in the two regiments for, in order to raise the second regiment quickly, the burgesses had offered additional inducements. Also needed were baggage, forage, and bat money for the officers and clothing and equipment for the men. Blair granted these requests insofar as he could, but some of them were to be passed on to the new governor. By the time Fauquier arrived in the colony, Washington's regiment consisted of 950 men and Byrd had 900 men, far in excess of what Forbes actually had expected.

It was while Washington was in Williamsburg, or shortly after, that Lieutenant Governor Fauquier arrived in the colony, but Washington considered his duties too pressing to tarry in Williamsburg in order to see the governor. Fauquier's respite from the minutiae of military matters was of short duration, though, for he soon received a letter from the Colonel which modestly but appropriately began, "Although but a poor hand at Complimenting, but permit me, nevertheless to offer your Hon'r my congratulations on your appointment; and safe arrival to a Government which His Majesty has been Graciously pleas'd to entrust to you with the Administration of, and to assure you, that I most sincerely wish your Administration may be attended with pleasure to yourself and strength to the People Governed." After an apology for not calling on him, came a request for an officer's commission, details about a payroll, and the need for a supply of clothing for both regiments and field equipage of all kinds which he suggested should be obtained in England. Fauquier also had the problem of obtaining a surgeon for the army. After sending one with whose qualifications he was not satisfied, he found one who had been a surgeon in the king's navy and was more suitable in every way, to whom he also gave a commission. Then in justification of this he wrote, "My zeal for the Service is so great that perhaps I may incommode you by repeated Recommendations, but I think it better to have one or two superfluous than that the Forces should want one."?

Fauquier's early correspondence with Washington and Byrd dealt mainly with the adjustment of complaints regarding military conditions. The second regiment, commanded by Byrd, was in con-
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fusion. The men complained because they lacked clothing; the officers complained because their recruiting accounts had been refused and threatened to refuse commissions unless they were allowed the necessary expenses. Without money in the treasury, all the council could do was to permit Byrd and the field officers to examine and audit the officers’ recruiting accounts and then grant them what was found reasonable. Any further action would have to wait for the next assembly. French prize-cloth in the possession of the colony could be used to clothe Byrd’s 800 men. Shirts were already available from the cloth for 200 men, and there was sufficient cloth to provide shirts for the other 600 as well as “leggings.”

Fauquier assured Byrd that nothing would be lacking on his part “to give all reasonable Content to every Man engaged in his Majesty’s Service” as far as was within his power. There is no evidence that Fauquier ever had Dinwiddie’s ambitions to acquire military glory or that he desired control of the military forces of Virginia. At all times he did his best to cooperate with those military officials above him and with those below him. Upon his arrival in Virginia, he immediately informed General Abercromby of his appointment, assured him of his readiness to engage in any correspondence with him and, no doubt most welcome of all, forwarded to him a letter from Mrs. Abercromby (to whom Fauquier had been introduced by the Virginia agent in England, James Abercromby) with assurances that his family was well. Having thus smoothed the way, Fauquier presented to General Abercromby the question of Virginia’s share of the £50,000 grant from Parliament on which a report from General Abercromby was necessary before the Board of Trade in England would act. Fauquier enclosed the various acts of February 14, 1754, October 17, 1754, May 1, 1755, August 5, 1755, March 25, 1756, and March 1757 of the House of Burgesses indicating military expenditures of £207,600.

