

“The Historiography of
The *Margaretta* Affair,
Or,
How Not To Let the Facts
Interfere With a Good Story”

by
Edwin A. Churchill

On June 12, 1775, angry settlers at Machias, Maine attacked and captured His Royal Majesty's schooner *Margaretta*. The first naval battle between the American colonists and an armed British vessel during the War for Independance, the story of the engagement has been frequently retold, although never quite the same way in any two instances. In quality, the numerous renditions of the *Margaretta* story vary from generally accurate versions to tales replete with factual errors and heavily encrusted with local traditions and patriotic folklore.

Close examination of the many accounts reveals that there have been three historical schools concerning the *Margaretta* affair: the Jones-Williamson school, the traditionalists, and the revisionists. All three deserve consideration. The first, a highly reliable version of the incident, was based on the reminiscences of Stephen Jones, written in 1822. Jones' memory was superb. Where his remarks can be compared with documents generated at the time of the capture, he is invariably correct. Only once, when he attempted to excuse the Loyalist leanings of his uncle, Ichabod Jones, did he stray from the facts. It was Jones' recollections that served as the basis for William D. Williamson's description of the event in his monumental two volume *History of Maine* published in 1832. His account was factually correct with the minor exception that he called the British schooner the *Margranetto*. This version of the story appeared once more when George L. Drisko quoted Williamson in his *Life of Hannah Weston* twenty-five years later, although he did note that the vessel was the *Margaretta* not the *Margranetto*.¹ This seems to be

the last time that the Jones-Williamson account was used by nineteenth-century historians. By mid-century, it had been replaced by another version, one plagued with inaccuracies and replete with local and patriotic mythology.

The new version grew out of the recollections of Joseph Wheaton and John O'Brien, both of whom had participated in the capture of the *Margaretta* and both of whom had notoriously bad memories.² Their reminiscences were then augmented by numerous local and patriotic mythologies which were introduced, developed and perpetuated by a group of historians who, for lack of a better term, will be called the traditionalists.

When examining the writings of these men, two points emerge: first, the various myths and traditions evolved over time before reaching their final form, and second, many of the tales that were introduced actually had a basis in fact. (It should be noted, though, that due to the evolution of these stories, the final versions often bore little resemblance to the actual incidents or situations.) Because of these two points, plus the fact that the various myths travelled quite different paths from introduction to standardization with no general pattern as to which historians included or ignored specific stories, it seems that the best way to analyze the writings of the traditionalists is to trace the development of the major myths that grew up around the *Margaretta* incident rather than to discuss each individual historian.

The most dramatic myth to be developed, the liberty pole incident, was introduced by John O'Brien in his reminiscences of 1831. He stated that Lieutenant James Moore provoked the attack on the *Margaretta* by insisting that the Machias people take down the liberty pole, which they had erected upon hearing about Lexington and Concord, or "the town would be fired upon." The inhabitants refused then and at a town meeting held several days later. While Moore waited for the results of yet another meeting before he took action, the inhabitants resolved the issue by capturing the British schooner and killing the Lieutenant in the action.³

O'Brien's story seems to have been an invention of his imagination. There is no evidence that the quarrel had anything to do with a liberty pole. Every primary source, as well as the recollections of Stephen Jones and Ephriam Chase, flatly state that the quarrel resulted from the activities of merchant Ichabod Jones, who, supported by Lieutenant Moore, coerced the people into purchasing English goods and allowing him to load lumber to take to the British garrisons in Boston. The town meeting that was held considered the question of Jones' trading. The question of a liberty pole does not arise.⁴

For some reason, O'Brien's tale of the liberty pole did not again appear until 1857, when Charles P. Ilsley resurrected it in his *The Liberty Pole: A Tale of Machias*.⁵ He obviously felt that O'Brien's account needed more life and so provided pseudo-dialog to embellish his presentation. According to Ilsley, when Moore saw the liberty pole, the Lieutenant immediately disembarked from his vessel and demanded to know who had erected it.

"That pole, sir," answered John O'Brien, "was erected by the unanimous approval of the people of Machias."

"Well, sir," rejoined the officer, "with or without their approval, it is my duty to declare it must come down."

