

## THE ROLE OF VIRGINIA AND VIRGINIANS IN THE EARLY HISTORY OF SOUTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA<sup>1</sup>

ALFRED P. JAMES

THE territorial area of the Westmoreland-Fayette Historical Society has historical significance greatly out of proportion to its size and its population. The literary record or documentary evidence of civilized human life and activity in this area barely extends beyond two hundred years; but within that time no area of comparable size in the United States, with the possible exception of the Hudson River valley north of Albany, has been the location of so many historical events, influences, and developments. No local historical society therefore deserves greater support and a more continued future existence and activity.

History is an enormous matter. James Harvey Robinson once pronounced it all that man ever felt, thought, said, or did. This highest concept of history is, of course, unreal, for much of man's past as a whole or even in a relatively small area is unrecorded. The fundamental bases of history are found in the extant records. For the story of mankind as a whole the mass of such records is overwhelming. For a relatively small area, such as Westmoreland and Fayette counties, the records are sufficient in quantity to keep local historical scholars busy for centuries to come. They involve numerous documents in London, Paris, and Ottawa; our own national archives in Washington; state archives in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, and other states of the Union; provincial archives in Quebec and Ontario; and collections in large private libraries. Above all, they involve vast amounts of local data in Pennsylvania county courthouses at Philadelphia, Lancaster, York, Carlisle, Bedford, Somerset, Pittsburgh, Washington, Beaver, Greensburg, and Uniontown; in Maryland county courthouses at Frederick, Hagerstown, and Cumberland; and in Virginia county courthouses at Staunton, Winchester, and Romney. The material in those county courthouses is greatly neglected by historians and

<sup>1</sup> Paper read at the Founder's Day meeting of the Westmoreland-Fayette Historical Society, West Overton, Pennsylvania, on June 17, 1950.—*Ed.*

utilized mainly by genealogists and lawyers, none of whom are primarily interested in history.

Geography, especially topographical geography, is one of several inescapable essentials of history. Only the physiological and psychological character of the population and the cultural background of a people compete with geography for consideration by the historian. Geography has played a dominant role in the story of man in Westmoreland and Fayette counties, Pennsylvania. The history of western Pennsylvania, western Maryland, old Virginia, and (since 1863) West Virginia has been continuously affected by the Appalachian mountain system, with its numerous ridges and the rivers or tributaries of rivers which drain its plateaus and valleys. The Susquehanna, the Potomac, and the Ohio rivers and their main tributaries have been the approach not only to the territory but also to the history of Westmoreland and Fayette counties. Such streams as the Juniata, the Conemaugh, the Loyahanna, Wills Creek, the Castleman, the Youghioghney, and the Monongahela literally predetermined access to the passage through these counties, a topographical feature which can never be eliminated even by railroad and turnpike tunnels. Only by mankind's taking wholly to airway transportation can their role be eliminated.

Geography has, of course, also profoundly affected local history in Westmoreland and Fayette counties in the matter of various soils and climate, thus affecting the story of man here in agriculture, mining, and industry.

When white men, able to report for record their observations, first entered this region more than two hundred and fifty years ago, it was unoccupied as an abode of human beings. It was a great hunting ground, claimed and dominated by the Iroquois Indians farther north, a claim contested to some extent by the Muskogean Indians of the regions farther south. Between 1725 and 1750 the Delaware and Shawnee Indians of eastern and central Pennsylvania migrated across the Allegheny mountains into the Ohio Valley. These Indians had, since the arrival of the white man, become much dependent on the guns, powder, bullets, watch-coats, strouds, gloves, stockings, and other materials of the white man. In turn, the white man greatly desired the furs, pelts, and skins obtained from the Indians. Thus arose the fur trade.

The fur trader era in this region immediately followed the first

westward Indian migration. The history of western Pennsylvania, 1725-45, is largely that of the fur trader and his activities. Unfortunately, the documentation of this period is slight. Our information is derived mainly from what illiterate Indians said at conferences and from correspondence of traders, many of whom were illiterate. Like every age, this period had its later legends and traditions, some of which were incorporated in the recently published and generally discredited *Horn Papers*, put out from Waynesburg, Pennsylvania.

