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ABSTRACT

In the second half of the eighteenth century, tensions ran high in the American colonies. The popular feeling was fervor for revolution against the British overlords. A large minority of colonists chose to remain loyal to the crown. As a result, the allegiances of the colonists split into different camps. While there was a group that was indifferent, the two larger groups felt very strongly about their cause. This caused brother to be against brother, husband against wife. The study makes use of both primary and secondary sources pertaining to the loyalist colonists. Why did these loyalists choose to remain loyal to the crown? Results are presented in chapters on (1) causes of the Revolution, (2) the loyalists who chose to remain on American soil and fight the patriots, (3) loyalists who chose to leave the colonies before the conflict, (4) the black loyalists, and (5) conclusions.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The residents of the British colonies in North America struggled with difficult decisions. One of these decisions was the question of loyalty to King George III. Many of the colonists were expatriates of Great Britain. During the eighteenth century, a large minority of the colonists in America refrained from joining the patriots or Whigs and remained loyal to the crown. This minority constituted from perhaps 20% to 33% of the total population. According to John Adams, one third of the colonists were loyal, one third rebel and one third neutral.¹ The members of this loyalist or Tory faction were comprised of three main groups. The first group remained on American soil and fought alongside the British troops and against the patriots. The second group chose to emigrate during the conflict. The third group, known as the black loyalists, consisted of slaves and black freedmen.

Many loyalists did not believe in the patriots' cause and joined ranks with the British and their German mercenary troops. They wanted to preserve their way of life in America and believed the best way to accomplish this was to help put down the revolution. They were valuable members of the royal army as they knew the
landscape as well as where patriot supplies were kept. They also were acquainted with (and sometimes related to) members of the patriot army and at times served as spies. After the war started, some of these families made arrangements that put members on both sides to ensure that the family would not lose.

Other loyalists chose to leave the tensions and persecutions of life as a Tory in the colonies. Many traveled to Nova Scotia and then moved to what are now the provinces of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. Others traveled further west to modern-day Ontario. Some moved to the western edge of the American colonies to what is now Tennessee and Kentucky. Still others returned to the homeland of their ancestors, England. What were their reasons for moving away from their homes and to the unknown?

The third and least known group was the black loyalists. These people were either black freedmen or slaves that were freed by British troops. Even though chattel slavery was legal in England there was not a tradition of it there so the British considered these people freemen. England, rather, had a tradition of indentured servitude. In this system, the servants became subjects to a master for a set period of time and were able to earn their freedom.
colonies, due to an insufficient number of indentured servants and the availability of black slaves from the Atlantic slave trade and the West Indies, chattel slavery became common in the colonies as a logical extension of indentured servitude. Some of these black loyalists emigrated to Canada while others moved to Jamaica or other islands in the West Indies. Another group moved to the west coast of Africa and founded Freetown, in Portuguese Sierra Leone.

A complete study of the British Loyalists during the Revolutionary War will require the study of sources concerning the causes of the war and their consequences. This will show why some of the colonists chose to remain loyal to the crown.

In 1776, Thomas Paine wrote the pamphlet Common Sense. This pamphlet explained in Paine’s words why it was unnatural for America to have a king. James Chalmers countered this in his pamphlet Plain Truth. Chalmers contended that Paine was just publishing “Insidious Tenets” and that the true evil was democracy.

Gordon Wood’s The Radicalism of the American Revolution delves into the philosophies of American society leading up to the war. He depicts American society as a collection of feudal dependencies, a system of patronage and a culture separating the nobility and
the commoners. Bernard Bailyn’s *Faces of Revolution* is a book divided into chapters about various persons who were involved in the American Revolution. Bailyn’s contentions are that the Revolution was a result more of a clash of personalities and that the Revolution could have been avoided.

Barbara DeWolfe edited *Discoveries of America*, a collection of letters written by British emigrants to North America during the time leading up to the Revolution. These letters describe the thoughts and intentions of these émigrés including their search for opportunity, security, prosperity, independence and a better future. All of these were a challenge to the British authorities.

Edward Countryman’s *Americans: A Collision of Histories* delves into the psyche of the peoples of 18th century America. Countryman’s presentation of the loyalists includes those who gained from the patronage system and remained loyal because of their personal gains. He also describes black loyalists as a group who were loyal to the crown because they saw this as a means to escape slavery.

In *Divided Loyalties: How the American Revolution Came to New York*, Richard Ketchum describes the lives of two prominent New York families during the years leading
up to the American Revolution. One family remained loyal to the crown while the other was patriot. Again, this source provides the views from both sides of the conflict.

The British loyalists lead a precarious life during the conflict. Claude Van Tyne’s *The Loyalists in the American Revolution* contains descriptions of the lives of loyalists who stayed in America. Van Tyne covers both combatants and supporters. In *Generous Enemies*, Judith Van Buskirk describes the interactions of loyalists and patriots. Some of these interactions involve family members from opposite sides meeting during the conflict. Christopher New’s *Maryland Loyalists in the American Revolution* focuses on the loyalists on Maryland’s Eastern Shore and their military service.

*Eleven Exiles* is a collection of biographies of eleven loyalists during the war. These accounts detail why these loyalists made their decisions to stay in America. *The Durie Family* covers the lives of family members during the war. Durie goes into detail about families divided and torn apart because of the conflict and discusses families that split before the war with, in some cases, the husband fighting as a patriot and the wife moving to Canada. In *Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution* Gregory Palmer
expands on Lorenzo Sabine’s work of the same name from 1864 and includes biographies of over 1,000 loyalists. The Chronicles of Canada includes a volume titled The United Empire Loyalists, A Chronicle of the Great Migration. In this work, the author discusses the loyalists and how the patriots treated them during the war, why they left and the founding of the British colonies in the Canadian Maritimes as well as Ontario and Quebec.

Many loyalists chose to leave America during the conflict. The authors of The Loyal Refugees discuss the lives of loyalists who chose to move to what we now call Canada during the war. These “new” colonies include Upper Canada (Ontario) as well as Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Moore expands in The Loyalists: Revolution, Exile, Settlement with details of where these loyalists came from. He also includes the backgrounds of these loyalists. Both books include details on where the loyalists settled in Canada.

Maryland Loyalists in the American Revolution covers loyalists who left America before and during the war. In this book, M. Christopher New also discusses the new colonies of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, which were originally part of Nova Scotia, that were populated almost solely by loyalists.
A large and forgotten group of loyalists is the black loyalists. The Black Loyalists: The Search for a Promised Land in Nova Scotia and Sierra Leone, 1783-1870\textsuperscript{20} covers the history of the black loyalists including their origins and their search for a new homeland. The Black Loyalist Directory: African Americans in Exile After the American Revolution\textsuperscript{21} contains a record of the black loyalists, escaped slaves and free blacks who joined the British army during the American Revolution. In Moving On: Black Loyalists in the Afro-Atlantic World (Crosscurrents in African American History),\textsuperscript{22} John W. Pulis explores the lives, struggles and politics of black loyalists who dispersed throughout Canada, Britain, Jamaica and Sierra Leone. From Slavery to Freetown: Black Loyalists After the American Revolution\textsuperscript{23} follows the trail of black loyalists as they moved from Virginia and the Carolinas to their new home in Nova Scotia and then on to Sierra Leone. An unclouded day: A brief account of the black loyalists\textsuperscript{24} gives details of the lives of black loyalists after their arrival in Nova Scotia including their new trades. The Life of Boston King\textsuperscript{25} contains the autobiography of Boston King, a black loyalist as well as commentary by the editors.