"*Must come down!*" repeated O'Brien with some warmth. "Those words are very easily spoken, my friend, You will find, I apprehend, that it is easier to make than it will be to enforce a demand of this kind."

"What! Am I to understand that resistance will be made? Will the people of Machias dare to disregard an order not originating with me, gentlemen, but with the government whose officer I am?"

"The people of Machias," replied O'Brien, "will *dare* do anything in maintenance of their principles and rights."

Ilsley then described a patriotic meeting where the inhabitants movingly refused to take down the pole and shortly thereafter decided to capture Moore. Ilsley's account, like O'Brien's was virtually ignored for over twenty years and other writers continued to explain the colonists' actions in terms of the trading dispute.⁶ Clearly the liberty pole story was not gaining acceptance.

Then came the Revolutionary Centennial with all its attendant excesses, one of which was Foxhall Parker's "The First Sea-Fight of the Revolution: The Capture of the *Margaretta*" (1877).⁷ Ilsley seems mild by comparison. Parker mentions Jones' commercial efforts in passing but declares that "he would have been permitted to take on board the lumber and leave the harbor unmolested, but for the indiscreet conduct of Lieutenant Moore, 'who [upon]...learning what the liberty pole signified, ordered it to be taken down, under the threat of firing upon the town.'" Parker then says that the people rushed to the liberty pole and expressed their resolve that it "should stand 'until it rotted away'" and even the minister's wife, " 'a meek looking, mild-eyed little woman,' declar[ed] she would rather be burned at a stake than see the people humbled before that 'snip of a boy' [i.e. Moore]." Soon after, prodded by townsman Benjamin Foster, the people decided the time had come to fight.

George Talbot reduced Parker's overblown account to a more believable presentation in his 1877 article "The First Naval Battle of the Revolution." With Talbot's account, the liberty pole gained acceptance and, with few exceptions, was included in every traditionalist history thereafter.⁸

The second major myth that developed around the *Margaretta* affair was the story that although both the *Unity* under Jeremiah O'Brien and the *Falmouth Packet* under Benjamin Foster started after the British schooner, Foster inadvertently grounded his vessel and the O'Brien brothers and their comrades singlehandedly captured the *Margaretta*. Primary sources either flatly state or unmistakably imply that Foster was present at the battle; the tale of his grounding seems to have started because of the self-centered bragging of Joseph Wheaton, who had been on O'Brien's vessel during the attack. In 1818, he wrote enthusiastically about the capture and his part in it. However, nowhere did he mention Foster's role in the battle. Wheaton's version of the capture gained early acceptance and appeared in Charles W. Goldsborough, *The United States Naval Chronicle* (1824);

James Fenimore Cooper, *The History of the Navy of the United States* (1839); Ilsley, *Liberty Pole* (1857); and Henry B. Dawson, *Battles of the United States by Sea and Land* (1858). It was further reinforced in O'Brien's "Exertions of the O'Brien's" (1831).⁹

By mid-century, there was some concern about what had happened to Foster. In his *History of Maine* (1832), Williamson had clearly stated that two vessels had gone after the *Margaretta* as did the Machias Committee of Safety in their report of June 17, 1775 [first published in Lincoln, *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Provincial Congress* (1838)]. In 1863, William B. Smith provided the solution in his "Historical Sketch of Machias." He said, "Foster procured his schooner, called the Falmouth Packet, ready in due season, but before the attack was commenced on the *Margaretta*, his vessel got aground, leaving O'Brien to push on to the encounter single-handed."¹⁰ Smith's interpretation was instantly accepted, becoming part of nearly every traditional account thereafter, thus neatly depriving Benjamin Foster of his rightful place in the capture and conversely exalting the roles of the O'Briens and Joseph Wheaton.

Between 1860 and 1900, a number of other dubious stories were incorporated into the history of the *Margaretta*. Invariably it was William B. Smith who introduced the tale during the Machias Centennial in 1863, Foxhall Parker who popularized it in "First Sea-Fight of the Revolution" (1877), and George Talbot who standardized it in "The First Naval Battle of the Revolution" (1887). One such tale was "Foster's Rubicon." According to Smith there was a great debate prior to the attack whether "to take possession of the sloops and the *Margaretta* and make Capt. Jones and the officers and men of the cutter, prisoners."

