

*The View at Two Hundred Years:  
The Loyalists of  
the American Revolution*

WALLACE BROWN

'I would have hanged my own brother had he taken part with our enemy in the contest.' JOHN ADAMS, 1780.

'Family quarrels, especially between children, are always more difficult to reconcile than between strangers.' JOHN EARDLEY-WILMOT, *English Loyalist Claims Commissioner*, 1815.

'Not many citizens of the United States would now concede more merit to being called an American *Tory*, than they would to a robber or an incendiary.' CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, 1842.

'Tot ou tard tout se sait.' ARTHUR JOHNSTON, *Canadian Historian*, 1908.

'... in most textbooks and scholarly accounts of our War of Independence, the Tories still receive only grudging understanding.' DOUGLAS ADAIR and JOHN SHUTZ, *American Historians*, 1961.

THE VIEW at two hundred years must be heartening to the shades of the Loyalists. Here we are, at last, in the capital of their dreaded 'Yankey' Republic\* calling for deep study

\*This paper was read in Washington, D.C., by Professor Brown at a session, 'The Loyalists of the American Revolution,' at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association on December 28, 1969. The Chairman was Robert A. East of the City Uni-

of those for whom Washington himself recommended suicide!<sup>1</sup>

Since the Revolution the Loyalists have been like the weather: constant complaints but nobody ever seems to do anything about it. Thomas Balch wrote in 1855, 'It is greatly to be regretted that we have no full and truthful history of the loyalists'; in 1897 M. C. Tyler stated that Loyalist literature 'slumbers under a hundred years of distrust and contempt'; nearly fifty years later in 1940 Robert Demond could still justly complain that the Loyalists were 'generally neglected by both American and English historians'; in 1963 Jackson T. Main said bluntly, 'The name of Tory is odious to the American mind'; and earlier this year G. N. D. Evans lamented, 'the Loyalists continue to be neglected.'<sup>2</sup>

Although the Loyalists were outgunned in the historiographical battle just as they were in the propaganda and shooting battles of the Revolution there was considerable and often good contemporary published Loyalist history especially the works by Hewatt, Proud, Stedman, Hutchinson, Moody, Boucher, Galloway, Chalmers, Leonard, and Peters. The perspicacious David Ramsay and Alexander Graydon were two other contemporaries who commented fairly on the Loyalists from different non-Loyalist perspectives.<sup>3</sup> In 1828

---

versity of New York, Executive Director of the Program for Loyalist Studies and Publications, and comments on the paper were made by Clifford K. Shipton, Director Emeritus of this Society, and by Esmond Wright of the House of Commons and formerly of the University of London.

<sup>1</sup>Quoted by W. O. Raymond, *The United Empire Loyalists* (St. Stephen, N.B., 1899), p. 8.

<sup>2</sup>Thomas Balch, *The Examination of Joseph Galloway, Esq., By a Committee of the House of Commons* (Philadelphia, 1855), preface, no pagination; Moses C. Tyler, *Literary History of the American Revolution, 1763-1783* (New York, 1897), I, 294; Robert O. Demond, *The Loyalists of North Carolina during the Revolution* (Durham, 1940), p. viii; Jackson T. Main, *Rebel Versus Tory: The Crisis of the Revolution, 1773-1776* (Chicago, 1968), p. 1; G. N. D. Evans, *Allegiance in America: The Case of the Loyalists* (Reading, Mass., 1969), p. 135.

<sup>3</sup>David Ramsay, *History of the American Revolution*, 2 vols. (London, 1799), I, 114, 121, 125, 310-315, 387; II, 281, 285, 287, 308, and from Alexander Graydon, *Memoirs of a Life, Chiefly Passed in Pennsylvania, within the Last Sixty Years* (Harrisburg, 1811).

the third volume of Hutchinson's history was published in London at the solicitation of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Therefore the chorus of complaints about neglect of and bias towards the Loyalists is exaggerated. And the 1840s mark, if not a mountain, certainly the first significant foothill in Loyalist historiography in the United States. In 1841 it was at least admitted that many Harvard graduates were Loyalists and the 'forties also saw the publication of Curwen's *Journal*, a life of Peter Van Schaack, Simcoe's *Military Journal*, and the writings of William Wragg.<sup>4</sup> The climax came in 1847 when Lorenzo Sabine, the John the Baptist of Loyalist studies, published his famous *Historical Essay* (expanded in 1864). At the time Sabine was seriously charged with lack of patriotism<sup>5</sup> but the period of the Civil War and the Fenian Raids caused many Northerners to see loyalty more kindly, and helped produce considerable writing and editing.<sup>6</sup> The new attitude was well expressed in 1879 when the editor of Thomas Jones'

<sup>4</sup>'List of Graduates at Harvard University of Anti-Revolutionary or Loyalist Principles,' *The American Quarterly Register*, XIII (May 1841), 407, 403-417; XIV (November 1841), 167-172. G. A. Ward, ed., *Journal and Letters . . . of . . . Samuel Curwen* (London, 1842), Henry Van Schaack, *The Life of Peter Van Schaack* (New York, 1844), *Simcoe's Military Journal* (New York, 1844). For interesting reviews of Van Schaack and Curwen by Charles Francis Adams see the *North American Review*, LV (July 1842), 97-114, and LVI (January 1843), 89-108. For Wragg see 'American Loyalists,' *Southern Quarterly Review*, IV (1843).

<sup>5</sup>See Edward E. Hale, 'Memoir of the Hon. Lorenzo Sabine, A.M.,' Massachusetts Historical Society, *Proceedings*, XVII (1880), 377.

<sup>6</sup>Important items include: William S. Bartlet, ed., *The Frontier Missionary: A Memoir of the Life of the Rev. Jacob Bailey* (Boston, 1853); Balch, *Examination of . . . Galloway* (Philadelphia, 1855); Winthrop Sargent, *The Loyalist Poetry of the Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1857) and *The Loyal Verses of Joseph Stansbury and Doctor Jonathan Odell* (Albany, 1860); Frank Moore ed., *Diary of the American Revolution* (2 vols, New York, 1860)—Moore included lots of Rivington; 'Letters to Joseph Galloway from Leading Tories in America,' *The Historical Magazine*, V (1861), 271-273, 295-301, 335-338, 356-364; James Moody, *The Narrative of the Exertions and Sufferings of Lieutenant James Moody* (New York, 1865); *The Narrative of David Fanning* (New York, 1865); George E. Ellis, *Memoir of Sir Benjamin Thompson* (Boston, 1871); John J. Latting, 'Salem Loyalists—Unpublished Letters,' *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, XXVI (1872), 243-248; John L. Watson, 'The Marston Family of Salem, Mass.,' *ibid.*, XXVII (1873), 390-403; Charles C. Chesney, 'A Carolina Loyalist in the Revolutionary War,' *Essays in Military Biography* (New York, 1874), 135-153; 'Sufferings and Losses of Jolley Allen,' Massachusetts Historical Society, *Proceedings*, XVI (1878), 69-99; E. D. Neill, 'Jacob Duché,' *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, II (1878), 58-73.