In American Slavery,\textsuperscript{26} Kolchin discusses the activities of then Virginia Governor John Murray, Earl of
Dunmore, who offered freedom to black slaves in exchange for bearing arms against the revolutionaries. The book also covers the British victories in the southern colonies. These victories led to some blacks allying themselves with the loyalists. The editors of *Slavery in American Society* have collected essays that discuss how some of the patriots were conflicted about the revolution because it was only for the whites and how some of them had loyalist sympathies because the British were pro-abolition.

Bernard Bailyn also wrote *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* and *To Begin the World Anew*. *Ideological Origins* is a detailed study of the philosophies and inspirations of the leaders of the American Revolution. In *To Begin the World Anew*, Bailyn analyzes the thought processes of several of the early American leaders and some of the documents that they wrote, including the *Federalist Papers*.

In his book, *King George III*, John Brooke discusses the thoughts of King George III and the reasons behind his directives to the colonies.

Why did these colonists choose to remain loyal to the crown? It was in their self-interest to remain so. Benjamin Franklin’s illegitimate son William Franklin was appointed as a governor by the crown. He would lose this
status if the colonies became independent. Wealthy merchants used their personal contacts in England for their business connections. They stood to lose these personal contacts if the colonies left. The black slaves were offered personal freedom if they joined the loyalist cause. These three groups had a considerable amount to lose if independence from England was successful and therefore they went to war to maintain the colonial status quo that stood to benefit the loyalists in many various ways.

The lessons to be learned are why the loyalists made these choices and what their thoughts behind these various choices were. These were difficult decisions made by determined people during a turbulent time.
CHAPTER 2

CAUSES OF THE REVOLUTION

The best way to understand the loyalists' attitudes during the Revolution is to look at the underlying causes of the Revolution. Various scholars over the years produced their own theories about the Revolution and why the colonists wanted to leave the royal umbrella. These theories include social issues (the status of the colonial gentry versus the English gentry), economic pressures, corruption and personality conflicts. Bernard Bailyn sums it up by stating, "American resistance in the 1760s and 1770s was a response to acts of imperial power deemed arbitrary, degrading and uncontrollable...." 

Social Issues

For the first 150 or so years of the existence of the colonies in America, the crown left the American colonists to their own devices. The political climate in England changed under King George III. The King and Parliament began managing the colonies closely. The colonists established their own system of landed gentry, and recent acts by Parliament threatened the status and
wealth of this home-grown aristocracy. These acts by the King and Parliament upset this colonial order and threatened to take away the colonists’ influence and supposed independence. Under the direction of King George III, Parliament enforced British law in America and took a more active role in the running of the colonies. Edward Countryman states that, “the American Revolution began because Britain’s rulers decided to reform their empire.”

The revolution started as a revolt against unwanted change from quasi-independence to strong direct rule from London. The colonists were satisfied with the status quo and rejected forced change by King George III. The crown was too far away to make its presence felt. There was little sense of royal majesty in the colonies. Since this authority was so far removed and had left the colonists to their own devices for so long, the colonists were not prepared to accept an assertion of this royal authority after 1763.

Another social issue in the 18th century was that there was a belief that there was a conspiracy to rid the colonies of Presbyterianism. This conspiracy theory was mentioned in a speech to the House of Lords in 1770, when Lord Chancellor Camden accused the ministry “of having
formed a conspiracy” against the colonists. Jonathan Mayhew (a colonial radical of the 18th century) wrote in 1763 that an arm of the Anglican church “long had a formal design to root out Presbyterianism, etc., and to establishing both episcopacy and bishops.” Bailyn states that there was a, “latent danger of an active conspiracy of power against liberty.”

The colonists based their ideas of liberty on this concept of electing government officials as opposed to them being nominated by the crown. These Presbyterian concepts established by John Knox (a 16th century theologian) were followed by the secular concepts of a republic espoused by Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau.

There was no supreme church leadership in America. The presiding Anglican bishop was in London. This meant no real concept of supreme leadership of the king. The king appointed the Archbishop of Canterbury who nominated all of the bishops. This conspiracy theory went on to discuss that an arm of the Anglican Church was working to rid America of Presbyterianism and establish episcopacy with British bishops. The theory was that the Archbishop was planning to appoint bishops to America to both
strengthen the Anglican Church there and to weaken the Presbyterian and Congregational churches.\textsuperscript{38} Once the Anglican bishops took over religion in America, the crown would have a better footing and liberty would be lost forever.

The colonists inherited a form of republicanism from the English. Republicanism already existed in England but it had become corrupt. The members of Parliament were no longer voted based on what their constituents wanted. When Parliament was first conceived under Magna Carta, the members were required to vote according to the wishes of their constituencies. In the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, they were free to vote their own conscience which, more often than not, was to serve their own self interests. The revolutionists saw that it their duty as “purifying a corrupt constitution, eliminating courtiers, fighting off crown power, and, most important, becoming republicans.”\textsuperscript{39} What turned royal power into a wicked force was not its own character so much as the nature of man and his susceptibility to corruption and his lust for self-aggrandizement. It was “the incapacity of mankind to withstand the temptations of power”\textsuperscript{40} that was the root cause of this corruption of the crown. The colonists
accused King George III himself of being corrupt with power.

The critics and intelligentsia who summoned republican principles and attitudes were opposed to the values and systems of the dominant monarchial world. The framers of the Declaration of Independence wanted to ameliorate and invigorate their society. The high ratio of freeholders in America proved to be a society naturally made for republicanism. The colonists were ready for the legal recognition of their natural rights and the elimination of the practices and institutions of the ancient English regime. The colonists saw that in order to preserve their liberty, they had to maintain an effective check on those in power. King George III himself epitomized this feeling of absolute corruption at the top when he wrote, “the pride, the glory of Britain, and the direct end of its Constitution is political liberty.”\(^\text{41}\) According to Thomas Paine, George III was the villain of the “piece”\(^\text{42}\) because he wanted to suppress freedom. King George III’s idea of freedom was to abolish the Constitution. He wanted to end the freedoms that were expressed in the Constitution.
Economic Issues

In 1763, the king and ministers decided to make the white colonists pay for the protection of governance of the colonies. This would be on the King’s terms, not the colonists’. Parliament stated that it could tax the colonists despite never having done so previously. These taxes included the Sugar Act of 1764, the Stamp Act of 1765 and the Townshend Taxes beginning in 1767. These taxes culminated in 1773 when Parliament taxed tea to subsidize the East India Company. Because of this subsidy, tea from the East India Company cost less than that of colonial merchants. Even though these acts were imposed by the will of the King, they were enacted by Parliament.

