12

"REAL" INDIANS, "WHITE" INDIANS, AND THE CONTEST FOR THE WYOMING VALLEY

PAUL MOYER

In October 1755, eight years before the massacre of the Conestogas, forty-nine men from the Paxton district of Pennsylvania rode into an ambush along the east bank of the Susquehanna River. The party, led by merchant and fur trader John Harris, was returning home after visiting settlements along Penn's Creek that had been recently devastated by Indian raiders. More than half a dozen Paxton men were shot dead or drowned in the river trying to escape. Their assailants were probably Delawares.[1] About fifty miles north and as many years later, the Pennsylvania frontier was the scene of another deadly ambush. In July 1804, Edward Gobin, a surveyor employed by Pennsylvania land speculators, was "shot through the body with a rifle bullet" and killed while working near the Tioga River. A proclamation issued by Pennsylvania Governor Thomas McKean offered a reward for the capture of Gobin's murderers, described as "a company consisting of about eighteen persons, dressed like Indians."[2] Gobin was one of many surveyors and land agents who became victims of White settlers who fought government authorities and powerful speculators for possession of frontier land in postindependence America. The pseudo-Indian insurgents responsible for Gobin's death were what many people referred to as "Wild Yankees," settlers holding deeds issued by Connecticut-based

land companies who resisted Pennsylvania's attempts to impose its authority over them.

The juxtaposition of these two episodes raises important questions. How, in the fifty years between 1750 and 1800, did the Pennsylvania frontier go from being a place where Indians and Euro-Americans intermingled to a place where the only "Indians" to be found were disguised and disgruntled White settlers? And why did those disgruntled Whites dress as Indians? The fact that such behavior was not confined to Pennsylvania but was repeated on the frontiers of Maine, Vermont, and elsewhere makes the question even more pertinent.[3] Such manipulation of ethnic identities suggests a deeper question: how did the experience and memory of Indian-White conflict shape the contests over land and authority that plagued the American frontier into the nineteenth century?

Many factors contributed to the transformation of the Pennsylvania frontier. Disease, war, the expansion of Euro-American settlements, and the impacts of Indian-European trade devastated Native communities and undermined their autonomy.[4] But jurisdictional disputes between colonies and colonists also contributed to the process. As previous chapters have demonstrated, the expulsion of Indians was directly connected to the rise of conflicts over property and power, not only between Native Americans and colonists, but also among White settlers, land speculators, and government officials. The replacement of "real" Indians by "White" Indians was one consequence of intercolonial land disputes and of numerous face-to-face conflicts waged by ordinary people over frontier land. Another was a culture of violence that was profoundly shaped by White settlers' contact with Indians and their experience of bitter, racially charged frontier wars.

The story of the Wyoming Valley, a narrow strip of land along the north branch of the Susquehanna River, highlights how late eighteenth-century land disputes were both products and catalysts of Indian dispossession.[5] The contest there, which emerged in the 1750s and was not completely resolved until the early 1800s, was multidimensional, involving various groups of Indians, Pennsylvania and Connecticut, and the settlers and land speculators who entered the Wyoming region under their auspices. A distinct culture of violence emerged among the valley's White settlers—a culture of violence in which the legacy of conflict and contact with Indians is undeniable. Indeed, one of the most important links between Indian-European competition over land and later battles over jurisdiction and soil rights that emerged during and after the Revolution was the violence that

White frontier settlers deployed, first against Indian adversaries and later against the land speculators, government officials, and settlers who threatened their soil rights.

The Wyoming dispute grew out of problems endemic to British America: conflicting colonial borders and overlapping land grants. Imperial officials, who often possessed little knowledge of the American landscape they parceled out, issued vague or inaccurate patents that either interfered with earlier grants or encroached on competing claims. In addition, Indians, with their decentralized political systems, their own jurisdictional controversies, and their distinctive cultural definitions of property rights and ideas about "nature," commonly resold the same piece of land to different purchasers—or rather, various Native leaders granted permission for various Euro-Americans to use a single plot of land for varied purposes.[6] As a result, colonies that assumed these grants ceded absolute possession frequently became embroiled in territorial disputes. Pennsylvania and Connecticut were no exceptions. In 1662 Connecticut obtained a charter from Charles II that awarded that colony a massive tract running from Pennsylvania's eastern border west to the "South Sea," a domain 120 miles wide by several thousand miles long (see Map 2). Although no one seemed to notice at the time, the royal grant that established Pennsylvania in 1681 conveyed to the colony's proprietor, William Penn, territory well within Connecticut's 1662 charter bounds. Penn's gift brought forth no immediate howls of protest from Connecticut; indeed, the New England colony let its extensive western claim lay dormant for almost a century. Only when Connecticut began to experience a land shortage in the 1750s did its inhabitants begin to reassert their charter bounds. The New Englanders, having only recently settled a decades-long border dispute with New York, decided not to challenge the territorial integrity of their western neighbor but focused instead on land west of the Delaware River claimed by Pennsylvania.[7]

