Historical Papers
Communications historiques

The Loyalist Myth in Canada

Jo-Ann Fellows

Volume 6, numéro 1, 1971

St. John 1971

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/030459ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.7202/030459ar

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada

ISSN

0068-8878 (imprimé)
1712-9109 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer cet article

Fellows, J.-A. (1971). The Loyalist Myth in Canada. *Historical Papers / Communications historiques*, *6*(1), 94–111. https://doi.org/10.7202/030459ar

THE LOYALIST MYTH IN CANADA

JO-ANN FELLOWS

University of New Brunswick

One voice, one people, one in heart
And soul, and feeling, and desire!
Re-light the smouldering martial fire,
Sound the mute trumpet, strike the lyre,
The hero deed cannot expire,
The dead still play their part.*

INTRODUCTION

The Loyalist Myth is an elusive prey. I undertook its study convinced that such a beast existed, or had existed.[1] As "myth" or as one of its synonyms, "tradition", "legend" or "cult", few studies of the Loyalists can avoid mentioning it.[2] But behind this familiar usage, there lies a mèlange of ideas involving intellectual history and values, social ideas, and political ideas and ideologies.

The Loyalist Myth in Canada decisively commences with the war of 1812, and although I expected to find that it was now a relic of the Canadian past when I started this study, I am now convinced that the Loyalist Myth is still with us albeit in a rather subtle form. Thus, its study involves an investigation of fairly complex areas of thought over a wide area of Canadian history.

First, a definition of "myth" is offered, as it is used in this study. Then, an outline of all writings on the Loyalists by Canadians or published in Canada is given. Some examples of this writing in various media are sampled in order to outline the Myth. A discussion of the Loyalist Myth and its effects on Canadian Identity and National Purpose is also included. It is proposed that there is a basic tripartite structure of national mythologies or value systems in Canada.

Finally, it should be emphasized that this study does not deal with the Loyalists *per se,* it deals with the impact of the Loyalists on Canadian History and Canadian life by outlining the basic tenets of the Myth and indicating some of its effects.

THE MYTH

The Myth is a joy to those who enjoy paradox. It is of the past, yet it is timeless. It explains the past and the present, as well as the future.[3] It is all things to all people.

* From "Brock October 13, 1859" by Charles Sangster.

According to Claude Levi-Strauss, the Myth in modern societies is the political event. As he writes: ". . . the French Revolution is both a sequence belonging to the past . . . and a timeless pattern which can be detected in the contemporary French social structure and which provides a clue for its interpretation."[4] Thus, the Myth is the distortion through time by succeeding generations in order to serve their own, contemporary, purposes. A myth is relative to the contemporary society.

Thus, the Loyalist Myth in Canada is built upon the historical event of the Loyalists' activities through the American Revolution, their exile and arrival in Acadia and Quebec, and their subsequent history in this country. These events are then pictured by succeeding generations in the light that best suits the purposes and needs of these generations.

Levi-Strauss also describes the purpose of myth. He writes: ". . . the purpose of myth is to provide a logical model capable of overcoming contradiction." He goes on to explain that the myth is a construction of layer upon layer of repetitious explanations built around the contradiction in order to explain it away.[5] Thus, a myth establishes an internally-consistent picture of the historical event for the benefit of succeeding generations — a group rationalization.

The Loyalists, arriving in a strange country under adverse conditions, began almost immediately to justify themselves. For example, in the September 23, 1784 issue of *The Saint John Gazette and Weekly Advertiser,* Saint John, N.B., a proposal is made to set up a subscription to write an accurate history of the Loyalists and their settlements. The Loyalists were united by adversity and intimately aware, because of their experiences in the American Revolution, of the power of public opinion.

Certainly, the Loyalists had many contradictions to overcome. The Loyalists were un-American Americans,[6] enduring a love-hate relationship with their brothers and cousins to the South. The Loyalists admired British institutions, but were often repelled by British society.[7] The challenge of inconsistency and the need for identity and justification produced the Loyalist Myth.

The Myth, once established, tends to take on a life of its own. As it interacts with society, the Myth is both a justification of events and a cause for other events. Robert Lee Wolfe makes this point in a study of mythologies where he writes: ". . . men often adopt an ideology

in order to justify some course of action already planned, and . . . thereafter the political practitioner may become the victim of his own ideology."[8] In the full flowering of the Loyalist Myth in the latter part of the nineteenth century, it developed into a potent political force. Macdonald could laugh at the suggestion that he send troops to support the British in the Sudan in 1885, but by 1899 Laurier found it necessary to authorize the sending of volunteers to fight in the Boer War.