On one side, it was objected that if successful, such was our defenceless and destitute situation, we should only invite a sudden destruction by the enemy. On the other, it was urged that resistance to British aggression had already commenced elsewhere, and that it was their duty to follow the noble example of our bretheren at Lexington. At length, Foster, tired of the discussion, stepped across a small brook near which the party was

standing, and invited all who were in favor of taking Capt. Jones' vessels and the *Margaretta*, to cross over also. On this a large majority followed him, at once, and the minority falling in, a unanimous declaration of war was agreed upon."

There is little doubt that there was some kind of discussion held outside the village. On June 14 the Machias Committee of Safety reported that some inhabitants from neighboring towns "joined our people, in the woods, near the settlement [and]...they all agreed to take Capt. Jones and Stephen Jones Esqr." Stephen Jones also stated that there was a discussion in the woods whether or not to capture Ichabod Jones and the officers of the *Margaretta*, and that after some debate it was decided to make an attempt. However, Foster's theatrical stride across the brook probably was born of an overactive imagination. But it was just the type of story which would appeal to Foxhall Parker. He enthusiastically described the meeting, including such dialog as Foster's exclamation just as he was to step across the brook: "Let all who are willing to strike for Freedom follow me! Those who are in favor of British tyranny, and think it right to send lumber to Boston wherewith to build barracks for our oppressors may stay where they are!" With that, he strode over the stream, "*Cross[ing] the Rubicon*." Everyone else immediately followed suit. Ten years later George Talbot repeated Parker's account but in less heroic terms and was himself repeatedly quoted by later writers.¹¹

William B. Smith also introduced the legend of London Atus in his 1863 narrative. According to Smith, when Foster and company attempted to capture Ichabod Jones and Lieutenant Moore in Church, "London Atus, a negro servant of Parson Lyon was the first to [see them coming]...Not knowing the object of this warlike movement, our friend London, gave an outcry of alarm, and jumped through a window." Warned by this outburst, Jones and Moore were able to escape, the former to the woods and the latter to his ship. It's difficult to guess where Smith got this story. Every primary and secondary account prior to his presentation categorically states that Moore discovered the approaching mi-

litiamen himself and then made his escape. Possibly the story stemmed from an incident which occurred two years after the *Margaretta* affair. In an especially obscure passage, Stephen Jones indicates in his "History of Machias" that when the British attacked Machias in 1777, London Atus was somehow involved in the unjustified flight of some colonists from the battlefield. Whatever his role may have been, it is not difficult to believe that local folklorists would magnify it and integrate it with the more famous *Margaretta* incident.¹²

Regardless of the source of Smith's story, it takes little imagination to guess how Parker handled the tale. London Atus became "a thick-lipped, woolly-headed fellow of the true African stripe" with a penchant for dozing off in church. On the fateful day of June 11 he awoke from a nap and saw Foster and his band approaching the church. "Imagining that the 'Britishers' of whom he had recently heard so much were marching upon Machias, London, with one leap, was out the window and making tracks for the woods, crying out lustily as he went: 'Lord-a-massy! Lord-a-massy!' " Thus alerted, Jones and Moore were able to make their escape. Not surprisingly, no one ever matched Parker's performance; however, like so many other of his tales, the flight of London Atus was from then on fixed into the *Margaretta* story.¹³

Yet another story started by William Smith was that when ill-fated Lieutenant Moore sailed into Machias he brought two lady passengers "to one of whom he was to have been married at Halifax, whither he was bound in the *Margaretta*, after Jones' sloops were loaded." Besides being previously unmentioned in any document, this bit of melodrama is directly contradicted by Graves' order to Moore that the Lieutenant return to Boston with Jones' sloops. For some reason, Parker overlooked this tale, but it was picked up by George Talbot and others following him. It was Drisko, however, who put the finishing touch to the story in his *History of Machias* (1904), stating that the young lady (a niece of Ichabod

Jones) “was visiting in her uncle’s house, when the dying lover was brought to its door. The shock was too great as tradition tells us [and] she passed on in less than a year succeeding Captain Moore’s death.” The story disappeared after Drisko, appearing only once again in a brief remark in *Elkins Coastal Maine* (1924).¹⁴ Its passing need not be mourned.