Three Connecticut-based land companies—the Susquehannah and the First and Second Delaware companies—played leading roles in what would become the Wyoming dispute. The origins of these companies lay in the failed efforts of Connecticut residents to obtain permission from their colony to settle western lands. In May 1750, the inhabitants of Simsbury sent a petition to the Connecticut General Assembly requesting a town grant west of the Hudson River in order to relieve overcrowding in their community. Although the legislature rejected the petition, other towns joined

Simsbury in calling on Connecticut to assert its latent charter claims. Between 1750 and 1753, the Assembly received a total of twelve such petitions. One, submitted by the inhabitants of several eastern towns in March 1753, contained the first mention of the Wyoming region. The Connecticut Assembly rejected all of these entreaties for fear of upsetting the recently negotiated boundary settlement with New York and because most legislators believed that any claim based on the 1662 charter would not withstand close legal scrutiny. In response, the petitioners shelved their plans to obtain modest town grants from the legislature and set out upon the more ambitious scheme of establishing a colony west of the Delaware River.[8]

The Susquehannah Company was born from this effort to create a new Connecticut in the west. The company's structure evoked the town-founding traditions of Puritan New England; it was not a legally chartered corporation but a self-created entity whose existence depended upon the consensus of its members. Unlike early New England towns, however, the Susquehannah Company did not obtain land through the colonial assembly. Instead, it rested its claims upon the direct purchase of Indian lands. Moreover, the company added a commercial ethic to the communal approach of seventeenth-century town corporations; its shares could be sold or traded for a profit.[9] Interest in the venture soon spread throughout New England, and the company, which started out with three hundred members in summer 1753, had expanded its ranks to eight hundred shareholders by 1754.[10]

The creation of the Susquehannah Company placed Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and the region's Indians on a collision course. At the company's first meeting on 18 July 1753, shareholders agreed to send a committee of seven men to the Susquehanna Valley to find a site suitable for settlement, purchase the land from the local Indians, and survey it into towns and lots. This "Journeying Committee" departed in October, explored the region, surveyed several town sites, and made its way back to Connecticut.[11] In November, Pennsylvania's provincial secretary, Richard Peters, reported to the proprietors the "disagreeable News" that people from Connecticut had been to Wyoming and had "made great disturbance among the People" with the news that they would return in the spring "with a Thousand Men and settle those lands."[12]

Pennsylvania's proprietors were not the only ones disturbed. The Iroquois of the Six Nations claimed possession of the Wyoming Valley and, according to Pennsylvania Governor James Hamilton, were "highly of-

fended" at the prospect of this land being "overrun with White People." The few Nanticoke Indians who inhabited the valley must have also been discomfited by the arrival of the Susquehannah Company's emissaries. In addition, the news angered Delaware Indians from the Moravian settlement of Gnadenhütten. Hoping to forestall Euro-American intrusions and encouraged by the Six Nations, about seventy Delawares led by Teedyuscung occupied the Wyoming Valley early in 1754.[13]

Later that year, the Susquehannah Company and Pennsylvania's proprietors both made aggressive moves to secure possession of the Wyoming Valley—moves that placed Indians and Indian soil rights at the center of the conflict. Indeed, as Peters later observed, the dispute was not only "between Subject and Subject but between Indian and Englishman."[14] The Albany Congress of 1754, which provided a backdrop for Pennsylvania's and Connecticut's continuing struggle over the Wyoming Valley, drew Indians deeper into the conflict.[15] The New Englanders purchased millions of acres of land in the upper Susquehanna and Delaware valleys from Iroquois Indians attending the conference without asking the permission of provincial or imperial officials.[16]

To make matters worse, rumors spread that the Indians who ratified the agreement only did so after being plied with generous amounts of alcohol. For their part, the Iroquois who signed the agreement did so without consulting the council of the Six Nations. Adding to the confusion, in an effort to check the New Englanders, Pennsylvania's delegation to the Albany Congress also obtained a deed from the Six Nations—a deed that covered much of the same land purchased by the Susquehannah Company (see Map 4). Now, not only conflicting colonial charters divided Pennsylvania and Connecticut, but also competing Indian purchases. Moreover, the Albany Congress drove a wedge between the Six Nations and the Delaware Indians who actually occupied the Wyoming Valley.[17]