As far as military events were concerned, Fauquier was more interested in the decisions and movements of General Forbes. About
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the middle of June, a conference was held at Conococheague at which Governor Sharpe of Maryland, Colonel Henry Bouquet, Sir John St. Clair and Washington decided the movement of the troops.\(^\text{32}\) Washington with five companies of the first Virginia regiment left Winchester for Fort Cumberland in Maryland on June 24, six days before Forbes left Philadelphia for Carlisle. A few days after Washington’s departure, Colonel Byrd advanced with eight companies of the second regiment and arrived at Fort Cumberland July 6.\(^\text{33}\) At Raystown, where Colonel Bouquet was in command, Virginia and Pennsylvania troops were to engage in the construction of a fort. The Pennsylvanians were willing to work for a gill of rum a day, but the Virginians refused to work unless they were paid. Bouquet, therefore, had the Virginians mount guard while the Pennsylvanians worked. Bouquet was extremely irked by the attitude of the Virginians for, as he said, it was impossible to proceed without an axe or a spade in the hand and to pay the soldiers for such work would increase the costs fourfold. The Virginians finally agreed to work for a gill of rum a day.

Such were the events that had transpired by the time Fauquier reported to the Board of Trade on June 28, 1758; from then on the campaign took a new turn — one not to the liking of the Virginians.

The campaign proved to be one not of battles but of road building. The chief enemies were not the French and the Indians but the mountainous terrain and the rain which bogged down the horses and wagons and undid much of the work accomplished in building the roads.\(^\text{34}\) The Virginians expected General Forbes to march to Fort Duquesne along Braddock’s road. All during the month of July, Washington attempted to sound out Bouquet and Forbes regarding the route, at the same time stressing the advantages of using Braddock’s route. Washington’s troops, three hundred in number, worked on the construction of a road from Fort Cumberland in Maryland toward Fort Frederick where five hundred men worked in their direction.\(^\text{35}\) While Captain Dagworthy, in command of a Maryland contingent, worked on the road toward Fort Frederick, Colonel George Mercer began work on July 8 on another road toward

---
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Raystown. When Captain Dagworthy’s group returned, Washington sent Major Peachy with three hundred men to start clearing Braddock’s road for a ten-mile distance. The work progressed without much difficulty; and Washington suggested to Bouquet that the Virginia troops proceed to the Great Crossing of the Youghiogheny, constructing posts at the most advantageous situations and opening the road as they proceeded, for “if any use is intended to be made of this Road, from such a step, great Advantages may certainly be deriv’d.” When, in spite of his constant needling of Bouquet, Washington received no assurances that the Braddock Road would be used, he requested a conference with Forbes and Bouquet. Bouquet came away from the conference, at which Forbes was not present, critical of Washington’s blindness of the difficulties involved in using the Braddock Road and convinced that Washington did not know the difference between a party and an army. Of a persistent nature, Washington, in a very lengthy letter, enumerated the following reasons for using Braddock’s road:

1. Braddock’s road had been long opened, often used, and well repaired. Therefore, if the ground of the two roads being considered was equally good, it should be the firmer and better of the two roads.

2. If the English intended to attack Fort Duquesne that year, there was not enough time left to make a road elsewhere as good as Braddock’s road. To delay attack until the following year would be disastrous, for it was not likely the colonies could again offer the aid they had provided that year.

3. Failure of the campaign would encourage Indian depredations along the frontier.

4. It was as easy to obtain forage in the mountains of Virginia as in the mountains of Pennsylvania. The Raystown Road was more barren than Braddock’s road.

5. The rivers were no obstacle because they never became so high as to obstruct passage. Washington himself with a body of troops had crossed the Youghiogheny after practically thirty days of rain. The Monongahela could be avoided if necessary.

6. It was easy to cross the defiles and, furthermore, all mountain
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roads had defiles unless one kept to heights that were impracticable.

7. As for the shortness of the Pennsylvania Road, it would take less time to cross a road of 145 miles already made than to cut a road 100 miles in length, much of which was over almost impassable mountains. If the only project possible that year was the construction of a post on the other side of the mountain, it was preferable to build it on a road that had the best communication with Winchester and with Ford Frederick.

