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Since World War II there has been a great revival of interest in local history. As Edmund Morgan and others have pointed out, too often generalizations about American life have been made without the prerequisite local research, town by town, family by family. On the other hand, local history has often been too narrowly restricted to a genealogical or biographical approach.

This study of Rutland is the investigation of only one of the myriad of small towns and villages in late eighteenth century America and as such is only one "bit" of evidence. Yet it seems that it is only by many such "grass roots" approaches that many questions can be answered, false impressions corrected and "clio" vindicated.

Rutland was selected for both personal and historical reasons. The author's residence in Rutland made it possible for him to know the ecological features and the character of the people of the community today, as well as to have ease of access to the necessary primary resources. Historically Rutland was important to Vermont. It had been the Vermont Military Headquarters during the Revolution and had real hopes of becoming the capital of Vermont after the War for Independence. For a time it held a legislative and judicial importance which began to generate the urban economic
support required for such a center. Today it is still an important regional economic center in Vermont and the state's second largest city with nearly 20,000 people. Thus this study treats the origins of a small, but important urban center of Vermont.

This history considers Rutland as a community of people from its first known settlement in 1770 to 1791 when Rutland and Vermont entered the Union. It deals especially with the character and change of character of the community. It treats individuals and individual topics in so far as they contribute to the life of the community or exemplify some aspect of the community's life. However, the chief concern is always the character of the community.

Originally this work was conceived as a minor portion of a chronologically longer project. However, what had appeared to be susceptible to such simple treatment became increasingly complex and lengthy. Secondary sources failed to answer questions that needed to be asked and answered. What had seemed at first to be ground that was well worked over became a rich mine of "bits and pieces" that even yet are not exhausted for their evidence bearing on the settlement and early development of Rutland.

Although it might be expected that little of significance would happen in such a small frontier town in such a short chronological span, nevertheless it should be noted that historical change is not limited to events nor com-
munities of great magnitude. Rather, subtle changes in the small towns of post Revolutionary America are particularly representative of what was really happening in much of America of the time.

In Rutland the primary evidence of the early years of settlement and development unavoidably contained large gaps yet it was sufficient to establish a rather specific community character. The evidence of the period following the Revolution showed clear signs of urbanism and an attendant conservatism which signified a quiet, but none-theless important, change in the character of the community.

Not only did these "bits and pieces" provide signs of significant change but they all began to focus on the summer of 1784 as a turning point. From this point on, new faces and new interest groups seemed to direct and control a budding urbanism and conservatism in Rutland.

It is this change of character in the community of Rutland with which this study is concerned.
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CHAPTER I

EARLY SETTLEMENT AND ITS PROBLEMS

By the mid-eighteenth century many inhabitants of Connecticut and Massachusetts had felt the effects of population pressures developed by a century of growth. The French and Indian wars to the north and an alien New York to the west, however, prevented the natural venting of these pressures into unsettled areas. But by 1760 the dangers from the French and Indian wars were nearly dispelled and a stream of migration northward into Vermont began. Paradoxically, these same wars, which has prevented immediate settlement, provided many soldiers an opportunity to observe in person the beautiful and fertile river valleys of Vermont. For many other people back in southern and western New England, these observers were a source of equally, if not overly, attractive tales of opportunity.¹

The appeal of Vermont land was further increased by a series of generous land grants by Governor Benning Wentworth of New Hampshire. Between 1749 and 1764 Governor Wentworth granted one hundred and thirty-one townships, each about six miles square, west of the Connecticut River in what was later to be called Vermont. One hundred and fourteen of these grants were made between 1761 and 1764, mostly to citizens of New Hampshire and Massachusetts but a few to citizens of New York. Although many of the grants quickly, if not originally, came into the hands of speculators, prices that ranged from less than a third of a shilling to slightly more than a shilling an acre by 1770, were still very reasonable. Land speculation may have delayed actual settlement in some cases, but it did not prevent it. Between 1760 and 1775 more than ninety settlements were begun in what was to be Vermont.²

²Crockett, I, 167-8, 176-188; Mathews, pp. 111-112; Lamson, p. 90. Evidence of the reasonable price of land in 1770 can be found in the Rutland Town Records MS (hereafter cited as TR) (City Clerk's Office, Rutland, Vermont), Book I, 34, 170. For example, Nathan Stone sold to James Mead twenty rights \(\sqrt{\text{approximately } 7,000 \text{ acres}}\) for £100 (September 30, 1769) and Samuel Smith sold to his son John Smith, 1,080 acres for £64 (December 4, 1770). These examples held true in other Vermont towns. For examples see Crockett, I, 213, 250.
Not all obstacles to settlement in Vermont had been overcome, however. In 1764 the British government established the Connecticut River as the boundary between New York and New Hampshire, thus making the New Hampshire grants of Governor Wentworth of dubious value. After the promulgation of this decision in America in 1765, the provincial government of New York began granting lands in Vermont. Conflicting New Hampshire and New York land grants opened a great opportunity for the land speculator and in turn made the title of the land owner extremely uncertain. Controversy immediately arose, especially in western Vermont. Most of Vermont's early settlers held New Hampshire titles, perhaps for no other reason than that the New Hampshire fees were usually much less than those of New York. On the other hand the settlers, with few exceptions, were accustomed to the New England way of life and the same reluctance that previously kept them from settling on New York lands to the west still undoubtedly prevailed, although the settlers might have been much more amenable to New York jurisdiction if New

3Crockett, I, 189-191, 271; Roy Hidemiichi Akagi, The Town Proprietors of the New England Colonies: A Study of Their Development, Organization, Activities and Controversies, 1620 - 1770 (Philadelphia, 1924), pp. 124, 185. Akagi notes that most settlers refused to pay these settlement fees and no effort was made to collect them.
York had been more eager to validate their New Hampshire titles. 4

In spite of the drawbacks created by the land title controversy, Vermont land had numerous overriding natural advantages. Numerous streams not only provided transportation and mill sites but the occasional flooding of the alluvial flats along the margins of the streams provided extremely fertile farmland. 5

In addition to the abundance of cheap and fertile land, one of Vermont's attractions was its proximity to settled regions to the south. Thus it was possible for a settler to visit the potential settlement, build a shelter, even plant a crop, and return home to Massachusetts or Connecticut for the winter. Only later would he return with his family to establish a permanent home. Even after permanent settlement, contacts with the "community of origin" were still maintained by many Vermonters. Thus the early expansion into Vermont required no great leap into the wilderness. 6

4Crockett, I, 239-290, 317-318.

5Zadock Thompson, History of Vermont, Natural Civil, and Statistical, In Three Parts (Burlington, Vt., 1842) Pt. I, 6-7; Lamson, p. 106.

6Crockett, I, 210, 216, 232; Lamson, pp. 80, 105; Matthews, p. 115.
Expansion into Vermont followed two natural highways north. On the one hand the people from east of the Connecticut River generally went up the Connecticut River Valley and settled east of the Green Mountains. On the other hand the people who lived west of the Connecticut River went through the Berkshire Hills of western Massachusetts and up the valley between the Taconic Mountains on the west and the Green Mountains on the east into the Champlain Valley lowlands. Only along the Crown Point Military Road in mid-Vermont did these two northward streams of settlement find opportunity to mix and that, for the most part, after the Revolution.\(^7\)

These two streams of settlement in Vermont differed not only in origin but also in manner of settlement. Eastern Vermont generally experienced a transplantation of groups of people from one or two communities in Connecticut or Massachusetts. In western Vermont the pattern could best be described as a series of "stepping stones." Settlers would move in steps, the length of which varied from the distance to the next town to perhaps one hundred miles.

\(^7\)Harold A. Meeks, "An Isochronic Map of Vermont Settlement," *Vermont History*, XXXVIII:2 (Spring, 1970), 95-102. Apparently all the Rutland settlers before the Revolution moved south to north up the western route. None of the pre-Revolutionary inhabitants seemed to be from the east. The earliest recorded use of the Crown Point Military Road by a Rutland immigrant is the account of the movement of the McConnell family to Rutland in 1779. (See Chapter Four.)
toward the frontier. There they would establish for a while and then some would move on again.8

This pattern in western Vermont was undoubtedly influenced by the uncertainties of the New Hampshire land titles in the face of challenge by the New York authorities. However, there was some precedent from the settlement pattern in western Massachusetts, where many people were only one generation or less removed from Connecticut. The same settlement pattern had also occurred in western Connecticut. The communities of western Vermont thus tended to be composed of mixed "communities of origin" but with a definite Connecticut background.9

Rutland was in the western stream of the migration north into Vermont. The first settler of Rutland, according to tradition, was Colonel James Mead, whose migration was an excellent example of the "stepping stone" pattern. Colonel Mead was born on the Connecticut-New York border at the extreme southwestern corner of Connecticut. His family migrated about fifty miles north to Nine Partners, a Connecticut settlement in Dutchess County, New York, which was only a few miles from the Connecticut border. In 1764 Colonel Mead moved to

8 Lamson, pp. 80, 103.

9 Crockett, I, 259-261; Lamson, pp. 101-103; Mathews, pp. 115-117. Evidence of a preponderance of Connecticut influence in early Vermont can be found in Vermont's first independent name - New Connecticut.
Manchester, Vermont, about one hundred miles north of Nine Partners. He lived there for five years before visiting Rutland, thirty-five miles north, in the fall of 1769. In Rutland he purchased twenty rights of land, ten of which he immediately sold, and prepared a shelter before returning to Manchester. In March, 1770, he moved his family to Rutland.\(^\text{10}\)

The migrating patterns of the other early settlers of Rutland included many of the "stepping stone" variety and some who came directly from Connecticut. The "communities of origin" of the immigration into Rutland formed a line running north from Nine Partners, New York, through Salisbury, Connecticut, Lanesboro and Williamstown, Massachusetts, Bennington and Manchester, Vermont, to Rutland. Other settlers seemed to move into this pattern from Saybrook and New Haven, in southern Connecticut, Waterbury and Woodbury, in central Connecticut, and Wallingford and Simsbury, a little further north in Connecticut. Most of these "communities of origin" were west of the Connecticut River and thirty to forty miles from one another.

Although the Rutland settlement had a relatively broad "community of origin" base in southern Vermont, western

\(^{10}\) H.F. Smith and W.S. Rann, ed., History of Rutland County, Vermont (Syracuse, N.Y. 1886), pp. 307–308; Crockett, I, 236; Mathews, p. 95.
Massachusetts and western Connecticut, with few exceptions most of the early families of pre-Revolutionary Rutland could be traced to western Connecticut origins, and thus demonstrated a strong Connecticut cultural influence.\footnote{Based on the author's unpublished study of "communities of origin" of a number of pre-Revolutionary Rutland settlers. The genealogical notes of Mrs. Alton Swan, 5 Crown Street, Rutland, Vermont were an invaluable source for this study. Numerous early land records also indicated the source community of the purchaser of land.}

Earliest settlers in Rutland must have been attracted by its natural advantages. An amphitheater of mountains virtually surrounded the township. From these mountains numerous streams fed into Otter Creek, which flowed north through the township and the Champlain Valley lowlands to Lake Champlain. These waterways created a number of intervale of rich soil, dotted with numerous mill sites. It was on one of these rich intervale, reputed to have been an ancient beaver meadow, that Colonel Mead had located in 1770. Not far distant, about a mile below the juncture of East Creek and Otter Creek, he built a mill at the "Little Falls" on Otter Creek. Good pine lots stood less than two miles away.\footnote{Smith and Rann, pp. 303, 308, 319; David C. Gale, Proctor, The Story of a Marble Town (Brattleboro, Vt., 1922), p. 23; Lawson, pp. 110-113. Lawson notes that the part played by numerous streams in influencing settlement of a town, can hardly be overestimated.}
Thomas Rowley, who surveyed much of early Rutland, summarized many of his favorable impressions of Rutland's attributes in a pre-Revolutionary poem, entitled "To Rutland Go." In the poem he publicized Rutland's soil, air, streams and pine timber and included a special invitation to poor New York tenant farmers to come and settle under the New Hampshire Grants, free from the aristocratic domination of New York. He concluded with an admonition not to fear the designs of New York land jobbers who controlled the New York titles. These could be successfully opposed.13

The pre-Revolutionary settlement of Rutland was dominated by this opposition to the land claims of New York titleholders. In 1771 New York had made a grant of land called Socialborough. This included the lands of Rutland and Pittsford, to the north, which had been granted previously by Governor Wentworth under the New Hampshire grants. Although there were many settlers in Clarendon, to the south, who held New York titles, nearly all of Rut-

13 Thomas Rowley, "To Rutland Go," The Rural Magazine: or Vermont Repository, I: 7 (July, 1795), 383-385. Rowley's poem was composed, and undoubtedly published, over twenty years before its appearance in The Rural Magazine. It can be conveniently found in the Appendix of this work and in Abby Maria Hemenway, ed., The Vermont Historical Gazetteer: A Magazine embracing a history of each town, civil, ecclesiastical, biographical and military, III, Orleans and Rutland Counties, (Claremont, N.H., 1877), 1093-1094.
land's early inhabitants had settled under New Hampshire grants. 14

Perhaps inspired by Rowley's admonitions, Rutland's settlers, though not the young radicals of frontier folklore, were ready to make a vigorous defense of their land against all encroachments by the emissaries of New York. One of the unfortunate representatives of these New York interests was William Cockburn. He had been hired by New York claimants to survey the Rutland lands granted under the New York charter name of Socialborough. In the summer of 1771 Cockburn had established a north-south line from the northern boundary of Clarendon and was more than halfway through the town of Rutland when James Mead and Asa Johnson, another early Rutland settler, "urged" him to depart and not return. 15

The Rutland resistance to the New York encroachments was so determined that Benjamin Spencer, a supporter of New York interests in Clarendon, warned James Duane, New York land speculator and principal proprietor of Socialborough, of the dangers posed by attempting to survey in

14Smith and Rann, pp. 310-315; Crockett, I, 193-194.

