Acadiensis

ACADIENSIS

The Loyalist Perception

Robert M. Calhoon

Volume 2, Number 2, Spring 1973

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/acad2_2art01

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

The Department of History of the University of New Brunswick

ISSN

0044-5851 (print)
1712-7432 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this article

Calhoon, R. M. (1973). The Loyalist Perception. *Acadiensis*, *2*(2), 3–14.

ROBERT M. CALHOON

The Loyalist Perception

The nature of loyalism in the American Revolution is an intractable historical problem, in part, because the Loyalists appeared in several distinct social and political settings: pre-Revolutionary colonial society, rebellious American states, the various parts of the British Empire to which they fled, and the post-Revolutionary republic where still more re-emerged as respectable citizens. In each of these contexts the Loyalists revealed different facets of the values, attitudes, and characteristics which accounted for their adherence to the Crown. While it is dangerous to read back into the Loyalists' Revolutionary experience things they said in retrospect, it is also misleading to assume that the Loyalists revealed everything they had to say about themselves under the intense pressures of specific crises in the pre-Revolutionary controversy or later during the Revolution itself.

While a perceptive kind of comparative history will be needed to bring together the pieces of the Loyalist puzzle, it is also important to explore as analytically as possible the Loyalists' perception of reality, the structure of their values, and the pattern of their rational and emotional responses within each of the historical contexts from which they operated. Historians dealing with the Loyalists have, for the most part, asked questions about the location and condition of identifiable groups of Loyalists, the thrust of Loyalist rebuttals to specific tenets of Whig belief, and the political and social conditions which made some colonists unusually dependent on British authority for their security and identity. Another kind of question should probe the Loyalists' view of themselves and focus on their own statements of self-consciousness and self-awareness. Pre-Revolutionary critics and victims of colonial resistance felt conscious of certain political and social *roles* which they tried to play as the imperial controversy progressed; they wrestled with the *dilemma* of adapting, improving, relaxing, or intensifying their performance of those roles as the pre-Revolutionary movement made those roles increasingly awkward; as each individual realized that he was not going to regain his former authority, influence, or equanimity, he communed within himself and gave some expression

to the *anguish* he felt. The Loyalists' understanding and presentation of their roles, dilemmas, and anguish in letters, pamphlets, oratory, state papers, and in the way they dealt with public issues and devised strategies for defending themselves revealed a coherent view of external events and their own character in time of crisis.

A useful tool in the examination of this kind of Loyalist testimony is the concept of *perception*, the process of giving structure to thought and sensations. Perception seeks explanations and patterns in the random data which the senses detect in a social situation; it uses language "to determine or at least to influence what one notices around him"; it is a process which creates categories and "category-systems" in the mind. Perception deals with a man's self-image, emotional and intellectual dexterity and stamina, the imperatives which govern his conduct in times of crisis and the predispositions which operate in periods of routine. By treating pre-Revolutionary opponents of colonial resistance as verbalizing, category building, reflective, self-conscious figures, one can gain access to the interior of their political thought.[1] As the pre-Revolutionary critics and opponents of colonial resistance responded to the crises of that period, they constructed three reasonably distinct models of political reality. One was the enunciation of principle, the repeated statement of legal, historical, and constitutional rules which bound the Empire together and necessarily circumscribed colonial liberty. A second was the search for accommodation, the belief that grounds for compromise existed and could be discovered and exploited through the use of good sense and prudence. A third was the appeal to doctrine, the sometimes shrill, uncompromising insistence that all colonial resistance and remonstrance was morally wrong and aesthetically abhorent.

