#### NOTE ON TRANSCRIPTION OF CLAIM OF JAMES DUKE, SR.

The original document was scanned in the incorrect page order. The transcription has been completed in proper page order for clarity.

TRANSCRIPTION PAGE NUMBER	SCANNED PAGE NUMBER	
1 of 17	1 of 11 right side	
2 of 17	2 of 11 left side	
3 of 17	2 of 11 right side	
4 of 17	1 of 11 left side	
5 of 17	3 of 11	
6 of 17	4 of 11	
7 of 17	5 of 11	
8 of 17	6 of 11	
9 of 17	7 of 11 left side	
10 of 17	7 of 11 right side	
11 of 17	8 of 11 left side	
12 of 17	8 of 11 right side	
13 of 17	9 of 11 left side	
14 of 17	9 of 11 right side	
15 of 17	10 of 11 left side	
16 of 17	10 of 11 right side	
17 of 17	11 of 11	

# Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 1 of 17

The commissioners are respectfully asked to reconsid -er the claim of the representatives of James Duke Sen'r No 580 – on the docket – which has had been heretofore decided submitted to the Board of Commissioners & acted upon by them, & the claim allowed for nine slaves – The object of the present application is to get an allowance for one slave, in addition to the nine already allowed – ten slaves, being the number which were lost to their owner – by their absconding to the British –

When this claim was first considered by the Board of Commissioners – (upon the same evidence as is now filed in the claim, no new evidence having been taken since the claim was first submitted) the following award was made on the 25 March 1828 – endorsed in the handwriting of the Commissioners upon the statement made by the agent – "Allowed to the duly authorized representatives [illegible] for one slave (Thomas) taken from Georgia, 390 – int & remainder of claim reserved – James & John on Halifax list p 71 & 94 – Taking of all ten proved" – on the 21<sup>st</sup> May 1828 – This further award was made by the commissioners – "allowed for eight slaves taken from Maryland a 280 each – 2240 – int reserved". At the time this last award was made – Judge [illegible] filed a paper containing a summary of the evidence, with

# Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 2 of 17

the reasons which induced the Board, to make the allowance for eight slaves – instead of <u>nine</u> which was the number allowed for by the first award – exclusive of Tom who was allowed for at the Georgia average – to which award & the reasons for the same the commissioners are refered [sic] –

The evidence rec'd at the Department of State – on the 26 May 1821 - & which was taken on the 21 Apl preceding – proves I think satisfactorily the loss of ten slaves – the property of James Duke –

James Denton – proves the loss the loss of James - 1.

Joseph W. Reynolds – & not Joshua Sedwick – the witness stated by Judge Sedwick, by mistake – Sedwick being the magistrate before whom Reynolds deposed, proved a woman 25 yrs old & child 3 or 4. [illegible] 2.

Booth proves Tom. Jenny & child aged 1 year ) 3.

Basil Duke – the loss of Minty John & Mary & also Sarah seen at Halifax with Tom who has been before enumerated, making 4 in all - 4.

As these depositions of the witnesses here named were filed in the Department of State – on the 26 May 1821 – from this evidence so filed, the Clerk in the Department of State who made out the definitive list, for the mixed commission has endorsed – the claim of Ja's Duke thus - "James Duke Sen 4 depositions – 8 (9) slaves - & he mentions their names enumer -ating James twice, he being in doubt, whether, the claim-

## Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 3 of 17

-ant lost two slaves – named James or one – if two then the number of slaves lost would be nine – if one – then only eight.

The error in the clerk of the Department of State, who made out the number of slaves to be only eight – arises from his overlooking the deposition of Joseph W. Reynolds, who proves the loss of one woman & her child – the names of whom are not given – but are since given in the deposition of Nathan -iel Duke, Esq. taken on the 29 Dec'r 1827 – and whose names are Susan Wilson & her son Frank Wilson – which added to the number described by name – makes the whole number to be ten –

The Commissioners will perceive that it is not attem -pted to prove by any evidence except that which was filed in the Department of State at the time the definitive list was made out, the loss of the ten slaves – it has been shewn [sic] that is was owing to the circumstance of Mr. Reynolds not having described the slaves – Susan & Frank – by their names – which may have been unknown to him, although – he knew the fact that they were the slaves of James Duke Sen'r – the mistake of the clerk of whether of judgment or otherwise shall not prejudice the claimant – it the evidence was filed in the Department of State previous to the transmission of the definitive list to the mixed commission, proving the loss of property – the [illegible] of Congress constituting this Board, provides for the considera –tion of the claim, although the said claim had been omitted to be placed upon the definitive list.

