Skinners: Patriot “Friends” or Loyalist Foes?

by Lincoln Diamant

It is never too late to correct a libel, even though, as Mark Twain joked, a lie is halfway around the world before the truth can pull on its pants. But to set the record straight for future lower Hudson Valley histories, pamphlets, and schoolbooks . . the answer to the title question of this essay is, simply, “loyalist foes.”

For more than a century and a half, the patriot irregulars who fought British and German invaders in the “neutral ground” between royalists and patriots in Westchester County during the Revolutionary War have been slandered. Ignoring printed evidence 165 years old, too many authors and eminent historians have accused these patriotic citizens of war crimes equal to or worse than those committed by the British Army, its loyalist allies, and its German mercenaries. Unfortunately, the libel continues, telling us more about the ways mistakes are repeated in contemporary historical scholarship than we may wish to acknowledge. Correcting an error so long enshrined in the literature is no easy task.

Where to begin? Perhaps the best place is Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, which carries this definition: “Skinner: one of a band of guerrillas and irregular cavalry claiming attachment to either the British or American troops and operating in Westchester County in New York during the American Revolution.”1
“British or American?” Even the simplest definition is ambiguous, and it ignores an important piece of evidence about the origin of the name. It did not come from any patriot guerrilla practice of “skinning” Hudson Valley farmers of their food or household goods. “Skinners” were simply the three battalions of British refugee volunteers raised by the fifty-year-old erstwhile attorney general of New Jersey, Brigadier General Cortlandt Skinner. Under his Tory leadership, Skinner’s Skinners saw partisan service for King George III in and around New York City from 1778 to 1783.

The alternative nickname “Cowboys” was applied by the Continental soldiers, militia, and patriotic farmers to the provincial Westchester Light Horse battalion, another British loyalist corps raised in 1777 by loyalist Colonel James De Lancey. Distinctively uniformed in green jackets, the Light Horse cavalry were stationed in the Morrisania section of Westchester, near King’s Bridge. The Cowboys raided regularly between the lines, rounding up food—especially cattle on the hoof, hence their sobriquet—for the British army and civilian population of lower Manhattan Island.

With the exception of a single diary entry to which we shall allude, one finds no mention of Skinners in any portion of the vast collection of Revolutionary daybooks, journals, orders, and dispatches. On the other hand, references to De Lancey’s Cowboys abound. One example of the latter is Joseph Plumb Martin’s Narrative of Some of the Adventures, Dangers and Sufferings of a Revolutionary Soldier. Martin, a private who fought through the entire Revolution from Massachusetts to Virginia, relates how an officer along the Hudson “had collected some stores of flour, port &c. for the use of the militia in his neighborhood. A part of the enemy,” says Martin, “denominated ‘Cowboys’ (Refugees) destroyed his stores.” No mention anywhere in Martin’s autobiography of Skinners—just Cowboys. But when George F. Scheer edited the little book for publication in 1968 under the new title Private Yankee Doodle, Scheer found it necessary to add a footnote to supply what he considered important missing information: “The Tory sympathizers called themselves Cowboys or Refugees, and the rebel sympathizers called themselves Skinners.”

How and where did this myth about the Skinners arise?

It began in the imaginations of James Fenimore Cooper and Washington Irving—those wonderful spinners of tales of fearless
Hudson River Americans who conquered adversity, slept for twenty years, and rode around with pumpkins on their heads. Early in both authors' careers, they sank their teeth into the exciting wartime history of the Valley, particularly of Westchester County.

Cooper was born in Burlington, New Jersey, six years after the end of the Revolution. Literary legend tells how, in 1820, he tossed aside an English novel he was reading aloud to his wife, Susan De Lancey Cooper, a direct descendant of the militant Tory family which included the commander of the Cowboys. "I could write a better one myself," said the thirty-year-old Cooper, a former naval officer, and proceeded to make the attempt.

His first effort was the novel *Precaution*, quickly forgotten on both sides of the Atlantic. Unfazed, Cooper continued his new career. The *Encyclopedia Britannica* says of his second book *The Spy: A Tale of the Neutral Ground*, published anonymously in Philadelphia in 1821: "Never was a work written with such contemptuous carelessness." Despite only rare flashes of dramatic narrative buried beneath a verbiage of exposition, Cooper's sprawling novel still commanded three printings in a single year, and quickly became the most successful book yet published in the infant United States. Unusual among contemporary novels, *The Spy* dealt with thinly disguised actual Revolutionary personages and events in the Hudson Valley, most of which held nostalgic appeal for readers in the forty-year-old nation. *The Spy* also proved to be of great interest abroad, where this country was still largely geographic and political terra incognita. Cooper's mannered, prolix prose may also have been improved by its translators—including one who rendered it in Russian.