8. By using Braddock's road, it would be possible to take Fort Duquesne by the middle of October.

This array of reasons for using the Virginia route availed naught, for a few days later Fauquier heard from Washington that the route to Fort Duquesne might be a new road, not yet constructed, for which purpose Virginia labor would no doubt be used as it had been in opening a road from Fort Cumberland to Raystown.41 Fauquier shared the general Virginia gloom. He did not expect Fort Duquesne to be taken that year if a new road was to be constructed. The Virginia regiments which the assembly had raised with such alacrity were expected to accomplish their task that year. The second regiment was to disband in December, "and God only knows" what the assembly would do the following year, even with his endeavors to persuade them. He urged Washington and Byrd to point this out to their superior officers.42

Virginia pressure to use the Braddock Road eventually irritated Brigadier General Forbes who insisted he had kept an open mind regarding the route and had come to a decision slowly and only after an investigation into the merits of the two routes. Not until late in July did he decide to cross the Allegheny Mountains at Laurel Hill unless he found this impracticable. The decision was based largely on the shorter length of the Pennsylvania route and the fact that there were no river crossings.43 On the other side of Laurel Hill construction would be easy since the country consisted of nut and oak trees with no underbrush. A very important reason, too, for using this route was the opportunity to deceive the enemy who in all probability expected an attack by way of the old route.44

To deceive the enemy to that way of thinking, Forbes suggested that Washington's men clear the Braddock Road, while the main part of
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the army assembled at Raystown and moved from that point. Undoubtedly a road through Pennsylvania was of great advantage to the Quaker Colony, which in the past had been so phlegmatic in assisting the Crown. It gave Pennsylvania a route to the Ohio lands and a greater opportunity to supply the army with provisions.

Virginia, which had taken the initial steps to wrest control of the Ohio from the French, had no desire to see that control, when almost within her grasp, drop into the hands of the grasping Dutchmen who at the same time were extorting exorbitant prices for their wagons, horses, and flour. To John Robinson, speaker of the assembly, Washington, who had fretted over the slowness of the campaign, referred to his superiors as “d-ps, or something worse to P-s-v-n Artifice, to whose selfish views I attribute the miscarriage of this Expedition, for nothing now but a Miracle can bring this Campagne to a happy Issue.” He concluded, “It has long been the luckless Fate of Poor Virginia to fall a Victim to the views of her Crafty Neighbours; and yield her honest efforts to promote their common Interest, at the expense of much Blood and Treasure . . . .”

Washington likewise informed Governor Fauquier of his fruitless efforts to enlighten General Forbes as to the selfish interests of the Pennsylvanians whose frontier the expedition was protecting and whose future trade the construction of a chain of forts would facilitate. However, instead of seeing the evil in the minds and hearts of the Pennsylvanians, it was the Virginians whom Forbes considered the “partial people.” If the campaign failed, as Washington was so certain it would, the responsibility would rest directly on the Pennsylvanians.

Robert Munford, an officer in the Virginian army, excoriated the Pennsylvanians as a “set of dirty Dutchmen” who, by persuading the General to cut a road for their convenience, were responsible for the delay in the campaign. Though the Virginians preferred to breathe revenge upon the enemy, their occupation was to follow the dogs across the mountains and their sole satisfaction was the sound sleep produced by fatigue. He placed the blame on an “old scoundrel” who had accused the Virginians of bribing the guides to report unfavorably on the route over the mountains. This “old dog,” who wished to
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supersede Edmund Atkins as superintendent of Indian affairs, was also responsible for the loss of the Indians. Thus was the expedition ruined by persons "whose souls scorn a thought that tends not immediately to their own advantage." 48

The discovery of a gap through Laurel Hill clinched the decision. Although Lieutenant Harry Gordon, an engineer who was with the 60th regiment,49 favored the Virginia route, Sir John St. Clair (who for a time had wavered in favor of the Virginia route) and Colonel James Burd of Pennsylvania were confident a good wagon road could be made without difficulty. The route also had the advantage of many fine springs and plenty of forage for the horses.50 Twelve hundred men were put to work on the road and Forbes got ready to move to Loyalhannon as soon as the supplies were ready there.51 Five hundred men, fortified with whisky, were given the "diabolical" work of cutting the road to the top of the mountain. St. Clair expected to accomplish this in five days,52 but rain severely impeded the work.53 By November 11 the army was no farther than Loyalhannon and had fifty miles yet to cover.54