*History of New York* (written nearly a century earlier!) referred to the Civil War: 'Americans then learned by experience for the first time . . . that "loyalty" was a virtue, that the supporters of "the powers that be" were worthy of honor, and that "rebels" and "rebellion" were to be put down at any cost.'<sup>7</sup>

However, the modern professional approach to the Loyalists dates from the turn of the twentieth century when several factors contributed to a boom in Loyalist studies. Generally there was an American-British rapprochement stimulated by the imperialistic Spanish-American War (and finally World War I), and by the popularity of racialist themes maintaining that blood was thicker than water and deploring the 'Anglo-Saxon Schism.'<sup>8</sup> As early as 1883 a New York historian praised Loyalist Canada in contrast to the United States which had

<sup>7</sup>Thomas Jones, *History of New York during the Revolutionary War*, 2 vols. (New York, 1879), I, ix. This view was often repeated, e.g., John Watts De Peyster, *Life and Misfortunes, and the Military Career of Brig.-Gen. Sir John Johnson* (New York, 1882), p. xii and n; Theodor B. Myers, *Tories or Loyalists in America: being Slight Historical Tracings . . . of Sir John Johnson* (Albany, 1882), p. 144; Moses C. Tyler, 'The Party of the Loyalists in the American Revolution,' *American Historical Review*, I (October, 1895), 24-46; Theodore Roosevelt, *Gouverneur Morris* (Boston and New York, 1900), p. 29. The view had been expressed earlier in 1874 by Chesney, *Essays*, and even in 1853 before the shooting war began by George Burgess in his preface (p. vii) to Bartlet's life of Bailey. Meanwhile the output of material relevant to the Loyalists continued and included the following: Sidney S. Rider, ed., *The Diary of Thomas Vernon* (Providence, 1881); E. E. Beardsley, *Life and Correspondence of the Right Rev. Samuel Seabury* (Boston, 1881); Peter O. Hutchinson, ed., *The Diary and Letters of Thomas Hutchinson*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1884, 1886); James Allen, 'Diary,' *Pa. Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, IX (1885-1886), 176-196, 278-296, 424-441; George E. Ellis, 'The Loyalists and Their Fortunes,' in Justin Winsor, ed., *Narrative and Critical History of America* (Boston and New York, 1888), VII, 185-214. (Ellis is good on bibliography.) Richard Hildreth in *The History of the United States*, 6 vols. (New York, 1882), 57-58, 137-139, was unusually fair to the Loyalists but, like all of the classic nineteenth-century historians, ridiculously brief.

<sup>8</sup>Goldwin Smith quoted by J. K. Hosmer, *The Life of Thomas Hutchinson* (Boston, 1896), p. xviii. On the same page Hosmer called for a reunification of the Anglo-Saxons to whom 'supreme dominion in the earth would be sure to fall.' One of the chapter headings in James H. Stark's *The Loyalists of Massachusetts and the Other Side of the American Revolution* (Boston, 1907), is 'Blood is Thicker than Water.' In Canada in 1893 W. O. Raymond, *The United Empire Loyalists*, p. 2, wrote that both Canadians and Americans were at last beginning to realize 'the common heritage of the Anglo-Saxon race.' This attitude is very apparent in the works of Theodore Roosevelt and can also be seen in Woodrow Wilson, *A History of the American People* (New York and London, 1901, 1902), V, ch. IV. The Anglophile Wilson is not bad on the Loyalists.

become, through immigration, 'the cesspool of the world.'<sup>9</sup> The democratic excesses of the Gilded Age and the results of the ethic of success placed the Loyalists as conservatives in a new perspective,<sup>10</sup> and, of course, the 'lesson' of the Civil War remained prominent. The Loyalists benefitted from the beginnings of the 'imperial' school of historians as it was called later, and from the rise of 'scientific' history.<sup>11</sup> It was fitting that Tyler, a founder of the American Historical Association, wrote the best and earliest of the reassessments of the Loyalists.

It was Tyler who declared that the Massachusetts banishment act of 1778 reads 'almost like a beadroll of the oldest and noblest families concerned in the founding and upbuilding of New England civilization.'<sup>12</sup> Although not the first, Tyler echoes a repeated American *cri de coeur* which notes that America's loss was Canada's gain.<sup>13</sup> This realization of the sheer quality of so very many Loyalists plus a sense of fair play has been a continuing stimulus to Loyalist studies.

Apart from Tyler's work (which restored the Loyalists to intellectual history long before they made comparable advances in other fields) that of Flick, Van Tyne, Fisher, Stark, and the indefatigable Siebert deserves special mention.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>9</sup> John Watts De Peyster, *An Address Delivered Before the Historical Society of New Brunswick* (New York, 1883), p. 7.

<sup>10</sup> E.g., De Peyster, *Sir John Johnson*, pp. clxv, clxvii.

<sup>11</sup> The imperial school did not write directly about the Loyalists with the striking later exception of Lawrence H. Gipson, *Jared Ingersoll; a Study of American Loyalism* (New Haven, 1920).

<sup>12</sup> Tyler, 'Party of the Loyalists,' 31.

<sup>13</sup> This point dates back to such contemporaries as Alexander Hamilton who worked for the re-admission of the Loyalists to the United States—see Wallace Brown, *The Good Americans* (New York, 1969), p. 177—and among historians it dates back at least to Bancroft's classic history and to Sabine—see *North American Review*, LIX (October 1844), 300. See also James Hannay, 'The Loyalists,' *New England Magazine*, IV (1891), 297–315, a very good popular and early revisionary article, and John T. Waugh, *The United Empire Loyalists* (Buffalo, 1925), p. 121.

<sup>14</sup> Moses C. Tyler, *The Literary History of the American Revolution, 1763–1788*, 2 vols. (New York and London, 1897); Alexander C. Flick, *Loyalism in New York during the American Revolution* (New York, 1901); Claude H. Van Tyne, *The Loyalists in the American Revolution* (New York, 1902); Sydney G. Fisher, *The True History of the American Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1902) and 'The Legendary and Myth-Making Process in Histories of the American Revolution,' *American Philosophical Society*,

But despite some achievements, the promise of such writings was not fulfilled after the war perhaps because much of the faith in Anglo-Saxons evaporated, and it has only been during the last decade that those early years have been rivalled.<sup>15</sup>

---

*Proceedings*, LI (April-June 1912), 53-75; Stark, *Loyalists of Massachusetts* (1907); W. H. Siebert published many useful studies too numerous to be listed here, see Oscar Handlin et al., *Harvard Guide to American History* (New York, 1967), p. 302.

It should be noted that American response to Loyalist studies was not entirely favorable. For example, Tyler in his article 'The Party of the Loyalists,' p. 26, admitted that even in 1895 it was difficult for Americans 'to shake off the inheritance of a century of 4th of July and Washington's birthday oratory,' and in 1896 the Bishop of Iowa saw fit to refute charges that most of the clergy had been Loyalists, see William S. Perry, *The Alleged 'Toryism' of the Clergy of the United States at the Breaking out of the War of the Revolution* (n.p., 1896).

Other interesting items of the period not already mentioned include: G. A. Gilbert, 'The Connecticut Loyalists,' *American Historical Review*, IV (January 1899), 273-291; Edward McCrary, *A History of South Carolina* (New York, 1901), III; Nina M. Tiffany, ed., *Letters of James Murray, Loyalist* (Boston, 1901); Arthur W. Eaton, *Recollections of a Georgia Loyalist* (New York and London, 1901); E. H. Baldwin, 'Joseph Galloway, The Loyalist Politician,' *Pa. Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, XXVI (July 1902), 161-191, 289-321, 417-442; the two relevant volumes in the American Nation Series dealt well with the Loyalists, George E. Howard, *Preliminaries of the Revolution, 1763-1775* (New York and London, 1905) and Claude H. Van Tyne, *The American Revolution, 1776-1783* (New York and London, 1905).