The Albany Congress marked a turning point, not only for the colonies and colonists involved in the Wyoming dispute, but also for the Indians who inhabited or claimed land between the Delaware and Susquehanna rivers. The Congress itself saw the Six Nations relinquish control of the Wyoming region. More important, the conference spurred both Connecticut and Pennsylvania to redirect their energies toward recruiting settlers to occupy their claims. The Connecticut land companies, believing that actual occupation was the best way to secure territory, were determined to settle the valley. The outbreak of the Seven Years' War, however, delayed their

plans for five years. This imperial conflict was linked, at least locally, to the Wyoming dispute. The moves made by Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and the Six Nations at Albany outraged the Indians of the upper Susquehanna and Delaware river valleys, who used the onset of hostilities between the French and the English as an opportunity to even the score.[18]

The advent of permanent Euro-American settlement transformed the Wyoming dispute from a conflict primarily involving legal jockeying between colonial governments, land companies, and Indians to a struggle in which ordinary colonists would play an increasingly dominant role. After the Treaty of Easton in 1758, the Delawares abandoned the war, allowing the New Englanders to believe things were safe for them to forge ahead with their plans for settlement.[19] By summer 1760 word reached Philadelphia that Connecticut settlers operating under the auspices of the Delaware Company had formed a settlement along the Delaware River at a place called Cushietunk. In September, Teedyuscung visited Governor James Hamilton in Philadelphia to complain of the New Englanders' arrival and to warn him that, if they did not leave, the Delawares would "turn them off." The timing of the Connecticut settlers' arrival was particularly bad for Pennsylvania's proprietary government. Not only was the province's territorial integrity being challenged, but many feared that the intrusion would lead to another costly Indian war. The prospect of Indian-White violence became even more immediate in August 1761 when the Six Nations denied the validity of the Susquehannah and Delaware company purchases.[20] Tensions further increased when the Susquehannah Company decided to send a large party of settlers to the Wyoming Valley in May 1762.[21] Once more Teedyuscung led Indian resistance to the company's plans. Upon returning from an August treaty conference in Lancaster, where he had again protested the arrival of the New Englanders, Teedyuscung encountered more than a hundred recently ensconced Susquehannah Company settlers. He and his Indian companions traded angry words with the New Englanders and managed to scare them off with threats of violence. But the Delaware leader knew that he had only won a temporary reprieve.[22]

More than any other event, Teedyuscung's murder in April 1763 encapsulates the role of the Wyoming dispute in the dispossession of the region's Indian inhabitants. Teedyuscung burned to death while asleep in his house. His death was no accident; twenty neighboring dwellings also burst into flame, destroying the Indian village at Wyoming. There is little doubt

about who was behind these acts of arson. Less than two weeks after the fire, a dozen Connecticut families took possession of the settlement, and within a month more than 150 New Englanders were planting crops and building cabins.[23] Teedyuscung's assassination did not guarantee New Englanders an easy occupation of their western claims, however, for both Indians and imperial authorities set up new obstacles to White settlement. Fearing that the arrival of large numbers of colonists along the Susquehanna would provoke a war with the Six Nations, the Privy Council issued orders in June 1763 that forbade further settlement in the Wyoming region.[24] Yet the orders arrived in North America too late to halt either the settlers or the conflict. Four months later, during Pontiac's War, Teedyuscung's son, Captain Bull, led a Delaware war party that slaughtered or took captive the New Englanders who remained in the Susquehannah Company settlement.[25]

The failure of the Privy Council to avoid bloodshed between Indians and Euro-Americans in the Susquehanna Valley reflected a much larger process. Territorial and jurisdictional conflicts like the Wyoming dispute made it almost impossible for provincial or imperial authorities to regulate frontier expansion or protect Indian soil rights. Connecticut settlers were determined that no one, Indians or Pennsylvanians, would keep them from occupying their claim. Likewise, Pennsylvania officials, realizing that Indians could no longer serve a useful role in the Wyoming dispute, turned to other methods to maintain their hold on the valley.

