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I. DESCRIPTION OF WORK AND THESIS STATEMENT

The project involves a series of fifty to one hundred mixed medium prints and drawings on paper based on events documented in written depositions, letters, and colonial government papers from 1730 to 1732 that act as a series of detailed incident reports.¹ The events were a precursor to a war between the colonies of Maryland and Pennsylvania over their shared border. To fill in the fragmented historical information, among other things, the project incorporates the 18th century “scientific” anatomical drawings of the period and the layered prints of the artifacts of local colonial archeological burial digs as merged and manipulated borrowing the technology, ethics, and practices of the internet’s ethos.

II. RESEARCH MATERIAL

I initially researched this event in preparation for writing a proposal to make a series of drawings for consideration by historical societies.² During my research on this period, I located original colonial period documents in the archives of the States of Maryland and Pennsylvania. There are contained in the archives the depositions of the witnesses to the event, the colony officials’ letters, correspondence between the colonies, and intra-colony correspondence and minutes, transcribed in text and in some instances in the original handwritten document. Relevant documents of the period also include land grants and patents involved in the dispute as recorded in the Maryland Land records. I also visited the geographical areas in which the events took place on the Susquehanna River and took photographs of the areas. I researched 18th century anatomical “science” of the period and investigated and interacted with local and mid-Atlantic archeological colonial sites, artifacts and professionals as a source for images. I have also endeavored to absorb relevant modern forensic practices that are used to re-establish an individual’s “appearance” from their remains.
III. THE BEGINNING OF THE CONOJOCULAR WAR (1730-1732)

The documents placed in order tell a traditional narrative of the events that led up to the Conojocular War. The colonies of Maryland and Pennsylvania, led by Lord Baltimore and William Penn, respectively, had a long dispute over the border between the two colonies.\(^3\)

In 1730-1732, the Susquehanna River became the focal point of the disagreement. The river's main branch flows south from New York through Pennsylvania and then through Maryland, where it eventually empties into the Maryland portion of the Chesapeake Bay. The Maryland officials claimed land so far north as to include Philadelphia, while the Pennsylvania officials claimed land so far south as to gain access to the Chesapeake Bay. The Susquehanna River provided a border between the settled lands of Penn's colony on its east bank and the unsettled lands on the west bank. Penn’s colony had settled the lands from Philadelphia westward to the Susquehanna River and by his order stopped at the Susquehanna River until agreements could be made with the Native Americans. To the south where the Susquehanna flowed into the Maryland portion of the Chesapeake Bay, settlement was encouraged by Maryland colony officials. Settlers filed Maryland land patents with settlements on both sides of the Susquehanna River, moving north and into the unsettled lands on the western bank opposite of where Penn’s people had settled the east bank.

This period of the disagreement centered upon the Susquehanna River was called the Conojocular War, otherwise referred to as Cresap’s War. Thomas Cresap purchased land in the late 1720s in the disputed area from Stephen Onion, a mining speculator. The land was recorded with the Maryland land patent office but was located west of the
Susquehanna River, in the lands that Penn also claimed. No documents show that Cresap was purposefully sent as an agent. Cresap purchased and sold Maryland more patented land to other Marylanders expanding the Maryland settlement along the west bank of the Susquehanna River. This resulted in the first described encounter between the men of Penn’s Lancaster County and the Marylanders, with Cresap a witness to Marylander John Lowe’s (his brother-in-law) arrest and beating on the frozen river of 1731. The recitation of the events by the Pennsylvania and Maryland colonists refer to horses left to graze on the west bank, crop damage, name calling, threats, squatters, trespassers, a Lancaster trader’s black mare, a dead mare, a frozen river, a gang of rioters, a sheriff enforcing the law, and thugs crossing the river. The conflicting events of that night are written in both colonial powers’ papers and filed depositions. Only the intervention of the King of England ceased the hostilities, temporarily.
Figure No. 1-1. Map of 1730/1731 Disputed Territory’s