<sup>15</sup> More on the last ten years later. However, some good works done in the interim deserve mention. There have been several state studies of varying quality: Hammond on New Hampshire (1917), Harrell on Virginia (1926), Peck on Connecticut (1934), Hancock on Delaware (1940), Demond on North Carolina (1940), and James Truslow Adams on *Revolutionary New England* (1927) can be recommended as a good example of the more tolerant attitude of the twentieth century. Some good sources appeared in print including Boucher's *Reminiscences* (1925), Ann Hulton's *Letters* (1927), E. Alfred Jones' collections of New Jersey and Massachusetts material (1927 and 1930), Vance's edition of the *Letters of a Westchester Farmer* (1930), and Mayo's edition of Hutchinson's *History* (1936). In 1943 Evarts B. Greene gave an excellent account of the Loyalists in *The Revolutionary Generation*. In 1944 Leonard W. Labaree published a good piece in the *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society (note also his *Conservatism in Early America* [1948]). The best example of Loyalist fiction, *Oliver Wiswell* by Kenneth Roberts, which appeared in 1940 was both pro-Loyalist and successful. (The novel may have inspired Carl Van Doren's exaggerated remark in 1941 that lately the public overpraised the Loyalists' 'virtues and abilities' and saw 'them as romantic heroes,' *Secret History of the American Revolution* (New York, 1941), p. 434. Tyler's *Literary History* was reissued in 1949 and 1957.

On the other hand many good works during the period were not adequate as far as the Loyalists are concerned. Examples include: the third volume of Channing's *History of the United States* (1912), Randolph G. Adams, *Political Ideas of the American Revolution* (1922), James Truslow Adams, *The Epic of America* (1931), Merle Curti, *The Growth of American Thought* (1943), the Beards, *A Basic History of the United States* (1944).

The fact of Loyalist neglect cannot be disputed. Several states still lack satisfactory accounts, and it is a telling comment that Van Tyne is still the best general treatment, best by default rather than by its (very real) virtues. All this quite apart from the myriad of Loyalist topics which require scholarly investigation. (More on this later.)

The United States does itself a disservice by its neglect of distinguished Loyalists. As one commentator put it sixty years ago, 'it would seem to be settled by precedent that this nation could not be trusted with all portions of its own history.'<sup>16</sup> Thomas Hutchinson is by any standards a great son of Massachusetts yet he has largely disappeared from the Commonwealth's traditions. During the Revolution Hutchinson Street in Boston became Pearl Street, his family tomb was commandeered by a Whig, and the town of Hutchinson was renamed Barré. Even in the mid 1880s 'there were educated men in the Bay State to whom the name of Thomas Hutchinson was still anathema,' and it was not until 1896 that his biography was written.<sup>17</sup> William Smith, Jr., of New York suffered similar neglect until recently and one can also mention Sir John Johnson, Joseph Galloway, and, in North Carolina, John Hamilton.<sup>18</sup> Samuel Peters' *General History of Connecticut* which was first published in London in 1781 was so unpopular when it

---

The crisis of World War II does not seem to have produced anything resembling the 'Anglo-Saxon' revival of World War I as far as the Loyalists are concerned, although a study of Galloway published in 1941 saw him as the prophet of the ideal of a united British Empire and the United States, 'so that all may live as free men.' [Oliver C. Kuntzleman, *Joseph Galloway, Loyalist* (Philadelphia, 1941), p. 172.] The same year Julian P. Boyd published a good essay, *Anglo-American Union: Joseph Galloway's Plans to Preserve the British Empire, 1774-1788* (Philadelphia, 1941). Boyd made no overt reference to the world situation but the 'blurb' mentioned the events which were then emphasizing 'the common heritage of the United States and the British Empire.'

<sup>16</sup>Stark, *Loyalists of Massachusetts*, p. 6.

<sup>17</sup>Hosmer, *Hutchinson*, p. 324; L. S. Mayo, ed., *The History of the Colony of and Province of Massachusetts Bay*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1936), I, v, vi; Brown, *Good Americans*, pp. 249-250. Samuel Curwen's obituary in the *Salem Gazette* omitted all mention of Curwen's Loyalism, see *The Christian Examiner*, XLIII, 121. For one interesting attempt at a resurrection of a Loyalist see Chandler Bullock, *The Loyalist Side of the American Revolution* (Worcester, 1925).

<sup>18</sup>Demond, *Loyalists of North Carolina*, vii, 59n.

reached Connecticut that it 'was publicly burnt, and the court prohibited the republishing of the work in the State.' When the book was reissued in New York in 1877 the editor remarked 'possibly there are not twenty persons living who have ever read it.'<sup>19</sup> The fate of Dr. Jonathan Odell is instructive. In 1872 the author of a study of Odell's alma mater could discover very little about his career yet the facts were easily available.<sup>20</sup> To this day the distinguished satirist is not commemorated in any way by Princeton. It is significant that neither Jefferson (in 1782) nor Samuel Miller (in 1803) mentioned the Loyalist architect, Peter Harrison, although both desperately wanted examples of colonial artists.<sup>21</sup>

The hostility towards the Loyalists has been profound. There are many reasons for it. As we see in the case of ex-colonies of our own time, repudiation of the former imperial power and its supporters is only natural. The harsh criticism of the Loyalists from Washington and John Adams downwards,<sup>22</sup> the hatreds engendered by civil war, the mystique of patriotic unanimity and the revolutionary United States 'success story' were reinforced by most of the popular nineteenth-century historians, Bancroft being the most notorious and influential,<sup>23</sup> and were never fully rectified in the more objective twentieth century. Even in the better college textbooks

<sup>19</sup> (New York, 1877), p. 8.

<sup>20</sup> Tyler, *Literary History*, II, 99 and n; Robert R. Palmer, *The Age of the Democratic Revolution* (Princeton, 1959), I, 190.

<sup>21</sup> Brown, *Good Americans*, p. 250. The chief exception to the national amnesia is Count Rumford whose scientific achievements simply could not be ignored and who, on his death, benefitted Harvard. Ellis, *Memoir of Sir Benjamin Thompson*, Hosmer, *Life of Hutchinson*, p. xvi.

<sup>22</sup> Washington and Adams have already been cited. Governor Clinton of New York is credited with the following: he would 'rather roast in hell to all eternity than show mercy to a damned Tory,' G. M. Wrong, 'The Background of the Loyalist Movement 1763-1783,' *Ontario Hist. Soc. Papers and Records*, XXX (1934), 176. Benedict Arnold became synonymous for a Tory and Arnold has, of course, traditionally been rated only slightly above Judas in the descending scale of American villainy.