There were certainly problems enough in constructing the road without making additional ones. St. Clair, however, was one of those individuals who had the knack of creating trouble. Before the month was over, he had stirred up the Virginians to near mutiny by arresting Adam Stephen, the officer in command, for exercising authority which St. Clair considered rightfully his. Ordered to report to Raystown, Stephen refused. Major Andrew Lewis assumed command while Stephen was under arrest.55 Bouquet, who thought St. Clair was to blame for exercising military authority in his capacity as quartermaster-general, urged him to make his peace with Stephen, which evidently was done.56
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Bouquet also had his share of trouble with the provincial troops at Raystown over their allowance of provisions. The reduction of their rations to the same basis as that of the king's troops led the provincials, whether because they were larger of stature or possessed of heartier appetites, to protest vigorously their starvation diet. In order to prevent wholesale desertion, Forbes and Bouquet prudently decided to let them have their way. By this time Forbes was disgusted with the provincials both in and out of the army. In his opinion, except for a few of the principal officers, they were "an extrm bad collection of broken Innkeepers, Horse Jockeys & Indian traders, and that the Men under them, are a direct copy of their Officers . . . a gathering from the scum of the worst of people in every Country . . ." The slowness of the campaign he partly blamed on the "horrible roguery" and "rascality" of the country people who had failed to fulfill their contracts honestly and promptly. He damned the Pennsylvanians, especially, for their unwillingness to provide wagons and for the exorbitant prices. Extremely concerned lest Washington and Byrd find comfort in the failure of the Pennsylvania route, Forbes urged Bouquet to keep reconnoitring the road to the Ohio so that all would proceed properly.

Washington and Byrd, meanwhile, became restless and impatient of their inactivity at Fort Cumberland, even though work was continued on the Braddock Road, scouting parties were sent out to obtain intelligence, and the numerous small details of army life received attention. Washington learned that the French strength at Fort Duquesne was only 800 men including the Indians who represented about half of the number. In a frenzy of frustration, he suggested that the Speaker of the Virginia Assembly make a full representation to the King "how grossly his Hon'r and the Publick money have been prostituted." He bewailed the "golden opportunity lost; and perhaps never regain'd," and hoped that he could return to Virginia to paint in its true colors the conduct of the expedition.

A discouraging situation faced the Virginia Assembly when it met on September 14, 1758. Virginia had lost its enthusiasm for the expedition, pessimism permeated the Virginia military corps, and the
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probability of any further support for a campaign so long in unfolding seemed very poor indeed. The treasury was empty and the men in the army were unpaid. Fauquier hoped for one bold stroke that would reinvigorate the colony and rekindle the flame that was flickering so low. He realized the necessity of keeping the regiments in service, yet (no doubt because he had been in the colony so short a time) doubted that he had sufficient influence with the assembly to be successful. To Washington he gave assurances that he would always recommend to the assembly anything the colonel found necessary for the service. 63

The governor in his opening address to the assembly was careful to express the customary courtesies that grease the wheels of human relationships. He wasted little time, however, in discussing the main business of the assembly — the need for money, especially "to make good the Deficiencies now subsisting from the Expences already incurred" for military purposes. 64 In answer to the governor's request for funds, the assembly pleaded "an aggravated Poverty, from continuing to bear the same Proportion we have hitherto done," but they offered to take such measures as within their power. 65 As Fauquier saw it, the members of the assembly were definitely "soured" by the campaign and their offer of some aid was a compromise between "granting and refusing the whole." He was hopeful, however, that the assembly would be more generous in action than it was in spirit. 66

