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CHAPTER I.
INTRODUCTORY SURVEY

The untold possibilities of the extensive and fertile Mississippi Valley were practically unknown to the British when they became sovereigns of this region by the Treaty of Paris in February, 1763. It was evident that a colonial policy needed to be determined and inaugurated in order to protect the Indians from exploitation by the unscrupulous traders; and thus dispel their well founded distrust of the English. But the many conflicting opinions as to the nature of such a policy and the dissensions among the ever changing ministries in England proved an insurmountable obstacle to the launching of whatever policy was planned.

In England, westward expansion was viewed from three angles--there were some persons who heartily favored it as a means of producing markets for English goods; others who favored a gradual process; while there were those who, deeming its primeval condition more conducive to fur trading, absolutely disapproved of any settlements west of the Appalachian Mountains.

The first definite constructive work towards a colonial policy after 1763 was done by the youthful Lord Shelburne, then President of the Board of Trade. Realizing the emigrating spirit in the eastern colonies and the temptation to occupy the rich lands in the West, he wished to satisfy this tendency but at the same time to pacify the anxious fears of the Indians who
saw their hunting grounds gradually shrinking in size. For these reasons, building upon the work of his predecessors, he proposed that a boundary line be run beyond which no white settlements could be founded until the Imperial government had purchased the land from the Indians. The ministry, considered this boundary line merely a flexible and temporary demarcation which would be extended westward as new purchases would from time to time be made by the English government. This plan would allow for a gradual and legitimate settlement of the West.

Unfortunately fate doomed its execution to be postponed. Pontiac's War allowed no time for the establishment of such a carefully laid boundary line; and so on October 7, a proclamation naming the Appalachian Mountains as the termination of settlements was issued by Lord Shelburne's successor, Lord Hillsborough. It was not until the treaty of Fort Stanwix in November, 1768, that the boundary line favored by Lord Shelburne was accepted by the Iroquois Indians.

The regulation of fur trade was one of the paramount considerations of the ministries when they viewed western policies. The only restriction upon fur trading, according to the Proclamation of 1763, was the need of licenses which the governors of the respective colonies were to issue to prospective western traders upon their promise to obey any new trade regulations. In the summer of 1764, the Board of Trade proposed that an Imperial department of Indian affairs, dependent neither upon the military commander-in-chief nor upon the colonial governments, be created. A detailed administrative system was worked out and a corps of officials, including superintendents for the territory
north and south of the Ohio, were to be appointed.

But once again the hope of obtaining a system of administrative control for the West was blighted. A tax on fur trade had been suggested as the means of defraying the expenses necessary for such a centralized organization but the Old Whigs, who were responsible for the repeal of the odious Stamp Act, were adverse to passing an act of colonial taxation. As a result, no Imperial plan was put into execution by the home government. In March, 1768, the control of Indian trade was again placed in the control of the individual colonies. Since the latter did not agree as to one common policy, uncontrolled trading resulted. In this same month, steps for some regulation had been taken in Illinois. Captain Forbes, the commandant at Fort de Chartres, ordered all traders to state the number of packs that they were sending down the Mississippi and also to give a security of £ 200 to the effect that these goods were destined for a British post. The governor of Louisiana was notified to keep the people of his province from ascending the Illinois, Ohio, and Wabash rivers. But these measures actually did little to prevent New Orleans from receiving most of the Illinois peltry.

No complete system of civil government for the West was provided until the passage of the Quebec Act in 1774. This negligence, most likely due to the prevalent ignorance of the character of the villages and to the desire of promoting the fur trade rather than settlement, caused the French much discomfort.

1.—On March 18, 1768, the Ministry definitely accepted the principle of allowing the colonial governments to manage the trade of the West, the proposition of establishing a tentative boundary line, and the retention of the offices of Indian superintendents. Alvord, *Mississippi Valley in British Politics*, vol. ii, 31.
Consequently we find the task of maintaining order devolving upon the English commandants. This duty, which did not legally belong to their office, was very poorly executed by the military men.

Although several attempts had been made to relieve the French garrison at Fort de Chartres during Pontiac's War, it was not until 1765 that the Illinois country was actually occupied by the British troops. The British and Colonial governments felt that once the British garrison took possession of the posts, trade, which followed its natural outlet through New Orleans, could be directed eastward up the Ohio and centered in Pennsylvania. Meanwhile traders in Pennsylvania watched conditions with a hopeful eye, ready to seize their first opportunity to participate in any advantages resulting from the Treaty of 1763.

Fort Pitt at the head of the Ohio river was the rendezvous of groups of eastern merchants interested in fur trading. The first company to enter actively into the exploitation of Illinois was that of Baynton and Wharton, later known as Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan, when the name of Baynton's son-in-law, George Morgan, was added. Morgan, young and full of optimism, became their personal representative in Illinois. As early as March, 1766, five bateaux of their goods, to be exchanged for the Indians' peltry, were making their way down the Ohio, under the command of

---
1. For a thorough discussion of these policies see Alvord, *Mississippi Valley in British Politics*, passim.
2. It was chiefly due to the influence and efforts of George Croghan that peace was made with Pontiac in July. Learning of Pontiac's promise that the English troops would not be hindered in their passage to Illinois, Captain Stirling left Fort Pitt on August 24, and arrived at Fort de Chartres on October 9. *Great Britain and the Illinois Country*, 38-45.
In order to discourage the Shawnee from carrying their furs to other traders at Fort Pitt, this firm had established a post on the Scioto river. But certain merchants had no intentions of allowing Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan, to monopolize the fur trade. On October 4, 1766, Simon and Milligan, John Gibson, Alexander Lowrey, and others at Fort Pitt protested to Sir William Johnson, Indian superintendent, against the establishment of the Scioto post.

Especially opposed to Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan was the Lancaster group of merchants whose pioneering and speculative spirits were as fresh in 1768 as in 1748, when they expended their first efforts towards the West. The mere mention of names of Joseph Simon, David Franks, George Croghan, and William Trent recalls a host of trading operations in which they figured prominently. Probably the most important merchants of this group were Joseph Simon and David Franks who composed the firm of "Levy and Franks". In addition to their individual enterprises, it was customary for these men to enter from time to time into special partnerships with each other. Their special interest was fur trading and Lancaster was early the origin of many such expeditions into the present states of West Virginia, Ohio, and Kentucky.

To be concerned in the activities of this group was a practical preparation for western fur trading. Two enterprising young men, Barnard and Michael Gratz, were especially fortunate in

3.-- Joseph Simon, one of the wealthiest Indian traders in Pennsylvania, came to Lancaster about 1740. Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 3.
receiving such a business education. Each in turn became a clerk in David Franks' Philadelphia counting house, Barnard in 1754, and Michael in 1759; and thus acquainted with David Franks' associates. Their relationship was further enhanced by the marriage of Michael in 1759 to the daughter of Joseph Simon. After 1760, the two brothers were often concerned together in various business operations, but in 1768 they formed the wholesale firm of B. and M. Gratz of Philadelphia. Their natural interest in the West was greatly stimulated in the summer of 1768, by their knowledge of the Iroquois Confederacy's intention to cede land in the present state of Virginia to traders who had suffered losses during Pontiac's War. It was in that year that William Murray made his debut into Illinois history as their agent.

But who was this William Murray and why was he chosen to represent the Gratz brothers in Illinois, one may well ask. The question of his identity is moot. In November, 1764, a Captain William Murray of the forty-second regiment of Royal Highlanders, commanded five companies at Fort Pitt. It is probable that he had taken part in the critical battle of Bushy Run, the year before, under Colonel Bouquet. We have record of him still acting as

1. For a detailed discussion of this cession, see Alvord, Mississippi Valley in British Politics, vol. ii, chap. iii.

2. In 1763 Colonel Bouquet commanded at Philadelphia when the new rising of the Indians was instigated by Pontiac, he marched to the relief of Fort Pitt. On August 5, he defeated the Indians in a long and stubborn contest at Bushy Run. Four days later he reached Fort Pitt. Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, vol. xvi, 151. See also Parkman, Conspiracy of Pontiac, vol. ii, 67, 76, 370, 408.
commandant at Fort Pitt late in the year of 1766. While in charge of Fort Pitt, he became intimately acquainted with George Croghan, the deputy agent of Indian affairs, and possibly with his associates. In this frontier post, he learned first hand the frontier practices—the squatters, and the ensuing Indian resentment, and at one time was ordered to remove some homesteaders at Red Stone Creek. Being in frequent communication with Major Farmer and his successors at Fort de Chartres, Captain or Major (these titles were used interchangeably) Murray was no stranger to the conditions existing in Illinois. Moreover, the Western traders and merchants, waiting to embark on new ventures and returning from previous ones, gathered at Fort Pitt where they talked over their anticipations and disappointments, sold their peltry, purchased new merchandise, and gossiped about conditions in general. Captain Murray himself, purchased merchandise from Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan with which to alleviate the almost continuous complaints of the Indians. The fact that Captain Murray was well acquainted with western conditions and men added to the absence of his name in the Pennsylvania Archives after William Murray appears in Illinois, suggests that they may have been one and the same man. Of course, it is possible that he may have sailed with those Royal Highlanders who left America in 1767.