Figure No. 1-2. Map. Lewis Evans, MDCCXLIX.L. Hebert Culp (1749) (Marking the location of Cresap’s cabin on the Susquehanna)
Figure No 1-3. Handwritten -- Maryland Council Notes 1732, April 23, 1732)\textsuperscript{5}
(First reference to Thomas Cresap in Maryland Records)
Figure No. 1-4. Hand Written letter from Samuel Ogle to Penn Council
Figure No 1-5. Image of Maryland Patent/Land Grant from Stephen Onion to Thomas Cresap. “Pleasant Gardens”
IV. DIGITAL REALITY, AUTHORSHIP, AND THE FICTITIOUS AUTHENTICITY: METHODS AND PROCESS

Sparse beauty and poetics notwithstanding, the technological limitations of language and text is most ill-suited, and mostly fails miserably, as a vessel of information. Written language, the oldest way of recording human events in time, unfortunately was not constructed to hold or contain the full knowledge or imagery or memories of a person or event. It can only travel back to shore with the most basic version. Therefore, all colonial objects, people, and things have reached us in the form of minced information: “fluid,” “shippable”, with re-packable, divert-able “content”, which can disappear into subterranean streams, or take the shape of a provided vessel. These historical textual, pre-digitized records do not simply lack “appearance” beyond the written text, but they fail, or so we think, to be enhanced or benefitted by the more in-depth use of the present technological media.

In the height of our present advancements in the new digital age, the record of a thing is more unshakably linked to its’ “appearance.” But regardless of use, these digitized icons carry the link to a specific object, as well as an indexical link to the moment the appearance was recorded. This indexical link remains even though the original purpose or content is long buried or passed or forgotten or obscured. While the technology of the photographic image once claimed “authority for the representation of the ‘real’ ”6, with respect to the digitized world “a document can change from second to second as the attribute feeder data on which it depends is continuously altered.” Even for the professional archivist, “[i]n this fluid electronic environment, the idea of a record
physically belonging in one place or even in one system is crumbling … Conceptual paradigms [and] creatorship is a more fluid process of manipulating information from many other sources in a myriad of ways, or applications, rather than something leading to a static fixed, physical product.”

In the digital universe, an acceptance of the fictitious for one’s own chosen use results in a dissident tension between present use and lingering residual memory or ripples. The “internet”, from which there is an unprecedented harvest of stolen images, multiple alias, exposed lives, and fictional personas with an unregulated self-determined “ethics” provides its own means for accountability. This accountability is at times ruthless. For example, the folkloric Charles Weston Chandler became famous in an internet world where he lives out his raw, exposed, made-up life in real time. His internet persona disposes of its own champions and encourages its detractors. He uninhibitedly and prodigiously churns out an unending ream of storyboards and thoroughly recorded antisocial behavior, cheered on by a jeering interactive audience. (Figure No.2-1.)

Simon Bronner observed that: “How folklore is enabled by virtualization for its users and how it is differentiated from the face-to-face world referred to as analog culture, demands a rethinking of assumptions and questions about the workings of tradition. Tradition was once thought to be a product or relic of the past, arising out of the land and group and belongings to ‘others’ removed by a lack of technological advancement or cosmopolitanism…. The significance of rhetorically understanding the internet as a folk system is its suggestion of how technology allows everyone in to enact and alter tradition
in some form, whether digitally or analytically.... and becomes the primary mediator of
cultural connection.”8

A past series I completed involving The King of the Hill (KOTH) gives insight to my use
of the internet and internet ethics and ethos and its folkloric symbols. The collaborative
KOTH series examines the world of internet fan fiction, but with “additional layers of
abstraction and subversion to already loaded visuals.”9 (Figure No. 2-2 ) A particular
character can host infinite variations by countless different fan fiction authors, though the
“character” is a familiar guide through all the authors’ different ideas of what a body is, or
what a person does or who a “person” is.10 This series likewise used various multiple
images to hammer out one scene working under a fantasy assumption that beneath the
painted production cell of the original series is a vast archive of Texas kitchenettes and
grandma reaction shots, adding subtle anthropomorphic content and causing the viewer to
experience unexpected emotion looking at a cabinet in a scene.