England also stifled free trade of certain goods including tea, hats, and refined iron. The colonists could only sell these goods directly to England and not other nations such as France and Spain. The English would then sell these products to others at a profit. Likewise, the colonists were required to buy these goods only from England. Through this process, the English were able to set the prices for the raw materials and
products sold by the colonists and the English products sold to the colonists.

There was no mass poverty or severe oppression in the colonies. However, the colonists saw their way of life ending. The Crown and ministry had left the colonists alone to conduct their business as they deemed proper until the late 18th century. The Crown was now enforcing laws that infringed on this liberty of free trade.

In *Faces Of Revolution*, Bailyn states that,

Then in the 1760s and 1770s, when the colonists believed themselves faced, not as heretofore with local threats but with an organized pan-Atlantic effort of highly placed autocrats to profit by reducing the free way of life that the colonists had known – a “design” set on foot by manipulators of the colossus “at home” they were led by the force of these ideas, reinforced by suddenly articulated views of the imperial constitution and by the latest formulations of the English radicals, into resistance and revolution.\(^{43}\)
The colonial economy was being endangered. The organizers of the Stamp Act resistance (1765) knew that their economic successes, including the lack of unemployment and poverty, were at stake as much as their historic practice and liberty of self taxation. Small revolts continued through the Boston Tea Party in 1773.

**Corruption**

Another issue was corruption in the colonial government. Governor Thomas Hutchinson of Massachusetts was considered by many to be the epitome of corruption. It was believed that Hutchinson was in concert with the “gang in Whitehall” to oppress the colonists. It was believed that this long-respected scion of generations of enterprising New England leaders had intentionally misinformed the British ministry on the intentions and opinions of the colonists in order to advance his personal interests the ministry.

This perception was compounded by the fact that the Hutchinson family was almost exclusively responsible for royal authority in Massachusetts in the 1760s. This family held a monopoly on public office. John Adams was not interested in any public office that Governor
Hutchinson might offer to him in Massachusetts because he felt that any such offer would have too many strings attached. He thought that by taking the position he would entail a compromise of his ethics, “a sacrifice of my honor, my conscience, my friends, my country, my God.” Adams was not the only colonial to have considered Hutchinson corrupt.

Josiah Quincy, Jr. believed that all of the actions taken against America were proposed and advocated by Governors Hutchinson and Sir Francis Bernard. Bernard was Hutchinson’s patron. These sentiments were echoed by John Wilkes and John Dickenson as well. They all considered Governor Hutchinson to have been a puppet of a power mad ministry in England. These colonists equated getting rid of the monarchy to getting rid of patronage and corruption.

Personality Issues

A modern look at the causes of the American Revolution has revealed that perhaps the Revolution was caused more by a clash of personalities than any real social or economic basis. The revolution was not only about self-rule in the colonies, but also who was to
rule. It mattered to the colonists who was in charge, who led the struggle against the Crown. The American aristocracy felt that the English establishment did not properly respect them.

George Washington knew that his holdings were far less than his English counterparts were. At first, he was not looking for revolution, just recognition. George Washington’s status was “roughly equal to the better sort of yeomanry in England.”\textsuperscript{49} If Washington and his peers had the respect of British aristocracy that they desired they would have risen in status but not become heroes of a revolution. They wanted the status and respect of the English gentry and senior military officers. Likewise, John Adams wanted to be able to make a name for himself. The colonial aristocracy was never as well established, as wealthy, or as dominant as that in Britain.

The colonists saw themselves acting only as good Englishmen should when they resisted tyranny. The Revolution started as a notables’ revolt. The colonists faced many intellectual problems but were critical in the last analysis. Because of the fact that the break from England was violent and radical meant that in important ways, it was the product of human decision and of the
impact of personalities and ideas upon the events of the time.
There were several reasons why the Tories chose to remain loyal to the Crown. They saw the rebels’ cause as “miseries attendant on anarchy and tyranny.” One was that the Crown had been good to them. Scores of loyalists were the gregarious acquaintances of those in real positions of power and depended on them for their assumed status. Many considered what the rebels were doing to be anarchy and preferred the peace and security of the Crown.

Another large group was the Anglican clergy who had taken an oath of loyalty. These were followed by the religious Tories whose motto was “Fear God and honor the King.” There were also the conservatives who depended on the above groups for their own personal gain. Some were recent immigrants who received protection from the crown. Another group was the rural small landowners who had nothing to gain but everything to lose by the rebels’ actions.

These groups, whose membership sometimes overlapped, had a common goal; they wanted to continue the status
quo. They did not see any social or economic conditions intolerable enough to break away from England.

Backcountry Landowners

In the lower colonies of North and South Carolina and Georgia, the coastal landowners were against the Crown and any actions against their liberty and independence. They were resistant to any British authority.\textsuperscript{51} These larger landowners sought to impose their wills and ideals upon the smaller backcountry landholders. The backcountry landholders and settlers, on the other hand, needed the backing of a strong authority that could assist and protect them against the coastal aggressors.

The rural and inland leaders were against any expression of hostility towards Britain and the empire or submission to the coastal landowners. These leaders considered the efforts of the seaboard gentry as infuriating and seditious.\textsuperscript{52} They decided to form a local congress to find a plan of accommodation between Britain and the colonies. They were against any form of anarchy.

One of the landowners elected to the South Carolina congress was Moses Kirkland. He possessed a considerable
fortune and was held in a very high regard. The people elected him, as well as other backcountry landowners such as Thomas McKnight and Dr. Lewis Johnson, to this congress as sympathizers to royal power. These loyalists were friends of the traditional government and did not believe that this government was “broken and in need of fixing.”\textsuperscript{53}

James Allen was a backcountry landowner in Pennsylvania. With his father’s assistance, he acquired a thriving estate at rural Northampton (now Allentown). He was well connected as his brother-in-law was Governor John Penn. He was also against the anarchy proposed by the rebels and his opposition to them was from a pacifist perspective. His loyalist passivism cost him in the end because the remainder of his family joined the revolt.

The Mohawk Valley of New York was settled mainly by Highlanders and former British officers.\textsuperscript{54} As in the uplands of Georgia and the Carolinas, they were secluded from the politics of the coast and saw no need for the rebellion. Their life was good and they did not have any cause to rebel against the crown. They were monarchists who loved peace and order as opposed to the anarchy that the republicans called liberty and independence.
Another group of backcountry loyalists were the religious pacifists. These included the Quakers and Mennonites of Pennsylvania. Their religions taught them to avoid conflict at any cost. “Since colonial times when the first Mennonites arrived in Pennsylvania, conflict has forced confrontation and compromise between colonial militias and pacifist Mennonite settlers.” In 1777 the rebels changed the law to force these pacifists to support the war by choosing between hiring substitutes, supplying non-military support or paying fines and special war taxes. The majority chose the protection of the British.

Fear God and Honor the King

One of these groups of loyalists had a pious ring to their reason for remaining faithful to the crown. This group includes both the Anglican clergy and their dedicated followers. Since the king was the head of the Anglican Church, he was the superior to all of the clergy. It was part of their job to obey the King and serve him unquestionably.

