

LOYALIST CITADEL ON THE MOHAWK: LOYALISM IN TRYON  
COUNTY NEW YORK DURING THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

by

Michael P. Kurilla, Jr.

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of  
Master of Arts  
in the  
History  
Program

James P. Ronda August 16, 1976  
Adviser Date

Frederick J. Blue August 16, 1976  
Adviser Date

[Signature] August 16, 1976  
Dean of the Graduate School Date

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

August, 1976

## ABSTRACT

LOYALIST CITADEL ON THE MOHAWK: LOYALISM IN TRYON  
COUNTY NEW YORK DURING THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Michael P. Kurilla, Jr.

Master of Arts

Youngstown State University, 1976

Tryon County, colonial New York's western upstate boundary named after the last royal governor William Tryon, became a separate political and geographic entity in March 1772. Before that date, the vast agrarian territories of the Mohawk and Susquehanna Valleys were an appendage of neighboring Albany County. Tryon County was composed of a population of nearly 10,000 inhabitants by the Revolution, spread across the northern New York frontier in small clusters of burgeoning towns. The county was coterminous with the expansive Indian territories of the Iroquois to the west and northwest. During the second half of the eighteenth century until the outbreak of the Revolution, the territory within these geographic bounds was the political bailiwick of the influential Johnson family. Operating from a strong base of support centered around the county seat at Johnstown, the Johnsons symbolized royal authority in western New York, founded upon the vivid legacy of the county's foremost patron, Sir William Johnson. The names

synonymous with royal authority before the Revolutionary War were those most conspicuous of Loyalist leadership in the region during the war: Sir John Johnson, Guy Johnson, John Butler, Walter Butler, Daniel Claus, Joseph Chew, and Joseph Brant.

Tryon County was the scene of some of the most fierce civil warfare manifested during the Revolution. This warfare fragmented communities, families, and long established personal relationships. The Loyalists in Tryon constituted a decided minority of the frontier population. With the crisis of royal authority and uncertainty of continued British rule, the Loyalists were placed in a threatened position. Most of the Tryon Loyalists fled across the adjacent Canadian border, following a Johnson directed exodus. The Loyalists who remained in Tryon suffered unremitting persecution, social ostracism, and for some banishment at the hands of the Whig directed committees of correspondence. From Canada the Loyalists, in concert with their Iroquois allies, attacked the defenseless Tryon border settlements with impunity. The border warfare, carried on throughout the course of the war between the attacking Loyalist-Indian bands and the defending Tryon militia, resulted in the progressive deterioration of the once prosperous county.

The widespread destruction witnessed by the Whigs

and remaining Loyalists was complete by 1781, as evidenced by the ruination of the crops, the burnt buildings, the displaced and broken families, and the precipitous decrease in the size of the county's population. The 1775 growing population of 10,000 had been reduced to approximately 3,000 due to death, displacement, capture, and voluntary relocation. Following the war, the exiled Tryon Loyalists resettled in the United Empire Loyalist settlements in Upper Canada.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to those who have contributed to the completion of this thesis:

Mr. Mark S. Connelly, who greatly assisted during the initial stages of research.

Dr. Frederick J. Blue, who read the manuscript and offered many helpful editorial suggestions.

Dr. James P. Ronda, who has generously given of his time in directing all phases of the research and writing. His careful reading and constructive critique of the manuscript, advice, and encouragement have greatly contributed to the completion of the thesis.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT . . . . .	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS . . . . .	vi
CHAPTER	
I.    THE OTHER SIDE OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
II.   EARLY NEW YORK SETTLEMENT AND UPSTATE DEVELOP- MENT TO THE OUTBREAK OF THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR . . . . .	19
III.  THE POLITICAL CONFIGURATION OF NEW YORK AT THE OUTBREAK OF THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR: LOYALIST STRENGTH IN TRYON COUNTY, 1775- 1777 . . . . .	47
IV.   INTERNECINE WARFARE ON THE FRONTIER: THE DISINTEGRATION OF TRYON COUNTY, 1777- 1781 . . . . .	75
V.    THE LOYALISTS OF TRYON COUNTY: WARTIME STATUS AND DISPERSION . . . . .	103
VI.   CONCLUSION . . . . .	135
APPENDIX I.    ANTI-LOYALIST RESOLUTIONS ISSUED IN TRYON COUNTY . . . . .	143
APPENDIX II.   LOYALIST PROTECTIVE PROVISIONS OF PEACE TREATY VIOLATED BY NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE . . . . .	147
APPENDIX III.  EXCERPTS OF LOYALIST CLAIMS OF TRYON COUNTY . . . . .	151
APPENDIX IV.   LOYALIST CLAIMS FROM TRYON COUNTY, NEW YORK . . . . .	155
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	199

## CHAPTER I

## THE OTHER SIDE OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Introduction

American Loyalist participation in the American Revolution has until recently represented a lost chapter in the history of the Revolution. Historical accounts and popular commentaries have expounded upon the fortitude and assertiveness of the patriots, the foresight and determination of the founding fathers, and the valiant struggle waged against British tyranny by the colonists. Accompanying this examination of the hagiography of the founding fathers, the spotlight has been focused upon the legacy of the revolutionaries articulated in the rhetoric embracing the ideals of the Declaration of Independence: liberty, equality, justice--with democracy acknowledged as the apotheosis of the American tradition. Little mention, however, if any has been recorded recognizing those who decided to oppose independence and remain loyal to the crown. The "Good Americans", the losers of much more than the actual conflict, were condemned to virtual obscurity in the literature published subsequent to the termination of the war. Consequently, the early historiography of the Revolution presented only "one side" of the Revolution, ignoring the participation of the Loyalists and excluding a lost dimension of the Revolutionary milieu.

One reason for the development of a one-sided view of the Revolution was the adverse effect of the wartime propaganda and mythology formulated vis-a-vis the Loyalists. Subsequent perpetuation of the inaccuracies molded a distorted reconstruction of Loyalist activities and Revolutionary events. Another reason was the popularly accepted interpretation of the Revolution propounded by the Whig school of British history and reiterated by nineteenth century American historians, reinforcing a monolithic Rebel model of the Revolution at the expense of the Loyalists. With the British Annual Register consulted as the prime source of American Revolutionary study, fact became subordinate to legend in proffering an "anti-loyalist" version of the Revolution.<sup>1</sup> The wartime polarization of attitudes solidified a Whig and Tory stereotype creating a good-guy--bad-guy image. This dichotomy provided the basis for the projection of the value judgement generalizing anything remotely associated with loyalism as inherently evil and hence anti-American. Loyalists were perceived as depraved traitors, barbarous villains, and savage butchers of defenseless women and children; whereas the patriots were viewed as virtuous, spirited, and high-minded colonists fighting for the "right" cause.

---

1

Wallace Brown, The Good Americans: The Loyalists In The American Revolution (New York: William Morrow and Co., Inc., 1969), p. 226.



Recent scholarly studies have provided a corrective counter-point in examining the "other side" of the Revolution. The Loyalists were in fact as much American as their rebellious counterparts. The Loyalists were rightful subjects of the British monarchy; Americans fighting to insure the maintenance of the existing political order, to safeguard their possessions, and save their lives. Therefore, it has been due primarily to these latest contributions in the examination of Loyalist history that the barriers of inaccuracy have begun to break down exposing the actual role, participation, and consequences of American colonists embracing loyalism.

The ever present problem in the study of loyalist history remains the formidable task of constructing a reliable definition of the "loyalist" during the Revolution. The absence of much needed eighteenth century demographic data, coupled with the impossibility of establishing a working definition equally applicable throughout the colonies during all stages of the war, compounds the process of defining the Loyalists. Loyalist historian Paul H. Smith emphasizes the complexity of the undertaking in asserting that loyalism represented "different things to different persons in different situations".<sup>2</sup> The historian must utilize a general definition of a loyalist as a base from

---

2

Paul H. Smith, "The American Loyalists: Notes On Their Organization And Numerical Strength," William and Mary Quarterly, XXV (1968), p. 261.

which to further modify and identify the characteristics of Loyalists according to the findings of regional, colony centered, and county centered examinations. Acknowledging that a loyalist was one who opposed independence and favored the preservation of the status quo under the king's authority, a more precise definition must be attempted defining the Loyalists on the basis of criteria reflecting the unique political, socio-economic characteristics in specific geographic areas during specific time frames.

In order to more accurately define the "loyalist", the following six classifications represent general types describing Loyalists in the colonies from 1776 to 1781. The hard core loyalist, that is one who served in the British provincial corps or who had been recorded as an enthusiastic supporter of the crown in both word and deed, is the easiest to classify due to listings of extant military rosters and other official documentation. In contrast to the hard core loyalist, the "quiet loyalist" was less visible and presents the most difficulty in classification. A quiet loyalist, one who generally escaped exile and confiscation of property following the Revolution, was not an active participant but rather a passive supporter during the war. Eschewing overt advocacy of the Tory position, the quiet loyalist nevertheless shared the same basic loyalist sentiments vis-a-vis the Revolution. A third type which must be noted was the Whig-Tory-Whig-Tory loyalist. This fence-straddler loyalist switched sides wherever and whenever personally expedient throughout the course

of the war. The fence-straddler loyalist greatly complicates the efforts of the researcher in determining the composition of the Whig and Tory camps. The "red loyalist" denotes those Indians who supported the crown and actively bore arms on the British side. The red loyalists were particularly active in the areas of upstate New York and along the Southern frontier. The "black loyalists" were those blacks who physically aided the British military effort in both combat and non-combat roles, thereby placing them on the loyalist side of the Revolutionary continuum. However, just as the red loyalists were motivated primarily by self-interest to the side of their British protectors, the black slaves who were not forced into the British service by loyalist masters and escaped to fight with the British did so for reasons of "personal advantage".<sup>3</sup> Given the position of the black in colonial society on the eve of the Revolution, black loyalists had everything to gain in siding with the British. The British utilized the blacks during the war principally in non-combat capacities, however, in the South the blacks were used in limited numbers in direct combat roles.<sup>4</sup> A sixth type is the Whig-Loyalist, that is one who initially espoused the rebel cause and subsequently was drawn into the loyalist camp.

---

3

Brown, The Good Americans, pp. 48-49.

4

Benjamin Quarles, The Negro In The American Revolution (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1961), pp. 147-148.

The New York historian and jurist William Smith, Jr. was such a type. The Whig-Loyalist was an active patriot during the Stamp Act crisis favoring the employment of force to secure colonial autonomy. The overriding fear of "social upheaval" as a direct consequence of advancing independence, however, exerted a strong influence in the decision to remain loyal once the "issue" of independence surfaced.<sup>5</sup>

In considering the actual loyalist strength in the colonies, the traditional formula of one-third Whig, one-third Tory, and one-third neutral "fairly" accurately describes the distribution of the 2.5 million colonial population. This estimate of the loyalist composition is slightly higher than presently accepted estimates. Paul H. Smith estimates that roughly 16% of the total colonial population was loyalist, representing approximately 20% of the white population; whereas Wallace Brown utilizes a low-high scale in estimating 13-30% of the population was loyalist, constituting 15-36% of the colonial white population.<sup>6</sup> Based upon an examination of fragmentary British records and tracing the evolution of the provincial corps, it has also been estimated

---

<sup>5</sup> William A. Benton, Whig-Loyalism: An Aspect of Political Ideology In The American Revolutionary Era (Rutherford, Madison, Teaneck: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 1969), p. 18.

<sup>6</sup> Wallace Brown, The King's Friends: The Composition And Motives Of The American Loyalist Claimants (Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 1965), p. 250; Smith, "American Loyalists", p. 269.

that no more than 19,000 Loyalists "formally" bore arms in the provincial service during the Revolution.<sup>7</sup> The displacement of the Loyalists resulted in the removal of numerous productive segments of colonial society immediately after the Revolution. The diaspora of the Loyalists, precipitated by personal choice, local coercion, or state edict, was a phenomenon which spanned the course of the war from 1776 to 1783. During this period, an estimated 80,000 to 100,000 Loyalists fled their homes for uncertain futures in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Africa, the West Indies, and England.<sup>8</sup> The ultimate location of loyalist resettlement was directly dictated by the financial latitude of the individual loyalist family, consequently, the poorer the loyalist family, the fewer the viable options available.

In addition to the complexities contained in formulating a working definition of the Loyalists, the question of motivation is one which possesses sundry inherent traps. It is a difficult endeavor at best to determine with accuracy the motivation of an individual examining a large amount of written evidence, let alone that of a large, diverse group of people based upon a fragmentary or non remaining record. The decision to become a loyalist was one subject to a number of

7

Smith, "American Loyalists", p. 267.

8

Brown, The Good Americans, p. 192.

383549

WILLIAM F. MAAG LIBRARY  
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

interconnected variables in each personal decision, including such factors as local and provincial political affiliations, religious and social cleavages, the vicissitudes of war, self-interest, the proximity of the enemy army, the efficacy of local Whig committees, and the wartime status of the contiguous geographic vicinity. The best the historian can do is to indicate which factor or combination of factors were more likely to have a determinative influence in a specific geographic region. Sweeping generalizations obfuscate an understanding of the complex decision making process. The decisions of the colonial aristocrats directing the operation of colonial government were "fundamentally dissimilar" with those of tenant farmers, artisans, and others positioned on the lower rungs of the social ladder.<sup>9</sup> Likewise, geographic location, although easily overlooked, played a key factor in influencing Loyalists. Inhabitants of New York and Philadelphia were not confronted with the same opportunities as North Carolinians to escape active military involvement.<sup>10</sup>

In analyzing the dimensions of loyalist participation in the Revolution, a recurring query is directed to the overall ineffectiveness of the Loyalists. The principal reasons for the loyalist political and military ineffectiveness

---

9

Smith, "American Loyalists," p. 261.

10

Ibid.

was a deficiency in basic organization and leadership in comparison with their rebel counterparts. In attempting to preserve the existing political order, the Loyalists adopted a moderating role in attempting to modify the radical demands of the Whigs. The colony of New York serves as the foremost example of the loyalist mollifying strategy. New York marks the only colony in which the Loyalists exerted actual control over the legislature and the nascent Revolutionary machinery.<sup>11</sup> The Loyalists initially underestimated Whig strength and organizational ability. When the war commenced, the Loyalists were politically dismembered and militarily paralyzed to a "fatal dependence" on British initiative.<sup>12</sup> The loyalist role, on their own, was thus confined to one of passive expectation of British military operations. Loyalist inactivity in Albany County New York before, during, and after the Burgoyne expedition in 1777 provides an excellent example of local loyalist disorganization and their state of dependence on the British.<sup>13</sup>

Another key in understanding the Loyalists military ineffectiveness is an examination of the British utilization of loyalist forces throughout the war. The Loyalists were

---

11

Brown, The King's Friends, p. 95.

12

Brown, The Good Americans, pp. 123 and 116.

13

Mark S. Connelly, "The Failure Of Loyalism In Albany County During The American Revolution" (Master's Thesis, Youngstown State University, 1975), pp. 47 and 59.

initially perceived as a necessary military expedient and employed as a temporary complement in the British plans of waging the war. Although Britain extensively utilized Loyalist forces during the early campaigns (especially the Southern Expedition of 1775-1776), this policy was quickly changed subordinating the Loyalists to non-military support roles once the British military organization crystallized.<sup>14</sup> British military policy vis-a-vis the Loyalists must therefore be characterized as ambivalent, inconsistent, and over-estimative. Once the North Ministry became dependent upon Southern loyalist support to justify the continuance of the war effort in 1779, the pendulum of inconsistency once again swung to a reliance on loyalist manpower to relieve the strain placed upon British regulars.<sup>15</sup> Consequently, the war effort was abandoned by the House of Commons in February 1782 when the anticipated loyalist response to the Southern Campaign (1780-1782) failed to materialize. The errors produced by the British relative to their use of the Loyalists were twofold: 1) the British summoned the Loyalists to play a decisive military role "too late", 2) the British relied upon Loyalist support "too completely".<sup>16</sup> Although in general the

---

14

Paul H. Smith, Loyalists And Redcoats: A Study In British Revolutionary Policy (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1964), pp. 56-57.

15

Ibid, p. 121; 164-167.

16

Ibid, p. 173.



Loyalists were not an effective military force, their most effective fighting prevailed in local, small scale guerrilla type operations. The upstate New York region, consisting of Tryon, Albany, and Charlotte counties, was such an area where effective loyalist military activity existed during the Revolution.

One of the sources extensively cited in the pioneering loyalist works was the Loyalist Claims, that is, the collective findings of the British Commission of Enquiry into the Losses, Services, and Claims of American Loyalists. The claims filed by the Loyalists as a research source contain three component parts: 1) a "memorial" describing the claimants possessions, involvement during the war, and the estimated itemized losses; 2) "evidence" produced to corroborate the claimants itemized losses; 3) "sworn testimony" of witnesses attesting to the validity of the claim and the veracity of the claimant. The rigorous restrictions imposed by the Claims Commission were specific in detail in screening the claimants. The best chance for a loyalist to have his plea accepted was if his name were recorded in one of three places documenting active service for the crown: 1) a confiscation or sequestration act; 2) a bill of attainder; 3) or some other official statement.<sup>17</sup>

Eugene R. Fingerhut has examined this material in

---

17

E.R. Fingerhut, "Uses And Abuses Of The American Loyalist Claims: A Critique Of Quantitative Analysis," William and Mary Quarterly, XXV (1968), p. 247.

terms of useful source material and has concluded that it is deficient in numerous areas for providing a valid quantitative analysis of the Loyalists. Those who filed claims were not "statistically representative" of the Loyalists in their respective counties and colonies. The deficiencies of the claims are substantive weaknesses: 1) there is a lack of uniform information recorded and often vague or incomplete data provided; 2) there was a tendency on the part of Loyalists to inflate their losses reflecting inaccurate estimates; 3) the claims generally do not accurately reproduce property possession; 4) most Loyalists were too poor to file claims. The strongest argument raised against the use of the claims points to the miniscule percentage of the population which actually filed claims. In the colony of New York, which represented the second highest percentage of the thirteen colonies filing claims, 0.54% of the population filed claims. Notwithstanding the inherent weaknesses of the claims and their lack of comprehensive data on which to base a valid quantitative analysis, the claims still provide a useful resource in analyzing loyalism. The claims are valuable in providing a reservoir of information mirroring the pre-war social order and wartime participation of the Loyalists. Although the picture constructed from the claims solely is

---

18

Ibid, p. 248.

19

Brown, The King's Friends, p. 253.

an incomplete one with numerous voids, it nevertheless furnishes a supplemental source in coming to grips with loyalism within a micro and macro framework.

The colony of New York was a significant Revolutionary colony due to its militarily strategic geographic location and its position as "the" loyalist stronghold in the colonies. The Hudson Valley--Lake Champlain route was perceived by both sides as a vital channel through which a quick mobilization of forces could sever New England from the other colonies. Following the Burgoyne failure to affect this strategy (1777), New York was thereafter split, with the rebels in control of the upper half of the colony and the British dominant in the lower half firmly entrenched in New York City.<sup>20</sup> New York's strategic link with Canada became the focus of a flurry of military activity during the war. New York provided the stage for approximately one-third of the military engagements during the Revolution. Although New York ranked only seventh in population, the colony supplied more Loyalists for the British service than the other colonies combined.<sup>21</sup> The colony also was a hotbed of Loyalist activity. New York harbored approximately one-half of the American Loyalists.<sup>22</sup>

---

20

Ibid, p. 88.

21

Brown, The Good Americans, p. 231.

22

Ibid.

New York was also a colony which experienced destructive frontier warfare, especially in the upstate region in the three counties of Tryon, Albany, and Charlotte. Tryon County, however, the colony's western perimeter, became the focal point of the internecine border warfare which was inexorably waged throughout the entire war. The defenseless New York frontier provides a scale model of the type of civil warfare which characterized the Revolutionary conflict. In examining the county during the Revolution, one can invariably identify brother fighting against brother, nephew against uncle, and neighbor against neighbor. Communities, families, and personal relationships were fragmented over the ensuing conflict. The families in Tryon were "irreconcilably divided" over the conflict as evidenced by the decisions of the Frey, Herkimer, and Hooples families. Lieutenant-Colonel George Herkimer, the brother of Whig General Nicholas Herkimer, was an avid loyalist. Colonel Henry Frey was a loyalist, whereas his brother Major John Frey served as the chairman of the Tryon County Committee of Safety. <sup>23</sup> Two brothers, Jurgen and John, of the Hooples family supported the Whigs, while a third brother <sup>24</sup> John turned loyalist.

---

23

Catherine S. Crary, The Price Of Loyalty: Tory Writings From The Revolutionary Era (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), p. 240.

24

Ibid.

By the end of the war, the thriving agrarian economy and developing frontier communities were left in shambles by the destruction leveled by the Loyalists. A further dimension of the conflict rooted in the colony of New York and localized in Tryon County, was the Indian involvement in the loyalist forces. From the defeat of Burgoyne in 1777 to the ultimate loyalist defeat at the battle of Johnstown (October 1781), the red and white Loyalists ravaged the Tryon County frontier under the able leadership of Sir John Johnson, John and Walter Butler, and the Mohawk chief Joseph Brant.

The initial northern Indian response (Six Nations) to the outbreak of hostilities was one of maintaining a neutral stance and fending off the pressures to become actively involved. The Indian perception of the rebellion was that of an "unnatural" conflict pitting Englishmen against Englishmen, a relationship analagous to a recalcitrant son rebelling against his father.<sup>25</sup> The Iroquois regarded the British as their protectors due to the legacy of Sir William Johnson as Indian Superintendent and opted to fight on the British side for both reasons of "moral obligation" and

---

25

Barbara Graymont, The Iroquois In The American Revolution (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1972), p. 66.

26

Indian defined "self-interest". The Indians who had played such an active part in the settlement and affairs of the northern colonies were not able to enjoy the luxury of neutrality for a long period. The Burgoyne campaign of 1777, with active Iroquois involvement at the Battle of Oriskany in Tryon County, ended all hopes of remaining neutral. This Indian participation marked the committment of Iroquois involvement and drove a wedge between the already internally weak Iroquois confederacy.<sup>27</sup> Not all the tribes of the Iroquois confederacy, however, took up the hatchet against the Revolutionaries. The Mohawks, Onondagas, Cayugas, and Senecas sided with the British; whereas the Oneidas and Tuscoras allied with the Whigs. The inroads made by New England missionaries, spearheaded by the Rev. Samuel Kirkland, had served to engender internal instability, marking the triumph of "localism" in drawing the confederacy into the conflict after persistent prodding by both the Whigs and Tories.<sup>28</sup>

Tryon County represented a county in the colony of New York which mirrored the true diversity, sanguinary com-

---

26

Robert M. Calhoon, The Loyalists In Revolutionary America, 1760-1783 (New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, Inc., 1965, 1969, 1973), p. 425.

27

Ibid, p. 428.

28

Graymont, Iroquois In American Revolution, p. 128; Calhoon, Loyalists In Revolutionary America, p. 425.

bat, and highlighted forgotten dimensions which existed during the Revolutionary Era. Tryon County was unique in that in this one county, many of the Revolutionary characteristics present throughout the colonies collectively, were present within the boundaries of one geographic area. First, Tryon County had primarily an agricultural economy and the Loyalists were generally poor farmers. Secondly, Tryon County was the retreat of one of the most politically influential and powerful colonial figures in the person of Sir William Johnson. Thirdly, although the Loyalists in general produced no leaders of the caliber of the rebel leadership, Tryon did produce some of the prominent loyalist leadership which was very active in the upstate region throughout the war. Fourthly, an examination of the county during the war reveals some of the most savage and barbarous fighting on the Revolutionary frontier, pointing to the true destruction which was the consequence of civil warfare. Fifthly, Tryon County was the principal contact of the Six Nations prior to the war and is a key in analyzing the Indian participation in the war. Lastly, Tryon County was viewed as a strategic county militarily, and it naturally followed that the Continental Congress acted with dispatch in countering Tory influence by forcing the evacuation of Sir John Johnson in May 1776.

Tryon County was an exemplary county in colonial New York, guided by the stewardship of the Johnson family and the network of personal political alliances cemented by

the Baronet. With such a robust and noted tradition of royal service exhibited by the county's leadership, there was little doubt which direction Tryon would turn in the face of the Revolution. Once royal authority was successfully challenged and dismantled in the colony, the Johnson domain was placed in a temporary political vacuum. Due to the death of Sir William Johnson, the erosion of royal authority, and the assiduity of the district committees in the Canajoharie, Palatine, German Flatts, and Kingsland districts, the county's political leverage slipped through the hands of the Johnson family, relaxing the once tight grip which they had so long enjoyed. Tryon County quickly followed in the direction of its upstate sister counties in enthusiastically supporting the patriot cause. In the ensuing five years of the Revolutionary War, the remaining inhabitants would pay dearly for that decision.



## CHAPTER II

EARLY NEW YORK SETTLEMENT AND UPSTATE DEVELOPMENT  
TO THE OUTBREAK OF THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR

The early colonial history of New York was a period characterized by slow settlement and colonization. Subsequent to exploration initiated by the Dutch along the Hudson River, nascent Dutch settlements took root early during the seventeenth century. Expansive settlement, however, was initially overshadowed by concerted efforts to further commercial advantage. Emigration was encouraged by the Dutch government to bolster settlement, as evidenced by the implantation of the patroon system of land ownership in the New Netherlands.<sup>29</sup> This system generously rewarded those who brought settlers to the New Netherlands with considerable tracts of land. The patroon system maintained a policy of "perpetual leases" whereby the patroon leased land to settlers as opposed to selling land for settlement outright.<sup>30</sup> The "Freedoms and Exemptions" issued by the Dutch government in 1640 further enhanced emigration by extending rights

29

Stella H. Sutherland, Population Distribution In Colonial America (New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1966), p. 65.

30

Alexander Flick, ed., History Of The State Of New York (New York: Columbia University Press, 1933-1937), Vol. I, Ch. II, p. 267.

for Indian trade to "freemen" and "stockholders" of the Dutch West India Company, so that by 1664 the New Netherlands had an estimated population of 10,000 inhabitants.<sup>31</sup> Throughout the course of development in the New Netherlands, disagreement with the New England colonies over the imposing issues of land and trade prevailed.<sup>32</sup> The decline and elimination of Dutch rule was marked by the English takeover of New Amsterdam in 1664.<sup>33</sup> The period from the English ascendancy until the ultimate English predominance in New York at the conclusion of the Great War for Empire, was one of internecine warfare in a triangular tug-of-war between the contesting English, French, and Indians. The series of wars initiated in 1689 between the English and French represented an attempt to establish territorial and commercial hegemony in the new world. As a result of the protracted confrontation, the French were thereafter eliminated as a threat to the English in North America.

The physical environment played no little role in the early settlement, subsequent development, and molding of political, economic, and cultural institutions in colonial New York. The geographic location of the Hudson River,

---

31

Sutherland, Population Distribution, p. 65.

32

See Flick, History Of New York, Vol. I, Ch. II, p. 69.

33

Sutherland, Population Distribution, p. 66.

bisecting the colony, exerted a "centrifugal impetus" in settlement and development.<sup>34</sup> An examination of the seventeenth century cities of New York City and Albany, representative of the commercial-seaboard downstate and agrarian-country upstate regions respectively, points to the cultural diversity and economic polarity which existed within the colony.<sup>35</sup> Although the land system which the English inherited from the Dutch served as a model and superficially mirrored its predecessor, the English modification was indeed distinctive. Acknowledging that the Dutch patroon system was a failure,<sup>36</sup> it must be emphasized that during the English period the distinguishing difference was the method of land distribution following the initial issuance of patents.