With this relativity and inter-action of cause and effect in the nature of myth, it is hardly fair to blame the excesses of the Loyalist Myth on the Loyalists. The Loyalists would be as surprised as many historians[9] have been to see the picture of themselves and their beliefs that has come down to the present time.

Finally, the Myth is intimately associated with the value system of a society.[10] The myth is, in fact, the value system of a society writ metaphorically. Men in societies require an understanding of their own identities — their place in society and their societies' place in the world. Ultimately, identity involves values.

THE LOYALIST MYTH

The Loyalist Myth emerged not exactly "full-grown" from the war of 1812, but at the conclusion of the war all the elements were available for its construction. Furthermore, the different regions believed for the first time that they could survive as political entities distinct from the United States, and it became more necessary than ever to construct a founding myth.

The waves of British immigration in the early nineteenth century along with the curtailment of American immigration after the war strengthened the Britishness of the Myth although the Loyalists retained their American background. Central to the Loyalist Myth throughout its history is the maintenance of a tension between its British and American aspects. By the 1850's the uneasy hold that the Loyalists had on political power in the different regions of Canada expired, as the Loyalists themselves must have. The demise of political power was not a result of mortality, however, but of the advent of responsible government. Confederation was the most severe challenge the Loyalist Myth had to face. Responding to this challenge, the Myth revived the idea of a wider union.[12] In one final gesture of faith, the Loyalist Myth threw up the idea of a united British Empire[13] leading eventually to the idea of "The Commonwealth" in the twentieth century, or the idea of an

Anglo-Saxon empire including the United States.[14] With the failure of these initiatives in a twentieth century that proclaimed a separation of national units, the Loyalist Myth failed as well. As Canadian independence became a reality, the adherents of the Loyalist Myth were left with a share of the more subtle "power-behind-the-scenes." As John Porter concludes in his study of social class and power in Canada: ". . . it became clear that the Canadians of British origin have retained, within the elite structure of the society, the charter group status with which they started out."[15]

A. R. M. Lower described the Loyalist Myth in an address in 1960 as being composed of two parts, "an oral tradition" regarding the American Revolution that has come down to the present day among Canadians of Loyalist descent, and "a more sophisticated, literate level" of which the works of William Canniff and Egerton Ryerson are given as examples.[16] The subject of this paper is the former category, although by necessity it deals also with the latter. I would extend Lower's "Canadians of Loyalist descent" to "Canadians of kindred spirit", however, since with the passage of time there are as many descendants of the Loyalists by adoption as there are by direct descent.[17] Further, all Canadians share in the Loyalist Myth by being aware of it, although their responses to it may be very different depending on their own orientations.

I consider that whatever has been said, thought or written in Canada about the Loyalists is part of the Loyalist Myth — "grist for the mill", so to speak. The Loyalist have been described and analyzed by historians. They have been commented upon by intellectuals. They have been hymned in patriotic verse. They have been romanticized by historical novelists. They have been laughed at by Canadians of non-Loyalists descent — the "dancing beggars" is an apt ephithet for more than just the Loyalists of Shelburne.

The majority of writings on the Loyalists have been conservative and pedestrian. Local history and geneological studies make up more than two-thirds of all the published material in Canada on the Loyalists. The figures are given in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Material published in Canada or by Canadians of the Loyalists, 1825-1970.

	Books		Articles	
Category	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Biography/Genealogy	73	31	107	33
Local History	90	39	129	40
General History	58	25	10	3
Other	11	5	70	22
Popular Article			8	2
Total	232		324	

The Loyalists with their disdain for popular appeal would have appreciated the singular lack of popular articles written about them. Interest in the Loyalists has centered, obviously, in their descendants and in local historical societies.

If we pay particular attention to when the written material was published, we see that interest was slight in the nineteenth century but expanded dramatically in the twentieth century, being interrupted only by the two world wars. Interest was obviously aroused by the 1884 celebrations, because the material increases after this date. The celebration in 1933 was accompanied by an increased publication of material.

The dates of publication are, of course, just that. One suspects that they function inversely in relation to popular interest. That is, as the Loyalist experience became less a matter of common knowledge or of social and political consequence, it became of more interest from an antiquarian or historical point of view.[18] Certainly most of the polemical or emotionally-charged material was written in the nineteenth, or early twentieth century.

Of all the material written on the Loyalists in Canada, it is just the polemical and emotionally-charged that is most useful for the delineation of the Loyalist Myth. It is assumed that the simplicities that are required of the Myth in its oral or popular form are most closely approximated by simplistic writing on the subject. The worse the writing is from a scholarly or aesthetic point of view, the better it is for the purposes of this study. The more extreme the statements, or the more maudlin the verse, the nearer one comes to the emotional

center of the myth. The picture of the Myth that is about to be painted, therefore, is the extreme one and the sources that are quoted are to a greater or lesser extent distinguished by their mediocrity.