The Fort Stanwix Treaty of 1768, which established a "line of property" between Indians and Whites, became the focus of both Pennsylvania's proprietors and Connecticut's land companies. Pennsylvania saw Fort Stanwix as an opportunity to take control of the territory between the Susquehanna and Delaware rivers. As with the Albany Congress of 1754, the Six Nations played a prominent role in the province's efforts to acquire land in the Susquehanna Valley. Pennsylvania's proprietors supported the fiction that the Six Nations held sovereignty, by right of supposed conquests made in the seventeenth century, over Indian lands in Pennsylvania and the Ohio country and avoided the stubborn refusal of Delawares, Shawnees, and other Indian groups to sell their lands by dealing directly with their Iroquois "overlords." For their part, the Six Nations were happy to oblige. First, such dealings helped to reinforce their image as the premier Indian power brokers of the north. Second, by controlling the process of land cessions, the Iroquois traded away other Indians' territory while keeping

their homeland largely intact. Finally, the Iroquois stood to benefit from the considerable gifts of trade goods that came along with treaty negotiations. Indeed, at the conclusion of the Treaty of Fort Stanwix, the Six Nations received gifts worth £10,000.[26]

Thus Pennsylvania acquired additional territory—the "New Purchase"—between the west and north branches of the Susquehanna River from the Six Nations. Governor John Penn leased one-hundred-acre tracts in the Wyoming Valley to Amos Ogden, an Indian trader from New Jersey; John Jennings, a leading Northampton County official; and Charles Stewart, a wealthy New Jersey speculator, for a term of seven years. Penn authorized these men to issue leases to settlers who promised to support Pennsylvania against the inroads of Connecticut claimants. Meanwhile, the Susquehannah and Delaware companies interpreted the Fort Stanwix Treaty (which placed the boundaries of Euro-American settlement west of the Susquehanna River) as a cancellation of imperial orders forbidding the settlement of the Wyoming region and as a go-ahead for their expansionist plans.[27] Thus, after 1768, the Wyoming dispute, formerly a multidimensional contest between Indians and colonists, became a struggle primarily between Euro-Americans.

The Wyoming dispute, like other frontier contests over property and power, contributed to a culture of violence among colonists—a culture of violence first deployed against Indians and later turned against other Euro-Americans. From the start, violence between Indians and colonists and violence among Euro-American land claimants was intertwined. In the Wyoming region, the bloody confrontations that occurred between Indians and colonists during the Seven Years' War, Pontiac's War, and the U.S. War for Independence schooled White settlers in terror tactics they later used against White adversaries. In short, Indians may have been forced from the Wyoming Valley, but the legacy of Indian-White conflict lived on.

The person who best exemplifies the connections between Indian-European conflict and White-on-White disputes over land and authority is Pennsylvania's notorious Indian killer and frontier outlaw Lazarus Stewart. Stewart was born in 1734 in Hanover, a settlement in what was then Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. His family, along with thousands of Scots-Irish, had immigrated to the frontier in the late 1720s. Stewart possessed a well-earned reputation for violence; by the time he was thirty-seven, Penn-

sylvania had issued warrants against him for murder, assault, riot, arson, and treason. On one occasion he beat a constable with an axe handle and threatened another man that he would "cut him to Pieces, and make a Breakfast of his Heart."[28] But Stewart was far more than a violent outlaw: he was also a father, a man respected by his neighbors, and a local military leader who gained his first taste of war leading a company of provincials during Braddock's ill-fated expedition in 1755. In the years that followed, he served as a captain of a ranger company.[29]

Stewart's service during Pontiac's War set the stage for his entry into the Wyoming dispute. In fall 1763, Pennsylvania ordered one hundred men under Captain Asher Clayton, including a company under Stewart's command, to proceed to the Wyoming Valley, remove the Connecticut settlers there, and destroy their crops in order to deny them to Indian forces. When Clayton's troops arrived at Wyoming, they found that the New Englanders' settlement had already been destroyed by Captain Bull's Delaware warriors. One victim, a woman, had reportedly been "roasted"; the rest "had Awls thrust into their Eyes, and Spears, arrows, Pitchforks, etc. sticking in their Bodies." Instead of removing the New Englanders, the Pennsylvanians ended up burying them.[30]

Soon after his visit to Wyoming, Stewart played a leading role in the Paxton Boys' massacre of the Conestogas, crystallizing an enduring pattern of anti-Indian violence and lawlessness.[31] In 1765 Cumberland County inhabitants, fearing that government-sponsored traders intended to sell firearms to Indians, attacked and plundered pack trains laden with trade goods. Later, the rioters, who became known as "Black Boys" because of the soot they smeared on their faces, resisted British troops and colonial authorities who attempted to restore order.[32] In another incident in January 1768, two frontiersmen, Frederick Stump and John Ironcutter, murdered ten Indians. Again, people defied provincial authority; when Cumberland County officials arrested Stump and his accomplice, a mob descended upon the county jail and set them free.[33]