The deposition of Nathaniel Duke, clearly

# Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 4 of 17

establishes the fact, that his father James Duke Sen'r lost ten slaves – they are all described by name in his deposition – which deposition was filed before the time, when the claim was first submitted to the consideration of the commissioners –

The commissioners will perceive, that the four witnesses who were first examined, do not profess to mention <u>all</u> the slaves of James Duke Sen'r who eloped from him & joined the British forces – Each witness speaks only as to what he knew upon the subject – the claimant himself in his life time omitted to make any statement upon oath by his loss – presuming I suppose that that oath would not [illegible word crossed out] avail him – but endeavoring, but the testimony of many witnesses, each of whom knew of the loss of some, one of his slaves – to make out his entire loss –

All which is respectfully submitted Robert P Denton Agent 28 July 1828

Petition for consideration of the claim of James Duke Sen'r No 580

# Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 5 of 17

Know all men by these presents that I James Duke of Calvert County & state of Mary -land have made constituted & appointed Robert P. Dunlop of George Town & District of Columbia my true & lawful attorney, for me & in my name & behalf to demand, prosecute & recover, before the Board of Commissioners under the Saint Petersburg con--vention, appointed to adjust & liquidate the claim provided for by the first article of the Treaty of Ghent by virtue of the decision given by the Emperor of the Russias, on the construction of said article -My claim for certain negroes [sic] carried away by the British forces - and to do all such further acts in the premises as I could do, were I personally present - hereby confirming all such acts & do--ings of my said attorney – In testimony whereof I hereto set my hand & affix my seal this twentieth day of January in the year eighteen hundred & twenty five -

James Duke

seal

Test Basil Duke

Calvert County – State of Maryland – to wit:
Be it remembered that on this
twentieth day of January – in the year
eighteen hundred & twenty five personally
appears James Duke the person named in the
above power of attorney, & acknowledges the same
to be his act & deed, for the purposes above men-tioned, according to the true intent & meaning thereof.
Taken & certified by

Taken & certified by Basil Duke

Claim of James Duke, Calvert County, Case No. 580, Case Files. Ca. 1814-28, entry 190, Record Group 76, National Archives, College Park. MSA SC 5496-050699

# Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 6 of 17

Calvert County State of Maryland to wit: December the Twenty Ninth in the year eighteen hundred & twenty seven – Personally appears Nathaniel Duke Esq'r before the subscriber a Justice of the Peace for the county & of the state aforesaid and makes oath on the Holy Evangely of Almighty God that during the late war between the United States & Great Britain his Father James Duke Sen'r lost the follow -ing negroes to wit: "James Patterson" - Thomas Sewall or Morgan" - "Jenny Gross" - & "Priscilla Gross her child" Sarah Deadfoot or Deadford or Deptford" - "Minty Culley" - "John Broom" -& "Mary Culley" child of "Minty Culley" aforesaid & Susan or Suckey Wilson" or Jackson" -& her child "Frank Wilson" - & that the said negroes nor neither of them ever again returned to the service of the said James Duke Sen'r nor that he ever received any compensation for them or either of them - & further this Deponent saith not – except that he hath always understood & believes that negro "Thomas Sewall or Morgan" belonged to his brother Basil Duke son of the said James Duke Sen'r - & that the rest of the said negroes belonged to the said James Duke Sen'r & how the said "Thomas Sewall or Morgan" happened to be returned as the property of the said James Duke Sen'r this Deponent knows not unless the Deponent or Depo -nents in the Deposition or Depositions originally filed in the office of the Secretary of State of the United States did

Claim of James Duke, Calvert County, Case No. 580, Case Files. Ca. 1814-28, entry 190, Record Group 76, National Archives, College Park. MSA SC 5496-050699

# Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 7 of 17

not know that the said "Thomas
Sewall or Morgan" belonged to the
said Basil Duke and took it
for granted that he belonged to the said
James Duke Sen'r because he was
in his possession – or because the said
Basil Duke was then absent from
Calvert County aforesaid –
Sworn before
Peregrine Bowen

State of Maryland, Calvert County Sc.

I hereby certify that Peregrine Bowen Esquire before whom the foregoing [illegible] was made and taken and who has thereto subscribed his name was at the time of [illegible] Justice of the peace of the said State in and for Calvert County [illegible] and sworn.

In Testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the Seal of Calvert County Court this seventh day of January in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty eight.