During the fur trade era, 1725-55, there was much uncertainty about the ownership of the trans-Appalachian west. The charters and colonial boundaries of Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania were uncertain and caused political confusion for more than a century. For the last century and a half there has been, indeed, no uncertainty about territorial and political jurisdiction. But historians and historical students may well disagree, and do disagree, about earlier claims.

Hundreds of questions can be asked, and have been asked, about the respective charter claims of Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania. Some of these questions are indicated in the second volume of Channing's *History of the United States*. Channing, in turn, relied greatly on James Veech's *Mason and Dixon Line*.

In point of time, the oldest claim is that of Virginia, which, by the charter of 1609, was declared to extend two hundred miles south of Old Point Comfort, two hundred miles north of Old Point Comfort and west and northwest. Obviously, much depended on where the northwest line started. If the line started at Old Point Comfort it would cut across much of southwestern Pennsylvania. If it started two hundred miles north of Old Point Comfort it would leave out of Virginia only the northeastern corner of present Pennsylvania.

But the Virginia charters were cancelled in 1624, and the colony became royal property. Some of the former territory was given to George Calvert and set up as Maryland in 1632. Some of it was cut off and set up as Carolina in 1664, and all the land between the Rappahannock and the Potomac was given to Lord Culpepper in 1669, and inherited by the Fairfaxes. Certainly the Virginia of 1609 was later mutilated.

The Maryland Charter of 1632 should be carefully studied by all interested in the history of southwestern Pennsylvania. West of Chesapeake Bay its southern boundary was to be the Potomac River, and its western boundary was to be the degree of longitude of the farthest west

source of the Potomac River. That famous Maryland figure, Thomas Cresap, deputy surveyor of Prince George County, failed to note that the so-called south branch of the Potomac rises at least ten miles farther west than the sources of the north branch; and thereby Maryland lost to Virginia (before 1863 and to West Virginia of today) a stretch of territory approximately 10 miles wide and 30 miles long, or about 300 square miles. If the south branch rather than the north branch of the Potomac had been established as the eastern and southern boundary of Maryland, it would, in addition to the 300 square miles just mentioned, today be in possession of all Mineral and Grant counties and parts of Hampshire, Hardy, Tucker, Pendleton, and Randolph counties of West Virginia, probably another 800 square miles, or a total of 1,100 square miles, or about 404,000 acres lost to Virginia and West Virginia, lost by poor little Maryland as a result of a surveyor's error. Had Maryland established possession of these 1,100 square miles in 1740, West Virginia might not today be in possession of the territory occupied by her counties east of the Alleghenies, such as Hardy, Hampshire, Mineral, Morgan, Jefferson, and Berkeley. With Maryland extending so far south as it might have extended by the terms of her charter of 1632, Virginia might not have had taken away from her, during the Civil War, Morgan, Jefferson, and Berkeley counties. Possibly these counties might have been given to Maryland. But, if stronger on her western boundary, Maryland might have been politically troublesome during the Civil War.

The northern boundary of Maryland was very vague. Maryland by its charter was supposed to extend "into part of the Bay of Delaware on the north which lyeth under the fortieth degree of north latitude." But what was meant by the "fortieth degree of latitude"? Did this mean the 40th parallel, which runs through Connellsville, Bedford, and Philadelphia? Or did it mean, as the Penn family later claimed, the 66  $\frac{2}{3}$  mile stretch of territory lying between the 39th and 40th parallels? The 39th runs just north of Washington, D. C., and south of Annapolis and Baltimore.

The Penn family attitude about latitude if accepted in toto would have mutilated beyond recognition the Maryland grant of 1632 to George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore. As we know, after a dispute of seventy-five years, Maryland got roughly five-sevenths of the 66  $\frac{2}{3}$  miles and lost two-sevenths to Pennsylvania, with the unique result that

today, and probably forever, the distance from Pennsylvania, through Maryland to West Virginia at Hancock, Maryland, is shorter than two miles.

It should also be observed that when members of the Penn family tried to get the three degrees of latitude intended for them in 1683 by going north to the 43rd parallel, they were rebuffed and had their theory of a degree as a stretch of  $66 \frac{2}{3}$  miles applied against them. An extension of Pennsylvania to the 43rd parallel would have greatly mutilated New York state of today.