The fan art on the internet and co-play historical reenactors share a similar use of a
personalized appearance, part borrowed, part created. The manner in which local history
routinely becomes enshrouded and reenacted, performed and undertaken is one of the
highest forms of American folk art. As Richard Slotkin explains: “The myth of the frontier
is our oldest and most characteristic myth, expressed in a body of literature, folklore, ritual,
historiography, and polemics produced over a period of three
centuries....”11

Necessary for both reenactor and fan artist is this acceptance of the fictitious and the
altered “real” with the ability to act out the fiction and still maintain a distinctive shape and
form and relation to the now altered source. The “character” is a familiar guide through all the fan artist’s different ideas of what a body is, or what a person does or what makes a person “that” person. Alternatively, the “names” in the textual historical documents are only associated with an “appearance” of the text, unless a name becomes a “character” through further “development.” If left to stand alone, the fragments (for instance the historical text of a “name”) without the narrative, allows for the gaps of nothing, or if not nothing, fictions of some type in the visual or narrative “space” between the textual fragments. The gaps between the fragments traditionally lend themselves to being “filled” by the narrative to create a logical story. In this thesis project, I reroute and re-synthesis and at times misalign the historical. I use a combination of modern and anachronistic science, images, and methods to combine the historical with the contemporary ethos of the internet culture. Internet culture loves borrowable images, obfuscates ownership and creates its own history. The authentic is a matter of perspective and the past does not decay and disappear in time but stays present, in electronic data bits, which morphs as attended to by its multiple authors in an accessible and track-able history.

In my project, the archival fragments may be the main character, but how they are understood and read relies on their layered context. This context allows the information to be presented in different forms, which changes shape with each layer of authorship. My project technically represents the interaction of two different moments in time, the first is being applied as a printed image, the second as a drawing occurring in a subsequent interval of time. There is a fluctuating relationship between the printed image and the overlaying drawing. The underpinning image limits the decision making in the drawing, which moves on top cautiously like a student driver, observant of the lines, yet not fully aware of the actions they dictate. It is helpful to compare the process to collage. The layers
are stacked and frozen in order. Through each layer can be pulled apart to speculate on its origins, it nevertheless at the same time simply represents the exact moment it was applied. The media quickly finds a predictable spot on the timeline dictated by the process: paper, print, drawing.

My process relies upon the ordering of the images denoting a physical timeline. Images are borrowed from stand in figures, archeological digs and the scientific anatomical studies and classifications. The narrative progresses in the process itself and evolves in the spaces between the fragments of data. The layered medium encourages the viewer to “stutter” visually when they see a familiar yet incongruous image which causes a visual discord. Likewise, there is also a value in the unexpected equalizing of all objects, which underscores the lack of equality of the objects. This jars the viewer’s perceptions. (e.g., Human, Horse, Hand, Hat, Apple, Human, etc.) The process allows the viewer to experience the multiple combinations of meaning and seeing: untruths are mixed with ambiguous authenticity.
Figure No. 2-1. Christian Weston Chandler Figures Pokémon/Sonichu Character Image

Figure No. 2-2 KOTH (Victor Vaughn) (2014)
Figure No. 3-1. Thesis Project Image

Figure No. 3-2. Thesis Project Image
Figure No. 3-3. Thesis Project Image

Figure No. 3-4. Thesis Project Image
Figure No. 3-5. Thesis Project Image
Figure No. 3-6. Thesis Project Image
Figure No. 3-7. Thesis Project Image
V. HISTORY, HISTORIOGRAPHY, HISTORICAL METAFICTION, HISTORY PAINTING — “I’m not really very interested in history painting and I don’t know much about it.” Gerhard Richter