15Gale, p. 28; Crockett, I, 338; Smith and Rann, pp. 312-313, 315. The average age of early Rutland heads of family was nearly forty years. Mathews also found that many who led settlement in western New York later in the century were "in the meridian of life." See Mathews, p. 166. Rutland heads of family who moved to western New York in the next decade also supported this pattern.
a number of Vermont towns especially from "those people in Socialborough [Rutland and Pittsford]." 16

In late 1773 John Smith, who owned three rights of Rutland land, and Sylvanus Brown, one of the younger settlers of Rutland, led similar opposition to the activities of New York authorities. Royal Governor William Tryon of New York retaliated by offering a fifty pound reward for their apprehension. On another occasion Sylvanus Brown and William Post, another early Rutland proprietor, were charged with ejecting Yorkers. Later, with Michael Whitney also a Rutland proprietor, they were accused of taking possession of a New York claimant's farm. 17

As late as January, 1775, there was active opposition to New York authority in the New Hampshire Grants. Benjamin Hough, a justice of the peace under the New York government, was apprehended by a group of men including Sylvanus Brown, James Mead and Samuel Campbell, all Rutland men, and taken forty or fifty miles south to Sunderland, Vermont, where he

16Crockett, I, 362-363; A ké bie1 M ké ooré1 Caverly, M.D., History of the Town of Pittsford, Vermont...with Biographical Sketches and Family Records (Rutland, Vt., 1872), pp. 84-85.

was imprisoned for four days. He was then tried and found guilty of attempting to support and participate in the New York government in the New Hampshire Grants by a court of seven judges, which included Ethan Allen and Rutland's James Mead. 18

Although Rutland successfully resisted the New York encroachments, the uncertainties of the situation hardly led to rapid growth. Nor were these uncertainties to be removed with the advent of the American Revolution and an additional threat from the north. 19


19 Some effort to establish a separate colony for the New Hampshire Grants was made in 1774 - 1775. If the Revolution had not intervened perhaps this would have provided a very practical solution to the controversy with New York. The Revolution did check the ferocity of the controversy with New York and although it flared up occasionally, it never reached its pre-Revolutionary intensity. See Crockett, I, 376-377.
Vermont and Rutland assumed an early role in the Revolution when the Green Mountain Boys captured Fort Ticonderoga on May 10, 1775. Among the heroes of the expedition was Gershom Beach, a Rutland blacksmith, who made a journey of sixty miles on foot over wooded terrain to gather men from the area for the attack on Ticonderoga. The journey was all the more amazing as it was completed in twenty-four hours, an exploit that certainly rivaled Paul Revere's ride. Numerous other Rutland men joined in the actual capture of Ticonderoga.¹

Following the victory at Ticonderoga, many Vermonters, including a number from Rutland, joined the ill-fated attempt to invade Canada in the fall of 1775. With the retreat of the American Army from Canada in the summer of 1776 and the consequent danger to the Vermont frontier, the inhabitants of the New Hampshire Grants petitioned the New Hampshire military authorities for ammunition to supply a

force to protect the frontier area so that they could gather crops. The petition, signed for the most part by men from Rutland and neighboring towns, indicated that Rutland and the other towns along the frontier were destitute in the face of a serious British threat.²

Meanwhile Vermonters, who had successfully opposed the rule of New York, petitioned the Continental Congress that they not be required to serve the Revolutionary cause under the New York Provincial Congress. A committee of the Continental Congress moved that Vermont "submit to New York without prejudice." However, the motion was withdrawn.³

In 1776 Vermonters moved to establish Vermont as a separate district that recognized the New Hampshire Grants. A series of conventions then took steps that finally culminated in Vermont's Declaration of Independence as a free and independent state on January 16, 1777. Captain Joseph Bowker, a Rutland delegate who had come to Rutland in 1773, was chosen chairman of each of these conventions but one. In July, 1777, a constitutional convention met and formed a constitution for Vermont. This convention appointed a

²Goodrich, Rolls, pp. 4-5, 655; Crockett, I, 530-531.

Committee of Safety to conduct affairs until the government could be organized. 4

On the military scene, the British General John Burgoyne and his Indian allies began to move south with the American army retreating in front. On July 7, 1777, the American rear guard fought a delaying action at Hubbardton, Vermont, about ten miles northwest of Rutland, thus allowing General Arthur St. Clair and the American army to retreat through Rutland and to the south. As he retreated, General St. Clair directed the Vermont militia that were with him to remain at Rutland for the protection of the people on the frontier. All the cattle to the north of Rutland were ordered removed and all carriages of use to the enemy were to be taken or destroyed. Most people moved to Rutland or further south, leaving the area to the north a "no man's land." Two days after the retreat at Hubbardton, General St. Clair ventured the opinion that the people of the Rutland area had "little to fear except the depredation of a few Indians." 5 However, many inhabitants apparently did not share General St. Clair's opinion of the danger. After burning Fort Rutland, a small picquet fort, most inhabitants fled, at least temporarily, from the Rutland area.

4Crockett, II, 178-179, 185, 193, 196, 204; G. & C., I, 15-47, 62-75.

And perhaps their flight was wise for a letter dated July 21, 1777, which was received by Meshech Weare, a New Hampshire leader, indicated that the main body of General Friedrich von Reidesel's German troops was at Rutland.\(^6\)

In the fall of 1777 Burgoyne's advance ended in disaster for him at Saratoga. But even with this turn of events, Rutland was not removed from all danger. Although the frontier was not attacked again by a force comparable to Burgoyne's, there were still numerous incursions and threats of invasion by the Indians and their Tory allies.\(^7\)

Vermont made plans in early 1778 to invade Canada. Colonel James Mead of Rutland was to have commanded one of the six militia regiments contemplated for the invasion, but the plans never materialized.\(^8\)

Upon the organization of the state government in 1778, Rutland was selected as the Vermont Military Headquarters and Fort Ranger, which enclosed over two acres, was erected at Center Rutland near the "Little Falls" where it served as the

\(^6\)Chauncey Kilborn Williams, \textit{Notes for a history}, MS (Vermont Historical Society, Montpelier, Vt.), I, 27–28; Crockett, II, 94.

\(^7\)Crockett, II, 256–270.

\(^8\)Crockett, II, 260; G. & Q., I, 216 n.2; Goodrich, \textit{Rolls}, p. 785.
principal supply depot for troops stationed at Pittsford, Castleton and Rutland. Undoubtedly Rutland’s central location and the surrounding amphitheater of mountains made the choice of Rutland, at the head of the Champlain Valley, a logical one. In addition, Rutland controlled Otter Creek, which had been used for decades by Indians moving south and east from Lake Champlain, and Crown Point Military Road, which cut through the Green Mountains to the east.9

On June 13, 1778, a party of five hundred Indians and Tories was reported at Crown Point about thirty-five miles northwest of Rutland. These raiders had just returned from a scalping tour of Tryon County, New York, where they had taken a number of prisoners. On the same day Vermont authorities dispatched men and supplies north to Rutland to meet the expected attack, but no major battle ensued.10

In 1779 Vermont began to take further steps for the defense of the frontier. At its session in February, 1779, the Legislature established a militia law which made all males between sixteen and fifty years old eligible for militia

9Crockett, II, 244-245, 265; G. & C., I, 301; Caverly, p. 165; Thompson, Pt. III, 153; Benjamin H. Hall, History of Eastern Vermont from its Earliest Settlement to the Close of the Eighteenth Century (New York, 1858), pp. 21-23; Smith and Rann, p. 304. Ft. Ranger could hold 200 - 300 men.

10G. & C., I, 266-267.
duty with few exceptions.11 In March, 1779, the Board of War established a frontier line consisting of the north line of Castleton and the north and west lines of Pittsford to the foot of the Green Mountains. All inhabitants north of this line were ordered to move within the line. Picquet forts were built at Pittsford and Castleton. Ammunition and provisions were supplied by the Vermont Military Headquarters at Fort Ranger in Rutland.12

During the winter of 1778-1779 Vermont faced a new problem. The military activities of 1777 and 1778 had prevented both civilians and military personnel from raising and harvesting crops. Consequently a severe shortage of provisions on the northern frontiers made it difficult for men to remain in service and provide food for their families or the army. In the spring of 1779 Governor Thomas Chittenden of Vermont requested military aid from General George Washington for the summer of 1779 so that Vermont men might be freed to grow and harvest food. Without such help it would be impossible to prevent the inhabitants from moving south with their families and what effects they could carry. This de-

11Crockett, II, 229; Allen Soule, ed., Laws of Vermont, 1777 - 1780; State Papers of Vermont, XII (Montpelier, Vermont, 1964), 57-65. (The State Papers of Vermont will hereafter be cited as S.P. of Vt.)

12Crockett, II, 262-263, 265; Gaverly, p. 165; G. & C., I, 295-296, 301.
velopment would make it difficult, if not impractical, to hold the frontier line that had been established in March, 1779. But continental troops were apparently never forwarded.\textsuperscript{13}

During the summer of 1779 Vermont raised one hundred and fifty men to serve at Rutland and on the frontier. On July 27th the Rutland inhabitants petitioned the Board of War for additional assistance in guarding the frontier. Captain Thomas Sawyer, commander of the post at Rutland, also sent a letter requesting assistance. In response a company of Rangers was dispatched and they arrived at Rutland in mid-August.\textsuperscript{14}

During the latter part of 1779 and the early months of 1780, the Congress of the Confederation was weighing recognition of Vermont's independence against the support of New York's claims. Meanwhile eight leaders of Vermont carried on one of the most ingenious and/or ambivalent secret negotiations in history, formally called the Haldimand Negotiations.\textsuperscript{15}

In 1778 the British government had given its representatives power to offer terms of peace to the colonies

\textsuperscript{13}G. & C., I, 292-293.

\textsuperscript{14}G. & C., I, 304-306, 308 n.1. A company usually consisted of fifty men.