In a special introduction written long after *The Spy*’s initial popularity, Cooper tells how the convoluted plot was derived principally from tales and anecdotes told him by a "Mr. —" now known to have been none other than his Westchester neighbor John Jay, then more than eighty years old. But the word "Skinner" is nowhere to be found in Jay’s public or private correspondence. Jay, who appears in Cooper's novel as “Mr. Harper,” was a key member of the Secret Committee of the New York State Convention controlling Hudson Valley espionage during the American Revolution. It was Jay who actually employed Enoch Crosby, a daring patriot secret agent—fictionalized as Cooper's country peddler, Harvey Birch.

With a bow towards his wife's forebears, Cooper inserted an exculpatory footnote in Chapter XVIII of *The Spy*, asserting that Colonel James De Lancey’s hitherto undisputed wartime cruelty was only...
"fancied . . . there is no evidence of his being guilty of any acts un­usual in this species of warfare."

That brings us directly to Cooper's literary problem. His imaginary British and American officers were always patrician gentlemen. With such an enormous cast of unblemished heroes, the fictional villains necessary to make a good story were in short supply. Cooper's solution was to introduce the Skinners, a name he added—we hope not permanently—to the Hudson Valley lexicon as a synonym for American patriot irregulars. Cooper uses the word first on the final page of Chapter I of *The Spy*, as part of the incoherencies uttered by the faithful Black retainer Caesar: "I been to see—Massa Harper on he knee—pray to God—no gemman who pray to God tell of good son, come to see old fader—*Skinner* do that—no Christian!" Cooper explains Caesar's rather cryptic reference in the four paragraphs that follow and end the chapter:

The convenience, and perhaps the necessities, of the leaders of the American arms, in the neighborhood of New York, had induced them to employ certain subordinate agents, of extremely irregular habits, in executing their lesser plans of annoying the enemy. It was not a moment for fastidious inquiries into abuses of any description, and oppression and injustice were the natural consequences of the possession of a military power that was uncurbed by the restraints of civil authority. In time, a distinct order of the community was formed, whose sole occupation appears to have been that of relieving their fellow citizens from any little excess of temporal prosperity they might be thought to enjoy, under the pretense of patriotism and the love of liberty.

Occasionally, the aid of military authority was not wanting, in enforcing these arbitrary distributions of worldly goods: and a petty holder of a commission in the state militia was to be seen giving the sanction of something like legality to acts of the most unlicensed robbery, and, not infrequently, of bloodshed.

On the part of the British, the stimulus of loyalty was by no means suffered to sleep, where so fruitful a field offered on which it might be expended. But their freebooters were enrolled, and their efforts more systematized. Long experience had taught their leaders the efficacy of concentrated force; and, unless tradition does great injustice to their exploits, the result did no little credit to their foresight. The corps—we presume, from their known affection to that useful animal—had received the quaint appellation of *Cowboys*.

Caesar was, however, far too loyal to associate men who held the commission of George III with the irregular warriors, whose excesses he had so often witnessed, and from whose rapacity neither his poverty nor his bondage had suffered even him to escape uninjured. The *Cowboys*, therefore, did not receive their proper portion of the black's censure, when he said, no Christian, nothing but a
Skinner, could betray a pious child, while honoring his father with a visit so full of peril.

Thus did Cooper move to establish villains to match his heroes — thereby creating the “Skinner myth.” Cooper’s patriot miscreants are subsequently allowed to wander in and out of the novel’s remaining 170,000 words. Cooper’s story ends with the death of the spy Harvey Birch on a Canadian battlefield—during the War of 1812! Fearing that the author would never complete his huge novel, Cooper’s publisher had insisted on premature delivery of that final scene.

In Chapter X, Cooper describes the leader of the Skinners:

A man still young in years, but his lineaments bespoke a mind long agitated by evil passions. His dress was of the meanest materials, and so ragged and unseemly, as to give him the appearance of studied poverty. His hair was prematurely whitened, and his sunken, lowering eye avoided the bold forward look of innocence. There was a restlessness in his manner, that proceeded from the workings of the foul spirit within him, and which was not less offensive to others than distressing to himself. This man was a well-known leader of one of those gangs of marauders who infested the country with a semblance of patriotism, and who were guilty of every grade of offense, from simple theft to murder.