An Anglican clergyman took an oath of loyalty to the king as part of his ordination. If he were to speak or
act against the king, he would be breaking his oath to God. In like manner, the parish priest would tell his flock that loyalty to the king had God’s stamp of approval. To be a good Christian (Anglican) was equated to being a good and loyal follower and supporter of the king. Rebellion against the king was akin to blasphemy.

Most of the loyalists in Maryland lived on the Eastern Shore. The plantation owners, dirt farmers, and fishermen were faithful church goers. On Sundays, virtually every priest would encourage his parishioners to remain loyal to the crown. This had a strong effect and most of the residents of the Eastern Shore remained loyalists.

The Reverend Jonathan Boucher of the Eastern Shore preached loyalty to the crown fervently. He believed in the “divine right of kings” and that “families on earth were subjected to rulers, at first set over them by God copying after the fair model of heaven itself, wherein there was government among the angels.” He considered the rebels and their cause to be sacrilege and did whatever he could to counter them.

Reverend William Edmondston of Cecil County, Maryland went a step further. In addition to preaching
loyalty to the crown from the pulpit, he published and circulated pamphlets asking people to continue their allegiance to the British government.\textsuperscript{58} Even though these men of the cloth were pressured by the rebels to recant and cease their loyalist teachings, they continued to support the crown.\textsuperscript{59} Even though there was no bishop in America, these men remained faithful to their calling.

These Anglican priests were chosen by the British government for their posts in America. They were also paid by this same British government. These “clergy received the support of the landowners and substantial businessmen, the men who were satisfied with the existing order of things.”\textsuperscript{60}

Other Anglican churchmen such as President Myles Cooper of King’s College, Samuel Seabury\textsuperscript{51} and Thomas Bradbury Chandler were insistent advocates of having an Episcopal bishop in the American colonies. They were very active in church affairs in New York. They were intimately involved in the struggle between the Anglican Church and the rebels.

John Howe, Sr. was a loyalist Christian, but he did not belong to the Anglican Church. He in fact belonged to a small Protestant sect known as the “Sandamanians.”
This group had a theology very similar to the Mennonites but differed in one very important aspect. One of their teachings was “Fear God and honor the King.” He was a staunch adherent to his principles supporting the king. He took his religious beliefs to the extreme and he even spied for the crown during the war.

These religious men kept to their convictions during this time of crisis. For some it was truly a religious conviction. For others, perhaps it was just expedient to follow their employer’s wishes to maintain their income and status.

Peace and Security versus Anarchy and Tyranny

Many colonists chose the course of loyalty because they preferred the way things were. Loyalty was the normal condition. The state that had existed and did exist was the British monarchy. It was the Patriots through their seditious meetings and anarchy that were the problem. Life was well structured, government was well structured and they were secure. This security was both a physical security with the British protecting them against violence from enemies and also a protection of
their way of life. They disliked the anarchy and chaos being promoted by the rebels.

Alexander MacDonald was an immigrant from Scotland. He had served as a lieutenant in Montgomery’s 77th Regiment of Foot in the French and Indian War. He retained his commission after the war and remained a staunch loyalist. In 1772 he was promoted to the rank of captain. “He found anything tainted with disloyalty odious” and “he expressed contempt and horror for actual rebellion.” He preferred order over disorder and security over anarchy. He was so compelled to enforce the king’s order, that in 1774 he headed up the Hudson River to recruit others and form a regiment of loyal Highland veterans. He was able to recruit over 100 volunteers for this purpose.

Samuel Curwen was a Harvard educated, successful businessman in Salem, Massachusetts. In addition to his business ventures, he held the public offices of Justice of the Peace and as a deputy in the Vice-Admiralty court of Massachusetts. He had served as a captain for the British in the French and Indian War. He preferred peace and order over social disturbance. He supported the established government which he felt could maintain
order. He saw the rebels as a threat to orderly society. He thought that the rebels “broke free from all restraints of law and religion.” He was content with society as it was and saw no threat from parliament to his liberty. The only threat he saw was from the anarchy of the rebels.

Another of the loyalists that preferred the security of the British government was Samuel Durie. He was a miller in Tappan, New York. He was opposed to the anarchy of the rebels. He tacitly supported the British forces with supplies from his mill. Because of this, the rebels confiscated his property and caused him to flee to New York City where he met up with the rest of his family. The loyalists were marked as traitors and their property was confiscated.

William Schurman was of a slightly different bent. He understood the ideals of the rebel leaders, but despised mob rule and anarchy. He also deplored the British autocracy, but enjoyed its benevolence. He was an example of the fence sitter loyalist. He strove to remain neutral.

David Durie of Bergen County, New Jersey was a landholder with “160 acres of land, 5 horses, 5 horned
cattle, 4 hogs, a slave, and a pleasure wagon." In September 1775 he was elected as a member of the Bergen County Committee of Observation and Correspondence. This committee was responsible for handling county affairs and carrying out the resolutions and orders of the Continental Provincial Congress. This congress of New Jersey was formed to replace the local legislature that had been disbanded by the royal governor. He and many other members of this committee were not supporters of the rebel cause. These farmers were for the most part prosperous and did not wish to be involved with anarchy which would upset their established way of life. In July 1777 he was arrested with several others, including his brother-in-law John Banta.

In his famous pamphlet, Common Sense, Thomas Paine explained his opinion that the concept of a monarchy was contrary to natural law and it was against all of the teachings of God in the Bible. In fact, he considered the concept of a monarchy a sin. James Chalmers, a wealthy landowner, wrote his own pamphlet to dispute Paine’s assertion. In Plain Truth Chalmers claimed that republics were prone to violence and disorder as opposed to the peace and security of the monarchy. He claimed
ancient republics such as Rome and Greece were always at war, either civil or with a foreign power. “This beautiful system our constitution is a compound of Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy.”73 He felt that the government that God wanted them to have was the one they did have.

The Germans and the Indians

There were two other groups who were loyalists, but were not originally British settlers. One group was the German immigrants who recently came from the German Palatinate. Another was the Native American Indians, primarily of the Mohawk Valley. Both had their own reasons for being loyalists. Even though they were not British, they favored the British government over that of the Rebels.

In the mid 18th century, many Germans migrated from the Palatinate to escape the war-torn countryside of Bavaria. The British crown arranged for their flight and consequent trip to America. Because of this support, many of them remained loyal during the Revolution. A second reason that they remained loyal was that the British monarch, George III, was actually German. The
King’s father, Frederick, Prince of Wales, his mother, Princes Augusta of Saxe-Gotha and his grandfather, George II, were all born in Germany.

Many of the Six Nations Indians in the Mohawk Valley were also loyalists. The Mohawk war chief, Joseph Brant, was a longtime loyal supporter of the British. The Indian Superintendent, Sir William Johnson, was very popular with the natives because of his support of the Indians in the French and Indian War. William Johnson’s wife, Molly Brant (Joseph Brant’s sister), adopted her husband’s politics.