\textsuperscript{15}Crockett, II, 300-302, 338-340. The correspondence of these negotiations can be found in G. & C., II, Appendix I, 396-484. See also John A. Williams, ed., The Public Papers of Governor Thomas Chittenden, S.P. of Vt., XVII (Montpelier, Vt., 1969), Chapter Four - The Haldimand Negotiations, 1779 - 1783, pp. 323-388.
generally or separately. In March, 1779, Lord George Germaine ordered General Frederick Haldimand, British commander in Canada, to open negotiations with Vermont. In September 1779, Haldimand replied that the Vermonters were a "profligate banditti" but he would do what he could. In March, 1780, Germaine again urged the importance of drawing Vermont to the British side. Accordingly, Colonel Beverly Robinson, who had succeeded in obtaining the treason of Benedict Arnold, composed a letter to Ethan Allen which suggested the possibility of an independent role for Vermont within the British Empire. When Allen received the letter in July, 1780, he read it and said he would consider it. Governor Thomas Chittenden of Vermont and a few others were immediately informed of the situation. 16

In July, 1780, Governor Chittenden suggested that the tyranny of the American Confederation would leave Vermont with little reason to continue hostilities with Great Britain. But General Haldimand reported that there could be no dependence on the word of Ethan Allen or those around him. In October, 1780, Allen forwarded a messenger who expressed that Vermonters were fed up with New York's treatment and the constant alarms caused by threatened British

16Crockett, II, 314-316.
invasion. The British replied to Allen that a cessation of arms would be granted as much as possible but not a truce.\textsuperscript{17}

By February, 1781, New York was nearly ready to give up its opposition to Vermont's entrance into the American Confederation. Only the objections of diehard Governor George Clinton remained. Meanwhile Vermont had moved to unite a part of western New Hampshire to Vermont. By April, 1781, some eastern New York towns had also petitioned to become a part of Vermont.\textsuperscript{18}

In the summer of 1781 General Haldimand began to be concerned that the Vermonters had only used the negotiations to deal more effectively with the Confederation Congress. However, he still held some hope of success and proceeded to extend the cessation of arms. In the late summer of 1781 British agents reported that the Vermonters expected to secure themselves by truce, cartel and negotiations until they could see the results of the negotiations at Vienna. But a meeting with Ira Allen and Joseph Fay at Skeensborough, New York, in early October, 1781, almost entirely convinced General Haldimand of Vermont's sincerity. As a result, Vermont again escaped serious offensive operations by the British. In late November, 1781, word of the surrender of General Charles Cornwallis at Yorktown left General Haldimand with

\textsuperscript{17}Crockett, II, 303-304, 316-317.

\textsuperscript{18}Crockett, II, 309, 350-357.
little hope of bringing the Vermont negotiations to a successful close.19

By means of the Haldimand Negotiations the artful Vermonters had kept the British from launching any major offensive campaigns from 1780 until the end of the war. Just when Vermont seemed in an almost defenseless position, a group of her leaders had performed the impossible. In addition, the negotiations did a great deal to pressure the American Confederation Congress into recognizing Vermont's position again New York's claims.20

The Revolution in Vermont thus turned into a series of alarms to raise militia troops to meet the dangers posed by frequent Indian and Tory scouting expeditions. As late as the spring of 1782 there was still concern about raising sufficient men to meet these Indian and Tory threats.21

Rutland inhabitants seemingly had little Tory sentiment whereas Tory sympathizers probably constituted a majority of the people in Clarendon, where most of the friends of New York were British sympathizers and took protection

19Crockett, II, 327-333.

20Crockett, II, 343-344.

21Goodrich, Rolls, p. 774 and passim; TR, I, 232.
papers from General Burgoyne. The four Tory estates confiscated in Rutland probably constituted the grand total of Tory sentiment there. It was highly improbably that any estates would escape confiscation as Captain Joseph Bowker and Colonel James Claghorn, both of Rutland, were district commissioners for the confiscation and sale of Tory properties.22

On the positive side, there was a sizable local support for the Revolutionary cause. Nearly two hundred different inhabitants of Rutland served with the militia or Continental units at various times, including fifty who attained some leadership role.23

Direct local support of the war was encouraged by an act of the Vermont General Assembly passed in March, 1780, which empowered the inhabitants of a town to tax themselves for a variety of reasons. At a town meeting on May 10, 1780,

---

22 Crockett, II, 272; Mary Greene Nye, ed., Sequestrations, Confiscation and Sale of Estates / Loyalist Material, 1777 - 1822: S.P. of Vt., VI (Montpelier, Vt., 1941) 9, 17-18; Hemenway, III, 1016; G. & C., I, 190-191, 198. This confiscation and sale of Tory properties provided the bulk of monies for the Vermont war effort and enabled Vermont to finish the war relatively debt free.

23 Unpublished study by the author based on Goodrich, Rolls. This number undoubtedly represented a large majority of the Rutland males of militia age.
Rutland freemen showed further support for the war by voting a tax rate of four pence per pound, as money went in 1774, to pay Rutland people for scouting.24

Meanwhile the food supply problems in Vermont continued. The transportation of food products outside of the state, except for the use of Continental troops or with the permission of the Governor and three of his Council, was forbidden by the Legislature in March, 1780. In November, 1780, quotas for military provisions to be provided by each town were made into law. Accordingly, on December 14, 1780, the people of Rutland voted a tax rate of one shilling and two pence per pound to raise provisions for the Army on the frontiers.25

The Revolutionary sentiment of Rutland was well illustrated by the story of Nathan Tuttle. In 1777, when many people fled south in fear of Burgoyne's advance, Nathan was among those who remained in Rutland. On one occasion, Nathan, who had been drinking very freely, met Solomon Johns and Gustavus Spencer who had come to Rutland with a scout of Indians and Tories. They accosted and threatened Tuttle, who

24 Soule, S.P. of Vt., XII, 189; TR, I, 98.

25 Crockett, II, 229-230; Soule, S.P. of Vt., XII, 191, 212-216; TR, I, 119.
dared them to touch him. Whereupon Johns ran him through with a bayonet, killing him instantly. Then they weighted his body and threw him into Otter Creek below the "Little Falls" and escaped. Although Tuttle's behavior had been foolhardy, it well represented the fiercely independent spirit of Rutland's early inhabitants during the American Revolution.26

Rutland was neither the earliest nor the largest community in the area, but it seemed to have gathered an especially aggressive group of "the most active and rebellious race of the continent," whether they were opposing "Yorkers" or "Tories."27 Although a temporary population of soldiers, who manned Fort Ranger, and refugees from the north did much to fill the town and stimulate its economy, most inhabitants of Rutland appear to have remained during most of the Revolution. Thus the community was able to maintain a continuity throughout the Revolution which communities to the north were not able to do.28

26Smith and Rann, p. 319 n; C.K. Williams, Notes... I, 29-30.

27Letter from General John Burgoyne to Lord George Germaine written after the Battle of Bennington and quoted in part in Crockett, II, 150.

28Based on an informal analysis of town records during the Revolution. In particular, see TR, I, II, passim; PR, passim; Goodrich, Rolls, passim.
CHAPTER III

FROM FRONTIER FOUNDATIONS TO URBAN BEGINNINGS

From the earliest years of Rutland's settlement there were signs of division in the community. These were undoubtedly attributable to the natural divisions of geography as well as to the aggressive spirit of independence of the people. The first settlements in Rutland were for the most part at Center Rutland near Mead's mill at the "Little Falls" and in the west part of the town where the soil was more fertile. There were some exceptions to this pattern, especially where it involved the establishment of mills on the tributaries to East Creek and Otter Creek. However, later settlement tended more and more to locate on a plateau of higher land to the east, removed about two miles from Otter Creek and the Center Rutland area. Tradition says that the Center Rutland land owners forced the development of the east village by the high prices they demanded for their land. However, the common pattern of Vermont settlement was to locate on the higher ground where the forest stand was lighter and the soil less damp and heavy.

1 The character and personality of a community are determined by the quality and the mixture of the people making up that community. Although these are subtle things to delineate, there are signs that provide evidence of their nature. However, the subtlety and complexity of the evidence makes the demonstration difficult. In addition, changes in the quality and mixture are constantly, but almost unnoticeably, going on.
There was also some concern that the low damp areas were more susceptible to disease, particularly the recurring summer fevers. Then too, perhaps, the settler of the east village saw the greater urban possibilities of the commodious plateau of the east village.  

The division of the town also had a basis in the early proprietary structure. As early as 1773 the proprietors had divided their rights into three groups: the twenty rights in the southwest section of the town, the fifteen rights in the southeast section and the five rights adjoining north of the fifteen rights. On June 5, 1780, the general proprietary authorized the proprietors of each group of rights to lay out divisions within their respective locality, keep their own records and generally conduct their own affairs, thus tending to maximize the independence of the proprietors and contribute to the division of the community. In the same year the town freemen further ratified

2 The Rutland Herald (hereafter cited as RH) Centennial Edition, Dec. 8, 1894, p. 2; Smith and Rann, p. 303; C. K. Williams, Notes ... I, 18; Hemenway, III, 1057,1059; TR, I, passim; Seventy-seventh Annual Report (Fiscal Year July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969) City of Rutland, Vermont (n.d., n.p.), p. 16; Lamson, pp. 81, 115; J ohn A. Graham, L.L.D., A Descriptive Sketch of the Present State of Vermont, One of the United States of America, (London, 1797) pp. 77-78. In 1784 a petition of sixty-nine inhabitants of Rutland County (mostly from Clarendon) urged that the county seat be developed in the east village of Rutland because it was the "most commodious" and best location for communication between the westerly part and east on account of roads already laid out. Two other petitions, now missing, but to the same effect, were also submitted to the General Assembly. See Edward A. Hoyt, ed., General Petitions, 1778-1787: S.P. of Vt., VIII (Montpelier, Vt., 1952) pp. 98-99. See also the petition of the East Parish for a separate religious society on p. 293.
the town division by voting to build two pounds for the enclosure of stray livestock, one for the east side and one for the west side of the town. The east side pound was to be built on the hill near the east side school which indicated that there was already a division in schools.  

Perhaps the most significant division of the town was the religious separation of the community into east and west parishes or societies. On October 20, 1773, fourteen people, ten of whom were Rutland inhabitants, had formed a church at Center Rutland under the direction of the Reverend Benajah Roots who had recently been pastor of the First Church in Simsbury, Connecticut. The members of the Church met in a log meetinghouse which was located in the center of town near Mead's Mill at "Little Falls." Although all the inhabitants of the town did not unite in supporting the Reverend Roots, he still obtained the first settled minister's right of land.

3PR, pp. 2, 73 and last page unpaged which hereafter will be indicated as u.p.; TR, I, 99. Akagi found the same situation to have existed in other New England townships where proprietors organized into two or more independent groups to overcome the inconvenience of geographic barriers. See his Town Proprietors, p. 72.

The Reverend Benajah Roots had graduated from New Jersey College in 1754 and had served fifteen years as pastor in Simsbury, Connecticut. In 1770 his ministry had come under some question concerning its orthodoxy. Roots had published a pamphlet in which the underlying themes seemed to contain elements of the "New Light" movement. In addition, his expulsion of an important church member, without prior consultation, smacked of a disciplinary independence that was not in keeping with the orthodoxy of the "Standing Order" of Connecticut. Accordingly, Roots was charged with "holding and publishing sundry unsound, dangerous and heretical doctrines, and of some instances of conduct contrary to the scriptures." Although Roots was acquitted, his congregation dismissed him in 1771.5

The record of the Reverend Roots' ministry in Rutland, as well as his dedication to his ministry, was less than complete. Whether due to disinclination, the infirmities of advancing age, or a combination of both, the Reverend Roots was able to show little accomplishment in making additions to his flock. With the exception of six additions to the church in the first few months of his pastorate, there were no additions to the church in eleven years. The traditional

belief was that Roots was engaged to preach for only five years and that there was dissatisfaction when he asked for more money at the end of this term. On the other hand, Roots had extensive real estate dealings which indicated that the ministry did not absorb all his time and energy. William McConnell, a young contemporary, described Roots as a "militia preacher," which seemingly referred to his irregular service since Roots was never a member of the militia.