Take poetry, for example. Oliver Goldsmith wrote a competent, if derivative, piece, "The Rising Village" in 1825 which describes a thriving community of Loyalist settlers in Acadia. The tone is cheerful and the Loyalist Myth is noticeable by its absence. Charles Sangster wrote a memorial poem to Brock in 1859. Brock is one of the military heroes in the Loyalist Myth. Sangster's poem is among his better works. The only hint of the Loyalist Myth is in a touch of ancestor worship and in the reference to a "golden age". Towards the end of the century, Charles Mair produced a poem entitled, "In memory of William A. Foster" which is as much "Canada First" and Anti-French-Canadian as it is Loyalist Myth. Still, the piece is Anti-American and strenuously pro-British. The verse,

> First feel throughout the throbbing land
> A nation's pulse, a nation's pride —
> The independent life — then stand
> Erect, unbound, at Britain's side!

describes a contradiction that must have given even the Loyalist Myth a severe attack of indigestion.

However, for an unexcelled exposition of the Loyalist Myth in doggerel verse it would be hard to surpass "Lester the Loyalist" written by Douglas Sladden and published in 1890. Interestingly enough, the piece was published by The Hakubunsha in Tokyo, Japan, and printed on rice paper with rather oriental maple leaves underprinted on the pages.

The introduction contains the sense of unrelieved grievance that is such an important characteristic of the Loyalist Myth. "It is strange that . . . the self-sacrifice of the American Loyalists, who founded the Canada of today, should almost have been forgotten, both in England and the United States." The basic colonialism of the Loyalist Myth is evidenced by the author's seeking recognition of the Loyalist fate from Great Britain and the United States.

The joint elements of suffering and elitism are introduced by this statement, still from the introduction: "They (the Loyalists) were composed largely of Judges, Lawyers, Merchants, Divines, Officials, in fact of the Upper Classes before the Revolution; and therefore their sufferings in pioneering were the more severe."

The fallacy of exclusively upper-class origins of the Loyalists has been thoroughly exposed by historians in this century. Class distribution among the Loyalists seems to have been quite similar to that in the society they left behind.[19] The only variation between the Loyalists and American Society in class structure was that urban dwellers seem to have been over-represented in the Loyalists.[20] It is this latter point that probably explains much of the ineptness of the Loyalists as pioneers.

To consider another example of the Loyalist Myth in verse, Mary Diamond Bloomfield published a collection in 1924, "In Commemoration of the Hundred and Fortieth Anniversary of the United Empire Loyalist settlement on the Bay of Quinte." In the Foreword, she explains, "The inspiration of the verse lies in the steadfastness of the Loyalists to the principle of British unity in the face of popular contumely, personal persecution and maltreatment, robbery and injustice, and their great and splendid sacrifice made for its sake."[21] Here, the British connection is maintained and there is just a hint of anti-Americanism.

Again, the "worthy people" are mentioned. "The aristocracy of culture, of dignified professions and callings, of social rank and hereditary wealth."[22] The upper class of American Society had come to Canada as Loyalists, their descendants, the author assures us, now constitute "an aristocracy in democracy as marked as is that of Mayflower descendants elsewhere."[23] Here is the American model yet again although the author discreetly writes "elsewhere" instead of "the United States".

The basic elements of the Loyalist Myth in verse are very simple — upper class origins, great sacrifice and suffering, union with Great Britain, grievance and betrayal.

The Loyalist Myth in prose exhibits similar characteristics. There is not much written until the middle of the nineteenth century. Interest builds in the latter half of the century and continues unabated in the twentieth century.

Most commentators are agreed that the high point of the late nineteenth century material is the work of Egerton Ryerson. Ryerson's massive tomes provided enough material from the past — the dates of his study were 1620 to 1816 — to feed half a dozen myths.[24] Ryerson reprinted, in this work, an Address he had delivered in 1875 at the "Celebration" of the battle of Lundy's Lane. This address is an establishment version of the Loyalist Myth.

Ryerson commences by being very pro-British, revealing that Canadian's "hearts beat responsive to those noble principles that made England the glory of all nations and British institutions the honour of mankind" (Vol. 11, p. 477). Ryerson then outlines his understanding of the slogan "loyalty". Not surprisingly, the word "loyalty" is the key one in an understanding of the Loyalist Myth. It simplified a number of complicated concepts into a single-word slogan. Making up the concept, "Loyalty", was loyalty to king (monarchical government and colonialism), and loyalty to religion (usually, the Church of England). Above all, loyalty was respect for the law, and the past as exemplified in the *status quo*.