For all their inventiveness, the traditionalist historians had one problem that they could not handle adequately—the Loyalism of Ichabod Jones. His role in the episode was too vital and too well-known to ignore. However, they felt uncomfortable in admitting that so important a local figure had been an enemy to the Patriotic cause; besides, nephew Stephen Jones was an honored member of the community. But for all their wishes, the primary evidence strongly indicates Ichabod sided with the British in the early war years. On May 24, 1775, General Thomas Gage wrote Vice-Admiral Samuel Graves, stating that:

The Bearer Mr. [Ichabod] Jones having exerted himself for the Service of Government, is threatened by the Inhabitants of the Eastern parts of this Province, to intercept and destroy his Vessels, by which means they will be rendered useless hereafter, his Settlement is at Machias where there are several Guns belonging to the Halifax Schooner cast Ashore there; he thinks an Armed Vessel’s being sent there to bring them away, may have a good effect, and prevent their fitting out Vessels from those parts to annoy his Majesty’s Subjects, and to encourage the Inhabitants to the Eastwood to bring fuel, Lumber &c to the Port of Boston; I am therefore to recommend this to you as a Matter that might be usefull to the Town and Garrison here: Mr. Jones further desires a Certificate, both from you and myself, that any Persons bringing Supplys to this Port they shall have free Permission to come in and go out, without Molestation.

In their report of June 14, 1775, the Machias Committee of Safety also stated that Jones had cooperated with Captain Moore in forcing the people to trade, and on June 17, wrote that they found “that both Capt. Jones’s Sloop...were, in the King’s Service.” Jones’ contemporaries had no doubts as to his sympathies. Benjamin Foster and Jeremiah O’Brien called him “a known Enemy to the Rights & Liberty of america;” General Horatio Gates characterized him as “one Tory,

Ichabod Jones;" and General George Washington titled him "a malignant and inveterate Enemy to his Country."¹⁵

Stephen Jones offered the first apology for his uncle's actions in his 1822 "History of Machias." Essentially, his argument was that Ichabod wanted to get his family, friends, and belongings out of Boston and badly needed provisions to Machias and the only way he could get out of Boston harbor was to agree to return from Machias with lumber to be used by the British garrison.¹⁶

After Stephen Jones' effort to resurrect his uncle's reputation, the first historian to broach the subject was Charles Ilsley in his *Liberty Pole* (1857).¹⁷ His approach was singular in that his characterization of the merchant bears little resemblance to the actual situation. Ilsley made no mention that Jones had anything to do with the sloops being loaded with lumber for the British in Boston; in fact, he claimed Jones "cordially approve[d] the spirit" of rebellion. He further portrayed Ichabod as the settler's go-between with Moore, convincing the Lieutenant not to fire on the town while keeping the townspeople informed of any new developments. Ilsley's portrayal was so inaccurate that it was never resurrected. However, the desire to clear Ichabod Jones did not die so quickly.

The next individual to consider the problem of Ichabod Jones was William Smith in his "History of Machias."¹⁸ He at least put the merchant in proper historical context, indicating Ichabod's actual role in the *Margaretta* affair. However, he completely accepted Stephen Jones' argument that his uncle's main reason for cooperating with the British was so that he could get family, friends, and possessions out of Boston and provisions for Machias. Not surprisingly, Smith discovered a fact heretofore not known to anyone else. He found that "before [Jones]...left for Boston...he appears, also, to have fortified himself with a certificate from the Selectmen of that place, desiring the people [at Machias]...to permit Capt. Jones to return and bring away from Boston other distressed inhabitants and their affects." Sadly, Smith

does not indicate the source of this information. In yet another effort to redeem Jones' reputation, Smith carefully soft-peddled Ichabod's discriminatory trading activities once the town had consented to the merchant's commercial proposals, stating that "there is a tradition that Capt. Jones in making sale of the supplies which he had at this time bought, 'favored those who favored him,' and would give credit only to those who voted in favor of [his] carrying lumber to Boston." Of this tradition, which is documented in the June 14th report of the Machias Committee of Safety, Smith clearly implies his doubts.