At present, the question has not been definitely decided.


2. -- Clarkson’s Diary, August 6, 1766 — April 16, 1767, Alvord and Carter, The New Régime, 349.

CHAPTER II.
WILLIAM MURRAY, TRADER IN ILLINOIS.

William Murray, trader and land speculator, before going to Illinois was not unacquainted with the East. Such reference as: "You know him (David Franks)," by Michael Gratz in writing to Murray, "when he takes a thing into his head, it is not so easily forgot", and "Since my Brother Barnard's letter to you, mentioning his going to London in company with your old and esteemed friend, Miss Richi Franks", lead us to infer that Murray knew the Franks family exceedingly well.\(^1\) As an "old and esteemed" friend, Murray must have known "Miss Richi" for many years.\(^2\) His letters to and from the Gratz display much intimacy and regard for each other. Almost every letter contains some personal touch. The Gratz continually send wishes for Murray's health and remembrances to his family in which Mrs. Gratz and her children joined. Such allusions as the following are character-

---

1. -- September 1, 1769, Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 102

2. -- Mr. Byars' explanation of this allusion is as follows: "If he is the Captain Murray of the Royal Highlanders ordered to Lancaster after the Conestoga Massacre, and stationed at Fort Pitt,—he certainly would have spent some time in New York on landing there with the troops, and his acquaintance with Miss Franks might have begun them." Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 103.

Miss Richi Franks, daughter of Jacob Franks, sailed for London not long after her father's death in 1768, probably in order to consult her brothers, Moses and Napthali, then in London, about the management of her father's estate. American Jewish Historical Society Publications, vol. xxii, 139.
istic of the friendliness and good will of the Gratz towards Murray: "I am glad to hear you made so good a hand of the goods you took with you, whether we are concerned in them or not, and I shall always be glad to hear of the welfare of our friend, who I hope will not forget us." In Philadelphia, Murray had a large circle of friends who, John Ormsby wrote Murray after he reached Fort de Chartres, joined him in his wishes for his safe arrival and future success.

Ormsby with whom Murray had had business relations, was well acquainted with the Murray family. The latter consisted of Mrs. Murray, Franky and Miss Jenny, all of whom followed Mr. Murray to the west.

Murray had named Gratz as his attorney to close up his affairs in the East—to settle all outstanding debts and to find a purchaser for his land in Shearman's valley. Having much

1. Michael Gratz to William Murray, September 1, 1769, Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 102-103.


3. In his very first letter to the Gratz from Carlisle, Murray asked that they would please not "forget the Little ones down the River," and wished that they might be bound out to some honest tradesman in town or country." June 8, 1768, Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 84. He repeated these requests, speaking of them as "the two poor Little Chance Boys". Ibid., June 8, 1768, Idem., 95. The Gratz in turn wrote of visiting "Your Little Ones down the River" and of "clothing them and paying their board." April 4, 1770, Idem. 109.

In the Record of Apprentices of Philadelphia we find that on March 13, 1773, Barnard Gratz had apprenticed William Murray with consent of his father, to Alexander Hamilton of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, vol. xxiv, 121. Murray must have had another son, for Mary Robertson wrote him from Scotland in 1775 concerning the education of his son, Willie, then in Scotland. This son can hardly have been the one spoken of above. Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 353.
faith in Barnard Gratz's fairness he left the terms of its disposal to his discretion. The disposal of his land would seem to indicate that he regarded his future home in the Illinois as rather permanent, an assumption strengthened by the fact that his wife and two children soon joined him.

Murray's partnership with the Gratz must have been formed in the early summer of 1768, for he intended to accompany Lieutenant-Colonel Wilkins to the Illinois country. The latter with five companies of the eighteenth regiment was to relieve Captain Forbes and the garrison at Fort de Chartres. Although Wilkins left Philadelphia early in June, due to obstructions from the inhabitants in the back parts of Pennsylvania, he was unable to embark upon the Ohio before July 20.

These intervening weeks gave Murray ample time in which to make the final preparations for his new venture. On his way up to Fort Pitt, he stopped at Lancaster and visited Mr. Simon, whom we are not surprised to find a factor in Murray's expedition. Indeed part of his cargo to the value of £600 had been purchased of "Levy and Franks" (of which Mr. Simon was a partner) and £100 of silver work, including rings.

---

1. William Murray to Barnard Gratz, June 8, 1768, Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 38.
bracelets, and earbobs, of Mr. Simon. 1 These invoices, however, were both on the account of Moses Franks, Arnold Drummond, and Company of London. 2 The Gratz were likewise sending an adventure in this cargo. 3 Thus we see how closely interwoven were the interests of the London and American merchants in the westward movement and how they both were gaging probable benefits to trade from the coming Fort Stanwix conference with the Indians. Murray's personal account amounted to £ 320, and consisted mostly of shoes and stockings for soldiers. 4

The Fort Pitt wharf on the hot July day of embarkment was the scene of much commotion. Moving excitedly amongst the scarlet clad soldiers and roughly dressed traders was William Murray—now shouting orders (often mingled with his fluent and colorful profanity) to the men busily engaged in unloading the casks of rum, the sacks of sugar and coffee, and the precious rifles and silverwork from the wagons as they slowly came up; now hastening to see that they were carefully

1.—"The silver ware", wrote George Morgan to his partners, "is a good parcel, but the principal articles thereof and many of the small ones are charged from 20 to 50 per cent too high." October 30, 1768, Pennsylvania Division of Public Records.

2.—See Ibid.

3.—Michael Gratz to William Murray, July 8, 1768, Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 87.

4.—William Murray to Barnard Gratz, June 8, 1768, Idem, 84 For this goods purchased from Sproat and Company Murray gave his bond payable in December, 1768 (next). Morgan to Baynton, Wharton and Morgan, October 30, 1768, Pennsylvania Division of Public Records.
reloaded upon the large flat boats; now assigning new tasks to his clerk, Mr. Burk, or taking a hand in the loading. And yet he was not a little pleased when he stopped to reflect, for the King's bateaux were carrying his cargo. This arrangement saved him the cost of bateau men's wages and provisions, not a small item in transportation expenses. The long journeying about the intricate windings of the Ohio river for over a thousand miles to its mouth, was enlivened by the pursuit of game, which proved very abundant after the Scioto river was reached; ¹ by occasional trading through which Murray fortunately disposed of most of his shoes and rum; and by shooting the falls of the Ohio, ² which were reached August 8.

When about 150 miles below the falls, the newcomers were initiated into the gruesome side of their new life, for news came of the murder of several hunters by Indian war parties. The journeyers met with no great impediments, however, until the rapid and muddy Mississippi was reached. In spite of their greatest exertions they were unable to ascend the strong current until scouts, going ahead to Fort de Chartres, sent back boats in which part of the cargoes were loaded. ³

---

1. Indeed so plentiful was the game that Ensign George Butricke asserts each company was commonly served with one buffalo a day besides quantities of deer, geese, turkeys, ducks, turtles, and the extremely large catfish. Butricke to Captain Barnsley, September 15, 1768, Historical Magazine, vol viii, 259. For a biographical note of Barnsley, see Idem., 258.

2. "The falls appear tremendous at first sight", wrote Butricke, "and startled our people." It was only after he had gone safely over them that the rest followed. Ibid.