William S. Morsell Clk of Calvert County Court

# Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 8 of 17

James Denton proves that in 1814 Br Officers told him James was on Board [illegible] 1 Joshua Sedwick proves woman 25 yrs 2 old & child [illegible] Brooke proves Tom, Jenny & child aged one year 3 Basil Duke, the loss of Minty, Jms & Mary being three, besides James & Sarah who were seen at Halifax after the peace by Wilson, as he was informed - from the statement of this witness that only five were lost. By the claim sent in by the Gov't to the mixed commission, which is called the defentive [sic] list, there are nine claimed according to the amount made out at the State Department; altho [sic] correct by the proofs then in, make but six, as above, according to the most extended construction, & but five, by what is most to be relied on, yet I must take it as for nine – this list cannot be increased but by proof then in the office

# Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 9 of 17

Dep.

Slaves.

Siaves.	Бер.	
Duke, James, Sen'r – C	Calvert Co. Md.	
25 April 18	321	
recd 26 May "		
Four Dep'ns – 8 (9) slaves		
		1 - 500
James	46 \$400	2 – 400
Thomas	32 500	2 – 300
Jenny	18 300	2 - 100
Priscilla	1 30	<u>2</u> - 30
(James	42 400 perhaps same as above)	9
Sarah	60 100	
Minty	22 300	
John	3 100	
Mary	½ <u>30</u>	
	( <del>2760</del> )	
	(2160)	

58

# Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 10 of 17

State of Maryland - Calvert County -Mr. James D. Denton being first duly sworn deposeth & saith, that in the year eighteen hundred & fourteen, in the month of August, he was informed by some of the British (who then lay in the Patuxent River in armed vessels) that negro James the slave of Mr. James Duke Sen'r of the County & state aforesaid – aged about forty six years of age - & worth about four hundred dollars was on board of their fleet, in their service, sawing timber, [illegible] - This Deponent further states that he lives & at the time above specified lived – very near the residence of the said James Duke Sen'r in whose service he frequently saw the above mentioned negro before he was told by the British that he (the said negro) was in their service - & that since being so informed by the British – he hath never seen nor heard of the said negro - & fur -ther saith not – given under my hand this twenty fifth day of April, in the year eighteen hundred & twenty one -Signed James D. Denton

Be it remembered that on this twenty fifth day of April in the year of our Lord one thousand, eight hundred & twenty one, James D. Denton made oath on the Holy Evangely of Almighty God to the truth of the above De-position, to the best of his knowledge, recollection & belief – Before the Subscriber a Justice

# Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 11 of 17

of peace for Calvert County & State of Maryland – Wm C Dawkins

Joshua Sedwick

State of Maryland Calvert County to wit On this the 28<sup>th</sup> of April 1821 personally appeared before me a Justice of the Peace for Calvert County, Joseph W Reynolds & made oath on the holy Evangely of Almighty God that when confined on board of his Britanic [sic] Majesties ship the Loire lying in the river Patuxent Capt Brown as a prisoner, he saw a negro wom [sic] & child the property of James Duke of Calvert County, received on board of said ship the woman appeared to be about 25 years of age and the child appeared to be 3 or 4 years old both worth at that time about four hundred dollars -Sworn before

## Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 12 of 17

Maryland - Calvert County -Matthias Booth about fifty years of age being first duly sworn on the Holy Evangely of Almighty God, deposeth & saith that in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred & fourteen, in the month of July, a negroe [sic] man & a negroe [sic] woman & child slaves for life of Cap't James Duke of the state & county aforesaid, to wit: Thomas about thirty two years of age & worth about five hundred dollars - & Jenny about eighteen years of age, & worth about three hundred dollars & negroe [sic] Pricilla [sic] aged one year worth about thirty dollars, went off from from the farm of the said Cap't James Duke, to the British; as this Deponent verily believes as he afterwards saw the said negroes in the company with, or in the possession of the British, several times – some some of whom (the British) then lay in an armed vessel or vessels in the Patuxent River - & frequently landed on the shore & travelled about contiguous to the river – during which (landing & going about as aforesaid), this Deponent saw the aforesaid negroes, as above stated -& further saith not – given under my hand this twenty fourth day of April in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred & twenty one - Matthias Booth Signed

Be it remembered that one the date of the date of the above Deposition, Matthias Booth personally appeared and made oath to the truth of the abovesaid Deposition to the best of his recollection, belief & knowledge – Before the Subscri-Ber a Justice of the Peace in and for Calvert County & State of Maryland