Throughout the seventeenth century, the distribution of land in New York was issued to a handful of landowners in quantities of immense patents.<sup>37</sup> After the issuance of the patents, however, these immense tracts generally did not re-

---

34

Patricia U. Bonomi, A Factious People: Politics And Society In Colonial New York (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1971), p. 17.

35

See Ibid, p. 40.

36

Ibid, p. 5.

37

Sutherland, Population Distribution, p. 80.

tain their original composition for the duration of the colonial period. The majority of the patents were divided incrementally by means of sale to land speculators, sale of individual lots to prospective buyers, and internal allotments among family members.<sup>38</sup> Very few huge patents remained intact, such as the massive Johnson and Schuyler holdings in Albany County.<sup>39</sup> The geographic composition of colonial New York displayed a patchwork of small farm units sold or rented within the framework of the vast patents.<sup>40</sup> New York in the colonial period contained two hundred and eighty-five "farming districts" attracting three basic types of settlers: 1) newly arrived immigrants; 2) workers who relocated from the country to the town; 3) farmers who migrated from one colony to another.<sup>41</sup> The land units were not sold outright or allotted in large parcels,<sup>42</sup> but were generally leased to newly arrived settlers. Samuel McKee described the landowners as "manorial lords" in

---

38

Bonomi, A Factious People, p. 185.

39

Ibid.

40

Flick, History Of New York, Vol. II, Ch. VIII, p. 285; Bonomi, A Factious People, p. 177.

41

Flick, History Of New York, Vol. II, Ch. VIII, p. 285.

42

Sutherland, Population Distribution, p. 81.

their handling of vast estates in which the arrangements  
 were analagous to those of medieval land ownership.<sup>43</sup> The  
 land owner provided the tenant farmer with the equipment  
 and other requisites to cultivate the soil. The medieval  
 analogy of tenancy infers a comparison of the tenant farmer  
 with a medieval serf. Although on the surface this analogy  
 appears attractive given the economic dependence of the ten-  
 ant vis-a-vis the landowner, such a comparison clouds an ac-  
 curate depiction of the colonial tenant farmer. The tenant  
 farmer was not forced to work for a landowner and enjoyed  
 more latitude than a serf, notwithstanding the tenants po-  
 sition on the lower end of the colonial social order. Ten-  
 ant farmers were even permitted to vote if they satisfactor-  
 ily met the requirements of the freehold franchise regula-  
 tion.<sup>44</sup>

The policy of issuing land grants continued well in-  
 to the eighteenth century. The actions of New York Lieuten-  
 ant Governor Cadwallader Colden relative to land grants as  
 late as 1764 were illustrative of this policy.<sup>45</sup> Land  
 grants were issued by the Dutch in the pre-1664 period of

---

<sup>43</sup>  
 Flick, History Of New York, Vol. II, Ch. VIII, p.  
 290.

<sup>44</sup>  
 Carl Becker, "Nominations In Colonial New York,"  
American Historical Review, VI (1901), pp. 263-64.

<sup>45</sup>  
 Sutherland, Population Distribution, p. 88.

Dutch rule and subsequently in the forms of proprietary and royal grants under the English. It was estimated that the Dutch issued "somewhat less" than one thousand patents following a loosely structured process, however, with the ascendancy of the English a defined procedure was formulated and implemented.<sup>46</sup> Edward P. Alexander portrayed the colonial land system as a "political football" which was kicked about by the New York aristocracy and governors at the expense of the colony's best interests.<sup>47</sup> Consequently, incoming immigrants or men of moderate means had to assimilate into the existing landowner-tenant structure or settle elsewhere to obtain freehold land.<sup>48</sup>

During the early years of English control in New York, emigration was minimal. A steady influx of German, Scotch, and Irish immigrants, however, settled in the colony during the first half of the eighteenth century.<sup>49</sup> The largest group to emigrate to the colonies during the 1760's was the Scotch-Irish. Although most of the Scotch-Irish settled in the southern colonies and Pennsylvania, a sizeable group became tenants of the land magnates in upstate

---

46

Flick, History Of New York, Vol. III, Ch. V, p. 154.

47

Ibid, p. 161.

48

Ibid.

49

Sutherland, Population Distribution, p. 87.

New York (particularly in the Mohawk Valley and near Lake  
 50 George). Abandoning dismal economic and strained social  
 conditions in Europe, most of the immigrants pursued the  
 numerous reported opportunities available on the colonial  
 frontier. Land tenancy represented an inseparable part of  
 colonial frontier development. Tenancy provided the immi-  
 grants a means to successfully erect new communities through  
 collective co-operation and insured individual economic sta-  
 51 bility in an uncertain new environment. Sir William John-  
 son, whose family wielded tremendous influence in Albany  
 County and who was the principal patron of Tryon County,  
 became one of the foremost land magnates attracting tenants  
 in upstate New York. Johnson arrived in the Mohawk Valley  
 with a band of Scotch-Irish immigrants settling at Warren-  
 bush in 1741, and thereafter pursued an active career in  
 the service of the crown which few contemporary colonial  
 52 figures could rival.

By the eve of the Revolution, the New York frontier  
 was fairly well populated and developed. The increase in

---

50

Jack M. Sosin, The Revolutionary Frontier, 1763-1783 (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1967), p. 22.

51

Ibid, p. 42.

52

Washington Frothingham, The History Of Montgomery County (Syracuse, New York: D. Mason and Co., 1892), p. 58;  
 Hazel C. Mathews, The Mark Of Honour (University of Toronto Press, 1965), p. 8.

the growth of the Mohawk and Schoharie Valley populations in the seventeenth century, primarily Dutch and German in composition, was further augmented with the settlement of the Scotch-Irish along the Susquehanna River.<sup>53</sup> Even though westward expansion progressed at a trickle pace and could not match the development of the interior urban centers of the colony, the frontier had come a long way in little over a hundred years. Illustrative of the growth and extended settlement was the series of ten forts which stood between Fort Hunter on the Mohawk River and Lake George in 1779.<sup>54</sup> At the outbreak of the Revolution, the colony of New York ranked seventh with an estimated population of 193,167.<sup>55</sup> New York was subdivided into fourteen counties at the time of the Revolution. Tryon County was not established until 1772, being prior to that date a political and geographic appendage of Albany County. Therefore, specific population figures are not extant for Tryon County before the separation from Albany County. According to the 1786 New York Census, Tryon County had 15,057 white inhabitants and 405 blacks.<sup>56</sup> Stella H. Sutherland, on the

---

53

Francis W. Halsey, The Old New York Frontier (New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1901), pp. 116-17.

54

Ibid, p. 117.

55

Sutherland, Population Distribution, p. xii.

56

Ibid, p. 70.



basis of the proportion which existed between Albany and Tryon counties in the 1786 census, estimated that the population of Tryon in 1771 was approximately 9033.<sup>57</sup> If this estimate is accurate, Tryon County ranked eighth among the fourteen New York counties according to population with its inception in 1772. The generally accepted population figure utilized by historians for Tryon County on the eve of the Revolution is 10,000 inhabitants.

No account of the upstate New York region and Tryon County in the eighteenth century could be complete without examining the activities of a central colonial figure--Sir William Johnson. Johnson was an energetic, highly successful, and ubiquitous figure for three decades (1745-1774) in New York colonial history. Johnson directed the central leadership in the establishment of Tryon County and prior to 1772, the spirited activities of this influential individual were repeatedly recorded in New York frontier history. Sir William Johnson experienced a singularly distinguished career in the Crown's service, acting in numerous capacities which included the following: justice of the peace for Albany County (1745), Indian agent (1746), colonel of the Six Nations warriors and white settlers (1746), colonel of 14 companies of militia (1748), appointed a member of New York provincial council by Governor George Clinton (1751), commissioned major general (1755), received the title of Baro-

net (1755), commissioned colonel, agent, and superintendent of the Six Nations (1756), commissioned superintendent of Northern Indian Affairs (1761).<sup>58</sup> The key to Johnson's successes in amassing such great power during his relatively short career can be attributed to his unique vantage position in the four corners of the colonial frontier arena: 1) Johnson was a leading New York land magnate and astute businessman possessing an estate which ultimately consisted of some 500,000 acres, 2) Johnson served with distinction as a military organizer on the frontier and military leader during the French and Indian Wars, 3) Johnson achieved and maintained a special relationship with the Iroquois, as evidenced by his being made a Mohawk chief, adopting the Indian name "Warraghiyagey" (the uniter of peoples),<sup>59</sup> 4) Johnson remained until his death in 1774 a foremost political influence in Albany and Tryon counties on both the regional and provincial level.

Sir William Johnson's initial development of the 14,000 acre Mohawk Valley tract, entrusted to him by his uncle Sir Peter Warren, was an auspicious undertaking and

---

58

James Sullivan et al., eds., The Papers Of Sir William Johnson, Division Of Archives And History, Vol. 1 (Albany: University Of The State Of New York, 1921), pp. xvii-xxvi; Frothingham, Montgomery County History, p. 60.

59

Peter H. Bryce, "Sir William Johnson, Bart., The Great Diplomat Of The British-French Frontier," New York State Historical Association Proceedings, XXV (1927), p. 357.

harbinger of future expansion. After a five year period of extending settlement at Warrenbush, the Johnson land represented the largest cleared tract in the district.<sup>60</sup>

The initial successes of Johnson were soon followed by the acquisition of an additional 4000 acres on the north side of the Mohawk River, which became the site of Fort Johnson.<sup>61</sup>

The scanty settlement at Fort Johnstown marked the skeleton for the gradual construction of Johnstown--the commercial center and county seat of Tryon County in 1772. From the acquisition and development of the first sizeable tract on the Mohawk, Johnson established a pattern of obtaining land through purchase and receiving expansive grants for services performed for the crown. Johnson represented a "capitalist entrepreneur" on the frontier, developing the undeveloped, enlarging the Johnson family holdings, and building and improving the social institutions necessary to encourage settlement.<sup>62</sup>

In competing for tenants with other upstate land giants such as Philip Skene and James Duane, Johnson advertised the growing improvements and desirable advantages available in the Mohawk Valley in the New York Journal.<sup>63</sup>

---

60

Ibid, p. 355; Mathews, Mark Of Honour, p. 8.

61

Bryce, "Sir William Johnson," p. 355.

62

Sosin, Revolutionary Frontier, p. 42.

63

Ibid.

Sir William was actively engaged in promoting orderly development through careful planning, minimizing wastefulness on the frontier. Johnson promoted specialization on the frontier by attracting outside tradesmen and artisans to complement the agrarian economy and facilitate systematic development.<sup>64</sup> The Baronet's inducements proved quite attractive in procuring some 600 necessitous tenants for the Johnson estate. Johnson's newly arrived tenants were provided with numerous physical and economic advantages: a network of roads throughout the county linking the settlement outposts with larger towns, sawmills, gristmills, cleared lands for communal cultivation, and a trade store serving as the central supplier for public necessities.<sup>65</sup> Sir William worked to improve methods of agricultural production and engaged in the stock breeding of animals. There was an "agricultural experimental station" located at Johnson Hall which made available to local farmers the innovative agricultural methods tested in the Mohawk Valley.<sup>66</sup> By 1771, Johnstown comprised a thriving commercial enclave within

---

64

James Thomas Flexner, Mohawk Baronet: Sir William Johnson Of New York (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), p. 298.

65

Frothingham, Montgomery County History, pp. 58 and 67; Flexner, Mohawk Baronet, p. 298.

66

Flexner, Mohawk Baronet, p. 299; Frothingham, Montgomery County History, p. 64.

the predominantly agricultural countryside. <sup>67</sup> Sir William also attended to the religious and educational needs of both his tenants and the Indians. Under Johnson's supervision and assistance, St. John's Episcopal Church in Johnstown (1766) and St. George's Church in Schenectady (1769) were constructed. <sup>68</sup> Johnson, an Irishman who early in life espoused the Anglican faith for reasons of political ambition, remained sympathetic with his Scotch and Irish Catholic tenants. The Baronet, however, did not allow the Scotch and Irish Catholics public organization for worship. <sup>69</sup> Johnson constructed free schools as settlement stretched westward. Examples of such schools were the two organized at Fort Hunter and Johnstown. Opened in 1769, these schools were staffed by teachers from the Anglican Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. <sup>70</sup> The industrious efforts of Sir William Johnson sealed their imprint on the prosperous agricultural economy of Tryon County on the eve of the Revolution.

Sir William Johnson's energetic participation in the ongoing border warfare between the French and English during

---

<sup>67</sup> Frothingham, Montgomery County History, p. 65.

<sup>68</sup> Bryce, "Sir William Johnson," p. 369; Flexner, Mohawk Baronet, p. 301.

<sup>69</sup> Flexner, Mohawk Baronet, p. 300.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid, p. 301.

the French and Indian Wars earned him a well respected military reputation. This outstanding record of achievement further enhanced his political stature in colonial New York. Colonel Johnson organized the militia in upstate New York in 1746 at the behest of Governor Clinton to bolster the defense of the frontier given the increasing French presence.<sup>71</sup> When appointed superintendent of Indian affairs by Governor Clinton, Johnson performed a wartime role which he was to subsequently assume during peacetime: intermediary with the Six Nations.<sup>72</sup> Johnson's appointment as major general in command of the colonial forces for five colonies (1756) demonstrated the calibre of his military abilities and reflected the important influence he exerted relative to winning Indian loyalty for the British.<sup>73</sup> Johnson remained an influential military figure for the duration of the Great War for Empire.

Sir William Johnson was able to derive numerous political benefits from his strong military position and noted record. The Johnson political bailiwick also significantly increased due to the unparalleled relationship the Baronet maintained with the Iroquois. Illustrative of the authority

---

71

Frothingham, Montgomery County History, p. 60.

72

Bryce, "Sir William Johnson," p. 359.

73

Ibid, p. 364.

and extraordinary control possessed by Johnson was his 1756 appointment as "colonel, agent, and sole superintendent of all the affairs of the Six Nations and other northern Indians".<sup>74</sup> Johnson enjoyed a virtual free hand in his dealings with the Indians, answering directly only to the Earl of Loudoun.<sup>75</sup> In his role as Indian superintendent, Johnson had to keep open the lines of communication with the Indians; while maintaining amicable relations to reinforce the existing alliance between the king and the Six Nations. The Six Nations represented six Indian tribes--the Mohawks, Oneidas, Onondagas, Cayugas, Senecas, and Tuscaroras--who comprised the Iroquois Confederacy occupying the vast territories west and northwest of Tryon County.<sup>76</sup> Tryon County marked out the colonial boundary of the northwest perimeter of New York. Sir William had the difficult task of sustaining the precarious balance that existed between encroaching white settlement and the rights of the Six Nations.<sup>77</sup> A major event in Johnson's career was the fixing of the Fort Stanwix Treaty Line of 1768. As a consequence of this agreement, the border between the Indian territory and white settlers was

---

74 Sullivan et al., Johnson Papers, I, p. xxvi.

75 Ibid.

76 Halsey, Old New York Frontier, p. 13.

77 Sullivan et al., Johnson Papers, V, p. ix.

pushed farther west with land south and east of the Ohio,<sup>78</sup> Susquehanna, and Unadilla rivers ceded to the English. In order to quell Indian discontent in the aftermath of Pontiac's war, the English delivered "20 large batteaux" of presents to the Indians in exchange for the land ceded<sup>79</sup> in the agreement. While the boundary established was intended to protect the Indians from imminent white encroachment, it also constituted a welcome addition to the material aggrandizement of Sir William Johnson and New York land speculators. These territorial acquisitions planted the seeds for future Indian vexation. The years 1769 to 1771 denoted the apogee in the eventful career of Sir William Johnson. In examining the "quantity" and "extent" of correspondence dispatched and received from Johnson Hall in these years, Alexander Flick portrayed Johnson as "perhaps<sup>80</sup> the most influential man in British Colonial America."

Sir William Johnson was a principal actor on the eighteenth century political stage of colonial New York. In analyzing the suzerainty of the Tryon County patron, who insured the perpetuation of his family's political interests through intermarriage, patronage appointments, and

---

78  
Halsey, Old New York Frontier, p. 99.

79  
Ibid.

80  
Sullivan et al., Johnson Papers, VII, p. ix.



the extension of informal and personal controls, Carl Becker asserted that Johnson's influence was "perhaps greatest of all".<sup>81</sup> The reach of Johnson's political influence was not confined solely to the Mohawk Valley region, but encompassed the entire upstate area. Sir William Johnson was in fact a political factor in the election of officials in Schenectady and Albany. A case in point was the 1768 election of Albany assemblymen in which assemblyman Philip Schuyler was up for re-election. Although Sir William had supported Schuyler in past elections, reports of Schuyler's anti-Johnson expressions in the previous assembly session raised uncertainties as to Schuylers being "set up" again by the Baronet.<sup>82</sup> Individuals close to Sir William intimated that he might opt to set up his son Sir John Johnson for the New York assembly seat. Sir William, however, finally supported Philip Schuyler for re-election following Schuyler's rejoinder concerning the misunderstanding.<sup>83</sup> Thus, Schuyler maintained amicable relations with the powerful New York political leader. The question of who the lo-

81

Becker, "Nominations In New York," p. 262; Flexner, Mohawk Baronet, p. 335.

82

Hugh Wallace to Sir William Johnson, 7 January 1769, Sullivan et al., Johnson Papers, VI, pp. 570-71.

83

Don R. Gerlach, Philip Schuyler And The American Revolution In New York, 1733-1777 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), p. 180.

cal populace supported or what position a candidate embraced was an irrelevant question in the political milieu of eighteenth century New York. In the example of the Schuyler election, the salient question was "whom is Sir William or  
84  
Colonel Livingston for".

A visible demonstration of the political power wielded by Sir William Johnson can be traced in his maneuvering relative to the formation of Tryon County. Tryon County was established on March 12, 1772, being named after  
85  
the last royal governor of New York William Tryon. The movement advocating the creation of a new county was spearheaded by Sir William Johnson and strongly supported by Philip Schuyler, a member of the New York provincial assembly.  
86  
The vigorous and vigilant prodding of Johnson for the addition of the new county began as early as May 1769, as indicated in the volume of correspondence initiated from Johnson Hall after that date. Sir William, in a letter to Hugh Wallace on May 26, 1769, voiced his belief that Albany County was "much too large" and intimated his sentiments

84

Becker, "Nominations In New York," p. 265; Gerlach, Philip Schuyler, p. 143.

85

Graymont, Iroquois In American Revolution, p. 3.

86

Sullivan et al., Johnson Papers, VIII, p. x.

relative to new boundary proposals. <sup>87</sup> On May 30, 1769, Sir William received a letter from one William Gamble seeking a recommendation to the governor for a clerkship on his hearing about the formation of a new county. <sup>88</sup> Johnson expressed his interest concerning the new county to James DeLancey, another member of the provincial assembly, in June 1769, stressing the fact that the interests of the inhabitants took precedence over his own vested interests. <sup>89</sup> The provincial assembly met and drafted a proposed Act delineating boundaries for the new county. Discontent quickly surfaced, <sup>90</sup> however, throughout New York against the proposed boundaries. Consequently, Sir William forwarded a petition of the inhabitants with a "more favorable line" to James DeLancey, asking him to lay it before the assembly and imploring the support of James' uncle Oliver DeLancey in the provincial coun-

---

87

Hugh Wallace was a political ally of Sir William Johnson and a member of the New York provincial council. Sir William Johnson to Hugh Wallace, 26 May 1769, Sullivan et al, Johnson Papers, VI, p. 780.

88

William Gamble to Sir William Johnson, 30 May 1769, Ibid, p. 786.

89

Sir William Johnson to James DeLancey, 14 June 1769, Ibid, VII, pp. 19-20.

90

Sir William Johnson to Henry Moore, 26 June 1769, Ibid, p. 42.

91  
 cil. The petition stressed the inhabitants desire for separation from Albany County and proffered an alternative line of division to calm the discontent that had been manifested. In November 1770, Johnson again expressed his confidence in realizing the proposed separation to James DeLancey and called for a division consonant with the boundaries stipulated in the recent petition.<sup>92</sup>

The question of fixing mutually agreeable boundaries was indeed the principal point of contention in New York. Hugh Wallace assured Sir William that the division would soon come to pass and that disagreement with Albany and Ulster counties could be "obviated" by adhering to the suggested line.<sup>93</sup> On January 2, 1772, Sir William forwarded a second petition to James DeLancey containing a new modification of the division line, which modification would not preclude the "farther division" of Albany or Ulster counties.<sup>94</sup> This second petition was initially drawn up by Guy Johnson,

---

91  
 Sir William Johnson to James DeLancey, 26 June 1769, Ibid, p. 43.

92  
 Sir William Johnson to James DeLancey, 9 November 1769, Ibid, pp. 995-96.

93  
 Henry Wallace to Sir William Johnson, 14 November 1769, Ibid, VIII, p. 316.

94  
 Sir William Johnson to James DeLancey, 2 January 1772, Ibid, p. 360.

who afterwards obtained the needed signatures of the inhabitants. Sir William anticipated the passage of the division Act by the assembly and proceeded to subdivide the new county into five districts. Johnson supplied Philip Schuyler with the sketched boundaries of the five districts which were to comprise Tryon County: the Mohawk, Palatine, Conajoharie, Kingsland, and German Flatts.<sup>95</sup> In the same correspondence to Schuyler, Johnson stated his readiness to set the administrative wheels of the new county in motion with the forthcoming passage of the Act.

Sir William Johnson voiced his desire to many individuals for placing the county seat at Johnstown. Johnson enumerated the advantages of placing the court house in Johnstown for Hugh Wallace, mentioning the accessible geographic location of the town and the existing facilities available for county use.<sup>96</sup> On March 4, 1772, Hugh Wallace informed Sir William Johnson that the county bill had passed the assembly and that a second new county was formed directly north of Saratoga named Charlotte.<sup>97</sup> Hence, because of the growing frontier population, the progression of settlement,

---

95

Sir William Johnson to Philip Schuyler, 29 January 1772, Ibid, p. 383.

96

Sir William Johnson to Hugh Wallace, 1 January 1772, Ibid, p. 357.

97

Henry Wallace to Sir William Johnson, 4 March 1772, Ibid, p. 413.

and the concomitant local political pressures, two new counties were carved out of the existing boundary of Albany County. The final form of the bill was passed on March 12, 1772 with Johnstown designated as the county seat by governor in council.<sup>98</sup> The months of July and August at Johnstown were busily devoted to actuating the machinery of county government in concert with the participation of the governor and certain members of the provincial council.<sup>99</sup> Sir William's recommendations for the appointment of civil officials in the new county were faithfully followed. All of the "Johnson men" recommended were appointed except in two positions, that of sheriff and county clerk.<sup>100</sup> Moreover, Sir William hand picked the two Tryon County assembly representatives. Johnson's son-in-law Guy Johnson and Hendrick Frey were nominated by the Baronet for assembly seats and were subsequently "unanimously" elected.<sup>101</sup> In a letter to Sir William dated January 12, 1773, Hugh Wallace related that the novice Tryon assembly representatives were seated and should encounter no major obstacles in producing legis-

---

98

Ibid, p. 329.

99

Sir William Johnson to John Blackburn, 28 May 1772, Ibid, p. 503.

100

Flexner, Mohawk Baronet, p. 335.

101

Ibid.

lation. The following passage from Wallace's correspondence reflected the indomitable influence Sir William brandished through the eyes of a contemporary:

Sir William Johnson (says a certain lawyer) can carry anything he pleases both with Gov<sup>r</sup> Council and Assembly--He returns two members by his nod and can direct the election of the Albany and Schenectady members as he pleases. . . .<sup>102</sup>

Hugh Wallace's aforementioned assurance to Sir William regarding the effective legislative performance of the Tryon representatives proved a well-informed dictum. Guy Johnson acted as the foremost representative of the Johnson interests during his initial assembly term, pushing through appropriations to upgrade county public buildings and laboring to safeguard the Johnson local political domain. <sup>103</sup> Sir William Johnson had amassed a vast estate and accrued considerable political control during his lifetime. With the death of Sir William on the eve of the Revolution (July 11, 1774) at the age of fifty-nine, his son Sir John Johnson assumed control of the family estate and his nephew Guy Johnson succeeded as Indian superintendent.

Tryon County served as a crossroads of Loyalist-Rebel military activity throughout the Revolutionary War. Directly north of Tryon County, the Canadian frontier territory was

---

102

Hugh Wallace to Sir William Johnson, 12 January 1773, Ibid, p. 690.

103

Flexner, Mohawk Baronet, p. 335.

employed as a base of operations for loyalist militia and British regulars. Directly south of Tryon was situated the colony of Pennsylvania. Albany and Tryon counties were coterminous with the northeastern portion of Pennsylvania. To the southeast of Tryon, Albany County's adjacent border stretched to Lake George. Following the defeat of Burgoyne, the Loyalists of Albany and Tryon counties experienced a commonly insufferable fate at the hands of the rebel controlled political apparatus. The Albany town of Schenectady, situated close to Tryon geographically and within the Johnson's political reach, presents a model of anti-Johnson sentiment channeled into an embracement of the patriot position. Predominantly Dutch in population, the Dutch who espoused the Tory cause because of the Johnson influence were opposed by Dutchmen who perceived the Johnsons as a potential threat to the security of Schenectady. Alice P. Kenny contends that the Dutch motivation was "entirely local" given the unsheltered geographic position of Schenectady. Anti-Johnson Dutch sentiment, however, did exist throughout Albany County prior to the Revolution. This anti-Johnson sentiment was rooted in the rising career of Sir William Johnson and his consequent domination of previously held Dutch prerogatives in the upstate New York region. From the Johnson usurpation of the Albany Indian commissioners role

---

104

Alice P. Kenny, "The Albany Dutch: Loyalists And Patriots," New York History, XLII (1961), p. 336.



(1746) to the formation of Tryon County, the accumulation of Johnson power was resented by the Albany inhabitants.<sup>105</sup> Charlotte County formed the eastern border of Tryon and was an active loyalist county in New York. Examining the Loyalist Claims filed from Charlotte as a crude measuring device, Charlotte represented the third largest loyalist county with 14% of the New York claimants. Thus, the Albany-Tryon-Charlotte tri-county region supplied 64% of New Yorkers filing claims.<sup>106</sup> Located west of Tryon County was the vast Indian territory of the Six Nations. The western boundary was delineated by the Fort Stanwix Treaty Line of 1768. This territory west of Tryon was the scene of recurrent military skirmishes throughout the course of the war.

At the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, Tryon County comprised a heterogeneous ethnic population. This county of 10,000 inhabitants by the spring of 1775 contained settlements reflecting the diverse ethnic backgrounds of the colonists: English, Dutch, German Palatines, Scotch-Irish, Scots, and Mohawk Indians.<sup>107</sup> During the early patent granting period, colonists were attracted to communities which

---

<sup>105</sup> Alice P. Kenny, Stubborn For Liberty: The Dutch In New York (Syracuse University Press, 1975), p. 137.

<sup>106</sup> Brown, The King's Friends, p. 81.

<sup>107</sup> Mathews, Mark Of Honour, p. 31.

mirrored similar ethnic characteristics and in which a particular ethnic group was predominant. By the Revolution, Tryon County was dotted with clusters of ethnic settlements retaining the language and customs of the inhabitants of those settlements.<sup>108</sup> This does not mean that other ethnic groups were absent from such communities, but that there was generally a predominant group represented in each settlement. From the lower Mohawk castle at Fort Hunter to the point of white western expansion at German Flatts, the major towns of the Mohawk Valley attracted specific types of immigrants. The German Palatines were settled primarily in the Mohawk and Schoharie Valleys, concentrated in the towns of Stone Arabia, Canajoharie, Palatine, and German Flatts.<sup>109</sup> The Germans settled along the Mohawk River following the footsteps of their Dutch predecessors, moving in stages from Pennsylvania to the Schoharie Creek--Albany--Schenectady area, and then finally to the Mohawk.<sup>110</sup> The county seat at Johnstown contained a sizeable German popu-

---

108

Ibid.