3. Ibid., 260.
Fort de Chartres was reached early in September and on September 5, Colonel Wilkins took charge of the fort. The sight of the square stone fort with its many loop holes and bastion at each corner and the nearby stone barracks, commanding a view, on the one side, of the Mississippi, and on the other, of the vast expanse of meadows with their tall swaying grasses stretching out till they mingled with the distant horizon, must indeed have soothed their fatigued spirits. 1

Upon his arrival at Fort de Chartres, Murray lost no time in starting the business for which he had come to Illinois. His activities fall into three classes: trading, provisioning the garrison at Fort de Chartres, and land speculation. Although the thread of each can be discerned as distinct in character, still being discharged by the same person and at the same time, they tend to overlap at many points. Due to the often seeming complexity of his duties, we shall consider each one not only separately but also as related to each other.

Being desirous of establishing a business in Illinois, Murray soon became acquainted with his new surroundings. Of course he was not a total stranger, for on his trip he had

---

1. "Fort Chartres," Butricke added, "is a midling sized Fort--- the walls about 2 foot thick and 20 foot high---with Loop holes to fire small arms thro'---[and]---some port holes for great Guns. But they seldom use them for they shock the works too much, the barrackes are very good built of stone, But they will not contain more than 200 exclusive of officers." Fort Chartres was built in 1720, at a distance of a mile from the Mississippi. It was repaired in 1750. By 1768, owing to a new channel formed by the river, it was not over eighty yards from the water. After the surrender of the West to the British, St. Ange de Bellerive, an old and experienced French officer, held it though the period of Pontiac's conspiracy. On October 10, 1765, Captain Sterling took charge of it for Great Britain. History Magazine, vol. viii. 257.
learned to know Colonel Wilkins and most of the troops. Then too, as provisioner of the garrison, he was almost immediately thrown into constant communication with the military population. But there was one person who watched Murray's activities with no little concern. Murray's venture was not unknown to the far-sighted George Morgan, agent of Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan, who long before Murray's arrival had been anticipating such a business rival with no few misgivings and had sent each tiny scrap of information concerning him to his firm. He had tried, however, to minimize the probable results of his competition with Murray, writing: "Depend upon it unless Mr. Murray be an adept in business and the French tongue, he will not soon make himself master of the trade here."¹ What he feared most was that Murray might have negroes to sell, which at that time commanded anything in the market, such as flour, cattle, and furs.

Baynton and Wharton had not remained inactive in the East where they had gleaned much knowledge of the business intentions of their prospective competitor.² They and Morgan were both aware of Murray's appointment as the Illinois agent not only of B. and M. Gratz but also of the London syndicate of Messrs. Franks, Nesbitt, and Sir Robert Colebrock who had contracted to supply the British garrisons in America.

---

1. -- Morgan to Baynton and Wharton, July 20, 1768, Morgan Letter Book.

2. -- Ibid.
Soon after Murray reached Illinois, Morgan had frequent conversations with him. Vigilant as ever, he wrote his colleagues: "Most of Murray's other goods (that remaining after his vendues along the Ohio) will remain with him unless we find it prudent to purchase the whole from him—which I assure you I am no ways anxious to do--I shall exceed my own judgment rather than let him into the spirit of the trade. But in doing this I shall be in no hurry—for except for a few quarts of rum and some pairs of shoes he has sold nothing." Morgan admitted, that he was particularly anxious to deprive Murray of his silver work which was greatly coveted by the Indians. But being desirous of selling Murray provisions, he acted very civilly toward him. Morgan, well educated and a man of cultured tastes, could prove a charming companion if he so desired and Wilkins and Murray could frequently be found dining with him. Occasionally, commissary Cole, McMillan and Richardson joined this trio.

With Mrs. Murray's coming in November, life in Illinois became more comfortable and happy for Murray, especially as his home was enlivened by his two children, Frank and

1. -- Morgan to Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan, October 30, 1768. Division of Public Records, Pennsylvania State Library. This remark seems ironical in view of the fact that it was later Murray who purchased the merchandise of Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan. Poste., 20.
Miss Jenny. Murray soon became very attached to his new home and developed much confidence in the possibilities of the Illinois country. "With a number of industrious Germans", he felt Illinois would make one of the finest countries in the world. Proper settlement in his estimation would certainly tend to drive away the common and distressing ague. He had himself made a small purchase of land which he felt if he has a "genius for husbandry would turn to good account". By land conveyance and vendues he was sure he could more than clear himself.

Let us follow Murray in his activities as a western merchant. To understand more clearly his trading activities it is advisable to consider them as dividing into the following periods: from his arrival in Illinois in September, 1768, until his partnership with James Rumscy formed on May 19, 1770; from the formation of this partnership, until the fall (probably October 19) of 1770 when it was merged into that of "David Franks and Company;" from the fall of 1770 until April 3, 1773, when Murray was appointed their attorney to

1. Mrs. Murray and her children left Philadelphia on July 8, and arrived at the mouth of the Kaskaskia in November. Ibid., November 7. Later Murray sent Franky East—probably to be educated. In 1771, the Gratz wrote that they had seen him and that he was growing into a fine fellow. Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 119. In the account books of "Levy and Franks", Murray is charged with £ 104: 18:6 1/2 for payments made (March 30, 1771-April 2, 1773) to James Cannon for Franky's maintenance. Pennsylvania Historical Society, Etting Collection.

2. William Murray to B. and M. Gratz, April 24, 1769, Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 93.

3. Ibid.
close up their business in Illinois; from April 3, 1773, until
his final departure from Illinois, during which period he acted
now independently and now in partnership with others.

Before turning to an examination of each individual
period, let us consider some general considerations which are
true for the whole time. The merchandise sent to Illinois
was diverse in nature, extending from rat and mouse traps
(for the preservation of the peltry) to soap which lost in
its competition with the homemade brands of the industrious French
housewife. The "Indian goods", often sent, included among
its scores of articles, guns, axes, kettles, pipes, blankets,
scarlet cloth, linen, ribbons, laces, and silver trinkets as,
hair ornaments, earrings, bracelets, and arm bands. Of course,
large quantities of clothing were sent. There were occasional
orders for shoes—as one order by Rumsey for one dozen "wo-
men's neat clogs."¹ In the cloth line, coarse goods, and checks
were found the most salable. There was always a large demand for
rum, wine, tea (green and bohea), coffee, spices and sugar,
with which the inhabitants were prone to vary their plan diet.
We have record of one shipment by the Gratz to "Franks and
Company" consisting of fifty pounds of loaf sugar at 11- pence
¹ (25 cents) a pound and thirty-two gallons of spirits at 51 pence
²

1. -- James Rumsey to Barnar and Michael Gratz, January 26,
1771, Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 115.
($1.05) per gallon, totaling over £9 or $45.  

When we stop to think that today we complain if sugar sells at ten cents a pound, and then consider the scarcity of money in those days and its greater purchasing power, we realize that it was indeed a luxury for the frontiersmen. The beverages were especially welcome during the frequent and distressing epidemics of the malaria.

The greater portion of this merchandise was shipped from England, often in the boats of Mr. David Sproat, a Philadelphia merchant and boat owner. These goods were either spoken for in advance by the American merchants, or purchased in England by them (if they chanced to be there) or by their relatives and friends who were constantly on the lookout for goods suitable for western trade. These wholesalers, such as David Franks, Josephy Simon, and the Gratz brothers in turn forwarded this merchandise in the contractor's bateaux, carrying provisions for the troops, to the traders such as Murray and Rumsey actually stationed in Illinois.

During Murray's independent trading and his brief


2. -- During the Revolution, David Sproat was Commissary of the Naval Prisoners. The mortality of the prisoners under his care at New York was very great. He was attainted of treason in Philadelphia and his estate was forfeited.

3. -- Michael Gratz wrote Murray that he hoped Barnard who was in London would bring home an assortment of goods suitable for Illinois. Michael Gratz to William Murray, April 9, 1770, Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 109.
partnership with Rumsey, sometimes he was concerned alone in these shipments as his portion (valued at £320) of the first Gratz cargo to Illinois—or sometimes the Gratz were concerned alone. When he was concerned alone, the Gratz merely acted as wholesalers, as did "Levy and Franks." The latter concern sent the largest amount of the goods which was sold on Murray's own account or on that of Gratz and Murray. But the usual practice was for Murray and the wholesalers to be jointly concerned in them. Interesting is the consignment of jewelry (valued at £95:8:6) sent by the Gratz as adventure for their children, Rachel, Solomon, and Frances. We note that the Gratz agreed to have it sold either on commission or else by allowing Murray and Rumsey to be one-quarter concerned in it. Due to the complexity of the business arrangements between Murray and his associates, it is impossible to estimate his profits accurately.