West of Maryland, the territory lying between the 39th and 40th parallels was in dispute between Virginia and Pennsylvania. Virginia claimed that she was not bound by Mason and Dixon's line but rightfully extended as far north as the 40th parallel, thus including all of Greene County and three-fourths of Fayette County of today. In turn, the Penn family asserted they were not bound by Mason and Dixon's line west of Maryland and claimed all the territory as far south as the 39th parallel, running through Davis, West Virginia, and including virtually all of the present West Virginia counties of Monongalia, Preston, Marion, Harrison, and Taylor, and also parts of Wetzell, Barbour, and Tucker counties—territory in which today are located Morgantown, Clarksburg, Grafton, Kingwood, and Terra Alta—a claim embracing 2,400 square miles, or more than 1,500,000 acres. Certainly our ancestors, whether Virginian or Pennsylvanian, were not given to self-denial.

This boundary line was finally adjusted, during the common danger and common fervor of the War of American Independence, by mutual agreement to accept a compromise extending due west the Mason and Dixon Line, a decision of great importance, as will be more fully considered later.

The establishment of the western boundary of Pennsylvania was a long drawn out affair concluded only in 1786. The line might have followed the sinuosities of the Delaware, but such a line would have made a very poor western boundary. The western line might have been measured from the farthest east point of the Delaware River, opposite Bordentown, New Jersey, which is forty miles east of the place on the Delaware from which it was run. These forty miles would have thrown out all of western Pennsylvania west of a line running through Uniontown, New Kensington, and Oil City. Had the average distance of

twenty miles been used, the western boundary of Pennsylvania would have been a vertical line running through Ambridge and Meadville.

The role of Virginia and of Virginians in the region of present-day southwestern Pennsylvania grew in part out of boundary disputes which were due to geographical uncertainty and to vague and conflicting clauses in the colonial charters of Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania.

Political geography, however, was only a part of the geographical factor. Physical geography or topography was even more influential. Topographically and historically, western Pennsylvania had approaches from many points of the compass; from the south and southwest by way of the Ohio River; from the northwest, overland from the Great Lakes; from the north by way of the Allegheny River; from the east by way of the tributaries of the Susquehanna; and from the southeast by way of the Potomac and its tributaries. Here, in Westmoreland and Fayette counties, we are concerned topographically and historically only with the Susquehanna and Potomac routes.

Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania, of today lies athwart the Susquehanna routes from the east, while Fayette County of today lies athwart the old routes from the Potomac to the Monongahela. It is evidence of the healing aspects of passing time that today the Westmoreland-Fayette Historical Society includes two areas with such different historical backgrounds and characteristics. The settlers of old Westmoreland were predominantly Pennsylvanians while those of Fayette County were predominantly Virginians. There were only a few Virginians in early Westmoreland County, but Virginians were very numerous in early Fayette County, and, later, in Washington, Allegheny, Beaver, and Greene counties. A large number of these so-called Virginians, however, were not of old Virginia ancestral stock, but were originally from Pennsylvania, having gone south along the Cumberland Valley and settled in the Shenandoah Valley. Probably before 1752, but certainly afterwards, not only the Ohio Company, George Washington, and Virginians in general, but also many of the Scotch-Irish and Pennsylvania Dutch of the Cumberland Valley, whether as traders or as homesteaders, believed that the route successively known as Nema-colin's Path, the Ohio Company Road, Washington's Road and Brad-dock's Road, offered the easiest and safest route to the Ohio Valley. The path or road, in Biblical phraseology, may not have been "broad" but "many there were who entered upon it."

But we must turn back to more directly human aspects of the matter of Virginians in southwestern Pennsylvania.

According to a great mass of documents relating to the Ohio Company which are being edited for publication by the University of Pittsburgh Press, Virginia land speculators began to seek grants in the Appalachian mountains as early as 1743. A year later a new impetus was given to such speculation. At the Indian Conference of Lancaster in 1744, Virginia received a relinquishment, from the Indians, to the Crown and thus indirectly to Virginia's jurisdiction, of "all the lands within the said Colony of Virginia as it is now or hereafter may be peopled and bounded by his majesty our Sovereign Lord, the King his Heirs and Successors." Our colonial ancestors, be it said, were highly skilled both in negotiation and in legal terminology. In this particular negotiation, Virginia was represented by two prominent men, Thomas Lee and William Beverley. Both shortly became involved in land speculation.