The use of historical material brings with it, intended or not, the expectations of historiography, history painting, and literature’s historical metafiction. History, as the study of past human events, comes from the Greek word *historia*, originally meaning “inquiry” or “knowledge” by investigation.\(^{12}\) Human events occurring prior to writing are considered prehistory, inextricably linking the written language or symbols to “history.” Historiography, while subject to competing schools, methodology and theories, is understood as the writing of history and specifically the writing of history “based on the critical examination of sources, the selection of particulars from the *authentic* materials, and the synthesis of particulars into a *narrative* that will stand the test of critical methods.”\(^{13}\)

Traditional “history painting” was not intended to embody the accurate or documentary description of actual events but rather was used to embody a grand historical narrative and include “actions intended to have didactic overtones.”\(^{14}\) The use of the word “history” in this context relates to the Italian *istoria*, meaning narrative or story.\(^{15}\) Great American history paintings are seen in the iconic *Washington Crossing the Delaware* and *The Death of General Wolfe* which stay true to the grand historical “overtones.”
At one time held as the pinnacle of painting in the salons of Europe, the history painting legacy was eventually no longer viable and reduced to an illustrative history of theatre costumes and sets. Yet, transitioning from the 19th century, painting and historiography underwent a change, with the change extending to history painting. A beginning of this change was viewed in Courbet’s realism. Rather than grand story-telling, Courbet upset expectations by painting the rural unsophisticated mourners at his own relative’s contemporary funeral in an oversized grand 10 by 22 foot painting judged “as a work that had thrust itself into the grand tradition of history painting, like an upstart in dirty boots crashing a genteel party, and in terms of that tradition it was of course found wanting.”

“Contemporary” history painting, (that is the painting of contemporaneous events) was adopted by Picasso’s mythologizing of war and Max Beckmann’s raw journalistic sensationalism, further reflecting these early 20th century changes.

But the “narrative” in history, painting and literature is a shared issue of an ontological nature. While traditional history painting was originally all about a narrative picture telling/storytelling, historiography was late recognizing the reality of the “historical narrative” in its field. The “problematic nature of the relation of writing history [historiography] to narrativization and, thus, to fictionalization, rais[es] the same questions about the cognitive status of historical knowledge with which current philosophers of history are also grappling.”

Linda Hutcheon observed that: “To speak of provisionality and indeterminacy is not to deny historical knowledge, however……. What the postmodern writing of both history and literature has taught us is that both history and fiction are discourses, that both constitute systems of signification by which we make sense of the past (“exertions of the shaping, ordering imagination”). In other
words, the meaning and shape are not in the events, but in the systems which make those past “events” into present historical “facts.” This is not a “dishonest refuge from truth” but an acknowledgement of the meaning-making function of human constructs.”¹⁹

Modern critics recognize “that all documents or artifacts used by historians are not neutral evidence for reconstructing phenomena which are assumed to have some independent existence outside them. All documents process information and the very way in which they do so is itself a historical fact that limits the documentary conception of historical knowledge.[²⁰] This is the kind of insight that has led to a semiotics of history, for documents become signs of events which the historian transmutes into facts.[²¹] They are also, of course, signs within already semiotically constructed contexts, themselves dependent upon institutions (if they are official records) or individuals (if they are eyewitness accounts) …..”²²

In literature, “historical metafiction”,²³ has dealt with some of these issue in part by the “use of historical details to accent futile attempts of assimilating the historical details or of purposefully misplacing historical events and dates in order to foreground the possible mnemonic failures of recorded history.”²⁴ Author Salman Rushdie speaks of having to reflect the world in fragments of broken mirrors,²⁵ but that the “shards of memory acquired greater status greater resonance because they were remains, fragmentations made trivial things seems like symbols and the mundane acquired numinous qualities….”²⁶ To the extent that painting has dealt with these same issues, it has done so relative to the mode of its medium. Just as the writing of history is, at the same time, proposed as a part of the history of writing, (citing Hayden White), it is proposed that the
imaging of history (i.e., history painting) cannot be separated from the history of images. History painting, like history writing, is seen partly as a history of itself, to the extent that painting has

“become bound by its own sense of historicity…[I]ts relationship to painting’s trajectory took on some of the functions of traditional forms of history painting.”