Thomas Hutchinson was, of course, the pre-eminent Loyalist enunciator of principle, combining a sure grasp of fundamentals with a sensitivity for intricacies. "I have but one set of principles upon government in general and the constitution of this province in particular. There must be one supreme legislature in every state." He admitted, however, that "it is a very difficult matter

1 This paragraph is based on a variety of writings in social psychology and phenomenology. Jerome S. Bruner, "Social Psychology and Perception," in E. E. Maccoby *et al.*, eds., *Readings in Social Psychology* (New York, 1958), pp. 85-94 and Roger Brown, *Social Psychology* (New York, 1965), chapter 12 both discuss the major recent writings in the field and quotations are from the Bruner article. See also Frank P. Chambers, *Perception, Understanding, and Society* (London, 1961), p. 51; Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *The Primacy of Perception* (Evanston, Ill., 1964), p. 25; Zevedi Barbu, *Problems in Historical Psychology* (New York, 1960), pp. 20-22; the extensive discussion of work on motivation in Robert F. Berkhofer, *A Behavior Approach to Historical Analysis* (New York, 1969), pp. 55-67. This scholarship meshes closely with several recent historiographical articles: Samuel H. Beer, "Casual Explanation and Imaginative Re-enactment," and Bruce Kuklick, "The Mind of the Historian," both in *History and Theory,* III (1963), pp. 6-29 and VIII (1969), pp. 313-331, and John Dunn, "The Identity of the History of Ideas," *Philosophy,* XLIII (April, 1968), pp. 85-104.

to determine any certain proportion of freedom necessary to the happiness of a subordinate state."[2] He devoted a lifetime to the search for that "certain proportion of freedom" and we know a great deal about the depth and nature of that commitment from Edmund S. Morgan's analysis of Hutchinson in the Stamp Act crisis, Malcolm Freiberg's dissection of his ambition and his self-doubts, Clifford K. Shipton's defense of his rectitude, and Bailyn's discovery of his constitutional acumen.[3] What this fragmented, somewhat static, portrait lacks is an appreciation of Hutchinson's emotionality – the passions which integrated his roles and aspirations and aggravated his suffering. One way to fill this void is to focus, not only on his manifest principles, ambitions, and skills, but also on the strange paradoxes and polarities of his political character.[4]

The strongest of those polarities was his belief that he was primarily a defender of colonial liberty and that prudent submission to British authority was a subtle strategy for preserving that liberty. As Professor Morgan showed in 1948, Hutchinson privately came close to denying the legitimacy of the entire Grenville program and stated categorically that it did infringe on inherent colonial rights; yet in 1770 he privately proposed a horrifying set of coercive measures for Britain to impose on Massachusetts. Hutchinson was never conscious of any contradiction. The coercion he sadly recommended was intended to have a stunning, sobering effect on the shortsighted and excited men and inaugurate a stabilizing period and thereby strengthen Massachusetts' capacity to resist British encroachments.[5] Hutchinson's tremendous personal reserve created the very suspicions which kept his political life in upheaval; against his aloofness, however, tugged his ambition to provide decisive public leadership. He candidly spoke of this tension in his character during his dispute with the General Court over the Boston Resolves in 1773:

2 Hutchinson to Rev. Eli Forbes, 16 October 1773, and to John Hely Hutchinson, 14 February 1772, Hutchinson Letterbooks, XXVII, pp. 556-57, 296-300, Massachusetts Archives, State House, Boston (available in typescript at the Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston).

3 Morgan, "Thomas Hutchinson and the Stamp Act," *New England Quarterly,* XXI (1942), pp. 459-492; Freiberg, "How to Become a Colonial Governor," *Review of Politics,* XXI (October, 1951), pp. 646-656; Shipton, *Sibley's Harvard Graduates* (Cambridge and Boston, 1933-), VII, pp. 383-413; B. Bailyn, *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), pp. 121-123.

4 This statement is made prior to seeing Professor Bailyn's forthcoming study of Hutchinson, which may well deal with him as a man of passion as well as cold realism. Bailyn's comments in John A. Garraty, ed., *Interpretating American History: Conversations with Historians* (New York, 1970), I, p. 74 treat him as kind of *constant* in eighteenth-century political orthodoxy against which novel pre-Revolutionary ideas and practices can be measured.