About 1780 the town decided to employ the Reverend Mr. Roots no longer. On January 4, 1781, the town voted to settle a minister and established a committee to obtain preaching. At least four different preachers served varying and irregular periods of trial during the next two years. In the spring of 1784 the town voted to take advantage of an act of the General Assembly adopted at its last session in 1783, which enabled towns to tax for the support of preaching and the construction of a meetinghouse, and proceeded to vote to build a meetinghouse. The town then voted to make a settlement with Mr. Roots for his "preaching of late" while at the same time requesting him to continue preaching until the town could procure some other minister. The town originally voted

6 Swan, "West Parish Records," p. 5; Smith and Rann, p. 320; Rev. Samuel W. Boardman, The Log Book of (Deacon) Timothy Boardman including biographical sketch (Albany, N.Y., 1885), p. 51; Rutland Probate Court Records MS II, 100-101; O. K. Williams, Notes... I, 26, II u.p.
a tax rate of two pence per pound on the Grand List of 1774 for the settlement with the Reverend Roots but later reconsidered and voted one penny per pound on the Grand List of 1784 for "preaching sometime past" which seemed to indicate some dissatisfaction with the irregularity of the Reverend Roots' ministry.  

In the summer of 1784 Rutland experienced a religious revival which culminated in forty-nine additions to the church in 1785. The Reverend Jacob Wood led the revival and although the great majority of the conversions were inhabitants of the west part of town, both parts of the town made provisions for the voluntary support of the Reverend Mr. Wood.

7Swan, "East Parish Records," p.1; TR, I, 99, 145, 190, 191, 211, 273, 284, 287, 316, 331, 336, 354, 365. The use of the 1774 Grand List in the first instance and the use of the term "preaching sometime past" in the second instance suggest the probability that this sum paid Rev. Roots represented more than his most recent service. The different rates on the two grand lists would probably have raised about the same sum of money, given the probability of a larger grand list at the later date. But even that would hardly represent full time preaching for any lengthy period of time. It is significant to note that the irregular preaching obtained in 1781 and 1782 was also paid by a penny per pound rate. See TR, I, 190, 211.

Meanwhile, although the town had approved the purchase of two thousand feet of boards for the meetinghouse in 1780, had authorized Colonel Mead to repair the old meetinghouse in 1782, had voted to erect a new one in 1783 near where the old one stood, and again in the Spring of 1784 had voted to build a new meetinghouse, nothing apparently had been done. Therefore in June, 1784, at their own expense the inhabitants of the east part of Rutland erected a meetinghouse in a location central to that part of the town. In 1785 they held the first meeting in it.9

On January 25, 1787, these same inhabitants of the east part of Rutland petitioned the General Assembly to divide the town of Rutland into two societies. Further, they petitioned that the east part be incorporated into a religious society with the same power in law as other incorporated towns and societies, including the power to tax themselves. The petitioners argued that, being of similar sentiments in religion, they desired to settle a minister in a regular order and build a meetinghouse in a central location but could never agree as a whole town. As a result they, the petitioners, had gone ahead and built a meetinghouse at a very large expense.10


10Hoyt, S.P. of Vt., VIII, 293-294.
A copy of the petition was directed to Benjamin Whipple Esquire, Colonel James Mead and Mr. John Johnson, one of the Selectmen, all inhabitants of the west part and members of the standing church, to show cause why the town should not be divided into two religious societies. On February 13, 1787, a meeting of the inhabitants of the west part appointed a committee composed of John Johnson, Timothy Boardman, and Andrew Crocker, to draft a remonstrance to the petition of the eastern inhabitants. In the remonstrance the committee pointed out that the present church included members from each side of town and that no objection to the division was made in regard to religious sentiments. Instead they argued, and accurately, that the town had agreed to build a meetinghouse near the old one at Center Rutland, which was most convenient for the majority of the town. The failure to pursue this oft-made decision was laid to the east side as the west side had already subscribed about two hundred pounds for this purpose. The remonstrance closed with a notice of the inconsistency of the petition which it claimed was not founded on good will to the whole of the town. Nevertheless, the Legislature granted the East Parish petition on October 22, 1787.11

11 Hoyt, S.P. of Vt., VIII, 294-295, 322; Swan, "West Parish records," pp. 5-6; TR, II, 508; I, 316, 331. The other two selectmen were signers of the East Parish petition.
Although both parts of the town professed to have similar sentiments in religion, there were some differences in the articles under which the first church, hence to be called the West Parish, was organized and under which the new East Parish was organized in 1788. The West Parish clearly rejected the Halfway Covenant and evidenced some of the "New Light" tendencies. The East Parish adopted the Halfway Covenant and evidenced more rationalistic tendencies. Yet both parishes belonged to the Association of the Western District of Vermont and seemed to practice mutual fellowship and helpfulness. 

The major cause of the division of parishes appeared to be more an economic one. The location of a meetinghouse in a town was usually more than just a question of convenience. It brought with it the location of other public buildings and created a town center which increased the land values there and decreased them in the old center. Thus

the location of a meetinghouse was a very important economic factor in determining the form of town development. 13

Eighty-four male inhabitants of the east part of the town had signed the petition for the creation of a separate parish which made possible the legal recognition of the meetinghouse they had already built by subscription in 1784. Yet sixty-two of the signers were not members of the East Parish Church nor would they or their wives become members in the next decade. In addition, two persons were members of the standing church and remained members as it became the West Parish Church. Certainly town development and not theology had to be the primary concern here, although the more rationalistic Halfway Covenant school of theology seemed more appropriate to the urban tendencies of the East Parish than the revivalistic New Light theology.

13 Richard L. Bushman, From Puritan to Yankee: Character and Social Order in Connecticut, 1690 - 1765 (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), pp. 60 - 62; Freeman in his article, "Puritans in Rutland ...." concluded that basic theological differences lay at the heart of the division of Rutland into East Parish and West Parish. It is true that there were differences of doctrine but Freeman's thesis did not consider a number of other sources which were undoubtedly unknown and/or unavailable to him. Chief among these were the petition of the east part and the remonstrance of the west part in which both parties stated that theological differences were not the basis for the separation.
of the agrarian West Parish.\textsuperscript{14}

Coincidentally or not, discernible signs of urbanization also began to appear in the deliberations and decisions of the town at this same period. At the end of 1782 the townspeople began to be more concerned about roads. They appointed a committee to find some way to pay for highways and other committees to wait on the proprietors to obtain land that was set aside in the charter for highways. The proprietors had voted on June 5, 1780, to give out the highway land but apparently had not implemented their decision. One road, apparently laid out in 1780 through the farm of William Roberts, one of the

\textsuperscript{14}Hoyt, S.P. of Vt., \textit{VIII}, 294; Swan, "East Parish Records," pp. 171-172; Swan, "West Parish Records," pp. 5-9. The parish division also seemed to involve some elements of a non-proprietary vs. proprietary (at least the proprietors of the twenty rights) conflict as only two proprietors holding a total of three proprietary rights can be definitely identified among the East Parish petitioners and the twenty rights proprietors were wholly within the West Parish. A fuller treatment of the proprietary conflict is to be found in Chapter Four. In addition, there was a large representation of commercial as opposed to agrarian interests among the East Parish petitioners.
early proprietors, engendered a long controversy with the town. However, the controversy did not seem to be one of the town versus proprietors as the town's representative in the case was himself a proprietor from the same part of town.\textsuperscript{15}

In 1783 there were hopes that Center Rutland might become the capital of Vermont. It had been the Vermont Military Headquarters during the Revolution and was in a somewhat central location. Now there seemed to be a conscious attempt to develop the town as opposed to the early agrarian proprietors' concern to maximize their independence. A new town attitude seemed faintly discernible in the actions of the town meeting beginning in 1783. At the town meeting on March 11, 1783, the town appointed a committee to divide the school districts, directed the selectmen to erect stocks near the old meetinghouse in Center Rutland, voted to confine rams from the middle of

\textsuperscript{15}TR, I, 99, 145, 190, 191, 196, 273, 284, 285, 287, 309, 316, 351, 354, 389, 390; PR, last page but one \textsuperscript{u.p}. Bushman found that a new meetinghouse usually led to petitions for new roads to it. In Rutland, much of the road development seems to have preceded the construction of the meetinghouse. Bushman also found that proprietors tended to oppose roads through their lands. See his \textit{From Puritan to Yankee}, pp. 63-64.
August to the middle of November and decided that swine should not be allowed to run at large at any time.16

On September 9, 1783, a committee from the town participated in a convention of several towns in the county which decided that the county courthouse would be built in Rutland. Although the freemen of Rutland disagreed on the number of towns to be included in the county, they voted to become a county town and to accept the location of the county courthouse and jail in the west part of Rutland near the Great Road that led from Rutland to Castleton. In the spring of 1784 the General Assembly formalized the county's decision and also established post offices at five locations in the state, one of which was Rutland.17

In the summer of 1783 the east part of the town received the benefit of a town decision to build two good cart bridges over the East Creek. This placed the east part of Rutland at the intersection of great roads north, south and west, with good bridges north and west over the East Creek. With the location of the new meetinghouse in the east village in the summer of 1784, it was not

16Boardman, p. 31; TR, I, 296.

17Rutland, Vt., MS (Vermont Historical Society, Montpelier, Vt.); TR, 319; John A. Williams, ed., Laws of Vermont, 1781 - 1784; S.P. of Vt., XIII (Montpelier, Vt., 1965), 257; Crockett, II, 393.
surprising that in the fall of 1784 the location of the new county public buildings was moved to a location near the center of the east village of Rutland. 18

The reasons for moving the county seat from the original and more central town of Tinmouth to the west part of Rutland and then again to the east part were undoubtedly political and economic. The east village was without doubt the best location for the county seat both in regard to its ease of access from the north and east and in regard to its spacious potential for accommodating a larger population. But perhaps health was also a factor. The town of Tinmouth, which was the county seat, was seasonally plagued with the "fever ague" which was later traced to the stagnated waters of a small lake in the town. As a result, the desirability of the town as a habitation and the land values decreased. The western location in Rutland was not near a lake but was in a very low and damp area which, although desirable for farming, was not considered to be as healthy as the higher land of the east village. 19

18 TR, I, 308; Williams, S.P. of Vt., XIII, 288-289. A good bridge had been constructed across Otter Creek in the west part by order of General Horatio Gates of the American army in the summer of 1776. See Crockett, II, 5.

19 Graham, pp. 77-78; Lamson, p. 115.
In 1785 there was a movement toward the centralization of town government in Rutland. The number of selectmen was reduced from five to three. From 1785 to 1787 a continuity developed in that the same three selectmen were elected each time. Prior to this, the town had re-elected individual selectmen but had never provided such continuity to a complete group.\(^{20}\)

Not only did the town centralize power in a smaller group but it gave more authority and discretion to the selectmen. In April, 1785, the town gave the selectmen power to abate whatever tax rate bills they thought proper. And in September, 1788, they gave the selectmen power to alter highway districts in such manner as they judged would best accommodate the public. Prior to this time, an abatement request had been a topic for town meeting and not executive action.\(^{21}\)

The number of town meetings, with their controversies and vacillations, decreased until the next decade when only one was held each year. Controversy in the town, like the one with William Roberts over a highway, a controversy which

\(^{20}\)TR, I, 389, II, 507; C.K. Williams, "Notes...\(^{2}\) II, \(\text{u.p.}\). \(^{21}\)TR, I, 390, II, 506.
was finally settled after a little over four years, began to disappear from the town meeting. For all practical purposes these developments indicated an increased power and scope in the selectmen's office.22

The new selectmen were mostly new faces in the office and significantly younger than the selectmen before them. Two were relatively recent migrants to the area. In the Spring of 1784 Joseph Hawley, who had been town clerk for many years, moved from the town and on July 11th of the same year, Joseph Bowker, who had been town treasurer, died. As a result of these events, new and younger men had an opportunity to fill both of these important town offices. Timothy Boardman, a thirty year old recent arrival in Rutland, became town clerk and Asa Hale, who was only twenty-five years old, became town treasurer. By 1787 the town clerk, the town treasurer, and two of the three selectmen were inhabitants of the east part of Rutland and signatories of the petition of the east part to divide Rutland into two religious bodies, thus centering the new power and dominance in the east part.23

22TR, I and II, passim.