In order to obtain more generous action from the assembly, the governor found it necessary to compromise on a matter seemingly unrelated to military affairs, a question on which he had received his earliest instructions, that of separating the two offices of speaker and treasurer which had been and were likely to be held by the same individual. Within a few days after his arrival in the colony, Fauquier began exploring the possibility of carrying out his instructions to separate the two offices of speaker and treasurer. 67 Before plunging precipitately into a pit that might lead to disaster, Fauquier "sounded many of the principal people" on the subject and arrived at the conclusion that to carry out his instructions would be foolhardy if not well-nigh impossible. Long before the assembly convened, Fauquier
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was certain “not a penny” would it grant for military services if it tampered with the situation as it then existed; in fact, to do so “would obstruct all public Business, and entirely break up the Harmony that at present subsists between that of the Legislative Bodies,” and which he also hoped to have. The course of events proved Fauquier was correct. The assembly had the whip hand; the ruling clique gave Fauquier assurances that if he did not “create a Misunderstanding” he could obtain anything within reason from the spring session if the campaign continued into the summer.68 To please the Crown it was essential that he please the colony.

The assembly devoted itself primarily to defensive measures, almost completely ignoring the fact that the campaign might extend into the following year. It appropriated £20,000 for the pay of the two regiments until December 1 and for their arrears in pay. The money was to be raised by a land and poll tax. Perhaps as a result of the agreement on the dual office question, this proposal was modified, for the bill as presented on October 10 continued the first regiment until May 1, for which purpose £15,000 was appropriated. The governor, however, was to order the return of the first regiment to the colony after December 1 to defend the frontier. If the regiment was detained after the first of December for any other service, that service would receive no pay from the colony. The assembly also provided four companies of rangers to be stationed along the frontier for duty within the colony only. The militia was to continue to garrison the forts until December 20 or until the first regiment returned.69

While the assembly was in session, instead of receiving word of the long-awaited fall of Fort Duquesne, it received news of Major Grant’s unfortunate attempt to achieve fame and glory by his premature attack on the fort on September 14. In this fiasco the first Virginia regiment had 62 men killed or missing, five officers killed, and Major Andrew Lewis imprisoned. It seemed that the campaign was doomed from beginning to end. Washington did not withhold from the governor his disgust with what he considered a miserably managed campaign which he predicted would be soon abandoned since only a month of favorable weather remained for action. And

68 Ibid., 175-176.
the only reason that Washington could see for the delay was the badness of the road.\(^{70}\)

In closing the first session of the first assembly, Fauquier commended the assembly for its measures to protect the frontier, promised to obtain the best available knowledge about the frontiers, assured it he would not spend any of the money "wantonly," and agreed to write to General Forbes that the defense of the frontier necessitated the return of the first regiment to the colony, for which purpose Forbes should order the regiment to return immediately after December 1.\(^{71}\)

The attitude of Virginians toward Forbes is reflected in the action of council which met on October 18 to consider several requests from him. Council did nothing for his request to maintain the Virginia light troops on the same basis as in the campaign of 1755. Forbes also wanted to know what action to take if the fort were taken and the extent to which Virginia would garrison the various posts. The governor informed the general that the commander-in-chief should make the decision about the fort, that the Virginia regiment could continue in service only until December 1, and that it was not within his power to predict "what a future Assembly may be prevailed upon to do."\(^{72}\)

A letter from Colonel Byrd, indicating that the army would be near Fort Duquesne between the 20th and 30th of November, spurred council into action, since his regiment was to be disbanded December 1. Byrd also requested £200 reimbursement for the waistcoats supplied to the men because of the cold weather. Council decided to summon the assembly for November 9 in order to extend the service of the two regiments so that, if the expedition failed, the blame would not rest on Virginia.\(^{73}\) Before the assembly met, the governor again received a request from Forbes to garrison the posts, especially Forts Cumberland and Frederick. Since Fauquier had presented the question to council previously, he merely read for the approval of council his answer to the request.\(^{74}\)

To get immediate action from the assembly, the governor waived all ceremonies. He urged the assembly to retain the regiments


\(^{72}\) Virginia Council Journals, Oct. 18, 1758.