109

Sosin, Revolutionary Frontier, p. 53, Mathews, Mark Of Honour, p. 31.

110

William A. Campbell, Annals Of Tyron County, Or The Border Warfare Of New York During The Revolution (Cherry Valley, New York, 1831), p. 3.

lation. Within four miles of Johnstown, however, a Catholic  
111  
Scot Highland colony resided in Johnson Bush.

The Scots were primarily concentrated along the upper Susquehanna and Delaware Rivers at the towns of Springfield, Cherry Valley, Harpersfield; and particularly on the Harper, Banyar, and Kortright Patents opened to settlement  
112  
in the spring of 1771. An example of the type of ethnic recruiting which occurred was the John Harper attempt to attract Presbyterian Scotch-Irish New Englanders to settle on  
113  
Harper's Patent and work in the Harper maple sugar industry. Settlement west of the Susquehanna was initiated by the Rev. William Johnstone quite late and gradually the communities of Richfield, Middlefield (Newton-Martin), Laurens, and Otego developed. The Laurens-Otego area was referred to as the Old England District, pointing out the attraction of English immigrants to this area and its general ethnic composition.  
114

Therefore, although the county was politically sub-

---

111

Frothingham, Montgomery County History, p. 64.

112

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, pp. 6-9; Sosin, Revolutionary Frontier, p. 53; Mathews, Mark Of Honour, pp. 10 and 13.

113

Mathews, Mark Of Honour, p. 2.

114

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, p. 12; Mathews, Mark Of Honour, p. 11.

divided into five districts, there were three principal areas of settlement and development: 1) the Mohawk-Schoharie Valleys; 2) the Susquehanna-Deleware River region; 3) the area west of the Susquehanna extending to the Treaty Line of 1768. As the years 1774-1775 approached, the past patterns of local development and settlement were important factors in the Loyalist-Rebel division within Tryon County. Even more important, however, than the specific ethnic orientation of individual areas, was the past tie of communities and individuals to the Johnson power structure and the differentiation between native born and 2nd-3rd generation ethnic groups. These two factors weighed heavily in the initial months of the war for individuals in Tryon County equivocating over the Loyalist-Whig decision.

## CHAPTER III

THE POLITICAL CONFIGURATION OF NEW YORK AT THE OUTBREAK OF  
 THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR: LOYALIST STRENGTH IN TRYON COUNTY  
 1775-1777

The pre-Revolutionary political framework in the province of New York was characterized by an early period of minimal factional strife, which subsequently gave way to heated factional conflict. The 1690-1720 interval of stable factionalism witnessed a political alignment pitting a "commerical" faction against a "landed" faction during the governorship of Robert Hunter. The principal issue of contention dividing the commerical and landed interests was the matter of constructing a workable revenue policy for  
 115  
 the colony. The Morris-Livingston landed faction allied with Governor Hunter in restoring a "degree of order" in New York at the expense of the DeLancey-VanCortlandt commer-  
 116  
 cial faction. This interval of surface political tran-

---

115

The term stable factionalism refers to political factionalism in which two "semi-permanent" rival interest groups vied for political supremacy. See Jack P. Greene, "Changing Interpretations Of Early American Politics," in Gatell and Weinstein, ed., American Themes: Essays In Historiography (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 50; Bonomi, A Factious People, p. 79.

116

Bonomi, A Factious People, p. 87.

quility, however, was succeeded by a cycle of chaotic factionalism, ignited during the governorship of William Burnett (1720-1755) with the ascendancy of a revived merchant interest.<sup>117</sup> The 1755 to 1775 period was one characterized by stable factionalism, in which the Livingston and DeLancey factions vied for provincial political control against the backdrop of events leading to the Revolution.<sup>118</sup> The 1768 ascendancy of the DeLancey majority in the provincial assembly, displacing a Livingston dominated assembly, represented a changing of the two factions adversary political roles. Forced into a minority position on the provincial level, the Livingstons solidified an alliance with Isaac Sears and John Lamb (leaders of the Sons of Liberty); while the DeLanceys diligently moved to safeguard their newly acquired station, by allying with Lieutenant Governor Cadwallader Colden. Membership in the political factions was not ideologically oriented, but determined on the basis of wealth, so-

---

117

The term chaotic factionalism refers to the "ad hoc" and "impermanent" organization of rival political groups forming short term alliances to achieve specific objectives. See Greene, "Changing Interpretations Of Early American Politics," p. 49; Bonomi, A Factious People, p. 87.

118

Robert M. Calhoon, Revolutionary America: An Interpretative Overview (New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, Inc., 1976), pp. 79-83; Connelly, "The Failure Of Loyatism," pp. 39-41.

cial position, religious faith, and the desire to obtain  
 119  
 immediate political and personal advantage.

From 1690 to 1775 there occurred in colonial New York a discernible shifting of political alliances through the medium of the political faction. The primary vehicle utilized to gain, retain, and reacquire lost political control in the colonies were rival political factions. Colonial factions maintained no commitment to well defined ideology or detailed platforms comparable to modern political parties, but concentrated instead on the immediate, local interests directly connected with the control of public office. Factional designations, reflective of those who wielded political power and those who did not in a given period, also bore the standards of the Whig and Loyalist camps. As the issue of independence surfaced as the focus of attention, the Loyalists ascended from the ranks of the politically dominant DeLancey faction; while their opposition crystallized in the ranks of the politically mute Livingston faction.<sup>120</sup> Both the DeLancey and Livingston factions were in accord in their denunciation of the Stamp Act.

---

119

Greene, "Changing Interpretations Of Early American Politics," p. 45; Alexander Flick, Loyalism In New York During The American Revolution (New York: Arno Press and New York Times, 1969), p. 16.

120

Brown, The King's Friends, p. 94.

Following the year 1770, however, each event that presented itself was transformed into a clearly identifiable factional position.<sup>121</sup> New York represented the only colony in which the Loyalists effectively monopolized the provincial assembly and nascent Revolutionary machinery. The Loyalists manipulated the Committee of Fifty-One and exerted a conservative influence in the election of New York delegates to the First Continental Congress.<sup>122</sup> After the First Continental Congress, the terms Whig and Loyalist connoted terms of "unmistakable meaning".<sup>123</sup> The signing of the Declaration of Independence signaled the point of no return between the two irreconcilably polarized positions.

The beginning of the Revolutionary War witnessed the gradual dissolution of New York provincial and local governmental machinery. The extinction of royal authority in New York was in no manner a uniform phenomenon. The last session of the New York General Assembly which commenced January 13, 1775, was dominated by the Loyalist membership which obstructed the path of radical proposals presented for deliberation.<sup>124</sup> With the temporary adjournment of

---

121

Flick, Loyalism In New York, pp. 19 and 21.

122

Brown, The King's Friends, p. 95.

123

Flick, Loyalism In New York, p. 31.

124

Ibid, p. 40.



the provincial assembly (April 3, 1775) and subsequently the repeated prorogation of that body, the assembly ceased to function as an operative governmental organ. <sup>125</sup> Consequently, the New York Whigs turned to an "extra-legal" convention, the Provincial Congress, to circumvent Loyalist roadblocks. <sup>126</sup> Correspondence initiated by New York Lieutenant Governor Cadwallader Colden to British colonial Secretary of State the Earl of Dartmouth from July 6, 1774 to May 3, 1775, divulged the disintegration and ineffectiveness of royal authority. Colden portrayed the dismal condition of affairs in New York City in a letter dispatched 3 May 1775:

. . . The want of any degree of Resolution in the Magistrates to support the authority of Government in opposition to popular measures, rendered the leaders of the People insolently bold and daring--The Friends of order and Government saw no power either in the exertion of the Magistrates, or the feeble aid that could be afforded by the very small body of Troops quartered in the city to protect their persons and property from violence and destruction. Several Incidents combined to depress all legal Authority. . . The people were assembled, and that scene of disorder and violence begun, which has entirely prostrated the powers of gov-

---

125

Agnes Hunt, The Provincial Committees Of Safety Of The American Revolution (n.p., 1904; reprint ed., Haskell House Publishers, Ltd., 1968), p. 62; See Bonomi, A Factious People, Appendix C, p. 310.

126

Brown, The King's Friends, p. 96.

ernment, and produced an association by which the Province has solemnly united with the others in resisting the Acts of Parliament.<sup>127</sup>

New York's forcible activities in the organization of extra-legal committees, at the direction of the Continental Congress, cannot be characterized as generating united, colony wide support. The impetus for the organization of committees and the establishment of a Whig directed provincial government was spearheaded by energetic merchant discontent centered in New York City.<sup>128</sup> Once the Whig committees successfully localized their authority, undermining the efficacy of royal Governor Tryon in New York City, the committees goaded the conservatively oriented rural counties to acquiesce to Whig designs.<sup>129</sup> The tracing of the genesis, longevity, jurisdiction, and termination of extra-legal committees operative during the Revolutionary period underscores a complex undertaking. Committee development becomes easier to trace and analyze, however, by acknowledging the structural hierarchy of committees, with the Continental Congress

---

127

Lieutenant Governor Colden to the Earl of Dartmouth, 3 May 1775, E.B. O'Callaghan, ed., Documents Relative To Colonial History Of New York (Albany: Weed, Parsons, and Co., 1857), VIII, p. 571.

128

Hunt, Provincial Committees of Safety, p. 62.

129

Ibid.

manifesting the ultimate Whig administrative authority. The New York Provincial Congress was next in descending order, followed by the general committee on Tories, the individual county committees, and the district committees. 130

The development and growing strength of the extra-legal committees in New York City provided a forum in which Whig motions gradually gained a foothold in steering the political course of New York colony from 1774 to 1777. New York Whigs effectively utilized the committees to neutralize their conservative opposition and by-pass the existing constituted channels of royal authority. Before the de facto demise of the royal government, New York colonists experienced a chaotic juncture of dual authority vested in the extra-legal committees and the vestiges of colonial government. In response to Bostonian denunciation of the Coercive Acts, in particular the Boston Port Act; New York City's two local political factions were embroiled in forming a committee to correspond with the radicals in Boston. The New York City merchant and mechanic factions both provided members for a Committee of Fifty-One which assembled for the first time May 23, 1774. 131 Although the

---

130

Flick, Loyalism In New York, p. 79.

131

Carl Lotus Becker, The History Of Political Parties In The Province Of New York, 1760-1776 (Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 1909), pp. 112-117.

conservatively dominated Committee of Fifty-One did not alter New York's posture relative to non-importation, it attempted to broaden its base of support by establishing county committees of correspondence and encouraged the election of delegates for the First Continental Congress. The response of conservative elements in the counties to two circular letters urging the organization of committees and the election of delegates for Congress was less than encouraging. Relating to the first query, the reaction was "no general response" with only three counties complying (Suffolk, Orange, Cumberland); while in response to the second letter, three counties sent their own delegates (Kings, Orange, Suffolk) and four counties authorized New York City delegates to act in their behalf (Albany, Westchester, Dutchess, Ulster).<sup>132</sup> The conservatives were successful in selecting a moderate slate of delegates for the Congress reflecting their political point of view, although the radicals had asserted themselves in this initial jockeying for position.<sup>133</sup>

After the Committee of Fifty-One was dissolved, a general Committee of Inspection co-ordinated affairs until the ascendancy of the Committee of Sixty. The Committee of

---

132

Ibid, pp. 137 and 139.

133

Ibid, p. 141.

Sixty, elected during the early months of 1775, was primarily formed to implement the non-importation agreement resolved by the Continental Congress and advance the enforcement of the Association.<sup>134</sup> The new committee was composed of both conservative and radical elements who pushed for the adoption of their respective proposals. The election of the Sixty, however, signaled a "victory" for the radicals in terms of the increase in radical membership and the shifting orientation of the committee.<sup>135</sup> The Committee of Sixty contacted the outlying counties to request the convocation of a Provincial Convention to meet April 20, 1775.<sup>136</sup> The purpose for assembling the convention was to select New York delegates to attend the Second Continental Congress. The response to the summons of the committee indicated a "marked increase" in radical effectiveness with eight counties sending deputies to the convention. Four counties, however, took no action whatsoever (Charlotte, Cumberland, Tryon, Gloucester) and Richmond County flatly

---

134

Hunt, Provincial Committees Of Safety, p. 63;  
Flick, Loyalism In New York, p. 46.

135

Becker, History Of Political Parties, pp. 167-68.

136

Hunt, Provincial Committees Of Safety, pp. 63-64;  
Becker, History Of Political Parties, pp. 77; 186-87.

137  
 refused the invitation. The dissolution of the Provincial Convention (April 22, 1775) coincided with the news filtering into New York of the outbreak of conflict at Lexington.

Presented with the imminent threat of conflict within the province, the radicals perforce shifted into high gear. The county committees were again summoned to a Provincial Congress to commence May 22, 1775,<sup>138</sup> The New York City dispatch called for the selection of delegates to deliberate upon measures to promote the "common safety" of the province.<sup>139</sup> Moreover, the Committee of Sixty emphasized the necessity of electing deputies for a new committee to be comprised of one hundred members. With the election of the Committee of One Hundred completed May 1, 1775, this new body represented a de facto Whig provincial government

---

137

Becker, History Of Political Parties, p. 187.

138

New York City Call For A Provincial Congress, 28 April 1775, Calander of Historical Manuscripts Relating To The War Of The Revolution (Albany: Weed, Parsons and Co., 1865-66), I, p. 4, in Larry R. Gerlach, ed., The American Revolution: New York As A Case Study (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1972), pp. 69-70, hereafter cited as CHM.; Hunt, Provincial Committees Of Safety, pp. 63-64.

139

New York City Call For A Provincial Congress, 28 April 1775, CHM., pp. 69-70.

restoring order in New York City and replacing the moribund  
 140 colonial assembly. Thus, the invariable augmentation of  
 radical influence and control manifested in the Committees  
 of Sixty and One Hundred directed New York government until  
 the convergence of the Provincial Congress. The ascendancy  
 of the Provincial Congress marked the virtual collapse of  
 royal government in New York, whereupon Governor Tryon re-  
 treated to the British vessel Dutchess of Gordeon, not to  
 return until the British occupation of New York (September  
 141 1776). The Provincial Congress, in the form of a resolu-  
 tion issued May 29, 1775, strongly urged all New York coun-  
 ties to construct a network of committees to implement the  
 resolutions of the Provincial and Continental Congresses.  
 A concomitant section of the resolution impelled "every"  
 inhabitant to subscribe the general association in all dis-  
 142 tricts of their respective counties by July 15.

An important committee which played a decisive role  
 during the interim between sessions of the four Provincial  
 Congresses was the Committee of Safety. The first Committee

---

140

Becker, History Of Political Parties, pp. 197-98.

141

Flick, Loyalism In New York, p. 49.

142

Journals Of The Provincial Congress, 1775-1777  
 (Albany, N.Y., 1842), I, p. 18, in Gerlach, The American  
Revolution, pp. 77-78, hereafter cited as JPC.

of Safety was appointed July 8, 1775, during the two week  
 143  
 adjournment of the First Provincial Congress. The Com-  
 mittee of Safety assumed the function of Congress in actu-  
 ating resolutions and recommendations framed by the Provin-  
 cial Congress. The Committee served as a liaison monitor-  
 ing and co-ordinating the activities of the county and dis-  
 trict committees. The central focus of Committee responsi-  
 bility was military in nature, anticipating the military  
 exigencies of the province and dictating the corresponding  
 144  
 logistical directives.

The Second Committee of Safety sat from July 2 to  
 145  
 October 2, 1775, with increased duties to discharge. The  
 supervision of the county militia and the commission of mi-  
 litia officers rested within the purview of the committee.  
 The Third and Fourth Committees of Safety (December 1775-  
 May 1776) concentrated more power, possessed an expanded  
 scope of responsibility, and adopted a special function in  
 the overall framework of the committee corpus. These com-

---

143

Becker, History Of Political Parties, p. 211;  
 Hunt, Provincial Committees Of Safety, p. 64.

144

See Hunt, Provincial Committees Of Safety, pp.  
 64-66; Becker, History Of Political Parties, pp. 211-227.

145

Becker, History Of Political Parties, p. 211;  
 Hunt, Provincial Committees Of Safety, p. 64.



mittees assumed the traditional powers of enforcing the Provincial and Continental Congress fiats, but also acted as an operative standing body when the Congresses were in session.<sup>146</sup> The Committee possessed the authority to review the utilization of military material and wielded a carte blanche management of the provincial purse in the acquisition and dissemination of war material. Thus, the Committee of Safety served as an invaluable Revolutionary committee in insuring the continued operation of Whig government. The Committee performed the administrative assignments of the Provincial Congress in recess and exerted a stabilizing influence when a Convention quorum was unobtainable.

The salient resolution produced by the Third Provincial Congress was a call for the establishment of an independent state government, in compliance with the instructions of the Second Continental Congress. In a resolution dated May 27, 1776, the Provincial Congress stated that the right of framing a new civil government rested "in the people"; and recommended either the retention of present delegates or the election of new delegates for a new convention.<sup>147</sup> These delegates would come to the convention empowered to

---

146

Hunt, Provincial Committees Of Safety, pp. 67-68.

147

JPC., I, pp. 88-89.

erect a new internal form of government. Committees of Safety continued to act in concert with the Provincial Congress (summer 1776-spring 1777) until the meeting of the Fourth Provincial Congress. The Fourth Congress (May 8, 1777) appointed a "Council of Safety" to preserve administrative continuity until the new state government materialized.<sup>148</sup> Delegates were duly elected throughout the colony in June 1776 for the new Congress, the Fourth Provincial Congress, and on July 9, 1776 the Congress issued its Declaration of Independence.<sup>149</sup> This Declaration identified the reasons proffered by the Continental Congress for separation as "cogent and conclusive", and exhibited the province of New York's de jure recognition of the tenets of the Declaration of Independence. The Provincial Congress met as a New York convention of Representatives in July 1776 and on April 20, 1777 promulgated the New York State Constitution.<sup>150</sup> George Clinton, who had been General of the New York State militia and delegate to the Continental Congress, was elected the first Governor of the

---

148  
See Hunt, Provincial Committees of Safety, pp. 71-73.

149  
JPC., I, p. 92; Becker, History Of Political Parties, p. 273.

150  
JPC., I, pp. 98-109, 68.

state of New York. The first House of Assembly and Senate  
151  
convened at Kingston on September 9, 1777.

Throughout the various stages of the metamorphosis of New York from a colony to a state, Tryon County had played a quiescent and uncertain role. The local committees were painstakingly organized in Tryon, while the Johnsons indefatigably launched counteractive campaigns. The county, or more specifically the Tryon delegates, were not active participants in New York City through the aforementioned stages of transformation. The following events demonstrate the conspicuous absence of Tryon representation in the New York extra-legal committees until the late date of April 1776: 1) in response to the June 22, 1774 circular letter of the Committee of Fifty-One, Tryon County conveyed no interest to take part in the matter; 2) Tryon did not respond to the second circular letter of the Fifty-One sent July 29, 1774 requesting the election of delegates for the Continental Congress; 3) the Tryon County committees could not comply with the March 16, 1775 directive of the Fifty-One to circulate the association due to the machinations of the Johnsons; 4) in March 1775 Tryon took no action at the directive of the Committee of Sixty to send deputies for a

---

151

Editorial Introduction, Hugh Hastings, ed. The Public Papers Of George Clinton, First Governor Of New York, 1777-1795, 1801-1804 (New York and Albany: The State Of New York, 1899-1914), I, pp. 98-99.

Provincial Convention (held April 20, 1775); 5) on April 28 the Committee of Sixty again requested the election of delegates for a Provincial Convention--the Tryon County committee "appointed" two deputies on June 11, three weeks after the opening of the convention (the delegates arrived June 21); 6) the Tryon County representative on the First Committee of Safety was P.V.B. Livingston of New York City--in accordance with regulations, unrepresented counties at the Congress were represented by a member of the New York City delegation; 7) Tryon did meet the November 7, 1775 summons to elect delegates for the Provincial Congress, however, the delegates did not arrive until February 12, contributing to the nagging complications of raising a quorum; 8) in April 1776, elections were held in Tryon County for the Third Provincial Congress delegates without any recorded difficulty. <sup>152</sup>

Tryon County's record of participation at the provincial level did not equal the notable activist counties of Kings and Orange, or the moderately activist achievements of Albany. Tryon's contributions were comparable to those of the coterminous upstate county of Charlotte. The reasons for the quiescent Tryon posture until April 1776 can be attributed to the following factors: the early and persistent efforts of the Johnsons to thwart the development of Whig

committee formation; the intangible but ever present psychological intimidation commanded by the Johnson close relationship with the Six Nations; the communication gaps and transportation time factor given the geographic location far removed from New York City; and the presence of only one strong district committee until the gradual construction of a county-wide Whig organization. Even though Tryon County attracted no special notice in most of the provincial bodies, it should not be inferred that the committee system was non-existent on the county level. The committee system developed slowly in four of Tryon County's five districts, so that nearly a year elapsed before the districts met as a unified, organized assemblage. Sir John Johnson, Guy Johnson, and their political fraternity exerted an intimidating presence in Tryon County prior to the outbreak of hostilities. The truly intense Loyalist sentiment was rooted solely in one district of the county, the Mohawk District.<sup>153</sup> The Whig sentiment predominated in the other four districts of the county, and was conspicuously evident in the German Palatine District.<sup>154</sup> Therefore, even though

---

153

Bernard Mason, The Road To Independence: The Revolutionary Movement In New York, 1773-1777 (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1966), p. 89; Frothingham, Montgomery County History, p. 74; Crary, The Price Of Loyalty, p. 70.

154

Frothingham, Montgomery County History, p. 74.

the committee system was initially weak and constrained in Tryon, it nevertheless drew upon a generative base with the Whigs decidedly outnumbering the Loyalists.

Tryon County was the first county in New York to form a "county" committee of correspondence. At a Palatine district meeting August 27, 1774, the inhabitants in attendance issued a set of resolves in which a standing committee of correspondence was appointed. <sup>155</sup> The substantive sections of the nine resolves recognized King George III as the "lawful and Rightful Lord and Soverign" of Great Britain; pledged loyalty to British law if consistent with the "constitutional rights and liberties" of British subjects; stated that the colonists possessed an "undeniable priviledge" to be taxed by their "own consent"; declared the Boston Port Act "oppressive and arbitrary"; pledged aid to the Bostonians; commended the general Continental Congress as a "salutary measure"; agreed to obey resolutions produced by Congress; appointed Christopher P. Yates, Isaac Paris, John Frey and Andrew Fink as the nucleus of the county committee; urged the printed copy of the proceedings distributed to the other districts and encouraged the formation of district committees. <sup>156</sup> The Johnsons and Butlers actively discouraged

---

155

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, pp. 17-19;  
Flick, Loyalism In New York, p. 78.

156

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, pp. 17-19.

any type of Whig meetings in the Mohawk Valley. Sir John Johnson, Guy Johnson, Joseph Brant, and a band of Johnson retainers disbanded a Whig meeting with a show of force at Caughawaga in September 1774.<sup>157</sup> In the spring of 1775, a court convened at Johnstown in which the magistrates and grand jury drafted, endorsed, and circulated a Loyalist association condemning the measures supported by the Continental Congress.<sup>158</sup>

The threatening intrusiveness of the Johnsons was an incessant preoccupation of the Tryon County committee subsequent to the commencement of the Revolutionary War. Notwithstanding the fact that the Johnsons possessed an actual predominance in only the Mohawk District, the county committee proceeded gingerly because of the apprehensiveness that existed concerning Guy Johnson's relationship with the Six Nations. In a letter dispatched May 18, 1775 to the Albany county committee, the Tryon committee indicated its concern on hearing that Johnson Hall was being fortified and assured Albany that the Indians would be closely watched.<sup>159</sup> The following extract highlights a telling disclo-

---

157

Frothingham, Montgomery County History, p. 75.

158

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, p. 20; Mason Road To Independence, p. 88.

159

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, pp. 21-23.

sure of the county committee's standing in May 1775:

This county has, for a series of years, been ruled by one family, the different branches of which are still strenuous in dissuading people from coming into congressional measures, and even have last week at a numerous meeting of the Mohawk district, appeared with all their deputies armed to oppose the people considering their grievances; their number being so large, and the people unarmed, struck terror into most of them, and they dispersed. . . . As we are a young county, remote from your metropolis, we beg you will give us all the intelligence in your power, We shall not be able to send down any deputies to the provincial congress, as we cannot possibly obtain the sense of the county soon enough to make it worth our while to send any, but be assured, we are not the less attached to American liberty.<sup>160</sup>

Colonel Guy Johnson, superintendent of Northern Indian Affairs, became a central figure of committee attention during the summer of 1775. Guy Johnson sent a letter (May 20, 1775) to the magistrates in the upper districts of New York informing them of his precarious situation in Tryon County.<sup>161</sup> According to Johnson, rumors circulated that a band of New Englanders planned to seize him because he was inciting the Indians. Johnson issued a warning to discourage any antagonistic actions directed toward him or his family: "All men must allow, that if the Indians find their council fire disturbed, and their superintendent insulted, they will take a

---

160

Ibid.

161

Minute Book Of The Committee Of Safety, Tryon County (New York: 1905, p. 125), in Crary, The Price Of Loyalty, pp. 71-72.



162

dreadful revenge". The Albany committee corresponded with Guy Johnson concerning this matter. The committee dismissed the rumors as "ridiculous and malicious" reports most likely spread by Tryon Tories to excite the Indians. <sup>163</sup> Following their admonition of Colonel Johnson, the committee reminded him of his responsibilities as superintendent to maintain peace in the region.

The Tryon county committee manifested its disdain for the obstructive maneuvers which the Johnsons were engineering in the Mohawk Valley in the form of a resolution censuring Colonel Guy Johnson. <sup>164</sup> Upon receiving news that certain Indians were preparing to support Guy Johnson at Guy Park, the Tryon committee immediately alerted its neighboring county and made an appeal for assistance. In a letter sent to the Albany committee May 20, 1775, the Tryon committee notified Albany that it had instructed Tryon inhabitants to ready themselves with "arms and ammunition" to meet any contingency. <sup>165</sup> The letter revealed the progress of committee development in the districts other than the Palatine. Eight months had elapsed since the formation of the Palatine

---

162

Ibid.

163

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, p. 28.

164

Ibid, p. 25.

165

Ibid, p. 26.

committee of correspondence and as yet the other districts had not solidified viable committees. The correspondence was sanguine in tenor anticipating the forthcoming consolidation of district committee organization:

We are sorry to inform you that all communication with your county is entirely stopped by Col. Johnson. . . Tomorrow is to be a meeting of Canajoharie District, when we expect they will adopt Congressional measures very heartily, and we propose to have a meeting of both districts, and propose the question whether we will not open the communication by force. . . We have just sent off an express to the German Flatts and Kingsland districts, desiring them to unite with us and give us their assistance; which districts, or at least a great majority of them, we are credibly informed, are very hearty in the present struggle for American liberty. We are, gentlemen, perhaps in a worse situation than any part of America is at present, We have an open enemy before our faces, and treacherous friends at our backs, for which reason we hope you will take our case into your immediate consideration. . .<sup>166</sup>

The response of the Albany committee was negative relative to direct assistance, informing Tryon County that no material would be forthcoming. Moreover, the Albany committee strongly suggested that the Tryon Whigs not attempt to forcibly open channels of communication and thereby unnecessarily incense the Loyalists.

Nine and a half months after the initial meeting of the Palatine committee, on June 2, 1775, a meeting of the Tryon County committee was convoked. All of the district

---

166

Ibid, pp. 26-27.