Murray's first cargo turned out exceedingly well. By June, 1769 he was able to remit the Gratz, £239:19:0 (£1,167) assuring them if he had had time to get in fees, vendue commissions, and outstanding debts of his own private sales he could have made this check for £500 (£2,430) more. He had also sent David Sproat, of whom he had purchased his first goods with a bond payable in December, the full amount of

this bond with interest till the twenty-ninth of August.

After 1768, due to the transference of the management of the Indian affairs to the colonies, Wilkins was forced to manage the local Indian affairs. Fortunately for the business interests of the traders, Wilkins succeeded in keeping most of the Indians pacified. There were, however, continual rumors of an Indian war and threatened attacks upon Fort de Chartres in 1769 and several white settlers about the Post were murdered. Murray, somewhat worried, warned the Gratz brothers that he feared mischief on the Ohio. By the spring of 1769, Murray had already felt the effects of the competition with the French traders at St. Louis and Sainte Genevieve, who succeeded in keeping many Indians away from the stores at Kaskaskia, Cahokia, and Chartres village. But he was too clever a business man, knowing the conditions, to "stock up" in Indian goods, and therefore advised the Gratz not to send much goods. In spite of his wish that they should send him other goods on their joint account by the first bateaux, Michael Gratz refrained from doing so partly because of fear of a war by the discontented Senecas.

2. -- Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 93.
3. -- Michael Gratz to Barnard Gratz, August 21, 1769, Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 100. "The Seneca Indians," wrote Michael Gratz to his brother then in England, "are much discontented on account of the purchase money that was given at the last treaty [referring to Fort Stanwix] to the Nether Indians, and their share not yet received by them, which makes them very insolent and daring, though it is thought they want nothing but presents and rob, if they can in the meantime. So I am in no ways sorry that we did not send any more, as I am much afraid of what we have there already, if an Indian war should happen."
because of the scarcity of goods (due to the non-importation act), and because Mr. Franks insisted upon using for other purposes the goods coming in Mr. Sproat's boat, although the Gratz brothers had spoken for them. ¹ Knowing that the purchase of the goods in Philadelphia would be more expensive, they deterred from forming a cargo.

Meanwhile Murray was in the depths of despair in not receiving a large cargo. He sent a letter to the Gratz full of disappointment. So disheartened was Murray, that he even suspected that the goods were not sent because his partners doubted his ability to pay for them. If this were the case, he felt that Mr. Franks would have advanced the money—besides "[he] would have made [a] remittance before the goods produced [it]."² It was not the real Murray, buoyant and optimistic, who spoke thus. Being attacked for the sixth time with the fever, we can well understand his mood, especially when he concluded with the saying so common during our recent epidemic, "I must go to bed and sweat." His despondency only accentuated his tastes for the luxuries of a more civilized life, for he exclaimed: "A plague! why did you not send some good spirits, sugar, tea, Port wine, if possible, and some little et ceteras for my own use?"³ This plea was answered by a cask of madeira, as with thorough searching Michael Gratz was unable to procure any port.⁴

¹-- Ibid. September 1, 1769, Idem., 102.
²-- Idem, 104.
³-- William Murray to B. and M. Gratz, September 22, 1769. Ibid.
⁴-- B. and M. Gratz to William Murray, April 4, 1770, Idem., 109.
Murray's letter of September, brought a very gracious and reassuring reply from Michael Gratz. He was assured that it was not indeed any possible diffidence in his honor which prevented a shipment of goods, but merely a lack of goods, when the last bateaux left for the west, due to the non-importation act. Furthermore he was gathering a cargo to be shipped in the spring. He kept his promise faithfully, notifying Murray in April, 1770, that he had sent goods to the amount of £ 608:11:4 Penn., ($1,760) in the contractor's bateaux. It is interesting to note that Gratz credited Murray in their accounts with £ 166:7:11\(\frac{1}{2}\) ($906) as one half share of the profits of this venture. From such transactions, we see that their profits were often one hundred per cent. One must remember that their risks were correspondingly great.

We are rather surprised to find George Morgan's right hand man, James Rumsey, going over to the enemy. Morgan had

1. Michael Gratz to William Murray, December 28, 1769, Idem., 108. On October 25, 1765, "the merchants and other citizens of Philadelphia," including David Franks and the Gratz, adopted the "Non-Importation Resolutions" in which they agreed not to have any goods shipped from Great Britain until the Stamp Act was repealed. Morais, The Jews of Philadelphia, 22. It still was in force in 1770, although the Stamp Act had been repealed. In that year Michael Gratz proposed to Barnard, who was still in London, that they would ship their goods to Illinois by the way of Baltimore, Maryland, for canvas goods, linens, cloth from 4 to 6 shillings per yard, blankets and rugs could be imported there. Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 112

2. William Murray's Account Current with B. and M. Gratz, 1773-1774. This account further states "as pr Sales in Franks and Company Books."

written of him on September 19, 1769, "It would be a principal part of my happiness to go hand in hand with a union of souls with Mr. Rumsey, through the different stages of life enjoying and partaking of each other's blessings or sorrows." This associate of Morgan, entered into partnership with Murray on May 19, 1770.

The articles of agreement stated that Murray and Rumsey were to be partners at Kaskaskia for three years. Murray was not to be hindered in functioning as Commissary to the troops at Fort de Chartres nor as the agent of the Gratz brothers. The £340 of goods which Murray had on hand were to be put up on their joint account, and they bound themselves to the amount of £1,000. This agreement stipulated that David Franks, if he so desired, should be admitted as a joint partner.¹ This latter step was taken in the fall of 1770. The Gratz brothers and Alexander Ross became the other members of this firm designated as "David Franks and Company."

James Rumsey entered immediately into the spirit of this new partnership. In January, he intended to take invoice of the unsold goods belonging to the Gratz and to put them on the joint account. By the first of the new year he had disposed of the most salable part of the spring cargo sent by the Gratz brothers. On January 26, he sent them a public bill for the amount of £640 in order to show them how much he had the interest of "Mr. Murray's friends" at heart. Since Murray had gone East on a business trip, he was very busy attending to their three

¹-- Pennsylvania Historical Society, Elting Collection, Miscellaneous manuscripts, vol. 1, 133.
stores, performing his duties as Secretary to Wilkins, and counteracting the machinations of his former friend, Morgan, whom he now characterized as a "Bedlamite."¹ Morgan's relations were also severed with Wilkins, and between 1770 and 1772, Illinois was torn with party strife—Morgan leading the opposition, composed mostly of disconnected French, against Rumsey and Wilkins.²

Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan determined to withdraw from Illinois in the spring of 1771. Murray informed Gratz on May 7, that he and Rumsey had purchased a large part of that firm's residue of merchandise.³ This transaction caused the Gratz no little concern, and they wrote October 2,"—was sorry to hear of the large purchase which was made of B. W. and Morgan's old goods, which I suppose must be a great deal of damaged and unsalable goods amongst. Such a large sum as we are told they expect in payment for the goods next month— I am sure they cannot get without a large remittance from you."⁴ M. Gratz seems to have had suspicions of Mr. Rumsey and cautioned Murray to be frugal,

---


2. Carter, Great Britain and the Illinois Country, 71. Wilkins had formerly been very friendly with Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan, and had made them grants of lands, in which he, himself, was interested. Gabriel Cerré's Testimony Concerning Illinois, July, 1786, Alvord, Kaskaskia Records, 384.

3. The cost of this purchase was £ 9,955:14:4, excluding £ 1,000 of goods charged to the firm but rejected by Rumsey. Pennsylvania Historical Society, Supreme Court Records, April Term, 1773. In May, 1774, Thomas Wharton wrote his brother that David Franks had not yet paid this bill although he had obtained judgment for it "12 months" since. Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, vol. xxiii, 333.

industrious, and careful. They had received from Mr. Franks only £ 640 (sent by Rumsey) on all the goods they had sent up and begged him for a small remittance. 1

The firm of "David Franks and Company" did not confine its operations to Fort de Chartres, but on August 8, 1771, purchased three lots, a stone house, and a mill for £ 300 Penn. (£850) in Kaskaskia. The indenture was made in the name of Moses and Jacob Franks of Philadelphia, James Rumsey, and William Murray of Illinois. 2 Murray and Rumsey made frequent business trips east as the letters forwarded took so long to reach their destination that there were continual misunderstandings. On one return trip a blacksmith and a distiller, accompanied Rumsey in order to enlarge further the firm's undertakings.