Jeff Wall on a very obvious scale revisits the tradition of history painting in the photograph “The Restoration” which shows a panoramic view of young women working on the restoration of the panorama history painting, the Bourbaki, Panorama (1881). The original painting shows the outcome of the French armies’ defeat under General Bourbaki and the armies’ subsequent disarmament in neutral Switzerland all observed first hand by the original artist, Edouard Castres. Reflecting its contemporary groundings, the image can be seen “slipping back and forth as it does between the different layers of reference - the event of war, the painting of the event of war, the restoration of the painting of the event of war, the photograph of the restoration of the painting of the event of war.”

In Destroyed Room, Wall’s composition and rich color, pursued through a highly detailed and planned photograph, echoes Eugène Delacroix’s highly composed and controlled chaos of the 1827 painting, Death of Sardanapalus. Both reflect the similar theme of the destruction of possessions and self (presumably in facing defeat).

Anselm Kiefer is identified as a history painter by some and a politi-kitsch painter by others because he frequently addresses issues involving German history and identity in the context of Norse legend, Wagnerian opera, and the Holocaust. Capturing the flavor of the
politi-kitsch, a reviewer (intentionally or not), observed about Kiefer’s “ashes” work, that: “He will not let the ashes of history’s victims blow away, but thrusts them in your face as a handful of truth.... Over the ash on the lower part of the painting, Kiefer has added cracked clay – a layer of brown earth crumbling as it dries. Dangled down the entire height of the painting is a single, dried colossal sunflower.”

Gerhardt Richtor’s 48 Portraits and 18 October 1973, are works that start with the photograph. 48 Portraits are a series of portraits of important men of contemporary history painted from similar positioned portrait photographs except that the subjects are positioned so as to gradually shift perspectives from ¾ view to the left and ¾ view to the right gradually until the center portrait is a full frontal view. Gerhardt Richtor’s 18 October 1973 is a group of paintings that captures the contemporaneous historical photographs of the Baader-Meinhof Group who were responsible for a series of domestic attacks in Germany in the 1970s. After capture and incarceration, the members were found dead in their cells. The 15 paintings are paintings of the modified, mostly blurred, contemporary photographic images obtained of the death scenes, the bodies, the high-school type photographs of attractive youths, and the funeral. Benjamin Buchloh stated “[T]his group resists the modernist restriction of painting to a mediation of historical experience exclusively in the discursive reflection on the evolution, the materials and the procedures of the pictorial medium itself. It is the construction of this dilemma marked by both the conflict in medium—painting/photography—and the conflict in ideas about representability—the painting’s self-referentiality/photography’s ‘transparency’ to the event—that Richter’s work testifies to the contemporary difficulties in the production of historical representation in painting.” However, David Green maintains that: “The dialect that
underlies Richter’s work is not that between painting and photograph, per se, nor even between abstraction and representation, but between the different orders of temporality that are invested therein.”\textsuperscript{36} Despite the use of the photographs (or the indexical) as the starting point, in the end Richter states that: “It is impossible for me to interpret the paintings,…they are if possible an expression of speechless emotion.”\textsuperscript{37}

A dialog is prevalent between contemporary technologies and image making amongst the various contemporarily labeled “history paintings” (labeled as such because of their content linked to human events or their references to painting). The profundity of some themes identified by the critics as “history painting” elevates the art to a level perhaps otherwise not attainable for some works if stripped and left to stand on their own authenticity. The current labeling by critics of history painting seems to be based on the assumed gravity of its subject, gravity of the content, gravity of the process, and gravity of the art. I have an intense compulsion to be free of the gravity and in freeing the images of such weighty assumptions, allow the art to be seen in its absurd authenticity.