William Johnson died after suffering a stroke on July 11, 1774. After her husband’s death, Molly continued his work of supporting the Six Nations Indians and the British government. She was an ardent loyalist. She believed that it was her duty to council her people to support the king and to remain loyal. Her son, Peter Warren Johnson, was a lieutenant in the king’s army. Her step-son, Sir John Johnson, was a captain in the Albany Militia and followed his father’s footsteps as being a leader and defender for the Six Nation Indians, guiding them to follow the crown.
Hedge Your Bets

There are stories of many families that were separated by the Revolution. These stories tell of brother fighting against brother. The Key family appears to be an example of this situation. Philip Barton Key was a captain with the Maryland Loyalists while his brother, John Ross Key (father of Francis Scott Key), was an officer in the Continental Army.\textsuperscript{78} The difference was they had a special agreement. These brothers were not each other’s opponents. The family wanted to hedge its bet on the outcome of the Revolution. By having family members on both sides of the conflict, no matter which side was the victor, the other would not be at the mercy of the victor. “If the Americans won, a Continental officer would have the needed influence to keep his loyalist family members out of harm’s way. The same would be true if the British won.”\textsuperscript{79} Other families made similar agreements. These included John and William Sterling who joined with the Maryland Loyalists as officers while Henry and Isaac Sterling enlisted with the Rebels.\textsuperscript{80}
Business Ties

One group of loyalists was not particularly political. Their loyalty was based on the politics of their employers. They were either recent indentured workers or worked directly for a company in Britain. James Whitelaw and David Allen were leaders of a group of immigrants from Paisley, Scotland. They settled in Ryegate, New York. These pioneers were indentured to the Scots American Company of Farmers and were dependent on the company for their support. They were required to account for how the company monies were spent. In a letter back to the parent company, James Whitelaw wrote, “We now conclude with sending you an account of the way and manner we have used your money.” These people were loyalists for pure economic reasons.

Another settler from Paisley was Hugh Simm. He immigrated to New Jersey. He kept close ties to his friends and family back in Scotland. He even encouraged them to join him in America. Due to his ties to those still in Scotland, he was offered the position of quartermaster in the Loyal American Regiment. Again, he was loyal because of the direct support he received from those still in Britain.
John Campbell was another merchant immigrant. He was a representative of the merchant firm Findlay, Hopkins and Company of Glasgow, Scotland. His loyalty to the crown was also based on the fact that he was the Scottish representative for his company in America. He had planned on staying in America only briefly, but because of business stayed for five years.\textsuperscript{84}

One more business immigrant was George Ogilvie. He came to South Carolina to manage his uncle’s plantation. He was so successful, he was able to buy his own farm land. Again, because of his close family ties in Scotland and London, he remained a staunch loyalist.\textsuperscript{85} He was often lonely and homesick for Scotland. He refused to take the Oath of Abjuration required by the Rebels, so he was banished from South Carolina and returned home to Scotland.

I’m Loyal Because the Crown is Good to Me

The people in colonial government had been appointed to their offices by the Crown. These colonial officials included royal councilors, militia generals, judges of the highest courts, lieutenant governors, and governors. In addition to their salaries, they were paid various
fees and given land grants. Their livelihood and status depended on them remaining loyal.

One of the most powerful loyalist families was the DeLanceys. They were friends of the Archbishop of Canterbury. One of their daughters even married into the British aristocracy. If they chose to side with the rebels, they would lose their status, power and position. In short, if they decided not to be loyalists, they would lose everything.

John Banta served as a captain in the Bergen County Militia during the French and Indian War. Due to receiving this commission from the crown, he was able to extend his land holdings to “370 acres plus 25 acres woodland.” For this financial consideration, he remained loyal during the Revolution.

Another settler that gained financially from his attachment to the crown was Francis Green. He served in various theaters with the British army as an officer until 1766. For his loyal service, he was granted “2032 acres in addition to the 240 he already owned.” He owed his fortune to the King. He adhered to the British Constitution in the desire of an honorable compromise without violence or call to arms to settle the dispute
with the rebels. He displayed an unmistakable attachment to the British Government, and vigorously opposed the rise of the rebellion in America. There were many other former officers who were veterans of the French and Indian War who remained loyal for this reason.

One of the wealthy merchant fleet owners in America at the time of the Revolution was Joseph Durfee. His shipping business was based in Rhode Island. His fleet would take lumber and fish from Rhode Island and sail to the West Indies to sell it. They would then buy rum and molasses which were then taken to London. These goods would then be traded for other commodities which would then be sold in Boston and other colonial cities. He earned his riches under the King and was against the anarchy of the rebels. He served as a lieutenant for the King in the Revolution.89

Another category of loyalist was not one that directly made his fortunes from the king, but rather as a protégé of the landed aristocracy. Ward Chipman, Sr. was one of these. His mentor and benefactor was Jonathan Sewall, who was a political rival of John Adams. Chipman became a strong loyalist following in the footsteps of Sewall. He even signed the Loyal Petition to General
Gage.\textsuperscript{90} In 1777 he was given the position of Deputy Muster-Master General of His Majesty’s Provencial Forces for New York. He was paid very well (£500 per annum) in this post.\textsuperscript{91} He was able to indulge himself in a lifestyle that suited his social position. His circle of friends included many influential loyalists in addition to Sewall. Since he prospered because of his loyalty to the King, he remained a defender of the crown.

By far the strongest reason many remained loyal to the crown was because of personal financial gain and social status. It was in their self interest to remain loyal. They had a considerable amount to lose if independence from England was successful and therefore they went to war to maintain the colonial status quo that stood to benefit the loyalists in many various ways.
CHAPTER 4

LOYALISTS WHO STAYED DURING THE CONFLICT

There were many loyalists who chose to remain in America during the Revolutionary War. They had various reasons for staying during this dangerous time. Some stayed as a matter of principle. They considered that “defending the empire and all it represented meant defending their personal honor.” Others were forced to move to the relative safety of New York City to wait out the war. Perhaps the largest group was those who took up arms against the rebellion.

For King and Honor

One loyalist who stayed to defend the empire and his honor was Samuel Hale of Portsmouth, New Hampshire. He thought himself to have been “cool and consistent.” He believed that the rebels were misguided and needed correction. He attempted to show the colonists that their congress was inferior to Parliament. He felt it was his duty to “point out to them the connection they all had with the supreme legislature and their necessary dependence.” He accepted as true the notion that the
colonies could not survive alone and needed to be part of the empire. He stayed behind to try to convince the rebels to give up their cause.

William Smith was a well-known New York loyalist politician. He could not accept American independence. He was very outspoken against the rebels and their cause during the war. He stood by the sides of the likes of loyalist Governor William Tryon and Sir Guy Carleton, the British commander in New York.

Another of those who stayed was Francis Green. He was a former British army officer. He served in the French and Indian War. He left the active ranks of the British army in 1766 and retired to his land holdings. He condemned the lawless destruction of property by the rebels. He remained loyal to the crown because while he was an army officer he had taken an oath of loyalty to the King “which must be obeyed.”

Others including Massachusetts attorney-general Jonathan Sewall, customs collector Isaac Hubbard of Stamford, Connecticut, and postman Bart Stavers, considered defending the Crown and all that it stood for to be defending themselves and their own principles. Many loyalist commoners also stayed to defend what they
considered right. They stayed in the colonies as long as they could in the face of danger and personal abuses for the cause of “King and Country.”