5 Morgan, "Thomas Hutchinson and the Stamp Act," pp. 487-492; Donald C. Lord and Robert M. Calhoon, "The Removal of the Massachusetts General Court from Boston, 1769-1772," *Journal of American History,* LV (1969), p. 728, n. 9.

6 *Acadiensis*

> If I am wrong in my principles of government or in the inferences I have drawn from them, I wish to be convinced of my error. I have laid before you the principles of your constitution. If you do not agree with me I wish to know your objections. They may be convincing to me or I may be able to satisfy you of the insufficiency of them. In either case, I hope, we shall be able to put an end to those irregularities which shall ever be the portion of a government where the supreme authority is controverted.[6]

In 1773, that was exactly the kind of dialogue Hutchinson sought to have with his contemporaries — a healing exchange in which he prescribed the premises of the discussion. He could emerge just that far, but no farther, from his private contemplation of the issues of liberty and authority.

Hutchinson struggled intelligently with these conflicting impulses toward withdrawal and involvement. He resisted the temptation to dismiss Whig argument with superficial rebuttals; he regarded the complexity of the pre-Revolutionary debate with great seriousness; this polarity pitted his dismay against his intellect and curiosity. It enabled him to be at once withdrawn and self-conscious and also capable of seeing himself in a larger context. When he became fully engaged in the task of understanding a tenet of Whig belief, Hutchinson brought to his work the full force of his highly controlled emotionality. During the protracted dispute from 1769-1772, over the removal of the General Court from Boston, he tried to breathe life and vitality into the notion that the royal instructions to colonial governors were a positive benefit to the political life of the province. As he elaborated his explanation, the Crown's prerogative became an intimate, all-embracing, pervasive, organic influence which transmuted mobility and finesse to otherwise static executive authority. In turn the governor's receptiveness, discretion, and intelligence in responding to imperial directives determined their effectiveness. Hutchinson constructed an idealized minuet between Crown and governor which was almost poetic and sensuous in its structure and intricacy.[7] Hutchinson, significantly conceived of British power as a throbbing, expansive force which could permeate and activate his own behavior as governor. Colonial leaders conceived of British power in exactly the same fashion; as Professor Bailyn observes, they were transfixed by the "essential . . . aggressiveness" of political power and by its "endlessly propulsive tendency to expand itself beyond legitimate boundaries."[8] Confident that he could serve as a channel and instrument of British authority without damaging the liberty of his province, Hutchinson only succeeded in confirming his enemies' deepest fears about the capacity of the Crown to insinuate itself into the political life of the province.

6 Hutchinson, *Speeches of . . . Governor Hutchinson to the General Assembly . . .* (Boston, 1773), pp. 13-14; see also his "Dialogue between a European and an American [Englishman]," Hutchinson Papers, XXVIII, p. 102, Mass. Arch.

7 Lord and Calhoon, "The Removal of the General Court," pp. 747-48, 753-54.

8 Bailyn, *Ideological Origins,* p. 56.

Hutchinson's insistence on principle and his calculated style of debate and exposition distinguished him from William Smith, Jr. and other moderate critics of colonial resistence who shunned dispute over principle and sought practical, improvised accommodation with Britain. In imperial-colonial disputes, Smith complained in 1767, "both sides fly to the constitution for arguments . . . diametrically opposite to each other . . . . The truth is, that the Empire, long after the Constitution was formed, acquired a new adventitious state, and the question therefore is, not what the Constitution is or was, but what present circumstances considered, it ought to be." The study of "present circumstances" convinced him that "the Constitution, be what it will, ought to bend" enough to accommodate the growing maturity and complexity of the Empire.[9] Smith's conception of a constitution as a malleable instrument which men could shape to serve the public interest and his realization that the British and the colonists necessarily brought to this task different expectations and assumptions were original and almost prophetic insights.