The next historian to take up Jones' defence was Foxhall Parker.¹⁹ According to him,

Mr. Ichabod Jones' conduct both before and after the 6th of June, [was]...only such as prudence would have dictated to a thrifty merchant whose property was at stake, and who believed, as he, like many other very probably did, that the difficulties with the home government would have been settled without further bloodshed, provided the counsels of the moderate men on both sides were but listened to and heeded.

Parker portrayed Jones as a conciliator and stated that the people, although disturbed about having to trade lumber to the British for provisions, would have cooperated with Jones had not Lieutenant Moore riled them by making an issue over the liberty pole. Parker further stated that Ichabod's poor reputation resulted in part because of the vicious tongue of Martha, wife of Reverend James Lyon. She was angry because when her color-blind husband went to Jones to buy black cloth for a coat, the merchant sold him several yards of scarlet material instead. She felt Jones had knowingly tricked her husband; however Parker knew better.

"The fact is the worthy parson was alone to blame for the mistake; for, on going on board the *Unity* and laying violent hands on a piece of cloth, which he found to be of the finest texture, and imagined to be *black*, he asked for the number of yards he required, without saying to what use he intended putting it. So, of course, it was cut off and handed to him. [Upon his arrival home his wife told him]...that a *scarlet* coat would suit one of the Pope's cardinals better than an *orthodox* clergyman.

George Talbot, the next writer to follow Parker, re-

established William Smith's defense of Jones, noting that the merchant had no choice but to deal with the British, and reiterating the story that "the selectmen of Boston furnished him with a petition to the people of Machias desiring them not to hinder him in his enterprises." The petition, Talbot thought, clearly indicated that Jones "stood well with the promoters of the revolution." He also accepted Parker's judgement that, although Jones' trading activities irritated some people in town, everything would probably have gone along all right had not Moore caused trouble over the liberty pole. Talbot's version, a combination of William Smith and Foxhall Parker, was to be the standard portrayal of Ichabod Jones in the traditionalist histories that followed.²⁰

Even as the traditionalist account of the *Margaretta* affair was being perfected, the first historian of the revisionist school, Charles Pope, read his "Machias in the Revolution" at a meeting of the Maine Historical Society. Presented in December, 1894, this was the first serious effort to return to the primary sources and construct the story without reference to the numerous tales that had been sprouting forth. Citing pertinent petitions to the Massachusetts Provincial Congress and passages from its journals, Pope developed an accurate portrayal of the *Margaretta* incident. However, he did not stop there. He carefully listed the various legends that had grown up including the liberty pole, Foster's Rubicon, the alarm of London Atus and Foster's grounded vessel, after which he calmly noted that none rested on "documentary or other good evidence." Pope's account had but one fault; it was completely ignored and the traditionalist story remained firmly entrenched. This situation would not change for many years in local and state histories; however, more broadly focused studies were returning to primary documents for their information. Gardiner Allen, in his *Naval History of the American Revolution* carefully pursued the documents printed in Pope's article as well as some from the British Admiralty. Only when he tried to decide whether there was one or two vessels did he turn to Wheaton's recollections and several traditionalist histories, and he soon be-

came thoroughly confused. Finally, in 1934, Allen French, in his *The First Year of the American Revolution* provided the first wholly accurate, although brief, description of the *Margaretta* affair since Stephen Jones' account of 1822. Using Admiralty Records, "The Conduct of Vice-Admiral Samuel Graves," Peter Force, *American Archives* and other similar sources, his was the most solidly based study of the event written to that time. The only major item which French overlooked was Jones' "History of Machias."²¹

After French's short account, there was a long period before another scholarly study went to press. In 1966, John Ahlin's *Maine Rubicon* was published and the second chapter consisted of a lengthy documented description of the *Margaretta* affair, the first such study since Pope's article written in 1894. Ahlin carefully utilized Jones' "History of Machias," pertinent documents at the Massachusetts Archives, and various private manuscripts in preparing his account. The study does have some weaknesses, though. For one thing, British records were apparently overlooked; for another, Ahlin consulted O'Brien's "Exertions" and several traditionalist histories and ended up including the tales of the liberty pole and alarm of London Atus in his account. Still, with those exceptions, the story is well told and a useful addition to the *Margaretta* bibliography.²²