As seen in the previous chapter, woven throughout these outbreaks of racialized violence was a criticism of Pennsylvania's government for its failure to fulfill its patriarchal duties of protection and for its inability to equitably distribute, or effectively rule, frontier lands.[34] On 27 March 1769, Stewart and sixty-three frontier inhabitants added their voices to this rising tide of dissent when they sent a petition to the Pennsylvania Assembly expressing their dissatisfaction with the colony's land policies. In particu-

lar, the petitioners asserted that favoritism had denied them access to lands in Pennsylvania's "New Purchase." Even though land office regulations limited claimants to three-hundred-acre grants, government insiders had managed to engross thousands of acres. Worse still, the land office allowed well-connected gentlemen to file their claims before ordinary settlers had an opportunity to do so, thus enabling them to secure the best lands.[35]

Concern among Pennsylvania's western inhabitants for effective local government and equitable land policies set the stage for an alliance between Stewart's Paxton Boys and the Susquehannah Company. It also set into motion the process by which they redirected the violence once aimed at Indians toward fellow Euro-Americans. Stewart believed that the company could provide them with an opportunity to obtain land and escape Pennsylvania's rule. He and other leading men from Hanover, Paxton, and Donegal townships in Lancaster County began negotiations with the company late in 1769. The frontiersmen offered to rid the Wyoming Valley of Pennsylvania claimants in return for a land grant, and the company eagerly accepted the deal.[36] In February 1770, Stewart and his followers journeyed to the valley to join the New Englanders who had settled there in defiance of Pennsylvania's provincial government. In March, John Penn informed his brother Thomas that more than fifty "lawless villains" had marched from Lancaster County and "plundered and destroyed" the homes of proprietary tenants at Wyoming.[37]

The intervention of the Paxton Boys intensified an ongoing struggle for control of the Wyoming Valley between Yankees (settlers holding Connecticut deeds) and Pennamites (those who occupied the land under Pennsylvania's auspices). The fight commenced when a contingent of forty Yankee settlers arrived in February 1769. Another two hundred New Englanders reinforced them in the spring.[38] These Connecticut claimants ran headlong into Pennsylvania authorities and Pennamite settlers who had taken up land in the valley. The two sides exchanged shots and on two occasions Pennsylvania officials arrested Yankee settlers, including their leader Major John Durkee. The Connecticut claimants were briefly forced from the valley in November when Sheriff John Jennings arrived with a force of more than two hundred armed men supported by a cannon. This event was not the end but rather the beginning of a frontier war. Between 1769 and 1771, Pennamites and Yankees engaged in a seesaw conflict during which the Wyoming Valley changed hands five times.[39]

The struggle spawned increasing levels of brutality. Baltzer Stager, one

of Stewart's followers, became the first victim of this violence when a Pennamite bullet took his life on 28 March 1770. Connecticut claimants also committed their share of hostile acts. John McDonner, for example, recalled how he and twenty-eight companions painted themselves like Indians and "abused and Robbed" Amos Ogden and those who leased land from him. Zebulon Butler, a leading Connecticut settler, kept a memorandum book in which he recorded similar assaults on Pennamites. On 23 February 1770, he noted that "the Boys went and Laid [John] Solomon's House level with the Earth." Five days later, Yankees "Leveled [Charles] Stewarts House to the Ground."[40] The Pennamites retaliated in September 1770 when a party of 150 men under Amos Ogden captured the entire valley and plundered its Yankee settlers. By spring 1771, when reinforcements from Connecticut allowed the Yankees to reconquer the valley, a number of colonists had been killed and wounded in gun battles, and several hundred more had been stripped of their property and possessions.[41]

Lazarus Stewart contributed to this rising tide of bloodshed and plunder. In January 1771, he and his followers dispossessed several Pennamite inhabitants and took possession of a Pennamite fort. In response, Northampton County Sheriff Peter Kachlein raised a posse—which included Deputy Sheriff Nathan Ogden, Amos Ogden's brother—and surrounded Stewart and his men. After days of waiting, Ogden and several others approached the fort and tried to talk its occupants into surrendering. Stewart ended these negotiations when he placed his rifle through a loophole and shot Nathan Ogden dead. Others in the fort then opened fire and wounded three other Pennsylvanians. As in the past, Lazarus Stewart and his men escaped justice. The night after the killing they slipped out of the fort and fled. This sort of cold-blooded killing, which had become increasingly common between Indians and Whites after the Seven Years' War, came to characterize the struggle between Pennamites and Yankees. Wyoming's White settlers not only took to dressing like Indians when they robbed and assaulted one another, but they also began to engage in a brand of violence they had learned in their struggle against Native Americans.[42] The culture of violence, forged in the fires of Indian-White conflict and frontier land disputes, survived into the American Revolution and beyond.