Besides these partnerships, Murray had his own personal affairs. He still maintained a correspondence (mostly of a business nature) with Messrs. Callender, Thompson, Roker, Murphey, Simon, and Burke of Pennsylvania. With some of these he was debtor, as with Callender and Thompson, and with other a creditor as with Mr. Cameron. In such relations, the Gratz acted for him in the East. During 1772, Murray officiated as the executor of the estate of Captain James Campbell, a former member of Wilkins' Court. In this capacity, he sold the estate at auction, paid the laborers who had worked on it, and compensated "Franks and Com-

1. — Ibid.
2. — Draper Manuscripts, 12 s 293.
pany" for supplies furnished the slaves.  

Although the Gratz and David Franks were very much concerned in these trading ventures, yet that was not their all-absorbing interest. Ever since Samuel Wharton had sailed to London on behalf of the Indiana Grant, these prominent easterners had watched his progress with breathless interest. Wharton had received a private opinion from Lord Camden and Lord Chancellor Yorke in 1769 to the effect that titles to land purchased directly from the Indian tribes by individuals or groups of individuals would be upheld in the British courts. In spite of Wharton's attempts to keep this opinion secret, it leaked out about 1772. The knowledge of it most likely led to the decision of "Franks and Company" in 1773, to discontinue their trading operations and take advantage of this opinion by entering into land speculations of their own. On April 3, consequently, Murray was appointed their attorney with full power to settle and close up the business of this company whose partnership was soon to expire.

1. -- August 31, 1773, Estate of Captain James Campbell, in account with William Murray, Executor. Supreme Court Records, April Term, 1773. Pennsylvania Historical Society.

2. -- Wharton to Johnson, June 14, 1769, in Johnson Manuscripts. vol. xvii, 190.

3. -- The demolition of Fort de Chartres in the fall of 1772, the reduction of the size of the garrison stationed in Illinois, and the talk of doing likewise to Fort Pitt must have greatly discouraged these men and made them even more eager for land speculation. See Hillsborough to Gage, December 4, 1771, in Public Records Office, Colonial Office Papers, 5:90, p. 5; and Gage to Hillsborough, September 2, 1772, in idem, p. 113.

4. -- Kaskaskia Court Record, 265.
In this settlement we gain some idea of the way in which they had conducted this business and its magnitude. From October 19, 1770, to April 24, 1773, the Gratz furnished "Franks and Company" with £ 1,953:104\frac{3}{4} ($9,600) worth of merchandise. On July 1, 1773, they had a balance of £ 1,560:0:11 ($8,392) with this concern.\textsuperscript{1} They profited as wholesalers on the goods which they sent and besides, shared in the profits after the goods were retailed. It is probable that David Franks did likewise. We have record of one shipment alone by him amounting to £ 724:10:10 ($3,520). Murray and Rumsey in addition to the profits on the final sale of the goods, must have received remuneration for their services. Murray continued to be in account with "Levy and Franks." On November 20, 1772, they credited him with £ 14,641:6:10\frac{1}{4} ($71,157) because of disbursements he made at the Illinois between June 25, 1770, and September 10, 1772.\textsuperscript{2} We see by the last statement that Joseph Simon, member of "Levy and Franks" was also concerned in Murray's affairs. Rumsey made his final settlement in September with "Franks and Company" through William Murray. His account consisted of 10,634 livres (French money) most of which was to be paid in flour and other provisions for the garrison.\textsuperscript{3}

We can see that the trading operations were often closely

\textsuperscript{1} Pennsylvania Historical Society, Etting Collection, Gratz Papers.

\textsuperscript{2} Pennsylvania Historical Society, Etting Collection, Miscellaneous Manuscripts, vol. 1, 146.

\textsuperscript{3} Recognition of Indebtedness to Franks and Company, by J. Rumsey, May 15, 1773, Kaskaskia Manuscripts, Court Record, folio 273.
associated with the provisioning of the troops. Before following these merchants in their land speculations let us take a brief survey of the history of the provision branch. From Kaskaskia on July 11, 1768, Morgan had written of a contract made by Mr. Moses Franks and two other London gentlemen for provisioning the troops there at 1 3/- Sterling per ration or twenty-seven cents per person a day. Moses Franks, Mr. Nesbitt, and Sir Robert Colebrook had for several years supplied the British armies in America with food. It was William Murray who acted as deputy for David Franks at Fort de Chartres where he was to personally supervise the fulfillment of the contract mentioned by Morgan. The failure to receive this contract was a great disappointment to Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan. So apprehensive was Morgan of its detriment to their interests, that he urged the senior members of his firm to arrange with Mr. Franks to supply William Murray with the rations at 1 3/- pence Pennsylvania, or 2 New York currency. In this

1. -- David and Moses Franks were sons of Jacob Franks of New York. During the French and Indian War, the armies in America were supplied with provisions by Messrs. Moses Franks, Nesbitt, and Colebrook. The latter two are probably the "other two men" referred to by Morgan. Contracts to the value of £ 76,400 were made for provisioning British Armies and Garrisons in North America, particularly in New York, Maryland, Fort Pitt, and the Illinois Country. Both Moses and David figure prominently in the correspondence of this firm (1759-1779) as its agents. David Franks managed their interests in Pennsylvania. American Jewish Historical Publications, vol. xi, 181-183.

2. -- Baynton, Wharton and Morgan did however receive large contracts for supplying the Indian department with goods to be used as presents to the Indians. Carter, Great Britain and the Illinois Country, 83.

3. -- July 11, 1768, Morgan Letter Book. £ 100 Sterling was equivalent to £ 170 Pennsylvania.
way their firm could profit from the sale of provisions while the London company could profit by the difference of exchange.

Morgan did achieve his end in this branch, for within a few weeks after Murray reached Fort de Chartres, he procured his order for 35,000 pounds of meat to be delivered by February 1 for the garrison at Fort de Chartres. Morgan charged Murray higher rates for these provisions, except the pork than had been formerly charged, by agreeing to deliver the provisions in the English weight which was 12 per cent. to 9 per cent. higher than the French weight. He was also to be allowed one-half bushel of salt for preserving the meat, for every barrel of beef of 220 pounds. Thus, although competitors, Murray and Morgan found themselves dependent upon each other.

Murray in turn received vouchers from the government through Mr. Reed, commissary at Fort Pitt. It appears that in 1769, a Mr. Ross was manager of the contractors at Fort Pitt. In this capacity he was in the habit of supplying the contractors, of whom Murray was one, with provisions from the East. We might well infer that the Franks by this time preferred to fulfill their own contracts rather than to purchase the provisions from Baynton, Wharton, and Morgan. Murray, however, embarrassed Ross by not sending him an account of what he needed; and so Ross knew not how to supply him. Reed, perturbed by Murray's actions wrote Wilkins that Murray might deem it below him to send the account,

1.--- Morgan to Baynton and Wharton, October 30. Morgan said he thought they could arrange matters so as to lay in 50,000 pounds. Ibid.

2.--- Reed to McMillan, April 16, 1769, in J. P. Branch, Historical Papers, vol. iv, no. 2, 109-110. Reed is not to be confused with Lieutenant-colonel John Reed, stationed at Fort de Chartres in 1766-1768.
adding: "Trade which makes the contractor's people rich often make them above their business." Murray may have sent his order directly to Mr. Franks or to the Commissary General.

The provisioning of the garrison never seemed to have been satisfactory to the military officials. Murray and Wilkins in the late spring of 1770, had a dispute about the provisions. Wilkins wrote Rumsey: "I must beg that there be an end to this dispute and that the troops are regularly served as I have ordered, and which is the only manner they can be fed at present. vizt as at New York or Philadelphia or other places where cattle is to be got when demanded. I cannot see in what manner Mr. Murray proposes to make a deposit of fresh meat otherwise than I have directed weekly, shall desire Lieutenant De Berniem to consult him on that head. Am not surprised at Mr. Murray's inscription with respect to the credit he has given me for deposits made in my name but must declare that I have never asked any price but left the matter to him and yourself at any rate I cannot boast of my farming scheme but am happy to find all articles so much reduced since I took the same in hand I have myself much to do at present, therefore must beg that if Mr. Murray and yourself have more to say in the present dispute (wherein I have nothing in view but justice to the public and contractors) that you will make me a visit so as to put an end to the affair, and if Mr. Murray imagines he hath given me a partial credit—he pleased to apologize for my not remitting to him at present."


