"A DANGEROUS COMBINATION OF VILLAINS": PENNSYLVANIA'S WILD YANKEES AND THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF AGRARIAN RESISTANCE IN EARLY AMERICA[1]

Paul B. Moyer
State University of New York College at Brockport

On the night of June 26, 1788, fifteen men crept into Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, broke into the home of Luzerne County Clerk Timothy Pickering, and entered the room where he, his wife Rebecca, and their nine-month old son slept. Startled awake, Pickering asked who was there, to which he received the curt reply, "get up." Pickering got out of bed and started to dress; Rebecca left the room and returned with a lit a candle. In its dim glow, Picking saw that the room was "filled with men, armed with guns and hatchets, having their faces blacked and handkerchiefs tied round their heads." Once Pickering had dressed, the intruders bound his arms and spirited him out into the night. After a brief stop for a drink at a tavern ten miles above Wilkes-Barre, Pickering's kidnappers carried him up the Susquehanna River into the sparsely inhabited forests of northern Pennsylvania.[2] With this night-time raid, Pickering became the captive of Wild Yankees: New Englanders who settled the upper Susquehanna and Delaware valleys under Connecticut deeds and who violently

PENNSYLVANIA HISTORY: A JOURNAL OF MID-ATLANTIC STUDIES, VOL. 73, NO. 1, 2006.

resisted Pennsylvania's efforts to impose its jurisdiction and soil rights over the region.

A little less than a year before Pickering's abduction, the *Connecticut Courant* described Pennsylvania's Wild Yankees as "a dangerous combination of villains, composed of runaway debtors, criminals, [and] adherents of Shays."[3] This vivid characterization raises some important questions about these backcountry rebels. What motivated Yankee settlers to become insurgents—what did they hope to gain or what fate did they hope to avoid through their resistance? Moreover, who were Pennsylvania's Wild Yankees—were they the desperate agitators the *Connecticut Courant* implied or something quite different, and how can exploring the insurgents' identity help to reveal their deeper motivations and aspirations? Though valuable in its own right, understanding the mindset of Pennsylvania's Wild Yankees takes on a far greater significance when placed in the wider context of agrarian unrest in early America.

The Yankee settlers who abducted Timothy Pickering were some of the many rural inhabitants who engaged in rebellion and resistance between the mid-eighteenth and mid-nineteenth centuries. Farmers from Maine to the Carolinas battled government officials, wealthy land speculators and, at times, each other in over a dozen distinct episodes of agrarian conflict. These disturbances took many forms; some were relatively short, sharp insurrections like the Massachusetts' Regulation or the Whiskey Rebellion in which thousands of farmers took up arms against government authorities, while others were less spectacular but more drawn out insurgencies, like those mounted by Maine's White Indians and Pennsylvannia's Wild Yankees, against governments and land speculators who challenged the soil rights of backcountry farmers. Instances of agrarian unrest also differed in terms of the conflicts that ignited them; the struggle over land or the terms under which it was held or acquired, jurisdictional disputes between colonies or states, contention over taxes or debt, and even arguments over Indian policy sparked bitter battles across the countryside.[4] A phenomenon that spanned such vast amounts of time and space and that involved the activities of such a large number of people demands investigation; specifically, it calls for an explanation of why so many ordinary people took the risky path of rebellion.

By focusing on the events surrounding the kidnapping of Timothy Pickering, this paper seeks to explore Wild Yankee resistance and, by extension, the character of the rural uprisings that convulsed early America. Like Timothy Pickering in that dim, candle-lit room, the kidnapping brings us

face to face, though faintly and fleetingly, with early America's agrarian insurgents. In the weeks and months that followed Pickering's capture, Pennsylvania collected dozens of court depositions—from men and women, from Wild Yankees and their opponents, and from several of the kidnappers themselves. These sources, when pieced together with other relevant materials, shed light on the kidnapping, and, more importantly, on the identity of Yankee insurgents and the nature of their resistance.[5]

As with this study, questions of identity and motivation stand at the center of previous explorations of early America's agrarian disturbances. Roughly speaking, historians have portrayed rural insurgents and their movements in one of three ways. For some, the rebellions that plagued the countryside are clear indications of class conflict. Under this paradigm, unrest was the product of farmers' efforts to resist exploitation at the hands of wealthy land speculators, government officials, and backcountry merchants. Moreover, according to those who promote this class-based perspective, farmers' resistance was symptomatic of a much deeper struggle to defend a corporate, tradition-bound, non-market oriented way of life from the inroads of commercial capitalism.[6] A second group of historians perceive agrarian insurgents in a far different light. Namely, they portray rebellious farmers as being motivated, not by class enmity, but by their desire for property. Under this formulation, agrarian insurgents possessed the same acquisitiveness and drive for personal advantage that characterized the landlords and speculators they fought against. Moreover, rural unrest was not symptomatic of rural folks' resistance to capitalism but simply reflected their aggressive efforts to get the most from a commercial, market-oriented economic order that already existed.[7] A third group of historians has more recently forwarded a vision of early America's agrarian rebels that bridges some of the gaps between the first two and that strikes out in new directions. While denying that rural insurgents were solely motivated by class, these scholars argue that deep social and cultural rifts separated rebellious farmers from their opponents. They contend that deep disagreements over the nature of property and how it could be rightfully acquired, over theology and religious practice, and over the meaning of the American Revolution and the proper arrangement of America's post-independence social order fueled agrarian disturbances.[8]

This study makes two contributions to the ongoing exploration of agrarian unrest in early America. First, it demonstrates that contests over property did not invariably pit farmers against land speculators. Although Yankee insurgents bitterly resisted the claims of some of Pennsylvania's most

powerful land developers, they cooperated with speculators who supported the Connecticut claim. Indeed, the region's "dangerous combination of villains" not only included ordinary settlers who struggled to defend their frontier freeholds, but also land speculators from New England and New York who sought to secure far more extensive claims.[9] Second, the events surrounding Pickering's abduction reveal that settler resistance in northeast Pennsylvania emerged out of, and intertwined with, the aspirations, day-to-day activities, and face-to-face relationships that circumscribed the lives of ordinary farm families.

Both of these findings have significant implications for our understanding of rural unrest. Though agrarian disturbances commonly pitted poor farmers against wealthy gentlemen, the first point demonstrates that such conflicts were not simply expressions of class enmity. More significantly, this study's second observation places the social origins of agrarian unrest in a broader, and ultimately more meaningful, context. Besides being agrarian insurgents, Pennsylvania's Wild Yankees were rural people enmeshed in local relationships and motivated by local concerns; namely, their ability to acquire enough land to achieve for themselves and their heirs agrarian independence: possession of a freehold sizeable enough to support a household and free it from dependency upon, and subordination to, others. It was the pursuit of independence by thousands of ordinary rural inhabitants that stood at the center of agrarian unrest in early America; though disturbances took many forms and were generated by diverse conflicts, they all ultimately impinged on rural people's ability to acquire and enjoy the possession of freehold farms.

This new formulation of the social context of agrarian unrest challenges, to different degrees, each of the three characterizations of agrarian insurgents outlined above. It largely discards the view of early America's rural rebels as class warriors bent on resisting the capitalist transformation of the countryside. Farmers did come into conflict with the wealthy and powerful, but only when they stood in the way of their ability to achieve independence. Therefore, though class conflict contributed to early America's agrarian disturbances, it was as much "circumstantial" as systemic. Moreover, those historians who portray agrarian insurgents as rambunctious petty capitalists are right in focusing on ordinary farmers' determined efforts to acquire land, but largely fail to recognize that the pursuit of property intersected with deep social tensions and could, in itself, generate popular movements with radical potential. Finally, though the interpretation of agrarian unrest presented in this paper matches most closely with the third portrayal of rural insurgents, it does serve

as a reminder that farmers did not have to draw inspiration from the American Revolution or evangelical Christianity in order to mount campaigns of agrarian resistance—that the sources and motivations of conflict were intrinsic to rural society itself.

The Kidnapping & the Wyoming Controversy

Pickering's abduction was but a single episode in a struggle over property and power that overshadowed northeast Pennsylvania between the 1750s and first decades of the nineteenth century. Known as the Wyoming controversy, the dispute involved, at one time or another, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, several Connecticut-based land companies, thousands of settlers and land speculators who operated under their auspices, and the Indian peoples who claimed or occupied the region. The contest began when Connecticut's land-hungry inhabitants reasserted dormant land claims contained in their colony's 1662 charter—claims that, in theory, gave the colony jurisdiction over territory extending to the "South Sea" (the Pacific Ocean), including land between the forty-first and forty-second degrees of latitude claimed by Pennsylvania under its 1681 charter.[10] The dispute heated up when the New Englanders formed the Susquehannah and the First and Second Delaware companies in 1753 to orchestrate the settlement of their claims and purchased deeds from the Iroquois covering lands spanning from the Delaware River to the headwaters of the Allegheny at the Albany Congress of 1754.[11] Courtroom battles eventually gave way to decades of armed conflict between Pennamites (settlers loyal to Pennsylvania) and Yankees (settlers who upheld the Connecticut claim) who converged on a stretch of land along the north branch of the Susquehanna River known as the Wyoming Valley. Connecticut, which officially annexed the Susquehannah and Delaware company purchases in 1774, won control over the contested region in December 1775 when the Continental Congress resolved to temporarily recognize its jurisdiction.[12] A final judgment on the question of jurisdiction came in 1782 when Connecticut and Pennsylvania, in accordance with Article IX of the Articles of Confederation, brought their dispute before a five-judge tribunal convened at Trenton, New Jersey. On December 30, after more than a month of testimony, the judges, in their now famous "Trenton Decree," overturned Connecticut's jurisdiction and returned the Wyoming region to Pennsylvania.[13]