Let Ryerson explain it himself. "Loyalty in its true essence and meaning was the principle of respect to our Sovereign, the freedom of our institutions, and the excellencies of our civilization, and it was therefore a feeling worth to be perpetuated by the people" (Vol. 2, pp. 448-9).

Ryerson goes on to recount the course of Loyalist history. He exaggerates both the steadfastness and the suffering of the Loyalists. He also carves a Founding Fathers place for them in Canadian history. The climax of Ryerson's speech is his description of the war of 1812. His view of that war is quite simple. "In the war of 1812 to 1815 . . . both the loyalty and courage of the Canadian people were put to the severest test, and both came out of the fiery ordeal as refined gold" (Vol. 11, p. 449). This passage is followed by a good deal of Anti-Americanism. Madison's motives in declaring war when Britain was locked in a life and death struggle with Napoleon are questioned, to put it mildly, (Vol. 11, pp. 453-55).

Then, the exaggeration of the role of the militia in the war is given. ". . . in three months after the declaration of war, they (the people of Upper Canada) had, with the aid of a few hundred regular soldiers and noble officers, driven back three invading armies . . ." (Vol. 11, p. 455). This sub-myth of the Loyalist Myth is the dominant idea that came out of the war — that the Canadians, both English- and French-speaking, saved the country with the help of a few British regulars. Military historians contend just the opposite.[25] However, a myth does not pay too much attention to either historical accuracy or to military historians.

Ryerson's account of the war concludes with that familiar claim if not of victory then of not being defeated, ". . . at the end of three

years not a foot of Canadian territory was in possession of the invader" (Vol. 11, p. 455).

The address concludes with accolades for the Queen and the Governor-General followed by "(Loud Cheering)" Vol. 11, p. 458).

The Queen and the Governor-General do not fare quite so well in an article written by Robert Grant Haliburton in 1872. The article was originally published in the *St. James Magazine,* but was re-issued as a pamphlet entitled, "A Review of British Diplomacy and its Fruits: The Dream of the United Empire Loyalists of 1776".[26] Mr. Haliburton is very angry. His article is in response to the Treaty of Washington of 1871. He thinks that the British government has sold Canada down the river yet again. The article reminds one that the Loyalists admired British institutions, but not necessarily the British. Haliburton writes, "A century of British diplomacy has taught us to regard the arrival of English statesmen with the same dread that heralds in the coming of the cholera or the approach of an earthquake" (p. 2). Haliburton's outrage is extended to the Queen's representative in Canada. The Governor-General's duties are "to draw the large salary which we supply him and to practise among us the frugal virtues of official seclusion" (p. 14).

Basically, however, Haliburton is angry because the British government is refusing to play its part in the "dream" of the Loyalists — the extended union.

Haliburton writes with a marked sense of outrage and grievance as he traces a century of abuse that the loyalists have suffered for "the idea of a United Empire" (p. 20). Haliburton outlines the basic characteristics of the U.E.L. "dream". "A century ago the mantle of the Old Jacobites seemed to have fallen upon our ancestors. Loyalty to the crown was the first duty of man; and rebellion was a grievance offence, not only against the King, but also against the King of Kings! The state was a unit, and the colonies merely component parts of it. In the dim future, they saw a united empire, that, strengthened and cemented by time, was destined to overshadow the world" (p. 15).

Haliburton goes on to repeat other catechisms of the Loyalist faith. He describes, for example, the upper class origins of the Loyalists, (p. 5). Incidentally, he also offers an interesting explanation of the building of Shelburne. He suggests that it was not merely the folly it seemed, but a grand, final gesture of defiance on behalf of its inhabi-

tants before they sacrificed themselves to the hard labour and loneliness of life in the bush, (p. 1).

All in all, Haliburton offers a polished, sophisticated version of the Loyalist Myth with quite a strong Romantic flavour. He concludes the article by suggesting that instead of "going once more through the monotonous process of being sacrificed for the sake of the empire, "a union with the United States should be considered. As he writes, *"Our loyalty to the Crown has swallowed up our loyalty to the race."* And, he reminds his readers that although they are sons of the Old World, they are brothers of the New, (p. 9).

Both Ryerson and Haliburton offer similar accounts of the Loyalist Myth although they reach very different conclusions. Ryerson's version is inward-looking — a tight-little-prosperous-Ontario version — while Haliburton's account is more concerned with the Loyalist ideology as it relates to foreign affairs and the world at large.