Having so established the imagined character of his Hudson Valley irregulars, Cooper, in Chapter XIV, has a Skinner party burn Birch’s house. A Virginia cavalry troop horsewhips them in Chapter XVIII. The Skinners burn another home in Chapter XXII. And in Chapter XXXII, in one of the grimmest scenes in American literature, the turncoat Skinner leader is lynched by two Cowboy officers, but not before crying out:

“Help! Cut the rope! captain!—Birch! good peddler! Down with the Congress!—sergeant! for God’s sake, help! Hurrah for the King!—O God!—mercy, mercy—mercy!”

When Cooper published The Spy in 1821, no aging British military refugee volunteers came forward to comment on the author’s application of a Tory nickname to a group of fictional patriot banditti. It was four decades after the Revolution had ended, and most members of General Skinner’s corps had long since died or been evacuated to Nova Scotia. But a corrective description of Skinners—in the memoirs of Continental Army surgeon James Thacher—appeared in print almost immediately.

Dr. Thacher was not only an excellent medical man but an astute historical observer and writer. Born in 1754, he served the Revolution from the siege of Boston to the siege of Yorktown, and lived to be ninety. In his sixty-ninth year, Thacher saw through the press his
voluminous two-volume manuscript *Military Journal During The American Revolutionary War*, from 1775 to 1783, Describing Interesting Events and Transactions of This Period, with Numerous Historical Facts and Anecdotes. The *Military Journal* was only one of Thacher’s many books; he also wrote an *American Medical Biography*, *American Orchardist*, *Management of Bees*, *Demonology, Ghosts and Apparitions*, and a *History of the Town of Plymouth* [MA]. In *The Spy*, Cooper’s compassionate Continental Army dragoon surgeon-philosopher, Dr. Archibald Sitgreaves, may even have been modeled on the talented doctor. “It was a maxim with Dr. Sitgreaves,” wrote Cooper, “that no species of knowledge was to be despised.”

Thacher’s memoirs, based on his wartime diary, recalled his long role in the American Revolution. It was quite a story. In the fall of 1780, Thacher was stationed in the lower Hudson Valley. His journal entry for November 24th reads:

The country which we lately traversed, about fifty miles in extent, is called neutral ground, but the miserable inhabitants who remain are not much favored with the privileges which their neutrality ought to secure to them. They are continually exposed to the ravages and insults of infamous banditti, composed of royal refugees and tories. The country is rich and fertile, and the farms appear to have been advantageously cultivated, but it now has the marks of a country in ruins. A large proportion having abandoned their farms, the few that remain find it impossible to harvest the produce. The meadows and pastures are covered with grass of a summer's growth, and thousands of bushels of apples and other fruit are rotting in the orchard. We brought off about two hundred loads of hay and grain, and ten times the amount might have been procured, if teams enough had been provided. Those of the inhabitants of the neutral ground who were tories, have joined their friends in New York, and the whigs have retired into the interior of our country. Some of each side [emphasis supplied] have taken up arms, and become the most cruel and deadly foes. There are—within the British lines—banditti [emphasis supplied] consisting of lawless villains, who devote themselves to the most cruel pillage and robbery among the defenceless inhabitants between the lines, many of whom they carry off to New York, after plundering their houses and farms. These shameless marauders have received the names of Cow-boys and Skinners [emphasis supplied] By their atrocious deeds they have become a scourge and terror to the people.

Thacher’s story is straightforward. It is reproduced unedited here only because his diary contains the sole firsthand reference to Skinners anywhere during the American Revolution. Everything else is later and secondhand. Even a casual reading of the above entry reveals that the antecedent of Thacher’s nouns, “These shameless marauders . . . Cow-boys and Skinners,” is not “Some of each side”—
but “banditti . . . within the British lines.” Skinners were British banditti, never Americans. After 1823, only the most inattentive historical reader could develop a contrary view.

But why did Cooper slip so easily into his unprecedented identification of the lower Hudson Valley’s angry, impoverished patriot yeomen of 1780–1781—the period of The Spy—with the frightful depredations created by their opposite numbers, Brigadier General Skinner’s loyalist volunteers? After all, two generations after the Revolution, printed descriptions of British devastation in the area were not uncommon. Chaplain Timothy Dwight’s haunting eyewitness description of the Post Road from New York to Boston during the Revolution is just one example: “Where I had heretofore seen a continual succession of horses and carriages, and life and bustle lent a sprightliness to all the environing objects, not a single, solitary traveler was visible from week to week, or from month to month.”