167

Ibid, p. 29.

committees participated, including the Mohawk representatives, marking the first time the entire county was convoked.<sup>168</sup> During the same month, Colonel Guy Johnson abandoned Guy Park for Fort Stanwix and then Ontario to attend an Indian council. John Butler, Walter Butler, Joseph Brant, and a small party of Loyalists accompanied Colonel Johnson, who thereafter travelled to Oswego and Montreal.<sup>169</sup> Colonel Johnson remained securely in Canada beyond the extended reach of the Continental Congress and the menacing county committees. Utilizing Canada as a base of operations during the war, Guy Johnson bolstered the Loyalist leadership in directing Loyalist-Indian forays into western New York. The ardent Loyalists who remained in Tryon County turned to Sir John Johnson for protection and direction at the Loyalist

---

168

The following list contains the names of the Tryon County Committee Representatives. Palatine District: Christopher P. Yates, John Frey, Andrew Fink, Andrew Reeber, Peter Waggoner, Daniel McDougal, Jacob Klock, George Ecker, Jr., Harmanus Van Slyck, Christopher W. Fox, Anthony Van Veghten; Canajoharie District: Nicholas Herkimer, Ebenezer Cox, William Seeber, John Moore, Samuel Campbell, Thomas Henry, John Pickard; Kingsland and German Flatts Districts: Edward Wall, William Petry, John Petry, Augustine Hess, Frederick Orendorf, Geroge Wentz, Mitchell Ittig, Frederick Fox, George Herkimer, Duncan McDougal, Frederick Helmer, John Frink; Mohawk District: John Morlett, John Bliven, Abraham Van Horne, Adam Fonda, Frederick Fisher, Sampson Simmons, William Schuyler, Volkert Veeder, James McMaster, Daniel Lane. Ibid, pp. 31-32.

169

While en route to Fort Stanwix, Col. Johnson relocated his family and retainers from Guy Park to Cosby's Manor, north of German Flatts. Frothingham, Montgomery County History, p. 78; Campbell, Annals Of Tyron County, pp. 39 and 44.

170

stronghold on the Mohawk, Johnson Hall. The sudden departure of Guy Johnson permitted the district committees an opportunity to crystallize their structural organization, organize the county militia, accelerate the arrest and imprisonment of disaffected inhabitants, and concentrate on the remaining citadel of loyalism in the county--Johnson

171

Hall. The Tryon County militia was raised in August 1775. The county committee divided the militia into four battalions and commissioned Colonel Nicholas Herkimer the

172

commander. The committee maintained close surveillance of all irregular movements around Johnson Hall. Guy Johnson and Sir John Johnson, however, continued to enjoy an active correspondence, utilizing Indian expresses to shuttle information from upstate New York to Canada. The

173

county committee alerted the New York Provincial Congress of Sir John Johnson's ominous position in the county. In

---

170

Frothingham, Montgomery County History, p. 78.

171

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, p. 44.

172

The four battalions were subdivided into the following corresponding districts: First Battalion, Canajoharie District, Col. Nicholas Herkimer; Second Battalion, Palatine District, Col. Jacob Klock; Third Battalion, Mohawk District, Col. Frederick Visscher; Fourth Battalion, Kingsland and German Flatts Districts, Col. Hanyoost Herkimer. Frothingham, Montgomery County History, pp. 82-83; Crary, The Price Of Loyalty, p. 71; Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, p. 46.

173

Frothingham, Montgomery County History, pp. 78-79; Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, p. 47.

a missive dated September 7, 1775, the county committee related the various activities of the "proved enemies against our association and regulations thereof".<sup>174</sup> The committee implored the assistance of the Provincial Congress to counter Sir John's indomitable entrenchment. The response of the Provincial Congress was one that encouraged the committee to keep the local situation manageable and not provoke the Loyalist leader. The Congress recommended that Sir John remain unmolested so long as he rested "inactive".<sup>175</sup>

Although the New York Provincial Congress initiated no decisive countermeasures in September 1775 to combat Sir John Johnson, by December the condition in Tryon County captured the attention of the Continental Congress. A special Committee of Investigation filed a report with the Continental Congress, indicating that arms and ammunition were reportedly being stored in Tryon County. The Continental Congress perceived this potential Tory threat as warranting an immediate response, and consequently dispatched an order to General Schuyler of Albany County to neutralize Tryon Coun-

---

174

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, p. 47.

175

Ibid, p. 49.

176  
 ty. General Schuyler proceeded to raise a detachment of men who worked in concert with the Tryon County militia in the defusing operation. The alarming stories of the Johnson fortifications and collusion with the Indians were blown out of proportion in actuality. A false affidavit filed by Johnathan French, Jr. with the Tryon committee and forwarded to Albany, provided what General Schuyler termed "ostensible reasons for raising the militia".<sup>177</sup> Following three days of negotiations in obtaining agreement to a surrender treaty, with Mohawk Indian sachems acting as mediators, General Schuyler received Sir John as a prisoner January 19, 1776. General Schuyler confiscated the arms and munitions at Johnson Hall, which he described as "a much smaller quan-

---

176

December 30, 1775. "Resolved, that the said committee be directed to communicate intelligence with General Schuyler, and in the name of Congress desire to take the most speedy and effectual measures for securing the said arms and military stores, and for disarming the said Tories, and apprehending their chiefs". Thomas Jones, History Of New York During The Revolutionary War (New York: New York Historical Society, 1879; reprint ed., New York: Arno Press, Inc., 1968), I, p. 578; See Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, p. 50; Flick, Loyalism In New York, p. 86.

177

The affidavit of Johnathan French, Jr. stated that a certain woman relayed information that Sir John Johnson was fortifying Johnson Hall and had-called 300 Indians to the Hall. Jones, History Of New York, I, p. 578.

tity than I expected"; and on the 20th of January rounded up the arms of two hundred to three hundred Scotch Highlanders.<sup>178</sup>

Sir John Johnson was paroled after his capture to the custody of General Schuyler. Reacting to the recurrent prodding of the Albany committee, however, Schuyler announced (May 10) his intention of making Sir John a "close prisoner".<sup>179</sup> Once made a close prisoner, Sir John was to be delivered to General Washington through the Albany committee. Colonel Elias Dayton arrived at Johnstown May 19 with orders abrogating Sir John's parole and accompanying instructions to seize Johnson and the Highlanders immediately. But, Johnson had received Schuyler's message by express prior to Dayton's arrival and chose to abandon Johnson Hall with his Highland tenants, retiring to Sac-<sup>180</sup>ondaga and then on to Montreal. Sir John fled to Canada with his Scotch retinue as had his predecessors, the Butlers and Guy Johnson. The departure of the last of the Johnsons signaled both a symbolic and real triumph for the Tryon County Whigs. The Whigs thereafter received no political opposition of any consequence following the May

---

178

Ibid, I, p. 581.

179

Ibid, I, p. 584.

180

Ibid, I, pp. 586-87.

19, 1776 Loyalist exodus. The occasional flareups of Tory defiance in the county were quickly extinguished through the channels of the committees of safety.<sup>181</sup>

The only remaining Loyalists in the county were those who passively persisted in a dormant state, anxiously awaiting a Johnson resurgence; or the fence sitters on the borders of the county, willing to placate either side in order to retain possession of their meager holdings. The Whigs could cherish the euphoric months of tranquility in which they commanded a free reign of government in Tryon County. Nevertheless, the displaced Tryon Loyalists had not expressed a final farewell to their Whig neighbors. It was only too soon that internecine border warfare re-established contact between the two opposition factions in the county.

---

181

Frothingham, Montgomery County History, pp. 80-81.



## CHAPTER IV

INTERNECINE WARFARE ON THE FRONTIER: THE  
DISINTEGRATION OF TRYON COUNTY, 1777-1781

The excitement of recent accomplishments, sense of internal security, and relative calm which the Tryon Whigs experienced immediately after the abrupt departure of the Johnsons was short-lived. The inhabitants of Tryon County had to withstand repeated reports of British-Loyalist mobilization, coupled with the rumored British organization of Indian forces along the frontier. Since Tryon's proximity to the Canadian border provided a virtual gateway into western New York, the recorded apprehension of the inhabitants was a well-founded concern. In most cases, the reports relayed exaggerated estimations of British troop strength on the eve of the Burgoyne expedition, only serving to further augment the increasing alarm widespread throughout the county. Tryon County served as one stage in the unsuccessful three-pronged Burgoyne expedition of 1777. For the western frontier of New York, this expedition represented the last major British offensive mobilized for the duration of the war; for Tryon County, the checkmate of the expedition marked the commencement of five years of tempestuous border warfare. The planned diversionary expedition through Tryon

County, directed by Lieutenant-Colonel Barry St. Leger, coincided with General Burgoyne's advance on Albany. The St. Leger offensive signified the principal British military effort generated within the boundaries of Tryon County. St. Leger's failure to reduce Fort Stanwix and subsequent retreat spared the Mohawk Valley from the immediate danger of a British advance. At the same time, the adverse consequence of the 1777 campaign dictated the adoption of a defensive British military posture along the New York-Canadian border, ushering in a succession of indefensible Loyalist-Indian forays into Tryon County.

The anxiety of the local inhabitants and misgivings of the Tryon Whig committees was lessened somewhat with the arrival of Continental troops in Johnstown and German Flatts in the spring of 1776. <sup>182</sup> Colonels Van Schaick and Dayton commanded the Continental detachments relegated to Tryon County. In order to provide a security outpost in defense of the Mohawk Valley, General Schuyler ordered Colonel Dayton (June 1776) to construct a fortress at the site of old Fort Stanwix, a fortification previously utilized by the French. Colonel Dayton initiated construction of the fortress with the aid of the Tryon County militia, and in April

---

182

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, p. 59.

1777 Colonel Peter Gansevoort was appointed to complete the project with his Third New York Continentals.<sup>183</sup>

The British ministry very early developed contingency plans for a military offensive based from Canada to bring New York colony under British control. Lieutenant General John Burgoyne committed to writing (February 1777) his own contingency plans for the reduction of Crown Point and Ticonderoga, with the ultimate objective of achieving a rendezvous with General Howe.<sup>184</sup> In these plans sketched by Burgoyne, he expressed the view that a diversionary expedition through Ontario and Oswego--descending through the Mohawk Valley--would provide a "highly desirable" offensive complement. Burgoyne estimated that the diversionary expedition should consist of no more than Sir John Johnson's Corps, a hundred British (Second Brigade), a hundred of the Eighth Brigade, four light artillery, and a body of Indians.<sup>185</sup> In a correspondence from Colonial Secretary Lord George Germaine to Governor Guy Carleton (dated Whitehall 26 March 1777), Germaine instructed Carleton to defend Quebec and detach Burgoyne to

---

183

Jones, History Of New York, I, p. 701; Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, pp. 59-60.

184

Thoughts For Conducting The War From The Side Of Canada, 28 February, 1777, John Burgoyne, A State Of The Expedition From Canada (London: J. Almon, printer, 1780; reprint ed., New York: Arno Press, Inc., 1969), Appendix No. III, pp. x-xi.

185

Ibid, p. xi.

186

effect a link-up with General Howe. Germaine emphasized that a juncture of the two armies was a necessity to secure a speedy termination of the rebellion. Consequently, Germaine authorized the Burgoyne Albany expedition and the simultaneous St. Leger Mohawk expedition, stressing that his Majesty "strongly" recommended the employment of Canadians and Indians in both operations. St. Leger was ordered, if successful, to proceed down the Mohawk to Albany and place his force under the command of Sir William Howe. Burgoyne arrived in Quebec on the 6th of May and notified Germaine that preparations were being made for the descent into New York.

188

The months of May and June 1777 were tremulous months for the inhabitants of Tryon County. New York Whig-Loyalist William Smith in neighboring Albany County revealed that on May 15 he was informed "180 men" of Colonel Willet's Corps were en route to defend Fort Stanwix. Smith echoed con-

189

186

Lord George Germaine to Guy Carleton, 26 March 1777, Ibid, Appendix No. IV, pp. xii-xvi.

187

Ibid, p. xiii.

188

Lieutenant General Burgoyne to Lord George Germaine, 14 May 1777, Ibid, Appendix No. V, pp. xvii-xviii.

189

William H.W. Sabine, ed., Historical Memoirs Of William Smith From 16 March 1763 to 12 November 1783 (New York: New York Times and Arno Press, 1969 and 1971), I, p. 139.

temporary apprehensions that a revolt was rumored to erupt in Tryon County. The externally induced uprising was reportedly designed to supplement British mobilization in Canada, and was allegedly to be directed by Captain McAlpine, Colonel Butler (from Niagara), and a band of disaffected Indians. Although no such revolt materialized in May 1777, this report illustrated the state of alarm which pervaded the county. Each incoming communication of Loyalist-Indian movement along the border triggered an immediate crisis response. Tryon County experienced recurrent intervals of emergency preparedness and then welcome relief once spared from the jeopardy of rumored false alarms. Furthermore, these abrupt calls for defense exposed the vulnerability of Tryon County, daily taxing the emotions, energies, manpower, and domestic production of the inhabitants.

On July 11, Burgoyne informed Germaine that Ticonderoga had been captured and the main expedition was proceeding from Skenesborough.<sup>190</sup> More importantly, Burgoyne relayed that a party of Indians had been sent through the woods to St. Leger,<sup>191</sup> urging his immediate departure for the Mohawk.

---

190

For an account of the remainder of Burgoyne's Albany expedition, See Connelly, "Failure of Loyalism", pp. 55-60.

191

"Now is the critical time for his push upon the Mohawk. I have certain intelligence that all the country round Fort Stanwix is in alarm. . ." Lieutenant General Burgoyne to Lord George Germaine, 11 July 1777, Burgoyne, State Of The Expedition, Appendix No. VIII, p. xxxix.

The Tryon county committee diligently recruited troops from the militia and Continental ranks to defend the Fort Stanwix outpost. Unable to raise a satisfactory force, Brigadier General Nicholas Herkimer made public a proclamation (July 17) ordering a standby militia call for every male inhabitant from "16 to 60 years of age".<sup>192</sup> Shortly thereafter, the Tryon committee received a letter from Thomas Spencer (dated Oneida July 29) warning of the imminent arrival of the Kings troops at Fort Stanwix.<sup>193</sup> General Herkimer at once led a party of 800 militia and supplies to reinforce the outpost, reaching Oriskany Creek August 5, 1777, some five and a half miles from the fort.<sup>194</sup>

In the meantime, Colonel St. Leger steadily proceeded forward from Lachine with approximately 1700 men and invested Fort Stanwix August 3, 1777.<sup>195</sup> The figures describ-

---

192

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, p. 61; Jones, History Of New York, I, p. 700.

193

Thomas Spencer alerted the committee that British troops were four days away from the fort. Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, p. 62.

194

Ibid, p. 64; Jones, History Of New York, I, p. 700; Sosin, Revolutionary Frontier, pp. 112-114; John Albert Scott, "Joseph Brant At Fort Stanwix And Oriskany," New York State Historical Association, XXXVI (1938), p. 401.

195

Colonel St. Leger's Account Of Occurances At Fort Stanwix, 27 August 1777, Burgoyne, State Of The Expedition, Appendix No. XIII, p. lxxvii.

ing the composition of the St. Leger expedition varied somewhat, however, it was generally agreed that the opposing Continental forces of Colonel Gansevoort numbered approximately 600 inside the fort.<sup>196</sup> St. Leger did not immediately attack the fort at full strength, but divided his regulars in executing carefully planned phases of the operation. While a limited force primarily composed of Indians initiated the siege, the remainder of the expedition was preoccupied with two pressing logistical concerns. St. Leger devoted two days in opening Wood Creek, a strategically important artery which the Tryon Whigs had effectively barricaded as an obstacle.<sup>197</sup> The Tryon militia had beforehand felled trees blocking up a 20 mile stretch of the creek, utilizing 150 men in the two week project. St. Leger's second concern was the construction of an access road through 25 miles of woods in order to transport the artillery within range of the fortress.<sup>198</sup> St.

---

196

J.A. Scott listed the St. Leger expedition at 1400--200 British, 80 German rifles, 380 Royal Yorkers, 70 rangers, 50 Canadians, 20 artillery, 600 Indians; Jack Sosin estimated St. Leger's troop strength at 1700 Tories and Indians; Thomas Jones listed the St. Leger force at 1675--200 British Regulars, 342 German Chasseurs, 133 Sir John Johnson's Royal Greens, 1000 Indians under Joseph Brant. Scott, "Fort Stanwix And Oriskany," p. 401; Sosin, Revolutionary Frontier, p. 113; Jones, History Of New York, I, p. 700.

197

Colonel Claus to Secretary Knox, 16 October 1777, Doc. Rel. To N.Y. Col. Hist., VIII, p. 718; Colonel St. Leger's Account of Occurances At Fort Stanwix, 27 August 1777, Burgoyne, State Of The Expedition, p. lxxvii.

198

Ibid.

Leger received news on August 5 that General Herkimer's reinforcement party had reached the nearby Indian village of Oriska. The British Colonel quickly ordered Sir John Johnson and Colonel Butler with a force of rangers, regulars, and Indians to intercept the Herkimer advance. The successful British ambush of Herkimer's column constituted a stunning setback for the Rebels. The outcome of the Battle of Oriskany was devastating for the Rebels: 200 killed, 200 wounded and taken prisoner, the remainder escaping in the confusion, and the permanent loss of General Herkimer, who died of wounds incurred in the pitched battle.

The Tryon County losses were great when considered in terms of the depletion in fighting capability and the leadership vacuum of key positions on Whig committees. Most of the Tryon committee membership joined Herkimer in the e-

---

199

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, pp. 69-72; Scott, "Fort Stanwix And Oriskany," pp. 401-02; Col. St. Leger's Account Of Occurances At Fort Stanwix, 27 August 1777, Burgoyne, State Of The Expedition, p. lxxviii; W.M. Beauchamp, "Indian Raids In The Mohawk Valley," New York State Historical Association Proceedings, XIV (1915), p. 200.

200

Ibid.



201

mergency reinforcement march. Although the Indian losses in the Tory camp were numerically less than the Rebel losses, and the Indian unit emerged practically intact, their minimal losses had a debilitating effect on morale and future Indian enthusiasm for the British expedition. Some 100 Indian warriors were killed, 30 of whom were Senecas, and among those killed were key sachems of the tribes. 202 On the heels of St. Leger's devastating victory, he attempted to seize the fort and take advantage of the Indian discontent which had surfaced. After one surrender overture of Colonel Butlers' was rebuffed by the Rebels in the fort, St. Leger sent a message to Colonel Gansevoort repeating the surrender demand. St. Leger emphasized that the Whigs were surely "without resource" given the defeat of Herkimer, the reported gains of Burgoyne to the east, and the difficulty of controlling the Indians over the loss of their warriors.

---

201

The following are some of the key figures lost to the county: Cols. Cox, Seeber; Senator Isaac Paris; Assemblyman Jacob Snell; Majors Eisinlord, Klepsattle, Van Slyvk; Capt. Graves; Indian interpreter Thomas Spencer; John Frey and Col. Bellenger taken prisoner; Assemblyman Michael Ittig deserted to the British. Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, pp. 74 and 77; The Committee Of Tryon County to George Clinton, 7 September 1777, Hastings, Clinton Papers, II, p. 284.

202

Col. St. Leger's Account Of Occurances At Fort Stanwix, 27 August 1777, Burgoyne, State Of The Expedition, pp. lxxviii-lxxix; Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, p. 74.

St. Leger concluded with the following postscript for greater impact in convincing the Rebels to surrender:

I expect an immediate answer, as the Indians are extremely impatient; and if this proposal is rejected, I am afraid it will be attended with very fatal consequences, not only to you and your garrison, but the whole country down the Mohawk River; such consequence as would be very repugnant to my sentiments of humanity, but after this entirely out of my power to prevent.<sup>203</sup>

The British demands were rejected by Gansevoort, who planned to defend the fort to the last man. The St. Leger assault was stepped up and diligently continued, but was unsuccessful in penetrating the fort due to the ineffectiveness of the light artillery employed by the British.<sup>204</sup> General Schuyler feared the short term consequences for Tryon and Albany counties, and the long term entanglement for New York in the event that Fort Stanwix was reduced. Consequently, Schuyler dispatched General Benedict Arnold with 900 troops and General Learned with a trailing force to repulse St. Leger and the Loyalists.<sup>205</sup> St. Leger experienced the dual problem of maintaining morale amidst the confusion of the

---

203

Jones, History Of New York, I, p. 217; Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, pp. 78-79.

204

Col. St. Leger's Account Of Occurances At Fort Stanwix, 27 August 1777, Burgoyne, State Of The Expedition, p. lxxx; Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, p. 80.

205

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, p. 81.

siege and formulating prospective offensive strategy in the face of increasingly inflated reports of the Arnold advance. The British Colonel observed that the "same zeal no longer animated the Indians" because of their lost tribal leaders, intelligence reports revealing Burgoyne's degenerating position to the east, and news of Arnold's swift approach.<sup>206</sup>

With each incoming intelligence report, the numbers of the Arnold force markedly increased, while his progress en route correspondingly gained momentum. At one point, St. Leger agreed to personally command an offensive attack combining the forces of the British regulars, Loyalists, and Indians; but rumor triumphed over the reality of the military situation, dictating the prostration of the Mohawk expedition. The Indians decamped and deserted the British encampment in sizeable numbers. Since the Indians comprised the largest component in the expedition, St. Leger was forced to lift the siege on August 22, retreating to Oswego.<sup>207</sup> At the time of St. Leger's sudden departure, Benedict Arnold was in fact some 40 miles away at Fort Dayton.

Although St. Leger assigned culpability for the quick British exodus on the intractability of the Indians,<sup>208</sup> and

---

206

Col. St. Leger's Account Of Occurances At Fort Stanwix, 27 August 1777, Burgoyne, State Of The Expedition, p. lxxxii.

207

Ibid, p. lxxxiii; Scott, "Fort Stanwix and Oriskany," p. 402.

even though the Indian unwillingness to persist did precipitate the termination of offensive operations, the ultimate blame for the failure to reduce Fort Stanwix must rest with St. Leger. St. Leger started the expedition equipped with the men and material recommended in the Burgoyne contingency plans, including what proved to be the significant factor in the campaign--light artillery. The British commander decided to move on the inaccurate reports of Colonel Butler concerning the standing of Fort Stanwix instead of the exact intelligence gleaned by a reconnoitering mission directed by Daniel Claus. Colonel Butler estimated the armed force inside the fortification a small band of 60 men; whereas Daniel Claus discerned that there were 600 regulars manning the well-<sup>209</sup> fortified structure. St. Leger failed early on in the campaign to requisition heavier artillery to bolster the foot soldiers in the Mohawk expedition. Sir Henry Clinton, General Howe's successor as Commander-in-Chief in America, subsequently observed that the Mohawk route would have represented an alternative course to Albany for the principal expedition. Clinton remarked:

If Burgoyne meant to have established himself in Albany, and was sure he could be subsisted there, perhaps he had better have made this his principle attack; this failed from inadequacy of numbers and want of cannon of calibre.<sup>210</sup>

---

209

Crary, The Price Of Loyalty, pp. 241-42.

210

Jones, History Of New York, I, p. 703.

On receiving news of St. Leger's impasse at Fort Stanwix, Burgoyne indicated that he did consider the feasibility of quickly advancing from his position at Stillwater and thereby indirectly aiding St. Leger. Burgoyne dismissed this rapid movement forward, however, which he characterized at the time as of the "utmost consequence" given the British military position.<sup>211</sup> Burgoyne contended that sound military judgement dictated retention of the "favorable opportunity" which his forces enjoyed. A sudden thrust would have endangered the consequent spreading out of supply lines from Fort George.

The St. Leger retreat spared Tryon County from impending peril and freed western New York from a British link-up with Burgoyne. The Mohawk expedition, however, touched off the initial phase of civil warfare between Loyalists and Whigs in Tryon County. At the Battle of Oriskany, Sir John Johnson's Loyalist band engaged in combat with their former Whig neighbors and relatives from Tryon. The utilization of the Indians and Loyalists by the British intensified the fears and hardened the determination of the Tryon Whigs. This ill-fated reunion had a deleterious effect upon the Loyalists' uncertain position. The British void in upstate New York created by the St. Leger retreat and the eventual

---

211

John Burgoyne to Lord George Germaine, 20 August 1777, Burgoyne, State Of The Expedition, Appendix No. VIII, p. xl.

Burgoyne defeat exposed those Loyalists who conspicuously surfaced to a renewed cycle of persecution. In Tryon County, those Loyalists who committed themselves by taking to the woodlands were fined and subject to imprisonment on their return.<sup>212</sup> Furthermore, Tryon Loyalists were ostracised by local merchants, their wives and children were removed from the county, and a committee of sequestration was authorized to confiscate the property of those who joined the British. Once the Loyalists who had quietly waited in isolation ardently committed themselves and were then abandoned by St. Leger, the options available were none too attractive. Loyalists could return to Tryon County to face certain persecution, escape to one of the Canadian Loyalist settlements and an uncertain future, or if desirous of an active role,<sup>213</sup> attempt to reach Burgoyne north of Albany.

The defenseless frontier presented a profusion of problems for Tryon County during the sober respite following Fort Stanwix, but even more so as the war years progressed. The foremost consideration was the very nature of the exten-

---

212

Mabel G. Walker, "Sir John Johnson, Loyalist," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, III (1916), p. 336; The Committee Of Tryon County to George Clinton, Hastings, Clinton Papers, II, p. 283.

213

Some Loyalists travelled great distances to join the British military effort, from locations as far away as Wyoming (on the Susquehanna River west of West Point), Mathews, Mark Of Honour, p. 211.

sive Tryon frontier. The vulnerability of the scattered outpost settlements rendered the exposed county literally defenseless, given the minimal resources of the local militia and the limited assistance extended by the preoccupied Continental forces throughout the war. Tryon County was thus entrapped in a paralyzed position. The inhabitants had to futilely ward off the guerrilla attacks of the Loyalists and Indians, while watching the gradual but progressive deterioration of their once productive lands. Moreover, the county was continually encouraged by the New York state government to persevere and stand its ground, while in the same breath repeated appeals for additional protection from Kingston were denied.

The demands made upon the Tryon Whig population were numerous. The dislocation of regular local agrarian activity was further strained by the local production of grain for external priorities of the Continental army. The incessant answer to militia calls by the male residents left wives, children, and the aged to continue cultivation wherever possible. The Tryon militia units were subject to relocation throughout New York when summoned by Governor Clinton. The vigilant posting of sentinels to monitor the enemy movement and approach continued to be a necessary precaution. Besides the extant defensive forts in the country, auxiliary forti-

214

fications were erected on the outskirts of the frontier. These latter fortifications were more accurately house forts, that is, fortified houses utilized as places of refuge by small settlements too far removed from the major forts. The maintenance of a viable militia presented a very real predicament for the Tryon County committee. The county committee's problem was twofold: 1) due to the varying lengths of the militia stints, it was a complex task to sustain a coherent militia battalion, 2) the absence of qualified indigenous militia leadership following the death of General Herkimer plagued Tryon County throughout the war. <sup>215</sup> Desertion represented an invariable hindrance,

while the raising of paid volunteers to pursue the Indians on the frontier provided a device easily exploited by necessitous individuals. Scores of volunteers prematurely deserted their military units once in possession of the £ 30 <sup>216</sup> paid for several months service. In addition to the numerous sacrifices already made in various forms, the inhabi-

214

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, pp. 90-97; Beauchamp, "Indian Raids In Mohawk," p. 204.

215

Jacob Ford to General Abraham Ten Broeck, 18 July 1778, Hastings, Clinton Papers, III, p. 556; Governor Clinton to The Tryon Committee, 26 April 1779, Ibid, IV, p. 761; Tryon Citizens to Governor Clinton, 28 September 1778, Ibid, IV, p. 118.