<sup>23</sup> For an interesting personal account of patriot indoctrination see James H. Stark, 'The United Empire Loyalists,' The U.E.L. Assoc. of Canada, *Annual Transactions, 1914-1917* (Toronto, 1917), pp. 45-62. In 1882 a distinguished New Yorker concluded gloomily that the American people had 'sucked in fiction as fact with their mothers' milk and no amount of reason could reverse the verdict of success, however obtained,'



the Loyalists either barely exist or at best a short subsection of one chapter deals perfunctorily with the topic almost as a footnote or afterthought. But the American Revolution cannot be adequately written about unless the Loyalists are made an integral part of the story, any more than the war can properly be described without seeing it constantly as a civil war. Howard H. Peckham's *The War for Independence* (Chicago, 1958), in many ways an excellent book, is deficient in this respect. A recent survey of new trends in American historiography does not mention the Loyalists (John Higham, ed., *The Reconstruction of American History* [New York, 1962]), while Carl N. Degler in his deservedly popular *Out of Our Past: Forces that Shaped Modern America* (New York, 1962) does not consider the Loyalists worth any real discussion, and Daniel Boorstin wrote an entire interpretation of the colonial experience without any recourse to the Loyalists. A check of the third series of the *William and Mary Quarterly* from 1944 to the present reveals remarkably few articles on the Loyalists. (James J. Talman's excellent *Loyalist Narratives from Upper Canada* [Toronto, 1946] was not even reviewed!) It would not surprise me if this present session is the first the *American Historical Association* has ever had on the Loyalists.<sup>24</sup>

---

De Peyster, *Sir John Johnson*, p. clxv. Generally the popular historians either briefly attacked the Loyalists or (perhaps the cruelest blow) ignored them. Those who attacked include Mrs. Warren, Botta, Bancroft, and McMaster; those who ignored include Marshall (*Life of Washington*), George Tucker, Schouler, and E. Benjamin Andrews.

<sup>24</sup>Even in 1934 G. M. Wrong, 'Background,' p. 178, could write that the U.S. could be 'influenced' against Great Britain more easily than against any other great power. The history of American Anglophobia begins with the Declaration of Independence and the hatred of the Loyalists. See Brown, *Good Americans*, p. 246. In the nineteenth century the tendency of American politicians to twist the lion's tail helped keep the Loyalists in disrepute. For example in 1842 a scheme in Massachusetts to publish a new edition of Hutchinson's *History* collapsed possibly because of the Oregon situation. Alan P. Grimes, *American Political Thought* (New York, 1960), does not cite Galloway at all. In the high schools the time lag between new research and its incorporation into texts is more blatant than at the college level. Thus nineteenth-century bias is proverbial and even in 1925 one commentator noted that despite the work of Flick, Tyler, Siebert, and Van Tyne public school history was not much affected. Waugh, *The United Empire Loyalists*, p. 73.

Anglophobia and the branding of opponents as 'Tories' have a long tradition in American politics.<sup>25</sup> The Loyalists lost a kind of medieval trial by combat during the Revolutionary War, many of the most able went into permanent exile, and those who did not remained quiescent or accepted the myths of the young Republic.<sup>26</sup> The disappearance of the Loyalists from American traditions is in stark contrast to the losers of the second civil war. The reason is that Loyalism was delineated mentally more than geographically whereas the South remains obstinately there.<sup>27</sup>

Nowhere has American bias, not to say hypocrisy, been better illustrated than by accounts of Tory 'atrocities' during the war. There were, indeed, atrocities but committed by both sides and it is only Tory partisan warfare which has usually been condemned. Thus Ferguson is a villain, Marion a hero. As James Stark pointed out long ago there is little difference between 'a cowboy and a skinner.'<sup>28</sup> As for the use of Indians the American patriotic myth dates from the Declaration of Independence and the war itself when the rebels tried to convert their failure to gain Indian allies into a propaganda advantage.<sup>29</sup> The Tory-Indian 'atrocities' were for long a staple of

<sup>25</sup> Thus to take the most obvious example we note Jackson being dubbed King Andrew and his supporters Tories by his Whig opponents who in turn were accused of being latter day aristocratic Loyalists. See Brown, *Good Americans*, pp. 245-246.

<sup>26</sup> Some Loyalists did have successful political careers in the young Republic, but not, of course, under a Loyalist banner. Those who became Federalists were two-time losers. Many Loyalists felt what a writer in the mid-nineteenth century called 'a false shame' (*The Christian Examiner*, XLIII, 119), and did all they could to hide their previous politics, sometimes by denouncing the Tory position in order 'to wipe the stigma . . . from their own characters.' (*Boston Gazette*, May 5, 1783).

<sup>27</sup> The Loyalists are more akin to the Copperheads than the secessionists, but Southern 'heroes' figure in Fourth of July Oratory and have been well treated by scholarly and popular writers alike. The Southern tradition is kept alive by monuments, statues, markers, etc., even Trafalgar Square boasts a statue of George Washington, but I know of no Loyalist statue in the entire United States.

<sup>28</sup> *Loyalists of Massachusetts*, p. 90.

<sup>29</sup> The same comment can be made regarding the use of Negroes. See Wallace Brown, 'Negroes and the American Revolution,' *History Today*, XIV (August 1964), 556-563.

nationalistic oratory<sup>30</sup> and even today despite some scholarly revision the myth persists.<sup>31</sup>

The view at two hundred years all depends upon where one is standing. Canada is the one place where the Loyalists, founding fathers for many, have never been completely neglected.<sup>32</sup> As early as 1789 bona fide Loyalists were granted the right to affix the letters U. E. after their names as a 'Mark of Honor' and the Loyalist tradition was certainly maintained in the Maritimes and to a degree in Ontario. For many Canadians the righteousness of their cause was reinforced by the War of 1812 and given divine sanction when the American Civil War demonstrated again the results of disloyalty. However, the necessity of opening up the wilderness left little time for Loyalist writing, and there is a comparative dearth of Loyalist sources.<sup>33</sup> But the Loyalists have not had the 'loser' image which attaches to them elsewhere.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>30</sup>E.g., Eben G. Scott, *Historical Address, Delivered at the Wyoming Monument, July Third 1893, On the Occasion of the Observance of the Anniversary of the Battle and Massacre* (Wyoming, Pa., 1893). Scott, however, reflected the spirit of the nineties by distinguishing between 'Tories' who massacred and 'Loyalists' such as Hutchinson who were 'intelligent' and 'honorable' (see pp. 15-16). A reviewer of Sabine's first edition declared that next to Benedict Arnold the individual most responsible for Loyalist obloquy was John Butler the notorious Indian leader and in the early twentieth century D. W. Griffith made Butler the 'heavy' in his last great epic film, *America*.

<sup>31</sup>A good scholarly example of the myth in the nineteenth century is in John Fiske, *The American Revolution*, 2 vols. (Boston and New York, 1891), II, 85-86. In 1902 Woodrow Wilson's popular *A History of the American People* was generally sympathetic to the Loyalists but took a harsh attitude towards their use of Indians (see II, 292-293). Ryerson, *Loyalists*, II, 85-97 has a very revealing analysis of American historians' treatment of the 'Massacre of Wyoming'; see also Howard Swiggett, *War out of Niagara: Walter Butler and the Tory Rangers* (New York, 1939); George F. Stanley, 'The Six Nations and the American Revolution,' *Ontario History*, LVI (December 1964), 217-232; Talman, *Loyalist Narratives*, concludes that John Butler's reputation for barbarity is 'almost wholly unsubstantiated,' p. xxxvi.

<sup>32</sup>In 1892 the Loyalists were described as the 'rock' and the 'soul' of Canada, a view repeated in many school and university texts, E. J. Fessenden, *Upper Canada* (n.p., 1892), p. 3. See also George H. Locke, 'The Loyalists in Ontario,' *Ontario Historical Society Papers and Records*, XXX (1934), 181, where the Loyalists are compared to the Pilgrim Fathers.

<sup>33</sup>Talman, *Loyalist Narratives*, p. ix.