Instead of ending the Wyoming controversy, the Trenton Decree only initiated a new phase of the conflict for, though it settled the issue of state jurisdiction, it did not address the equally thorny problem of *private* soil rights. At this point, the contest for northeast Pennsylvania shifted from a relatively clear-cut jurisdictional fight between colonies and states to a battle for property that pitted Connecticut claimants against the state of Pennsylvania, its settlers, and some of its most powerful land developers. The latter half of the 1780s witnessed the emergence of a coherent resistance movement in northeast Pennsylvania and saw the region's Connecticut claimants earn the epithet "Wild Yankees."[14]

Pennsylvania's efforts to quiet Yankee resistance set in motion the events that led to Timothy Pickering's kidnapping. In March 1787 the state passed the Confirming Act—a piece of legislation that sought to end conflict in northeast Pennsylvania by recognizing the tenure of Connecticut claimants who had obtained and occupied lands before the Trenton Decree. However, the law made no provision for settlers who took up lands after the court's decision or for non-resident proprietors. The Confirming Act, not accidentally, served to divide Connecticut claimants into two parties: more established settlers who could take advantage of the state's offer and those holding newly issued deeds who were excluded from the legislation's provisions. The state further inflamed Yankee factionalism when it set off the upper Susquehanna valley (an area mostly inhabited by Connecticut claimants) from Northumberland County and established the separate county of Luzerne. Some Connecticut claimants reacted positively toward the state's initiative, seeing in it an opportunity to gain greater control over local affairs. However, Yankee hardliners opposed the move, fearing that it would bring state authority closer to their doorsteps, and reacted angrily toward those who supported the formation of the new country. For example, Solomon Strong, a die-hard supporter of the Connecticut claim, warned William Hooker Smith that if he did not withdraw his support for the state's plan, Yankee insurgents, or "Mad Boys" as he called them, would "Destroye him."[15]

These state initiatives eventually brought Timothy Pickering to the Wyoming Valley. Officially, he came to help organize the new county government; unofficially, his task was to take the lead in state efforts to promote the Confirming Act and divide and conquer Yankee resistance. Like the insurgents he faced, Pickering was a New Englander. Born in 1745 to one of the leading families of Salem, Massachusetts, Pickering graduated from Harvard in 1763 and then returned home to practice law. During the Revolution he sided with

the Patriot cause and served in the Massachusetts militia before joining the Continental Army in 1776 where he rose to the post of adjutant general and, later, quartermaster-general. After the war, Pickering moved to Philadelphia with hopes of entering into business. However, instead of becoming a merchant, he used his political connections to become a leading figure in Pennsylvania's efforts to resolve the Wyoming controversy. Pickering and his family took up residence in Wilkes-Barre early in 1787; he spent the rest of the period up to his abduction convincing Connecticut claimants to accept state authority and keeping state officials abreast of the activities of Yankee insurgents.[16]

Another pivotal figure in the story of Pickering's kidnapping, John Franklin, emerged as the Wild Yankees' leading man, and Timothy Pickering's main rival, in the years following the Trenton Decree. Franklin, whose father had been an early shareholder in the Susquehannah Company, moved from Connecticut to the Susquehanna Valley in 1774. Once there he slowly rose through the ranks of local office holders to become a captain in the Connecticut militia by the time of the Revolutionary War. After the trial at Trenton, Franklin became a prominent figure of resistance among Yankee settlers and spearheaded opposition to the Confirming Act and the formation of Luzerne County.[17] In September 1787 Franklin made the fateful decision to disrupt the muster of Luzerne County's militia, believing that the creation of an armed force controlled by the state would shift the balance of power against his Wild Yankees. On September 29 Franklin ordered his followers to gather together on the morning of October 9 "Completely Armed & equiped" in order to prevent the "Pennsylvania Loyalists" from forming a militia.[18] State officials quickly got wind of Franklin's scheme and set in motion plans to rid themselves of this persistent troublemaker. On October 2 six deputies arrived at Wilkes-Barre to arrest Franklin; posing as prospective settlers, they entered the settlement and accosted Franklin in the street. After a sharp struggle, in which Timothy Pickering intervened on the side of the deputies, the Pennsylvanians bound Franklin to a horse and whisked him away to Philadelphia. Charged with treason for his opposition to state authority, Franklin languished in a Philadelphia jail cell where his hopes and health quickly declined.[19]

Outraged by the imprisonment of their leader, Wild Yankees searched for ways to win his release; ultimately, they hit upon the idea of capturing Pickering and using his life to bargain for Franklin's freedom. Timothy Pickering's ties to the state and his long-standing efforts to undermine settler

resistance, not to mention the part he played in John Franklin's arrest, made him the logical focus of Yankee ire. All of this led to the June 26 raid on Wilkes-Barre that resulted in Pickering's capture. After being taken, Pickering spent the next twenty days in the comfortless care of Yankee insurgents—an experience he documented in a diary he kept during his captivity. When not on the move, Pickering occupied his time by recording bits of homespun wisdom he gleaned from his guards on topics that ranged from the feeding of pigs and the proper handling of Oxen to the most effective ways to clear trees from the land. On one occasion, he even learned of a backcountry substitute for coffee: a well-toasted crust of bread boiled in water. Pickering found the beverage "very tolerable."[20]

Although the kidnappers achieved their aim of taking Pickering prisoner, they failed to accomplish the larger goal of winning John Franklin's freedom. Instead of forcing their leader's release, Pickering's abduction gave state officials an excuse to crack down on Yankee insurgents. Locally, the kidnapping only exacerbated divisions between Connecticut claimants. Many settlers aided the kidnappers, while others, believing that Pennsylvania would ultimately prevail, took the opportunity to prove their newfound loyalty to the state by taking part in efforts to bring the kidnappers to justice. Within days of the abduction, Pickering's captors found themselves hunted by numerous parties of militia. The backwoods chase that ensued led to the death of one kidnapper and the near mortal wounding of a militia officer.[21] In the end, Pickering's captors decided to release their prisoner. Before freeing him, however, they sought Pickering's forgiveness and offered to turn themselves in to state officials if he agreed to intercede on their behalf (Pickering declined to make such a promise). In a strange turn of events, these Wild Yankees switched from frontier rebels into deferential farmers and attempted to transform Pickering from captive to patron.[22]

Settlers & Speculators

One key to understanding the kidnapping plot and its failure lies in recognizing that agrarian resistance in northeast Pennsylvania was not just the work of disgruntled settlers but was abetted by non-resident land speculators who held thousands of acres in the region under the Connecticut claim. The Susquehannah Company, which had taken a leading role in promoting the Connecticut claim before the Revolutionary War, again became a major

player in the Wyoming controversy when aggressive land developers resurrected the company and offered their support to Yankee insurgents.[23] Thus, from the outset, it needs to be recognized that Yankee resistance was not predicated on a class-based enmity between settlers and land speculators and that Yankee insurgents drew distinctions between land developers who aligned themselves with Pennsylvania and threatened their freeholds and those who supported the Connecticut claim and, by connection, the soil rights of Connecticut settlers.[24]

Leading proprietors and agents of the Susquehannah Company were clearly involved in the plot to abduct Timothy Pickering. During his captivity, Pickering heard his guards make allusions to the "great men" who directed their actions. More tellingly, Pickering recalled that several months before his abduction, John Jenkins, who served as the Susquehannah Company's chief surveyor and as a liaison between Yankee settlers and the company's leading proprietors, had "menacingly" threatened that Wild Yankees would carry him off. Moreover, it is clear that Jenkins and his brother, Stephen, took a hand in recruiting and encouraging the kidnappers. One of Pickering's captors later claimed that John Jenkins offered him land at Tioga Point in return for taking part in the kidnapping and promised to give fifty dollars to the "boys" who captured Pickering so that they would "have the money among them to make a frolic;" another testified that the Jenkins brothers had "at sundry times" "urged" him and others to "make a party & sieze Colo Pickering" and, once the kidnappers had assembled, supplied them with gunpowder.[25] For their part, the kidnappers believed that prominent figures in the company planned to support their insurrection by marching into Pennsylvania at the head of five hundred men.[26] Such rumors, though they proved to be based more on fantasy than fact, demonstrate that Yankee insurgents expected leadership and aid from the Susquehannah Company's chief proprietors.

Tensions that emerged between Yankee settlers and the Susquehannah Company are also evident in the kidnapping plot and in the story of its collapse. The plan to win John Franklin's freedom began to unravel as the gap widened between the backing Wild Yankees expected from the company and the tangible aid they actually received. For their part, John and Stephen Jenkins failed to support the kidnappers as the plot to abduct Pickering moved to fruition; indeed, both brothers slipped out of Pennsylvania and took refuge in New York soon after Pickering's capture.[27] Eventually, eleven of the kidnappers made their way to Tioga Point (a settlement on the New

York-Pennsylvania border that served as the company's frontier headquarters) to see for themselves if its proprietors and agents would match their pledges of assistance with action. They must not have received much satisfaction for, upon their return, the insurgents freed Pickering and either returned to their farms or fled the state. The kidnappers' sense of betrayal clearly emerges in court deposition collected in the wake of Pickering's release. Daniel Earl bitterly complained that the "persons who had advised them in this affair, had now fallen back" and expressed his desire that "the whole matter should now be brought out, that the worst should come to the worst and that," as he put it, "every shoe should bear its own weight." John Hyde, unlike Earl, clearly pinned the blame on one person, Stephen Jenkins; Hyde exclaimed, "Dam that Villain! If it had not been for him I should never have gone into this scrape . . . It will never do for him to show his head again where I am, for I [would] cudgel him."[28]

Whether it illustrates cooperation or conflict between settlers and speculators, the kidnapping plot undeniably demonstrates that a relationship—an alliance—existed between the two groups. Even the anger Wild Yankees exhibited toward their speculator allies in the wake of Pickering's release was an animosity based on intimacy. The kidnapping plot was a disappointing reversal to what had been a productive relationship between Yankee insurgents and leading members of the Susquehannah Company. Although the company failed to support its settler allies in the wake of Pickering's kidnapping, they had aided in the creation of a coherent Yankee resistance movement in the years preceding it.