This ability as a constitutional theorist and diagnostician complimented a different set of Smith's predispositions during the pre-Revolutionary period: his fondness for the intricate strategies which his fellow councillors employed in competing for the ear and trust of successive royal governors, especially William Tryon who arrived in 1771. After one protracted struggle Smith believed he had won Tryon's confidence and made him suspicious of the rival Delancey faction. "I shall feed that spirit," he exulted in a moment of revelation, "to disentangle him from a fear of Council and Assembly." During the Tea crisis in December 1773 he tried to use the same methods to guide Tryon's hand during a hazardous period. He beseiged Tryon with suggestions on how to avoid violence if the tea was landed or how to prevent its unloading if violence was unavoidable. The destruction of the tea in Boston took the decision out of Tryon's hands and launched a new period of greater crisis for royal officials. "It must mortify Tryon who had spoken so vauntingly and assured the government of the landing" of the tea, Smith noted with customary care. But he was much more aware that his own attempts to guide Tryon's hand had been of little practical value to the governor. "Tryon will think I animated him to render him unpopular," he lamented; "how dangerous it is to give private advice."[10]

Smith appeared in 1774-1775 simply to be a conservative gravitating to the right of his former allies in the Livingston faction; in reality he was wholly engrossed in working out the implications of his chosen roles as constitutional analyst and behind-the-scenes manipulator of government and party policy.

9 Robert M. Calhoon, ed., "William Smith's Alternative to the American Revolution," *William and Mary Quarterly,* third series, XXII (1965), pp. 105-118.

10 W. H. W. Sabine, ed., *Historical Memoirs from . . . 1763 to . . . 1776 of William Smith* (New York, 1956), pp. 118, 156-164.

He wrote and circulated numerous essays on the constitutional and tactical problems facing colonial leaders and propounded an almost clinical set of negotiating tactics, which included "feeling the pulse of the ministry," proceeding "without a word about rights," and exercising exquisite tact and timing. When all this came to naught he responded by writing his longest and most moving exposition of the issues of the Revolution, one which juxtaposed a scathing indictment of British policy and defense of colonial liberty with an absolute refusal to sanction armed rebellion. The conflict between the two commitments reduced him to an abject state of intellectual immobility long before his apparently opportunistic conversion to the British cause. "I persuade myself," he told an inquisitive committee of safety on July 4, 1776, "that Great Britain will discern the propriety of negotiating for a pacification." He could not relinquish the hope that the elusive search for accommodation would transfix the lives of other men as completely as it had his own.[11]

The enunciation of principle often reflected a concern with law and the details of imperial administration while the search for accommodation expressed an awareness of the subtleties of colonial politics. In contrast, the appeal to doctrine came from men on the periphery of political life and imperial government. Eschewing legal and practical objections to colonial resistance, they focussed directly on the immortality and ugliness of discontent. The high Anglican polemicists were, of course, the quintessential doctrinaire Loyalists and Bernard Bailyn has most effectively shown that their writings struck with jugular accuracy at the most significant tenets of Whig theory. In Samuel Seabury's vivid denunciation of violence and intimidation, Jonathan Boucher's taut authoritarian logic, and Thomas Bradbury Chandler's breathtaking endorsement of subordination, Bailyn found "wrathful epitaphs" to an "ancient, honorable, moribund philosophy" of order and obedience.[12]

Seabury's fame as a polemicist rests on his colorful and pugnacious denunciation of whig tactics for enforcing the Continental Association boycott on trade with Britain in late-1774 and early-1775. But his vivid language has distracted attention away from the systematic argument which formed the core of the *Letters of a Westchester Farmer*— the nature of perception itself. Seabury was fascinated with the way in which the mind handles sense impressions and organizes them into concepts. He beseached his readers to practice enough sophistication to subject each new impression of rebellion to careful and critical scrutiny. Unless men assessed the future implications of their actions and appreciated the power and destructiveness of mass contagion, they could not prudently restrain their enthusiasms nor calm the passions of their fellow men. The root of the problem was the finite capacity of the mind and the limitless

11 *Ibid.*, pp. 224-228c, 271-277, 279.