In 1745, no less than five enormous land grants in the west were made by the Virginia government. Another enormous grant was made in April, 1747, and on October 20, 1747, Thomas Lee and eleven others put in a petition for two hundred thousand acres, largely in territory now occupied by Westmoreland and Fayette counties, Pennsylvania.

Governor Gooch and the Virginia Council tabled this petition and Gooch asked for instructions from the imperial government in London. In turn, the Ohio Company in October, 1748, decided to seek a grant from the royal government. Their petition to the Crown, presented in midwinter 1748-49, was acted upon favorably on March 16, 1749, and the grant on royal instructions, duly made by Virginia on July 12, 1749. On the same day four other enormous grants were approved by the Virginia government.

The Ohio Company played a great role in the history of early western Pennsylvania. Its story is much too large for anything more than a summary statement. It sent out explorers, notably Christopher Gist, who gave the first full report on this region. It opened up the road from Wills Creek (later Cumberland) to the Monongahela. It made the first farm homestead settlement and the first land surveys in western Pennsylvania, mainly in what is now North Union Township, Fayette County. It engaged extensively in trade, selling two cargoes of imported goods, purchased for £4,000 and sold for more than double

that amount to settlers and fur traders in western Virginia, western Maryland, and western Pennsylvania. But the Ohio Company's expectations were shortly ruined by the French and Indian War, 1754-58; by imperial military occupation of the territory following 1758; by the coming of Pennsylvanians after the opening of the Forbes Road in 1758; by the royal Proclamation of 1763; and by Pontiac's Conspiracy of the same year. During much of this period the Ohio Company also faced the rivalry of other Virginians and companies; the hostility of Virginia politicians; and the competition of military veterans for the territory, in fulfillment of Governor Dinwiddie's proclamation, February 19, 1754, of two hundred thousand acres of land in the west to military recruits.

Virginians, already in this region from 1750-54, were driven out during the French and Indian War. Some of them crept back in 1760-63, only to be driven out again in 1763 in Pontiac's Conspiracy. From 1764 to 1769 they crept back again in ever increasing numbers, so much so that the territory of southwestern Pennsylvania of the present day, south of the Ohio River and of the line of the Pennsylvania Turnpike, and east of Chestnut Ridge, became predominantly Virginian in its folk lore and in social, religious, and legal institutions.

But from 1760 to 1769 Pennsylvanians pushed west along the Forbes Road in large numbers, into the territory of Bedford, Somerset, and Westmoreland counties of today. Western Pennsylvania from 1769 to the outbreak of the War of American Independence was thus divided in culture and in colonial loyalties. This period of division has never been fully investigated and historically depicted. The extant papers of Thomas Gage, commander-in-chief of his majesty's forces in North America, available for nearly a quarter of a century, have not yet been fully canvassed on this period in this area. More significantly, the vast amount of documentary material in Harrisburg, at Carlisle, at Bedford, and at Greensburg has not been adequately canvassed and exploited in historical research and writing. It is a rumor, greatly discreditable to us and highly creditable to them, that the Mormons of Utah are microfilming and preparing to study some of this material which we have neglected for more than a century and a half. What is said is not by any means intended to disparage the value of much which hitherto has been written; but exhaustion of available documentary evidence is a primary demand of sound historical method. We simply have

not done all that can be done and should be done, and eventually will be done.

Lord Dunmore, a Virginian only by official position as governor, and his tool, Dr. John Connolly, a native of Pennsylvania, took advantage of the Indian cession of 1768 at Fort Stanwix and the withdrawal of the British troops from Fort Pitt in 1772. They played in the troubled waters of divided loyalties in southwestern Pennsylvania. They took a wholly one-sided viewpoint in the old boundary dispute assuming the extreme Virginia claims and attempting to establish them. There is an exhaustive and bulky thesis on Lord Dunmore in the University of Pittsburgh Library and a smaller but equally exhaustive article on Dr. John Connolly published in the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine*, both treatises the work of Percy B. Caley. Lord Dunmore was himself a land speculator and both he and Dr. Connolly, his tool, were, as was to be expected, British imperialists, called Loyalists or Tories, when the Revolutionary dispute came to a crisis in the early summer of 1775. But there is no sound reason for blaming their Loyalism or Toryism on Virginia or on Virginians.