This settler-speculator alliance first came into focus in 1785. Encouraged by the bold resistance of Yankee setters immediately following the Trenton Decree and tempted by the rising value of frontier lands, speculators from New England and New York revived the Susquehannah Company and reasserted the Connecticut claim. The new leaders of the Susquehannah Company helped to transform the Wyoming dispute from a contest between Pennsylvania and Yankee settlers into a struggle that would spread beyond the Wyoming Valley and involve the energies and fortunes of land speculators from throughout the Northeast.

Before the Susquehannah Company could revitalize the Connecticut claim, if first had to reorganize itself. This process began at a company meeting held on July 13, 1785 when shareholders decided "to dispose of Six Hundred Rights" of company lands totaling some 360,000 acres to those willing to promote the settlement of northeast Pennsylvania under the Connecticut

claim. This offer of company rights drew new men to the Susquehannah Company and rekindled the ambitions of many of its long-standing proprietors. For example, the company, hoping to reestablish its influence over Wyoming's Yankees, issued a number of rights to John Franklin and other leading Connecticut settlers.[29] More striking, the company awarded twelve shares to the architect of agrarian insurgency in Vermont, Ethan Allen, in order to win his pledge of support.[30] In 1786 the Vermonter did travel to northeast Pennsylvania, but the promise of an alliance between backcountry insurgents in Pennsylvania and Vermont never bore fruit; Allen stayed in Pennsylvania only long enough to administer a dose of the belligerent rhetoric for which he was famous before he made his way back to New England.[31] Many of the six hundred full-share rights ended up in the hands of John Jay AcModer, Captain Peter Loop, Captain John Bortle, and other individuals who inhabited New York's eastern frontier: a swath of territory lying between the Hudson River and the borders of New England that had become home to a large number of New England immigrants during the second half of the eighteenth century.[32] For decades the New York-New England borderlands had experienced the sorts of jurisdictional conflicts, land disputes, and popular disturbances that troubled northeastern Pennsylvania. Thus, with its offer of shares, the Susquehannah Company recruited new members from a region whose own turbulent history of agrarian unrest had taught them that conflict could translate into an opportunity for land acquisition.[33]

A triumvirate of New England-born Hudson Valley speculators stood at the center of the revival of the Susquehannah Company and the resurrection of the Connecticut Claim. Caleb Benton of Hillsdale, Joseph Hamilton of Hudson, and Zerah Beach of Amenia won positions of authority within the Susquehannah Company and obtained rights entitling them to tens of thousands of acres in the Connecticut claim.[34] Some of the most pressing calls for violent resistance came from these speculators and their names repeatedly crop up in connection with episodes of Yankee resistance, including an alleged separatist plot to form a new state out of portions of northern Pennsylvania and western New York.[35] For instance, less than a month before his arrest, John Franklin received a letter from Joseph Hamilton warning him that "principle & leading characters" in New York did not believe that he would be able "to klink up a Bubbery" (cause a disturbance) sufficient to overturn state rule. On another occasion, Hamilton chided Franklin and his followers for being "jockeyed" and "trucked" out of their lands without the "flash of a single Gun rifle or any of the least resistance."[36]

In addition to lobbying for the support of prominent men from across New England and New York, the company's new leadership also offered free land to individuals who were willing to settle northeast Pennsylvania under the Connecticut claim. At a meeting of the Susquehannah Company held in Hartford on July 13, 1785, shareholders voted to award three-hundred acres to "every Able bodied and effective Man" who would "Submit himself to the Orders" of the company. Since three hundred acres was half the size of a standard company share, or "right," those who took up this offer became known as "half-share men." In return for land and the prospect of legal title, settlers who accepted half-share rights had to fulfill a number of obligations. First and foremost, the Susquehannah Company demanded loyalty from its half-share men and expected them to defend the Connecticut claim. Moreover, half-share settlers had to remain on the ground for three years in order to have their rights confirmed. Finally, settlement had to be immediate: the company specified that they would revoke the rights of half-share men who did not occupy their lands by October 1, 1786.[37]

Through the half-share initiative the company promoted the development of a coherent Yankee resistance movement. Timothy Pickering testified to the effectiveness of this policy when he observed that the Susquehannah Company "principally depended" upon the support of its half-share men and asserted that these Yankee partisans had "been the instruments of all the outrages" committed against Pennsylvania.[38] A careful examination of who obtained half-shares bears out Pickering's assessment. Two months after the company's July 1785 meeting, John Franklin brought together the first contingent of settlers who had agreed to take up half-share grants and issued them their deeds. A search through the Susquehannah Company's account books reveals that several of the men who took part in Pickering's abduction obtained half-share rights at this meeting—other future kidnappers received half-share grants in the months that followed.[39]

In sum, Wild Yankee resistance was born of settlers' determination to secure frontier freeholds *and* non-resident speculators' efforts to acquire, and profit from, large tracts of frontier land. On July 20, 1786, Yankee settlers (mostly half-share men) and representatives of the Susquehannah Company—including John Franklin, John Jenkins, and Zerah Beach—gathered together and articulated the principles that framed their commitment to the Connecticut claim and each other. The settlers and company proprietors described themselves as "joint-tenants" of the land and declared that they would stand together in the defense of their property. They argued that legitimate possession of the

land could only be obtained through a combination of "purchase and occupancy" and asserted that "the labours bestowed in subdueing a rugged wilderness" could not be wrested from frontier inhabitants without "infringing the eternal rules of right."[40] These statements blended two images of property. On the one hand, Connecticut claimants' talk of "purchase" as a means of acquiring land evoked a commercial conception of property in which land was a commodity that could only be acquired through a strict adherence to legal procedure. On the other, their mention on "occupancy" and "subdueing a rugged wilderness" alludes to a more leveling vision of property rights—a vision that emphasized how occupation and the application of labor, not money or legal right, provided the ultimate title to unsettled lands. The former perspective was more hierarchical and formal—it was the perspective of wealthy, well-connected land speculators and government authorities—the latter was the more egalitarian perspective of backcountry farmers.[41] The juxtaposition of these divergent views both reflects the extent to which these speculators and frontier yeomen managed to bring themselves together and highlights the distance that still separated them. Indeed, these competing definitions of property would remain compatible only for as long as Yankee farmers and Susquehannah Company speculators found common ground in their struggle for land.

The alliance between Connecticut settlers and Susquehannah Company proprietors seems to rule out the idea that relations between farmers and gentlemen were innately and invariably antagonistic. Wild Yankees certainly mounted a bitter struggle against Henry Drinker, John Nicholson, James Wilson, and other powerful Pennsylvania speculators; and certainly their opposition was colored by the fact that they saw these landlords as men who threatened to replace an economic order that promised opportunity and independence to the many with one that would only benefit the few.[42] Nonetheless, what is not certain is that Yankee insurgents looked beyond the *individuals* who challenged their soil rights and saw a *class* of men intrinsically at odds with them. Indeed, the willingness of Wild Yankees' to cooperate with speculators who supported the Connecticut claim demonstrates that distinctions of wealth and status between farmers and more well-to-do land developers could be mitigated by a common foe, a common set of interests, and perhaps even a common ethnic and regional background.[43] Thus any attempt to comprehend what motivated Pennsylvania's Wild Yankees needs to move away from explanations that solely focus on class conflict and towards ones that envision the social context of rural unrest in broader terms.

Half-share Men

The story of Pickering's abduction reveals that the interpersonal ties which bound settlers together into households and neighborhoods were foundational to Wild Yankee resistance. One of the first people to contribute to this understanding of northeast Pennsylvania's settler insurgency was Timothy Pickering himself. Soon after his capture, Pickering discovered that beneath the blacking that covered his assailants' faces were the familiar visages of Gideon and Joseph Dudley, sons of Martin Dudley, who had once been a "near neighbor" to Pickering in Wilkes-Barre.[44] This moment of recognition reflects how face-to-face relationships intersected with agrarian unrest—how settlers intertwined their activities as backcountry insurgents with their roles as members of households and communities.

Understanding just who Pennsylvania's Yankee insurgents were and where they stood in the social order is the first step in gaining a deeper appreciation of how agrarian unrest intersected with everyday life. For their part, Pennsylvania officials routinely portrayed Wild Yankees as outside agitators of little wealth and fewer morals who, having failed to make ends meet in older, eastern settlements, became willing recruits of the Susquehannah Company. In 1786 Timothy Pickering estimated that the vast majority of the 250 families who supported the Confirming Act were "old" settlers (Connecticut claimants who had settled their rights before the Trenton Decree) and reckoned that an equal number of "New Comers" (the half-share settlers who had taken up land after the decree) provided the bulk of the Wild Yankees' rank and file.[45] Such characterizations, however, rested more on prejudice than fact. Indeed, Pickering stopped drawing sharp distinctions between troublesome "New-Comers" and more orderly "old settlers," after he came to the realization that "*one half* of the old settlers & their sons" held half-share rights. In other words, the majority of Wild Yankees, far from being foot-loose outsiders, were settlers who had migrated to Pennsylvania before the Susquehannah Company adopted the half-share resolves and who eagerly accepted new lands from the company in return for their promise to hold them through "craft and violence."[46] Other evidence backs this conclusion. Susquehannah Company proprietor Zerah Beach cautioned his associates not "to have much dependence" on new immigrants lending their support to the cause and recommended that company agents concentrate on issuing half-share grants to Connecticut claimants who already resided in Pennsylvania. In addition, John Jenkins claimed that only thirty of the half-share rights issued by the company had been given to people who did not already reside in the Wyoming region.[47]