In 1821 when Cooper wrote his novel, the United States was still slowly working its way towards what we now term “Jacksonian democracy”—through the Embargo Act of 1807, the 1814 separatist Hartford Convention, and the Panic (and first Immigration Law) of 1819. Disturbing memories of Shay’s violent 1787 Massachusetts revolt and Pennsylvania’s equally tumultuous 1794 Whisky Rebellion and 1799 Fries Uprising still lingered in the minds of the literate propertied classes that included most of Cooper’s readers, and into which he—the eleventh of twelve children from a log cabin family—had successfully married. To that audience, the concept of patriot Hudson Valley Skinners was not unwelcome.

What happened thereafter? In 1855, after almost two generations of Americans had absorbed The Spy’s characterization of Skinners as marauding patriots, Washington Irving added new life to Cooper’s myth in A Chronicle of Wolfert’s Roos:

Hence arose those two great orders of border chivalry, the Skinners and the Cow-boys, famous in the heroic annals of Westchester county. The former fought, or rather marauded, under the American, the latter under the British banner; but both, in the hurry of their military ardor, were apt to err on the safe side, and rob friend as well as foe. Neither of them stopped to ask the politics of a horse or cow, which they drove into captivity; nor, when they wrung the neck of a rooster, did they trouble their heads to ascertain whether he were crowing for Congress or King George.

Periods of social ferment lend explosive license to common criminality. There is no reason to assume that the Hudson Valley during the American Revolution offered an exception. But for Cooper to have buttressed a creaky plot by provocatively asserting that patriots
operating under the sanction and protection of the Continental Army were freebooters is an unacceptable libel that places the founding fathers' Revolutionary purpose in an unfavorable light.

As an object lesson in the dissemination of incorrect information, it is therefore of some interest to see how many otherwise thoughtful and distinguished historical writers and researchers during the last century and a half have picked up and even embellished Cooper's fictional allegation.

First was Jared Sparks, the well-known American historian who spent four years as chaplain of the United States House of Representatives. Later he became president of Harvard. Sparks' biography of Benedict Arnold (1834) asserts:

The Skinners and Cow-boys often leagued together. The former would sell their plunder to the latter, taking in exchange contraband articles brought from New York. It was not uncommon for the farce of a skirmish to be acted near the American lines, in which the Skinners never failed to come off victorious; and then they would go boldly to the interior with their booty, pretending it had been captured from the enemy while attempting to smuggle it across the lines.7

Sparks, also known to have bowdlerized Washington's collected letters, offers no source for the anecdote.

Robert P. Bolton's pioneer History of the County of Westchester (1848) brings additional flavor to Cooper's myth:

There was another description of banditti, called Skinners who lived, for the most part, within the American lines, and professed attachment to the American cause; but, in reality, they were more unprincipled, perfidious and inhuman than the Cowboys themselves; for these latter exhibited some symptoms of fellow feeling for their friends,—whereas, the Skinners committed their depredations equally upon friends and foes.8

Nevertheless, only six years later John M. McDonald's paper The Neutral Ground of Westchester, delivered before the New-York Historical Society in 1854 and based on 407 interviews with 241 different county residents born before the Revolution, makes no reference at all to Skinners. That dedicated antiquarian refers only to "lawless followers who hung loosely upon the skirts of either party," and "plunderers who huzzaed for 'God and Congress.'" Ignoring those firsthand McDonald interviews, Benson J. Lossing's Pictorial Field-Book of the American Revolution (1860) further embroiders the Skinner myth: "The Skinners generally professed attachment to the American cause, and lived chiefly within the patriot lines; but they were of easy virtue... treacherous, rapacious, and often brutal."9 Lossing also repeats Sparks's anecdote, by then twenty-six years old.
Moving into the present century, the pace of misinformation increases. Frederic Shonnard and W. W. Spooner's History of Westchester County (1900) claims that "In addition to the regular troopers on either side, there were unauthorized and wholly illegal bands, organized principally for plunder, called Skinners and Cowboys, the former being patriotic and the latter of Tory affiliation."\textsuperscript{10} And again Benson J. Lossing, now editing the Encyclopedia of United States History (1902) inserts a Skinner entry: "A predatory band in the Revolutionary War whose members professed to be Whigs. They were not very scrupulous in their choice of victims, plunder being their chief aim."\textsuperscript{11}

More recently, Nelson Greene's Valley of the Hudson (1931) says that the guerrilla bands "which lurked within or near the American posts were known as Skinners. The bandits frequently changed their 'loyalty' as the occasion required."\textsuperscript{12} The authoritative Dictionary of American History uses "ironically" to iron out possible ambiguities: "The Skinners, ironically named after Gen. Cortland (sic) Skinner's Brigade of New Jersey volunteers . . . claimed attachment sometimes to the British and sometimes to the Americans."\textsuperscript{13}