Wm C Dawkins

# Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 13 of 17

State of Maryland - Calvert County -Basil Duke about thirty one years of age [illegible] first duly sworn deposeth & sayeth, that he was [illegible] Mr James M. Wilson – (since deceased) that he saw [illegible] James & Sarah the property of Capt' James Duke in [illegible] after the war between G Britain & America, & that said negroes did call upon said Ja's M. Wilson [illegible] a present of money - & the deponent further state ages to be about James about forty two years Sarah sixty years – James value about four hundred dollars & Sarah about one hundred - & the deponent further sayeth the same James Duke lost three [illegible] negroes [sic] viz Minty aged twenty two value about three hundred dollars, <u>John</u> aged three years & [illegible[ about one hundred dollars, Mary six month [illegible] thirty dollars. The said negroes [sic] went off in [illegible] with some negroes that have since been seen [illegible] the British soldiers & further this deponent [illegible] not – Given under my hand this the sixteenth [illegible] of May on the year eighteen hundred & twenty [illegible] Signed **Basil Duke** 

Be it remembered that on the date of the date [illegible] mentioned deposition, Basil Duke made oath on the [illegible] Evangelist of the Almighty God to the truth thereof to the [illegible] of his knowledge, recollection & belief.

Before the Subscriber
a Justice of the Peace for Calvrt [sic] County in the state Maryland

Young Parran

# Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 14 of 17

State of Maryland, Calvert County Sc.

I Hereby certify that William C

Dawkins Joshua Sedwick & Young Parran Gentlemen
before whom the annexed depositions were made and taken and
who have thereto subscribed their names were at the time of so
doing three of the Justices of the peace of the said State in
and for Calvert County aforesaid duly commissioned & sworn

In Testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed the Seal of my office this sixteenth day of May in the year of our Lord Eighteen hundred and twenty one –

Wm S. Morsell Clk of Calvert County Court

### Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 15 of 17

580

James Duke Sen'r Calvert County Md Claim for ten slaves. Statement of agent. Robert P. Dunlop agent

--- Submitted ---25 Mar: 1828 to the duly authorized Rep't [illegible] Allowed for one Slave (Thomas) taken from Virginia Georgia \$390 Int & remainder of claim reserved James & John on Halifax list P: 71 & 94 -(Ten) Taking of all proved

See the other side for the award 21<sup>st</sup> May 1828 – allow'd for eight slaves taken from Maryland @ \$280 each \$2240 -Int. reserved

## Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 16 of 17

The claim of James Duke Sen deceased, late of Calvert County, in the State of Maryland is respectfully submitted –

The representatives of James Duke dec'd claim indemnity for ten slaves, viz James Patterson, Thomas Sewall or Morgan, Jenny Gross - & Priscilla Gross her child, Sarah Deadfoot or Deadford or Depford, Minty Cully, John Broom, Mary Cully child of Minty Cully – Susan or Suckey Wilson or Jackson & her child Frank Wilson – See the Deposition of Nathaniel Duke – for the names & number of J. Duke's slaves –

The Clerk in the State Department – who made out the definitive list, has in enumerating the slaves of J. Duke deceased, committed two errors – the first error in inserting the name of James, (Patterson) twice - & the second in overlooking the two negroes viz the woman & her child mentioned in the Deposition of Mr. Reynolds, who were seen by him when a prisoner on board the "Loire" & whom it is believed new [sic] Susan Wilson & her son Frank, whose names are not mentioned on the Definitive list It is respectfully submitted if the proof files in the Department of State in proper time, shewed, the list of other slaves than those named on the definitive list, whether the error of the Clerk in making out that list can prejudice the claimant – It is believed that it cannot –

The Commissioners are refered [sic] to page 94 of the document – Halifax list, for the name of James Patterson – to page 94 of the document – for the name of Thomas Morgan – one of the slaves of J. Duke being known by the names of Thomas Sewall or Morgan – page 81 of the document – for Jenny Gross & her child – Priscilla – then can only Henry, Daniel & Richard Gross – all on the Halifax list appear from that list to have each of them had a Wife & one child – name of wife & child unknown Sarah Bradford, is proved by the deposition of Basil Duke

# Claim of James Duke Sr. Page 17 of 17

to have been seen in Halifax after the termination of the war – her name cannot however be traced on the Halifax list –

The commissioners are refered [sic] to page 75 of the documents Halifax list – two names are found – on that list together, viz Caden Minty, Cullen Mary – which it is very likely are Minty Cully & her child Mary whose names are thus incorrectly given –

See Page 71 of the documents for the name of "John Broom" –

The other slaves cannot be traced upon any of the printed lists – but it is submitted – whether from the number of the slaves of James Duke Dec'd whose names appear on the British lists, the Commissioners ought not to presume that the whole of Mr. Duke slaves were with the British forces within the limits of the U States at the ratification of the Treaty of Peace – especially as no proof to the contrary has been offered on the part of the British government –

Robert P. Dunlop agent for the representatives of James Duke Dec'd

The commissioners are also referred to the Halifax list – page 90 for the name of Thomas Morgan –