Indeed, the Revolution in the Wyoming Valley saw an intensification of violence as Pennamites and Yankees rekindled old animosities by wrapping them in issues of revolutionary allegiance. In the valley, the term "Tory" became roughly synonymous with Pennamite and "Whig" with Yankee.

The origins of this development lay in the fact that in 1774 Connecticut formally annexed the Wyoming region and dubbed the new territory Westmoreland County. The Continental Congress, wishing to reduce intercolonial friction and present a united front against Britain (and much more impressed with Connecticut's revolutionary zeal than with Pennsylvania's), temporarily ratified the New Englanders' jurisdiction. In light of this, it is easy to understand why Yankee settlers sided with Whig forces. With Yankees assuming the title of Patriots, many Pennamites became Tories, not because they necessarily had any greater love for King George than did Connecticut claimants, but because Yankee-controlled revolutionary committees persecuted Pennsylvania claimants and alienated them from the American cause.[43] Thus the stage was set for the continuation of bloodshed in the Wyoming Valley. In December 1775, William Plunket, a Northumberland County magistrate, led more than five hundred Pennsylvanians in an effort to eject Yankee settlers from their lands. Four hundred Connecticut claimants commanded by Zebulon Butler intercepted this "band of Tories" along the banks of the Susquehanna River. In the battle that ensued, Yankees killed or wounded half a dozen of Plunket's men.[44]

The extreme violence that marked the revolutionary period in the Wyoming Valley was not only a product of enduring animosities between Pennsylvania and Connecticut claimants, but of renewed conflict between Indians and Whites. In 1778, seven hundred Indians and Euro-American Loyalists under the command of John Butler descended upon the valley and killed more than two hundred Connecticut claimants (including Lazarus Stewart) at the battle of Wyoming. This engagement was just as much a continuation of the Wyoming dispute as an episode in the war for U.S. independence. Among the Indians who served under Butler—most of whom were Senecas and Cayugas—were a number of Delawares who must have looked upon the campaign as an opportunity to take revenge on the New Englanders who had invaded their territory. Likewise, many of the Euro-American Loyalists who accompanied Butler were old Pennamites who had been forced from their farms by Yankees. Among these was Frederick Vanderlip, a dispossessed Pennsylvania claimant who returned as a member of Butler's Rangers, a Loyalist military unit.[45]

The Indians, Whigs, and Tories who inhabited the upper Susquehanna Valley during the Revolution fought without mercy. Combatants and noncombatants alike became victims. North of Wyoming, Indians and Loyal-

ists killed more than forty women and children when they destroyed the settlement of Cherry Valley in New York. Whigs responded in kind. The four thousand Continental Army soldiers who invaded Iroquois territory under the command of General John Sullivan in 1779 did not discriminate between combatants and noncombatants. Tioguanda, an Onondaga chief, recounted that Sullivan's men killed women and children when they raided his village. The crops, livestock, houses, and tools of Wyoming inhabitants also became military targets. Both British and American commanders waged brutal campaigns in which sources of sustenance that could not be taken from the enemy were destroyed. Indians and Euro-American Loyalists devastated the Pennsylvania frontier during a large-scale expedition in 1778 and in more than thirty raids between 1780 and 1782.[46] Settlements in the Wyoming Valley bore the brunt of these attacks. In 1777, Connecticut rated Westmoreland County's taxable estates at £20,322 and counted 515 taxable inhabitants. Two years after the disastrous battle of Wyoming, officials valued county assets at a mere £2,353 and only about a hundred taxables remained.[47]

In the same way that the Seven Years' War and Pontiac's War had schooled men like Lazarus Stewart in the ways of violence, the War for Independence initiated the next generation. The experiences of a single Connecticut claimant, John Franklin, illustrate this process. Franklin, whose father had purchased a Susquehannah Company share in 1754, arrived in the Wyoming Valley in winter 1774. Once there he established a farm on his father's claim, raised a family, and held a variety of town and county offices. After serving in the Westmoreland County militia, he volunteered to accompany Sullivan's 1779 expedition against the Six Nations. A year later, Franklin became captain of a company of Wyoming men raised by the state of Connecticut. By the end of the war, he had emerged as one of the valley's leading Yankee settlers and was fully prepared to put his military experience to use.[48]