\(^{74}\) *Ibid.*, Nov. 4, 1758.
not only for the common cause, but also to prevent censure of the colony should the expedition end in failure. Since the second regiment could not continue beyond December 1, the governor hoped honor would induce them to continue voluntarily in the service.\textsuperscript{75} The assembly acted with unusual alacrity. In three days it passed a bill allowing the first regiment to serve outside the colony until January 1 and permitting the second regiment to continue its services on a voluntary basis.\textsuperscript{76} The governor was directed to inform Forbes that the only motive for postponing the march of the first regiment to the colony was the "Expectation of Success from his Conduct."\textsuperscript{77} Fauquier closed the session with a short but eloquent address indicative of the harmony already established between governor and assembly. Immediately informing Colonel Byrd of the assembly action, he expressed confidence in a victory by the beginning of the following month.\textsuperscript{78}

Fortunately, at about the same time that Virginia acted in support of the campaign, Forbes at Loyalhannon succeeded in capturing three prisoners from whom he extracted information about the weakness of Fort Duquesne.\textsuperscript{79} Although a council of war had previously determined to remain at Loyalhannon for the winter, the General now decided to move as quickly as possible with a light train of artillery, leaving behind most of the equipment. When the army was within a day's march of the fort, the enemy, numbering five hundred, set fire to the fort and sailed down the Ohio.\textsuperscript{80} Fort Duquesne, renamed Fort Pitt, thus fell into the hands of the British without any struggle except that with the roads, the weather, and the discontented, scheming, profiteering colonials. Forbes adjusted Indian matters and stationed a garrison of two hundred Virginians and Pennsylvanians at the fort.\textsuperscript{81} Washington urged Forbes to leave British forces at the fort as his men were ill-equipped to remain there; but Forbes, without such instructions, refused to agree. Washington then exerted himself to see that provisions were provided. For that purpose he wrote a circular letter to the frontier inhabitants

\textsuperscript{75} Journals of House of Burgesses 1758-1761, 449-450.
\textsuperscript{76} Hening, VII, 251-253; John Robinson to Washington, Nov. 13, 1758, Letters to Washington, III, 94.
\textsuperscript{77} Journals of House of Burgesses 1758-1761, 52.
\textsuperscript{78} Nov. 12, 1758, Draper MSS. 4ZZ43, W.H.S.
\textsuperscript{79} Forbes to Abercromby, Nov. 17, 1758, Writings of Forbes, 255; Washington to Fauquier, Nov. 28, 1758, Writings of Washington, II, 308.
\textsuperscript{80} Washington to Fauquier, Nov. 28, 1758, Writings of Washington, II, 308-309.
\textsuperscript{81} Forbes to Pitt, Nov. 27, 1758, Writings of Forbes, 269.
of Virginia, pointing out to them the advantages of holding the fort, the difficulty of doing it without their help, and the good prices they would receive for the provisions they brought.

Since Washington was a beneficiary of Dinwiddie's proclamation granting lands in the Ohio to participants of Braddock's expedition, he naturally wanted to establish the interests of Virginia in the valley. He urged Governor Fauquier, in order to maintain a firm and lasting peace, to send a strong garrison to the fort as early as possible, to construct a post at Redstone Creek which could assist in supplying the Ohio troops, and to develop immediately a well-regulated trade with the Indians so as to erase from their minds the injustices received at the hands of unscrupulous traders and to secure for Virginia the fur trade with the Ohio Indians and those tribes to the west. To prevent one colony from undermining the system to the injury of another colony, Washington proposed the appointment of commissioners from the colonies to regulate the trade.82 Fauquier was unable to act on Washington's suggestions, for the assembly was not in session and, having met so recently, would not again convene until February.83 Brigadier General Forbes, the "Iron Head," who had been seriously ill throughout the expedition, returned to Philadelphia, there to die on March 11, 1759.