<sup>34</sup>In Canada the Loyalists succeeded in developing new provinces and maintaining their principles and respect. As a poet put it, they were 'victorious in defeat,' William Kirby, quoted by Hiram A. Cody, *The King's Arrow* (Toronto, 1922), p. v. On the other hand Mordecai Richler recently quoted Hugh MacLennan with approval to the

Canadian Loyalist historiography does not really begin until Caniff's amateurish but meritorious volume of 1869,<sup>35</sup> and did not produce a comprehensive work until 1880 with Egerton Ryerson's odd compendium, *The Loyalists of America and Their Times*. Ryerson had been collecting material for twenty-five years ever since the *Toronto Globe*, and others, had noted a disturbing degree of ignorance of the Loyalists among the Canadian people. Since 1880 there have been some useful books, articles, and collections of material in various periodicals, some useful theses, in 1908 Arthur Johnston, a Canadian Bancroft in tone not quality, tried to refute the patriotic version of history calling the Loyalists the 'True Heroes of the Revolution,' and one can add a very few recently published professional works such as that by Esther Clark Wright.<sup>36</sup>

The Loyalists are not nearly as important in Ontario, which has dominated Canadian historiography, as they are in the Maritimes which have not produced an institution comparable to the University of Toronto. Even within Maritime colleges a degree of intellectual snobbery has hindered Loyalist studies.

Thus despite their role in Canadian history the Loyalists do not have a distinguished historiography, and Canadian scholar-

---

effect that Canada is a nation founded by losers, Scots and French, and went on to argue that the failure of both Maury Wills and Manny Motta only so long as they wore Expo uniforms betokens a continuing loser tradition! See 'My Year in Canada,' *Weekend Magazine* (September 27, 1969), p. 6.

<sup>35</sup>*History of the Settlement of Upper Canada* (Toronto, 1869). Earlier a long Loyalist poem, *The U.E. A Tale of Upper Canada* (Niagara, 1859) by William Kirby should be noted. Kirby's purpose was to 'preserve a few peculiar traits of a generation of men, now alas! nearly passed away' who were 'brave devoted defenders of the British crown' (preface, no pagination).

<sup>36</sup>*Myths and Facts of the American Revolution* (Toronto, 1908), *The Loyalists of New Brunswick* (Fredericton, 1955). A few other items in Canadian historiography should also be mentioned: Arthur W. H. Eaton, *The Church of England in Nova Scotia and the Tory Clergy of the Revolution* (New York, 1891); William Kingsford, *The History of Canada* (Toronto, 1894), VII; W. O. Raymond ed., *Winslow Papers* (St. John, 1901); Alexander Fraser, ed., *Report of the Bureau of Archives for Ontario* (Toronto, 1904)—Loyalist claims in Canada; William S. Wallace, *The United Empire Loyalists* (Toronto, 1914); Arthur Bradley, *Colonial Americans in Exile* (New York, 1932); A. L. Burt, *The Old Province of Quebec* (Toronto, 1933); J. B. Brebner, *The Neutral Yankees of Nova Scotia* (New York, 1937); George M. Wrong, *Canada and the American Revolution* (New York, 1935); Talman, *Loyalist Narratives*.

ship lags far behind American. As late as 1965 the Canadian Historical Association (founded in 1922), had not had a single paper on the Loyalists proper delivered at its annual meetings!<sup>37</sup> Generally speaking the standard Canadian textbooks, like the American, reflect a degree of confusion and equivocality concerning the Loyalists. This is partly a reflection of the general fact that Canada is not as developed as the United States and thus lags in most fields. But there are other reasons Canadians as a whole have never been able to accept the Loyalists as founding fathers in the way the Americans accepted the Revolutionary leaders. The Whig-Democratic tradition in Canada has always found the Loyalists somewhat 'un-Canadian' with their reputation (deserved or not) for leaning towards an established church and an aristocratic regime exemplified by the Family Compacts.<sup>38</sup> Neither have later immigrants whether from the United States, the British Isles, or Europe, far less the French-Canadians, necessarily found the Loyalist tradition congenial.<sup>39</sup> Outside of the Maritimes Loyalist stock was soon submerged by later arrivals and a strong Loyalist tradition had even possibly disappeared by the end of the War of 1812 in Ontario.

To all that may be added the cultural weight of the United States,<sup>40</sup> and the failure of British historiography to redress the balance. Even in the late nineteenth century a Canadian pro-Loyalist writer complained that comparatively few Canadians (such was the power of American indoctrination) knew

<sup>37</sup> W. G. Shelton, 'The United Empire Loyalists: A Reconsideration,' *Dalhousie Review*, XLV (Spring, 1965), 15n.

<sup>38</sup> Even some Loyalist boosters have criticized Tory conservatism. E.g., G. W. Ross, 'Some Characteristics of the United Empire Loyalists, and their Influence on Canadian History,' *The United Empire Loyalists Association of Ontario, Annual Transactions* (Toronto, March 1899), p. 38. For general criticisms see John Davidson in L. F. S. Upton, *The United Empire Loyalists: Men and Myths* (Toronto, 1967), pp. 162-172.

<sup>39</sup> Even Ryerson is ambivalent towards the Loyalists which befits his Dutch ancestry and Methodist faith. Until he reaches the Declaration of Independence he writes like a good Whig. See A. R. M. Lower, 'The United Empire Loyalists,' *The Loyalist Gazette*, VII (Spring 1969), 9.

<sup>40</sup> In 1908 Johnston, *Myths and Facts*, p. 25, quoted half a dozen Canadian school books which he said propagated the American 'myths.'

who the U. E. L. were and he quoted a Canadian teacher who instructed his class that the Loyalists were 'the curse of Canada' which 'had retarded its progress in every respect.'<sup>41</sup>

Canadian nationalism, which vitally influences the Loyalists' reputation, is compounded out of the wavering love-hate relationship Canada feels for the United States and Great Britain respectively. Thus the U. E. L. 'cult' began with the nationalism associated with the fear of the republic to the south during the Civil War period and exemplified by such incidents as the Fenian raids.<sup>42</sup> As for the British relationship, in 1872 a U. E. L. writer, bemoaning the Treaty of Washington of 1871, complained of 'a century of neglect' which made the sufferings of the Jacobites pale into insignificance and proclaimed the evaporation of the dream of a united empire.<sup>43</sup> The year 1883 saw great celebrations of the centennial of the Loyalist landing in New Brunswick, and centennial celebrations were held in 1884 in Ontario at Adolphustown, Toronto, and Niagara, but the cult did not come to fruition until the 1890s marked in 1895 by the founding of the Niagara Historical Society (which concentrated on Loyalist publications), and by the foundation of the first United Empire Loyalist Associations in Toronto and Nova Scotia in 1896 and 1897 respectively. In 1914 a Dominion-wide association was formed. There was much support for Britain during the Boer War which was soon accentuated by the deepening European crisis.

All this was the Canadian counterpart of the nationalism, Anglo-Saxonism and social Darwinism notable elsewhere.

<sup>41</sup>Justus A. Griffin, *The United Empire Loyalists* (n.p., n.d.), p. 1. Cf., F. C. Wade, 'The United Empire Loyalists,' *The Nineteenth Century and After*, XCVI (August, 1924), 280, who quotes a speaker of 1884: 'It must not be forgotten that all the advantages we have to-day we owe to our ancestors, the United Empire Loyalists.'

<sup>42</sup>In mid-century William H. Merritt, J. P. Merritt, George Coventry, and others 'created what has become known as the "Loyalist tradition" in Ontario by collecting Loyalist material and founding in 1861 the "Upper Canada Historical Society".' James J. Talman, 'Ontario: A Product of the American Revolution,' *The Loyalist Gazette*, VI (Autumn 1968), pp. 20-21.