12 Bailyn, *Ideological Origins*, p. 312; a highly original but gingerly examination of high Tory ideology is Michael D. Clark, "Jonathan Boucher: The Mirror of Reaction," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, XXXIII (1969), pp. 19-32.

appeal of false political ideas. "At present politics seems to engross almost every body," he complained in 1769, "and leaves no room for more serious and important reflection." The result by 1774 was a "sullen, sulky obstinacy" which "takes possession of us .... Preposterous pride! ... It degrades instead of exalting our characters" and was the product of "all the *insidious arts* that evilminded and *designing* men can possibly make use of." Only by assuming a posture of aloof, watchful skepticism could a man avoid contamination from glib, appealing, but unsupportable patriot contentions. In the midst of a long series of obtuse propositions — one, for example, resurrected virtual representation in terms which no politically knowledgeable Loyalist would have defended — Seabury abruptly related the discussion to his central concern. "That you will perceive the force of this reasoning," he told his polemical rival, Alexander Hamilton, "I cannot pretend to say. A person ... with jaundice sees no color but yellow. Party heat, the fever of liberty, may vitiate the mind as much as jaundice does the eyes."[13]

Hutchinson, Smith, and Seabury only suggest the distinctiveness of the ideas, beliefs, sensibilities, and patterns of response exhibited by men who enunciated principle, searched for accommodations, or appealed to doctrine during the pre-Revolutionary controversy. Although principle, accommodation, and doctrine were not mutually exclusive categories into which men can be placed, the leading prominent opponents of colonial resistance and the most widely circulated anti-whig ideas of the pre-Revolutionary period almost all adhere to one of these three modes of thought and feeling. Principle, accommodation, and doctrine were orientations and assumptions which gave direction and focus to men's thinking and conduct. In some cases individuals shared more than one of these orientations. John Wentworth of New Hampshire was preeminently a man of accommodation with his warm association with the Rockingham Whigs, thorough contempt for the policies and style of officials like Hillsborough, and primary concern for the interests of his province. He gracefully adapted to a substantial reduction in his family's power in New Hampshire during his governorship. He had a rare degree of serenity which enabled him — without a trace of ambivalence — to contemplate the use of military force to uphold British authority and accept without apparent bitterness his own exile from America. No other Loyalist embodied so fully as Wentworth a congenial attachment to both principle and accommodation.[14]

In most cases, a man who partook of more than one of these orientations was dominated by one particular view of political reality and borrowed inci-

13 Seabury to Rev. Daniel Burton, 17 December 1769 and 29 March 1770, Society for the Propagation of the Gospel Papers, Fulham Palace, London; ms. sermon, Lambeth Palace, London; Clarence Vance, ed., *Letters of a Westchester Farmer* (White Plains, New York, 1930), pp. 152, 72-75, 104, 111-112, 116.

14 Wentworth to Dr. Belham, 9 August 1768, Wentworth Letterbooks, New Hampshire Department of Records and Archives, Concord, New Hampshire, quoted extensively in L. S. Mayo, *John Wentworth* ... (Cambridge, 1921), pp. 122-124.

dentally from the others. Joseph Galloway desperately wanted to engineer single-handedly an imperial compromise in 1774. The structure of his ideas about the preservation of liberty and the scope of his ambition to heal the Empire in one brilliant stroke dictated that he pronounce rigid principles about the nature of the Empire and that he insist on the complete acquiescence of other colonial leaders to his leadership. When men did not listen to his explanations of principle and liberty and ignored his pretentions to leadership, they created an unexpectedly severe dilemma: they shattered his image of himself as a master of political theory and public persuasion. Galloway then replaced this shattered self-image with one still more magnificent and yet also consistent with his initial posture as an advocate of accommodation and enunciator of principle: "I have deduced your rights and explained your duties. I have laid before you the constitutional extent of parliamentary jurisdiction. I have pointed to the mode which you ought to pursue for a restoration of those rights." His concept of role and the dilemma in which it placed him compelled Galloway to locate all of the wisdom necessary to a solution of the imperial impasse in his own mind. At each stage his perception undermined his advocacy of accommodation and intensified his insistence on principle.[15]