23Unpublished study by the author based on TR, I, II, passim; Swan Genealogical Notes; and the East Parish Petition found in Hoyt, S.P. of Vt., VIII, 294. The new selectmen were eight to ten years younger than the men they replaced.
From 1785 to 1790 the town clerk, the town treasurer and all the selectmen, with one exception, belonged to either the East or the West Parish Church. In addition, most of these officials took prominent roles in their church. Although Rutland's leaders were nearly all church members, the vast majority of inhabitants were not. Only about one hundred of over fourteen hundred people in 1791 belonged to the two churches combined. Two-thirds of these belonged to the West Parish Church and one-third belonged to the East Parish Church. Conversely, the East Parish had numerous committees with non-church members on them, which further demonstrated that political and economic factors rather than religious factors lay at the heart of the division of the community into parishes.²⁴

During the decade of the 1780's a great change had quietly taken place in Rutland, and for the most part that change centered on the summer of 1784. The east village had improved its position at the intersection of the north, south and west highways by good bridges and a new meetinghouse which, combined with its selection as the county seat and the

²⁴ TR, I, 389, II, 502-507; O.K. Williams, "Notes...", pp. 57; Swan, "West Parish Records," pp. 171-172; Swan, "East Parish Records," pp. 171-172; Swan, "East Parish Minutes," pp. 171-172; Heads of Families at the First Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1790: Vermont (Washington, D.C., 1907), pp. 43-44. It should be noted that the census of Vermont was not authorized until 1791 when Vermont became a State.
site for the county public buildings, clearly identified it as a growing urban center. On the other hand the religious revival, which started in the summer of 1784 and found its greatest effect in the west part of Rutland, was perhaps more the sign of a resignation of worldly power by the west part to the east part. 25

This change was also symbolized in the death of one Rutland leader and the rise to power of another. On July 11, 1784, Colonel Joseph Bowker, an acknowledged leader of both Rutland and Vermont, died. Meanwhile a young militia captain, Samuel Williams, had been elected selectman as well as representative to the State Legislature in 1783 and had risen rapidly to assume a leader's role in Rutland and Vermont until his untimely death in 1800. Although these changes were coincidental rather than causally related, they still significantly symbolized the passing of the old generation and the rising of a new generation. 26

25 Early revivals in Rutland centered at a time and in a place where a group had just lost, or was about to lose, worldly power and influence. This was demonstrated in 1784 and 1785 in the West Parish. In 1801 and 1803 it was exemplified in both the East and West Parishes.

There were many elements of community life in motion in the summer of 1784 and, although they were not always causally connected, their influences combined, as zephyrs often combined to produce a wind of change that was distinctly blowing in the direction of the development, dominance and urbanization of the East Parish under the leadership of a younger generation.
THE NEW IMMIGRATION AND POSTWAR PROBLEMS

At the end of the American Revolution there was a significant immigration into Vermont, some of which was simply a renewal of the migration north that had been interrupted by the war. Yet some was caused by the fact that Vermont was not heavily burdened with war debts and taxes as were the states of the Confederation. Some migration was simply because people were in debt and had nothing to lose by the change. To some degree the post-Revolutionary migration from Connecticut and Massachusetts was part of a general restlessness among the people. This restlessness was also found among many people who had previously come to Vermont and now moved north into the Champlain Valley, picking up the "stepping stone" pattern where they left off, or took the larger leap into western New York.¹

Before the Revolution Rutland did not have an especially rapid growth. An observer in 1773 estimated that there

¹John E. Goodrich, "Immigration to Vermont"  /Was Immigration to Vermont stimulated in the years 1760 - 1790 by persecution on the part of the "standing order" in Massachusetts and Connecticut?/, Proceedings of Vermont Historical Society for 1907 - 1908 (n.p. n.d.), pp. 84-85; Crockett, II, 385, 442, 500.
were thirty-five families in Rutland and in 1774 another observer estimated that there were sixty to seventy families. These estimates were generous if not excessive. Yet little of this early immigration located in the east part where the urban village of the next decade was to develop. During the height of the Tory danger during the Revolution (1777-1780) many families were compelled to abandon their homes and move south, some as far as Massachusetts, as a matter of personal safety. In 1778 the construction and garrisoning of Fort Ranger added a significant number of people and economic opportunity to the community of Rutland. After 1780 much of the northern threat was held in check by the Haldimand Negotiations and some signs of immigration into Vermont were seen. Some of the immigrants were refugees returning to their homes but a number were new settlers.  

Three factors significantly distinguished this new immigration from the pre-Revolutionary immigration. First, much of it came from the east from New Hampshire and east-

\[2\] Smith and Rann, p. 313; Crockett, I, 237, II, 244, 265, 279; John Clement, "Naming Vermont in 1763?" Proceedings of the Vermont Historical Society, n.s. (I, 1930) 90; Matthews, pp. 129, 131; unpublished study by the author of the origins and occupations of immigrants to Rutland, 1780-1790. According to Silas Pratt, an eyewitness, there were only three houses in the east village area in 1775. See C.K. Williams, /Notes .../ I, 19. Fort Ranger often held one hundred and fifty to two hundred men.
ern Massachusetts. Second, much of it came over the east portion of the Crown Point Military Road. Although the road had been in existence since the French and Indian wars and was an important link between the forts at the lower end of Lake Champlain and the sources of supply in the Connecticut River Valley, apparently few, if any, immigrants to Rutland used the road before the American Revolution. Third, many of these new immigrants were men who had commercial, professional and artisan interests as opposed to the almost solely agrarian interests of the early immigrants. Thus Rutland's location on the Crown Point Military Road, just on the west side of the Green Mountains and at the head of the passageway north into the Champlain Valley corridor, was an economically advantageous position for profiting from the transient immigrant and thus attracted and retained a new commercially oriented population.\(^3\)

The earliest immigrant family of record in this new immigration into Rutland over the Crown Point Military Road was the McConnell Family, which came to Rutland in 1779. Thomas McConnell and two of his sons, Samuel and William, came to Rutland in the spring of 1779. In the fall his wife Mary, another son John, and two daughters, Margaret and Mary, joined the family in Rutland. At this time they built a new home

\(^3\)Meeks, p. 100; unpublished study by the author of the origins and occupations of immigrants to Rutland, 1780-1790.
to replace the log house they had lived in during the summer.

The McConnells' trip through the Green Mountains well illustrated many of the difficulties and first impressions that were common to travelers crossing the Green Mountains from the east. Upon their arrival at Captain Coffin's Inn in Cavendish, the McConnells discovered that the Coffins' cow had become lost that night and as a result they had only Indian pudding and molasses for supper and breakfast the next morning. The horses had nothing to eat and although they were turned out to pasture, the grass had not yet started to grow. The next day they came only thirteen miles over a muddy and icy road in the midst of snow and rain all day long. That night they stopped in Ludlow where the horses had only oats. But the next day was a warm pleasant day. They reached the west side of the mountain and found it summer-like with some green grass already sprouted. 4

Not only was the McConnell family part of a new immigration from the east but they were also part of a new mixture. Thomas had been born in Scotland and Mary in Ireland. Thomas was reputed to have been a member of the Boston

4C. K. Williams, "Notes . . .", I, 25; Hall Papers — "Wm. McConnell." Even today the traveler by automobile very often travels through a rainstorm in the Green Mountains only to emerge into the bright sunshine on the west side of the mountains. In the distance the Rutland area lies surrounded by an amphitheater of mountains. See Smith and Rann, p. 303.
Tea Party and Samuel, his eldest son, had been a sailor.

In 1785 Nathan Osgood, a young merchant from Charlestown, New Hampshire, came to Rutland's east village, where he opened a store. Charlestown was at the west end of the Crown Point Military Road and had been the chief center for exchange for central and eastern Vermont into the Revolutionary years. Osgood's move signified at least an anticipation of the development of a trade center in Rutland.

In August 1787, young James Butler, who had been born in Boston, moved to Rutland's east village where he began a hatter's trade. Five years later he opened a store in Rutland. About this time Timothy Cheney and his sons came to Rutland from Dedham, Massachusetts, and made brick at the south end of the east village. The Cheneys also laid the brick that they made. Timothy often stated that he "carried on his business more independently than any man he knew for he not only made his own materials, but he made his own workmen." Numerous other artisans and craftsmen came during the 1780's and most of them pursued their occupations in the growing village.

5 Swan Genealogical Notes; Hemenway, III, 1083. Another early immigrant from the east was Eleazar Wheelock who came to Rutland from eastern Massachusetts in the summer of 1779.

6 Williams, S.P. of Vt., XVII, 766; PR, p. 58; Lamson, p. 119

7 Cogswell, The New England Historical and Genealogical Register, I; 2 (1847), 170; Swan Genealogical Notes; Hall Papers / unidentified but probably William Storrer, a Rutland silversmith /; C.K. Williams, / Notes.../, I, 35; unpublished study by the author of the origins and occupations of immigrants to Rutland, 1780-1790.
During 1788 and 1789 the new immigration was complemented by new clergy. The Reverend Lemuel Haynes, a mulatto, came from Massachusetts in 1788 to fill the pastorate in the West Parish after the death of the Reverend Benajah Roots in 1787. In 1788 the Reverend Augustine Hibbard came to the East Parish as a preacher. He was a graduate of Dartmouth College and had been pastor in Claremont, New Hampshire. But in the spring of 1789 the East Parish decided to settle the Reverend Doctor Samuel Williams from Harvard College. Dr. Williams had been a graduate of Harvard in 1761 and had served fifteen years in the ministry at Bradford, Massachusetts, until he was appointed Hollis Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy at Harvard. He was at Harvard from 1780 until June, 1788, when he resigned under a cloud of suspicion regarding his handling of trust funds.  

On October 19, 1787, a small group of Rutland inhabitants, who lived in Whipple Hollow in the northwest corner of the West Parish, decided to unite with some of their neighbors in the Pittsford part of the Hollow to organize a religious society to

---

to obtain preaching more conveniently. On September 9, 1788, this society, called the Orange Society, petitioned the General Assembly to authorize the erection of the Orange Parish so they could settle a minister. Their petition was refused for reasons that are not apparent. Nevertheless, by 1789 they had obtained the preaching of the Reverend Abraham Carpenter from Plainfield, New Hampshire. The Reverend Carpenter, who was originally from Rehoboth in eastern Massachusetts, served his people most faithfully until his death in 1797.9

The rapid postwar growth of Vermont led to a shortage of food which existed at least until 1789, although Noah Webster's claim that Vermonters were reduced to eating tadpoles and pea-straw boiled with potatoes seems to be nonsense. Missionary testimonies substantiated these shortages and tended to see little of optimism in the crude beginnings of urban communities. However, even the highly critical Reverend Nathan Perkins found Rutland to be a county town of considerable settlement when he visited it in 1789.10

9Edward A. Hoyt, ed., General Petitions, 1788-1792: S.P. of Vt., IX (Montpelier, Vt., 1955), 20-22; Hemenway, III, 1020; G.K. Williams, /Notes.../, I, 19, 40; Caverly, 267; Swan Genealogical Notes.

But there were other problems. Even before the end of the Revolution a question arose which threatened the homes of many Vermont inhabitants. Due to their speculative nature, many proprietary titles to land in Vermont had exchanged hands numerous times. As a result there was often uncertainty as to the validity of land titles, especially since many of the New Hampshire grants were matched by conflicting New York grants. The situation was further complicated by the loss of proprietary records during the war and the difficulty of recording claims under wartime conditions. In addition, there were numerous settlers who had simply settled, some knowingly and some unknowingly, on other people's land. The result was that many settlers on Vermont lands had little certainty of their title to the lands.11

The situation required some just compromise between the anarchy of complete squatters' rights and the injustice of wholesale ejections. On the one hand many legitimate settlers unknowingly had defective land titles. On the other hand many absentee proprietors with legal title had done nothing to protect or improve their land during the Revolution. Although titles had to be upheld, it seemed only just to allow the settler some compensation for his improvements.12

11Lamson, p. 96; Crockett, II, 279, 574.