<sup>43</sup>Robert G. Haliburton, *A Review of British Diplomacy* (London, 1872), pp. 2, 5, 7, 15.

World War I and its aftermath of disillusionment seems to have stunted further enthusiasm, the U. E. L. associations were moribund, there was a small Loyalist revival during World War II; during the 1960s the U. E. L. associations have been enjoying a slight revival, but a similar movement in historiography is not nearly so apparent as in the United States.

Loyalist history, like the Loyalists themselves at the time, and most American history, generally has been spurned by the British.\* The Loyalists have been an embarrassment to the Whig tradition of historiography<sup>44</sup> (which liked these losers no more than did its American counterpart), beginning with Burke and the *Annual Register* and given full-blown expression by Sir George Otto Trevelyan at the beginning of the twentieth century.<sup>45</sup> It is noteworthy that Burke, the great philosopher of conservatism, barely mentions the Loyalists in his writings.<sup>46</sup>

However, there have been some important pro-Loyalist statements from the British. In the nineteenth century both Adolphus and Lecky were fair to them.<sup>47</sup> In 1815 John Eardley-Wilmot published his account of the Claims Commission which is permeated by strong regrets for both the

\*In his comments Mr. Wright stressed this matter of the Loyalists being ignored by the British and was curious to know just why the Loyalists were not close to the British establishment of the day and had so little influence upon policy.

<sup>44</sup>John R. Green, *A Short History of the English People* (London, 1876) is a good example of the Whig view in which the Loyalists are simply absent.

<sup>45</sup>Ironically at the very time when Americans were viewing the Loyalists in a kindly light.

<sup>46</sup>James Grahame, *The History of the United States of North America*, 4 vols. (London, 1836), J. W. Fortescue, *A History of the British Army*, vol. 3 (London, 1902), Max Beloff ed., *The Debate on the American Revolution, 1761-1783* (London, 1949) are all examples of neglect of, or bias toward, the Loyalists. It is only fair to add that George M. Trevelyan in his *History of England* (London, 1952), pp. 553-554, 591-593 refers briefly but reasonably to the Loyalists. But J. H. Plumb, *England in the Eighteenth Century* (Baltimore, 1963) makes only one brief mention.

<sup>47</sup>John Adolphus, *The History of England, from the accession of King George the Third* (London, 1805), III, 387; William E. H. Lecky, *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1882), IV, 7-8, 9-10, 100, 264-268. Moses Coit Tyler used to recommend Lecky to his students as an antidote to chauvinism. See Michael Kraus, *The Writing of American History* (Norman, 1963), p. 243.

Revolutionary War and the hostilities of 1812, and a great sympathy for the Loyalists whom he had disliked at first but grown to admire during the years he had examined them.<sup>48</sup> A century later Henry Belcher was much more partisan in his aptly titled *The First American Civil War* (London, 1911) which violently took the Loyalist point of view. Shortly afterwards, in 1915, Hugh E. Egerton edited an important source, and in the process contributed a model introductory essay in which he invoked the old tag, 'tout comprendre est tout pardonner.'<sup>49</sup> Recently Piers Mackesy has dealt very expertly with the Loyalists in the War,<sup>50</sup> and we have even had an encomium for the 'Forgotten Loyalists' from that great individualist, Robert Graves,<sup>51</sup> and Upton, Evans and myself are Britishers who have written sympathetically about the Loyalists, but, significantly out of an American educational background.

The British tradition with its champion Chatham, its belief or rationalization that things worked out for the best in the American Revolution, and its shibboleth, 'the special relationship,' finds it much easier to make heroes of the American Patriots than the forgotten American Loyalists.

And now the question: Whither Loyalist research? The first call is for objectivity and no more apologies for the Loyalists. Loyalism must not be viewed as an aberration—even Sabine, Tyler, Nelson, and Benton are essentially *advocati diaboli*.<sup>52</sup> Typically a distinguished American colonialist reviewing Oliver's *Origin and Progress* writes: 'It is readily

<sup>48</sup>*Historical view of the Commission for Enquiring into the Losses . . . of the American Loyalists* (London, 1815).

<sup>49</sup>*The Royal Commission on the Losses and Services of the American Loyalists, 1783-1785* (Oxford, 1915), p. lii.

<sup>50</sup>*The War for America, 1775-1783* (London, 1964).

<sup>51</sup>*The Crane Bag and Other Subjects* (London, 1969), pp. 115-123, a rather damp squib from the great poet.

<sup>52</sup>More extreme is Vernon L. Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought: The Colonial Mind, 1620-1800* (New York, 1927) who is very scathing towards the Loyalists' alien philosophy (e.g., p. 194). Cf. Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America* (New York, 1955).



evident that his view of the coming of the Revolution was a very narrow one.<sup>53</sup> No doubt it was, but the same could be said of many patriot accounts. The distinction has too much been that there are sources (i.e. Whig) and tainted sources (i.e. Loyalist). Canadian scholars must avoid being overly filiopietistic as a recent excellent article on Bishop Charles Inglis' inflated reputation suggests.<sup>54</sup>

Historians apart I would say that the Loyalist tradition in Canada has been much more objective than the patriot tradition in America partly because the Loyalists contrived to think of Americans as close, if rather misguided, relatives, and many Loyalists continued ties with the United States and had their children educated there. Today the United Empire Loyalist Association is a much more level headed and sophisticated organization than the D. A. R. as a perusal of the rather fine *Loyalist Gazette* will readily show.

Few historians have seen the Tories in the context of the general question of loyalty from the seventeenth century to the present which is an aid to objectivity. In 1882 Theodorus B. Myers having rightly stressed the similarity between the English Revolution of the seventeenth century and the American Revolution added that at least Cavaliers and Roundheads were equally respected historically.<sup>55</sup> In 1891 James Hannay, in a popular pro-Loyalist article, noted that the American public was much more sympathetic to the expelled Acadians

<sup>53</sup>John Alden in the *William and Mary Quarterly*, XIII (January 1956), 126.

<sup>54</sup>Judith Fingard, 'Charles Inglis and his "Primitive Bishoprick" in Nova Scotia,' *Canadian Historical Review*, XLIX (September 1968), 247-266. Note too the inflated reputation of Sir Guy Carleton. See Paul H. Smith, 'Sir Guy Carleton, Peace Negotiations, and the Evacuation of New York,' *Canadian Historical Review*, L (September 1969), 245-264. As Mabel G. Walker pointed out many years ago Sir John Johnson has traditionally been overpraised by Canadian historians and severely censured by American historians. Justice, as the cliché has it, doubtless lies somewhere between the two extremes. Mabel G. Walker, 'Sir John Johnson, Loyalist,' *M.V.H.R.*, II (December 1916), 318, 346.

<sup>55</sup>*Tories or Loyalists*, p. 149. J. H. Elliott has written a very stimulating article which provokes thoughts about the eighteenth century: 'Revolution and Continuity in Early Europe,' *Past and Present* (February 1969), pp. 35-56.

(a comparatively minor event) than the exiled Loyalists,<sup>56</sup> and about the same time Douglas Sladen made the same point in a long poem, *Lester the Loyalist*, fittingly written in the same meter Longfellow used to romanticise the Acadians.<sup>57</sup> A merit of Hammond's study of the New Hampshire Tories was his point that *all* American wars, from the Revolution to the Spanish-American War, have had domestic opponents but that only the Loyalists went into permanent disgrace.<sup>58</sup> In a different way Evans' new collection attempts a broad approach to loyalty.