Loyalism in the thirteen colonies is a subject to which much attention, both favorable and unfavorable, has been given by historical writers in the twentieth century. Loyalists probably outnumbered Revolutionists at the beginning of military hostilities in 1775. They were numerous, both in Virginia and Pennsylvania. It is well established that there was some Loyalism or Toryism in western Pennsylvania. But in 1775 the vast majority of all settlers in what is now western Pennsylvania, whether of Pennsylvania or of Virginia antecedents, were anti-imperialists, local autonomists, and Revolutionary patriots. In proportion to its population at that time the region now in southwestern Pennsylvania probably put in the field a larger number of regimental soldiers, militiamen, and rangers than any other part of the thirteen revolting American colonies.

In this military service, in defense of the region, the cause, and the country, the participation of those Virginian antecedents and affiliations equalled that of those of Pennsylvania extraction and loyalty. Sometimes Pennsylvanians and Virginians co-operated, as in the notable expedition of Colonel Archibald Lochry of Westmoreland County to the support of Virginia troops under the command of Colonel George Rogers Clark in 1781.

But we must consider further Lord Dunmore and Dr. John Connolly. The revolutionary spirit of Virginians both here and along the Chesapeake brought about the downfall of both Lord Dunmore and Dr. Connolly. The American Revolutionary War made of their personal plans a complete failure and of their period of political domination of western Pennsylvania, merely an episode. Neither of them was representative of Virginians. And Virginians do not claim them. In fact, Virginians feared them and disliked them as much as did Pennsylvanians.

But back of this episode was the solid fact of division of allegiance in western Pennsylvania. A Virginia company of militia under Colonel John Neville of Frederick County, Virginia, took over military jurisdiction at Fort Pitt in September, 1755. For nearly two years Colonel Neville remained in command of the region. There was no lively opposition to him. Bigger issues were involved and at stake. All western Pennsylvanians were in a common plight and involved in a common cause. And as early as June, 1776, Virginia opened negotiations with Pennsylvania for the establishment of fixed boundaries in the west. For three years the negotiations dragged on, before any agreement was reached.

It was during this long period of negotiation that by statute Virginia, in October, 1776, divided the territory of southwestern Pennsylvania of today. Once considered a part of Augusta County, Virginia, and later designated as the District of West Augusta, it now was split up into three new counties, Yohogania, Monongalia, and Ohio. Much historical information about these counties is available in extant official county records found today in the original manuscripts in Washington, Pennsylvania, and in the Darlington Library of the University of Pittsburgh. Some of them, printed years ago by Boyd Crumrine, are in the *Annals of the Carnegie Museum*.

Undoubtedly, this temporary development of Virginia counties and Virginia jurisdiction was distasteful to many. Pennsylvania authority in Philadelphia, however, could do little about it in late 1776 and throughout 1777, and not much before late 1778. Eastern Pennsylvania jurisdiction along the Delaware was itself seriously threatened with liquidation. Virginia military and local government authority was, likewise, distasteful to the statutory authority of Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania, over the same territory.

It was during the war that in August, 1779, commissioners of Virginia and Pennsylvania met in Baltimore and agreed to establish the permanent boundary between them in the west by extending Mason and Dixon's line to a point five degrees west of the Delaware and by drawing a line due north from that point. This agreement, if and when ratified, meant the end of actual Virginia political jurisdiction in what is now western Pennsylvania.

Seemingly Pennsylvania gave preliminary ratification to the agreement in November, 1777, but Virginia held up her ratification for several reasons. Primarily she was concerned about the property rights of more than a thousand property owners in the area holding property on Virginia claims, some of which were twenty-five years old, others fifteen years old, and many more from five to ten years old. Such consideration for a long-held property right is a feature of both common and statutory law in the United States and elsewhere in the world. There was nothing diabolical about it. Undoubtedly it was based on that vague idea of human rights which has characterized many centuries, more particularly the last few centuries. Anyhow Virginia sent commissioners to the region formerly in dispute and gave them authority to investigate land entries, surveys, and claims, and to issue certificates of ownership to those with seemingly valid claims. More than a thousand certificates of entry were issued. They covered 633,000 acres (989 square miles of territory) or an area 31.4 miles square, and therefore slightly larger than all of Fayette County. In the language of the excellent article on Virginia in the *Pennsylvania Archives*, third series, volume three: "Upon many of the entries, however, surveys were never made or returned and of course titles to them under Pennsylvania laws never completed." According to this article, disputed titles brought into litigation were handled by the Pennsylvania courts with perfect equity, in accordance with all relevant agreements.