Thus, Haliburton, unlike Ryerson, is aware of the potentially powerful call of Canadian Nationalism. Haliburton writes: "The Old World is bidding farewell to the land and to the dream of the United Empire Loyalists . . . and when the last British soldier is called upon to do a last act for the encouragement of trade by furling the British flag and carrying it away with him from our shores, he will leave us a *nation"* (p. 20). Haliburton was looking for alternative directions for the Loyalist Myth. Ryerson was content with the *status quo*. Not coincidentally, Ryerson was a product of the Loyalist Myth in Ontario and Haliburton, that of the Myth in the Maritimes.

There are many other examples of the Loyalist Myth in Canadian verse and prose. The historical novelists, Thomas H. Raddall and Kenneth Roberts are the best known of a number of such who have dealt with the Loyalists. Among novelists *per se,* I am convinced that the Jalna series of Mazo de la Roche is the Loyalist Myth, transfigured and romanticized. School text books are a rich source of accounts of the Loyalist Myth, although such accounts are stilted and cliché-ridden.[27] Newspapers and magazines are less helpful dealing, as they do, with the immediate event rather than the mood of the times. An account of virulent Anti-Americanism during the war of 1812;[28] or a nose-thumbing article at the United States showing that Charles Lindburgh was a loyalist descendant;[29] or a series of fulsome features on local Loyalist families[30] — span the limits of journalistic interest.

Historians have had some effect on the Loyalist Myth, as the Myth has had some effect on historians. In the nineteenth century, the predominant school of Canadian historical writing was much in tune with the Loyalist Myth — "the Britannic or Blood-is-thicker-than-water School" as J. M. S. Careless had labelled it.[31] The twentieth century has been largely antithetical to the Loyalist Myth — exposing its historical inaccuracies and deriding its values.[32] As the model for historical investigation became American instead of British, the severely pro-British orientation of the Myth in its late nineteenth and early twentieth century form proved a decided disadvantage.[33]

Loyalist historiography has recently been very adequately surveyed by Wallace Brown in an article entitled, "The View at two hundred years; The Loyalists of the American Revolution".[34] Furthermore, a book by L. F. S. Upton in the Issues in Canadian History series gives a good outline of the material in Canada.[35]

All in all, the Loyalist Myth had reached its maturity by the late nineteenth century and had assumed the messianic form so familiar in national myths. In its view, "The Founders of the Nation" were a superior race, the upper class in the American colonies prior to the Revolutionary War. The evil antagonist against which The Founders struggled was the United States. Republican government and institutions had been the original target of Loyalist attack, but after the war of 1812 anti-Americanism was substituted for Anti-Republicanism, giving the Myth a simple object of attack.[36] The suffering and sacrifice of the Loyalists both during and after the Revolutionary War is stressed repeatedly — giving them an appropriate pattern of struggle through adversity to triumph.

The creed of the Loyalists was their faith in the British way of life. A faith in the inherent rightness of hierarchical political, social and religious institutions was at the core of the Loyalist Myth. However, in its popular form the myth encouraged an imitation of all things British. Underhill, for example, stresses the degree to which the British way of doing things inspired Canadian development in the immediate pre- and post-confederation periods.[37] The war of 1812 was the triumph of the Myth, militarily. The country's, or the separate region's, right to exist was righteously affirmed in battle.[38] Likewise, the prosperity that grew steadily as the country was opened up, contributed to the impression of divine blessing on the Myth.

The Loyalist Myth originated in Canada as a justification by the Loyalists of their defeat and exile. It became a founding myth for Ontario and New Brunswick and, to a lesser extent, Nova Scotia. As British immigration swamped the Loyalist settlements in the first half of the nineteenth century, the Myth became much more pro-British. The Myth was taken over by the newcomers as a creed with many familiar characteristics; and, after the Myth was thus taken over, its British flavour was accentuated. Finally, the Myth became an important pillar of the Imperial Federation movement in Canada, during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[39] In the support of this movement, the Loyalist Myth re-affirmed its affinity with the original Loyalists by once again being on the losing side.

In writing this paper, I have been less concerned with telling exactly what the Loyalist Myth was, and being more concerned with investigating its tone or style. The half-truths or outright lies that some people in Canada came to believe about the Loyalists seem less important than the attitudes or prejudices that inspired these inaccuracies. In any case, the Myth was a whole series of Myths. It altered through time, and even at the same time it altered from individual to individual across a broad spectrum of moderate to extreme positions. Thus, the substance of the Myth is less important than its style or tone. This tone was basically conservative and basically colonial — the latter possible deriving from the former characteristic.