Orientations toward principle, accommodation, or doctrine not only overlapped, they also cut across without completely severing other intellectual alignments during the pre-Revolutionary controversy. Alan Heimert has associated rationalist theology with loyalism or with lukewarm, insensitive support of the Whig movement.[16] In direct conflict with the Calvinist Whigs, the rationalist clergy did not believe that British policy sprang from utter human depravity nor believe that confession and repentance was an integral preliminary stage in the defense of American liberty. To the rationalist clergy sin afflicted the thoughtless and unreflective. In political terms the sins which needed confessing and forgiving in 1774-1775 were "turbulent desires, secret views of fostering party spirit, lust for unjust dominion, and impatience with lawful government."[17] In elaboration of Heimert's thesis it must also be pointed out that rationalists were sub-divided into accommodating and doctrinaire Loyalist positions. The accommodating rationalists included Anglicans like William Smith and Jacob Duche and Congregationalists like Gad Hitchcock and Daniel Shute. They endorsed just enough remonstrance to bring colonial discontent to British attention but not so much as to exacerbate the conflict. The doctrinaire rationalist clergy led by Boucher, Chandler, Cooper, and Seabury eschewed this search for a moderate position: political opposition was not an instrument which men might employ responsibly; its "bitterness

15 Robert M. Calhoon, "'I have deduced your rights': Joseph Galloway's Concept of his Role, 1774-1775," *Pennsylvania History,* XXV (1968), pp. 356-78.

16 Alan Heimert, *Religion and the American Mind: From the Great Awakening to the Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass., 1966).

17 William Smith, *The Works of William Smith, D.D.* (Philadelphia, 1803), II, p. 123.

and wrath and anger and clamour and evil speaking . . . bitter ungodly spirit toward those who differ . . . in things civil or religious" were intrinsically evil," explained the Rev. Samuel Andrews of Connecticut in 1775. The "confidence" and sense of "girding" for righteous conflict which he saw all around him — which the accommodating rationalists wanted to dignify, channel ,and moderate — blinded men, in Andrews' view, to the truth that political change was the prerogative of God and not of men.[18]

Just as Andrews felt compelled to look squarely at the moral earnestness of his Whig contemporaries, most pre-Revolutionary Loyalists felt driven to discover and articulate a single quintessential insight into the causes of the Revolution and of their own plight. The reconstruction of their perception leads directly to each man's discovery of some central truth about himself and the Revolution. For Egerton Leigh, it came when he discovered that he could relate every step in South Carolina's political and constitutional development to some stage in his own humiliation and downfall. Once he sensed that unity and coherence in South Carolina history, he could at the same time write a trenchant account of the province's political development and also establish his own identity by accentuating the very presumptions about himself which most outraged Charlestown's planter-merchant elite and made him a pariah.[19] Jonathan Sewall's withering contempt for the Whig protest in Massachusetts reflected a conflict he had felt throughout his adult life: tension between his intellectual distinction and courage on one hand and his insecurity about his social and political pre-eminence on the other. He developed an ironic, slightly cynical, and sometimes bemused dismay over any exuberant human enterprise. These defences protected him from the kind of volcanic eruptions of rage which racked his cohort, Peter Oliver, and enabled him to locate the source of disorder in Massachusetts, which "is, I say, so truly astonishing, so entirely out of the course of nature, so repugnant to the known principles which most forceably actuate the human mind that we must search deeper for the grand and hidden spring . . . . This is an enthusiasm in politics like that which religious notions inspire, that drives men on with an unnatural impetuosity [and] baffles and confounds all calculation grounded upon rational principles."[20]

The Loyalist perception of the coming of the American Revolution consisted of brilliantly incisive but partially formed and almost stillborn political fears, apprehensions, uncertainties, impulses toward obstruction, and sensations of ambivalence, immobility, and helplessness. This fragmentation and

18 Samuel Andrews, *A Discourse Shewing the Necessity of Joining Internal Repentance with the External Profession of It* . . . (New Haven, 1775), pp. 15-18.