Late in 1782 the Wyoming dispute entered a new and more violent phase when the Confederation government attempted to adjudicate the dispute between Pennsylvania and Connecticut. A special court convened at Trenton, New Jersey, decided to award jurisdiction over the disputed territory to Pennsylvania.[49] But the "Trenton Decree" only reignited the conflict, for the competing land claims of Yankee and Pennamite settlers remained unresolved. The Wyoming Valley again became the scene of violent com-

petition over land and authority as Pennamites reentered the region to press their claims and Yankees lined up to resist them. Armed conflict erupted in fall 1783 and raged through the following year.[50]

John Franklin was at the center of Yankee resistance. Drawing on his experience during the War for Independence, he helped to orchestrate a campaign of terror against invading Pennamites and Pennsylvania authorities. Racially charged conflict between Indians and Whites during the Revolution colored Franklin's attitudes and actions and those of his fellow Yankees. During the war, many frontier settlers had come to associate Tories with Indians and to view them as being just as "savage," "uncivilized," and undeserving of mercy as their Native allies. As Gregory Knouff reminds us, frontier Patriots saw Tories "not only to be traitors to their country but also traitors to their race." By extension, Wyoming's Yankee settlers, who considered their Pennamite opponents little more than thinly disguised Tories, found it easy to apply the same brutal treatment to them as they had to their Loyalist and Indian adversaries. Thus in 1787, when Franklin issued an order for Yankee settlers to muster "Completely Armed and equipped" in order to stop the "Pennsylvania Loyalists" from forming a militia, he tapped deep veins of revolutionary rage.[51]

As a result, conflict between Pennamites and Yankees after independence was more brutal and bloody than the confrontations between Pennsylvania and Connecticut claimants in the 1760s and 1770s. Whereas a few White settlers were killed and wounded before the Revolution, dozens of Pennamites and Yankees became casualties in the fighting that took place in the valley between 1783 and 1785. In July 1784, for example, opposing armed patrols exchanged shots after they stumbled into one another. Two Pennsylvania claimants, Henry Brink and Wilhelmus Van Gordon, were wounded and two Connecticut claimants, Elisha Garret and Chester Paine, killed.[52] Four days later, Yankee settler Benjamin Blanchard received a gunshot wound in the thigh. The following day, a rifle shot killed another Connecticut man. Later that month Pennamites shot John Franklin through the wrist and killed Nathan Stevens.[53] In August, Yankees killed one Pennsylvania militiamen and wounded three others in a skirmish that came to be known as the battle of Locust Hill.[54] Late in September, Yankees shot and killed Lieutenants Andrew Henderson and Samuel Reed during a raid on Wilkes-Barre's garrison of Pennsylvania state troops.[55] In October, half a dozen Pennamites and Pennsylvania militiamen became casualties during an intense gun battle with Connecticut claimants near Abraham's

Creek.[56] In another practice highly reminiscent of revolutionary-era frontier warfare, Yankees and Pennamites plundered each other's farms, leaving families stripped of provisions, tools, livestock, and other essentials. In one instance, Henry Brink testified that Yankees "armed with Rifles and Pistolls" seized 350 bushels of corn and two of his cows. Once the Yankees had taken what they wanted, they ordered Brink to "quit the Country" and threatened that if he did not go "they would drive him before the Muzzle of their guns."[57]

The violence that marked the Wyoming dispute was shaped by decades of conflict between Indians and Whites; however, the similarities between Pennamite-Yankee violence and violence between Indians and colonists go only so deep. First, conflict between Pennamites and Yankees never gained the racial component of struggles between Whites and Indians. Connecticut and Pennsylvania claimants may have come from different regional backgrounds, but they did not perceive each other as different races. More important, Wyoming's White inhabitants never dehumanized each other as they did Indians. Pennamites and Yankees may have attacked and even killed each other, but they did not engage in the scalpings and mutilations that marked violence between Indians and Whites. Even Lazarus Stewart, who contributed to his reputation as a violent man when he killed Nathan Ogden, did not repeat the sort of butchery that made his attacks on the Indians at Conestoga and Lancaster so infamous. Moreover, Pennamites and Yankees may have assaulted, dispossessed, and terrified women and children but they did not indiscriminately slaughter them.[58]