There has always been some controversy about whether the Loyalists were tories or conservative whigs or, indeed ordinary whigs.[40] However, the Loyalist Myth is definitely conservative. It proclaimed the necessity of loyalty to established institutions and the sanctity of law and order. Above all else, the Myth always reacted to events — it was inevitably prodded into expression, and was determinedly reticent in the face of great national questions.[41]

The Loyalist Myth was never ashamed of its colonialism. After all, one of the basic tenets of the Myth was a justification, on principle, of the maintenance of a united empire. Berger points out that to some degree the Imperialists in Canada were inspired by a desire to avoid a colonial status.[42] They choose to do so rather in the manner of a branch-plant attempting to take over the parent company. The Loyalist Myth found itself with a strong faith in Colonialism just as this condition was beginning to be disparaged. Imperialism was an answer to this challenge.

There is one final characteristic of the Loyalist Myth that should be mentioned. The Myth always contained a deep sense of grievance. Everyone conspired against the Loyalists — friend and foe alike. The Americans were unreservedly hostile. The New England settlers in Acadia, and the French-Canadian settlers in Acadia, and Quebec were hostile and indifferently hostile, respectively.[43] The British government — or successive British governments — were ungenerous to the Loyalists, offering them pittances to replace lost fortunes. British officials attracted much displeasure. Thus, the Loyalist Myth perpetuated a sense of grievance that was forever to remain unrelieved.

THE LOYALIST MYTH AS VALUE SYSTEM

The Loyalist Myth was the minority expression of a minority. The articulate, educated segment of the loyalists who came to Canada first propounded the Myth in this country. In Canada, however, the Loyalists were, even from the beginning, in a minority position vis-à-vis the total provinces — New Brunswick and Ontario — and these provinces were created for that very purpose. Population figures are given in Table 2. By 1850, the Loyalist element in Canada had been numerically submerged.

TABLE 2

Population figures (Approximate) for British North America before the Loyalists arrived, and Loyalist figures.

District	Before Loyalists	Loyalists[D]
Quebec	70,000[A]	1,000
Upper Canada	a few hundred	7,000
Nova Scotia	13,000[B]	15,000
New Brunswick	4,000[C]	15,000

A. Creighton, D. G., *Dominion of the North,* p. 152

B. *Ibid.,* p. 149

C. Morton, W. L., *Kingdom of Canada,* p. 177

D. Tallman, J. J., "Loyalty, Nationalism, and the American Revolution: Nova Scotia and Quebec," Unpublished Ms., pp. 17-18.

Commentators on the Loyalists have suggested that the Loyalists should be considered carefully because the first people in a country

have effects beyond what their numbers might indicate.[44] Certainly, the Loyalists established English speaking societies in New Brunswick and Ontario, and they fought it out toe to toe with the New Englanders in peninsular Nova Scotia.

Given the establishment of the basic Loyalist Conservative dogma in these areas, and the establishment of an opposite liberal orientation in the United States, immigration from abroad and emigration to the United States, may have functioned so as to reinforce these tendencies. The economic motive, moreover, can be viewed as a function of ideology. That is, the Loyalist maintained the paramount value of a successful family or community life; and the American proclaimed economic betterment as the chief, individual good.[45]

However, at the same time as the Myth was extending its effects, its exclusiveness was preventing all segments of the Canadian population from sharing in it. The French-Canadians and the New Englanders in Acadia were as much The Founders of Canada as were the Loyalists. However, because of the shocks they had suffered the Loyalists were inclined to use their Myth as a weapon in their power struggle with the prior inhabitants of the country. The neutral yankees of Nova Scotia were "lanquid wretches",[46] and the French-Canadians of Quebec were the traditional enemy.

There are, therefore, three distinct ideologies in Canada underlying a sense of being Canadian. These are the Loyalist and French-Canadian Myths and a liberal tradition. Canada does not suffer from a paucity of national mythologies but from an over-abundance.

The general tone of the country, at a given time, is determined by the interactions of these three traditions. For example, if Frank Underhill has encountered problems during his search for Canadian liberalism, it is because two out of the three myths are conservative and colonial.