The critics often overlook the place for dirty boots.
Figure No. 4-1. The Death of General Wolfe, Benjamin West (1770)

Figure No. 4-2. Third of May, Francisco Goya (1808)
Figure No. 4-3. Washington Crossing the Delaware, Emanuel Leutze. (1850)

Figure No. 4-4. A Burial at Ornans, Gustave Courbet (1849–50).
Figure No. 4-5. The Sinking of the Titanic, Max Beckmann (1912-13).

Figure No. 4-6. Guernica, Pablo Picasso (1937).
Figure No. 4-7. *The Restoration*, Jeff Wall (1993)

Figure No. 4-8. *Section of Bourbaki Panorama*, Edouard Castres (1881)
Figure No. 4-9. *Destroyed Room*, Jeff Wall (1978)

Figure No. 4-10. *Death of Sardanapalus*, Eugène Delacroix (1827)
Figure No. 4-11. Aschenblume Anselm Kiefer (1983-97)

Figure No. 4-12 48 Portraits, Gerhard Richter (1971/72)
Figure No. 4-13. 18 October 1977, Gerhardt Richter (1988)
VI. CONCLUSION

My thesis project has allowed me to explore and synthesis the subjects of authenticity and authorship in image-making, using the disparate subjects provided in the digitized internet and the archival papers of the colonial period. For my thesis show, my installation is centered on the image-making. Through the use of in excess of fifty images, I unified the space provided with its long and short section of walls. Instead of space between the drawings, I used blemished stained papers to create space, between the images, which still, nevertheless, continued to created continuity. Ultimately, my images act as a simplified coherent line going the circumference of the room.

This project is not an ending, for I am in the process of investigating the use of three-dimensional and layered mediums within the context of forensic anthropology and possible dioramas. The beginnings of this exploration, juxtaposed with the existing images, are displayed on a table off-centered in my installation, while other parts I continue to work on in my studio for the future.

These artistic investigations, together, provide the various mediums through which this historical period may be observed, indirectly at best, as it must be and as required by the almost 300 years since passed. But when the naked eye is without access to tools and technology, the universe’s oldest light, that travels the furthest through time, is best seen at night by peripheral vision. This project has made me consider whether, by putting certain subjects at the outer boundaries of one’s visional comprehension - at the peripheral of perception - through the layering of the mediums and the distraction
of incongruity, more is seen of the “un-see-able”: that an artistically created peripherally “vision” perhaps increases the possibility of seeing the momentary flicker, the transitory motion, the faint light from the oldest Cepheid in the night.

Figure No. 5-1

Figure No. 5-2
Figure No. 5-3
(Future in-progress related work)
Description: 50 to 100 Drawings on Paper. Mixed Medium,Untitled, (Dimension: 10 x 12) and Clay, Mixed Medium, Untitled

*Figure A-1: December 2015–Installation View*

Figure A-2: December 2015–Installation View
Victor Vaughn, Drawings on Paper. Mixed medium, Untitled,
Dimensions: 10 x12 (2014/2015)
Figure A-3: December 2015–Installation View
Figure A-4: December 2015–Installation View
Victor Vaughn, Drawings on Paper. Mixed medium, Untitled,
Dimensions: 10 x12 (2014/2015)
Figure A-5: December 2015–Installation View
Figure A-6: December 2015–Installation View
Victor Vaughn, Drawings on Paper. Mixed medium, Untitled,
Dimensions: 10 x 12 (2014/2015)
Figure A-7: December 2015–Installation View
Victor Vaughn, Drawings on Paper. Mixed medium, Untitled,
Figure A-8: December 2015–Installation View
Victor Vaughn, Drawings on Paper. Mixed medium, Untitled,
Dimensions: 10 x12 (2014/2015)
Figure A-9: December 2015–Installation View
Figure A-10: December 2015–Installation View
Victor Vaughn, Drawings on Paper. Mixed medium, Untitled,
Dimensions: 10 x12 (2014/2015)
Figure A-11: December 2015—Installation View
Victor Vaughn, Drawings on Paper. Mixed medium,Untitled,
Dimensions: 10 x12 (2014/2015)
Figure A-12: December 2015–Installation View
Figure A-14: December 2015–Installation View
Victor Vaughn, Drawings on Paper. Mixed medium, Untitled,
Dimensions: 10 x12 (2014/2015)
Figure A-15: December 2015–Installation View

This resource is sometimes referred to as a “Fond”, that is, “the entire body of records of an organization, family, or individual that have been created and accumulated as the result of an organic process reflecting the functions of the creator.”