216

Sabine, Smith Memoirs, II, p. 264.



tants of Tryon were called on at the close of 1777 to help raise a tax assessed to New York state by the Continental Congress. The burden of the £ 80,000 assessed New York fell upon the counties of Orange, Dutchess, Ulster, Albany, and Tryon.<sup>217</sup> The downstate counties of New York, that region under British control since the British occupation in the fall of 1776, was therefore excluded from the Whig finance raising measure.

In examining the lively correspondence between Governor Clinton and the Tryon committee throughout the war years, two predominant themes are discernible: 1) the recurrent appeals for financial and other available material aid, 2) the recurrent appeals imploring protection on the frontier in the form of Continental troops or militia units from contiguous counties. A close examination of the Whig petitions cogently highlights the menacing and irrepressible nature of the desultory Loyalist-Indian forays. Following the Fort Stanwix defensive stand of August 1777, the rest of the year was devoted to obtaining military relief, planning defensive strategy, and regenerating the governing committees. An example of the considerable number of petitions registered was the active month of September 1777. The county committee relayed to Kingston the yet unstable condition of government and the efforts exerted in the prosecution of suspect Loyalists. The

---

217

Ibid, I, p. 273.

committee also went to work in securing Governor Clinton's assistance in restoring the county legislative membership of those positions lost through the events of August 1777.<sup>218</sup>

The governor was made aware of the dismal condition of Tryon County at an early date. Daniel Gros informed Clinton in September 1777 that the militia had not been paid in months, and that some Loyalists were "set at liberty" at what Gros described as lenient fines handed down by sham trials.<sup>219</sup>

Once the Loyalist-Whig controversy shifted from the innocuous polemic phase to the actual shedding of blood, emotions were high pitched as evidenced by Whig discontent regarding the treatment of accused Loyalists, however minimal their participation. Although the local committees did release some Loyalists after fining them, the most flagrant violators and dangerous ring-leaders of the Loyalist sympathizers were rounded up. Christopher Reddig and Henry Frants, two Loyalist leaders who openly recruited their Tryon neighbors to take up arms, were forwarded by the Tryon committee to the Governor at Kingston (Ulster County) for "further tryal".<sup>220</sup>

---

218

Committee of Tryon County to George Clinton, 7 September 1777, Hastings, Clinton Papers, II, pp. 283-86.

219

Daniel Gros to George Clinton, 8 September 1777, Ibid, II, p. 288.

220

Peter S. Deygert to Governor George Clinton, 9 September 1777, Ibid, II, p. 290.

The Tryon committee received good news from the New York Council of Safety regarding protection for the county during the same week of internal reorganization. In order to bolster the frontier defense, "100 riflemen and 400 militia" from the surrounding counties were ordered to Tryon County by a Council of Safety resolution. <sup>221</sup> Nevertheless, the committee learned that a quick reply from Kingston and the actual materialization of troops were two different matters. Governor Clinton informed the county committee that the Council of Safety had been dissolved by the new legislature, and that the Governor now handled all correspondence. The committee was notified that the promised troops for the protection of the frontier "cannot be spared" without endangering New York's northern army. <sup>222</sup> The cause for jubilation was soon transformed into one of grave concern in this still relatively quiet respite following Oriskany. This disappointment at the prospect of needed military assistance was something which the Tryon committee and inhabitants would despondently experience on numerous occasions in the future.

Although the winter months of 1777-1778 were calm in

---

221

Peter S. Deygert to Council of Safety, 10 September 1777, Ibid, II, p. 300.

222

George Clinton to Committee of Tryon County, 17 September 1777, Ibid, II, p. 331.

terms of military activity, Tryon residents looked forward with guarded caution to the approaching spring. In February of 1778, public affairs in the county were still characterized as in an "unstable state" by the committee and the "unprovided state" of the local militia had not substantially improved.<sup>223</sup> The Loyalists launched the first of the series of raids directed toward the crippled county in the spring and summer months of 1778. These destructive raids conducted by the Loyalists and Indians were principally engineered by the Johnson exiles--Sir John Johnson, John Butler, Walter Butler, Joseph Brant--and continued until October of 1781. The tactic employed in the Loyalist-Indian attacks was a quick plunge into the county by a small, mobile group, followed by a speedy retreat to the Canadian border or an advance to another targeted settlement. This attack-retreat tactic accorded every advantage to the offensive striking units, leaving the sedentary Tryon population little time to successfully react or adequately defend. The menacing raids of 1778 delivered a fearful plight to western New York, but especially in Tryon County: in June Brant burned Springfield to the ground; in July Brant overturned Andrustown, and in the same month Brant and John Butler ravaged the Wyoming Valley; in August Brant and Major

---

223

William Wills to George Clinton, 10 February 1778, Ibid, II, pp. 741-43.

Cochran raided German Flatts; in November Brant and Walter  
224  
Butler attacked the settlement of Cherry Valley.

The citizens of Schenectady, a town located in Albany County and more removed from the frontier borders, alerted Governor Clinton in June 1778 of the attacks in the Schoharie Valley. The message indicated the "real danger" that existed for those who remained on the frontier, reported that many people were seeking refuge in Schenectady and crowding the city, and emphasized that one of the principal wheat producing regions of New York was in serious jeopardy. 225  
The deceptive speed with which the Loyalist forays were executed would have outmaneuvered an organized, well-disciplined militia, let alone the unsettled Tryon militia. The following excerpt of a report by Colonel Jacob Klock portrayed the agility of the Loyalists:

. . . All this had been done [the attacks on Springfield, Andrustown, and along Ostego Lake], that the garrison at Cherry Valley did not know anything about the enemy; tho Springfield is not above four miles distant from the said place, As soon as the news came, I ordered immediately the militia to march to stop the progress of the enemy. The same instant I received a letter from

---

224

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, pp. 98, 100, 103-115; Frothingham, Montgomery County History, p. 90; Beauchamp, "Indian Raids In Mohawk," p. 201; Jacob Ford to General A. Ten Broeck, 18 July 1778, Hastings, Clinton Papers, III, pp. 555-56.

225

Citizens of Schenectady to George Clinton, 15 June 1778, Hastings, Clinton Papers, III, pp. 459-60.

Coll. Peter Bellinger of the German Flatts, that the enemy was burning houses within four miles of the Flatts praying for assistance. I did order up five companies of the Palatine and Canajohary battalion; the rest I marched straight to Andrewtown; ordering Coll. Bellinger to join me in order to intercept if possible the enemy. But on my march thither I learnt that he the enemy was gone; and nothing was left, as to scour the woods, as I got informed, that still a strong party of the enemy was left to do mischief. As soon as the Flatts militia was on their march in the woods, the enemy fell out at the Flatts took two prisoners and killed one man . . . .<sup>226</sup>

On July 19, 1778, a distressed Colonel Klock informed Brigadier General Ten Broeck that the county was destitute of protection. This alarming report points to the demands of the war on available manpower and the lack of assistance proffered the county:

. . . The Continental troops stationed among us are gone, the militia under Coll. Livingston is on the march home, so that we are entirely destitute of any assistance. I have given the necessary orders to stop the progress of the enemy, but the frontiers is too extensive to be guarded by militia alone, and if no Continental troops or a standing force can be continued, I fear the whole county by parcels may meet the fate of the above settlements . . .<sup>227</sup>

The next day, July 20, Klock described to the Governor the refusal of the militia to obey orders. Occupied with the labor demands of the harvest season, and by this time ac-

---

226

Jacob Klock to Governor Clinton, 22 June 1778, Ibid, III, pp. 475-76.

227

Jacob Klock to General A. Ten Broeck, 19 July 1778, Ibid, III, p. 559.

customed to giving the excuse that their duty time had expired, militia soldiers responded to the June 12 call for 600 men with a service enrollment of only 220. Since the channels of the county committee provided an inefficient route in obtaining military assistance, five prominent men from the German Flatts wrote directly to Governor Clinton on July 22 requesting immediate succor. No support for German Flatts was forthcoming, and consequently the settlement was levelled the following month. During the closing months of 1778, Governor Clinton worked hard to find a solution to counteract the Loyalist incendiary activity in upstate New York. Clinton addressed the state senate and assembly in October, reporting the destruction and desolation that prevailed in Albany, Tryon, and Ulster counties. The Governor stressed the ineffectiveness of a defensive military posture given the costly recent lessons of frontier warfare. By November 1778, seven settlements had been overwhelmed in the state. Following the onslaught at Cherry Valley, Governor Clinton contacted John Jay in the hope of gaining the ap-

---

228

General A. Ten Broeck to George Clinton, 20 July 1778, Ibid, III, pp. 563-64.

229

Colonel Peter Bellinger et al to George Clinton, 22 July 1778, Ibid, III, p. 581.

230

Governor Clinton's Legislative Speech, 13 October 1778, Ibid, IV, p. 156.

probation of the Continental Congress for a major offensive. Clinton reviewed the impracticality of defending the frontier and strongly urged the consideration of an offensive response to the Loyalist-Indian threat.<sup>231</sup>

The spring of 1779 witnessed renewed Indian attacks on the north side of the Mohawk, with the battering of Stone Arabia.<sup>232</sup> Loyalist-Indian raids, however, were overshadowed the remainder of the year by the Sullivan-Clinton expedition into the vast Indian territory west of Tryon County. The startling events and deplorable condition of western New York captured the attention of the Continental Congress, which authorized a retaliatory offensive expedition. The Continental forces commanded by General Sullivan ascended the Wyoming and Chemung Valleys directly west of Tryon County. The Wyoming and Chemung Valleys adjoined the homelands of the Cayuga, Seneca, and Onondaga tribes of the Six Nations. The Continental regiments under the command of General James Clinton proceeded up the Mohawk Valley to Fort Schuyler (Fort Stanwix),<sup>233</sup> and then branched off toward Sullivan. The Continental troops burned Indian grain in the fields,

---

231

George Clinton to John Jay, 17 November 1778, Ibid, IV, pp. 289-90.

232

Beauchamp, "Indian Raids In Mohawk," p. 201; Frothingham, Montgomery County History, p. 90.

233

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, pp. 116-17; Sosin, Revolutionary Frontier, pp. 120-33.



systematically destroyed villages, and seized Indian prisoners. The American raiding expedition was on the march from August 29 to October 15, and recorded the following accomplishments: Chemung levelled, Catherine's Town destroyed, a town north of Cayuga Lake overturned, supplies at Kanadasago ruined, Kashanguash demolished, Kanandagua burned to the ground, Chennesee burned, settlements surrounding Cayuga Lake razed, cornfields along a branch of Tioga River wasted.

234 The litany of destroyed towns was only too familiar for the western New York region, with the Sullivan-Clinton march reading like a chapter from a Loyalist-Indian book on frontier warfare. The ten week expedition, which trekked a 280 mile upland course commencing at Easton and extending to the Genesee Castle, completely devastated the lands of the Onondaga, Cayuga, and Seneca. The Indians who escaped imprisonment were forced to flee north for shelter at Fort Niagara.

235 The Loyalists and Indians struck back with a vengeance manifested in the flurry of raiding activity in 1780. The Indians were eager to repay the Tryon Whigs for the displacement and hardship caused by the 1779 Sullivan campaign. The

---

234

Extract from manuscript journal of an officer, Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, pp. 121-28; Frothingham, Montgomery County History, p. 90.

235

Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, p. 132.

Loyalist-Indian incursions rendered useless some 600,000  
 236  
 bushels of grain during the one year period. The ubiqui-  
 tous raiders traversed the county at will, returning to some  
 settlements for a second and third appearance: in February  
 Fort Schuyler was blockaded; in April Harpersfield, Cherry  
 Valley, and Riemendsnyder's Bush were attacked; in May Sir  
 John Johnson fell upon Canadigua en route to Johnstown which  
 was harried; in June Little Falls was ravaged; in July Scho-  
 harie, Cherry Valley, and German Flatts were assailed, in  
 August Canajoharie, Fort Plain, Schoharie near Norman's Kill,  
 and the south side of the Mohawk River was devastated; in Oc-  
 tober the Schoharie Valley was beset, including Caughnawaga,  
 237  
 Stone Arabia, and the north side of the Mohawk River.

After two years and eight months of seeking substan-  
 tive military assistance from the Governor, the Tryon commit-  
 tee petitions nevertheless echoed the same urgent theme in  
 238  
 March of 1780. Governor Clinton received scores of ap-  
 peals for relief from necessitous affected New Yorkers as the

---

236

Beauchamp, "Indian Raids In Mohawk," p. 202; Sosin,  
Revolutionary Frontier, p. 133.

237

Beauchamp, "Indian Raids In Mohawk," pp. 201-02;  
 Frothingham, Montgomery County History, pp. 91-93; Campbell,  
Annals Of Tryon County, pp. 142-47, 151-53, 161-65.

238

Colonel Klock to George Clinton, 17 March 1780,  
 Hastings, Clinton Papers, V, p. 546.

depredations of civil war became widespread by 1780. Particularly hard hit were the remaining Tryon Whigs, especially the abandoned wives and children of militiamen who were killed, captured, or deserted. Governor Clinton received one such petition from 44 widows and orphans requesting aid from Kingsland District, Tryon County, whose husbands were killed, houses burned, and possessed no remaining means of subsistence.<sup>239</sup> The remainder of the war months (until April 1782) evinced a reduction in the number of co-ordinated raids launched, although the spotted attacks continued to represent an intimidating menace. The last eventful Loyalist-Indian foray into Tryon County was the Walter Butler--Major John Ross descent of October 1781. Ross and Butler proceeded to strike at Warrensburgh and pillage up and down the Mohawk River, until confronted and repulsed by Whig Colonel Willet<sup>240</sup> at the Battle of Johnstown. The Tories thereafter retired to the Canadian border, retaining a hold of the Fort Niagara region for the duration of the Revolutionary War.

Three years after the commencement of war, the burgeoning settlements and prosperous agrarian economy came to a virtual standstill in Tryon County. The prosperity which

---

239

Mary Tennis et al to George Clinton, 18 August 1780, Ibid, VI, p. 123.

240

Sosin, Revolutionary Frontier, p. 134; Beauchamp, "Indian Raids In Mohawk," p. 204.

had been fostered by the county's early patron Sir William Johnson, was transmuted into an unrecognizable barren expanse by the Loyalist descendents of that prominent family. The report of Tryon County sent to the state legislature December 20, 1780 revealed the extent of the irreparable damage: 613 persons were listed as desertions; 177 residents were recorded killed; 121 inhabitants were noted taken prisoner; 700-1000 buildings had been burned; over 1000 farms throughout the county were left unattended; and over 600,000 bushels of grain had been wasted.<sup>241</sup> It must be noted that these estimates relative to the status of inhabitants were conservative estimations, since the confusion of the wartime milieu discouraged the accurate recording of demographic statistics. The most telling wartime statistic pointing to the plight and dislocation of the inhabitants, was the fact that the pre-Revolutionary War population of 10,000 had been reduced to approximately 3,000 by 1781. It is by placing aside the surface abstract figures and probing the personal wartime experiences of the Loyalists and Whigs, that the real tragedy of the civil warfare becomes meaningful.

---

241

Frothingham, Montgomery County History, pp. 96-97; Clarke, The Bloody Mohawk, p. 286.

## CHAPTER V

## THE LOYALISTS OF TRYON COUNTY:

## WARTIME STATUS AND DISPERSION

The wartime experiences of Tryon Loyalists encompassed the activities of two groups of Loyalists. These groups were interrelated during all stages of the war, yet at the same time divergent. The military participation of those Loyalists who fled with the Johnsons early in the war was an energetic, direct involvement; while the course of conduct of those who decided to remain in Tryon or later returned was constrained to a passive, indirect support. The Loyalist regiments engaged in combat were subject to the rigors and vicissitudes of border warfare. Although those who participated in frontier military engagements could not in any manner be considered out of danger, the Loyalist combatants under the Johnsons and Butlers maintained a definite advantage in striking with impunity the outlying settlements. The position of the Loyalists who remained in Tryon County, although less exposed to constant conflict, was much more precarious since their well-being was consigned to the caprice of the punitive Whig committees. In addition to the active-passive classification, Tryon Loyalists can be categorized as prominent Loyalists and common Loyalists. The prominent Tryon Loyalists were those who symbolized local

royal authority before the war, and who following their departure assumed leadership positions in the British service. The most conspicuous prominent Loyalists were members of the Johnson political family--Sir John Johnson, Guy Johnson, John and Walter Butler, Joseph Brant, Daniel Claus, and Joseph Chew. Besides holding positions as agents in the Indian Department under Sir William Johnson, these men occupied key positions in the public offices of Tryon County: Guy Johnson was the first judge; John Butler served as a judge; Sir John Johnson and Daniel Claus were assistant judges. <sup>242</sup> The Johnson court house gang also commanded the Tryon local militia prior to the Revolutionary War. The militia was under the ultimate control of Sir William Johnson. Guy Johnson, John Johnson, and Daniel Claus headed regiments of the militia, with Guy Johnson doubling as an adjutant general. <sup>243</sup>

Sir John Johnson, heir of the Johnson estate, was a central Loyalist military figure and after 1783 a principal colonizer of United Empire Loyalist settlements in Canada. Overshadowed by the singularly distinctive career of Sir William Johnson, the record of Sir John was one of noted

---

242

Bryce, "Sir John Johnson," p. 252; Frothingham, Montgomery County History, p. 182.

243

Frothingham, Montgomery County History, p. 71; Flexner, Mohawk Baronet, p. 335.

achievement in the service of the crown and support for the Loyalists. Sir John raised and directed Loyalist battalions throughout the war, receiving orders from Sir Frederick Haldimand.<sup>244</sup> As the war drew to a close, Sir John attained the rank of Brigadier-General and was commissioned "Superintendent General and Inspector General of the Six Nations Indians and Those in the Province of Quebec".<sup>245</sup> In July 1784, Johnson was appointed by Sir Frederick Haldimand to supervise the colonization of the disbanded Loyalists escaping to Canada. Johnson oversaw the development of thirteen townships (five townships on the Bay of Quinte and eight townships on the north bank of the St. Lawrence west of Lake St. Francis)<sup>246</sup> where 3,776 original Loyalist settlers migrated. Most of the settlers were native Tryon residents who had served in Johnson's battalions or intentionally abandoned the county. The thirteen townships were geographically arranged somewhat analagous to settlements in Tryon County prior to the Revolution, each marked with an identifiable ethnic concentra-

---

244

Claim of Sir John Johnson, 9 August 1785, Great Britain, Public Record Office, Exchequer And Audit Department, AO.12, American Loyalist Claims, Series I, Vols. 19-33, 1776-1781, 20/314-48; Walker, "Sir John, Loyalist," pp. 336-42; Bryce, "Sir John Johnson," pp. 244-52.

245

Walker, "Sir John, Loyalist," p. 342.

246

Ibid, pp. 345-46; Bryce, "Sir John Johnson," pp. 252-71.

tion. The township nearest the Quebec border was a Scotch-Highland Catholic settlement, followed respectively by colonies of Scotch Presbyterians, Palatine Germans, civilian refugees, members of Lieutenant Colonel Jessup's battalion, and Captain Grass's group.<sup>247</sup> Sir John Johnson's post-war years were industriously spent in promoting the interests of Loyalists both in Canada and England. Johnson worked closely with Lord Dorchester (Sir Guy Carleton-Governor of Quebec), served in the capacity of legislative councilor, and played an instrumental role in the formation of the new province of Upper Canada in 1791.

Colonel Guy Johnson, superintendent of the Six Nations during the Revolutionary War until the summer of 1782, intentionally recruited Indian fighting forces throughout Canada. Even though Guy Johnson was not a conspicuous military figure in the Loyalist-Indian raids along the border, he nevertheless operated behind the scenes in procuring Indian fighters, supplying requisite provisions, and cohering Indian loyalty for the British.<sup>248</sup> The voluminous correspondence between Guy Johnson and Lord George Germaine accentuated the practical complexities that had to be met in delivering the Six Nations. For example, Johnson forwarded to Germaine the im-

---

247

Bryce, "Sir John Johnson," p. 253.

248

Claim of Guy Johnson, London 23 March 1784, AO. 12/22/22-25.



portance of utilizing the Indians at the "proper time" of year, recognizing their hunting seasons and timing British raids accordingly. <sup>249</sup> Johnson frequently related how he and his deputies arranged to keep the Indians out of the reach of the encroaching Rebel emissaries. Moreover, the superintendent stressed that the Indian Department continually discouraged the employment of acts of cruelty by the Indians. <sup>250</sup> Guy Johnson moved to bring the disaffected Iroquois tribes into the British camp, and could report by July 1780 that <sup>251</sup> "the major part of the disaffected tribes are come in". Johnson had warned the Oneidas that time was running out if they expected to remain in the favor of the British government. Consequently, the Oneidas abandoned their territory for Niagara, augmenting Colonel Johnson's fighting capability by 100 warriors. Johnson estimated that 1600 Indian males of the Six Nations Confederacy were under the British flag in 1780. Twelve hundred were described as warriors, and in

---

249

Colonel Guy Johnson to Lord George Germaine, 11 November 1777, O'Callaghan, Doc. Rel. To N.Y. Col. Hist., VIII, p. 777.

250

Colonel Guy Johnson to Lord George Germaine, 12 March 1778, Ibid, VIII, p. 740; Colonel Guy Johnson to Lord George Germaine, 10 September 1778, Ibid, VIII, p. 752; Colonel Guy Johnson to Lord George Germaine, 26 July 1780, Ibid, p. 797.

251

Colonel Guy Johnson to Lord George Germaine, 26 July 1780, Ibid, VIII, pp. 796-97.

July 1780 the superintendent reported that 836 Indians were mobilized across the frontier. Johnson observed that this represented the largest Indian force in service "at any one time without the army".<sup>252</sup> It has been estimated that throughout the course of the war, there were between 500-1000 Indians at any one time utilized by the British.<sup>253</sup>

Colonel John Butler and his son Captain Walter Butler, two Tryon native sons much maligned by Whig wartime propaganda, were leaders of Loyalist ranger units on the western frontier. Colonel Butler was appointed deputy-commissioner of the Indian Department in autumn 1775, operating out of Niagara. Butler raised a corps of rangers consisting of eight companies, which was later enlarged to ten companies; and was supported by Walter Butler and Joseph Brant's Indian forces.<sup>254</sup> Under the capable direction of John Butler, the fort at Niagara was transformed into a

---

252

Ibid, p. 797.

253

Beauchamp, "Indian Raids In Mohawk," p. 206.

254

Claim of John Butler, 19 August 1765, AO.12/21/403; Jones, History Of New York, II, p. 339; Crary, The Price Of Loyalty, pp. 252-53; Wilbur H. Siebert, "The Dispersion Of The American Tories," Mississippi Valley Historical Review, I (1914), pp. 188-91; Bryce, "Sir John Johnson," pp. 247-49; See Howard Swiggett, War Out Of Niagara: Walter Butler And The Tory Rangers (New York: Ira J. Friedman, Inc., 1963), pp. 136-246; Mathews, Mark Of Honour, p. 48.

noted Loyalist stronghold. Fort Niagara provided a sanctuary for escaping Loyalist fugitives and displaced frontier settlers. Colonel Butler's ranger corps were amassed from the disjointed groups of Loyalist escapees, frontier wanderers, and loyal Indians in the Niagara region. Over and above the outfitting of Loyalist fighting units, Butler had to house at Niagara scores of dispersed Indians. Along with the 2000 Indians already stationed at Niagara, Butler had to shelter 3000 additional Indians as a result of the 1779 Sullivan scorched-earth raids.<sup>255</sup> Throughout the Revolutionary War, Butler's Rangers launched raids along the border settlements of Tryon County, foraged the countryside for provisions, assisted retreating Loyalists, and reconnoitered the enemy position.

Joseph Brant, the Mohawk Indian chief who maintained a close relationship with the Johnson family, was an able ally of the British. Brant's sister, Molly Brant, was the wife of Sir William Johnson. Brant at an early age took the field with Sir William Johnson in the French and Indian Wars. As an interpreter in the Indian Department and a member of the small cadre close to the Johnsons before the Revolution, Brant acted as an important Indian liaison in securing the

---

255

Siebert, "Dispersion Of Tories," p. 188.

256

loyalty of the Iroquois and field officer during the war. Brant was stationed at Fort Stanwix, accompanying Butler's Rangers and spearheading independent Indian assaults on Tryon County border towns. Immediately following the war, Captain Brant was a central Indian personage in the United States--Canadian management of the Six Nations. The Iroquois were altogether forsaken by the terms of the Peace Treaty, with their vast territories peremptorily expropriated. T. Wood Clarke portrayed the Iroquois post-war predicament as "homeless, penniless, and deserted". After heated debate in the Continental Congress, the prodding of George Washington and Philip Schuyler for the moment reestablished the Iroquois homelands. The Mohawk tribe following the leadership of Joseph Brant, however, refused to accept the Whig terms of resettlement. After Brant consulted Sir John Johnson and General Haldimand about the destitute Mohawk condition, the British compensated the tribe with a strip of land twelve miles wide and one hundred miles long,

256

Graymont, Iroquois In Revolution, pp. 52-53, 166-67, 178-79, 184-91, 240-41; Scott, "Fort Stanwix And Oriskany," pp. 402-06; Beauchamp, "Indian Raids In Mohawk," pp. 201-04; Campbell, Annals Of Tryon County, pp. 103-115.

257

Bryce, "Sir John Johnson," pp. 261-66; Walker, "Sir John, Loyalist," p. 343.

258

Clarke, Bloody Mohawk, pp. 2-3.

extending from the Grand River into western Ontario. From 1794 on, Brant acted as Indian agent for the Six Nations in overseeing matters relative to their newly acquired Canadian land.<sup>259</sup>

Colonel Daniel Claus, the brother-in-law of Sir John Johnson who lived along the Mohawk River, assisted in the British Indian Department throughout the war years. Colonel Claus served as superintending agent for the northern district (Province of Quebec) early in the 1760's and later recruited Canadians and Indians for the British war effort. Claus had assembled 150 Missesague and Iroquois to join the St. Leger expedition, and was commissioned to attend all Indian related matters of the expedition.<sup>260</sup> After the war, Claus continued a close personal relationship with Sir John Johnson and worked as a deputy Indian commissioner based in Montreal.<sup>261</sup> Joseph Chew, another Tryon Loyalist whose family lived in Johnstown, set out with the Loyalist retinue accompanying Guy Johnson in May 1775. Chew was appointed secretary in the Indian

---

259

Ibid, p. 3; Bryce, "Sir John Johnson," p. 261.

260

Colonel Claus to Secretary Knox, 16 October 1777, O'Callaghan, Doc. Rel. To N.Y. Col. Hist., VIII, p. 710; Claim of Daniel Claus, 24 January 1786, AO.12/21/247-60.

261

Bryce, "Sir John Johnson," pp. 256-60.

Department in July 1774, and consequently accompanied the officers of the Department to the various treaty sessions, conferences, and treks accross New York and Canada. <sup>262</sup> The Tryon secretary was also a contact for escaping Loyalist refugees as disclosed in this excerpt of the Chew claim:

. . . He was very useful in those employments he was engaged in, particularly in procuring intelligence and furnishing proper persons to go with expresses through the country to Canada, Niagara, etc., etc., which with the number of persons connected with the Indians and Loyalists to firm the back country who escaped from rebel gaols and others that contrived to get within the British lines who resorted to him put him to much expense for which he had no reimbursement. . .<sup>263</sup>

Four of the aforementioned prominent Loyalists of Tryon County--Sir John Johnson, Guy Johnson, Daniel Claus, and John Butler--were cited with fifty-five other leading New York Loyalists in an Act of Attainder passed by the New York State Legislature October 22, 1779. <sup>264</sup> This Act attainted the four Loyalists, asserting that their real and personal estates were ipso facto expropriated.