The upshot of all of this is that Pennsylvania's Wild Yankees should not be viewed as mercenaries who were drawn to the Wyoming region by the Susquehannah Company's offer of free land but, rather, as inhabitants who were tightly bound to households and communities and who saw in the half-share grants an opportunity to further their pursuit of property and independence. A handful of backwoods settlements tied together by kinship, the collective endeavor of frontier settlement, and mutual opposition to Pennsylvania's rule provided the bulk of active Wild Yankees and contained nearly all the individuals who took part in Pickering's abduction. Kidnappers Ira Manville, Benjamin, Daniel, and Solomon Earl, Zebulon Cady, Daniel Taylor, and Frederick Budd all resided in the neighborhood of Tunkhannock Creek. Allensborogh, a settlement on the banks of Meshoppen Creek, contributed John Hyde, Gideon and Joseph Dudley, Aaron and Timothy Kilborn, David Woodward, and William Carney to the party that took Pickering. Finally, kidnappers Benjamin and Nathan Abbot, Garret Smith, and John Tyler hailed from Whitehaven, a Yankee enclave just south of Meshoppen Creek.[48]

Like communities across the early American countryside, northeast Pennsylvania's Yankee settlements rested on a social hierarchy in which a few leading men maintained links with the wider world and provided leadership to a larger number of humble but independent householders who, in turn, held authority over an even larger group of dependent sons waiting to obtain their own freeholds. In such communities, age, family ties, and local reputation, not just wealth, helped to establish male social rank.[49] A petition drawn up by Connecticut claimants protesting their treatment by the state of Pennsylvania illustrates that Wild Yankee resistance possessed a structure that paralleled this rural social order. Among the names included on the document were those of John Jenkins, Elisha Satterlee, and John Swift. These individuals represented a veteran cadre of leading men who had lived in the Wyoming Valley since before the Revolutionary War. For example, John Swift had emigrated from New England to Pennsylvania in the early 1770s and filled a number of local offices under Connecticut's jurisdiction. He served in the Continental Army during the Revolutionary War and later went on to lead Yankee resistance to Pennsylvania after the Trenton Decree. By the late 1780s Swift was an established and respected settler. Next, men like Joseph Earl, Nathan Abbot, Ephraim Tyler, and Martin Dudley signed the petition. These individuals were older, household heads who advised and supported the efforts of younger, rank-and-file Wild Yankees. Among this latter group were Ira Manville, John Hyde, Daniel Earl, Benjamin Earl,

Gideon Dudley, and other signatories who actually perpetrated Pickering's kidnapping.[50]

The rural social structure outlined above provided a chain of command and a system of recruitment for Pennsylvania's Wild Yankees. Leading men like John Swift and Elisha Mathewson served both as local resistance leaders and as intermediaries between their neighbors and the Susquehannah Company. Older heads of households like Nathan Abbot and Joseph Earl provided the insurgents with material support; more important, they supplied the resistance with recruits. Indeed, many of the settlers who kidnapped Timothy Pickering were the sons of established freeholders and it is likely that younger men represented a good portion of the Wild Yankees' rank and file.[51] Most of the settlers who kidnapped Pickering do not appear in lists of Connecticut settlers before the late 1780s. Nevertheless, this does not prove that the insurgents were recent immigrants to Pennsylvania for, though the names of Pickering's assailants may not show up in such documents, their fathers' do. For example, Martin Dudley turns up in a 1783 list of Connecticut claimants as a carpenter residing in Wilkes-Barre while his two sons, Gideon and Joseph, do not. Likewise, Darius Parks' signature appears on a petition from 1783 but William Carney, Parks' grandson and another one of Pickering's kidnappers, does not. Because of their youth and propertylessness the names and identity of these young men were subsumed beneath those of their fathers. Therefore, the invisibility of the kidnappers in the written record signifies their youth and dependent status rather than their absence.[52]

Thus, the Yankee insurgents who abducted Pickering were not just bound to households and communities—they were bound to them in a very specific way. Many of the kidnappers were household dependents; they were young, aspiring farmers who were separated from property and independence, not by static social barriers, but by a dynamic social process whereby one generation passed on property to the next. This pattern was well established in the northern countryside where a household economy that rested upon the productive capacity of families reinforced generational ties between parents who depended on their progeny for labor and children who looked to inherit property from their elders.[53] Therefore, youth, not poverty, was the essential characteristic of most of the kidnappers and there is evidence that the same was true of many Yankee rebels. During a tour of Pennsylvania's northeast frontier in 1787, Timothy Pickering commented that only "rash young men" openly supported the Susquehannah Company and engaged in acts of resistance. Likewise, the word "boys" repeatedly crops up in descriptions of the

insurgents. This characterization is accurate: one of Nathan Abbot's sons was seventeen years old when he helped to abduct Pickering; Aaron Kilborn, who also played a supporting role in the kidnapping, was only fifteen.[54]

Wild Yankees tapped into a familiar framework of household relationships—particularly those that bound together fathers and sons—to bridge the gap between agrarian insurgency and their lives as backcountry farmers. The roles young men played in early America's rural communities made them ideal Wild Yankee recruits. Specifically, they formed a household-based labor force that lent a hand on the family farm or were hired out by their fathers to work for others. This practice rested on a long-standing tradition whereby sons labored for fathers who, in return, promised to supply them with the land, tools, and livestock they would need to set up their own farms when they came of age. An example of this labor system in operation appears among testimony collected after the kidnapping. A few days after Pickering was taken, Stephen Jenkins hired Calvin Adams to accompany him on a journey down the Susquehanna River. Jenkins negotiated the arrangement, not with Calvin, but with his father. This episode fit into a common pattern whereby older men swapped their sons' labor for cash, goods, or a promise to return the favor.[55] This same arrangement furnished Yankee settlers with a method for obtaining men to carry out Pickering's kidnapping and other acts of insurgency. For instance, a few weeks before the abduction, Darius Parks told John Jenkins that, in addition to donating money and provisions to the kidnappers, he "would turn out one man." Daniel Earl shed light on Park's statement when he later testified that "William Carney was encouraged to join us by Darius Parks his grandfather who fixed him out for the purpose." Like Mr. Adams, Mr. Parks used his patriarchal authority to engage the services of his grandson "Billy;" however, unlike Calvin Adams, William Carney was employed not as a laborer, but as a kidnapper.[56]

The investigation that followed Pickering's abduction revealed the importance of local, face-to-face networks to the functioning of Yankee resistance; specifically, state authorities discovered that the kidnappers' families and neighbors had provided them with provisions, shelter, and information on the whereabouts of state troops. Once state officials fully realized the extent of this community-based support network, they arrested the kidnappers' fathers and other close relations. Joseph Earl, Martin Dudley, and Joseph Kilborn ended up before Pennsylvania magistrates for the auxiliary role they played in the abduction; they all claimed that they had no foreknowledge of any plans to take Pickering, yet the testimony of their fellow conspirators did not

support their story.[57] Garret Smith testified that when he asked Martin Dudley if he knew anything of the plot, Dudley answered that he did and added that he did not want both of his sons to participate in the kidnapping. When Smith asked him why, Dudley replied, "for fear they should be found out, for if one was at home, people would think the other was somewhere at work," demonstrating that he hoped that the common practice of trading young men's labor would hide his family's involvement in the kidnapping. In the end, Martin decided that Gideon would go and that Joseph would stay at home, "lest it should be found out that his sons were in the Scrape."[58]

This marriage of household relationships and backcountry insurgency did not operate without generating tensions, both between the Susquehanna Company and Yankee insurgents and within settler households. Opposition to the state of Pennsylvania held many risks and imposed many burdens—risks and burdens that struggling farm families could ill afford. Some parents willingly sent their sons to help kidnap Pickering; others did so only grudgingly. For instance, Anna Dudley defied the directives of the Susquehannah Company and leading Wild Yankees when she opposed her family's involvement in the plot. When Darius Parks asked Anna to tell her husband to "turn out provisions" for the kidnappers, she refused to do so and defiantly told Parks that she would speak against anyone who "should attempt to persuade him to it." Anna Dudley never specified why she opposed the plot to take Pickering, but it is likely that she was loath to risk her sons in such a desperate venture; moreover, as a women in a society that provided few if any opportunities for females to own land, Anna may not have been as invested as her husband and sons in northeast Pennsylvania's battle for property. Besides dividing men and women, the kidnapping plot generated friction between parents and children. Joseph Earl was one father whose protests of ignorance about his sons' involvement in the kidnapping may have been genuine. Joseph claimed that he only learned of their part in the plot when he returned home one day to find his wife crying because Daniel, Solomon, and Benjamin had gone off to take Pickering. Likewise, it must be remembered that Joseph Dudley, despite his fathers' decision that he stay at home, defied his father and went with his brother, Gideon, to join the party that kidnapped Pickering.[59] Thus, rather than invariably enhancing parental authority and domestic harmony, Yankee resistance could also undermine it.

This exploration of agrarian resistance in northeast Pennsylvania and how it crossed paths with rural life is not intended to prove that Wild Yankees, or other rural rebels for that matter, were all young men whose activities as

insurgents were an adjunct to their roles as household dependents; rather, what is important here is not the particulars of the above discussion but its broader implications. Namely, the close intertwining of face-to-face relationships and Yankee insurgency points to the fact that the real impetus behind agrarian unrest lay in the aspirations and daily experience of ordinary farm families.