Canadian independence posed, as I have already suggested, a major challenge to the Loyalist Myth. Thus, the history of Canadian independence, and hence of Canadian nationalism, is one hundred years of slow grudging acceptance of these ideas. For example, the Statute of Westminster made Canadians "truly independent" in 1931, although Confederation was supposed to have done that in 1867. Possibly the cessation of appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council made Canadians truly independent; or did that week

in 1939 during which Great Britain was, and Canada was not, at war with Germany make us free. Perhaps, the ability to amend the constitution within Canada will give us control of our national destinies; or will it take an entirely new constitution to do that. This description of the nation's advance towards independence only confirms a statement that Underhill made in 1946, "we are still colonial."[47]

There are a number of illustrations of the effects of the Loyalist Myth on the Canadian national character. For example, a tolerance of government involvement in the life of the individual, a tendency for place-seeking and patronage, a careless disregard for the natural resources of the country, a tolerance of other ideologies combined with a stubborn faith in the tenets of the Myth — all these characteristics can be attributed, in whole or in part, to the Loyalist tradition.[48]

The Loyalist Myth posits basic differences between American and Canadian society, but at the same time the Loyalists imported American forms and usages into Canada. Thus, the basic polarity of English-speaking Canada is at the heart of the Loyalist tradition. Likewise, the Loyalist Myth is also part of the explanation of Canada's external relations with both Great Britain and the United States, especially in the nineteenth century.

Suffice it to say, however, that the Loyalist Myth — a peculiar, eccentric deity — has its place in the national pantheon; and that its effects in the history of Canadian ideologies or value system has been significant.

CONCLUSION

The original Loyalists were Americans with a difference. Within the broad area of North American history, Canadians remain Americans with a difference. This study attempts to indicate one cause of this difference.

A brief outline of the origin and progress of the Loyalist Myth is given. Writings are sampled to indicate the main characteristics of the Myth, along with its characteristic tone or style. Some indication of the effects of the Loyalist Myth on Canadian identity and nationalism is given.

All of the conclusions in this study are tentative. Its areas of investigation — the history of ideas, generally; and the Loyalists, specifically — have not been given much attention by historians in Canada.

There certainly remain many areas of investigation, that could receive attention.

There is a great deal of material extant that illustrates popular opinion in Canada in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The Loyalist Myth has only been outlined impressionistically in this paper. It would benefit from a more extensive study. Likewise, the variations in the growth and development of the Myth could be studied in more detail, as an illustration of one aspect of Canadian intellectual history. The effects of the Myth on major events in Canadian history, especially in the nineteenth century, could be explained. The relations between French- and English-speaking Canadians have been influenced, to some extent, by the Loyalist tradition. Likewise, Canadian military history has been influenced, to some extent, by the Myth.

Finally the Loyalist experience is at the center of Canadian identity. It provides a link between the two most important extra-national influences in Canadian history — Great Britain and the United States — even if this linkage consists of being ground between them as Gen. John Watts De Peyster remarked in an address given to the N.B. Historical Society, and printed in 1883. (His tone of fatalistic acceptance would have appealed to the Loyalists.) "When great cataclysms occur in human affairs money becomes dross and men victims. So it was with the Loyalists of America. They were sacrificed, and between the upper millstone of the colonies and the nether millstone of the British ministry they were ground into powder. So it ever has been, so it is, and so it ever will be in revolutions."[49]

NOTES

[1] Articles that deal specifically with the Loyalist Myth in Canada are: John Davidson, "The Loyalist Tradition in Canada", *Macmillan's Magazine*, Toronto, September, 1904, pp. 390-400; Carl Berger, "The Loyalist Tradition" Chap. 3 in *The Sense of Power* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970); David V. J. Bell, "The Loyalist Tradition in Canada" *J. of Can. Studies* 5 No. 2 (1970) 22-33.

[2] For example, L. F. S. Upton, *The United Empire Loyalists: Men and Myths* (Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Company, 1967) p. 5; or Kenneth McNaught, *The Pelican History of Canada* (Hammondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1969) p. 57.

[3] Claude Levi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1963) p. 209.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 209.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 229

[6] William H. Nelson makes this assertion in *The American Tory* (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1961) p. 91.

[7] See Chapter VIII in Nelson, *Ibid.*, for a sampling of Loyalist opinion to this effect.

[8] In Henry A. Murray, ed., *Myth and Mythmaking* (New York George Braziller, 1960) p. 175.

[9] See, for example, Esther Clark Wright's *The Loyalists of New Brunswick* (Fredericton: The author, 1955) for the deflation of many points in the Loyalist Myth of that province.

[10] John T. Marcus in Murray, *Op. Cit.*, p. 233

[11] See Arthur R. M. Lower, *Canadians in the Making* (Don Mills, Ont.: Longmans Canada United, 1958) pp. 184-5, for the long range effects of the war.