2. -- Illinois Historical Survey.
But Wilkins was soon again on terms of friendship with Rumsey and Murray. He wrote Rumsey, on October 25, that he hoped the excesses which he had suffered at Fort de Chartres would cease at Kaskaskia, and sent his regards to Mr. Murray.—1

Lieutenant Colonel Wilkins was discharged from the service in September, 1771, on the charge of falsifying accounts and taking large sums to himself.2 He was succeeded by Major Isaac Hamilton who after abandoning and destroying Fort de Chartres left fifty soldiers at Fort Gage, near Kaskaskia, under Captain High Lord.3

Gage ordered Captain High Lord to inquire into frauds suspected of the contractor's agent—Mr. Murray. Captain Lord informed Gage that in September, 1772, Colonel Wilkins had made a requisition for a deposit of provisions, but that the buffalo beef had to be condemned. He stated further that Murray, who was at that time acting for the contractors and most of his employees were away; and so he was prevented from giving the requested information.4 After the abandonment of Fort de Chartres in September, and the withdrawal of most of the troops, we have scarcely a mention of the provisioning of the troops except, when Murray wrote the Gratz in 1773 from Pittsburg that if Croghan's information be

---

1. Pennsylvania Historical Society, Gratz Papers. This statement shows that Murray was going to make Kaskaskia the center of his business and connects with the purchase of the lots "etc" made there in August. See ante, 22.


3. Hillsborough sent Gage orders for its demolition on December 4, 1771. Public Record Office, Colonial Office Papers, 5:90, p. 5. Its abandonment and demolition were reported to Hillsborough by Gage on September 2, 1772. See, idem., p. 113.

4. April 9, 1773, in British Museum, Additional Manuscripts, 21730 f. 27.
correct "that the administration (intended) to send a battalion to the Illinois country, as they had at last found it to be the master key to Canada they would not fail doing something worthy."\(^1\)

---

1. — May 15, 1773, Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 130.
CHAPTER III.

WILLIAM MURRAY, LAND SPECULATOR
IN ILLINOIS.

It was during Murray's brief sojourn with Croghan, mentioned in the previous chapter, that Murray was assured by the latter that Lords Camden and York had personally confirmed to him their opinion concerning Indian titles, when he was last in England. Murray quite elated over this confession transmitted it to the Gratz adding, "So courage, my boys. I hope we shall yet be satisfied for past vexations attending our concern at the Illinois." A traveler whether by land or canoe or barge was most always the deliverer of some letters or goods at his destination. Murray brought three horses here to Mr. Mahon. Light-hearted and jestingly he wrote, "By two of them (horses) he sold in a few minutes after he gained possession, he gained eleven pounds. You see, Michael, that a Scotch-Irishman can get the better in a bargain with a Jew. I cannot have it in my power to transgress the Mosaic law by eating swine's flesh here. Not an ounce of it can be had in this beggarly place---"

Murray did not tarry long in the east but returned soon to Illinois in order to make the land purchase, which he and his partners had planned during his stay, as quickly as possible. Murray continued his journey down the Ohio with brighter prospects.

1.--Ibid. This acknowledgment of his being Scotch makes us naturally think of him as possibly being the Captain Murray of Fort Pitt.
than those which had attended his former returns. Already twenty-two stockholders had signed the proposed new land affair, including Thomas Minshall of York county, Captain John Campbell, Robert Callender, and William Thompson of Cumberland county. All of these men were Pennsylvanians. Thus as early as May, fairly definite plans for the Illinois company had been formulated. Murray upon arriving at Kaskaskia on June 11, made known the opinion of the British lawyers to Captain Lord. But the latter, far from acquiescing and allowing himself to encourage such schemes, replied that: "He should not suffer him to settle any of the lands as it was expressly contrary to his Majesty's orders"—referring of course to the provisions of the Proclamation of 1763. But Murray's spirit was not one to be daunted by pessimistic denunciations of one of his Majesty's less important servants. During the month of June, Murray held several public conferences at Kaskaskia with the Illinois trices, to which the British officers and the residents of the village were invited. Such an open meeting together with his orders against giving the Indians liquor, he thought, would show he had no intentions of trickery. He allowed nearly a month for their transactions, in order that the chiefs and sachems would have plenty of time for deliberation and consultation with the tribes which they represented.

1. --- Ibid.
2. --- Lord to Gage, July 3, 1773, Johnson Manuscripts, vol. xxv, no. 211.
The bronzed Indians with their blankets wound about them—some standing in majestic dignity, others lounging about smoking their long pipes; the red coated soldiers; the buckskin clad Frenchmen—all gazing upon the purchase price consisting of piles of bright red blankets, shirts, stockings, shining brass kettles, steel knives, sacks of flour; and even cattle and horses—must have formed a peculiarly striking and impressive setting for the signing of the agreement perfected on July 5 at Kaskaskia.

By this contract, William Murray purchased for himself and his colleagues two tracts of land east of the Mississippi river—one between the Ohio and the Mississippi rivers just below Kaskaskia, and the other from the mouth of the Missouri north to that of the Illinois, and thence along the latter's course. But even more impressive was the ceremony itself—the translation and explanation into French of the complicated and formal deed, by Richard Winston to Michael Dane and Peço Blorit, Indian interpreters, who in turn repeated the lengthy explanation, in the most ceremonial manner, to the Indians. The Indian chiefs, in front of the entire assemblage assented to this transference and, one by one, set their characteristic seals, in the form of bear's heads, fish, or a cross, if baptized, upon the parchment. The cost of this purchase was later stated to have been $537,326.17.

The interpreters were duly sworn before the commandant

1.-- Ibid. Richard Winston was an inhabitant of Kaskaskia.

2.-- Ibid. This estimate covered the purchase price, the cost of the treaty, and the interest on the balance of the goods.
of the Illinois, Captain Hugh Lord, who certified this act on July 20, 1772. In all, it took about fifteen days to complete the transaction. On examining the list of the twenty-two grantees we find that all except Moses and Jacob Franks of London, William Murray of Illinois, and James Rumsey, late of Illinois, were Pennsylvanians. Most of them had had business dealings with the Franks Company (all of whom were grantees). We notice the familiar names of David Sproat, Milligan, and John Inglis of Philadelphia; Joseph Simon and Andrew Levi of Lancaster, Thomas Marshall of York county; Robert Callender of Cumberland county; and John Campbell of Pittsburg who with the Gratz formed Croghan's closest associates. All of these men had been connected with trading with Illinois and being naturally speculative, it is not surprising to find them venturing together in a quicker realization of profits. We have seen that Murray had not tried to get the consent of the British Council before making this purchase but had worked on the assumption that the Indian tribes were sovereign nations who could grant lands and that, although the British Crown was the possession of this territory, it did not personally own the soils since it had never purchased or leased the land itself.

This deviation of policy—to buy lands without government sanction—which seemed a defiance to British control and even in direct opposition to the Proclamation of 1763, caused an almost continuous exchange of letters between the British authorities. In a letter written September 30 to Haldimand, Superintendent Johnson condemned such purchases in these words: "I think Mr. Murray's proceedings very extraordinary. The spirit of purchasing
and pushing settlements into the back country, remote from the influence of government and where they do as they please, is already so prevalent that unless his majesty shall fall on some vigorous measure to prevent it, I despair of its ever being done!" From this letter we see Johnson feared such purchases would cause no small administrative problem. Haldimand replied to Johnson that he was glad to hear that the latter's opinion concerning these purchases corresponded with his own, in their representation to the secretary of State,[Dartmouth]. Haldimand sent his objections to Dartmouth in November. Although no actual settlements which were rumored to be made in the spring by emigrants from the East, would irritate the Indians and make the region one of lawlessness.

The grantees, realizing the opposition of the crown to their purchase, when they could receive no aid from their own state, Pennsylvania, cleverly seized upon the plan of obtaining the sanction of Virginia, who by her charter claimed the whole Northwest. Accordingly Murray went East, and on April 19, 1774, presented a petition on behalf of the Illinois Land Company to the Earl of Dunmore, Governor of Virginia, asking that: "Virginia extend her laws and jurisdictions" over their purchase since it was

1.-- In British Museum, Additional Manuscripts, 21670. f. 82.