12Land title trials had been suspended by the General Assembly in October, 1783. See John A. Williams, ed., Laws of Vermont, 1785 - 1791; S.P. of Vt., XIV (Montpelier, Vt., 1966), 66.
In 1785 Nathaniel Chipman, a brilliant young lawyer from Tinmouth, Vermont, authored a novel law called the Betterment or Quieting Act which secured to the occupant of the land, compensation for his improvements. Ejectment could not be carried out unless the compensation was first paid. Under the act the settler received one-half of the difference between the value of the land before and the value of the land after improvement and the full value of the buildings. In addition, no ejectment could be prosecuted after three years if the cause occurred before the act. The law was of a temporary nature for it did not extend to anything in the future, nor to any possessions after October, 1780.\(^{13}\)

At the end of the Revolution another problem arose which was not unique to Rutland nor Vermont. Although living conditions in Vermont were in many ways better than those prevailing in the states of the American Confederation, there was a shortage of money nearly everywhere and what Continental paper money was available was so greatly depreciated that it was of little value. The problem was further aggravated by the judicial procedure which required liquidation of accounts upon a judgement which usually involved an additional lawsuit by the

\(^{13}\)Hiland Hall, *The History of Vermont from its discovery to its admission into the Union in 1791* (Albany, 1868), pp. 439-440. See Williams, *S.P. of Vt.* XIV, 64-67, for the text of the act. Rutland supported the proposed law by a 39-5 vote on April 13, 1785, and approved a memorial expression to the General Assembly in support of the act on October 7, 1785. See TR, I, 378, 390.
adjudged on his debtors in order to raise the money to meet the original judgement. Court costs, lawyers' fees and the form of judicial procedure combined to bring the cost of justice to an unreasonable height.\textsuperscript{14}

On August 15, 1786, nearly two hundred farmers from ten towns of Rutland County assembled at the Supreme Court session in Rutland to protest these conditions. The gathering and protestation was moderate and in no way disturbed the peace and order of the community.\textsuperscript{15}

On September 5, 1786, the freemen of the town of Rutland voted unanimously to submit a petition, concerning the problems of the judicial procedure and the lack of currency, at the next session of the General Assembly which was to be held in Rutland in October. Deacon William Roberts and Benjamin Whipple, Esquire, two older West Parish proprietors, were selected as agents to present the document.

In this appeal to the General Assembly the freemen complained of the operations of some attorneys who got an assortment of blank writs, had them signed by a justice of the peace and then proceeded to get notes or accounts due upon which to issue writs. The size of the note or account due was not important. Then the attorney often got a deputy sheriff in a

\textsuperscript{14}Hoyt, \textit{S.F. of Vt.}, VIII, 189 - 192; Crockett, II, 418.

\textsuperscript{15}Crockett, II, 412.
remote part of the county to serve a writ, thus increasing costs and enabling some deputy sheriffs to make a regular business of serving writs. In such cases costs often exceeded the value of the debt under execution. The petition charged that the estates of debtors were often posted for sale and bid off by the sheriff or some of the creditors for little or nothing and in some cases left the original debt still unpaid.

In court, the petition charged attorneys had used intimidation of witnesses, had confused juries with the intricacies of the law, had tried to invalidate defendants' evidence and generally had made it more difficult for a jury to come to a just decision. By intimidation and slurs, attorneys had generally discouraged parties from speaking in their own causes. All of which had resulted in large fees for lawyers at the expense of the parties concerned. Many small but just debts thus had become useless to prosecute because of the high legal costs.

The petition concluded with a request that the General Assembly would make some changes in the judicial procedure to remedy these evils. In addition, since the economic system of notes and book accounts created a very complex system of interlocking credit but with no easily convertible instruments of credit, the petition requested either the issue of paper money on some substantial basis to provide a medium of
trade or the enactment of a general tender act whereby cattle, grain, horses, etc. would satisfy. 16

In October, 1786, the legislature met at the court house in Rutland. There was a general feeling of discontent and a large number of representatives wanted the state to issue paper money and to enact a general tender law. A few conservative members of the legislature in concert with Nathaniel Chipman, who was beginning to assume leadership of a conservative movement in Vermont, were convinced that these measures would increase rather than decrease the evils they sought to remedy. Thus they succeeded in postponing action by moving that the people should vote on the questions at a special town meeting on January 1, 1787, and that returns should be made at the next session of the legislature in February, 1787. Chipman's views prevailed when the returns to the General Assembly showed that each of the radical measures had been thoroughly turned down in Rutland and throughout Vermont. 17

16 Hoyt, S.P. of Vt., VIII, 189-192.

After the adjournment of the General Assembly several citizens denounced its actions and attempted to incite resistance to the execution of the laws. One of the leaders of the resistance was Colonel Thomas Lee of Rutland, now a private citizen, but who had served in a command position with both the militia and the Continental troops during the Revolution.

On Tuesday, November 21, 1786, the judges of the County Court arrived in Rutland to hold their scheduled session of court. Some of the lawsuits at this session were for recovery of debt and since the General Assembly had not acted to stay such executions, a mob of citizens decided to prevent the Court from sitting. A mob of men and boys, armed with clubs, filled the streets and then gathered around the courthouse to protest the holding of the Court. The Court opened but adjourned until two o'clock in the afternoon. At this juncture a number of men presented a petition to the judges requesting that they adjourn without doing any business. The judges replied that they would consider the petition at the end of the day's business. When the Court reconvened at two o'clock, Colonel Lee with about one hundred men, rushed into the building and threatened the Court for not granting the petition. Under the circumstances the Court decided to adjourn until nine o'clock the next morning. Infuriated by the failure of the Court to act favorably on the
petition, a few of the mob quickly went to a neighboring house where they procured firearms. Upon their return they armed the rest of the mob which then surrounded the courthouse and held all in the building, prisoners for about two hours. Failing to thus intimidate the Court, the mob released them to their quarters. Again the mob presented its petition which was formally rejected by the Court. Part of the mob, well armed, then occupied the courthouse to prevent the Court from sitting the next day. Messengers were then sent to the neighboring towns to obtain reinforcements for the mob.

In the evening Sheriff Jonathan Bell sent orders for assistance in supporting the Court to the militia colonels in Castleton, Pawlet, and Tinmouth, in the west part of the county. By nine o'clock in the morning two groups of militia had arrived with a force of such strength that the mob left the courthouse and offered no further interference. During the day additional militia arrived from other towns in the west part of the county.

Meanwhile, the mob, by misrepresentation and false reports, stirred up indignation toward the Court and during the day received numerous reinforcements, chiefly from the west part of Rutland and from Pittsford to the north. Some also came from the neighboring towns of Ira, Chittenden and Clarendon. But even with the additional numbers, the mob was not such as to challenge the militia with force. However, the mob did continue its noisy demonstrations during the day.
At night Colonel Benjamin Cooley, one of the leaders from Pittsford, retired with about fifty of the mob to the house of Lieutenant Roswell Post, about a mile north of the courthouse. As night fell, several of the more prominent members of the mob, who had remained in the village, were arrested. Colonel Lee, however, escaped. About midnight a group of the militia received orders to arrest Colonel Cooley and his company. The militia surrounded the Post house and called on Colonel Cooley and his men to surrender. A few of the mob escaped by diving out a window. In the exchange one member of the mob, Nehemiah Hopkins, Jr., from Pittsford, had his arm shattered by a shot. The next day Doctors Ezekiel Porter and Daniel Reed, both of Rutland, successfully amputated his arm. The prisoners were brought back to the village and placed in jail.

The next morning the mob had gone from the streets, the Court opened and the prisoners were arraigned. Some were discharged without trial, twenty-one pled guilty and were fined nine or ten shillings and court costs and released. Thirteen pled not guilty and received a trial by jury. Charges were discontinued in two cases, five were found not guilty and six were found guilty.
Of the six found guilty of inciting riot, one was from Brandon, two were from Pittsford and three were from Rutland. Apparently these six men were the most active in leading the mob. All were fined from six pounds to twenty-five pounds, and required to post bonds with surety for good behavior for one year and pay court costs. The bonds varied from fifty pounds to one hundred and fifty pounds. The Rutland men who were found guilty and fined were William Roberts and Benjamin Whipple, two early proprietors from the west part of Rutland. They had also been the agents who had presented the Rutland petition to the General Assembly in October. Silas Mead, nephew of Colonel James Mead, was also found guilty and fined.

The militia were dismissed late Saturday and started home on Sunday morning. As they moved west, word came that there were some two hundred malcontents at Colonel James Mead's house in the west part of Rutland. The Court then ordered a recall of the militia and a call for reinforcements. Troops still in Rutland halted at Center Rutland to the east of the Mead house. The militia, returning from the west with reinforcements, halted to the west of the Mead house thus placing the malcontents at Mead's house between two bodies of the militia.

During the latter part of the preceding week, some of the members of the rebellion had circulated through the neighboring towns with false charges about the Court's attitude
and its treatment of the prisoners. The gathering at Colonel Mead's house was the result of righteous indignation falsely aroused.

As Sunday wore on several friends of law and order, such as the Reverend Jacob Wood, who had been a successful rival preacher in Rutland and in the county in 1784, used their influence to persuade the mob that the causes of their rebellion were not real but rather falsehoods perpetrated by a few men. What evil conditions did exist at the time could not be laid to the Court. Thus convinced, the mob abandoned its rebellion and volunteered support of the Court, the laws and the militia. By Monday all was quiet. The representatives of law and order had triumphed.

Times were changing in Vermont and the aggressive agrarian interests of the early settlers were either replaced by younger conservative and commercial interests or they adapted to the new interests. No longer did the Allens and their friends control Vermont but rather Nathaniel Chipman and his conservative associates were leading Vermont toward federalism and union with the United States.¹⁹


In Rutland a similar change in the political control of the town had taken place. A new and younger group had taken over control of the town government and, aided by the new immigration, was developing an important political and commercial center in the county and the state. The proprietary interests had lost control and only the removal of the formal proprietary distinctions, by the completion and securing of the division and distribution of proprietary lands, remained to be accomplished in order to secure individual landholders in their titles and set the stage for real urban development.  

On November 17, 1788, the proprietors of Rutland met to see if they would establish the former surveys of the proprietors and agree on some measure for giving all the proprietors an equal division of the town in such a manner as "to quiet the present settlers and render justice to all the proprietors...." An examination of the records of the proceedings of the proprietors revealed on June 17, 1789, that

20Proprietors in Vermont had an important role but did not hold all power for manhood suffrage was not based on property (Crockett, II, 216). Non-proprietors quickly became a majority of the population. The Rutland Freeman's List well illustrates this (TR, I, 112). Also consult Akagi, p.3. However, the identification of Rutland proprietors is difficult due to the fact that land might be purchased with or without the proprietary right to the undivided lands of the town and the proprietary records are little help as they do little more than record grants of land. Thus in the exchange of a right of land, the proprietary right might be transferred or only the land might be transferred. Florence May Woodward notes this same difficulty in determining who the proprietors were in The Town Proprietors in Vermont: The New England Town Proprietorship in Decline (New York, 1936), pp.61-63. Also consult Akagi, pp. 70, 81, 157, 299, 301.
although they had divided their land, at least partially, there was no way of determining the method of division nor sufficient records to provide legal evidence in a court of law. To make a new division at this time, as the laws directed, would do great injustice to the already settled inhabitants and cause the utmost confusion. Thus the proprietors decided that since the remaining records indicated that most of the proprietors had already received a large part of their land, and that most of that land was in actual possession of the inhabitants of the town, then nearly the same division as the original division would give the most justice and satisfaction to all. It was clear that forty rights had been laid out in groups of twenty, fifteen and five rights. Twenty-eight original rights apparently had never been laid out and the proprietors directed a committee to lay out two hundred acres to each right not in the forty rights. Another division of one hundred acres was then voted to each of the twenty-eight rights. In many cases the settler was allowed to exchange his draft of land for the lot he lived on. After electing Samuel Williams Esquire as the new Proprietors' Clerk, the proprietors voted to send a petition to the General Assembly in October to have the former actions of the twenty, fifteen and five rights confirmed by the legislature.

In August, 1790, the proprietors voted to lot out any of the forty rights not yet parcelled out. The first
division was to include two hundred acres to the right and the second division to include an additional one hundred acres. In all of the divisions a highway allowance of six acres per hundred acres was to be included.\textsuperscript{21}

By the fall of 1790 all the lands in Rutland had been divided, a town plan had been made, and the proprietors began a lengthy process of distribution. The distribution of land was completed by the fall of 1792 when the General Assembly ratified the proprietors' division of the town which was as nearly equal as the situation of the town would admit and met the approval of both the proprietors and the inhabitants of the town.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{21}PR, pp. 71-77. See actual land distribution for allowance of exchange of drafted lot for occupied lot.