The Safety of New York City

Many loyalists fled their native homes for the safety and comfort of New York City during the war. They were abused, fined, jailed, and harassed by the rebels. Some had their property confiscated. They took flight to the royal stronghold where the British could best protect them.

John Durie and his wife Sarah lived in rural Bergen County, New Jersey. They were declared “Tories” for giving aid and support to the British troops. They were arrested and fined for this activity of following their conscience. They were forced to flee to New York City to escape this persecution.

Well-to-do families such as the DeLanceys were also forced to move to New York City during the conflict. They were well connected with the Royal family and church leadership in England. Because of their status, they were considered a threat to the rebels. Not only was their loyalty considered a problem, they had the means to
significantly assist the British forces and the cause of the crown.\textsuperscript{103}

The merchants of New York City controlled most of the trade with Britain. As this was the only legal trade, they therefore controlled most of the trade of the colonies with the outside world. They had many loyalist friends in the colonies. After the conflict broke out, several of these businessmen fled to New York City for the protection of both the British troops and their wealthy friends and associates. They valued the British and the trade they generated with the colonies and thence their fortunes.\textsuperscript{104}

Those that fled to New York City sought refuge from the war and the abuses that they suffered at the hands of the rebels. They were against the rebellion, but it was not their station to actively take up arms. Some were tradesmen who supported the British materially and had their livelihoods taken away from them. Some were either old or they had young families. Others were people of substance who had no desire to join in the dirty business of fighting and sought the comfort of New York City.\textsuperscript{105}
I’d Rather Fight

The group that influenced the war the most was those who actively took up arms against the rebels. Some of these were professional soldiers, while others were opportunistic and used their wealth and influence to obtain a commission in the military when war broke out. They were all determined to make a difference and to fight for a British victory. They fought not only against the rebels, but also against the British prejudice against any loyal forces that were not part of the British regular forces.

One of these opportunists was James Chalmers. He was a wealthy land owner in Maryland before the war. He had very strong feelings against the rebels’ cause and felt that they would only cause misery and eventually anarchy. He was involved in a war of words with Thomas Paine. He used his wealth and status to obtain a commission with the British army. His goal was to lead troops to fight the rebels and reinstate law and order in the colonies. He was anxiously seeking recognition from the crown. Because of his status and tenacity, he was appointed as the leader over a regiment of his own. He served as a lieutenant colonel over the Chalmers Corps of the Maryland Loyalists.

Alexander MacDonald was a longtime associate of the British army. He was an immigrant from Scotland before
the French and Indian War. He was commissioned as a lieutenant in the 77th Regiment of Foot in that conflict. After that war, his regiment was disbanded and he settled on Staten Island. He married into wealth and politics. His wife, Suzanna Livingston, belonged to one of the most prominent families of the New York elite. They were not only wealthy landowners, but also leaders of an important faction in New York politics. He retained his commission and stayed on the inactive list at one half pay. In 1772 he was promoted to the rank of captain.

In October of 1774, MacDonald headed up the Hudson River to recruit others to form a regiment of loyal Highland veterans. After getting over 100 volunteers, "he headed to Boston to place his new corps at the service of the Army." He was hoping for a promotion and a raise in pay. He was disappointed when his corps was combined with another and he was relegated to a lesser position.

A wealthy back country land owner in South Carolina was also given a command of his own. Moses Kirkland accepted the command of a colonial militia company. He marched this company from the coast to his home town of Ninety-Six in the backcountry of South Carolina. Once there, he arrested the junior officers and with the help
of Thomas Brown and Thomas Fletchall made it a loyalist company.\textsuperscript{112}

He stayed loyal to the king because he needed the support of the empire against the coastal landowners who were rebels. Contrary to Thomas Paine, he considered loyalty to the king a natural condition. He and his company stayed in the hinterlands of South Carolina during the war and saw little action.\textsuperscript{113}

The loyalists considered the rebels to be anarchists who were unruly and destructive to both the loyalist way of life and property. The rebels were not the only ones who caused destruction and mayhem. Abraham Van Buskirk was a prosperous doctor in Bergen County, New Jersey before the war. He formed a loyalist regiment early on. His regiment was known for the burning of “many barns and Presbyterian churches” in Bergen County.\textsuperscript{114} He later served as a high ranking officer to Benedict Arnold.

Sir John Johnson lived among the Indians in the Mohawk Valley in upstate New York. He followed his father’s footsteps\textsuperscript{115} of being a defender of the Six Nation Indians for the crown.\textsuperscript{116} He was commissioned as a captain in the Albany County militia.\textsuperscript{117} He rallied both white and Indian loyalists to fight against the rebels.

These are but a few of the loyalists who actively fought the rebels in the war. However, the British army
did not consider the loyalist regiments to be a part of the army. Since they were not from England, it was believed that they could not possibly have been trained properly nor could they be depended upon to fight to the same standards as the British regulars. The loyalist regiments were relegated to minor roles or even sent far from the action as was Moses Kirkland.\textsuperscript{118}
CHAPTER 5

LOYALISTS WHO LEFT DURING THE CONFLICT

Other loyalists chose to leave the colonies during the Revolution. Even before the war broke out, a number of loyalists considered it to be too unsafe to remain in America. They faced public ridicule and loss of life, liberty, and property. They left for various destinations and for various personal reasons. Loyalists left America because of fears of broken promises by the British and the lack of the will of the rebels to accept them. These destinations included other British colonies in America such as Nova Scotia, Lower Canada (Quebec) and Upper Canada (Ontario). Some went to Jamaica or other West Indies colonies. Others returned to England.

The Anglican Priesthood

When open warfare broke out, one of the groups of loyalists to leave the colonies was composed of Anglican priests. These ministers were forced by the rebels to either conform to the revolutionary ideals or leave. Most of these ministers were loyalists because as part of their ordination, they swore loyalty to the crown. Since the king was the head of the church, all Anglican
priests were accountable to the king. Their loyalty to the Anglican Church also included loyalty to the king. Their positions, their standing in the community and their income all came from the king.

One of these priests was the Reverend Jonathan Boucher of the eastern shore of Maryland. Boucher thought and preached that the king was put on the throne by God. He believed that to act against the king was to act against God. With others, he attempted to forge a coalition of Anglican clergy in Philadelphia to persuade against the revolution. This attempt failed since many of the clergy in Philadelphia were either patriots or chose to remain neutral. He preached loyalty to the king in his Sunday sermons, including his well known sermon titled, “On Civil Liberty, Passive Obedience, and Nonresistance. He eventually “left Maryland and sailed for London.”

Another fiery Anglican priest who left was the Reverend William Edmondston of Cecil County, Maryland. He not only preached loyalty, but published and circulated pamphlets asking people to continue their allegiance to the British government. He refused to recant when confronted by the rebels. They wanted him to sign a paper repudiate his loyalist teachings. He and his family were threatened with bodily harm, and the
rebels threatened to tear down his house. He was finally forced to flee to England in November of 1775.\textsuperscript{123}

The Loyal Businessmen

There were several leading loyalist businessmen in America when the war broke out. Many of these businessmen were new to the colonies. They were not yet jaded against the crown and still had strong loyalties. They had family and many business associates still in England and Scotland. Some were born in the colonies, but they had received their positions either directly or indirectly from the king. They saw both their lives and livelihoods threatened by the rebels and left early in the conflict.