The second call is to integrate the Loyalists into our overall accounts of the Revolution which the various 'schools' of interpretation have failed to do, yet the Loyalists hover disconcertingly like Banquo's ghost. They have an obvious bearing on most of the debated questions of the Revolution which will be much less of an enigma when the Loyalists have been taken more fully into account.<sup>59</sup> Loyalist studies suffer from what one might term 'Siebertism'—i.e. a great deal of scattered material which has never been satisfactorily pulled together.

The third call is for a comparative approach:\* the Loyalists vis-à-vis Canada, the West Indies,<sup>60</sup> Sierra Leone,<sup>61</sup>

<sup>56</sup> 'The Loyalists,' p. 297.

<sup>57</sup> *Lester the Loyalist: A Romance of the Founding of Canada* (Tokio, 1890).

<sup>58</sup> Otis G. Hammond, *Tories of New Hampshire in the War of the Revolution* (Concord, 1917), pp. 51–52.

<sup>59</sup> One notes that neither contemporary Patriot nor Loyalist historians would agree with the 'consensus' approach. Loyalist historians have been scandalously neglected. See Merrill Jensen in *The Reinterpretation of Early American History* (San Marino, 1966), pp. 108ff.

\*Mr. Wright in his comments was happy about the mention of comparative approaches to Loyalism which the Program will make possible. He stressed that the need for all Loyalist sources to be made available is a primary need of scholarship.

<sup>60</sup> The Bahamas should be an important area of Loyalist study but neglected, partly it seems because the white Loyalists were not as permanent an addition to the population as in Canada. Perhaps the majority of white Loyalists deserted the islands with the failure of the cotton crop and the approach of emancipation. Today the Loyalist heritage is known but not much cultivated. There is a great need for research into the Loyalists (black and white) in the West Indies generally and the Bahamas in particular. The Floridas relevant here, have been studied. See Cecil Johnson, *British West Florida, 1763–1783* (New Haven, 1943) and Charles L. Mowat, *East Florida as a British Province, 1763–1784* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1948). For the West Indies see W. H. Siebert, *The Legacy of the American Revolution to the British West Indies and Bahamas*

Great Britain; and those Loyalists who remained in the United States.<sup>62</sup> In Canada, for example, the U. E. L. must not be studied *de novo*. The U. E. L. and the Loyalists of the revolting colonies must be viewed as two ends of the same worm. And there is scope for many such detailed comparative studies as New York City and St. John, or New Brunswick and Maine. Loyalist investigations can throw much light on such other societies as the British, West Indian, and others. In the case of British history we want to know the effect of the Loyalists on British policies, domestic and imperial, patronage, and the like.<sup>63</sup> Perhaps the comparative approach has to be extended to questions of Canadian and American nationalism, and following Palmer's excellent lead, comparisons between the French and the American Revolutions including perhaps parallels between the French peasant and the back-country farmer, the Vendée and the Floridas, the whole question of eighteenth-century conservatism. A com-

---

(Columbus, 1913); Michael Craton, *A History of the Bahamas* (London, 1962); Alan Burns, *History of the West Indies* (London, 1954); Thelma Peters, 'The American Loyalists in the Bahama Islands: Who They Were,' *Florida Historical Quarterly*, XXXX (January 1962), 226-240 and Thelma Peters, 'The Loyalists Migration from East Florida to the Bahama Islands,' *ibid.* (October 1961), 123-141; A Talbot Bethel, *The Early Settlers of the Bahama Islands*.

<sup>61</sup>Good work has been done on the Loyalist contribution to the history of Sierra Leone. See Christopher Fyfe, *A History of Sierra Leone* (London, 1962), pp. 31ff, and Arthur T. Porter, *Creolehood* (London, 1966), an interesting sociological study which analyses the influence of the black Loyalists on Freetown society. James Walker, a doctoral candidate in the History Department, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia is studying black Loyalists in Nova Scotia and Sierra Leone and a forthcoming book on the Negro in Canada by Robin Winks should be instructive. See also Wallace Brown, 'Negroes and the American Revolution.' Despite the existence a few years ago of the Settlers Descendants Union there seems to be no real Loyalist tradition alive in Sierra Leone today.

<sup>62</sup>L. F. S. Upton is now studying this question. See Oscar Zeichner, 'The Rehabilitation of the Loyalists in Connecticut,' *New England Quarterly*, XI (1938), and also 'The Loyalist Problem in New York After the Revolution,' *New York History*, XXI (1940).

<sup>63</sup>Mary Beth Norton of the University of Connecticut is completing a study of the Loyalists in England. See also Wallace Brown, 'American Loyalists in Britain,' *History Today*, XIX (October 1969), 672-678; Lewis Einstein, *Divided Loyalties: Americans in England during the War of Independence* (Boston, 1933); R. B. Mowat, *Americans in England* (Boston, 1935) and William L. Sachse, *The Colonial Americans in Britain* (Madison, 1956).

parative study of all the British colonies which did not rebel might prove fruitful.

The fourth call is for lots more detailed studies,\* such monolithic terms as Puritan, or Loyalist, being clearly outmoded. These should include biographies, motivational investigations (in the mass and in individual cases, the latter being well illustrated by a recent investigation of Sir Egerton Leigh by Weir and Calhoun),<sup>64</sup> geographical, occupational, and religious approaches, more on the effect of Loyalist confiscations, the return of the Loyalists to the United States, the fitting of the Loyalists into the story of the pre-Revolutionary decades,<sup>65</sup> and government patronage, intermarriage and social connections.

Local studies could go beyond Smith's excellent monograph in explaining the still curious Loyalist lack of organization and success. I would like to see more on the minorities—Negroes, Indians, and women. Can we penetrate the mind of the inarticulate, rank and file Loyalist? Is a Namier-style dictionary surpassing Sabine worthwhile? Do we actually know who the Loyalists were? And extremely important: was the American Revolution really without a 'Terror'? The story of Loyalist persecution\* has not yet been fully told.<sup>66</sup>

Finally there is tremendous scope for both broad and narrow Loyalist research in Canadian history. For all their apparent importance the extent and nature of the contributions of the Loyalists are still not really known especially as

\*On the matter of more monographs Mr. Shipton pointed out that the Program for Loyalist Studies and Publications was concerned first with 'the sources from which a later generation of scholars may arrive at the truth.'

<sup>64</sup>Robert M. Weir and Robert M. Calhoun, 'The Scandalous History of Sir Egerton Leigh,' *William and Mary Quarterly*, XXVI (January 1969), 47-74.

<sup>65</sup>Jack P. Greene, 'Changing Interpretations of Early American Politics,' in R. S. Billington ed., *Reinterpretations of Early American History*.

\*On this matter Mr. Shipton again demurred, noting that 'one of the most significant aspects of the American Revolution is the comparative humanitarianism with which both sides carried through,' primarily in New England.

<sup>66</sup>Gordon S. Wood, 'A Note on Mobs in the American Revolution,' *William and Mary Quarterly*, XXIII (October 1966), 635-642.

regards nationalism and the Canadian character.<sup>67</sup> In fact are the Loyalists of central importance in Canadian history or are they 'just another group of immigrants making their contribution to our cultural mosaic?'<sup>68</sup> More should be done in the provocative Hartz frame-work of 'fragmentation.'<sup>69</sup> Detailed studies of all kinds cry out for attention. For example despite pioneering work by Siebert the history of the Loyalists in Quebec, especially in the Eastern townships and the Gaspée remains to be written.