[12] The "Wider union" is a major idea in Loyalist ideology. See for example, Joseph Galloway, Letter signed "Americanus" in *Pennsylvania J.*, 29 Aug. 1765, quoted in O. C. Kurtzleman, *Joseph Galloway, Loyalist* (Philadelphia, 1941) pp. 64-66, or William Smith, "A Plan for Confederation, 1790" in L. F. S. Upton, *The United Empire Loyalists: Men and Myths* (Toronto: The Copp Clark Publishing Company, 1967) pp. 35-38.

[13] For example, G. T. Denison, "Presidential Address", *Trans. of the Royal Society of Canada,* 2nd series, 10 (June, 1904) pp. XXV-XXIX.

[14] For example, Robert Grant Haliburton, *The Dream of the 'United Empire Loyalists' of 1776* (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Low, and Searle, 1872).

[15] John Porter, *The Vertical Mosaic* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), p. XIII.

[16] Reprinted in *The Loyalist Gazette,* 7, No. 1 (1969), 9-12.

[17] Carl Berger makes this point in *The Sense of Power* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970) p. 108.

[18] The decline of the Loyalist Myth as a political force is illustrated by the biographies of M.P.'s in the *Canadian Parliamentary Companion.* In 1883, 10% of the members listed Loyalist ancestry, in 1933, 6% did so, and by 1961, none did so although some members were qualified to do so.

[19] Wallace Brown, *The King's Friends* (Providence, R.I., Brown University Press, 1965) p. 267, concludes that the Loyalists were slightly more representative of the wealthy, than the lower economic groups.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 257.

[21] *A Book of Verse on Loyalist and Patriotic Themes* (Toronto: Ontario Press Limited, 1924).

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[24] Egerton Ryerson, *The Loyalists of America and Their Times,* Vol. I-II (Toronto: William Briggs, 1880).

[25] For example, see J. MacKay Hitsman, *The Incredible War of 1812* (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1965) p. 93, or Harry L. Coles, *The War of 1812* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965) p. 264.

[26] (London: Sampson Low, Murston, Low and Searle).

[27] For example, see J. Frith Jeffers, *History of Canada* (Toronto: Canada Publishing Company, 1879) or W. H. P. Clement, *The History of the Dominion of Canada* (Toronto: William Briggs, The Copp, Clark Company Limited, 1898).

[28] "Editorial," *The Quebec Gazette,* 28 April, 1814.

[29] George Pearson, "The Laugh is on the U.S. this Time", *The Canadian Magazine* 70 (August, 1928) 43-44.

[30] M. I. F. Carrell, "Fowler Family in N.B.", *The Daily Gleaner,* 10 Feb., 1933; "Kent and Ruloffson Families" *The Daily Gleaner,* 11 Feb., 1933.

[31] "Frontierism, Metropolitanism, and Canadian History" in *Approaches to Canadian History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967) p. 64.

[32] For example, historical inaccuracies have been pointed out by Wright, *Op. Cit.*, and J. J. Talman, "Loyalty, Nationalism and the American Revolution" unpublished Ms.

[33] See Careless, *Op. Cit.*, pp. 65-9, for descriptions of schools of Canadian historians in the twentieth century.

[34] *Proc. of the American Antiquarian Society,* (April, 1970), pp. 25-47.

[35] *The United Empire Loyalists: Men and Myths.*

[36] Lower makes this point in *Canadians in the Making,* p. 185.

[37] Frank H. Underhill, *In Search of Canadian Liberalism* (Toronto, The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1960) p. 15-17.

[38] Lower, *Op. Cit.*, p. 184.

[39] For a good account of this relationship see Berger, *Op. Cit.*

[40] See Bell, "The Loyalist Tradition in Canada" *Op. Cit.*, p. 22, for a discussion of this point.

[41] For example, G. T. Denison, "Presidential Address", *Op. Cit.*, p. xxxv states that the Imperialist movement was started in reaction to the movement for a commercial union with the U.S.

[42] *Op. Cit.*, pp. 259-260.

[43] See, for example, "A Memorial from the French Inhabitants of Madawaska," 22 Feb., 1785, N.B. Crown Lands Dept., Land Petitions, Public Archives of N.B., M.S. Madawaska County, No. 5, for the hostility that was engendered by the arrival of the Loyalists.

[44] For example, Davidson, *Op. Cit.*, p. 162.

[45] Berger, *Op. Cit.*, p. 263, concludes that the Tory Imperialists were upholding a simple rural way of life against the advance of industrialization.

[46] Quoted in Tallman, *Op. Cit.*, p. 20.

[47] Underhill, *Op. Cit.*, p. 31.

[48] Tallman, *Op. Cit.*, p. 31, gives a summary of characteristics in present-day Canada attributable to the Loyalist Myth.

[49] (N.Y.: Charles H. Ludwig, printer) p. 21.