Ahlin's is the last documented study of the event to have come to press. My account of *The Margaretta Affair* is due for publication in the spring of 1976. With the groundwork laid by Allen, French, and Ahlin, and the mass of material now available in the new series, *Naval Documents of the American Revolution*, this hopefully will be the most accurate study to date. Its one major shortcoming is that, due to format requirements, footnotes are not permitted; therefore, the researcher will have to depend on the annotated bibliography for information on sources.²³

—NOTES—

¹Stephen Jones. "Historical Account of Machias" (See above, pp. 47-56); William D. Williamson, *The History of the State of Maine*, 2 volumes. Hallowell, Me.: Glazier, Masters & Co., 1832, Vol. II, pp. 430-431; [George L. Drisko]. *The Revolution: Life of Hannah Weston*. Machias, Me.: C. O. Furbush & Co., 1857, pp. 47-49, 98.

²John O'Brien. "Exertions of the O'Brien Family of Machias, Maine in the American Revolution," Maine Historical Society, *Collections*, 1st. s. II (1846), pp. 242-249; "Letters of Joseph Wheaton," Maine Historical Society, *Collections and Proceedings*, 2nd s. II (1891), pp. 109-112.

³O'Brien, "Exertions," pp. 243-244.

⁴William B. Clark and William J. Morgan, eds. *Naval Documents of the American Revolution*. 6 volumes, Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964-, Vol. I, pp. 676-677, 740, 767-768. (Hereafter cited as *NDAR*); James Phinney Baxter, ed. *Documentary History of the State of Maine*, XIV (Portland, Maine, 1910), pp. 280-283. (Hereafter cited as *Baxter MSS*); William Lincoln, ed. *Journals of Each Provincial Congress of Massachusetts in 1774 and 1775*. Boston, 1838, pp. 395-396. (Hereafter cited as Lincoln, *Provincial Congress*); "Statement of Captain Ephraim Chase," in George L. Drisko. *Narrative of Town of Machias*. Machias, Maine: Press of the Republican, 1904, pp. 66-68. See Jones, "Machias" and "Report of the Machias Committee of Safety (June 14, 1775) above, pages 50 and 57 respectively.

⁵Charles P. Ilsley. *The Liberty Pole: A Tale of Machias*. Machias, Me.: C. O. Furbush & Co., 1857 (Reprinted in 1890 and 1912), pp. 3-15.

⁶Writers who continued explaining the *Margaretta* incident in terms of the trading dispute for the period from 1857 to 1877 include William B. Smith, "Historical Sketch of Machias" and John C. Talbot, "Col. Benjamin Foster," both in *Memorial of the Centennial Anniversary of the Settlement of Machias*. Machias, Me.: C. O. Furbush, 1896, pages 36-41 and 108-109 respectively, and Frederick Kidder, *Military Operation in Eastern Maine and Nova Scotia During the Revolution*. Albany, New York: Joel Munsell, 1867 (Reprinted in 1971), pp. 37-39. The only individual to mention the liberty pole in this period was George Walker in his article "Col. Jeremiah O'Brien," in *Memorial of the Centennial...of Machias*, p.103.

⁷Foxhall A. Parker, "The First Sea-Fight of the Revolution: The Capture of the *Margaretta*," *The Magazine of American History*, I (April, 1877), pp. 209-214.