During the last decade the indications are that we can begin the long awaited assimilation of the Tories into American history. If I may make some personal comments: when I was a graduate assistant teaching a research seminar at Berkeley I was always faintly surprised that students evinced a fierce desire to study the Loyalists, being rightly conscious of the inadequacy of the standard textbook treatments. In 1962 I published a short article surveying the Loyalists in *History Today*. This was followed by an unexpected flood of letters from publishers in the United States and England to an obscure graduate student about a trade book. (Some even offered advances!) I think the Loyalists are now the beneficiaries of the general, even fashionable, concern for justice to minorities. To this can be added a note of masochism: several of the newspaper reviewers of my recent book have noted the striking parallel between the Vietnam War and the Revolutionary War,<sup>70</sup>

<sup>67</sup>For a beginning see: S. D. Clark, *Movements of Political Protest in Canada, 1640-1840* (Toronto, 1959); Frank H. Underhill, *In Search of Canadian Liberalism* (Toronto, 1960); Seymour Martin Lipset, *The First New Nation* (London, 1964); W. S. MacNutt, *New Brunswick, A History, 1784-1787* (Toronto, 1963).

<sup>68</sup>Shelton, 'U. E. L.', p. 5, whose words these are thinks not.

<sup>69</sup>See Kenneth D. McCrae, 'The Structure of Canadian History' in Louis Hartz ed., *The Founding of New Societies* (New York, 1964), and G. Horwitz, 'Conservatism, Liberalism, and Socialism in Canada: An Interpretation,' *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, XXXII (May 1966), 143-171, an article critical of Hartz-McCrae which nevertheless uses the 'fragment' approach. Like Lipset, but not as severely, Horwitz finds the difference between Tories and Patriots more pronounced than do Hartz and McCrae.

<sup>70</sup>Ho Chi Min himself was aware of the parallel it seems. See Ed Hotaling, 'The Ho Chi Min Story: Making of a President,' *The Village Voice* (July 17, 1969), pp. 5-6.

notably the misplaced confidence put in the allegedly large numbers of 'Loyalists.' As the Revolutionary bicentennial approaches I think that compared to the centennial we will get a much more objective 'warts and all' picture of the Revolution at both the scholarly and popular levels.

Already a good start has been made. We are enjoying a boom in Loyalist studies which dates from the publication in 1962 of William H. Nelson's meritorious *The American Tory*, and a scholarly edition of Peter Oliver's *Origin and Progress*.<sup>71</sup> Since then in chronological order we have had Upton's excellent edition of Smith's Diary (1963 and 1965), Callahan's two volumes (1963 and 1967), Smith's fine military study (1964), a reprint of one of the best state studies, Demond's *Loyalists of North Carolina*, Mathews, *Mark of Honour* (1965), a Canadian approach, an analysis of the Loyalist claimants, a reprint of Sabine's two volumes (1966), a good collection of documents on the United Empire Loyalists edited by Upton (1967) while 1968 saw documentary collections edited by Rawlyk and Upton respectively and the launching of the Loyalist Studies and Publications project. In 1969 we are getting a reprint of Jones' collection of Massachusetts material, Upton's biography of William Smith Jr., Evans' edition of Loyalist documents, and Benton's interesting intellectual history, *Whig Loyalism*. Samuel Curwen's delightful journal is coming back into print with a reissue by Da Capo of the earlier edition and, more importantly, there is now in the press at Harvard a new edition edited by Andrew Oliver, and this

<sup>71</sup>In the years just before two important reprints appeared: Sabine's *Historical Essay* (1957) and Van Tyne's *American Loyalists* (1959). In 1956 William H. W. Sabine edited the *Historical Memoirs of William Smith*, 2 vols. (New York, 1956) noting acidulously that he was forced by lack of a publisher to use a mimeograph format. Other books which might be mentioned include Arthur M. Schlesinger, *Prelude to Independence: The Newspapers War on Britain, 1764-1776* (New York, 1957) which deals well with the Loyalists and John Bakeless, *Turncoats, Traitors and Heroes* (Philadelphia and New York, 1959) which discusses spying and counterfeiting by both sides. It should be noted too that the *Harvard Guide to American History* (Boston, 1954) is dramatically better on the Loyalists than such earlier guides as Channing and Hart's (1896). John Alden's volume in the New American Series is also good on the Loyalists.

study is to be the first of the letterpress volumes of the Loyalist papers. I have not mentioned learned articles but there have been several stimulating ones.<sup>72</sup> And let us remember with gratitude that for many years the Loyalists have been alive and well in the pages of Clifford K. Shipton's *Biographical Sketches of Those Who Attended Harvard College*.<sup>73</sup>

If the backwards glance is rather bleak, the view forward at two hundred years is favorable. Something of a renaissance in Loyalist studies is now taking place and all indicates that the movement will grow.\* Perhaps the best augury is the projected Program for Loyalist Studies and Publications which brings me to my final delayed call. Loyalist sources from histories and pamphlets to private papers and diaries remain comparatively unexploited and untapped and it is these that the Program will make available.†

<sup>72</sup>Good articles include: Wallace Brown, 'Viewpoints of a Pennsylvania Loyalist,' *Pa. Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, XCI (October 1967), 419-433; Robert S. Lambert, 'The Confiscation of Loyalist Property in Georgia, 1782-1786,' *William and Mary Quarterly*, XX (January 1963), 80-94; Richard D. Brown, 'The Confiscation and Disposition of Loyalists' Estates in Suffolk County, Massachusetts,' *ibid.*, XXI (October 1964), 534-550; Beatrice G. Reubens, 'Pre-Emptive Rights in the Disposition of a Confiscated Estate, Philipsburgh Manor, New York,' *ibid.*, XXII (July 1965), 435-456; Eugene R. Fingerhut, 'Uses and Abuses of the American Loyalists' Claims: A Critique of Quantitative Analysis,' *ibid.*, XXV (April 1968), 245-258; Paul H. Smith, 'The American Loyalists: Notes on Their Organization and Numerical Strength,' *ibid.*, 259-277; T. W. Acheson, 'A Study in the Historical Demography of a Loyalist County,' *Social History* (Carleton University, April 1968), I, 53-65; Wallace Brown, 'The American Farmer During the Revolution: Rebel or Loyalist?' *Agricultural History*, XLII (October 1968), 327-338; Robert M. Calhoun, "'I Have Deduced Your Rights': Joseph Galloway's Concept of his Role, 1774-1775," *Pennsylvania History*, XXXV (October 1968), 356-378.

<sup>73</sup>One book not mentioned in the foregoing is Jack M. Sosin, *The Revolutionary Frontier, 1763-1783* (New York, 1967) which considers the Loyalists and has a good bibliography.

\*Mr. Wright noted two final reasons why the Loyalists should be the object of closer scholarly scrutiny. The first is that it is simply a matter of justice to the losers in that civil war, and the second is that the Program will assure that for the Loyalists the record of the past shall be a record of actuality.

†Mr. Brown's paper was followed by one by James E. Mooney, Editor of the American Antiquarian Society and Associate Director of the Program. This paper spoke of the origins and history of the Program, its international sponsorship, its plans to include in the edition the complete body of Loyalist thought and experience, and the mechanics of the Program.

Copyright of Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society is the property of American Antiquarian Society and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.