\textsuperscript{22}John A. Williams, ed., \textit{Laws of Vermont, 1791-1795: S.P. of Vt., XV (Montpelier, Vt., 1967), 106 -107; PR, 79.}

The Act of the General Assembly required that the proprietors would make a map or plan of the divisions of the town with each proprietor's name written on each lot voted to him. The plan was to be approved by Frederick Hill and Daniel Chipman and placed in the office of the town clerk within two months of the date of the Act. Today no town plan can be found except an early twentieth century reconstruction. The proprietors' records contain references to such a document and have evidence of payment for its completion but the document can not be found. There is a later reference to a town plan in the town orders of the town treasurer's book in October, 1794, but there is no sign of this document either. See PR, p. 79; Rutland Town Treasurer's Book MS (City Clerk's Office, Rutland, Vermont) I, p. XVI. See Crockett, II, 574 for another instance of proprietors being authorized to make new divisions due to missing records.
The only dissenting voice to the establishment of the proprietors' actions was from the non-resident proprietor who found himself left with the undesirable lots of land insofar as the inhabitant was generally accorded the privilege of exchanging his draft for the land he occupied. In addition, the division and development of the land invariably led to taxes. After 1791 many absentee proprietors found their lands sold for taxes and many of the sales were little less than confiscatory.23

Little concern was exhibited for the absentee proprietor and the speculator in Vermont lands and perhaps rightfully so. During the controversies before the Revolution and during the Revolution, the absentee proprietor had risked nothing to preserve his land and now he could reap a profit as the towns developed and the value of land rose. In 1783 the Legislature had passed a law requiring proprietors to settle their rights within three years after the war under pain of forfeit of the land. In 1786 this was amended to allow settlement three years after the outlines of the town had been run.24

23 Akagi, p. 70; Williamson, p. 188. Richard Bushman also touches on this problem in From Puritan to Yankee, p. 77.

24 Akagi, p. 53; Williams, S.P. of Vt., XIII. 220, XIV, 83.
Rutland apparently had little problem with absentee proprietors. One exception was John Kelley, one of the great land speculators of the time, who had purchased five rights of land in Rutland from absentee proprietors. In January, 1791, he apparently petitioned the General Assembly with some antagonism toward the actions of the Rutland proprietors. But Kelley evidently met little success for in 1803 the administrators of his estate sold his claims in five rights of Rutland land through a quit claim deed for five hundred dollars.25

By 1789 many Vermonters were ready to secure further their future by joining the United States of America. The one obstacle to entering the Union was the threat of New York challenges to Vermont land titles. During the winter of 1788 - 1789, Nathaniel Chipman, leader of the conservative forces in Vermont, met with Alexander Hamilton, the leader of New York conservatism, in Albany, New York. Hamilton who was eager to have Vermont enter the Union, worked out an arrangement with Chipman whereby New York would no longer threaten Vermont land titles nor oppose Vermont's entry into the Union. In return, Vermont should pay thirty thousand dollars.

25H. Hall, Early History of Vermont, p. 509; R.C. Benton, The Vermont Settlers and the New York Land Speculators (Minneapolis, Minn., 1894), p. 179; TR, II, 21, 46, 56, VI, 156. There is no record of Kelley's petition other than a note that Samuel Williams and Benjamin Whipple were appointed agents to defend the proprietors in this case. See PR, p. 85.
to New York to compensate the holders of New York titles. By 1790 Vermont and New York had ratified the terms of the agreement. A convention to ratify the Constitution of the United States was held in Bennington, Vermont, in January, 1791. The convention, dominated by conservatives, overwhelmingly approved the ratification of the Constitution. The return of relatively prosperous times had led to some political indifference by the ordinary farmer while a conservative leadership, growing in power, was about to lead Vermont into a golden age of growth and prosperity.26

Rutland had developed from a frontier settlement, fraught with controversy, to the Vermont Military Headquarters during the Revolution. Although Rutland's experience as a military headquarters did not directly confirm its future, it certainly must have sown the seed of possibility. Directly it did provide a political security and a financial income not to be found in other frontier towns, as in 1784 Rutland became a county town and an important political, judicial and legislative center in the Vermont Republic.27

26Crockett, II, 441 - 442; Williamson, pp. 177-180; B. Hall, History of Eastern Vermont, pp. 555 - 565.

27Conant, p. 209. The legislature met in Rutland in 1784 and 1786.
This opened up numerous opportunities for the various professional, artisan and commercial activities required by a developing urban area. A large part of this requirement was filled by a new, urban-oriented immigration from east of the Green Mountains and from older urban areas, particularly eastern Massachusetts. With its urban orientation the new immigration brought a more conservative as well as a more urban character to Rutland. Finally statehood provided the crowning element in opening an urban era for Rutland and a golden age for Vermont. 28

28 Wade, in his Urban Frontier, found that urban-oriented people at this time tended to come from urban areas.
An invitation to the poor Tenants that live under their pateroons in the Province of New-York, to come and settle on our good Lands under the New-Hampshire Grants. Composed at the time when the Land-jobbers of New-York served their writs of ejectment on a number of our Settlers, the execution of which we opposed by force, until we could have the matter fairly laid before the King, and Board of Trade and Plantations, for their direction.

I.

Come all you labouring hands
That toil below,
Among the rocks and sands;
That plow and sow,
Upon your hired lands
Let out by cruel hands;
'Twill make you large amends,
To Rutland go.

II.

Your pateroons forsake,
Whose greatest care,
Is slaves of you to make,
While you live there:
Come, quit their barren lands,
And leave them in their hands,
To Rutland go.

1Only the "s" has been normalized in this text from Thomas Rowley, "To Rutland Go," The Rural Magazine; or Vermont Repository, 1:7 (July 1795), 383-385. Original spelling, capitalization and punctuation have been retained.
For who would be a slave,
    That may be free:
Here you good land may have,
    But come and see.
The soil is deep and good,
Here in this pleasant wood;
Where you may raise your food,
    And happy be.

West of the Mountain Green
Lies Rutland fair;
The best that e'er was seen
    For soil and air:
Kind zephyr's pleasant breeze,
Whispers among the trees,
Where men may live at ease,
    With prudent care.

Here cows give milk to eat,
    By nature fed:
Our fields afford good wheat,
    And corn for bread.
Here sugar trees they stand,
Which sweetens all our land,
We have them at our hand,
    Be not afraid.

Here's roots of every kind,
    To preserve our lives;
The best of anodynes,
    And rich costives.
The balsam of the tree,
Supplies our chirurgery:
No safer can you be
    In any land.
VII.
Here stands the lofty pine,
   And makes a show;
As straight as Gunter's line
   Their bodies grow.
Their lofty heads they rear,
   Amid the atmosphere,
Where the wing'd tribes repair,
   And sweetly sing.

VIII.
The butternut and beach,
   And the elm tree,
They strive their heads to reach
   As high as they:
But falling much below,
   They make an even show:
The pines more lofty grow,
   And crown the woods.

IX.
Here glides a pleasant stream,
   Which doth not fail,
To spread the richest cream
   O'er the interval.
As rich as Eden's soil,
   Before that sin did spoil,
Or man was doom'd to toil,
   To get his bread.

X.
Here little salmon glide,
   So neat and fine,
Where you may be supply'd
   With hook and line:
They are the finest fish,
   To cook a dainty dish,
As good as one could wish
   To feed upon.
XI.
The pigeon, goose, and duck
They fill our beds;
The beaver, coon, and fox,
They crown our heads.
The harmless moose and deer,
Are food and clothes to wear;
Nature could do no more
For any land.

XII.
There's many a pleasant town
Lies in this vale,
Where you may settle down;
You need not fail
To make a fine estate,
If you are not too late,
You need not fear the fate,
But come along.

XIII.
We value not New-York,
With all their powers;
For here we'll stay and work,
The land is ours.
And as for great Duane,
With all his wicked train,
They may eject again.
We'll not resign.

XIV.
This is that noble land,
By conquest won:
Took from a savage band,
With sword and gun.
We drove them to the west,
They could not stand the test
And from the Gallic pest,
This land is free.
XV.

Here churches we'll erect
Both neat and fine;
The gospel we'll protect,
Pure and divine.
The pope's supremacy
We utterly deny,
And Lewis we defy;
We're George's men.

XVI.

In George we will rejoice,
He is our king;
We will obey his voice
In everything.
Here we his servants stand,
Upon his conquer'd land,
Good Lord may he defend
Our property.
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY

The bibliographical essay was selected as the most desirable form in which to discuss the sources for this history as they are somewhat scattered in location and reference aids are not accurate or not available for all of them. In addition, the use made of many materials was often not an obvious one. Rather many pieces of the puzzle of early Rutland found their way into this work in most unlikely ways. The very process of gathering and examining these source materials was an experience in itself.

It has also seemed most practical to arrange these materials by chapters as the principal sources of each chapter are rather distinct. This is not to overlook the fact that there are frequent instances in which they overlap.

CHAPTER I  EARLY SETTLEMENT AND ITS PROBLEMS

Although Lois Kimball Mathews, *Expansion of New England* (1962) was first published more than half a century ago, it is still the definitive source for a broad picture of the outward movement of New England people from 1620 - 1865. *Vermont: the Green Mountain State* (1921), a five-volume work by Walter Hill Crockett, is a byword in the study of Vermont history. These five volumes have a broad sweep, yet they do not sacrifice attention to local detail. Although they lack footnotes, they are the starting point
for the study of almost any topic in Vermont history. Genevieve Lamson, "Geographic Influences in Early History of Vermont," Proceedings of the Vermont Historical Society for the Years 1921, 1922 and 1923 (1924), is a lengthy and sometimes repetitious monograph. Given these criticisms, it is still an excellent single source for both the human and the physical historical geography of Vermont. Zadock Thompson, History of Vermont, Natural, Civil and Statistical (1842) is a much longer work with a larger scope and much less interpretive concern. Nonetheless, it is quite reliable for geographical description and statistical information for this early period of Vermont history since it is only sixty or seventy years removed from the time period under consideration. Harold A. Meeks, "An Isochronic Map of Vermont Settlement," Vermont History, XXXVIII:2 (1970) is a visual presentation of Vermont settlement with concise descriptive material. Although the isochronic map is based on neither a complete nor a definitive study, its use of four-year intervals is an excellent aid in visualizing the broad patterns of early Vermont settlement.

On the local level, there is not a good history of Rutland. However, there are some helpful treatments, especially of early settlement. H. P. Smith and W. S. Rann, ed., History of Rutland County, Vermont (1886) contains a good chapter on Rutland but tends toward the biographical treatment typical of local histories of the period. Abby
Maria Hemenway, ed., *The Vermont Historical Gazetteer. III Orleans and Rutland Counties* (1877) is very unreliable in many ways but is sometimes a more convenient source of previously published material. There is a tendency for each of the above local histories, and especially Hemenway, to use undocumented and hearsay evidence which, if not erroneous, is unsubstantiated as neither work is adequately footnoted. Two neighboring town histories are helpful. 

Albee J. Moore, *History of the Town of Pittsford* (1872) is a good history of the town bordering the north line of Rutland, and David C. Gale, *The Story of a Marble Town* (1922) is a history of Proctor, the southern part of which was a part of early Rutland. Both of these works often deal with people, events and conditions which are broader than a single town and thus involve Rutland's history.

Two manuscript sources which are indispensable to an analysis of the early settlement of Rutland are books I and II of the Rutland Town Records (TR) and a single volume of the Rutland Proprietors' Records which are in the office of the Rutland City Clerk. These volumes consist mainly of land deeds to which the City Clerk maintains an alphabetical card index. This index is filed by the name of the grantor and the grantee. These records are the starting point for identification of early settlers, approximate dates of settlement and, in many cases, the community from whence the settler came. Land prices and the amounts of land purchased by
individuals can also be found in the land records. However, attempts to reconstruct accurately the community from these records present numerous, if not insurmountable, difficulties. Many survey landmarks were not permanent and many deeds appear to be conditional mortgage deeds, some of which served as crop liens which were renewed periodically. Consequently, actual land transfers are difficult to distinguish from paper transfers. The Proprietors' Book, although helpful in separating the proprietor from the non-proprietor, is extremely brief in the details of proprietary actions other than the surveying and deeding of land.