Independence & Localism

If the face-to-face relationships that tied early America's rural inhabitants together into households and neighborhoods structured agrarian resistance, then it was the attitudes and aspirations of ordinary rural folk that motivated agrarian insurgents and determined their goals. Agrarian resistance, first and foremost, was intertwined with the pursuit of agrarian independence. In northeast Pennsylvania, and across the early American countryside, farmers translated the ethos of independence into social action by building farms, raising families, and, on occasion, taking up arms against those who threatened their property and autonomy. In addition, unrest was framed by rural inhabitants' localist outlook—by their preoccupation with economic, political, and social relationships that operated on a face-to-face level and their habit of interpreting larger events in the light of local experience. Taken together, these realities shed additional light on the relationship between rural society and agrarian resistance as well as on the ties, and the tensions, that developed between Yankee settlers and the Susquehannah Company.

On the day of Pickering's abduction, an encounter took place that illustrates the central role that the pursuit of independence played in motivating agrarian resistance. The episode started when Joseph Kilborn accosted Minor York as the latter traveled to a tract of land he was clearing along Mehoopenny Creek. York, hoping to secure rightful possession of this property, had recently replaced his Connecticut deed with a Pennsylvania patent obtained through Timothy Pickering. In doing so, he made himself the enemy of settlers, such as Joseph Kilborn, who exclusively supported the Connecticut claim. Kilborn told York that those who accepted Pennsylvania titles would not be allowed to hold land and that the property he was clearing had been awarded to John Hyde and Martin Dudley—two staunch supporters of the Connecticut claim. Before leaving, Kilborn informed York that if he did not quit the land within a week he would receive a "threshing." The day after this confrontation, Minor York

returned to the contested tract and squared off against Kilborn and another Wild Yankee, Thomas Kinney. The two men warned York to abandon the land; York responded by informing them that Timothy Pickering had accepted the legitimacy of his claims and issued him a Pennsylvania deed. To this Joseph Kilborn responded, "If Pickering & his laws are any thing, I am nothing, and hold no lands: but if I am any thing, & hold land, then Pickering & his laws are nothing."[60] These words testify to how contention over property became bound up with powerful emotions. To Kilborn, land did not just represent a material possession but the key to individual self worth—to him, the struggle for the Connecticut claim was intensely personal.

Wild Yankees like Joseph Kilborn had to contend, not only with compromise-minded settlers like Minor York, but with the paradox of a resistance movement that promoted their property rights and independence on one level but, on another, required them to subordinate themselves to the dictates of a land company dominated by non-resident speculators. Specifically, they had to reconcile their interests, which were anchored in households and local communities, with the more far-reaching aspirations of their speculator allies and mesh their struggle for property with a larger defense of the Connecticut claim. Perhaps the most troubling aspect of this relationships for Wild Yankees was the fact that the conditions of occupancy and obedience the company attached to its half-share grants contradicted a central tenant of agrarian independence: the right of every man to attend to his own affairs without outside interference. Simply put, fealty to the company was, at best, a potential infringement upon a settler's autonomy and, at worst, a dependent relationship that would undermine his independence.[61] The Susquehannah Company may have hoped that its half-share men would serve as obedient pawns in its land-grabbing schemes; however, events proved that Yankee insurgents remained conscious of, and committed to, their own goals.

Wild Yankees overcame the inconsistency of participating in a resistance movement that involved ties of dependency with non-resident proprietors by turning to a larger paradox that stood at the center of rural society: that the independence of male household heads rested upon the subordination of their wives and children. In particular, they looked to a familiar domestic hierarchy that structured relations between parents and children—more specifically, between fathers and sons—to help legitimize their relationship with the company. As has already been discussed, adult male propertyholders wielded power over dependent sons who lacked the resources they needed to establish their own independent households. Moreover, when yeomen fathers

participated in economic exchanges that infringed upon their status as autonomous householders—ones that required them to sell their labor or involved commercial relationships beyond their immediate control—they relegated such duties, when possible, to their dependents. For instance, in order to make ends meet, parents might arrange for their children to work as wage laborers for a wealthy neighbor or to participate in craft production for local merchants.[62] In other words, only dependent people were fit for dependent labor. Seen in this light, the fact that many of Pickering's kidnappers were young men takes on additional significance. To avoid the dependant relationship that came with the acceptance of half-share grants, at least some Yankee farmers turned to their sons to carry out the most onerous of their obligations to the Susquehannah Company. For example, half-share man Nathan Abbot sent his two sons, Benjamin and Nathan, Jr., to abduct Pickering instead of taking part in the kidnapping himself. Likewise, Solomon Earl did not hold a half-share right but he may have joined the kidnapping party in the place of his father and half-share holder, Joseph Earl.[63]

As alluded to earlier, Yankee resistance not only reinforced fathers' authority over their sons but, at times, served as a way for sons to defy or escape it. Indeed, the kidnapping of Timothy Pickering was bound up in the tensions that simmered between fathers who wished to exercise their patriarchal authority and sons on the cusp of adult independence who bridled at their continued subordination.[64] To young men, half-share grants represented both an entrance to landed independence and an exit from parental dependence. This realization helps to explain the glimpses of generational conflict that appear in the court depositions collected in the aftermath of the kidnapping. Joseph Dudley's aforementioned defiance of his father's wish that he not join the kidnapping party reflected how the plot to take Pickering forced young half-share men to choose between obedience to their fathers and loyalty to the Susquehannah Company. Joseph may have joined the kidnapping party against his father's will fearing that, if he did not, the company would revoke the half-share right he held. In a similar fashion, Daniel and Benjamin Earl's obligations to the Susquehannah Company seem to have trumped their obedience to their father. If, as Joseph Earl alleged, the two brothers joined the kidnapping party without his knowledge or permission, they probably did so in order to secure half-share grants that would have offered them passage into the ranks of independent landholders.[65] In the end, a settler's choice to accept a half-share grant should be seen in this light—as an attempt by older settlers to secure property and independence,

or as a decision made by their sons to accelerate their passage from adolescent dependence to adult autonomy.

Besides backcountry farmers' efforts to secure their independence, the other factor that framed agrarian resistance in northeast Pennsylvania was Yankees settlers' deep-dyed localism. An emphasis on personal independence, the importance of kin and neighborhood networks, and the primacy of a household economy all engendered localism among rural inhabitants.[66] This localism, like the household hierarchy that enabled yeoman fathers to mobilize the labor of their dependant sons, helped half-share men to fuse their aspirations with the goals of Susquehannah Company speculators; namely, by focusing on local issues and relationships, Wild Yankees embedded agrarian resistance in daily life.

As with their stubborn desire to avoid dependency, Yankee settlers' localism did not always rest comfortably with their speculator allies' bid for land and profits. One of the most striking features of Pickering's abduction, and one that highlights Yankee settlers' localist outlook, was the fact that the kidnappers themselves never articulated why they had taken Pickering or what they hoped to gain from it. This curious silence also reveals the gap that existed between the local concerns of Yankee settlers and the more wide-ranging interests of the Susquehannah Company. The half-share men who actually carried out the kidnapping, instead of focusing on the larger motives behind the abduction, often used it as an opportunity to settle old scores. Such local, interpersonal conflicts between backcountry inhabitants should not be seen as a sub-plot or side show to Pickering's abduction but as evidence of the localism that informed Yankee resistance.

Kidnapper Garret Smith described how he and his compatriots effortlessly blended their efforts to win John Franklin's release with more personal and parochial concerns. Smith believed that in return for Pickering's capture he would receive land and crops confiscated from Yankee turn-coats who had turned their backs on the Connecticut claim and transferred their allegiance to Pennsylvania. In particular, he claimed that the kidnappers planned to take possession of a mill owned by Wilkes-Barre merchant John Hollenback. Smith recalled that when he asked Gideon Dudley what they would do if they captured Hollenback, Dudley replied that they would "tomahawk him." The fact that Hollenback, a one time shareholder in the Susquehannah Company, had recently turned in his Connecticut deeds for title under Pennsylvania would seem to explain why he became a focus of Wild Yankee ire. However, the kidnappers' animosity toward Hollenback was more directly rooted in an

incident that took place the preceding summer when Hollenback had a writ served against Joseph Earl for debts he owed to him. What galled Earl and other Wild Yankees was not so much that Hollenback wanted his money back, but that, instead of seeking redress locally, he prosecuted Earl under Pennsylvania law.[67]

The tensions that emerged when settlers' local ambitions came into conflict with the wider goals of the Susquehannah Company can be seen throughout the kidnapping crisis. For instance, a week after Pickering's abduction, Wild Yankees from Tunkhannock Creek "assembled in a riotous manner about the House of a Mr. [Zebulon] Marcey" and tore down his cabin. Though linked to the larger Wyoming controversy, the riot sprang from a series of local confrontations between Marcy and his neighbors. Although he was a Connecticut claimant, Marcy had angered his predominantly half-share neighbors by offering his support to Pennsylvania authorities. More important, he had earned the enmity of Tunkhannock's half-share settlers when he challenged their property rights before the Susquehannah Company's executive committee in 1786. Thus, the attack on Marcy's home in 1788 was, at least in part, the product of an old grudge. On another occasion, Pickering's captors came out of hiding with the intent of killing Zebulon Marcey's oxen; only with some difficulty did Stephen Jenkins, who feared that they would be apprehended by the numerous parties of militia scouring the woods for them, divert the kidnappers from their plan. Here, and elsewhere, Yankee insurgents' goals intertwined and, at times, interfered with the larger objective of winning John Franklin's release.[68]

In the end, the deconstruction of Timothy Pickering's kidnapping illustrates two things: that ordinary farmers' vigorous pursuit of landed independence formed the mainspring that propelled Wild Yankee resistance and that the battle for independence was a complex and multifaceted struggle. On one level, the Wyoming controversy was a battle over land that divided people along lines of jurisdictional affiliation and class—that pitted ordinary Connecticut settlers against Pennsylvania and its most powerful land speculators. On another level, and one that both followed and *crossed* class lines, the struggle for land in northeast Pennsylvania generated tensions between Yankee insurgents, their speculator allies, and the different and, at times, contradictory visions of property they held. Finally, the struggle for independence in northeast Pennsylvania took place outside the contours of class and within the confines of rural households. Here the contest mainly involved yeoman fathers who sought land in order to secure

their status as autonomous householders and sons who perhaps saw agrarian resistance as an avenue to acquire property and escape subordination to their fathers.