On July 1, 1780, Virginia ratified the Baltimore agreement of August, 1779, but "on condition that the private property and rights of all persons acquired under, founded on or recognized by the laws of either country previous to the date hereof, be saved and confirmed to them." However unpopular this condition was then, and however much it was condemned later, the great "country," Pennsylvania, accepted it, and the agreement with this condition attached was ratified and thereby went into effect on September 27, 1780. This meant the end of Virginia

jurisdiction in those parts of Yohogania, Monongalia, and Ohio counties within the boundaries assigned to the "country" of Pennsylvania by the agreement. After that date all the people within the boundary agreed upon were jurisdictionally Pennsylvanians. Any discord in the area after September 27, 1780, was among Pennsylvanians and certainly not between Virginia and Pennsylvania. The famous burning of Hannastown, the county seat of Westmoreland County, on July 13, 1782, was carried out, not by Virginians, but by Seneca Indians, Canadian rangers, and possibly a few so-called "renegade" Tories of Pennsylvania.

The boundary agreement with the attached condition was duly carried out. A temporary line was run in November, 1782. The permanent southern boundary was surveyed and marked in 1784. The western boundary was similarly established later, in two stages: first north to the Ohio in 1785, and then to Lake Erie in 1786. Thomas Hutchins, Surveyor General of the United States, who began surveys of the Northwest Territory in 1785, in accordance with the Survey Ordinance of 1785, participated also in surveying the western boundary of Pennsylvania.

But we are here concerned only secondarily and indirectly with boundary lines. Our primary concern is with the role of Virginians in early western Pennsylvania history. There were probably more than five thousand of them here in 1780. Relatively complete information about their landed property is accessible in the Land Commissioner's Office in the Bureau of Internal Affairs in Harrisburg. There, in an almost perfect state of preservation, are to be found the original Virginia certificates, some of the original Virginia county surveys, and all the later Pennsylvania acceptances, surveys, and patents.

Since the Virginia certificates were issued only in southwestern Pennsylvania, west of Laurel Hill, it is obvious that from twenty to twenty-five per cent of all the land in this area is held by titles based on the old Virginia regime in this region. A thousand farms meant a thousand farm families. A thousand families probably represented five thousand or more inhabitants. This number would increase each generation. There were by 1815 a large number of people in southwestern Pennsylvania whose background was not that of central and eastern Pennsylvania but that of the Potomac River and Chesapeake Bay area of Virginia and Maryland.

That the Virginians settled in southwestern Pennsylvania of today

were either wickedly here or bad people is historically an unjustifiable idea. No one is perfectly free from sympathies and antipathies, but sound history is expected to be as free from them as is humanly possible. History is supposed to be scientific, rather than emotional. Historical criticism warns against letting emotions distort objective facts clearly established by documentary evidence. All the rules of evidence accepted in law and judicial decision are applicable as well to historiography. Patriotism, both local and national, is laudable, but it should be kept within the bounds of justice, truth, and reason.

Writing twenty-five hundred years ago, Hecateus, the first important Greek historian, said: "The stories of the Greeks are numerous, and in my opinion ridiculous." He was referring to their claims about Greek origins and Greek superiority. We, twenty-five hundred years later, should not fall below the ideals and standards of Hecateus.

The old Virginia settlers in southwestern Pennsylvania were probably neither worse nor better than the settlers of old Pennsylvania background. It is a perfectly sound conclusion, I believe, that their numerous descendants of later years have been perfectly satisfactory citizens of Pennsylvania.

Viewed from the larger standpoint of the westward expansion of the United States, the first Virginia settlers were before 1780, as their descendants have been since, an asset and not a liability. America has been and still is famous as a "melting pot" of races and cultures. The central Mississippi Valley people claim their region to have been more particularly the great American "melting pot." But Pennsylvania, from the beginnings along the Delaware, has always been a great "melting pot." Westmoreland and Fayette counties fully continued the early tradition. The "melting pot" still operates here and just as successfully as anywhere else in the United States. That, in the second half of the eighteenth century, this region became the "melting pot" of old Virginians and of old Pennsylvanians is more a matter for pride than for regret.