A prominent loyalist who also returned to England early in the conflict was Samuel Curwen. He was Harvard-educated and a successful businessman in Salem, Massachusetts. He held the colonial government posts of Justice of the Peace and on the Admiralty Court of Massachusetts. When General Thomas Gage was appointed governor in 1774, Curwen signed an address of welcome. Curwen considered the rebels to be amoral anarchists who revolted against all of the laws of truth, religion and justice.\textsuperscript{124} He preferred order and peace to the chaos of the revolution. When security became an issue in 1775
due to his loyalist stand, he fled to Philadelphia. In June 1775 he sailed for London.\textsuperscript{125}

George Ogilvie was a successful and wealthy South Carolina land owner. Since he had strong financial and familial ties to Britain, he remained loyal. In 1773, his uncle, Charles Ogilvie, offered to send him to South Carolina to manage his plantations. George agreed and soon he made enough money to buy his own plantations in South Carolina and Georgia. In 1779 he refused to take the Oath of Abjuration.\textsuperscript{126} The rebel government in South Carolina banished him so he returned to Scotland that year.\textsuperscript{127}

John Campbell, another prominent businessman from Scotland, was a storekeeper for Glasgow firm of Findlay, Hopkins and Co. He did not intend to stay in America for a long period of time. He came to Chesapeake in search of his fortune. Once he was successful, he was planning on returning to Scotland. As part of his payments, he received a 10 per cent share of the company assets in Chesapeake. He was a loyal representative of his company and wanted no part of the revolution. He was persecuted and harassed by the patriots. He was finally able to return to Britain in August 1776.\textsuperscript{128}

Another destination was Nova Scotia.\textsuperscript{129} In 1776, the colony of Nova Scotia included the modern provinces of
Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.
With the great influx of loyalist refugees in 1783, the
region was broken up into the three areas of
governance.  

The Politicians

Most of the politicians of the time were loyalists. They obtained their positions either directly or indirectly from the crown. Their livelihood depended upon their remaining loyal. And since the king had been good to them they were just returning the favor.

A prominent New York politician named William Smith was one of the loyalists who moved to Nova Scotia. He was outspoken against the rebels and stood by the sides of Governor William Tyron and Sir Guy Carleton. Because of his staunch loyalism, he was forced to flee. He was accompanied by several commoners such as Martin Lawler, Francis Staple and Mary Airy. They were lured to Nova Scotia because of the promises of land and money by the Crown.  

John Howe, Sr. was a newspaper apprentice when hostilities broke out. His family had lived in Boston for over 140 years, but his loyalties and convictions were with the British. The family that he worked for was staunchly loyalist. He was listed in the Confiscation and Banishment Act of Massachusetts in 1776 and was
forced to leave for Nova Scotia in April of that year. He took advantage of his position as a newspaper man and used his connections to spy for the British.\textsuperscript{133}

The matriarch of the Six Nations Indians, Molly Brandt, chose a different destination. She moved herself and her family to land granted to her on the Bay of Quinte in Upper Canada (Ontario) in “compensation for the estates she had forfeited in the Mohawk Valley.”\textsuperscript{134} The British gave her this land for her many years of loyalty.

During the conflict it was not safe for loyalists to remain in America. Many left for their own personal safety. Others, men of means, fled for the comfort of England. Many were unable to leave America during the war, so they sought the shelter of New York City until they were able to leave during the evacuation of 1783. After the war, loyalists left America because of fears of broken promises and the lack of the will of the states to accept them.\textsuperscript{135} They left because they did not trust the new government.\textsuperscript{136}
The third group of loyalists was the little known group called black loyalists. The black loyalists were composed of two main groups. The larger group consisted of black slaves who escaped and joined the loyalist cause. A smaller group was black freedmen who were used by the British to complement their fighting force.\textsuperscript{137}

Freedom for Service

At times, slaves were given their freedom in exchange for service to the British army.\textsuperscript{138} This began as a small, informal effort. Eventually, it became British policy.

In the fall of 1775, John Murray, Earl of Dunmore, was forced to abdicate his position as the governor of Virginia. At this time, many of his troops deserted and most of those remaining were blacks of an uncertain origin.\textsuperscript{139} Lord Dunmore issued a proclamation offering freedom to slaves of rebels who were able to bear arms if they joined his cause.\textsuperscript{140} His proclamation in part states that, “I do hereby further declare all indented Servants, Negroes, or others” would be given freedom after a term
of service for His Majesty’s Army. Lord Dunmore was able to muster 300 black slaves as the Ethiopian Regiment under the motto “Liberty to Slaves.”

The idea caught on. King George III continued to incite domestic insurrection by promising freedom to slaves who would support the royal cause. This concept was codified by Sir Henry Clinton in 1779 with the issuance of the Philipsburg Proclamation. In this proclamation, Clinton expanded Dunmore's Proclamation to include any slave of a rebel who could escape, whether they were ready to serve the British Army or not, anywhere in the colonies. Dunmore’s proclamation was only for able bodied men in Virginia whereas Clinton’s was for any black slave who deserted from a rebel master an offer of full security within British lines. These proclamations only applied to slaves of rebels, not slaves of loyalists. In total, perhaps 100,000 black slaves escaped from their patriot masters, inspired by these proclamations. Thomas Jefferson wrote that Virginia lost as many as 30,000 slaves during the first year alone. Only a few of these escaped slaves remained free after hostilities ended though. The majority were recaptured by their former owners.
In addition to the Ethiopian Regiment, these escaped black loyalists served in many units for the British including the Black Pioneers and Guides, the Black Brigade, the Jersey Shore Volunteers, the King's American Dragoons, the Jamaica Rangers and the Mosquito Shore Volunteers. However, these proclamations did not have a large military effect. What they did do was cause disorder among the rebel slave holders. They caused a sense of anarchy and instability on the plantations and made the slave owners tighten security around their slaves to prevent escape. They drained resources from the rebels.\textsuperscript{146} A few of these black loyalists did become military leaders in their own right, fighting for the British.

Colonel Tye and Colonel Stephen Blucke

Colonel Tye and Colonel Stephen Blucke were two of the escaped slaves who became leaders for the British military. The British did not formally commission blacks into their Army, but rather sometimes gave titles of honor and respect to men such as Tye and Blucke.\textsuperscript{147}

The man known as Colonel Tye was a black slave named Titus. He was one of four black slaves owned by Quaker
John Corlies of Shrewsbury, New Jersey. Quakers generally did not believe in owning slaves. Those that did own slaves educated and eventually freed them. Corlies not only kept his four slaves illiterate, but was known to have been cruel to them.\textsuperscript{148} It is not known for sure whether Titus escaped before or after Lord Dunmore made his proclamation, but Titus worked his way to Virginia and joined Dunmore’s other recruits. He took up the offer of freedom for service for the British.