Conclusion

By the fall of 1788 the furor produced by Pickering's kidnapping had died down and northeast Pennsylvania returned to a tense and temporary calm. Pickering continued to preside as one of Luzerne County's leading officials until he accepted the post of United States Postmaster General and moved his family back to Philadelphia in 1791. Pickering would later become Secretary of War in 1795 and, less than a year later, Secretary of State—a post he held till 1800. A staunch Federalist, Pickering returned to his native Massachusetts, which he represented in Congress till he retired from public life in 1820.[69] John Franklin finally returned home after being released on bail in March 1789 (he was never brought to trial). His seventeen-month jail term may have subdued Franklin's opposition to the state, but it certainly did not extinguish it. Shortly after his return, Franklin moved from Wilkes-Barre up-river to Tioga Point where he continued to lead efforts to vindicate the Connecticut claim. Like Pickering, Franklin led a successful career in politics, albeit on a more provincial level; Franklin held the post of Luzerne County sheriff between 1792 and 1796, served as lieutenant-colonel of the county's upper militia battalion in 1793, and was elected to Pennsylvania's House of Representatives numerous times between 1795 and 1803.[70]

In contrast to Pickering and Franklin, the kidnappers, their accomplices, and families did not fare so well. Most of those involved in the abduction plot ended up before Pennsylvania magistrates. In an effort to avoid any more disturbances, state officials reduced the charges the kidnappers faced from treason (which carried the death penalty) to riot and assault. Young Arron Kilborn, "who had particularly insulted" Pickering, spent a month in jail and faced a hefty fine. Zebulon Cady, described as "an atrocious villain," avoided a fine because of his poverty but spent three months in prison. The rest of the "young men" who had been "misled by the old men" received lesser sentences. Of the kidnappers' elders, the court acquitted Martin Dudley, Ephraim Taylor, and Nathan Abbot; Darius Parks received a fifty-dollar fine, while Thomas Kinney received a one hundred-dollar fine and a six-month prison term.[71] John Hyde, Frederick Budd, and others connected to the plot escaped justice

by fleeing to New York. Joseph Dudley, who received a mortal gunshot wound during a skirmish with militiamen, became the only fatality associated with the kidnapping.[72] The promise of household independence contained in the Susquehannah Company's half-share initiatives soured in the wake of the kidnapping. For the Dudley family, the gamble they took in accepting half-share grants ended in disaster. Instead of strengthening their family's economic standing, Martin and Anna Dudley lost their son, Joseph. His death, more than anything else, symbolizes how the needs of settler households, the interests of land speculators, and the demands of agrarian resistance did not always exist in harmony.

The debacle sparked by the kidnapping does not erase the fact that Yankee settlers and Susquehannah Company speculators had formed a working alliance, nor did it mark an end to Wild Yankee resistance. Opposition to Pennsylvania's authority and soil rights continued to provide a common ground for settlers and non-resident land developers. Besides this simple congruence of interests, the ability of backcountry inhabitants to integrate agrarian insurgency into familiar patterns of daily life and link it to their struggles for independence assured the survival and effectiveness of this settler-speculator union. Based upon these foundations, Yankee resistance endured into the first decade of the nineteenth century.[73]

Finally, to return to the question at the core of this study, how does this exploration of Pennsylvania's Wild Yankees contribute to our understanding of agrarian unrest in early America? First, by highlighting that Yankee resistance rested, in part, on an alliance between ordinary settlers and well-heeled land speculators connected to the Susquehannah Company, this study challenges the view that class conflict was an invariable antecedent of agrarian contention. Second, this examination of Pennsylvania's Wild Yankees, in painting of picture of backcountry insurgents whose resistance was intermeshed with rural life, informed by a pervasive localism, and motivated by their desire to acquire land, suggests a new way to comprehensively understand early America's history of agrarian conflict. Namely, it argues that ordinary settlers' desire to achieve independence was the primary factor behind the disturbances that convulsed the early American countryside—that the source of agrarian unrest and radicalism was ultimately rooted in the dynamics of rural society and not in pervasive class conflict, the American Revolution, or, in the case of northeast Pennsylvania, the promptings of aggressive Susquehannah Company speculators.

NOTES

1. Adapted from *Wild Yankees: The Struggle For Independence Along Pennsylvania's Revolutionary Frontier, 1760–1820*, by Paul Moyer. Forthcoming Copyright 2007 © by Cornell University. Used by permission of the publisher, Cornell University Press.
2. Charles W. Upham, *The Life of Timothy Pickering*, 4 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown, & Co, 1873), 2:381–82.
3. Extract from the *Connecticut Courant*, September 10, 1787, in Robert J. Taylor, ed., *The Susquehannah Company Papers,* 11 vols. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970), 9:188 (hereafter *SCP*).
4. The body of scholarship that focuses on agrarian unrest in early America is extensive and ever-growing; some of the more recent, and prominent, works include: Alan Taylor, *Liberty Men and Great Proprietors: The Revolutionary Settlement of the Maine Frontier, 1760–1820* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990); Michael A. Bellesiles, *Revolutionary Outlaws: Ethan Allen and the Struggle for Independence on the Early American Frontier* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993); Reeve Huston, *Land & Freedom: Rural Society, Popular Protest, and Party Politics in Antebellum New York* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000); Brendan McConville, *These Daring Disturbers of the Public Peace: The Struggle for Property and Power in Early New Jersey* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999); Terry Bouton, "A Road Closed: Rural Insurgency in Post-Independence Pennsylvania," *Journal of American History* 87 (December 2000): 855–887; Paul Douglas Newman, *Fries's Rebellion: The Enduring Struggle for the American Revolution* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); and Marjoleine Kars, *Breaking Loose Together: The Regulator Rebellion in Pre-Revolutionary North Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).
5. Several dozen depositions gathered in the wake of Timothy Pickering's kidnapping lay at the heart of this study of early America's agrarian insurgents; these depositions can be found in *SCP*, 9:390–525, and in The Timothy Pickering Papers, vol. 58 (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society Microfilm Publications, 1966). In addition to these depositions, volume 9 of *SCP* contains the journal Pickering kept during the period of his captivity (406–409) as well as numerous letters and other documents concerning the abduction and its aftermath.
6. The class-conflict model of agrarian unrest has been around for a long time and finds its roots in the scholarship of progressive historians such as Irving Mark, *Agrarian Conflicts in Colonial New York, 1711–1775* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940). This perspective has been revived by neoprogressives such Kay, "The North Carolina Regulation, 1766–1776: A Class Conflict" in *The American Revolution: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism*, Alfred F. Young, ed. (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1976), 71–123; Staughton Lynd, "Who Should Rule at Home? Dutchess County, New York, in the American Revolution" and "The Tenant Rising at Livingston Manor, May 1777," in *Class Conflict, Slavery, and the United States Constitution*, Staughton Lynd, ed. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1967), 63–77; and Edward Countryman, "'Out of the Bounds of the Law': Northern Land Rioters in the Eighteenth Century," in *The American Revolution*, 37–69. Some more recent studies emphasize cultural conflict over class enmity but still tend to portray agrarian disturbances as confrontations between communitarian farmers and wealthy gentlemen who represented a new, more commercialized social order: David P. Szatmary, *Shays's Rebellion: the Making of an*

Agrarian Insurrection (Amherst: The Univeristy of Massachusetts Press, 1986), esp. 1, 18; and Kars, *Breaking Loose Together*, esp. 6, 215–216.

7. For this perspective on early America's agrarian insurgencies, see: Thomas L. Purvis, "Origins and Patterns of Agrarian Unrest in New Jersey, 1735–1754," *William and Mary Quarterly* 39 (October 1982): 600–627, esp. 615; Sung Bok Kim, "The Impact of Class Relations and Warfare in the American Revolution: The New York Experience," *JAH* 69 (September 1982): 326–346, esp. 332, 345; and Kim, *Landlord and Tenant in Colonial New York: Manorial Society, 1604–1775* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978), Chaps. 7 and 8, esp. 415.
8. These studies, mostly published in the last decade and a half, take somewhat of a middle ground between the two previous schools of thought: on the one hand, they shy away from blunt class-conflict explanations of rural contention but, on the other, argue that there were serious conflicts of interest and ideology between farmers and elites: Alan Taylor, "Agrarian Independence: Northern Land Rioters after the Revolution," in *Beyond the American Revolution: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism*, Alfred F. Young, ed. (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1993), 224–226; Taylor, *Liberty Men*, esp. 5–9; Whittenburg, "Planters, Merchants, and Lawyers: Social Change and the Origins of the North Carolina Regulation," *William and Mary Quarterly* 34 (April 1977): 215–238, esp. 220; McConville, *These Daring Disturbers of the Public Peace*, esp. 2–3, 174–76; Charles E. Brooks, *Frontier Settlement and Market Revolution: The Holland Land Purchase* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), esp. 11–12; Newman, *Fries's Rebellion*, Chap. 1; and Bouton, "A Road Closed."
9. For another study that finds settlers and land speculators working in cooperation in the context of agrarian resistance in northeast Pennsylvania and elsewhere, see: Alan Taylor, "'To Man Their Rights': The Frontier Revolution," in *The Transforming Hand of Revolution: Reconsidering the American Revolution as a Social Movement*, ed. Ronald Hoffman and Peter J. Albert, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995), 231–257.
10. The New Englanders, having only recently settled a decades-long border dispute with New York, did not challenge the territorial integrity of their western neighbor but, instead, focused on land west of the Delaware River claimed by Pennsylvania. For more information, see: Robert J. Taylor, *Colonial Connecticut: A History* (Millwood, NY: KTO Press, 1979), 56; and Philip J. Schwartz, *The Jarring Interests: New York's Boundary Makers, 1664–1776* (Albany; State University of New York Press, 1979), Chap. 4.
11. For an in-depth discussion of the origins of the Wyoming controversy, see the introductions to vols. 1–2, *SCP*.
12. For an overview of the Wyoming dispute between the end of the Seven Years' War and the Revolutionary War, see: the introductions to vols. 2–7, *SCP*; Oscar Jewell Harvey and Ernst G. Smith, *History of Wilkes-Barre, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania*, 6 vols. (Wilkes-Barre: Raeder Press, 1900–1930) vols. 1–3; Frederick J. Stefon, "The Wyoming Valley" in John B. Frantz and William Pencak, eds., *Beyond Philadelphia: The American Revolution in the Pennsylvania Hinterlands* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998), 133–152; and James R. Williamson and Linda A. Fossler, *Zebulon Butler: Hero of the Revolutionary Frontier* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1995).