The culture of violence that emerged along the Pennsylvania frontier was not just defined by its level of brutality and bloodshed but also by a symbolism steeped in decades of racialized conflict that endured well beyond the Revolution. Indeed, the feature of the Wyoming dispute that best highlights the connections between Indian-White conflict and the rise of agrarian unrest along the postindependence frontier is the fact that frontier insurgents often disguised themselves as Indians. When "Wild Yankees" assaulted, threatened, and intimidated Pennsylvania land claimants, surveyors, or government officials, they donned an "Indian" guise, which usually meant that they blacked their faces, draped blankets over their bodies, and wrapped handkerchiefs around their heads. "Indian" assaults increased in frequency after the War for Independence. For instance, more than a dozen Wild Yankees dressed as Indians kidnapped Timothy Pickering—a leading Pennsylvania official in the Wyoming Valley who would

later become a prominent figure in national politics—in the summer of 1788 and kept him a prisoner in the woods for several weeks. Likewise, in 1792, a band of Indian-disguised Yankee insurgents fired upon and later raided the camp of a group of Pennsylvania surveyors along Tunkhannock Creek. And in 1801 a large number of Yankee "Indians" tarred and feathered Thomas Smiley, a settler in the employ of a group of Pennsylvania land speculators.[59]

The use of disguise and Indian imagery by Wild Yankees was deeply rooted in European traditions of popular protest as well as the more immediate legacy of the American Revolution. Mummery, street theater, mocking rhymes—all common features of European festivals—offered common people a way to critique their social superiors, temporarily undermine bonds of deference, and defy government authority. Like European rioters, frontier insurgents blacked their faces and donned elaborate disguises to hide their identities from the authorities and, in the role-reversing tradition of European mummery, to transform themselves from farmers into agrarian rebels.[60] Of course, White frontier inhabitants did not have to look back to their European roots to formulate protest; the American Revolution, an event fixed in the memory of many settlers, furnished rebels with a wealth of ideas and precedents. In particular, the Boston Tea Party did much to connect Indian imagery with the struggle for independence in the minds of Euro-American colonists.[61]

Beyond age-old traditions of popular protest and the memory of the American Revolution, contact between Indians and Whites had a significant impact on the character of resistance along the postindependence frontier. Pennsylvania's Wild Yankees used Indian imagery not only to hide their identities, but to strike fear in their enemies. Wyoming settlers who had once lived under the threat of Native American attacks usurped the image of the Indian to forge an effective terror tactic. Land agents and surveyors who ventured to the frontier feared that people who looked like Indians might be as savage as Indians. As it turned out, their fears were not groundless. In Pennsylvania, Wild Yankees murdered Edward Gobin; in New York and Maine, other agrarian insurgents dressed as Indians killed a sheriff's deputy and a surveyor's assistant.[62]

Under the leadership of John Franklin, Pennsylvania's Indian-clad Wild Yankees maintained their resistance to the state of Pennsylvania into the nineteenth century. Only in the 1810s did a combination of government compromises and a more rigorous enforcement of the law undermine Yan-

kee insurgency. For their part, Connecticut claimants increasingly turned their backs on violent resistance as the process of farm building and frontier development made the prospect of accommodation with Pennsylvania more attractive and the purchase of state titles economically feasible. This pattern of reconciliation was repeated across the frontier until America's White Indians had themselves disappeared.[63]

The Wyoming dispute shows us that frontier land disputes pitting colony against colony and colonist against colonist were often intimately connected with relations between Indians and Whites. In addition, events in the Wyoming region demonstrate how such jurisdictional struggles contributed to the dispossession of Native Americans. The victims of violence in the Wyoming Valley were not only White settlers but also Indians like Teedyuscung. Moreover, the dispute between Pennsylvania and Connecticut forced both colonies to attempt to secure their claims, first by purchasing the land from Indians supposed to be its owners and, second, by occupying their claims with Euro-American settlers. Both strategies undermined Indian soil rights and disrupted Native communities.

The story of the Wyoming dispute also reveals something else. Even though Indians largely disappeared from the upper Susquehanna River valley after the Revolution, their impact on frontier life continued in the form of a distinct culture of Euro-American violence and protest. Pennsylvania's Wild Yankees and other White settlers who fought for land and autonomy in postindependence America did so armed with a legacy of racialized violence rooted in decades of struggle against Indian foes. Frontier insurgents, hoping to use the image of the savage Indian to their advantage, appropriated Indian guises as they fought government officials and land speculators. On a deeper level, frontier settlers who faced dispossession at the hands of the rich and powerful took on the identity of Indians they themselves had helped to dispossess as an expression of their deep alienation from a society that seemed to deny them the opportunity and independence that they so valued.[64]