Even Carl Van Doren says in his Secret History of the American Revolution (1941): "But in that Neutral Ground between the armies, where the more or less loyalist Cowboys and the more or less patriot Skinners kept up a savage warfare of raid and retaliation and plunder . . ."\textsuperscript{14}

Occasionally there is a glimmer of the truth—as in Ernest Freeland Griffin's Westchester County and Its People: "The infamous Cowboys and Skinners robbed and murdered. These last were worse even than the irregular troops. They were as likely to be American as Tory."\textsuperscript{15} But George F. Scheer and Hugh F. Rankin continue the original myth in Rebels and Redcoats: "In the 'Neutral Ground,' no stranger was safe. Allegedly patriotic Skinners fought as relentlessly as Cowboys for plunder more than for politics."\textsuperscript{16}

In 1958, Allison Albee, writing in The Westchester Historian, makes an assertion that goes far beyond Cooper's invention. "The Patriot Skinners, he says, "worked under arrangement with the regular Continental Army command."\textsuperscript{17}

Corey Ford in his A Peculiar Service relates: "Some bandits called themselves Skinners and leaned to the patriot cause."\textsuperscript{18} Ford also refers to Major Andre's captors as "Three illiterate Skinners."

The Oxford Companion to American History puts it bluntly: "Cowboys . . . lawless Tory marauders. (Their patriot counterparts were Skinners.)"\textsuperscript{19} In 1967, James H. Pickering writes in The Westchester Historian: "The Skinners seem to have been an anomalous group . . .
what turned a ‘patriot’ into a Skinner apparently, was the failure to discriminate between friend and foe.”

In *The Price of Loyalty* (1973), Catherine S. Crary levels the strongest allegation of rapacity and cruelty: “The rebel counterpart of the Cowboys were the Skinners, so-called because they robbed and often murdered their victims. They were banditti ... some of whom were simply bent on depredation and gainful plunder under the sinister guise of patriotism ... committing inhuman acts of banditry on hapless Westchester farmers whenever convenient.” Crary follows that denunciation with a lengthy quotation from Thomas Jones’s *History of New York During the Revolutionary War* which she captions: “The Skinners Plunder and Burn the Seat of General Oliver Delancey and Treat the Ladies of his Family Barbarously.” But nowhere in Jones’ writing does the word “Skinner” appear.

Again in *The Loyalist Americans* (1975), a collection of scholarly essays edited by the respected historians Robert A. East and Jacob Judd, Crary considers British guerilla activities in the lower Hudson Valley under the subtitle “Conventional Warfare or Self-Interested Freebooting?”—and follows the direction of Cooper’s century-and-a-half-old *Spy*. She refers to the U.S. experience in Vietnam to illustrate the “hazy bounds of conventional warfare” and concludes analogously that “the opprobrium heaped on [the Cowboys] at the end of the war went to extremes and was not justified.” At the same time, her observations on Skinners have softened: Skinners, “their rebel counterpart, skinned their victims of purses and clothes”; and the Skinners “in general supported the rebels.” Crary also repeats Pickering’s 1967 comment from *The Westchester Historian.*

Even so thoroughly researched a work as Mark Mayo Boatner III’s *Encyclopedia of the American Revolution* (1975) equivocates: “The Cowboys were generally concluded to be Tories and the Skinners patriots.”


And as recently as 1986, Robert McConnell Hatch makes three separate references in his *Major John André: A Gallant in Spy’s Clothing* to the mythical patriot guerrillas: “The Skinners called themselves
patriots, but this did not stop them from robbing anyone they came upon. John Paulding, Isaac van Wart and David Williams [Major André’s captors] were three of eight local residents who had set forth that morning. . . . Some, but not all, may have been Skinners. There was at least a fifty-fifty chance' that the three [captors] might have been Skinners and André should have instantly produced his [patriot] pass.”27 Is it possible that Major André failed to produce his pass because he knew that one or more of his captors were indeed Skin­ners, and he knew that Skinners were loyalists?

Nevertheless, the myth endures. In the identically titled Major John André by the British novelist Anthony Bailey,28 published just last spring, André “reminiscences” after his capture: “The militia Captain had warned us about Skinners, the rebel volunteers who served the Continental cause by . . . terrorizing the Westchester countryside . . . some of them moving back and forth, serving both armies as it suited their own interests.”

Putting all such questionable scholarship behind us, we conclude with a suggestion: Had James Fenimore Cooper not married into the aristocratic De Lancey family, the American patriot irregulars of the lower Hudson Valley could have gone down in history not as cut­throat “Skinners,” but as true patriots—as effective, selfless, and ded­icated as Leatherstocking himself.

Which, of course, they were.
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