The common Loyalists, the regular foot soldiers subordinate to the Johnsons and the suppressed minority of British sympathizers remaining in Tryon, walked a tightrope of

---

262  
99. Claim of Joseph Chew, 28 March 1784, AO.12/24/195-

263  
Ibid, p. 196.

264  
Jones, History Of New York, II, p. 269.

uncertainty during the war years. The Loyalist soldier was invariably distracted with the concern of whether he would again return to his abandoned land and deserted family; while the concerns of the remaining Loyalists were concentrated on the more immediate demands of day to day survival. The Loyalist regiments were generally well supplied along the border posts. The Loyalists in Tryon County, however, experienced a particularly wretched existence throughout the entire war. As the pace of the border warfare was accelerated, the known and suspected Loyalists were placed under closer scrutiny. With the appointment of the Third Board of Commissioners for "Detecting and Defeating Conspiracies In The State of New York" February 1778, a systematic monitoring procedure had evolved for the apprehension, prosecution, and confinement of disaffected Loyalists. The authority of the Third Board was more extended and its scope of jurisdiction more expanded when juxtaposed with former anti-Loyalist committees and nascent boards. The twenty-six members of the Board were appointed from the seven upstate Whig counties. William Wills, Soverinas Cock, and James McMasters were the initial

---

265

See Introduction in Psaltis for chronology, evolutionary development, and jurisdiction of Board of Commissioners, Victor H. Psaltis, ed., Minutes Of The Commissioners For Detecting And Defeating Conspiracies In The State Of New York, Albany Sessions, 1778-1781 (Albany: State Of New York, 1909), I, pp. 12-14.

three commissioners appointed in Tryon County pursuant to  
 266  
 the legislative Act.

The domestic activities of suspect Tryon residents were carefully observed and their mobility within the county severely constrained. George Herchemer, restricted from travel to his farm because he was allegedly disaffected, was granted permission by the Albany Board to go at large in  
 267  
 January 1779. Because of the precarious position and special problems encountered in Tryon County, disaffected inhabitants who had been apprehended were usually sent to the Albany Board for incarceration. Colonel Lewis DeBois transferred twenty-four Tryon prisoners under guard in June  
 268  
 1779 to Albany. Tryon Loyalists who fled the county and subsequently reappeared were quickly brought before the commissioners for questioning. Albert Van Der Werken, a Loyalist who went to Canada in the spring of 1780 and returned,

---

266

Ibid, II, p. 829.

267

Ibid, I, p. 306.

268

Henry Merkle, Jacob Merkle, Derick Merkle, Godfrey Supher, Peter Schuyler, David Barber, John Staring, George Fikes, John Kitman, Julius Bush, Dedirick Louks, William Empey, Nicholas Shafer, Adam Shafer, John Shafer, John Alt, Nicholas Alt, Jacob Broadhower, Michael Cochnought, John Van Sela, John Devoe, John Bullingham, John Waters, Ibid, I, p. 364.



threw himself "upon the mercy of the county".<sup>269</sup> The Albany Board released Van Der Werken to go at large after he entered into a £ 200 recognizance and agreed to be periodically recalled. Individuals who in any way assisted transient Loyalists were subject to punitive action. A warrant was issued to apprehend John Docksteder because he had housed a wounded soldier of Sir John Johnson in the spring of 1780.<sup>270</sup> Docksteder had disguised the recuperating soldier in womans cloathing and aided in effecting his escape to Canada. Therefore, even inconspicuous Loyalist sympathizers were pursued with the same vigor as the known armed Loyalists. The Albany Board issued arrest warrants for William Laird and Dr. Tice of Tryon, on receiving information that the two would soon depart to join the Tories.<sup>271</sup> Tryon County's location on the perimeter of the frontier represented the last Whig boundary to be traversed in a route leading to Fort Niagara and Loyalist settlements along the Canadian border. On numerous occassions, Tryon backwoodsmen were apprehended for concealing Loyalists en route to the Canadian border. The Albany Board detained William Parker, John Wait, Isabel Parker, Jane Wait, and James Parker for

---

269  
Ibid, II, p. 560.

270  
Ibid, II, p. 563.

271  
Ibid, II, p. 682.

carrying on an ongoing correspondence with the Tories across the border, and harboring and supplying Loyalist parties in transit.<sup>272</sup> It was extremely difficult to obtain the release of suspected Loyalists who had been confined by the Board. A common test that had to be passed before a release was granted was the approbation of a confined persons Rebel neighbors. Nicholas Schuyler's father, Peter Schuyler, was denied a release until requested or recommended by the "principal well affected inhabitants" of the county.<sup>273</sup>

An additional domestic barometer which can be utilized to measure the distressed condition of the Tryon Loyalists were the relative hardships of their well affected Whig countrymen. Reports revealing the destitute conditions of district after district in Tryon County were filed with the Northern Department of the Continental Army. On April 7, 1779, 59 persons from the Mohawk District were recorded as devoid of most of their personal property.<sup>274</sup> On April 13, 1779, Lieutenant-Colonel Samuel Clyde reported that 164 persons from Cherry Valley lost their "houses, barns, green cat-

---

272

Ibid, II, p. 733.

273

Ibid, I, p. 401.

274

List Of Distressed Families In Mohawk District, 7 April 1779, Hastings, Clinton Papers, IV, p. 700.

275  
 tle, and money". A return from the town of Springfield  
 also dated April 13 listed 80 persons who were in a neces-  
 276  
 sitous state. Lieutenant-Colonel Clyde informed Colonel  
 Frederick Fisher April 30 that 256 persons from the Canajoharie  
 District were left with destroyed property, 137 of  
 whom were not able to work for a livelihood and entitled to  
 277  
 state relief. The wartime posture of those Loyalists who  
 remained behind is brought into clearer focus when placed  
 within the framework of the devastation manifested through-  
 out the Whig dominated county.

Throughout the war years, the property of common Loy-  
 alists was subject to confiscation. Following the initial  
 act of the Continental Congress in August 1775, a number of  
 additional steps brought the confiscation process to frui-  
 tion. On February 22, 1777 six commissioners were appointed  
 278  
 to sell the property sequestered from the Loyalists. On  
 March 6, 1777 three Commissioners of Sequestration were ap-  
 pointed to supervise the confiscation procedures. The three

---

275

List Of Sufferers In Tryon County, 13 April 1779,  
Ibid, IV, pp. 721-22.

276

Return of Springfield, 13 April 1779, Ibid, IV,  
 pp. 722-23.

277

A List Of Sufferers In Canajoharie District, En-  
 titled To State Relief, 30 April 1779, Ibid, IV, pp. 786-88.

278

Flick, Loyalism In New York, p. 137.

principal duties that the commissioners were authorized to discharge were the expropriation of Loyalist property, the leasing of confiscated Loyalist land, and the sale of Loyalist personal property.<sup>279</sup> Between August 21, 1777 and July 1781, £ 27,815 was raised in Tryon County through confiscation and sale.<sup>280</sup> Tryon County was considered in the western district by the commissioners. Commissioners John Lansing, Christopher Yates, and Jerimiah Van Rensselaer had sold the property of thirteen prominent New York Loyalists by April 30, 1781 amounting to £ 477,396, including the property of Sir John Johnson, Guy Johnson, and Daniel Claus.<sup>281</sup> The New York state legislature emphatically asserted that forfeited and sequestered property was not to be returned to the Loyalists.

Great Britain provided compensation for Loyalists who emigrated to Canada and Nova Scotia after the war primarily through land grants. The claims of wealthy prominent Loyalists, however, were either compensated in a monetary fashion, or employment was provided by the crown, as in the case of Sir John Johnson who was made Superintendent-General

---

279

Ibid, p. 140.

280

Ibid, p. 142.

281

Ibid, p. 151.

282

for settling Loyalists in Canada. After the Revolutionary War, hundreds of Loyalists flocked to England to register claims of their losses. By June 10, 1789, 939 claims were examined in England and 1272 in Nova Scotia.<sup>283</sup> In order to facilitate the claims process, commissioners were sent to America to receive claims of Loyalists, John Anstey being the commissioner in New York. The phase of inquiry of the commissioners in America lasted from December 5, 1785 until December 19, 1788, with "loyalty, service, and the extent of losses" the primary considerations examined in each case.<sup>284</sup> The strongest case was registered by and compensation generally granted to Loyalists who could demonstrably prove that they had borne arms for the British. The final report of the Board of Commissioners was filed May 15, 1789 after 5072 claims had been presented, 4118 of which were examined. The total expenditure of the British government for the Loyalists including compensation, temporary relief, annuities, and assistance for those settling in Canada and

---

282

Walker, "Sir John, Loyalist," p. 342; Flick, Loyalism In New York, p. 201.

283

Flick, Loyalism In New York, p. 204.

284

Ibid, p. 209.

Nova Scotia was an estimated \$30,000,000. New York Loyalists<sup>285</sup> received approximately one third of this total amount.

Tryon and Albany counties represented the region with the heaviest concentration of Loyalists in New York. The Loyalist claims from Tryon and Albany constituted 50% of the total number of claims filed in New York.<sup>286</sup> As Wallace Brown emphasized, however, the areas with the greatest concentration of claims may not accurately reflect the real Loyalist strength in those areas. It is important to note that only a small percentage of Loyalists filed claims. Throughout the colony of New York, 0.54% of the population were Loyalist claimants.<sup>287</sup> There are no hard extant figures indicating the number of Loyalists that comprised Tryon County's population of 10,000. John McKenna, a Loyalist from Tryon, indicated that the band of Loyalists that accompanied Sir John Johnson to Canada were "outnumbered" by the ratio of ten to one.<sup>288</sup> This estimate did not account for those who departed earlier with Guy Johnson, those who departed on their own, and those Loyalists who remained be-

---

<sup>285</sup> Ibid, pp. 211-13; Jones, History Of New York, II, p. 645-59.

<sup>286</sup> Brown, The King's Friends, p. 81.

<sup>287</sup> Ibid, p. 253.

<sup>288</sup> Ibid, p. 81.

hind. From most of the contemporary estimates of Loyalist strength in Tryon, the available evidence indicated that the Loyalists composed no greater than one-fifth of the population. Therefore, the 255 Loyalist claims examined from Tryon County do not provide a statistical analysis of Loyalism in the county, but rather an incomplete, yet useful, view of those Loyalists who bore arms (230 of the 255 claimants bore arms for the British).

Of the 255 Tryon County claimants examined, 218 claimed £ 500 or less; 13 claimed £ 500-1000; 6 claimed £ 1001-2000; 5 claimed £ 2001-5000; 4 claimed £ 5001-10000; and 4 claimed over £ 10000. Tryon County claimants did not mirror the other New York county claimants in terms of the total wealth declared. 64% of the New York claimants filed small claims for £ 500 or less; while 6.9% claimed £ 5000 or more; and 3.7% filed for £ 10000 or more. <sup>289</sup> 85.4% of the Tryon claimants filed small claims of £ 500 or less; 1.6% claimed £ 5000 or more; and 1.6% filed for £ 10000 or more. In examining occupations, 234 Tryon claimants fit into the farmer-landowner category constituting 91.7% of the claimants, 191 of whom were tenant farmers. Tryon County had 66 native born claimants (25.8%) and 184 immigrants (72.1%). Although the information provided in the claims was most sketchy concerning the arrival

of the immigrant claimants, a heavy concentration arrived before the outbreak of the Revolutionary War. Fifty-four immigrants came to America and then Tryon County before 1770, 110 between 1770 and 1775, and 1 arrived in the 1775-1780 period. The most complete data gleaned from the Tryon claims was the eventual destination reached by Loyalists during the diaspora following the war. Two hundred and forty-eight of the Tryon claimants, too poor to relocate in England, settled near or in the townships colonized by Sir John Johnson.<sup>290</sup>

An examination of the Tryon claims revealed the small farm economy which existed in the county and brought to light many of the wartime experiences of the common Loyalists. The following eight areas were those with the greatest concentration of claimants in the county: Sir William Johnson's Lands, Sir John Johnson's Lands, Johnstown, Johnson Bush, Kingsborough, Along the Mohawk River, Along the Susquehanna River, and Tryon County (those claims which are not specific as to location or from areas in which there are no other claims). There were 12 claims filed by claimants from Sir William Johnson's Lands. All 12 served with the British, 9 claimants possessed tenant land, and 11 Loyalists filed claims of £ 500 or less. Peter Grant, a native of Scotland who came to Amer-

---

290

American Loyalist Claims, AO.12/20-33, passim.



ica in 1774, leased 100 acres on Sir William's Lands claim-  
 ing £ 168..15.<sup>291</sup> Grant left behind his possessions, which  
 the Rebels confiscated, to join Sir John Johnson's regiment  
 which he served in for the duration of the war. Isabel Mc-  
 Leod, a widow with six infants residing at New Johnstown,  
 filed a claim of £ 83..7..3.<sup>292</sup> Malcolm McLeod, her late  
 husband who possessed 16 acres of tenant land, joined Sir  
 John Johnson at the outbreak of the Revolution. McLeod was  
 too infirm to journey to Canada and was imprisoned by the  
 Rebels for harboring and assisting British scouts. Alexander<sup>293</sup>  
 McPherson, a native of Scotland, filed a claim for £ 158..12.  
 McPherson served with Sir John Johnson for three years, after  
 which he received a discharge (1779) and thereafter worked  
 in the engineer's department. These three claims are repre-  
 sentative of the type of claim filed by the immigrant tenant  
 farmer from Tryon County.

There were 35 claims filed by Loyalists on Sir John  
 Johnson's Lands. Thirty of the claimants served with the  
 British, 30 indicated that they possessed tenant land, and

---

291  
 95. Claim of Peter Grant, 1 November 1781, AO.12/29/

292  
 147-48. Claim of Isabel McLeod, January 15 ?, AO.12/29/

293  
 17-18. Claim of Alexander McPherson, July 4 ?, AO.12/27/

32 filed small claims. The largest claim filed was that of Sir John Johnson for £ 103,162..3.<sup>294</sup> The lengthy memorial of Johnson revealed his vast holdings in terms of real and personal property, as well as his service involvement. Among the itemized list of possessions, Johnson listed 11 slaves at £ 60 each. This figure is quite high considering that the average tenant farmer from Tryon listed having a house, barn, and stable for about a comparable amount. Sir John had seven prominent Loyalists submit sworn testimony as evidence including Guy Johnson, Daniel Claus, Joseph Chew, Colonel John Butler, and Colonel Ebenezer Jessup. The claim of Alexander White represented that of one of Tryon's chief public officials, high sherrif. White disclosed that in November 1775, he was ordered by Governor Tryon to publish "His Majesty's Publication", which he did at the county court house and throughout the county in "different congregations".<sup>295</sup> Because of this action, the Rebels released all the prisoners from the county goal and attacked the claimant's house. His memorial was replete with unsuccessful attempts to join Sir John and numerous imprisonments after being betrayed on several occassions and captured. White claimed 1330 acres of land and a total loss of £ 3220..10..3. The claim of

---

294

Claim of Sir John Johnson, 9 August 1785, AO.12/20/314-48.

295

Claim of Alexander White, 24 October 1787, AO.12/20/27-35.

Michael Gollinger divulged that he was forced to serve the Rebels with his "horses and waggon" and imprisoned 6 months by the Rebels.<sup>296</sup> Gollinger filed a claim of £292..7..6 and had four sons that fought the entire war. Daniel Foyke was a native German Loyalist who possessed 100 acres tenant land, claimed a loss of £169..12, and joined Sir John Johnson in 1780.<sup>297</sup> Foyke accompanied Johnson in the Loyalist raid on "Cooknawasa" and had two sons that served with him till the reduction in 1784.

The town of Johnstown had 45 Loyalists file claims, 38 of whom possessed tenant land from the Johnsons. Forty-two claimants declared a loss of £500 or less and 39 served with the British in some capacity. John McKenna, an Irish Roman Catholic priest who had settled at Johnstown in 1773,<sup>298</sup> filed a claim for £431. McKenna stated in the memorial that he, fearful that he would be forced into the "service of Congress", fled to Canada (some 500-600 miles) and provided General Carleton with the first information about the state of affairs in that part of New York. McKenna relayed that

---

296

Claim of Michael Gollinger, Montreal 14 February 1788, AO.12/31/280-82.

297

Claim of Daniel Foyke, Montreal 8 February 1788, AO.12/31/292-94.

298

Claim of Rev. John McKenna, 15 May 1787, AO.12/24/243-46.

following his example, a body of "emigrants" effected their escape to Canada and formed two regiments--the Royal Highland Immigrants and the Royal Yorkers. McKenna served as a chaplain with the two companies and was with St. Leger at Fort Stanwix. The claim of Margaret Hare was illustrative of the recurring problem of incomplete information provided in the claims. The claimant was a widow, whose husband Captain John Hare, was killed at "Ariskan" in the Fort Stanwix expedition 6 August 1777. <sup>299</sup> The claimant listed £155..4 for book debts, £40..4..11 for damages sustained by General Schuyler's party of Rebels, and other articles; but no total sum was listed, with some enumerated articles not having a corresponding value affixed. Margaret Hare mentioned in the memorial that her husband was a sheriff. The Rebels overtook the goal and converted it into a fortification, in the process taking timber from John Hare's house and from his father's property. The claim of Thatcher Sears was one of a Loyalist who did not bear arms in the British service. Sears real and personal estate was sold by the Rebels, which he claimed at £580. <sup>300</sup> Sears escaped to Long Island in August 1776 and carried on his business as hatter, during which time he carried wood for

---

299

Claim of Margaret Hare, August 25 ?, AO.12/28/50-53.

300

Claim of Thatcher Sears, St. Johns 23 November 1786, AO.12/23/401-08.

the army and inhabitants of New York. Sears stated that he performed other services for the crown and was at one time imprisoned. The claim of Thatcher Sears recorded the procedure which he followed in filing his claim. Sears gave his claim to a Mr. Hardy in St. Johns (1783) who had advertised in the newspapers to carry home claims of interested Loyalists.

The town of Johnson Bush had 25 Loyalists file claims. Twenty-three claimants possessed tenant land of the Johnsons, 24 claimants filed small claims, and all 25 served in the British service. The claim of Alexander Ferguson was representative of the claims of Loyalists from Johnson Bush. Ferguson, a native Scot Loyalist, was a tenant farmer who fought with Sir John's First Battalion and who afterwards gave his claim to his commanding officer for £91..19 New York Curren-

301

cy. The claim of John McDonell contained the claimants production of a certificate from his commanding officer as evidence. This was a common practice of Loyalists who bore arms to provide a convincing record of their service. McDonell, a native Scot Loyalist who joined Sir John in 1776, claimed a loss of £100..8NYC. McDonell produced a certificate "to the loyalty of claimant" from Capt. Arch McDonell.

302

---

301  
Claim of Alexander Ferguson, Montreal 25 January 1788, AO.12/29/111-13.

302  
Claim of John McDonell, January 16 ?, AO.12/29/235-37.

The town of Kingsborough had 17 Loyalists who filed claims. Fifteen claimants were immigrants (13 Scotch), 16 possessed tenant land, and 17 fought with the British and filed small claims. Duncan Murchison, a native Scot tenant farmer, registered a claim of £147..13..5.<sup>303</sup> Murchison joined Sir John serving as a serjant for 3 years and afterwards as a conductor in the Indian Department. John Freel was a Loyalist who possessed 100 acres of tenant land claiming a loss of £186..15.<sup>304</sup> Freel joined Colonel Guy Johnson in 1775, and after six months duty returned home to "assist his family", where the Rebels imprisoned him. The Rebels released him and he thereafter escaped to join Sir John Johnson at Lakine in 1777.

Twenty-five Loyalists filed claims who resided along the Mohawk River. Fourteen of the claimants were native Americans, 15 possessed tenant land, 19 claimed £500 or less, and all 25 fought with the British. Two prominent members of Tryon County filed large claims from this area: Daniel Claus and John Butler. Daniel Claus, son-in-law of the late Sir William Johnson and deputy-superintendent of the Indian nations, filed

---

303

Claim of Duncan Murchison, 31 October 1787, AO.12/29/165-66.

304

Claim of John Freel, n.d., AO.12/28/13-16.

a claim of £17,564..7..2 3/4.<sup>305</sup> John Butler, who operated in the Indian Department and as a Lieutenant-Colonel during the Revolution, claimed losses of £9611..3..1.<sup>306</sup> Adam Young was a native American Loyalist who joined Colonel Butler at Oswego in 1778, however, before that time he was imprisoned 11 months for refusing to take the Rebel oath and "at last" taken to Norwick Goal in Connecticut.<sup>307</sup> The Rebels burnt his house and buildings because he gave provisions to Loyalists en route to Canada and "at one time he sent 74 men". Young lost 2600 acres of land, a saw mill, buildings, and other effects declared to be valued at £1968..15.

There were fourteen Loyalists who resided along the Susquehanna River that filed claims. Twelve of the claimants filed losses of £500 or less, 10 possessed tenant land, and 10 bore arms for the British. John Glassford, a native of Scotland who came to America when a boy, filed for £986 NYC.<sup>308</sup> Glassford had two sons that joined Captain Joseph Brant. The Rebels plundered Glassford's house in 1779, consequently he

---

305  
Claim of Daniel Claus, 24 January 1786, AO.12/21/250-60.

306  
Claim of John Butler, AO.12/21/403-07.

307  
Claim of Adam Young, September ?, AO.12/28/358-61.

308  
Claim of John Glassford, February 12 ?, AO.12/29/332-34.

and his family had to flee to Niagara since they had "almost starved".

The largest number of claims appeared under the heading of Tryon County. This category is a catch-all in which claims with incomplete information were placed or areas not included in the other listings. The claim of Guy Johnson, Colonel and Superintendent of the Six Nations who resided at Guy Park, declared losses of his real and personal estate at £22,584..9..9<sup>309</sup> Margaret Francis Hill, who had been the housekeeper of Guy Johnson, was approached by the Rebels to kill one of the Johnsons as related in the following passage from her memorial:

. . . She rejected with abhorrence a considerable sum of money which they repeatedly offered her if she would agree and promise to administer some poison to these gentlemen, in consequence of refusing to comply or promise to execute such a horrid deed, they immediately divested your memorialist of all that she possessed of in this world which amount on a moderate calculation to £567..5<sup>310</sup>

While en route to Quebec with Colonel Guy Johnson's family, Margaret Hill was captured and refused to comply with the Rebel offers. A large claim was filed by Joseph Chew in be-

---

309

Claim of Guy Johnson, London 23 March 1784, AO.12/22/22-34.

310

Claim of Margaret Francis Hill, 20 March 1784, AO.12/24/70-71.



half of the children of Mary Brant, children born of the marriage between Sir William Johnson and Mary Brant, Mohawk chief Joseph Brant's sister. A vast amount of property belonging to the eight children of Mary Brant was confiscated and sold by the Rebel commissioners, property estimated at <sup>311</sup> £18,484..7 1/2 in the claim.

The Loyalist claims, despite their limitations--such as the incomplete information provided, the padding of information in the claims, the small percentage of Loyalists who filed claims--still provide useful research information about the Revolutionary period through a microcosmic perspective. The Loyalist claims from Tryon County uncover valuable pieces of information, which when collated, aid in constructing a picture of the inhabitants and general composition of the county during the Revolution.

Following the termination of the war, the state of New York in 1784 passed a resolution repudiating the Continental Congress's proclamation pledging to fulfill the spe-  
<sup>312</sup> cifics of the Peace Treaty. Two hundred Tryon Whigs had very early petitioned (January 1783) the state legislature to prohibit Loyalists who joined the British during the war from returning. This action was followed in February with a

---

311

Claim of Joseph Chew in Behalf of Children of Mary Brant, Montreal 2 July 1787, AO.12/27/255-57.

312

Jones, History Of New York, II, pp. 500-503.

second Tryon petition (180 signatures) intended to banish from the county those who voluntarily escaped to the British lines.<sup>313</sup>

Anti-Loyalist legislation was adopted by the New York state legislature ostracizing the Loyalists. Three specific pieces of legislation were passed in April-May 1784: 1) An Act For The Immediate Sale Of Certain Forfeited Estates; 2) An Act To Preserve The Freedom And Independence Of The State Of New York And For Other Purposes Therein Mentioned; 3) An Act For The Speedy Sale Of The Confiscated And Forfeited Estates Within This State And For Other Purpose<sup>314</sup> Therein Mentioned. In addition to these punitive post-war Acts, the anti-Loyalist legislation passed during the war years remained unrepealed.

The diaspora of the Tryon Loyalists was in no manner a uniform phenomenon, and consequently was difficult to trace. Native Tryon Loyalists set out from the county early in the war with the Guy and John Johnson departures, during the various stages of the war, and immediately following the war. Those New Yorkers who possessed the financial means embarked from Manhattan and emigrated to London from 1783-

---

313

Oscar Zeichner, "The Loyalists In New York After The Revolution," New York State Historical Association, XXXVIII (1940), p. 290.

314

Ibid, Laws Of The State Of New York, I, pp. 772-74, in Gerlach, The American Revolution, pp. 142-44.

1784. The transplanted Englishmen soon discovered, however, that their arrival in England was not enthusiastically applauded by the British nation.<sup>315</sup> The acclimation and acceptance of the Loyalists was marked with great personal difficulty and disillusionment. The Tryon Loyalists, generally indigent farmers, relocated in the Loyalist townships of Upper Canada under the direction of Sir John Johnson. Loyalist claimants from Tryon County resettled in the following recorded locations in Canada: Bay Of Quinte (9), Carlisle Bay (2), Cataraqui (5), Charlottenburgh (1), Fort Erie (1), Lancaster (2), Machiche (1), Montreal (5), New Johnstown (105), New Carlisle (1), Niagara (6), Oswegotchie (4),<sup>316</sup> River Raisine (28), Sorell (3).

Thus, after the war the Tryon Loyalists were expelled New Yorkers without a county. Forced to resettle in the new environs of colonized townships in Upper Canada, the Tryon Loyalists attempted to recreate in defeat what they had hoped to preserve with a British triumph. The immigrant Loyalists who had just begun to settle down in Tryon and were then abruptly uprooted by the war, had to begin anew the process of acclimating to a new region. The different ethnic compo-

---

315

Mary Beth Norton, The British-Americans: The Loyalist Exiles In England, 1774-1789 (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1972), p. 66.

316

American Loyalist Claims, AO.12/20-33, passim.

sitions of the Canadian townships, mirroring the patchwork of Tryon settlements they had abandoned, reflected the clan-nish nature of early immigrant settlement on the frontier. For those Loyalists who had lived in Tryon County since the early arrival of Sir William Johnson, displacement meant leaving behind forty years of toil which helped mold the county into the prosperous condition achieved by 1775. The Tryon Loyalists were therefore denied the opportunity of returning to rebuild the British county in which they had contributed so much; and a Whig county which, ironically, they had worked so hard to dissolve.

## CHAPTER VI

## CONCLUSION

Tryon County has been depicted as a Loyalist stronghold in the voluminous accounts which recorded the Revolutionary history of upstate western New York. While this designation was fairly accurate in describing the Loyalist presence during the opening months of the conflict, the Loyalist direct command of internal affairs in Tryon was at no time complete and only of short duration. The early predominant position of the Loyalists was attributable more to the past history and accomplishments of Tryon's leading family, than to the efficacy of Loyalist actions in the county after the firing of shots at Lexington. Numerically, the Loyalists represented a minority of the population when contrasted with their Whig counterparts, comprising approximately one-fifth of the 10,000 inhabitants. This estimate does not represent a solid Loyalist block which materialized at the commencement of the regional hostilities, but reflects the county's relative Loyalist strength throughout the entire war. The Loyalists, although they effectively thwarted the development of the district committees of correspondence for a nine and a half month period, possessed actual control only in the Mohawk District.