13. For more on the Trenton Trial, see: *SCP*, 7: xx–xxxiii, 144–246 and Robert J. Taylor, "Trial at Trenton," *William and Mary Quarterly* 26 (October 1969): 521–547.
14. For narratives of the Wyoming dispute after the Trenton Decree, see: the introductions to vols. 8–11, *SCP*; Harvey and Smith, *A History of Wilkes-Barre*; David Craft, *History of Bradford County, Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: L.H. Everts & Co, 1878); Louise Welles Murray, *A History of Old Tioga Point and Early Athens* (Wilkes-Barre: Raeder Press, 1907); and Paul B. Moyer, "Wild Yankees: Settlement, Conflict, and Localism along Pennsylvania's Northeast Frontier, 1760–1820," (Ph.D. diss., William and Mary, 1999).
15. The Confirming Act, March 28, 1787, *SCP* 9:82–86; Resolution of the Pennsylvania General Assembly, April 3, 1786, *SCP* 8:313–314, 314 n. 4; *SCP* 8: xxxv–xxxix; Solomon Strong to Zebulon Butler and Paul Schott, May 22, 1786, *SCP* 8:338.
16. *SCP* 9: xv–xvi; *Dictionary of American Biography*, 31 vols. (New York: Scribners' Sons, 1928), 14:565–66; Upham, *Life of Timothy Pickering*, vols. 1–2.
17. James Edward Brady, "Wyoming: A Study of John Franklin and the Connecticut Settlement into Pennsylvania" (Ph.D. diss., Syracuse University, 1973), especially 20–22, 88, 146–52, 190.
18. Nathan Kingsley to Zebulon Butler, September 29, 1787, *SCP* 9:209; John Franklin to Jehiel Franklin, September 29, 1787, *SCP* 9:209–10.
19. Proclamation for the Arrest of John Franklin and Others, Sept. 25, 1787, *SCP* 9:204–05; Instructions to John Craig, Sept. 26, 1787, *SCP* 9:207; Stewart Pearce, *Annals of Luzerne County* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1866), 93–95; Charles Miner, *History of Wyoming* (Philadelphia: J. Crissy, 1845), 413–414.
20. Journal Kept by Timothy Pickering during His Captivity, June 26-July 15, 1788, *SCP* 9:406–09; Upham, *Life of Timothy Pickering*, 2:381–90.
21. Timothy Pickering to Benjamin Franklin, September 24, 1788, *SCP* 9:497; Zebulon Butler and Others to Benjamin Franklin, July 9, 1788, *SCP* 9:399–400; Zebulon Butler to Peter Muhlenberg, July 29, 1788, *SCP* 9:438–440.
22. John Hyde Jr., and Others to Timothy Pickering, July 15, 1788, *SCP* 9:409–410; Timothy Pickering to Benjamin Franklin, July 19, 1788, *SCP* 9:415–417.
23. For an overview of the history of the Susquehannah Company, see: Julian P. Boyd, "Connecticut's Experiment in Expansion: The Susquehannah Company, 1753–1803," *Journal of Economic and Business History* 27 (1931): 38–69.
24. Alan Taylor makes a similar distinction in "'To Man Their Rights'," 232–238. Taylor also provides a sensitive analysis of relations between settlers and various types of land speculators along the revolutionary-era frontier in *William Cooper's Town: Power and Persuasion on the Frontier of the Early American Republic* (New York: Vintage Books, 1996), 70–75, 87–110.
25. Deposition of Daniel Earl, Sept. 13, 1788, *SCP* 9:488–498; Deposition of Benjamin Earl, July 19, 1788, *SCP* 9:418–420; Deposition of Noah Phelps, Aug. 26, 1788, *SCP* 9:477–478.
26. Timothy Pickering to Benjamin Franklin, July 19, 1788, *SCP* 9:416–17; Upham, *Life of Timothy Pickering*, 2:381, 385; Deposition of William Carney, July 29, 1788, *SCP* 9:432; Deposition of Garret Smith, Aug. 7, 1788, *SCP* 9:454.
27. Deposition of Daniel Earl, Sept. 13, 1788, *SCP* 9:489–490; Deposition of Isaac Blackmer, Aug. 1, 1788, Pickering Papers, 58:75.

28. Deposition of Isaac Blackmer, Aug. 1, 1788, Pickering Papers, 58:75; Deposition of Noah Phelps, Aug. 26, 1788, *SCP* 9:477–478; Deposition of William Griffith, Aug. 18, 1788, *SCP* 9:469.
29. Minutes of a Meeting of the Susquehannah Company, July 13, 1785, *SCP* 8:249; Whole-shares Nos. 77, 79, 80 granted to John Franklin, May 1 & June 28, 1786, Susquehannah Company Account Books, Liber I:58, Connecticut Historical Society (hereafter SCA).
30. Letter to Ethan Allen, August 4, 1785, *SCP* 8:254; Ethan Allen to William Samuel Johnson, August 15, 1785, *SCP* 8:255–256; Ethan Allen's Receipt for Susquehannah Company Shares, August 19, 1785, *SCP* 8:256. For insights into Ethan Allen's relationship to the Susquehannah Company and his past speculating efforts in Vermont, see: J. Kevin Graffagnino, "'The Country My Soul Dlights In': The Onion River Land Company and the Vermont Frontier," *New England Quarterly* 65 (March 1992): 24–60.
31. William Shaw to Benjamin Franklin and the Pennsylvania Council, May 18, 1786, *SCP* 8:332; Bellesiles, *Revolutionary Outlaws*, 248–252. Bellesiles overplays Allen's impact on the Wyoming Controversy and misrepresents the Confirming Act by inclinating that it led to a resolution of the dispute.
32. Whole-shares Nos. 43, 44, and 38 issued to Capt. John Bortle, November 24, 1786, SCA,Liber I:28; Whole-share No. 82 issued to Capt. Peter Loop, November 24, 1786, SCA, Liber I:28; Whole share No. 32 issued to John Jay AcModer, September 28, 1786, SCA, Liber I:168; David J. Goodall, "New Light on the Border: New England Squatter Settlements in New York During the American Revolution," (Ph.D. diss., State University of New York at Albany, 1984).
33. Oscar Handlin, "The Eastern Frontier of New York," *New York History* 18 (January 1937): 50–75; David M. Ellis, "Yankee-Dutch Confrontation in the Albany Area," *New England Quarterly* 45 (June 1972): 262–270. For an in-depth view of the political dimension of jurisdictional disputes along the New York-Massachusetts border refer to Schwarz, *The Jarring Interests*, Chaps. 6, 7, 12.
34. Newton Reed, *Early History of Amenia* (Amenia, New York: DeLacey & Wiley, Printers, 1875), 81, 120. For shares held by the New Yorkers see: "600 Whole Share Proprietors," SCA, Liber A; John Franklin to Joseph Hamilton, November 25, 1786, *SCP* 8:421; and John Franklin to Joseph Hamilton, June 8, 1786, *SCP* 8: 358. For offices held by Benton, Hamilton, and Beach see: Minutes of a Meeting of the Susquehannah Company, December 26, 1786, *SCP* 8: 426.
35. For a discussion of the new state plot, see Julian P. Boyd, "Attempts to Form New States in New York and Pennsylvania, 1786–96," *New York State Historical Association Quarterly Journal* 12 (July 1931): 246–266 and the introduction to vol. 8 of *SCP*.
36. Joseph Hamilton to John Franklin, September 10, 1787, *SCP* 9:185; Joseph Hamilton to John Franklin, September 10, 1787, *SCP* 9:187.
37. Minutes of a Meeting of the Susquehannah Company, July 13, 1785, *SCP* 8:249.
38. Timothy Pickering to John Pickering, Aug. 4, 1788, *SCP* 9:446–49.
39. John Franklin's Diary, Sept 10, 1785, *SCP* 8:277. Joseph Kenny, Zebulon Cady, Daniel Earl all obtained half-shares on Sept. 10, 1785—see, SCA, Liber I: 12, 32, 33. Another kidnapper, Benjamin Earl, received his half-share on Oct. 1, 1785, SCA, Liber I: 98. For half-share grants to other kidnappers, see "Of the 400 Half Shares I issued to settlers," SCA, Liber C.
40. Minutes of a Meeting Held in Wyoming, July 20, 1786, *SCP* 8:371–72.
41. For a more extensive exploration of these competing visions of property see: Taylor, *Liberty Men*, 24–29 and Brooks, *Frontier Settlement and Market Revolution*, 31, 121, 124, 130–32.