Titus became a member of Dunmore’s Ethiopian Regiment and probably fought in the early battles in Virginia such as Kemp’s Landing and Great Bridge.\textsuperscript{149} He eventually commanded about 800 men in the Ethiopian Regiment. In 1778, he became one of the leaders of the Black Brigade, an elite guerilla unit composed of blacks from New Jersey. He used his intimate knowledge of the Shrewsbury area to steal supplies from the patriots and make sneak attacks them.\textsuperscript{150} He led groups composed of blacks and white loyalist refugees. He was the perhaps most feared Loyalist in the area, raiding fearlessly through New Jersey. During these raids, he and his men would not only kidnap patriot soldiers and officers, but
also carry off sliver, clothing and cattle for British troops.¹⁵¹

Colonel Tye continued on these successful raiding missions until the fall of 1780. During a raid on the hated patriot leader Josiah Huddy, he was shot in the wrist and wounded. Huddy was captured and his house burned down. Shortly after the raid, Tye developed tetanus and died.¹⁵²

After his death, Colonel Tye was replaced by Colonel Stephen Blucke of the Black Pioneers as leader of the raiders. Colonel Blucke continued these attacks well after the British defeat at Yorktown. In 1783, he was asked by Governor Parr of Nova Scotia to set up the community of Birchtown there for the black loyalists. Birchtown became the largest Black Loyalist community in Nova Scotia. After moving to Birchtown, he remained an active leader in the militia there. He also served as a teacher for the black community in Birchtown.¹⁵³ Colonel Blucke disappeared in 1796 and the mystery of his disappearance has never been solved.
Henry Washington, Thomas Peters and Boston King

Three other slaves who took up the British offer of freedom for service were Henry Washington, Thomas Peters and Boston King. These are but three of the many black loyalists who served in the British army and are more representative of the slaves who escaped from their rebel masters to serve the British than Colonels Tye and Blucke. One was from Virginia, one from North Carolina and one from South Carolina. They chose service for the British army over remaining slaves for rebel masters.

George Washington was a slave holder in Virginia. One of his slaves was named Henry Washington. Henry escaped during the Revolutionary War to find freedom with the British. He served with the British army during the war. In 1783, he moved to Birchtown, Nova Scotia with some 3,500 other former slaves. He later moved to Freetown, Sierra Leone in Africa. In 1800, he was involved in an uprising there for independence from Britain. This uprising failed.

Another slave who took the British up on their offer was Thomas Peters. In 1760, the man would later be called Thomas Peters, was a free man in West Africa, a member of the Yoruba tribe. He was kidnapped by slave
traders and sent to the American Colonies. He was originally sold to a Frenchman in Louisiana. He was later sold to an Englishman and eventually wound up as a slave in Wilmington, North Carolina. He worked on the docks along the Cape Fear River.\textsuperscript{156}

He had tried to escape three times while in Louisiana. When the British arrived in the Cape Fear River in 1776, he escaped and was sworn into the Black Pioneers by Captain George Martin. He served as a sergeant with this unit.\textsuperscript{157} He became a leader among the black loyalists. After the war he moved to Birchtown, Nova Scotia. While there, he took complaints of broken promises to London for the other black loyalists. In 1792, he received permission from the crown to take 1,200 unhappy black loyalists to the Portuguese colony of Sierra Leone in West Africa.\textsuperscript{158} This contingent represented one third or 1,200 of the 3,600 black loyalists in Nova Scotia at the time.\textsuperscript{159}

In 1780, a South Carolina slave accepted Sir Henry Clinton’s offer. A slave named Boston considered his master to be very cruel. “To escape this cruelty, I determined to go to Charles Town, and throw myself into the hands of the English.”\textsuperscript{160} After joining the British
army, Boston took the surname “King”, perhaps in honor of King George III.¹⁶¹

Boston King served the British army in many capacities and many locations during the war. As a slave he apprenticed as a carpenter so he first served the British as a carpenter. He later served as an orderly and then afterward as a deck hand on both a man-of-war and a pilot boat.¹⁶² After the war, he relocated to Birchtown, Nova Scotia with other black loyalists. While at Birchtown, he became a Christian and served as a Methodist minister.¹⁶³

In 1792, he followed Thomas Peters to Sierra Leone. In addition to free passage to Africa, he was promised “TWENTY ACRES of land for himself, TEN for his Wife” plus provisions until he could provide for himself.¹⁶⁴ In exchange, the Sierra Leone Company would buy the produce from his farmland there.

These five slaves are an example of the many slaves who chose to escape from their masters and join the British in the war effort. These escaped black slaves along with the loyalist black freedmen who joined the British forces formed the group known as the black
loyalists. The estimated total number of black loyalists was 3,600.\textsuperscript{165}
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

During the American Revolution, a large minority of the colonists in America chose not to join the rebels but rather remained loyal to the crown. The estimates of how many loyalists there were vary from as little as 15% to as much as 33% of the total population, with a generally accepted number of 20%. The population of the American colonies in 1776 was 1.6 million. Based on 20%, this would have made the number of loyalists to have been about 333,000, not including the slaves of loyalists. These loyalists composed three main groups. The first group of the loyalists was those who remained on American soil and either fought alongside the British troops or served in a political or support function for the British. The second group was those who chose to emigrate to Canada, the West Indies or the hinterlands of the colonies during the conflict. The third group, known as the black loyalists, consisted of slaves who escaped from the rebels and black freedmen who selected service to the British.

There is a common thread among the reasons why people chose to join one of these groups. It was in their self interest to be loyalists. Their fortunes, either
present or future came from the crown. Some had long
been associated with the crown and their family fortunes
in the colonies came from the crown. Others saw the
rebels as a threat to their way of life and believed that
the British could protect them. Still others accepted
the British offer of emancipation in exchange for their
loyalty.

The black freedmen who fought alongside the British
were afraid that the rebels would take away their freedom
and send them into slavery. By choosing the British
side, they hoped to retain their freedmen status. Since
manumission was not common in the southern plantations,
many black slaves accepted the British offer of
emancipation in exchange for service as their way to
personal freedom. Neither of these groups were so much
pro-England as anti-Rebel. They had their own selfish
goals.

Another group did not care about the war. They
wanted to escape its ravages and maintain their way of
life. They sought the protection of the British against
the rebels. In most cases, they had the British move
them from the American colonies to safe British lands,
avay from the rebels. Once moved, they could continue in
their private lives as they had before the Revolution.
They did not necessarily care one way or the other about
the crown; they just wanted protection from the rebels. Their goal was their own self-interest.

Perhaps the largest group was those who stayed in America during the Revolution and fought for the British. They fought both actively on the battlefield and in other roles such as political, religious and logistical support for the British. Most were wealthy and owed their fortunes directly to the British. These included the political office holders such as governors, judges and senior civil servants. Since they owed their status as well as their fortunes to the crown, they remained loyal for their own self-interest, their own aristocracy.

These who chose loyalty to the crown had a significant amount to lose if the rebels won independence from England. They went to war to maintain things as they were in the colonies. It did not matter whether or not they liked the king or not. They had a lot to lose personally if the colonies became independent. For their own self-interest, they chose loyalty, not the better good of society.
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