The Susquehanna River Zimmerman Center for Heritage Museum, Vision of the Susquehanna Art Collection, the Columbia Historical Preservation Society and Museum, and The Irvine Allen/Michael Cresap Museum.

The Pennsylvania’s charter described the southern boundary shared by Maryland “by a Circle drawne at twelve miles distance from New Castle Northward and Westward unto the beginning of the fortieth degree of Northern Latitude, and then by a streight Line Westward to the Limitt of Longitude above-mentioned.” As New Castle was about 25 miles south of the 40th Parallel, the 12 mile arc noted would never intersect with the 40th parallel causing a dispute as to the location of the border. Maryland maintained the Pennsylvania southern border extended along the 40th Parallel to the Delaware River, while Pennsylvania, stressed the location of the circle locating the border significantly further south at 39 degrees and 36 minutes north. In 1738, they halted hostilities agreeing to a temporary border 15 miles south of Philadelphia. The London courts declared the final border in 1750 at 39 degrees and 40 minutes north. In 1767, the border was surveyed by Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon.

“Cresapwarmap” by Kmusser - based primarily on the description at http://cip.cornell.edu/DPubS/Repository/1.0/Disseminate/psu.ph/1129771136/body/pdf. Licensed under CC BY-SA 2.5 via Commons

Transcription of April 23, 1732 Maryland council meeting notes, Maryland State Papers. Maryland Archives.

(“His Excellency produces to this Board a Paragraph of a Letter from the Govern, of Pensylvania, and also a Copy of a Letter which was sent from Samuel Blunston a Magistrate of Lancaster County to Mr Charles [Calvert Esq.] at Philadelphia, complaining of some ill Treatment used by One Cressap an Inhabitant of this Province to some Indians

55
living at Conestogoe Advised that His Excellency be pleased to write to Cressap to come down to him at Annapolis, and that he inform Cressap, so long as he behaves himself well, he shall be protected from any Insults of the Pennsylvanians; and that it is the best Method for him to live in Peace and Friendship with the Indians; and it is also advised that his Excellency use what means he thinks most convenient to induce Captain Civility and the rest of the Indians to come down to Annapolis to renew the Articles of Peace and Friendship already entered by them with this Government.” (April 25, 1732, Maryland Council Meeting Minutes)


http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1034&context=usupress_pubs


10 I used as a basis for each image in the KOTH series either a single frame of animation from the show reworked, or a single photo that is molded into a cartoon shape sometimes through the use of multiple random photos that make up the scene.


12 http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/history


14 http://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/paintings/glossary/history-painting

15 http://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/paintings/glossary/history-painting

Stanley Cavell, “Literary Studies: Consequences of Skepticism,” ed Richard Wildridge and Bernard Rhie (New York: Continuum, 2011) 212 (Brian McHale has characterized postmodernist “as work that foreground ontological questions in contrast to the epistemological dilemmas—what knows what, how reliable one’s knowledge is, how trustworthy different speakers, as characteristically at play in Modernist works.”)


The historical metafiction portrayed in Thomas Pynchon’s Mason Dixon finds Thomas Cresap, in his later years retelling his own fragment of history.


Polit-Kitsch is a contrary approach to contemporary historical issues and a term used by Benjamin Buchloh.


Sardanapalus, the last King of Assyria, ordered his all his possessions destroyed including his concubines before dispatching himself, being faced with military defeat and, in that, not only the composition, but the nature of destruction are shared in the two works.

In this instance the use of ashes is a symbolic “stand-in” (but not the same since it could be from something as innocuous as wood fires) for the ashes of the crematorium.