19 Robert M. Calhoon and Robert M. Weir, "'The Scandalous History of Sir Egerton Leith,'" *William and Mary Quarterly,* third series, XXVI (1969). pp. 47-74.

20 Sewall to General Frederick Haldimand, 30 May 1775, quoted in Jack P. Greene, ed., *Colonies to Nation, 1763-1776* (New York, 1967), pp. 266-268.

lack of coalescence in pre-Revolutionary Loyalist ideology testified to the fragility of elaborate political ideas in eighteenth-century America and the rapid mortality rate of particular formulations of thought as public men struggled continually to revamp slightly out-of-date intellectual postures. In a political culture which took ideas very seriously, this instability cast marginal political figures like the critics and victims of pre-Revolutionary protest into an excrutiating position. This unstable, fluid political culture not only dominated the eighteenth century — as Jack P. Greene's two recent articles on colonial pessimism and anxiety dramatically emphasized — but elements of this malady continued well into the nineteenth century and provided much of the distraught energy expended by James M. Banner's Federalists and Fred Somkin's Fourth of July orators.[21]

With the commencement of hostilities in 1775 and the Declaration of Independence in 1776, these discrete categories of conservatism and defense of the established order tended to dissolve. War and the creation of new state governments widened the scope of the conflict and caught thousands of previously obscure men in the machinery of internal security. The people that Professor Nelson calls "The Tory Rank and File" were clusters of "cultural minorities" scattered throughout the geographical and social periphery of American life: religious pacifists, pre-British Indian traders, backcountry southern farmers, unassimilated ethnic minorities, as well as isolated individuals everywhere impelled by custom, instinct, greed, accident, resentment, or bad luck to oppose independence.[22] They expressed their opposition to the Revolution in more elemental ways than did their counterparts in the pre-Revolutionary controversy. As the War for Independence created Loyalist communities in occupied New York, Charlestown, and Philadelphia and as communities of exiles formed in England and Canada, a new sense of Loyalist identity emerged: the Loyalists' ironic discovery that they were victims of both American aggression and British incompetence. That understandable, if somewhat irrational paranoia, became a positive force in shaping post-Revolutionary Loyalist behavior. It engendered a tough, realistic, and implacable determination to surmount the difficulties of rebuilding their lives and constructing a new political and social order in British North America. The pre-Revolutionary Loyalist perception was only one ingredient in this long and fascinating process. But if this interpretation of the stages of Loyalist thought is a valid

21 Jack P. Greene, "Search for Identity: An Interpretation of the Meaning of Selected Patterns of Social Response in Eighteenth-Century America," *Journal of Social History,* III (1970), pp. 189-220 and "Political Mimesis: A Consideration of the British Colonies in the Eighteenth-Century," *American Historical Review,* LXXV (1969), pp. 337-367; James M. Banner, *To the Hartford Convention: The Federalists and the Origins of Party Politics in Massachusetts, 1789-1815* (New York, 1970) and Fred Somkin, *Unquiet Eagle: Memory and Desire in the Idea of American Freedom, 1815-1860* (Ithaca, 1967).

22 See W. H. Nelson, *The American Tory* (Oxford, 1961), chapter V.

preliminary diagnosis of the historical problem, then the riches of the *Loyalist Papers Project* may well fuel a far-reaching inquiry into the comparative intellectual history of colonial America, Revolutionary America and England, and post-Revolutionary Canada.[23]

23 On these patterns see Wallace Brown, *The Good Americans: The Loyalists in the American Revolution* (New York, 1969), chapter 6; David V. J. Bell, "Nation and Non-Nation: A New Analysis of the Loyalists and the American Revolution" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1969); and Mary Beth Norton, *The British-Americans: The Loyalist Exiles in England, 1774-1789* (Boston, 1972).