The author found it necessary to make a brief unpublished study of the first settlers of Rutland. The main sources for this study were the aforementioned land records and the genealogical records of Mrs. Alton Swan, 5 Crown Street, Rutland, Vermont. The materials were supplemented by obituaries in the Rutland Herald (RH) of the early nineteenth century, wills in the Rutland County Probate Court, typescripts of the East and West Parish church records (see materials for Chapter III in this essay for a detailed listing) made by Mrs. Alton Swan, and various published genealogical materials which are in the Vermont Room of the Rutland Free Library and the library of the Vermont Historical Society in Montpelier, Vermont. Monographs on the early settlement of Rutland and its problems are apparently nonexistent. The main obstacle to such research seems to be the difficulty of access to the appropriate materials rather
than the lack of material.

Other than unreliable traditions, there is a dearth of impressionistic material for the early settlement of Rutland. A rare exception is Thomas Rowley's poem "To Rutland Go" which was composed at the time of the early settlement in Rutland. It is a participant's poetic view of the environment of Rutland and the conflict with New York. Materials for the controversy with New York are found in the petitions and letters complaining to New York authorities about the activities of Rutland people. These are most conveniently quoted in Vermont histories. John P. Sargent, _Address, Vermont Sesqui-Centennial Celebration 1927_ is a case in point. Edmund Bailey O'Callaghan, ed., _Documentary History of New York_ (1849 - 1851), a four-volume compilation, is a less accessible but more complete source for a New York record of the controversy with Vermont. Consult especially Volume IV. Matt Bushnell Jones, _Vermont in the Making, 1750 - 1777_ (1939) focuses on the development toward independence from the Vermont side.

CHAPTER II REVOLUTIONARY RUTLAND

A good chronological description of the Revolution in Vermont can be found in volumes I and II of Walter Hill Crockett, _Vermont: the Green Mountain State_ (1921). Benjamin H. Hall, _History of Eastern Vermont from its Earliest Settlement to the Close of the Eighteenth Century_ (1858) is an excellent treatment of many topics that apply to the whole
state. The main source for documentary material is El liakim/ Persong Walton, ed., Records of the Council of Safety and the Governor and Council of the State of Vermont to which are prefixed the Records of the General Conventions from July 1775 to December 1777, I, II, (1873 - 1874) which is commonly cited as Governor and Council (G. & C.), Volume I includes the records of the Council of Safety which served as the government and as the Board of War for Vermont until a constitution was established and a government elected. Vermont was unique among the colonies rebelling against Great Britain in that it had no existing colonial government in most areas. Where there was government it was administered by New York. After the Vermont government was established the Governor and Council served as the Board of War. Thus these volumes are a single source for the political and military administration of Vermont during the early years of the Revolution. Legislative policy during the war is documented in Allen Soule, ed., Laws of Vermont, 1777 - 1780; State Papers of Vermont, XII (1964). The acts of the legislature tell much about Revolutionary conditions and the Vermont reaction to them.

The correspondence of the Haldimand Negotiations can be found in Governor and Council, II, Appendix I. Additional materials can be found in John A. Williams, ed., The Public Papers of Governor Thomas Chittenden; State Papers of Vermont, XVII (1969) in Chapter IV. Chittenden was Vermont's first
governor who served eleven consecutive years. His correspondence is an excellent supplement to *Governor and Council* and the various *State Papers of Vermont*.

The military history of the Revolution in Vermont can be seen in some detail in John E. Goodrich, comp. and ed., *The State of Vermont: Rolls of Soldiers in the Revolutionary War, 1775 - 1783* (1904). The *Rolls* contain unit payrolls with individual names which are thoroughly indexed. Numerous other papers in the *Rolls* make possible an identification of units and their actions. Although the *Rolls* are unavoidably incomplete, in conjunction with *Governor and Council* they provide an excellent base for describing Revolutionary activity, which in Vermont was mainly militia activity.

Mary Greene Nye, ed., *Sequestrations, Confiscations and Sale of Estates / Loyalist Material 1777-1822*: *State Papers of Vermont, VI* (1941) is an outstanding collection of Loyalist materials pertinent to Vermont and is the starting point for dealing with a subject that has not been adequately treated. The data is detailed enough to allow local and individual treatment of the subject. Many of the documents include extremely detailed inventories of estates and goods confiscated and sold. Many claims for notes due against the estate of the Loyalist make this an extremely valuable and largely untapped source for locating, dating and relating the Loyalist to the community. It is important to note that this confiscation and sale procedure enabled Vermont literally to pay the State's
cost of the Revolution.

Local involvement in the Revolution is touched upon in a general way in the published local histories cited previously in this essay. The author used Goodrich's Rolls to make an unpublished study of Rutland's participation in Revolutionary activities. In addition, the publications of the Daughters of the American Revolution and various published pension rolls are indispensable to patriot identifications. TR, I, contains the records of town meetings from 1780 to 1785. These are scattered throughout the manuscript volume but occasionally they indicate local support and home front involvement in the war.

Chauncey Kilborn Williams, Notes for a history MS is a two-volume collection of notes on deposit at the Vermont Historical Society. These are especially valuable because they contain statements of eyewitnesses to the Revolution and information from people only one generation removed from the events. The statements must be used carefully but they often contain a key word or phrase that supports what could only be hypothetical without them.

CHAPTER III FROM FRONTIER FOUNDATIONS TO URBAN BEGINNINGS

The second decade of Rutland development is treated in the local histories previously mentioned in this essay. In addition, the Rutland Herald (RH) Centennial Edition, Dec. 8, 1894, is an excellent secondary work which was carefully compiled by Mason A. Green from a great variety of
early materials, some of which are no longer available. It is perhaps the best history of Rutland to be found in one source. Most of the information is quite reliable and appropriate attention is given to interpretation. The years before 1794 suffer a somewhat weaker treatment because the intent of Green's work was to trace the history of the Rutland Herald which began in 1794. However, the editor has made a good attempt to treat the early background years of the community from other sources. John A. Graham, A Descriptive Sketch of the Present State of Vermont. One of the United States of America (1797) is a highly literate statement by a contemporary, though a decade after the events. Graham's Sketches has preserved much background information for many Vermont communities. Although Graham had a reputation as a great "teller of tales," his Sketches generally seem quite reliable.

Many issues of the day can be profitably traced through the various petitions to the state legislature. These petitions not only present the attitudes of the people on an issue but the signatures of the petitioners identify the holder of a particular position. Edward A. Hoyt, ed., General Petitions, 1778 - 1787: State Papers of Vermont, VIII (1952) provides a well edited and footnoted collection. The legislative reaction can often be traced in John A. Williams, ed., Laws of Vermont, 1781 - 1784: State Papers of Vermont, XIII (1965) as well as the General Petitions where the footnotes lead to the legislative deliberations.
Local religious history is contained in manuscript church records which have been copied in typescript by Mrs. Alton Swan, 5 Crown Street, Rutland, Vermont. These include the "West Parish Records," the "East Parish Records," and the "East Parish Minutes." Stephen A. Freeman, "Puritans in Rutland, Vermont, 1770 - 1818," Vermont History, XXXIII:2 (April, 1965) provides a good analysis of the theological background of the East Parish and the West Parish but fails to consider the political and economic motives which can be traced in the General Petitions. Consequently, Freeman's conclusions regarding the parish division are erroneous. Both the East Parish petition and the West Parish remonstrance expressed reasons for the division. However, both concluded that theology was not the basis of the division. Richard L. Bushman, From Puritan to Yankee: Character and Social Order in Connecticut, 1690 - 1765 (1967) found many of the same political and economic motives at the heart of parish divisions a generation earlier in Connecticut. Bushman's work is excellent for these eighteenth century relationships which apparently moved north with the many Connecticut people who came to Vermont.

Town meeting minutes, scattered through the Town Records (TR) from 1780 - 1797, contain not only the details of local political activity but also some record of religious decisions. The author of this history made an unpublished study of town officials based on TR, I and II, the Swan Genealogical Notes and the East Parish petition in the General
Petitions. The analysis provided a rather clear delineation of political change.

The Rev. Samuel W. Boardman, The Log Book of (Deacon) Timothy Boardman including biographical sketch (1885) has a short biographical sketch which includes much good family and local history from a period which has little impressionistic material remaining.

CHAPTER IV THE NEW IMMIGRATION AND POSTWAR PROBLEMS

John E. Goodrich, "Immigration to Vermont" was immigration to Vermont stimulated in the years 1760 - 1790 by persecution on the part of the "standing order" in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Proceedings of Vermont Historical Society for 1907 - 1908 is an excellent monographic treatment of immigration to Vermont. John Clement, "Naming Vermont in 1763?" Proceedings of the Vermont Historical Society n.s. I (1930) includes an early manuscript map of the area which identifies the first church, the first mill and an early road in Rutland. The article also contains the population estimates of an early observer. Goodrich's "Immigration to Vermont" was supplemented and localized by the author's unpublished study of the origins and occupations of immigrants to Rutland from 1780 to 1790. This study was based largely on an analysis of various town records (TR) and a list of freemen which began in 1780 and contains periodic undated additions. Although these entries are not individually dated it is still possible to approximate
dates from names before and after a given entry. Also there are periodic changes in the color of the ink which seems to coincide with the external dating.

The "Henry Hall Papers MS and C.K. Williams, "Notes ..." at the Vermont Historical Society, Montpelier, Vermont are valuable for biographical information and material on some special topics. Timothy Mather Cooley, D.D., Sketches of the Life and Character of the Rev. Lemuel Haynes, A.M. (1839) is a good summary of the life of the Reverend Lemuel Haynes, mulatto preacher in Rutland's West Parish from 1788 to 1818. The book includes many anecdotes which provide an insight into the character of the Reverend Haynes and his times. The Reverend Samuel Williams does not have a full biography but deserves one. There seems to be sufficient material available for at least an intellectual biography. Merle Curti and William Tillman, ed., Philosophical Lectures by Samuel Williams, L.L.D., On the Constitution, Duty and Religion of Man: Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, N.S. IX:3 (1970) compiles most previous biographical material on the Reverend Samuel Williams and also documents Williams' intellectual importance.


For the Rutland riot, Caverly, History of the Town of Pittsford (1872) provides a definitive treatment based on an extensive use of primary materials, especially county court records.

Roy Hidemichi Akagi, The Town Proprietors of the New England Colonies: A Study of Their Development, Organization, Activities and Controversies, 1620-1770 (1924) is a definitive study of the proprietorship in New England. Florence May Woodward, The Town Proprietors in Vermont: the New England Town Proprietorship in Decline (1936) follows Akagi in treating the proprietorship in Vermont. Bushman's From Puritan to Yankee is also helpful background to an understanding of the proprietorship and its operation. Many Vermonters were only a short time removed from the Connecticut conditions which Bushman analyzes so well. For Rutland the Proprietors' Records (PR) have a rather extensive treatment of the proprietary difficulties at this time.

Conditions of life can be gleaned from Joseph A. Gallup, Sketches of Epidemic Diseases in the State of Vermont from its first settlement to 1815 (1815) which provides a contemporary doctor's detailed observations of health and disease in Vermont and from Nathan Perkins, Narratives of a Tour Through
the State of Vermont (1920) which provides an observer's valuable, though caustic, remarks on Rutland and Vermont during a visit in 1789. M.D. Gilman, The Bibliography of Vermont (1897) has a biographical note which contains a long letter from the Reverend Samuel Williams to his wife which describes many Rutland conditions in 1789. Frederic F. Van de Water, The Reluctant Republic (1941) and Chilton Williamson, Vermont in Quandary: 1763 - 1825 (1949) treat the mood of Vermont during the years between the end of the Revolution and the entry of Vermont into the Union. Hiland Hall, The History of Vermont from its discovery to its admission into the Union in 1791 (1868) is especially good in its treatment of Vermont's entry into the Union as is Benjamin H. Hall, History of Eastern Vermont (1858).

Richard O. Wade, The Urban Frontier (1964) is an excellent seminal work on urban development along the Ohio River frontier at this period of time. Wade suggests numerous elements in frontier urban development that were found to have parallels in Rutland.