In order to place the early Loyalist position in

Tryon in its proper perspective, the importance of Johnson Hall--the actual Loyalist stronghold in the county--must be acknowledged. Johnson Hall represented in 1775 much more to Loyalist and Whig alike than the seat of royal government in the county and the estate of Sir John Johnson. Johnson Hall symbolized the progress that had been attained on the frontier and the political leadership of the influential Johnson family which had molded the county's development. After the flight of Guy Johnson with a band of Loyalists, Johnson Hall was in fact the Loyalist refuge remaining in the county. Not only were the immediate members of the Johnson family prominent county figures, but the extended political family of the Johnsons controlled the apparatus of county government. Although Sir William Johnson was no longer in the forefront of county affairs, and the admiration for Sir John and Guy Johnson was not as great by comparison, the Johnson nucleus of political power remained intact. The Loyalist maintenance of the upper hand in Tryon until January 1776 was the result of two salient factors: 1) the capable leadership provided by those Tryon residents occupying positions of royal authority--Sir John Johnson, Guy Johnson, John Butler, Daniel Claus, Joseph Chew, Joseph Brant, Alexander White, 2) the psychological intimidation commanded by the Johnsons given their standing in the Indian Department and relationship with the Iroquois.

The Johnson relationship with the Iroquois was one

of great concern and fear for the Tryon Whigs. The familiarity with the operations of the British Indian Department predated the formation of the county to the memorable years of Sir William Johnson. A number of the members of the Johnson political fraternity were employed in the Department. Although the Iroquois had remained neutral while the Johnsons still resided in the county, there was little doubt in the minds of Tryon Whigs which side the Iroquois would favor. The Whigs could recount the numerous meetings with the Indians at Johnson Hall conducted by Sir William Johnson and continued by the new Indian Superintendent Guy Johnson.

With the breakdown of royal authority in the colony extending to the outposts of the frontier, the Johnsons recognized their powerless position if they decided to remain in the county. The sudden departure of Guy and John Johnson with most of the county's Loyalists placed the Whigs in a totally unfamiliar situation. The Whigs had bided their time all along, moving carefully, hoping not to provoke the Loyalists into adopting an offensive posture. The ascendancy of the Whigs to positions of power in the vacated county government pointed to another dimension of the Revolution in Tryon County. The Whigs had primarily won a temporary victory in eliminating a Tory threat from within their boundaries. In addition to this, however, the Whigs had divested themselves of the powerful Johnsons, the Johnsons who had commanded events in the region long before Sir William John-

son molded the county according to his personal design.

The Loyalist-Whig decision was one which had to be directly addressed by the inhabitants of Tryon County. The county's residents could not enjoy the luxury of adopting a neutral stance as some individuals could in safe counties in other sections of the colonies. Tryon County's geographic location marked it as a crossroads of active Loyalist-Indian-Whig military activity. Consequently, the Tryon population was forced to take sides, whether or not the decision was openly professed or enthusiastically supported. Acknowledging that the decision to remain loyal to the king involved a number of variable factors of varying degrees of importance, there were certain factors in the Tryon geographic region which were more compelling than others. The first influential factor was the holding of a position in the service of the crown and the possession of large personal and real estates prior to the Revolution. There was a strong correlation in Tryon between the wartime Loyalist leadership and the pre-war royal officials. Particularly concentrated in the county seat of Johnstown, the patronage of the Johnsons cemented alliances in the network of county offices. In addition to public office positions, a number of Loyalists had served in the Indian Department in some capacity. While aiding Sir William Johnson in the Indian Department and at the county level, members of his political cadre acquired considerable estates when compared with the



meager tracts of the average Tryon farmer. In order to preserve their positions and possessions, the adherence to Loyalism was a logical step. A second factor was the time frame during which an inhabitant moved into the county and how long he had lived there before the war. A sizeable number of immigrant tenant farmers cultivating tracts on the Johnson lands were Loyalists. Over half of the Loyalists who fled the county in the two stage Johnson exodus had come to Tryon in the 1770-1775 period. The newly arrived tenant farmer who had received munificent benefits from the tenancy of Johnson perceived the Revolution by a different set of standards than the native born German Palatine inhabitant.

Although a sizeable number of the Tryon Loyalists were tenant farmers and political retainers of the Johnsons, not all of the Loyalists fit into these two categories. Principle undoubtedly represented a prime motivational factor for some, as evidenced in cases where one son or brother would join the Loyalist forces while the rest of the family staunchly supported the Whig position. Another factor less obvious, but nevertheless very real for those in the Mohawk District, was the possible Whig application of the guilt by association concept. Even though a family residing in the Mohawk District may not have been directly involved with the Johnsons before the war, the fear that the Whig committees would there-

after take punitive action against the "Loyalist Johnson sympathizers" forced some to accompany the Loyalists.

Whatever the leading motivational factor or combination of factors in bringing a Tryon inhabitant to actively work for a return to the status quo, Loyalism persisted as a preoccupation of the Tryon Whigs throughout and immediately after the war. Those who chose to support the king in the most effective manner available, had to do so externally, outside of the county's boundaries and the extended reach of the county committees. Those who remained, although not highly visible and always under the control of the dominant Whigs, nevertheless kept alive the Loyalist hopes for a Johnson renaissance. The greatest Loyalist ally in Tryon during the war proved to be the internal instability and insecurity of the county. Left with a Whig leadership vacuum following the defensive stand at Fort Stanwix, an ineffective and erratic militia, a defenseless expanse of border territory to protect, and virtually no military assistance from the Provincial or Continental forces; the unextinguished Loyalist flame was periodically rekindled by the repeated Loyalist-Indian forays into the county. The long awaited Johnson renaissance, however, never materialized, leaving the Loyalists homeless and without resource.

## APPENDICES

- I. Anti-Loyalist Resolutions Issued In Tryon County
  - A. Committee Resolutions of Canajoharie District
  - B. Resolution of Mohawk District Following Revolutionary War
  
- II. Loyalist Protective Provisions Of Peace Treaty Violated by New York State Legislature
  - A. Article V of 1783 Treaty of Peace
  - B. Ratification Proclamation of Peace Treaty by Continental Congress
  
- III. Excerpts of Loyalist Claims Of Tryon County
  - A. Claim of Joseph Chew Esq.
  - B. Claim of Colonel William Edmeston
  
- IV. Loyalist Claims From Tryon County, New York
  - A. Schedule of Claims Filed
  - B. Canajoharie
  - C. Cherry Valley
  - D. German Flatts
  - E. Sir William Johnson Lands
  - F. Sir John Johnson Lands
  - G. Johnstown
  - H. Johnson Bush
  - I. Albany Bush
  - J. Scotch Bush
  - K. Stone Arabia
  - L. Kingsborough

- M. Harpersfield
- N. Along Delaware River
- O. Along Susquehanna River
- P. Along Mohawk River
- Q. Cobus Kill
- R. Turlock
- S. Tryon County



## TRYON COUNTY COMMITTEE RESOLUTIONS

Conajohary District, May 24, 1775

Resolved unanimously by this Committee, that it be Recommended to the Inhabitants of this District, and it is expected that no person or persons, or any other for or in their Behalf do or shall from this Day have any Dealings or other Connections in the Way of trade with any person or persons whatsoever, who have not signed the Association entered into by this District. Also Resolved, that every owner of Slaves and Servants do not permit them to absent themselves from home either by Night or Day, unless they be upon their Masters or Mistresses Lawful Business and with a Certificate specifying such Business; And Such persons, as do infringe or break through these two Resolutions will be dealt with as Enemies to the District and to their Country: And it is Requested of every Friend to this Country to take up and secure every Servant or Slave not having such Certificate---

Ordered therefore that these Resolutions be published by the Clerk of the Committee at all the publick places in the District.

(Gerlach, The American Revolution: New York As A Case Study, p. 77)

RESOLUTION OF THE PEOPLE OF MICHIGAN DISTRICT, 1793

APPENDIX I-B

Resolution Of Mohawk District Following Revolutionary War

As for those who have... their lands... and... with... they may... and...  
 The... of... for... in...  
 of Representatives... to the... of any...  
 for the safety of the State... or...  
 or the... of... by order of the...  
 of the...

Washington, the District of Mohawk County, 1793

MICHIGAN STATE LIBRARY

## RESOLUTION OF THE PEOPLE OF MOHAWK DISTRICT, May 9, 1793

Resolved, unanimously, that all those who have gone off to the enemy or have been banished by any law of this state, or those whom we shall find tarried as spies or tools of the enemy, and encouraged or harbored those who went away, shall not live in this district or any pretense whatever; and as for those who have washed their faces from Indian paint and their hands from the innocent blood of our dear ones, and have returned, either openly or covertly, we hereby warn them to leave this district before the 20th of June next, or they may expect to feel the first resentment of an injured and determined people.

We likewise unanimously desire our brethren in the other districts in this county to join with us to instruct our representatives not to consent to the repealing of any law made for the safety of the state against treason, or confiscation of traitors estates or to passing any new acts for the return or restitution of tories. By order of the meeting. Josiah Throop, chairman.

(Frothingham, The History Of Montgomery County, p. 100)





ARTICLE V

It is agreed, That the Congress shall earnestly recommend it to the Legislatures of the respective States, to provide for the restitution of all Estates, Rights, and Properties which have been confiscated, belonging to real British Subjects; and also of the Estates, Rights, and Properties of Persons resident in Districts in the Possession of His Majesty's Arms, and who have not borne Arms against the said United States: and that Persons of any other Description shall have free Liberty to go to any Part or Parts of any of the thirteen United States, and therein to remain twelve months unmolested in their Endeavors to obtain the Restitution of Such of their Estates, Rights, and Properties as may have been confiscated: and that Congress shall also earnestly recommend to the several States, a Reconsideration and Revision of Acts or Laws perfectly consistent, not only with Justice and Equity, but with that Spirit of Conciliation, which, on the Return of the Blessings of Peace, should universally prevail. And that Congress shall also earnestly recommend to the several States, that the Estates, Rights, and Properties of such last-mentioned Persons shall be restored to them, they refunding to any Persons who may be now in Possession the Bona Fide Price (where any has been given) which such Persons may have paid on purchasing any of the said Lands, Rights, or Properties since the Confiscation.

And it is agreed, That all Persons who have any interest in confiscated Lands, either by Debts, Marriage Settlements, or otherwise, shall meet with no lawful Impediment in the Prosecution of their just Rights.

(Thomas Jones, History Of New York During The Revolutionary War, II, p. 665)



By the United States Congress, in Congress assembled, A Proclamation.

And we the United States Congress, assembled, having seen and duly considered the definitive articles aforesaid, did by a certain act under the seal of the United States, bearing the date this fourteenth day of January, 1784, approve, ratify, and confirm the same, and every part and clause thereof, engaging and promising that we would sincerely and faithfully perform and observe the same, and never suffer them to be violated by any one, or transgressed in any manner as far as should be in our power. . . .

And in compliance with the fifth article of the treaty alluded to in the forgoing proclamation, they resolve unanimously: nine States present: "That it be, and is hereby recommended to the legislatures of the respective States, to provide for the restitution of all estates, rights, and properties, which have been confiscated, belonging to real British subjects, and also the estates, rights, and properties, of persons resident in districts which were in possession of his Majesty's arms, at any time between the 30th day of November 1782 and the 14th day of January 1784, and who have not borne arms against the said United States; and that persons of any other description shall have free liberty to go to any part or parts of the thirteen United States, and therein to remain twelve months unmolested, in their endeavors to obtain the restitution of such of their estates, rights, and properties, as may have been confiscated. And it is also hereby earnestly recommended to the several States, to reconsider and revise all their acts or laws regarding the premises, so as to render the said laws or acts perfectly consistent, not only with justice and equity, but with that spirit of conciliation which on the return of the blessings of peace, should universally prevail. And it is hereby also earnestly recommended to the several states, that the estates, rights, and properties of such last mentioned persons should be restored to them, they refunding to any person who may be now in possession the bona fide price (where any has been given) which such persons may have paid on purchasing any of the said lands, rights, or properties, since the said confiscation."

(Thomas Jones, History Of New York During The Revolutionary War, II, pp. 669-670)



Claim of Joseph Chew Esq.:

The Memorial of Joseph Chew Esq., His Majesty's Secretary for the Indian Affairs in North America.

That in consequence of the late rebellion in America he left his family and property near Johnson Hall Tryon County and colony of New York in May 1775 and went with Colonel Guy Johnson and other officers of the Indian Department to the treaties held with the Six Indian Nations and their allies in the back country from thence to Canada and England, that he returned to New York in July 1776 and joined the British army then on Staten Island. That when on service in order to procure forage for the army he was in May 1777 taken prisoner by a large party of rebels commanded by Colonel Meggs near the east end of Long Island and carried to Connecticut where he remained in a very disagreeable situation until the September following. That in the fall of the year 1778 Colonel Guy Johnson the superintendent finding it necessary that he should go to Canada, he for several reasons was left with the army at New York by leave from the commander in chief, where he continued faithfully and zealously to do everything in his power for His Majesty's service until November 1783 when the army quitted that country and hopes on many occasions he was very useful in those employments he was engaged in, particularly in procuring intelligence and furnishing proper persons to go with expresses through the country to Canada, Niagara, etc., etc., which with the number of persons connected with the Indians and Loyalists to firm the back country who escaped from rebel gaols and others that contrived to get within the British lines who resorted to him put him to much expense for which he had no reimbursement. . . . That in July 1776 in consequence of insults and depredations made on them by the rebels his wife with two small children was under the necessity of quitting her habitation near Johnson Hall and retiring to some relations she had in Connecticut leaving his stock, farming utensils, and most of their household furniture as well as the crop growing on the farms all of which was taken plundered and destroyed by the rebels. That notwithstanding his frequent requests and application his family could not get leave from the government of Connecticut to quit that colony until April 1780. . . .

28 March 1784

(Records of the Commission of Enquiry into the Losses and Services of the American Loyalists, Audit Office series 12, British Public Record Office, London, England. AO.12/24/195-197)



Claim of Colonel William Edmeston:

## The Memorial of Colonel William Edmeston of the 50th Regiment

That your memorialist was made prisoner on the 28th of May 1776 at his estate in the County of Tryon. . . for having succomed and supported the friends of government in that quarter that he was sent to Albany where they forgot to bind him by parole, that he from that circumstance could have early effected his escape to Canada into the Kings troops at New York either of which most certainly would have been to his interest to have done, as by acting with the army in his professional line, he would have had many emoluments with other advantages and avoided many. . . dangers and very imminent risks, which he afterwards was exposed to. But the Loyalists who were a very considerable and respectable body at Albany and in the neighborhood thereof and many of whom he then visited daily in the goals, told him he must not leave them for they wanted the assistance of experienced officers as they were determined to erect the Kings standard there as soon as Sir Guy Carleton crossed Lake George or General Sir William Howe oppened the passage through the Highlands obstructed by several forts which the rebels erected there--that as soon as either of those events took place they would put me at the head of a considerable body of men. Flattered with this prospect and seeing the distress they were in, your memorialist could not think of leaving them, and from that time until he went into New York in February 1777--every exertion was made that could in any degree favor the royal cause. By. . . and supporting the Loyalists on every emergency and occasion by printing and circulating papers and proclamations as will appear from some of the annexed certificates.

(Records of the Commission of Enquiry into the Losses and Services of the American Loyalists, Audit Office series 12, British Public Record Office, London, England. AO.12/24/250-251)



APPENDIX IV-A

Schedule Of Claims Filed

The following eighteen tables provide a summary of the claims filed in the above-captioned case. The claims are listed in the order in which they were filed. The date of filing is indicated in the right-hand column. The claims are listed in the order in which they were filed. The date of filing is indicated in the right-hand column.

The following tables provide a summary of the claims filed in the above-captioned case. The claims are listed in the order in which they were filed. The date of filing is indicated in the right-hand column. The claims are listed in the order in which they were filed. The date of filing is indicated in the right-hand column.

- 1. Country of Birth
- 2. Presently Resided
- 3. Presently Resided
- 4. Presently Resided
- 5. Presently Resided
- 6. Presently Resided
- 7. Presently Resided
- 8. Presently Resided
- 9. Presently Resided
- 10. Presently Resided
- 11. Presently Resided
- 12. Presently Resided
- 13. Presently Resided
- 14. Presently Resided
- 15. Presently Resided
- 16. Presently Resided
- 17. Presently Resided
- 18. Presently Resided

The following eighteen tables provide microcosmic extracts from the entire two hundred and fifty-five claims examined. In collating the information contained in the claims, Tryon County was sub-divided into eighteen units determined on the basis of geographic proximity in order to focus upon the similarities and differences in the various areas of settlement. The claims filed by the Loyalists contained three component parts: 1) a "memorial" describing the claimants possessions, involvement during the war, and the estimated losses, 2) "evidence" produced to corroborate the claimants itemized losses, 3) "sworn testimony" of witnesses attesting to the validity of the claim and the veracity of the claimant. Although the claims are similar in composition, each individual claim is different in the degree of detail recorded and the specific kinds of information included. The following areas of inquiry represent the criterion utilized in analyzing the claims and recording information in the tables:

- 1) COUNTRY OF BIRTH
- 2) PROPERTY POSSESSED
  - a) OWNED
  - b) TENANT LAND
  - c) NO LAND CLAIMED
- 3) ESTIMATED WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS
  - £ 500-LESS
  - £501-£1000
  - £1001-£2000
  - £2001-£5000
  - £5001-£10000
  - OVER £10000

- 4) MILITARY SERVICE
  - a) BORE ARMS
  - b) IMPRISONMENT
  - c) NO SERVICE
  - d) YEAR CLAIMANT JOINED BRITISH
  - e) MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION
- 5) RELIGION
- 6) FAMILY MEMBERS IN BRITISH SERVICE
  - a) SON OR SONS
  - b) BROTHER
- 7) CAPACITY SERVED WITH BRITISH
  - a) JOINED SIR JOHN JOHNSON
  - b) BUTLERS RANGERS
  - c) 84th REGIMENT
  - d) SERVED WITH BURGOYNE
  - e) OTHER
- 8) OCCUPATION
  - a) FARMER/LANDOWNER
  - b) COMMERCIAL OCCUPATION
  - c) OFFICE HOLDER

Due to the heterogeneous nature of the claims as aforementioned, some categories in the tables appear incomplete because of insufficient information recorded or the total lack of information in specific cases. Consequently, a complete picture of each unit is not an achievable objective. The tables provide specific supplemental data to make more clear the general discussion of Tryon County and give some degree of local perspective in the information concerning specific settlements.

LOYALIST CLAIMS FILED FROM TRYON COUNTY

CANAJOHARIE	6
CHERRY VALLEY	7
GERMAN FLATTS	4
SIR WILLIAM JOHNSON LANDS	12
SIR JOHN JOHNSON LANDS	35
JOHNSTOWN	45
JOHNSON BUSH	25
ALBANY BUSH	2
SCOTCH BUSH	4
STONE ARABIA	6
KINGSBOROUGH	17
HARPERSFIELD	6
ALONG DELEWARE RIVER	3
ALONG SUSQUEHANNA RIVER	14
ALONG MOHAWK RIVER	25
COBUS KILL	4
TURLOCK	4
TRYON COUNTY	46

---

255

COUNTRY OF BIRTH

YEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

PROPERTY ASSESSED

APPENDIX IV-B

Canajoharie

PROPERTY ASSESSED

Claimants who owned land  
 Claimants who possess no land  
 Claimants who did not claim land

HEALTH OF CLAIMANTS

1800-1805 1  
 1806-1810 0  
 1811-1815 1  
 1816-1820 0  
 1821-1825 0  
 OVER 210000

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	5	Number Claimant Joined
No service	1	British service
Number who bore arms	5	
Number captured	0	1777 1
Number in Miller's Regt	2	1780 1
Number for British Army	1	
Number for American Army	1	
Number for both Armies	0	

EXERCISE

Former landowner 1  
 Clerk/Trader 1

REMARKS CITED IN CLAIM FILE

See Canajoharie  
 List of Claims  
 Canajoharie

STATE OF NEW YORK  
 COUNTY OF ...  
 ...

COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

America	1	Pre-1770	2
Germany	2		
Ireland	1		

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	5
Claimants who possessed tenant land	0
Claimants who did not claim land	1

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	3
£501-£1000	0
£1001-£2000	1
£2001-£5000	2
£5001-£10000	0
OVER £10000	0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	5	Year Claimant Joined	
No Service	1	British Service:	
Number who bore arms	5		
Number imprisoned	2	1777	1
Served in Indian Dept.	2	1780	1
Recruiter/Liaison for Brit.	1		
Scout for American army	1		
Joined Sir John Johnson	2		

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	5
Clerk/Trader	1

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	1
Bay of Quinty	1
Cataraqui	1

COUNTRY OF BIRTH YEAR CLAIMANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

English  
Irish  
Scottish

APPENDIX IV-C

Cherry Valley

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land  
Claimants who possessed tenant land  
Claimants who did not claim land

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (ESTIMATED)

2500-12500  
1251-25000  
2501-50000  
50001-100000  
100001-250000  
OVER 250000

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	Year Claimant Joined British Service
Number who were army	
Number who were navy	
Number who were discharged	1775
Number who were discharged	1776
Number who were discharged	1777
Number who were discharged	1778

EMPLOYMENT

Farmer / Landowner  
Merchant

PEOPLE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

John Johnson  
John Quincy  
James Hill

COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

America	1	Pre-1770	1
England	1	1770-1775	5
Ireland	3		
Scotland	2		

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	1
Claimants who possessed tenant land	4
Claimants who did not claim land	2

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	7
£501-£1000	0
£1001-£2000	0
£2001-£5000	0
£5001-£10000	0
OVER £10000	0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	7	Year Claimant Joined	
Number who bore arms	7	British Service:	
Number imprisoned	1		
Produced discharge	2	1775	1
Joined Sir John Johnson	4	1776	1
Butlers Rangers	2	1777	2
		1778	1

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	6
Shoemaker	1

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	2
Bay of Quinty	1
Niagara Fall	1



COUNTRY OF BIRTH

YEAR CLAIMANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

America  
Germany  
Austria

APPENDIX IV-D

German Flatts

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land  
Claimants who possessed lease land  
Claimants who did not own lease land

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (ESTIMATED)

\$500-LESS 1  
501-1000 0  
1001-2500 0  
2501-5000 1  
5001-10000 0  
OVER 10000 0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service 2 Year Claimant Joined  
No Service 2 British Service  
Number who bore arms 2  
Number Imprisoned 1  
Joined Sir John Johnson 1  
Number Hungary

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Proprietor 1  
Trade

NUMBER OF CITIES WHERE CLAIM FILED

Chicago 1  
Dallas 1

COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

America	2	Pre-1770	1
Germany	1		
Ireland	1		

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	3
Claimants who possessed tenant land	1
Claimants who did not claim land	0

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	3
£501-£1000	0
£1001-£2000	0
£2001-£5000	1
£5001-£10000	0
OVER £10000	0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	2	Year Claimant Joined	
No Service	2	British Service:	
Number who bore arms	2		
Number imprisoned	1	1777	2
Joined Sir John Johnson	1		
Butlers Rangers	1		

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	3
Trader	1

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

Niagara	1
Carlisle Bay	1

LIST OF CLAIMANTS WHOSE NAMES APPEAR IN THE

APPENDIX IV-E

Sir William Johnson Lands

PROPERTY POSSESSION

Claimants who owned land  
Claimants who possessed land  
Claimants who did not own land

WEAVER OF CLAIMANTS (ORDERS)

1500-1570 11  
1571-1600 1  
1601-1650 1  
1651-1699 1  
1700-1750 1  
1751-1800 1  
1801-1850 1

MILITARY SERVICE

	Year Claimant Served British Service
Number of British service	
Number who bore arms	
Number hospitalized	
Number discharged	1770
Number British scouts	1770
Served British Company	1770
Other Americans	1770
Number of John Johnson	

OTHER DATA

Number of landowners

PROPERTY HELD BY OTHER PARTIES

Number of landowners

32-3111-1111  
SOUTHAMPTON

COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

America	1	Pre-1770	3
Germany	3		
Ireland	1		
Scotland	7		

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	1
Claimants who possessed tenant land	9
Claimants who did not claim land	1

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	11
£501-£1000	1
£1001-£2000	0
£2001-£5000	0
£5001-£1000	0
OVER £1000	0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	12	Year Claimant Joined	
Number who bore arms	12	British Service:	
Number imprisoned	1		
Produced Discharge	1	1775	2
Assisted British Scouts	1	1776	3
Raised British Company	1	1777	3
Royal Americans	1	1779	1
Joined Sir John Johnson	11		

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	12
------------------	----

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	6
---------------	---

COUNTRY OF BIRTH

YEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

Denmark  
England  
Ireland  
Germany  
Sweden

APPENDIX IV-F

Sir John Johnson Lands

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land  
Claimants who possessed land  
Claimants who did not own land

RELATE OF CLAIMANTS (STARLING)

1500-1550  
1551-1600  
1601-1650  
1651-1700  
1701-1750  
1751-1800  
1801-1850  
1851-1900  
1901-1950  
1951-2000

MILITARY SERVICE

Year of Service	Year Claimant Arrived	British Service
1775	1775	
1776	1776	
1777	1777	
1778	1778	
1779	1779	
1780	1780	
1781	1781	
1782	1782	
1783	1783	
1784	1784	
1785	1785	
1786	1786	
1787	1787	
1788	1788	
1789	1789	
1790	1790	
1791	1791	
1792	1792	
1793	1793	
1794	1794	
1795	1795	
1796	1796	
1797	1797	
1798	1798	
1799	1799	
1800	1800	
1801	1801	
1802	1802	
1803	1803	
1804	1804	
1805	1805	
1806	1806	
1807	1807	
1808	1808	
1809	1809	
1810	1810	
1811	1811	
1812	1812	
1813	1813	
1814	1814	
1815	1815	
1816	1816	
1817	1817	
1818	1818	
1819	1819	
1820	1820	
1821	1821	
1822	1822	
1823	1823	
1824	1824	
1825	1825	
1826	1826	
1827	1827	
1828	1828	
1829	1829	
1830	1830	
1831	1831	
1832	1832	
1833	1833	
1834	1834	
1835	1835	
1836	1836	
1837	1837	
1838	1838	
1839	1839	
1840	1840	
1841	1841	
1842	1842	
1843	1843	
1844	1844	
1845	1845	
1846	1846	
1847	1847	
1848	1848	
1849	1849	
1850	1850	
1851	1851	
1852	1852	
1853	1853	
1854	1854	
1855	1855	
1856	1856	
1857	1857	
1858	1858	
1859	1859	
1860	1860	
1861	1861	
1862	1862	
1863	1863	
1864	1864	
1865	1865	
1866	1866	
1867	1867	
1868	1868	
1869	1869	
1870	1870	
1871	1871	
1872	1872	
1873	1873	
1874	1874	
1875	1875	
1876	1876	
1877	1877	
1878	1878	
1879	1879	
1880	1880	
1881	1881	
1882	1882	
1883	1883	
1884	1884	
1885	1885	
1886	1886	
1887	1887	
1888	1888	
1889	1889	
1890	1890	
1891	1891	
1892	1892	
1893	1893	
1894	1894	
1895	1895	
1896	1896	
1897	1897	
1898	1898	
1899	1899	
1900	1900	
1901	1901	
1902	1902	
1903	1903	
1904	1904	
1905	1905	
1906	1906	
1907	1907	
1908	1908	
1909	1909	
1910	1910	
1911	1911	
1912	1912	
1913	1913	
1914	1914	
1915	1915	
1916	1916	
1917	1917	
1918	1918	
1919	1919	
1920	1920	
1921	1921	
1922	1922	
1923	1923	
1924	1924	
1925	1925	
1926	1926	
1927	1927	
1928	1928	
1929	1929	
1930	1930	
1931	1931	
1932	1932	
1933	1933	
1934	1934	
1935	1935	
1936	1936	
1937	1937	
1938	1938	
1939	1939	
1940	1940	
1941	1941	
1942	1942	
1943	1943	
1944	1944	
1945	1945	
1946	1946	
1947	1947	
1948	1948	
1949	1949	
1950	1950	
1951	1951	
1952	1952	
1953	1953	
1954	1954	
1955	1955	
1956	1956	
1957	1957	
1958	1958	
1959	1959	
1960	1960	
1961	1961	
1962	1962	
1963	1963	
1964	1964	
1965	1965	
1966	1966	
1967	1967	
1968	1968	
1969	1969	
1970	1970	
1971	1971	
1972	1972	
1973	1973	
1974	1974	
1975	1975	
1976	1976	
1977	1977	
1978	1978	
1979	1979	
1980	1980	
1981	1981	
1982	1982	
1983	1983	
1984	1984	
1985	1985	
1986	1986	
1987	1987	
1988	1988	
1989	1989	
1990	1990	
1991	1991	
1992	1992	
1993	1993	
1994	1994	
1995	1995	
1996	1996	
1997	1997	
1998	1998	
1999	1999	
2000	2000	

PROPERTY OWNERS

Property Owner  
Property Owner

COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

America	3	Pre-1770	10
England	1	1770-1775	20
Ireland	3		
Germany	5		
Scotland	23		

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	3
Claimants who possessed tenant land	30
Claimants who did not claim land	2

WELATH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	32
£501-£1000	0
£1001-£2000	0
£2001-£5000	0
£5001-£10000	1
OVER £10000	1
No Figure Recorded	1

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	30	Year Claimant Joined	
No Service	5	British Service:	
Number Imprisoned	2		
Produced Discharge	4	1775	6
Number wounded	2	1776	9
Number who bore arms	29	1777	5
In Engineers Dept.	3	1779	1
Joined Sir John Johnson	21	1780	8
84th Regiment	5	1781	1
Served with Burgoyne	1		

Had son or sons in service: 5

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	34
Royal Office Holder	1

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	13	Charlottenburgh	1
River Raisine	10	Sorell	1

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN      YEAR OF ARRIVAL IN AMERICA

America  
 England  
 Ireland  
 Scotland

APPENDIX IV-G

Johnstown

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land  
 Claimants who possessed property  
 Claimants who did not claim land

AGE OF CLAIMANTS (UNDERLINES)

5500-6000      12  
 6001-6500      1  
 6501-7000      1  
 7001-7500      1  
 7501-8000      1  
 8001-8500      1  
 8501-9000      1  
 No Figure Reported

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	1	Year Claimant Joined	
No Service	2	Year Claimant Served	
Number who gave arms	10		
Number Captured		1775	6
Produced Discharge	9	1776	1
Accounter	1	1777	1
Interpreter	1	1778	1
Intelligence	2	1778	2
Indian Dept.	1	1780	1
Brigadier Genl.	1	1781	2
Col. Sir JOHN JOHNSON	12		
Genl. Regent	1		

Number of sons in service  
 Number of brothers in service

EXPIRIENCE

Farmer/Laborer  
 Royal Militia Soldier  
 Miner  
 Mill Worker  
 Carpenter  
 (Unclear)

COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

America	12	Pre-1770	9
England	2	1770-1775	15
Ireland	2	1775-1780	0
Scotland	19		

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	4
Claimants who possessed tenant land	38
Claimants who did not claim land	3

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	42
£501-£1000	1
£1001-£2000	0
£2001-£5000	0
£5001-£10000	0
OVER £10000	0
No Figure Recorded	2

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	39	Year Claimant Joined	
No Service	6	British Service:	
Number who bore arms	36		
Number imprisoned	9	1775	6
Produced Discharge	9	1776	5
Recruiter	1	1777	10
Interpreter	1	1778	1
Intelligence	2	1779	2
Indian Dept.	1	1780	7
Engineer Dept.	1	1781	2
Joined Sir John Johnson	22		
84th Regiment	3		

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	33
Royal Office Holder	1
Hatter	1
Mill Wright	1
Interpreter	1
(Indian Dept.)	