⁸The traditionalist writers, who incorporated the liberty pole incident in their accounts after Parker's, included: George F. Talbot, "The First Naval Battle of the Revolution at Machias, Maine, June 11, 1775," Bangor

Historical Magazine III (1887-8), pp. 161-167. (Talbot's article was later republished as "The Capture of the *Margaretta*," in Maine Historical Society, *Collections and Proceedings*, II (1891), pp. 1-17, and Ronald Banks, ed. *A History of Maine: A Collection of Readings on the History of Maine, 1600-1970*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt, 1969 (Revised editions in 1971 and 1974), pp. 109-114); Edgar S. MacClay. *A History of Privateers*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1899, pp. 53-55; Andrew M. Sherman. *Life of Captain Jeremiah O'Brien, Machias, Maine*. Morristown, New Jersey: George W. Sherman, 1902, pp. 25-42; Drikso. *Machias*, pp. 32-38; John F. Sprague. "The Lexington of the Seas," *Sprague's Journal of Maine History*, I (1913), 162-4, 175-177; Henry E. Dunnack, *The Maine Book*. Augusta, Maine n.p., 1920, p. 48; L. Whitney Elkins. *The Story of Maine; Coastal Maine*. Bangor, Maine: The Hillsborough Co., 1924, p. 338; and Marion Jaques Smith, *A History of Maine: From Wilderness to Statehood*. Freeport, Maine: The Bond Wheelwright Company, 1949 (Reprinted in 1960), pp 212-213. (It should be noted in fairness to Mrs. Smith that in her Bicentennial Booklet, *Maine in the American Revolution* (to be published in early 1976) she has discarded the liberty pole story as well as other myths about the *Margaretta* affair.) The only traditionalist historian who did not incorporate the liberty pole incident in his account was M. E. C. Smith, "Machias in the Revolution and Afterward," *New England Magazine*, New Series, (1895), pp. 673-688.

⁹"Letters of Joseph Wheaton," pp. 109-112; Charles W. Goldsborough. *The United States Naval Chronicle*. Volume I. Washington City: Printed by James Wilson, 1824, pp. 25-28; James Fenimore Cooper. *The History of the Navy of the United States of America*. 2 volumes. Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard, 1839, Vol. I, pp. 90-92; Ilsley. *Liberty Pole*. pp. 15-18, Henry B. Dawson, *Battles of the United States by Sea and Land*. 2 volumes. New York, 1858, Vol. I, pp. 44-46; O'Brien, "Exertions," pp. 244-246.

¹⁰Williamson, *Maine*, Vol. II, p. 430; Lincoln. *Provincial Congress*, p. 396; W. B. Smith, "Machias," p. 41.

¹¹W. B. Smith, "Machias," pp. 39-40; "Report of the Machias Committee of Safety (June 14, 1775)," see above p. 58; Jones, "Machias," see above p. 51; Parker, "First Sea-Fight," p. 214; Talbot, "First Naval Battle of the Revolution," p.6.

¹²W. B. Smith, "Machias," p. 40; NDAR, I, pp. 655-656; Jones, "Machias," see above pp. 55; "Statement of Captain Ephraim Chase," p. 66.

¹³Parker, "First Sea-Fight," p. 216.

¹⁴W. B. Smith, "Machias," p. 43; NDAR, I, p. 537; Talbot, "First Naval Battle of the Revolution," Drisko, *Machias*, p. 47; Elkins, *Coastal Maine*, pp. 342-343.

¹⁵NDAR, pp. 518-519, 537-538, 676-677, 697, 1108, 1113-1114, 1124, 1195;

Baxter MSS, XIV, 283-284.

¹⁶Jones, "Machias," see above p. 49-50.

¹⁷Illesley, *Liberty Pole*, pp. 5-11.

¹⁸W. B. Smith, "Machias," pp. 36-38.

¹⁹Parker, "First Sea-Fight," pp. 211, 213.

²⁰Talbot, "First Naval Battle of the Revolution," pp. 3-5.

²¹Charles H. Pope, "Machias in the Revolution," *Maine Historical Society, Collections and Proceedings*, 2nd s., VI (1895), pp. 121-138; Gardner W. Allen, *A Naval History of the American Revolution*, 2 volumes, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1913, Vol. I, pp. 6-14; Allen French, *The First Year of the American Revolution*, New York: Octagon Books, 1968 (Reprint of 1934 publication), pp. 358-366.

²²John H. Ahlin, *Maine Rubicon: Downeast Settlers During the American Revolution*, Calais, Maine; Calais Advertiser Press, 1966, pp. 11-26.

²³Edwin A. Churchill, *The Margarettta Affair* (Bicentennial Booklet to be published in early 1976).