42. Peter C. Mancall, *Valley of Opportunity: Economic Culture along the Upper Susquehannah, 1700–1800* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1991), Chap. 7 provides a good account of the economic order Pennsylvania's powerful land developers but only mentions Yankee settlers' reactions to it (pg. 176). For other studies that explore the activities and outlook of prominent Pennsylvania land speculators, see: Margaret L. Brown, "William Bingham: Eighteenth-Century Magnate," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 61 (October 1937): 378–434; Thomas M. Doerflinger, *A Vigorous Spirit of Enterprise: Merchants and Economic Development in Revolutionary Philadelphia* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1987), 314–329; Robert D. Arbuckle, *Pennsylvania Speculator and Patriot: The Entrepreneurial John Nicholson, 1757–1800* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1975); Norman B. Wilkinson, *Land Policy and Speculation in Pennsylvania, 1779–1800: A Test of the New Democracy* (New York: Arno Press, 1979); and Barbara Ann Chernow, "Robert Moris: Land Speculation, 1790–1801" (Ph.D., diss., Columbia University, 1978).
43. Taylor, "'To Man Their Rights'," 233–236. The concept of "ethno-deference" that Brendan McConville forwards in *These Daring Disturbers of the Public Peace* (pg. 47–50) provides a model for understanding the complex relationships that developed between Yankee settlers and land speculators in northeast Pennsylvania.
44. Upham, *Life of Pickering*, 2:384.
45. Extracts from Timothy Pickering's Journal, August 1786, *SCP* 8:385–86.
46. Timothy Pickering to Peter Muhlenberg, Aug. 9, 1788, *SCP* 9:460–61; Timothy Pickering to Benjamin Franklin, July 28, 1788, *SCP* 9:429.
47. Zerah Beach to Zebulon Butler, Sept. 21, 1785, *SCP* 8:262; Timothy Pickering to Peter Muhlenberg, Aug. 9, 1788, *SCP* 9:460. For a listing of half-share grants issued by John Franklin, see SCA, Liber I.
48. "Of the 400 Half Shares I issued to settlers," SCA, Liber C; "Proceedings of Committee of Claims Respecting the Claimants of Putnam," Nov. 27, 1786, SCA, Liber I: 31. It is important to note that the term "town" refers to a New England town (i.e. a distinct area of land and a unit of local jurisdiction comparable to a Pennsylvania township) rather than an urban center.
49. Robert Gross describes this age and kin-based status structure throughout his book, *The Minutemen and Their World* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1976), 10–11, 62–63, 70–71. Also see Christopher M. Jedry, *The World of John Cleaveland: Family and Community in Eighteenth-Century New England* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1979).
50. Remonstrance of Luzerne Inhabitants against William Montgomery, Sept. 18, 1787, *SCP* 9:195–98. Biographical information on John Swift can be found in Harvey and Smith, *History of Wilkes-Barre*, 3:1406
51. Alan Taylor and Michael Bellesiles have put together age profiles for agrarian insurgents in Maine and Vermont that seem to contradict my findings. Both authors find that individuals under the age of 26 are actually *under-represented* in the ranks of the insurgents and that those over the age of 26 are dramatically *over-represented* (Taylor, *Liberty Men*, 260–262; Bellesiles, *Revolutionary Outlaws*, 285–286). Nonetheless, the samples (108 individuals for Bellesiles and 127 for Taylor) upon which both authors base their findings only represent a small proportion (less than 10% in the case of Bellesiles) of active insurgents in Vermont and Maine. Moreover, as Bellesiles points out, those back-country insurgents for whom biographical information exists might well represent more prominent

members of their respective resistance movements who were perhaps older than the norm and thus may skew the insurgent's age profile.

52. Harvey and Smith, *History of Wilkes-Barre*, 3:1312–14, 1332–33.
53. For more on the relationship between age, wealth, and social standing in New England, see: Philip J. Greven, Jr., "Family Structure in Seventeenth-Century Andover, Massachusetts," *William and Mary Quarterly* 23 (April 1966): 234–256; Daniel Vickers, *Farmers and Fishermen: Two Centuries of Work in Essex County, Massachusetts, 1630–1850* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 64–77, 219–229; Fred Anderson, *A People's Army: Massachusetts Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years' War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 28–39; Jedry, *The World of John Cleaveland*, 63–64; and James Henretta, "Families and Farms: *Mentalite'* in Pre-Industrial America," *William and Mary Quarterly* 35 (January 1978): 6–8.
54. Journal of Timothy Pickering's Visit to Wyoming, Jan. 26 & 31, 1787, *SCP* 9:52, 56; Upton, *Life of Pickering*, 2:386; Timothy Pickering to Peter Muhlenberg, Aug. 9, 1788, *SCP* 9:458; Timothy Pickering to Thomas Mifflin, Nov. 15, 1788, *SCP* 9:518.
55. For a more in-depth discussion of household labor systems in early America, see: Daniel Vickers, "Working the Fields in a Developing Economy: Essex County, Massachusetts, 1630–1675," in *Work and Labor in Early America*, ed., Stephen Innes (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 49–69 and Vickers, *Farmers & Fishermen*, 64–77, 219–229; Deposition of Calvin Adams, Aug. 19, 1788, Pickering Papers 58:109.
56. Deposition of Anna Dudley, Aug. 20, 1788, *SCP* 9:473; Deposition of Daniel Earl, Sept. 13, 1788, *SCP* 9:490; Deposition of William Carney, July 29, 1788, *SCP* 9:431.
57. Evidence against Thomas Kinney, Elijah Reynolds, Joseph Earl, Ephraim Tyler, Martin Dudley, and Joseph Kilborn, July 5, 1788, Pickering Papers 58:111.
58. Deposition of Garret Smith, Aug. 7, 1788, *SCP* 9:452–53. For additional evidence of Martin Dudley's prior knowledge of the kidnapping, see the deposition of William Carney, July 29, 1788, *SCP* 9:431.
59. Testimony Concerning the Capture of Timothy Pickering, July 5, 1788, *SCP* 9:394.
60. Deposition of Elizabeth Wigton, August 1, 1788, *SCP* 9:444–45; Deposition of Minor York, August 18, 1788, *SCP* 9:470–71.
61. For an in-depth discussion of independence and dependency, see: Vickers, *Farmers & Fishermen*, especially pages 14–16 and 19; Vickers, "Competency and Competition": 7; and Richard L. Bushman, "'This New Man': Dependence and Independence, 1776" in *Uprooted Americans: Essays in Honor of Oscar Handlin*, ed. Richard L. Bushman, et. al. (Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1979), 77–96, especially, pg. 81.
62. Vickers, "Competency and Competition": 9–10.
63. For the half-share (No. 101) issued to Nathan Abbot and Joseph Earl (No. 104) see "Of the 400 Half Shares I issued to settlers," SCA, Liber C.
64. Gross, *Minutemen and Their World*, 75–76, 81–83, 88–89; Vickers, "Competency and Competition," 23; Vickers, *Farmers and Fishermen*, 219–229; Jedry, *The World of John Cleaveland*, 73–74.
65. For the half-share grants (Nos. 80, 103, 203, and 204) issued to Daniel and Benjamin Earl and Gideon and Joseph Dudley, see: "Of the 400 Half Shares I issued to settlers," SCA, Liber C; Testimony Concerning the Capture of Timothy Pickering, July 5, 1788, *SCP* 9:394; Deposition of Garret Smith, Aug. 7, 1788, *SCP* 9:452–53.

66. A good exploration into the theme of localism in early American can be found in Darrett B. Rutman, "Assessing the Little Communities of Early America," *William & Mary Quarterly* 43 (April 1986): 166–67, 178. In contrast to Rutman's broad overview of localism, other historians have focused on how such parochialism manifested itself in the backcountry: Albert H. Tillson, Jr., "The Localist Roots of Backcountry Loyalism: An Examination of Popular Political Culture in Virginia's New River Valley," *Journal of Southern History* 54 (August 1988): 387–88 and Charles Desmond Dutrizac, "Local Identity and Authority in a Disputed Hinterland: The Pennsylvania-Maryland Border in the 1730s," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 115 (January 1991): 35–61. For insights into New England's localist culture see Michael Zuckerman, *Peaceable Kingdoms: New England Towns in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), 15–16, 46, 254 and T.H. Breen, "Persistent Localism: English Social Changes and the Shaping of New England Institutions," *William and Mary Quarterly* 32 (1975): 3–28.
67. Deposition of Garret Smith, Aug. 7, 1788, *SCP* 9:454; Timothy Pickering to Samuel Hodgdon, August 9, 1787, *SCP* 9:156.
68. Deposition of Andrew Ellicott, June 8, 1788, *SCP* 9:394–95; Proceedings of Committee of Claims Respecting the Claimants of Putnam, Nov. 7, 1786, SCA, Liber I: 31; Deposition of Isaac Blackmer, Aug. 1, 1788, Pickering Papers, 58:75.
69. *Dictionary of American Biography*, 14: 66–67.
70. Pearce, *Annals of Luzerne*, 524; Brady, "Wyoming: A Study of John Franklin", 275–76, 288, 301.
71. Indictment of Ira Manville and Thirteen Others, Sept. 2, 1788, *SCP* 9:480–82; Timothy Pickering to Samuel Hodgdon, Nov. 9, 1788, *SCP* 9:516–17.
72. Timothy Pickering's Memorandum on His Abductors, Aug. 7, 1788, *SCP* 9:436–38; Timothy Pickering to Thomas Mifflin, Nov. 15, 1788, *SCP* 9:517–19; Timothy Pickering to Benjamin Franklin, July 29, 1788, *SCP* 9:432–36.
73. For narratives of the Wyoming dispute after Pickering's kidnapping, see: the introductions to vols. 10 and 11, *SCP*; Craft, *History of Bradford County*; Murray, *A History of Old Tioga Point*; and Moyer, "Wild Yankees: Settlement, Conflict, and Localism," Chaps. 4–8.