2.-- October 20, 1773, in British Museum, Additional Manuscripts, 21670, f. 91.

3.-- November 3, 1773, in the British Museum, Haldimand Papers: Correspondence with Lord Dartmouth (1773-1775).

within her limits. Their reasoning follows logically: 1 That they wished for well regulated commerce and to avoid the evil consequences which come with irregular and lawless emigrants, that such regulated settlements would form a frontier for the present frontier of Virginia as well as for the other states, and that they would comply with any rules, such as quit rents, which Virginia should choose to impose.

Murray knew the way to a true speculator's heart, such as Governor Dunmore's of Virginia, and most likely promised him due compensation for his support. Dunmore strongly urged Dartmouth to act favorably on this petition of April, a copy of which he sent him in May, and spoke highly of the names attached to the petition. The three men were known to him, especially, Mr. Murray, of whom he said; "[He] has been long a merchant in the Illinois country, knowing well the country which they were about settling and thoroughly understands the advantages that may be derived from their settlement there, to trade which is the principle of their undertaking and therefore cannot be prejudicial in any sense to His Majesty." Dartmouth, who did not react favorably to his proposal, wrote Johnson that Dunmore's reasons had no weight with him.

Meanwhile Murray was busy planning his "compensation" for Dunmore. As early as May 16, 1774, he spoke of the "old and new affair" about which he had had letters sent to the Franks brothers of London. His activity shows him to be the prime insti-

1.--Public Record Office, Colonial Office Papers, 5, 1352, p. 141.
2.--May 16, 1774, in idem.
3.--David Franks, John Cambell, and Murray were the "names attached to the petition."
gator. Plans were well under way as he wrote the Gratz on that day: "Further exploring has been determined upon at last meeting; some settlement to be made by way of taking possession, and all former transactions fully approved by those who were not formerly concerned, as well as on the part of the new hands." Eight Marylanders had already signed the new affair.

Murray's hopes once again seemed high and gave rise to such exclamations as "My rib presents her compliments to you"—and his little joke at the expense of Michael Gratz of whom he writes: "Now as the Devil will have it, you must be informed forsooth, that Moses was upon the top of a mount in the month of May—consequently his followers must for a certain number of days cease to provide for their families, though perhaps he may be promoted to such high rank above that he may think it beneath his dignity to associate with his countrymen."

The border warfare on the Ohio in 1774, increased in gruesomeness. Murray wrote the Gratz from Philadelphia that verbal reports of the murder of thirty-eight or forty-eight Indians by white people had reached them. "If this intelligence be true," he anxiously wrote, "it would mean much against us and greatly endanger my scalp. I hourly hope to hear that the report is void of truth." These rumblings bespoke of the Dunmore War which soon broke out. This war involved Virginia and Pennsylvania and made the

1. — Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 140
2. — Idem, 141,
the western Indians restless and Illinois the scene of frequent raids. Murray was still in Philadelphia in June and Michael Gratz hoped he would not leave until he learned the reports of the raids along the Ohio were groundless and advised that he return via New Orleans.

Meanwhile the British ministry had not viewed Murray’s purchase as favorably as had Lord Dunmore. General Gage then in England urged the ministry very strongly against validifying the grant. As early as May, the secretary’s opposition was known to the speculators through a letter written by Samuel Wharton to his brother stating that: “Lord Dartmouth had sent orders to Lord Dunmore not to grant a foot of Lands to any person on the Ohio and for him to make null and void the patents he has already granted.”

Gage wrote to Captain Hugh Lord commending his opposition to those land purchases which greatly pleased Lord Dartmouth. He then related the following commands: “you will therefore take all opportunities to acquaint the Indians with this, His Majesty’s concern for their happiness and welfare, in preventing persons taking advantage of them and purchasing the lands which it is the King’s determined resolution to reserve to them, and to prevent as much as lays in your power any purchase so contrary to the royal will and regulations... and that his Majesty’s new subjects may not be deceived and persuaded to act contrary to the intent of it, (i.e. the Proclamation) you will be pleased to order the Notary Public

1. See Alvord, Mississippi Valley in British Politics, vol ii, 188 ff.
to erase from his Registers any proceedings relative to the purchase already made and publicly to protest against them, and to declare all that has been or may be done hereafter relative to it void and of non-effect."¹

It was these unlawful purchases which caused the British ministry in Quebec Act of June, 1774, to included Illinois in the province of Quebec.² By so doing they hoped to discourage settlements in Illinois, since the residents could not enjoy English law; and thus fur trading would be encouraged. An annulment of Murray's deed was attempted. "Eighteen months subsequent (about January, 1775) to this transaction (July, 1773, purchase)" stated Murray, "General Gage ordered—(Captain Lord) to convene the Indian chiefs afresh after I purchased the lands, and to inform them; 'That notwithstanding the sale they had made, and the consideration that they might hold these lands and that they were still their property.'" After some deliberation, the chiefs replied: "'That they thought what the Great Captain said was not right; that they sold the lands to men and my friends not for a short time, but, as long as the sun rose and set; That I had paid them what they had asked for—and they would protect us against our enemies and we do the same for them when we settled.'³ Murray was content with the

¹-- Haldimand to Lord, March 9, 1774, in British Museum, Additional Manuscripts, 21693, f. 355.
²-- Alvord, Mississippi Valley in British Politics, vol ii, 237 ff.
³-- Account of the Proceeding of the Illinois and Ouabache Land Companies.
Indian reply and ignored the rebuke from the crown. In September, he commenced a series of negotiations similar to those of 1773, at Post St. Vincent and Ouiatenon with the different tribes of the Piankashaw and Wea.

He was not acting merely on the Camden opinion, for he wrote, "Previous to my commencing to negotiate either purchase, I had records examined [kept since early days by the French] to see what lands were ceded by--the Indians for garrisons or use of the inhabitants and by what titles the latter held them." If the crown could stop his purchase could they not nullify the French claims? And what an uproar such reasoning would cause among the French! By consulting the oldest Indians and the earliest French settlers, he learned that their landholding "originated from cessions obtained for a valuable consideration from Indians." He stated that his purchases were made from the same Indians. These Indians he claimed were sovereign and not tributary to the Six Nations or any other Nation.

Was the idea that Frenchmen who once bought land from the Indians could do so again, the reason for having his French partner, Louis Viviat, act as the purchaser of the Wabash lands? Did he reason that the English crown would not dare oppose

1.-- Ibid.
2.-- Ibid.
3.-- After his brother's departure from Illinois, Daniel Murray declared the partnership between William Murray and Louis Viviat dissolved, as "Viviat had acted in a manner unjust and illegal since the absence of his partner." April 13, 1777, Kaskaskia Manuscripts, folio 111. This estrangement may have been caused by their different political affiliations--Murray being pro-American and Viviat being Pro-British.
such a prominent Frenchman as Louis Viviat who was merely reiterating the acts of other French settlers—on a larger scale of course! By using him, Murray could of course gain the good will of the French. In any case, Louis Vivat, prominent French merchant and former judge at Kaskaskia, held public conferences, similar in nature to those held in 1773, at Post Vincent and Vermillion. There he obtained from their chiefs on October 18, two large tracts of land, one above and one below Vincennes. Merchandise similar in character to that used for the first purchase but valued at $42,477.73 ($5,000 in excess of the former purchase) was paid for this land.¹ The Earl of Dunmore's name stands prominently among the grantees, in fact his name is the first of the eighteen on the list and is followed by that of his son, John Murray. Maryland had a fair representation and we note that William Murray's brother, Daniel, is now engaged with him. This deed was duly registered on December 5, 1775. In the deed again appears the names of our old friends Moses and Jacob Franks, who with Murray and David Franks are he only grantees of 1775. The names of Rumsey, Cratz, Campbell, Simon are conspicuous by their absence. With the American Revolution, their most prominent sponsor with the ministry, Lord Dunmore, was dropped from their journals.

Events were moving with lightning rapidity in America during the fall of 1775 and the year 1776—hopes of the removal of grievances began to engender thoughts in bolder minds of independence; parties were beginning to form; and the conservatives, neither Tory nor Pro-Independent, began to be forced to cast their lot in with one of the two sides. William Murray must

¹ Account of the Proceedings of the Illinois and Ouabache Land Companies.
have watched these events with some apprehensions and yet with some hopes—war certainly would delay the settlement of these newly acquired lands, but now that Britain had shown her absolute disapproval of his undertakings by direct criticisms and by the inclusion of Illinois in the Quebec Province, would he not have a better chance by casting his fortunes in with the Revolutionists? Besides his Scotch blood probably seized the opportunity to side in with the Colonies against England.