Had son or sons in service: 5  
Had brother in service: 2



OCCUPATION

Blacksmith	1
Clergy	1
Weaver	1

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	29
Bay of Quinty	2
Oswegotchie	1
River Raisine	2
Montreal	2

COUNTRY OF BIRTH

Canada  
Scotland

APPENDIX IV-H

PROPERTY POSSESSION

Johnson Bush

Claimants who owned land  
Claimants who possessed property  
Claimants who had a life interest

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (1945)

£500-£1000  
£1001-£2000  
£2001-£5000  
£5001-£10000  
OVER £10000

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service  
No. Service

Number in Royal Air Force  
Number in Royal Navy  
Number in Army  
Number in Merchant Navy  
Number in Civilian Service

Number in Home Service  
Number in War Service  
Number in War Service (Overseas)

Number in War Service (Overseas)  
Number in War Service (Overseas)

EDUCATION

Number in University  
Number in Secondary

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Number in University  
Number in Secondary

COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

Germany	1	Pre-1770	0
Scotland	24	1770-1775	24

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	0
Claimants who possessed tenant land	23
Claimants who did not claim land	2

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	24
£501-£1000	1
£1001-£2000	0
£2001-£5000	0
£5001-£10000	0
OVER £10000	0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	25	Year Claimant Joined	
No Service	2	British Service:	
Number imprisoned	2		
Number who bore arms	23	1775	9
In Engineers Dept.	2	1776	2
Produced Discharge	12	1777	5
Joined Sir John Johnson	17	1779	3
84th Regiment	3	1780	3
Queens Rangers	1		
22nd Regiment	1		
Served with Burgoyne	1	Had son or sons in	
		service:	1

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	24
Blacksmith	1

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	8
River Raisine	9

COUNTRY OF BIRTH

YEAR IMMIGRATED AND WHERE IN AMERICA

CLAIMANT'S NAME

DATE OF BIRTH

APPENDIX IV-I

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Albany Bush

Claimants who owned land

Claimants who possessed tenant land

Claimants who did not claim land

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (ESTIMATED)

\$500-\$1000	1
\$1001-\$1500	2
\$1501-\$2000	6
\$2001-\$2500	3
\$2501-\$3000	0
OVER \$10000	0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	2	Year Claimant Joined	
Number who bore arms	2	British Service	
Number imprisoned	1		
Secret Service	1	1777	1

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner

RESIDENCE CITY AND STATE

New Amherst

COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

Germany	2	Pre-1770	2
---------	---	----------	---

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	1
Claimants who possessed tenant land	1
Claimants who did not claim land	0

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	2
£501-£1000	0
£1001-£2000	0
£2001-£5000	0
£5001-£10000	0
OVER £10000	0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	2	Year Claimant Joined	
Number who bore arms	2	British Service:	
Number imprisoned	1		
Secret Service	1	1777	1

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	2
------------------	---

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	2
---------------	---

COUNTY OF JEFFERSON

YEAR CLAIMANTS ARRIVED IN MARYLAND

Scotch Bush

APPENDIX IV-J

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Scotch Bush

Claimants who owned land 0  
 Claimants who possessed tenant land 1  
 Claimants who did not claim land 0

HEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

\$500-1000 1  
 1001-2000 0  
 2001-3000 0  
 3001-4000 0  
 4001-5000 0  
 OVER 5000 0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	4	Year Claimant Joined	
Number who bore arms	4	British Service	
Produced Discharge			
Joined Sir John Johnson	4	1775	1
		1776	1
		1777	1

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner

RESIDENCE CITED WITH CLAIM FILED

New Johnston 2  
 River Landing 1

COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

Scotland	4	Pre-1770	1
		1770-1775	3

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	0
Claimants who possessed tenant land	4
Claimants who did not claim land	0

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	4
£501-£1000	0
£1001-£2000	0
£2001-£5000	0
£5001-£10000	0
OVER £10000	0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	4	Year Claimant Joined	
Number who bore arms	4	British Service:	
Produced Discharge	2		
Joined Sir John Johnson	4	1775	1
		1776	1
		1777	1

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	4
------------------	---

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	2
River Raisine	1





COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

America	3	Pre-1770	3
Germany	2		

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	4
Claimants who possessed tenant land	0
Claimants who did not claim land	2

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	3
£501-£1000	2
£1001-£2000	1
£2001-£5000	0
£5001-£10000	0
OVER £10000	0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	5	Year Claimant Joined	
No Service	1	British Service:	
Number who bore arms	5		
Number imprisoned	4	1777	2
Produced Discharge	1	1780	2
Signed Association	1		
In American Militia	2		
		Had son or sons in	
		service:	1

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	5
Tanner	1

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	5
Sorell	1

APPENDIX IV-L

Kingsborough

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land  
Claimants who possessed property  
Claimants who did not own land

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

E500-1234 17  
E501-1234 6  
E1001-1234 0  
E2501-1234 0  
E5001-1234 0  
OVER EIGHTY 0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British service 17  
Number who bore arms 15  
Number imprisoned 15  
Served in Indian Army 15  
Received decorations 15  
Served with Sir John Johnson 15  
Served with Burdett 15  
Number of years of service 15

EXTRAITS

Farmer/Landowner 17

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New York 17

COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

America	2	Pre-1770	5
Germany	1	1770-1775	11
Ireland	1		
Scotland	13		

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	1
Claimants who possessed tenant land	16
Claimants who did not claim land	0

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	17
£501-£1000	0
£1001-£2000	0
£2001-£5000	0
£5001-£10000	0
OVER £10000	0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	17	Year Claimant Joined	
Number who bore arms	16	British Service:	
Number imprisoned	2		
Served in Indian Dept.	1	1775	5
Produced Discharge	5	1776	6
Joined Sir John Johnson	16	1777	4
Served with Burgoyne	6	1780	2

Had son or sons in  
service: 1

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	17
------------------	----

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	5
River Raisine	5

APPENDIX IV-M

Harpersfield

Claimants who owned land	0
Claimants who possessed vacant land	0
Claimants who did not own land	0

AGE OF CLAIMANTS AT DEATH

Under 10	0
10-19	0
20-29	0
30-39	0
40-49	0
50-59	0
60-69	0
70-79	0
80-89	0
Over 90	0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	0	Number in United States Service	0
Number who bore arms	0	Number in United States Service	0
Number imprisoned	0		
Producers Discharge	0		
Widow's Pension	0		

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Hawthorn

REMARKS

No John...  
C... ..

COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

Germany	1	Pre-1770	1
Scotland	5	1770-1775	5

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	0
Claimants who possessed tenant land	6
Claimants who did not claim land	0

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	6
£501-£1000	0
£1001-£2000	0
£2001-£5000	0
£5001-£10000	0
OVER £10000	0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	6	Year Claimant Joined	
Number who bore arms	6	British Service:	
Number imprisoned	2		
Produced Discharge	1	1777	1
Joined Sir John Johnson	4	1778	1
		1779	1
		1780	1

Had sons in service: 1

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	6
------------------	---

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	3
Oswegotchie	1

APPENDIX IV-N

Along Delaware River

Claimants who owned land  
Claimants who possessed land  
Claimants who did not possess land

HEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (SICILIANI)

1500-1599  
1600-1699  
1700-1799  
1800-1899  
1900-1999  
OVER 20000

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service  
Number in other arms  
Intelligence  
Joined 92nd Airborne  
Served with other Regt

OCCUPATION

Farmer/landowner

APPROXIMATE BIRTH YEAR (SICILIANI)

Birthplace  
Fingers

COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

Scotland	3	Pre-1770	0
		1770-1775	2

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	0
Claimants who possessed tenant land	3
Claimants who did not claim land	0

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	2
£501-£1000	0
£1001-£2000	0
£2001-£5000	0
£5001-£10000	0
OVER £10000	0
No Figure Recorded	1

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	3	Year Claimant Joined	
Number who bore arms	2	British Service:	
Intelligence	1		
Joined Sir John Johnson	1	1780	1
Served with Major Jessup	1	1781	1

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	3
------------------	---

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

Carlisle Bay	1
Niagara	1

COUNTY OF LINTH

APPENDIX IV-O

Along Susquehanna River

PROPERTY POSSESSOR

Claimants who owned land  
Claimants who possessed  
Claimants who had title

HEALTH OF CLAIMANTS

5000-LESS 12  
5001-11000 1  
11001-12100 0  
12001-15000 0  
15001-18000 0  
OVER 18000 0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service  
No Service  
Number in Continental  
Army or Navy  
Number who were  
served in the  
British Army  
Number who were  
served in the  
Continental Army

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner  
Trader

RESIDENCE WITH WIFE

Residence with wife  
Not with wife



<u>COUNTRY OF BIRTH</u>		<u>YEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA</u>	
America	6	Pre-1770	2
England	2	1770-1775	5
Germany	1		
Scotland	5		

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	4
Claimants who possessed tenant land	10
Claimants who did not claim land	0

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	12
£501-£1000	1
£1001-£2000	1
£2001-£5000	0
£5001-£10000	0
OVER £10000	0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	10	Year Claimant Joined	
No Service	4	British Service:	
Number imprisoned	4		
Produced Discharge	2	1777	2
Number who bore arms	10	1778	5
Joined Sir John Johnson	4	1779	2
Butlers Rangers	3		
Served with Brant	3		
Served in Batteau Company	2		

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	13
Trader	1

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	3	Niagara	1	Lancaster	1
New Carlisle	1	Oswegotchie	1	(Lake St.	
Montreal	1	Machiche	1	Francis)	

COUNTRY OF BIRTH

APPENDIX IV-P

Along Mohawk River

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned property  
Claimants who possessed property  
Claimants who did not own property

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (ESTIMATED)

1000-LESS  
1001-2000  
2001-5000  
5001-10000  
10001-25000  
OVER 25000

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service  
Number who wore arms  
Number imprisoned  
Produced his papers  
Served in Indian Dept.  
Served in Engineers Dept.  
Served in Artillery  
Served in Cavalry  
Served in Infantry  
Served in Royal Engineers  
Served in Royal Artillery  
Served in Royal Cavalry  
Served in Royal Infantry  
Served in Royal Engineers  
Served in Royal Artillery  
Served in Royal Cavalry  
Served in Royal Infantry

OCCUPATION

Farmer  
Merchant  
Soldier  
Clerk  
Teacher  
Physician  
Lawyer  
Artist  
Musician  
Dancer  
Actor  
Writer  
Printer  
Bookbinder  
Carpenter  
Blacksmith  
Tanner  
Fletcher  
Shoemaker  
Hatter  
Tailor  
Cobbler  
Saddler  
Basket maker  
Cooper  
Wheelwright  
Cabinet maker  
Joiner  
Carpenter  
Blacksmith  
Tanner  
Fletcher  
Shoemaker  
Hatter  
Tailor  
Cobbler  
Saddler  
Basket maker  
Cooper  
Wheelwright  
Cabinet maker  
Joiner

COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

America	14	Pre-1770	5
England	1	1770-1775	4
Germany	2		
Ireland	3		
Scotland	4		

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	4
Claimants who possessed tenant land	15
Claimants who did not claim land	6

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	19
£501-£1000	0
£1001-£2000	2
£2001-£5000	1
£5001-£10000	2
OVER £10000	1

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	25	Year Claimant Joined	
Number who bore arms	24	British Service:	
Number imprisoned	9		
Produced Discharge	7	1775	3
Secret Service	1	1776	5
Indian Dept.	1	1777	10
Engineers Dept.	1	1778	2
Scout	1	1780	3
Took Oath	1	1781	1
Joined Sir John Johnson	12		
Served with Guy Johnson	1	Had son or sons in	
Butlers Rangers	4	Service:	4
Served with Burgoyne	3		

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	23	Apprentice	1	Royal Office Holder	1
------------------	----	------------	---	---------------------	---

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	6	Montreal	1	Fort Erie	1
Cataraqui	2	Niagara	1		
River Raisine	1	Bay of Quinty	1		

APPENIDX IV-Q

Cobus Kill

COUNTRY OF BIRTH

Address

Category

PROPERTY POSSESSION

CLAIMANTS WHO OWNED LAND

CLAIMANTS WHO POSSESSED LAND

CLAIMANTS WHO DID NOT

AMOUNT OF CLAIMS

1500-1850

1801-2100

2101-2400

2501-2800

2801-3100

OVER 3100

NO CLAIMS RECORDED

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service

Number who bore arms

Produced Discharge

Joined Sir John Johnson

Outlets, Saddlers

Served with Sir Peter

OCCUPATION

Farmer, Landowner

RESIDENCE CITIES WHERE BORN

New York

COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

America	2	Pre-1770	1
Germany	2		

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	4
Claimants who possessed tenant land	0
Claimants who did not claim land	0

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	3
£501-£1000	0
£1001-£2000	0
£2001-£5000	0
£5001-£10000	0
OVER £10000	0
No figure recorded	1

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	4	Year Claimant Joined	
Number who bore arms	4	British Service:	
Produced Discharge	1		
Joined Sir John Johnson	2	1777	3
Butlers Rangers	1		
Served with St. Leger	1		

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	4
------------------	---

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	3
---------------	---

COUNTY OF ...

APPLICANT ...  
ADDRESS ...

APPENDIX IV-R

PROPERTY SUBJECT

Turlock

Grantor and owner of land  
Claimant and holder of lease  
Grantor and owner of land

PROPERTY SUBJECT

- 1500-1550
- 1501-1600
- 1601-1700
- 1701-1800
- 1801-1900
- OVER 1900

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in military service  
Number who bore arms  
Produced discharge

Was Claimant in  
British Service

RESIDENCE

Former residence

REFERENCE TO OTHER PARTS

See ...  
Page of ...

COUNTY OF BIRTH

America	3
Germany	1

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	2
Claimants who possessed tenant land	2
Claimants who did not claim land	0

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	4
£501-£1000	0
£1001-£2000	0
£2001-£5000	0
£5001-£10000	0
OVER £10000	0

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	4	Year Claimant Joined	
Number who bore arms	4	British Service:	
Produced Discharge	1		
		1777	4

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	4
------------------	---

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	3
Bay of Quinty	1





COUNTRY OF BIRTHYEAR IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN AMERICA

America	16	Pre-1770	8
England	4	1770-1775	16
Germany	6	1775-1780	1
Ireland	1		
Scotland	16		
Unknown	3		

PROPERTY POSSESSED

Claimants who owned land	10
Claimants who possessed tenant land	29
Claimants who did not claim land	7

WEALTH OF CLAIMANTS (STERLING)

£500-LESS	34
£501-£1000	17
£1001-£2000	1
£2001-£5000	0
£5001-£10000	2
OVER £10000	2

MILITARY SERVICE

Number in British Service	43	Year Claimant Joined	
No Service	3	British Service:	
Number who bore arms	39		
Produced Discharge	6	1775	4
Recruiter	1	1776	1
Number imprisoned	6	1777	9
Indian Dept.	1	1778	3
Provincial Forces	1	1780	6
Scouted for Rebels	1	1781	1
Took Oath of Neutrality	2		
Fined by Rebels	2		
Served in Militia	1	Had son or sons in	
		Service:	2
Joined Sir John Johnson	17		
Butlers Rangers	1		
Served with Burgoyne	2	Had brother in service:	1
Served with Major Jessup	1		
84th Regiment	4		
Joined Indians	1		
Served with Capt. McAlpine	1		

OCCUPATION

Farmer/Landowner	36
Mill Wright	1
Merchant	1
Housekeeper	1
Royal Official	2
Clergy	1
Proprietary Official	1

RESIDENCE CITED WHEN CLAIM FILED

New Johnstown	14
Sorell	1
Lancaster	1
Montreal	1
Niagara	1
Oswegotchie	1
Bay of Quinty	3
Cataraqui	2

TOTAL WEALTH ACCORDING TO CATEGORY  
OF CLAIMANTS IN TRYON COUNTY

£500-LESS	218
£501-£1000	13
£1001-£2000	6
£2001-£5000	5
£5001-£10000	4
OVER £10000	4
NO FIGURE RECORDED	5

TOTAL FIGURES FOR TRYON COUNTY SHOWING  
"COUNTRY OF BIRTH" OF CLAIMANTS

AMERICA	66
ENGLAND	11
GERMANY	30
IRELAND	16
SCOTLAND	125
UNKNOWN	7
	<hr style="width: 10%; margin-left: auto; margin-right: 0;"/> 255 CLAIMANTS

TOTAL FIGURES SHOWING "OCCUPATION"  
OF TRYON COUNTY CLAIMANTS

FARMER/LANDOWNER	234
CLERK	1
SHOEMAKER	1
TRADER	2
ROYAL OFFICE HOLDER	5
PROPRIETARY OFFICIAL	1
CLERGY	2
HATTER	1
MILL WRIGHT	2
INTERPRETER	1
BLACKSMITH	2
WEAVER	1
TANNER	1
APPRENTICE	1
MERCHANT	1
HOUSEKEEPER	1

TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMANTS WHO POSSESSED TENANT LAND: 191

TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMANTS WHO OWNED LAND: 47

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary SourcesBooks

- Burgoyne, John. A State Of The Expedition From Canada. London: J. Almon, printer, 1780; reprint ed., New York: Arno Press, Inc., 1969.
- Campbell, William A. Annals Of Tryon County, Or The Border Warfare Of New York During The Revolution. Cherry Valley, New York, 1831.
- Crary, Catherine S., ed. The Price Of Loyalty: Tory Writings From The Revolutionary Era. New York, St. Louis, San Francisco: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Gerlach, Larry R., ed. The American Revolution: New York As A Case Study. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1972.
- Hastings, Hugh, ed. The Public Papers Of George Clinton, First Governor Of New York, 1777-1795, 1801-1804. 10 vols. New York and Albany: The State Of New York, 1899-1914.
- Jones, Thomas. History Of New York During The Revolutionary War. 2 vols. New York: New York Historical Society, 1879; reprint ed., New York: Arno Press, Inc., 1968.
- O'Callaghan, E.B., ed. Documents Relative To The Colonial History Of New York. 15 vols. Albany: Weed, Parsons and Co., Printers, 1853-1887.
- Psaltis, Victor H., ed. Minutes Of The Commissioners For Detecting And Defeating Conspiracies In The State Of New York, Albany Sessions, 1778-1781. 2 vols. Albany: State Of New York, 1909; reprint ed., New York: De Capo Press, 1972.
- Sabine, William H.W., ed. Historical Memoirs Of William Smith From 16 March 1763 to 12 November 1783. 2 vols. New York: New York Times and Arno Press, 1969 and 1971.

Sullivan, James et al., eds. The Papers Of Sir William Johnson. Division of the State of New York, 1921-1931.

### Manuscripts

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Exchequer And Audit Department. AO. 12. American Loyalist Claims. Series I. 146 vols. 1776-1831.

### Secondary Sources

#### Books

- Becker, Carl Lotus. The History Of Political Parties In The Province Of New York, 1760-1776. Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 1909.
- Benton, William A. Whig-Loyalism: An Aspect Of Political Ideology In The American Revolutionary Era. Rutherford, Madison, Teaneck: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 1969.
- Bonomi, Patricia U. A Factious People: Politics And Society In Colonial New York. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1971.
- Brown, Wallace. The Good Americans: The Loyalists In The American Revolution. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The King's Friends: The Composition And Motives Of The American Loyalist Claimants. Providence, Rhode Island: Brown University Press, 1965.
- Clarke, T. Wood. The Bloody Mohawk. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1940.
- Calhoon, Robert M. The Loyalists In Revolutionary America, 1760-1781. New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, Inc., 1965, 1969, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Revolutionary America: An Interpretive Overview. New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, Inc., 1976.
- Flexner, James Thomas. Mohawk Baronet: Sir William Johnson Of New York. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

- Flick, Alexander, ed. History Of The State Of New York. 10 vols. New York: Columbia University Pre-s, 1933-1937; reprint ed., Port Washington, L.I., New York: Ira Friedman, Inc., 1962.
- Flick, Alexander. Loyalism In New York During The American Revolution. New York: Arno Press and New York Times, 1969.
- Frothingham, Washington. The History Of Montgomery County. Syracuse, New York: D. Mason and Company, 1892.
- Gerlach, Don R. Philip Schuyler And The American Revolution In New York, 1733-1777. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964.
- Graymont, Barbara. The Iroquois In The American Revolution. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1972.
- Griffis, William Elliot. Sir William Johnson And The Six Nations. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1891.
- Halsey, Francis W. The Old New York Frontier. New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1901.
- Hunt, Agnes. The Provincial Committees Of Safety Of The American Revolution. n.p., 1904; reprint ed., Haskell House Publishers, Ltd., 1968.
- Kenny, Alice P. Stubborn For Liberty: The Dutch In New York. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1975.
- Mason, Bernard. The Road To Independence: The Revolutionary Movement In New York, 1773-1777. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1966.
- Mathews, Hazel C. The Mark Of Honour. University of Toronto Press, 1965.
- Norton, Mary Beth. The British-Americans: The Loyalist Exiles In England, 1774-1789. Boston, Toronto: Little, Brown, and Company, 1972.
- Quarles, Benjamin. The Negro In The American Revolution. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1961.
- Smith, Paul H. Loyalists And Redcoats: A Study In British Revolutionary Policy. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1964.

- Sosin, Jack M. The Revolutionary Frontier, 1763-1783. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Sutherland, Stella H. Population Distribution In Colonial America. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1966.
- Swiggett, Howard. War Out Of Niagara: Walter Butler And The Tory Rangers. Port Washington, New York: Ira J. Friedman, Inc., 1963.
- Talman, James J. Loyalist Narratives From Upper Canada. Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1946.
- Upton, L.F.S. The Loyal Whig: William Smith Of New York And Quebec. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

#### Articles

- Beauchamp, W.M. "Indian Raids In The Mohawk Valley." New York State Historical Association Proceedings, XIV (1915), pp. 195-206.
- Becker, Carl L. "Nominations In Colonial New York." American Historical Review, VI (1901), pp. 260-275.
- Bryce, Peter H. "Sir William Johnson, Bart., The Great Diplomat Of The British-French Frontier." New York State Historical Association Proceedings, XXV (1927), pp. 352-373.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sir John Johnson, Baronet; Superintendent-General Of Indian Affairs, 1743-1830." New York State Historical Association, XXVI (1928), pp. 233-271.
- Fingerhut, E.R. "Uses And Abuses Of The American Loyalist Claims: A Critique Of Quantitative Analysis." William And Mary Quarterly, XXV (1968), pp. 245-258.
- Greene, Jack P. "Changing Interpretations Of Early American Politics," in Gatell and Weinstein, ed., American Themes: Essays In Historiography. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968, pp. 26-54.
- Kenny, Alice P. "The Albany Dutch: Loyalists And Patriots." New York History, XLII (1961), pp. 331-350.
- Scott, John Albert. "Joseph Brant At Fort Stanwix And Oriskany." New York State Historical Association, XXXVI (1938), pp. 399-406.



- Smith, Paul H. "The American Loyalists: Notes On Their Organization And Numerical Strength." William And Mary Quarterly, XXV (1968), pp. 259-277.
- Siebert, Wilbur H. "The Dispersion Of The American Tories." Mississippi Valley Historical Review, I (1914), pp. 185-197.
- Walker, Mabel Gregory. "Sir John Johnson, Loyalist." Mississippi Valley Historical Review, III (1916), pp. 318-346.
- Zeichner, Oscar. "The Loyalists Problem In New York After The Revolution." New York State Historical Association, XXXVIII (1940), pp. 284-302.

Unpublished Theses

- Connelly, Mark S. "The Failure Of Loyalism In Albany County During The American Revolution." M.A. Thesis, Youngstown State University, 1975.