In the early summer of 1776, Murray left Illinois for the East, in order to exert more direct influence for his grants. Before leaving Kaskaskia, he instructed his brother Daniel, whom he left in charge of his western affairs, to give every assistance to any American troops that might arrive there. These instructions he repeated through Colonel George Gibson who came from New Orleans to Illinois.

Faithful to his brother's commands, Daniel Murray preferred valuable aid to George Rogers Clark upon his entry into Kaskaskia on July 4, 1778. Indeed, it is even suggested that the loyal Daniel opened the door of the fort to him. By the morning of the fifth he and Winston had plenty of provisions for the fatigued and hungry troops, whose gratitude to such friends of the


2. Alvord, Cahokia Records, Introduction, xiii. Murray was a close friend of Thomas Bentley who was accused of aiding the Americans. For an account of their activities, see Alvord, Kaskaskia Records, Introduction, xvi--xxv.
American cause must have been very great.

Daniel Murray continued his assistance and supplied Clark with large quantities of flour, beef, pork, salt, tallow, liquor, and merchandise. For these commodities, he accepted continental money at gold valuation without stopping to consider depreciation, and he later claimed to have induced the French to do likewise. Not only did Daniel Murray act as voluntary provisioner of the troops, but he also acted as commissary and quartermaster, and served in military operations under Clark. His assistance to the Virginians proved very detrimental to his interests and those of his brother. In a memorial on December 29, 1781, to the Virginia Delegates in Congress, he prayed them to save himself and his brother from ruin by the payment of two bills for $6,484 and $1,590, which were drawn by Colonel Montgomery.

Although it is not within our scope to pursue Murray's activities outside of Illinois in any detail, yet the following account seems necessary. Clark's undertakings were not unknown in the East. After a long interval of no meetings, the Illinois and Wabash Land Companies held a joint session in Philadelphia on November 3, 1778, thirteen days before the news of Clark's achievement reached Williamsburg. Could not their western sympathizers such as Daniel Murray have sent them news of Clark's success? At this meeting, the companies determined to unite, to rectify the indefinite boundary lines of the Illinois river tract of the 1773 purchase, to cede sufficient land to

1. -- Clark's Memoir, 1773-1779, in James, George Rogers Clark Papers, 229.

2. -- Virginia State Papers, vol. ii, 675, Clark must have been surprised to find the continental money passing at par. It is said that many merchants tried to buy up goods in Illinois on this basis. Alvord, Cahokia Records, Introduction, 1.

pay the soldiers enlisted in the American cause, and to present
a memorial to the Virginia Legislature. William Murray was appoin-
ted as executor of many of their proposed plans—to supervise
the correction of the northern boundary (for which £ 600 to be
increased to £ 1,000 if necessary was appropriated) and to pre-
sent their memorial to Virginia. Seeing that it was Virginia who
actually occupied the Illinois country, the proprietors were anx-
ious to make their claims formally known. On December 26, 1778,
William Murray presented this memorial to the Legislature at
Williamsburg. After stating briefly that they had purchased lands
on the Wabash river, the Illinois and Wabash Companies tactfully
added that when conditions allowed for the settlement of these
lands they had no intention to dispute the jurisdiction of Vir-
ginia or any other state rightfully claiming jurisdiction over
them.¹

In 1779 frequent meetings of the companies were held.
George Ross, signer of the Declaration and now chairman of these
companies sent Captain John Campbell, their surveyor-general, in-
structions for the founding of a town at the junction of the Ohio
and Wabash rivers, and the terms of settlement proposed. They
informed him that Murray was their agent in this affair.

In spite of Virginia's reiteration on May 18 that no
persons could purchase any land within her limits, the companies

2— On March 13, August 20, and November 8. Account of the Pro-
ceedings of the Illinois and Ouabache Land Companies.
went hopefully ahead in completing their organization and plans. In August, they divided their lands into eighty-four shares, two of which were soon after sold to Mr. Robert Morris, renowned financier of the Revolution, and Mr. John Holder, Counsel of France, for $8,000 each. With the names of these prominent members added to those of Gerard, the French minister who had a large following in Congress, and Governor Thomas Johnson of Maryland, in addition to the ten members from Maryland, we are not surprised at Maryland's opposition to Virginia's obtaining permanent sovereignty in the West. On April 29, 1780, a definite constitution was drawn up; a resolution was passed ordering that $4,000 (from the sale of the shares to Messrs. Holder and Morris) be paid to Murray, for defraying the necessary expenses of the Companies; and detailed provisions were made for settlements at the mouth of the Ohio and Illinois rivers as well as at the mouth of the Wabash. They decided to postpone the actual settlement of these sites until peace was declared. The various events leading to Maryland's ratification of the Articles of Confederation on February 2, 1781, showed plainly that the Companies could now hope for little success by working through Maryland alone. Knowing Maryland's intention of ratification they presented a memorial to Congress on February 3, 1781, which found no favor. The members of the United-Illinois-Wabash Companies refused to cast

2. Ibid.
entirely aside their visions of golden prosperity, and we accordingly find them petitioning the Continental Congress in 1788, the United States Congress in 1791, 1797, and 1804.\textsuperscript{1} The petition of 1791 had been presented by James Wilson, the eminent Pennsylvanian, and his friends. The House acted favorably on it but a deadlock in the Senate prevented any action.\textsuperscript{3} No better fortune favored that of 1797. The whole matter was finally repudiated on January 30, 1811.

During this period of the futile attempts of the Illinois–Wabash–Land Companies to gain official sanction to its purchases, we have but a fleeting glimpse of William Murray. The affairs of these United Companies had become his chief interest. Besides, the Revolutionary War had greatly curtailed western trading, not only by making western expeditions hazardous, but also by discouraging the Indians from trapping. Shortly after the March meeting of 1779 of the land companies, the Gratz brothers intended to make a final settlement with Murray. Michael cautioned his brother to take care when he settled with him to get "hard" money instead of the depreciated paper. Murray may have gone West in the interest of their companies for Daniel Murray wrote Bentley

\begin{enumerate}
\item— Ibid.
\item— Ibid.
\item— Ibid.
\item— Idem., vol. ii, 253.
\item— Michael Gratz to Barnard Gratz, April 13, 1779, Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 180.
\end{enumerate}
that he expected him. We hear nothing of him in the years following, until 1786, when he is the bearer of a letter from Barnard Gratz then in Richmond, Virginia, whither his business interests had moved, to Michael. He still maintained business relations with the Lancaster group. In June of that year, he deeded one-half of his 2,000 acre land tract, in Jefferson County, Virginia, to Joseph Simon. This land adjoined the military survey of Colonel John Campbell which lay within the present site of Louisville, Kentucky.

His holdings in Kentucky and the subsequent failure of the Illinois-Wabash Companies to maintain their titles cause us to wonder if he was not the William Murray who appeared so prominently in Kentucky's history as the opposer of the Kentucky Resolutions, in 1798. Since the interests of the Gratz were turned in that direction he may have followed in their path. If he is this William Murray, he emigrated to Natchez, Mississippi, in 1803, and died there in 1805. But the absolute proof of this

1. -- Daniel Murray to Thomas Bentley, May 25, 1779, Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections, vol., xix, 417.


3. -- This deed is recorded in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, Byars, B. and M. Gratz, 374.

4. -- Collins, History of Kentucky, 277. William Murray representative from Franklin County, led the debate against these resolutions. Collins states that his contemporaries spoke of him in terms of admiration and he was probably the most eminent scholar in his day. Ibid. Shaler suggests that Murray's opposition was given "in order to balance his as yet unpublished relation" to the intrigue of the Spanish governor, Carondelet, in gaining the secession of Kentucky from the Union. Shaler, Kentucky, 141. For an extended treatment of this conspiracy, see, Green, The Spanish Conspiracy.
case is still wanting. Thus we see the finale as well as the
beginning of the life of this dramatic personage remains still
to be ascertained. In my discourse I have attempted to trace
his activities in Illinois alone; and so I must leave the solution
of this problem to later researches or to others, ambitious of
throwing light upon some of the truly eminent pioneers who their
most precious years to laying a cornerstone for our state of
Illinois.
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